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ABSTRACT

4QInstruction has enriched our understanding of the way Second Temple Jewish authors interpreted Genesis 1-3. The Qumran text provides a fuller sense of the ways the figure of Adam was read during that period by adding a sectarian and primarily positive take on the biblical portrayals of the first human. Further, with 4QInstruction we are able to identify traditions that may have influenced other Early Jewish authors, such as Philo and the author of 4 Ezra. Philo’s double creation accounts in Leg. 1.31-32 and Opif. 134-35 suggest that, although significantly influenced by Hellenistic thought, his interpretation of Genesis 1-3 may have also been shaped by Palestinian Jewish traditions. The author of 4 Ezra, although colored by the apocalyptic tradition in light of the destruction of the temple, may have used the Genesis 1-3 exegetical traditions found in 4QInstruction to articulate the future rewards of righteous Israelites who obey the Torah. Philo and 4 Ezra appears to have appropriated and reworked exegetical traditions regarding Genesis 1-3 attested in wisdom literature composed in Palestine in the second century B.C.E.

With 4QInstruction it is also possible to observe a larger shift from the second century B.C.E. to the first century C.E. in which Adam is increasingly used to account for human sinfulness, as exemplified most clearly in 4 Ezra. 4QInstruction not only provides a better understanding of the traditions used by individual Second Temple authors, the more complete picture of how Adam was interpreted during this period more clearly reveals a larger trend that was not available before the publication of this sapiential Qumran text.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: OH, THE HUMANITY!

1.1 The Problem

In this study, I will attempt to demonstrate how 4QInstruction has enriched our understanding of the way Second Temple Jewish authors interpreted Genesis 1-3. In particular, I will examine how authors used the figure of Adam when reflecting on the human condition. Early Jewish exegetes regularly focused on specific elements of the creation of Adam in Genesis 1-3. They paid particular attention to the claim that he was created “in the image of God” in Gen 1:26-27, and the description of Adam as formed from dust in the garden of Eden in Gen 2:7. The publication of 4QInstruction in 1999 and subsequent scholarship on its contents provide a more complete picture of how Early Jewish authors developed conceptions of humankind based on the biblical portrayals of Adam. A key contribution of this study is to demonstrate how 4QInstruction helps us establish a sort of “typology” of the way Second Temple period authors interpreted the biblical portrayals of Adam. The main conceptions of Adam that are dominant in Early Jewish literature include Ben Sira’s use of the portrayals of Adam to understand the human condition in general; Philo’s association of Adam with humanity in a general sense while also using him to distinguish between the wicked and the virtuous; and 4 Ezra’s use of Adam to depict the current state of sinful humanity and the rewards enjoyed by the righteous in the eschatological garden of Eden. By incorporating the interpretation of the biblical portrayals of Adam.

Adam in 4QInstruction—primarily his association with the angels and the elect—into our knowledge of the major interpretative traditions during the period, it is possible to better understand them. One of the key issues is whether Adam is employed to understand the nature of a small segment of humankind—the elect—or humanity in general.

I will also explore the possibility that Genesis 1-3 traditions attested in 4QInstruction were appropriated and reworked by other Second Temple Jewish authors. I argue that Philo and 4 Ezra were both influenced by Genesis 1-3 traditions found in 4QInstruction. This Qumran composition further helps us identify a trend from the second century B.C.E. to the first century C.E. in which Adam was increasingly interpreted to account for human sinfulness.

1.1.1 The Anthropology of 4QInstruction Rooted in Genesis 1-3

Since 4QInstruction is central in this study, some review of its discussion of the nature of the human condition and exegesis of Genesis 1-3 is merited before the layout and structure of the dissertation can be explained. 4QInstruction contends that there are two contrasting kinds of humans—the ☡♫ ☣ (“ἁοὶ ὀιῖ”) and the ☡♫ ☣ (“ἁοὶ ὀιῖ”). (This topic is discussed at length in Chapter Two.) This dichotomy is rooted in Genesis 1-3, primarily the portrayal of Adam. The ☡♫ ☣ signifies the elect, who are like the angels and possess access to supernatural revelation. The ☡♫ ☣ represents the non-elect. They do not have access to revelation. While the ☡♫ ☣ can be understood as possessing the hope of a blissful eternal life, like the angels, the expression ☡♫ ☣ denotes human mortality and the finitude of physical existence. The main lesson of the passage is for the ☡♫ ☣ to learn that he is like the ☡♫ ☣. This group should be understood as a model for the ☡♫ ☣ to follow. The addressee is distinguished from the ☡♫ ☣, as are the ☡♫ ☣ (4Q418 81 1-2). He has access to the ☡♫ ☣; the ☡♫ ☣ have the vision of Hagu. The ☡♫ ☣ are fashioned “according to the likeness of the holy ones”
The instruction is in “the lot of the angels” (4Q418 81 4-5). The addressee are associated with Adam (אדם); the addressee has authority over the garden of Eden (4Q423 1). The vision of Hagü passage as a whole constitutes a lesson from which, after much reflection and study, the addressee could attain understanding about key aspects of his elect status. 4QInstruction contains several anthropological reflections based on Genesis 1-3 that were not well known in Second Temple Judaism prior to its discovery. This is most evident in the text’s use of Adam in a “sectarian” manner—4QInstruction turns to Adam and exegetes this figure to explain to the elect the nature of their own elect status. Further, the composition also includes the motif that takes the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 as conveying a “high” anthropology—associated with the heavenly realm, while the Adam of Gen 2:7 is read as portraying a “low” anthropology—emphasizing the base, creaturely aspects of humanity.

1.1.2 Scholarship Addressing the Interpretation of Genesis 1-3 in Early Judaism

There has been a great deal of scholarship on the interpretation of Genesis 1-3 in Early Judaism, but none approach the topic in the same manner as this study. Concerning the topic of the interpretation of the portrayals of the biblical Adam during the Second Temple Period, there has only been one monograph written in the previous 25 years: John R. Levison’s Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch, published in 1988. This study was done well before the official publication of 4QInstruction in 1999, thus Levison does not address the interpretation of Genesis 1-3 in 4QInstruction. Further, he does not include any Genesis 1-3

---

attested in the other Dead Sea Scrolls. In his study, Levison is primarily concerned with
emphasizing the differences in the interpretations of the biblical Adam that existed in Early
Judaism. He asserts that there is clear diversity in the extant traditions, which indicates that
motifs of a common, non-biblical “Adam speculation” or “Adam myth” posited by earlier
scholars do not exist. Instead, he argues, each interpretation of Adam is taken directly from
Genesis and is adapted according to the author’s Tendenz. Levison states his thesis as: “Early
Jewish authors creatively developed portraits of Adam by adapting the Genesis narratives to their
individual Tendenzen.” To argue his view, Levison analyzes seven authors: Ben Sira, Wisdom
of Solomon, Philo, Jubilees, Josephus, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch. He also extends his sampling
beyond his initially established guidelines to include the Vita Adae et Evae. While Levison’s
book provides a helpful overview of how seven Second Temple Jewish writings portrayed
Adam, the absence of the Dead Sea Scrolls significantly limits the contribution of his study. By
incorporating the Genesis 1-3 traditions attested in 4QInstruction, I believe we are able to gain a
better sense of both the diversity argued by Levison, but also the unity of traditions attested
during the Second Temple period.

3 Levison, Portraits of Adam, 145. He is specifically referring to the assertions of authors such as Robin Scroggs,
The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966); Egon Brandenburger, Adam und
Christus: Exegetisch-religions-geschichtliche Untersuchung zu Röm 5,12-21 (1 Kor 15) (WMANT 7; Neukirchen:
Neukirchener Verlag, 1962); William D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline
Theology (4th ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980); Jacob Jervell, Imago Dei: Gen 1,26 f im Spätjudentum, in der
Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen, (FRLANT 58; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1960); Charles K.
Barrett, From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology (Hewlett Lectures; New York: Charles Scribner’s
Sons, 1962).

4 Levison, Portraits of Adam, 145.

5 Levison, Portraits of Adam, 29, uses four criteria to determine which texts should be included in his study: Texts
must: 1) be confidently dated to have originated ca. 200 B.C.E.-135 C.E.; 2) be of Jewish origin; 3) have an
adequate number of references to Adam; and 4) have a “discernible Tendenz.”
Gary A. Anderson’s 2001 book *The Genesis of Perfection: Adam and Eve in Jewish and Christian Imagination* also emphasizes the diversity of the interpretations of the biblical Adam. Anderson includes Second Temple Jewish texts, such as *Jubilees* and *Vita Adae et Evae*. His study extends beyond the Second Temple period. Anderson uses a variety of sources to describe how both Jews and Christians in the first few centuries C.E. understood the story of Adam. He draws from rabbinic Judaism and the early church, from the commentaries of Origen and Augustine, from later writings such as Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, from early iconography, and from liturgical writings. Although he provides a rich survey of traditions, he does not refer to Ben Sira, which includes the oldest datable interpretation of the story of Adam, or to the Dead Sea Scrolls. James L. Kugel’s *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era*, published in 1998, offers a thorough sampling of the exegetical traditions that grew from early interpreters’ reading of the Pentateuch between the third century B.C.E. and the first century C.E. Chapter Three provides a methodical discussion on the interpretation of the portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3. Although several Dead Sea Scrolls are discussed, the wisdom texts (including 4QInstruction) are not incorporated into Kugel’s survey.

George H. van Kooten, in his *Paul’s Anthropology in Context: The Image of God, Assimilation to God and Tripartite Man in Ancient Judaism, Ancient Philosophy and Early Christianity*, published in 2008, argues that Paul’s anthropology is most obviously influenced by the ideas reflected in Philo’s work. He contends that this is clearest in the apostle’s interpretation of Gen 1:27 according to Platonic categories. By way of filling in the backdrop

---

6 Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 93-144.

for his study, van Kooten dedicates an entire chapter to surveying the Early Jewish texts that refer to the Genesis proclamation that humanity is made in “the image of God.” While the chapter is comprehensive, each text is discussed only briefly and seldom is secondary scholarship referenced. Moreover, the secondary literature that he does interact with is done so in a terse manner and he often fails to account for why he does not agree with a particular author. One possible exception is his treatment of 4QInstruction. While he does address key aspects of the composition’s interpretation of Gen 1:27, I believe his final assessment of the anthropology of 4Q417 i 15-18 is incorrect, specifically his argument that אדам refers to humanity in general rather than Adam (see section 2.4.2.3). Further, van Kooten does not address the Early Jewish anthropological assertions based on the portrayal of Adam in Gen 2:7. John J. Collins has consistently demonstrated the benefit of comparing the various interpretations of Adam found in Second Temple Jewish literature, including the Dead Sea Scrolls. Collins’ contributions to the field are invaluable. The interpretation of Adam in Second Temple Jewish literature has been recently addressed by Matthew J. Goff. He has published a number of articles and book

---

8 Van Kooten, Paul’s Anthropology in Context, 1-91. Other monographs that include a discussion of the “image of God” tend to focus exclusively on either the Hebrew Bible or the New Testament. Only Jerwell, Imago Dei, contains an extensive discussion of the image of God in Second Temple Judaism. The best treatment of this topic is Levison, Portraits of Adam. However, as noted above, his study does not address the Dead Sea Scrolls.


chapters demonstrating that several Early Jewish compositions include anthropological reflections rooted in the biblical portrayals of Adam that are also attested in 4QInstruction. Both Collins and Goff contend that the Genesis 1-3 traditions found in 4QInstruction have been appropriated and reworked by other Early Jewish authors. This dissertation builds upon their scholarship by offering a monograph length study that integrates 4QInstruction and its exegesis of Adam in Genesis 1-3 into our knowledge of this topic in Second Temple literature.

1.2 The Approach of this Study

In order to show the manner in which 4QInstruction has changed the landscape of how scholars understand Early Jewish exegetical traditions of Genesis 1-3, I will compare the Genesis 1-3 traditions of 4QInstruction to those found in other Second Temple Jewish compositions. In this study, I will examine the anthropological considerations rooted in the biblical depictions of Adam primarily according to Ben Sira, Philo of Alexandria, and 4 Ezra. In this study, Chapter Two is dedicated to 4QInstruction; Chapter Three, Ben Sira; Chapter Four, Philo; Chapter Five, 4 Ezra. Although I do not dedicate an entire chapter to them, I will also engage several other compositions, such as the Wisdom of Solomon, Vita Adae et Evae, texts from the Enochic tradition, and several Dead Sea Scrolls outside of 4QInstruction. These compositions also contain significant Genesis 1-3 interpretations. The sampling of the Second Temple Jewish interpretations of the biblical portrayals of Adam used in the following chapters is by no means comprehensive. Such an endeavor is well beyond the scope of this study. However, the four texts that I will chiefly examine provide a diverse cross section of major anthropological

---

perspectives rooted in Genesis 1-3 from the late Second Temple period. Ben Sira uses the portrayals of Adam to understand the human condition in general and also roots the election of Israel in Genesis 1-3; Philo emphasizes Adam’s association with humanity in general as well as both the virtuous and the wicked; 4 Ezra uses Adam to depict the current conditions experienced by sinful humanity and the future rewards of the righteous individuals from Israel in the eschatological garden of Eden. Each exemplifies a key issue for understanding how the figure of Adam was read in the Second Temple period—that he is used as a focal point for reflection on either humankind as a whole or a distinct group of people. 4QInstruction helps provide a more complete typology of major ways Adam was interpreted in Early Judaism. The Qumran text primarily associates Adam with the elect rather than humankind in general, but also understands the dual biblical descriptions of Adam as conveying two opposed kinds of humans—the רוח הרוח and the בשר בשר, with the former associated with the angels and the elect while the latter is linked to the non-elect and human mortality. The emphasis on connecting Adam with the elect and the angels in 4QInstruction gives a better sense of the exegetical background of Philo’s and 4 Ezra’s discussions of Adam. Similar to 4QInstruction, both of these authors turn to Adam to explain the condition of the virtuous, in the case of Philo, and the righteous in the case of 4 Ezra.

1.2.1 The Structure of the Dissertation

I begin the study in Chapter One by providing a basic definition of anthropology and how it is understood in a religious context. I then give several examples of how the portrayals of Adam have been interpreted in Early Judaism. This provides background to how 4QInstruction adds to understanding the exegetical traditions that were available prior to its publication in 1999. Chapter Two includes an analysis of the assessment of humanity in 4QInstruction. In this chapter, I examine the anthropology of the text based on an interpretation of the biblical
portrayals of Adam that builds upon the scholarship of John J. Collins and Matthew J. Goff. This chapter functions as the basis for examining the interpretations of the portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 in other Early Jewish compositions addressed in the subsequent chapters of the study. In Chapter Three, I analyze the sapiential composition, the Wisdom of Ben Sira. I primarily focus on three passages that contain the sage’s anthropology rooted in Genesis 1-3 (17:1-10; 15:14-17; 33:10-15). I argue that Ben Sira interpreted the portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 to provide a general description of the human condition and to fit his two-tiered conception of humanity based on the apportionment of wisdom given to Israel and the nations. Israel is on the top tier and all other nations are below. The examination of this rough contemporary of 4QInstruction highlights the two different interpretations contained in these two texts and provides a broader context in which to understand them. Chapter Four is primarily dedicated to Philo of Alexandria. I focus on the double creation of humanity accounts given by Philo in Leg. 1.31-32 and Opif. 134-35. In this chapter, I argue that although Philo’s anthropological reflections rooted in Genesis 1-3 were extensively influenced by Hellenistic philosophy, his ideas were also shaped by Jewish Palestinian sapiential thought attested in 4QInstruction. I also discuss the interpretation of Genesis 1-3 found in the contemporary Alexandrian composition, the Wisdom of Solomon. Chapter Five addresses the anthropological reflections of the apocalyptic work 4 Ezra. I contend that the author of 4 Ezra turns to Adam to describe the present condition of humanity and appropriates exegetical traditions that are used to portray the elect in 4QInstruction and applies them to the eschatological rewards promised to the righteous after death. Chapter Six comprises the conclusions of the study.
1.3 Humanity in Relation to God: Theological Anthropology

Anthropology is the study of humankind. The discipline is broad, and not limited to the exegesis of Genesis 1-3, although this study focuses on the use of these chapters in anthropological reflection. Anthropology includes the study of when, where, and how humans originated, human behavior, and their physical, social, and cultural development.\(^\text{11}\) In a religious context, anthropology is a theological discipline that attempts to provide a systematic explanation of three primary aspects of humanity in relation to God: 1) the origin of humans; 2) the human condition; and 3) the destiny of humanity.\(^\text{12}\) This approach is known as theological anthropology.\(^\text{13}\) In this study, I use the term “anthropology” to refer to individual theological anthropology, as opposed to other aspects of the discipline, such as social anthropology. The definition of the human condition that I will be working from is based on the work of John Kekes: the human condition encompasses the unique and inescapable features of being human in a social, cultural, and personal context. It can be described as the irreducible part of humanity that is inherent and not connected to factors such as gender, race, or class (e.g., death).\(^\text{14}\) Thus, I focus my discussion on the anthropological assertions that affect both male and female. There are no systematic theological anthropologies in the extant Early Jewish literature. However, there are several compositions, such as the texts examined in this study, which provide anthropological

---


reflections, all of which are from a theological perspective. In these texts, Genesis 1-3 often serves as the backbone of the authors’ views concerning humanity.

1.3.1 Theological Anthropology in Second Temple Judaism

The first three chapters of the Hebrew Bible include two creation accounts (Gen 1:1-2:4a and 2:4b-3:24). Neither of these accounts is extensively engaged in the Hebrew Bible outside of Genesis 1-3. The notion that humanity was made in the image of God in Gen 1:26-27 seems to all but disappear after the prohibition against murder in Gen 9:6. The story of Adam and Eve recounted in Genesis 2-3 appears rarely and obliquely in the Hebrew Bible. Ezekiel 28 invokes Eden—“the garden of God”—and describes Adam as covered in “every precious stone” (v. 13; cf. Gen 13:10; 1 Enoch 20-36). As argued by Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, Ezekiel knew a tradition about Eden that is quite different from the version of the story of Adam and Eve in Genesis 2-3. Interpretations of the biblical creation of humanity accounts do not begin to become extensive and prominent until the late Second Temple period.


16 Concerning this issue in relation to the dating of the J (Yahwist) source, see Richard E. Friedman, “Torah (Pentateuch),” ABD, 6:605-22.

17 Collins, “Before the Fall,” 294; Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “Eden and Paradise: The Garden Motif in Some Early Jewish Texts (1 Enoch and other texts found at Qumran),” in Paradise Interpreted, Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity (ed. G. P. Luttikhuizen; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 37-62. Ezekiel 31 compares the king of Assyria to a cedars of Lebanon and says that no tree in “the garden of God” could compare with him, and that all the trees of Eden envied him. Ezek 31:8b-9: “no tree in the garden of God was like it in beauty. I made it beautiful with its mass of branches, the envy of all the trees of Eden that were in the garden of God.”

18 Moshe Greenberg, Ezekiel 21-37 (AB 22A; New York: Double Day, 1997), 593, contends that Ezekiel contains “known mythical motifs freshly combined in a unique structure.” The “known mythical motifs” are thought to be a combination of the P and J accounts in Genesis. However, key features of Ezekiel’s poem have no parallel in Genesis, while key features of the Genesis story have no parallel in Ezekiel. From this account, the only thing that can be inferred is that Eden was known as the garden of God. Ezek 28:12-19 places the garden of God (Eden) on the mount of the gods (v. 13). Ezekiel does not mention any trees, but instead stones of fire (v. 14). Although the description of the location is different, there are thematic parallels. Adam and Eve, along with the cherub in Ezekiel’s account, have gained some sort of knowledge. They are also expelled from the garden. Both texts describe the end of those who once dwelled in the garden. Further, Genesis states that humans will return to “dust” (מות), while Ezekiel uses the term “ashes” (ינש). See Tigchelaar, “Eden and Paradise,” 37-38.
In each of the two creation narratives in Genesis 1-3, humanity is portrayed differently. Second Temple Jewish authors would regularly turn to the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 to assert a “high” anthropology—associated with the heavenly realm, while the Adam of Gen 2:7 was consistently read as portraying a “low” anthropology—emphasizing the base, creaturely aspects of humans. In both accounts, there are several ambiguous elements. This has led to numerous interpretations of the portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3. For example, Ben Sira appeals to both the portrayal of Adam in Gen 1:26-27 and Gen 2:7 to describe humanity (see section 3.2.1). The sage emphasizes the “low,” creaturely trait of human mortality by appealing to the creation of Adam out of the earth in Gen 2:7: “The Lord created human beings out of earth, and makes them return to it again. He gave them a fixed number of days” (17:1-2a). The sage continues by alluding to Gen 1:26-27 and states that in spite of human mortality, God “granted them authority over everything on the earth. He endowed them with strength like his own, and made them in his own image” (vv. 2b-3). The Adam of Genesis 1 is used to highlight the “high” anthropological assertion that humans have been made in God’s image. Further, Ben Sira associates possessing the “knowledge of understanding” and being shown “good and evil” with being made in the image of God (17:6-7). Elsewhere, Ben Sira appeals to Gen 2:7 to emphasize humanity’s base and creaturely nature, along with God’s sovereignty (33:10; see section 3.4.1). In each of these accounts, Adam is interpreted by Ben Sira as the paradigm of humanity. The sage uses the portrayal of Adam in Gen 1:26-27 to stress humanity’s similarities to God, while the Adam of Gen 2:7 is employed to emphasize humankind’s creaturely characteristics.

In the Wisdom of Solomon, the author appeals to the portrayal of Adam in Gen 1:26-27 to argue that humanity was originally created to be immortal: “God created us for incorruption,
and made us in the image of his own eternity” (Wis 2:23; see section 4.2.2.1.4.2).19 Pseudo-
Solomon, similar to Ben Sira, appeals to the Adam of Gen 2:7 to emphasize human mortality: “I
also am mortal, like everyone else, a descendant of the first-formed child of earth” (7:1; cf. 9:15).
The author goes on to identify the soul with that which God endows Adam in Gen 2:7 as the
image of God (Gen 1:26-27)—the part of humanity that is immortal (15:11). The divine aspects
of humanity—those associated with immortality and the heavenly realm—are conveyed by
exegeting the Adam of Gen 1:26-27, while mortality is highlighted using the Adam of Gen 2:7.

Philo of Alexandria appeals to both creation accounts in a similar manner as the Wisdom
of Solomon. (This is discussed throughout Chapter Four). In Leg. 1.31-32, Philo explains that
the two portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 refer to two very different races of humanity, which
he identifies as ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἄγιος (“the heavenly man”) and ὁ γῆνος ἄνθρωπος (“the earthly
man”). ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is in the image of God—“incorruptible” and does not participate in
anything earthly (Gen 1:26-27; cf. Opif. 24-25; 68-88). ὁ γῆνος ἄνθρωπος, in contrast,
possesses a composite nature of body and soul, is corruptible and associated with the earth (Gen
2:7; see section 4.2.2.1). In Opif. 134-35, Philo understands the biblical portrayals of Adam as
emphasizing different aspects of the human condition (see section 4.2.2.2). Philo reads the
depiction of Adam in Gen 2:7 as referring to composite humanity, consisting of body and soul.
The soul, he contends, is the part of humanity made “according to the image of God” (κατὰ τὴν
εἰκόνα θεοῦ). Philo further claims that the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 is not only similar to God, but
also the angels (Sacr. 5-7; see section 4.2.2.2.1.5.1). Philo clearly distinguishes between the two

---

19 In the Sib. Or. 3:24-28, the author states “indeed it is God Himself who fashioned four-lettered Adam, the first
man fashioned, who completes in his name morning and dusk, antarctic and arctic. He too both established the
fashion of the form of mortal men and made the beasts and things that creep and fly.” This reference to the creation
of Adam in contrast to the creation of “mortal men” and the animals indicates that Adam may have been understood
as immortal. Cf. 2 En. 30:13.
portrayals of Adam in the Genesis narrative. The Adam described in Gen 1:27 is used to convey humans as similar to God and the angels, while the depiction of the first man in Gen 2:7 is used to emphasize humanity’s base characteristics. Further, similar to Ben Sira and Pseudo-Solomon, Philo understands Adam as a paradigm of the human condition.

The Qumran composition, the Hodayot, also stresses the “low,” base characteristics shared by all humanity by appealing to the creation of humanity in Gen 2:7. This portrayal of Adam is used by the author to convey a pessimistic anthropology. The author emphasizes humanity’s weakness, limitations, and sinfulness. The speaker laments the material weakness of humanity by appealing to Gen 2:7. For example, in 1QH 18:3-9, the hymnist contemplates why God would reveal his mysteries and wisdom to a human being. He asks, “What, then, is man? He is nothing but earth. [From clay] he is fashioned and to dust he will return. But you teach him about wonders like these … I am dust and ashes” (ll. 4-5). The author uses the terms “dust” and “clay” to refer to human frailty and limitation (cf. Job 33:6). The author negatively

---

20 The Hodayot is a lengthy composition of which multiple copies were found in Caves 1 and 4 of the Qumran site. The corpus of Hodayot material, aside from the main text of 1QH, includes 1Q35 (1QHb) and 4Q427-432. For discussion of the 4QH texts, see Esther G. Chazon et al., eds., Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2: Qumran Cave 4.XX (DJD 29; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 69-254; Eleazar L. Sukenik, The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University (Jerusalem: Magness Press, 1955), 39.


24 In 1QH 19:10-14, the hymnist addresses God with thanks, proclaiming, “you have done wonders with dust, and have acted very mightily with a creature of clay.”

interprets humanity’s origins described in Gen 2:7 through the curse given in Gen 3:19. He states that since humanity is made of dust, he will become dust again at the end of his life.

For the Hodayot, the primary issue associated with the human condition is the problem of being made from perishable material, which is depicted in the creation of Adam in Gen 2:7. However, the author explains that there is hope for a select group—the elect—who have been chosen according to God’s divine plan (cf. 9:17-18; 25:11; 1QH a 9:23-24). The elect are different from the rest of humanity. In 1QH a 19, after affirming that the elect have been given revelation, the author declares: “You have purified man (א zend) from offence, so that he can make himself holy for you ... to become united with the sons of your truth and in the lot with your holy ones (קדישם) ... so that he can take his place in your presence with the perpetual host ... to renew him with everything that exists forever” (ll. 10-14; cf. 14:13). The of this text refers not to all humankind, but the elect who have been purged of the baser elements that characterize

---

26 Gen 3:19: “By the sweat of your face you shall eat bread until you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; you are dust, and to dust you shall return.”

27 The Hodayot includes several expressions that emphasize that man is a frail creature destined to perish. For example, the author stresses that humanity is created from the earth and the limitations of flesh. As noted above, the author describes humans as “clay” and “dust.” The phrase “creation of clay” (נעד הים) and the idea that humanity is created from dust (נעד שירן) appear several times in the composition (e.g., 11:22-25). The speaker also states that at the end of man’s worldly existence he will return to the dust of the earth (18:5-7; 20:28-29; 23:24). “Son(s) of man/Adam” (e.g., 7:19 [4QH a 8:11]; 9:29, 36; 12:31; 19:6) and “born of a woman” (5:31; 21:2, 9; 23:13) point to the birth of each human and may allude to Adam and Eve. The phrase “son(s) of Adam” is common in the Hebrew Bible, although it is often difficult to determine if an author is referring to humanity in general or specifically to Adam. The same ambiguity is present in the Hodayot. At the very least, the phrase, along with “son(s) of man,” recalls the fact that humans are created beings. The phrase “born of a woman” is used in Job it indicate the fraility and mortality of humanity (14:1; 15:14; 25:4). The expression “kneaded from water” (דתות בים; 5:21; 9:21; 11:24; 20:25) likely refers to Gen 2:7. The expression recalls the origins of humanity from dust and highlights the fraility and worthlessess of a human. The phrases “foundation of shame” and “source of impurity” also occur several times as descriptions of humanity (5:32; 9:24; 20:28). These phrases are used to stress that humanity is in opposition to God.

28 The Hodayot has a deterministic conception of God: “before creating them you know (all) their deeds forever and ever. [Without you nothing is done, and nothing is known without your will” (1QH a 9:7-8; cf. 6:27; 7:15-17; 18:9). The composition contends that during the final judgment rewards will be given to the elect. For example, 1QH a 14:29 states that the “sons of his truth” will be recompensed at the final judgment. 1QH a 19:9 associates the “sons of your favor” with mercy from God during judgment (cf. 6:10; 12:32-33).
the human condition, which are associated with the creation of the Adam of Gen 2:7. Further, the author asserts that the elect possess the “glory of Adam” (1QHα 4:14-15; cf. 1QHα 16:4-6; 4Q433a 2). In the Treatise on the Two Spirits and the Damascus Document, the “glory of Adam” is promised to the elect, and understood as eternal life (CD 3:10; 1QS 4:22-23; 4QpPsα 3:1-2). While the expression remains enigmatic, in 1QHα 4, the “glory of Adam” is associated with the redemption of the elect, who have been cleansed of their iniquities. In the Hodayot, the author directly associates the depiction of Adam in Gen 2:7 with the creaturely aspects of humanity.

4QInstruction has deepened our understanding of the way Jews in the Second Temple period interpreted the figure of Adam in Genesis 1-3. Like other Second Temple Jewish interpretations, 4QInstruction appeals to the creation of Adam in Gen 1:27 to express a “high” anthropology—associating the elect with the angels, while the portrayal of Adam in Gen 2:7 is used to convey a “low” anthropology—the mortality of humankind. The author associates each portrayal of Adam with the creation of opposing kinds of humans—the ווזר וווז and the וווזר וווז.

The following chapters of this study will demonstrate that 4QInstruction allows us to observe the diversity of the interpretation of the biblical portrayals of Adam in such a way that we have not

29 John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997), 41. The composition concludes with the statement that God “has given them as a legacy to the sons of man so that they know good [and evil]” (4:26). Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 96, has emphasized that in the Hodayot, this glory is something that the elect already enjoy. This same glory is promised to the elect in the rule-books, and in CD it is explicitly associated with eternal life (CD 3:20). The theme of a renewal of a prelapsarian state is combined with angelic fellowship in 1QHα 14:14-16 (6:14-16): “They (the elect) will be your princes in the lot of your holy ones. Their root] will sprout like a flower of the field forever, to make a shoot grow in branches of the eternal planting. … All the streams of Eden [will water] its [branch]es” (cf. 4Q428 8).

30 Matthew J. Goff, “Reading Wisdom at Qumran: 4QInstruction and the Hodayot,” *DSD* 11 (2004): 263-88. Van Kooten, *Paul’s Anthropology in Context*, 15-22, has argued that this phrase alludes to Gen 1:26-27, which is interpreted elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls as Adam being “fashioned in the likeness of your (God’s) glory” (4Q504 8 4).
been able until its publication. This makes for a more complete typology of the way Adam was interpreted during the Second Temple period. Other “types” of Adam found in the literature examined in this study include Adam as the representation of all humankind, as seen in Ben Sira and 4 Ezra, as the future righteous in 4 Ezra, and as both the virtuous and the wicked in Philo. Moreover, the anthropology of 4QInstruction reveals the exegetical traditions of the biblical portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 are richer than previously known. Equipped with the knowledge of these traditions, it is reasonable to contend that other Early Jewish authors have appropriated and reworked the Genesis 1-3 traditions attested in 4QInstruction. Further, it is possible to determine larger trends that occurred concerning the interpretation of Adam. The evidence indicates that there is a broad transition from interpretations of Adam during the second century B.C.E. that are primarily favorable, in which the first man is used to depict the elect, or describe the general aspects of the human condition—as divine and creatures. There is, further, no mention of his transgression in the garden or blame for his actions leading to human mortality or a miserable human existence. In the first century C.E., Adam is used to account for human sinfulness, as exemplified in 4 Ezra.
CHAPTER TWO
ADAM, THE ANGELS, DIVINE REVELATION, AND THE ELECT: THE INTERPRETATION OF GENESIS 1-3 IN 4QINSTRUCTION

2.1 Introduction

4QInstruction (1Q26, 4Q415-418, 4Q423), also known as musar le-mebin, is the longest sapiential text from Qumran. Portions of at least seven manuscripts of this document are extant (1Q26, 4Q415, 4Q416, 4Q417, 4Q418, 4Q418a, and 4Q423). The text was officially published in 1999 in DJD 34 by John Strugnell and Daniel J. Harrington. Among the many features of this text is an anthropology based on an interpretation of Genesis 1-3. 4QInstruction utilizes these chapters to describe the elect status of the addressee and his affinity with the angels, and they are the basis for the assertion that there are “fleshly” and “spiritual” types of humanity. The anthropology of 4QInstruction includes adaptations of features from Genesis 1-3, particularly the portrayal of Adam. This has been a popular subject of scholarship since the publication of the

---


2 Major fragments are preserved in 4Q416, 417 and 418 (two copies), and smaller fragments in 1Q26, 4Q415, and 4Q423. Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34, 21, agree with, Torleif Elgvin, “An Analysis of 4QInstruction” (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1997), 19-20, claiming that at least seven copies were found at Qumran.

3 Strugnell and Harrington entitle the text musar le-mevin (“Instruction for a Maven”). Before the publication of DJD 34, the work was often known as “Sapiential Work A.”
composition.\textsuperscript{4} The approaches of John J. Collins and Mathew J. Goff have continued to receive attention in the scholarly field.\textsuperscript{5} This chapter builds upon and is informed by the work of Collins and Goff. In this chapter, I will argue that the interpretation of Genesis 1-3 in 4QInstruction is based on the idea that there are two opposed kinds of humans—the יִרְאֶה בְּשָׁר and the יִרְאֶה. This dichotomy is rooted in Genesis 1-3, primarily the two portrayals of Adam. However, Adam is much more explicitly connected with the יִרְאֶה, which signifies the elect, and is used to understand the elect status of the addressee, including his access to supernatural revelation and his similarity to the angels. The יִרְאֶה represents the non-elect, and is plausibly connected to the Adam of Gen 2:7, the earthly realm, mortality, and lack of access to revelation. This chapter will function as the basis for examining the interpretation of the portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 in Ben Sira, the work of Philo of Alexandria, and 4 Ezra in the following chapters of this study.


2.2 Basic Background Information on 4QInstruction

Some background information regarding 4QInstruction is necessary to better understand the role of Genesis 1-3 in the composition. Scholars generally identify this work from Qumran as from the second century B.C.E. 4QInstruction is widely understood to be a wisdom text, a tradition represented in the Hebrew Bible by Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes, and in the Apocrypha by Ben Sira and the Wisdom of Solomon. The Qumran text gives advice on practical matters, mostly in the form of admonitions, addressing subjects such as marriage, the exchange of goods, the payment of debts, and ethical behavior. Further, the 4Q418 221 2-3 explains that the purpose of the text is to make both the simple and the intelligent ones understand (cf. 4Q418 81 17). The addressee of 4QInstruction is identified as ἀποικός, or “understanding one.”

While not explicitly identified as a teacher, the author assumes the role by instructing the addressee as a student. In this way, the composition is consistent with the older biblical wisdom tradition, exemplified by Proverbs.

---


8 This term is used in Proverbs to refer to someone who desires to attain knowledge and understanding. Prov 17:24: “Wisdom is before the face of the perceptive man while the eyes of the dolt are in the ends of the earth.” See Michael V. Fox, Proverbs 10-31 (AB 18B; New York: Doubleday, 2009), 635-36, who explains that the “understanding one” of the verse does not yet possess wisdom but has the potential to acquire it (cf. 8:9; 17:10). This is similar to what is found in 4QInstruction. The term ἀποικός occurs at least twenty times in 4QInstruction. See Kampen, Wisdom Literature, 51-52.
2.3 Wisdom and an Apocalyptic Worldview: The יד מ☝ה in 4QInstruction

Unlike texts such as Ben Sira and Proverbs, 4QInstruction contains a number of apocalyptic features.\(^9\) This is particularly evident in the text’s frequent use of the phrase יד מ☝ה.\(^10\) This is an important expression for understanding the interpretation of Genesis 1-3 in 4QInstruction because those who are granted access to it are created like the Adam of Gen 1:27. The enigmatic phrase יד מ☝ה denotes a form of supernatural revelation. The expression can be reasonably translated as “the mystery that is to be” (see section 2.3.1, below). The phrase יד מ☝ה does not appear in the Hebrew Bible, and in other ancient Jewish literature, outside of 4QInstruction, the phrase only occurs three times. יד מ☝ה is used twice in the Book of Mysteries (1Q27 1 i 3) and once in the Community Rule (1QS 11:3-4).\(^11\) In 4QInstruction, however, the phrase יד מ☝ה is

---


11 In the Book of Mysteries, the יד מ☝ה is associated with eschatological judgment. The text states that the wicked do not know the יד מ☝ה and cannot save themselves from this mystery (1Q27 1 i 3). In 1QS 11:3-4, the phrase signifies supernatural revelation given to the elect: “For from the source of his knowledge he has disclosed his light, and my eyes have observed his wonders, and the light of my heart the יד מ☝ה.”
used over twenty times. 12 Goff accurately, and succinctly, notes that הַדִּיסִיָּה is “difficult to interpret.” 13 The phrase has received a tremendous amount of attention and numerous attempts to determine its meaning. I will not endeavor to lay out all of the proposed theories concerning the phrase. In this section, I will instead examine a few of the more persuasive ones, and ultimately determine which one I find the most convincing.

The term הַדִּיסִיָּה denotes supernatural revelation in apocalyptic literature. 14 It appears nine times in Daniel 2. 15 The content and interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream revealed to Daniel are described as “mysteries” (חֵיֵיתָה) (2:29; cf. vv. 2:18-19, 27-30, 47 [2x]; 4:6). 16 In 1 Enoch, the word הַדִּיסִיָּה refers to knowledge revealed to Enoch by the angels: “I know the mysteries that the holy ones have revealed and shown to me, and that I have read in the tablets of heaven” (1 En. 106:19 [4QEn⁴ 5 ii 26-27]; cf. 8:3 [4QEn⁴ 1 iv 5]; 4Q203 9 3). 17 The term הַדִּיסִיָּה is also used

---

12 4Q415 6 4; 4Q416 2 i 5 (par 4Q416 2 i 10); 4Q416 2 iii 9, 14, 18, 21 (par 4Q418 9 8, 15; 4Q418 10 1, 3); 4Q417 1 i 3, 6, 8, 18, 21 (par 4Q418 43 2, 4, 6, 14, 16); 4Q417 1 ii 3; 4Q418 77 2, 4; 4Q418 123 ii 4; 4Q418 172 1; 4Q418 184 2; and 4Q423 4 1, 4 (par 1Q26 1 i, 4). According to Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 13, the phrase can be reconstructed in 4Q415 24 1; 4Q416 17 3; 4Q418 179 3; 4Q418 190 2-3; 4Q418 201 1; 4Q418c 8; 4Q423 3 2; 4Q423 5 2; and 4Q423 7 7. See Kampen, *Wisdom Literature*, 51-52.

13 הַדִּיסִיָּה is borrowed from Persian and is the common Aramaic term for “mystery,” adopted into post-biblical Hebrew and often in the Qumran sectarian texts. See Strugnell and Harrington, *DJD* 34, 28-29. Samuel I. Thomas, *The “Mysteries” of Qumran: Mystery, Secrecy, and Esotericism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SBLEJL 25; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 245-51. See also Rey, *4QInstruction*, 287.

14 הַדִּיסִיָּה is also used over 150 times in the non-biblical texts discovered at Qumran. See Thomas, *The “Mysteries” of Qumran*, 136-86.


in other Qumran texts to indicate supernatural revelation. For example, 1QH 10:13 states: “you have set me like a banner for the elect of justice, like a knowledgeable mediator of wondrous mysteries (רֵי פֶּלֶס).” Although the term רֵי is used in similar manners in 4QInstruction, Daniel, and 1 Enoch, the Qumran text includes an understanding of the word that is different from the other compositions. Implicit in Daniel and 1 Enoch, in 4QInstruction, the term רֵי נַחַל refers to God’s sovereignty over the created order. God uses the רֵי נַחַל to create the world:

“With the mystery that is to be (דָּבָר נַחַל) he spread out its (the world’s) foundation and indeed made (it) with wisdom and, regarding everything, [with cleve]ness he fashioned it” (4Q417 1 i 8-9).

By associating the origin of creation with the רֵי נַחַל, 4QInstruction implies that the cosmos is under divine control. The overall framework of the cosmos has been established by

---

2003), 193-210 (esp. 203-4); idem, The Ethiopic Book of Enoch (2 vols.; New York: Oxford University, 1979); Florentino García Martínez, Qumran and Apocalyptic (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 45-96.

18 For a recent survey of רֵי in the Dead Sea Scrolls see Thomas, The “Mysteries” of Qumran, 136-86.

19 See, also, for example, 1QH 9:21; 12:27-28; 17:23; 19:19; CD 3:18; 1QpHab 7:4-5; 4Q300 1a ii-b 2. Ben Sira is an exception to this. He uses רֵי to refer to secrets that are not divinely revealed (8:18; 12:11).

20 Goff, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 30-32. For the Persian background of the term רֵי, see Thomas, The “Mysteries” of Qumran, 245-51. See further, Rey, 4QInstruction, 287.

21 Matthew J. Goff, “The Mystery of Creation in 4QInstruction,” DSD 10 (2003): 163-86, notes that this claim alludes to Prov 3:19, which states that God fashioned the world by means of wisdom (דָּבָר נַחַל): “The LORD by wisdom founded the earth; by understanding he established the heavens.”

means of the רָאִיתָהּ רָאִיתָהּ. Therefore, by understanding the רָאִיתָהּ רָאִיתָהּ can perceive God’s dominion over the cosmos.

The term רָאִיתָהּ further indicates God’s dominion over the cosmos. This term’s meaning has been extensively examined by Goff. He aptly states that the רָאִיתָהּ should be understood as something that “extends throughout the entire chronological scope of the created order.” This is supported by the use of the term elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls to also refer to the entire scope of history as past, present, and future (cf. 1QS 11:11, 17-18). The Treatise on the Two Spirits (1QS 3:13-4:26), for example, begins by proclaiming, “From the God of Knowledge stems all there is and all there will be” (רָאִיתָהּ רָאִיתָהּ) (3:15; cf. CD 2:9-10; 4Q180 1-2; IQM 17:5). In this example, the term רָאִיתָהּ refers to the future but the passage states that all (רָאִיתָהּ) of history, not only the future, is established by God. The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice also uses רָאִיתָהּ to refer to the past, present and future. In 4Q402 4 12, the author proclaims: “For from the God of Knowledge came into being everything [which exists forever] (רָאִיתָהּ רָאִיתָהּ; cf. 1QH 5:28-29, 19:17, 21:13; 4Q418 69 ii 7; 4Q369 3 2). The term רָאִיתָהּ is used in a similar manner in 4QInstruction. In the composition there are three instances that רָאִיתָהּ is associated with the tripartite division of time (4Q417 1 i 3-5 [2x]; 4Q418 123 ii 3-4). In 4Q417 1 i 3-5, the word רָאִיתָהּ may be used to indicate the future in 11:8-9. In the future the intended audience is described as an "eternal planting throughout all future ages (רָאִיתָהּ רָאִיתָהּ)." Cf. 10:4-7; CD 2:9-10; 13:7-8; 4Q402 4 12; 1QH 5:17-18; 19:13-14; Sir 42:19; 48:25; 1QM 1:11-12; 17:4-5; Wis 8:8.

Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 62.

Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 33.


Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 57-58. For a more extensive discussion of the temporal range of רָאִיתָהּ, see Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 54-61. See also Thomas, “Mysteries” of Qumran, 150-51.

is used twice. Lines 3-4 exhort the to “gaze [upon the mystery that is to be and the deeds of] old, at what exists and what has existed, upon wh[at will be] …” ( … )]. The three-fold sequence refers to the entire scope of the chronological order. Lines 4-5 includes a tripartite division of time: “at what exists and at what has existed, upon what will be” ( … ). 4Q418 123 ii 3-4 also describes time from a multifaceted perspective: “Everything that exists in it, from what has been to what will be in it (חול המה נמה למה הה והה ב) … His period which God revealed to the ear of the understanding ones through the mystery that is to be (רנ מנה).”

Lange asserts that the phrase is referring to the “pre-existent, hidden, sapiential order of the world,” revealed principally in the Torah, and is thus similar to the figure of personified Wisdom in texts such as Ben Sira and Baruch. Since the Torah is never mentioned in 4QInstruction, and there is no mention of the personification of wisdom anywhere in the composition, Lange’s approach seems too narrow. Goff’s understanding of the is far more convincing.

The addressee is instructed to gain understanding of the through study. This is mentioned in 4Q417 1 i 6-7, for example: “[ … day and night meditate upon the mystery that] is to be (ברא) and study (ית) constantly. And then you will know truth and iniquity, wisdom [and f]oll[y …” In 4Q417 1 i 18-19, the is again exhorted: “And now, understanding son, gaze upon the and know [the path]s of all life and the manner of one’s walking that is appointed over [his] deed[s]” (cf. ll. 10-12). The is also instructed to (גaze upon”;

28 cf. 4Q417 1 i 3-4; 1QS 3:15; CD 2:9-10; 1QH 19:16-17; Wis 7:18. A tripartite view of time is also found in other ancient texts that were composed after 4QInstruction. For example, the Apocalypse of John conveys a similar division of time: “Grace to you and peace from him who is and who was and who is to come (ὅ ὁν καὶ ὁ ἔν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος)” (1:4). This verse alludes to Exod 3:14 (LXX), “I am the one who is.” See Elgvin, “An Analysis,” 259; David Aune, Revelation 1-5 (WBC 52a; Dallas: Word Books, 1997), 30-33.

The addressee has access to this mystery and is supposed to study it. The addressee is further told that through the study of the רז נמהה he can learn the knowledge of good and evil (4Q417 i 6-8). Goff rightly claims: “In 4QInstruction knowing good and evil is not simply a capacity for moral conduct. It denotes the acquisition of wisdom about the divine framework in which the human realm should be understood.” This trope is related to the composition’s interpretation of Genesis 1-3. In 4Q423 1, the addressee is exhorted to cultivate metaphorically the garden of Eden like the Adam of Genesis 2-3 in order to obtain eternal life (see section 2.5). This is done by acquiring wisdom through the study of the רז נמהה. As mentioned above, by studying the רז נמהה, the addressee can also attain the knowledge of good and evil. This suggests that through access to this revelation the addressee can obtain knowledge originally possessed by Adam in the garden. The רז נמהה signifies God’s deterministic plan that shapes the entire breadth of history and creation, presented to the addressee as a revealed truth. This reflects the understanding that God has dominion over all of history, from beginning to end. The addressee possesses a form of elect status. He is in “the lot of the angels” (4Q418 81 4-5; see section 2.5.3). This allows him access to supernatural revelation in the form of the רז נמהה. The study of this mystery is the primary manner in which the addressee can obtain wisdom (cf. 4Q418 43 4).

---

30 See also 4Q415 6 4, which tells the addressee to “test (משך) these things” by means of the רז נמהה. The addressee is also reminded that the רז נמהה has already been disclosed to his ear (1Q26 1 4; 4Q416 2 iii 18; 4Q418 123 ii 4; 4Q418 184 2; cf. 4Q418 190 1).

31 Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 62.
2.3.1 The Translation of דְּבַר מֵהָיוֹת

The complicated nature of the phrase דְּבַר מֵהָיוֹת is further evidenced by the many translations that have been proposed. Some of the most recent include: “the mystery of the past”; 32 “the mystery of existence” or “the mystery of being”; 33 “the mystery of becoming”; 34 “the mystery to come”; 35 “the mystery of that which was coming into being”; 36 and “the mystery of the future.” 37 Goff notes that the temporality of the word מֵהָיוֹת “makes translating this phrase inherently problematic” because although the word denotes God’s control over the past, present, and future, typically a translation of the participle must choose a single tense. 38 However, he goes on to convincingly argue that דְּבַר מֵהָיוֹת could be reasonably translated as “the mystery that is to be.” 39 This is a


37 In 1Q26 and 1Q27, D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, Qumran Cave 1 (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), J. T. Milik translates the phrase as “Le mystère future.”

38 Goff, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 34.

reasonable translation based on the understanding of the term תֵּהָה discussed above as signifying the extent of God’s dominion throughout the entire scope of history, from beginning to end.40

2.4 The Vision of Hagu (חָוּה הַחָמָה): 4Q17 1 i 13-1841

In 4QInstruction, the other expression that signifies divine revelation is “the vision of Hagu” (חָוּה הַחָמָה).42 While the term occurs throughout the text, the vision of Hagu is only referred to twice. Both instances are in a much discussed lesson concerning the שֵׁם הָדוּה (“the spiritual people”) and the יִשְׁמָל (“fleshly spirit”) in 4Q17 1 i 13-18.43 John J. Collins’ has profoundly contributed to obtaining a better understanding of the vision of Hagu. Collins asserts that the vision of Hagu passage includes a “double creation” interpretation of Genesis 1-3 that establishes a dualistic anthropology.44 According to Collins, the passage explains that God created two kinds of humanity—the שֵׁם הָדוּה (“the spiritual people”) and the יִשְׁמָל (“fleshly spirit”).45 To articulate

---


42 This phrase can be translated in various ways. In Strugnell and Harrington, *DJD* 34, 155, for example, it is translated as “the appearance/vision of the meditation.” In this study, I use the translation “the vision of Hagu.” See Goff, *4QInstruction*, forthcoming (Introduction).


45 For a discussion concerning the text’s portrayal of two types of humankind as spiritual and fleshly, see also Jörg Frey, “Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the
this idea, the author of 4QInstruction turns to the portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3. In this section, I will discuss the impact that Collins’ and Goff’s scholarship has had on understanding the text’s interpretation of the first man in Genesis 1-3 as it relates to the text’s anthropology.

2.4.1 The Text and Translation

This much debated passage reads:

And you, understanding one, inherit your reward by remember the might because it is coming. Engraved is the statute and ordained is all the punishment, because engraved is that which is ordained by God against all the iniquities of the sons of Sheth. The book of remembrance is written before him for those who keep his word—that is, the vision of Hagu of the book of remembrance. He bequeathed it to Adam (אדם) together with a spiritual people because He fashioned it (lit. "him") according to the likeness of the holy ones. But no more did he give Hagu to the fleshly spirit because it did not distinguish between good and evil according to the judgment of its spirit.


Parallel texts include 4Q418 43-45 i; 4Q418a 11. For a detailed discussion of the text critical issues see, for example, Goff, 4QInstruction, forthcoming (Ch. 6); idem, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 83-88; Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34, 151-69; Tigchelaar, To Increase Learning, 52-54; idem, “Spiritual People’, ‘Fleshly Spirit,’” 103-18; Rey, 4QInstruction, 278-82; Wold, Women, Men and Angels, 138-41; Émile Puech, “Apports des textes apocalyptiques et sapientiels de Qumrân à l’eschatologie du judaïsme ancien,” in Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition (ed. F. García Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003), 133-70; Lange, Weisheit und Prädestination, 49-51; Elgvin, “An Analysis of 4QInstruction,” 256-58.

I follow Goff’s reconstruction and translation of the text given in his, 4QInstruction, forthcoming (Ch. 6). For discussion of the text, see Goff, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 84-88; Tigchelaar, “‘Spiritual People,’” 105-16; Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34, 160-66; Tigchelaar, To Increase Learning, 52-54; André Caquot, “Les Textes de sagesse de Qumrân (Aperçu préliminaire),” RHP 76 (1996): 1-34.
2.4.2 An Anthropological Dichotomy: The “Spiritual People” (נפש האדם) and “Fleshly Spirit” (רוח بشם)

This passage is directed to the נשאר. It is presented as a lesson that the addressee is to contemplate and study. The phrase “the vision of Hagu” is enigmatic, but reminiscent of “the book of Hagu” mentioned in the Rule of the Congregation and the Damascus Document (1QSa 1:6-7; CD 10:6; 14:6-8). In 4QInstruction, the vision of Hagu is associated with a heavenly book and therefore understood to be a form of divine revelation. This lesson includes the understanding that the final judgment is divinely ordained (cf. 4Q416 1; 4Q418 69 ii). Lines 14-15 indicate that the vision of Hagu conveys supernatural knowledge regarding the final judgment.

4QInstruction explains that not everyone has access to the vision of Hagu. The נשאר are given this vision and the נשאר are not. These designations signify two different kinds of humanity. The נשאר are connected to angels (רוח השם; see section 2.5.3) and revelation (the vision of Hagu). The נשאר is associated with lacking both revelation and the knowledge of good and evil. The נשאר of the phrase נשאר נשאר indicates similarity with the heavenly domain, and the נשאר of the נשאר signifies separation from the supernatural world.48 While the term נשאר is not found anywhere else in 4QInstruction, נשאר is. In 4Q418 81 1-2, the addressee is told that he has been separated from the נשאר in order to remove him “from all that he (God) hates” (cf. 4Q417 1 ii 14; 4Q418 126 ii 8; 4Q418 221 4). 4Q416 1 12 affirms that the נשאר will be destroyed in the final judgment declaring that “every fleshly spirit will be laid bare.”49


The phrase ידש הרוח בשר suggests the mortality of the human body. This is also the case with other texts found at Qumran, especially the Hodayot.

2.4.2.1 The ידש הרוח in the Hodayot. In the Hodayot, the term ידש הרוח is used to indicate creaturely existence in contrast to a connection to the heavenly realm.\(^50\) In 1QH 5:19-20, the author asks how a ידש הרוח can comprehend the revelation that has been given to him: “In the mysteries of your insight [you] have apportioned all these things … [How is] a spirit of flesh (רוח בשר) to understand all these matters?” (cf. 1QH 5:15).\(^51\) In these verses, the ידש הרוח is used to emphasize the earthly and creaturely aspect of being human. The author perceives himself to be a ידש הרוח and is aware that this is not compatible with having access to supernatural revelation, which he nevertheless has.\(^52\) There is a tension between his flesh and his possession of divine revelation. In 1QS 11:9, the speaker states that although he has access to supernatural revelation, including the ידש הרוח, he still belongs to the “assembly of unfaithful flesh” (סוד בשר עולם; cf. ll. 3-4, 6). These two compositions depict a different understanding of the ידש הרוח than what is found in 4QInstruction. In 4QInstruction, the ידש הרוח does not have access to divine revelation. In 4Q417 i 13-18, the term ידש הרוח should not be understood as the human condition like it is in the Hodayot and the Community Rule. Rather, the ידש הרוח, in 4QInstruction, is a designation for people who are not among the elect.\(^53\) As noted above, the text states that they will be destroyed in the final judgment (4Q416 i 12). This is presumably due to the fact that the ידש הרוח cannot

---


\(^{50}\) Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 95.

\(^{51}\) Hartmut Stegemann, Eileen Schuller and Carol Newsom, *Qumran Cave I.III: 1QHodayot with Incorporation of 1QHodayot* and 4QHodayot* (DJD 40; Oxford: Clarendon, 2009), 86. See also, Frey, “Flesh and Spirit,” 378-97.

\(^{52}\) Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 95.

\(^{53}\) Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 95.
distinguish between good and evil (4Q417 1 i 17-18). Further, 4Q418 81 asserts that God “hates” the רוח חסニ. These statements could indicate that this group is inclined towards wickedness. However, this is not explicit in the vision of Hagu passage. A polemic about its evil nature is not a prominent feature of the text. The רוח חסNi is never directly described as wicked. 4Q417 1 i 13-18 is more concerned with differentiating the רוח חסNi from the רוח חסNi, rather than recounting what the רוח חסNi is like. In 4QInstruction, the term רוח חסNi likely refers to the non-elect—humankind apart from the community to which the composition is addressed. People in this category would include the wicked but are not limited to only wicked people. Those among the רוח חסNi are not in the lot of the angels. They have not been given the רוח חסNi and do not have the knowledge of good and evil. This is in direct contrast to the situation of the רוח חסNi. They have access to supernatural revelation in the form of the vision of Hagu. 4QInstruction states that the angels have eternal life (4Q418 69 ii 13). Since the רוח חסNi are connected to the angels, the רוח חסNi can be linked to eternal life as well. They presumably have the prospect of life after death. The main issue for understanding the רוח חסNi is not that the phrase signifies people who are evil, but rather those who do not have the prospect of a blessed afterlife.


55 “Flesh” could be understood as something wicked in the phrase “fleshly [incl]ination” in the fragmentary 4Q416 1 16. This is probably similar to the “evil inclination” (צר עון) that is found throughout Early Jewish compositions and mentioned in 4QInstruction (4Q417 1 ii 12; see section 3.3.1.1). See also Johann Cook, “The Origin of the Tradition of the רוח חסNi and the זכרו ה亚马א של רוח חסNi,” *JSJ* 38 (2007): 81-92; Collins, “Wisdom, Apocalypticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 369-83.

56 Goff, *4QInstruction*, forthcoming (Ch. 6).

57 Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 134, claims that the רוח חסNi is also immortal. However, the composition explicitly states that the רוח חסNi will be destroyed in the final judgment (4Q416 1 12).
2.4.2.2 The רוח המשר, the רוח, and Genesis 1-3. The author of 4QInstruction roots the formation of the two distinct types of humanity in the biblical creation account. This is evident by the repeated allusions to Genesis 1-3 in the vision of Hagu pericope. The description of the opposing kinds of humans is fundamental to the author’s anthropology and primarily rests in 4Q417 1 i 16-17. Collins argues that the term הָעַבְדָה הָעָבְדָה (l. 17) is employed to mean “image” or “likeness.” In the Hebrew Bible the term הָעָבְדָה is used to mean a “blueprint for a construction” (cf. Exod 25:9, 40) “figure” or “image” (Deut 4:16-18, Isa 44:13, Ezek 8:3; 10:8). In Ezekiel, the term הָעָבְדָה is used as a variant at times for the word אֶת (e.g., Ezek 1:28). The word also occurs in a number of places in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4Q403 1 ii 3; 4Q405 20 ii 8; 11QShirShabb 5-6 2) that demonstrate a clear usage as “image” or “likeness.”

Collins, agreeing with Lange, reads the term הָעָבְדָה as referring to angels. He explains that although there are instances such as Ps 34:10 that refer to Israel as הָעָבְדָה along with a few ambiguous usages, in the Qumran texts the overwhelming uses of the term in Hebrew and Aramaic is to mean heavenly beings. The ambiguity of the term הָעָבְדָה in the scrolls, Collins explains, stems from the understanding that the sect enjoyed some sort of fellowship with the angels (e.g., 1QM 10:10; cf. Dan 7:27). There is no case in the Dead Sea Scrolls where הָעָבְדָה refers unambiguously to human beings.

The use of the term הָעָבְדָה in 4Q417 1 i 17 recalls the creation of Adam and connects him with the angels. Whether הָעָבְדָה is taken as a verb or noun, Collins concludes that, “if God

---

fashioned אורות in the likeness of the holy ones then his inclination is in their likeness too.”

The term is used in Gen 2:7 (וַיָּצָא יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת-הָאָדָם) to describe the formation of Adam. Collins also observes that two yods in Genesis Rabbah are the basis for a rabbinic tradition that claims humanity has two inclinations (see section 3.3.1.1). Gen. Rab. 14:3 also cites Gen 1:26-27 for the purpose of describing the formation of humans as being in the likeness of the angels. In the rabbinic text, the affinity between Adam and the angels is rooted in the creation account of Genesis 1. This is a major issue in the interpretation of Adam in Second Temple literature. For example, Philo also suggests that the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 was made in the likeness of the angels (Sacr. 5-7; Fug. 68-70; see section 4.2.2.1.5.1).

Just as Genesis Rabbah 14 uses Gen 1:26-27 to depict Adam as being made like the angels, 4QInstruction appears to interpret these verses in a similar manner. 4Q417 1 i 17 states:

“He fashioned him (Adam) according to the likeness of the holy ones” (דְּמַעְרֵי קָדוֹשֵׁי צֵרוֹ). This expression can reasonably be understood as paraphrasing the expression בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים (“in the image of God”) from Gen 1:27. The term אֱלֹהִים, Collins contends, can be used to refer to


62 “...There were two formations [one partaking of the nature] of the celestial beings, [the other] of the earthly creatures. . . . He created him with four attributes of the higher beings (i.e. the angels) and four of the lower creatures (i.e. the beasts). . . . R. Tifdai said in R. Aha’s name: The celestial beings were created in the image and likeness (of God) and do not procreate, while the terrestrial creatures procreate but not created in [His] image and likeness. Said the Holy One, blessed be He: “Behold, I will create him (man) in [My] image and likeness; [thus he will partake] of the [character of the] celestial beings, while he will procreate [as is his nature] of the terrestrial beings.” R. Tifdai (also) said in R. Aha’s name: The Lord reasoned: ‘If I create him of the celestial elements he will live [forever] and not die; while if I create him of the terrestrial elements, he will die and not live. Therefore, I will create him of the upper and lower elements, if he sins he will die, and if he dies he will live’” (Gen. Rab. 14:3).

63 This is possibly implied in 4 Ezra. See section 5.6.2.2.4, footnote 135.

64 Collins, “In the Likeness of the Holy Ones,” 613.
angels (e.g., 4Q400 1 ii 7; 2 2; 11QMelchizedek 2:10).\textsuperscript{65} He reasonably argues that the phrase that Adam was made כּלֶלֶמֶלֶי לַיִּשֶׂ could be read as the first man being formed in the likeness of angels, not God. There are several other rabbinic passages in the midrashim where Adam is said to be created in the likeness of angels rather than God (e.g., \textit{Gen. Rab.} 21:5; \textit{Exod. Rab.} 30:16).

To further support his reading of 4Q417 1 i as Adam being fashioned in the likeness of the angels and the recipient of a book, Collins references similar traditions such as \textit{The Letter Sent to Adam by God}. In this composition, God reveals a written document to Adam.\textsuperscript{66}

\textbf{2.4.2.3 \textit{Enosh, humanity, or Adam?}} 4Q417 1 i 16 states that God granted access to the vision of Hagu along with the ability to comprehend to both \טִפְּחֶלֶמֶלֶי and the \טִפְּחֶלֶמֶלֶי. There is no consensus on the meaning of the term \טִפְּחֶלֶמֶלֶי. The meaning of this term is important to understanding the anthropology that is espoused in the composition. There are three primary interpretations proposed for the term \טִפְּחֶלֶמֶלֶי:\textsuperscript{67} 1) the patriarch Enosh; 2) humanity; and 3) the biblical figure Adam. Lange proposes the first option arguing that \טִפְּחֶלֶמֶלֶי refers to the patriarch Enosh.\textsuperscript{68} He posits that the fall of the angels and the rise of iniquity that led to the flood should be associated with the offspring of the patriarch Seth.\textsuperscript{69} Enosh, however, is never described as


\textsuperscript{67} See Goff, \textit{4QInstruction}, forthcoming (Introduction and Ch. 6); Tigchelaar, “‘Spiritual People,’” 107.

\textsuperscript{68} Strugnell and Harrington, the official editors of \textit{4QInstruction}, suggest that \טִפְּחֶלֶמֶלֶי refers to either the patriarch Enosh or humanity in general. See Strugnell and Harrington, \textit{DJD} 34, 164.

\textsuperscript{69} cf. l. 15, which refers to the “sons of Sheth.” Lange, \textit{Weisheit und Prüdetermination}, 88. See also Wold, \textit{Women, Men and Angels}, 125-28.
receiving revelation in Second Temple Jewish literature. Moreover, Seth is often portrayed positively in this period as one who possesses the image of God and serves as a foil for Cain.

The second view, that אָנָשָׁה is a general term for humanity, initially suggested by Strugnell, is currently being championed primarily by Benjamin G. Wold. Both correctly notes that אָנָשָׁה is most often used for “man” in the Qumran texts, including elsewhere in 4QInstruction (4Q418 55 11; 4Q418 77 3). Wold claims that the Hagu passage indicates that there was no distinction between the רוחַ בֵּשַׂר and the שם הרוח, and that at some point both groups were given access to the vision of Hagu. He goes on to state that later it was taken away from a portion of humanity, referred to as the שם הרוח (I engage this idea below). However, if Wold is correct, with the שלמה reasonably understood as a group of people, it is not clear why 4Q417 1 i 16 would state that the vision is given to both the שלמה and ש♠י humanitarium (anוש) in general (l. 16).

---


71 Goff, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 90.


74 Wold, Women, Men and Angels, 148-49.

75 Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34, 164-65, prefer the translation “man.”
Further, the vision of Hagu is not given to רוח בראש, who signify the majority of people—the non-elect.\textsuperscript{76}

Collins has proposed the most persuasive interpretation of the term כותנה והחיים, which Goff follows. Collins argues that although the word כותנה והחיים is not used, it is possible to take כותנה והחיים as a reference to the biblical Adam.\textsuperscript{77} In the Treatise on the Two Spirits, כותנה והחיים alludes to Adam in Gen 1:27: “He created man (אדם) to rule the world” (IQS 3:17-18). In 4Q417 1 i 17-18, the reference to good and evil also evokes Adam: “… the fleshy spirit for it did not distinguish between good and evil …” The use of the word רוח in l. 17 to describe the creation of the רוח alludes to Gen 2:7, which further supports Collins’ claim that כותנה והחיים refers to Adam. In 4Q417 1 i 16-17, רוח is used in reference to the רוח כותנה והחיים. It states that the רוח כותנה והחיים were given the vision of Hagu “be[cau]se he fashioned (צבי) him according to the likeness of the holy ones (כותנה והחיים) (4Q417 1 i 16-17). Understanding כותנה והחיים as a reformulation of the description of Adam in Gen 1:27 (see section 2.4.2.2, above) provides further support for interpreting כותנה והחיים as referring to the first man. With this understanding, the suggestion that the רוח כותנה והחיים are formed in the “likeness of the angels” not only means that there is similarity between these people and the angels, it also implies that Adam was fashioned like the angels. At the very least, the רוח כותנה והחיים and

\textsuperscript{76} Collins, “In the Likeness,” 610. The “book of remembrance” is established “for those who keep his word” (ll. 15-16). This is presumably a reference to the elect (or at least the righteous). All of humanity does not have access to this book, which is equated with the vision of Hagu.

\textsuperscript{77} Collins, “In the Likeness,” 610-12; idem, Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age, 121-25. This position has been advocated by Goff. See, for example, Goff, The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 94-103 (esp. 96-98). See also Macaskill, Revealed Wisdom, 83. Wold, Women, Men and Angels, 131-35, observes that if כותנה והחיים does refer to the biblical Adam as Collins and Goff claim, it seems that the author would have made it more obvious. Note, also, that the word כותנה והחיים nowhere else in 4QInstruction refers to Adam (4Q416 2 ii 12 par 4Q418 8 12; 4Q418 55 11; 4Q418 77 3). In Second Temple Jewish literature, the term כותנה והחיים is ambiguous. At times it refers to humanity in general and others it refers to the first man, Adam. In Ben Sira, for example, כותנה והחיים is used to refer to all humanity (e.g., 15:14, 33:10). The only verse that uses the term to identify Adam as an individual is Sir 49:16: “Shem and Seth and Enosh were honored, but above every other created living being was Adam.” See John R. Levison, Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism From Sirach to 2 Baruch (JSPSup 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), 33-48.
Adam have access to the same heavenly revelation, the vision of Hagu. Since Adam was created like the angels, who have eternal life (4Q418 69 ii 12-13; see section 2.5.3) it is likely that he was created to have a blessed afterlife as well. Further, in order for the נזיר to achieve eternal bliss, he is encouraged to emulate Adam in the garden of Eden by studying the same supernaturally revealed wisdom that the first man possessed in paradise (4Q423 1; see section 2.5). 4QInstruction connects the נזיר to Adam’s association with the image of God in Gen 1:27. The composition also links Adam to the addressee, who has elect status (4Q423 1).

2.4.2.3.1 Adam acquiring heavenly knowledge in Second Temple literature.

4QInstruction’s description of Adam acquiring heavenly knowledge is consistent with his depiction elsewhere in Second Temple Jewish literature. In Early Jewish texts, Adam is often associated with the angels and heavenly knowledge. For example, Jubilees states that angels instructed Adam in the garden (3:15). The Treatise on the Two Spirits also associates heavenly revelation with Adam. 1QS 4:22-23 states that God will make “the wisdom of the sons of heaven” (ה쉐מה בן שמים) available to the elect so that they may obtain the “glory of Adam,”

---

78 Goff, “Adam, the Angels, and Eternal Life,” 17.
79 Goff, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 97-98.
which is usually taken as a reference to eternal life (cf. CD 3:20; 1QH 4:27). In Gen 3:5, the serpent tells Eve “for God (אלהים) knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God (אלהים), knowing good and evil” (v. 22). In the Septuagint version of the story, it states that once Adam and Eve eat the fruit they will possess knowledge of good and evil and be “like divine beings” (ὁς θεοῖ). This reads the Hebrew סלדתר as a plural noun rather than as a reference to God. This indicates an exegetical tradition that understands Adam as like the angels.

2.4.2.3.2 The Adam of Genesis 2-3 and the רוח הנשר. Following Collins, Goff convincingly posits that the god-like Adam of Genesis 1 corresponds with the רוח הנשר, while the Adam formed from the earth in Genesis 2-3 coincides with the רוח הנשר. However, Goff is careful to qualify this position since the text does not explicitly posit two opposed Adams, as is seen the work of Philo, for example (Leg. 1.31-32; Opif. 134-35; see Chapter Four).


82 Goff, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 100.

83 In Gen 3:5 (LXX), the first ὁ θεὸς is singular and the second is plural (ὁς θεοῖ). There is a similar situation in the LXX version of Ps 8:6. The phrase θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐστι ἀνθρώπινος of this verse is normally translated as “you have made them a little lower than God,” however, the LXX reads: “You made him a little less than the angels (ἡλπτοσας αὐτον βραχο τα παρ ἠγγέλους).”

vision of Hagu passage, Adam is associated directly with the רוח נש רוח, not with the רוח נש רוח and Adam is more indirect. The association of the two portrayals of Adam with opposing types of humanity is based on the understanding that Gen 1:26-27 stresses Adam’s affinity with the divine realm, while Gen 2:7, his earthly nature: “then the Lord God formed man (אדם) from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the man became a living being (אדם נשמה).” This verse conveys a base assessment of humankind, since the text emphasizes the creation of Adam in relation to the dust of the earth. 4QInstruction stresses the mortality of the רוח נש. 4Q416 1 12, for example, states that the רוח נש (non-elect) will perish. Goff contends that if it is plausible to associate "רוח נש" with the expression רוח נש in 4QInstruction, it is possibly a paraphrase of רוח נש in Gen 2:7.

The expression רוח נש is used elsewhere to mean “creature.” This is the case, for example, in Gen 9:16: “When the bow is in the clouds, I will see it and remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh (כל נשׂי והכל נשׂי) that is on the earth” (Ezek 47:9). The connection with Adam is explicit in the case of the רוח נש and at best implicit with regard to the רוח נש.


85 Goff, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 98-99. See Menahem Kister, “‘First Adam’ and ‘Second Adam’ in 1 Cor 15:45-49 in the Light of Midrashic Exegesis and Hebrew Usage,” in The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature (ed. R. Bieringer et al.; JSJSup 136; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 352-56. Elgvin understands the phrase כֹּל נשׂי והכל נשׂי as a conflation of Gen 1:27 and 2:7, arguing that 4QInstruction did not interpret Genesis as describing the creation of two Adams, but only one. See his “An Analysis of 4QInstruction,” 91. The issue, however, is not whether Genesis 1-3 was understood as having two Adams or one. 4QInstruction describes two different ways of being human by relying on the two contrasting portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3.
2.4.2.4 Did the רוח בהשרא once possess the Vision of Hagu? It is possible that the author of 4QInstruction did not suppose that two separate kinds of humankind were fashioned at creation, but rather that they later became two opposing groups, as Wold has argued. The claim that God “but no more” gave Hagu to the רוח in 4Q417 1 17 may suggest that at one point the רוח possessed the vision of Hagu, but it was later taken away. Reading temporally suggests that the vision of Hagu was later taken away because it did not distinguish between good and evil (ll. 17-18). It is possible to understand the explanation of the רוח and the רוח as two distinct stages in Adam’s life. In this reading, the רוח corresponds to Adam when he was in Eden and the רוח with Adam at the point he had been removed from the garden. 4QInstruction may then include an oblique reference to Adam’s expulsion from Eden and, consequently, his lack of access to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. However, 4QInstruction does not indicate that רוח ever had the vision of Hagu, or, if it did, why it was not able to distinguish between good and evil. Also, there is an overwhelmingly positive conception of Adam throughout 4QInstruction. 4Q417 i 17, for example, describes Adam as having been fashioned “according to the likeness of the holy ones”

---


87 For Goff’s argument for the translation of ובש התע as “moreover” see his, Worldly and Heavenly, 84, 99-100. Wold, Women, Men and Angels, 119, critiques Goff’s reading of the phrase ובש התע in 4Q417 1 i 17, which Goff translated “Moreover he did not give …” (p. 84). See Goff, “Recent Trends,” 384-85.

88 Wold, Women, Men and Angels, 119; Goff, “Recent Trends,” 384-85; Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34, 166, prefer the translation of the phrase as “But no more.” See also Collins, “The Mysteries of God,” 287-305. Cf. 4Q418 81 1, which can be translated “Long ago, he separated you from every fleshy spirit.” This is in reference to the addressee. See Tigchelaar, To Increase Learning, 231; Bruce K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 657.


In 4Q423 1, the addressee is encouraged to metaphorically imitate Adam cultivating the garden of Eden, which the addressee was entrusted (see section 2.5). Given this positive rendering of Adam, it is thus not surprising that the text does not explicitly mention his transgression in the garden and expulsion. The author does not appear interested in explaining how the vision of meditation was taken away from the addressee. Although Wold’s position is possible, the reasons I mention make it unlikely.

2.4.3 The Elect Addressee and the Vision of Hagu

The primary goal of the vision of Hagu is to help the elect addressee identify with and imitate the Elect. The elect status of the addressee makes him like the Elect. The addressee is exhorted to study and contemplate the wisdom revealed to him in the form of the vision of Hagu. A primary consequence of his contemplation on the vision was that he identify with the Elect rather than the non-elect. Both the Elect and the addressee have been given supernatural revelation. The Elect has the vision of Hagu, while the addressee has the 4Q417 1 i 6-8. The Elect are in the likeness of the holy ones and the addressee is in the lot of the angels. The addressee is

---

91 Wold, in his, Women, Men and Angels, 141-46, argues against the division of humanity into two opposing groups at creation and the translation of אָנֵה as Adam by appealing to the work of Philo. Wold contends that Philo’s use of Gen 1:26 to account for humanity’s moral deficiencies leaves room for the possibility that Genesis 1 (and 4QInstruction’s use of Gen 1:27) also includes the identification of humanity with either being “fleshly” or “spiritual” based on their given inclinations. One of the texts that Wold appeals to is Mut. 31-32: “Indeed, he (God) did not make the soul of the wicked man, for wickedness is hateful to God. And the soul, which is between good and bad, he did not make by himself. . . . It is said in the scriptures, ‘Let us make man in our own image’ (Gen 1:26), that if it receives a bad impression it shows itself to be the work of others, but if it receives a good impression it shows itself to be the work of him who is the Creator only of what is beautiful and good.” While Wold is clearly correct that this passage appeals to Gen 1:26 to account for humanity’s ability to sin, the description of the different kinds of humans is based on the way that they are made at the moment of creation. Rather than support the idea that 4Q417 1 i 16-17 refers to humanity in general, I believe this passage further supports the position of Collins and Goff that 4QInstruction includes a description of different types of humans established at creation, and is best read as referring to Adam.

92 Goff, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 104.
distinguished from the דָּרוּת בֵּית רָקָּע (4Q418 81 1-2), like the שם רוח. Their affinity with the angels indicates that the שם רוח have the prospect of eternal bliss, in contrast to the דָּרוּת בֵּית רָקָּע. Similar to the שם רוח, the one is promised an “inheritance of glory” (4Q416 2 iii 12) and taught that he will join the angels after death. As the שם רוח are associated with Adam, 4QInstruction explains that the addressee has been entrusted with the garden of Eden (4Q423 1; see section 2.5, below). The Hagu passage contains a lesson for the addressee about his elect status. The שם רוח signify an ideal to which the addressee is to aspire. This pedagogical nature, and the instructional ethos of the work as a whole, presumes that the שם רוח could follow either the right or the wrong path. He can live in a way that is like the שם רוח or the דָּרוּת בֵּית רָקָּע. 4QInstruction teaches that it is God’s plan that the שם רוח should be among the elect. However, this is only realized through living ethically and understanding his elect status, which is aided by reflection on the Hagu passage. To depict this notion, the text draws on the portrayal of Adam in Genesis 1 to help the addressee understand the nature of his elect status.

2.5 Authority Over the Garden: The Elect Status of the שם רוח and the Garden of Eden (4Q423 1)

In 4Q423 1, the author again turns to the figure of Adam to further articulate the human condition of the שם רוח. 4Q423 1 1-3 reads:93

93 Goff, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 100, notes that it is also plausible that there is a link between Adam and the revelation revealed to the addressee in the fragmentary text, 4Q423 1. This text is reconstructed in Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34, 528, as פְּרָי הַמִּשְׁתֹּפָה. This could be translated as “G]od [gave] through Adam.” Concerning the text of 4Q423 1, see Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34, 507-8; Tigchelaar, To Increase Learning, 141; Elgvin, “An Analysis of 4QInstruction,” 278-79; Wold, Women, Men and Angels, 113-14.
In these verses, the addressee’s elect status is portrayed as a restoration of the prelapsarian relationship God enjoyed with the first man. The is to understand himself as similar to Adam. The text claims that he has been given authority over the garden of Eden. This passage relies considerably on the Genesis 2-3 narrative and reformulates language from the biblical account. Line 1 includes a description of Eden based on the depiction given in Genesis 2-3. The description of the trees as (“every delightful tree, desirable for giving insight”) is from Gen 2:9 and 3:6. Gen 2:9 states that the garden contains “every tree that is desirable to the sight.” Gen 3:6 describes the tree of the knowledge of good and evil as “desirable to make one wise” (םודד הטמיה לשלשל). 4Q423 1 combines elements from Gen 2:9 and 3:6 to stress that every tree in the garden is able to provide knowledge. This is not in the

---


95 Goff, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 100-102. See also idem, “Adam, the Angels and Eternal Life,” 1-21; Wold, Women, Men and Angels, 119.

96 Goff, Worldly and Heavenly, 100; Wold, Women, Men and Angels, 114; Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34, 509.

97 Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34, 509. See also Chazon, “The Creation and Fall of Adam,” 18.

98 The beauty (ונת恶心 ותesimal) of the trees in this passage is similar to the trees in orchards that Enoch visits on his travels. See, for example, 1 En. 24:5: “Behold, this beautiful tree! Beautiful to look at and pleasant (are) its leaves, and its fruit very delightful in appearance.” 1 En. 32:5: “This tree (is) beautiful! How beautiful and pleasing (is) its appearance!” See also 31:3; 32:2; Jub. 3:20. For further scholarship concerning 1 Enoch 24-32, see Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “Eden and Paradise: The Garden Motif in Some Early Jewish Texts (1 Enoch and other texts found at Qumran),” in Paradise Interpreted, Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity (ed. G. P. Luttikhuizen; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 38-49.
Genesis narrative. 4QInstruction not only uses the biblical adjective נפש (“desirable” and “delightful”). Gen 2:9 uses the term נפש to refer to all the trees of the garden. In Gen 3:6, the word is also associated with Eve’s realization that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is desirable. Gen 3:6 further states that only the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, not all of them, is able to make one wise (תרבות). Unlike the description in Genesis, 4Q423 1 1 uses the phrase “to make one wise” from Gen 3:6 to describe the entire garden. The prohibition of Gen 2:17, to abstain from eating from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, is not mentioned. Instead, 4Q423 1 conflates Gen 2:9 and 3:6 to stress that all the trees of the garden provide wisdom. The lack of prohibition reflects a positive conception of Adam. This is consistent with the exhortation to imitate Adam by faithfully cultivating the garden in 4Q423 1 2. Further, it reflects a positive portrayal of Adam in the vision of Hagu as made in the likeness of the angels (4Q417 1 i 17-18).


100 See also Wold, Women, Men and Angels, 115.

101 The omission of the divine prohibition of Gen 2:17 is found in other sapiential texts. For example, Ben Sira states, “He filled them with knowledge and understanding, and showed them good and evil” (17:7; see section 3.2.1.2). Cf. 4Q305 2 2-3: “He gave to Adam knowledge. The next line of the text is fragmentary but may have mentioned the knowledge of good and evil: “and evil(?) [ ]to know (?) ...” See Torleif Elgvin et al., Qumran Cave 4. XV Sapiential Texts, Part I (DJD 20; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 158. The fragmentary 4Q303 8-9 also appears to indicate that Adam ate from the tree of knowledge without any indication of a prohibition: “... and insight of good and evil, to ... Adam taking from it.” See Tigchelaar, “Eden and Paradise,” 51; Elgvin, DJD 20, 153. The prohibition against eating the fruit of the tree is mentioned in 4Q422 1 i 10; 4Q504 8 7; Jub. 3:18; 1 En. 25:4. See further Chazon, “The Creation and Fall of Adam,” 13-24 (esp. 14, 20); James L. Kugel, “Some Instances of Biblical Interpretation in the Hymns and Wisdom Writings of Qumran,” in Studies in Ancient Midrash (ed. J. L. Kugel; Cambridge: Harvard University Center for Jewish Studies, 2001), 155-69 (esp. 164-65); John R. Levison, “Adam and Eve,” in The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism (ed. J. Collins and D. Harlow; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010), 300-02; Konrad Schmid and Christoph Riedweg, eds., Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2-3) and Its Reception History (FAT 2/34; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).
2.5.1 The Authority of the Addressee over Eden

The most striking feature of 4Q423 1 is that the address has been given dominion over the garden of Eden. This is clearly stated in l. 2, which reads: “He (God) has given you (the addressee) authority over it (המשליות).” This assertion is derived from Adamic grant of dominion in Gen 1:28: “and have dominion over (רדה) the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over every living thing that moves on the earth” (cf. 1:26). This reworking of Genesis terminology is meant to help the address understand his elect status. The term המשלי is used elsewhere in 4QInstruction to refer to the address’s elect status. For example, 4Q418 81 3, states: “Over] his [in]heritance he has set you in authority (המשלי)” (cf. l. 9). 4Q416 2 iii 11-12 also reads: “and he has given you authority (המשליות) over an inheritance of glory” (cf. 1QH 5:23-24).

The verb המשלי, used in 4Q423 1 2 to describe God’s bestowal of elect status to the addressee, is also used in other Early Jewish traditions texts that discuss the grant of dominion given to Adam in Gen 1:28. For example, Ps 8:7 reads: “You have given them dominion (המשליות) over the works of your hands; you have put all things under their feet.” This use of המשלי is also in 4QWords of the Luminaries: “[Adam] our [fat]her, you formed in the likeness of [your] glory ... [the breath of life] you [br]eathed into his nose, and understanding and


knowledge ... [in the garden] of Eden which you planted you made [him] rule (דַּמֵּשֶׁךְ אָדוֹן, 4Q504 8 4-6).”^106 4QBlessings^b also mentions the Adamic grant of dominion: “You have made the man master (דַּמֵּשֶׁךְ אָדוֹן) (4Q287 4 2).”^107 4Q422 (4QParaphrase of Genesis and Exodus) 1 i 9-10 describes Adam as possessing the authority to eat the fruit of the garden, except for the tree of knowledge: “he set him in charge (דַּמֵּשֶׁךְ אָדוֹן) to eat the fruit [of the soil,] that he should not eat from the tree that gives knowledge of good and evil.”^108 4Q381 (4QNon-Canonical Psalms^b) 1 7 employs the verb דַּמֵּשֶׁךְ in a similar manner: “And by his breath he made them stand, to rule (לַדָּמֵשֶׁךְ) over all of these on earth ...”^109 The Treatise on the Two Spirits also alludes to God granting dominion to Adam: “He created Adam for dominion over (דַּמֵּשֶׁךְ) the world” (1QS 3:17-18; cf. 1Q34 3 ii 3).^110 These texts allude to Gen 1:28, referring to either stewardship over the world or the garden of Eden. Similar to 4Q504 and 4Q422, 4Q423 1 2 uses the word דַּמֵּשֶׁךְ to affirm that the addressee enjoys stewardship over Eden, as Adam once did.^111

---


^110 See Eshel, *DJD 13,19*; Moshe T. Segal, *The Complete Book of Ben Sira* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1953) (Hebrew), 102, uses דַּמֵּשֶׁךְ in his reconstruction of Ben Sira 17:2: “He gave them a fixed number of days, but granted them authority over everything on the earth.” See also Chazon, “The Creation and Fall of Adam,” 19; Jeremy Cohen, “Be Fertile and Increase, Fill the Earth and Master It”: The Ancient and Medieval Career of a Biblical Text (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989), 69. Cf. Wis 9:2: “and by your wisdom (you) have formed humankind to have dominion (יִנְתָּ פְּדוּתֵיכֶם) over the creatures you have made.”

2.5.2 Wisdom and the Cultivation of the Garden of Eden in 4QInstruction

In 4QInstruction, Eden functions as a metaphor for the wisdom that the ṣe’erīn has access to due to his elect status. The addressee is instructed to emulate the ṣeqār who are described as similar to angels and the divine Adam of Genesis 1 (4Q417 1 i 13-18). They have access to the same supernaturally revealed vision of Hagu that Adam had in the garden. 4Q423 1-2 suggests that by metaphorically granting the ṣe’erīn stewardship over the garden that he can possibly obtain the same knowledge that Adam once had in Eden.112 The ṣeqār is not mentioned in 4Q423 1, but it is likely referred to in l. 2 (ב[ה]ש[לוי]א[ו]ו[ו], “for making one very wise”). The wisdom that Adam possessed in the garden is the knowledge of good and evil, which all the trees provided according to 4Q423 1-2. 4Q417 1 i 6-8 claims that the addressee, like Adam, can learn the knowledge of good and evil—become wise—by studying the ṣeqār (cf. 4Q418 221 5; 4Q423 5 6; see section 2.3). This knowledge in 4QInstruction goes beyond knowing the difference between right and wrong. Rather, it refers to the acquisition of wisdom that also includes an understanding of the cosmos and the deterministic plan that directs it, not unlike the ṣeqār (4Q417 1 i 6-9).113 This understanding of the knowledge of good and evil is supported in the Treatise on the Two Spirits. In this text, the knowledge of good and evil is associated with a deterministic understanding of creation (1QS 4:24-26).114 The notion that both the ṣe’erīn and

---

112 Grant, Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology, 110; Goff, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 100-101. For a different formulation of a similar idea, see Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory of Adam, 117. Cf. 4Q418 251 1, “[the inheritance of Adam]” (שהאראʾא[ו]ו). The text may have originally discussed the addressee’s “inheritance” (cf. 4Q416 2 iii 11-12) as being similar to the “inheritance of Adam.” It is also possible that אראא refers to humankind and that the text stated that God has established the inheritance of all people. This is similar to 4Q418 81 20, for example.

113 Goff, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 62-64.

114 The Treatise on the Two Spirits concludes its teachings on the state of the world by claiming: “For God has sorted them into equal parts until the appointed end and the new creation. He knows the result of their deeds for all times [everlas]ting and has given them as a legacy to the sons of man so that they may know good [and evil]” (1QS 4:24-26).
Adam acquire the knowledge of good and evil, understood as divinely revealed knowledge about the created order, is consistent with other ancient Jewish texts that associate Adam with angels.\(^\text{115}\)

4QInstruction emphasizes that the המין is supposed to work in the garden. 4Q423 1 2 states that he was given dominion over Eden (לֵוהֵת וּלְשָׁמָרָה (“to serve it and till it”)). This line derives from Gen 2:15, which states: “The Lord God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to till it and keep it (לָצֵא וּלְשָׁמָרָה).”\(^\text{116}\) In Genesis 2, God places Adam in the garden to till and keep it, and in 4Q423 1 2, the addressee is exhorted to do the same.\(^\text{117}\) This further emphasizes the elect status of the המין and the instruction to understand himself as similar to Adam. The emphasis on toil helps the garden function as a metaphor for the addressee’s acquisition of wisdom. The המין obtains knowledge from the study and contemplation of the מִזוֹת.\(^\text{118}\) The use of Eden indicates that he must fulfill the promise of his elect status through right conduct and contemplation of the מִזוֹת.

2.5.2.1 The lack of cultivating the garden in 4QInstruction. In 4Q423 1, tilling and keeping Eden by the המין represents his successful acquisition of wisdom, but l. 3 states that the garden may also produce “thorn and thistle.” The phrase, used in 4Q423 (“[the earth] will make thorn and thistle sprout for you”), is a clear allusion to Gen 3:18 (cf. Hos 10:8; Isa 32:13). In Gen 3:18, “thorn and thistle” are yielded by the earth (ราָם) as a

\(^{115}\) Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 101.


\(^{117}\) The verb לָצֵא denotes working the earth, which is also the case in Gen 2:5; 4:2, 12.

\(^{118}\) Eden is not evoked as the final home of the righteous in the same way as it is in *1 Enoch* 32-33, for example. However, 4QInstruction’s stress on the beauty of the garden’s trees is consistent with the Enochic eschatological tradition. See Tigchelaar, “Eden and Paradise,” 38-49; Sandra R. Shimoff, “Gardens: From Eden to Jerusalem,” *JSJ* 26 (1995): 145-55.
consequence of Adam’s transgression. This phrase further represents the miserable conditions Adam must work after he is expelled from Eden. Although 4Q423 1-3 uses language from Gen 3:17 that is associated with the expulsion of Adam from Eden, expulsion is not a motif of 4QInstruction. The claim that the .setBackgroundResource(199,199,199) is granted authority over the garden assumes that he has access to it, not that he is banished from it. Rather than referring to the earth producing as in Genesis 3, 4Q423 1-3 states that the garden itself has the potential to produce if it is not maintained properly. This phrase describes an inversion of the picturesque setting of Eden. Similarly, 1QH 16:25-26 states: “When I withdraw (my) hand, it (the garden) becomes like a juniper [in the wilderness], and its rootstock like nettles in salty ground. (In) its furrows thorn and thistle (BlockSize(name="755", size=20, offset=0, depth=-2)) grow up into a bramble thicket and a weed patch.” Here, the phrase signifies a beautiful garden falling into disarray. In 4QInstruction, Eden functions as a metaphor for the elect status of the addressee—he has access to the garden, but he has to cultivate it to achieve wisdom. In the description in 4Q423 1, for the elect, both the right path and the wrong path are represented by the garden. A thriving, lush garden indicates

---

119 The end of 4Q423 1-3 also alludes to the Genesis narrative. Line 3 states, “and its strength will not yield to you” (הסה עות תתן). This recalls language from Cain’s punishment for murdering his brother in Gen 4:12: “it [the earth] will no longer yield to its strength (BlockSize(name="500", size=20, offset=0, depth=-2))”. The Apocalypse of Moses also conflates Gen 3:18 and 4:12 when recounting Adam’s expulsion from Eden (24:2). See Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34, 510; Karina Martin Hogan, “The Exegetical Background of the ‘Ambiguity of Death’ in the Wisdom of Solomon,” JSJ 30 (1999): 1-24.

120 Goff, “Adam, the Angels and Eternal Life,” 1-21 (esp. 7).

121 For an extended discussion concerning the affinities between the Hodayot and 4QInstruction see Goff, “Reading Wisdom at Qumran,” 263-88. See further, Macaskill, Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology, 86-88; Julie A. Hughes, Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot (STDJ 59; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 150-59, 178-81.

122 This phrase is used to evoke the imagery of desolation in Hos 10:8: “The high places of Aven, the sin of Israel, shall be destroyed. Thorn and thistle (BlockSize(name="418", size=20, offset=0, depth=-2)) shall grow up on their altars. They shall say to the mountains, Cover us, and to the hills, Fall on us.” Cf. Heb 6:8: “But if it (the basic doctrine of Christ that leads to maturity taught to an individual) produces thorns and thistles, it is worthless and on the verge of being cursed; its end is to be burned over.”

123 Chazon, “The Creation and Fall of Adam,” 18; Wold, Women, Men and Angels, 119.
the addressee’s successful procurement of wisdom through the study of the adeshah. Its degradation symbolizes his failure to reach the pedagogical intentions of the text, and his elect status is then at risk. As with Adam, it is the responsibility of the adshah to maintain the health of the garden through diligence and hard work, dedicated to attaining wisdom. Living a life devoted to the study of wisdom also connects the elect addressee with the adeshah.

2.5.3 Adam, the Angels, the Masach, and Eternal Life

The masach is instructed in the vision of Hagu to identify with the adeshah, who are among the elect, described as similar to the angelic Adam of Genesis 1 and fashioned in “the likeness of angels” (4Q417 1 i 17), as observed above. The masach is also likened to the angels throughout 4QInstruction. A key text for this topic is 4Q418 81 1-5, which reads.

---

124 Goff, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 104.


126 Goff, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 104-115.

Your lips he has opened as a spring to bless the holy ones. So you, as an eternal spring, praise [his name, beca]use he has separated you from every fleshly spirit. And you, separate yourself from all which he hates and keep away from all abominations of the soul, [beca]use he has made everyone and has bequeathed to each man his inheritance. He is your portion and your inheritance among humankind, [and over] his [in]heritance he has given you dominion. So you in this way glorify him, by making yourself holy to him, as he has established you as most holy [of all the people of the] world. And among all the [a]n[gels] he has cast your lot and your glory he has greatly magnified. He has established you for himself as a first-born son among …

This text helps the addressee understand that he is different from the rest of humankind because God has granted him elect status, which is described in 4Q418 81. Lines 1-2 proclaim that he is separated from the רוח ברש (ll. 1-2). The should thus separate himself from this spirit, and, likewise, he is to keep away from what God hates and abominations of the soul. The רוח ברש is probably referring to not only the wicked but all the non-elect who do not possess the potential to achieve life after death, in contrast to the addressee. The רוח ברש is opposed to the רוח ברש in the vision of Hagu passage (4Q417 1 i 13-18). 4Q416 1 states the רוח ברש will be destroyed in the final judgment (l. 12).

God created all people and gave each person a particular “inheritance” or allotment in life (cf. l. 20; 4Q416 3 2; 4Q423 5 3). Line 3 makes the claim that God himself is the “inheritance” of the addressee: “But he is your portion and your inheritance (חקלאות וחללים) among humankind.” This is an allusion to Num 18:20. This passage refers to a biblical tradition that justified Aaronid authority over Temple sacrifices (cf. Ezek 44:28). Although Strugnell and

128 Goff, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 104-115.

129 Num 18:20: “Then the Lord said to Aaron: You shall have no allotment in their land, nor shall you have any share among them; I am your share and your possession (חקלאות וחללים) among the Israelites” (cf. Pss 16:5; 73:26). See Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34, 305; Puech, “Les Fragments eschatologiques,” 111; Rey, 4QInstruction, 317; Elgvin, “The Mystery to Come,” 121.

Harrington argue that the intended audience of the text enjoys some degree of priestly authority, it is more likely that priestly tropes are used to describe the elect status of the addressee. In 4Q418 81 3, Num 18:20 is applied to the תֵּחָן indicating the special inheritance that God has determined he have—the supernaturally revealed הֵמָּה, that he is in lot of the angels (l. 5), and that he has the hope of eternal life. Further, in Num 18:20, God is the inheritance of Aaron to make him special among “all the sons of Israel.” In 4Q481 81, God is the inheritance of the תֵּחָן to make him special among “all the sons of Adam,” or humankind in general. The elect addressee is portrayed as holy and superior to the non-elect—all other people.

4Q418 81 5 declares that God has established the תֵּחָן as his “first-born son” (בָּנוֹי) (cf. 1Q26 3 2). This term usually refers to the son who is to receive his father’s inheritance. The addressee is among the “sons of God,” a phrase used elsewhere to refer to angels. Understanding the תֵּחָן as similar to the angels is supported in 4Q418 81 4-5, which claims that “With all the [div]ine being[s] he has cast your lot” (בָּנוֹי (חָטָא תְפִיפָרָם) (cf. 1 En. 69:11; cf. 1QS 11:7-8; 1QH 19:14-15). The term “lot” reflects a deterministic perspective that indicates the status of

---

131 Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 106-107; Strugnell and Harrington, *DJD 34*, 20; Torleif Elgvin, “Priestly Sages? The Milieu of Origin of 4QMysteries and 4QInstruction,” in *Sapiiential Perspectives*, 67-87. The available evidence does not indicate that the תֵּחָן is a priest. Important issues such as ritual purity and liturgical prayer are never mentioned. See Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Halakhic Elements in the Sapiiential Texts,” in *Sapiiential Persrsectives*, 89-100.

132 cf. 4Q416 4 3; 4Q418 88 ii 8; 4Q418 1025; 4Q418 1725. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 179, contends that 4Q418 81 is written to Aaronic priests who bless the “holy ones,” whom he understands as the “laity of Israel.” However, 4QInstruction never makes a distinction between “priest” and “laity.” See Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 236; L. T. Stuckenbruck, “‘Angels’ and ‘God’: Exploring the Limits of Early Jewish Monotheism,” in *Exploring Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism* (ed. L. T. Stuckenbruck and W. E. S. North; JSNTSup 263; New York: Continuum, 2004), 45-70.

the elect is part of God’s inheritance that he established for him. The Rule of Benedictions also claims that the elect have been placed among the lot of the angels (1QSb 4:26). 1QS 11:7-8 describes the elect status of the members of the Dead Sea sect by claiming that God “has given them an inheritance in the lot of the holy ones” (cf. 2:2). In 4Q423 8 4, rather than claim that the addressee is the first-born son of God (בכור), claims that he is like his first-born (בכור). This kaf-variant indicates that some scribes who copied 4QInstruction may have been wary of the angelology of this text as too extreme.

This statement may be referring to the creation of Adam in the likeness of the angels described in 4Q417 1 i 17. In other Second Temple Jewish literature, Adam is also called the firstborn. In Conf. 63, for example, Philo states that Adam is known as “the eldest son” and “the firstborn.” Also, in Leg. 2:14, Philo explains that “the firstborn man” was the first to give “names to things,” referring to the Adam naming the animals in Genesis 2 (cf. Cher. 53). Thus, the author of 4QInstruction may be claiming that the addressee is similar to the angel-like Adam. Because of his elect status, the בכור is in a sense more like the angels than other humans.

134 The deterministic text, Treatise on the Two Spirits, states that God has “cast the lots” of all people (1QS 4:26). See also Lange, “The Determination of Fate,” 39-48; Elgvin, “The Mystery to Come,” 121.

135 Goff, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 106.

136 Also, in Conf. 1:63, τοῦτον μὲν γὰρ πρεσβύτατον οὐν ὁ τῶν ὄλων ἀνέτευξε πατήρ, ὃν ἐτέρωθι πρωτόγονον ὄνομασέ, καὶ ὁ γεννηθεὶς μὲντοι, μιμοῦμενος τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς ὦδοὺς, πρὸς παραδείγματα ἀρχήτου πιόυκον ἑμῖρρον τὰ εἰδὴ. (Italics are mine.)

137 Leg. 2.14: ἢ μὲν ρητῇ, παρόσον τὴν θέσιν τῶν ὄνομάτων προσήψε τῷ πρῶτῳ γενομένῳ ὁ νομοθέτης. (Italics are mine.) cf. Cher. 53, μετὰ γὰρ τοὺς φύντας ἐκ γῆς ἀρχόμενος δηλοῦν τὸν γεννηθέντα πρῶτον ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, περὶ οὗ τὸ παράπαν οὐδὲν ἐφήκαν, ὡς ἦδη πολλάκις τοῦνα αὐτοῦ προειπὼν ἀλλὰ μὴν αὐτὸ κατατάττων εἰς τὴν ἐν λόγῳ χρῆσαν, φησὶν ὅτι ἔτεκε τὸν Κάν. This passage indicates that Adam was born from a divine source rather than earthly parents. (Italics are mine.)

138 It is also worth mentioning that Jesus, designated the second Adam by the apostle Paul (1 Cor 15:45; cf. Rom 5:14-21), is identified as the firstborn over all creation (Col 1:15; cf. Wis 7:1). Also, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, Jesus—the new Adam—is described as the son of God and greater than the angels: τοσοῦτον κρέατόν γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων ὅσω διαφορότερον παρ’ αὐτούς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα. Τίνι γὰρ εἶπεν ποτὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων· υἱὸς μου εἶ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγένηκα σε; καὶ πάλιν· ἐγὼ ἐσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱὸν; ὅτεν δὲ
4Q418 81 1 encourages the צָרִים (צָרִים), a descriptor often used for angels in Second Temple Jewish literature. Similarly, ll. 11-12 exhort: “Before you receive your inheritance from his hand, glorify his holy ones (צָרִים) begin [with] a song of all the holy ones.”

4Q418 81 4 uses צָרִים to exhort the addressee to give glory to God. 4Q416 2 iii 11 instructs him to “praise his name constantly” (cf. 4Q417 1 ii 6, 9).

Praise of God by the angels is a concept in Early Jewish literature. For example, it is a central element in Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: “They are honored among all the camps of the αἱ ἄνθρωποι and revered by councils of humans … they declare the splendor of his kingship” (4Q400 2 2-3; cf. 4Q403 1 i 32-33; Daniel 7; Ps 103:20-21; 148:1-2; 1 En. 40:1-5; 61:12).

By praising God the צָרִים acts in a way that is like the angels. The Hodayot also describes the elect as in the “lot of the holy ones” and links this notion with the praise of God (1QH 19:6-12; cf. 1QS 11:7-8; 4Q511 2 i 8).

4Q418 81 emphasizes the similarity between the addressee and the “holy ones” by explaining that the צָרִים is holy. Lines 3-4 read: “And you, with this glorify him: by consecrating (בְּהַמְדָּכֵר) yourself to” him, as he has established you as (the) most holy one [of all] the world.

---

139 See Tigchelaar, To Increase Learning, 232; Rey, 4QInstruction, 315-16.

140 The blessing of angels is relatively uncommon in Second Temple Judaism (Tob 11:14; 11Q14 1 ii 2-6; 4Q400 2 2-3; cf. 4Q403 1 i 32-33). See Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34, 304; Stuckenbruck, “‘Angels’ and ‘God,’” 64-65. For a different interpretation of the term “holy ones,” see Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory of Adam, 178, 186. See also Puech, “Les Fragments eschatologiques,” 110-11; Sullivan, Wrestling With Angels, passim.

141 Tigchelaar, To Increase Learning, 94, Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34, 301. See also Puech “Les Fragments eschatologiques,” 109.

142 4Q418 126 ii could refer to angels praising God: “Continually they praise his name” (l. 10). However, the text is fragmentary. See Goff, Discerning Wisdom, 40.

143 See Stuckenbruck, “‘Angels’ and ‘God,’” 61.

144 Goff, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 113.
Goff has provided a convincing defense of reading the phrase קדוש קדשים in 4Q418 81 3-4 as a reference to the holiness of the addressee. He responds to the interpretation of this phrase as referring to the “the Holy of Holies” and metaphorically describing the elect קדש as the sanctuary itself. Goff correctly argues that קדוש קדשים should be interpreted as a superlative adjective (“most holy”) rather than as a direct reference to the holy of holies (cf. Exod 30:10). The קדש is a “most holy one.” This interpretation is consistent with the assertion that he is most holy “[of all the people of the] world.” Language of holiness describes the elect status of the addressee, his special inheritance from God. The root קדש also recalls the angels—“the holy ones” (ll. 11-12)—evoking the central theme that his elect status makes him like the angels (ll. 4-5). The phrase קדוש קדשים of l. 4 alludes to the temple, but the main point of the

---

145 See Tigchelaar, To Increase Learning, 233.

146 Goff, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 105-6.

147 Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34, 302.

148 Puech, “Les Fragments eschatologiques,” 112. While holiness is clearly the theme here, the temple is not the primary topic because it rarely comes up in the text, nor do cultic/ritual purity issues. Further, the reference to Num 18:20, mentioned above, takes the priestly language out of a leviitical context, which also supports Goff’s interpretation of the text. For an extended discussion concerning the use of the term קדוש קדשים: see Goff, Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom, 104-15. See also Goff, Discerning Wisdom, 40.

149 See Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34, 15. In their translation of 4Q418 81, they prefer “Holy of Holies” (p. 302). Translating the phrase as a superlative is also favored by Kampen, Wisdom Literature, 132; Tigchelaar, To Increase Learning, 231; Wold, Women, Men and Angels, 107, 162. See Elgvin, “Priestly Sages?” 81, “he set you as holy among the holy ones,” and Rey, 4QInstruction, 309, “il t’a établi saint des saints.”

150 4Q418 234 1 includes a fragmentary reference to “an inheritance of holiness.”
phrase is to express the holiness of the addressee. The connection between the חסד and the angels is further strengthened by Adam’s connection to the angels throughout the Second Temple period (see section 2.4.2.3.1).

2.5.4 Working for a Reward: Imitating Adam and the Angels

The addressee is not only created like the angels, he is supposed to imitate them in order to fulfill his elect status. The angels, according to 4Q418 69 ii 13-14, never cease pursuing truth: “Indeed, would they say: ‘We are tired of works of truth, [we] are weary of …’ Do [they] not wal[k] in eternal light? … [gl]ory and an abundance of splendor are with them.” Fragments 55 and 69 ii of 4Q418 assert that the חסד should be like the angels. 4Q418 81 4-5 indicates that he should act like the angels because he was fashioned by God in a way that makes him similar to them. 4Q418 81 4-5 thus elaborates the claim of ll. 1-2 that God has separated the addressee from the rest of humankind (הוהי וּלְךָ). The vision of Hagu passage (4Q417 1 i 13-18) instructs him to be like the וּלְךָ וּלְךָ, who were created in the likeness of the angels. The addressee is in the “lot” of the angels; however, his reception of any rewards associated with this status is not a given. 4Q418 55 8-10 states that he must fulfill the destiny allotted to him by consistently pursuing all the roots of understanding. This comes through the study of the רז נַעְשָה. This lesson is similar to the exhortation in 4Q423 1 for the addressee to imitate Adam and, in a metaphorical sense, till the garden.

In order to gain eternal life, the חסד is instructed to emulate Adam in the garden of Eden by studying the רז נַעְשָה (4Q423 1; see section 2.5). Similarly, the addressee is to follow the example of the angels in order to enjoy a blessed afterlife with them after death. The addressee is reminded that he will die. 4Q418 103 ii 9 teaches that both a person’s belongings and body will pass away: “[More]over your wealth is together with your flesh. [When the days of] your
life [come to an end], they (also) will come to an end together” (cf. 4Q416 2 iii 7-8; 4Q418 55 11). After expiration of his flesh, the part of him that has affinity with the angels simply continues to exist. While eternal bliss for the elect is not explicitly stated in 4QInstruction, it can be reasonably inferred. 4Q418 69 ii 12-13 claims that the angels have eternal life: “the sons of heaven, whose inheritance is eternal life” (cf. 1. 7). 4Q417 2 i 10-12 states that through the study of the addressee can know who will inherit glory and who will inherit iniquity. Lines 10-12 read:

10 for what is more lowly than a poor man? Do not rejoice (חתמה) in your mourning lest you toil in your life. [Gaze upon the mystery]
11 that is to be and seize the birth-times of salvation. Know who is to inherit glory and (who) iniquity. Has he not [established for the contrite of spirit]
12 and for those who mourn eternal joy (업체ת צלום)? Be an advocate on behalf of your own interests and let there not be …

These lines teach that the addressee should not “rejoice” (חתמה) in his mourning and that there is “eternal joy” (업체ת צלום) established for those who mourn. The passage portrays the current life of the addressee as characterized by mourning. This characterization accords with the ethics of 4QInstruction, which emphasizes that the addressee should be “humble” (עון), 4Q417 2 i 14). If

---

151 Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34, 331; Tigchelaar, To Increase Learning, 99.


153 The life of the addressee is portrayed in a much more positive manner elsewhere in the composition. For example, 4Q416 2 iii 11-12 states: “He (God) has raised your head out of poverty. With the nobles he has placed you, and he has given you authority over an inheritance of glory” (cf. 4Q415 6 2; 4Q418 126 ii 8; 4Q418 177 5). See Wold, Women, Men and Angels, 155-56. See also Goff, Discerning Wisdom, 43. For scholarship addressing the notion of realized eschatology in 4QInstruction, see B. Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing”: Liturgical Communion with Angels in Qumran (SSU 14; Uppsala: University of Uppsala Press, 1999); D. Dimant, “Men as Angels: The Self-Image of the Qumran Community,” in Religion and Politics in the Ancient Near East (ed. A. Berlin; Bethesda;
mourning characterizes the present existence of the מִשְׁכַּב, “eternal joy” is reasonably understood as referring to the future eternal life he can obtain after death. 4Q418 102 5 reads: “[from the] iniquity of abomination you will be innocent, and in the joy of truth you will ...” Here joy signifies being spared from God’s judgment. 4Q416 4 3 associates joy with the inheritance allocated to the מִשְׁכַּב who is urged to “rejoice in the inheritance of truth” (cf. 4Q416 2 iii 8). Associating joy and eternal life is found elsewhere in Early Judaism. In I Enoch, for example, joy is placed in an eschatological context to refer to the future reward of the righteous. The Epistle of Enoch promises that “you will have great joy like the angels of heaven” (I En. 104:4). Joy is also promised to the righteous in 2 Bar. 73:1 and 4 Ezra 7:91 (see section 5.6.2.2.2).

In 4QInstruction, “eternal joy” likely refers to eternal life with the angels, which is available to the addressee after death. He is encouraged to guard his holy spirit by carrying out the instruction of the text (e.g., 4Q416 2 ii 6). If the elect addressee successfully preserves this spirit, it continues to exist after the death of the body. In the Treatise on the Two Spirits the phrase “eternal joy” is apportioned to the elect along with eternal life as שֵׁמֶשׁ הַשָּׁמְשֹׁי בַּהֲיוֹן נֶצֶך (Šēmēš ha-shamsi bāḥayyā netzēḵ) as

---


155 I En. 104:2, 4; Jub. 23:30-31; 1QS 4:6-8; cf. I En. 51:4-5; Dan 12:3.

eschatological rewards (1QS 4:7; cf. Jub. 23:30-31; T. Jud. 25:4; 4Q417 2 i). This text describes
one of the punishments designated for the wicked as the “eternal pit” (שֵׁאֵת עַלְמָה), a reference to
their death and ensuing relocation to Sheol (4:12). 4QInstruction uses similar language. 4Q418
69 ii 6 proclaims that upon death “the foolish of heart” will return to “the eternal pit (שֵׁאֵת עַלְמָה)”
(cf. 4Q418 126 ii 7-8), which probably refers to punishment after death. The wisdom text
does not describe the eternal life the addressee can acquire. However, given the composition’s
emphasis on his affinity with the angels, it is reasonable to conclude that if he emulates them by
modeling himself after Adam through proper care of the garden, he will join them after death. In
4QInstruction, the anthropological concept of life after death for the elect is then linked to Adam,
the נֵפֶשׁ גֵּרְיוֹן and the angels. Whether or not the נֵפֶשׁ גֵּרְיוֹן obtains the eternal bliss designated for the
elect after death is based on his conduct and devotion to the pedagogical instruction of this
Qumran sapiential text.

2.6 Conclusion

4QInstruction depicts two opposed kinds of humans—the נֵפֶשׁ גֵּרְיוֹן and the נֵפֶשׁ רָעָה. This is
understood as two different kinds of humans. This dichotomy is rooted in Genesis 1-3, primarily
the portrayal of Adam. The נֵפֶשׁ רָעָה signify the elect, who are like the angels and possess access to
supernatural revelation. The נֵפֶשׁ רָעָה represents the non-elect, who do not have access to
revelation. While the נֵפֶשׁ רָעָה can be understood as having the hope of a blissful eternal life, like
the angels, the נֵפֶשׁ רָעָה indicates human mortality and the finitude of physical existence. The
main pedagogical goal of the vision of Hagu is for the נֵפֶשׁ רָעָה to learn that he is like the נֵפֶשׁ גֵּרְיוֹן.
They should be understood as a model to follow. The addressee is distinguished from the נֵפֶשׁ רָעָה

157 For an extensive discussion see Goff, 4QInstruction, forthcoming (Ch. 10).
as are the רז נביה (4Q418 81 1-2). He has access to the עם רוח הבשר; יraised יף have the vision of Hagu. The רז נביה are fashioned “according to the likeness of the holy ones.” The מטב is in “the lot of the angels” (4Q418 81 4-5). The רז נביה are associated with Adam (אמרות) because they are created in the same manner—like the angels—and both have the hope of eternal life after death with the angels. The addressee, like Adam before him, has authority over the garden of Eden (4Q423 1). The vision of Hagu passage as a whole constitutes a lesson from which, after much reflection, the מטב could attain understanding about key aspects of his elect status.

The anthropology of 4QInstruction is based on a positive interpretation of the figure of Adam to help members of the elect understand their own elect status. The elect are created like the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 (and the angels, 4Q417 1 i 17), have access to the same knowledge that Adam had in Eden (the רז נביה), and are entrusted to work the garden in a faithful manner as Adam did, in order to gain eternal life (4Q423 1). 4QInstruction also reads the figure of Adam as the basis of a dualistic anthropology. The רז נביה and the יף רז נביה represent two different ways of being human. However, Adam is more explicitly allied with the יף רז נביה than the רז נביה.

The author of 4QInstruction turned to Genesis 1-3 when reflecting on the nature of humankind. This is the case with other Early Jewish authors. Ben Sira, Philo of Alexandria, and 4 Ezra all relate conceptions of humanity to these chapters in Genesis. I will now examine how the Genesis 1-3 exegetical traditions found in 4QInstruction change the way we understand those found in other Second Temple Jewish compositions. In the next chapter, I will examine the Wisdom of Ben Sira and demonstrate that although the author also turns to the figure of Adam to explain the human condition, this contemporary of 4QInstruction interprets the first man differently.
CHAPTER THREE
SOME FOR ALL AND MORE FOR SOME: GOD’S APPORTMENT OF WISDOM
AND BEN SIRA’S INTERPRETATION OF THE BIBLICAL ADAM

3.1 Introduction

The Wisdom of Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus) is the most extensive extant instruction from the
Second Temple period.¹ The text was written by “Jesus son of Eleazar son of Sirach” (50:27) in
Hebrew in Palestine between 196-175 B.C.E, sometime between the death of the high priest
Simon II (50:1-21) and the beginning of the Hellenistic reform imposed under the reign of
Antiochus IV (175-164 B.C.E.).² His grandson later translated the text into Greek ca. 117 B.C.E.
The composition is modeled on the book of Proverbs while reflecting the contemporary
circumstances. In many ways, Ben Sira defends the biblical sapiential tradition and the ideas of
the sages who preceded him. For example, he explains that an ethical life is essential for

¹ The original title of the instruction is not known since no extant Hebrew MS includes this information. The
author’s full name is located in a subcaption of MS B: “Simon son of Jeshua son of Eleazar son of Sil’a” (51:30; cf.
50:27). In this discussion, “Ben Sira” will be used for the book and the author who is responsible for its content.
For the Hebrew text, see Pancratius C. Beentjes, The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant
Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts (VTSup 68; Leiden: Brill, 1997);
Francesco Vattioni, Ecclesiastico: Testo ebraico con apparato critico e versione greca, latina e siriaca (Naples:
Istituto Orientale di Napoli, 1968), provides a synopsis of the Heb., Gk., Lat., and Syr. Because of the fragmentary
state of the extant primary text, it is often difficult to establish a definitive translation, especially since only 68
percent of the composition survives in Hebrew. For a general introduction to the Wisdom of Ben Sira, see Maurice
Krause, S. M. Schwertner, and G. Müller; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 307-17; Richard J. Coggins, Sirach: Guides to
Apocrypha and Pseudepigraph (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998). Concerning Ben Sira and Qumran, see
Émile Puech, “Ben Sira and Qumran,” in The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction and Theology
(ed. A. Passaro and G. Bellia; DCLS 1; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 79-118.

² George W. E. Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Literary and Historical
While most scholars agree that the Simon referred to Sir 50-1-21 is Simon II, James C. VanderKam, From Joshua to
Caifaphas (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), 141–57, contends that it is Simon I, who was high priest about one-
hundred years earlier. Even if VanderKam is correct, we can determine the dates Ben Sira likely composed his work
based on the reference to his grandson in the prologue. It is assumed that if Ben Sira had written during the time of
Antiochus IV’s imposed reforms, he would have made some reference to them. See Skehan and Di Lella, The
Wisdom of Ben Sira, 8-9.
righteous living. Ben Sira claims that living according to the guidance of wisdom will lead to abundant rewards and blessings, including a full and prosperous life and an eternal name (Sir 4:11-19; cf. Prov 2:1-11). The combination of shorter sayings and lengthy theological units is also similar to Proverbs. In his composition, Ben Sira wants to provide instruction on a number of theological issues. Of particular importance in the text is the nature of God’s control over the world and the human condition.

3.1.1 A Brief Background

Ben Sira lived in Jurasalem (50:27), where he had established some kind of context to provide instruction to men apart of the upper strata of society. Ben Sira writes in part to respond to the increasing Hellenism of the Jews in Palestine. To express his thought, Ben Sira regularly uses Hellenistic rhetoric and literary genres. Along with polemicizing against Greek cultural influence, Ben Sira also attempts to address other issues that were important to him. He praises Simon and the temple cult during a period when there was an increased struggle over the


5 Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 62.


priesthood, especially the high priesthood. Ben Sira also seems to polemicize against apocalyptic wisdom like what is found in the Enochic tradition.

3.1.2 Structure of this Chapter

This chapter explores Ben Sira’s anthropology—how he understands the nature of humankind. The sage conceives of a two-tiered understanding of humanity. Israel is on top and all the other nations below. The core difference between the two groups of humanity is that because of the covenant that Israel has with God, they have been apportioned more wisdom than the other nations. The sage explains that in principle all people have access to God’s wisdom. He states that humans can appreciate wisdom through the observation of the created order (Sir 39:12-43:33; cf. 1:9-10). He also claims that wisdom is available from learning about other cultures and studying the words of the sages (38:34-39:5). Moreover, Ben Sira contends that wisdom once had a more direct connection to all the nations. In chapter 24, the sage proclaims that wisdom is first associated with the entire world before she settles in Israel: “Over waves of the sea, over all the earth, and over every people and nation I (Lady Wisdom) have held sway” (Sir 24:6). He also claims that humans were imbued with wisdom at creation. In 17:7, Ben Sira explains that in the primordial period Adam (i.e., humanity) was shown the tree of knowledge. In vv. 11-14, the sage’s reference to the Torah indicates that the tree of knowledge can also be understood as the Torah. This indicates that all humanity once had access to the Torah. However, in 24:8-11, Ben Sira states that God commanded Lady Wisdom to make her dwelling

---

8 Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 62.

in Israel, which implies she was no longer available to the other nations in the same way as before. The result of Wisdom dwelling in Israel is the codified Torah.\textsuperscript{10}

Ben Sira presents the Torah as the ultimate expression of wisdom, superior to any other source. Therefore, Israel not only has access to the wisdom available to all the nations, they also have the extra portion of wisdom in the form of the Torah. According to Ben Sira, there are two kinds of wisdom, which I categorize as general wisdom and special wisdom, following Gregory S. Goering.\textsuperscript{11} General wisdom is available to all human beings through the created order and special wisdom is made available to Israel through God’s commandments given to Moses on Sinai. The Torah differentiates Israel from everyone else and is the core of Ben Sira’s two-tiered conception of humanity. To depict this understanding of humanity, the sage turns to the portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3. In this chapter, I will demonstrate how Ben Sira uses the biblical depictions of Adam to depict the human condition. Further, I will compare Ben Sira’s anthropology based on the portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 with what is found in 4QInstruction. I will show that although both texts turn to the same passage to discuss the human condition, there are major differences between the two compositions. The primary difference is that 4QInstruction uses Adam to depict the elect status of the addressee while Ben Sira interprets the biblical portrayals of Adam to portray humanity in general, but the issue is complicated by the fact that Ben Sira reads the tree of knowledge of good and evil as a cipher for the Torah, God’s bequest to Israel over against the other nations, as discussed below.


\textsuperscript{11} Gregory S. Goering, \textit{Wisdom’s Root Revealed: Ben Sira and the Election of Israel} (JSJSup 139; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 79-89
Ben Sira’s anthropological reflections based on Adam are primarily found in three passages: 1) 15:14-17; 2) 17:1-14; and 3) 33:10-15. This chapter is divided into two primary sections that chiefly focus on these three passages of the instruction. In the first section, I will examine how Ben Sira understands the biblical Adam as the paradigmatic figure for all of humanity. The sage uses the portrayals of the first man in Genesis 1-3 to contend that all humans share traits such as mortality, dominion over all the other creatures, moral discernment, and free will (Sir 15:11-20; 17:1-10). For example, Ben Sira turns to the depiction of Adam in Gen 2:7 to argue that all humanity has been created with the freedom to choose whether or not to obey the Torah. Also, in chapter 17, Ben Sira explains that Adam was given access to the tree of knowledge, which is understood to be the Torah (17:7).

In the second section of this chapter, I will discuss the manner in which Ben Sira differentiates Israel from the other nations. The sage contends in chapter 33 that Israel is the chosen nation of God. Although the Torah is made available to all humans from the beginning (17:7; 24:6), in chapter 24, Ben Sira explicitly states that as the elect people of God, Israel was allotted more wisdom than the rest of humanity once Lady Wisdom came to dwell specifically in Jerusalem (vv. 8-11; 1:9-10). Ben Sira roots these events in creation by drawing upon Genesis 1-3. The distinction based on the accessibility to wisdom is at the core of Ben Sira’s two-tiered conception of humanity.

3.2 Adam and Characteristics Common to All Humans

Ben Sira makes several general anthropological reflections based on his interpretation of the portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3. The sage presents Adam as the paradigmatic figure for all humanity. The most extensive discussion addressing the human condition in the instruction is
found in 15:11-18:14. This passage as a whole addresses the theme of human sin. The unit includes an extended argument responding to the accusations that God causes humans to sin and that he is not concerned with punishing sinners because he cannot see the deeds of every person. The passage consists of two sections: 1) 15:11-16:14; and 2) 16:15-18:14. Each section takes the form of a debate between the sage and an accuser. Both sections open with the formula “Do not say…” (15:11; 16:17). This phrase is followed by the sage’s rendition of his opponent’s words starting with “From God…” (15:11; 16:15). As part of his response to the accusations Ben Sira turns to the biblical portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3. The sage gives his interpretation of the first man to account for basic human characteristics. This section will examine those traits recounted by Ben Sira. I will begin by exploring 17:1-10 in which Ben Sira provides his fullest interpretation of the biblical Adam.

3.2.1 Adam and All Humanity (17:1-10)

3.2.1.1 Echoes of Genesis: mortality and dominion (17:1-4). In 16:26-30, Ben Sira recites a poem dedicated to God’s creation. He proclaims that the cosmos has been arranged in
perfect harmony according to God’s divine wisdom (vv. 26-30; cf. 43:10; Isa 40:26; Wis 11:20). Ben Sira begins in 16:26 by recalling Gen 1:14-18, in which God created the celestial bodies. In vv. 28-30, following the order of creation in Genesis 1, the sage states that God next turned his attention to the earth and filled it with his good things (16:29; cf. Gen 2:4b-5). Like the biblical account, the sage first describes the creation of the animals followed by humanity (Gen 1:20-25). He concludes his recounting of the animals by noting that they, in contrast to the stars (Sir 16:27-28), will return to the earth from which they came (cf. 40:11; Gen 3:19; Job 34:15; Qoh 3:20; 12:7). Ben Sira continues to follow the Genesis 1 creation narrative by next giving a report of the creation of humans. To do this, he naturally looks to the biblical figure of Adam. The sage provides an exegesis of the biblical creation account of the first man in 17:1-10. The first four verses of this passage read:


15 George W. E. Nickelsburg, I Enoch (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 155; F. Lelli, “Stars,” in Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible (2d ed.; ed. K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P. van der Horst; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 809-15. Ben Sira declares that the stars have dominion over the heavens (16:26; 43:9-10) and “They neither hunger nor grow weary, and they do not abandon their tasks” (16:27b; cf. 17:30-32; Gen 1:16, 18; Pss 103:22; 104:19; 136:8-9; 148:5-6). According to the sage, they obediently follow their heavenly courses which God established. This is similar to the description of the luminaries of heaven in I En. 2:1, which states that they move according to their appointed order (cf. 41:5; 69:20). The celestial bodies are presented in contrast to the mortal creatures of the earth (Sir 16:29-17:2a).

16 For text critical issues see Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 279-80. See also Goering, Wisdom’s Root Revealed, 82. Luis Alonso Schökel, “The Vision of Man in Sirach 16:24-17:14,” in Israelite Wisdom: Theological and Literary Essays in Honor of Samuel Terrien (ed. J. G. Gammie, W. A. Brueggemann, and S. Terrien; Missoula, Mont.: Union Theological Seminary Scholars, 1978), 235-60, observes that the creation of humankind is dealt with in the reverse of the biblical order: mortal condition, dominion over the earth, image of God. Ben Sira’s account also alludes to Genesis 9; Psalms 8; 90; Job 14; and Isaiah 65. See Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 281-2.
1 κύριος ἐκτίσεν ἐκ γῆς ἄνθρωπον
καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστρεψεν αὐτὸν εἰς αὐτήν
The Lord created human beings out of earth,
and makes them return to it again.

2 ἡμέρας ἀριθμὸν καὶ κυριόν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς
καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τῶν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς
He gave them a fixed number of days,
but granted them authority over everything on the earth.

3 καθ᾽ ἐαυτὸν ἐνέδυσεν αὑτοὺς ἰσχύν
καὶ κατ᾽ εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτοὺς
He endowed them with strength like his own,
and made them in his own image.

4 ἔθηκεν τὸν φόβον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσις σαρκός
καὶ κατακυριεύειν θηρίων καὶ πετεινῶν
He put the fear of them in all living beings,
and gave them dominion over beasts and birds.

In this passage, Ben Sira describes humanity by alluding to both portrayals of Adam in
Genesis 1-2. In v. 1, the sage uses the term ἄνθρωπον in the singular to mean “humanity” in a
general sense. Burton Mack argues that since the term is singular the sage is specifically
referring to Adam. The pronouns referring back to ἄνθρωπον after 17:1 are plural (e.g., αὐτοῖς
in 17:2a), supporting Mack’s understanding of Adam as used as a universal figure in Sir 17:1-10.

3.2.1.1 Human mortality. Contrary to what is described in the biblical creation
account, Ben Sira proclaims that God intended humanity to be mortal from the beginning. The
sage, in 17:1a, explains that humankind (ἄνθρωπον) was created from the earth (ἐκ γῆς). This is
a reference to the creation of Adam in Gen 2:7: “then the LORD God formed man from the dust

---

17 Burton Mack, *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira’s Hymn in Praise of the Fathers* (Chicago: University of

of the ground” (LXX: ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς). The sage continues by proclaiming that God makes all humans return to the earth (εἰς αὐτήν) from which they are formed and that all people live only a certain number of days (cf. 17:30, 32; Gen 6:3; Ps 146:4; 4 Ezra 7:116; 139; 8:7; 10:14; 2 Bar. 48:46).

Verse 1b alludes to Gen 3:19 and to the judgment against Adam and Eve for eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. In the biblical account, God tells Adam that “out of it (the ground) you were taken; you are dust, and to dust you shall return” (Gen 3:19; LXX: ἐξὸς τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι σε εἰς τὴν γῆν ἡς ἡς ἐλήμφθης ὅτι γῆ εἰ καὶ εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσῃ; cf. Qoh 12:7). Esther G. Chazon aptly observes, “Ben Sira places the allusion to Adam’s return to dust in antithetical parallelism with and as a counterpoint to the creation of human beings from the earth (cf. Gen 2:7). The return to dust is thus presented as inherent in creation and morally neutral.” This viewpoint is supported throughout Ben Sira’s composition.

For example, the verse that immediately follows reads: “He gave them a fixed number of days” (Sir 17:2a; cf. 18:9-10; Pss 8:6-9; 90:10; Job 10:9; 14:1-2; 15:5; Isa 65:20).

The sage also reminds his students that “all must die” (Sir 8:7) and that all humans are “dust and

---


20 Far more than what is attested in 4QInstruction, Ben Sira and Qoheleth stress that death is an inescapable reality for all people. They express this notion by using the root “to return” (שׁמע), similar to 4Q18 69 ii 6 (e.g., Sir 40:11; Qoh 3:20). This is also the case in Gen 3:19, which states that humans will return (שׁמע) to the earth.
ashes” (17:32; cf. 10:9; 17:30-31; Gen 2:7; Ps 103:15-18). The sage echoes this view of human mortality in 41:10a claiming: “Whatever comes from earth returns to earth.” In 40:1b, Ben Sira again stresses the inevitability of death for all humans: “from the day they (the children of Adam) come forth from their mother’s womb until the day they return to the [earth]” (cf. Gen 3:20; Job 7:1-2; Qoh 2:22-23). The sage exhorts the addressees: “Do not fear death’s decree for you” (Sir 41:3) because it is “the Lord’s decree for all flesh” (v. 4). In the biblical story, mortality is God’s judgment against Adam for rebelling in the garden. However, Ben Sira interprets death as a universal axiom. Ben Sira never indicates that death is a result of Adam’s sin. Instead, mortality was intended for humanity from the beginning.

The possible exception to this statement is Ben Sira’s claim in 25:24 that “From a woman sin had its beginning, and because of her we all die.” This verse suggests that Ben Sira blames Eve for sin and death (Gen 3:6). This viewpoint becomes standard in later tradition. For example, the first century C.E. text, the Apocalypse of Moses, includes Adam accusing Eve of bringing destruction in the form of death upon all humanity: “And Adam says to Eve: ‘What have you made among us? You have brought great wrath upon us, which is death, ruling over all humanity’” (14:2). A similar sentiment is found in Pseudo-Philo (L.A.B. 13:10). In the New Testament, 1 Tim 2:13-14 declares that the woman, not Adam, was deceived and became a  

---

21 In 18:1, which immediately follows the reference to “dust and ashes” in 17:32, Ben Sira contrasts mortal humanity with the eternal creator God: “He who lives forever created the whole universe.” In this way, he emphasizes the mortal state of humanity.

22 This verse may allude to Qoh 12:7: “and the dust returns to the earth as it was, and the breath returns to God who gave it.” See Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 470.

transgressor. In light of these kinds of passages, it is reasonable that many scholars assume that Ben Sira is referring to Eve in Sir 25:24.24

John R. Levison and John J. Collins have also discussed other passages that shed light on the identity of the woman in Sir 25:24. Levison claims that the sage’s hermeneutic could be indebted to the portrayal of the “strange woman” (הַרְשָׁפָה) of Proverbs 7.25 John Collins also notes an interesting parallel found in the fragmentary wisdom text from Qumran, 4Q184, entitled “The Wiles of the Wicked Woman.” 4Q184 8-9 states that “She is the start of all the ways of wickedness … for her paths are paths of death.”26 Neither Proverbs nor 4Q184 refers to Eve or directly addresses the origin of sin and death. Their concern seems to be describing a particular type of woman. Sir 25:24 is consistent with the sage’s sexist attitude throughout the composition.27 This attitude is also reflected, for example, in Sir 42:14: “Better is the wickedness of a man than a woman who does good; it is woman who brings shame and disgrace.” Levison argues that 25:24 is best read in the context of a lengthy reflection on the “evil wife,” rather than referring to Eve (Sir 25:13-26).28 While Levison’s position is possible, it is also reasonable that Ben Sira is referring to the Genesis 3 account of Eve transgressing God’s prohibition. According to the Genesis narrative, Eve succumbs to the temptation of the serpent

24 Kugel, Traditions of the Bible, 127, also notes the contradiction between these two passages.


by eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil (Gen 3:6), then gives the fruit to Adam to eat as well (v. 7). This led to God pronouncing the punishment of mortality to the first couple, expelling them from Eden, and blocking the entrance with a flaming sword (vv. 19-24). Because of this, it is easy for an author to blame Eve for the reality of death. Further, it is possible that this is the same tradition that is found in other Early Jewish compositions, along with rabbinic and Christian texts. In Ben Sira, the reference to Eve, however, appears to be an *ad hoc* comment about her made during his passionate warning concerning bad wives that is not consistent with his statement on death elsewhere in his instruction. Rather than indicate that Ben Sira has a fall of humanity in mind, I am inclined to give more weight to the sage’s discussion of death in Sir 17:1-2a. These verses are in the context of the instruction dedicated to creation and the sage’s anthropology (Sir 16:24-18:14). Ben Sira contends that death is the fate of all humanity from the beginning, not a consequence of the actions of Adam and Eve. Ben Sira’s emphasis on human mortality is far more pronounced than in 4QInstruction. In 4QInstruction, most humans (the שֵׁרֶץ) will be destroyed in the final judgment (4Q416 1 12), while the elect addressee is promised the hope of a blissful eternity after the physical body expires (see section 2.4.2). Ben Sira is more similar to Qoheleth who proclaims that all humans die (e.g., Qoh 2:16; 3:2; 7:17; 9:5; Sir 14:17).

**3.2.1.1.1 Is hard work a consequence of Adam’s sin?** Ben Sira also addresses the reality of hard work. He instructs his students: “Do not hate hard labor or farm work, which was created by the Most High” (Sir 7:15). The sage’s statement is different than the Genesis narrative. Rather than understood as a consequence of sin, it is simply described as a creation of God and should not be hated. In Gen 3:17b, God declares that since Adam ate of the forbidden fruit, “cursed is the ground because of you (אֲרוֹרָה הַאדָם וְעָבְרָה) //LXX: ἐν τοῖς ζῷοις τῆς γῆς/
λόπαι); in toil you shall eat of it all the days of your life.” Later in the narrative, it states that the “LORD God sent [Adam] forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from which he was taken. He drove out the man” (Gen 3:23). Hard work and toil as a result of Adam’s sin is echoed, for example, only chapters later in Gen 5:29: “he named him Noah, saying, ‘Out of the ground that the LORD has cursed this one shall bring us relief from our work and from the toil of our hands (LXX: ἀπὸ τῶν ἐργῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν λυπῶν τῶν χειρῶν ἡμῶν).’” 29 Contrary to the Genesis narrative, Ben Sira indicates that God created hard work and it was not the consequence of Adam’s transgression. Ben Sira also addresses the issue of hard work in 40:1 stating that “hard work (LXX: ἀσχολία μεγάλη) was created for everyone and a heavy yoke is upon the sons of man (LXX: ἐπὶ νοῦς Ἀδάμ), from the day they come forth from their mother’s womb until the day they return to the mother of all the living” (cf. L.A.E. 44:3). This verse alludes to Gen 3:19-20: “By the sweat of your face you shall eat bread until you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; you are dust, and to dust you shall return (יִּדְשֶׁהָ כּוֹרָדוֹתֶּ בַּאֲדָם כּוֹרָדוֹתֶּ).” In this verse, work and death are linked together. Ben Sira makes the same association in his statement in 40:1. The sage’s reference in 40:1b to “return to the mother of all” refers to Adam’s description of Eve in Gen 3:20. 30 Ben Sira, however, understands the phrase “the mother of all the living” as referring to the earth, and the return to it as death. The association of mortality and hard work in the biblical account appears to be adopted by the sage. However, unlike the Genesis account, Ben Sira does not explain that these aspects of the human condition are consequences for eating of

29 cf. Gen 8:21: “And when the LORD smelled the pleasing odor, the LORD said in his heart, ‘I will never again curse the ground because of humankind, for the inclination of the human heart is evil from youth; nor will I ever again destroy every living creature as I have done.’”

30 This verse alludes to Gen 3:20: “The man named his wife Eve, because she was the mother of all living (יִּדְשֶׁהָ כּוֹרָדוֹתֶּ בַּאֲדָם כּוֹרָדוֹתֶּ).”
the forbidden fruit because it was available to Adam from the beginning (Sir 17:7). Rather, both hard work and death were created by God and are simply part of being human. Ben Sira’s reinterpretation of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and the origin of mortality and hard work suggests that the sage does not hold to a doctrine of the fall to explain the human condition.

3.2.1.1.2 Dominion over all creation. In 17:2-4, the sage utilizes the portrayal of Adam in Gen 1:26-28 to explain that humanity has been given dominion over all other creatures. In v. 2b, the sage asserts that although God made humans mortal he “granted them authority (ἐξουσίαν) over everything on the earth.” This recalls Gen 1:26 and 28 in which God proclaims that humans have authority (ἐξουσίαν) over the earth and all that is in it (cf. Gen 9:2). The sage explains that human dominion over the earth is based on God bestowing humanity strength (ἰσχίων) like his own (v. 3a) and creating them in his own image (εἰκόνα αὑτοῦ, v. 3b). The meaning of the term ἰσχίων is not immediately evident. Gerald T. Sheppard argues that 17:3a could be read as God “clothed them with strength like his own.” He takes this to be a reference to Gen 3:21, in which God made Adam and Eve garments of animal skin for clothing after pronouncing the judgment of their expulsion from Eden. Sheppard asserts Ben Sira may have reinterpreted Gen 3:21 in light of Proverbs 31. Proverbs 31:17 states that the wise woman “girds her loins strongly (ἰσχυρῶς)” (v. 17) and “strength (ἰσχίων) and beauty are her clothing” (v. 25). These verses are understood by Sheppard to have been reused to shape Gen 3:21 into proverbial wisdom. However, given the manner in which Ben Sira is following the Genesis creation account (vv. 2-4) “dominion” seems to be a more reasonable translation than “strength.”

Further, similar understandings of ἵσχύν are found in the Hebrew Bible. For example, Job 26:12 explains that God has complete control over his creation by stating that God, ἴσχω κατέσασθε τὴν θάλασσαν (“by his power he stilled the sea”). In Isa 40:26, ἴσχύς is used by the author to assert that God has control over everything, from the grass to the princes and rulers to the ends of the earth. Also, in the Wisdom of Solomon, the word ἵσχυν is used to indicate the dominion humanity was given over all creation (10:2). The sage thus contends that the dominion granted to humanity is like God’s, which is complete dominion over the earth (cf. Jub. 2:14; Opif. 142). The notion that God has total dominion over the earth is found throughout the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Jewish literature. In the Second Temple composition Bel and the Dragon, for example, the author describes God as the one “who created heaven and earth and has dominion over all living creatures (ἐξο�ντα πάσης σαρκὸς κυριεύαν, 1:5).” Ben Sira continues his discussion of humanity’s dominion in v. 4. This verse recalls Gen 1:26 and 28 in which God commands the first couple to exercise dominion (LXX: κατακυριεύσατε) over all the animals of the earth. The sage uses the same verb found in Gen 1:28 to explain that God gave humanity “dominion (κατακυριεύειν) over beasts and birds” (Sir 17:4; cf. Gen 9:1, LXX). This assertion is similar to the psalmist’s claim in Ps 8:7 that God gave humans dominion (ἐν θεώσι //LXX: κατέστησας) over the works of his hands. Allusions to Genesis 1 to describe God granting humanity authority over the earth are also found in several other Second Temple compositions.

32 Wis 10:2: ἐδωκεν τε αὐτῷ ἵσχυν κρατῆσαι ἀπάντων.

33 Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 281-2. Since 17:3b alludes to Gen 1:27, it is reasonable to read v. 3a as referring to Gen 1:26. He is thus reflecting the biblical account in his interpretation. Cf. Levison, Portraits of Adam, 36-37, 47-48.

34 For references to God’s dominion over the earth in the Hebrew Bible and other Early Jewish Literature see, for example, Job 25:2; Pss 22:28; 72:8; 103:22; 145:13; Zech 9:10; Bel 1:5; Jub. 12:19; cf. Ps 8:6; Wis 9:2. See also Rev 1:6; 1 Tim 6:16.

35 ἐνθάδε (the verb used in Ps 8:7) is also used in Gen 1:18 and 3:16 to express the notion of having dominion.
In the Wisdom of Solomon, for example, the author claims that by his wisdom God “formed humankind to have dominion (ἰνα δεσποτή) over the creatures you (God) have made, and rule the world (διέπει τὸν κόσμον) in holiness and righteousness” (9:2-3a). The Treatise on the Two Spirits states: “He (God) created Adam for dominion over (לטמאישון) the world” (1QS 3:18). In 4Q423 1-2, the elect are likened to Adam by being given dominion over the garden of Eden (see section 2.5). While Ben Sira turns to Genesis 1 to understand the human condition, 4QInstruction uses the same language to understand the elect. Ben Sira, in v. 3b, explains that God made humanity “according to his own image,” which clearly alludes to Gen 1:26a, 27a (cf. Gen 9:6b; 4 Ezra 8:44). The sage further associates dominion (ἰσχὼν, v. 3a) with being made in the image of God.

3.2.1.2 Made in the image of God (17:6-10). In vv. 6-10 of the poem, the sage expands on what it means for humanity to be made in the image of God. The passage reads:

36 4QWords of the Luminaries describes Adam’s authority over the garden: “[in the garden of Eden which you (God) planted you made [him] (Adam) rule (לטמאישון)’” (4Q504 8 6; cf. 4Q422 1 i 9-10; 4Q287 4 2; 4Q381 1 7). The grant of dominion of Adam over the world and Eden is also important in 4Q423 1 2.

37 Ben Sira’s understanding of God’s sovereignty is associated with the sage’s depiction of God as king of the cosmos. For more on Ben Sira’s views concerning kings and kingship, see Martha Himmelfarb, “The Wisdom of the Scribe, the Wisdom of the Priest, and the Wisdom of the King according to Ben Sira,” in For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity (ed. R. Argall, B. Bow, and R. Werline; Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity, 2000), 89-99; Benjamin G. Wright III, “Ben Sira on Kings and Kingship,” in Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers (ed. T. Rajak et al.; Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 76-91. See also Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 281.

38 Wicke-Reuter, Göttliche Providenz und menschliche Verantwortung, 251; Sheppard, Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct, 78-79; Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 282. See George H. van Kooten, Paul’s Anthropology in Context: The Image of God, Assimilation to God and Tripartite Man in Ancient Judaism, Ancient Philosophy and Early Christianity (WUNT 232; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 9. The expanded Greek version of this text includes 17:5 listing the various faculties which God bestowed on man, including the gift of mind and reason: “They obtained the use of the five faculties of the Lord; as sixth he distributed to them the gift of mind, and as seventh, reason, the interpreter of one’s faculties.” Di Lella observes: “This purely Greek gloss seems to have been prompted by the five items enumerated in v. 6 and by the subsequent text of vv. 7-10.” Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 279.
6 διαθούλιον καὶ γλῶσσαν καὶ ὀρθαλμοῦς
καὶ καρδίαν ἔδωκεν διανοεῖσθαι αὐτῶς
Discretion and tongue and eyes,
ears and a mind for thinking he gave them.
7 ἐπιστήμην συνέσεως ἐνέπλησεν αὐτῶς
καὶ ἀγαθὰ καὶ κακὰ ὑπέδειξεν αὐτῶς
He filled them with the wisdom of understanding,
and showed them good and evil.
8 ἔθηκεν τὸν ὀρθαλμὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν
δεῖξαι αὐτῶς τὸ μεγαλεῖον τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ
He put the fear of him into their hearts
to show them the majesty of his works.
9 ἵνα διηγῶνται τὰ μεγαλεῖα τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ
to proclaim the grandeur of his works.
10 καὶ ὅνομα ἄγιοσμοι αἰνέσουσιν
And they will praise his holy name.

Ben Sira’s depiction of humanity in 17:6-8a is aptly summarized by Gregory S. Goering.
He states that according to the sage’s anthropology “Human beings have a general, God-given
capacity for sensory perception, moral action, and intellectual acuity.”40 While vv. 6-8a describe
humanity’s sensory, psychological, intellectual, and moral endowments, vv. 8b-10 explain the
reason God has given humans these gifts. Verse 8 states that the fear of the Lord is a divine gift
that allows humans to see the “the majesty of his (God’s) works” (cf. 18:4). The sage continues
by claiming that the observation of God’s works should naturally elicit praise of the creator (vv.
8-10). Most striking about these verses is his statement that God gave humanity wisdom and

---

39 Sir 17:8b-10 is textually problematic. The two lines contained in vv. 9-10 are reversed in some MSS. GI repeats
the phrase “The magnificence of his works” in vv. 8b and 9. The future indicative verb form in v. 10 does not fit the
context. I have followed the reconstruction of Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 279.

knowledge (ἐπιστήμην, vv. 6-7; cf. Gen 2:9)\(^{41}\) from the beginning.\(^{42}\) The sage asserts that God not only shows (δείξα) humanity his works, he has also shown (ὑπεδείξεν) them the difference between good and evil (v. 7).\(^{43}\)

3.2.1.2.1 Adam is given “good and evil.” The phrase “good and evil” (ἀγαθὰ καὶ κακὰ) in v. 7b recalls the biblical portrayal of Adam in Genesis 2-3, specifically Gen 2:17 and 3:1-24. The expression alludes to the fruit of tree of the knowledge of good and evil, which God commands Adam not to eat (Gen 2:17). In the Genesis account, Adam obtains wisdom and knowledge by disobeying God and taking of the forbidden fruit (Gen 3:6). Ben Sira, however, reads Genesis 1-3 from a sapiential perspective. He states that God himself gave humanity wisdom and showed them good and evil (v. 7).\(^{44}\) It is possible that Ben Sira’s association of the knowledge of good and evil with wisdom is rooted in the description of the fruit of the tree in Gen 3:6, which states that the tree was desirable to Eve because it would make her wise (знанияем חצץ). Proverbs 3 similarly depicts wisdom as a tree that should be seized: “She (wisdom) is a tree of life to those who lay hold of her; those who hold her fast are called happy (3:18).” Ben Sira also compares wisdom to a tree using Edenic language.

---

\(^{41}\) The term ἐπιστήμην is consistently translated as “wisdom” by a number of scholars. See, for example, Sheppard, *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct*, 81; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, 59; Goering, *Wisdom’s Root Revealed*, 90-94.

\(^{42}\) Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, 59. Mack, *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic*, 114, observes: “In Sir 17:1-14, the divine bestowals upon the human creature are listed and come to climax in the gift of a ‘heart to understand’ (17:6b).”

\(^{43}\) In v. 6a, it should be noted that διαβούλων (“discretion”), is the same word the Ben Sira’s grandson used to translate the term רצון in 15:14b. Here, the word is used in a neutral sense to stress human free will. See Skehan and Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 282

\(^{44}\) Adams, *Wisdom in Transition*, 186.
3.2.1.2.1 Wisdom and the garden of Eden imagery. Ben Sira describes wisdom in 24:13-17 using imagery that recalls the garden of Eden. In vv. 16-17, the sage alludes to the depiction of Eden in Genesis. In v. 16, the sage states that Lady Wisdom proclaims that her “branches are glorious and graceful (δόξης καὶ χάριτος);” in v. 17 he announces that she “bud[s] forth delights” (ἐβλάστησα χάριν) that “become glorious and abundant fruit” (καρπὸς δόξης καὶ πλοῦτος; cf. 1:11; 4:13; 6:29, 31; 14:27; 40:27; Prov 8:17, 19; 11:30). The verb ἐβλάστησα (“budding forth”), used to describe wisdom’s produce, is the same term used to describe the growth of the fruit bearing trees in Gen 1:11 (LXX: βλαστησάτω). Also, in Gen 2:9, the author proclaims: “Out of the ground the LORD God made to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight (ὁραῖον εἰς ὁράσιν) and good for food (καλὸν εἰς βρῶσιν).”

Ben Sira’s portrayal of wisdom in vv. 13-17 is similar to the depiction of Eden found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. In Ezek 31:5-9, the author describes Assyria as a cedar of Lebanon that “towered high above all the trees of the field; its boughs grew large and its branches long, from abundant water in its shoots” (31:5). The branches of the tree provided protection and shade for all the animals and nations. The author describes the tree as “beautiful in its greatness, in the length of its branches. The cedars in the Garden of God (גarden of Eden) could

---

45 Sheppard, *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct*, 19-71 (esp. 50-61). Sheppard (p. 52) claims that the vegetation vocabulary evokes the description of Eden in Genesis 2. He contends that the creation motif is most clearly evidenced by the direct references to the rivers that spring from Eden in vv. 25-29. In the biblical account, the description of the rivers immediately follows the creation of the trees and Adam (Gen 2:10-14).

46 For a discussion of the priestly imagery in vv. 13-17, see Sheppard, *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct*, 55-56. Similar to Sir 24:17, although likely composed in the second century C.E., 3 Baruch also describes the tree of the knowledge of good and evil as a vine. In 4:8, “the tree that led Adam astray” is identified as “the vine,” which God “did not permit Adam to touch.” The composition goes on in the same chapter to say that it was “the cause of great evil” (v. 9) and brought a “curse” to humankind (v. 15). The taste of the vine was “bitterness” but was later transformed into “sweetness” (v. 15).

47 cf. Gen 1:11 (LXX): “Then God said, ‘Let the earth put forth (βλαστησάτω) vegetation: plants yielding seed, and fruit trees of every kind on earth that bear fruit (ζύλων κάρποιον ποιοῦν καρπῶν) with the seed in it.’ And it was so.”
not rival it, nor the fir trees equal its boughs; the plane trees were as nothing compared with its branches; no tree in the garden of God was like it in beauty” (31:8). This passage implies that Eden was understood to contain various kinds of extremely beautiful trees, including cedars, firs and plane trees, which are among the trees listed in Ben Sira’s description of Eden (cf. Sir 24:13-14).

Ben Sira’s description of wisdom in 24:13-17 is also similar to depictions of flora associated with Eden in other Second Temple Jewish literature. 1 Enoch, for example, portrays the trees located just outside of the Garden of Righteousness (Eden) in a similar manner (1 Enoch 29-32). In both Ben Sira (24:15) and 1 Enoch, the trees are described as aromatic (亞ורים; 1 En. 29:2; 30:2-3; 31:1, 3; 32:1) and associated with specific fragrances including cinnamon (כנסימי; 1 En. 30:3; 32:1; 4QEn 1 12:25; cf. Exod 30:32), myrrh (שמורה; 1 En. 29:2; 32:3), onyx (шедדה), and galbanum (ץאּבֲאֶן; 1 En. 31:1; חלבנה). Ben

48 Whether or not Ben Sira had access to 1 Enoch 1-36 is not clear. However, it is possible that he was familiar with traditions that were present in 1 Enoch. There is evidence for this position also in understanding the sage’s argument concerning the origin of sin in Ben Sira 15 and 33 set against the notion that the Watchers were responsible for sin coming into the world. See Argall, 1 Enoch and Sirach; cf. Wright, “Putting the Puzzle Together,” 89-113, also argues that there are thematic similarities in Ben Sira and 1 Enoch.

49 In Ben Sira, Lady Wisdom proclaims that she gives a sweet smell like κνίναμομο in order to prompt listeners to pursue her. In Prov 7:17, however, κνίναμομο and σμύρνας are associated with the adulterous woman that lures simple men to their dooms (see 7:1-27). In Proverbs, the adulterous woman is pitted against Lady Wisdom. The adulterous woman is associated with alluring smells (along with other imagery) to portray her as desirable. See Michael V. Fox, Proverbs 1-9 (AB 18A; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 239-62 (esp. 247). Cf. Song 1:13; 3:6; 4:6, 11, 14-16; 5:5, 13.

50 For a discussion concerning the reconstruction of this verse, see Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch, 325.

51 1 En. 24:3-6 and 2 En. 8:3 also refer to various fragrances to describe the tree of life (e.g., “fragrant” and “of ineffable . . . fragrance”; cf. 2 Bar. 29:7). However, this tree is located outside of the garden and 1 Enoch’s description of the tree of knowledge is more consistent with Ben Sira’s description of wisdom as a tree. See Peter T. Lanfer, Remembering Eden: The Reception History of Genesis 3:22-24 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 95-96. Further, the imagery especially in Sir 24:15 makes clear references to Exod 30:23-24: “Take the finest spices: of liquid myrrh (LXX: το ανθος σμορνης ἐκλεκτης) five hundred shekels, and of sweet-smelling cinnamon (LXX: κνηαμομον οδοους) half as much, that is, two hundred fifty, and two hundred fifty of aromatic cane, and five hundred of cassia—measured by the sanctuary shekel—and a hin of olive oil.” Exod 30:34 lists all three of the fragrances used by Ben Sira to describe wisdom: “The LORD said to Moses: Take sweet spices, stacte, and onycha, and galbanum, sweet spices with pure frankincense (LXX: ἡσσματα στακτης ὄνχης χαλβανης...
Sira’s depiction of wisdom is also similar to the description of the tree of knowledge of good and evil in 1 Enoch.\(^{52}\) In 1 En. 32:3-6, the tree is called the tree of wisdom (τὸ δένδρον τῆς φρονήσεως, v. 3).\(^{53}\) Similar to Ben Sira’s depiction of wisdom, the tree is described as “very beautiful and glorious and majestic” (καλὰ καὶ ένδοξα καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῆ, v. 3; καλὸν, v. 5; cf. Sir 24:16-17), “pleasant in appearance” (ἐπίχαρι τῇ ὁράσει, v. 5; cf. Sir 24:16-17), and “emitting a strong aroma” (ἡ δὲ σμήνα αὐτοῦ, v. 4; cf. Sir 24:15). Like the fruit of the tree in Ben Sira, in 1 Enoch, the fruit is compared to “a bunch of grapes from a vineyard” (cf. Sir 24:17), which give the one who eats of them “great wisdom” (ἐπιστάνται φρόνησιν μεγάλην, v. 3; cf. Sir 24:22-29).\(^{54}\) This portrayal of wisdom further emphasizes Ben Sira’s description of wisdom using ήδοσμοὶ καὶ λίβανον (an equal part of each).” The sage explicitly states that these aromas are associated with the odors of the incense in the tent (cf. Sir 24:15). Cf. Jub. 3:27: “And on that day on which Adam went forth from the Garden, he offered as a sweet savour an offering, frankincense, galbanum, and stacte, and spices in the morning with the rising of the sun from the day when he covered his shame.” See Gus W. Van Beek, “Frankincense and Myrrh,” BA 23 (1960): 82-83.

Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch, 323, claims that in 1 Enoch 29-32 the author assumes that his audience identifies the east as the well-known origin of spices and perfumes, and Enoch’s references of these locations is evidence that he traveled there. The author primarily describes spices that were brought to Jerusalem for the temple cult because the audience would have been familiar with them. I agree that the references to the spices would have certainly been understood by his audience as associated with the temple cult. However, I believe the author’s reference to the east is not to display proof of Enoch’s journey. Rather, it seems that based on the consistent references to Eden, which is identified as the garden of Righteousness, the reference to the east refers to the placing of Eden in the biblical account (Gen 2:8). Further, it seems likely that the author intends to establish a connection between the temple and Eden, possibly in an effort to portray the temple as the restored Eden. See Tichelaar, “Eden and Paradise,” 42.

\(^{52}\) Argall, 1 Enoch and Sirach, 93-94, argues that the descriptions of the tree of wisdom in 1 Enoch 32 and the metaphor of the tree of wisdom in Ben Sira 24 “draw upon a common tradition that describes four principle aspects of the tree of wisdom: its height, foliage, fruit and fragrance,” and suggests that the similarities between the two descriptions “derive from an oral tradition antecedent to both accounts. The tradition likens the tree’s height to a needleleafed conifer, its foliage to that of a broadleafed tree, its fruit to the fruit of the vine, and its fragrance to the bark of aromatic trees.” Although I agree with Argall that there are strong parallels shared between the portrayals of Wisdom in Ben Sira 24 and the description of the tree of knowledge in 1 Enoch 32, I tend to agree with Tichelaar, “Eden and Paradise,” 42, who contends that claiming the descriptions originate in oral tradition is not well supported. However, it is not completely unreasonable that both may have been drawing upon the same tradition, or that Ben Sira may have been using 1 Enoch (cf. Jubilees 3).

\(^{53}\) Both are understood as the tree of Wisdom, and both are likely drawing on Gen 3:6-7. See Tichelaar, “Eden and Paradise,” 40-41.

\(^{54}\) Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch, 327, argues that the ambiguous nature of the wisdom that Adam and Eve obtained from the tree may indicate that it was good. However, if the knowledge from the tree is understood to be positive, there is no indication as to what other circumstances may have caused Adam and Eve to be driven from the garden (1 En. 32:6).
Edenic language. There is similar language also used to describe the garden of Eden in the *Apocalypse of Moses* (the *Vita Adae et Evae*). The garden is depicted as containing aromatic vegetation (ἔωδιας, 38:4) that produces fragrant fruit (ἔωδιας, 29:3-5; άρωματα 29:5). In 29:5-6, Adam takes food from the garden which is described as sweet spices and fragrant herbs (ἔωδιας άρωματα). The composition goes on to specify that Adam took “crocus and nard and calamus and cinnamon and the other seeds for his food” (κρόκον καὶ νάρδον καὶ κάλαμον καὶ κινάμωμον καὶ λοιμὰ σπέρματα εἰς διατροφὴν αὐτοῦ; cf. Song 4:15). *4 Ezra* depicts Eden in a like manner. The flowers of Eden are described as “beautiful” (6:3), and, in 6:44, the author recounts the creation of the garden: “Immediately fruit came forth in endless abundance and of varied appeal to the taste, and flowers of inimitable color, and odors of inexpressible fragrance (fructus multitudinis immensus et concupiscentia gustus multiformis et flores colore inimitabili et odores odoramentis investigabiles)” (cf. 7:12; Gen 1:11-12; 2:9; 3:6; *Jub.* 2:7). Similar to Ben Sira, the Hodayot associates knowledge with the restored Eden (1QH 16:4-8). The author describes the garden as full of trees, including “cypress and elms … cedars …” and “trees of life” (ll. 6-7). The use of Edenic language in the description of wisdom in Ben Sira 24 reinforces Ben Sira’s claim that God gave Adam access to the tree of knowledge from the beginning.


It is possible that the portrayal of the tree of life in *1 Enoch* 24-25 could be used to support the notion that Ben Sira is also comparing Wisdom to the tree of life. However, *1 Enoch* does not place the tree of life in Eden, while Ben Sira places Wisdom as a tree residing firmly in the garden.


The author of the Hodayot’s knowledge has been supernaturally revealed (1QH 16:4-8). This is similar to Ben Sira’s portrayal of the Torah. The sage explains that Torah was supernaturally revealed and that its dwelling place is a sort of restored Eden (Israel).
Ben Sira’s interpretation of Genesis 2-3 implies that Adam was not prohibited from
eating of the tree.\textsuperscript{58} Rather, Adam was given access to its wisdom from the beginning (17:7). In
the biblical account, Adam and Eve gain wisdom because they eat of the forbidden fruit of the
tree of the knowledge of good and evil. However, Ben Sira does not mention any prohibition or
primordial sin. Further, he explains that Adam had free access to the tree of knowledge. While
some later Jewish (and Christian) authors who found the origins of sin and death in Adam and
Eve’s disobedience,\textsuperscript{59} Ben Sira seems not to have held to a doctrine of the “fall” of humankind.\textsuperscript{60}
In 4QInstruction, there is also no mention of the prohibition from eating of the tree of knowledge
of good and evil. This is consistent with the positive portrayal of Adam throughout the
composition (see section 2.4.2.2), and claim that all the trees of the garden provided wisdom
(4Q423 1; see section 2.5). Other Dead Sea Scrolls also appear to ignore the Genesis
prohibition. The Words of the Luminaires (4Q504 8) proclaims that when God fashioned Adam
in the image of his glory he blew into his nostril the breath of life, and intelligence and
knowledge.\textsuperscript{61} Like Ben Sira, this composition claims that God gave Adam commandments
(“you imposed on him not to turn away”), but it appears he was not prohibited from acquiring

\textsuperscript{58} The prohibition against eating the fruit is mentioned in other Early Jewish literature. For example, see 4Q422 l i
10 and 4Q504 8 7; l En. 25:4; 32:6; Jubilees 3. See G. Vermes, “Genesis 1-3 in Post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic
Literature before the Mishnah,” \textit{JJS} 43 (1992): 221-25. This notion may also be reflected in his description of
Wisdom in Ben Sira 24. In this chapter, Ben Sira makes several references to the Genesis creation account and uses
Edenic imagery to describe Wisdom. It is possible that he intended to portray her as the tree of the knowledge of
good and evil. In his description he transforms the tree from being forbidden and the cause of death to being freely
available and the source of life. It may, thus, also be reasonable to argue that Ben Sira transforms the tree of the
knowledge of good and evil into the tree of life. See Skehan and Di Lella, \textit{The Wisdom of Ben Sira}, 276; Collins,
\textit{Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age}, 59; Goering, \textit{Wisdom’s Root Revealed}, 90.

\textsuperscript{59} For interpretations of the garden of Eden story as the introduction of sin into the world, see, e.g., 4 \textit{Ezra} 3:21-2;
7:118 (see section 5.2.1.1); cf. Rom 5:12: “Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death
came through sin, and so death spread to all because all have sinned.”

\textsuperscript{60} James Kugel, \textit{Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as it was at the Start of the Common Era} (Cambridge,

\textsuperscript{61} Chazon, “The Creation and Fall of Adam,” 15.
wisdom. Another fragmentary text, 4QMeditation on Creation C (4Q305) 2 2 states: “He (God) gave Adam (":"knowledge.” The next line of the text is difficult to reconstruct because of its fragmentary state, but may mention the knowledge of good and evil.62 4Q303 (4QMeditation on Creation A) 8-9, also fragmentary, suggests that Adam ate from the tree of the knowledge without any sense of prohibition “… and insight of good and evil, to … Adam (":"taking from it.”63 These texts, similar to Ben Sira, indicate that Adam was given wisdom from the beginning. The kind of wisdom that the tree of knowledge provided Adam is explicated by Ben Sira in 17:11-14. In these verses, the sage reflects upon traditions of the Israelites recorded in the Hebrew Bible and how they might apply to the human condition. Central to his anthropological reflections, the sage claims that the Torah was once available to all of humanity.

3.2.1.3 Adam and the Torah (vv. 11-14): creation and “the Law of Life.” Ben Sira’s anthropological reflections in 17:11-14 incorporate events from Israel’s history. These verses read:64

---

62 4Q305 2 3: []הנשת, “and evil to know …”


64 For text critical issues see Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 280.
He bestowed knowledge upon them, and allotted to them the law of life.

He established with them an eternal covenant, and revealed to them his decrees.

Their eyes saw his glorious majesty, and their ears heard the glory of his voice.

And he gave commandment to each of them concerning the neighbor.

In these verses, the sage alludes to the nomic traditions of Israel recorded in the Hebrew Bible: the law of life (νόμον ζωῆς, v. 11b), an eternal covenant (διαθήκην αἰῶνος, v. 12a), decrees (τὰ κρίματα, v. 12b), and commandments concerning one’s neighbor (περὶ τοῦ πλησίον, v. 14b; cf. 28:7). The phrase νόμον ζωῆς (17:11) refers to the Mosaic law. This phrase is derived from Deut 30:11-20, where Moses tells Israel, “I have set before you life and death, blessings and curses. Choose life” (cf. Sir 15:14-17). In Sir 45:5, νόμον ζωῆς is identified as the Torah given at Sinai: “He allowed him to hear his voice, and led him into the dark cloud, and gave him the commandments face to face, the law of life and knowledge, so that he might teach Jacob the covenant, and Israel his decrees.” This verse recounts the Sinai event and affirms that Moses received “the law of life” from God.

---

In the context of chapter 17, the διαθήκην αἰώνος (17:12a) seems to refer to the Sinaitic covenant, as suggested by Collins (cf. Exod 19:16-19). Luis Alonso Schökel argues that the eternal nature of the covenant indicates that it more likely alludes instead to the Davidic covenant (2 Sam 23:5) or the Aaronic covenant (Sir 45:15). It is true that διαθήκην αἰώνος is used in Sir 44:18 for the Noahic covenant. However, there are several references that indicate this phrase in 17:12a is best understood as referring to the Mosaic covenant recounted in Deuteronomy. For example, there are clear allusions to the Torah in Sir 17:12b and 14. In v. 12b, the reference to “his commandments” recalls the Torah, given to Moses on Sinai. The reference to God’s “majestic glory” and “his glorious voice” in v. 13 draws from Exod 19:16-19 and 24:15-17 (cf. 20:19; 24:16-17; Deut 4:12; 5:4; 30:20). The Torah is identified as “the law that endures forever” in Bar 4:1, while Ben Sira uses the phrase “everlasting covenant” (v. 12a). Moreover, Sir 17:14a likely refers to the negative commandments, “Thou shalt not…” of the Ten Commandments (Exod 20:1-11; Deut 5:6-15) and the following statement in v. 14b alludes to the second part of the Decalogue (Exod 20:12-17; Deut 5:16-21). This connects the phrase διαθήκην αἰώνος with the Mosaic covenant. Therefore, I favor the interpretation of Collins over that of Schökel (cf. Sir 24:23; 28:7; 45:5).

66 Collins, Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age, 59.


68 Collins, Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age, 59.

69 Verse 14 may allude to the commands to love God above all things (Deut 6:5) and to love your neighbor as yourself (Lev 19:18; cf. Matt 22:34-40; Mark 12:28-34; Luke 10:25-28; 1 John 4:21; Rom 13:8-10). See Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 282; Sheppard, Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct, 81.

70 While the allusions point to the events at Sinai narrated in Exod 19-24, Wicke-Reuter, Göttliche Providenz und menschliche Verantwortung, 161-64, has convincingly argued that Ben Sira’s language reflects the theology of law found in Deuteronomy.
In 17:11-14, Ben Sira places the covenant in the context of creation, which suggests that the Torah was initially given to all people. Rather than mark a clear distinction between the creation of humanity and the giving of the law to Moses, Ben Sira merges creation and Sinai. The sage collapses the time period between Adam dwelling in Eden and the giving of the Torah as recorded in the Pentateuch. In doing so the sage suggests that the law of the covenant was given to humanity from the beginning. This is supported by Ben Sira identifying the Torah and the wisdom Adam received from the tree of knowledge with the same word (ἐπιστήμη; vv. 7, 11). John Collins rightly states that in Ben Sira’s view, “The law of creation and the law of Sinai are one in the same.” Similarly, Nuria Calduch-Benages observes, “It is remarkable that in 17:11-14 the argument moves from creation to the Sinaitic revelation, which Ben Sira considers to have universal range.” In 17:11-14, Ben Sira places the covenant in the context of his interpretation of Adam and thus claims that the Torah was available to all nations in the beginning. The Early Jewish composition, Jubilees, also places the Torah in the context of creation. For example, in 3:8-14, the retelling of the story of Adam and Eve includes purification rules that are given in Leviticus 12. This indicates that the Torah was revealed and available to humanity since the beginning. The author may be suggesting that the Torah was


available to all humanity since the beginning.\footnote{Segal, The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology, and Theology (JSJSup 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 6-7.} In Ben Sira, the availability of the Torah from the beginning is also supported in chapter 15 to which we now turn our attention.

3.3 Sin, Adam, and Humanity: Free Will, the רכ, and the Human Condition (15:11-17)

3.3.1 Ben Sira’s Account of the Origin of Sin

In 15:11-20, Ben Sira uses the portrayal of Adam in Gen 2:7 to explain that humanity has been created with free will. The sage opens by presenting the accusation to which he intends to respond.\footnote{Collins, Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls (London: Routledge, 1997), 30-35; Trenchard, Ben Sira’s View of Women: A Literary Analysis (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1982).} “Do not say, ‘It was the Lord’s doing that I fell away’; for he does not do what he hates” (Sir 15:11). The interlocutor claims that God causes humans to sin (vv. 11a, 12a). This passage indicates that the sage was part of a larger debate emerging in Hellenistic Jerusalem that began in the early second century B.C.E. concerning theodicy, and more specifically, the origin of sin.\footnote{Collins, Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls (London: Routledge, 1997), 30-35; Trenchard, Ben Sira’s View of Women: A Literary Analysis (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1982).} Ben Sira, in 15:11-20, addresses the topic of human free will in the context of the origin of sin and evil.\footnote{Collins, Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls (London: Routledge, 1997), 30-35; Trenchard, Ben Sira’s View of Women: A Literary Analysis (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1982).} One contemporary explanation of the origin of sin is found in \textit{1 Enoch} 1-36 (the \textit{Book of the Watchers}). \textit{1 Enoch} employs the account in Gen 6:1-4 of the “sons of God” who were attracted to the daughters of men (\textit{1 Enoch} 6-11).\footnote{Tigchelaar, “Eden and Paradise,” 38, contends: “Paleographic evidence indicates that the first part of \textit{1 Enoch}, the \textit{Book of Watchers} (\textit{1 Enoch} 1-36) already existed in the beginning of the 2nd century BCE, and that the other three discovered compositions of \textit{1 Enoch} were copied in the 2nd and 1st century BCE. The \textit{Parables of Enoch}, which are conspicuously absent from Qumran, are generally considered to be younger than the other writings of \textit{1 Enoch}.} The author explains that fallen
angels ("Watchers") brought evil into the world by disclosing information to humans to which they previously did not have access (e.g., violence, weaponry). This story situates evil with a supernatural origin, not humans. A contrasting account of the origin of evil in the Enochic tradition is found in the Epistle of Enoch (92:1-5; 93:11-105:2), which was likely written after Ben Sira. 1 Enoch 98:4 reads: “I swear to you, you sinners, that as a mountain has not, and will not, become a slave, nor a hill a woman’s maid, so sin was not sent on the earth, but man of himself created it.” This verse indicates that different than the Watchers story, sin originates with humans. These contrasting ideas suggest that there was an on-going debate concerning the origin of sin and evil in the same tradition. Ben Sira offers his perspective by turning to the biblical portrayals of Adam.

Ben Sira responds to accusations that God is the origin of sin. These allegations may have been supported by biblical precedents. John Collins has proposed that the accuser possibly turned to 1 Samuel. In 1 Sam 19:9, an “evil spirit from the Lord” was upon King Saul causing him to do evil. 80 It is possible that the accuser in Ben Sira also appealed to the account of God hardening Pharaoh’s heart in the Exodus narrative, which resulted in his sinning (cf. Exod 4:21; 7:3; 8:15; 9:12; 10:1, 20, 27; 11:10; 14:4, 8). 81 As the accuser may have appealed to scripture,

Most scholars argue that the Parables originated in the first century CE or slightly earlier.” Józef T. Milik, The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments from Qumran Cave 4 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 31, argues that the story of the Watchers in 1 Enoch 6-11 is older than Genesis 6, but his proposal has been almost universally rejected. See, for example, James C. VanderKam, “The Interpretation of Genesis in 1 Enoch,” in The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation (ed. P. Flint; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001), 133-34. For more on the dating of the various parts of the Enoch tradition, see Milik, The Books of Enoch, passim.

80 If Collins, Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age, 87, is correct that Ben Sira’s opponent had 1 Sam 19:9 in mind, this suggests that it was believed an outside influence causes humans to sin. This idea is similar to the rabbinic tradition that claimed the evil inclination was an external force that prompted humans to do evil (see below).

81 cf. Exod 7:13, 22; 9:35; 13:15; 1 Sam 6:6. Also, in Deut 2:30, God hardened the spirit of King Sihon of Heshbon, which made him defiant against Israel. The king’s defiance is described as a negative action. See also Isa 45:7; Job 1:21; 2:10; cf. Exod 11:10; 2 Sam 24:1; Jer 6:21; Ezek 18:22, 28.
the sage likewise establishes his response in scripture. He provides an interpretation of Adam in Genesis 1-3 that includes several anthropological reflections. The first three chapters of Genesis provide the primary account most often understood to offer an explanation of the origin of sin in Jewish (and Christian) tradition. However, as noted in Chapter One (see section 1.3.1), the story receives little attention outside of Genesis in the Hebrew Bible. Ben Sira is likely the first author to use Genesis 1-3 to explain the origin of evil. The portrayal of Adam in Genesis 1-3 is used in 15:11-20 to defend God from implication in human wickedness. Ben Sira replies to the accusation that God causes people to sin with two arguments: 1) God hates all abominations (v. 13) and the claim that he causes people to sin is inconsistent with God’s character (vv. 11b, 12b) and; 2) each person has the freedom to choose to do good or evil (vv. 14-17). The sage concludes this section by stating that God sees all wickedness and does not desire anyone to do evil (vv. 18-20; cf. 4Q418 126 ii 5; 4 Ezra 7:21-24). Ben Sira’s reply to the accuser is given in a formulation inspired by Deut 30:15-20. Sir 15:14-17 reads:

---


83 This is with the possible exception of a few Dead Sea Scrolls. See Collins, Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age, 80. See also Levison, Portraits of Adam, 34-35.

84 Levison, Portraits of Adam, 34.

85 Beentjes, “Theodicy in Ben Sira,” 514, proposes (without much discussion) that the structure of 15:11-20 is derived from the discussion technique used most notably by Stoic philosophers.

14 It was he who created humanity (אדם) in the beginning (בראשית) and he left him in the power of his inclination (והוה בן זרע).

15 If you choose, you can keep the commandments, and to act faithfully is a matter of your own choice.

16 He has placed before you fire and water; stretch out your hand for whichever you choose.

17 Before each person are life and death, and whichever one chooses will be given.87

This portion of his argument begins by evoking the biblical portrayal of Adam. In v. 14a, the sage recalls Gen 1:27 and 2:7 with the term humanity (“humanity”). This reference is coupled with the beginning (“in the beginning”), the first phrase of Genesis (Gen 1:1). This places his argument in the context of creation. Ben Sira goes on to explain that God has allotted humanity an inclination.88 This term is an important term for understanding Ben Sira’s notion of human free will and divine determinism, in both Second Temple and rabbinic literature.89 The noun form, used in v. 14, is derived from the verb to form; to shape). This verb is also used in Gen 2:7 to describe God forming Adam from the earth; then the LORD God formed man from the dust of the ground; cf. Sir 33:10). In the Hebrew Bible, is used in several different ways. For example, in Ps 103:14, means the “form of man (made of/formed out of clay).” In Isa 26:19 and Hab 2:18, the noun refers to a “pot/vessel”: vessel (formed by the potter) (Isa 29:16). In Isa 45:16, this term refers to an “idol.” The noun is most often used in the Hebrew Bible in an abstract sense to mean “thoughts or purpose (that which is formed in the mind)” (Gen 6:5; 8:21; Deut 31:21; 1 Chron 28:9, 29:18; Isa 26:3).

87 Cf. Deut 30:15, 19; see also Gen 2:17; 3:3.


Although the verb form is used in the creation of humanity account, the noun צר (“inclination”) is not found in Genesis 2-3. However, it occurs elsewhere in Genesis. The term is employed twice in the flood narrative (Genesis 6-9). The first reference, in Gen 6:5, reads: “every inclination of the thoughts of their hearts was only evil ( bordel מורתב לחר יד) continually.”

The second reference states that, “the inclination of the human heart is evil (צֵר לְבָדָם רָע) from youth (8:21).” In both of these instances evil is linked to the term צר. In the Hebrew Bible, there are only two passages that use the term in a positive sense: 1) Isa 26:3 uses the term צמר סמוע (“a steadfast disposition”); and 2) in 1 Chron 29:18, David asks God to preserve the presumably good inclination of the thoughts of the heart of the people (شعارה יאת לעולמ לצר מורתב לבר).90

3.3.1.1 The צר in Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism. The term צר is also found throughout Second Temple Jewish literature. By examining a cross-section of texts from this period it is possible to gain a better understanding of the sage’s understanding of the term. We can also observe the attempts of later traditions to define צר and how Ben Sira should be situated in his broader historical context. The term is mentioned in several Qumran texts. For example, 4Q422 1 12 (4QParaphrase of Genesis and Exodus) attributes Adam’s disobedience in the garden to a צר רע (“evil inclination”; cf. 4Q370 1 i 3).92 The speaker in 4QBarki Napshi praises God for having given him a pure heart and having removed an evil צר (4Q436 1a-b i 10). A similar phrase, “guilty inclination” (צֵר אָשֵׂם), in the Damascus Document is taken to be a force


91 In 1 Chron 28:9, the term is likely used in a neutral manner.

that is responsible for wickedness (CD 2:16). Some Early Jewish texts understand the “evil inclination” to be a supernatural evil that applies its influence upon humankind.\(^93\) 1QH 15:6-7 states: “For Belial (is present) when their destructive inclination (,Yesher רוש) manifests itself.” In the non-canonical psalm, the “Plea for Deliverance,” the speaker appeals to God to forgive him: “Let not Satan rule over me, nor an evil spirit, let neither pain nor evil inclination (רָצְרָצִי) take possession of my bones” (11Q5 19:15-16). 4QInstruction also uses the phrase “evil inclination.”

The single use of the phrase יֵשְׁרַר is found in 4Q417 1 ii 12, in which the author exhorts the addressee: “Do not let the thought of an evil inclination (חלשך יֵשְׁרַר) mislead you…” The יֵשְׁרַר, in this instance, signifies a propensity towards behavior that should be avoided.\(^94\) The “evil inclination” (cor malignum, likely a translation of יֵשְׁרַר) is also prominent in 4 Ezra (e.g., 3:21-22; 4:20; 8:53; see section 5.2.1.1).\(^95\)

Later in rabbinic literature, the יֵשְׁרַר acquires a technical sense, and is regarded as a force that influences human actions.\(^96\) According to the Talmud, Rabbi Jose the Galilean states, “the righteous are ruled by the good inclination … the wicked are ruled by the evil inclination … average people are ruled by both” (b. Berakot 61b; cf. Mut. 31-32). For the rabbis, the notion of dual human inclinations is derived exegetically from Gen 2:7. In Gen. Rab. 14:4, the etiology of

---


95 For more on the wicked רוש, see Goff, 4QInstruction, forthcoming (Chap. 7).

the two יודs in the word יוד כנף in Gen 2:7. The interpretation of the verb that describes the creation of Adam is understood as each יוד representing an inclination given by God. In the rabbinic tradition, the יוד is also used as an anthropological term that indicates propensity towards sin. For example, 'Abot de Rabbi Nathan states that an evil יוד grows within the womb as an inherent part of every individual. Rabbis also describe the יוד as a demonic or supernatural entity that enters a human being and combats his desire to do what is right. The Amora Resh Laqish, for example, equates יוד הרוח with Satan and the angel of death: “Satan, the evil inclination and the angel of death are all one” (b. B. Bat. 16a). Sirfe Deuteronomy 45 explicitly places responsibility for the evil inclination on God himself: “My children I have created for you the evil יוד, (but I have at the same time created for you the Torah as antidote.)” In the rabbinic discussion concerning the יוד, the evil יוד is discussed far more than the good יוד. The Qumran, rabbinic, and Ben Sira traditions each use יוד. Ben Sira, in 15:14-17, explains that the יוד is not a demon-like entity or explicitly an evil inclination. Rather, it is something given by God to everyone and is responsible for a person’s proclivity to do good or evil. Ben Sira’s understanding of the יוד contains an interpretation of the Adam of Gen 2:7.

3.3.2 The יוד in Ben Sira

---


99 See Stuart, Struggle in Man, 214; Urbach, The Sages, 1.472.

100 Collins, Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age, 84.

101 See Rosen-Zvi, “Two Rabbinic Inclinations?,” 21, 24. See also Collins, Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age, 81-84; Goff, 4QInstruction, forthcoming (Ch. 7).
Ben Sira, like the Dead Sea Scrolls and later rabbinic tradition, claims that every human has been given a רצון. However, the sage understands the concept somewhat differently than these two traditions. Although he does not contend that the רצון is an outside influence that acts on an individual, the sage does not claim that humanity has complete free will. In chapter 15, he stresses that humans have the moral freedom to make their own choices, as discussed below.

But, in chapter 33, Ben Sira explains human destiny, and even the whole of creation, lies “in the hands of the potter (יוצר), to be molded as he pleases” (Sir 33:13). Like 15:14, the sage references the portrayal of Adam in Gen 2:7 in which the first man is shaped (יצר) by God out of the earth. Ben Sira thus suggests that every person is fitted with a רצון at creation according to God’s purpose. This indicates that humans have the tendency to do either good or evil based on the רצון given by God. Humans have free will, but their actions are ultimately determined by God.

While Ben Sira does not appear to understand the רצון as some sort of demonic outside influence on an individual, an objection could be raised based on the extant manuscript evidence. In manuscript B (Vaticanus), manuscript A (Alexandrinus), and the Hebrew text from the Cairo Geniza there is an extra colon at the end of verse 14 that states, God “set him (man) in the power of his spoiler (or snatcher, or kidnapper)” (cf. Wis 2:24; Rev 12:9). This is likely a reference to:

---

102 Jean Hadot, *Penchant Mauvais et Volonté Libre dans la Sagesse de Ben Sira (L’Ecclesiastique)* (Bruxelles: Bruxelles Presses Universitaires de Bruxelles, 1970), 13, rightly warns against associating the developed rabbinic understanding of רצון too closely with a perspective that is much earlier and less developed.


103 Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, 80.
Satan that possibly equates the רȼ with some sort of demonic power. F. V. Reiterer has argued that this is an authentic saying of Ben Sira. He claims that “his spoiler/his will” (v. 14) displays antithetical parallelism similar to “water/fire” (v. 16) and “life/death” (v. 17). However, this colon of verse 15:14 is almost universally understood to be a later addition. Scholars believe that this third colon disrupts the poetic balance of the verse and tricolons are very rare in Ben Sira. Further, this would break from Ben Sira’s emphasis on the human ability to choose whether or not to obey the Torah explicated in vv. 15-17, which immediately follows.

3.3.3 Adam, Humanity, Free Choice, and the Torah

The sage stresses in 15:15-17 that humans are created with the ability to choose whether or not to obey the Torah. In these three verses, the verb “to choose” (זְכַר) is used three times to emphasize human freedom of choice (vv. 15a, 16b, 17b). The sage proclaims that all humanity can choose by placing the statement in the context of the covenant between God and Israel. In v. 15, he explicitly states that every individual is created with the ability to choose whether or not to obey God’s commandments (cf. Prov 19:16; Qoh 8:5). In fact, he explicitly states that humanity has the ability to choose whether or not to follow faithfully the law of the covenant (v. 15). This statement directly addresses the accusation that God causes humans to sin (v. 11). He goes on to

---


105 See, for example, Adams, Wisdom in Transition, 185; Gabriele Boccaccini, Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 105; Collins, “Before the Fall,” 296.

106 Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 269-71. See also Di Lella, The Hebrew Text of Sirach, 121-25; Cook, “The Origin of the Tradition,” 85; Bauer, “Sir. 15,14 et Gen. 1,1,” 243-44. Collins, “Wisdom, Apocalypticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 376. For discussion concerning the recensions, see Collins, Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age, 43-44. Hadot, Pencchant Mauvais et Volonte Libre, 209, provides an extensive survey of other passages where רȼ might be reconstructed on the basis of the Greek. His study provides a basis for a possible objection to the sage’s neutral understanding of the term רȼ. He demonstrates that it may be raised based on the Greek text of Sir 37:3: “O inclination (ἐνθομα) to evil, why were you formed to cover the land with deceit?” However, this is understood to be likely due to a mistranslation of the Hebrew. Collins, “Before the Fall,” 299.
illustrate the extreme freedom humanity has with the opposing elements of fire and water (v. 16; cf. 3:30a). Then, in v. 17, there is a clear reference to the Mosaic covenant recounted in Deut 11:26-28 and 30:15-20 (cf. Jer 21:8). Ben Sira specifically evokes Deut 30:19, which reads: “I have set before you life and death, blessings and curses. Choose life so that you and your descendants may live.” The sage associates the human condition with the ability to obey the Torah. He does this by using the portrayal of Adam in Gen 2:7 to argue that all humans have been created in a way that allows one to choose whether or not to follow the commandments of God. Ben Sira contends that whether a human has been given a good or bad רוש, the Torah helps people choose to do what is good. The idea that the Torah helps one overcome an evil רוש is found in the rabbinic tradition. For example, Sifre Deuteronomy 45 explains: “My children I have created for you the Evil Inclination, (but I have at the same time) created for you the Torah as an antidote.” The Torah is understood as the remedy to the anthropological problem of being created with an evil רוש. This is similar to what is found in 4 Ezra (see section 5.6.1.1).

Ben Sira applies the covenant language of Deuteronomy to the Adam of Gen 2:7 in order to emphasize the endowment of humankind with the opportunity to choose the Torah from the beginning. This places the Torah in the context of creation. In this way, as mentioned above, Ben Sira collapses the time interval between creation and the giving of Torah recorded in the Hebrew Bible. Thus, the Torah, which is referred to in 15:15 was available to Adam. This also supports the notion that the tree of knowledge was available to Adam mentioned in Sir 17:7 can

---

107 Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 272. Unlike, Skehan and Di Lella, who argue that fire and water are used to show that humanity can choose either extreme or anything in between, Beentjes, “Theodicy in Ben Sira,” 513-14, contends that these elements are used to emphasize that although one has a choice it is not possible to have them both at the same time. He believes this is supported by the choice of life and death in the following verse (v. 17).
reasonably be understood to be the Torah which was given to all humans in the beginning (cf. Ben Sira 24; Exod 19:16-19; 17:1-14; see section 3.5.1).  

3.3.3.1 Human discernment in Ben Sira and 4QInstruction. Although Ben Sira and 4QInstruction draw upon some of the same vocabulary from Genesis 1-3, their interpretations are rather different. In 4QInstruction, the one who cannot distinguish between good and evil is categorically a different type of person than the one God made according to the image of the angels. In 4QInstruction, the שֶׁפֶחַ רוּחַ בֵּיתָא and the מִשְׁפָּט are also differentiated based on access to the שֶׁפֶחַ רוּחַ בֵּיתָא. Sir 17:7 does not reflect the same dualistic understanding. According to this verse, the knowledge of good and evil in the form of the Torah was universally available. No one can attribute sinful behavior to inherent deficiencies. If an individual’s יָנוֹר causes someone to turn towards sinful behavior, the choice to overcome this inclination still rests with the individual. However, neither Ben Sira nor 4QInstruction are consistent in their positions on free will and divine determinism (e.g., see section 3.3.2, above).

3.4 Separate, But Not Equal: The Election of Israel According to Ben Sira

Ben Sira adamantly affirms human freedom to make choices. However, the sage does not contend that God wonders what humans will do next or that he has left creation to run itself without any interest in human actions. This was the position taken by Ben Sira’s opponents (16:17, 20-22), and he explicitly rejects it. In the sage’s view, God remains the sovereign creator and nothing is hidden from his sight (15:18-19; 17:19-20; 23:19). In 33:10-15 (chapter 36 in G), Ben Sira again addresses the notion of divine sovereignty. In his efforts to explain that God is


the creator of all while also attempting to exonerate him from being identified as the originator of evil, Ben Sira seems compelled to clarify statements such as 11:14: “Good things and bad, life and death, poverty and wealth, come from the Lord.”\textsuperscript{110} In chapter 33, Ben Sira affirms that God controls the world and the ordered nature of creation reveals his control. God’s sovereignty over humanity is asserted by appealing to the portrayal of Adam of Gen 2:7. The sage also presents his doctrine of opposing pairs (33:14-15) to affirm God’s control over the cosmos.\textsuperscript{111} This dualism that pervades creation is also reflected in the sage’s understanding of humanity. The sage appeals to the portrayal of Adam of Gen 2:7 to argue that God has deliberately chosen Israel as his elect and he has cursed other nations (e.g., the Hittites, the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizzites) who have set themselves against God’s chosen people.\textsuperscript{112} I will further show that, as God’s chosen people, Israel has been given access to God in a way that the other nations do not have.

3.4.1 The Omnipotence of God and the Reality of Evil (33:7-15)

In 33:7-15, the sage addresses the issue of an omnipotent God in light of evil present in the world. He stresses two primary points: 1) God is sovereign over his creation; and 2) Israel is the elect people of God who have been set apart according to divine wisdom (cf. Sir 42:15; 43:26;


\textsuperscript{112} Goering, \textit{Wisdom’s Root Revealed}, 59.
IQH 18:4). Ben Sira gives an analogy in vv. 7-9 to support his understanding of the human condition in relation to the created order. In v. 7, the sage begins by asking a question concerning an observation of the natural order: “Why is one day more important than another, when all the daylight in the year is from the sun?” (v. 7). He explains that the days that mark festivals and seasons God has “exalted and hallowed” (רַבְרֶה וְהִיוֹשֶׁנ וַאֲיֵהַיוֹשֶׁנ) from the “ordinary days” (לַיְמֵי מַסְפָּד) yet the same sun shines on both (cf. 43:1-12). Ben Sira acknowledges that God is the creator of every day, and each one shares the quality of enjoying the same sun. However, some have been designated as holy in contrast to those that are ordinary. The sage’s observation of the natural order concerning two different kinds of days, those “exalted and sanctified” and those “ordinary” is then applied to humanity in vv. 10-15. Sir 33:10-15 reads:

---


114 See Goering, *Wisdom’s Root Revealed*, 50-53. Goering (p. 53) observes that the verb רַבְרֶה often means setting something apart from a whole for God. Examples that support this notion include Num 3:13; 8:17; 15:9, 20; 18:19, 24, 26; 31:28, 52; Ezek 45:1, 13; 48:8-9, 20; Ps 89:20 (Eng. 19); 1 Kgs 9:3, 7; 2 Chron 7:16, 20; 30:8; 36:14; Jer 1:5.


10 All human beings are vessels of clay (שָׂלָל חָצָר), for humankind was created out of the dust.¹¹⁷
11 In the fullness of his knowledge the Lord distinguished them; and appointed their different ways.
12 Some he blessed and exalted, and some he made holy and brought near to himself; but some he cursed and brought low, and turned them out of their place.¹¹⁸
13 Like clay in the hand of the potter (אֵין יָד הַפָּרָר), to be molded as he pleases, so all are in the hand of their Maker, to be given whatever he decides (cf. 27:5).
14 Good is the opposite of evil, and life the opposite of death; so the sinner is the opposite of the godly.
15 Look at all the works of the Most High; they come in pairs, one the opposite of the other (cf. 11:14).

In this passage, Ben Sira answers an implicit question that parallels the one asked in v. 9. He responds to the question: “Why are some people/nations more important than others, when all humans share the same basic characteristics, are mortal, and formed by God from the same earth?” As he does in Sir 15:14, in 33:10 Ben Sira makes a direct reference to Gen 2:7 (ים קּוַּר, v. 10b). He asserts that humans are made of the dust of the earth.¹¹⁹ Similar to chapters 15 and 17, in this passage, Ben Sira uses the Adam of Genesis 2 as the paradigm of all humanity (15:17-20; cf. 4 Ezra 7:116; 7:139; 8:7; 10:14; 2 Bar. 48:46).¹²⁰ According to the sage, God determined for all people to share the same basic quality of being formed from the earth (cf. 17:1-2). The portrayal of Adam in Gen 2:7 is used differently in 4QInstruction. In the Qumran

¹¹⁷ MS E partially reconstructed from G, Sir 33:10 [E]: “So, to, all people are of vessels of clay (שָׂלָל חָצָר), for from earth humankind was formed.” See Goering, Wisdom’s Root Revealed, 52.

¹¹⁸ For textual notes see Goering, Wisdom’s Root Revealed, 52, 55-56; Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 395.

¹¹⁹ Ben Sira may have quoted Gen 2:7 verbatim, however, the Hebrew is too fragmentary to be definitive. See Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 395.

¹²⁰ See Levison, Portraits of Adam, 41.
text, the author alludes to the Adam of Gen 2:7 to depict the רוח בראש in contrast to the רוח.

Ben Sira, in 33:10-13, however, appeals to Gen 2:7 to emphasize that God made both the blessed and the cursed. The sage again uses Gen 2:7 to stress the sovereignty of God over humanity in v. 13. In this verse, Ben Sira identifies God as a “potter” (יָאנָקָר) who forms humanity according to his will, similar to the manner in which he formed Adam out of clay, as discussed above.121 The term יָאנָקָר is employed by the sage in vv. 10 and 13. However, he does not use it to assert that God fashioned humankind with complete free will as is the case in 15:14. Instead, the portrayal of Adam in Gen 2:7 is used in chapter 33 to emphasize the omnipotence of God.122 While the dualistic determinism in chapter 33 is in tension with the sage’s argument concerning individual responsibility, the sage does not appear to view this as a contradiction.123 Rather, he seems more concerned with staying true to the biblical tradition at this point in his instruction. When read together, the sage’s comments in chapters 15 and 33 suggest that human autonomy is

121 See Levinson, Portraits of Adam, 41-42; Daniel J. Harrington, “Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom: Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A,” JSP 16 (1997): 28-30; Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 400. The metaphorical designation of God as a potter is attested throughout the Hebrew Bible and Early Jewish texts (cf. Isa 29:16; 45:9; 64:7; Wis 15:7; cf. Pss. Sol. 17:23; T. Naph. 2.2.4). Jer 18:6, for example, reads: “‘Can I not do with you, O house of Israel, just as this potter (יָאנָקָר) has done?’ says the LORD. ‘Just like the clay in the potter’s hand, so are you in my hand, O house of Israel.’” In the Dead Sea Scrolls, the speaker of the Hodayot metaphorically refers to himself as a “broken vessel” (מַלְאָן אָבֶַּב; 12:10).

122 Collins, Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age, 84, notes that the implications of divine responsibility based on the creation theology explained using dualistic language appear in the secondary recensions of Ben Sira. For example, Sir 11:14 reads: “Good and evil, life and death, poverty and riches, are from the Lord.” The Hebrew MS A from the Cairo Geniza adds another line that is not reflected in the Greek: “Sin and righteous ways are from the Lord.” The Greek adds two verses, the first affirming that “wisdom and understanding and knowledge of the Law are from the Lord,” and the second stating that “error and darkness were formed with sinners from their birth.” This is understood to be a secondary addition in the Hebrew. Neither the Greek nor the Syriac contains this material. Although these verses are not the work of Ben Sira himself, they attempt to clarify the origin of sin and it is easy to see how the scribe came to those conclusions. See Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 237.

123 It has been argued that there is an unresolved tension in Ben Sira’s thought between divine determinism and human free will in his instruction, especially as depicted in chapters 15 and 33. This tension is recognized by Gerhard Maier, Mensch und freier Wille (WUNT 12; Tübingen: Mohr, 1971) 98-115. According to Maier, the deterministic view was traditional and Ben Sira moves away from it in the context of debating with opponents in chapter 15.
conditioned by the רוח, a part of the human being that can either be good or bad. Ben Sira contends that the Torah helps people choose the good.

3.4.1.1 The election of Israel according to God’s will. Ben Sira argues that the election of Israel is rooted in the created order. The sage illustrates the idea that all of God’s creation comes in opposing pairs by appealing to stories from the Hebrew Bible. As an example of God’s wisdom displayed in his creation, he contrasts the election of Israel with the disposition of the Canaanites (v. 12). The sage begins in v. 11 by explicitly claiming that “the Lord distinguished [humans] and appointed their different ways.” In this verse, Ben Sira states that God intentionally and deliberately chose Israel as his elect.

3.4.1.1.1 The Biblical election of Israel according to Ben Sira. Ben Sira describes the election of Israel by appealing to important events in the Hebrew Bible. The sage, in 33:12a, alludes to the initial election of Abram as the backdrop for his depiction of Israel: “I will make of you a great nation, and I will bless you, and make your name great, so that you will be a blessing. I will bless those who bless you, and the one who curses you I will curse; and in you all the families of the earth shall be blessed” (Gen 12:2-3). In 33:12a, the sage uses the verb ברך (“to bless”) to recall the election of Abram and his descendants (e.g., Gen 24:60; 28:13-14; Exod 32:13; Deut 1:10; cf. Sir 44:19-23). Although, the verb יָבֵר (“to exalt”; v. 12a) is not found in the biblical account of the election of Abram or his descendants, it is reasonable to assume Ben


125 Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, 84-85; Perdue, *Wisdom and Creation*, 273, also comments, “Thus [Ben Sira] moves from cosmology, in particular the bipolar structure of time, to anthropology, where he posits the same dualistic system of opposites.”

Sira is referring to the promise that Abram would have numerous offspring (Gen 15:5; 22:17).\textsuperscript{127} This reading is supported by the Greek text. The verb ἀνυψώσω in G Sir 33:9a (Heb. v. 12a) is the same term used in G 44:21d which states that God promised “to exalt [Abraham’s] offspring like stars” (καὶ ὡς ὀστρα ἄνυψώσαι τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ).

The election of Israel is again referenced in v. 12b, in which he alludes to the priests of Israel: “and some he made holy and brought near to himself.” The verb ἀναπληράσκω ("to draw near") recalls the Levites and the priests who are distinct from the rest of Israel as the ones who draw near to God through temple service (Ezek 40:46; 42:13; 44:15-16; 45:4).\textsuperscript{128} The adjective ἁγιός ("holy") is commonly used to describe priests who are set apart for temple service in the Hebrew Bible (Lev 21:6-8; Num 16:5, 7; 2 Chron 23.6; 31:18; 35:3; Ps 106:16; Ezra 8:28).\textsuperscript{129} The reference to the priests of Israel is especially important. The sage stresses that the elect have access to God. Ben Sira provides a clearer picture of what this involves in 24:10-12 (see section 3.5.2). He explains that Lady Wisdom settled in the temple in Jerusalem and the result was the availability of the Torah to Israel in a manner that the other nations do not have. The sage

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{127} Goering, Wisdom’s Root Revealed, 54.

\textsuperscript{128} Goering, Wisdom’s Root Revealed, 54. Goering contends that this language especially evokes the Korahite-Aaronite controversy in Numbers 16 (cf. Sir 16:6; 45:18-19). In Num 16:5, a test is described to determine whom God will ἀναπληράσκω ("choose") and ἀναπληράσκω ("draw near to himself").

\textsuperscript{129} Goering cites the episode in the Hebrew Bible that recalls the choosing of priests from among the elect Israel to support his claim that Ben Sira does not have duality in mind. However, the second half of the verse indicates otherwise. Rather than understanding Israel as simply chosen for a special purpose among primarily neutral humanity, the priestly language is used to emphasize that Israel has access to God and his law (the Torah) in such a way that others do not. The sage further explains that God’s favor of Israel is set in contrast to others who are cursed. This further emphasizes the holiness of Israel (33:12; cf. 24:1-24). Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 400, and Perdue, Wisdom and Creation, 274, both interpret the overall emphasis in this poem as one of opposition. For an analysis of Ben Sira’s priestly ideology and its relationship to varying priestly ideologies in the Hebrew Bible, see Saul M. Olyan, “Ben Sira’s Relationship to the Priesthood,” HTR 80 (1987): 261-86 (esp. 267-75).
\end{footnotesize}
refers to this in order to emphasize how this sets them apart from the rest of humanity. Both of the references made by Ben Sira to Israel’s history emphasize its chosenness.  

3.4.1.2 The cursed Canaanites. After establishing Israel as the elect people of God who are set apart from the rest of humanity, the sage continues in 33:12c-d by describing the type of humanity that is contrary to the elect. This group portrayed opposite Israel is described in v. 12c as “cursed” (כִּזְנֵ). This recalls the promise given to Abram in Gen 12:2-3, that God would curse all those who curse Abram, as discussed above. The verb כִּזְנֵ (“to curse”) also evokes the story of the Canaanites in Gen 9:25-27 (cf. Exod 33:1-3). In Ben Sira, the Canaanites are placed in opposition to Israel. According to the promise given to Abram (Gen 12:3), the Canaanites were cursed because they set themselves against God and his people. This is consistent with Ben Sira’s description of the human endowment of free will along with the promise of divine retribution described in 15:15-17.

In v. 12c, Ben Sira continues his allusion to the cursing of Canaan with the verb כִּזְנֵ (“to bring low”). The term כִּזְנֵ seems to emphasize further Israel’s chosenness. While different language is used, the term may allude to the punishment of Canaan recounted in Gen 9:25 to be the “the lowest servant” (כִּזְנֵ). Ben Sira’s claim that Canaan was brought low refers to him being made the servant of his brothers.

---


132 See Goering, *Wisdom’s Root Revealed*, 57-61, for his view that there are two groups understood to be part of those who are not elect—the non-elect and the anti-elect. The Wisdom of Solomon references those who were in the land of Israel prior to the people of Israel, “For they were an accursed race from the beginning, and it was not through fear of anyone that you left them unpunished for their sins” (12:11).

133 This interprets the punishment similar to the translation provided in the NRSV in which God says, “Cursed be Canaan; lowest of slaves shall he be to his brothers.” See Kautzsch, GKC, 133 i. Gesenius categorizes כִּזְנֵ as an expression of the superlative because it includes the substantive in the construct state before the plural of the
In v. 12d, the verb יָרֵדְתָם ("to drive away") refers to the Canaanites who were expelled from the land (cf. Gen 9:27; 4 Ezra 1:21). Throughout the Hebrew Bible the Canaanites are depicted as a nation who chose to set themselves against Israel and God (e.g., Deut 20:17; Num 21:3). Because of this, they were cursed and driven out of the land. Thus, following the biblical narrative, Ben Sira appears to understand the Canaanites, not as divinely determined people who were destined to be opposed to Israel. Rather, they are people who were opposed to God’s chosen people from the time of Israel’s election. This is consistent with the statement in the Wisdom of Solomon which connects creation with the cursing of the inhabitants of the land of Israel who were there prior to God’s elect. Pseudo-Solomon asserts “they were an accursed race from the beginning (ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς)” (Wis 12:11). The election of Israel is set in the context of the dualistic language, which immediately follows in vv. 14-15. Ben Sira’s contends that Israel’s election falls in line with the perfect harmony of God’s creation (cf. 42:24-25).

Ben Sira describes the election of Israel using the portrayal of Adam in Gen 2:7 in order to stress God’s determinism. The description of the elect people of Israel is placed in contrast to the cursed people of Canaan. Although Canaan is the figure used to describe the group opposite Israel, Di Lella and Skehan are likely correct that Ben Sira uses the story of the Canaanites to refer “to the Gentiles in general, who were not chosen as Israel had been.” This contrast fits into the harmony of the dualistic system that is inherent in creation according to God’s

---

134 Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 400. Cf. Gen 12:6-7; Exod 33:1-3; Deut 34:1-4; 1 Sam 2:6-8. Goering, Wisdom’s Root Revealed, 60, notes that יָרֵדְתָם is only used in the passive and only found in late biblical texts to mean “to rush, to hurry” (e.g. 2 Chron 26:20; Esth 3:15; 6:12; 8:14). Cf. Gen 3:23-24a: “Therefore the LORD God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from which he was taken. He drove out the man.” Rather than “place” (στάσις), MS E has “labor” (עֶדְיָנִים) (cf. Gen 3:19). For an extended discussion concerning divine election as part of a coherent system as described in 33:14-15 see Prato, Il Problema della Teodicea, 13-61.

135 Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 400.
wisdom. The primary aspect that differentiates Israel as the elect people of God from the other nations is the Torah. However, as stated above, all humanity was given the Torah in the beginning through Adam, but this changed with the promise given to Abraham and the election of Israel (Gen 12:1-3). The sage is attempting to establish an awkward balance between the universal nature of Adam and the particularistic nature of Israel’s election, over against the Gentiles. The sage also addresses this issue in chapter 24 (see section 3.5, below).

3.4.1.3 Ben Sira’s determinism and the Treatise on the Two Spirits. Ben Sira states that God, in his wisdom, has blessed some people and cursed others. Further, in 1:14, Ben Sira claims that wisdom was created “with the faithful in the womb.” These kinds of statements suggest a divine decision to favor certain people from birth. This deterministic view is similar to the perspective espoused in the Community Rule (1QS). The Treatise on the Two Spirits (1QS 3:13-4:26) begins by proclaiming that “from the God of Knowledge comes all that is and shall be” (3:13). Further, God placed two opposing spirits within humankind (3:18). One spirit is of truth and light, and is identified as the cause of good conduct. The other spirit is of darkness and deceit, and is identified as the cause of evil conduct. These two spirits battle against one another within each person. Every person possesses each spirit in the amounts determined by God. Implicitly, God has determined the destiny of each human. This notion is found throughout the text. For example the Treatise states that, “Before they (humans) existed,


he (God) established their glorious design. And when they have come into being, at their appointed time, they will execute all their works according to his glorious design, without altering anything” (1QS 3:15-16). Further, some designated by God will experience, “all the curses of the covenants … and God will set him apart for evil.”\textsuperscript{138} The notion of two different spirits in each person is not found in Ben Sira, nor is the strong dualistic theme of light and darkness. However, this dualistic understanding of human conduct is consistent with Sir 33:10-15, although it is at odds with the sage’s vigorous defense of human responsibility in chapter 15. Different than Ben Sira’s description of humanity in chapter 33, the Treatise’s two spirits are not rooted in an interpretation of Genesis 1-3 as extensively as Ben Sira. However, the author appears to turn to these chapters to describe certain aspects of the human condition.\textsuperscript{139} For example, the elect, who have a stronger spirit of light, will receive “the glory of Adam” (4:22-23). This group is the elect who are associated with Adam. The determinism of the Treatise is far more explicit than what is found in Ben Sira. Although both compositions emphasize the sovereignty of God over humanity, Ben Sira does not contend that someone’s ability to obey the Torah is determined at creation. The sectarian Treatise, however, contends that one chooses good or evil based on the kind of spirit an individual is given when created.

3.4.1.2 Duality and the harmony of creation (vv. 14-15). Ben Sira contrasts the election of Israel with the disposition of the Canaanites in order to argue that the election of Israel is determined by God. This reflects the cosmological principle of symbiotic pairs inherent

\textsuperscript{138} Translation is from Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, \textit{The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition} (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997-98).

\textsuperscript{139} This phrase is mentioned in other scrolls, including 1QH 4:14-15 and CD. In 1QH, the “glory of Adam” is something the elect already possesses, while in CD it is associated with eternal life. See Crispin H.T. Fletcher-Louis, \textit{All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls} (STDJ 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002), for an extensive study on this phrase in the scrolls.
in creation listed in vv. 14-15. In v. 14, the sage lists three contrasting pairs of opposites, “Good” and “evil,” “life” and “death,” and “the sinner” and “the godly.”

Verse 15 explains that dualism is an intrinsic facet of the harmony of creation and that everything comes in pairs, “one the opposite of the other.” Argall correctly states that according to Ben Sira there is “a built-in polarity” in the divine works and “the duality of creation.” However, Gregory S. Goering has argued that the opposing pairs in Ben Sira should not be understood dualistically. He instead appeals to the study of Saul Olyan and explains that the dyads given by the sage should be taken to represent totalities rather than categorical opposites. However, as we have observed in Ben Sira’s description of the contrast between Israel and the Canaanites, for example, the sage seems to have a clear duality in view. Further, the sage may have been influenced by Stoic conceptions of dualism. This is evidenced by similar language in a passage attributed to Chrysippus (ca. 287-207 B.C.E.). In both the Greek text and in Ben Sira, evil is needed as a counterbalance to good, and the one helps define and clarify the nature of the other.

140 MS E and Syr. include the pair “darkness” and “light.” This is taken as an allusion to Gen 1:2-3, which includes the lack of creation (darkness) opposite God’s first creation (light). Cf. Qoh 7:13-14: “Consider the work of God. Who can make straight what he has made crooked? On a good day enjoy good things, and on an evil day consider: Both the one and the other God has made, so that man cannot find fault with him in anything.” See Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 400.


142 Argall, I Enoch and Sirach, 135, 145.


144 Chrysippus (from Book 4 of his treatise, On Providence): “There is absolutely nothing more foolish than those men who think that good could exist, if there were at the same time no evil. For since good is the opposite of evil, it necessarily follows that both must exist in opposition to each other, supported as it were by mutual adverse forces; since as a matter of fact no opposite is conceivable without something to oppose it. For how could there be an idea of justice if there were no acts of injustice?” See Collins, Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age, 85; Winston, “Theodicy in Ben Sira and Stoic Philosophy,” 239-49. Some scholars reject the idea that there is any Stoic influence in Ben Sira. See, for example, S. L. Matilla, “Ben Sira and the Stoics: A Reexamination of the Evidence,” JBL 119 (2000): 473-501.
This same concept is expressed in a different manner in the sage’s “Hymn to God’s Works in Creation” (42:15-43:33): “All these things live and remain forever; each creature is preserved to meet a particular need. All things come in pairs, one opposite the other, and he has made nothing incomplete” (42:23-24). The creation theology espoused in 42:23-24 and 33:7-15 implies that the election of Israel necessarily requires a complimentarily opposite group, and, according to the sage, this is fulfilled by the Canaanites. The sage’s comments in chapters 15 and 33, when read together, suggest that human autonomy is conditioned by the "יו" which can either be good or bad. Ben Sira contends that the Torah helps people choose the good. However, according to the sage, the Torah rests only with Israel, the elect people of God.

3.5 General and Special Wisdom: Two Kinds of Wisdom According to Ben Sira

The Torah is the primary defining feature that sets Israel apart from the rest of the nations. Yet, the sage does not contend that the rest of humanity has no access to wisdom. Wisdom, according to Ben Sira, has been dispensed by God to all humanity. However, the distribution is disproportionate. The sage contends that although wisdom was once equally available to all nations, eventually God’s elect were apportioned more wisdom than everyone else. At that point in time, the availability of wisdom changed. Wisdom became the special domain of Israel, rather than humanity in general. Ben Sira categorically describes two kinds of wisdom that exist after the election of Israel—general wisdom and special wisdom. General wisdom is available to

---

145 Concerning the importance of 39:12-35 in the scope of free will and divine sovereignty, see Jan Liesen, Full of Praise: An Exegetical Study of 39,12-35 (JSJSup 64; Leiden: Brill, 2000).

146 Marböck, Weisheit im Wandel, 127-8, also distinguishes two kinds of wisdom in Ben Sira. He claims that the composition includes “wisdom from above” (Weisheit von oben) and “wisdom from below” (Weisheit von unten). He explains that the wisdom from above is “divine wisdom” and the wisdom from below is “profane wisdom.” Marböck’s depiction of two kinds of wisdom is similar to the distinction I use (following Goering) to differentiate between special wisdom and general wisdom. Marböck associates wisdom from above with personified Wisdom
all human beings through the created order; special wisdom is possessed by Israel through God’s commandments given to Moses on Sinai. The uneven distribution of wisdom is the basis for Ben Sira’s two-tiered conception of humanity. This disproportion is established in Ben Sira’s understanding of Israel being the elect people of God.

3.5.1 General Wisdom in Ben Sira

General wisdom, according to Ben Sira, is universally available. Any human being could observe nature and discern something about the creator. For Ben Sira, general wisdom has three characteristics: 1) it is revealed through creation; 2) it is universally available; and 3) it is codified in the teachings of the sages.

In continuity with the older wisdom tradition (see e.g., Prov 3:19; 8:22-31; Job 28:38-41), Ben Sira emphasizes the observation of nature as a universal mode for the acquisition of wisdom. In the opening poem of Ben Sira’s instruction (Sir 1:1-10), the sage lays the foundation for his position that wisdom is universally available through the created order. In Sir 1:9b-10a, the sage proclaims that, “he (God) poured her (wisdom) out upon all his works, upon all the living (“all flesh”) according to his gift” (ἐναρπάσας πάσης σαρκὸς κατὰ τὴν ὅσιν ὁμοίως καὶ ἐξορύξας αὐτὴν τοῖς ἄγαπῶσιν αὐτὸν). This notion is further supported in chapter 24. In 24:6, Lady Wisdom proclaims that “over every people and nation I held sway.” This is also consistent with Ben Sira’s meditation on creation 42:15-43:33. The sage associates creation with wisdom. In 24:3,

who resides in Israel and wisdom from below with the general wisdom tradition that exists beyond Israel. However, I agree with Goering’s challenge to the characterization of the wisdom present in Israel as “universal” argued by Marböck, Weisheit im Wandel, 131 (see section 3.5.2). For an extended discussion on this topic, see Goering, Wisdom’s Root Revealed, 79-89.

147 See John J. Collins, “The Biblical Precedent for Natural Theology,” JAAR 45 (1977): 35-67. Collins points out that the wisdom tradition shares with natural theology the notion that knowledge of God is universally accessible through the natural world.

148 For an extended discussion on this topic, see Goering, Wisdom’s Root Revealed, 79-89.
Lady Wisdom says that she came from the mouth of the Lord and covered the earth like a mist, recalling the creation account where God speaks to create the cosmos (cf. Gen 1:1-2:4a). This indicates that at some point in the creation of the world, all nations were given wisdom (the Torah; see section 3.5.2, below.) In 42:15, Ben Sira explains that it is by God’s word that the world was created (cf. Prov 3:19; 8:30; Ps 104:24). The association of wisdom and creation is further stressed in his comment in 42:21, in which the sage proclaims that creation reflects God’s wisdom in its ordering. The sage continues by providing an illustration of God’s wisdom in the created order by recalling the harmonious dualism that is inherent in creation described in 33:7-15: “All things come in pairs, one opposite the other, and he has made nothing incomplete” (42:24). Ben Sira contends that wisdom has been poured out on all of creation (1:9-10) and is perceptible by humans. This is explicitly discussed in the description of humanity in chapter 17. In this chapter, Ben Sira connects human sensory, psychological, intellectual, and moral endowments with the ability observe the wisdom in God’s created order (vv. 6-8). The sage also contends that even Adam had access to the access to wisdom (the Torah) in the garden from the beginning (vv. 7, 11-14; see section 3.2.1.2). However, Ben Sira goes on to explain that wisdom was given to Israel in the form of the written Torah (Sir 24:8-11; see section 3.5.2, below).

Ben Sira also contends that the wisdom tradition has codified these observations about nature into sayings and instructions. In 6:18-37, for example, Ben Sira exhorts his readers to associate themselves with wisdom. The sage states that the divine training (v. 18a) or discipline

---

149 Ben Sira ends this chapter with a comment stating how wonderful it is to see God’s glory. This comment associates the wisdom of God with his glory. Thus, it is reasonable to understand the observation of God’s glory through creation as a way to also observe his wisdom. The sage uses an analogy of the sun to explain that wisdom is universally available: “The sun looks down on everything with its light, and the work of the Lord is full of his glory” (Sir 42:16). Goering, *Wisdom’s Root Revealed*, 46-47. Cf. the universal effect of the sun implied in Ps 19:7 (Eng. 6). See James Barr, *Biblical Faith and Natural Theology* (Gifford Lectures 1991; Oxford: Clarendon 1993), 87-88.

(v. 22a) provides the means to attain wisdom (v. 18b). That wisdom can come from the instruction of the wise elders, according to the sage’s statement in 6:34-35. Ben Sira describes the instruction of the elders as “discourse” and “wise proverb,” terms that appear in synonymous parallelism (v. 35). This is also found in 8:8-9, in which Ben Sira warns against deviating from “the traditions of the (wise) elders” (v. 9a) passed down from one generation to the next.151 Since the sage’s audience is Jewish, Ben Sira indicates that general wisdom is found among Jews and non-Jews alike. Thus, the Israelite sapiential tradition forms one part of a much larger wisdom tradition which is part of what I categorize as Ben Sira’s view of general wisdom.

Ben Sira claims that wisdom—general wisdom—derives from observation of nature. Since the natural world can be observed by anyone, this kind of wisdom is universally available to all human beings. General wisdom is at the same time universally observable and divinely revealed. General wisdom contrasts with special wisdom, which is available only to a particular group of people.

3.5.2 Special Wisdom in Ben Sira

How does Ben Sira distinguish special wisdom from general wisdom? According to Ben Sira, special wisdom has three characteristics: 1) it derives from observance of God’s special wisdom rather than from nature; 2) it is possessed specifically by Israel; and 3) it is codified in the traditions of ancient Israel in the Torah.

The distinction between special wisdom and general wisdom does not mean these are two distinct types of wisdom. Rather, as I mentioned above, the sage contends that all humanity has access to wisdom. However, there is a clear difference in the amount of wisdom that was given to Israel and the nations. In Sir 1:9b-10b, the sage states that there is an additional lavishment of

151 Skehan and Di Lella, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, 213.
wisdom upon the elect: “[God] lavished [Wisdom] upon those who love him (Israel)” (καὶ ἐχορήγησεν ὧν τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν ὧν, 1:10b). Further, 43:33 states that God gave wisdom to the righteous. While general wisdom is derived from observation of nature, special wisdom comes from the observance of God’s special commandments. Although whether the subject of the passage is Israel or not is unclear, immediately following the composition’s opening poem on wisdom he proclaims that God will pour out (χορηγήσει) wisdom on those who follow his laws (v. 26). This is the same verb used in 1:10 (ἐχορήγησεν) that refers to the second portion of wisdom given to Israel. Ben Sira associates the special apportionment of wisdom to the elect who love him with the observance of the commandments. This connection indicates that the sage has in mind special wisdom and not the general wisdom available to humanity. Thus special wisdom is lavished upon the elect and connected to observance of the commandments.

The commandments Ben Sira has in mind are the Torah. While Psalm 119 describes the joy of the Torah, prior to Ben Sira there are no Israelite instructions that characterize obedience to the law as a means of attaining wisdom. Ben Sira is the first sapiential text that directly identifies the Torah as a source of wisdom (Sir 24:23). In Sir 6:37, for example, the sage

---

152 If “those who love him” is the correct reading of Sir 1:10b, it is possible that here the tradition concerning King Solomon has influenced Ben Sira. According to the Deuteronomistic Historians, Solomon “loved the Lord” (1 Kg 3:3). This statement is followed by the proclamation that wisdom had been lavished upon him. See Goering, *Wisdom’s Root Revealed*, 84-85.

153 Calduch-Benages, “God, Creator of All,” 89, identifies the connection between Sir 43:33 (“For the Lord has made all things, and to the godly he has given wisdom.”) and Sir 1:10 (“upon all the living according to his gift; he lavished her upon those who love him”). See also Nuria Calduch-Benages, “The Hymn to the Creation (Sir 42:15-43:33): A Polemic Text?,” in *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology* (ed. A. Passaro and G. Bellia; DCLS 1; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 119-138.

154 The Mosaic law is associated with being wise in Deut 4:6: “You must observe them diligently, for this will show your wisdom and discernment to the peoples, who, when they hear all these statutes, will say, ‘Surely this great nation is a wise and discerning people!’” Ezra is a “wise” scribe whose goal is the fulfillment of the Torah (e.g., Ezra 7:25-26).

encourages continual meditation “on [God’s] commandments” in order to become wise (cf. 15:1; 19:20). The sage suggests that the path to obtaining special wisdom for Israel lies in fulfilling God’s commandments.

Ben Sira suggests that the special commandments given to Israel are the Torah. The clearest depiction of the notion that the special wisdom revealed to Israel is codified in the Torah is found in chapter 24. This passage resembles Proverbs 8 as well as Hellenistic texts about the goddess Isis. The main section of the chapter is a hymn in which Lady Wisdom praises herself (vv. 3-22). She is the first of God’s creatures and resides in the heavenly council (vv. 2-3; cf. 1:4; Prov 8:22). Ben Sira goes on to make several references to the biblical creation account in his depiction of wisdom (cf. Prov 8:30). For example, wisdom originates from God’s mouth and is active in the creative process (Sir 24:3; Gen 1:3; 2:4-6). In v. 6, the sage states that at one time Wisdom held sway over all nations: “Over waves of the sea, over all the earth, and over every people and nation I have held sway” (ἐν κόμασιν θαλάσσης καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ καὶ ἐν πάντι λαό καὶ έθνει ἐκτησάμην). This is consistent with the claim in 17:7 that Adam (all humanity) was shown the tree of knowledge (the Torah; vv. 11-14). Ben Sira claims that
Wisdom was available to all humanity in the beginning in the same manner. However, in 24:8-11, Ben Sira states that God later commanded Lady Wisdom to make her dwelling and settle in Israel where she will minister to God in the Jerusalem temple (cf. Deuteronomy 12). This implies that Wisdom was no longer available to the other nations in the same way as before. Although chapter 24 never mentions why Wisdom begins to reside in Israel rather than the other nations, it is possible that the sage has in view the election of Israel opposed to the other nations, especially the Canaanites (see chapter 33; section 3.4.1.1) and the giving of the Torah on Sinai (see section 3.2.1). The promises given to Abraham marks the election of Israel (Gen 12:1-3) and the giving of the Torah at Sinai is the point that the elect receive special wisdom (the Torah) (Exod 20:1-21). Possessing the Torah is what differentiates Israel from all other nations.

---

159 See Howard N. Wallace, “Tree of Knowledge and Tree of Wisdom,” ABD 6:656-60. The tree of wisdom is also discussed in 1 Enoch 28-32; 82:2-3: “I have given wisdom to you, to your children, and to those who shall become your children in order that they may pass it (in turn) to their own children and to the generations that are discerning. All the wise ones shall give praise, and wisdom shall dwell upon your consciousness they shall not slumber but be thinking; they shall cause their ears to listen in order that they may learn this wisdom; and it shall please those who feast on it more than good food.” (Italics are mine.) See Argall, 1 Enoch and Sirach, 32-35; Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 343. It is possible in portraying Wisdom in this way that Ben Sira is metaphorically describing the people of Israel as Adam and the land of Israel as the restored garden of Eden.

160 E. P. Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 331. Goering, Wisdom’s Root Revealed, 93. The claim that wisdom is available to the Gentiles, but not the Torah, is similar to the statement in Lam. Rab. 2:9: “If anyone will say to you that there is wisdom among the Gentiles, believe him. If he will say that there is Torah among the Gentiles, do not believe him.” Also, “And it was for the following reason that the nations of the world were asked to accept the Torah: In order that they should not have the opportunity to say, ‘Had we been asked we would have accepted it.’ For, lo, they were asked and they refused to accept it, as it is said ‘And behold the Lord came from Sinai, etc. (Deut 33:2).’ First he appeared before the children of Esau the wicked and said to them, ‘Will you accept the Torah?’ They replied, ‘What is written in it?’ He answered, ‘You shall not murder (Deut 5:17).’ They then replied, ‘That is the very inheritance our father left us, as it is said, By your sword you shall live (Gen 27:40).’ He then appeared to the children of Ammon and Moab. He said to them, ‘Will you accept the Torah?’ They replied, ‘What is written in it?’ He answered, ‘You shall not commit adultery (Deut 5:18).’ They then replied, ‘But we are all children of adulterers, it is said, ‘Both the daughters of Lot became pregnant by their father (Gen 19:36).’ He then appeared to the children of Ishmael. He said to them, ‘Will you accept the Torah?’ They replied, ‘What is written in it?” He answered, ‘You shall not steal (Deut 5:19).’ They then replied, ‘The very blessing pronounced upon our father was He shall be a wild ass of a man, with his hand against everyone (Gen 16:12), and also it is written, For in fact I was stolen out of the land of the Hebrews (Gen 40:15).’ But when he came to Israel, a fiery law for them in his right hand (Deut 33:2), they all opened their mouths and said, ‘All that the Lord has spoken we will do, and we will be obedient (Exod 24:7).’ Thus, it is said, ‘He stopped and shook the earth; he looked and made the nations tremble (Hab 3:6).’ See Exod. Rab. 27:9; Num. Rab. 14:10.
Wisdom uses Edenic language to describe how she took root and grew in Israel in 24:12-18. The passage concludes with Wisdom exhorting her hearers to enjoy her life-giving fruit, which satisfies any hunger and quenches any thirst (24:19-22). Wisdom is depicted in this passage in a similar manner as the tree of knowledge in Genesis 3 and other Second Temple Jewish texts (see section 3.2.1.2.1.1). The life giving properties of the tree also alludes to the tree of life, which is mentioned in Genesis 2-3. This suggests that Ben Sira conflates two traditional ideas: 1) the tree of wisdom; and 2) the tree of life. The sage states that the result of Wisdom settling in Israel is “the book of covenant of the Most High God, the law that Moses commands us as an inheritance for the congregation of Jacob” (24:23; cf. 3:1-16; 35:4-11; 7:27-28; Deut 33:4). This does not mean that the Gentiles are in principle cut off from the Torah. Ben Sira is instead stressing the fact that since wisdom is planted in Israel, the Jews have access to it in a way that other peoples do not. Creation is the result of God’s wisdom and reflects his wisdom, which gives all people access to wisdom. However, the codified Torah given to the elect nation of Israel indicates that Israel was given more wisdom than other the nations.

3.5.3 Determinism, Freewill, and Special Revelation in Ben Sira and 4QInstruction

Ben Sira includes a tension that God favors certain people from birth (1:14; 33:15-17) and that every person has the ability to freely choose to follow Torah or not (15:11), which is similarly present in 4QInstruction. In the Qumran text, there is a clear elect group of people favored by God—the בֶּן הָיָה. This type of humanity is made in the likeness of the angels (4Q417 i 17) and given access to the הַר בָּשָׂר (4Q418 184 2). They are placed in opposition to the רֵעַ הָאָדָם, who is

---

161 See Sheppard, *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct*, 103. The sage continues by likening the Torah to the Jordan River and to the rivers of paradise. The sage proclaims that the Torah gushes forth Wisdom into a boundless abyss (Sir 24:25-29; cf. Gen 2:10-14). Ben Sira extends this simile to explain that he is a channel that carries the life-giving waters of the Torah’s Wisdom to a sea. This sea is presumably the composition he authored, which is available to his students and all future generations (vv. 30-33). Skehan and Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 337.
not made like the angels and do not have access to divine revelation. However, the are not guaranteed a blissful afterlife, and they could lose their elect status if they do not pursue wisdom.

Ben Sira’s description of how God made the knowledge of good and evil available stands in contrast to that of 4QInstruction. In both compositions, following the Genesis narrative, God establishes the knowledge of good and evil in the garden of Eden (17:7; 4Q423 1). While Ben Sira associates this knowledge with the Torah (17:11-12; 45:5; 24:13-17), 4QInstruction links it to the (4Q417 i 6-8). This mystery is associated with creation (4Q417 i 8-9). Ben Sira similarly places the Torah in the creation narrative. The sage places the Torah as existing chronologically prior to Adam. Ben Sira also claims that all humanity once had access to the wisdom of the Torah in the form of the knowledge of good and evil in Eden. 4QInstruction, however, states that the knowledge of good and evil is not universally available. Rather, one obtains access to it in the form of the , which was exclusively given to the elect (along with Adam).

### 3.6 Conclusion

The portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 are central to Ben Sira’s anthropology. The sage interprets the biblical creation accounts according to his understanding of wisdom and the election of Israel. He also alters his interpretation according to his purpose to present a two-tiered conception of humanity.

Ben Sira primarily appeals to the biblical portrayals of Adam to make anthropological assertions about humankind in general. This is clearest in 15:11-17 and 17:1-14. In 15:11-17, the sage provides an interpretation the Adam of Gen 2:7 to emphasize that although each person has been given either a good or bad by God, each has the ability to choose whether or not to
follow the Torah. In 17:1-14, the sage provides his fullest treatment of the creation of humanity. In this passage, the sage uses both portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 to make statements about the condition of humanity. He uses Gen 1:26-27 to explain that since humanity was created in God’s image, they have been given authority over the earth and the knowledge of good and evil (17:2b-3). Gen 2:7 is the basis for Ben Sira’s claim that mortality is part of God’s intended purpose for humanity (17:1-2a). It is not a consequence of Adam’s sin. In fact, he does not even mention the prohibition against eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil or Adam’s transgression. The actions of the first man are not taken to in any way impact the human condition of later generations. Ben Sira explains that Adam had access to the tree of knowledge in Eden and that humanity was endowed with wisdom from the beginning. The sage goes on to combine creation and the Sinai account and thus identify the law of Sinai as the same law laid out before Adam. Although the Torah was available to Adam according to chapter 17, in chapter 24 the sage states that wisdom settled specifically in Israel because they were God’s chosen people. However, the sage does not claim wisdom ceased to be available to other nations. All humanity has access to the general wisdom through the observation of the natural order. While all people once had the Torah, now access to it is a key component of the election of Israel over against the other nations. Although Ben Sira uses the figure of Adam to discuss the human condition in general, in 33:7-15 the sage appeals to the portrayal of Adam in Gen 2:7 to explain that the election of Israel is according to God’s wisdom. Because they are the chosen people of God, Israel was given a double apportionment of wisdom (1:9-10). Ben Sira’s anthropology is characterized by this understanding of Israel’s elect status and the apportionment of wisdom.

Ben Sira interpreted the portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 to fit his two-tiered conception of humanity. Features of the biblical account such as the prohibition of eating from
the tree of knowledge and the transgression of Adam and Eve along with its consequences are not mentioned, which is also the case in 4QInstruction. The sage, instead, retells the story in a way that reflects his intended purpose. Firmly planted in the context of Jerusalem, Ben Sira’s commitment to follow faithfully the sapiential tradition reflected in the biblical book of Proverbs prompts him to interpret the figure of Adam as humanity in general, who has access to wisdom through the created order, while Israel has been given more wisdom than others in the form of the codified Torah.

Ben Sira provides an interpretation of the portrayal of Adam in Genesis 1-3 from an author writing in the early second century B.C.E., roughly the same time 4QInstruction was composed. These two authors represent different strata of society. Ben Sira comes from an upper stratum, while 4QInstruction comes from a lower one. Although Ben Sira and 4QInstruction draw on Genesis 1-3 to provide their understandings of the human condition, their interpretations demonstrate major differences. Unlike 4QInstruction, Ben Sira understands the figure of Adam paradigmatically—he is used to describe the condition of all humans. 4QInstruction, instead, uses Adam to primarily articulate the status of the elect addressee.

The two portrayals of Adam in Genesis are not assigned to two opposing types of humans, as found in 4QInstruction. Further, each author understands what the knowledge of good and evil is and who has access to it differently. Ben Sira associates the knowledge of good and evil with the Torah (Sir 17:7) and contends that it resides with Israel, but all are able to study it. 4QInstruction, however, links the knowledge of good and evil with the הַיּוָדָעַ and claims that only the elect is able to study it. Although Ben Sira states that God favors Israel over the rest of the nations through his giving more wisdom to his chosen people in the form of the Torah, this

---

does not exclude those outside of Israel from the possibility of enjoying a life dedicated to
pursuing wisdom.

In the following chapters, I will examine the work of Philo and 4 Ezra, which are situated
circa the first century C.E. In the next chapter, I examine Philo’s interpretation of Genesis 1-3
and gain a better understanding of how the traditions attested in 4QInstruction may have
influenced his thought as he attempted to harmonize the Hellenistic philosophical tradition with
the Jewish Scriptures.
CHAPTER FOUR
INTERPRETING ADAM IN ALEXANDRIA: PHILO, THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON, AND GENESIS 1-3

4.1 Introduction

Both 4QInstruction and Philo utilize Genesis 1-3 to articulate core anthropological principles. 4QInstruction adapts elements from these chapters, primarily the portrayals of Adam, when describing the elect status of the addressee, and asserting that there are “fleshly” and “spiritual” types of humanity. In one of his many interpretations of Genesis 1-3, Philo argues for a double creation of humanity. In Leg. 1.31-32, Philo explains that the differing portrayals of Adam in Genesis suggest there are two categorically different kinds of men in the world—”the heavenly man” (ὁ οὐρανιός ἄνθρωπος), “fashioned in the image of God” (Gen 1:26-27); and “the earthly man” (ὁ γῆινος ἄνθρωπος), “molded” out of the clay (Gen 2:7). He further explains that these two kinds of humanity should be understood as signifying different kinds of minds. In Opif. 134-35, Philo applies this dualistic interpretation of Genesis 1-3 to the human condition. In this double creation of man account, Philo uses the contrasting portrayals of Adam in two ways: 1) he refers to humanity before, during, and after life as a composite being—comprising body and soul; and 2) he asserts that there are two opposed modes of human existence. A virtuous life is associated with the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 and the immortality of the soul. In contrast, a life of wickedness and the death of the soul are more closely linked to the description of Adam in Genesis 2-3. Philo exhorts every person to strive to imitate the portrayal of Adam in Gen 1:26-27 while also trying to become less like the Adam of Gen 2:7 who sinned in the garden of Eden.
Karina Martin Hogan has demonstrated the importance of understanding Philo in relation to the Wisdom of Solomon, which was likely written in Alexandria during the time of Philo.¹ I will likewise appeal to the ideas of Pseudo-Solomon to establish a broader context concerning the contemporary use of similar exegetical traditions. Matthew J. Goff has reasonably argued that Pseudo-Solomon was probably influenced by exegetical currents found in 4QInstruction.² 4QInstruction allows us to also examine older exegetical traditions that may have influenced Philo.³ In this chapter, I will work within the framework established by Hogan and Goff concerning the Wisdom of Solomon’s relation to Philo and 4QInstruction to support the argument that Philo’s double creation of man account draws on older interpretative traditions that are attested in 4QInstruction. Both compositions appeal to the two creation accounts in Genesis 1-3 to describe two opposing ways of living. I will further demonstrate that Philo diverges from the dualistic interpretation of Genesis 1-3 attested in 4QInstruction by applying Hellenistic philosophy to the exegetical tradition. I contend that although extensively influenced by Hellenistic philosophy, his ideas were also shaped by Jewish Palestinian sapiential thought. It is useful to understand Philo as utilizing traditions attested in 4QInstruction not only because it provides a better understanding of the ideas Philo adopted, but also the extent to which he


³ Goff, “Adam, the Angels and Eternal Life,” 1-22, also briefly discusses the double creation of man account in Philo and traditions found in the Wisdom of Solomon.
reworked them according to his own purposes. To do this, I will focus on Philo’s double creation of man interpretation of the biblical Adam found in *Leg.* 1.31-32 and *Opif.* 134-35. I will also provide a rough overview of Philo’s extensive engagement with Genesis 1-3.

### 4.1.1 A Brief Background

Philo of Alexandria (ca. 15 B.C.E. - 50 C.E.) was a Jewish philosopher who wrote and lived in Alexandria, the cultural and educational center of the Hellenistic world. He came from a wealthy Alexandrian family. Philo’s brother and nephew were high-ranking Roman bureaucrats, who renounced their Jewish heritage. His nephew even served as governor of Judea, prefect of Egypt, and chief of staff under the general Titus during the time of the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. Philo served as an advocate for the Alexandrian Jewish people. This is evident in his role as the leader of a delegation that was dispatched to Rome in 40 C.E. to address the recent treatment of the Jews in Alexandria.

Philo’s education reflected his social status in Alexandria. He received an extensive Greek education (*paideia*) (*Mos.* 1.21-24). This included the *encyclios paideia* (“preliminary studies”) and philosophy. His familiarity with Greek subjects is evident based on his knowledge of the Greek language in his writings. He is also familiar with Greek history, myth, philosophy, literature, science, law, mathematics, and music. In his work, Philo cites philosophers such as Aristotle, Homer, Hippocrates, Plato, and Zeno.

---


Philo believed that the Jews were God’s chosen people and that their responsibility to the traditions in the Torah set them apart from the rest of the world. He desired for his fellow Jews to observe the Torah while living in the Hellenistic culture. Although Philo considered himself a faithful and observant Jew, his interpretation of the Hebrew Bible reflects his effort to fuse and harmonize the Jewish Scriptures with Greek thought. He approached scripture through the lens of Hellenistic philosophy. Philo believed the stories in scripture are divinely revealed and therefore are literally true. However, he also believed that it is not always possible to accept scripture literally because of apparent contradictions that arise (Plant. 36). For example, Philo argued that the reference to God planting a garden in Genesis 2 must be understood figuratively (Leg. 1.43-46). If read literally, Philo argued that this would directly contradict the statement in Num 23:19, which reads: “God is not a man” (Sac. 94; Cher. 53; Conf. 98; QG 1.55; 2.54). He, therefore, concluded that the truth available in these instances can be extracted by employing the allegorical method (e.g., Gig. 13-15, 58, 60; Fug. 22, 121; Det. 33, 125). Philo subjected his affinity for Greek philosophy to his Jewish identity. He understood philosophy as the pursuit of wisdom. The goal of philosophy was also wisdom (Congr. 79). Philo contended that wisdom was achieved by correctly understanding God through the Hebrew Bible.

---


7 Philo develops several principles to guide someone who employs the allegorical method. See, for example, Somn. 1.73, 246; Spec. 1.287; Abr. 68; Det. 167; Contempl. 152.
Philo wrote extensively on the contents of the Hebrew Bible. He devoted most of his attention to the book of Genesis. Philo’s work on this book constitutes almost the same amount of material he composed on the rest of the Jewish Scriptures. Of his work on the book of Genesis, he focused much of his attention on the first three chapters, which is primarily found in De opificio mundi, Legum allegoriae, and Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin.8

4.2 Philo’s Interpretation of the Creation of Man in Genesis 1-3

Philo’s work reflects a rich tradition of the interpretation of the creation accounts of the first man in Genesis 1-3.9 Scholarship on Philo has drawn attention to the extent to which Philo’s treatises incorporate older sources and traditions, especially the exegetical traditions of earlier generations of Alexandrian Jews.10 In particular, the work of Thomas H. Tobin’s 1983 book on the interpretation of the creation of man in Philo has become a classic in the field. According to Tobin, Philo preserves earlier stages of an exegetical tradition regarding the two accounts of the creation of Adam found in Gen 1:26-27 and 2:7 along with his own allegorical interpretations.11 Tobin contends that Philo’s work demonstrates discernible stages of interpretation that build upon one another. Although Tobin concludes that Philo’s influences primarily originate in

---


Hellenistic thought, I believe 4QInstruction, published in 1999, and thus after Tobin’s book, supports the basic thrust of his argument. The interpretation of Adam in 4QInstruction suggests that Philo’s double creation of man account may be informed by ideas beyond Hellenistic philosophy. The Qumran text supports Tobin’s contention that there is an older exegetical tradition behind Philo’s double creation of man account (see section 4.2.2.1 and 4.2.2.2). In this section I will briefly review Philo’s main exegetical options for understanding Adam. I will then focus on his double creation of man idea.

4.2.1 Philo’s Many Interpretations of Adam

Philo provides a range of philosophical explanations of the Genesis accounts of the creation of man. In *Opif.* 24-25, for example, he expounds the first account of the creation of man by employing several concepts that are from Middle Platonism, especially the notion of the *Logos* as the intermediary between God and creation:

> And if any one were to desire to use more undisguised terms, he would not call the world, which is perceptible only to the intellect, anything else but the reason of God, already occupied in the creation. . . . This is the doctrine of Moses, not mine. Accordingly, when recording the creation of man, he asserts in the following words, that he was made in the image of God—and if the image be a part of the image, then manifestly so is the entire form, that is, the entire world perceptible by the external senses, which is a greater imitation of the divine image than the human form is. It is also evident that the archetypal seal, which we call that world which is perceptible only to the intellect, must itself be the archetypal model, the idea of ideas, the reason of God.


14 cf. *Leg.* 3.95-6; *Her.* 230-31; *Spec.* 1.80-81, 3.83, 3.207; *QG* 2.62.
Philo models this interpretation of the creation of man after Plato’s *Timaeus*. The expression κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ in Gen 1:27 is understood to mean that the human person is “the image of an image,” a “copy” of the original divine image or “archetypal seal” that is the Logos (cf., e.g., *Spec.* 1.81; 3.83; *Leg.* 3.96; *Her.* 231). Thus, in this text, Philo uses the portrayal of Adam in Gen 1:26-27 to explain that humans are the sense-perceptible copies of the divine Logos.

In *Opif.* 69-71, rather than an “image,” Philo more identifies the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 as the mind in all human beings. He explains:

For nothing that is born on the earth more resembles God than man. Let no one think that he is able to judge of this likeness from the characteristics of the body. For neither is God in human form, nor is the human body God-like. No, it is in respect of the mind, the sovereign part of the soul, that the word “image” is used.

---


Philo states that the “earth-born” (γηγενές) man resembles (ἐμφερέστερον) God more than any other creature. Philo explains that humanity’s “resemblance” to God is not in the body. Rather, it is “the mind, which rules the soul.” In *Opif*. 69-71, after comparing the mind (as “image”) to a “statue” of a god, which our bodies parade around on our shoulders, Philo shifts his analogy to focus on what is similar between God and humans. He does not mention the Logos as an intermediary as he did in *Opif*. 24-25. He explains that, for example, the mind and

---


19 Runia, *On the Creation*, 224, 254. There is a shift in Philo’s cosmogonic (and therefore anthropogonic) perspective in *Opif*. 129-50 from what is found in *Opif*. 13-128.


21 This is not the case in *Leg*. 2.12-13. In this section, Philo distances not only the man of Gen 1:27 from the man of Gen 2:7, but also the animals of Gen 1:24 from those of Gen 2:19. Philo’s hermeneutical approach to Genesis 1-2 is identical to his perspective in *Opif*. 129, and different than the one found in *Opif*. 69-128.


God are “invisible,” “see all things,” and are made of an unclear substance. In this passage, Philo claims that humankind is in God’s image because of the rational mind and not the body.

In some instances, Philo reads Genesis 1-3 as a unified description of the human condition. This can be observed most clearly in Det. 79-90. For example, Philo states:

The creator made no soul in any body capable of seeing its creator by itself. But, God decided that it would be of great advantage to the creature should it obtain the knowledge of the creator and proper understandings of the work of creation, since this is what determines happiness and blessedness. God breathed into the man from above of his own divine nature. The invisible deity stamped its own impression in an invisible manner on the invisible soul, in order that even the earth might not be without a share in the image (εἰκόνα) of God. But the archetypal pattern is, of course, so devoid of all visible form that even God’s image cannot be seen. Having been indeed struck according to the divine model, it entertained ideas not now mortal but immortal. . . . How then was it likely that the mind of man, being so small, contained in such small bulks as a brain or a heart, should have room for all the vastness of the sky and the universe, had it not been an inseparable fragment of that divine and blessed soul? For no part of that which is divine cuts itself off and becomes separate, but it does extend itself. (Det. 86-87, 90)

Cf. Det. 87-90; Opif. 70-71 (see also Plato’s “flight of the soul” in Phaed. 246a-249d).


This is seen elsewhere in Second Temple Jewish literature. For example, in Ben Sira’s description of humanity, he explains that “The Lord created human beings out of earth” (17:1) “and made them in his own image” (17:3; cf. Sir 17:1-8). A similar hermeneutical move is found in the Wisdom of Solomon. In Wis 2:23-24, for example, Pseudo-Solomon combines Gen 1:27 with elements found in Genesis 3: “for God created us for incorruption, and made us in the image of his own eternity, but through the devil’s envy death entered the world, and those who belong to his company experience it.” The author also combines Gen 2:7 in Wis 7:1; Gen 1:28 in Wis 9:1-2; Gen 2:7 in Wis 9:15; and Genesis 3 in Wis 10:1.

See Tobin, The Creation of Man, 89.
In the passage the human soul is understood as an inseparable fragment of the divine soul. This is a Stoic interpretation of the verse. Philo adopts the Stoic notion of πνεῦμα and applies it to the creation of Adam in Gen 2:7. Recalling this verse, Philo explains that the fragment is something divine, breathed into the human body. The divine breath in Gen 2:7 is understood as the πνεῦμα by Philo. This is the aspect of humanity with which one can reason and obtain immortality. He uses Stoic concepts elsewhere in his work to similarly describe the soul. Philo contends that the human soul is “a divine fragment” (ἀπόσπασμα θείον, Leg. 3.161) of the αἰθέριον πνεῦματος and the “effulgence” (ἀπάγγελμα) of the divine nature (Spec. 4.123).

Philo also provides a Platonic interpretation of Gen 1:26-27. He states that the image of God is also an “impress” (τύπος, Det. 86), “stamped” (ἐνέσφραγιζέτο, Det. 86; cf. Plant. 1.18; Opif. 1.146; Leg. 3:95-96) on the invisible soul (Gen 1:26-27). Philo again follows Plato’s Timaeus, claiming that humanity was created in the image of the archetypal Logos. In this passage, Philo combines the Platonic interpretation of Gen 1:26-27 and the Stoic interpretation of Gen 2:7 in a complementary manner (cf. Opif. 139; Virt. 203-205; Her. 55-57; Spec. 1.171). While in this account Philo reads Genesis 1-3 as a unified text, elsewhere he...
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30 Tobin, The Creation of Man, 77-79. Runia, Philo of Alexandria, 485; See also Leg. 1.39-40; Her. 281-3; Somn. 1.33-34; QG 2.59.

31 Leg. 3:95: καὶ τοῦτο τὸ σχῆμα τῇ ἑλεχτῷ ἐντετύπωκεν ὁ θεὸς νομίσματος δοκίμου τρόπον.

32 Tobin, The Creation of Man, 62.

33 Martin Hogan, “The Exegetical Background,” 6. For further discussion of this passage, see Tobin, The Creation of Man, 87-93. Philo combines Gen 1:27 and 2:7 throughout his work. For example, see Opif. 69-88; Her. 55-57; Det. 83; Plant. 18-22; Mut. 223; Spec. 1.171; Virt. 203-05. See Francis Watson, Text and Truth: Redefining Biblical
offers an exegetical explanation as to why the book contains two creation narratives. He famously posits that they are referring to two different men.

4.2.2 Two Creations of Humanity: Philo’s Theory of “Two Men”

As is well known, the differences and tensions between the Seven Day creation story (Gen 1:1-2:4a) and the Adam and Eve narrative (Gen 2:4b-3:24) has caused scholars to conclude that they are two different accounts, attributing them to the P and J sources, respectively. One difference between the two creation stories is the creation of Adam. In Genesis 1, we read: “God created humankind in his image” (v. 27). In the Genesis 2 account, however, we are told: “the LORD God formed man from the dust of the ground” (v. 7). Philo understood the same exegetical problem discerned by modern scholars. Whereas they often explain it through source criticism, Philo offered a different solution. In Opif. 134-35, Philo explains that the two accounts in Genesis of the creation of humanity should be read as meaning that God created two different kinds of humanity—a man “fashioned in the image of God” (Gen 1:26-27) and a man formed “from the dust of the ground” (Gen 2:7).\(^{34}\) Tobin correctly states that Philo’s “double creation of man” theory is the sage’s attempt to “explain why the description of the creation of man occurs twice in Genesis. In such an interpretation this is taken to mean that two different ‘men’ were

---

\(^{34}\) This contrast is found in Leg. 1.32 and 1.90. Although other terms are also used to contrast these two figures, I will use the terms “heavenly” and “earthly” to distinguish between them. Cf. 1 Cor 15:47-9. Elsewhere they are referred to as the “man after the image” and the “molded man.” See QG 1.4, 8.2.56. In Opif. 4, 62-3, 146, the “heavenly man” is identified explicitly with the Logos.
created, the one heavenly and part of the intelligible world, the other earthly and part of the sensible world.\textsuperscript{35}

Philo never states explicitly how the distinction between the two kinds of people should be understood. However, he does comment on their different characteristics at various points in his writings. This is done most explicitly in \textit{Leg}. 1.31-32 and \textit{Opif}. 134-135. In this section, I will examine what Philo says about the opposing types of humanity in these two passages. I will then discuss how 4QInstruction may contribute to how we read these interpretations. I will begin by arguing that in \textit{Leg}. 1.31-32 Philo uses the dual portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 to symbolize two different kinds of minds, which he sees as representing opposing types of people. In his double creation of man account in \textit{Opif}. 134-35, Philo uses the contrasting portrayals of Adam in two ways: 1) As referring to humanity before, during, and after life as a composite being of body and soul; and 2) as denoting contrasting ways a human can live as a composite being. Philo argues that every person should strive to imitate the portrayal of Adam in Gen 1:26-27 and become less like the Adam of Gen 2:7.

\textbf{4.2.2.1 The two men in \textit{Legum allegoriae} 1.31-32}. In his \textit{Leg}. 1.31, Philo states: \textit{“The races of men are twofold; for one is the heavenly man (ό οὐράνιος ἀνθρώπος), and the other the earthly man (ό γῆϊνος ἀνθρώπος).”}\textsuperscript{36} Philo appeals to the two portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3. ο οὐράνιος ἀνθρώπος is associated with the Adam in Gen 1:26-27—”in the image of God.” ο

\textsuperscript{35} Tobin, \textit{The Creation of Man}, 108.

γῆνος ἄνθρωπος is connected to the Adam in Gen 2:7—molded “out of clay.” Thus, each race is a kind of ἄνθρωπος. Philo approaches the two portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 allegorically. It is reasonable that the two kinds of ἄνθρωπος symbolize two kinds of minds. Those who possess the mind that is symbolized by the ὁ οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος are those who live a virtuous life. Those who possess the mind signified by the ὁ γῆνος ἄνθρωπος are those who live a life pursuing the passions of the flesh. The notion of two kinds of minds leads to the notion that there are two different types of people (“races of men”) in the world. Philo’s anthropological dichotomy is recounted primarily in Leg. 1.31:

“And God created man, taking a lump of clay from the earth, and breathed into his face the breath of life, and man became a living soul” (Gen 2:7). The races of men are twofold: there is the heavenly man, and the earthly man. The heavenly man, on the one hand, being born in the image of God, has no participation in any corruptible or earth-like essence. But, the earthly man, on the other hand, is made of loose material, which Moses calls a lump of clay. On which account, he says, not that the heavenly man was made, but that he was fashioned according to the image of God. But the earthly man, he calls a thing made, and not begotten by the maker.

καὶ ἐπλάσεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν λαβὼν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνεῦν ζωῆς, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῴσαν.”” διίτα ἄνθρωπον γένη: ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος, ὁ δὲ γῆνος. ὁ μὲν οὖν οὐράνιος ἄτε κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ γεγονός φθαρτῆς καὶ συνόλως γεώδους οὐσίας ἀμέτοχος, ὁ δὲ γῆνος ἐκ σποράδου θύλης, ἢν χοῦν κέκληκεν, ἐπάγη: διὸ τὸν μὲν οὐράνιον φησιν οὐ πεπλάσθαι, κατ’ εἰκόνα δὲ τετυπώσθαι θεοῦ, τὸν δὲ γῆνος πλάσμα, ἀλλ’ οὐ γέννημα, εἶναι τοῦ τεχνίτου.

---

37 Leg. 2.4: “For there are two kinds of men, the one made according to the image of God, the other fashioned out of the earth” (δύο γὰρ ἄνθρωπον γένη, τὸ τε κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα γεγονός καὶ τὸ πεπλασμένον ἐκ γῆς). See Opif. 134; Leg. 1.31, 53, 88-95, 2.4; Plant. 44; QG 1.4, 8; 2.56; QE 2.46; Her. 57. The distinction between the “heavenly” and “earthly” human occurs in Leg. 1.31, 90-95, and the “two types of humankind” in Leg. 1.31, 2.4.
Philo interprets the two portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 as referring to two very different races of humanity—the ὁ οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος and ὁ γῆινος ἄνθρωπος. ὁ οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος is in the image of God, “incorruptible” and does not participate in anything terrestrial (Gen 1:26-27). ὁ γῆινος ἄνθρωπος, by contrast, possesses a composite nature of body and soul, is corruptible and associated with the earth (Gen 2:7).38 A number of scholars have argued that these two men can reasonably be understood as also mentioned in Opif. 134, which also contains a description of humanity rooted in the dual portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 (see section 4.2.2.2).39 Philo seems to have a different understanding of the two men portrayed in this passage. As Stephen Hultgren has reasonably argued, in Legum allegoriae, Philo allegorically interprets ὁ οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος and ὁ γῆινος ἄνθρωπος to symbolize different kinds of mind (νοῦς).40 This is evident by the way Philo describes the two depictions of Adam in Legum allegoriae 1. In Leg. 1.32-33, Philo explains that “the man formed from the earth” (ἄνθρωπον δὲ τὸν ἐκ γῆς) represents “the mind caught up in the body” (νοῦν εἰσκρινόμενον σῶματι) “and this mind” (ὁ δὲ νοῦς οὖν) is “earthly and corruptible” (γεώδης ἐστὶ τῷ ὄντι καὶ φθαρτός), “earth-born and a lover of the body” (τὸν γηγενῆ καὶ φυλοσώματον). Although Philo never uses the term “mind” as a designation for the ὁ οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος in 1.31-32, he does so in 1.88:

38 Tobin, The Creation of Man, 111.


The man whom God made differs from the man molded, as I have mentioned before. For the molded mind is somewhat earthly, but the created mind is purer and more immaterial, having no participation in any perishable matter, but having received a purer and more simple constitution.

In this section, Philo refers to the two creations of Adam in Genesis 1 and 2. He explains that they represent two kinds of minds and that these minds are clearly different, which he states that he has addressed previously. Philo is likely referring to his discussion of the portrayals of Adam earlier in the composition, in *Leg.* 1.31-32. In *Leg.* 1.88, Philo compares the “the molded” man (τοῦ πλασθέντος) to “the man whom God made” (δὲ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς ἄνθρωπον). The molded man is identified as the “mind that was formed” (ὁ μὲν γὰρ πλασθεὶς νοῦς ἐστὶ γεωδέστερος). Philo states that this mind “is more earthly” (ἐστὶ γεωδέστερος), material, and “perishable” (φθαρτής). This description recalls the ὁ γῆινος ἄνθρωπος described in *Leg.* 1.31-32. Further, to describe this man and mind, Philo uses the verb πλάσσω, which is the same term used in the creation of Adam in Gen 2:7 (LXX). In *Leg.* 1.88, Philo states that opposite the sort of mind that is represented by the Adam of Gen 2:7 is “the man whom God made,” which refers to the Adam of Gen 1:27. Philo calls this sort of man “the mind which was made” (ὁ δὲ ποιηθεὶς νοῦς). He claims that this mind is “purer and immaterial, having no participation in any perishable matter” (ἅλατερος, φθαρτής ὄλης ὀμέτοχος, καθαροτέρας). Philo’s description of this mind is similar to the description of ὁ οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος in *Leg.* 1.31-32. Further, to describe this man and mind, Philo uses the verb ποιέω, which is the same used in Gen 1:26-27 (LXX). Philo’s interpretation
of Adam in *Leg.* 1.88 as two different minds supports the notion in *Leg.* 1.31-32 that Philo is also referring to two different minds. In this passage, Philo reads allegorically the two “men” of Genesis 1 and 2 as representing two different kinds of mind.

In *Legum allegoriae* 1, Philo’s interpretation of the two Genesis creation accounts is influenced by Platonism. He contends that Gen 1:1-2:3 describes the creation of the ideal forms of mind, sense-perception, intelligible things, and sense-perceptible things, whereas Gen 2:4a and following describe the creation of their empirical counterparts.

Although *Legum allegoriae* 1 makes a division between the creation of the intelligible world and the creation of the empirical world based on Gen 2:4-5, both ὁ οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος and ὁ γῆινος ἄνθρωπος serve as symbols for mind and belong in the empirical world. ⁴¹ Neither of these minds exists exclusively in the intelligible world.

There are clear differences between these two minds. ὁ οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος represents “pure mind” (τὸν καθαρὸν νοῦν, *Leg.* 1.89). This sort of mind is completely separate from the senses and the passions. It also does not need any instruction because it “possesses virtue instinctively” (1.92). ⁴² ὁ γῆινος ἄνθρωπος, in contrast, represents mind that is “mixed with body” (1.32). ⁴³ Philo calls this the “earthly mind” (νοῦς γεώδος, *Leg.* 1.31). Philo explains that ὁ γῆινος ἄνθρωπος was saved from inevitable corruption (φθαρτός) of the soul due to God

---


⁴² Hultgren, “The Origin of Paul’s Doctrine of the Two Adams,” 349. Philo also states that the man is perfect and “possesses virtue instinctively” (τὴν ἐρήμην αὐτομαθῶς, *Leg.* 1.92). Further, in *Leg.* 3.97-104, he explains that the heavenly man is able to “lift his eyes” and to gaze directly into the essence of the divine. It is difficult to see how a Platonic idea would be able to possess virtue instinctively and gaze into the divine essence. Gerhard Sellin has additionally argued that a Platonic reading of the two kinds of humanity is almost impossible based on Philo’s identification of the two men as διττά ἄνθρωποι γένη in *Leg.* 1.31. From a Platonic perspective, Gerhard Sellin, *Der Streit um die Auferstehung der Toten: Eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung von 1 Korinther 15* (FRLANT 138; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 103, observes that one γῆινος cannot operate as the material manifestation of another.

inbreathing the spirit of genuine life (ἐὰν μὴ ὁ θεὸς ἐμπνεύσειν αὐτῷ δύναμιν ἀληθινῆς ζωῆς, \textit{Leg.} 1.32). This allows ὁ γῆνος ἀνθρωπος to either learn wisdom and virtue or succumb to “the passions, and the vices, and innumerable other things” (ἀισθήσεις καὶ πάθη καὶ κακίαι καὶ μιρία ἄλλα τούτῳ, 2.4; cf. 1.31, 37). This is similar to Philo’s description of the mind symbolized by “the formed” (τὸν πεπλασμένον) Adam of Gen 2:7 in \textit{Plant.} 44-45. In \textit{Plant.} 45, Philo explains that since the earthly mind is attached to sense-perceptible realities:

> It possesses faculties which draw it in contrary directions, so that it should be kept in a state of doubt when called upon to discriminate as to what it should choose and what it should avoid, since if it chose the better part it would reap immortality and glory. If it chose the worse, it would meet with reproach and death.

οὐκοίς πρὸς τάναντα κεχρημένον δυνάμειν ἐπὶ τήν διάκρισιν τε αὐτῶν ἀνακληθέντα, ἵνα πρὸς αἵρεσιν καὶ φυγὴν ὀρμήσας, εἰ μὲν τὰ ἁμείνω δεξιώσατο, ἅθανασίας καὶ εὐκλείας ἀπόναιτο, εἰ δ’ αὖ τὰ χείρω, ψεκτὸν θάνατον εὑρήται.

This passage explains that although ὁ γῆνος ἀνθρωπος can choose, he has difficulties distinguishing between what is right and wrong.\textsuperscript{44} Philo uses the portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 to symbolize the two kinds of minds that can be possessed by humanity. Those who live a life pursuing the passions of the flesh have the mind symbolized by the Adam of Gen 2:7 and those who live a life pursuing virtue have the mind symbolized by the Adam of Gen 1:26-27.

Philo contends that everyone has one of the two minds represented by the Adams of Genesis 1-3. This indicates that there are two kinds of humanity in the world. Philo states this explicitly in \textit{Leg.} 1.31: “the races of men are twofold.” Thus, he categorizes humanity based on

the mind that one possesses. Philo’s distinction between two kinds of humanity due to their mental state is similar to his discussion in Her. 54-57. In Her. 57, Philo states:

So that the race of mankind also is twofold, one lives by the divine spirit and reason; the other exists according to blood and the pleasure of the flesh. This species is formed of the earth, but the other is an impress resembling the divine image.

Philo here states that there are two races of humanity as he does in Leg. 1.31-32. He also appeals again to the dual portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3. Philo suggests that humanity has a choice as to how to live. One can live according to the description of Adam in Gen 1:26-27 by living “by the divine spirit and reason.” Or, one can live according to the pattern of the Adam of Gen 2:7 by following “the pleasure of the flesh.” According to Leg. 1.31, the way one lives indicates not only which Adam one is associated with, but also the race of humanity that a person belongs to.

---

45 cf. QG 2.56; QE 2.46. See Horsley, “Pneumatikos vs. Psychikos,” 279.

46 Horsley, “Pneumatikos vs. Psychikos,” 180-84, argues that the Adams of Gen 1:26-27 and Gen 2:7 for Philo represent different levels of spiritual attainment. He contends that, according to Philo, the ordinary Jews are represented by the Adam of Gen 2:7 and the extraordinarily virtuous are signified by the Adam of Gen 1:26-27. Horsley correctly notes that in Her. 58 Philo states that all human beings are “molded clay,” which refers to Gen 2:7 and the sensible world. In contrast to an association with the material world, Isaac and Moses are used to represent a “perfection” that others do not possess. This perfection is understood by Richard A. Horsley, 1 Corinthians (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998), 211-12, to be connected to the Adam of Gen 1:26-27. While his argument that Philo’s use of the Patriarchs to distinguish levels of spiritual attainment contains merit, his description of ὁ υἱόνος ἄνθρωπος and ὁ γῆνος ἄνθρωπος does not seem to fit this paradigm in quite the same way Horsley describes as discussed in this study. However, I believe Horsley is correct that Philo contends that as someone becomes more like ὁ υἱόνος ἄνθρωπος, then that person is understood to be more spiritual. As I discuss in this chapter, Philo’s categorically separation of humanity into two groups is based on one’s manner of living. The association of Adam with particular mode of living is, however, more evident in Opif. 134-35 (see section 4.2.2.2). Cf. Goodenough, By Light, Light, 241.
4.2.2.1.1 4QInstruction and the two men in *Legum allegoriarum* 1.31-32. 4QInstruction allows us to read the double creation account in *Leg.* 1.31 from a different perspective than we were able before its publication. Philo’s argument that the two portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 represent “the two races of humanity”—ό οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος and ὁ γῆινος ἄνθρωπος—fits well with the Hagu passage in the Qumran text (4Q417 i 13-18; see section 2.4). The two races of humanity, which symbolize different kinds of mind (νοῦς), correspond with the division of humanity into the הר הatron ו and the הר הבר in 4QInstruction. Both authors associate the divine Adam of Gen 1:27 with the group of people that live an ethical life and possess the possibility of eternal life. Also, in both compositions, the base Adam of Gen 2:7 is associated with a life that does not continue beyond physical existence. Reading Philo’s “two races of humanity” in light of the Hagu passage allows us to contend reasonably that by claiming that the two biblical portrayals of Adam should be understood as two minds, Philo is possibly adapting philosophically an older exegetical tradition about two opposed types of humankind that is attested in 4QInstruction. Philo uses the portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 to associate one way of being human in relation to the heavenly realm (Gen 1:27), and the other with an earthly focus (Gen 2:7). This is similar to the הר הatron ו and the הר הבר in 4QInstruction. Like the הר הatron ו, ὁ γῆινος ἄνθρωπος is connected to the Adam of Gen 2:7, physical existence, and ultimately death. In contrast, similar to the הר הatron ו, ὁ οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος is associated with the Adam of Gen 1:27, the divine, and eternal life. Philo’s conception of “earthly” and “heavenly” types of men appears to be expressing the basic idea one finds in 4QInstruction that there are “fleshly” and “spiritual” kinds of people. (This issue is discussed in more detail in section 4.2.2.2.3, below.)

---

4.2.2.2 Philo’s “Double Creation of Man” in *De opificio mundi*. Philo’s *De opificio mundi* contains an extended exegesis of the portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3. In *Opif.* 134-35, Philo interprets the two biblical creation of humanity narratives as indicating God created two different kinds of humans—”the molded man” (πλασθέντος ἀνθρώπου) and the man “according to the image of God” (κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα θεοῦ). Philo’s interpretation of the dual portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 recounted in *Opif.* 134-35 is based on his understanding of human existence in the physical body and life before and after as a disembodied soul. Philo associates each portrayal of Adam with a manner of living while on the earth and the consequences that follow upon death of the body. The portrayal of Adam in Gen 2:7 he associates with living according to the passions of the flesh, which leads to death of the soul upon physical death. The Adam of Gen 1:26-27, in contrast, Philo associates with living a life of virtue, which leads to an eternal blissful life of the soul after the death of the body.

Philo stresses the significant difference between the biblical portrayals of Adam in *Opif.* 134:

After this, Moses says that “God made man, having taken clay from the earth, and he breathed into his face the breath of life” (Gen 2:7). And by this expression, he shows most clearly that there is an immense difference between man formed now and the man formed before, who was made according to the image of God. For man formed now shares in what is perceptible to the external senses, possesses qualities, consists of body and soul, man or woman, by nature mortal. But man made according to the image of God was an idea, or a genus, or a seal, perceptible only by the intellect, incorporeal, neither male nor female, imperishable by nature.
After citing most of Gen 2:7 (LXX), Philo explains that there is an immense difference
between the human being formed now and the one that came into being at a point earlier in time.
He demonstrates this by describing each of the kinds of humanity with five opposing traits.48 He
explains that the human being after the image (Gen 1:26-27) is: 1) “an object of thought”
(νοητός), 2) “a kind of idea or genus or seal” (ιδέα τις ἡ γένος ἡ σφραγίς), 3) “incorporeal”
(ἀφθαρτός), 4) neither male nor female, and 5) by nature immortal (ἀφθαρτος φύσει). The
molded human being (Gen 2:7), in contrast, is: 1) an object of sense-perception (αἰσθητός), 2)
participating in quality (μετέχον ποιότητος), 3) “composed of body and soul” (σώματος καὶ
ψυχῆς), 4) “either man or woman” (ἀνήρ ἡ γυνή), and 5) “by nature mortal” (φύσει θνητός).

4.2.2.2.1 Before, during, and after: the meaning of Philo’s double creation of man
account in Opif. 134-35. Philo’s understanding of the distinctive types of humanity in Opif.
134-35 is not immediately evident. Several scholars have argued that the human after the image
of God should be conceptualized as strictly the Platonic idea of man, and the composite man as
its material manifestation in the sensible world.49 This reading is logical because there are

49 e.g., Charles K. Barrett, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (2d ed.; London: Black, 1971),
374-75; Anthony C. Thiselton, The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text (NIGTC;
Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000), 1283; George H. van Kooten, Paul’s Anthropology in Context: The Image
of God, Assimilation to God, and Tripartite Man in Ancient Judaism, Ancient Philosophy, and Early Christianity
(WUNT 232; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 2008), 272-97 (esp. 272-3); See Sellin, Auferstehung, 94. For discussion on
Platonic forms in Philo’s interpretation of day 1 in Genesis 1. The terminology, for example, of the human being “after the image” (κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα) is similar to that used for the ideas in “day one” (Opif. 16-35). This has been taken by several scholars as Philo referring to the “Idea of humankind” in the technical sense as the intelligible model for the diversity of “empirical” human beings. However, it seems inconsistent that Philo would state that all the ideas were created on “day one” except the idea of humankind, which was created on the sixth day. Tobin argues that there is a shift between Opif. 76, in which Philo uses an idea as a paradigm, and Opif. 134. Tobin contends that in Opif. 134 Philo understands the human being after the image as a real figure, as opposed to simply an idea. David T. Runia agrees with Tobin’s position. Runia provides further support by observing that Philo’s description of the man after the image of God as ιδέα τις suggests that he does not use the term ιδέα in a technical sense. Runia notes a similar “loose” use of the term elsewhere in De opificio mundi. In Opif. 74, Philo describes the rational human mind as τῆς ἀνακεκραμένης βελτίωνος ιδέας (“the better idea having been mixed


51 Runia, On the Creation of the Cosmos, 322.

52 Tobin, The Creation of Man, 126. Although, Tobin contends that the human after the image should be identified with “the heavenly man” of Leg. 1.31, Hultgren, “The Origin of Paul’s Doctrine of the Two Adams,” 343-70, has argued that such a position is not correct. Further, Runia, On the Creation of the Cosmos, 322, rightly states that strictly speaking the descriptor “heavenly” is absent from Opif. 134 and Legum allegoriae belongs to a different exegetical series than De opificio mundi. He also notes that it is also absent from Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesis. Cf. Dillon, The Middle Platonists, 176.

Runia contends that in *Opif*. 134-35 Philo is more likely highlighting the distinction between life in the flesh and life as a bodiless soul (or mind). The Adam of Gen 1:26-27 is human existence as a disembodied soul before and after life in the flesh, which he associates with the Adam of Gen 2:7. Runia identifies disembodied humanity as Philo’s “true man.” This is the original state of human existence as a spiritual, non-physical being, unceasingly contemplating the divine. Runia presents the two kinds of humans that Philo has in mind as a contrast “between the ‘true man’ and man in his corporeal existence.” In *Gig*. 33, Philo explicitly states that the “true man (ὁ πρός ἀλήθειαν ἀνθρωπος) will never come voluntarily to those pleasures loved by and related to the body, but he will take great pains to always alienate himself from these things.” This is “not the man who consists of body and soul, but the man who has given oneself to virtue” (cf. *Her*. 231; *Fug*. 71; *Sonn*. 1.215; *Congr*. 97; *Plant*. 42). This state of being, Philo explains, cannot be experienced by a human whose soul is entangled by the body (ἐστὶ τὸι μὴ τὸν ἐκ σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς). It can only be experienced before and after life in the body as a disembodied soul. Further, it is only available to the one who is completely possessed by virtue (τὸν ἀρετῆς) and leaves the cares of this world behind. In this section, I will build upon Runia’s argument in order to provide a context to demonstrate that Philo not only has the embodied and disembodied soul in mind, but that he also contends that the two portrayals of Adam should be understood as two different ways of being human.

---

54 Runia, *On the Creation of the Cosmos*, 323.

55 Runia, *Philo of Alexandria*, 337. The terms “mind” and “soul” are used interchangeably by Philo. See Horsley, “Pneumatikos vs. Psychikos,” 272-3.


**4.2.2.1.1 Human Existence prior to and during physical life.** Runia’s position fits well with the description of the two kinds of humanity in *Opif.* 134-35. In *Opif.* 134, Philo states that the first sort of humanity was created according to the image of God. He goes on to list several attributes that are consistent with his description of the soul elsewhere in his work (see section 4.2.2.2, above). For example, in *Somn.* 1.137, Philo states that the Adam of Gen 1:26-27, souls are “imperishable and immortal” (ἀφθάρτους καὶ ἀθανάτους; cf. *Opif.* 135). According to *QE* 2.46, upon receiving the tablets of the law on Mt. Sinai (cf. Exod 24:12-18), Moses temporarily becomes bodiless like the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 on the basis of a second divine birth, in contrast to the composite Adam of Genesis 2. He states that Moses became like an immortal, disembodied soul and no longer had any corruptible characteristics.58 Philo explains that this was only possible because he liberated himself from all earthly concerns (*Gig.* 54; *Her.* 64; cf. *Leg.* 3.41, 69). This idea is similar to the description in *Mos.* 2.68, where Philo explains that as the prophet of God “it was necessary for (Moses) to purify not only his soul, but also his body, so that it should be connected with and defiled by no passion, but should be pure from everything which is of a mortal nature.” In the *Testament of Abraham*, likely written in the Egyptian Diaspora about the same time as Philo, the author explains that, shining like the sun and the angels, Abraham was taken up “into the heavens from where he came” (7:4).59 This suggests that before life on earth, Abraham lived in heaven in the likeness of the angels. This is

---


similar to description of the state of humanity before and after a composite existence as depicted by the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 in *Opif.* 134.\(^{60}\)

Philo explains that prior to lives in the flesh, humans pre-existed as pure disembodied souls and that “some souls have descended into bodies” (τῶν οὖν ψυχῶν αἱ μὲν πρὸς σῶματα κατέβησαν, *Gig.* 12). Philo expands on this notion again in *Somn.* 1.137-38:

That (the air is) like a populous city, its citizens are imperishable and immortal souls, equal in number to the stars. Of these souls, some descend to be bound up in mortal bodies, all those which are most near to the earth and lovers of the body.

\[\text{α\'λλα ο\'ι πόλις ε\'υ\'ανδρε\'ι πολίτας ἀφθάρτους καὶ ἀθανάτους ψυχάς ἔχων ἱσαρίθμους ἄστροις. τούτων τῶν ψυχῶν αἱ μὲν κατίσασιν ἐνδεθησόμεναι σῶμασι θνητοῖς, ὃσαι προσγειότατοι καὶ φιλοσώματοι.}\]

The description of humanity in this passage parallels *Opif.* 134-35. This passage indicates that humanity initially existed as disembodied souls, which are described in a similar manner as the humanity associated with the Adam of Genesis 1 in *Opif.* 134. The joining of the disembodied soul with the corporeal body is the state of existence of humanity after being first created as souls. It is the current condition of humanity, which Philo associates with the Adam of Gen 2:7 in *Opif.* 134-35. In an allegorical reading of the fall of humanity, Philo further explains that the Eden account of Genesis 2-3 should be understood as a description of the joining of the soul and the body to form composite humanity (i.e., sense perception, *Leg.* 2.71-72).\(^{61}\)

\(^{60}\) Philo goes on to explain that while still connected to the flesh, the experience of the bliss to come is only temporary (*Virt.* 217; *Her.* 45-46, 264-67; *Somn.* 2.232-33).

\(^{61}\) Cf. *Leg.* 3.57-58; *Cher.* 56-60.
Philo describes the joining of disembodied souls with physical bodies in *Opif.* 135. The sage states, “the formation of the individual man, perceptible by the external senses is a composition of earthy substance, and divine spirit” (*τοῦ δ’ αἰσθητοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ μέρους ἀνθρώπου τὴν κατασκευὴν σύνθετον εἶναι φησιν ἐκ τε γεώδους οὐσίας καὶ πνεύματος θείου; e.g., Spec. 2.64; Cher. 113; Sacr. 126; Ebr. 69; Conf. 62; Gig. 33). He further explains that everyone possesses a spirit which God “inbreathed” (*δὲ γὰρ ἐνεφύσησεν*) for the advantage of humans (*ἐπ’ ὕφελείᾳ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν*), so that, even if one is mortal in terms of the physical aspect of humanity, humans might be immortal according to that portion that is invisible (*ἰεὶ καὶ θνητόν ἐστι κατὰ τὴν ὀρατὴν μερίδα, κατὰ γοῦν τὴν ἀόρατον ἀθανατίζηται*). Thus, according to *Opif.* 134-35, humanity consists of a mortal body and an immortal soul, which previously existed in a disembodied state.

### 4.2.2.2.1.2 A rotting corpse, a tomb, and simply evil: Philo’s view of the body. In *Opif.* 134-35, Philo provides a clear distinction between the body and soul. He explains that the physical aspect of humanity makes the composite being “by nature mortal” (*φύσει θνητός*) and corruptible. Philo understands that for humanity death ends a wasting away, a decaying that is common to all material. While *Opif.* 134-35 emphasizes the mortal and immortal aspects of composite humanity, we are able to gain a fuller sense of Philo’s view of composite humanity by looking at the way he regards the body in his other works. In *Migr.* 1.9, Philo explains that the

---


63 Plato uses “visible” for sensory and “invisible” for Idea: *Tim.* 30a, 31b, 32b, 36e, 52a; cf. *Resp.* 529b5; *Soph.* 246b7 with Alcinous’ *Did.* 7.4. See Runia, *On the Creation of the Cosmos*, 165.

64 See Philo’s use of “invisible” in *Opif.* 12, 29 (Gen1:2) and in *Opif.* 129 (Gen 2:4-5).

body is the “earthly” (γεώδους) part of a human, a “base and polluted prison” (τὸ παμμίαρον δέσμωτήριον) which entraps the soul through “pleasures and appetites” (ήδονὰς καὶ ἐπιθυμίας). In *Leg.* 1.108, Philo states that the body is like a tomb and is evil (cf. *Spec.* 1.329). In *Plant.* 43, Philo declares that the body contains “all the most tamable and ferocious evils of the passions and vices” (κεχώρηκε τὰς παθῶν καὶ κακιῶν ἀτιθάσους κάζηγριωμένας κήρας; cf. *Leg.* 1.42, 88). He also explains that knowledge is limited while in the mortal body (*Mut.* 219). Philo, however, claims that because of humanity’s “composite” nature as body and soul, wickedness is not inevitable. Rather, evil is a potential and the body is a “road to wickedness” (*Conf.* 179). He claims that the body can also work together with the mind to guide contemplation away from the earthly and perishable into the heavenly and imperishable realm (cf. *Det.* 84-85; *Plant.* 16-17). However, he also warns that this is not easy because the body is full of contrary desires (*Plant.* 43), and the mind can and will do whatever it desires because of the “impressions” made on it like those made on wax (*Fug.* 69-70; *Mut.* 30-31). Philo also explains in *Conf.* 178 that “although humans have knowledge of good and evil, they often choose the most evil things, and avoids those things which are worthy of diligent pursuit” (ὅ ἀνθρωπος ἀγαθὸν καὶ κακὸν ἐχων ἐπιστήμην αἰρεῖται μὲν πολλὰς τὰ φαιλότατα, φεύγει δὲ τὰ σπουδῆς άξια; *QG* 1.5; *Leg.* 2.22-24; cf. Sir 17:6-7). Based on Philo’s description of the body examined above, it is reasonable to assume that when reading *Opif.* 134-35, the body is not only understood as mortal and corruptible, but as a negative part of the human condition.

---


67 See Radice, “Philo’s Theology,” 138, 143.

4.2.2.1.3 Philo’s understanding of death and the afterlife in Opif. 134-35. To gain a better understanding of how Philo relates the two portrayals of Adam to the human condition in Opif. 134-35, I will now examine his view of death and the afterlife. According to Philo’s description of humanity in Opif. 134-35, humanity was originally created in a way that Philo associates with the Adam of Gen 1:26-27, as immortal, disembodied souls. However, because some of those souls chose to join with a physical body, the current nature of the human is as a composite being, consisting of body and soul. Philo appeals to the depiction of Adam in Gen 2:7 to emphasize the mortality of the body. While the biblical account attributes human mortality to a consequence of Adam eating from the tree of knowledge of good and evil (Genesis 2-3), Philo views the punishment of death for transgressing God’s law as death of the soul and that mortality was intended for composite humanity from the beginning.

4.2.2.2.1.4 Adam, death, and composite humanity. Philo contends that death comes in two forms for humanity formed from the earth—the death of the human body and the death of the soul (ὅτι διπλῶς ἐστὶ θάνατος, ὁ μὲν ἀνθρώπου, ὁ δὲ ψυχῆς ἰδιος, Leg. 1.105).69 In his explanation as to why Adam and Eve continued to live after they ate from the tree of knowledge, Philo explains that there are the two kinds of death that composite humanity faces. Physical death occurs when the soul separates from the body (ὁ μὲν οὖν ἀνθρώπου χωρισμός ἐστι ψυχῆς ἀπὸ σώματος, 1.105). This sort of death is part of the natural order and awaits everyone (e.g., 1.106). The death of the soul, however, is the result of destroying virtue by living a life of wickedness (ὅ δὲ ψυχῆς θάνατος ἄρετῆς μὲν φθορά ἐστι, κακίας δὲ ἀνάληψις, 1.105). Philo proclaims that a wicked life results in burying the soul in “passions and all kinds of evil” (ὅς ἐστι

ψυχής ἐντυμμεμενή πάθεσι καὶ κακίας ἀπάσαις, 1.106). By pursuing the passions of the senses, one subjects the soul to the body, which leads to death of the soul (κρατοῦντος μὲν τοῦ χείρονος σώματος, κρατουμένου δὲ τοῦ κρείττονος ψυχῆς, 1.106). In Leg. 2.77, Philo also explains that while in the body, those who get “entangled in pleasures” (ἡδονᾶς περιπίπτει) experience a death, which is “the destruction of the soul by vice” (ἄλλα ψυχῆς ὑπὸ κακίας φθοράν). Thus, for the wicked, once the body dies, the soul does as well.70 This notion is also found in the Wisdom of Solomon, discussed below (see section 4.2.2.2.1.5).

4.2.2.2.1.4.1 Adam, sin, and the mortality of the soul: punishment for eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. In the Genesis narrative, Adam and Eve were punished with physical mortality for eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Gen 3:17-19). According to Philo, however, physical death has always been a part of the natural order and the sin of the first couple cost them the immortality of their souls.71 This is found explicitly in Leg. 1.107, which reads:

---

70 On several occasions, however, Philo refers to post-mortem punishment reserved for the wicked. In Somn. 1.151, for example, Philo explains that the virtuous are assured eternal life, “but the wicked have received as their share the dark recesses of hell, having from the beginning to the end of their existence practised dying, and having been from their infancy to their old age familiarized with destruction” (κακοὶ δὲ τοὺς ἐν Ἁιδῶν μοχοὺς, ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἄχρι τέλους ἁπαθήσουτοι ἐπετετευκώτες καὶ εἰς γήρας ἐκ σπαργάνων φθορᾶς ἑβάδες ὁντες). Also, in Praem. 152, Philo states that the one “who has adulterated the coinage of his noble birth, will be dragged down to the lowest depths, being hurled down to Tartarus and profound darkness” (ὁ δὲ εὐπατρίδος παρακόψας τὸ νόμισμα τῆς εὐγενείας ὑποστήρησαι κατοτάτῳ πρὸς αὐτὸν τάρταρον καὶ βαθὺ ἱκότος ἐνεχθεῖς, ἑνα ταῦτα ὀρδόντες τὰ παραδείγματα πάντες ἄνθρωποι σωφρονιζοῦνται). See also Cher. 1.2, which states, “he who is weighed down by, and wholly subjected to, a violent and incurable disease [of succumbing to the passions of the flesh], must bear his misfortunes forever, being for all times unalterably cast out into the place of the wicked, that there he may endure unmitigated and everlasting misery” (τὸν δὲ πεπεθύνα καὶ ὑποβεβηλῆμαν σφοδρῷ καὶ ἀνάτῳ νόσῳ φέρειν ἀνάγκη τὰ δεινὰ μέχρι τοῦ παντὸς αἰῶνος ἑβάδες σκορακισθεῖντα εἰς ἀσεβῶν χώρον, ἵν’ ἄκρατον καὶ συνεχὴ βαιροδαιμονίαν ὑπομένῃ). Cf. 4 Ezra 7:78-99.

71 Philo regularly argued that a life of wickedness leads to the death of the soul. See for example, Spec. 1.345, Fug. 113.
When, therefore, God says, “to die the death” (Gen 2:17), you must remark that he is speaking of that death which is inflicted as punishment, and not of that which exists by the original ordinance of nature. The natural death is that one by which the soul is separated from the body.

ὅπου δ’ ἂν λέγῃ “θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖν”, παρατίθει ὅτι θάνατον τὸν ἐπὶ τιμωρίᾳ παραλαμβάνει, οὐ τὸν φύσει γινόμενον· φύσει μὲν οὖν ἐστί, καὶ θ’ ὃν χωρίζεται ψυχὴ ἀπὸ σώματος.

Philo elsewhere gives similar interpretations of the consequences of the fall of humanity. In *QG* 1.51, for example, he offers reflections on Gen 3:19 (“until you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; you are dust, and to dust you shall return”). In his interpretation, Philo again echoes the composite nature of the Adam of Gen 2:7 that we find in *Opif.* 134-35. He explains that this Adam consisted of a body formed from the earth and a soul created by God in his image. When presented with the choice between virtue and wickedness in the garden, Philo claims that Adam chose the wickedness of the earth (cf. *Conf.* 177-8). He goes on to say that by rejecting what is good (ὅλον αὐτὸν προσένειμεν τῇ γῇ) Adam “cuts away” the heavenly aspect of being human (τὴν τοῦ κρείττονος μέρους ὑποτεμνόμενος οὐρανομίμητον πολιτείαν), and thus his immortality (*QG* 1.51; cf. *QG* 1.4, 8). Philo states explicitly in *QG* 1.51 that “the earth, as it is the beginning of a wicked and depraved man, so also it is his end” (ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἡδονὴν ἐξῆλθεν, δι’ ἣς ψυχικὸς θάνατος ἐπιγίνεται, τῇ γῇ προσενεμήθη). Similarly, in *Virt.* 204-5, Philo explains that good and evil were placed before him and Adam deliberately chose what was evil (ἀγαθοῦ καὶ κακοῦ καὶ καλοῦ καὶ αἰσχροῦ καὶ ἄληθος καὶ ψευδος, τὰ μὲν ψευδῆ καὶ αἰσχρὰ καὶ κακὰ προθύμως εἴλετο, τῶν δὲ ἀγαθῶν καὶ καλῶν καὶ ἄληθῶν ἠλόγησεν.

---

72 For a similar anthropology connected to Gen 3:14, see *Leg.* 3.161.
Virt. 205). He continues, explaining that the consequence of Adam’s choice was a change from an immortal to a mortal existence concerning the soul and an earthly life full of hardships and difficulties (ἐφ’ οίς εἰκότως θνητόν ἄθανάτου βίον ἀνθυπηλλάξατο μακαριότητος καὶ εὐδαιμονίας σφαλείς καὶ ῥάστα μετέβαλεν εἰς ἐπίπονον καὶ κακοδαίμονα ζωήν, Virt. 205). Philo interprets Adam’s transgression of God’s law forbidding eating of the tree of knowledge as forfeiting the immortality of his soul. Physical immortality is never mentioned as an option for Adam according to this line of Philo’s interpretation.

Philo does not blame the inevitability of physical death on Adam’s choice to disobey God’s command. Physical mortality is a given part of the human condition. In Opif. 134-35, Philo suggests that every human on earth has been created like the Adam of Gen 2:7—a composite being of body formed from the earth and an immortal soul made according to the image of God. Although the corporal body will expire, the immortal soul can live on. Philo contends that every person has the same opportunity at spiritual immortality that was offered to the composite Adam. Those who follow the example of the Adam described in Genesis 2-3 and pursue a life of wickedness will likewise forfeit the soul’s immortality and any chance of life beyond a physical existence. This sort of person loses the possibility of eternal life depicted in Opif. 134 as signified by the Adam of Gen 1:26-27. In Opif. 134-35, Philo portrays the Adam of Gen 2:7 as the paradigmatic figure for all composite humanity (see section 4.2.2.2.1.4). Based on the evidence examined, Philo appears to more precisely associate the Adam of Genesis 2-3 with a final death that is connected with the mortal body and death of the soul. This suggests this is also the case in Opif. 134-35.

73 Martin Hogan, “The Exegetical Background,” 10. QG 1.45 places the blame for the loss of immortality primarily on Eve. Cf. Sir 25:24: “From a woman sin had its beginning, and because of her we all die” (see section 3.3.4).

74 Martin Hogan, “The Exegetical Background,” 11.
4.2.2.1.4.2 Adam, the wicked, and death of the soul in the Wisdom of Solomon.

Philo’s contention that a life of wickedness leads to the death of the soul is consistent with the position of the contemporary work, the Wisdom of Solomon, likely also composed in Alexandria.\textsuperscript{75} Pseudo-Solomon, in Wis 1:16-2:20, states that the wicked consider physical death to be the final end of the human being, which is the basis of a philanderous lifestyle.\textsuperscript{76} The author explains that they are in fact correct, but only partially. The death which awaits the wicked is indeed the death of the body, but also the death of the soul. Due to their sinful conduct they forfeit any opportunity for a blissful afterlife. Thus, for the wicked, physical death is the end of existence (cf. 3:10).\textsuperscript{77}

In \textit{Opif}. 134-35, Philo contends that humanity was originally created perfect as disembodied souls, but there are humans who no longer enjoy that state of existence. Instead, they exist as composite beings. This is similar to what is found in the Wisdom of Solomon. Pseudo-Solomon contends that death was not originally part of God’s design for humanity. Wisdom 1:13 explicitly states that “God did not make death.” The author states elsewhere that, “God created us for incorruption, and made us in the image of his own eternity” (2:23). This verse is likely referring to life as a soul rather than a physical body. As Philo does in \textit{Opif}. 134-35, the Wisdom of Solomon uses language from the portrayal of Adam in Gen 1:26-27 to describe the original state of humanity. Both authors turn to the portrayal of Adam in Genesis 1 to explain that Adam, and thus humanity, was originally created in the image of God as a


\textsuperscript{77} Goiff, “Adam, the Angels and Eternal Life,” 8.
disembodied soul. The association of the Adam of Gen 1:27 with eternal life is also alluded to in 4QInstruction, as discussed in Chapter Two.

Pseudo-Solomon contends in 2:24 that death came into the world due to the envy of the devil, which is generally understood as an allusion to the snake of Genesis 3 (Wis 14:13-14). However, the sage is vague concerning his meaning of “death.” Kolarick has argued that the death that “God did not make” can reasonably be understood as the death of the soul. Therefore, it is possible that, like Philo (Leg. 1.105-7), according to the Wisdom of Solomon, the sin of Adam did not result in physical death, but in the mortality of the soul. The anthropology posited by Philo and Pseudo-Solomon offers an exegetical explanation as to why the “heavenly” Adam comes before the “earthly” one in Genesis 1-3. This understanding of the soul and death offers a way to explain why the biblical creation narrative first gives an account of a purely spiritual, non-corporeal Adam and then one that is set in the material world.

4.2.2.2.1.5 Soul survivor: Adam, angels, and the immortality of the soul in Philo and the Wisdom of Solomon. In Opif. 134-35, Philo contends that the soul was given to humanity as a blessing despite the physical body. He explains that the soul is “for the advantage of our race, in order that, even if man is mortal according to that portion of him which is visible, he may at all events be immortal according to that portion which is invisible” (Opif. 135). Although

---


80 Further, the association of physical death and Adam does not include any sort of a negative connotation. In Wis 7:1, the author states that he is mortal because he is “a descendent of the first-formed child of earth” (cf. v. 6; 9:5). See Collins, “The Mysteries of God,” 300-1.

81 According to Birger A. Pearson, The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians: A Study in the Theology of the Corinthians Opponents of Paul and its Relation to Gnosticism (SBLDS 12; Missoula, Mont.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973), 17-23, Philo and the author of the Wisdom of Solomon use Gen 2:7 (esp. 2:7b) as a “proof text” for man’s immortality. He contends that this is the opposite of what is found in the Dead Sea
the physical part of humanity will perish, there is hope of life beyond the material world. Those who live a life of virtue will return to the state of humanity as it was originally created by God—as an immortal, incorporeal soul. In Opif. 134, Philo describes this state of being by appealing to the Adam of Gen 1:26-27. The promise of eternal life for the virtuous is found throughout the work of Philo. For example, in QG 1.51, which states that “the one seeking immortality becomes a lover of only virtue and receives the heavenly portion” (ει μην γαρ ἀρετῆς, ἤτις ἀπαθανατίζει, ἐραστής ἐγένετο, πάντως ἄν ἠλιχες κλήρον τὸν οὐρανίον) and “heaven is the beginning and end of him who is virtuous.”\(^{82}\) The soul of the virtuous is described as returning to the original spiritual condition of humankind. Leg. 1.108 proclaims that when a virtuous person dies, the soul is released from the evil, dead body and lives according to its proper life (ει δὲ ἀποθάνοιμεν, τῆς ψυχῆς ζώσης τὸν ἴδιον βίον καὶ ἀπηλλαγμένης κακοῦ καὶ νεκροῦ συνδέτου τοῦ σώματος). However, as mentioned above (see section 4.2.2.2.1.4), he does not contend that all souls have a blessed afterlife awaiting them. In QG 1.51, for example, Philo states that for “the wicked person [the] beginning and end is the earth.” This reaffirms his notion that following the desires of the body results in a life that ends with the death of the body (cf. Virt. 205). This is in contrast to the notion that the virtuous will return to the original state of humanity as disembodied souls.

Philo argues that eternal bliss is reserved for the virtuous. In Somn. 1.151, for example, he states that the virtuous “have obtained the heavenly and celestial country as their habitation”

---

\(^{82}\) Philo also reflects on the “immortality of the soul” (ἀφθαρσίαν ψυχῆς) in QG 3.11: “He clearly indicates the *immortality of the soul*, when it transfers itself out of the abode of the mortal body and returns as it were to the metropolis of its native country, from which it originally emigrated into the body.” (Italics and bold are mine.) This recalls Philo’s claim in Somn. 1.137-38 that the air is like a populous city whose citizens are immortal, disembodied souls (see section 4.2.2.2.1.1).
Also, in Ios. 264, Philo argues that virtuous people “will live for ever and ever, without growing old, in an immortal nature which is no longer bound up in the necessities of the body” (τέθνηκε δ’ οὐδεὶς παρ’ ἐμοὶ κριτῇ τῶν ἁγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ζήσεται τὸν ἅ ἐρόν ἄγηρος ἀθανάτῳ φύσει, ψυχή μηκέτι ταῖς σώματος ἁγάκας ἐνδεδεμένη). In Praem. 152, he further claims that those who are virtuous receive “as a most appropriate reward, a firm and sure habitation in heaven, such as one cannot describe” (τῷ τε αὐτομολῆσαι πρὸς θεὸν καὶ τῷ γέρας λαβεῖν οἰκεῖται τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ τάξιν βεβαιῶν, ἢν οὐ θέμεις εἰπεῖν; cf. Mos. 2.291; QG 3.11). Philo’s view of what awaits the righteous upon death offers a fuller understanding of how he perceives the period of time a human exists as a composite being as discussed in Opif. 134-35. The promise of a blissful afterlife for the righteous is expanded upon elsewhere in Philo’s work where he appeals to the angels and their relationship to the Adam of Gen 1:26-27.

Philo claims in Virt. 204-5 that those who protect their souls by imitating the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 will experience a blessed and happy afterlife (δέον ἀκηλιδωτὸν τὴν εἰκόνα φυλάξαι καθ’ ὅσον οἶδα τῇ ἐπακολουθήσαντα ταῖς τοῦ γεννήσαντος ἁρεταῖς, προτεθέντων εἰς αἱρέσεις καὶ φυγᾶς τῶν ἐναντίων). This is achieved by living a virtuous life, imitating the Adam portrayed in Gen 1:26-27 as much as possible (Spec. 4.36, 188; Virt. 31, 168; Plant. 64; Fug. 92; QG 4.188) by “continually mounting upwards” towards the divine (ἄνω φοιτᾶν ἂεὶ μεμαθηκότες, Somn. 1.151). Elsewhere, in Spec. 1.345, Philo explains that by pursuing God one enjoys a happy everlasting life (ἀθάνατον βίον ἡσίαν). He further explains that the goal of the composite human is to eliminate all earthly passions (e.g., Leg. 3.129) and to follow the divine reason

---

83 Hay, “Philo’s Anthropology,” 137. For an analysis stressing the moral implications of Philo’s ideas about the double creation accounts, see Levison, Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism, 77, 86-89.
imparted to every individual, rather than the senses (e.g., _Leg._ 2.30; 3.49-52). In doing this, one becomes more like the way God had originally created humanity in the beginning (cf. _Gig._ 33).

Philo’s appeal to do away with everything that is fleshly is similar to the exhortation that is found in _4 Ezra_ 14:13-14: “And now renounce the life that is corruptible, and put away from you mortal thoughts; cast away from you the burdens of humankind, and divest yourself now of your weak nature” (see section 5.3.2.1). The author of the Wisdom of Solomon also claims in Wis 6:18-19 that one can attain “incorruption” and closeness to God through fidelity to his divine laws (cf. 12:1; 18:4). Philo contends that in doing so, one is then free to pursue only what is virtuous and become more like the original state of humanity—an immortal disembodied soul (_Opif._ 134-35; _Leg._ 1.107-8). In _Opif._ 134-35, Philo uses the dual portrayals of Adam to represent two different manners of living. According to Philo, imitating the portrayal of Adam in Gen 1:26-27 leads to being able to return to the state of existence as a disembodied soul, which is represented by the Adam of Genesis 1. Following the example of Adam portrayed in Genesis 2-3—living a life of wickedness—leads to a life that ends with physical death, which is also associated with the Gen 2:7 Adam. In _Opif._ 134-35, the portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 represent models of how one can live. This is different than the double creation of man account described in _Leg._ 1.31-32 (see section 4.2.2.1), which explains that humanity is categorized into two opposing races. Rather than models to follow, in _Leg._ 1.31-32, the portrayals of Adam are used to represent the kind of mind one possesses and thus which race of humanity one belongs.

The author of the Wisdom of Solomon places the blame for the death of the soul on the Devil (2:24) rather than directly stating that it is a consequence of Adam’s decision to eat from the tree (cf. Gen 2:17; 3:19). Both Philo and Pseudo-Solomon contend that Adam’s choice to sin led to the death of the soul. However, the Wisdom of Solomon claims that Adam was cleared of
all wrong doing (10:1; cf. 4Q423 1). Rather than remove culpability from the Adam of Genesis 2-3, Philo uses the portrayal of Adam as eating from the tree as a representation for living a wicked life, which is placed in contrast to the virtuous Adam of Gen 1:26-27. Philo claims that every human is more like one portrayal of Adam than the other depending on how one lives, while the Wisdom of Solomon states that the righteous are more like Adam than the wicked.\textsuperscript{84} According to Pseudo-Solomon, the righteous can attain immortality and the wicked cannot. The righteous enjoy immortality of the soul and the wicked do not live beyond physical existence. This is similar to Philo’s position concerning the association of the virtuous with the Adam of Gen 1:26-27. However, unlike Philo, the Wisdom of Solomon does not claim that the wicked follow the example of Adam’s sinfulness as portrayed in Genesis 2-3. Further, although it can be implied, the mortality of Adam is not explicitly connected to Gen 2:7 as it is in Philo’s work.\textsuperscript{85}

Like Philo, the Wisdom of Solomon includes the notion that the righteous enjoy eternity with the angels. In Wis 2:13-18, the wicked state that the righteous presently claim that they are among “the sons of God.” The promised rewards given to the righteous after the expiration of the body are depicted as the same characteristics shared with the angels while in the flesh.\textsuperscript{86} In Wis 5:5, the righteous are depicted as joining the angels after the final judgment: “Why have they been numbered among the sons of God (κατελογίσθη ἐν υἱοῖς θεοῦ)? And why is their lot among the holy ones (ἐν ἁγίοις ὁ κληρος αὐτοῦ ἐστιν)?” (cf. 18:13). However, different from Philo, as Collins and Goff argue, the notion of the righteous joining the angels should not be

\textsuperscript{84} This is similar to 4QInstruction’s emphasis on Adam being associated with the elect. See Goff, “Adam, the Angels and Eternal Life,” 12-13.


\textsuperscript{86} Goff, “Adam, the Angels and Eternal Life,” 19.
taken literally. It is better to understand this claim metaphorically as indicating the soul uniting with God.\(^87\) Similar to Philo, the author of the Wisdom of Solomon seems to have reformulated the Early Jewish notion of eternity with the angels in terms of the Greek conception of the immortality of the soul.\(^88\)

4.2.2.1.5.1 Eternity with and being like the angels according to Philo. According to *Opif.* 134-35, the virtuous will enjoy a blissful, eternal life as disembodied souls as symbolized by the Adam of Gen 1:26-27. To gain a fuller understanding of what this entails, we now turn our attention to how Philo relates this concept to the angels. He does this primarily in two ways: 1) he argues that the virtuous enjoy a blissful eternity in the company of the angels; and 2) the virtuous become like the angels at the time of death.

Philo explains that once life in the body comes to an end, the disembodied soul of the virtuous enjoys a blissful eternity in the company of angels. He mentions several patriarchs who have been added to the lot of the angels upon death. For example, he claims that Abel, Isaac, and Jacob have transitioned to the state of immortal incorruptibility.\(^89\) Concerning Abraham, Philo writes in *Sacr.* 5 that at death he was "added to the people of God," (Gen 25:8) having received immortality, having become equal to the angels; for the angels are the host of God, being the incorporeal and happy souls" (καὶ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐκλιπὼν τὰ θνητὰ "προστίθεται τῷ θεῷ λαῷ," καρποῦμενος ἀρθαρσίαν, ἰσος ἀγγέλωις γεγονός· ἀγγέλοι γὰρ στρατός εἰσί θεοῦ,


\(^{88}\) Goff, “Adam, the Angels and Eternal Life,” 19.

\(^{89}\) In *Sacr.* 5-7, Philo explains that Abraham and Jacob go to be with the angels, i.e. the Forms (εἴδη) in the sense of species. Isaac is said to go to some ἀπὸ τοῦ καὶ τελεῖότερον γένος, which is presumably Plato’s Form of the Good. Philo states that Moses goes to be with God himself and the people of God.
Also, in *QG* 3:11, Philo contends that the promise that Abraham will be buried in peace at an old age in Gen 15:15 refers to his immortal soul returning to heaven from which it originally emigrated into the body (cf. *QG* 1.51). Philo explains that Abraham joined the incorporeal inhabitants of the divine realm at his time of death (cf. *Opif.* 54). He also proclaims in *Cher.* 1.114 that the virtuous will join the incorporeal beings once the body expires (οἱ μετὰ ἀσωμάτων σύγκριτοι ποιοί).

Philo suggests that the virtuous not only join the company of angels, but also become like angels upon death. This is supported by the fact that Philo describes the angels in a manner similar to the Adam formed according to the image in Gen 1:26-27. In fact, Philo argues that the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 is created in the likeness of the angels. He bases this on the interpretation of the phrase “let us” in Gen 1:26 (*Mut.* 29-34; *Opif.* 72-77, 179). Philo provides several similarities shared by humanity based on the portrayal of Adam in Gen 1:26-27 and the angels. Both, for example, are incorporeal (*Conf.* 174; *Somn.* 1.115, 135), incorruptible, immortal (*Conf.* 28; *Somn.* 1.142) souls (*Abr.* 113; *Spec.* 1.66), which are free of evil (*Conf.* 174). And, both, unlike God, have the ability to do evil because they have the will to choose. In *Conf.* 179, for example, Philo explains that the portion of the soul that is good was created by

---

90 Cf. *QG* 2:8. The “divine substance” of this passage seems to be what God gives to the pious according to 2:10. See also *Sacr.* 5; *Her.* 276-283 (esp. 280), where Philo says that “some” teach that the return to the “fathers” is return to the archetypal Forms.


92 Fug. 68-70: “[Moses] described man alone as having been fashioned with the cooperation of others. His words are: ‘God said, let us make man after our image’ (Gen 1:26), ‘let us make’ indicating more than one. So the Father of all things is holding parley with His powers, whom he allowed to fashion the mortal portion of our soul. . . . Therefore God deemed it necessary to assign the creation of evil things to other makers, reserving that of good things to himself alone.”

93 This is supported by the idea that they are sometimes identified as *logoi* and the Adam is said to have been formed in the image of the *Logos*. This also helps to further understand their connection with the *Logos* as the archangel (*Conf.* 28; *Somn.* 1.142).
God, but the angels formed the portion of the soul that is free to choose between good and evil. Thus, the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 is associated with the angels and the state of human existence as a disembodied soul before and after life in the flesh.

Philo repeatedly argues that since God is utterly holy, he is only responsible for the good aspects of humanity (Opif. 72-76; Conf. 171-180; Fug. 65-70; Mut. 27-34).94 Benjamin Wold argues that since humans either pursue virtue or wickedness and Gen 1:26 is used to explain that this ability comes from the angels’ involvement in creation, it is reasonable to assume that the Genesis 1 creation account includes the categorical division of humanity by identifying some as “spiritual” and others as “fleshly” based on how they were created.95 While Wold’s position is reasonable when reading passages such as Mut. 30-31, in Opif. 134-35, there is no indication that the Gen 1:26-27 creation account includes categorizing humanity into opposing groups.96 Rather, Opif. 134-35 emphasizes that the immortality that the soul possesses and the capacity to recognize the good makes humans similar to God and morally responsible.97 This account does not immediately consider the involvement of angels in the creation of humanity. However, in Opif. 72-76, Philo clearly states that the contribution of the angels to the creation of humanity is the human ability to choose between virtue and wickedness rather than categorizing opposing

---

94 For an overview of the relation of assistants in Philo to Platonism, see Runia, Philo of Alexandria, 242-51.

95 Wold, Women, Men, and Angels, 144-46.

96 “Indeed, [God] did not make the soul of the wicked man, for wickedness is hateful to God. And the soul, which is between good and bad, he did not make by himself. ... It is said in the scriptures, ‘Let us make man in our own image’ (Gen 1:26), that if it receives a bad impression it shows itself to be the work of others, but if it receives a good impression it shows itself to be the work of him who is the Creator only of what is beautiful and good” (Mut. 30-31).

humanities (cf. *Deus* 47-8; *Conf.* 177-78). Wold’s position is also at odds with Philo’s consistent association of vice with the composite Adam of Gen 2:7 (see section 4.2.2.2.1.4). Moreover, Wold’s argument conflicts with the positive likeness of the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 to the angels. Philo, then, reasonably contends in *Opif.* 134-35 that humanity according to the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 was initially made in the image of God and the image of the angels—“incorporeal, neither male nor female, imperishable by nature.” Therefore, upon the death of the body the virtuous return to their original state as disembodied souls—become like the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 and the angels (*Sacr.* 5-7; cf. *Wis* 18:13).

The idea that upon death the soul leaves the body and humanity once again becomes equal to the angels is similar to what is found elsewhere in Second Temple Jewish literature. The likeness of humans to the angels is evident in *I En.* 69:11: “For humans were not created to be different from the angels, so that they should remain pure and righteous. And death, which ruins everything, would not have laid its hand on them. But through this, their knowledge, they are perishing, and through this power it devours us.” This verse suggests that both humans and angels were originally intended to be holy and immortal. Also in *2 En.* 22:1-10, for example, the author states that Enoch was removed from his “earthly garments,” anointed, and put in “garments of [God’s] glory” (v. 8). Verse 10 states that Enoch was “shining like the sun’s ray . . . and was like one of [God’s] glorious ones” (cf. 40:1-13; *I En.* 46:1; 62:2, 5; 61:9; 69:29).

Adam is identified as an angel in *2 En.* 30:11: “And on the earth [God] assigned him (Adam) to be a second angel, honored, and great and glorious.” Thus, similar to Philo, according to 2

---


99 *69:11* can also be translated in this way: “For men were created exactly like the angels, to the intent that they should continue pure and righteous.” Robert H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (TED 1; London: SPCK, 1917).
Enoch, Enoch not only becomes like the angels, but also like Adam before he transgressed God’s prohibition in the garden. Further, although likely composed during the second century C.E., in 3 Enoch, Enoch ascends into heaven where he is transformed from a person into the lesser Yahweh (12:5) and identified with the Angel of the Lord (23:20-21). The transformation of a person into an angel-like state is also found in the Dead Sea Scroll text known as the Self-Glorification Hymn (4Q491c 1; cf. 4Q427 7). In this text, the author claims, “For I have dwelt on [high … ] in the heavens, and there is no one [ … ] I am reckoned with the angels and my abode is in the holy congregation” (4Q491c 11 1:14). He further states, “[ … For] I am reckoned with the angels, [and] my glory with that of the sons of the King” (4Q491c 11 1:18). In T. Ab. 7:4, as mentioned above, Abraham is depicted as shining like the angels, and being taken up “into the heavens from where he came” (cf. Sacr. 5). This verse suggests Abraham was likened to the angels at the time he was to experience eternal life in heaven. These portrayals of exalted humans are consistent with Philo’s description of humanity prior to and after life in the flesh in Opif. 134-35, as well as his view of the angels.

4.2.2.2.2 The dueling Adams of Genesis 1-3: two contrasting modes of living according to Philo in Opif. 134-35. Philo’s double creation of man account in Opif. 134-35 can be reasonably understood as symbolizing the distinction between humanity as a disembodied soul and as a composite being (see section 4.2.2.2.1). Based on this understanding, it appears that Philo also suggests that the dual portrayals of Adam represent two contrasting modes of living for humanity while in the physical body. As mentioned above (see section 4.2.2.1.4),

---

the Adam of Genesis 2-3 is the model for humanity who choose to live a life according to earthly matters and wickedness, which leads to the death of the soul. In contrast, the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 is the example for composite humanity to follow in order to enjoy a blissful everlasting life of the soul.

In *Opif*. 134-35, Philo presents the Adam of Genesis 2-3 as the paradigm of composite humanity. He repeatedly explains that because Adam chose to live according to his passions, he forfeited the immortality of his soul (cf. *Virt*. 205). According to Philo, the body prevents a human from being the person one ought to be (cf. *Gig*. 33). However, as he explains in *Opif*. 135, everyone is also created with an immortal soul made according to the image of God (Gen 1:26-27). The composite humanity that exists now faces the same situation as the first human also made of body and soul. In Philo’s view, the composite humanity must choose to live a life of virtue modeled by the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 or a life of wickedness modeled by the Adam in Genesis 2-3. This choice has eternal consequences.

In Philo’s famous allegorical interpretation of the Adam and Eve story, he likewise claims that following the example of the Adam of Gen 2:7 leads to the death of the soul. In his “allegory of the soul,” Adam represents the mind, Eve stands for human senses, and the serpent signifies pleasure (e.g., *Opif*. 165). Adam’s submission to the fleshly passions as portrayed in Genesis 2-3 results in a miserable life and the soul becoming mortal. Therefore, once the body dies, the soul dies as well. This is similar to the position espoused in Wis 1:16-

---

101 cf. *Hyp. Arch*. 91:4-11: “They turned to their Adam and took him and expelled him from the garden along with his wife; for they have no blessing since they too are beneath the curse. . . . Moreover they threw mankind into great distraction and into a life of toil so that their mankind might be occupied by worldly affairs, and might not have the opportunity of being devoted to the holy spirit.”


103 Tobin, *The Creation of Man*, 135-49. The distinction between the earthly mind and heavenly mind is determined based on Gen 2:8, 15-17. See *Leg*. 1.53-5, 88-89, 90-91; *QG* 1.8.
2:20 (see section 4.2.2.1.4.2). Pseudo-Solomon contends that the wicked are right when they say that physical death is the end of existence, as mentioned above (5:9-14; cf. 3:10). However, it is only the end for the wicked; the righteous enjoy eternal life (3:2; cf. 1:15; 4:17; 6:19; 8:17; 15:3). Philo uses the Eden story to moralize about the negative consequences of allowing the mind to be ruled by the senses, which are susceptible to the lure of pleasure.\textsuperscript{104} This further demonstrates the harmful consequences of living like the Adam portrayed in Genesis 2-3.

4.2.2.2.2.1 Emulating the angels and Adam in Philo and 4QInstruction. The author of 4QInstruction exhorts the addressee to imitate the angels in order to achieve eternal life. A similar assertion is found in \textit{Opif}. 134-35. By examining the way this idea is articulated in the Qumran text, we are able better understand the trope in Philo’s work. According to Philo, the proper life of the soul is the state of existence that the soul enjoys before and after entering the body—that is as a disembodied soul, which is like and among the angels.\textsuperscript{105} In \textit{Opif}. 134-35, the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 is identified with the angels. Philo not only claims that the virtuous upon physical death become a disembodied soul like the Adam of Genesis 1, he explains that they also become like the angels (see section 4.2.2.1.5.1). If Philo contends those who emulate the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 will gain an eternal blissful life, then it is reasonable to assume that one can likewise achieve immortality by emulating the angels. Therefore, by living a virtuous life one becomes not only more like the Adam of Gen 1:26-27, but also like the angels, and thus less like the Adam of Genesis 2-3.

\textsuperscript{104} Martin Hogan, “The Exegetical Background,” 10. For example, see \textit{Leg}. 3.109-10. \textit{QG} 1.45-6. In this instance, according to Philo, Genesis 2-3 is best read as symbolic descriptions of human psychology. Although in \textit{QG} Philo often shows a preference for the allegorical reading of Genesis 2-3, he does not exclude the importance of a more literal interpretation of the passage. Tobin, \textit{The Creation of Man}, 154-61, explains that Philo’s unique contribution to the history of exegesis is the notion that a text could contain more than one level of meaning. Thus, it would be entirely acceptable for Philo to understand a particular text as containing a literal and an allegorical meaning.

\textsuperscript{105} Runia, \textit{Philo of Alexandria}, 337.
This notion is similar to what is found in 4QInstruction. A key lesson found in the sapiential text is that if the ḫḇsr emulates the angels in life he will join them after death (see section 2.5.4). The author of 4QInstruction explains that the elect are able to live like angels by pursuing truth and righteous living (e.g., 4Q416 2 ii 6). Once the body expires, the part of the ḫḇsr that has affinity with the angels continues to live (4Q418 81 4-5). The elect status of the addressee is conveyed with regard to both angels and Adam. Philo similarly contends that those who act like the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 and the angels in life will join them after death. (See section 4.2.2.2.3.1 for discussion concerning the pursuit of wisdom in the garden of Eden according to Philo.)

4.2.2.2.3 4QInstruction and Philo’s double creation account in Opif. 134-35.

4QInstruction uses Genesis 1-3 to divide humankind into fleshly and spiritual groups—the ḫḇsr and the ṣp ḫḇsr. Philo’s “double creation of man” theory is an adaptation of this anthropological dichotomy. Writing in the 1980s, before the publication of 4QInstruction in 1999, Thomas H. Tobin posited that Philo’s “double creation of man” is drawing on an older tradition because at times he “corrects” the dichotomy so that it refers not to two men but two minds (e.g., Plant. 44-46; QG 1.8).106 The notion of shared exegetical traditions in Philo and 4QInstruction has been addressed to some extent by John J. Collins and Matthew J. Goff.107

Philo’s anthropology based on the portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 in Opif. 134-35 has significant points in common with the two types of humankind described in the Hagu passage—


the image of God and the virtuous group of humanity of Philo’s texts are associated with “the image of God” of Genesis 1, an idea which both works read as a reference to eternal life. The Qumran text construes the “image” as a type of divine paradigm that influences the creation of one kind of humankind (the רוח ובש). In Opif. 134-35, however, Philo contends that humanity was originally created according to God’s image and in the likeness of the angels before descending into earthly bodies. As composite beings, he states that the soul is the part of humanity that is in “the image of God.” Each author posits that a particular group is offered the possibility of a blissful after life—the virtuous in the case of Philo and the רוח ובש in the case of 4QInstruction. Both authors further contend that each group has some affinity with Adam. Like the virtuous described in Philo’s work, the elect addressee of 4QInstruction experiences physical death, which is associated with the Adam of Gen 2:7. Both Philo and 4QInstruction contrast those who attain eternal life with a type of humanity that is associated with the physical death of the body. The wicked in Philo and the רוח ובש will ultimately be destroyed by God (4Q416 1 12; e.g., Leg. 1.107; QG 1.51). Philo teaches that the wicked will live a miserable life and cease to exist after physical death (Virt. 204-5; cf. Wis 5:9-14). 4QInstruction is not as explicit on this point, but asserts that the “foolish of heart” go to the “eternal pit” (4Q418 69 ii 6). This seems to indicate that they (their souls) will undergo some sort of suffering after the expiration of the body (cf. Praem. 152; Somn. 1.151; Cher. 1.2).

Philo associates each portrayal of Adam in the creation narrative with a particular mode of living. This is similar to the two different kinds of humanity laid out in the vision of Hagu—the רוח ובש and the רוח ובש. Both Philo and 4QInstruction associate the Adam of Genesis 1 and the angels with eternal life. Philo contends that those who wish to obtain eternal life must live a virtuous life dedicated to the pursuit of wisdom according to the example of the Adam of Gen
1:26-27 and the angels, as discussed above. The Qumran text makes similar claims (see section 2.5.4). However, 4QInstruction explains eternal life is only available to the elect—the elect who are like the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 and the angels. Further, they are the only people who have access to the חכם נפש— the wisdom that requires study in order to gain eternal life. In contrast to the virtuous associated with Genesis 1, Philo portrays the Adam of Genesis 2-3 as the paradigm of the wicked, which leads to death of the soul once the body expires. Similarly, although it is implied at best, 4QInstruction associates the Adam of Gen 2:7 with the רוח נשך who are opposite the רוח נשך of 4QInstruction, which is never portrayed as evil. 4QInstruction never states that the non-elect are wicked. They are simply the non-elect, and because of this they do not have the חכם נפש, which is necessary to obtain eternal life. 4QInstruction has a clear sectarian reading of the two portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3, which is absent from Philo. The sage contends wisdom and eternal life are available to all humans who lead virtuous lives.

Both authors explain that the inevitability of bodily death is not a consequence of Adam’s sin. Rather, in Philo is understood as part of the condition of (composite) humanity. For 4QInstruction, death is an inherent aspect of the רוח נשך (4Q416 1 12). Philo also associates the mortality of all humankind with the Adam of Gen 2:7, while both authors contend that those who are like the Adam portrayed in Genesis 1 can obtain a blissful eternal life. 4QInstruction further associates the המרב with the Adam of Genesis 2-3. The המרב is given stewardship over Eden, which suggests that the knowledge he can attain through חכם נפש is a kind of restoration of wisdom originally possessed by Adam. Philo describes the garden as the scene where Adam in
Gen 2:7 forfeits the immortality of his soul. However, he also uses the cultivation of Eden as a metaphor for the virtuous pursuit of wisdom, which leads to eternal life originally intended for Adam.

4.2.2.3.1 The virtuous pursuit of wisdom in the garden of Eden. 4QInstruction helps us better understand the Philo’s use of Adam to articulate his understanding of the pursuit of wisdom. Philo contends that a key aspect of virtuous living that leads humans to more resemble the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 (and the angels) is contemplation of the divine. He turns to the garden of Eden episode of Genesis 2-3 to demonstrate how prior to the transgression of Adam, the first man preserved the immortality of his soul by practicing virtue.

Philo describes the garden of Eden as a symbol or example of “the contemplative life in order that through a vision of the world and the things in it praise of the Father might also be attained” (QG 1.6). He also states that the tree of life is “the knowledge, not only of things on the earth, but also of the oldest and highest cause of things. If anyone is able to obtain a clear impression of this, he will be fortunate and blessed and truly immortal” (QG 1.6). This is similar to description of wisdom in the biblical book of Proverbs: “She is a tree of life to those who lay hold of her” (3:18; cf. 11:30). Philo contends that the tree of life represents living a virtuous existence through contemplation of the divine that is rewarded with the immortality of the soul. In Opif. 153, Philo further states that “in paradise, made by God, all the plants” produced “imperishable wisdom” (ἄμεια ὀφθορὸν σώστιν). The expulsion of Adam and Eve from paradise is interpreted by Philo as primarily concerned with Adam’s abandonment of the cultivation of wisdom. In QG 1.56, Philo explains:
When (Adam) was cultivating wisdom in paradise, he took care of the cultivation of wisdom as if of trees, nourishing himself on its immortal and beneficial fruits, through which he became immortal. When he was driven out of the place of wisdom, he practices the opposite—works of ignorance, through which his body is polluted, and his mind is blinded, and being starved of his own food, he wastes away and suffers a miserable death. As a reproach to the foolish man, God called paradise “pleasure” as the opposite of a painful and terrible life. For, in truth, a life of wisdom is a delight of immense joy and an enjoyment most suitable to the rational soul. But a life without wisdom is harsh and terrible. For even though one is completely deceived by pleasures of the senses, both before and after comes suffering. (cf. Leg. 1.43, 45, 64-65; Cher. 1.12-13; Post. 1.32, 128; Plant. 1.38; Somn. 2.242; QG 1.7)

For Philo, the kind of life offered by Eden is related to the pursuit of wisdom. The trees of Eden, especially the tree of life, represent wisdom. The toil of Adam is the cultivation of wisdom, which leads to immortality. The expulsion from Eden leads to Adam’s descent into ignorance and wickedness. Philo depicts Eden as a place where wisdom is freely enjoyed and the cultivation of wisdom as the primary occupation of Adam.

There is a similar view of the garden of Eden in 4QInstruction (see section 2.5). In 4Q423 1, the author depicts the קַדְשָׁ֖ו as having been entrusted with the garden of Eden. The author, like Philo, associates the cultivation of Eden with the pursuit of wisdom. He exhorts the addressee to “till” and “guard” the garden as a metaphor for the pursuit of wisdom. Unlike Philo, 4QInstruction stresses that this comes by studying the supernaturally revealed הָדוֹֽו, which is only available to one group of humanity—the elect. Philo does not claim that only one sect or community is able to pursue wisdom, and he does not indicate that it involves any

supernatural revelation. Like Philo, the Qumran text states that “every delightful tree” in the
garden is “pleasing to give knowledge.” According to 4Q423 1, all the trees of the garden
provide wisdom, as discussed in Chapter Two. Different than Philo’s depictions of Adam
breaking God’s commandment (see section 4.2.2.1.4.1), there is no reference to a prohibition
from eating of the tree of knowledge. The fact that the 橄=image (has stewardship over the garden
suggests that the knowledge he can attain represents a restoration of wisdom originally possessed
by Adam (cf. 4Q417 1 i 18-19; 4Q418 77 2). Further, the addressee is associated with Adam as
well as the angels (see sections 2.4; 2.5). Like Philo, the author of 4QInstruction likely viewed
both Adam and the angels as immortal (cf. Wis 2:23; see section 2.5.4). The addressee is told
that if he acts like Adam, which is symbolized by cultivating the garden, he will enjoy eternal
life with the angels (4Q418 69 ii 6, 13-14; cf. 4Q416 2 ii 6; 4Q418 55 8-11). This is similar to
Philo’s idea that the cultivation of wisdom is in a sense claiming the immortality originally
intended for Adam in Eden (QG 1.6, 56; see section 4.2.2.2.3.2). Both 4QInstruction and Philo
contend that upon death of the physical body, those who pursue wisdom will experience a
blissful afterlife with the angels.

Both 4QInstruction and Philo also associate the garden of Eden with the lack of the
cultivation of wisdom, but each does so in a different manner. Philo uses the Adam of Genesis
2-3 to describe the result of those who live a life dedicated to the earthly things. He explains that
since Adam did not pursue wisdom in the garden, he was banished. For Philo, banishment from
the garden, living a life of suffering and hardship, symbolizes the abandonment of the cultivation
of wisdom, which ultimately leads to death (of the soul) (QG 1.56). Different than Philo,
however, 4QInstruction explains that not pursuing wisdom is represented by the garden falling
into disarray (4Q423 1 3), not banishment from the garden. The Qumran text explains that the
garden will produce “thorns and thistles” if the addressee does not maintain it properly. Thus, the addressee taking the wrong path is symbolized by Eden falling into a state of decline and disarray. This seems to indicate that the elect can return to the proper way of life if he restores the garden by refocusing himself on the pursuit of wisdom, while Philo suggests that there is no return to the garden once a way of life is chosen.

Philo suggests that for the virtuous life as a disembodied soul after the death of the body is a sort of returning to the garden of Eden at which point one is able to continually dwell on and cling to the divine. Philo’s depiction of the Adam of Gen 2:7 prior to the fall is more like his view of the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 in Opif. 134. According to this line of interpretation, Philo portrays the Adam cultivating the garden of Genesis 2-3 as imitating the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 who constantly meditates on the divine things. In this way, the Adam of Genesis 2-3 is presented as a model for those to follow who desire eternal life.

Like what is found in Philo, in 4QInstruction, the is exhorted to model himself after the Adam of Genesis 2-3 to attain a blissful eternal life. Both authors also have in mind the Adam of Genesis 2-3 before his transgression. In the Qumran text, the elect are like Adam and the who are created in the likeness of the angels. This is not unlike the virtuous in Philo, who are likened to both the angels and Adam.

\[109\] Other Second Temple Jewish authors also associate Adam and the garden with wisdom. For example, in 17:6-7, Ben Sira explains that wisdom from the tree of knowledge was given as a divine gift to avoid wickedness (cf. CD 3:20; 1QH 4:27). In 1 Enoch 32, the author states that Adam ate from “the tree of wisdom” (vv. 3, 6). In 4:9 of the Psalms of Solomon, the author states that the serpent destroyed the wisdom, which is presumably referring to biblical episode of Adam in the garden. See Samuel L. Adams, Wisdom in Transition: Act and Consequence in Second Temple Instructions (JSJSup 125; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 186. Adams asserts that Ben Sira’s reversal of the negative consequences of the tree of knowledge betrays the anti-wisdom bias of the Eden narrative.

\[110\] This is similar to what is found in Louis Ginzberg’s, The Legends of the Jews, vol. 1, ch. 1, “Adam and Eve in Paradise”: “There (in the garden of Eden) the souls of the pious are transformed into angels, and there they remain forever, praising God and feasting their sight upon the glory of the Shekinah.”
4.2.2.2.3.2 Philo’s use of the two kinds of humanity attested in 4QInstruction. The differences between the dual portrayals of Adam in Opif. 134-35 and 4QInstruction indicate that Philo provided a number of his own ideas to those traditions he inherited that are attested in this Qumran composition. Philo does this by primarily reformulating the ideas in terms of the Greek conception of the immortality of the soul. A clear difference is the way that Philo directly refers to both Adams in Genesis 1-3. He is attempting to account exegetically for the two creation of humanity narratives. Philo also provides a much closer reading of Genesis 1-3. For example, Philo uses the portrayal of Adam in Gen 2:7 to not only refer to physical mortality, as 4QInstruction does. Gen 2:7 is interpreted as indicating that humanity also has an immortal soul. According to Philo, this means that in principle all humanity is a composite being made of body and soul, and all humanity has the possibility of eternal life. However, it is only actually obtained by the virtuous. This is in stark contrast to 4QInstruction’s claim that the possibility of eternal life is only available to the elect. Philo also has the sin and expulsion from Eden of the Genesis 2-3 Adam in view. The Adam of Genesis 2-3 is depicted as a paradigm of the wicked. Just as the Adam of Genesis 2-3 lost the immortality of the soul because he pursued the passions of the flesh, humans can do the same. This is a far more developed understanding of the portrayal of the Adam of Gen 2:7 than what is found in 4QInstruction. Philo views the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 in a similar manner as 4QInstruction (e.g., a model for eternal life and the pursuit of wisdom). However, he also understands this depiction of Adam as representing the disembodied soul before and after life as a composite being. The addressee in 4QInstruction has the hope to join the angels upon the death of the body. Yet, there is no mention of life prior to earthly existence or what the post-mortem experience will entail for the elect. In contrast, Philo discusses these notions in considerable detail. In Opif. 134-35, Philo presents the flesh/spirit
anthropological classification that is attested in 4QInstruction in a more philosophical manner. Rather than two kinds of humanity, in this passage Philo prefers the idea of two modes of being human. This is a different kind of anthropological dualism than what is found in the Hagu passage.

As mentioned above, there is also a double creation of man account mentioned in Leg. 1.31-32 (Section 4.2.2.1). Philo’s use of the two portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 in Leg. 1.31-32 appears to be closer to the two kinds of people idea found in 4QInstruction than that of Opif. 134-35. Rather than two opposed modes of being human as found in Opif. 134-35, both Leg. 1.31-32 and 4QInstruction claim that humanity was created as two categorically opposing groups. In the vision of Hagu, the two groups—the צר ורבי, associated with the Adam of Gen 1:27 and the רבי כי, associated with the Adam of Gen 2:7—are established at creation. In Leg. 1.31-32, however, the distinction between the two kinds of humans—ὁ ὄφρανιος ἀνθρωπός, associated with the Adam of Gen 1:27 or ὁ γήινος ἀνθρωπός, associated with the Adam of Gen 2:7—is determined by the life one lives. It is not predetermined like it is in 4QInstruction. Philo further identifies each portrayal of Adam as a representation of a sort of mind one possesses. This philosophical interpretation of the portrayals of Adam is not found in the Qumran text. While 4QInstruction allows us to better see traditions that Philo appropriated in his work, we are also now able to get a better understanding of how the sage reworks these traditions by incorporating his own ideas and reflections within his context.

4.3 Conclusion

Philo offers numerous interpretations of the two portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3. One of his most significant is his “double creation” account. In Leg. 1.31, Philo contends that there are two
kinds of humanity—one associated with the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 (ὁ οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος) and one with the Adam of Gen 2:7 (ὁ γῆς ἄνθρωπος). He suggests that the two portrayals of Adam signify different minds, indicating that he may have reworked an older exegetical tradition about the creation of two different kinds of people. In *Opif.* 134-35, Philo understands the dual portrayals of Adam in two ways. First, he contends that the Adam made in the image of God (Gen 1:26-27) is understood as the disembodied soul. This is the state of human existence before and after life in the flesh. The Adam formed from the earth (Gen 2:7) is understood as composite humanity—body and soul. Second, Philo associates each portrayal of Adam with a particular mode of living. This is important because whether or not one experiences a blissful afterlife or death of the soul is determined by the way one lives. Philo explains that everyone has the choice of living a virtuous or wicked life. Those who wish to live a life according to virtue are to follow the example of Gen 1:26-27 (and the angels, of whom the Genesis 1 Adam is created like). The virtuous can thus attain the immortality that Adam was originally endowed according to Philo’s depiction of Gen 1:26-27 if they follow the pattern of the Genesis 1 Adam. That way they are able to preserve their image of God and the immortal aspect of being a composite human—their soul. Those who live a life of wickedness follow the example of the Adam of Gen 2:7 as Philo portrays him in Genesis 2-3. This leads to the death of the soul when the physical body expires.

*4QInstruction* provides a new context for evaluating the extent to which Jewish Diaspora literature attests ideas and tropes found in older Hebrew literature. Both *4QInstruction* and Philo describe an ideal type of humankind. The Qumran text calls this sort of humanity the שם ות. This group is called the virtuous by Philo. Both authors describe this kind of humanity with the phrase “image of God” from Genesis 1. This group of people, they both also explain, has the
hope of eternal life. The more perfect sort of humanity is distinguished from another that is linked to physical death. Both 4QInstruction and Philo also explain that if their addressees emulate the angels they will attain immortality. Each writer also connects the prospect of eternal life with Adam and the garden of Eden. Both the righteous and the virtuous are encouraged to imitate the Adam of Genesis 2-3 prior to sinning by maintaining the garden. This allows them to attain eternal life. These parallels indicate that Philo’s interpretation of Genesis 1-3 should not only be attributed to his reliance on Greek philosophical thought, but it is also possible that he adopted older Early Jewish exegetical traditions. As argued above, Philo’s Alexandrian contemporary, the author of the Wisdom of Solomon, may have also been influenced by some of these same interpretive traditions. 4QInstruction demonstrates that the older traditions that may have influenced the Alexandrian authors are present in Hebrew sapiential literature composed in Palestine. The Qumran composition further demonstrates that Philo’s interpretation of Genesis 1-3, though significantly influenced by Hellenistic thought, appear to have also been shaped by Palestinian Jewish exegetical traditions.
CHAPTER FIVE

GAINING WHAT ADAM LOST: 4 EZRA AND THE ADAMS OF GENESIS 1-3

5.1 Introduction

Both 4QInstruction and the author of 4 Ezra use Genesis 1-3 to assert core anthropological principles. When describing the elect status of the addressee and his affinity with the angels, 4QInstruction adapts elements from these chapters, especially their portrayal of Adam and the garden of Eden (see section 2.5). 4 Ezra employs these same chapters from Genesis as well to describe the opposite fates awaiting the righteous and the wicked in the age to come. 4 Ezra associates the ultimate reward of immortality of the soul with Adam and the garden of Eden, not unlike 4QInstruction. Daniel Harrington has published the only scholarship (I am aware of) that compares 4QInstruction with 4 Ezra. However, he only scratches the surface of exploring the relationship between the two compositions. Building upon John Collins’ and Matthew Goff’s research, in this chapter I will argue that the manner in which 4 Ezra employs Genesis 1-3 suggests that the composition draws on older interpretative traditions that are attested in 4QInstruction. Although I do not believe that the author of 4 Ezra used 4QInstruction as a literary source, I contend that the author of 4 Ezra uses exegetical traditions that describe the elect in 4QInstruction and applies them to the rewards that the righteous will receive after death. For example, the elect of 4QInstruction are given stewardship over Eden and the righteous of 4 Ezra are promised to inhabit Eden in the age to come. Further, the elect are made in the image of the angels and the righteous are told they will become like the angels in Eden. For 4 Ezra, the

---

1 Daniel J. Harrington, “Wisdom and Apocalyptic in 4QInstruction and 4 Ezra,” in Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition (ed. F. García Martínez; Leiden: Leuven University Press, 2003), 343-55, explicitly states that he “uses the method of comparison primarily to show their fundamental differences” (p. 343). I, on the other hand, emphasize the similarities of the two compositions.
possibility of a blissful afterlife in Eden is available to all Israel rather than only a select group of
the nation that has received supernatural revelation. In this way, the sectarian aspects of the
tradition that may have been inherited from 4QInstruction are removed.²

The author of 4 Ezra also interprets Adam as the paradigm of humanity in general,
similar to what is found in Ben Sira. However, in 4 Ezra Adam is used to account for human
sinfulness, which is a far more negative interpretation than what is found in Ben Sira. In this
chapter, I will explicate 4 Ezra’s anthropology, which is rooted in the portrayals of Adam in
Genesis 1-3. I will further compare the traditions in 4 Ezra with 4QInstruction in order to
evaluate the possibility that 4 Ezra may appropriate exegetical traditions regarding Genesis 1-3
that are found in the Qumran text. I will also briefly examine 4 Ezra’s use of Adam as a
paradigm of all humanity and his association with the election of Israel against the traditions
attested in Ben Sira.

5.1.1 A Brief Background

4 Ezra is an apocalypse³ written between 70 C.E. and the Bar Kokhba Revolt (132-135 C.E.) in
response to the destruction of the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem.⁴ The composition consists of

² John R. Levison, Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism from Sirach to 2 Baruch (JSPSup 1; Sheffield: JSOT Press,
Testaments (ed. E. Kautzsch; 2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1900), 2:331-401, rightly argues that the text reflects
diverse traditions on which the author drew as opposed to the idea of distinct documentary sources. See Jonathan A.

³ Concerning 4 Ezra’s later popularity and reception, see Alastair Hamilton, The Apocryphal Apocalypse: The
Reception of the Second Book of Esdras (4 Ezra) From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment (Oxford: Clarendon
Press, 1999). Palestinian Jewish reactions to the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E. are attested in 2 Baruch, the
Apocalypse of Abraham and 3 Baruch, which are included in the Pseudepigrapha. 3 Baruch is taken to be less
reliable than the others because it is thought to have been composed in the Egyptian diaspora (in Greek, the
language in which it is extant) and also because it has been heavily redacted by Christians. The other three texts are
believed to have been written in Hebrew or Aramaic, but survive only in tertiary versions. Although all three were
preserved by Christians, they seem to have undergone relatively little Christian redaction.

⁴ On issues of dating and provenience, see Bruce M. Metzger, “The Fourth Book of Ezra” in OTP, 1:517-24; Jacob
M. Myers, I and II Esdras (AB 42; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1974), 1-19.
chapters 3-14 of 2 Esdras (chapters 1-2 and 15-16 are Christian additions). *4 Ezra* is preserved in Latin along with several other ancient versions, including Armenian, Syriac and Georgian. There is a consensus that the text was originally composed in Hebrew. Most scholars also believe that the book was written in Palestine around the end of the first century C.E.

In this apocalypse, Ezra is the pseudonym for the one who receives revelation through the mediation of the angel Uriel. The supernatural knowledge that is received concerns the transcendent world which is to come. Traditionally the composition has been read as a composite of several sources. Box argued in the early-20th century that a compiler used five different sources: 1) S, an apocalypse consisting of most of chapters 3-10; 2) E, an apocalypse that contains the signs of the end times found in 4:52-5:13 and 6:13-29; 3) the eagle vision; 4) the Son of Man vision; and, 5) E2, which makes up most of chapter 14. This source critical division is not adhered to today. Most scholars agree, however, that the composition is divided into seven episodes, traditionally referred to as visions, but only three of them contain symbolic visions followed by interpretations. The first three sections of the composition (3:1-5:19; 5:20-

---


11 For a discussion of the history of the scholarship on the structure of the text, see Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 196-98. *2 Baruch* seems also to be divided into seven sections, but they are less clearly marked than *4 Ezra*. See Gwendolyn B. Sayler, *Have the Promises Failed? A Literary Analysis of 2 Baruch* (SBDS 72; Chico, Calif.:}
6:34; 6:35-9:25) are not actually visions. Rather, they are dialogues between Ezra and Uriel (cf. Daniel 10-12). In these dialogues, Ezra expresses a consistently skeptical attitude concerning the justice of God, which Uriel attempts to correct. In the fourth unit of the composition—the first vision (9:26-10:59)—Ezra begins to share the angel’s understanding of God and the current state of humanity. This new perspective culminates in the visions of the eagle and the “man from the sea.” At the end of the composition Ezra becomes the mediator of revelation for the rest of the people.

A primary critical issue in 4 Ezra is Ezra’s shift in opinion. Scholars have proposed several different theories concerning this issue. Some have argued that Ezra is the voice of a tradition or movement that the author opposes. To others, such as Box, Ezra’s change in opinion suggested the author was drawing on a number of sources. Others contend that Ezra is the position of the author and that his skepticism is never actually appeased. According to this view, the change of Ezra’s attitude in chapter 10 is understood as ironic, or as doubts veiled by a concern for the condition of Israel. Still others, such as Michael E. Stone, following Gunkel, see the tensions of the book as evidence of an inner struggle or conveying a conversion

---


experience of Ezra. A conversion experience is argued to maintain the legitimacy of Ezra’s skepticism and the acceptance of the final revelation. Collins concludes that since Ezra demonstrates skepticism and the role of mediator of revelation in the final chapter, Ezra’s doubts should not be understood as an opinion contrary to the author’s. Recently, Karina Martin Hogan has skillfully argued that as a whole, 4 Ezra reflects actual debates among sages in the decades that followed the destruction of the temple, and the visions represent the author’s solution to the theological problems posed by the destruction of the temple. She rightly contends that the aim of the book is “to persuade the wise of the need to move beyond failed attempts to construct a rational theodicy, and to accept the revealed ‘wisdom’ of apocalyptic theology.”

4 Ezra is primarily concerned with the issue of theodicy. This is presented in the context of God at work in history, concerning specifically the destruction of the second temple and the continued success of the Romans (3:1-2). During the period immediately following the loss of the temple, obedience to the Torah became increasing important in an effort to establish Jewish

---


identity in light of the absence of the temple. This led to the composition of numerous new traditions that are now part of the rabbinic literature. While the destruction of the temple is directly addressed in the first vision (9:26-10:59), several other issues arise that relate to theodicy. These include how Israel’s current situation fits into the notion of election, the number of people saved versus the number of people damned, God’s mercy and justice, and the human condition. One of the major topics addressed in the debate between Ezra and Uriel is anthropology and human sinfulness. Both figures turn to Genesis 1-3 to provide their perspectives on the human condition.

5.1.1.1 The Relationship between 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. There is no doubt that 4 Ezra and the apocalyptic 2 Baruch are related. However, there has been some difficulty in isolating exactly what this relationship is. The two compositions share a similar structure, phraseology, and historical setting. Most scholars believe 2 Baruch was written in response to 4 Ezra. There are some, however, who claim that 2 Baruch is a source for 4 Ezra. I will focus on 4

---


18 2 Baruch is most similar to 4 Ezra in terms of the type of questions raised by the sage, but Baruch is not as persistent or skeptical as Ezra. He does not dispute the answers that he receives to his questions, which for most of the book come directly from God. The angel, Ramael, first appears in ch. 55 to give an extended interpretation (55:1-74:5) of a vision Baruch has in ch. 53. For a recent discussion, see Matthias Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel: Reading Second Baruch in Context* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 148-81.


21 Pierre Bogaert, *Apocalypse de Baruch: Introduction, Traduction de Syriaque et Commentaire* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1969), 287-88, argues for the priority of 2 Baruch. Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel*, 182, claims that one composition should not be read as a reaction to the other. Instead, he contends that the parallels shared by the two texts are from the earliest phase of their composition. Further, he claims that the compositions were extensively influenced by “both oral and written modes of composition, revision, and transmission.”
Ezra because it contains more Genesis 1-3 interpretation than 2 Baruch. When appropriate, I will reference 2 Baruch.

5.2 Adam, Humanity, and the “Evil Heart”: The Cause of Human Sinfulness

The anthropology presented in 4 Ezra is primarily rooted in the portrayal of Adam in Genesis 1-3. Both Ezra and Uriel turn to the figure of Adam to describe human sinfulness. They both argue human sinfulness is due to the “evil heart” (cor malignum). In the composition, the ultimate source of human sinfulness is reasonably understood to be God. (For a discussion of the cor malignum in relation to the Torah, see section 5.6).

5.2.1 The “Evil Heart” According to Ezra

Ezra blames human sinfulness on the “evil heart.”22 This is evident in the context of Ezra’s retelling of the history of Israel from Adam to the Exile (3:4-36). In 3:7, Ezra explains that Adam transgressed one of the commandments given to him by God.23 In 3:21-22, Ezra goes on to indicate what caused his rebellion: “For the first Adam, burdened with an evil heart, transgressed and was overcome, as were also all who were descended from him. Thus the disease became permanent.”24 Ezra continues in v. 26 by stating that Adam’s descendants did just as he did because “they also had the evil heart,” not because Adam sinned. This indicates

---

22 Cf. Sir 1:40 (Eng. 30): “quoniam accessisti maligne ad Dominum et cor tuum plenum est dolo et fallacia.” (“because you did not come in the fear of the Lord, and your heart was full of deceit.”)

23 The “one commandment” is argued by Jacob Jervell, Imago Dei: Gen 1,26 f. im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen (FRLANT, 58; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), 43, to refer to the Torah or righteousness. This notion is also found in Uriel’s parallel statement in 7:11, which claims that Adam transgressed God’s “statutes” (see section 5.4 for further discussion). See also Stone, Fourth Ezra, 69.

24 Ezra’s emphasis on the failure of humanity to do what is needed to be saved is different than the traditional Deuteronomic understanding of salvation history. See, for example, Pieter G. R. de Villiers, “Understanding the Way of God: Form, Function, and Message of the Historical Review in 4 Ezra 3:4-27,” in SBLSP 20 (ed. K. H. Richards; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981), 357-78.
that Adam has a sort of biological affinity with the rest of humankind, which also has the “evil heart.” According to Ezra, humans sin because of their “evil heart.” Ezra does not claim that Adam is the cause of human sinfulness. Adam is here not understood as the first sinner in a causal chain. Instead, he conveys Adam as the paradigmatic sinner who was the first to succumb to the evil heart (see section 5.4; cf. Sir 15:14-17). Ezra does not contend Adam’s sin as causative. Rather, the relationship between the sin of Adam and the sin of humanity is of correspondence. Adam and all people are created with the same physiology, which includes the evil heart. As discussed below, at times 4 Ezra blames the human condition on Adam not simply because of his evil heart, but also his actions in the garden.

5.2.1.1 Ezra’s “Evil Heart” and Rabbinic tradition. Ezra’s description of the “evil heart” finds its strongest parallel in the rabbinic concept of יהי רע. The term “evil heart” is likely a translation of the phrase יהי רע. (This trope is also discussed in section 2.2.3.1.1.) There is no consistent translation of this term into Greek, and in rabbinic texts יהי רע is used interchangeably with טובב. In rabbinic literature, there are two primary understandings of the

25 Levison, Portraits of Adam, 116.

26 Frank C. Porter, “The Yecher Hara: A Study in the Jewish Doctrine of Sin,” in Biblical and Semitic Studies: Critical and Historical Studies by the Members and Biblical Faculty of Yale University (New York: Scribner’s Sons, 1901), 93-156. For a survey of the views on this subject in the rabbinic tradition, see A. P. Hayman, “Rabbinic Judaism and the Problem of Evil,” SJT 29 (1976): 461-76; Ephraim E. Urbach, The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs (2 vols.; Cambridge: Harvard University, 1987), 1.472; George F. Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era (3 vols.; Cambridge: Harvard University, 1962), 1:453, 480. See also b. Ber. 16a. On God’s “regret” for having created the evil inclination, see b. Sukkah 52b; Gen. Rab. 26:4; Urbach, Sages, 480. In b. Sanh. 91b, there is a discussion between “Antoninus” and a rabbit that addresses the question of when the evil inclination begins to rule of an individual. The two possibilities that are discussed are from the moment of conception or from the moment of birth. See also Gen. Rab. 9:7. John J. Collins, “Wisdom, Apocalypticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism (JSJSup 54; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 369-85, explains that 4 Ezra does not go so far as to say that God created the evil heart, but notes that at least one rabbinic tradition places the blame directly on God.

27 Hogan, Theologies in Conflict, 114.

28 Porter, “The Yecher Hara,” 110-11; Harnisch, Verhängnis und Verheissung der Geschichte, 48-50, attempts to distinguish between the “evil root” (3:22) or “evil seed” (4:30), which he identifies with the evil inclination. This
1) the גור האופך is a foreign evil entity that enters a person like a demon and combats the desire to do what is right (e.g., b. B. Bat. 16a); and 2) the גור האופך is an inherent natural element of the human being, and is understood as a propensity towards sin (Sifre Deut. 45; b. Ber. 16b).

The latter view is clearly asserted by Ezra.

5.2.2 The “Evil Heart” According to Uriel

The angel Uriel understands Adam’s sinfulness in the same way as Ezra. Uriel confirms that humanity has the “evil heart” in his opening remarks, proclaiming in 4:4 that “the heart is evil.” Uriel focuses much of his attention on eschatological matters. Within this context, in 4:28-32, for example, the angel compares the judgment to a harvest and suggests that the origin of evil is associated with the creation of man: “For a grain of evil seed was sown in Adam’s heart from the beginning, and how much ungodliness it has produced until now—and will produce until the time of threshing comes!” (v. 30; cf. 8:6; 2 Bar. 32:1-2; Matt 13:30, 39). Because humanity has been created with the same evil seed as Adam, as it produced fruit in the first man, it also produces fruit in his descendants as well. Thus, like Ezra, Uriel contends that humanity is sinful because all were created like Adam—with an evil heart.

5.2.3 The Origin of the “Evil Heart” According to 4 Ezra

5.2.3.1 The origin of the “Evil Heart” according to Ezra. Michael E. Stone correctly comments that Ezra “carefully avoids directly attributing the creation of the evil inclination to God.” The rabbis, in contrast, explicitly state that the origin of the גור האופך is connected to the

---

*distinction is contrary to the rabbinic understanding, however, and conflicts with Ezra’s belief that the “evil heart” is universal (3:26).*

*The precise meaning of the evil seed’s transmission to Adam’s descendants is ambiguous (see Sir 15:14-15).*

*Stone, Fourth Ezra, 63.*
creation of humanity by God. For example, Sifre Deut. 45 directly places responsibility for the evil inclination on God himself: “My children I have created for you the זרע הוהי.” Likely composed around the same time as 4 Ezra, in the Apocalypse of Abraham, Abraham asks God, “O Eternal, Mighty One! Wherefore hast Thou willed to effect that evil should be desired in the hearts of men, since Thou indeed art angered over that which was willed by Thee, at him who is doing what is unprofitable in Thy counsel?” (23:14). In this verse, God is blamed for the evil heart and human sinfulness. In 4 Ezra, while Ezra does not explicitly claim זרע הוהי came directly from God, a divine origin can be implied. The זרע הוהי is present in Adam before his transgression. This is evident in Ezra’s retelling of the creation and first sin of Adam. In 3:4-5, Ezra stresses that God created Adam “without help.” Elsewhere, Ezra’s appeals for mercy are based on the idea that human beings are God’s own handiwork (7:134, 8:7-14, 44-45). Adam’s transgression of God’s “one commandment” resulted in death for all his descendants—“nations and tribes, peoples and clans without number” (3:7). In 3:21, Ezra explains the correspondence of the condition of humanity with that of Adam’s. Humanity is in the same situation because we have all descended from the first man (see section 5.4 for a discussion concerning Adam as the paradigmatic sinner). Ezra’s position is echoed (and expanded) in 2 Bar. 54:14 and 19: “For, although Adam sinned first and has brought death upon all who were not in his own time, yet each of them who has been born from him has prepared for himself the coming torment. . . .

Adam is, therefore, not the cause [of sin], except only for himself, but each of us has become our

32 Stone, Fourth Ezra, 63.
33 Ezra does not give any indication that the “evil heart” originates from an outside source (e.g., Satan, demons, angels).
34 Levison, Portraits of Adam, 114-15.
own Adam.” Baruch, in 48:42, also appears to share the same position as Ezra: “O Adam, what did you do to all who were born after you?” He, however, goes on to identify what he is referring to here in the next verse. In 48:43, Baruch states that the consequence of Adam’s action experienced by “all who were born after” the first man is “corruption” (48:43), not inherent sinfulness. This is the same notion expressed by Ezra. Both compositions contend that the consequence of Adam’s sin is human mortality. Ezra, however, is more direct concerning who is responsible for the evil heart 3:20: “Yet you did not take away their evil heart from them, so that your law might produce fruit in them.” Thus, Ezra suggests that God not only created humanity with the evil heart, but he also had the power to take it away but did not do so.

(Concerning the Torah as a remedy to the evil heart, see section 5.6.1.) This further suggests that according to Ezra God is to blame for the evil heart, which he gave to all humans.

5.2.3.1.1 Who’s really to blame?: other possible origins of human sinfulness in 4 Ezra. Although Ezra places the blame for the evil heart on God, even if only implicitly, on separate occasions his comments leave room to speculate if he believed human sinfulness originated elsewhere. In 7:118, Ezra seems to shift his position and place the blame not on God, but on Adam: “O Adam, what have you done? For though it was you who sinned, the fall was not yours alone, but ours also who are your descendants.” It is possible to read the phrase “the fall” (casus) as only referring to physical mortality, as in 3:7 and 21. The context of this verse, however, indicates that it is more likely alluding to Adam’s expulsion from the garden of Eden and the miserable existence that follows, rather than blame for being sinful (see section 5.3.1 for further discussion of 7:118.)

Ezra further suggests there may be another source of human sinfulness. In 7:116, Ezra explains: “I answered and said, ‘This is my first and last comment: it would have been better if
the earth had not produced Adam, or else, when it had produced him, had restrained him from sinning.” Ezra personifies the earth as the mother of humanity throughout the composition (e.g., 4:40-43; 5:48-50; 7:62). In this verse, he goes so far as to say that the earth could have restrained Adam from sinning. But rather than actually blame the earth for human sinfulness, Ezra is likely blaming the earth in order to avoid directly implicating God (cf. 7:62). To read 7:116 as claiming that the earth could have chosen not to produce Adam would question God’s sovereignty and role in creation. Further, this is inconsistent with other comments Ezra makes in the composition. For example, in his retelling of the creation narrative, Ezra emphasizes that God created Adam “without help” (3:4-5). Ezra further states that human beings “are a work of [God’s] hands” and “have been formed by [God’s] hands” (cf. 7:134). Thus, it is unlikely that he has abandoned the notion that God is responsible for burdening humanity with an evil heart (3:21). Ezra’s statement in 7:116 that the earth could have somehow prevented Adam from sinning should then not be taken literally.

5.2.3.2 The origin of the “Evil Heart” according to Uriel. Similar to Ezra, Uriel does not explicitly say that God sowed the evil seed (4:30), but there is no indication that it was anyone else. Further, like Ezra, Uriel claims that God alone is responsible for all of creation (6:6). Uriel contends that the “grain of evil seed” is the cause of all the “ungodliness” in the world. The angel further claims that “the evil thought . . . was formed with them” (7:92). He does not place the universality of sin or the proclivity to sin explicitly on God, but this is reasonably understood as implied.

35 For an extended discussion on the use of the idea of Mother Earth in 4 Ezra, see Karina Martin Hogan, “Mother Earth as a Conceptual Metaphor in 4 Ezra,” CBQ 73 (2011): 72-91.

36 Stone, Fourth Ezra, 258.

37 Levison, Portraits of Adam, 114-15.
5.2.3.3 The origin of the “Evil Heart” in Early Judaism. While both Ezra and Uriel implicitly blame God for human sinfulness, other Second Temple Jewish authors were quick to place the blame for humanity’s propensity to do evil—ץֶרֶד הָרוּחַ—on anything but God. 1QH 15:6-7, for example, associates evil with an outside demonic source: “For Belial (is present) when their destructive inclination (ץֶרֶד הָרוּחַ) manifests itself.” In the non-canonical psalm, the “Plea for Deliverance,” a speaker appeals to God to protect him from the external evil sources that cause him to sin: “Let not Satan rule over me, nor an evil spirit, let neither pain nor evil inclination (ץֶרֶד רָע) take possession of my bones” (11Q5 19:15-16). Both of these authors understand the “evil inclination” as a supernatural evil that influences humanity to sin.38

Rather than attribute the evil inclination to God, as Ezra does, Philo assigns the blame for human sinfulness on the angels. Philo, unlike Ezra, interprets Gen 1:26 as indicating the angels helped God in the process of creating humanity, which accounts for the ability of humanity to sin (cf. Opif. 72-76, Conf. 171-180, Fug. 65-70; see section 4.2.2.2.1.5). In Mut. 29-34, for example, Philo explains:

Indeed, he (God) did not make the soul of the wicked man, for wickedness is hateful to God. And the soul, which is between good and bad, he did not make by himself. . . . It is said in the scriptures, “Let us make man in our own image” (Gen 1:26), that if it receives a bad impression it shows itself to be the work of others, but if it receives a good impression it shows itself to be the work of him who is the Creator only of what is beautiful and good.

Philo’s interpretation of Gen 1:26 in this passage exonerates God from the notion that he was responsible for humanity’s moral shortcomings. Instead, Philo contends that it rests with

38 See, also, T. Ash. 1:8-9: “But if the mind is disposed towards evil, all of its deeds are wicked; driving out the good, it accepts the evil and is overmastered by Beliar, who, even when good is undertaken, presses the struggle so as to make the aim of his action into evil, since the devil’s storehouse is filled with the venom of the evil spirit.”
outside influences, such as the fleshly passions and the attributes that were given to humanity by
the angels. This is in stark contrast to *4 Ezra’s* contention that human sinfulness is directly from
God. Contrary to *4 Ezra*, numerous Second Temple Jewish authors went to great lengths to
explain that the origin of the נא והוה should not be situated with God.

5.3 The Consequences of Adam’s Sin in *4 Ezra*

While throughout the composition the inherent “evil heart” within humans is identified as what
causes them to sin and not Adam’s transgression, Adam is directly blamed for several
consequences that were triggered when he disobeyed God. Ezra and Uriel both provide their
understandings of how Adam’s sin affected the human condition. Ezra focuses on the effects of
Adam’s sin on the individual, while Uriel is more concerned with the way the world changed as
a result.

5.3.1 The Consequences of Adam’s Sin According to Ezra

Ezra’s understanding of the effects of Adam’s sin is evident in his interpretation of the portrayal
of the first man in Genesis 2-3. In *4 Ezra* 3, he recounts the creation of Adam (v. 5), his
placement in the garden (v. 6) and how because he, being “burdened with an evil heart,
transgressed” (v. 21) the “one commandment,” which led to God appointing “death for [Adam]
and his descendants” (v. 7, cf. 7:116-126). Ezra explicitly claims that human mortality is the
result of Adam’s sin.39 The “one commandment” that Ezra is referring to is the declaration of
God in Gen 2:17: “but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the
day that you eat of it you shall die.” The idea that the chief consequence of Adam’s sin is

39 Cf. *Jub.* 4:30: “And he lacked seventy years from one thousand years, for a thousand years are like one day in the
testimony of heaven and therefore it was written concerning the tree of knowledge, ‘In the day you eat from it you
will die.’ Therefore he did not complete the years of this day because he died in it.”
physical death has Gen 2:17 in view, but is primarily derived from God’s pronouncement in Gen 3:19: “By the sweat of your face you shall eat bread until you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; you are dust, and to dust you shall return” (cf. 3:3). In 4 Ezra 3, the association of sin and physical mortality is emphasized by the discussion of Adam’s sinful descendants (vv. 8-9). The author concludes this section: “And the same fate befell all of them: just as death came upon Adam, so the flood upon them” (v. 10). In this verse, Ezra stresses that the wickedness of humanity brought on the flood (i.e., death), which is the case in the Genesis narrative (6:5-7; cf. 2 Bar. 56:8-16). In v. 26, the descendants of Adam are said to have sinned because they, like Adam, were burdened with an evil heart, as discussed above. The author explains that the relationship between the sin of Adam and the sinfulness of humanity is not causal, as discussed above.

In 7:118, however, Ezra appears to shift his position and place the blame for human sinfulness, not on God, but on Adam: “O Adam, what have you done? For though it was you who sinned, the fall was not yours alone, but ours also who are your descendants.” The meaning of the term “the fall” is not immediately evident. It is possible that Ezra may be only referring to physical mortality. However, the context of this verse indicates that he is more likely referring to Adam’s expulsion from the garden of Eden and existence outside of paradise. In v. 117, Ezra asks, “For what good is it to all that they live in sorrow now and expect punishment after death?” The consequences of Adam’s sin are in view. This verse indicates that because of Adam’s sin, the present age is full of sorrows and that those who are wicked can expect punishment at the

---

40 Note that the biblical account of the flood associates an evil inclination with death: “The LORD saw that the wickedness of humankind was great in the earth, and that every inclination of the thoughts of their hearts was only evil continually” (Gen 6:4-5; italics are mine).
time of death (cf. *4 Ezra* 7:38, 49, 67, 72-76, 80, 84-89; 8:38, 59; 9:9, 12). In several verses immediately following his indictment of Adam in v. 116, Ezra contrasts the present reality with the benefits Adam enjoyed prior to sinning, which are promised to the righteous in the age to come (see section 5.6.2). Ezra is lamenting what Adam lost and would have implicitly been immediately available to his descendants—all humanity. Rather than life in the garden of Eden and all associated with it, Ezra grieves the fact that because Adam sinned humanity experiences difficult circumstances while on earth and for the many who are wicked, physical death is followed by no admittance to the eschatological paradise (v. 123), faces “blacker than darkness” (v. 125), suffering (v. 126), and ultimately the “death” of the soul (v. 119). Ezra indicts the first man for a difficult and toilsome existence that includes the likelihood of future torment, physical death, and death of the soul. Ezra is lamenting the loss of everything Adam enjoyed prior to sinning, to which humanity does not currently have access. Instead, humanity is now living in a world full of toil and difficulty. Thus, in this passage, Ezra is not blaming Adam for humanity possessing an evil heart. He is blaming the first man for the current state of the world and the lack of direct access to paradise. This passage indicates that humanity is not simply made in the same manner as Adam, but that they have been directly affected by the actions of Adam.

### 5.3.1.1 Death as a consequence of Adam’s sin in Second Temple Judaism.

The notion that a primary consequence of Adam’s sin is physical death is consistent with not only the biblical account but also several of *4 Ezra*’s contemporary Jewish authors. For example, the

---

41 *Bar. 15:6; 30:5; 44:12; 44:15; 51:6; 54:15; 54:21; 55:2; 59:2; 59:11; 85:9*. See also 59:10: “the mouth of hell, the standing place of vengeance, the place of faith, the region of hope.” In the *T. Jud. 25:3-6*, there is similar language: “eternity,” “fire,” “joy,” and “sorrow.” See Stone, *Features*, 77.

42 Other views attributed not death but a shortening of one’s life to Adam’s sin. See, e.g., *Jub. 4:30*: “And he lacked seventy years from one thousand years, for one thousand years are as one day in the testimony of the heavens and thus it was written concerning the tree of knowledge: ‘On the day that you eat from it you shall die.’ For this reason, he did not complete the years of this day; for he died during it.”
author of 2 Baruch writes that, “Adam sinned” then “death was decreed against those who should be born” (23:4). Similarly, in 54:15, the author of 2 Baruch states: “Adam first sinned and brought untimely death upon all.” Also, 2 En. 30:16: “For I have seen his (man’s) nature, but he has not seen his own nature, therefore [through] not seeing he will sin worse, and I said: ‘After sin [what is there] but death?’” Rabbinic tradition also includes the notion that the sin of Adam resulted in the punishment of physical mortality. For example, Sifre Deut. 339, composed circa 300 C.E., reads: “The ministering (or guardian) angels say to God, ‘Master of the Universe, why did Adam, the first man, die?’ God replies, ‘Because he disobeyed me.’ The angels then say to God, ‘But Moses has obeyed Your commands!’ God replies, ‘This is a decree that I have issued and which applies equally to all human beings.’” In 4 Ezra, Ezra’s position that physical death is a consequence of Adam’s sin is, however, contrary to the texts that I have addressed in the previous chapters of this study.43 Although Sir 25:24 is likely an allusion to Genesis 3, elsewhere the sage explains that death has always been a part of the human condition (17:1-2; 40:11; see section 3.2.1.1). As I discussed in Chapter Four of this study, both Philo (Opif. 134-35) and the Wisdom of Solomon (1:13; 2:23-24) also assume that the physical part of composite humanity—humankind consisting of body and soul—has always been mortal and the death that came into the world through the sin of Adam was death of the soul.44

43 This notion is consistent with Paul’s view. See, for example, Rom 5:12-14: “Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death came through sin, and so death spread to all because all have sinned--sin was indeed in the world before the law, but sin is not reckoned when there is no law. Yet death exercised dominion from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam, who is a type of the one who was to come.” 1 Cor 15:21-22: “For since death came through a human being, the resurrection of the dead has also come through a human being; for as all die in Adam, so all will be made alive in Christ.” cf. Exod. Rab. 32:1; Gen. Rab. 2; Lev. Rab. 27:4; b. ‘Abod. Zar. 5a; b. Shabb. 55b.

5.3.2 The Consequences of Adam’s Sin According to Uriel

Uriel blames Adam for the current state of the world. In 7:11, the angel recounts God’s reaction to the sin of Adam: “For I made the world for [Israel’s] sake, and when Adam transgressed my statutes, what had been made was judged” (cf. T. Mos. 1:12; 2 Bar. 14:19; 15:7; 21:24; Gen. Rab. 12:2). Due to Adam’s sin, the current age is “sorrowful,” full of “narrow paths,” “toilsome,” “evil,” “full of dangers and involved in great hardships” (et facti sunt introitus huius saeculi angusti et dolentes et laboriosi, paucae autem et mala et periculorum plenae et laborum magnorum fultae, 7:12). In 7:14, Uriel further proclaims that life outside of the garden of Eden includes numerous “difficult and futile experiences” (angusta et vana; cf. 7:18). This is consistent with the angel’s claim in 4:27: “this age is full of sadness and infirmities” (quoniam plenum maestitia est saeculum hoc et infirmitatibus). Uriel’s description of the human experience in the world is likely derived from Gen 3:17-19, which describes a painful and toilsome existence that ends with physical death (cf. Vita Adae et Evae 34; 2 Bar. 56:5; Rom 8:18-22). In the biblical account, such an existence is due to Adam’s sin and the subsequent expulsion from the garden. Uriel contends that Adam’s sin led to the miserable conditions of the present world that all humanity must experience.

---

45 This is likely a response to Ezra’s positive depiction of Adam as the primordial father of Israel in 6:54-59. Cf. 2 Bar. 4:2-3: “Do you think that this is the city of which I said: ‘On the palms of my hands I have carved you’? It is not this building that is in your midst now; it is that which will be revealed, with me, that was already prepared from the moment I decided to create Paradise.”

46 The word “narrow” (angusti) connotes brevity (of time) and oppressiveness. See Job 18:12; Zech 10:11; Isa 30.20; Jer 37:7. Cf. 2 Bar. 56:5-6: “And as thou didst previously see on the summit of the cloud black waters which descended previously on the earth, this is the transgression wherewith Adam the first man transgressed. 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.”

47 Stone, Fourth Ezra, 65.
Jonathan A. Moo has recently argued that 4 Ezra’s portrayal of the current world is more positive than scholars generally concede. Moo does this by calling into question the profound dualism and “apocalyptic eschatology” that is traditionally assigned to 4 Ezra. The composition, he argues, instead contains substantial elements of continuity between the present and future ages. Moo contends that there are still areas on the earth that remain untouched by Adam’s sin or humankind that can convey God’s sovereignty. Moo explains that, for example, the reference to the “field where no house had been built” (10:51) and the command to “eat only flowers” (9:24, cf. 12:51) are actually allusions to the garden of Eden. The field, he contends, is a foretaste of the eschatological rewards for the righteous and possibly suggests “that there is an earthly remnant of, or a pointer to, the Edenic paradise.” While the term “flowers” (flores) is associated with Eden elsewhere in the composition (cf. 6:2, 6:44), I believe the notion that the field could be the location of a portion of uncorrupted world goes too far. The flower imagery is not used elsewhere in the composition to explicitly describe the garden. Further, contending that some portions of the earth remain pristine, and even Edenic, does not appear to take into account the clear contrast made between the two ages in the composition. For example, the present age is described as “the place where evil has been sown” beginning with “the evil seed sown in Adam’s heart” (4:30) and must “pass away” or “the field where the good has been sown will not come”

48 Moo, Creation, Nature and Hope, 15-17, states that he agrees with the general positions of Christopher Rowland and Crispin Fletcher-Louis against “making eschatology definitive of apocalypticism” and with Klaus Koch’s objection to the term “dualism” as applied to the Enochic literature.

49 Moo, Creation, Nature and Hope, 152-53.

50 Ezra’s reflections on the place where he received the vision of the future Zion includes the comment: “I sat among the flowers and ate of the plants of the field, and the nourishment they afforded satisfied me” (9:26) is similar to the promise of access to the garden for the righteous in 8:52: “because it is for you that paradise is opened, the tree of life is planted, the age to come is prepared, plenty is provided, a city is built, rest is appointed, goodness is established and wisdom perfected beforehand.”

51 Moo, Creation, Nature and Hope, 146-48, 153.
There is no indication that portions of the world will be preserved in the future age, which implies that Uriel is claiming that all the earth is “evil” (4:30). Moo further asserts that the world is corrupted through contact with humanity, rather than the universality of Adam’s sin. However, this does not seem to be supported by the composition.\(^52\) The fact that the world was judged as a consequence of Adam’s sin is explicit: “when Adam transgressed my statutes, what had been made (the world) was judged” (7:11). The state of the world due to Adam’s sin is expanded upon in 7:12-18, for example, in which earth is situated as opposite life in the garden. Not only is humanity associated with evil, but the earth is as well (e.g., 7:12). This, I believe, also weakens Moo’s position that those who follow the commandments in “a more distant region, where humankind had never lived” (13:41) is a reference to a location where the original goodness of creation has not been lost.\(^53\) The commandments are not only obeyed by these people in a distant land. Both Ezra and Uriel contend that there are some among the Israelites in Palestine that are able to follow the commandments (see section 5.5). Further, those who followed the Torah in a distant land must return to the borders of Israel in order to be saved during “the last times” (13:46-50).

Although Uriel is far more interested in emphasizing the way Adam’s sin changed the state of the world, the angel also agrees with Ezra’s claim that the first sin resulted in physical mortality for all humanity. In 7:96, Uriel first reiterates that outside of Eden there is “toil,” then continues by contrasting the future hope of immortality for the righteous who return to the garden with the present corruptible age. The angel further states that human existence in the evil age is “corruptible” and “mortal” (14:13-14). Thus, while Ezra emphasizes Adam’s


responsibility for physical death, Uriel contends that Adam’s sin is responsible for both human mortality and the difficulties of the present age.

5.3.2.1 The notion of “death” in 4 Ezra. The term “death” (mortem) is used by both Ezra and Uriel throughout the composition. However, the word is not always used in the same manner, and it is not always immediately evident how the word is used in each situation. It is helpful to have a better understanding of the term so that we will be aware of how the author may be using it. The author employs the term death in two ways: 1) physical death (cf. 6:26; 14:9); and 2) eternal death (i.e., death of the soul). In chapter 3, Ezra states that death is the primary result of Adam’s sin (v. 7). Uriel describes this death as when “the spirit leaves the body” (7:78; cf. v. 100). This naturally occurs because the body is “corruptible” and “mortal” (14:13-14; cf. 4:11; 7:15; 8:13, 31, 53-54).

In response to Ezra’s lament over the human condition in the present age, Uriel asks, “Now therefore why are you disturbed, seeing that you are to perish? Why are you moved, seeing that you are mortal?” (7:15).

Although, as discussed above, physical death is understood as a consequence of Adam’s sin by both Ezra and Uriel (cf. 3:5-26), Stone has commented that the composition does not include a negative assessment of the body. However, I contend that Uriel does, in fact, regard the body in a negative manner. Although, his unfavorable perception of the body is not as extreme as Philo’s. The angel’s understanding of the body is primarily associated with the present age. The temporary nature of the body is connected to the sin of Adam and the present

54 Cf. 8:31, in which the terms “mortal” and “corruptible” appear to be interchangeable. See 2 Bar. 42:7, where “corruption” is opposite the notion of “life.” Healing is also a feature of the eschatological state of the righteous in 2 Bar. 73:2: “And then healing shall descend in dew; disease shall withdraw; anxiety and anguish and lamentation pass from amongst men; and gladness proceed through the whole earth.”

55 Stone, Fourth Ezra, 63.

56 E.g., Migr. 1.9; Leg. 1.108; Spec. 1.329. see section 4.2.2.1.2.
age, which will pass away in order for the future paradisiac age to come (cf. 3:5-26; see section 5.6.2). Uriel questions the ability of the mind of humans on earth to understand God: “How then can your mind comprehend the way of the Most High? And how can one who is already worn out by the corrupt world understand incorruption?” (4:11; cf. v. 21). Elsewhere, God exhorts Ezra to do away with the things that are mortal and associated with the body: “and put away from you mortal thoughts; cast away from you the burdens of humankind, and divest yourself now of your weak nature” (14:14). The corruptible, mortal aspect of humanity is associated with lack of understanding, weakness and being burdened (cf. 7:72). In 7:88, the angel calls the body a “mortal vessel” that the soul leaves upon death. The description of physical existence in the present age indicates that the designation “mortal vessel” is similar to what is found in other Second Temple Jewish literature. For example, in 33:10, Ben Sira states: “All people are of vessels of clay (דאִים צָלָה [E]), for from earth humankind was formed” (cf. 27:5; Gen 2:7). In the Hodayot, the speaker refers to himself as a “broken vessel” (דאִים צָלָה; 1QH 12:10). The Wisdom of Solomon states: “for a perishable body weighs down the soul, and this earthy tent burdens the thoughtful mind” (9:15). While 4 Ezra does not describe a clear dichotomy between physical

---

57 Cf. Diogenes Laertius 1.1.34: “If Thales cannot see the things at his feet, does he expect to learn the things in the heavens?” Also, Diogenes Laertius 6.2.28: “And [Diogenes] would wonder . . . that the mathematicians should gaze at the sun and the moon, but overlook matters close at hand.” Somn. 1.54: “And why, while walking upon the earth, do you soar above the clouds? And why, while rooted in the solid ground, do you say that you are able to reach what is in the sky?” b. Sanh. 39a: “You know not what is in your mouth, and yet wouldst thou know what is in heaven?” (cf. Gen. Rab. 25). John 3:12: “If I have told you about earthly things and you do not believe, how can you believe if I tell you about heavenly things?”

58 The term “vessel” is used in the following versions: Latin, Syriac, Georgian. The term “body” is used in the following versions: Ethiopic, Arabic 1, Arabic 2, Armenian. See Stone, Fourth Ezra, 236.

59 Stone, Fourth Ezra, 243. See David Winston, The Wisdom of Solomon (AB 43; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), 207. Cf. Phaed. 81C; Resp. 611C; Is. Os. See also 2 Cor 5:1: “For we know that if the earthly tent we live in is destroyed, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.”

60 Cf. Sir 33:13: “Like clay in the hands of a potter (_pot), to be molded according to his pleasure, so are people in the hands of their maker” (cf. 11:14).
body and the spirit, the physical aspects of this age, including the mortal body, are understood in a negative manner when compared to the things to come.

The second primary use of the term death refers to death of the soul. In 7:48, Ezra states that the “evil heart. . . has alienated us from God, brought us into corruption and the ways of death, and has shown us the paths of perdition and removed us far from life.” The reference to corruption recalls the result of Adam’s sin—physical death, which all people experience. Ezra continues explaining that those who follow the evil heart will also experience suffering after death and ultimately death of the soul. The notion of death of the soul in 7:48 is also mentioned in 7:92: “The first order, because they have striven with great effort to overcome the evil thought that was formed with them, so that it might not lead them astray from life into death.” Also, similarly in 8:31, “For we and our ancestors have passed our lives in ways that bring death; but it is because of us sinners that you are called merciful.” Death and destruction are further placed in opposition to salvation and a blissful eternal life.61 For example, Ezra asks, “For what good is it to us, if an immortal time has been promised to us, but we have done deeds that bring death?” (7:119; cf. 8:38-39). Uriel also mentions the death of the soul in 7:131, where he discusses its destruction in contrast to eternal life: “Therefore there shall not be grief at their destruction, so much as joy over those to whom salvation is assured.” Thus, death is understood in two very different ways in the composition—physical death and death of the soul.

The two conceptions of death that are described in 4 Ezra are similar to those found in the Wisdom of Solomon (see section 4.2.2.1.4.2). Like 4 Ezra, the Wisdom of Solomon claims

---

61 In 7:137-38, Ezra uses the term life to indicate salvation and in 8:6 mortal life is contrasted with eternal life. See also the use of “life” in 7:21, 66, 82, 92, 129; 8:6; 9:13; 14:30, 35. Cf. LXX Ezek 33:12 (“saved”) and Hebrew (“live”). See also, e.g., Pss. Sol. 14:3; 15:13; 1 En. 96:6. Nils Messel, Die Einheitlichkeit der jüdischen Eschatologie (BZAW 30; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1915), 120-29, contends that the terms “live” and “life” refer to a general “reward” rather than specifically “eternal life.”
that God did not make death (1:13), implying God originally created humankind to have eternal life. Death was not an original feature of the created order, but is attributed to the devil’s pollution of this system (2:23-24). In Wis 1:16-2:20, the wicked are depicted as asserting physical death is the final end of the human being. The author contends that the wicked are correct concerning those who live wickedly. According to Pseudo-Solomon, all people can expect the death of the body, but the wicked, as is also expressed in 4 Ezra, will also experience the death of the soul. Further, similar to the Wisdom of Solomon, in 4 Ezra, both understandings of death are associated with the biblical portrayal of Adam in Genesis 2-3.

5.3.2.2 Adam, the paradigmatic sinner, and death. In 4 Ezra, both Ezra and Uriel portray Adam as the paradigmatic sinner. Uriel does this most clearly in chapters 4 and 7. In 4:26-32, Uriel associates Adam with two topics: 1) the evil seed (or heart); and 2) the passing away of the evil present age (4:27-32; see section 5.2.1.1).\(^62\) By doing this, those who are also associated with Adam will join in his fate. Aligning Adam with sinners and the miserable condition of the present age, Ezra implicitly excludes the first man from enjoying the future rewards because neither the present age nor sinners will exist in the age to come. Thus, those who follow his example of transgressing God’s law will likewise lose any chance to enjoy the future blessings promised to the righteous.

Uriel also portrays Adam as the paradigmatic sinner in chapter 7. In 7:11, the angel claims that, “Adam transgressed [God’s] statutes.” Different than Uriel’s, Ezra’s paraphrase of Gen 2:16-17 in chapter 3 recalls that Adam was given only “one commandment” by God (v. 7)—not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Uriel, however, generalizes the transgression of the prohibition stating that Adam disobeyed God’s statutes. The term “statutes”

\(^62\) Levison, Portraits of Adam, 118.
in the plural usually refers to the Torah or divine commandments in general, not the single commandment given to Adam not to eat of the tree.\textsuperscript{63} It is possible that 7:21 is in view, in which Uriel states: “For the Lord strictly commanded those who came into the world, when they came, what they should do to live, and what they should observe to avoid punishment.” In 7:12-13, Uriel describes the consequences of Adam’s transgression, which include separation from Eden and lack of access to the tree of life. Thus, as discussed above, the “living” who will “receive those things that have been reserved for them” (7:14) are not identified with the Adam who sinned in Genesis 2-3. Instead, Adam is associated with those who transgress God’s laws and are denied access to paradise and immortality of the tree of life (cf. 4:30).

The portrayal of Adam as the paradigmatic sinner in 4 Ezra is similar to what is found in 2 Baruch. This is especially evident in 17:4-18:2. In this passage, Moses is said to have “brought the law to the seed of Jacob, and lighted a lamp for the nation of Israel” (17:4). Baruch responds and claims that Moses followed the Torah—took “from the light” (18:1). Baruch continues and states that “there are but few that have imitated him” (v. 1). Instead, he contends, “many” imitated Adam—they followed “the darkness of Adam and have not rejoiced in the light of the lamp (the Torah)” (v. 2). This indicates that Adam is also understood as the paradigm of sinners in 2 Baruch, similar to 4 Ezra. Further, these verses reflect the discussion of the few being saved while many are condemned that is also found in 4 Ezra (7:48).\textsuperscript{64}

\textsuperscript{63} Stone, Fourth Ezra, 194. Jervell, Imago Dei, 43, has demonstrated that a number of texts contend that the prohibition given to Adam was, “nicht als ein einzelnes Verbot sondern als das mosaische Gesetz in nuce, als Verordnungen, die ein Leben in Heiligkeit und Gerechtigkeit fordern.”

\textsuperscript{64} Collins, “Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 30-41, discusses how ca. 2nd cent. B.C.E. Jews often turned to the Enochic myth of the watchers to understand the origin of evil. This then gave way to rooting the origin of evil in the biblical portrayals of Adam. This is the situation found in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. See also, idem, “The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Congress Volume, Paris, 1994 (ed. J. Emerton; VTSup 61; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 25-38; Archie T. Wright, The Origin of Evil Spirits: The Reception of Genesis 6:1-4 in Early Jewish Literature (WUNT 2/198; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 127-37.
5.4 Adam in 4 Ezra and 4QInstruction

4 Ezra and 4QInstruction portray the figure of Adam in different ways. In 4QInstruction, Adam is primarily a positive figure associated most explicitly with the elect, whereas in 4 Ezra, he is connected with the sinfulness of humankind in general. The claim in 4 Ezra that Adam was created with the propensity to do evil is in contrast to 4QInstruction, in which the author suggests Adam was fashioned with a proclivity to do good (see section 2.4.2.2). The ⅉⅧⅧⅧ is allotted a life with the angels, but he has to strive to achieve it; he could go the wrong way at any point in his life. The positive account of Adam and the addressee’s affinity with him in 4QInstruction is clearly in contrast to the author of 4 Ezra’s claim that Adam was created “with an evil heart” (3:21). 4QInstruction does, however, include a reference to the “evil inclination.” In the composition, the author exhorts the addressee: “Do not let the thought of an evil inclination (מקשהא ⅉⅧⅧⅧ) mislead you …” (4Q417 1 ii 12; cf. 4Q416 1; see section 3.3.1.1). The composition of 4Q417 1 ii 12 signifies a propensity towards behavior that should be avoided. The composition indicates that the ⅉⅧⅧⅧ is an impulse that even the elect must fight. In this way, it is similar to the understanding of the ⅉⅧⅧⅧ in 4 Ezra as something that all humanity is encouraged to overcome. Given the text’s description of the addressee’s elect status, 4QInstruction is more optimistic about the being able to overcome the ⅉⅧⅧⅧ than 4 Ezra is about humanity being able to conquer the cor malignum.

4 Ezra portrays Adam as sinful, the first human to succumb to the evil heart (3:21) and as the paradigm of the wicked. The wicked are placed in opposition to the righteous and experience the death of the soul rather than a blissful afterlife. In the Qumran text, there is no reference to

---

the prohibition in the garden or the first sin, and the elect are encouraged to imitate metaphorically Adam faithfully cultivating the garden (4Q423 1; see section 2.5). Further, the elect and the ʧʥʸ ʭʲ are said to have been created in the same manner as the Adam of Gen 1:26-27. Because of this, both groups have the prospect of eternal life and are distinguished from those who were not created in this way (4Q418 81 1-2).

5.4.1 The Non-Elect of 4QInstruction, the Wicked of 4 Ezra, and the Post-Mortem Experience

Both 4 Ezra and 4QInstruction describe the fate of those who do not enjoy a blissful afterlife. In 4 Ezra, Uriel claims that after physical death this group will experience “fires and torments” (7:38; cf. v. 48). The angel calls the future abode awaiting this group “the furnace of hell” and “the pit of torment” (v. 36). The term “pit” is used consistently throughout the Hebrew Bible to refer to Sheol (see, e.g., Ezek 31:16; Ps 28:1). In 4 Ezra, “the pit of torment” indicates that Sheol, different than the biblical uses, is transformed into a location where the wicked are punished. In 4QInstruction, a “pit” is similarly promised to a portion of humanity after death. While 4QInstruction does not explicitly state that the “pit” is a place of eternal torment, as is the case in 4 Ezra, this term can denote destruction or perdition (see section 2.5.4).66

To describe the group of people who will not enjoy a blissful afterlife, both 4 Ezra and 4QInstruction appeal to the Adam of Gen 2:7. However, each author does so in a different way.

---

4 Ezra explains that this group consists of those who succumb to the evil heart as Adam did. Uriel, in 7:99, warns that, “those who do not give heed [to his exhortation to follow the Torah] shall suffer” what the angel calls “the ways of torment.” 4 Ezra teaches that the wicked will suffer torments after physical death and ultimately be destroyed (7:134, 8:7-14, 44-45, 60; cf. Wis 5:9-14). 4QInstruction alludes indirectly to the Adam of Genesis 2 to depict those who will not enjoy eternal life. The creation of Adam in Gen 2:7 is referenced to stress the mortality of the רַחַמָּ֣ת—the non-elect—who are portrayed opposite the רַחַמָּ֣ת (see section 2.4.2.2). The author of 4QInstruction never states that the non-elect are wicked. Instead, they are described as not like the angels and lacking supernatural revelation, which is necessary to obtain eternal life—not like the רַחַמָּ֣ת. In 4QInstruction, the non-elect (and those elect that choose to not obey what is in 4QInstruction)—“the foolish heart”—are promised Sheol and the “eternal pit,” similar to the wicked in 4 Ezra (שֶׁהָטַּלָּח, 4Q418 69 ii 6; cf. 4Q418 126 ii 7; 4Q286 7 ii 5; 4Q287 6 4; 1QS 4:6-14).67 While both 4 Ezra and 4QInstruction appeal to the Adam of Gen 2:7 to describe the group of humanity that will not enjoy a blissful eternity, 4 Ezra does so in a much more extensive and negative manner.

5.5 Two Groups of Humanity: Israel and the Nations, the Righteous and the Wicked

Ezra and Uriel divide humanity into two groups—those whom God favors and those whom he rejects.68 In this section, I will demonstrate that these two groups of humanity are depicted in

---

67 John Strugnell and Daniel J. Harrington, Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2. 4QInstruction (Mûsûr Lû Mêbîn): 4Q415ff. With a re-edition of 1Q26 (DJD 34; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 386, propose: “[You will be saved from] the eternal pit.” Cf. 1QH 11:20: “I thank you, Lord, that you have redeemed my life from the pit” (cf. 1QS 11:13).

68 This issue has correctly been understood by scholars as a debate between universalism and particularism. However, this approach has led to significant confusion due to the fluidity of the meaning of the terms used in the discussion in the text. Thompson, Responsibility for Evil, 158-60, concludes that Ezra is a universalist because he...
two different ways within the composition. Ezra regularly uses language of election to describe the contrasting groups, while Uriel tends to depict the division of humanity in terms of eschatological judgment based on obedience to the Torah. However, both appeal to the figure of Adam in Genesis 1-3 to argue their respective positions. Ezra argues that Israel’s inheritance includes salvation as well as the Adamic grant of dominion over the earth. Uriel, in contrast, contends that simply being apart of the elect does not guarantee salvation. It is necessary to follow the Torah. To explain that all of Israel has been created with the ability to follow the law, the angel appeals to Adam’s situation in Eden. He explains that Adam was created with the ability to choose and Israel likewise is able to choose whether or not to obey the Torah. Both Ezra and Uriel contend that there is no potential for salvation among the Gentiles, and Uriel further clarifies that only a small portion of faithful Israelites will receive eternal rewards. Both Ezra and Uriel turn to the portrayal of Adam in Genesis 1-3 to make anthropological statements concerning who is considered a part of the group of humanity favored by God.

5.5.1 Humanity According to Ezra

Ezra emphasizes that Israel is God’s chosen people among the nations. He describes the election of one man, Abraham, out of the “many nations” (3:12), with whom God made an “everlasting covenant” (v. 15). Ezra acknowledges that Israel is sinful, “doing just as Adam and all his descendants had done, for they also had the evil heart” (v. 26). However, he asks, “What tribes have so believed the covenants as these tribes of Jacob?” (v. 32). Ezra further states that Israel has also kept the commandments better than the other “inhabitants of the world” (vv. 34-35). He acknowledges to God in v. 36, “you may indeed find individuals who have kept your

hopes for the salvation of man while Uriel is a particularist because of his insistence on the salvation of a few. I, in contrast, contend the opposite. I argue that Ezra is more of a particularist and Uriel is more of a universalist.
commandments, but nations you will not find.” Ezra reminds God that “to this people (Israel), whom you have loved, you have given the law” (5:27). The Torah is given to Israel because God loves them, which reflects their chosenness. Ezra further claims that Israel is the only nation that has “believed [God’s] covenants” (5:29). In contrast, “the many” are “those who opposed your promises,” implying that all the other nations are God’s enemies. Thus, although Israel may have “acted wickedly” (8:35), Ezra entreats God to be “merciful” (v. 32) to his chosen people. Ezra calls out to God: “spare your people and have mercy on your inheritance, for you have mercy on your own creation” (v. 45).69

To further strengthen his argument that Israel has a special relationship with God, Ezra makes a striking statement concerning Adam.70 In 6:54, Ezra concludes his paraphrase of Genesis 1 by claiming from Adam “we have all come, the people whom you have chosen.” In the following verse he states “you have said that it was for us that you created the world” (v. 55).71 The notion that creation was for the sake of humankind may be inferred from Gen 1:26-28, which includes the grant of dominion given to Adam. However, Jacob Jervell rightly observes that to say creation was made for the sake Israel then “Adam was therefore an Israelite.”72 To support his interpretation of Genesis 1 in 4 Ezra 6:54, Ezra paraphrases Isa 40:15 and 17: “As for the other nations that have descended from Adam, you have said that they are

69 Levison, Portraits of Adam, 114-15, notes that Ezra’s appeals for mercy are based on the idea that humans are God’s own handiwork (7:134, 8:7-14, 44-45).

70 Concerning ethnocentrism, Longenecker, Eschatology and the Covenant, 34, proposes the term “ethnocentric covenantalism” in place of Sanders’ “covenantal nomism” for the typical outlook of Second Temple Judaism.

71 According to Stone, Fourth Ezra, 188, the position that the world was created for the sake of Israel is similar to what is found in the first century C.E. composition, T. Mos. 1:12: “He created the world on behalf of his people.”

72 Jervell, Imago Dei, 34. Levison, Portraits of Adam, 120, disagrees with this contention. This was not an unprecedented view of Adam, however. Levison, Portraits of Adam, 45, 96, agrees with Jervell that Ben Sira “is claiming the first human for Israel” in 49:16, and concludes that in Jubilees, Adam is portrayed as “the first of the virtuous Patriarchs of Israel.”
nothing, and that they are like spittle, and you have compared their abundance to a drop from a
bucket” (6:56). Ezra continues: “But we your people, whom you have called your firstborn,
only begotten, zealous for you, and most dear, have been given into their hands” (v. 58). Ezra
holds an ethnocentric perspective, seeing Israel, as the elect people of God, separate from the
other nations, entrusted with the Torah and the covenants (cf. 2 Bar. 4:3-4). Ezra’s interpretation
of Genesis 1-3 appears to write the election of Israel into Genesis’ account of the creation of the
world and humanity. Ezra integrates the Abrahamic covenant recounted in Gen 12:1-3 with the
Genesis 1-3 narrative. This is similar to the way Ben Sira establishes the giving of the Torah to
Israel in creation (see section 3.2.1).

Although Ezra appeals to God to have mercy on his chosen people to help overcome the
evil heart, he concedes that humanity is also given free choice. In chapter 7, Ezra sympathizes
with Adam and extends the first man’s predicament described in 3:20-22 to all humanity: “For
an evil heart has grown up in us, which has alienated us from God, and has brought us into
corruption and the ways of death, and has shown us the paths of perdition and removed us far
from life—and that not merely for a few but for almost all who have been created” (7:48; cf. Eph
4:28; see section 5.2.1). Similarly, in 10:10, Ezra proclaims that “from the beginning . . . almost
all go to perdition . . . and come to doom.” Ezra explains that there is hope: “If you, then, will
rule over your minds and discipline your hearts, you shall be kept alive, and after death you shall
obtain mercy” (14:34). These statements indicate that not all humanity is doomed to fall victim

73 “Like spittle” reflects the LXX version of Isa 40:15, or possibly, as Stone, Fourth Ezra, 189, notes, an alternate
Hebrew text that was preserved by the LXX translator, since it is also reflected in 2 Bar. 82:5 and Pseudo-Philo’s
Bib. Ant. 1:3.

74 Of these, the only term actually used of Israel in the Bible is “first-born” (Exod 4:22: “Thus says the LORD: Israel
is my firstborn son”). “Only-begotten” is used of Israel, parallel with “first-born,” in Ps. Sol. 18:2, while the phrase
“most dear” may be inferred from a number of biblical passages (e.g., Hos 11:1-4), including the Song of Solomon,
if the author read it allegorically. The meaning of the third term, aemulatorem in the Latin, is not immediately clear.
In the Vulgate, aemulator (“zealous”) is used to only describe God.
to the evil heart. However, Ezra laments that the vast majority of humanity will be destroyed (e.g., 7:134; 8:7-14, 44-45). He understands that this group includes numerous Israelites, which is why he attempts to elicit God’s mercy on sinful Israelites by recalling Israel’s special status among the nations, which he roots in Genesis 1-3.75

5.5.2 Humanity According to Uriel

Uriel divides humanity into two groups of people—the righteous, who follow God’s law and the wicked, who do not. Uriel gives his understanding of humanity in his response to Ezra’s question: “If the world has indeed been created for us, why do we not possess our world as an inheritance? How long will this be so?” (6:59). The angel addresses Ezra’s assumption that Israel’s elect status entitles them to future rewards and to his positive depiction of Adam in 6:54, discussed above. Uriel affirms that the world was created for Israel’s sake, but he explains that when Adam succumbed to the evil heart, the world was judged (7:11-13). Uriel also suggests that “Israel’s portion” (v. 10) included the eschatological garden of Eden, which the angel calls the “greater world” (vv. 12-13). The angel claims that once Adam sinned, this all changed. In v. 14, the angel describes the current condition: “Therefore unless the living pass through the difficult and futile experiences, they can never receive those things that have been reserved for them.” In this verse, the angel places Israel in the same category as the rest of humanity. Israel must exist in the present evil age with the rest of humanity. Israel, however, has the possibility of reclaiming their inheritance of the eschatological garden of Eden (“greater world,” 7:12) if

75 The assumptions underlying Ezra’s laments and questions are similar to those of the “pattern of religion” that Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 422, calls “covenantal nomism.” Sanders summarizes the “pattern” of covenantal nomism: “(1) God has chosen Israel and (2) given the law. The law implies both (3) God’s promise to maintain the election and (4) the requirement to obey. (5) God rewards obedience and punishes transgression. (6) The law provides for means of atonement, and atonement results in (7) maintenance or reestablishment of the covenantal relationship. (8) All those who are maintained in the covenant by obedience, atonement and God’s mercy belong to the group which will be saved.” Ezra affirms 1-5; Ezra calls 6 into question because of the destruction of the Temple, which is the primary means of atonement. For Ezra, the primary hindrance to salvation (8) is the “evil heart,” which makes obedience virtually impossible. Nevertheless, Ezra echoes the promised salvation of Israel by appealing to God’s mercy and their election (8:20-36).
they faithfully follow God’s law. Uriel thus contends that rather than on the basis of election only, as Ezra claims, the future rewards are given to the Israelites who follow the Torah.

Uriel addresses Ezra’s concern that no one can keep the law perfectly because of the evil heart (3:33-36). The angel responds by stating that every Israelite has been created with the same capacity to obey the Torah. The angel argues that like all humanity, Israel is responsible for their own actions in spite of the inherent evil heart (e.g., 7:21-24, 72-73, 127-131). To explain this, Uriel appeals to the portrayal of Adam in Genesis 2 and 3. This is first evident in the angel’s statement: “Adam transgressed [God’s] statutes” (7:11; see section 5.3.2.2). Rather than one commandment, as Ezra mentions in 3:7, the angel uses the plural “statutes”—a term used to refer to the Torah. Uriel further claims concerning Israel: “For the Lord strictly commanded those who came into the world, when they came, what they should do to live, and what they should observe to avoid punishment” (v. 21). In this verse, Uriel combines creation and the giving of the Torah. The reference to knowing what to do upon entrance into the world is likely referring to Gen 2:16-17, in which God commands Adam to eat of all the trees, “but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall die.” Uriel’s claim that Israel is aware of “what they should do to live and what they should observe to avoid punishment” also alludes to Deut 30:19. In this verse, Moses claims, “I have set before you life and death, blessings and curses. Choose life so that you and your descendants may live.”

The angel combines creation and the Torah to suggest that the ability to obey the

---

76 Longenecker, *Eschatology and the Covenant*, 96, remarks that Uriel, “with his rigid individualism, undermines the basis of a covenantal conception of Israel. If the designation ‘Israel’ is meaningful at all for Uriel, it is as a reference to the few who earn their way into the next age through faultless obedience to the law.” However, Uriel never identifies the few as ‘Israel’ in the dialogues. Longenecker appears to anticipate his argument that the national restoration imagery of the fifth and sixth episodes applies only to the few from Israel who are righteous.

77 The likelihood that in this verse Uriel is referring to Deut 30:19 is strengthened by the fact that he later uses the verse in 7:129 when discussing “the contest that all who are born on earth shall wage” (v. 127).
“law of God” has been given to everyone, beginning with Adam (7:20-21). Uriel applies Adam’s situation in Eden to Israel’s current circumstances. Israel has been given the Torah. They know what God requires of them, just as Adam did. The reference to Adam sinning in 7:11 is followed by the consequences of his sin (vv. 12-14). The connection of Adam’s ability to obey, but his unwillingness to do so, followed by the consequences of his son, emphasizes the fact that those who do not obey the Torah will share in the fate of Adam (see section 5.3.2.2).

The combination of creation and the giving of the Torah is in the background of Uriel’s statement that “Adam transgressed [God’s] statutes” (7:11). The angel does not claim that Adam had access to the Torah, or that at some point it was available to all the nations as is the case in Ben Sira (see section 3.5). Rather, Uriel appeals to Adam to argue that all Israelites have the ability to choose what is good in spite of the presence of the evil heart. This is further stressed in v. 129, in which the angel relates the notion of free choice to Moses’ command to “the people” to “choose life.” Uriel provides a biblical illustration to support his understanding of the human condition.

While Ezra appeals to the past promises given to Israel and understands humanity in terms of Israel vs. the nations, Uriel looks to the future judgment by dividing humanity based on those who have obeyed the Torah and those who have not—the righteous and the wicked. Uriel, similar to Ezra, claims humanity is able to choose between good and evil. The angel states that Israel is given “the opportunity to choose” (8:56) and “the Most High did not intend that anyone should be destroyed” (v. 60). However, those who are “contemptuous of [God’s] law, and abandoned his ways” (v. 56) will suffer “thirst and torment” (v. 59). Uriel describes Israel’s struggle to obey the law as a contest against the influence of the evil heart. He states that those who strive “with great effort to overcome the evil thought that was formed with them, so that it
might not lead them astray from life into death” (7:92) are given eternal rewards. He further emphasizes that, “if they are defeated they shall suffer what you have said, but if they are victorious they shall receive what I have said” (vv. 127-128). Uriel states, “I will not concern myself about the fashioning of those who have sinned, or about their death, their judgment, or their destruction, but I will rejoice over the creation of the righteous, over their pilgrimage also, and their salvation, and their receiving their reward” (8:38-39). Uriel claims that Israel will not receive special treatment merely because they are the elect. Every Israelite chooses whether or not to obey the Torah. They can follow the example of Adam and sin, or overcome the evil heart and enjoy future eschatological rewards. Both Ezra and Uriel claim that the Torah can overcome the evil heart.⁷⁸ This is similar to what is found in both Ben Sira and Rabbinic Judaism (see section 5.6.1.1, below).

5.6 Cultivating the Tree of Life: God’s Law and the Garden of Eden in 4 Ezra

In 4 Ezra, the notion that God’s law can overcome the evil heart is rooted in the garden of Eden episode of Genesis 2-3. Ezra explains that Adam and his descendants are burdened with “an evil heart” (3:21). However, in v. 22, he states that along with the “evil heart” the descendants of Jacob possess God’s law. Thus, Israel has both “the evil root” (evil heart) and the Torah. Ezra explains that the reason for this is so that the “law might produce fruit” (3:20).⁷⁹ The meaning of the word “fruit” is not immediately evident in this context. Based on the evidence given

⁷⁸ Similarly, in the rabbinic tradition, we find that the Torah is understood to be an adequate remedy for the evil inclination and that it is every individual’s responsibility to follow the Torah in order to subdue it. Porter, “The Yecher Hara,” 126-29. See Rosen-Zvi, Demonic Desires, 14-35.

⁷⁹ Stone, Fourth Ezra, 73. In this verse, Ezra suggests that having the Torah (the covenant with God) was not enough to secure the salvation of the nation of Israel. In the rabbinic literature, one tradition claims that the evil heart was removed at Sinai but returned with the sin of worshipping the golden calf recounted in Exodus 32 (Song Rab. 1:2).
elsewhere in the composition, the term is reasonably understood to refer to eternal “reward.”

“Fruit” is the metaphorical good consequence for Torah obedience. This is most explicit in 9:31, where God states: “I sow my law in you, and it shall bring forth fruit in you, and you shall be glorified through it forever” (cf. vv. 36-37). This statement is in contrast to the notion that those who lack the Torah lack the ability to produce the fruit of eternal reward mentioned in 9:29 (see section 5.6.1.2.1). The eternal glory promised to those who follow the Torah is used elsewhere in the text to refer to eschatological reward for the righteous (e.g., 7:95, 112; 8:49, 51). In 6:25-28, for example, Uriel proclaims that in the future age when only the righteous remain, the “fruit” of obedience to the divine law “shall be revealed” and “flourish” (v. 28). In 4:35, the angel also states that the righteous inquired concerning when “the harvest” of their “reward” will come. Ezra further states that those who do not follow God’s commandments bear “no fruit” that provides an eternal reward (3:33), which is consistent with the argument that the wicked will not enjoy postmortem bliss promised to the righteous throughout the composition (7:113-26). The fruit of the Torah is thus reasonably understood to be the eternal reward promised to those who are obedient to God’s law—the righteous.

The fruit that the Torah produces is further nuanced in the context of the discussion of eternal rewards. The fruit given as an eternal reward is associated with both the garden of Eden

---

80 Stone, Fourth Ezra, 73.
81 Stone, Fourth Ezra, 308.
82 Stone, Fourth Ezra, 73. Cf. 2 Bar. 32:1; “fruit of righteousness” is found in Lev. Rab. 27:1. Odes Sol. 8:2 states that a holy life brings forth fruit to the Lord. Cf. 4 Ezra 4:28-29: “For the evil about which you ask me has been sown, but the harvest of it has not yet come. If therefore that which has been sown is not reaped, and if the place where the evil has been sown does not pass away, the field where the good has been sown will not come.” Cf. Rom 7:4-5: “In the same way, my friends, you have died to the law through the body of Christ, so that you may belong to another, to him who has been raised from the dead in order that we may bear fruit for God. While we were living in the flesh, our sinful passions, aroused by the law, were at work in our members to bear fruit for death.”
and the fruit of immortality produced by the tree of life. Uriel states that for the righteous “paradise is opened,” “the tree of life is planted,” “corruption has been forgotten,” and “immortality” is enjoyed (8:52-54; cf. 7:96, 123). He also explicitly states that paradise contains “the fruit of immortality” (7:13). This terminology alludes to Gen 3:22-24, which describes Adam being prevented from eating of the tree of life: “Then the LORD God said, ‘See, the man has become like one of us, knowing good and evil; and now, he might reach out his hand and take also from the tree of life, and eat, and live forever.’ He drove out the man; and at the east of the garden of Eden he placed the cherubim, and a sword flaming and turning to guard the way to the tree of life.” The promise of the tree of life for the righteous is also attested in Apoc. Mos. 28:1-4. In this text, when Adam is expelled from the garden he beseeches God: “‘LORD, give me from the tree of life that I might eat before I am cast out.’ Then the LORD spoke to Adam, ‘You shall not now take from it.’ . . . ‘But when you come out of Paradise, if you guard yourself from all evil, . . . then there shall be given to you from the tree of life, and you shall be immortal forever.’”

In 4 Ezra, Uriel contends that the curse of mortality, along with the lack of access to Eden and the tree of life, are reversed for the righteous in the age to come (see section 5.6.2). As in the Genesis account, 4 Ezra implies that Adam originally enjoyed life in the garden of Eden and, although there is no mention that he ever ate from the tree of life, he also had access to the

83 Cf. 1 Enoch 32, in which the eschatological hope for the restoration of the garden of Eden is depicted as a replanting, or transplanting, of the tree of life.

84 Uriel’s claim in 8:52 that paradise and the tree of life are not available until the future age is similar to what is attested in other Early Jewish literature. For example, the T. Levi states that, “[God] will give the saints to eat from the tree of life” (18:11). Further, in the Psalms of Solomon, the author proclaims: “The pious of the Lord shall live by [God’s law] forever; The Paradise of the Lord, the trees of life, are His pious ones” (14:3). See George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Some Related Traditions in the Apocalypse of Adam, the Books of Adam and Eve, and 1 Enoch,” in Rediscovery of Gnosticism: Proceedings of the Conference at Yale, March 1978 (ed. B. Layton; Leiden: Brill, 1981), 515-39; R. B. Wright, “Psalms of Solomon,” in OTP, 2:639-60.
fruit of immortality (Gen 2:9). This is further supported by Ezra’s claim that Adam’s sin brought physical death to him and his descendants (3:4-7). This implies that prior to sinning the first man was immortal.\textsuperscript{85} Thus, those who follow the Torah are able to reverse the punishment of death and attain what was first given to Adam—existence in the garden of Eden and eternal life.\textsuperscript{86} Enjoying the immortality with which Adam was originally endowed through living a life pleasing to God is similar to what is found in Philo’s \textit{Opif}. 134-35 and the Wisdom of Solomon (2:23; 3:22; see section 4.2.2.1.5).

The association of the Torah with the tree of life is also supported by the interpretation of biblical sapiential passages as referring to God’s law in other Second Temple Jewish compositions.\textsuperscript{87} Most famously, the description of wisdom in Proverbs has been interpreted as referring to the Torah: “She is a tree of life to those who lay hold of her” (Prov 3:18).\textsuperscript{88} The association of the Torah with the tree of life in the Eden narrative is found in Ben Sira, for example (see section 3.2.1.4). In Sir 24:23, the sage equates wisdom with the “book of the covenant of the law of the Most High God,” and declares that the Torah “overflows like the Pishon with wisdom” (24:25; see section 3.2.1.2.1.1). Ben Sira places the tree by the river Pishon, which is one of the four rivers in Eden (Gen 2:11). He further describes this wisdom as a

\textsuperscript{85} Levison, \textit{Portraits of Adam}, 117.

\textsuperscript{86} This fruit not only gives immortality, but also “healing” (7:123; cf. Ezek 47:12; Rev 22:2). The notion that the tree of life possesses healing properties as mentioned in \textit{4 Ezra} 7:123 is also found in \textit{Vita Adae et Evae}. In 9:3, Adam suffers from an illness and instructs Eve and his son Seth to ask God to send an angel to Eden to “give me from the tree out of which the oil flows and bring it to me, and I will anoint myself and rest.” Although the tree of life is never explicitly identified as the tree of life, its life-giving properties suggest the association is reasonable. The tree providing healing is further consistent with Uriel’s promise that in the garden “illness is banished” (8:53; \textit{1 En.} 25:6).


\textsuperscript{88} cf. Prov 11:30: “The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life, but violence takes lives away.”
tree rooted in Zion/Jerusalem (Sir 24:9-14). Terje Stordahlen claims that according to Ben Sira this “wisdom is incarnated in the world as a Tree of Life in Zion-Eden, extending its blessing in the Law like Eden rivers.” Although the tree in Ben Sira is not explicitly identified as the tree of life, the description of the tree makes this assumption reasonable. The tree is established “in the beginning” (v. 9) in “Zion” (v. 10) / “Jerusalem” (v. 11), and it grew “tall like a cedar in Lebanon” (v. 13). The comparison of the tree to a cedar of Lebanon is the phrase used for the cosmic tree in Ezekiel 31, for the righteous in Psalm 92, and as the building material of the Temple in 1 Kings, 2 Chronicles, and Ezra. Each of these images links the tree to the garden of Eden. In 17:7-14, Ben Sira explains that Adam was given “knowledge and understanding, and” shown “good and evil” (v. 7), which is identified with the “knowledge” (v. 11) given on Sinai—”the law of life” (v. 11) and God’s “decrees” (v. 12). This implies that the fruit in Eden is the Torah. Further, in Sir 24:19, Lady Wisdom proclaims, “Come to me, you who desire me, and eat your fill of my fruits.” Although likely added to the composition between 50-150 C.E., Sir 19:19 states: “The knowledge of the Lord’s commandments is life-giving discipline; and those who do what is pleasing to him enjoy the fruit of the tree of immortality.” Wisdom is identified as Torah and life in Bar 3:36-4:1: “He found the whole way to knowledge, and gave


91 Alice M. Sinnott, *The Personification of Wisdom* (SOTSMS; Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2005), 132, 139.


93 The extended GII (Greek translation of Ben Sira) inserts two bicola (vv. 18-19): “The fear of the Lord is the beginning of acceptance, and wisdom obtains his love. The knowledge of the Lord’s commandments is life-giving discipline; and those who do what is pleasing to him enjoy the fruit of the tree of immortality.” This doctrine is not explicitly found elsewhere in Ben Sira. Skehan and Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 299.
to his servant Jacob and to Israel, whom he loved. Afterward she appeared on earth and lived with humankind. She is the book of the commandments of God, the law that endures forever. All who hold her fast will live, and those who forsake her will die.” The Pirkei Avot also proclaims: “Great is Torah, for it gives to them that practice it life in this world and in the world to come. . . . And [Scripture] says: ‘It shall be health to thy navel, and marrow to thy bones.’ And it says: ‘She shall be a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her, and happy are they that retain her’” (6:7). Similar to these authors, Ezra firmly associates the Torah with the tree of life. He suggests that the Torah is the tree of life whose fruit is immortality and is planted with the evil seed in human hearts. Also similar to other Early Jewish authors, in 4 Ezra the Torah is identified as wisdom: “You have nurtured it in your righteousness, and instructed it in your law, and reproved it in your wisdom” (8:12). The law of God is parallel to wisdom. The shift between the terms “the Torah” and “wisdom” in the composition is not surprising. Rather, it fits in a well-established tradition.

5.6.1 Cultivation of the Tree of Life: Obedience to the Torah

Ezra further extends the metaphor of the Torah as the tree of life by stating that the tree will bear fruit only through cultivation (cf. 3:20). Ezra asks God to give humanity “understanding” to cultivate their hearts so that “fruit might be produced,” which allows humans to “be able to live” (8:6). The life giving fruit mentioned is the product of the Torah—the tree of life—that was put “in the hearts of the people” (3:22). Ezra’s request in 8:6 to have the ability to cultivate properly the tree of life alludes to the biblical portrayal of Adam in the garden of Eden: “The LORD God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to till it and keep it” (Gen 2:15). The language

---

94 Stone, Fourth Ezra, 73.

95 Stone, Fourth Ezra, 211-19.
of “cultivation” of the tree indicates that obedience to God’s law requires work and effort (cf. 7:127-128). The cultivation of the tree of life—obedience to the Torah—is further understood as a metaphor for pursuing wisdom. The association of the garden producing life-giving fruit through cultivation is similar to the portrayal of Adam found in L.A.E. 22:2: “And the Lord God sent diverse seeds by Michael the archangel and gave to Adam and showed him how to work and till the ground, that they might have fruit by which they and all their generations might live.” In 4 Ezra 8:6, immortality is not something that can be taken for granted nor is it only given to an elect group of Israelites. The fruit is cultivated in the current age, but it is not enjoyed until paradise is opened in the age to come. The author implies that to be righteous, one should imitate the Adam of Genesis 2-3 prior to his disobedience because he presumably cultivated the garden in a manner that allowed him to remain inside.

5.6.1.1 The human condition in 4 Ezra and Ben Sira: the cor reconciliation and the Torah. 4 Ezra and Ben Sira both understand the biblical Adam paradigmatically to describe the condition of humanity. While the two compositions contain strong correlations concerning this topic, it is clear that 4 Ezra contains a much more negative interpretation of Adam. Both 4 Ezra and Ben Sira contend that God created every human with a cor reconciliation (see section 5.2.1.1). Ben Sira appeals to the creation of Adam in Gen 2:7 to explain that this cor reconciliation can either be good or evil (33:10-15; see section 3.3.2). 4 Ezra, however, explicitly claims that humanity is only created with a cor malignum (ע"ן כלל, 3:21). There is no room in his interpretation for a good cor reconciliation. Both authors also explain that obedience to the Torah can overcome a cor reconciliation. Ben Sira also roots the portrayal of Adam in Gen 2:7 in the context of the giving of the Torah in Deut 30:19 (Sir 15:14-17; see section 3.3).96 Ben Sira appeals to the creation of Adam in Gen 2:7 to explain that all humanity

96 Stone, Fourth Ezra, 197, 200.
was created with the ability to choose whether or not to obey the Torah. Further, the sage suggests that the Torah helps Israel defeat the evil inclination. In 4 Ezra, both Ezra and Uriel likewise explain that the evil heart can be mastered through obedience to the Torah. In 3:22, the author states that along with the “evil heart” Israel possesses God’s law. Israel, thus, has both “the evil root” (evil heart) and the Torah. Ezra explains that the reason for this is so that the “law might produce fruit” (3:20), which is eternal life (see section 5.6, above). The notion that the Torah is the remedy to the ṭאר רע is similar to the rabbinic tradition attested in Sifre Deut. 45: “My children I have created for you the ṭאר רע, but I have at the same time created for you the Torah as the antidote.” In this rabbinic text and 4 Ezra, the evil heart is a sort of poison that is an inherent part of the human condition and the Torah is the antidote. However, in 4 Ezra, the confidence in the fact that the Torah can overcome the evil heart is far less than what is attested by the rabbis. The tradition attested in Ben Sira, in which Adam is the paradigm of all humanity, created with a ṭאר רע according to God’s will appears to be in the background of 4 Ezra’s portrayal of the first man as reflecting the general human condition. However, 4 Ezra provides a far more unfavorable interpretation of Adam than Ben Sira.

5.6.1.2 Cultivating wisdom and reaping immortality in the garden of Eden in 4QInstruction and 4 Ezra. The association of pursuing wisdom in the context of the garden of Eden is also attested in 4QInstruction. In 4Q423 1, the author portrays the הֶסֶנ as having been entrusted with the garden of Eden (see section 2.5). In 4 Ezra, the tree of life (the Torah), which ultimately resides in the garden of Eden, is said to have been sown in the people of Israel (3:22; cf. 7:123; 8:52). In 4QInstruction, the author exhorts the הֶסֶנ to “till” and “guard” the garden,

---

97 For the opposition of the echo וּאָרֶץ הַ DataRow with study of the Torah, see also Ishay Rosen-Zvi, “Two Rabbinic Inclinations? Rethinking a Scholarly Dogma,” JSJ 39 (2008): 8; Urbach, The Sages, 472; Collins, Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age, 84.
while in *4 Ezra* enjoying the “fruit” of the tree of life in the eschatological garden of Eden requires “cultivation” (*4 Ezra* 8:6; see section 5.6). Both texts contend that those who want to enjoy a blissful eternity must actively work to do so. They must imitate the Adam of Genesis 2-3, who presumably cultivated the garden in a faithful manner prior to sinning. The clear difference between 4QInstruction and *4 Ezra* is that in the Qumran text the addressee is given the entire garden of Eden, while *4 Ezra* only mentions access to the tree of life prior to the future age. In *4 Ezra*, paradise is a reward promised to the righteous in the age to come (see section 5.6.2). The garden of Eden is never evoked as the final abode for the elect in 4QInstruction. Eden instead functions as a metaphor for the acquiring wisdom in this world and fulfilling the special allotment in life given to him by God. 4QInstruction stresses that the cultivation of the garden comes by studying the supernaturally revealed, which is only available to the elect. In *4 Ezra*, both Ezra and Uriel contend that only Israel has the Torah planted in their hearts and knows what is required to please God (e.g., 3:22). Similar to 4QInstruction, *4 Ezra* claims that the Torah only resides with one group—Israel. Different than 4QInstruction, *4 Ezra* appeals to the figure of Adam to argue that all humans have the same ability to choose to obey the Torah or not, rather than only one group of people. In this way, *4 Ezra* does not read Genesis 1-3 in a sectarian manner, as is the case in 4QInstruction. The author of *4 Ezra* removes the notion that only one group of people is capable of studying the in 4QInstruction. Further, the author removes the sectarian aspects of the tradition of turning to Eden to describe the rewards of the elect that he may have inherited, which are attested in 4QInstruction.

In 4QInstruction, the fact that the has stewardship over the garden suggests that the knowledge he can attain through the study of the represents a restoration of wisdom originally possessed by Adam (cf. 4Q417 i 18-19; 4Q418 77 2). Further, those elect who
pursue wisdom—who “till” and “guard” the garden—will enjoy a blissful afterlife. This is similar to the idea in 4 Ezra that humanity has been given the opportunity to cultivate the tree of life—pursue wisdom (the Torah). In doing so, the righteous are able to regain the fruit of the wisdom that Adam presumably had access to before he transgressed—immortality in the form of the tree of life. The righteous are able to enjoy the benefits of following the Torah, which Adam forfeited when he sinned. This is eternal life in the garden of Eden. 4 Ezra uses the tradition of Eden in 4QInstruction to depict access to the garden in the current age in the form of the Torah for Israel and in the future age to those Israelites who have faithfully followed the Torah. The parallels between these two texts suggest that 4QInstruction attests Genesis 1-3 traditions used by 4 Ezra.

5.6.1.2.1 The lack of cultivating the tree of life in 4 Ezra. In 4 Ezra, the lack of cultivation of the tree of life (the Torah) is understood as pursuing wickedness—succumbing to the evil heart (9:31-33; cf. 7:125-128; 9:17). Not cultivating the tree of life is described in two ways: 1) not producing the fruit of eternal reward; and 2) producing fruit that will be discarded at the end of the age. In 3:32-33, Ezra explains that those who did not follow the Torah and believe “the covenants” labored but will earn no “reward” and bear “no fruit.” In this verse, not following God’s law results in not bearing the fruit of immortality (see section 5.6.1, above). While the fruit of eternal reward is not produced, wickedness does bear fruit. This fruit is depicted in the context of the harvest and the “threshing floor” (9:17), which refers to the future judgment (cf. 5:48; 8:41).98 This is the fruit that is associated with the present evil age and the

98 Stone, Fourth Ezra, 298. For biblical associations of the harvest and judgment, see, e.g., Jer 51:33; Hos 6:11; Joel 4:13; cf. Rev 14:15-20. 2 Bar. 70:2 addresses what will happen “when the time of the world has ripened and the harvest of the seed of the evil one and good ones has come.” Cf. 11Q5 24:12-13 (Psalm 155): “Purify me, O Lord, from (the) evil scourge, and let it not turn upon me. Dry up its roots from me and let its leaves not flourish within me” (Sanders, DJD 4, 71). Sir 3:28: “A plant of wickedness has taken root in him (the proud).” See Stone, Fourth Ezra, 73.
example of sinful Adam (4:29; see section 5.2.1.1). The fruit produced by following the
time of Adam is associated with toil, sadness (7:12), difficulty (vv. 14, 18), and lack of
access to the garden of Eden. Ezra explicitly states that those Israelites who did not produce “the
fruit of the law” (9:32) “perished, because they did not keep what had been sown in them” (v. 33;
cf. v. 36). In this verse, “perish” refers to death of the soul (cf. 7:125-128; see section 5.3.2.1).
The wicked are associated with the sin of Adam, the present miserable conditions of the world,
and a finite form of existence that does not extend into the age to come.

5.6.1.2.1.1 The lack of cultivating wisdom in the garden of Eden according to
4QInstruction and 4 Ezra. There are several indications that the author of 4 Ezra’s depiction of
the wicked not pursuing wisdom is likely drawing from a tradition also found in 4QInstruction.
Both compositions use imagery from the curses pronounced in the Genesis narrative to describe
a life that does not include the cultivation of wisdom. Specifically, both turn to Gen 3:17-19 and
the description of the conditions of the world outside of the garden of Eden. 4Q423 1 explains
that Eden will produce “thorns and thistles” if the כֵּן does not maintain it properly (see section
2.5.2.1). Thus, the elect failing to pursue wisdom faithfully is symbolized by the garden of Eden
falling into a state of decline and disarray. This imagery is used in 4 Ezra and applied to the
entire world. The current state of the world is due to Adam’s disobedience (see section 5.3.1).
Those who, like Adam, fail to cultivate the tree of life—obey the Torah (wisdom)—will
experience continual toil, hardship (even after death), and ultimately eternal death, as discussed
above. In 4 Ezra, the fruit that wickedness produces is associated with the curses of Gen 3:17-
19. Not cultivating wisdom—following the example of Adam working the garden—leads to
producing the same fruit as the first man. This fruit is associated with toil, sadness (7:12), and a
miserably difficult life (7:14, 18; cf. 4:27). It is also associated with death (9:33), but in this
case, the author is referring to death of the soul rather than physical death (see section 5.3.2.1). Further, this fruit also keeps the wicked from enjoying eternal bliss in the garden of Eden that is reserved for the righteous (cf. 7:113-26). Rather, they experience suffering after death and eventual death of the soul, just as Adam experienced according to 4 Ezra. Similarly, in 4QInstruction, if the elect do not pursue wisdom, and thus produce thorns and thistles in the garden, they will not participate in the eternal bliss available to the elect (see section 2.4.2.2). The parallels in the compositions concerning the lack of cultivating wisdom in the garden indicate that 4 Ezra is likely drawing on the tradition that is also found in 4QInstruction. However, 4 Ezra uses the reference to the Genesis 3 curses to describe the consequences of not cultivating wisdom for all humanity rather than just the elect as is the case in the Qumran text.

5.6.2 Righteous Rewards: Life in the Garden of Eden in 4 Ezra

As discussed above, both Ezra and Uriel contend that in the age to come the righteous will inhabit the garden of Eden once enjoyed by Adam (cf. 4 Ezra 3:6). Ezra acknowledges in 7:123 that for the righteous, “paradise shall be revealed.” Uriel similarly proclaims that for the righteous “paradise is opened” (8:52). Along with access to the fruit of the tree of life—immortality (see section 5.6.1)—the righteous will enjoy rest and abundance.

The angel contends that the paradise awaiting the righteous is a place of rest. In 7:36, “the place of rest” is situated parallel to “the paradise of delight.” These two phrases are

---

99 Contrast the details of paradise provided in 2 Bar. 51:11-12: “For there shall be spread before them the extents of Paradise, and there shall be shown to them the beauty of the majesty of the living creatures which are beneath the throne, and all the armies of the angels, who [are now held fast by My word, lest they should appear, and] are held fast by a command, that they may stand in their places till their advent comes. Moreover, there shall then be excellency in the righteous surpassing that in the angels.”

100 The expression “paradise is opened” also occurs in Apoc. Sedr. 12:2: ὁ παράδεισος σοι ἤνοιγμα.

101 Cf. also Heb 3:18-19; 4:1; Odes Sol. 3:5; 8:7; 10:2; 11:3.

placed opposite “the pit of torment” and “the furnace of hell,” respectively. In 8:52, Uriel also explains that along with entrance into paradise and the fruit of the tree of life, “rest is appointed” for the righteous. This is similar to the promise in 2 Bar. 73:1 that for the righteous “rest will appear.” Also, in T. Dan 5:12, the author promises that “the saints shall rest in Eden.”

Not only will the righteous enjoy rest in Eden, Ezra proclaims that they will also find “abundance” (7:125), Uriel declares that in paradise “plenty is provided” (8:52). The assurance of rest of and abundance for the righteous in Eden can reasonably be taken as the reversal of the consequences of Adam’s sin that are described throughout 4 Ezra (see section 5.3.1), as well as the curses found in the Genesis narrative (Gen 3:17-19). In both 4 Ezra and the Genesis narrative, Eden is placed in contrast to the outside world. Paradise offers rest from the toil and sweat of working the cursed ground which produces thorns and thistles outside of the garden.

5.6.2.1 Eden! Eden! Where art thou, Eden? 4 Ezra depicts the garden of Eden in two ways: 1) The place where God placed Adam when he created the world; and 2) The future home of the righteous. Stone has argued that the garden of Eden enjoyed by Adam is different from the paradise promised to the righteous in the age to come. He distinguishes between paradise

---

103 For the notion of fire in relation to the future abode of the wicked, see, e.g., 2 Bar. 44:15; 48:43; 59:11; Apocalypse of Peter 22. See Stone, Fourth Ezra, 221.

104 The eschatological rewards of “rest,” “paradise,” and “fruit” are also found in T. Levi 18:9-11: “And the lawless shall cease to do evil. [And the just shall rest in him.] And he shall open the gates of paradise. And shall remove the threatening sword against Adam. And he shall give to the saints to eat from the tree of life, And the spirit of holiness shall be on them.”

105 The angel also states that paradise is free of “sorrows” (8:53-54). Further, in paradise “goodness is established” and the evil root, the cause of sin beginning with Adam, “is sealed up” (8:53).

that existed before the creation of the world (4 Ezra 3:6; cf. 4:7-8; 6:2)\textsuperscript{107} and eschatological paradise as the future abode of the righteous (7:38, 123; 8:52), which Stone contends is part of the mystical tradition.\textsuperscript{108} However, in 4 Ezra there are three indications that suggest the pre-existent garden of Eden should be understood as the same one promised to the righteous in the age to come. 1) Paradise is situated in heaven and is opposed to hell. In 4:7-8, Uriel states: “And he said to me, ‘If I had asked you, ‘How many dwellings are in the heart of the sea, or how many streams are at the source of the deep, or how many streams are above the firmament, or which are the exits of Hades, or which are the entrances of paradise?’ perhaps you would have said to me, ‘I never went down into the deep, nor as yet into Hades, neither did I ever ascend into heaven.’” Similarly, in 7:36, God says, “The pit of torment shall appear, and opposite it shall be the place of rest; and the furnace of hell shall be disclosed, and opposite it the paradise of delight.” 2) The reference to “paradise” being “revealed” suggests something other-worldly. The use of the term “revealed” along with the promise of immortality and the tree of life suggests that the eschatological paradise is the same as pre-existent paradise. 3) In the description of the rewards promised to the righteous, Uriel explains that “the world shall be turned back to primeval silence” (7:30), which alludes to Genesis 1. There is a return to what once was. This is consistent with the understanding that the eternal rewards are reversing the effects of the sin of Adam and returning to the garden of Eden.\textsuperscript{109}


\textsuperscript{107} 4 Ezra 3:6: “And you led him into the garden that your right hand had planted before the earth appeared.”

\textsuperscript{108} 2 En. 31:10: “Adam has life on earth, and I created a garden in Eden in the east, that he should observe the testament and keep the command.” The rabbinic tradition attests that Eden was created before the world. See for example, \textit{b. Ned.} 39b; \textit{b. Pesah.} 54a. See Stone, \textit{Fourth Ezra}, 68.

\textsuperscript{109} Levison, \textit{Portraits of Adam}, 222.
The location of the garden is important because it relates to the issue of whether people can access it or not. In his recent monograph, Moo has revisited the question of where the garden of Eden is located according to 4 Ezra. He contends that if the Latin paradisus is the translation of the original Hebrew צָרָם, which is used in Genesis 2-3, locating Eden in heaven is problematic because in Genesis the garden is clearly planted on the earth. In 4 Ezra, he concludes, agreeing with Box against Stone, that the garden of Eden is “transcendental and unearthly.” However, Moo also argues that paradise was temporarily in contact with the earth at the beginning of creation until Adam sinned. Along with Stone, Moo correctly states there is no indication in the text that the garden should be understood as merely spiritual. He also clarifies that to affirm the reality of paradise and its flowers, fruit, and tree is not to deny the transcendence and heavenly location. Moo ends his assessment of the portrayal of paradise in 4 Ezra by stating that the best way to view Eden in 4 Ezra is as similar to its depiction in 2 Enoch: “And I ascended to the east, into the paradise of Eden, where rest is prepared for the righteous. And it is open as far as the third heaven; but it is closed off from this world” (42:3 [J]). Moo believes that 4 Ezra conveys Eden as at once in both heaven and earthly realms, suggesting that paradise is situated in some manner temporally and/or spatially at the boundary

111 Moo, Nature, Creation, and Hope, 51.
between heaven and earth. The ambiguity of the location of Eden in 2 Enoch is different from what is found in 1 Enoch. 1 Enoch 17-36 includes a description of Enoch’s journey from the western most region of the earth to the eastern most.116 Enoch’s journey is an angel guided tour to places primarily located at the extremities of this world and that are not accessible to any other human.117 This includes the Garden of Righteousness (32:3-6), which is located in the east (cf. Gen 2:8).

While Moo helpfully encourages scholars to read the text from less conventional perspectives, I disagree with his conclusions concerning the location of the garden of Eden. Moo does not give enough weight to the consistent depiction of the garden of Eden in 4 Ezra. As noted above, the author of 4 Ezra repeatedly describes paradise as other worldly, in opposition to Hades, and at no point is there a reference to it coming in contact with the earth. Even Moo himself notes that Eden is located in heaven. His contention that at some point Eden was in contact with the earth but was removed once Adam sinned is not supported by the composition.118 Since Eden is in a heavenly realm, paradise is only accessible after physical death. This indicates that the eschatological garden can only be enjoyed by the righteous in the age to come.

5.6.2.2 Life in the Garden of Eden: Becoming Like the Angels in 4 Ezra. Ezra and Uriel claim that one of the rewards that the righteous will become like the angels in the future garden of Eden. Uriel, in 7:97, explains concerning the righteous that, “their face is to shine like the sun, and how they are to be made like the light of the stars, being incorruptible from then

116 See Kelley Coblentz-Bautsch, A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17-19: “No one has seen what I have seen” (JSJSup 71; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003).

117 Collins, Apocalyptic Imagination, 54.

118 Moo, Creation, Nature and Hope, 50-52.
Ezra echoes this same idea by claiming that the faces of those who are not overcome by the evil heart “shall shine more than the stars” (7:125). Stone has simply suggested that these verses are likely part of the general tradition of “the light of the redeemed.” Scholars such as Richard Bauckham rightly contend that the reference to the righteous becoming like the stars is referring to future angel-likeness. 4QInstruction adds clarity to understanding what this imagery is specifically referring to in 4 Ezra. This is most evident in the Qumran text’s description of the elect as created in the likeness of the angels (see section 2.4.2.2). Further, the Qumran text confirms what is suggested by the other Second Temple Jewish compositions—according to 4 Ezra, after death the righteous become like the angels in the garden of Eden. In the following sections, I will explicate 4 Ezra’s description of the righteous in the eschatological paradise along with how the description of the elect in 4QInstruction gives us a better understanding of what that looks like.

5.6.2.2.1 Death, the righteous, and angels in 4 Ezra and Second Temple Judaism.

Eternal life is connected to the angels in other Second Temple Jewish compositions. For example, the Wisdom of Solomon also associates the eternal life of the righteous with the angels. In 5:5, the wicked ask about the righteous: “Why have they been numbered among the children

---

19 Cf. 1 En. 86:1, 3; 90:21; Eccl 8:1: “Who is like the wise man? And who knows the interpretation of a thing? Wisdom makes one’s face shine, and the hardness of one’s countenance is changed.”

20 1 En. 43:1, 4: “The stars of heaven, and I saw how He called them all by their names and they hearkened unto Him. . . . ‘These are the names of the holy who dwell on the earth and believe in the name of the Lord of Spirits for ever and ever’” (cf. 46:7).

21 Stone, Fourth Ezra, 244.

of God? And why is their lot among the saints?” The author also links afterlife to the stars: “In the time of their visitation they will shine forth, and will run like sparks through the stubble” (3:7; see section 4.2.2.1.4.2). Further, the stars are called the host of heaven throughout the Hebrew Bible. In Job 38:7, for example, the stars are parallel to the angels: “when the morning stars sang together and all the heavenly beings shouted for joy?”

The descriptions of the future state of the righteous as having faces that “shine like the sun” in 4 Ezra are reminiscent of descriptions of angels found elsewhere in Early Jewish literature. The author of 2 Enoch, for example, describes the angels’ faces as “shining like the sun” (1:5) and “shining more than the sun’s shining” (19:1). In 22:9-10, Enoch exclaims that he was anointed (presumably on the head and face) and the ointment used made him shine “like the sun’s ray” like the angels. In the Testament of Abraham (1), the angel, Michael, is described as “shining more than seven suns” (7:3). Further, Abraham is symbolized as “the sun” when he is taken up “into the heavens” (7:4). Philo writes that Moses was taken up into heaven to be made like and dwell with the angels (see section 4.2.2.1.5.1). Philo describes this

123 Like 4 Ezra, the Wisdom of Solomon and 4QInstruction both also associate the eschatological rewards of the righteous with a restoration of God’s original relationship with humankind. 4QInstruction presents the addressee as typologically similar to Adam, claiming that he has authority over the garden of Eden and knowledge of good and evil (see section 2.5). See David Winston, The Wisdom of Solomon (AB 43; New York: Doubleday, 1979), 17.

124 Several rabbinic sources refer to the notion that the brightness of Adam’s face was taken from him when he was expelled from Eden. For example, Gen. Rab. 12:6 states: “He deprived him of his splendor and expelled him from the Garden of Eden, as it is written, ‘You change his countenance, and send him away’ (Job 14: 20).” This also seems to have been connected with Adam’s creation creation in the image of God. Gen. Rab. 23:6 explains that due to the expulsion, “men’s faces became ape-like.” This indicates that they became more like animals and less like God (and the angels).

125 E.g., see Gen 37:9; Jer 19:13; 33:22; Judg 5:20; Ps 148:2-3; Neh 9:6; 2 Kgs 23:5; cf. 21:5; Deut 4:19.

126 Cf. 2 En. 66:7-8. In 1 En. 71:1, the angel’s countenance is like snow.

127 Cf. “You look now upon my eyes, [the eyes] of a man big with meaning for you, but I have seen the Lord’s eyes, shining like the sun’s rays and filling the eyes of man with awe” (2 En. 39:4).

128 Probably composed in the first or second century C.E. and of Egyptian provenance.
transformation of Moses as God “transforming him wholly and entirely into a sun-like soul” (Vit. 2.288; cf. I En. 62:16). This could be recalling the episode in Exodus that explains that after Moses descended from Mt. Sinai, “the skin of his face was shining; and Moses would put the veil on his face again” (Exod 34:35). In I En. 51:4, when the righteous receive their reward and become like the angels, “the faces of [all] the angels in heaven shall be lighted up with joy” (cf. 104:4-6, discussed below).

Along with a face that shines brightly, Uriel proclaims that in the eschatological paradise, the righteous will “be made like the light of the stars” (7:97), while Ezra states that they will “shine more than the stars” (7:125). In Second Temple Judaism, star imagery is regularly used to depict an angelic afterlife. Daniel, for example, proclaims, “Those who are wise shall shine like the brightness of the sky, and those who lead many to righteousness like the stars forever and ever” (12:3; cf. 8:10; Luke 20:36). The Epistle of Enoch also promises the righteous eternal life, shining like the stars with the angels: “As stars of heaven you will light up and shine, and the gate of heaven will be opened to you, . . . you will have great joy like the angels of heaven, . . . you shall be associates of the host of heaven” (104:2-6). In 2 Bar. 51:10, the notion is echoed and expanded upon: “For in the heights of that world shall they dwell, and they shall be made like unto the angels, and be made equal to the stars, and they shall be changed into every

---

129 Matt 17:2: “And he was transfigured before them, and his face shone like the sun, and his clothes became dazzling white.” Rev 1:16: “In his right hand he held seven stars, and from his mouth came a sharp, two-edged sword, and his face was like the sun shining with full force.”

130 Collins, Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls, 112.

form they desire, from beauty into loveliness, and from light into the splendor of glory.” In the
Testament of Moses, the author states concerning the righteous: “And God will raise you to the
heights. Yea, he will fix you firmly in the heaven of the stars” (10:9). Similarly, in 4 Macc 17:5,
the seven martyred sons are described as “star-like” and “with the stars . . . firmly set in heaven.”
Pseudo-Philo also explains that upon death the righteous “will be like the stars of the heaven”
(Biblical Antiquities 33:5).

5.6.2.2.2 Joy and joining the angels in 4 Ezra and Second Temple Judaism. 4 Ezra
associates the angelic future state of the righteous with joy. In 7:91, Uriel explains that the
righteous will experience “great joy” (exultatione) when they are received by God and given
“rest” (requiescent) in Eden (cf. 1QS 4:7). Similarly, 1 En. 104:4-6 proclaims not only that
the righteous will shine like the stars with the angels, but also that they “will have great joy like
the angels of heaven” because they “shall be associates of the host of heaven.” In 1 En. 51:4,
the faces of the angels shine with “joy” in the age to come. In 2 Bar. 73:1, the author proclaims
that when the righteous are given their eschatological rewards, “joy shall then be revealed and
rest shall appear.” In this instance “rest” presumably indicates Eden. The association of “joy”
and “rest” attested in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch is also found in 2 En. [A] 42:3: “And from there I
went up into the paradise, even of the righteous, and there I saw a blessed place, and every
creature is blessed, and all live there in joy and in gladness and in an immeasurable light and in
eternal life.” In L.A.E. 10:4, the author explains that Adam’s sin results in the loss of both
“paradise and spiritual joy.”

132 The Testament of Asher also links eternal life with joy and angels: “if anyone is peaceful with joy he comes to
know the angel of peace and enters eternal life” (6:5). Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life, 161.

133 1 En. 104:4, like 4QInstruction, depicts life with the angels as eternal joy.
5.6.2.2.3 Glory and joining the angels in 4 Ezra and Second Temple Judaism.

Michael E. Stone contends that Uriel’s description of the righteous’ change in visage in 7:123 is parallel to the promise of future “glory” mentioned in 8:51.134 This is supported by the angel’s description of the transformation of the faces of the righteous in 7:97 as being “glorified” (v. 98). Uriel goes on to state in the same verse that those who have been glorified in this way move to be in the presence of God. The depiction of the righteous as glorified and in the company of God is similar to the description of the angels in 8:21 who are described as standing before God’s throne. The association of glory and being made in the likeness of the angels is similar to 2 Bar. 51:10, which states that the righteous “shall be made like unto the angels,” which is called “the splendor of glory.” Similar to this idea, 1 En. 104:2 claims that the eschatological paradise is opened to those who are made in the likeness of the angels. In 2 En. 22:10 and 30:11, the angels are called “glorious.” 4 Ezra suggests that the future angelic state of the righteous in Eden is glorious—“like the light of the stars” (7:97), and they will even “shine more than the stars” (7:125).

5.6.2.2.4 Being like the angels in 4 Ezra and 4QInstruction. The righteous in 4 Ezra and the elect in 4QInstruction are understood to become like the angels upon death. More accurately, 4QInstruction contends that the addressee will become more like the angels in the afterlife (see section 2.5.3). 4QInstruction explains that the יַרְשָׁנָה is created in the likeness of the angels (4Q417 1 i 17; see section 2.4.2.2). The addressee has also been given authority over the garden of Eden (4Q423 1). The author of this Qumran composition connects being like the angels with possessing paradise. Similarly, in 4 Ezra, the righteous are made like the angels and given the garden of Eden (8:52; see section 5.6). However, different from 4QInstruction, 4 Ezra

134 Stone, Fourth Ezra, 245, 286.
contends that joining the angels and attainment of the garden of Eden are post-mortem rewards. The author of 4 Ezra also places the eschatological rewards in the future, reserved for the faithful Israelites. In 4QInstruction, they are enjoyed to a degree by the elect in the present age. This aspect of the sectarian reading of the availability of Eden found in 4QInstruction is absent from 4 Ezra. Further, in 4QInstruction, the garden functions as a metaphor to articulate the elect status of the addressee. In 4 Ezra, paradise is a real place, as discussed above.

The association of eternal life like the angels with joy and glory that is found in 4 Ezra is similarly attested in 4QInstruction. In the Qumran text, the הָדָּה (הָדָּה רָעָה) has the hope of “eternal joy” after death (4Q417 2 i 11-12; see section 2.5.4). This is a reference to eternal life with the angels. The addressee is then fully realizing his elect status by becoming immortal like the angels. Further, since the הָדָּה is made like the angels, is in the lot of angels, and will become more like them after death, it is reasonable that the angels possess “eternal joy.” The association of eternal life with the angels and eternal joy in 4QInstruction supports the notion in 4 Ezra that the righteous will join the angels and experience joy in the garden of Eden.

Like 4 Ezra, 4QInstruction also associates eternal life with the angels and glory. In 4QInstruction, the eternal life available to the elect is called an “inheritance of glory” (נְחָלַה חָבוֹד), 4Q416 2 iii 11-12). This blissful afterlife is associated with the term “glory” (חָבוֹד) throughout the composition (e.g., 4Q417 2 i 11). Angels are also described as possessing “glory” (e.g., 4Q418 55 10; 4Q418 69 ii 13-14; cf. 4Q418 81 13). In 4Q418 69 ii 14, the author contends that the angels have “[g]lory and abundant splendor.” This “glory” that the angels possess is presumably available to the elect after death. Elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the elect who follow God’s law will attain eternal life and the “glory of Adam” (1QS 4:7, 22-23; CD 3:20; 1QH 4:15; cf. 4Q171 3 1-2; 4Q405 8 4-7). The rewards obtained by the righteous in 4 Ezra and
the elect in 4QInstruction are depicted in the same manner—Adam, glory, joy, eternal life, and joining the angels. The fact that both glory and joy are found in 4 Ezra and 4QInstruction suggests that the author of 4 Ezra is drawing from traditions attested in 4QInstruction. 4 Ezra uses the traditions that are employed to describe the elect and applies them to the righteous in Eden in the age to come. The association of future angelic glory and eternal life for the elect in 4QInstruction confirms the notion in 4 Ezra that the righteous will enjoy a glorious angelic state in the eschatological garden of Eden.\footnote{4 Ezra depicts the eschatological rewards given to the righteous as enjoying what was lost when Adam sinned (see section 5.3.1). It is reasonable then to contend that the eschatological reward of the glory of being like the angels promised to the righteous was once possessed by Adam prior to sinning (See the LXX translation of Gen 3:5; Gen. Rab. 21:5; Exod. Rab. 30:16). This is similar to claim in the Apocalypse of Moses that when Adam sinned, he lost “glory” (21:2). Also, 3 Bar. 4:16 claims that Adam lost the “glory of God.” The notion that the righteous regain the glory once possessed by Adam is also like the idea found in the Dead Sea Scrolls that the righteous will attain the “glory of Adam.” This is an enigmatic term that probably denotes the prospect of eternal life for the elect who follow God’s law. The association of Adam and glory in heaven is also found in the Testament of Abraham 11 (Recension A), which depicts Adam sitting on a throne in heaven, clothed in glory. In Apoc. Sdr. 7:6, the author describes the brightness of Adam when he was created: “I created Adam and his wife and the sun and said: Behold each other how bright he is.” Further, the idea that at one point that the first man possessed a glory like the angels is consistent with the idea of a heavenly Adam who lived in paradise, which was “planted before the earth appeared” (4 Ezra 3:6).

Although the notion that Adam was created like the angels is in tension with the statement that God created him with the evil heart, it is possible that the author’s concern to address the issue of theodicy and the present situation in Israel prompted him to alter the tradition that gives a positive portrayal of Adam, which is attested in 4QInstruction. Apart from Adam being created with the evil heart and sinning, the portrayal of what the first man once possessed is consistent with what is implied in 4 Ezra. Further, if it is reasonable to assume that the author of 4 Ezra has used other readings of Genesis 1-3 that are found in 4QInstruction, it is also possible this tradition was available as well. 4 Ezra suggests that the righteous are associated with the Adam of Gen 1:26-27, the prelapsarian Adam of Genesis 2-3 and the angels. The composition implies that if they imitate the Adam of Genesis 2-3 by cultivating the tree of life—faithfully following the Torah—they would become like Adam prior to his transgression—in immortal and like the angels, living in the garden of Eden (4 Ezra 3:4-10; cf. 6:3; QG 1:6, 56; see section 5.6.1). This is a far cry from the way the first man is depicted throughout the composition. This suggests that the author has altered the positive Adam tradition that is attested in 4QInstruction. See Leivson, Portraits of Adam, 117. See further Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls (STDJ 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 85-90; John J. Collins, “In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran,” in The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls (ed. D. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 615.}

5.7 Conclusion

The author of 4 Ezra is writing in the wake of the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E. In his reflections on the issue of theodicy, he addresses the human condition. To do this he turns to the
portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3. In *4 Ezra*, Adam is portrayed as the paradigmatic human—all of humanity is made in the same manner. The first man is created with both the evil root and ability to obey God’s commandments. This notion is used to emphasize Israel’s ability to do the same. The biblical depiction of Adam’s first sin is portrayed as the first man succumbing to the evil heart. According to *4 Ezra*, this results in physical death, existence outside of Eden in the miserable conditions of the present age, and, for Adam, death of the soul. Adam is further understood as the paradigm of disobedience. The wicked are associated with the mortal, sinful Adam who was expelled from paradise. Those who follow his example and sin will likewise not be granted entrance into the garden and experience death of the soul. There is a clear negative perception of the first man in the composition. However, the righteous are promised the garden of Eden, immortality, and becoming like the angels in the age to come. Implicitly, the author contends that the righteous will enjoy the blessings that Adam lost when he sinned and was expelled from paradise. Further, in order to obtain the future bliss of Eden, the righteous are expected to emulate Adam in the garden by faithfully cultivating the tree of life—obeying the Torah.

The Qumran composition, *4QInstruction*, provides a new context for evaluating the extent to which *4 Ezra* attests ideas and tropes found in older sapiential literature. *4 Ezra*, though significantly influenced by the apocalyptic tradition in light of the destruction of the temple, was also shaped by traditions attested in *4QInstruction*. This is primarily seen in the manner in which Adam and the garden of Eden are used to depict the rewards of the righteous in *4 Ezra* and the status of the elect in *4QInstruction*. In the Qumran text, the addressee is told that he has been created like the angels and if he acts like the angels by pursuing wisdom, he will enjoy eternal life with the angels. Having been made like them indicates that the elect have the
same sort of inclination that they do, which is to do what is good. This is in stark contrast to 4 Ezra, which states that every human is made like Adam, which includes the evil inclination. The author of 4 Ezra’s depiction of Adam is much more negative than what is found in 4QInstruction.

4 Ezra and 4QInstruction both use the garden of Eden. In 4 Ezra, the garden of Eden is an actual place that is promised to the righteous in the age to come. In 4QInstruction, however, the garden is a metaphor that the author uses to articulate the elect status of the addressee. The elect in 4QInstruction have stewardship over the garden in a metaphorical sense during life, but the righteous in 4 Ezra are given complete access to the literal garden only in the afterlife. The author of 4 Ezra contends that Israel has access to the tree of life (the Torah) while alive on earth and must metaphorically cultivate it by imitating Adam while he was in the garden (prior to sinning) in order to gain a blissful eternal life. This is similar to the charge in 4QInstruction that the addressee is to till and keep the garden. Here, however, the garden of Eden is only available to the elect. In 4 Ezra, the possibility of enjoying Eden is available to all of Israel, but only given to those who obey the Torah. Further, the wisdom that the addressee in 4QInstruction is to pursue is supernatural revelation that is also only available to the elect. The rewards that the righteous will receive in Eden depicted in 4 Ezra draw from the same notions in 4QInstruction that describe both current and future blessings of the elect. The righteous are told that in the garden they will become like the angels, which is associated with the terms joy and glory. In 4QInstruction, the elect are already like the angels even before the blissful afterlife because that is how they were made (like the Adam of Gen 1:27). The elect are told they can also look forward to becoming more like the angels after death at which point they will experience glory and joy in the company of the angels.
The parallels found in the 4 Ezra and 4QInstruction indicate that the author of 4 Ezra’s interpretation of Genesis 1-3 relies on older exegetical traditions attested in 4QInstruction. The traditions appropriated by the author of 4 Ezra also show signs of significant emendation. 4 Ezra takes older positive traditions about Adam, which are attested in 4QInstruction, and uses them in a negative manner. This supports Leison’s claim that 4 Ezra’s portrayal of Adam is drawing on an older tradition in which Adam was viewed more positively.\textsuperscript{136} For the author of 4 Ezra, the destruction of the temple was a transformative event. This profoundly influenced how the author read Genesis 1-3. The destruction of the temple was also the impetus to make Adam a paradigmatic figure associated with all humanity, as in Ben Sira, and read him in a much more negative manner to refer to human sinfulness as well. The author does not retain the notion that Adam should be understood as chiefly a positive figure primarily connected to one group of humanity—the elect—attested in 4QInstruction. In light of the context in which the author of 4 Ezra was writing, the more neutral depiction in Ben Sira and the favorable portrayal of Adam attested in the Qumran text have been exchanged for an overwhelmingly negative depiction of the first man. The positive use of Adam to describe the elect status of the addressee in 4QInstruction was shifted to depict the future rewards for the righteous in the world to come.

\textsuperscript{136} Leison, Portraits of Adam, 117. See Moo, Creation, Nature and Hope in 4 Ezra, 42-58.
CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

6.1 Introduction

The publication of 4QInstruction provides an occasion to reexamine the way Early Jewish authors read Genesis 1-3 when reflecting on the human condition. This study allows us to see the varied types of Adam that are represented in Early Judaism. The Genesis 1-3 traditions attested in 4QInstruction allow us to gain a better sense of the diversity of accounts not available to Levison in his 1988 study. Levison argued that the interpretations of Adam during the Second Temple period were far more diverse than previously argued (see section 1.1.2). He argues that Ben Sira uses Adam to make assertions about humanity as a whole, such as having freewill and being mortal. Levison contends that the Wisdom of Solomon understands Adam paradigmatically to explain that although humanity is made with a body that weighs down the soul, he was able to exercise dominion over the earth because he obtained wisdom. Humans are supposed to follow his example. Levison argues that Philo explains that the Genesis 1 account depicts the creation of the composite human race (Opif. 64-88) and Genesis 2 conveys the creation of composite individual man (Opif. 134-35). The Adam of Gen 2:7 is used to explain that humanity consists of an immortal mind and mortal body (Opif. 135). The breath that humanity receives is understood as the “image of God” possessed by humanity from Gen 1:26-27. Rather than the entire soul, Philo views the rational mind as immortal. Philo also interprets the Gen 1:26-27 as symbolizing the virtuous person who lives according to reason (Leg. 2.4; QG 2.62). The Adam of Gen 2:7 is the person who is capable of vice or virtue (Leg. 1.32) and is understood as the neutral person (Leg. 1.33-34, 38) opposed to the virtuous person, who is
described using the Adam of Gen 1:27. Philo also includes the Platonic interpretation of portrayals of Adam—the Adam of Gen 1:26-27 as the intelligible man and the Adam of Gen 2:7 as the sense-perceptible man (QG 2.56). Levison contends that apocalypses 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch have overwhelmingly negative interpretations of Adam. These authors appeal to both biblical portrayals of Adam to evoke God the creator’s mercy so he will free them from Roman rule.

4QInstruction uses Adam to primarily understand the nature of the elect and was not available to Levison when he published his study. 4QInstruction’s sectarian interpretation of Adam allows us to see that the Genesis 1-3 exegetical traditions were, in fact, even more varied than Levison proposed. The interpretation of Adam attested in 4QInstruction, however, allows us to also gain a better sense of the exegetical traditions that may have influenced other Early Jewish authors. This suggests that the Early Jewish Genesis 1-3 traditions may have more in common than Levison concedes in his book. Further, 4QInstruction makes it easier to discern a shift from the second century B.C.E. to the first century C.E.—from an association of Adam with the elect and the angels, towards turning to Adam to explain human sinfulness.

Early Jewish authors regularly turned to Adam to address various issues concerning the human condition, such as mortality and accessibility to wisdom. However, the interpretations were often quite different depending on the intentions of a particular author. The types of Adam represented in Early Jewish literature include: 1) 4QInstruction uses Adam in a sectarian manner by associating him with the angels and primarily to describe the condition of the elect; 2) Ben Sira interprets Adam to account for characteristics that all humanity shares, such as mortality and dominion over the earth; 3) Philo uses the two portrayals of Adam to argue that all humans belong to one of two categories of humanity, with each representing a different mode of being human (the virtuous and the wicked), and they are used to convey the state of existence before,
during, and after life in the flesh; and 4) the author of 4 Ezra uses Adam to account for the human condition, especially sinfulness, as well as the rewards enjoyed by the righteous in the eschatological garden of Eden.

The Early Jewish literature examined in this dissertation allows us to see the diversity of the ways Adam was interpreted. The primary issues that Second Temple Jewish authors addressed when interpreting Adam include: 1) sectarianism; 2) the elect and the virtuous; 3) humanity’s association with the angels; 4) the non-elect and the wicked; 5) all humanity; 6) human sinfulness; 7) wisdom; and 8) the afterlife.

6.1.1 Adam and Sectarianism

In 4QInstruction, Adam is used in a sectarian manner. The author appeals to the depiction of the first man in Genesis 1-3 to understand the nature of the elect. The elect are associated with the Adam of Gen 1:27. Both are made in the likeness of the angels (with a proclivity to do good), have access to divine revelation, and have the hope of eternal life. The status of the elect is also depicted by the proclamation that the addressee has metaphorically been granted dominion over the garden of Eden based on the portrayal of Adam in Genesis 2-3. The condition of the garden is used to symbolize the dedication of the elect addressee to the pursuit of wisdom. The composition also uses Adam to explain that there are two opposed kinds of humans—the רוח שלם חיות and the רוח✈ לעון חיות. This dichotomy is rooted in the portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3. The רוח שלם signifies the elect and are associated with the Adam of Gen 1:27. The רוח✈ לעון, in contrast, represents the non-elect and are associated with the Adam of Gen 2:7. This portrayal of Adam is used to explain that the non-elect will not experience life beyond physical existence.
6.1.2 Adam, the Elect, and the Virtuous

In 4QInstruction, the author turns to Adam to help the elect understand their own elect status. Philo, like 4QInstruction, describes an ideal type of humanity, which he calls the virtuous. In both *Opif*. 134-35 and *Leg*. 1.31-32, he associates the virtuous with the Adam of Gen 1:27, not unlike 4QInstruction. In *Opif*. 134-35, this group of humanity is understood as those who faithfully pursue wisdom. This sort of humanity will enjoy eternal life and become like the Adam of Gen 1:27 (and the angels)—in the form of a disembodied soul. Eternal life is achieved by imitating Adam in the garden of Eden, where Philo contends he constantly pursued wisdom (prior to sinning). Both *Opif*. 134-35 and *Leg*. 1.31-32 refer to an ideal sort of humanity. In the *Opif*. 134-35, the Adam linked to Genesis 1 and the cultivation of the garden together function as a model to emulate in life. In *Leg*. 1.31-32, the Adam of Genesis 1 symbolizes the race of humanity to which one belongs. The race of humanity to which one belongs is determined by the way one lives, rather than how God created him.

6.1.3 Adam and the Angels

In 4QInstruction and Philo, an important way that they describe an ideal type of humankind is that the group is more like angels than other people. In 4QInstruction, the elect are made in the same manner as the Adam of Gen 1:27—“according to the likeness of the holy ones.” Theinstruction refers to Adam (*אֲדָם*), who is also made in the likeness of angels. Similar to 4QInstruction, Philo contends that the Adam of Gen 1:27 is like the angels. In *Opif*. 134-35, those who practice virtue imitate the Adam of Gen 1:27 and the angels. The virtuous also become like the Adam of Genesis 1 and the angels in life and more so after death. In *4 Ezra*, the author suggests that Adam enjoyed being in the likeness of angels prior to his expulsion from the
garden. This is implied by the author’s description of the righteous becoming like the angels after death in the eschatological garden of Eden.

6.1.4 Adam, the Non-Elect, and the Wicked

In both 4QInstruction and Philo, the Adam of Gen 2:7 is used to describe the people who are in opposition to the elect and the virtuous. In 4QInstruction, the מָזַר represents the non-elect and are associated with the Adam of Gen 2:7, as mentioned above. This portrayal of Adam is used to explain that for this group of humanity there is no life beyond the finitude of physical existence. Philo, in Leg. 1.31-32, associates the non-elect with the Adam of Gen 2:7. Those who live a life of wickedness are associated with the earthly man (♂ γῆνος ἄνθρωπος), who is derived from Genesis 2. They do not obtain eternal life. In 4 Ezra, the Adam of Genesis 2-3 is portrayed as sinful, the first human to submit to the evil heart (3:21) and as the paradigm of the wicked. Those who sin as Adam did are associated with not only him, but also the evil present age. This group is placed in opposition to the righteous and, like Adam, will not enter and enjoy the garden.

6.1.5 Adam and All Humanity

Adam is used in Ben Sira, Philo, and 4 Ezra to make anthropological assertions concerning all humanity. Ben Sira primarily turns to Adam to explain humanity as a whole. The sage appeals to the creation of Adam in Genesis 1 to explain that humanity has been made in the image of God. Because of this, humans have dominion over all of creation and have been given knowledge from the beginning. Ben Sira uses Gen 2:7 to explain that humanity was created to be mortal from the beginning. Elsewhere, Ben Sira uses this verse to explain that all humans have the ability to choose whether or not to obey the Torah, regardless of the sort of inclination a human was given by God at creation. Philo uses the Adam of Gen 2:7 in Opif. 134-35 to explain
that all humanity is composite—consisting of body and soul. In 4 Ezra, Adam is used to explain that all humans are made in the same way. Like Adam, humans are created with the “evil heart” and have an inclination to sin.

6.1.6 Adam and Human Sinfulness

In Philo and 4 Ezra, the Adam of Genesis 2-3 is interpreted as a way of being human that is associated with sinfulness. However, this is done in different ways. In 4 Ezra, the author depicts the Adam portrayed in Genesis 2-3 as the paradigm of the wicked. In the composition, both Ezra and Uriel align Adam with sinfulness and death of the soul. Those who follow Adam’s example by living a sinful life also experience death of the soul. The author of 4 Ezra also explains that the condition of Adam corresponds with all humanity. In the composition, all humans, beginning with Adam are created with the evil heart. This means that all humans have the inclination to sin because they were all made in the same way as Adam. Philo also portrays the Adam of Genesis 2-3 as a model for the wicked. In Opif. 134-35, the Adam of Gen 2:7 is portrayed as the paradigm of the wicked. Composite humans, represented by the Adam of Gen 2:7, who live a life that is dedicated to wickedness will experience the death of the soul. This notion is based on Philo’s interpretation of Adam’s transgression in Eden. Philo provides the example of the Adam of Gen 2:7 as the life that is spent pursuing wickedness.

6.1.7 Adam and Wisdom

In 4QInstruction, Ben Sira, Philo, and 4 Ezra, Adam is used to discuss conceptions of knowledge and wisdom. 4QInstruction contends that Adam was given supernatural revelation in the garden of Eden called the vision of Hagu. This is the same revelation that is available to the עננים, who were made in the likeness of the Adam of Gen 1:27 (and the angels). This heavenly revelation includes the knowledge of good and evil. The knowledge of good and evil is available to the
addressee through the study of the (4Q417 1 i 6-8). Along with supernatural revelation, the elect have been granted metaphorical stewardship over Even. According to the author of 4QInstruction, the condition of the garden symbolizes the addressee’s study of wisdom, which should follow the example of Adam of faithfully caring for the garden in Genesis 2-3.

Ben Sira also contends that Adam had access to the knowledge of good and evil, given to him by God. This knowledge is understood to be the Torah. Ben Sira further states that the Torah later settled specifically in Israel and was no longer available to all humanity. This set Israel apart from the rest of the nations. Philo also contends that Adam had access to wisdom in Eden. Adam’s faithful pursuit of wisdom is symbolized by his cultivation of the garden. Those who follow his example as one who cultivates wisdom and lives virtuously will become like the Adam of Genesis 1, who effortlessly pursues wise. In 4 Ezra, Uriel uses Adam’s ability to obey the prohibition given to him in Eden to argue that Israel likewise has the ability to obey the Torah.

6.1.8 Adam and the Afterlife

In 4QInstruction, Philo, and 4 Ezra, the portrayals of Adam in Genesis 1-3 are used to convey notions of the afterlife. In 4QInstruction, the elect, who are made liken the Adam of Gen 1:27 (and the angels), have the hope of eternal life. They are able to obtain eternal life by metaphorically tending Eden like Adam did prior to sinning through the study of supernatural revelation. The author explains that the non-elect, who are associated with the Adam of Gen 2:7, will be destroyed in the final judgment. Philo contends, in Opif. 134-35, that humans who imitate the Adam of Gen 1:27 by living a life of virtue will enjoy eternal life. Elsewhere, in Leg. 1.31-32, the type of human that is identified as the heavenly man (ὁ οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος) is signified by the Adam of Gen 1:27. This group of humanity will also enjoy eternal life. To gain
eternal life, Philo explains that one can imitate the Adam of Gen 1:27 as well as Adam in Eden, who faithfully pursued wisdom. Those who live a life of wickedness follow the example of the Adam of Gen 2:7 and the sinful Adam of Genesis 2-3 who was expelled from the garden. The group of humanity who lives a life pursuing the passions of the flesh are associated with Gen 2:7 and called the earthly man (ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐνθρώπου). This sort of humanity will not enjoy eternal life. Rather, they will experience death of the soul. In 4 Ezra, as discussed above, Adam is associated with sinfulness and the present evil age that will pass away. Those who follow the example of Adam will experience death of the soul, just as the first man did. However, the portrayal of Adam in the garden of Eden is used by the author to describe the rewards that the righteous will receive after death (e.g., joining the angels, rest, abundance, and peace).

6.2 Conclusion

This study has demonstrated that the anthropological reflections based on Genesis 1-3 in 4QInstruction have changed how we understand the way the figure of Adam was interpreted during the Second Temple period. This Qumran text allows us to gain a better sense of the diversity of the interpretations of Adam in Early Judaism. The sectarian reading of the portrayals of Adam in 4QInstruction demonstrates a richness of exegetical traditions that scholars, such as Levison, were not aware prior to its publication. Levison contends that the interpretation of Adam in Early Judaism is more diverse than previously thought. With 4QInstruction we can see that Genesis 1-3 traditions of the Second Temple period were more diverse than Levison thought. While Adam is used in different texts to address similar issues, the authors read the first man differently. For example, 4QInstruction reads Adam in a sectarian manner to primarily
describe the condition of the elect. 4 Ezra, however, turns to Adam to account for human sinfulness.

4QInstruction also provides a context to better understand the exegetical traditions that may have influenced other Early Jewish compositions. Both Philo and 4 Ezra may have been influenced by the traditions attested in 4QInstruction. Philo, although significantly influenced by Hellenistic thought, was also possibly shaped by Palestinian Jewish tradition attested in 4QInstruction. This is evidenced by the accounts of the double creation of humankind found in Philo’s work. These accounts include an ideal type of humanity that is associated with the Adam of Gen 1:27 (and the angels) and the exhortation to pursue wisdom metaphorically like the Adam of Genesis 2-3 in Eden. Philo’s contemporary, the Wisdom of Solomon, also appears to have adapted some of the Adam traditions attested in 4QInstruction. This Qumran composition demonstrates that older traditions that are found in these Alexandrian authors are present in earlier Hebrew sapiential literature composed in Palestine. 4 Ezra may also include Genesis 1-3 exegetical traditions attested in 4QInstruction. The author may have employed the interpretation of Adam in 4QInstruction used to describe the elect status of the addressee by applying it to the future rewards that will be enjoyed by the righteous. Although attempting to determine the meaning of the destruction of the temple for Israel, the author of 4 Ezra also seems to have turned to Genesis 1-3 exegetical traditions attested in 4QInstruction to articulate the future rewards of the righteous, primarily the eschatological garden of Eden. The tradition used to describe the elect status of the addressee in the Qumran text is reworked by the author of 4 Ezra to signify the future rewards of the righteous Israelites who have faithfully followed the Torah. 4QInstruction suggests that Philo and 4 Ezra appropriated and reworked exegetical traditions.
regarding Genesis 1-3 attested in Palestinian wisdom literature composed during the second century B.C.E.

The larger context of 4QInstruction in Early Judaism demonstrates a shift in the interpretation of Adam from the second century B.C.E. to the first century C.E. In the second century B.C.E., 4QInstruction includes a primarily positive interpretation of Adam, while Ben Sira uses the first man to account for characteristics common to all humans. In Ben Sira, Adam is used to account for human mortality, but he is also used to account for freedom of choice, being made in the image of God, and having access wisdom. While Ben Sira’s interpretation of Adam is not as positive as 4QInstruction’s, it is quite favorable nevertheless. Adam is not used in either of these compositions to account for human sinfulness. However, there is a shift to directly appealing to Adam to account for human sinfulness in the first century C.E. In both Philo and 4 Ezra, Adam is used to explain sin. Philo explains that composite humanity must combat the temptations of the sense perceptible world. Those who choose to pursue the wickedness of the world follow the example of the sinful Adam of Genesis 2-3 and categorically belong to the group that is represented by the sinful Adam of Gen 2:7. The author of 4 Ezra appeals to Adam’s evil heart to explain that all humans have been made in the same way—with the propensity to sin. Those who live a life of wickedness follow the example of Adam, who sinned and experienced death of the soul. 4QInstruction allows us to more clearly see that there is a shift to interpreting Adam to account for human sinfulness that occurred from the second century B.C.E. to the first century C.E. The more complete picture of how Adam was interpreted during this period reveals a larger trend towards associating Adam with human sin that was not available before the publication of 4QInstruction.
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