

Anthropological Crisis and Solution in the *Hodayot* and 1 Corinthians 15*

JASON MASTON

Houston Baptist University, 7502 Fondren Rd, Houston, TX 77074, USA.
Email: jmaston@hbu.edu

This article describes how the writers of the *Hodayot* understand Gen 2.7 as describing an anthropological crisis: the human is formed from the dust and wasting away. Drawing on Ezekiel 37, the hymnists maintain that this crisis is overcome by God imparting his Spirit. This understanding of Gen 2.7 is used to illuminate Paul's argument in 1 Corinthians 15. Paul likewise reads Gen 2.7 as a description of an anthropological problem, and he finds the solution in Ezekiel 37. Yet, he introduces his own twist so that Gen 2.7 comes to express both the crisis and the solution.

Keywords: anthropology, body, death, eschatology, hermeneutics, Scripture

1 Corinthians 15 is Paul's great treatise on resurrection from the dead. Despite his passionate and lengthy argument, the precise view of the resurrected body that he presents here is widely debated.¹ Some, especially at the popular level, view the resurrection body as an escape from the material to a 'spiritual' body. More recently, a growing number of scholars contend that the resurrection body is composed of the higher elements of the heavenly realms. Others have contended, though, that the resurrection body is somehow related to the present body but defining this is not possible given the lack of detail in Paul's argument.

Across these viewpoints is one common problem: a failure to attend carefully to how Paul interprets Gen 2.7 in his argument. Many argue that Paul's reading of Gen 2.7 is best explained by comparison with Philo's reading of Gen 1.26 and 2.7.²

* The research for this study was supported by a British Academy/Leverhulme Trust Small Research Grant.

1 See the summary in A. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 1276–81.

2 See recently S. Nordgaard, 'Paul's Appropriation of Philo's Theory of "Two Men" in 1 Corinthians 15.45–49', *NTS* 57 (2011) 348–65. For important earlier studies, see R. A. Horsley, 'Pneumatikos vs. Psychikos: Distinctions of Spiritual Status Among the

The two share the same vocabulary: ‘first man’, ‘heavenly man’ and ‘earthly man’. However, several studies have shown that important differences exist between the two writers suggesting that Philo is probably not the best parallel for explaining Paul’s reading of Gen 2.7. For example, Philo seems to lack Paul’s consistency. While both identify the ‘Adam’ of Gen 2.7 as the ‘first man’, the terms ‘heavenly man’ and ‘earthly man’ are inconsistently applied by Philo.³ Moreover, the issues central to Philo – noetic and sense perception – are absent in Paul, and Philo lacks Paul’s eschatological perspective.⁴ While the similarities and differences indicate that comparisons are valuable and helpful for understanding how ancient Jews interpreted Gen 2.7, a comparison between Paul and someone with a similar eschatological perspective would be more fruitful.⁵

Such a comparison can be made with the *Hodayot*, a text that has a similar eschatological perspective to Paul. As will be shown in section 1 of this study, Gen 2.7 provides the hymnists with a textual description of an anthropological crisis: humanity is formed from the dust and as such is wasting away. The hymnists found a resolution to this anthropological crisis in Ezekiel 37, which describes God giving his Spirit to humanity. In section 2, this understanding of Gen 2.7 is used to illuminate Paul’s argument for the resurrection of the dead. Paul likewise reads Gen 2.7 as a description of an anthropological problem. He also finds the solution in Ezekiel 37. Yet, he introduces his own twist so that Gen 2.7 comes to express both the crisis and the solution.

1. A Dusty Body and the Spirit in the *Hodayot*

It has been rightly noted that the opening chapters of Genesis are foundational to the theology and anthropology of the *Hodayot*. Holm-Nielsen comments: ‘Gen. 1–3 is so used that one would understand the community to have considered its existence under eschatological circumstances as a reincarnation of the paradise of old.’⁶ More particularly, Yates and I have traced the significant role

Corinthians’, *HTR* 69 (1976) 269–88; A. J. M. Wedderburn, ‘Philo’s Heavenly Man’, *NovT* 15 (1973) 301–26.

3 J. D. Worthington, *Creation in Paul and Philo: The Beginning and Before* (WUNT 11/317; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011) 162–3, 166–72; cf. S. J. Hultgren, ‘The Origin of Paul’s Doctrine of the Two Adams in 1 Corinthians 15.45–49’, *JSNT* 25 (2003) 345–50.

4 Worthington, *Creation*, 76–7, 184–5, 203–10.

5 Another common theory suggests Gnosticism as the background. This theory has been thoroughly discredited. See for an assessment Hultgren, ‘Origin’, 357–9.

6 S. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran* (ATDan; Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget 1 Aarhus, 1960) 312.

of Gen 2.7 for the anthropology of the *Hodayot*.⁷ In order to understand how the hymnists utilised Gen 2.7 in their anthropology, it is important to begin by noting how they imagined eternal life and particularly the sharp contrast between the future age and present reality.⁸

1.1 *The Eschatological Goal for Humanity*

While this is not the dominant theme of the *Hodayot*, the hymns envision an eschatological age in which the elect dwell before God with the holy ones. The fullest statement is in 1QH^a 11.20–5, in which the hymnist thanks God because he has ‘lifted me up to an eternal height’. God has set him ‘with the host of the holy ones’ and he has ‘enter(ed) into community with the congregation of the children of heaven’ (ll. 22–3).⁹ This eschatological hope is juxtaposed with an anthropological crisis. The hymnist describes himself as ‘a perverted spirit’ (l. 22) and as one whose life was in Sheol-Abaddon (l. 20). More significant, though, is the comment ‘I know that there is hope for one whom you have formed from the dust for an eternal council’ (l. 21–2). The phrase ‘formed from the dust’ alludes to Gen 2.7 and sets the original creation in contrast to the eschatological vision for humanity. This contrast is even sharper when one considers 1QH^a 4.27, where the hymnist praises God because he has given the elect ‘an inheritance in all the glory of Adam for long life’. The exact meaning of ‘the glory of Adam’ is unclear. Nevertheless, the key point at present is that the hymnists view the eschatological new creation as a return to the Garden of Eden and a restoration to the state of the pre-lapsarian Adam.¹⁰ Yet, the hope for a return to the original is set over against the present situation of humanity as ‘formed from the dust’. This creates an anthropological crisis that must be resolved in order for humanity to attain its divinely intended purpose, namely, to dwell in God’s presence with all the glory of Adam.

⁷ J. W. Yates, *The Spirit and Creation in Paul* (WUNT 11/251; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 72–82; J. Maston, *Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism and Paul: A Comparative Study* (WUNT 11/297; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010) 80–94.

⁸ The authorship of the Hymns remains debated. For the purposes of this study, the division between ‘community hymns’ and ‘teacher hymns’ will not be factored in.

⁹ The column and line numbers all come from the DJD volume: H. Stegemann and E. M. Schuller, *Qumran Cave 1. III: 1QHodayot^a with Incorporation of 1QHodayot^b and 4QHodayot^{a-f}* (DJD XI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2009). I have used throughout Carol A. Newsom’s translation from DJD, with occasional modifications.

¹⁰ Contra C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002) 107–8, who, citing *Jub* 3.8–14, argues that the Qumranites did not view the Adam of Gen 2.7 as having entered into Eden. The dusty Adam, he contends, existed prior to entering a state of glory in Eden. There is no indication, though, that the hymnists held such a view of Adam.

1.2 *The Anthropological Crisis of Dusty Humanity*

Running throughout the *Hodayot* is a pessimistic anthropology that sharply distinguishes the human from the divine and stresses shame and indignity. Others have provided general surveys of the anthropological features, and my focus here is more narrowly on how Gen 2.7 is used in the anthropology of the *Hodayot*.¹¹

The *Hodayot* uses several expressions that call to mind the Genesis account of Adam's creation. The expression 'son(s) of man/Adam' (e.g. 7.19 (4QH^a 8 i 11); 9.29, 36; 12.31; 19.6) may point to Adam as the first human. More explicit connections with Genesis are found in the widespread references to humanity's origins in the dust or clay, particularly in the common phrases 'creature of dust' (יצר [ה]עפר) or 'creature of clay' (יצר [ה]חמר).¹² The following passage captures well the basic features of the *Hodayot's* anthropology and shows in particular how Gen 2.7 informs it:

As for me, from dust [you] took [me, and from clay] I was [sh]aped as a source of pollution and shameful dishonour, a heap of dust and a thing kneaded [with water, a council of magg]ots, a dwelling of darkness. And there is a return to dust for the creature of clay at the time of [your] anger [] dust returns to that from which it was taken. What can dust and ashes reply [concerning your judgement? And ho]w can it understand its [d]eeds? How can it stand before the one who reproves it? (20.27–31)

The passage begins with an allusion to Gen 2.7 and uses a range of other metaphors referring to the creation of humanity in order to develop a pessimistic outlook.¹³ The statement concludes by drawing on Gen 3.19. The return to dust indicates the final destiny of the mortal human being.

As the hymn continues, it becomes clear that the anthropological problem is one of inability and insignificance. Humans lack the capacity to endure the divine judgement since as creatures from dust they are far removed from God's glory. Compared to God, then, humans will simply return to the dust to waste away. The hymnist concludes this portion with the question 'What, then, is he who returns to his dust?' (1QH^a 20.34).¹⁴

In 18.4–9 the hymnist defines 'mortal man' as being 'dust, pinched off c[lay] whose return is to the dust' (l. 5).¹⁵ The first and last phrases clearly recall Gen

11 See Maston, *Divine and Human Agency*, 80–94; and N. A. Meyer, 'Adam's Dust and Adam's Glory: Rethinking Anthropogony and Theology in the *Hodayot* and the Letters of Paul' (PhD Thesis, McMaster University, 2013), 21–116.

12 עפר appears forty-seven times, חמר fourteen times, and the two expressions eighteen times.

13 For a discussion of these expressions, see Maston, *Divine and Human Agency*, 84–5.

14 Contrast Ps 8.4, which may be in the background of this hymn, and the ones discussed in the following pages.

15 On the grammar of this text, see Maston, *Divine and Human Agency*, 83.

2.7 and 3.19.¹⁶ By pointing to humanity's dusty state, the hymnist underscores its humble origin and from this develops ideas about human inability. The humble origin reveals humanity's complete weakness. Alone, the hymnist lacks the ability to devise his own plans, to understand and to speak. This hymn presses this thought further in the following lines where the contrast between God and 'he who returns to the dust' is drawn. The key difference between God and humanity is the weakness of humanity because of its creatureliness.

Similarly in 1QH^a 5.31–3 the hymnist asks: 'What is one born of a woman amid all your [gre]at fearful acts?' (l. 31).¹⁷ The answer begins with Gen 2.7, suggesting that the conception of humanity must be seen from this perspective: 'He is a thing constructed of dust and kneaded with water. Sin[ful gui]lt is his foundation, obscene shame, and a so[urce of im]purity. And a perverted spirit (וְרוּחַ נְעוּדָה) rules over him' (1QH^a 5.32–3). Each expression drives home the inherent weakness of the human being because the human is a creature of dust.

The inherent weakness of dust is captured by the hymnist's question: 'What is dust in their palms [and a w]ork of ashes in their hand? They are nothing' (23.27). And in light of this confession one recalls the question of l. 24: 'But, as for me, what am I? Truly from dust I was taken.' This notion of inherent weakness is pressed further by the reminder that as creatures drawn from the dust, humans will return to the dust (18.5–7; 20.29; 23.29). The idea that humans return to the dust is widespread across the Old Testament and ultimately rooted in Gen 3.19.¹⁸ For the *Hodayot* this parallel conception of humanity's beginning and ending reinforces the idea that humans are frail creatures by virtue of the material from which they are created. The return to the dust reminds humans that they are not eternal beings, but rather mere mortals. Eternity belongs to God alone.¹⁹

Given the pervasive allusions to Gen 2.7, one can ask how this text has influenced the anthropology of the *Hodayot*. First, one should not treat these expressions merely as idioms or dead metaphors. Julie Hughes claims that the phrase 'creature of clay' resembles Job 10.9; 33.6 and Isa 29.16; 41.25, and because of this wider usage one should not see an allusion to Gen 2.7 in every instance.²⁰ Yet, for the ancient reader, Genesis 1–3 already lies in the background of these OT texts. Moreover, as explained above, the *Hodayot* is deeply influenced by Genesis 1–3. This suggests that an ancient reader would have associated the phrase 'creature of clay' with Genesis rather than another text.²¹

16 The phrase 'pinched off c[lay]' probably comes from Job 33.6.

17 Cf. Job 15.14, which belongs within a group of texts reflecting on the place of humanity with creation.

18 See Job 17.16; 20.11; 21.26; 34.15; Ps 7.6 [Eng 5]; 22.15 [16], 30 [29]; 104.29; Qoh 3.20; 12.7.

19 See also 1QH^a 9 and 12.30–2 for other statements drawing on Gen 2.7 to describe the human.

20 J. A. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot* (STDJ 59; Leiden: Brill, 2006) 46.

21 For the links with Genesis, see nn. 6 and 7 above.

Second, one should not limit these phrases or the anthropology of the *Hodayot* to humans as sinful. Svend Holm-Nielsen suggests that ‘creature of clay’ and ‘kneaded with water’ ‘may be called technical terms in DSS for man’s sinfulness as contrasted with the divine nature’.²² This claim, however, overlooks how these phrases call to mind firstly creation ideas: it is not merely human sinfulness that is contrasted with the divine nature, but rather that humans are creatures and God is not. To be sure, phrases denoting especially human sinfulness are typically stated in the context. But this is precisely where the anthropological crisis of the *Hodayot* becomes so complex. The problem with humanity is not traced to an Adamic fall (cf. Rom 5.12–21; 4 *Ezra* 7.118; 2 *Bar.* 54.15), but rather to the fact that humans are creatures formed from a material that wastes away. Bilha Nitzan rightly states: ‘[Humanity’s] sins are not the result of error, carelessness, or human malice which may be overcome through the power of human will, nor are they the consequence of having been misled. Rather, they are rooted in a basic human weakness as a created being, against which man is powerless to act alone’.²³ When the hymnists describe humans with the language of Gen 2.7, that language does not denote in the first instance sinfulness, but rather weakness, frailty and ultimately mortality.

Third, the hymnists use language that calls to mind the physical composition of the human (dust, clay etc.), and this emphasis on the dusty origins of humanity could be read as indicating material substance. That is, one could think that the material *itself* is the fundamental problem that prevents humanity from attaining its eschatological goal. The solution, then, would be to reconstitute the human with a new substance (or none at all). This, however, misunderstands the anthropology of the *Hodayot*. For the hymnists the material substance always denotes creaturely weakness and inability. The references to the material composition of the human function as metonyms for the character of the human. The material itself is not the problem and the solution is not a refashioning of the physical properties of the human. Rather, as I will now show, the solution is a decisive act of God to restore the human through God’s Spirit.

1.3 *The Divine Solution of the Spirit*

The anthropological crisis described in the *Hodayot* arises from the material-as-character of the human being: having been formed from the dust, the human is marred by a creaturely condition of frailty and weakness, a condition that gives way to expressing itself in sinful actions. At the same time as the hymnists describe this pessimistic view of the human, they also repeatedly recall God’s act to resolve the dilemma.

²² Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 24–5 n. 43.

²³ B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1993) 337.

A key expression in the *Hodayot* is 'by the spirit which you gave me' (ברוח אשר נתתה בי, 5.36; 8.29; 20.14–15; 21.34). This statement, as Yates notes, is closest to Ezek 37.6, 14: נתתי בכם רוח (word order varies between the two verses; cf. 11.19; 36.26–7).²⁴ Verse 14 makes explicit that it is the divine Spirit that is given when God states that he will give 'my spirit': ונתתי רוּחִי בְכֶם. Additionally, both the *Hodayot* and Ezekiel link the Spirit with knowledge. For Ezekiel, the people will 'know that I am the Lord' because God has placed his Spirit in them (37.6, 14). Similarly, in 1QH^a 20.35–8, after declaring that no one can stand before God at the judgement because humanity comes from the dust, the hymnist queries how he will be able to understand or walk in God's ways unless God gives him understanding. The answer to his questions is found in the description of the Spirit as the one who brings knowledge (cf. 6.36). As the hymnist writes previously in this same hymn:

And I, the Instructor, I know you, my God, by the spirit that you have placed in me. Faithfully have I heeded your wondrous secret counsel. By your holy spirit you have [o]pened up knowledge within me through the mystery of your wisdom and the fountainhead of [your] pow[er ...] (20.14–16)

In 21.34 the hymnist contrasts his origins in the dust with the present possession of the Spirit: '[And as for me, a cr]eature of dust, I know by the spirit that you have placed in me that [...].' The same thought is echoed in 5.35–6, where the hymnist writes: 'I, your servant, know by means of the spirit that you have given me [].' This gift of knowledge through the Spirit is juxtaposed with the hymnist's reflections on his dusty origins in ll. 30–3 (see above).

The hymnists find the solution to the anthropological problem of Gen 2.7 in the divine promise announced in Ezekiel 37. This textual resolution is evident not only in the broad theological claims, but also in the very way in which the hymnists describe the human spirit and the gift of God's Spirit. Yates has shown that statements of the sort 'you formed [יצר] the spirit' (1QH^a 7.26; 9.17; 12.32; 18.24) are based on Gen 2.7.²⁵ The hymnists have 'conflated Gen. 2:7a–b into one action in which man is fashioned from dust and man's spirit is also "fashioned" in some way'.²⁶ This spirit given at creation is described throughout the *Hodayot* as corrupt and contributes to the idea that humans are destined for death. By contrast, Ezekiel 37 describes God 'giving' a new spirit, indeed, his Spirit (vv. 6, 14). The divine Spirit brings life and knowledge, thus acting in a manner contrary to the human spirit fashioned at the same time as humans are

24 Yates, *Spirit*, 79; cf. J. A. Bertone, *The Law of the Spirit: Experience of the Spirit and Displacement of the Law in Romans 8:1–16* (SiBL 86; New York: Peter Lang, 2005) 101–6.

25 Yates, *Spirit*, 76–8.

26 Yates, *Spirit*, 76.

drawn from the dust. By drawing on the spirit language of Ezekiel 37, the hymnists are able to overcome the anthropological crisis they find described in Gen 2.7.

The gift of the Spirit results in a transformation in the human condition. By possessing Spirit-endowed knowledge, the human is (to some extent) lifted out of the dusty condition and placed in the presence of the heavenly host (11.20–4; 19.13–17). This imparting of knowledge is coupled with the human being purified by the Spirit. While most of the statements about purification link the action with human sinfulness, these that describe the human becoming part of the heavenly community indicate that purification also involves a ‘cleansing of impurity associated with being human’.²⁷ In this newly found state of purity and with knowledge, the human is constituted to be given ‘all the glory of Adam for eternal life’. As 5.34 says, ‘By your splendour you glorify him, and you give [him] dominion [with] abundant delights together with eternal peace and long life’ (cf. 16.21–6).²⁸ Thus we come full circle: despite having borne the marks of dust and clay, by the gift of the divine Spirit, who imparts knowledge and purifies, humanity comes to possess the glory of Adam, brings to completion his assigned task and now dwells eternally in the presence of God with the heavenly host.

Exactly what the hymnists envisioned the future dwelling with angels to encompass is not specified.²⁹ According to Collins, ‘Since the well-attested ideal of the community was the angelic life, and angels were spirits, it is unlikely that the members had any desire to resume their bodily existence.’³⁰ Yet, it must be stressed that the hymnists nowhere claim that humans will be angels. Also, while bearing some characteristics of the divine (e.g. glory), humans come to participate *with* the angels in the worship of God (11.22–3). Moreover, the few explicit references to the eschatological age depict humans as resuming the tasks originally assigned to Adam (11.20–4; 16.21–6; 19.13–17). The act of God through his Spirit does not bring about a change in the material substance of human beings. This is particularly important to highlight since the problem with humanity is linked with the material from which it is formed: the dust. The physical material, though, stands for certain characteristics. It is these characteristics

27 D. Falk, ‘Psalms and Prayers’, *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, vol. 1: *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (ed. D. A. Carson, P. T. O’Brien and M. A. Seifrid; WUNT 11/140; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001) 31.

28 Cf. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 106–7. For the connections between column 16 and Genesis 2–3, see Yates, *Spirit*, 72–5.

29 There is also debate about whether the *Hodayot* has a doctrine of resurrection. For a recent discussion, see J. J. Collins, ‘The Essenes and the Afterlife’ and G. J. Brooke, ‘The Structure of 1QH^a XII 5–XIII 4 and the Meaning of Resurrection’, both in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Melanges Qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (ed. F. García Martínez, A. Steudeland and E. Tigchelaar; STDJ 61; Leiden: Brill, 2006) 15–33 and 35–53, respectively.

30 J. J. Collins, ‘The Angelic Life’, *Metamorphoses: Resurrection, Body and Transformative Practices in Early Christianity* (ed. T. K. Seim and J. Økland; Ekstasis 1; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009) 309.

that are discarded in the future age. At no point do the hymnists suggest that God replaces one body with certain physical properties (e.g. flesh) with another with different physical properties (e.g. *pneuma*).

1.4 Summary

The *Hodayot* reflect an eschatological vision of a return to the glory of Adam that is made problematic by an anthropological crisis that arises from the material out of which Adam was formed. This anthropological crisis is located textually in Gen 2.7. For the hymnists Gen 2.7 identifies all that is wrong with humanity in its present condition: humans are ‘creatures of dust’. The problem is not one of physical substance, but of character, as the dusty body is frail, weak and mortal. For the hymnists of the *Hodayot*, the present body must be radically reconstituted in order to be fit for dwelling in the divine presence. This refitting comes by virtue of God working through his Spirit to remake the body into what it was originally designed to be. The solution is derived from Ezek 37.1–14 with its announcement that God will recreate the human through his Spirit. The ‘Spirit’ body is a return to the original, pre-lapsarian body. The change, though, is not in substance (flesh to spirit or material to immaterial) but in quality. The dusty characteristics that denoted mortality are removed. This new body, then, is not itself a different body. The new body is the human body enlivened by the divine Spirit.³¹

2. Two Adams and their Bodies in 1 Corinthians 15

Paul’s argument for resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15 bears several similarities to the anthropology of the *Hodayot*. Not only is there the use of Gen 2.7, but both Paul and the hymnists use this text to articulate an anthropological crisis which contrasts sharply with the eschatological goal of humanity: dwelling in the presence of God forever. And for both authors the anthropological crisis is resolved by a pneumatically formed divine solution. This section explores how Paul understands Gen 2.7 while keeping a close eye on how the interpretation offered by the *Hodayot* can help bring out Paul’s meaning.

2.1 The Anthropological Crisis of the First Adam’s Body

Although Paul’s citation of Gen 2.7 comes later in the argument of 1 Corinthians 15, the influence of the creation account is already seen in vv. 21–8

31 The link between Gen 2.7 and Ezek 37.1–14 is also taken up in some later rabbinic texts (e.g. *Gen. Rab.* 14.5–8). See Hultgren, ‘Origin’, 359–66; L. Novakovic, *Raised from the Dead according to Scripture: The Role of the Old Testament in the Early Christian Interpretations of Jesus’ Resurrection* (JCTCRSS 12; London: Bloomsbury, 2012) 164–6; M. Kister, ‘“First Adam” and “Second Adam” in 1 Cor 15:45–49 in the Light of Midrashic Exegesis and Hebrew Usage’, *New Testament and Rabbinic Literature* (ed. R. Bieringer *et al.*; JSJSup 136; Leiden: Brill, 2010) 351–65.

as Paul explains the anthropological crisis to which resurrection is the solution: 'death came through a human being ... in Adam all die' (vv. 21–2). These parallel statements identify the human predicament as death. Paul's comment 'the last enemy to be destroyed is death' (v. 28) reinforces this indication that death is the central anthropological problem. This account of the anthropological crisis is sharply contrasted by the antithetical statements 'and the resurrection of the dead through a man ... in Christ all will be made alive' (vv. 21–2). The anthropological crisis – death – is set in contrast with the intended eschatological goal for humanity – life. As the passage continues, it becomes clear that the intended aim for humanity and all of creation is to be in the divine presence. At one level, then, the eschatological goal is the same for Paul and the hymnists of the *Hodayot*.

Many commentators fill out Paul's condensed statements in vv. 21–2 with the account of Adam's sin from Genesis 3 and particularly Paul's interpretation of this in Rom 5.12–21.³² In both Genesis and Romans death's entrance is traced to Adam's transgression. In 1 Corinthians 15, however, Paul never links Adam and sin. Instead, he only makes passing glances at sin: 'Christ died for our sins' (v. 3); 'If Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile; you are still in your sins' (v. 17); 'come back to your senses and stop sinning' (v. 34); and 'the sting of death is sin' (v. 56). None of these statements carries the heart of the argument, and none is linked with Adam as the cause of humanity's sinfulness. By inserting Adam's sin into the mix, scholars have missed how the two uses of Adam in 1 Corinthians 15 are correlated. Instead of answering the question of death's origin in vv. 21–2, Paul leaves it open. Death is simply the problem to which resurrection is the solution. But the origin of death is not explained.³³

At v. 35 Paul moves towards showing why death is the anthropological crisis and how it is linked with Adam. He begins with two questions. The first is general, 'How are the dead (οἱ νεκροί) raised?' and the second specifies exactly what is meant, 'With what kind of body (σώματι) do they come?' The introduction of the term σῶμα indicates a decisive shift in Paul's argument. Σῶμα did not appear in vv. 1–34, where the dominating word was νεκρός (11x). In vv. 35–58 the word νεκρός only appears three times, while σῶμα appears nine times. As the two questions of v. 35 indicate, the two words are closely related. Nevertheless, with the terminological shift Paul's discussion takes on a more narrowed focus, and in doing so highlights a second aspect of the anthropological crisis, namely, the Adamic body. Paul, like the *Hodayot*,

32 E.g. R. E. Ciampa and B. S. Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians* (PNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010) 764; E. J. Schnabel, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (HTA; Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 2010²) 920; Meyer, 'Adam's Dust', 199.

33 Cf. A. Lindemann, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (HNT 9/1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000) 343–4; J. Q. Martini, 'An Examination of Paul's Apocalyptic Narrative in First Corinthians 15:20–28', *CTR* 8 (2011) 61.

traces the anthropological problem of death back to its source in the dusty body given to Adam at creation.

The link with Adam appears explicitly in v. 45 when Paul quotes Gen 2.7. Far from being a 'second move' in his argument, vv. 36–44 actually anticipate Paul's citation.³⁴ Unlike a modern commentator Paul does not cite the scriptural text and then offer commentary. Rather, here the interpretation appears first as Paul contends that God has created various bodies according to his own will. It is important, therefore, to trace briefly the argument of vv. 36–44.

In vv. 36–38 Paul establishes that God is able to create 'just as he willed'.³⁵ This claim is illustrated in vv. 39–41, where Paul highlights the range of bodies that God has created.³⁶ The latter part of v. 38 is probably a commentary on Gen 1.11–12.³⁷ Paul's account of the types of bodies in 1 Cor 15.39–41 is based on the account of days 4–6 in Gen 1.14–28.³⁸

The allusion to Genesis 1 establishes two points. First, it places the reader in the context of the Genesis creation narrative and prepares one for Paul's citation of Gen 2.7. Paul wants his readers immersed fully in the world of Genesis so that he can show how God has already foreshadowed the future from the beginning. Second, it actually guards against a potential misunderstanding of Paul's argument. Anticipating the rather negative comments he will make about the nature of the first Adam's body (vv. 42–4, 47), he carefully highlights that all of the bodies designed by God are glorious (v. 40). Far from creating a hierarchy in which the heavenly bodies are superior, Paul is actually declaring that the earthly and heavenly bodies both have 'glory' just as God designed them to from the beginning.³⁹

34 Contra T. Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 29.

35 Cf. J. R. Asher, *Polarity and Change in 1 Corinthians 15: A Study of Metaphysics, Rhetoric, and Resurrection* (HUT 42; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000) 80.

36 A. T. Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet: Studies in the Role of the Heavenly Dimension in Paul's Thought with Special Reference to his Eschatology* (SNTSMS 43; Cambridge: CUP, 1981) 39; G. D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 782–3.

37 R. F. Collins, *First Corinthians* (SP 7; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999) 563–4; J. A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians* (AYB 32; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008) 589.

38 Ciampa and Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, 805–6. Worthington (*Creation*, 128) suggests that v. 40 is a reference to day 2 of creation (Gen 1.6–10).

39 See Worthington, *Creation*, 129–31; J. M. G. Barclay, 'Stoic Physics and the Christ-event: A Review of Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010)', *JSNT* 33 (2011) 411. Contra D. B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999) 126; Asher, *Polarity and Change*, 102–6; Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology*, 28. If the Corinthians held a strong polarity between the earthly and the heavenly, as Asher contends, then Paul does not accommodate their view, again as Asher claims, but fundamentally rejects it. Asher's reading is far better at explaining what the Corinthians may have believed than what Paul believed. For accounts

In vv. 42–4 Paul takes the point that God is able to create all types of bodies (as the previous verses established) and begins to show how this is relevant to the resurrection of the body. The final antithesis, *σῶμα ψυχικόν* and *σῶμα πνευματικόν*, indicates that throughout vv. 42–4 Paul is describing two different types of bodies, one that is sown in corruptibility and one that is raised in incorruptibility. This antithesis also provides the rhetorical link to Paul's citation of Gen 2.7 in v. 45. The phrases *σῶμα ψυχικόν* and *σῶμα πνευματικόν* are Paul's interpretive glosses of the scriptural text. This is suggested by the lexical correspondence, which indicates that Paul has Gen 2.7 in mind before he actually quotes it.⁴⁰

Verses 45–9 rhetorically bring the argument to its climax and, through the citation of Gen 2.7, explain where Paul gets the idea that there are two types of bodies: the present body (described by the negative statements in vv. 42–4) and the resurrected (described by the positive statements in vv. 42–4). He declares through his citation of Gen 2.7 that the two bodies were established by God, thus reconnecting with his assertion in v. 38 that God gives a body 'just as he willed'. Yet, Gen 2.7 has more to contribute to Paul's view than merely an understanding of the nature of the human body. It becomes clear in vv. 45–9 that Paul has been discussing the bodies of the first and second Adams all along. With the quotation of Gen 2.7 in v. 45 as a 'linchpin',⁴¹ Paul narrows the focus of the antitheses from vv. 42–4 into an antithesis between Adam and Jesus and particularly their bodies. However much the antitheses in vv. 42–4 lend themselves to abstract generalisations about the human body, the link between vv. 42–4 and vv. 46–7 indicates that Paul's argument has revolved around the bodies borne by the two Adams.⁴²

With the citation of Gen 2.7 Paul clarifies how death became a problem for humanity. His view follows the interpretive tradition set out in the *Hodayot*.⁴³

similar to Asher, see N. Bonneau, 'The Logic of Paul's Argument on the Resurrection Body in 1 Cor 15:35–44a', *ScEs* 45 (1993) 79–92; S. Brodeur, *The Holy Spirit's Agency in the Resurrection of the Dead: An Exegetico-Theological Study of 1 Corinthians 15,44b–49 and Romans 8,9–13* (TG.T 14; Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1996) 34–80.

40 The citation of Gen 2.7 here functions in the same manner as the citation of Hab 2.4 in Rom 1.17. See F. Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016²) 38–47. Cf. Yates, *Spirit*, 95–6.

41 Yates, *Spirit*, 96: 'verse 45 may be said to function as a hermeneutical lynchpin for the chapter'.

42 Paul has not yet moved to dealing with what type of body the rest of humanity bears. This comes only in vv. 48–9, where he employs the language of Gen 1.27 and 5.3 to describe humanity in the image of the first and second Adams. B. L. Gladd's attempt to explain the phrase *πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν* in 1 Cor 15.45 through the lens of Gen 5.3 falters on this account ('The Last Adam as the "Life-Giving Spirit" Revisited: A Possible Old Testament Background of One of Paul's Most Perplexing Phrases', *WTJ* 71 (2009) 297–309).

43 To be clear, I am not claiming that Paul is dependent on the *Hodayot*, but rather that the interpretation seen in the *Hodayot* helps shed light on Paul's.

As seen in the discussion of the *Hodayot*, the hymnists understand Gen 2.7 to be about the character of the human body. They use the language of dust and clay to denote the frailty, weakness and mortality of the human. For the hymnists, the human body is wasting away and will return to the dust. Likewise, for Paul Gen 2.7 speaks of the Adamic body as frail. The negative elements in the antitheses in 1 Cor 15.42–4 are descriptions of the present Adamic body. The three elements (φθορά, ἀτιμία, ἀσθένεια), which are captured in the expression σῶμα ψυχικός, all denote something about the character of the body, namely, its frailty. Additionally, understanding ‘dust’ (vv. 47–8) as a reference to frailty flows naturally into v. 50, where Paul states that ‘flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God’. The expression σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα does not mean literally ‘flesh’ and ‘blood’, but, as Jeremias and others have shown, refers to mortal humanity.⁴⁴ The Adamic body is unfit for the kingdom of God precisely because it is weak and subject to death.

By returning to the antithesis between Adam and Christ in vv. 45–7, the lack of detail in vv. 21–2 about the cause of death is now resolved. The issue is not simply death, but rather that the present human body is unfit for eternity because it is mortal. Moreover, the anthropological crisis, as Paul describes it in 1 Corinthians 15, is not Adam’s transgression, but specifically Adam’s mortal body. In this regard Paul’s understanding of Gen 2.7 follows the trajectory of the *Hodayot* which also identified the Adamic dusty body as mortal. Just as Gen 2.7 encapsulated the pessimistic elements of the hymnist’s anthropology, so this text encapsulates the pessimistic elements for Paul’s.

2.2 *The Divine Solution of the Second Adam’s Body*

The meaning of Gen 2.7 for Paul is not limited only to what it says about the anthropological crisis of the first Adam’s body. According to many scholars, Paul’s comment in 1 Cor 15.45b that the last Adam is πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν is intended to recall the middle clause of Gen 2.7: ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς (‘He breathed into his face a breath of life’).⁴⁵ This is surely mistaken.⁴⁶ There are no lexical connections between the two clauses. Nor is the claim that 1 Cor 15.46 is an interpretative gloss in which Paul is admitting that his reading is a blatant contradiction of the Genesis text persuasive.⁴⁷ Rather, Paul builds his assertion about the second Adam strictly on what is said about the first Adam

44 J. Jeremias, “Flesh and Blood Cannot Inherit the Kingdom of God”, *NTS* 2 (1956) 153. See A. Johnson, ‘On Removing a Trump Card: Flesh and Blood and the Reign of God’, *BBR* 13 (2003) 175–92, for a fuller discussion of the texts and this verse.

45 E.g. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 788–9; C. Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (TNNT 7; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1996) 409; Brodeur, *The Holy Spirit’s Agency*, 86; Hultgren, ‘Origin’, 361; Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology*, 29.

46 Cf. Novakovic, *Raised from the Dead*, 163.

47 Contra Kister, ‘First Adam’, 354.

so that there is correspondence (in the form of antithesis) at every point. When read from the perspective of the *Hodayot*, it is little surprise that Paul brings the Spirit in as part of the solution to the problem of humanity's dusty body.

Through the language of Ezekiel 37, the hymnists found the resolution to the anthropological crisis, and it seems likely that Paul was influenced by the same text.⁴⁸ The impact of Ezekiel 36–7 is clear in other places in Paul's writing. In 2 Cor 3.6 he uses the same phrase as in 1 Cor 15.45, πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ, in a context influenced by Ezekiel 36–7 (see 2 Cor 3.3). The description of the Spirit as 'making alive' recalls most explicitly the account of the Spirit in Ezekiel 37. In 1 Cor 2.5–16 the terms πνευματικός and ψυχικός distinguish between those who are able to understand the things of God and those who do not. The link between the Spirit and knowledge is present in the *Hodayot* and based on Ezekiel 37. Similarly, a key issue throughout 1 Corinthians is the purity of the church. The link between the temple, the Holy Spirit and purity in 1 Cor 6.19 reflects similar theological ideas running through Ezekiel (cf. 2 Cor 6.14–7.1). Although Paul does not 'cite' Ezekiel in 1 Cor 15.45, it seems highly likely that his phrase πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν is reflecting Ezekiel's vision of the Spirit's work.

Several scholars have argued that Paul envisions the resurrection body as consisting of the 'stuff' of heaven or *pneuma*. For example, Dale Martin claims that

[t]he resurrected human body will partake of a nature similar to that of heavenly bodies and will be as much higher than the current earthly body in the physiological hierarchy as the heavenly bodies are in comparison to earthly bodies ... What human beings have in common with heavenly bodies is, in Paul's system, incorporation as a 'pneumatic body' – that is, a body composed only of pneuma with sarx and psyche having been sloughed off along the way.⁴⁹

Asher and Engberg-Pedersen take a similar line regarding the idea that the resurrected body transforms into a pneumatic body which is made from the same 'stuff' as the stars.⁵⁰

The textual background in Ezek 37.1–14 and the similarities with the *Hodayot*, however, point in a different direction.⁵¹ In Ezek 37.1–14 the imparting of the Spirit does not result in a change in the material substance of the human

48 See particularly Novakovic, *Raised from the Dead*, 165; cf. Yates, *Spirit*, 102.

49 Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, 126.

50 Asher, *Polarity and Change*, 99–145; Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology*, 28–30. There are some important differences between, on the one hand, Martin and, on the other, Asher and Engberg-Pedersen, not least regarding the nature of the Corinthian problem with the body and the influences on Paul. However, these differences do not affect much in terms of their understanding of the resurrection body.

51 For a thorough response to the view of Martin and others, see V. Rabens, *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul: Transformation and Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013²) 86–96.

being, but rather brings life to the dead human. The picture of resurrection describes the formation of a ‘flesh and blood’ human. Similarly, in the *Hodayot* the human does not become something different because of the Spirit. Rather, through the Spirit’s work, the human sheds the dusty characteristics that prevent him from dwelling with the angels in the presence of God. Finally, Paul’s use of πνευματικός earlier in 1 Corinthians does not indicate that something has the physical properties of *pneuma* or heavenly ‘stuff’, but rather that one is characterised by the Spirit (2.13, 15; 3.1; 9.11; 10.3–4; 12.1; 14.1, 37).⁵² Given this context when Paul identifies the second Adam as πνευματικός or πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν in 15.45, he is not claiming that the second Adam becomes *pneuma* or heavenly ‘stuff’. The statement is about the Spirit’s work to transform the person into a being who is able to dwell in God’s presence. Paul seems, therefore, to share another commonality with the *Hodayot*. Both use Gen 2.7 to articulate the anthropological crisis and both turn to Ezekiel 37 to find the solution.

Yet Paul’s solution moves in a different direction with his insertion of the adjectives πρῶτος and ἔσχατος. Paul indicates that the text of Gen 2.7 itself speaks about two Adams: the original Adam and the eschatological Adam. Paul’s reading of Gen 2.7 correlates the *Urzeit* with the *Endzeit*.⁵³ As noted, the hymnists of the *Hodayot* envisioned eternal life as a return to Eden. For them the *Endzeit* is identified with the *Urzeit*: the future is a return to the glorious past. Paul takes up the same links between the two periods in his reading of Genesis. But against any attempt to identify the two, he reminds the reader in v. 46 that, although both Adams are spoken of in the text, there is a particular order that must be maintained. The ψυχικός must come first, then the πνευματικός can follow. The two adjectives probably carry a double reference to their respective Adams and their bodies, as Paul is speaking of the two Adams only in relation to their bodies. Thus, although Paul finds both Adams in the text of Genesis, he is compelled by the text to maintain a certain order.

Paul’s reading, though, is not simply imposed from the outside as a strange interpretation or a bizarre proof texting. Rather, Paul’s rereading of Gen 2.7 is necessitated by Ezekiel 37. For Paul, the prophet determines the meaning of the Torah. Ezekiel’s vision of resurrection and the work of the Spirit opens up for Paul a new way to understand Gen 2.7. The text speaks, then, not only of the original creation, but through the influence of the prophet also of the new creation.⁵⁴

52 This corresponds also to how Paul uses the term in his other letters (Rom 1.11; 7.14; 15.27; Gal 6.1; cf. Eph 1.3; 5.19; 6.12; Col 1.9; 3.16).

53 See esp. Novakovic, *Raised from the Dead*, 164–5; cf. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 570.

54 Paul’s hermeneutical method here parallels how Hab 2.4 influences his reading of the Torah. See Watson, *Hermeneutics of Faith*.

2.3 Summary

In summary, Paul's argument for the resurrection body is predicated on Scripture. He makes his claims about the first Adam on the basis of the original creation accounts in Genesis 1–2. And he makes his claims about the second Adam on the same basis but now with the help of Ezekiel's vision of resurrection. Genesis 2.7 is thus the crucial element in Paul's understanding of the resurrection body, for without it he would not have been able to give an account of death's presence nor answer the question ποίῳ δὲ σώματι ἔρχονται;

3. Conclusion

In the *Hodayot* Gen 2.7 is used to articulate from a scriptural perspective what is wrong with humanity. Taking the language of dust and clay, the hymnists depict humanity as frail, weak and mortal. The resolution to this anthropological crisis is for God to send his Spirit to recreate the human so that he or she is fit for dwelling with God. The divine solution is itself announced in Scripture, namely, Ezekiel 37. In a similar fashion Paul also uses Gen 2.7 to identify the anthropological crisis. Because of Adam's death has entered into the world, and through Gen 2.7 Paul is able to show that death has entered precisely because Adam's body is 'dusty', that is, φθορά, ἀτιμία and ἀσθένεια, a σῶμα ψυχικόν. For Paul, also, the divine solution is found in Ezekiel's prophecy of a Spirit enlivened body. Additionally, through a creative correlation of the *Endzeit* with the *Urzeit* directed by Ezekiel 37, Paul argues that Gen 2.7 announces not only the problem, but also the solution: a second Adam who brings a new body fitted with the right characteristics to dwell in the presence of God. Paul's reading of Gen 2.7 is itself influenced by Ezekiel's prophecy, for the second Adam's body is one made alive by the Spirit.