

THE WORSHIP OF ADAM AND CHRIST
AS THE IMAGE OF GOD*

D. Steenburg

7-51 Blandford Street
Woodstock, Ontario N4S 7H7, Canada

To my knowledge, the discussion of Adam speculation and its relevance for early Christology has not yet considered the suggestion that elements of Adam speculation may have played a formative role in the cultic veneration of Christ. Larry W. Hurtado in his recent book, *One God, One Lord*,¹ has explored the phenomenon of the extremely early origins of the worship of Christ and the various conceptual precedents that could have been drawn from to articulate worship of something or someone alongside the Most High God. Divine hypostases, angels and glorified patriarchs each offer ways of making intelligible the experience of Jesus as one worthy of veneration. A persistent theme of *One God* is that, though the language used to speak of Jesus has various precedents in Jewish tradition, nevertheless the Jewish-Christian worship of Christ is without precedent. Nowhere do we find any suggestion that the worship of any exalted being other than God alone was admissible, let alone actual. However, there is one speculative theme overlooked in this analysis that may be quite significant, the only theme which portrays the legitimate worship of someone other than God. The notion that Adam had been worshipped may have provided a crucial warrant for the worship of Christ.

I will argue that the worship of Jesus Christ was partially legitimated in its Jewish context by the principle that the worship of the image of God, insofar as it is a visible or physical manifestation of God, is within the bounds of Torah. This principle (which for the sake of convenience I shall call the Legitimacy Principle) finds a place also in Adam speculation and, judging from the Adamic imagery with which the visible manifestation of God in Christ is

portrayed, it may well owe its origin to the influence of Adam speculation. The argument is not conclusive, but the facts are sufficiently suggestive to merit further scholarly examination.

The Worship of Adam

Let us begin by considering that the major principle behind the Jewish denunciation of idolatry was that the form or physical appearance of God had not been revealed. This point is made explicitly in Deut. 4.12:

You saw no form of any kind the day the Lord spoke to you at Horeb out of the fire. Therefore watch yourselves very carefully so that you do not become corrupt and make for yourselves an idol, an image of any shape. . .

This is a recurrent theme in Scripture; one finds in Isa. 45.15f., for example: 'Truly you are a god who hides himself, O God and Saviour of Israel. All the makers of idols will be put to shame and disgraced'. Indeed, it may be quite possible that the reason for the use of the plural in Gen 1.26—where man is made in 'our image', that is, in the image of the 'gods' of the divine council—is to mitigate the idea that man is made specifically in God's image and the implication that the human form is a legitimate object of worship.²

In a passage of *The Life of Adam and Eve* that may well derive from Jewish sources³ the fall of Satan is associated with his refusal to worship Adam. The date of the portion of the work in which our passage is found is thought to be between the first and fourth century, with the earlier date being more probable.⁴ *Vit. Ad.* 13 reads:⁵

When God breathed into you the breath of life, and your face and likeness was made in the image of God, Michael brought you and made us worship you in the sight of God; and the Lord God said, Here is Adam. I have made him in our image and likeness.

Reference was made to this passage in a previous article,⁶ in which it was argued that the use of 'face' in this passage is an irregular departure from the standard idiom of 'image', a departure occasioned by the concern to relate God's image in Adam directly to his physical shape or visible appearance; this concern in turn is related, I believe, to the fact that Adam is worshipped. 'Image' is somewhat general and ambiguous with regard to the nature of the representation; the *imago*

dei is generally applicable to all human beings in *Vit. Ad.* 'Face' relates more specifically to physical, visual appearance, just as the angelic worship of Adam in *Vit. Ad.* is peculiar to Adam alone. God's command to worship Adam probably intended a single act of veneration rather than an ongoing cultus, yet even this is a significant deviation from strict monotheism. The literary purpose of God commanding the angels to worship Adam is to convey human superiority over angels and in this Adam is a representative of the human race. To be adequate to the text in its irregular usage of 'face', however, we are probably meant to understand that Adam is not just a representative by virtue of his patriarchy, but that he is also the *best* representative and that his superiority in this regard pertains to his physical or visible likeness to God. For the author to portray God commanding the angels to worship Adam, it must have been deemed a legitimate thing for God to say without compromising his Torah. The irregular use of 'face' evidently reflects an implicit attempt to justify God's command; it assumes the Legitimacy Principle—to worship the manifest appearance of God in his image is in accord with the law against idolatry.

There is a comparable passage in a Christian portion of the *Sibylline Oracles* (8.442-445), where a paraphrase of the creation of Adam in Gen. 1.26 is given.⁷

Let us make a man wholly like us in our form and give him life-sustaining breath. Although he is mortal, everything in the world shall serve him and when he is moulded of clay we shall subject everything to him.

I interpret λατρεύσει, 'serve', in this passage in the sense of religious service or worship, though not necessarily in a cultic sense. In part my reason for this is that it accounts for the use of μορφή rather than the idiomatic εικόν in a way that parallels *Vit. Ad.* 13 and may have been influenced by such a tradition. Also, the concessive force of πέρ in the participial phrase, ᾧ θνητῷ περ έόντι, assumes a tension between Adam being mortal and being 'served' by all things. Why this tension would exist is not clear if λατρεύω were meant in its more mundane sense. If this account of the passage is accurate, we have here another example of reverence for Adam, implicit in which is the Legitimacy Principle.

It is not my intent to argue that there was a prominent or cohesive body of Adam speculation in pre-Christian Judaism; that such was not the case has been shown by J.R. Levison.⁸ The single text in *Vit.*

Ad. simply illustrates the plausibility that the notion of Adam having been worshipped (and the Legitimacy principle it implies) had emerged in pre-Christian Judaism. Furthermore, I do not mean to imply that all Jews would have accepted the legitimacy of the Legitimacy Principle. *Genesis R.* 8.10 relates a story of the creation of Adam in which the ministering angels ‘mistook him and wished to exclaim “holy” before him’.⁹ This is likened to a situation where a king and a governor sat in a chariot together and people, wanting to do obeisance to the king, were confused because they did not know which one to hail as ‘Domine’. This tradition implied that Adam-worship, even given his visible likeness to God, was thought by some to compromise monotheism. It could be that this position was one that took shape in the wake of a heretical misappropriation of an earlier Jewish tradition in much the same way that Jewish monotheism redefined itself more carefully with respect to its mediation traditions due to the emergence of Christian and Gnostic permutations as Segal has argued.¹⁰

As an indirect attestation to the unique implications of Adam’s likeness to God, one might also note *Baba Bathra* 58a, in which an early third-century Tanna’, R. Bana’ah, is going through the caves of the patriarchs and taking their measurements—a theme with unmistakable Hekhalot overtones. He asks to see Adam’s cave but is not allowed to do so. He is allowed to see Abraham, who is the ‘likeness of My image’ (*dmwt dywqny*),¹¹ but not to see Adam, the image of God. The question naturally arises as to why Adam’s being the image of God makes it inappropriate for him to be seen. The most natural explanation would seem to be that it is related to the theme of the hiddenness of God. Seeing Adam is as inappropriate as seeing God.¹² This, too, may imply an argument against the worship of Adam. Just as God’s form had not been revealed, neither was Adam’s form to be revealed.

*Adam Christology and the Legitimacy Principle
in the Worship of Christ*

The next point to be discussed is the close association of Adam Christology with the worship of Christ in passages that indicate that God is visibly manifest in Christ. First, let us take account of the Adam motif as it occurs in implicit and explicit references to the worship of Christ. Two of the major passages commonly understood to be based on cultic hymns that implicitly celebrate Christ, Phil.

2.6-11 and Col. 1.15-20, both arguably begin with elements of an Adam Christology. The reference to Christ being 'in the form of God' in Phil. 2.6 has been acknowledged by various authors as synonymous with being 'in the image of God'.¹³ Col. 1.15 begins with the affirmation of Christ as 'the image of the invisible God'. The 'image' terminology points to Christ in Adamic terms, as I shall argue below. Finally, Heb. 1.6 is a passage which makes the theme of worship explicit: 'When God brings his firstborn into the world, he says, "Let all God's angels worship him"'. This passage is reminiscent of *Vit. Ad.* 13 and may depend on such a tradition; it is difficult to see how this ideal could be read into LXX Deut. 32.43 without such a tradition informing it. Furthermore, Heb. 1.6 needs to be read against the background of 1.3, which probably expresses an Adam motif. The juxtaposition of 'radiance of God's glory' and 'express image of his being' (χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως) brings to mind Paul's juxtaposition of 'image' and 'glory of God' in 1 Cor. 11.7. When Paul refers to all males as 'the image and glory of God', the reference to the Adamic nature in males is obvious. It is not unreasonable to suppose then that Heb. 1.3 implies an Adam Christology. In Hebrews however, clearly a special case is being referred to. Instead of using 'image', the author prefers to speak in terms of χαρακτήρ, which may assert more emphatically the exact likeness of the Son to the Father.

Each of the above passages dealing with the worship of Christ asserts or assumes the theme of the physical or visible manifestation of God in Christ. As noted with respect to Heb. 1.3, χαρακτήρ may be understood perhaps as more specific in conveying the distinctive visible likeness of the Adamic Christ to the Father; among the possible meanings of χαρακτήρ we find 'outward appearance, form'.¹⁴ Turning next to Phil. 2.6, in light of the distinction between εἰκών and μορφή that I have argued for in a previous paper, μορφή is used, rather than the idiomatic εἰκών, precisely because it conveys the nuance of visible likeness. Finally, in Col. 1.15 we find the juxtaposition of 'image' and 'the invisible God'. T.K. Abbot¹⁵ notes that God is emphatically qualified as invisible, which implies that 'image' here should be taken to connote the visible manifestation of the invisible. This is a connotation that would not naturally or necessarily attend the word 'image' apart from this juxtaposition. The concrete manifestation of God in Christ also seems to be the point of the affirmation in 2.9—'For in Christ all the fullness of the Deity lives *in bodily form*'.

If this is an adequate interpretation of the biblical material, in each of these three passages relating to the worship of Christ we find that imagery reflecting an Adam christology bears with it an emphasis on the visible manifestation of God in Christ. The emphasis on visible manifestation surely needs to be accounted for, and the Legitimacy Principle provides a way of accounting for it. Implicit in the emphasis on visible or physical manifestation of God in Christ stands the principle that to worship him accords with the reasons behind the prohibition of idolatry. Thus, in these early Jewish-Christian cultic hymns a way is found to include some reference to Christ's manifesting God, as a means of instilling confidence that such worship does not constitute a transgression of Torah.¹⁶ The fact that in both Philippians 2 and Colossians 1 the hymns begin immediately with Christ's revelatory character before addressing the further honour and distinction of his role in creation and/or redemption may be intended as a tacit justification of the worship that the hymns convey.

It might be noted that the veneration of Christ is often presented within these texts as having its basis in God's initiative; God gives Christ the title of 'Lord' in Phil. 2.9-11 and commands worship in Heb. 1.6. One might note also that it is at God's bidding that the angels are to worship Adam in *Vit. Ad.* 13. This indicates that the veneration of Christ or Adam is not based simply on his possessing God's form. The Legitimacy Principle provides a necessary premise but not a sufficient reason for venerating someone other than God.

It is interesting to note in passing that the adoration of Yahweh motif from Isaiah 45, which has been acknowledged as playing a part in the formulation of the hymn to Christ in Philippians 2, specifically deals with the adoration of Yahweh in a decisive rejection of idolatry by the nations.¹⁷ One might wonder whether one of the factors that led to the incorporation of the Isaiah 45 theme was an apologetic concern to relate the worship of Christ to the defeat of idolatry—especially if the hymn were composed before the incorporation of the gentiles into the Church, so that the theme of the nations turning to God was not the primary reason for its use. It may be mere coincidence that Philippians 2, opening on the note of the visible manifestation of God in Christ, draws from a passage that asserts the hiddenness of God as the ground for the impropriety of idolatry. Yet perhaps the juxtaposition of these themes helps to make clear that

worshipping Christ is not a participation in idolatry but rather the prophesied fulfilment of God's victory over idolatry.

Adam and Wisdom Speculation

Though the force of my argument rests on the emphasis of the visible manifestation of God in Christ in the context of worship, it is not inconsequential that this understanding of Christ is informed by the Jewish understanding of Adam, for this supports the plausibility that the Legitimacy Principle is indeed common to both and is a bridge between them. Therefore, fuller attention needs to be given at this point to the relationship of Adam speculation and Wisdom themes, for it is by no means certain that the christological themes of Hebrews and Colossians should be understood in terms of Adam Christology rather than Wisdom Christology. It is my position that, on one hand, it is artificial to speak of distinct Adam and Wisdom Christologies because the two themes merge not only in christological speculation but also in earlier Jewish thought. On the other hand, in spite of the integral unity of the two merged themes, one can trace the specific contributions of each because of distinct thematic differences between Adam and Wisdom speculation. I do not mean to imply by this that either line of speculation was a cohesive body of material but simply that each has distinct, typical motifs. Let us begin by reviewing these themes and the differences between them.

Considering first the Wisdom theme, one finds five distinctive motifs. First, there is Wisdom's antiquity. She is present with God in the Beginning, before any other creation. 'Yahweh created me when his purpose first unfolded, before the oldest of his works. From everlasting I was firmly set, from the beginning, before earth came into being' (Prov. 8.22). Secondly, Wisdom is a companion of God. She is the consort of God's throne (Wis. 9.4), a co-worker and guide (Wis. 8.4), 'ever at play in his presence' (Prov. 8.30). Thirdly, Wisdom plays a role in creation. This is implicit in Proverbs 8 and perhaps in Sirach 24. It is explicit in Wis. 7.21, where Pseudo-Solomon refers to the categories of natural science in which he has been instructed by Wisdom 'who designed them all'. She served as the ordering principle, the architect or foreman, of creation. Wisdom's role in creation is slightly different in passages such as *2 Enoch* 30.8: '... on

the sixth day I commanded my wisdom to create man . . . ' Here she is a servant who creates according to God's command. Fourthly, Wisdom has an ongoing role in sustaining the created order, an order that cannot be overcome by evil, and so all who live in accord with her live securely in harmony with the cosmos. 'She deploys her strength from one end of the earth to the other, ordering all things for good' (Wis. 8.1). Finally, Wisdom is a teacher and a revealer. She instructs in natural science and virtue but she also reveals the will of God. 'What man indeed can know the intentions of God? Who can divine the will of the Lord? . . . [W]ho could have learned it, had you not granted Wisdom and sent your holy spirit from above?' (Wis 9.13, 17). Sir. 24.23 goes further in explicitly identifying Wisdom with Torah.

Regarding Adam speculation, first one notes the theme of Adam's kingship over the earth. *2 Enoch* 31.3 is typical of this motif: 'I wished to create another world, so that everything could be subjected to Adam on earth, to rule and reign over it'. Secondly, Adam is uniquely superior to every created thing. His priority vis-à-vis the rest of the cosmos is considered in terms of excellence of nature and/or appearance rather than temporal precedence. Often the theme of Adam's greatness is understood in terms of his cosmic size. In *Baba Bathra* 58a again, R. Bana'ah manages to see Adam's heels despite the denial of permission, and those heels are said to be 'like two orbs of the sun'. Thirdly, Adam was seen as a perfect symbol or microcosm of the cosmos. His creation in *2 Enoch* 30, for example, portrays him as created out of the seven components, i.e., receiving aspects of all the previous creation so that creation is summed up in him. In *Sanhedrin* 38f., a compendium of Adam speculations, R. Meir is reported to have asserted that Adam represents all creation, having been composed of dust taken from all parts of the earth. Finally, the theme of the worship of Adam, while by no means a prominent one and, as has been mentioned, is not unquestionably orthodox, is nevertheless one found only with respect to Adam.

Certain differences stand out when these themes are set in juxtaposition. Both have a revelatory role, but Wisdom reveals God's will while Adam is the image of God, manifesting in some sense God himself. At very least one can say that Adam reflects God more than any other heavenly or earthly creature. In comparison, with regard to Wisdom, image terminology is used very little. It is used in Wis. 7.25f.:

She is a breath of the power of God, pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty; . . . She is a reflection of the eternal light, untarnished mirror of God's active power, image of his goodness.

Yet even here she is not God's image but the image of his goodness. His character is revealed in her, for she reveals his will. One might say that she manifests the glory of God rather than God himself.

In contrast to Adam speculation, the idea of sovereign rule is almost wholly absent from Wisdom motifs. Indeed, she orders creation and even guides God in his acts, but terms of ruling or a queenly role in her relation to the cosmos, or of subjection in its relation to her, are absent. Sirach 24 comes closest to giving her some form of authority where it speaks of Wisdom holding sway over, or having possession of, the nations and people (v. 10) and ultimately wielding authority particularly in Jerusalem (v. 11). Still, rather than having a throne she is the consort of God's throne. Kings are called not to submit to her but to honour and attend to her in submission of God (Wis. 6.1-22). Pseudo-Solomon seeks her as a lover and a wife, not as a lord (Wis. 8.2f.). She teaches men to rule rather than ruling them (Wis. 9.10f.). Perhaps the lack of ascription of sovereignty to Wisdom, and as well the fact that she reveals God's will rather than God himself, is in part a logical unfolding of what wisdom is by its nature but also in part the result of the gender of the word and the impact this has in the development of wisdom's personification. It seems more reasonable within Jewish patriarchy that God's will would be revealed through a female than that God should manifest himself as a female. *Sophia* in this regard is limited in the flexibility of its development in a way that the masculine *logos* is not.

While the Wisdom theme lacks the motifs of manifestation and sovereignty, Adam speculation on the other hand does not present him as a primordial principle of order. Adam is within creation rather than above and before it. It is possible to take exception to this point, for there emerged a concept of Adam as a macrocosmic divine being, in whom God is given form and in whom the whole of creation is prefigured. This First Adam is a principle of order in the sense that he represents the pattern of creation and does the actual work of creation. This idea finds its most extreme expression in later Jewish literature where Metatron is identified with the primordial Adam, Adam Kadmon, who sits on the Merkabah throne and whom the *Shiur Komah* refers to as *Yotser Bereshith*, the creator of the cosmos.¹⁸ G.G. Stroumsa¹⁹ has argued that already in the first

century CE 'there existed . . . a cluster of mythologoumena about the archangelic hypostasis of God, also identified with the First Adam, . . . whose body possessed cosmic dimensions'. If such a theme did exist at an early date, it does not necessarily invalidate the observation that Adam was not generally deemed a principle of order, in contrast to Wisdom. The notion of an ordering archangelic hypostasis was not limited to Adam speculation, though it did come to draw Adam speculation within its orbit. Perhaps the emergence of a primordial Adam illustrates the merging of Wisdom and Adam motifs under the influence of Hellenistic notions of the cosmos as a macranthropos. Whatever was operative in this distinctive development, there is evidence that Wisdom and Adam motifs did converge. For this evidence we turn now to Philo.

Philo demonstrates the integration of the two themes in his Logos concept. Philo, of course, is not strictly systematic and one could not argue that he had one integral *logos* concept. Rather, many themes find their way into his portrayal of the Logos. Sometimes Wisdom is kept distinct from the Logos, as in *Fug.* 109 where the Logos is said to be the child of God, his father, and Wisdom, his mother, through whom the universe came to birth. Generally, however, Wisdom as the primordial principle of order becomes the stoic Logos. The Logos assumes the role of Wisdom where those who do not yet seek virtue are enjoined to take their place under the Logos (*Conf. Ling.* 145f.). Like Wisdom, the Logos is pictured as the one who regulates the natural order of creation (*Agric.* 51).

The Logos is more than the principle of order and virtue, however, for Philo also employs it as a concept for explaining both biblical anthropomorphism and biblical accounts of how the unseen God, whom no one could see and live, had been seen by various saints. In this regard, the Logos in Philo contains elements of Adam speculation. The use of the Logos concept to explain the visible manifestation of God in problematic scriptural texts is possible only by virtue of the Logos being identified with the image of God in the context of Genesis 1. The Logos is the man made in the image of God as distinct from the moulded man, Adam (*Quaest. Gen.* 1.4). Elsewhere the Logos is described as the heavenly man, the true father of men, who is one of the two men put in Eden and called the father of the virtuous (*Leg. Alleg.* 1.31, 53). In light of the relative absence of the 'image of God' motif in Wisdom speculation apart from Philo's works, it seems that Philo's use of the motif does not reflect an inner

development of the logic of Wisdom themes but rather a synthesis of Wisdom and Adam themes.

Furthermore, the authority of the Logos is described in terms that do not seem to flow from Wisdom speculation. The Logos is the 'governor and administrator of all things' (*Quaest. Gen.* 4.110f.) with all created things being put under his care (*Agric.* 51). Even in *Conf. Ling.* 145f., where the Logos' role with respect to virtue resembles that of Wisdom, the characterization of that role becomes a rather military one. People are called to enlist under the Logos, whose qualifications as a leader are listed in terms of his angelic authority and his being 'the man in God's image'. While the idea of the Logos regulating creation expresses a Wisdom theme, the description of this role being one of authority or rule is probably a development of the idea of Adam's rule over creation by virtue of his being in God's image.

As further evidence of Adam speculation in Philo's Logos, it is interesting to note that Philo associates the Logos with the high priest, calling the Logos a high priest in *Fug.* 109. In Ezek. 28.12ff. the primordial man (and indirectly the Tyrean king of whom he is a type) is described as an angelic priest in Eden. The Ezekiel text also speaks of the first man as being appointed a guardian in Eden, which coincides with Philo's description of the Logos in *Leg. Alleg.* 1.55 as placed in Eden and, unlike the moulded man, Adam, appointed to be a guardian there. In conclusion, though Philo reserves the name Adam for the 'moulded man', there are clearly motifs of Adam speculation, as well as Wisdom speculation, woven into Philo's Logos concept.

I would suggest that a similar integration of Wisdom and Adam motifs is evident in the Christologies of Colossians 1 and Hebrews 1. The theme of Christ being a participant and a mediator in creation in both passages expresses Wisdom elements in early Christology. Still, there are elements in these texts—one being the 'image of God' terminology—that I believe do not hark back to Wisdom speculation. Having already considered the 'image and glory of God' underlying Heb. 1.3, let us focus on Col. 1.15.

Martin offers a good discussion of Adam and Wisdom themes in Col. 1.16-20.²⁰ It is interesting that he divides these themes up, finding a Wisdom theme in vv. 16-18a, where Christ is pictured as participating in creation, and an Adam theme in vv. 18b-20, behind which is the idea of Christ as the first man of a new creation. While I

think Martin is quite right in his delineation of these themes, he treats them as two different backgrounds rather than being themes that have already become integrally related. This gives rise to two problems in his analysis. First, he does not deal with the background of the notion of Christ as 'the image of the invisible God' in v. 15. The reason for not dealing with this seems to be the fact that Martin has decided that the Adam motif is restricted to the latter part of the hymn; the earlier part is dominated by a Wisdom theme. Appropriately, he does not deal with 'the image of God' as a Wisdom theme, for one cannot find a clear example of Wisdom being treated in these terms, so the phrase is simply not integrated into his discussion of the hymn's background. To accept that Adam and Wisdom themes had already been merged would allow for a discussion of the entire hymn as a more integral whole.

Secondly, Martin makes this comment on a unique element of Wisdom Christology: 'interpreters agree that there is no precise parallel in Jewish speculation concerning wisdom to the assertion that all things were created . . . for him'. One might note, however, that such an idea is not wholly absent from Adam speculation. Again it is worth comparing *2 Enoch* 31.3: 'I wished to create another world, so that everything could be subjected to Adam on earth, to rule and reign over it'. God speaks of creating a world for the sake of Adam's dominion over it. If it is correct to see an echo of such a theme in Colossians 1 and Heb. 1.2, both of which combine the two ideas of creation through Christ and creation for Christ, this would demonstrate how thorough the integration of Adam and Wisdom themes had been.

Conclusion

The point of my argument has been that in early Jewish devotion to Christ and thus in the development of the Christ cultus there was operative a sense of lawfulness derived from an understanding of Christ's (and Adam's) possession of the image of God. As noted at the outset, my findings do not present a conclusive case. A fuller argument would require a more exhaustive treatment of the way in which Adam is described as being in God's image. Is the reference to 'face and likeness' indeed unique; can it be accounted for in other ways? Would the argument that the element of visible manifestation is emphatic on the Adamic portrait of Christ stand up to a more

rigorous examination of the use of *μορφή* and *χαρακτήρ*? Also, the question of the extent and role of Adam Christology in the NT and the early Christian community would need to be considered.

Beyond drawing attention to the possibility of a direct relationship between the Legitimacy Principle, Adam Christology and the worship of Christ, I make no attempt to explain how this relationship came about. I do believe the correlation of Adam Christology and the Legitimacy Principle played a formative role in the veneration of Christ, but it may not have been a causal role. Whether the worship of Christ preceded its articulation in terms of an Adam Christology or whether Adam Christology preceded the recognition of the Legitimacy Principle—or whether they all merged together spontaneously out of some crucial event—is a consideration beyond the scope of a technical paper of this sort. While finding in the Legitimacy Principle a rationale for the worship of the image of God by devout monotheistic Jews, it takes us no closer to understanding the mystery of how the mundane Jesus came to be seen in this light.

NOTES

* I would like to thank Dr L. Hurtado of the University of Manitoba, whose criticisms have helped in clarifying the formulation of my position.

1. *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988).

2. G. von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary* (London: SCM, 1972). This possible explanation for the plural was suggested by von Rad: 'The extraordinary plural . . . prevents one from referring God's image too directly to God the Lord. God includes himself among the heavenly beings and thereby conceals himself in this multiplicity' (p. 58).

3. L.S.A. Wells offers reasons for thinking that chs. 13–17 of the *Life of Adam and Eve* come from older Jewish traditions (R.H. Charles [ed.], *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, vol. II [Oxford: Clarendon, 1913], p. 129).

4. Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

5. H.F.D. Sparks (ed.), *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), p. 150.

6. D. Steenburg, 'The Case against the Synonymy of *Morphê* and *Eikôn*', *JSNT* 34 (1988), pp. 77–86.

7. The latter half of *Sib. Or.* 8 is to be dated very probably before the end of the third century CE; it is extensively quoted from in Lactantius' *Divine Institutions*, completed in 313 CE, where it is already treated as a text with the authority of antiquity.

8. *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (JSPSup, 1; Sheffield: JSOT, 1988).

9. This is related in A.F. Segal's *Two Powers in Heaven* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977), p. 112. Segal considers the text late, attributing it to R. Hoshaya B. Shamaï, a fifth generation Palestinian Amora. The translation used by Segal inserts that the angels mistook Adam 'for a divine being'. It is obvious from the context, however, that Adam must have been mistaken for God himself.

10. *Ibid.*, pp. 263ff.

11. *Dwyqnn* is a 'reverential transformation' of the Aramic loanword 'yqwn, i.e., εἰκὼν (M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashim* [New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1903], s.v. 'dywqnn'.

12. For a discussion of the tannaitic controversy over the propriety of seeing God, cf. Ira Chernus, 'visions of God in Merkabah Mysticism', *JSTJ* 13 (1983), pp. 125-27. In other texts it is the Kabod or the Shekinah that is not allowed to be seen except by a worthy few.

13. R. Martin, *Carmen Christi: Philippians 2.5-11 in recent interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), p. 108. The point of my earlier paper was to argue that 'image of God' and 'form of God' are not strictly synonymous. Though 'form of God' has a distinct connotation, I concur that its denotation is the same as that of 'image of God'.

14. Arndt & Gingrich, s.v. χαρακτήρ.

15. *The Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians* (International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897), p. 210.

16. Rev. 5.6ff. is an important example of the veneration of Christ in which the elements of Christ's visible resemblance to God is absent. This may be taken to argue that the presence of Adam imagery in the references treated above is unrelated to the legitimation of the worship of Christ. However, there is no reason to think that throughout the early Christian communities legitimation would have been universally required or a single sort of legitimation accepted. It is only in a Jewish context that the worship of Christ would be recognized as being in tension with Mosaic Law and that the legitimacy Principle would resolve that tension. Revelation 5 may reflect concerns quite divorced from those of specifically Jewish devotion.

17. There is a seeming paradox in this passage; the nations recognize that the God of Israel is the only God and immediately afterward the hiddenness of God is emphatically affirmed. This juxtaposition has misled commentators such as C. Westermann (*Isaiah 40-46: A Commentary* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969], p. 169) into thinking the text corrupt. He fails to see the logical unity in which the promise of the nations subjecting themselves to Israel and Israel's God is followed by the vindication of Israel/God, the first point in the vindication being that God's hiddenness invalidates heathen idolatry.

18. G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1941), p. 65.
19. G.G. Stroumsa, 'Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ', *HTR* 76 (1983), p. 279.
20. *Colossians and Philemon* (New Century Bible; London: Oliphants, 1974), pp. 58ff.