

THE TYNDALE NEW TESTAMENT LECTURE, 1976

IMAGE AND INCARNATION IN PAULINE CHRISTOLOGY -
A SEARCH FOR ORIGINS

By Douglas R. de Lacey

In contemporary discussions of christology, it has become fashionable to lay the emphasis on the real and complete humanity of Jesus: so much so that, in the words of one recent study, 'It is indeed a constant astonishment that the *first* serious heresy that the church had to face was that of docetism'.^{/1/} But perhaps this astonishment indicates our own failure to grasp the true nature of the earliest stages of christological development. What is surely remarkable is that from its earliest days, as it would appear,^{/2/} the church regarded the man from Nazareth as worshipful. Two thousand years of custom have perhaps dulled our sense of wonder at this; but it would surely have been otherwise for a first-century Jew who was told that he ought to worship a Galilean artisan as he worshipped Yahweh. Small wonder, perhaps, if one early attempt to comprehend this led to docetism - a christian equivalent to pagan theophanies such as in the tale of Philemon and Baucis.^{/3/}

-
1. J. A. T. Robinson, *The Human Face of God* (London: SCM, 1973), 36; italics in the original.
 2. It is, of course, impossible to document the development of worship of Jesus before the time of the NT documents; but it is significant that the authors of those documents appear to see no need to defend the practice; it is simply assumed. See also C. F. D. Moule, *The Origin of Christology* (Cambridge: CUP, 1977), *passim*.
 3. Cf. also M. Hengel, *The Son of God* (London: SCM, 1976), 40f. The tale of Philemon and Baucis is told by Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 8.611ff, and is typical of many other such theophany-narratives.

In this lecture, my concern is to discuss how one particular early christian - the apostle Paul - came to grapple with the problem of understanding how a man could be worshipful. There are already many excellent studies in New Testament christology, which discuss with a wealth of detail the various titles used to express the church's belief in her Lord. But while there are still many problems as yet unsolved even on this level, I believe that we now have enough material to go behind this discussion to what, it seems to me, is the more fundamental question in christology: how this basic christian belief came to expression in the first place. And it is encouraging to discover other recent authors urging this same task./4/

My thesis, then, is this: that Paul was well aware of what we might loosely call the problem of the incarnation, namely, that a man should be worshipped as God; and that we can see in his writings evidences of how he came to accept and understand it - but that to do so we must move beyond a discussion of the titles which he ascribes to Jesus. In other words, I believe that we can institute a quest for the historic Christ, a bridge over that chasm which seems to have developed in contemporary thought between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith. It may be worth at this point summarizing those key points of Paul's christology for which, I am arguing, we should be seeking origins. The list is by no means exhaustive.

1. Jesus/5/ is worshipped, and put on the same level as

4. M. Hengel, *The Son of God* (see n. 3), *passim*; more recently C. F. D. Moule, *The Origin* (see n. 2) and S. Kim, *An Exposition of Paul's Gospel in the Light of the Damascus Christophany* (unpublished PhD thesis presented to Manchester University in 1977).
5. The name 'Jesus' is deliberately used to stress the remarkable nature of the development of pauline christology. Paul himself generally (though by no means invariably) uses the term 'Christ' for the exalted Lord; but it is a commonplace of NT study that this term has become for Paul all but a personal name rather than a messianic title: a fact which is itself remarkable from the point of view of Paul's christology.

God himself./6/ Exalted titles are ascribed to him, and without apology passages of the Old Testament which refer to Yahweh are referred to Jesus./7/

2. Jesus displaces the Law as the fundamental and authoritative manifestation of the will of God.

3. Jesus is viewed as the mediator of all things: cosmically, of creation;/8/ on a more personal level, of God's activity towards us and our responses to God./9/

4. Jesus bestows the Holy Spirit on his followers, so that he can even be called the Spirit of (Jesus) Christ;/10/ and the work of the Spirit can be identified with that of Jesus./11/

5. Jesus involves others (his followers) not just in the results of his work, but also in himself (the famous pauline ἐν Χριστῷ!), so that one could accept the phrase 'corporate personality' as a possible description - though in a very different sense from any which that phrase may meaningfully bear with reference to the Old

-
6. For instance, in the greetings at the beginnings of his letters; where grace and peace are 'from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ'.
 7. Most strikingly, Phil. 2.10f. On this subject see Moule, *The Origin* (as at n. 2), p. 41-44, and the references cited there. This christological use of the OT must surely be central to our understanding of Paul's application of the term 'Lord' to Jesus.
 8. 1 Cor. 8:6; 15:45; Col. 1:15-17. I have discussed this in my unpublished dissertation *The Form of God in the Likeness of Men* (presented to Cambridge University in 1974), chapter 3.
 9. See especially Rom. 1:5 and 8.
 10. Rom. 8:9; Phil. 1:19.
 11. Activities ascribed both to Jesus and to the Spirit are discussed in detail by G. Stalder, *Das Werk des Geistes in der Heiligung bei Paulus* (Zürich: EVZ, 1962), esp. 53ff.

Testament data./12/

6. Jesus' existence ante-dates that of the cosmos whose creation he mediated.

In developing an understanding of the person of Jesus Christ which could allow Paul to make such affirmations about him, Paul had three basic data which may have been primary for his thought. The kerygma of the early church already contained christological affirmations, which may already have been developed to a greater or lesser extent. Paul's own background in inter-testamental Judaism would have provided him with a particular framework of ideas within which to work. And his own experience of the risen Christ and the Holy Spirit will evidently have had significant bearing on the development of his ideas. These three are not unrelated to each other; but as far as possible it may be worth attempting a brief discussion of the rôle of each of them in Paul's mind.

The Kerygma of the Primitive Church

On almost any chronology of the New Testament, Paul's conversion must be put early in the history of the church,/13/ but earlier still some christology, or some several christologies, had already developed. That Jesus was the expected Christ of Israel was a part of the church's earliest declaration; also that he was Lord, that he mediated the gift of the Spirit and the forgiveness of God. The early church baptized in his name, and may already have linked the experience of Christian baptism with a sharing in the death of Christ./14/ To what extent these ideas had been

-
12. On this involvement, see M. Bouttier, *En Christ* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1962); F. Neugebauer, *In Christus* (Göttingen: V & R, 1961); M. D. Hooker, 'Interchange in Christ', *JTS* n.s. 22 (1971), 349-361, and 'Interchange and Atonement', *BJRUL* 60 (1978), 462-481. On the use and abuse of the term 'corporate personality' see de Lacey, *The Form of God* (as at n. 8), chapter 5.
 13. I would place it very early indeed: see D. R. de Lacey, 'Paul in Jerusalem', *NTS* 20 (1973-74), 82-86.
 14. See W. F. Flemmington, *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism* (London: SPCK, 1948), 72f, and R. C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising with Christ* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967), 10.

developed into a coherent christology before Paul's conversion we cannot tell, but it would appear that Paul was provided with the raw materials for his thinking rather than with developed ideas./15/ Only if it could be proved that pre-pauline hymns lie behind such passages as Colossians 1, or Philippians 2 could it be asserted with any confidence that Paul's traditions included christological interpretation./16/ It will perforce have to remain an open question at many points in our discussion whether we are investigating the activity of Paul or that of his predecessors; but we may continue to describe the object of our study as Paul, without loss of generality; though the coherence of the picture which it is hoped this study will display may make it reasonable to assume that we are dealing with the activity of a single mind. Doubtless many of the early church's assertions contain deep christological implications;/17/ but it is not evident that these implications were made explicit before the activity of Paul.

The Old Testament and Developments Therefrom

We may assume with confidence that Paul the Pharisee accepted our Old Testament as Scripture. What is not certain is whether, or to what extent, his canon was wider than ours. It is possible that he directly quotes extra-canonical literature as Scripture in at most three

-
15. One of the strongest evidences for this assumption is the fact that the christological development of these ideas led directly to that fundamental criticism of the Law which is unique to Paul in the NT writings. On this see my contribution to a forthcoming volume edited by D. A. Carson on the subject of the Sabbath and Sunday.
 16. On the problems attending the 'discovery' of such pre-pauline fragments, see *inter alia* the telling comments of M. D. Hooker, 'Philippians 2:6-11', in E. E. Ellis and E. Grässer (edd.) *Jesus und Paulus* (Göttingen: V & R, 1975), 151-164.
 17. In particular we may mention the fact that Jesus was seen as the bestower of the Spirit of God; and the corporate understanding of baptism into Christ (if this understanding was indeed pre-pauline).

places in his extant letters./18/ These may be citations from inter-testamental and/or early christian literature, but it is impossible to determine what status Paul would have attributed to them.

More significant is the fact that Paul often alludes to, or uses, ideas parallel to, and apparently drawn from, certain apocryphal books; notably the Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus./19/ We need only recall his use of the two-age structure developed during the inter-testamental period. Whether he would have regarded such writings as canonical or not we cannot, and perhaps need not, determine; it is enough to note that he evidently felt free to use ideas which had been developed from the OT during the inter-testamental period. It is also evident that he used the methods of his time in his interpretation of the OT./20/

Paul's Own Experience

Jeremias boldly asserts that 'the hour of Damascus is the key to Pauline theology',/21/ and few would deny this assertion, albeit in more muted form. Jeremias also reminds us that 'Paul's Kyrios was not a heavenly being but Jesus of Nazareth, the crucified',/22/ and this too

-
18. So TDNT 1, 756 (Schrenck, s.v. γραφή): the three places are 1 Cor. 2:9 (καθὼς γέγραπται ... ὅσα ἠτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν: the last three words are found in Ecclus. 1:10, and several fathers saw the origin of this quotation in an Elias Apocalypse); 1 Cor. 9:10 (... ἐγράφη ... ὅτι ... - if, as is not very likely, the ὅτι is here recitative. The saying is not attested elsewhere in the extant literature); and Eph. 5:14 (δὲ λέγει, "Ἐγείρε, ὁ καθεύδων κτλ. Again, there is no evidence of this 'saying' occurring elsewhere, though according to Epiphanius it comes from an Elias Apocalypse).
 19. Compare Rom. 1:18ff with Wisd. 13:1-5; &c.
 20. See D. Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine* (Missoula: SBL, 1975) and R. N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975).
 21. J. Jeremias, 'The Key to Pauline Theology', *Expt* 76 (1964-65), 27-30 (30).
 22. *Ibid.*

is an important point. In Luke's account the Vision reveals himself to be 'Jesus whom you are persecuting'; and in Paul's own writings the exalted Lord is always identified with the man who died a criminal's death. The central factor of that encounter on the Damascus road, therefore, is not to be seen in the glory and splendour which accompanied the vision so much as in the fact that Paul was forced to recognise that God had vindicated this man who had not only died, but died on a charge of blasphemy, forsaken by God and a curse to God. /23/ Further, according to Acts 9:17, through the service of Ananias Paul was filled with the Holy Spirit, /24/ and it is evident from Paul's own writings that this was to him a fact of immediate experience with far-reaching repercussions for his thinking. It was, further, an experience which he realized to have been mediated by Jesus, and we have already observed that this fact has significant christological implications.

One could of course add other data indefinitely to the three factors discussed here; /25/ but these three may be regarded as the most significant. We may now proceed to investigate how Paul developed his thinking by means of these data.

Paul and the Law

I wish to concentrate on the second of the three factors which have just been discussed; not because the others are of any less importance, but because - and this fact is itself highly significant for our understanding of Paul's christology - the other two factors seem to have

-
23. Dt. 21:23. It is true that this is not the situation envisaged by the deuteronomic legislation, but it is highly probable that this is how Paul before his conversion would have understood it in this case. See Hengel, *Son* (as at n. 3), 67f.
 24. Whatever be made of the historicity of Acts, it is indisputable that Paul regarded the reception of the Spirit as an integral part of Christian conversion; and it is unlikely that his own experience would have been exceptional in this respect.
 25. In particular we may note the circumstances in which the early Christians found themselves: see C. F. D. Moule, 'The Influence of Circumstances on the Use of Christological Terms', *JTS* n.s. 10 (1959), 247-263.

had a formative influence on precisely *how* Paul has used this background material.

Let me illustrate what I mean by an extract from Hengel, who hints at one of what I consider to be a number of extraordinarily important christological factors which the traditional approach through the titles of Jesus cannot comprehend. Hengel is commenting on what he calls 'a critical distinction between Christianity and Judaism':

We do not find within the pre-Christian Judaism of the diaspora, let alone in Palestine, a real and fundamental criticism of the law, that is, one with a *religious* motivation On the other hand, the early Christian criticism of the law which emerges in Palestine itself is not oriented on secular emancipation but entirely on a new understanding of the will of God. In other words, it must have had an eschatological basis, and ultimately goes back to an original authority, namely Jesus himself. Of course a reference to a 'new Torah of Messianic times' is also questionable (against W. D. Davies ... and H. J. Schoeps ...). ... if God's Christ was the ground of salvation, then the law of Moses could no longer be regarded as a way to salvation. God's Christ stood above the law which according to Deut. 21:23 had delivered him over to God's curse./26/

The Torah therefore loses its place of ultimate authority as the revelation of God's will; and it does so because of the other two factors: Paul's knowledge of Jesus in the kerygma and his own experience of the risen Jesus and the power of his Spirit. The question

-
26. Hengel, *Son* (as at n. 3), 68, n. 123, emphasis mine. The references are to W. D. Davies, *Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come* (Missoula: SBL, 1952); and H. J. Schoeps, *Paul* (London: Lutterworth, 1961), 171ff. Since this lecture was delivered E. P. Sanders has developed many of these ideas in his book *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (London: SCM, 1977).

of Paul's authorities, and the authority which he now ascribes to the Torah, thus turns out to be essentially christological and pneumatological in content. In Galatians, which I take to be the earliest extant pauline writing,^{27/} we already see this criticism of the Law fully developed: finding, to be sure, a justification in the pages of the Law itself. But it cannot be doubted that this justification is only subsequent to the radical new understanding of the Law, and could not have worked out independently.

The Law, then, becomes for Paul an interpretative key for understanding Jesus, rather than the authoritative self-revelation of God: and it is a key which contains forms of expression which had already forged certain links and connections between our nature and God's. These Paul appears to use as his building-blocks.

The Image of God

Of these forms of expression found in the OT and developed throughout the inter-testamental period, the most obvious, and perhaps the most significant, is the language of the image of God - though the field is wider than the mere linguistic unit *צֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים* *εἰκὼν θεοῦ* indicates. But inevitably our discussion must begin at Gen. 1:26f, within the wider context of the whole book of Genesis. Only such an approach can enable us to see what Paul - blissfully ignorant of J, E, D and P - may have made of it.^{28/} There is space here only for some rather dogmatic statements on the subject.^{29/} The terms 'image' and 'likeness' (*צֶלֶם* and *דְּמוּת*) are parallel and wellnigh synonymous ways of expressing, without detailed elaboration, that Adam was created 'like' God in some sense. This likeness was transmitted to his

27. See the article cited in n. 13.

28. A recent study by J. F. A. Sawyer, 'The Meaning of *צֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים* ('In the Image of God') in Gen. 1-xi', *JTS* n.s. 25 (1974), 418-426, seeks to investigate the meaning of this phrase for the final redactor, and stresses the relevance of other material in these chapters for our understanding of this meaning.

29. I have discussed the issues involved in coming to these conclusions in my thesis (see n. 8), chapter 4.

offspring and so to all men. The sense in which men are like God is nowhere explicated, but a variety of interpretations are hinted at, in a text which seems to have been left deliberately ambiguous. These hints include man's rule over nature;/30/ his ability to forge personal relationships;/31/ his ability to reproduce an image of himself;/32/ and his responsibility for other human life./33/ This last also suggests that each man actually represents God in some sense; so that the author of Proverbs can assert that to mock the poor is to insult God himself./34/ Whatever we may make of such interpretations, the significance of the bald statement that men are/35/ God's image cannot be overstressed. The very heart of the Torah forbids absolutely any representation of God;/36/ and yet the Torah begins with the statement that man is himself such a representation.

Developments of the Image-Idea

The ambiguity and indefiniteness which surrounds this phrase in Gen. 1 were developed and exploited in the inter-testamental period./37/ One particularly significant approach is that of Philo. His expositions are often confused and occasionally self-contradictory; but he produces a variety of interesting interpretations of the nature of the image. He makes much of the concept of *Λόγος*, which he describes as the image of

-
30. Gen. 1:26; 2:19: he names the creatures - a creative act - and rules as God's vicegerent; cf. also Ps. 8.
 31. Gen. 5:1f: 'when God created man he made him in the likeness of God. Male and female he created them'.
 32. Gen. 5:3, which uses the same terms as 1:26f.
 33. Gen. 9:5f.
 34. Prov. 17:5.
 35. Assuming that in Gen. 1:26f we have examples of *ἡ essentialia* and *ἡ veritatis*: see my thesis (as at n. 8), 42.
 36. Ex. 20:4, though the words there used are פסל וכל תמונה.
 37. On some of these developments, see my thesis (as at n. 8), 42 and n. 12; 44-51.

God/38/ or the archetypal seal./39/ Within this framework of ideas, man is not himself the image but created 'after' or 'according to' it./40/ In all cases, the reference is to Gen. 1:26f. It is commonly held that Philo distinguishes between the man of Gen. 1:26f and the man of Gen. 2:7, the former being a platonic ideal, the latter the concrete species of man. Although this is true in the main, here as elsewhere Philo is not always self-consistent; and in e.g. *Op.* 25 it is evidently the concrete creation which is in view. /41/ However, on either view, it is evident that in all these passages Philo does not view man as being himself the image of God, but at best an εἰκὼν εἰκόνος (*Op.* 25).

Another strand of philonic interpretation, however, actually equates the (ideal) man with the Logos,/42/ which comes close to identifying man with the image. /43/ It may be though that Philo's strong insistence that God cannot be conceived in physical terms/44/ would have prevented him from ever making that identification explicit.

Philo provides several interpretations of the content of the image as it is applied to man. At times it appears to be the platonic form of man, or the ideal

-
38. *Op.* 25; *Leg. Alleg.* 3:96; *Conf.* 97; 147; *Fug.* 101; *Quaest. in Gen.* 1:4; &c.
39. *Plant.* 1:8; *Quaest. in Gen.* 1:4. The idea is presumably similar to that of the image, since a seal when used impresses an image: cf. the language of 'stamping' man with the image of God (κατ' εἰκόνα δὲ τετυπωσθαι θεοῦ: *Leg. Alleg.* 1.31).
40. *Op.* 25; *Leg. Alleg.* 3:96; *Conf.* 146; *Quis. Her.* 230f; *Quaest. in Gen.* 2:62.
41. Cf. also *Quis. Her.* 56.
42. *Conf.* 41; 146 (ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπος. But cf. *Quis. Her.* 230f. for one possible philonic interpretation of κατὰ in this context). In *Conf.* 62 the ideal man is described as θεῖας ἀδιαφοροῦντα εἰκόνας.
43. Cf. also Philo's exposition of the content of the image in e.g. *Quis. Her.* 56f, which seems to attribute it to all men.
44. Cf. *Op.* 69.

man;/45/ however, Philo also wishes to assert that the concrete man (as distinct from the ideal) is also made κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ, and then the image is seen to consist in the mind or reason, which is spoken of in terms of a divine spirit breathed by the maker into the individual. /46/ This is not the only interpretation. Others identify the image with freewill/47/ or immortality./48/ One interesting interpretation is that which sees the image as in some sense future, man's goal rather than his origin. It then consists in acting as God desires by walking in his way and according to his laws./49/

It is evident that Philo made little attempt to harmonize these various interpretations of the biblical texts, but preferred rather to keep the *imago*-concept as fluid as possible. This has enabled him to give it a dynamic content, and even refer it to man's potential rather than simply to his present status.

Philo also presents us with the only unambiguous example of another and rather different understanding of the image of God which has recently become popular, indeed, for some theologians, it would appear, normative for an understanding of Paul's christology. Kümmel boldly asserts that

There is no doubt that Paul thus [viz. by use of the image-language] transfers to Christ a characterization of divine Wisdom as it was common in contemporary Judaism./50/

-
45. Cf. *Op.* 134f; *Quaest. in Gen.* 1:4. This may also be the significance of the use of the term ἀγαλμα in *Op.* 137; cf. the discussion on this term by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker in the Loeb edition, vol. 3, pp. 444f and 465.
 46. *Op.* 69; *Leg. Alleg.* 1:32; *Quis. Her.* 55f; 231; *Fug.* 71. This approximates to the idea of sense-perception: cf. *Spec. Leg.* 4:123.
 47. *Quod Deus* 48.
 48. *Conf.* 4:41.
 49. *Op.* 144; cf. *Quis. Her.* 57.
 50. W. G. Kümmel, *The Theology of the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1974), 163, emphasis mine.

But was it really common to view Wisdom as the image of God in this period? As has been said, Philo provides the only unambiguous example of this identification of Wisdom and Image: 'the sublime and heavenly wisdom is of many names; for he [Moses] calls it "beginning" and "image" and "vision of God"'./51/ But even this is only because Philo has in this context identified Wisdom with the Logos, so that the link is less direct than might at first appear. And in the Wisdom of Solomon, despite the appeals made to it in this context, Wisdom is not described as the image of God, but only as an image of his goodness./52/ I would not wish to deny for a moment that significant wisdom-speculations developed during the inter-testamental period, and may have formed an important part of Paul's background; but I doubt that this should be the first thing which comes to mind when we observe the term εἰκών in his writings. The Gen. 1 background seems so much more evident that we should at least begin with that.

But our field is wider than simply the phrase 'the image of God'. At least two other related and relevant factors need to be considered, albeit briefly, before we move on to Paul himself. These are anthropomorphisms used of God, and theomorphisms used of men.

Anthropomorphisms and Theomorphisms

Unless we are to restrict ourselves to the *via negationis*, some form of anthropomorphism is inevitable in our talk about God. The OT unashamedly uses many anthropomorphisms (and, indeed, theriomorphisms) which are evidently to be understood as pure metaphor: few Israelites can have believed that God really had hands or eyes or nostrils. But, equally evidently, the metaphor stands for some reality, and God was believed to experience and to act in ways analogous to the ways in which we do. So, although he was presumably not thought to have internal organs ('bowels' and 'reins'), he was really understood to have compassion and love. The *via negationis* occurs as well (the Egyptians are men and

51. *Leg. Alleg.* 1:43.

52. *Wisd.* 7:26: εἰκὼν τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ.

not God; God's thoughts are *not* like men's/53/), but it remains true that real parallels were seen. The fact that individual men, or Israel as a whole, could be called sons of God further serves to highlight this parallel between divine and human natures, which is also emphasized in the use of theomorphisms for certain men. Mauser/54/ has investigated two of these in the OT, and makes the general statement that 'das Menschenbild des Alten Testaments ... in bestimmtem Sinne Theomorph ist'. /55/ The two examples chosen are Hosea and Jeremiah, and Mauser points out how in each case the prophet saw himself as empathizing with God, and representing God through his own experience. So, despite the denial of sexuality in Hosea's understanding of God (in sharp contrast to the Canaanite background), it nevertheless remains true that 'Jahwe befindet sich in einer Ehe'; /56/ or, in Wheeler Robinson's words, 'there is no fundamental unlikeness between human and divine personality'./57/ Significantly, perhaps, the aspect of God's nature revealed in both cases is his suffering over the broken relationship between himself and his people.

A rather different sort of theomorphism occurs in certain works such as 3 Enoch, where Enoch himself becomes Metatron, whom God calls the Lesser Yahweh, and on whom he bestows 70 of his own names./58/ Now this is very much on the fringes of orthodoxy in Judaism, and the traditions behind it may well be later than the first century anyway. However, the fact that such ideas could occur at all in Judaism may be significant.

More directly relevant is the Melchizedek fragment from Qumran cave 11, in which Melchizedek appears to be given the name אֱלֹהִים and to take on a divine role, in that OT passages referring to God are in 11QMelch referred to

53. Isa. 31:7; 55:8f.

54. U. Mauser, *Gottesbild und Menschwerdung* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1971).

55. *Ibid.*, 17.

56. *Ibid.*, 63.

57. H. W. Robinson, *The Cross of Hosea* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1949), 21.

58. 3 Enoch 48 (p. 167-179 of the edition by H. Odeberg (New York: Ktav, 1973)).

Melchizedek:/59/ 'about him in the songs of David where it says "Elohim (has ta)ken his stand in the assembly (of El)"/60/ אלהים can of course mean something much less than 'God' (i.e. Yahweh) - but not, one would have thought, in this particular 'song of David'.

We may conclude, then, that theomorphic language and ideas about at least certain men were not totally foreign to Paul's background. We may now turn to investigate how he applies them to Jesus.

Paul and the Image of God

We begin by asking what Paul made of the idea of the image of God in men generally. It is assumed by the majority of commentators on 1 Cor. 11:7 that Paul, by faulty exegesis of Gen. 1:26-27a, asserts that whereas the male is the image of God, the female is not./61/ Others/62/ however have opposed this view, stressing that Paul does not state that women is εἰκὼν ἀνδρός, and that he substitutes δόξα for ὁμοίωμα./63/ It is disputed whether δόξα could be used at this point for a translation of the תְּמוּנָה of Gen. 1.26f;/64/ but while there is some evidence of a rather doubtful nature that δόξα might have been thought to have a similar meaning to

59. On 11QMelch see F. L. Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition* (Cambridge: CUP, 1976), 67-82 and the literature cited there.
60. Translation by Horton, *op. cit.* 68. J. A. Fitzmyer, 'Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11', *JBL* 86 (1967), 25-41, suggests that עליו might mean 'about it' (i.e. the מִשְׁפָּט of 1.9), but even so agrees that Melchizedek is the אלהים.
61. So Robertson and Plummer; Parry; Moffatt; Héring; Wendland; cf. also J. Jervell, *Imago Dei* (Göttingen: V & R, 1960), 299f and S. V. McCasland, 'The Image of God According to Paul', *JBL* 69 (1950), 85-100, esp. 85f.
62. De Wette and Bruce in their commentaries; cf. also J. B. Hurley, 'Did Paul Require Veils or the Silence of Women?', *WTJ* 35 (1973), 190-210.
63. ὁμοίωμα and ὁμοίωσις are the only translations of תְּמוּנָה in the Greek versions of Gen. 1:26f which have survived.
64. Cf. the two statements: 'Wir dürfen nicht bezweifeln, dass Doxa hier "Abglanz" heisst' (Jervell, *Imago Dei* (as at n. 61), 299); 'this sense of "doxa" (i.e. "reflection") is unknown' (Héring, *ad loc.*). It is noteworthy that 'glory' occurs in Ps. 8:5.

that of תְּמוּנָה or צֶלֶם,/65/ there appears to be none that its semantic field ever overlapped with that of גְּלוּרָה. On the other hand, God's glory is regarded in the OT as his sole prerogative; and if the rabbis later believed him to have shared it with Adam, then that was Adam's privilege and his alone./66/ Hence it is most improbable that Paul would have used the term δόξα if quoting from memory or freely translating; we may therefore assume that it was a deliberate choice determined by the argument which he wished to develop.

This has no little significance for our study, since it suggests that Paul is not simply quoting the OT passage to bolster a somewhat dubious argument, but is developing a new argument, which uses Gen. 1 as a basis,/67/ but puts a new interpretation on it. The woman is the glory of the man in that she was created from him and for his sake./68/ That glory is only

-
65. Cf. L. H. Brockington, 'The Septuagintal Background to the New Testament Use of ΔΟΞΑ', in D. E. Nineham (ed.) *Studies in the Gospels* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), 1-8; Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 174; Kittel, 'δόξα', *TDNT* 2, 237; E. Larssen, *Christus als Vorbild* (Lund: Gleerup, 1962), 281. But against these it must be noted (1) that the use of δόξα to translate תְּמוּנָה in Num. 12:8 and Ps. 17:15 may be due to an aversion on the part of the translators to referring to the 'form' of God, and not to a semantic overlap (cf. the Targumim); and (2) that to accept (with Jervell) that the *imago dei* was often interpreted in terms of a pristine glory is by no means to identify the semantic elements εἰκών and δόξα. Larssen's fine example of an explanation of *ignotum per ignotius* (*loc. cit.*), and Kittel's dogmatic statement with its one, dubious example, may safely be ignored.
66. Cf. von Rad and Kittel, 'δόξα', *TDNT* 2, 239-241 and 246; and D. Cairns, *The Image of God in Man* (London: SCM, 1953), 24-26. But cf. also Ps. 8:5.
67. This may also account for the fact that Paul finds it necessary to justify his statement that the woman is the glory of the man (v. 8f).
68. The background here is Gen. 2, not Gen. 1.

properly expressed when the woman takes her proper place in the divinely-appointed order; otherwise she brings dishonour to her head, meaning, at least in part, her husband./69/ If extrapolation of this be permissible, then presumably man's being the glory of God properly consists in his taking his rightful part in the created order, in which 'of every man, Christ is the head'. Hence we have here no 'natürliche Gottgleichheit',/70/ but rather an individual interpretation of the new man created in God's image which is later/71/ to be developed in terms of the church as a whole. Here Paul interprets man's being the glory of God in terms of the relationship with God, lost through Adam, which Christ has restored.

A similar line of thought is developed in Romans, where Paul begins by establishing the guilt of the whole world, in that men have turned aside from God. This turning-aside is expressed in terms of exchanging God's δόξα (not εἰκὼν) for the εἰκὼν of that which is not God,/72/ which results in the fact that all now lack the δόξα of God. To exchange the glory of God for the images of creatures, then, involves far more than just worshipping before one shrine rather than another, or using plastic representations to assist one's devotions: it involves stepping right outside the divinely-intended order in which man should govern the other creatures and be governed in turn by God. By stepping out of one's place in the created order, one forfeits the glory even as Adam did;/73/ and this, says Paul, is now the state of every man. However, Rom. 5:2 and 8:17-23 express the hope of its future restoration; a

69. See Hurley (as at n. 62) for a discussion of the argument in this section of the epistle.

70. Pace Jervell, *Imago Dei* (as at n. 61), 171.

71. In Col. 3:9f and Eph. 4:4.

72. Rom. 1:23: on this verse see N. Hyldahl, 'A reminiscence of the Old Testament at Romans i. 23', *NTS* 2 (1955-56), 285-288; Jervell, *Imago Dei* (as at n. 61), 312-331.

73. Although not always considered to be part of the image, glory is attributed to Adam in all strands of the rabbinic tradition.

restoration already achieved by God through Christ. /74/ There seems here to be a careful distinction being drawn between δόξα and εἰκὼν, the former being given an aspect of personal relationship not to be found in the latter. It is feasible, then, to see some connection here with the rabbinic concept of the Shekinah, which was seen as mediating God's presence: lost to men because of their sin, but restored by God's grace.

In Romans and 1 Corinthians, then, Paul develops one particular interpretation of Gen. 1-3; substituting his own term δόξα for εἰκὼν and stressing the aspect of personal relationship for which he may have felt εἰκὼν ill-suited.

Further, as has been noted by Thrall, /75/ Paul paradoxically interprets the true δόξα in terms of humiliation, lowliness and suffering. Within this framework, arrogant men have indeed lost the intended resemblance to God. This is not to deny that a likeness may still remain: it would be illegitimate to assume that Paul thought in terms of a loss of the εἰκὼν θεοῦ. /76/ But this does suggest that one strand of pauline thought views manhood in terms of relationship, and so of becoming, rather than those of static being.

In line with the above, we may note that Paul can talk of a 'new man' being renewed κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν: /77/ there is a sense in which the image of God

-
74. Rom. 8:30. Glory is also seen as the Christian's future hope in 1 Cor. 2:7; 15:43; 2 Cor. 4:17 and 1 Thes. 2:12.
75. M. E. Thrall, 'Christ Crucified or Second Adam?', in B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley (ed.) *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament* (Cambridge: CUP, 1973), 143-156; esp. 150-2.
76. There is no clear evidence in any of the literature that the image was believed to have been lost (or even, pace Larsson (as at n. 65) 144, 'gewaltig verminderte') by Adam's fall. It is noteworthy that it is never regarded as one of the things lost at the fall and to be restored at the end time (Gen R 12:6, &c).
77. Col. 3:10 (I assume pauline authorship). Cf. also Eph. 4:24.

is in the process of appearing. This again evidently gives the image a dynamic content, as many other passages in Ephesians and Colossians also suggest./78/ But here the new man is not the individual Christian, but rather the church, the community. In this 'corporate' language, the term $\delta\delta\epsilon\alpha$ does not occur, and the $\epsilon\lambda\kappa\omega\nu$ is evidently given a moral content. It is highly significant that this content is seen in terms of being like Christ, so that there is more than a hint here of the fact that Christ was seen as being in a very particular way the image of God.

Christ and the Image of God

That Christ is the image of God (in a way that others are not) is explicitly stated by Paul in 2 Cor. 4, within the context of an extended and tightly-knit argument which stretches from 3:1 to at least the middle of chapter 5. Paul begins with a defence of his apostleship (3:1ff) and goes on to demonstrate that it is proper for an apostle to suffer the maltreatment to which he has been subjected (4:7-12). Hence the quotation from Ps. 116:10, where the context is also one of great affliction. But Paul is determined not to lose heart, for he knows that God will raise him up as he raised Jesus,/79/ and that his very affliction is actually producing a weight of future glory. The argument is based on a *peshar* on Ex. 34, in which the $\kappa\upsilon\pi\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is Yahweh; and so, although 'the Lord' for Paul is normally the Lord Jesus, it is reasonable to suppose that the 'glory of the Lord' in 3:18 is the glory of God./80/ But this is seen by the Christian in the face of Christ (4:6). The construction is elliptical: the

-
78. Eph. 2:15; 4:4; 5:23-32; Col. 1:18; 1:22 with 24. It is noteworthy that in Col. 1:16 and Eph. 2:15 it is Christ, not God, who is the creator.
79. 2 Cor. 4:14: $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ seems to mean something like 'like' here: see the suggestion of C. F. D. Moule in *TDNT* 7, 783, n. 81.
80. Note the anarthrous $\kappa\upsilon\pi\tau\omicron\varsigma$ here, as commonly in the LXX to represent the tetragrammaton.

accusative after μεταμορφούμεθα is unusual,/81/ and αὐτήν has no antecedent. We can only assume, *faute de mieux*, that the idea of an image has entered Paul's mind through the term κατοπτριζόμενοι. As the Christian reflects on his Lord, he becomes more like that which he sees, as did Moses. In the text on which Paul bases his *pesher*, the content of the δόξα is quite physical: the brightness of Moses' skin. Paul's own vision of the glorious Christ on the Damascus road may well be in mind here./82/ But when he applies it to Christ, the δόξα takes on a metaphorical sense. Paradoxically, what is seen in apostles is not shining faces, but a carrying of the dying of Jesus: ἀεὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς οὐ ζῶντες εἰς θάνατον παραδιδόμεθα διὰ Ἰησοῦν (4:11). True glory, then, is seen at least in part in humiliation: and Christ so reflects the glory of God (4:6; the 'face' of Christ is evidently by analogy with that of Moses) that Paul can talk of the glory of Christ (4:4). For Christ to be the image of God, then, is for him to express the divine glory, to mediate the divine presence. Insofar as other men do this, they do so only indirectly, through Jesus' mediation. So we see here the development of a new understanding: the sense in which Jesus is the image of God is unique, not on a par with that in which Christians are seen to be the image of God.

A similar thought is expressed in Col. 1:15-20. Here the description of God as ἀόρατος leads us to suppose that the εἰκών should be interpreted as 'visible expression' - though the background to this is scarcely to be sought in platonic thought./83/ Nor is it likely that we should think specifically in terms of a glorious primal man,/84/ despite the link with creation,

-
81. See Blass-Debrunner-Funk, §159(4). But Plummer *ad loc.* cites parallels for other compounds of μετά.
 82. On this see the thesis by Kim, mentioned at n. 4. But Kim emphasizes the glory-motif to the exclusion of the vindication-motif, and correspondingly weakens his thesis.
 83. *Pace* Kleinknecht, *TDNT* 2, 389.
 84. *Pace* Lohmeyer, *ad loc.* and E. Käsemann, 'A Primitive Christian Baptismal Liturgy', in his *Essays on New Testament Themes* (London: SCM, 1964), 149-168 (154-159).

since there is no δόξα-language here, as might otherwise be expected. Further, the language here is functional: the εἰκών is expounded in terms of activity (creation, v. 18; reconciliation, v. 20) and status ('in him all the fulness of God was pleased to dwell', v. 19). The goal of this divine activity performed through Jesus is that Christians be presented holy and (morally) perfect before him (v. 22): it is surely significant that shortly afterwards the concept of the new man being renewed after the image of his creator is introduced. In both cases, then, where Christ is called the image of God, this is seen as something which he now shares with his body.

Paul, then, takes the image of God concept from Gen. 1:26f and employs it in a variety of ways, using it primarily as a functional and dynamic term to express human potential. This potential he sees as fulfilled in every way in the person of Jesus, and now in the process of being fulfilled in the church. The phrase therefore becomes for him a means by which he can express the mediatorial role of Jesus and his unique status. Men have forfeited their true human-ness; because Jesus responded in perfect obedience to God he fully manifested the divine image.

Other Comparable Ideas in Paul's Writings

In Rom. 8:29 and 1 Cor. 15:49 Paul makes a daring new departure by using the image language in a radically new way: the referent of the image is no longer God, but Christ himself. Paul's approach here seems comparable with that of Philo in which the Λόγος is the image of God, and the man of Gen. 1 is created 'after' or 'according to' it, so that he is at best an εἰκὼν εἰκόνοσ, /85/ We need not seek a logos-doctrine in Paul, but we see again how he was able to use the field of ideas behind the *imago dei* to ascribe unique status to his Lord.

Since the image in Gen. 1 was specifically Adam's, it may be thought that other 'man' language, while not explicitly using the phrase 'image of God', may yet reflect the same field of ideas. This is particularly

85. See above, p. 13.

true of his 'Adam' language. Attempts to read into Paul's thought a 'Son of Man' background/^{86/} are singularly unconvincing, not least because it has not yet been demonstrated with anything approaching cogency that it is justifiable to talk of a Son of Man title (still less of the Son of Man) before Jesus' own use of the phrase.^{/87/} But Adam does appear a couple of times in Paul's writings, and Paul also uses the idea of Jesus as the founder of a new humanity. We must beware of assuming, however, that Paul had to hand 'second Adam' speculations which he found neatly fitted Jesus. Of such speculations there is no pre-Christian evidence;^{/88/} nor is it evident from Paul's own writings that he assumed that his readers had any previous understanding of the idea of a second Adam. Rather, the impression is that we have to do here with Paul's own original development, but based on his already-developed idea of Jesus as the founder of a new humanity, the mediator of a new realm of imaging God. Hence the *imago dei* field of ideas is probably prior to the development of a second Adam motif.

A further relevant passage is Phil. 2:5-11,^{/89/} where again the context contains an appeal to become like Christ in this respect. But here the term used to describe him is not εἰκὼν but μορφή. Those who wish to see a background in Gen. 1:26f deny that this is of significance, claiming that 'the LXX often uses μορφή to translate the word תַּצְלָח'.^{/90/} This it does

-
86. E.g. by F. H. Borsch, *The Son of Man in Myth and History* (London: SCM, 1967), esp. 243; C. Colpe in *TDNT* 8, 470-473.
 87. See my thesis (as at n. 8), 72-80.
 88. See R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966), xxi-xxiv.
 89. On which see M. D. Hooker, 'Philippians 2:6-11' in E. E. Ellis and E. Grässer (eds.) *Jesus und Paulus* (Göttingen: V & R, 1975), 151-164.
 90. R. P. Martin, *Carmen Christi* (Cambridge: CUP, 1967), 107. In fairness to Martin it should be mentioned that he is here discussing other people's views, not presenting his own.

precisely once: μορφή is a comparatively rare word in the LXX, and the usual translation of מָצַל is εἰκὼν. But it is not unreasonable to see Gen. 1 as being in the conceptual background; though again we appear to have here another development of these ideas in the hands of Paul. He says little in elaboration of the content of the μορφή, but the phrase which follows is evidently in some sense epexegetic. Whether we interpret this phrase as meaning that 'il a estimé que ce n'était pas une usurpation d'être égal à Dieu' (with Carmignac/91/), or that he 'did not reckon that equality with God consisted in snatching' (with Moule /92/), it is evident that Paul is again thinking in functional or relation terms: this becomes further evident from v. 7, where the μορφή δούλου can only be functional. Christ mediates the presence and glory of God, not because he is an intermediary aeon as in later gnostic systems, but because he is equal with God. Further, Jesus so manifests his total submission to God's will by his submission to the death of the cross that his resurrection must be seen in terms of God's vindication of his life; a vindication so complete that he now comes to share God's glory and receives for himself the homage due properly to God alone.

Conclusions

Let me attempt to draw some strands together. Paul appears to have found in the opening chapters of Genesis an extraordinarily rich source of ideas in the concept of man's being created in the divine image. This he does not attempt to interpret as a piece of speculative metaphysics, but he chooses rather to interpret it in a wide variety of ways, notably in the context of status and relationships. It may well be that in so doing he has remained remarkably close to the intention of the originator of Genesis; and he has certainly done us a great service. For, as Cupitt has stressed recently, the concrete image can never be more than an idol:

-
91. J. Carmignac, 'L'Importance de la place d'une négation', *NTS* 18 (1971-72), 131-166 (142).
 92. C. F. D. Moule, 'Further Reflexions on Philippians 2:5-11', in W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin (eds.), *Apostolic History and the Gospel* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1970), 264-276 (264).

The only way it can be said that God is ... more than and other than some fashionable and popular image of him is by the inexcusable hooliganism of taking an axe to an idol ... [but] the iconoclast can only say by his act, "Not this!", and if people are shocked and say "Then what?", the iconoclast can say no more. His act is inexcusable because the available language cannot be made to express the excuse./93/

Paul may well have provided an answer to Cupitt's dilemma. For while he nowhere denies that men are in the image of God, by his constant stress on the imperative need for radical renewal/94/ he never allows the image to become an idol. Rather, in the new family relationship in Christ, mediated by the Spirit who cries 'Abba!' within us, we begin to take on the family likeness in a continuing process. It is thus that Paul interprets the glory of God.

But Paul also uses this realm of ideas to go beyond simply a self-understanding; using it to provide a link between the two poles of his thinking about Jesus: as a human being and as divine. It is because he totally manifests to us the image of God (seen primarily in his self-emptying) that it becomes proper to worship him and to see him in the OT manifestation of God. Thus we see Paul moving towards the first two of the aspects of his christology with which we began./95/

More than this: insofar as other men come to experience sonship of God, they do so by sharing Jesus' experience: his death and new life. And for them that life turns out to be wholly contingent on him, so that although the form of expression is rare in Paul's writings, Gal. 2:20 evidently expresses a fundamental aspect of his experience: 'I have been crucified with Christ; it is

-
93. D. Cupitt, *Christ and the Hiddenness of God* (London: Lutterworth, 1971), 63f.
 94. If the appeal to the Christian is 'become what you are', then for Paul the emphasis is surely on the *become*; and the appeal to the outsider is 'become what you are not!'.
 95. Above, pp. 4-6.

no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me.'/96/ It is therefore Christ who is reproducing himself, his own image, in other men: Christ, therefore, who has begun a whole new humanity, like the Adam of Gen. 5 who begets sons in his own image./97/ Hence it is that Paul's Jesus can only be described in supra-individual terms. He is not simply a paradigm of the new life - he is himself its source. This surely also takes us close to his mediation in creation in that he mediates a new creation and, through the Spirit which he bestows, the blessings of God in that creation.

I do not pretend that I have provided in the short space of this paper answers to the questions with which we began. The most that may be hoped is that this essay may encourage others to investigate comparable areas of Paul's thinking on the incarnation and shed light on his christology. Here we have attempted to highlight just one aspect of this in discussing Paul's use of the language of the image of God, and other language used of God, to describe Jesus Christ. For Paul this emphasizes total dependence: the Christian totally dependent on Christ; Christ totally dependent on God. Yet this never drowns individuality: the onus on us is for constant, voluntary self-surrender to the Lord who surrendered himself for the church./98/ To be truly human is interpreted in terms of using individual freedom to submit to another; and this turns out also to be of the essence of the nature of God. In the person of Jesus we see this self-submission at its fullest, carried to its greatest possible extent. The

-
96. Paul more usually talks of the Spirit dwelling in the Christian, and the Christian dwelling in Christ. This itself indicates how closely related (though not identified) are the Spirit and Christ in Paul's mind.
97. I.e. Paul *retrospectively* sees a parallel between Adam and Christ.
98. This is particularly evident in Phil. 2, if, with Moule (as at n. 92) we interpret ἀπαγγέλλω as *raptus*: Jesus interpreted his divinity not as snatching but as self-giving. In a comparable way, Paul interprets the Christian life as a life of self-giving, in accepting the νέκρωσις of Jesus.

resurrection proves God's acceptance of this and enables others to share the new life which is now the life of Christ himself. Thus the only true man turns out to be far more than merely a man; one who fulfils divine functions as the divine image. It is part of the paradox of the christian faith that the greatest of these functions - the greatest expression of the divine glory - is seen in his utter and absolute self-giving, even to the death of the cross, the place of the divine curse upon human rebellion and arrogance. Because he gave himself for us, we are now invited to give ourselves to him and find ourselves in him. This is τὸ εἶναι Ἰσα θεῷ.