

him as "the angel of the Lord" (LXX<sup>BA</sup>; LXX<sup>S</sup> "an angel of God"). Before he does so, he identifies himself as one of the seven holy angels who bring the prayers of God's people into God's presence (12:15).

In conclusion, there is in the Bible no single "The angel of Yahweh". The phrase *mal'ak YHWH* is better translated as "an angel (or messenger) of Yahweh" when it first appears in a narrative, for it represents the appearance of an unspecified supernatural envoy sent from Yahweh. In cases where a simultaneous identity and discontinuity is uncomfortably present between Yahweh and his messenger, the term *mal'ak* is probably a secondary addition to the text in response to changing theological perspectives.

IV. The phrase *mal'ak YHWH* is not yet attested in published, non-biblical materials from Qumran, despite a sophisticated and extensive angelology in these texts. This omission correlates with the non-specificity of the figure in early witnesses, for in spite of the proliferation of details about angels in extra- and post-biblical texts, the "angel of Yahweh" receives in general no special attention in Judaism. It is true that one may trace in Jewish apocalyptic the development of a single exalted angel that some have tried to derive from the earlier *mal'ak YHWH* (ROWLAND 1982:94-113), but the connection between the two remains undemonstrated and the terminology is different. Quite the contrary, a vigorous element in early Judaism resisted sectarians who believed that a certain principal angel was a special →mediator between God and man (SEGAL 1977:70). Developing descriptions about the highest-ranking angels tend to avoid the phrase "angel of the Lord" in favour of more elaborate titles. Extensive gnostic speculations about demiurges and the cosmic hierarchy likewise tend to bypass the nomenclature of the "angel of the Lord", although the "Messenger" is a significant divine emanation in some gnostic traditions such as Manichaeism (cf. Samaritan gnosticism [FOSSUM 1985]).

#### V. Bibliography

J. E. FOSSUM, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord - Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism* (WUNT 36; Tübingen 1985); F. GUGGISBERG, *Die Gestalt des Mal'ak Jahwe im Alten Testament* (Dach 1979); V. HIRTH, *Gottes Boten im Alten Testament* (Theologische Arbeiten 32; Berlin 1975); D. IRVIN, *Mytharion. The Comparison of Tales from the Old Testament and the Ancient Near East* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978); H. RÖTGER, *Mal'ak Jahwe - Bote von Gott. Die Vorstellung von Gottes Boten im hebräischen Alten Testament* (Frankfurt 1978); C. ROWLAND, *The Open Heaven - A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London 1982); A. F. SEGAL, *Two Powers in Heaven - Early Rabbinic Reports About Christianity and Gnosticism* (Leiden 1977); F. STIER, *Gott und sein Engel im Alten Testament* (Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen 12,2; Münster 1934).

S. A. MEIER

#### ANTHROPOS ἄνθρωπος

I. One designation, with or without qualification, of the highest being in many gnostic systems: *quae est super omnia virtus, et continet omnia, Anthropos vocatur* (Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1.12.4). The name draws attention to the direct or indirect link between supreme divinity and humanity, esp. the 'unwavering race', thanks to which redemption from the world created by the →Archons is possible. The name Anthropos signifies that →God is the prototype of Man (*anthropos*), because man is made, directly or indirectly, in his image. The *Religions-geschichtliche Schule* and others claimed that an oriental *Urmensch*-myth lay behind the gnostic doctrine. This account has been invoked to explain the Pauline passages (1 Cor 15:21-2, 45-49; Rom 5: 12-21) in which →Christ is compared and contrasted with the first man, →Adam. Neither of these views has worn well.

II. There are two related types of gnostic anthropological myth, both of which draw upon a motif, an image reflected in

water, that goes back to Satarnil and thus 'Samaritan' gnosis (Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1.24.1) (SCHENKE 1962:64-68). They share the basic premise that (human) man is at least potentially a higher being than the demiurge of the world, who enviously withheld this knowledge (the forbidden fruit of Gen 2:16-17) from Adam. The simpler is best exemplified by the long recension of the *Apocryphon of John* (NHC II.1, 14:13-21:16). This envisages Adam's 'choic' or material body as modelled by the Archons of the demiurge directly upon a glimpsed reflection of the image of the Perfect Man (the highest god) (14:24-15:12). His *psyche* is likewise created by the Archons; but his divine *pneuma* derives from Sophia. Coming directly from the world of light, it in fact pre-exists choic and psychic bodies. The second type, exemplified by the Naassene exegesis (in the distorted and lacunate account of Hippolytus *Ref. haer.* 5.7.3-9.9), protects the transcendence of the highest divinity by interpolating a hypostasis between Anthropos and Man: the hypostasis or →image (*eikōn*) supplies both the model for physical man and the divine particle of light. The Perfect Man, the Father of All, Adam, produces a son 'of the same substance'. The physical body of human Adam made by the Archons of the demiurge Esaldaios is (indirectly) modelled upon this son. When the son, probably in the form of divine light, descends to vivify the creature, he is trapped; over the generations descending from Adam, the light is split up into innumerable fragments, each of which may return to the Light World (FRICKEL 1984: 263). This principle could be indefinitely extended: any emanation from the Perfect Man may be named Anthropos, even the female Barbelo in *Apocryphon of John*, because she is 'the image of the Father' (14: 23; cf. 5:7; 6:4). In *Eugnostos*, a series of emanations from the First-Father, also called Anthropos (NHC III.3, 77:14), is named in turn First Man, Immortal Man, →Son of Man, →Saviour (78:3; 85:10-14).

As a key gnostic motif, Anthropos has figured in all accounts of the genesis or

proto-history of gnosticism. Older accounts may be briefly summarized. W. BOUSSET claimed that an ancient oriental myth, the creation of the world from the parts of a sacrificial victim, the prototypical man, must underlie the narratives of *Poimandres* 12-15 and several Christian accounts of gnostic systems (*Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* [Göttingen 1907, repr. 1973] 160-223). The best-known of these myths, that of the Iranian *Gayōmart*, stimulated R. REITZENSTEIN in turn to propose the existence of an Iranian popular cult of a redeemed redeemer, which ultimately inspired the gnostic myth as a whole (e.g. *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium*, Bonn 1921). C. H. KRAELING attempted to link Bousset's view to Jewish Messianism (*Anthropos and the Son of Man*, New York 1927), G. WIDENGREN to find the redeemed redeemer in early Iranian texts (*The great Vohu Manah*, Uppsala 1945). None of these views survived the criticisms of COLPE (1961:140-70; cf. 1969:411) and SCHENKE (1962:69-114), though it was still possible for RUDOLPH in 1964 to stress the supposed Iranian antecedents of gnosticism. The decisive considerations, as SCHENKE showed, were the new texts from Nag Hammadi, which provided far more reliable accounts of gnostic Anthropos than had been available, and an appreciation of the character of post-Biblical Jewish techniques of exegesis (cf. TRÖGER 1980:155-168). There is simply no evidence for the redeemed redeemer in gnosis until Manicheism. The key texts that inspire all gnostic anthropology are Gen 1:26-27; 2:7 & 2:21-24, together with the post-Biblical Jewish exegeses of these passages (cf. QUISPEL 1953:215-217, 226; PEARSON 1973:51-81; 1990). Certainly, gnostic 'systems' are syncretic, but no precise antecedent of the basic macro-/micro-cosmic scheme is required; and syncretism is only one of the processes involved in the elaboration of the complex gnostic scenarios. TARDIEU (1974) has provided a convincing account of the varied sources of inspiration, and the narrative logic, of one such anthropology, in the *Origin of the World* (NHC II.5). Iran, to say nothing of

ancient oriental myths, has disappeared totally from RUDOLPH's most recent summary (1990:99-130).

III. Within NT studies, the authority of R. BULTMANN, who tended to accept the 'oriental' origins of gnosis as a fact (e.g. 1964; 1984), caused it to be widely canvassed, and not only among his pupils (see e.g. J. JEREMIAS, s.v. Adam, *TWNT* 1 [1933] 142-143; H. SCHLIER, *RAC* 3 [1956] 437-53), that the Christology of Pauline Christianity was significantly influenced by "Urmensch und Erlöser", however they came to be combined into an eschatological Adam (cf. SINN 1991). But the objections to any direct relation between gnostic myth and Pauline Christology are decisive (SCHENKE 1973). Thus COLPE argued that 'Son of Man' has no genetic link with Gnostic ideas (1969:414-418). The basic premises of W. SCHMITHALS' *Die Gnosis in Korinth 3* (1969) were undermined by SCHENKE & FISCHER, *Einleitung in die Schriften des NT* (Berlin 1978-1979) 1:103-5. The contrast between *pneumatikos* and *psychikos* in 1 Cor 14:44-46 derives from Hellenistic-Jewish wisdom speculation, and was thus freely available both to Gnostics and to early Christians (PEARSON 1973). The differences in the structure and meaning of gnostic anthropology by contrast with the Pauline scheme have been noted by FISCHER 1980:289-294.

Although the inverse assumption viz., that the Pauline Adam-Christ inverted parallelism has Judaic sources, can also not be conclusively demonstrated, there have been adequate treatments of the Pauline Adam-Christ typology which do not concede even the limited gnostic influence allowed by BRANDENBURGER (1962) or SCHOTTRUFF (1970). COLPE (1969:475-477) showed that 1 Cor 15:45-49 is an elaboration through reduplicated antithesis of 15:21, and that no prior schema underlies the passage. In Rom 5:12-21, which is derivative from the Cor passage, an apocalyptic notion, →Jesus as the →Son of Man, has been recast into the prototype Man of the resurrection, contrasted with the death

brought about by Adam. The origin of the typology in Alexandrian wisdom speculation was pointed out by SANDELIN (1976:91-113), thus undermining Reitzenstein's view of Philo *Leg. Alleg.* 1.31; the same scheme lies behind Phil 2:6-9. BARRETT (1985) likewise analysed the role of exegesis of Gen 1-2 in 1 Cor 15, but stressed the probable allusion to the representative Man of Dan 7:13 and the implied rejection of Philo's Platonism in *Leg. Alleg.* 1:31 (cf. LIETZMANN ad 1 Cor 15:45-49). FISCHER has urged that 1 Cor 15:45-49 is a unique melding of strands of belief derived both from Jewish Apocalyptic (4 Ezra, 2 *Apoc. Bar.*) and from gnostic myth (1980:294-298), but that no coherent gnostic doctrine inspired Paul negatively or positively. The most recent discussions of 1 Cor 15 draw on both COLPE and BARRETT (WITHERINGTON 1992:184-193; 1994:308f.) – the analogies Paul uses are merely partial ones and not to be pressed. Attention has switched to the construction of the rhetorical argument as a whole in favour of the resurrection of the dead.

#### IV. Bibliography

F. ALTERMATH, *Du corps psychique au corps spirituel* (Beitr. Gesch. bibl. Exeg. 18; Tübingen 1977); C. K. BARRETT, The Significance of the Adam-Christ Typology for the Resurrection of the Dead, *Résurrection du Christ et des chrétiens* (ed. L. de Lorenzi; Sér. monogr. Bénédict., sect. bibl.-oec. 8; Rome 1985) 99-122; E. BRANDENBURGER, *Adam und Christus* (WMANT 7; Neukirchen 1962); R. BULTMANN, Adam und Christus nach Römer 5, *Der alte und der neue Mensch in der Theologie des Paulus* (Darmstadt 1964) 41-66, repr. from *ZNW* 50 (1959) 145-65; BULTMANN, *Theologie des NT* (Tübingen 1984<sup>9</sup>) 166-186; C. COLPE, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule* (Göttingen 1961); COLPE, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, *TWNT* 8 (1969) 403-481; K. M. FISCHER, Adam und Christus, *Altes Testament - Frühjudentum - Gnosis* (ed. K. Tröger; Berlin 1980) 283-98; J. FRICKEL, *Hellenistische Erlösung in christlicher Deutung: der gnostische Naassenerschrift* (NHS 19; Leiden 1984) 259-269; B. A. PEARSON,

*The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians* (SBLDS 12; Missoula 1973); PEARSON, *Gnosticism, Judaism and Egyptian Christianity* (Minneapolis 1990) 29-38; G. QUISPEL, Der gnostische Anthropos und die jüdische Tradition, *ErJb* 22 (1953) 195-234; K. RUDOLPH, Stand und Aufgabe in der Erforschung des Gnostizismus (1964), repr. in *Gnosis und Gnostizismus* (ed. K. Rudolph; Darmstadt 1975) 510-553; RUDOLPH, *Die Gnosis* (Göttingen 1990<sup>3</sup>); K.-G. SANDELIN, *Die Auseinandersetzung mit der Weisheit in 1 Kor. 15* (Åbo 1976); H.-M. SCHENKE, *Der Gott 'Mensch' in der Gnosis* (Göttingen 1962); M. SCHENKE, Die neutestamentliche Christologie und der gnostische Erlöser, *Gnosis und Neues Testament* (ed. K. Tröger; Berlin 1973) 205-229; L. SCHOTTROFF, *Der Glaubende und die feindliche Welt* (WMANT 37; Neukirchen 1970); G. SINN, *Christologie und Existenz: Rudolf Bultmann's Interpretation des paulinischen Christuszeugnisses* (TANZ 4; Tübingen 1991); M. TARDIEU, *Trois mythes gnostiques* (Paris 1974) 86-139; B. WITHERINGTON III, *Jesus, Paul and the End of the World* (Downer's Grove, Ill. 1992); WITHERINGTON, *Conflict and Community in Corinth* (Grand Rapids/Carlisle 1994).

R. L. GORDON

# ANTICHRIST ἀντίχριστος

I. The word *antichristos* is found only in 1 John 2:18,22; 4:3; 2 John 7, and in post-biblical Christian literature. Morphologically the closest analogy is *antitheos* which was in use since Homer (*Od.* 11:117; 13:378; 14:18). In Homer *antitheos* means 'godlike'. In later times it comes to mean 'contrary to God' (for instance Philo, *Poster.* 37:3; 123:4; *Congr.* 118:1; *Fug.* 140:3). The term *antichristos* is ambiguous ('opponent of →Christ' or 'false Christ') owing to the twofold meaning of *anti* in composita: it can mean 'against' (*anti-stratēgos*: 'the enemy's general', Thucydides 7:86) or 'instead of' (*antipsycho*: 'something offered instead of one's life', Dio Cassius 59:8; neuter in 4 Macc 6:29; 17:21).

In the Epistles of John *antichristos* is used as a designation for the ultimate eschatological opponent of →Jesus Christ. The appearance of the *antichristos* is expected to precede the *parousia* of Christ. The author of 1 and 2 John refers to this expectation as an existing tradition (1 John 2:18: 'as you have heard ...'), although the tradition of Antichrist is not attested in its full form before Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 5:25-30). After having referred to the tradition the author uses the word *antichristos* to characterize his opponents who as *antichristoi* deny Christ (1 John 2:18—plural; 1 John 2:22; 2 John 7—singular). Their teaching is inspired by the spirit of Antichrist, and presented by the author as proof that Antichrist has already come (1 John 4:3). By interpreting the conflict with those who deny Christ (1 John 2:22) by means of the expectation of Antichrist, the author of the Epistles of John argues the nearness of the end (1 John 2:18!).

II. Neither the word *antichristos* nor a Hebrew or other equivalent is used in any of the versions of the OT or in extra-biblical literature of the period. But although the word is not used before the Epistles of John, the concept of eschatological opposition reaching its climax in the appearance and activity of a single person is already found in some OT passages: Ezek 38-39 mentions →Gog of →Magog as Israel's final enemy (cf. Rev 20:8); Dan 7-8.11 describes the appearance of an evil tyrant who will act as the final enemy of God and Israel. The tradition of an evil tyrant as the climax of eschatological evil should be understood as a specification of the tradition of the eschatological enmity of the pagan peoples and Israel (cf. Isa 5:25-30; 8:18-20; 10:5-7; 37:16-20; Nah 3:1-7; Joel 4; Zech 14). This expectation of eschatological hostility between Israel and the peoples is also expressed in extra-biblical sources. Sometimes the hostility is thought to reach a climax in the rise of an eschatological tyrant (*I En.* 90:9-16; *Ass. Mos.* 8; 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 36-40; 70; 4 *Ezra* 5:1-13; 12:29-33; 13:25-38). Among the various passages of the Qumran literature containing forms of eschatological