

**THE MESSIAH IN THE *PARABLES OF ENOCH* AND  
THE LETTERS OF PAUL: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS**

by

James A. Waddell

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
(Near Eastern Studies)  
in the University of Michigan  
2010

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Gabriele Boccaccini, Chair  
Professor Brian B. Schmidt  
Professor Raymond H. Van Dam  
Professor Charles A. Gieschen, Concordia Seminary

© James A. Waddell

All Rights Reserved

2010

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I express my heartfelt appreciation to my mentor, Gabriele Boccaccini. His expansive knowledge, methodological clarity, and his brilliant insights into the cultural remains of Second Temple Judaism have been an invaluable gift to me. When I began my studies at the University of Michigan I did not anticipate the depth and the breadth of substance I was about to experience. I will always cherish his kindness as a human being, his warm hospitality, and our friendship that has developed over the years.

The members of my dissertation committee have offered solid contributions and guidance for my work and for this I am deeply grateful. Brian Schmidt made invaluable comments on my use of the Hebrew Bible, and on the tensions that exist in our understanding of Jewish messianism in diverse contexts of henotheistic and monotheistic beliefs in antiquity. Ray Van Dam pointed me in the direction of exploring the socio-historical mechanisms of orality and literacy for the transmission of traditions in the Second Temple period, a direction that holds promise for further development of this study. Charles Gieschen brought his widely known expertise on the divine name and christology. All of these scholars have proved to be mentors and friends.

I also wish to thank Jack Levison and Johannes Tromp for their kind and extraordinarily helpful private conversations and correspondence with me regarding the

Adam traditions and the importance of these traditions for understanding Paul. Both of these scholars are very detailed and exacting in their methodology and they have helped me to refine and clarify my argument.

The Department of Near Eastern Studies at the University of Michigan almost became my second home. Alexander ‘Sasha’ Knysh, Norman Yoffee, Gary Beckman, and Kevork Bardakjian all have my gratitude for their support of my program and travels abroad. The administrative staff of our department, Angela Beskow, Margaret Casazza, and Lisa Michelin, are treasures of the university who gave me much needed guidance through the maze of details required to complete my studies.

The Frankel Center for Judaic Studies at the University of Michigan has also been a friend and strong supporter of my program. I am deeply grateful to Todd Endelman and the Frankel Center for their generous material support of my program, especially for the numerous opportunities to study in Israel and Europe. I owe a debt of gratitude as well to the Michigan Center for Early Christian Studies and the Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies for their generous support of my education and travel abroad.

I wish also to thank my colleagues of the Enoch Seminar. They are too many to mention all of their names, but I especially think it appropriate to single out a few of them whose work I engage in this dissertation—Jim Charlesworth, John Collins, Helge Kvanvig, George Nickelsburg, David Suter, and Jim VanderKam.

I first became acquainted with Hanan and Esti Eshel through the Enoch Seminar. The intensity of their scholarship has always been tempered by their warm kindness and friendship. Hanan’s recent death was a blow to the academic world of Second Temple

Judaism, and especially to the close-knit community of the Enoch Seminar. Hanan's valuable scholarly contributions will be sorely missed, but even more we will miss his friendship in our midst.

I must acknowledge the friendships I have enjoyed among my graduate student colleagues in our Department at the University of Michigan—J. Harold Ellens, Jason von Ehrenkrook, Justin Winger, Anne Kreps, Stephanie Bolz, Isaac Oliver, Jason Zurawski, and Ron Ruark—all students in our Second Temple Judaism program. We have shared every kind of hope, doubt, uncertainty, and triumph imaginable. To these I should add the students of our Department already in the Hebrew Bible program when I entered Michigan—Vadim Jigoulov, Jason Tatlock, Jason Radine, and Brad Crowell, always there to help steer the inexperienced through the challenging maze of the academic world, and all of whom are now full-time faculty in various schools around the country and productive scholars in their own right. It is a real gift to be able to say that all of these colleagues are also my friends.

Finally, there are no words that can adequately express what my family experienced as I worked through each of the steps to complete the degree, this dissertation only being the visible result of a very long and arduous process—my wife Lisa and our children, Blythe and Joel. I love them with all my heart. This would not have been possible without their constant love, sacrifice, and support.

Material from *1 Enoch: A New Translation* by George W.E. Nickelsburg and James VanderKam copyright © 2004 by Fortress Press. Reproduced by special permission of Augsburg Fortress Publishers.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>viii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	<b>ix</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.A. The Question This Study Addresses .....	1
1.B. History of Research .....	3
1.C. Methodology .....	13
1.D. Mediatorial Figures in Second Temple Judaism .....	16
1.E. Dating the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> .....	20
<b>CHAPTER 2. THE MESSIAH IN THE <i>PARABLES OF ENOCH</i></b> .....	<b>28</b>
2.A. The Divine Figure in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> .....	28
2.A.i. Nature of the Divine Figure in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> .....	29
2.A.i.a. A Heavenly Being .....	30
2.A.i.b. A Holy Being .....	33
2.A.i.c. Foreknowledge .....	34
2.A.i.d. A Merciful Being .....	35
2.A.i.e. A Righteous Being .....	36
2.A.i.f. Repentance .....	37
2.A.i.g. An Eternal Being .....	38
2.A.ii. Functions of the Divine Figure in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> .....	40
2.A.ii.a. Creation .....	41
2.A.ii.b. Revelation of Wisdom .....	42
2.A.ii.d. Worship .....	44
2.A.ii.e. Judgment .....	45
2.B. Ambiguous References Either to the Divine Figure or the Messiah Figure .....	50
2.C. The Messiah Figure in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> .....	53
2.C.i. Nature of the Messiah Figure in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> .....	53
2.C.i.a. A Human Being .....	54

2.C.i.b. Identified with Enoch .....	57
2.C.i.c. A Heavenly Being .....	69
2.C.i.d. Preexistence .....	72
2.C.i.e. Association with Wisdom .....	73
2.C.i.f. A Righteous Being .....	82
2.C.i.g. The Divine Name .....	86
2.C.i.h. The ‘Son of Man’ Title .....	90
2.C.ii. Functions of the Messiah Figure in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> .....	104
2.C.ii.a. Revelation of Wisdom .....	105
2.C.ii.b. Salvation .....	107
2.C.ii.c. Judgment .....	110
2.C.ii.d. Worship .....	120
2.D. Summary and Conclusions .....	124

**CHAPTER 3. THE MESSIAH IN THE LETTERS OF PAUL ..... 129**

3.A. The Divine Figure in the Letters of Paul .....	129
3.A.i. Nature of the Divine Figure in the Letters of Paul .....	130
3.A.i.a. The One God .....	130
3.A.i.b. Deity .....	133
3.A.i.c. A Heavenly Being .....	134
3.A.i.d. A Righteous Being .....	135
3.A.ii. Functions of the Divine Figure in the Letters of Paul .....	137
3.A.ii.a. Creation .....	137
3.A.ii.b. Revelation of Wisdom .....	139
3.A.ii.c. Divine Acts in the Life of the Messiah Figure .....	142
3.A.ii.d. Salvation .....	145
3.A.ii.e. Worship .....	145
3.A.ii.f. Judgment .....	146
3.B. Ambiguous References Either to the Divine Figure or the Messiah Figure ...	148
3.C. The Messiah Figure in the Letters of Paul .....	149
3.C.i. Nature of the Messiah Figure in the Letters of Paul .....	150
3.C.i.a. A Human Being .....	150
3.C.i.b. A Heavenly Being .....	152
3.C.i.c. Preexistence .....	155
3.C.i.d. Association with the Wisdom of God .....	164
3.C.i.e. Pre-human .....	172
3.C.i.f. Divine Image and Glory .....	178
3.C.i.g. The Divine Name .....	179
3.C.i.h. Like an Angel .....	180
3.C.i.i. Without Sin .....	181
3.C.ii. Functions of the Messiah Figure in the Letters of Paul .....	182
3.C.ii.a. Agent of Creation .....	183

3.C.ii.b. Salvation .....	184
3.C.ii.c. Forgiveness of Sins .....	190
3.C.ii.d. Association with the Power of God .....	196
3.C.ii.e. Judgment .....	209
3.C.ii.f. Worship .....	214
3.D. Summary and Conclusions .....	218
<b>CHAPTER 4. A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE MESSIAH IN THE <i>PARABLES OF ENOCH</i> AND THE LETTERS OF PAUL .....</b>	<b>224</b>
4.A. Striking Similarities between the <i>Book of Parables</i> and the Letters of Paul ..	224
4.B. What Is New in Paul .....	231
4.C. EXCURSUS: Why Paul Did Not Use “Son-of-Man” Terminology .....	234
<b>CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>260</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>270</b>



## LIST OF TABLES

<b>TABLE 1. Development of Enoch’s Status in Enochic Intellectual Speculation . . . .</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>TABLE 2. Philosophical and Messianic Wisdom Associations . . . . .</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>TABLE 3. A Comparison of the Nature of the Divine Figure and the Nature of the Messiah Figure in BP . . . . .</b>	<b>127</b>
<b>TABLE 4. A Comparison of the Functions of the Divine Figure and the Functions of the Messiah Figure in BP . . . . .</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>TABLE 5. A Comparison of the Nature of the Divine Figure and the Nature of the Messiah Figure in LP . . . . .</b>	<b>222</b>
<b>TABLE 6. A Comparison of the Functions of the Divine Figure and the Functions of the Messiah Figure in LP . . . . .</b>	<b>223</b>
<b>TABLE 7. A Comparison of the Nature of the Divine Figure and the Nature of the Messiah Figure in BP and LP . . . . .</b>	<b>225</b>
<b>TABLE 8. A Comparison of the Functions of the Divine Figure and the Functions of the Messiah Figure in BP and LP . . . . .</b>	<b>226</b>
<b>TABLE 9. Precedented and Unprecedented Conceptual Elements of Messianic Nature Held in Common by BP and LP . . . . .</b>	<b>228</b>
<b>TABLE 10. Precedented and Unprecedented Conceptual Elements of Messianic Functions Held in Common by BP and LP . . . . .</b>	<b>229</b>

## ABSTRACT

### THE MESSIAH IN THE *PARABLES OF ENOCH* AND THE LETTERS OF PAUL: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

by

James A. Waddell

Chair: Gabriele Boccaccini

In the first century CE Jewish identity was defined in a context of significant religious diversity. This presents those who read Paul's Letters with a problem: how to locate Paul's thought within the complicated matrix of Jewish intellectual traditions of this period. A comparative analysis of the Messiah in the *Book of the Parables of Enoch* and the Letters of Paul, this study locates one aspect of Paul's thought, his christology, in the context of Jewish intellectual traditions of the first century CE.

Conceptual elements of messianic traditions are identified in these documents by examining the nature and functions of the divine figure and the nature and functions of the messiah figure. This has implications for understanding divine and human agency and

the relationships between mediatorial figures and the one God in Jewish literature from the Second Temple period. The literature demonstrates a complex variety of expressions for describing interactions between the divine figure and all other created beings.

Comparative analysis demonstrates that the *Book of the Parables* and the Letters of Paul share specific conceptual elements of messianic traditions. The combination of shared elements is so striking as to preclude the possibility that the *Book of the Parables* and the Letters of Paul constituted independent, parallel developments. It cannot be claimed, however, that Paul was familiar with the text of the *Book of the Parables*; there are no direct quotes of the *Book of the Parables* anywhere in Paul's Letters. We can say, however, that Paul was familiar with the conceptual elements of the Enochic messiah, and that Paul developed his concept of the *Kyrios* out of the Son of Man traditions in the *Book of the Parables of Enoch*. This study argues that at least one facet of Paul's thought, his christology, was heavily influenced by Enochic Son of Man traditions.

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.A. The Question This Study Addresses

Paul was a Jew. He lived at a time when being a Jew meant defining oneself in a context of remarkable diversity. Consequently the simple statement, “Paul was a Jew,” does not really tell us all there is to know. As in the case of the historical Jesus the question of Paul’s Jewish identity cannot be understood apart from the complicated realities of Jewish diversity during the Second Temple period. What kind of Jew was Paul? Was he a Hellenistic Jew? A Pharisee? A Sadducee? An Enochic Jew? Maybe he was a sophisticated combination of all these very different Jewish ideological points of view. Unlike Jesus, whose association with John the Baptizer is the only element that sheds some light on his formative years, Paul explicitly and repeatedly referred in his letters to his “earlier life in Judaism” (Ga 1.13). Paul identified himself as a Pharisee, advancing beyond his peers in the ancestral traditions. He identified himself in the most detailed terms, “with circumcision on the eighth day, from the people of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of Hebrews, according to law a Pharisee, according to zeal

persecuting the church, according to the righteousness that is by the law becoming blameless” (Phlp 3.5-6). This has led scholars for centuries to speak of Paul as a “former Jew,” but this was not Paul’s self-understanding. The so-called experience of “conversion” on the road to Damascus<sup>1</sup> did not put Paul out of Judaism. It did not cancel his Jewish identity. It only shifted his association from one Jewish group to another, from Pharisaic Judaism to the Jesus movement.<sup>2</sup> Paul was a Jew before his conversion. He remained a Jew after his conversion. Even in the heat of conflict with other Jews, Paul never denied his Jewish identity, nor did he understand his new “Christian” identity to be in opposition to Judaism. As Gabriele Boccaccini has argued, Paul’s literary output was a participation in an “inner Jewish debate in Second Temple Judaism.”<sup>3</sup>

We also know that Paul, as his literary output reveals, possessed an intellect of extraordinary complexity. His writings have been the focus of controversy and debate for nearly two thousand years. This has been the case not only within the Judaism of his own time, but also within the nascent Jesus movement contemporary to Paul and as this movement developed in the decades immediately after Paul. Paul’s life and writings are evidence not only of conflicts with other Jewish groups, but also with groups within the

---

<sup>1</sup>Acts 9.1-30, 22.1-21, 26.1-23.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Alan F. Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven: Yale, 1990).

<sup>3</sup>See Boccaccini’s essay, “Inner-Jewish Debate on the Tension between Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism,” in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*, John M. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole, eds. (London: T. & T. Clark, 2006) 9-26. In this essay Boccaccini develops his view that Paul is engaging in an inner-Jewish debate around the concept of the origin of evil and how this concept is developed differently in the literature from this period. Were human beings the victims of a supernatural origin of evil or were they responsible for evil in the world? Second Temple period Jewish texts offer a variety of answers to this question. See also Gabriele Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991) 220-222.

Jesus movement that did not agree with his positions.

This study proposes a contribution to the history of Pauline studies and the ongoing scholarly debate by examining Paul's place in the development of Jewish thought with respect to messiah figures between the second century BCE and the first century CE. The key question this study proposes to answer is: What is the relationship, if any, between the concept of the messiah figure in the *Book of the Parables of Enoch* and the concept of the messiah figure in the Letters of Paul? In other words, is there a relationship between the Enochic Son of Man and the Pauline *Kyrios*? A corollary question is: Where does Paul as a Jew fit within the landscape of Jewish intellectual development of messianic ideology of the Second Temple period?

### **1.B. History of Research**

In 1913 Wilhelm Bousset presented his influential study, *Kyrios Christos*. In this study Bousset argued from a history of religions perspective that the identification of the historical Jesus as *Kyrios Christos* developed as a result of Gentile cultic veneration. Bousset's analysis led him to conclude with regard to the term *Kyrios*, "that the primitive Palestinian community was not acquainted with this designation."<sup>4</sup> This, however, was Bousset's leading assumption. Bousset's assumption about the Pauline *Kyrios*, that it was largely a development out of a Hellenized, Greco-Roman Gentile environment of cultic veneration, owes its fundamental distinctions to the earlier nineteenth-century work of

---

<sup>4</sup>Wilhelm Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Iranaeus*, John E. Steely, trans. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1970; German original, 1913) 11.

F.C. Baur. Baur's analysis had already driven a significant wedge between "Jewish" and "Gentile" Christianity by applying the Hegelian model which pitted Paul's Gentile Christianity against the early Jewish followers of Jesus in Judea.<sup>5</sup> Baur's model shaped scholarly opinion about Paul for nearly a century, and Bousset fits within this development of the history of research on Paul.

In 1977 E.P. Sanders transformed the debate about Paul with his study, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*.<sup>6</sup> The beginning premise of Sanders' analysis was that Paul was a Jew, and his literary work should be understood in the context other Jewish literature from the period describing Jewish identity. By using a kind of common-denominator approach, Sanders concluded that all forms of Second Temple Judaism had to be considered variants of a common theological framework he defined as "covenantal nomism." Although Paul ultimately broke with this framework by replacing the Torah with Christ as the new center of Judaism, Sanders rightly identified Paul as a Jewish intellectual rather than the founder of a Hellenized form of Christianity.

Sanders' work sparked an entirely new trajectory of the conversation known as the New Perspective on Paul,<sup>7</sup> which has mainly focused on the question of soteriology. The

---

<sup>5</sup>Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche* (Tübingen, 1863); *Vorlesungen über Neutestamentliche Theologie* (Leipzig, 1864); *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, His Life and Work, His Epistles and Doctrine: A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity*, ET (London: Williams and Norgate, 1876); *The Church History of the First Three Centuries*, ET (London: Williams and Norgate, 1878).

<sup>6</sup>E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977).

<sup>7</sup>David E. Aune, ed., *Rereading Paul Together: Protestant and Catholic Perspectives on Justification* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006). Jouette M. Bassler, *Navigating Paul: An Introduction to Key Theological Concepts* (Philadelphia: Westminster/John Knox, 2006). Michael F. Bird, *The Saving Righteousness of God: Studies on Paul, Justification and the New Perspective* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock,

New Perspective has had profound implications for issues pertaining to christology, and raises important questions that are also at the center of the present study, for example, the relationship between wisdom and the messiah figure, the preexistence of the messiah figure, and Paul's Adam typology. One of the key problems in the study of Paul's concept of the messiah is the question of monotheism. James Dunn writes: "In assessing Paul's christology . . . and in theologizing further on the basis of it, a central fact remains primary: that Paul's christology was not seen as a threat to Israel's inherited monotheism by his Jewish contemporaries, nor was it intended by Paul himself as a complete redefinition of that monotheism."<sup>8</sup> This is a question that will also be addressed here.

In 2003 Larry Hurtado published an important volume on devotion to Jesus among the earliest followers of Jesus in the first century. Hurtado challenged the

---

2007). James D.G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*, second edition (London: SCM, 1989); Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (Philadelphia: Westminster/John Knox, 1990); Dunn, ed., *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, AD 70 to 135* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992); Dunn, ed., *Paul and the Mosaic Law* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001); Dunn, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 2003); Dunn, *The Justice of God: A Fresh Look at the Old Doctrine of Justification by Faith* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993); Dunn, *The New Perspective on Paul, Revised Edition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007); Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997); Dunn, *The Theology of Paul's Letter to the Galatians* (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1993). Pamela Eisenbaum, *Paul Was Not a Christian: The Original Message of a Misunderstood Apostle* (New York: Harper, 2009). John Gager, *Reinventing Paul* (New York: Oxford, 2000). Alan F. Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostacy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven: Yale, 1990). Michael B. Thompson, *The New Perspective on Paul* (Cambridge: Grove, 2002). N.T. Wright, *What St. Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997). Wright, *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision* (London: SPCK, 2009). Critical responses to the New Perspective on Paul include D.A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark Seifrid, eds., *Justification and Variegated Nomism: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, volume 1 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001); Carson, D.A., Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark Seifrid, eds., *Justification and Variegated Nomism: The Paradoxes of Paul*, volume 2 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004). A. Andrew Das, *Paul and the Jews* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003); Das, *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001). Simon J. Gathercole, *Where is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1-5* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

<sup>8</sup>*The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 293.



foundational thesis of Bousset, that worship of Jesus developed in the Hellenistic context of early Christianity.<sup>9</sup> Hurtado presents his argument based on three premises. First,

. . . a noteworthy devotion to Jesus emerges phenomenally early in circles of his followers, and cannot be restricted to a secondary stage of religious development or explained as the product of extraneous forces. Certainly the Christian movement was not hermetically sealed from the cultures in which it developed, and Christians appropriated (and adapted for their own purposes) words, conceptual categories, and religious traditions to express their faith. But devotion to Jesus was not a late development. So far as historical inquiry permits us to say, it was an immediate feature of the circles of those who identified themselves with reference to him.<sup>10</sup>

The fundamental flaw in this premise is that Hurtado does not take into consideration the extraordinary plurality of Judaism in the first century CE and the role this plurality played in the formation of the early Jesus movement in the first century. Hurtado assumes that the phenomenon of devotion to Jesus as a messiah figure was a unique “explosion.” His qualification of this claim, that “the Christian movement was not hermetically sealed,” is puzzling, especially in light of his discussion of the worship of a messiah figure in the *Parables of Enoch*. Discussing Crispin Fletcher-Louis’ work,<sup>11</sup> Hurtado rightly argues

---

<sup>9</sup>*Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids; Eerdmans, 2003) 19-26.

<sup>10</sup>*Lord Jesus Christ*, 2.

<sup>11</sup>Crispin Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2002); “Heavenly Ascent or Incarnational Presence? A Revisionist Reading of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*,” *SBLSP* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998) 367-399; “The High Priest As Divine Mediator in the Hebrew Bible: Daniel 7:13 As a Test Case,” *SBLSP* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997) 161-193; “4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christology,” *DSD* 3 (1996): 236-252; *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*, WUNT 2.94 (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1995).

that a clearer distinction could be made between various forms of reverence “expected for, and rather freely given to, any superior person or being, whether human or heavenly.”<sup>12</sup> Hurtado also rightly points out that the references to worship of the messiah figure in BP are not intended as worship of the divine figure.

Read in their contexts, the references in *1 Enoch* 48:5, 62:1-9 to the obeisance given by all the inhabitants of the earth and by the mighty kings and rulers to the Son of Man/Elect One simply envision the eschatological acknowledgment of this figure as God’s appointed one who will gather the elect and subdue the haughty kings and nations who have not acknowledged the true God and who have oppressed the Jewish righteous. There is no reason given . . . in *1 Enoch* to take the prophesied reverential actions as “worship” of any of these figures as a divine being.<sup>13</sup>

Hurtado is quite right to understand these texts as not extending “worship” in the “hard” sense, as he calls it, to figures that are not divine. However, Hurtado enhances his argument by ignoring the evidence in BP that suggests worship of a figure that is more than the typical reverential treatment of important humans like kings and high priests. The evidence in 1En 48 suggests that the language used with reference to the worship of the messiah figure in the *Parables of Enoch* is the same language used with reference to the worship of the divine figure in the *Parables of Enoch*.

What Hurtado rejects in his analysis is the possibility that such references to worship of a messiah figure in the *Parables of Enoch* constitute any kind of precursor to a

---

<sup>12</sup>*Lord Jesus Christ*, 38.

<sup>13</sup>*Lord Jesus Christ*, 38-39.

later, more developed form of early devotion to Christ. For Hurtado, there was no development. There was only a profound and extraordinarily unique and explosive appearance of devotion to Christ in the early decades following his crucifixion that had no precedent in Jewish experience or intellectual history. Yet there seem to be too many points of contact between the messiah figure in the *Parables of Enoch* and the messiah figure in the Letters of Paul simply to dismiss such references to the worship of the messiah figure in the *Parables of Enoch* as having no connection whatsoever to the devotion of Jesus among his earliest followers—namely, a pre-existent messiah figure who is both human and from heaven, who moves between the earthly and heavenly realms, who sits on God’s throne, administers God’s judgment, executes God’s punishment, and reigns over an eternal kingdom, *and* receives worship from humans.

Hurtado articulates the second premise on which he builds his argument in this way:

Second, devotion to Jesus was exhibited in an unparalleled intensity and diversity of expression, for which we have no true analogy in the religious environment of the time. There is simply no precedent or parallel for the level of energy invested by early Christians in expressing the significance of Jesus for them in their religious thought and practice. The full pattern of devotion to Jesus that we examine in this book is not one example of a class of analogous religious phenomena in comparable groups, but is instead truly remarkable in the history of religions, justifying (indeed, requiring) a special effort to understand it in historical terms. Toward that end I propose a model of the historical forces and factors that shaped and propelled early devotion to Jesus . . . .<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup>*Lord Jesus Christ*, 2-3.

This is a particularly extraordinary claim, and deserves a careful response. Is it true that “There is simply no precedent or parallel for the level of energy invested by early Christians in expressing the significance of Jesus for them in their religious thought and practice”? I would argue that the *Parables of Enoch* is a text that made an equally astonishing claim. At no point in the history of Jewish thought prior to the *Parables of Enoch* was there a text that came anywhere close to making the claims the *Parables of Enoch* made. Throughout his book Hurtado acknowledges the presence of these claims in the *Parables of Enoch*, but never does he draw out in any detail their full implications for the *Parables of Enoch* community or for his own arguments about Paul. Because Hurtado begins with an assumption that rejects the possibility of a developing Jewish concept of a messiah figure worshiped by human beings, he does not see the need to draw out the implications of this concept in the *Parables of Enoch*.

Hurtado’s third premise for his thesis is stated in terms of the relationship between intense devotion to Jesus and Jewish monotheism.

The third thesis is that this intense devotion to Jesus, which includes reverencing him as divine, was offered and articulated characteristically within a firm stance of exclusivist monotheism, particularly in the circles of early Christians that anticipated and helped to establish what became mainstream (and subsequently, familiar) Christianity. That is . . . these early believers characteristically insisted on the exclusive validity of the God of the Scriptures of Israel, rejecting all the other deities of the Roman world; and they sought to express and understand Jesus’ divine significance in relation to this one God. In their religious thought, that is, in the ways they defined and portrayed Jesus in their teachings, they characteristically referred to him with reference to God (e.g., as God’s “Son,” “Christ/Messiah,” “Word,” “Image”). In their devotional practices as well (for example, in their patterns of prayer and worship), they characteristically sought to express a rather full veneration of Jesus in ways that also affirmed the primacy of

God “the Father.”<sup>15</sup>

Hurtado’s characterization of devotion to Jesus in relation to God the Father within the framework of an exclusivist monotheism is essentially correct. However, it is the binitarian character of the relationship between the messiah figure and the divine figure that is precisely the issue. This binitarian relationship appears in Jewish literature in a number of texts (Ezek 1; Dan 7; 11Q13; etc.) during the Second Temple period. But there is a striking development of binitarianism in the *Parables of Enoch*. *The Book of the Parables of Enoch* exhibits an unprecedented combination of conceptual elements of messianic ideology, and while many of these elements are shared between the divine figure and the messiah figure in terms of nature and function, there are no scholars who would claim any sort of divine nature whatsoever for the messiah figure in the *Parables of Enoch*. While there is much in Hurtado’s study with which I agree, there are a number of important questions his study raises, questions regarding the relationship between the messiah figure and the divine figure in Jewish thought from this period that need to be addressed, especially how these questions relate to our understanding of the messiah figure in Paul.

Hurtado also tackles the “Son of Man” issue that is current in the scholarly debate. Was the phrase “Son of Man” used in the gospel traditions in a titular sense or is it only used as a self-referential designation for Jesus? Referring to the problems related to the “Son of Man” debate as “thorny issues and questions,” Hurtado writes: “The most

---

<sup>15</sup>*Lord Jesus Christ*, 3.

frequent expression that is often taken as a title is ‘the son of man.’ But, as recent studies have shown, the expression was not an established title in pre-Christian Jewish texts.”<sup>16</sup> But this is not the case, as the present analysis will demonstrate. The expression “Son of Man” in the *Parables of Enoch* simply cannot be a general reference to a human being. If it is true that “Son of Man” is not used in a titular sense in the *Parables of Enoch*, then it is incumbent on those who make this claim to demonstrate two things. First, it must be demonstrated that the other designations for the messiah figure in BP—Chosen One, Righteous One, and Messiah—are also not used in a titular sense, because they are used interchangeably with the phrase “Son of Man” and refer to the same figure. Second, it is not only a linguistic problem, as most of the studies have focused their analyses in this way. It is a matter of the role the “Son of Man” figure is given to play in the text, and that the Son of Man figure in the *Parables of Enoch* actually is more than a human being; he is a preexistent heavenly being. Maurice Casey has made a comprehensive analysis of the “Son of Man” phrase in Jewish literature from the period.<sup>17</sup> In chapter two of the present study I will interact in some detail with Casey’s analysis. It is enough to point out here that Casey is inconsistent in the application of his methodology to the evidence in the *Parables of Enoch* and this warrants some attention. This seems to be a common theme in the scholarly literature; the *Book of the Parables of Enoch* is either not taken seriously as a text reflecting messianic ideology that predates the New Testament, or the evidence in

---

<sup>16</sup>*Lord Jesus Christ*, 250-251; 290-316.

<sup>17</sup>Maurice Casey, *The Solution to the ‘Son of Man’ Problem*, Library of New Testament Studies 343, Mark Goodacre, ed. (London: T. & T. Clark, 2007).

the *Parables* is minimized in some way that enhances the status or the uniqueness of the evidence in the New Testament. The present analysis takes the evidence in the *Parables of Enoch* on its own terms, without imposing prior assumptions on the text.

It should also be pointed out that there are a number of scholars in recent years who have developed the christological discussion along the lines of angelomorphic christology and angelomorphic anthropology. Building on the work of Jarl Fossum,<sup>18</sup> these scholars have added to the debate a good deal of valuable evidence from the sources regarding the nature of the messiah figure in Jewish thought from this period. The most glaring methodological issue, as I have already intimated with reference to Crispin Fletcher-Louis' work, is that a fluid boundary between the creator and the created in some texts does not warrant that we should necessarily expect this same ideological stance across the board. Sometimes conclusions are pressed beyond what the evidence allows.<sup>19</sup> Sometimes terminology is used that reflects later theological development.<sup>20</sup>

It will be readily apparent to some, but not to most, that the present analysis builds on the work of the Enoch Seminar, an international consortium of specialists from a broad spectrum of disciplines. While all of these scholars are established in their

---

<sup>18</sup>Jarl E. Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology*, NTOA 30 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1995); "The Religionsgeschichtliche Schule: The Quest for Jewish Christology," *SBLSP*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991); *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism*, WUNT 36 (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1985).

<sup>19</sup>For example, Crispin Fletcher-Louis uses the second-century BCE text, *Ezekiel the Tragedian*, and the reference to the stars bowing down to Moses in heaven, as an example of a human being who is worshiped. See *All the Glory of Adam*, 7, 70, 101, 344. This will be discussed in more detail in chapter 3.

<sup>20</sup>Charles Gieschen, for example, uses the language of "hypostasis" to refer to earlier theophanic manifestations of God's glory and the divine name. See *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (Leiden: Brill, 1998) 51-123.

respective fields, they have come together to make their own unique contributions to a newly revived study of the Enoch literature, scholars like Gabriele Boccaccini, John J. Collins, Michael Knibb, George Nickelsburg, and James VanderKam. The influence of the Enoch Seminar on the present study will be readily apparent, although there are conclusions here with which some, I am sure, will disagree. The consensus arrived at by the Enoch Seminar at its 2005 meeting in Camaldoli, Italy, that the *Parables of Enoch* can be dated to the end of the first century BCE or the beginning of the first century CE is a critical conclusion that has gone by and large unnoticed by many New Testament scholars today.<sup>21</sup> It is critical because it brings to the fore once again the importance of the *Parables of Enoch* for the study of the New Testament and Christian origins, and it is especially critical for our understanding of the messiah figure in the New Testament.

### **1.C. Methodology**

When I was a child growing up in rural west-central Missouri, my cousins and I would ride our bikes along the old road in front of their family's home in the country. Not far from their home was an old country schoolhouse. Of course we had the usual parental warnings to stay away from the old dilapidated structure, the windows of which were all broken and the doors were off their hinges. And of course as young boys do, we rode our bikes there and we went inside to explore. I remember an old portrait of George Washington hanging on the wall in the main room of the schoolhouse. But the rest of the inside was pretty much empty. Nothing remained but the old portrait, symbolizing

---

<sup>21</sup>See the discussion on the date of the *Parables of Enoch* in the present chapter (1.E).



allegiance to a national identity that had long ago left the building. The outer structure of the building was still sound. It was built of old bricks that were all intact. I did not give it much thought then, but the old farmhouse was made of bricks too, probably bricks that were made from the same earth and the same material that went into the manufacture of the old schoolhouse bricks. The same kind of bricks were used to build both structures, but they were put together in such a way as to produce different buildings with some similar and some different functions.

The history of ideas is something like this. Individual conceptual elements of messianic ideology in a text are like bricks before they have been mortared into the wall of a building. Taken individually these conceptual elements—like preexistence, heavenly nature, agent of creation—do not really mean much. Some of the conceptual elements of messianic ideology in the *Parables of Enoch* have literary precedents. Some of them are unprecedented and are unique. Just to examine the sources to find precedents and parallels does not really mean much. We have to ask what the individual elements mean for a particular author or text. So again, it is not the individual elements that give us an accurate understanding of the kind of ideology a particular author of a text has in mind. It is how the author combined the elements to construct his ideology; this makes all the difference.

The primary sources that have been used in this study are the *Book of the Parables of Enoch* (hereafter BP) and the Letters of Paul (hereafter LP). BP is one of a collection of

five books identified as *First Enoch*.<sup>22</sup> This collection of five books ranges in date from the fourth to the first centuries BCE, and possibly into the first century CE (see the discussion on the date of BP below in the present chapter). BP contains numerous references to a messiah figure called “Son of Man,” “Chosen One,” “Righteous One,” and “Messiah.” This study also uses as its primary source documents the undisputed Letters of Paul. These undisputed Letters are 1 Thessalonians, Galatians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Philippians, Romans, and Philemon. The use of Philemon in this study is virtually non-existent, as there are no references to Paul’s messianic ideology anywhere in this letter. In all the other undisputed letters, however, Paul made numerous references to a messiah figure, which he called “Christ” (or “Messiah”), “*Kyrios*” (or “Lord”), “son of David,” and “son of God.” As I have already stated, the question this study addresses is: What is the relationship, if any, between the concept of the messiah figure in the *Book of the Parables of Enoch* and the concept of the messiah figure in the Letters of Paul? In chapter two I examine the nature and functions of the divine figure in BP and the nature and functions of the messiah figure in BP, in order to gain a clear understanding of the relationship between the two in the thought of the author(s). In chapter three I examine the nature and functions of the divine figure in LP and the nature and functions of the messiah figure in LP, again in order to gain a clear understanding of the relationship between the two in the thought of Paul. In chapter four I have done a comparative analysis of the nature and functions of the messiah figure in BP and the nature and

---

<sup>22</sup>*The Book of the Watchers* (fourth to third c. BCE); *the Astronomical Book* (fourth to third c. BCE); *Dream Visions* (200-165 BCE); *the Epistle of Enoch* (second c. BCE); and *the Parables of Enoch* (40 BCE to 70 CE).

functions of the messiah figure in LP. And chapter five is the conclusion of the dissertation which pulls together the analysis and draws out the implications of the research for our understanding of Paul's concept of the messiah.

### **1.D. Mediatorial Figures in Second Temple Judaism**

I use the terms “divine figure” and “messiah figure.” While on the surface it may be objected that I have already assumed a substantial difference between these two figures, I use the terms with the intent to avoid any bias with regard to the nature of the messiah figure in relation to the nature of the divine figure, and with the intent to elicit in my readers a genuine recognition that the relationship between these two figures remains an open question in the scholarly discussion today. There are those who read Jewish literature in the Second Temple period in such a way that there is fluidity in what has traditionally been assumed to be a hard and fast boundary between the creator and the created. There is no doubt that some Second Temple Jewish texts softened this boundary. One even could say, they have muddied the waters. Philo, for example, ascribed the characteristic of divinity to the *Logos* and to wisdom, and some texts of the Dead Sea scrolls refer to angels as divine beings (-yhl a).

A mediatorial figure is any figure that moves across the boundary between the creator and the created. Mediatorial figures are described in the literature from this period in various ways. Some are human. Some are angelic, heavenly beings. Some mediators serve a revelatory function. Some mediators act as the divine agent of eschatological punishment. Some mediatorial figures are described with the characteristic of

preexistence. Some are not. A messiah figure is a mediator who is given the explicit epithet “messiah” in a given text. While all messiah figures are mediatorial figures, not all mediatorial figures are messiahs. The specific conceptual elements of nature and functions of the messiah figure in BP and LP will be addressed in the following analysis.

The literature from this period demonstrates a complex variety of expressions for describing interaction between the divine figure and humans. Some of these expressions describe descents of heavenly mediatorial figures (some of which are characterized as divine) making contact with humans. Some expressions describe exalted human mediatorial figures who ascend to make contact with the divine figure. Still other expressions describe various combinations of these two basic movements of mediatorial figures between the creator and the created. Enoch, for example, moves back and forth between the earthly and the heavenly realms. The variety of expressions (and beliefs!) with regard to mediatorial figures in Second Temple period texts is extraordinarily complex and a challenge to navigate. Consequently it comes as no surprise that this is still an open question among scholars today.

To illustrate the complexity, wisdom is described in some traditions as a created being, while wisdom is not a created being in other traditions. In the early wisdom tradition of the Hebrew Bible, for example, wisdom is not created. But in the later wisdom tradition as the Greek translation of Proverbs shows, wisdom is created. In the *Wisdom of Solomon* wisdom is not a created figure, but an emanation of God that dwells on earth. In *Sirach* wisdom is an exalted creation that now dwells with the angels.

The same applies to messianic figures. On the one hand there are divine beings

that act in the unprecedented role of agent of creation. These divine beings, such as Philo's divine *Logos* and divine wisdom, have direct involvement as mediatorial figures in human affairs. On the other hand there are created beings who were exalted to unprecedented levels and given divine functions. For example, Daniel 7 describes a heavenly angelic mediatorial figure who is given military power and dominion to rule. The figure of Daniel 7 is not explicitly referred to in the text as a messiah figure, but because this figure has some of the functions of a messiah figure (e.g., eschatological authority to reign), the *Book of Parables* and the Christian traditions would later refer to him as a messiah figure. *Psalms of Solomon* 17 describes a human messiah figure who is given special power to defeat unrighteous kings and to have an eternal reign as Son of David.

The extraordinary diversity of expressions for mediatorial figures and messiah figures suggests a development of these concepts. This development began already in the exilic period with Ezekiel and the heavenly figure described in this text as the glory of God (a figure that also would later be interpreted by BP as a messiah figure). The question for scholarship today is: should a fluidity of language with reference to mediatorial figures in some Second Temple period texts lead us to read all Jewish texts from this period as having a softened boundary between the creator and the created, even to the extent that the boundary no longer exists? This is an open question among scholars today. While scholars such as Crispin Fletcher-Louis would say the boundary was fluid, other scholars strongly disagree. Kevin Sullivan made the point that while it was possible for movement to occur across the boundary between humans and angels as this is

described in the literature of Second Temple Judaism, the boundary between the creator (with all divine attributes) and the created was not fluid.<sup>23</sup> Richard Bauckham also holds this view, asserting that, “Jewish monotheism clearly distinguished the one God and all other reality.”<sup>24</sup> Rather than a fluidity between the creator and the created, Charles Gieschen sees in the literature of the period a fluidity between the divine figure and the messiah figure.<sup>25</sup> Gieschen takes the position that the messiah figure, at least in Paul’s thought, was included in the mystery of YHWH via the divine name. It comes as no surprise that the diversity of views in the literature of contemporary scholarship on christology reflects the diversity of Jewish views on the relationship between messiah figures and the divine figure in the Second Temple period.

This question has implications for our understanding of the development of christology. While the language of mediatorial figures and messiah figures exhibits a high degree of fluidity, the boundary between the created and the divine remained firmly in place, as there were no explicit ascriptions of divinity given to any messiah figures before the Gospel of John where the divine *Logos* (καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος – John 1.1) is explicitly identified with the Messiah Jesus. In the Gospel of John the boundary is eliminated.

Before 70 CE the evidence suggests a plurality of understandings of the interaction between the creator and created beings via a variety of mediatorial figures. The presence of mediatorial figures made the concept of monotheism in Second Temple Judaism very

---

<sup>23</sup>Kevin P. Sullivan, *Wrestling with Angels* (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

<sup>24</sup>Richard Bauckham, *God Crucified: Monotheism & Christology in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 4.

<sup>25</sup>Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*.

dynamic and diverse, and directly impacted the messianic ideal, as similar conceptual elements tended to be transferred from mediatorial figures to the various messiah figures from this period. The *Book of the Parables of Enoch* and the Letters of Paul will therefore be studied here not only in relation to competing messianic traditions, but also in the broader context of mediatorial figures in Second Temple Judaism.

### **1.E. Dating the *Parables of Enoch***

Something should be said about the date of the Enochic *Book of Parables*. When the Aramaic fragments of *I Enoch* were found at Qumran it was immediately apparent that BP was not represented among the fragments. This, along with the assumption that the Son of Man traditions in BP were a later response to the Son of Man traditions in the canonical gospels, led Josef Milik to conclude that BP should be dated to the late third century CE.<sup>26</sup> While Milik's view did not gain wide acceptance, it generally influenced scholars' views of BP as a later, less significant text of little relevance for New Testament studies, because scholars assumed that it postdated the canonical gospels. Only recently has specific research on the date of BP created a shift in the scholarly consensus among specialists of the Enoch literature. This consensus establishes the messianic traditions of BP, if not the text itself, to a date prior to Paul.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup>J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976) 89-98; and Milik's "Problèmes de la littérature hénochique à la lumière des fragments araméens de Qumrân," *HTR* 64 (1971): 333-378.

<sup>27</sup>See David W. Suter, "Enoch in Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Book of Parables," *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 415-443; Michael E. Stone, "Enoch's Date in Limbo; or, Some Considerations on David Suter's Analysis of the Book of Parables," *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 444-449; James H. Charlesworth, "Can We Discern the Composition Date of the Parables of Enoch?" *Enoch and the Messiah*

Because until now there has been no comprehensive, detailed traditio-historical analysis of BP that would give us a clearer grasp of the historical development of the redaction history of the text, at this point in the state of the research the best tool we have for dating BP is historical allusion. Scholars have identified a number of historical allusions in BP. The mention of “the Parthians and Medes” at 1En 56.5 has been identified by scholars as a reference to the events of 40 BCE, which then suggests a date of composition shortly after this. Something more may be added to the recent attempts to date BP by historical allusion. Chapters 56–57 of BP give us interesting details that suggest they are referring to specific historical events. 1En 56.5-8 has been identified as a reference to the Parthian invasion of Judea in 40 BCE. The evidence, however, suggests that the text is referring to different battles. Verse 5 reads: “In those days, the angels will assemble themselves, and hurl themselves toward the East against the Parthians and Medes.” The Parthian campaign of 40 BCE was a movement of Parthian forces from the East toward the West, not an attack “toward the East.” The Roman triumvir Crassus led an army against the Parthians at Carrhae in 53 BCE. The result was wholesale slaughter of the Roman army under Crassus’ command, Crassus himself being killed in the battle. This massive Parthian defeat of Crassus at Carrhae included the slaughter of some 24,000 Roman soldiers with 10,000 led captive to Margiana. This is also suggested in the text in verses 7 and 8: “Until the number of corpses will be enough due to their slaughter, and

---

*Son of Man*, 450-468; Darrell D. Hannah, “The Book of Noah, the Death of Herod the Great, and the Date of the Parables of Enoch,” *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 469-477; Luca Arcari, “A Symbolic Transfiguration of a Historical Event: The Parthian Invasion in Josephus and the Parables of Enoch,” *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 478-486; Hanan Eshel, “An Allusion in the Parables of Enoch to the Acts of Matthias Antigonus in 40 B.C.E.?” *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 487-491.



their punishment will not be in vain. In those days, Sheol will open its mouth, and they will sink into it. And their destruction will be at an end; Sheol will devour the sinners from the presence of the chosen.” The dislike for the victims expressed in this text corresponds to the harsh treatment the Jewish people received at the hands of Crassus. Josephus tells us what happened when Crassus assumed the governorship of Syria succeeding Gabinius in 54 BCE: “The government of Syria now passed into the hands of Crassus, who came to succeed Gabinius. To provide for his expedition against the Parthians, Crassus stripped the temple at Jerusalem of all its gold, his plunder including the two thousand talents left untouched by Pompey. He then crossed the Euphrates and perished with his whole army.”<sup>28</sup> Immediately following Crassus’ defeat at Carrhae, the Parthians seized the opportunity to retaliate. According to Josephus: “After the death of Crassus the Parthians rushed to cross the river into Syria, but were repulsed by Cassius, who had made his escape to that province. Having secured Syria, he hastened towards Judaea, capturing Tarichaeae, where he reduced thirty thousand Jews to slavery and put to death Peitholaus, who was endeavoring to rally the partisans of Aristobulus.”<sup>29</sup> This seems to correspond to what is described in 1En 56.5-6: “They will stir up the kings and a spirit of agitation will come upon them, and it will rouse them from their thrones. They will break out like lions from their lairs, and like hungry wolves in the midst of their flocks. They will go up and trample the land of his chosen ones, and the land of his chosen ones will be before them as a threshing floor and a (beaten) path; but the city of

---

<sup>28</sup>*JW* 1.179.

<sup>29</sup>*JW* 1.180.

my righteous ones will be a hindrance to their horses.”

1En 57.1-2 continues the narrative of BP: “After that I saw another host of chariots and men riding in them, and they came on the winds from the East and the West toward the South, and the noise of the rumbling of their chariots was heard. When this commotion took place, the holy ones took note from heaven, and the pillars of the earth were shaken from their bases.” The phrase, “After that,” changes the temporal frame of reference and lends credence to the suggestion that chapters 56 and 57 describe different historical events. The reference to chariots coming “from the East and the West toward the South” suggests a historical allusion to the alliance between the Roman Quintus Labienus and Pacorus I in 40 BCE. Labienus formed an alliance with the Parthians and secured the support of most of the Roman garrisons in Syria. From Syria Labienus launched a successful campaign against Octavian’s territories in Asia Minor, while Pacorus focused his efforts southward along the coast and into Judea. Josephus described the Parthian invasion of Syria and Judea in 40 BCE in terms that are very similar to 1En 57. The invasion was led by Pacorus, the son of the Parthian king Orodes II, and the satrap Barzaphranes. The invasion took a two-pronged approach, with Pacorus’ forces advancing southward along the coast in the West, and Barzaphranes’ forces advancing southward through the interior, to the East of Pacorus. This would correspond to the description in BP: “. . . they came on the winds from the East and the West toward the South.” Josephus described the strategy of the invasion: “Two years later Syria was occupied by Pacorus, the son of the Parthian king, and Barzaphranes, the Parthian satrap. . . . Pacorus went along the sea-coast while the satrap Barzaphranes went through the

interior.”<sup>30</sup> The purpose of the invasion was to usurp the throne of John Hyrcanus II and give it to his nephew Antigonus, the son of his now deceased brother and political rival Aristobulus. Antigonus, the last of the Hasmonean ruling party, allied himself with Pacorus in order to depose John Hyrcanus II from his position as high priest. According to Josephus, after the Parthian forces established themselves in Syria, Antigonus sent an emissary to Jerusalem to invite Hyrcanus to meet with him in Galilee. Hyrcanus and his advisor Phasael willingly accepted Antigonus’ invitation to meet, against the vigorous objections of Herod. After their meeting, under the ruse of sending Hyrcanus and Phasael away with gifts, Antigonus put them in chains and, as Josephus describes it, Antigonus “bit off the ears” of Hyrcanus in order to render him permanently unqualified for the high priesthood.<sup>31</sup> It is not improbable that “the holy ones taking note from heaven, and the pillars of the earth were shaken from their bases” refers to the Jerusalem priesthood and the crisis precipitated by Antigonus when he rendered his uncle unfit for the office of high priest. Hyrcanus was then taken into exile in Babylon.

This episode of Antigonus violently deposing Hyrcanus may also appear at 1En 46. Here the Son of Man “will raise the kings and the mighty from their couches, and the strong from their thrones” (1En 46.4). This is very similar to 1En 56.5 where the angels “will stir up the kings, and a spirit of agitation will come upon them, and it will rouse them from their thrones.” The difference is that in chapter 46 the Son of Man “will loosen

---

<sup>30</sup>*Ant.* 14.330-332. See *JW* 1.248-249.

<sup>31</sup>*Ant.* 14.330-366. See *JW* 1.248-270. When Hyrcanus fell at his feet, Antigonus literally “mutilated the ears with his teeth” (*JW* 1.270). “. . . o de. Urkanou/men prospesontoj autoj ta w#a lwatai toij odousin . . . .”

the reins of the strong, and he will crush the teeth of the sinners. He will overturn the kings from their thrones and their kingdoms” (1En 46.4-5), while in chapter 56 the kings “will go up and trample the land of his chosen ones” (1En 56.6). Both have an eschatological flavor, but chapter 46 describes what will happen after the war depicted in chapter 56. The connection with Antigonus appears near the end of chapter 46, after the kings have been shamed in defeat by the Son of Man.

These are they who †judge† the stars of heaven,  
 and raise their hands against the Most High,  
 and tread upon the earth and dwell on it.  
 All their deeds manifest unrighteousness,  
 and their power (rests) on their wealth.  
 Their faith is in the gods they have made with their hands,  
 and they deny the name of the Lord of Spirits.  
 And they persecute the houses of his congregation,  
 and the faithful who depend on the name of the Lord of Spirits (1En 46.7-8).

The language of those “who †judge† the stars of heaven” suggests a reference to Babylonian astronomical ideology. The word “judge” may reflect some form of *kriṇein*, which can mean to judge, or *diakriṇein*, which can refer to discerning astronomical signs.<sup>32</sup> It is also possible that those who “raise their hands against the Most High,” refers to the violent taking of the temple compound and its treasures by the Parthians in 40 BCE and the mutilation of John Hyrcanus II by his tyrannical nephew Antigonus. The reference to those who “tread upon the earth and dwell on it” appears to parallel 1En

---

<sup>32</sup>Cf. Matt 16.3. This, of course is assuming a Greek version of BP, of which there is no direct evidence. The Greek translation of other Enoch literature suggests the probability that this would have been the case for BP as well.

56.6: “They will go up and trample the land of his chosen ones, and the land of his chosen ones will be before them as a threshing floor and a (beaten) path.” “And they persecute the houses of his congregation” corresponds to Josephus’ description of the Parthian plunder of Judea during this campaign.

The possibility that those who “raise their hands against the Most High” is a reference to Antigonus’ usurpation of Hyrcanus’ high priestly office is particularly interesting if it is taken in connection with the fact that there are no explicit references to the temple, nor are there any hints of anti-priestly polemics anywhere in BP. It is also the case that no fragment of BP was found at Qumran, a community that did engage in anti-Second-Temple polemic, as is well known. It is entirely possible that the community responsible for producing BP was in some way a part of the mainstream Essene movement that retained some contact with the Jerusalem temple.<sup>33</sup> If this is the case, then it is not in any sense a stretch of the imagination that the authors of BP could consider an attack on the high priest in some sense to be an attack on the Most High. Crispin Fletcher-Louis’ analysis of *Sirach* 50 identifies the high priest with the Most High God.<sup>34</sup> I would nuance Fletcher-Louis’ point to suggest that the high priest was not actually considered

---

<sup>33</sup>I argued that the mainstream Essenes maintained contact with the temple in “Will the Real Judaism Please Stand Up? Ritual Self-Definition As Ideological Discourse from Qumran to Jerusalem,” *Henoah* 26.1 (aprile 2004): 3-23; esp. 11-13. See Josephus *Ant.* 18.18-19. See also Florentino García Martínez, “A ‘Groningen’ Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History,” *RevQ* 14 (1990): 521-541; García Martínez, “Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis,” *FO* 25 (1988): 62-136; García Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera, eds. *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995) 83-96. See also Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 21-49.

<sup>34</sup>Fletcher-Louis, “The High Priest as the Embodiment of God’s Glory,” *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 72-84.

God on earth, but God's agent whose sins also needed to be atoned,<sup>35</sup> and that an attack against the high priest in some sense would have been considered tantamount to an attack against the divine figure, the Most High.

All of this has implication for a comparative analysis between BP and LP. The inclusion of these events that occurred between 53 and 40 BCE suggests that these events were fresh on the minds of the authors of BP. This would further suggest a date for BP much closer to sometime within the latter half of the first century BCE after the Parthian invasion of 40. Assigning such a date for BP has critical implications for the timing of the development of the messianic traditions of BP, somewhere in the mid to late first century BCE, and for establishing a chronological relationship in which these traditions predate Paul.

---

<sup>35</sup>Cf. Hebrews 5.1-3.

## CHAPTER 2

### THE MESSIAH IN THE *PARABLES OF ENOCH*

#### 2.A. The Divine Figure in the *Parables of Enoch*

Monotheism constitutes one of the more dominant distinguishing characteristics of Jewish identity during the Second Temple period.<sup>36</sup> Maurice Casey has stated the issue in the following way, “In the second Temple period, Jews gradually committed themselves to a strict form of monotheism according to which only the LORD himself was regarded as genuinely God. . . . we must regard Jewish monotheism as a boundary marker of the Jewish community.”<sup>37</sup> Alongside Jewish monotheism in texts from this period one finds references to two powers in heaven.<sup>38</sup> The ideological stance of the *Book of Parables*

---

<sup>36</sup>Cf. Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis, eds., *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus* (Leiden: Brill, 1999).

<sup>37</sup>P.M. Casey, “Monotheism, Worship and Christological Development in the Pauline Churches,” *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*, 214-233, esp. 214.

<sup>38</sup>Alan F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1977). Daniel Boyarin, “Two Powers in Heaven; Or, the Making of a Heresy,” *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation. Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*, eds. Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman (Leiden: Brill, 2004) 331-370; and “The Gospel of the *Memra*: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John,” *HTR* 94.3 (2001): 243-284.

(BP) entails both a divine figure and a messiah figure as two separate entities in heaven. The intellectual landscape of the Second Temple period was of course not as neat and tidy as a simple identification of two powers in heaven. There were several different messianic views, most of which differed with regard to the nature and the roles of the various messiah figures, while also adhering to “a strict form of monotheism.”

Before analyzing the messiah figure in BP, it would be helpful first to examine on its own terms the divine figure in BP. A close examination of the nature and functions of the divine figure in BP will establish without ambiguity the relationship between the divine figure and the messiah figure.

### **2.A.i. Nature of the Divine Figure in the *Parables of Enoch***

There is very little evidence on the nature of the divine figure in BP that lends itself to detailed analysis.<sup>39</sup> To some extent the nature of the divine figure in BP may be assumed. The nature of the divine figure was not a contested issue during the Second Temple period. Monotheism, for example, was an assumption held by virtually every self-identifying Jewish group. Consequently what evidence there is in BP regarding the nature of the divine figure almost reads as if it were written incidentally. As scant as the evidence in BP may be regarding the nature of the divine figure, a few aspects of the divine figure’s nature may still be identified in terms of a heavenly nature, holiness,

---

<sup>39</sup>BP uses eight distinct epithets to refer to the same divine figure. Taking these in the order they appear in the text, they are Holy One, Lord of Spirits, Lord of Glory, Head of Days, Most High, the Lord, Lord of the Kings, and God. In BP there is a single occurrence of the epithet “God.” This comes in the context of the Noachic fragments near the end of BP. “The Divine Oracle about the Flood” of chapters 67–68 begins: “And in those days the word of God came to me and said to me, ‘Noah, your lot has come up to me, a lot without blame, a lot of love and uprightness’ (1En 67.1).



foreknowledge, mercy, righteousness, repentance, and eternity.

2.A.i.a. *A Heavenly Being*

Since virtually all references to the divine figure come in the context of Enoch's ascent and visions of heaven (with the exception of the introduction and the Noachic fragments), at the very least it may be assumed that this figure is divine and dwells in heaven. This assumption, however, does not yet distinguish the divine figure from other heavenly figures (e.g., angels or the messiah figure). These distinctions must be analyzed on the basis of other evidence in BP; for example, other aspects of the nature and functions of the divine figure in comparison and contrast to the other heavenly figures. The divine figure is the unique, only God who dwells in heaven.<sup>40</sup> Angels, on the other hand, are neither unique nor divine. They are heavenly beings who were created by God. The messiah figure is also a heavenly being, who appears to be unique among all the other heavenly beings in BP. What distinguishes the divine figure from the messiah figure in BP is the characteristic of divinity.<sup>41</sup> There is no evidence in BP that the messiah figure is

---

<sup>40</sup>Cf. *TestAb* 1.3.

<sup>41</sup>The expression for the divine figure that predominates in BP is the Lord of Spirits. Cf. 1En 37.2, 4 // FIRST PARABLE 38.2, 4, 6; 39.7-9, 12; 40.1-7, 10; 41.2, 6, 7; 43.4 // SECOND PARABLE 46.3; 47.1, 2, 4; 48.2-3, 7, 10; 49.2; 50.3, 5; 51.3; 52.5; 54.5, 6, 7; 55.3; 57.3 // THIRD PARABLE 58.4, 6; 59.1, 2; 60.6, 8, 24, 25; 61.5, 8, 9, 13; 62.2, 10, 12, 14, 16; 63.1-2, 12; 65.9, 11; 66.2; 67.8; 68.4; 69.24, 29 // 70.1; 71.2. The only place the epithet "Lord of Spirits" occurs in Enochic literature is in BP. The expression occurs dozens of times, far more than any other expression for the divine figure in BP. For the Lord of Spirits there is an association with, but clear distinction from, the messiah figure. The "Chosen One" dwells "beneath the wings of the Lord of Spirits" (1En 39.6-7). The Lord of Spirits chooses the Son of Man (1En 46.3). And the Lord of Spirits seats the Chosen One upon the throne of glory (1En 61.8; 62.2). The Lord of Spirits is identified with YHWH of Hosts of First Isaiah. This is highlighted by the watchers singing the triple *WDCQ* of Isaiah 6.3 to the Lord of Spirits (1En 39.12). See Matthew Black, "Two Unusual Nomina Dei in the Second Vision of Enoch," in *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke*, William C. Weinrich, ed. 2 vols. (Macon, GA: Mercer U.P., 1984) 1.53-59.

divine. There are, however, connections between the divine figure and the messiah figure in terms of shared functions (both act as judge, for example); but shared functions do not indicate that the two entities share the same nature. In other words, that the messiah figure in BP functions in a role that is also attributed to the divine figure in no way demonstrates that the messiah figure is also divine. Such sharing of roles only indicates that the divine figure has given authority to the messiah figure to function in a particular role that is usually identified with the divine figure, and nothing more than this may be asserted. As Maurice Casey has argued, “The transference of items from God to an intermediary figure is . . . a significant part of their development, and does not imply their deification.”<sup>42</sup>

That the divine figure dwells in heaven may be inferred from what BP states about Enoch speaking “the words of the Holy One in the presence of the Lord of Spirits” (1En 37.2). Enoch states, “Until now there had not been given from the presence of the Lord of Spirits such wisdom as I have received according to my insight” (37.4). The words of wisdom Enoch speaks he has received “from the presence of the Lord of Spirits,” suggesting that the Holy One, whose words Enoch speaks “in the presence of the Lord of Spirits,” dwells in heaven. Further evidence in BP that the divine figure dwells in heaven is Enoch’s heavenly vision. After he ascends to heaven (1En 39.3) Enoch sees the dwellings of the righteous ones “with his righteous angels and . . . with the holy ones” (1En 39.4-5). It is “in that place” that Enoch sees the Chosen One (1En 39.6), of whom Enoch then states: “And I saw his dwelling beneath the wings of the Lord of Spirits” (1En

---

<sup>42</sup>P.M. Casey, “Monotheism, Worship and Christological Development in the Pauline Churches,” 225.

39.7). The single occurrence of the name “Lord of Glory” in BP (1En 40.3), further demonstrates that the divine figure dwells in heaven.<sup>43</sup> Enoch sees the Lord of Spirits surrounded by four angelic figures, the archangels Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, and Phanuel, whose roles are explicitly stated at 1En 40.1-10. “And I heard the voices of those four figures uttering praise before the Lord of Glory” (1En 40.3). That the divine figure dwells in heaven is a characteristic that by and large may be assumed, as the

---

<sup>43</sup>There is a single instance in BP where the divine figure is referred to as “Lord of Glory” (1En 40.3). In chapter 39 Enoch ascends into heaven, where he sees the dwellings of the righteous angels (1En 39.5), and where he also sees with his own eyes the Chosen One (1En 39.6). The righteous angels in heaven and Enoch praise the name of the Lord of Spirits (1En 39.7, 9). In chapter 40 Enoch’s vision intensifies; he sees thousands and thousands “standing before the glory of the Lord of Spirits” (1En 40.1). Enoch sees four figures “on the four sides of the Lord of Spirits” (1En 40.2). “And I heard the voices of those four figures uttering praise before the Lord of Glory” (1En 40.3). Immediately following this is a reference to each of the four figures and the one to whom each figure gives praise. “The first voice blesses the Lord of Spirits forever and ever. The second voice I heard blessing the Chosen One and the chosen ones who depend on the Lord of Spirits.” The question then is, to which of these figures does the name “Lord of Glory” refer? Does it refer to the Lord of Spirits or to the Chosen One? Two passages in the immediate context suggest that the Lord of Glory is a reference to the Lord of Spirits. At 1En 39.12 direct reference is made to the Lord of Spirits and those who stand in his presence: “Those who sleep not bless you, and they stand in the presence of your glory; And they bless and praise and exalt, saying, ‘Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Spirits, he fills the earth with spirits.’” The second passage is 1En 40.1 where thousands and thousands, an “innumerable and incalculable” number, “were standing before the glory of the Lord of Spirits.” Both passages refer to standing in the presence of the glory of the Lord of Spirits. This suggests that “Lord of Glory” at 40.3 is a reference to the Lord of Spirits, rather than the Chosen One.

There are two references in the *Astronomical Book* (AB) to the Lord of Glory. At 1En 75.3 “the Lord of eternal glory” has placed the angel Uriel “over all the heavenly luminaries.” In chapter 81.1-3 Enoch is shown the heavenly tablets. “From that time forward I blessed the great Lord, the king of glory forever, as he had made every work of the world.” That the Lord of eternal glory and the king of glory are references to God are clear from the fact that this figure is responsible for making “every work of the world.” In the *Book of Watchers* (hereafter BW) there are several references to the Lord of Glory. Three passages will suffice to illustrate its meaning in BW. In 1En 24 the archangel Michael shows Enoch seven mountains. The seventh mountain rose above the other six; it was like the seat of a throne and was encircled by fragrant trees. Among these trees one stood out, having “a fragrance sweeter smelling than all spices.” Enoch inquires about the fragrance of the tree, and Michael answers Enoch: “This high mountain that you saw, whose peak is like the throne of God, is the seat where the Great Holy One, the Lord of glory, the King of eternity, will sit, when he descends to visit the earth in goodness” (1En 25.3). Referring to the fragrant tree, Michael tells Enoch that “no flesh has the right to touch it until the great judgment . . . . And it will be transplanted to the holy place, by the house of God, the King of eternity” (1En 25.4-5). The parallels between the Lord of glory, the King of eternity, and God, demonstrate that the phrase Lord of glory in BW refers to God. At 1En 25.7 the God of glory is equated with the King of eternity. And at 1En 26.3 this same connection is made between the Lord of glory and the King of eternity, which again identifies the Lord of glory with the divine figure in BW. It is widely accepted that BP is by and large dependent on BW.

visions Enoch sees take place after his ascent into heaven (1En 39.3).

2.A.i.b. *A Holy Being*

The divine figure in BP is holy. Following his first ascent into heaven (1En 39.3), Enoch sees “the dwellings of the holy ones, and the resting places of the righteous” (1En 39.4-5). These dwellings are “with his righteous angels” who “were petitioning and interceding and were praying for the sons of men” (1En 39.5). Enoch then sees the Chosen One (the first appearance of this figure in BP), whose dwelling is “beneath the wings of the Lord of Spirits” (1En 39.6-7). There the righteous and chosen “praised the name of the Lord of Spirits.” Enoch joins in this praise: “In those days I praised and exalted the name of the Lord of Spirits with blessing and praise, for he has established me for blessing and praise according to the good pleasure of the Lord of Spirits” (1En 39.9-10). Here BP expands with more detail the role of Enoch blessing God in BW (cf. 1En 12.3; 25.7; 27.1; 34.4). “And for a long time, my eyes looked at that place, and I blessed him and praised him, saying, ‘Blessed is He (*sic*), and may he be blessed from the beginning and forever’” (1En 39.10). At this point Enoch then includes in his blessing an assertion of the divine figure’s limitless presence: “And in his presence there is no limit” (1En 39.11). Following this is a section where the watchers join in this praise (1En 39.12-13). The Lord of Spirits is explicitly identified with the YHWH of Hosts of First Isaiah (Is 6.1-3). In the context of the prophet’s call, First Isaiah reports a throne vision where Isaiah saw YHWH seated on a throne in heaven. The prophet reports that he saw the seraphim speaking antiphonally: “And one called out to another and said: ‘Holy, holy, holy is YHWH of hosts (*vīdq vīdq*

twabc hwhy vwdq); all the earth is filled with his glory.” In BP the watchers “bless and praise and exalt, saying, ‘Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Spirits, he fills the earth with spirits’” (1En 39.12). While this text explicitly identifies the Lord of Spirits with the YHWH of hosts of First Isaiah, and by this identification ascribes the holiness of YHWH of hosts to the divine figure in BP, the divine figure in BP simply by virtue of the name Holy One can be understood to be holy in nature (1En 37.2; cf. also 1En 9.4).<sup>44</sup>

### 2.A.i.c. *Foreknowledge*

In the blessing of the divine figure in chapter 39 Enoch includes an assertion of the divine figure’s foreknowledge: “He knew before the age was created what would be forever, and

---

<sup>44</sup>There is a single instance in BP (1En 37.2) where the divine figure is referred to as “the Holy One.” Comparing the beginning of BP (1En 37.2) with the beginning of BW (1En 1.2), Helge Kvanvig points out that the divine name, Holy One, “is seldom used in the Enochic writings (93:11; 104:9).” See Kvanvig, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 179-215; see esp. 180. In the Introduction to BW, a figure is referred to as the Holy One. “Enoch, a righteous man whose eyes were opened by God, who had the vision of the Holy One and of heaven, which he showed me” (1En 1.2). In this text “God” and “the Holy One” could conceivably be two different figures; consequently this text does not resolve the ambiguity. Immediately following the Introduction of BW, there is a theophany describing the coming of God from heaven: “The Great Holy One will come forth from his dwelling, and the eternal God will tread from thence upon Mount Sinai” (1En 1.4). The parallelism suggests the equation of the “Great Holy One” with “the eternal God.” The progression of first coming forth “from his dwelling” and then to “tread from thence upon Mount Sinai” connects the two subjects of the two actions; the “Great Holy One” is “the eternal God” (cf. also *Dream Visions*, 1En 84.1-2; hereafter abbreviated DV). At 1En 10.1 “the Most High declared, and the Great Holy One spoke.” The parallelism equates the Great Holy One with the Most High. There is a scholarly consensus that there is literary dependence of BP on BW. Consequently, it makes sense to take the reference to “the Holy One” and to “the Lord of Spirits” at 1En 37.2 to be a dual reference to a single divine figure. On the literary dependence of BP on BW see, e.g., 1En 39.1-2 where the “seed” of “the chosen and holy . . . becoming one with the sons of men,” refers to the miscegenation of the fallen watchers of 1En 14.24–16.4. See also 1En 39.2 where the sentence, “Enoch received books of jealous wrath and rage,” probably includes a reference to BW. If the usage of BP depends at all on BW, this being a reasonable assumption as BW preceded BP in composition, then the single reference to the Holy One in BP is a reference to God. See the essay by James VanderKam, “The Book of Parables within the Enoch Tradition,” *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 81-99; see esp. 84-91. See also Helge Kvanvig’s analysis of a direct line of development from BW to BP in “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 179-185. And see George W.E. Nickelsburg’s comments in favor of BP’s development of traditions in BW in *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108, Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001) 7.

for all generations that will be” (1En 39.11; cf. also 1En 9.11 where BW also attributes foreknowledge to the divine figure).<sup>45</sup> BP includes foreknowledge as part of the nature of the divine figure.

*2.A.i.d. A Merciful Being*

The divine figure in BP is merciful. In a scene depicting the change that will occur at the *eschaton*, “On the day of distress, evil will be stored up against the sinners. But the righteous will conquer in the name of the Lord of Spirits” (1En 50.2). Apparently at this point BP refers to a group or a sociologically definable class of people who are not identified with the community that produced BP. “And he will show (this) to the others, so that they repent and abandon the works of their hands. And they will have honor in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, and in his name they will be saved; and the Lord of Spirits will have mercy on them, for great is his mercy” (1En 50.2-3). It is not clear precisely who “the others” are; they appear to be distinct from those who are identified as “the sinners,” against whom “evil will be stored up” in the end. But what is clear is that the “others” are not connected to the BP community before the *eschaton*.<sup>46</sup> The point, however, as far as the nature of the divine figure in BP is concerned, is that the Lord of Spirits is merciful. The divine figure gives mercy specifically to the righteous, and he

---

<sup>45</sup>This is also a characteristic of the divine figure in DV (1En 84.3).

<sup>46</sup>This is reminiscent of the “you,” “we,” “they” distinctions and the motif of persuasion explicit in 4QMMT. That the BP community may have been part of the mainstream Essene movement and not as radicalized as the Qumran community might explain why BP is open to entertaining the possibility that “the others” (the Qumran dxy? the Pharisees?) will repent and be saved in the end. While this reconstruction cannot be defended with any certainty, it is an interesting and attractive possibility.

withholds mercy from “the unrepentant” (1En 50.4-5). The merciful nature of the divine figure is stated in a number of other passages in BP. Following the Leviathan/Behemoth tradition at 1En 60.7-10 and 24, there is a fragmented text, containing “a snarl of duplications and omissions,”<sup>47</sup> which refers to the punishment of the Lord of Spirits resting “on them” (1En 60.24). It is impossible to determine to whom this refers. Immediately following this the text reads: “When the punishment of the Lord of Spirits rests upon them, afterwards will be the judgment according to his mercy and longsuffering” (1En 60.25). Following this is the enthronement of the Chosen One who “will judge all the works of the holy ones in the heights of heaven” (1En 61.6-9). The Lord of Spirits “will summon all the host of heaven and all the holy ones in the heights” who “bless and glorify and exalt” the Lord of Spirits (1En 61.10-13). BP then asserts: “For great is the mercy of the Lord of Spirits, and he is slow to anger” (1En 61.13). In BP the merciful nature of the divine figure is exclusively understood in terms of eschatological judgment.

### *2.A.i.e. A Righteous Being*

It is also explicitly stated in BP that the divine figure is righteous. After asserting the greatness of his mercy (1En 50.3), the text states: “But he is righteous in his judgment, and in the presence of his glory unrighteousness will not stand; at his judgment the unrepentant will perish in his presence, ‘And hereafter I will have no mercy on them,’

---

<sup>47</sup>George W.E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004) 76.

says the Lord of Spirits” (1En 50.4-5; cf. also 1En 61.9; Ps 9.4; Tob 3.2). According to BP the righteousness of the divine figure is defined with reference to his judgment against the unrighteous.

### *2.A.i.f. Repentance*

The divine figure in BP is capable of repenting. In a digression on the flood, “the Head of Days repented” that he had obliterated all who dwell on the earth (1En 54.7–55.2). This is a point of view that is consistent within Enochic Judaism, that the punishment for evil would be executed ultimately at the end of time, in contrast to the Zadokite-Sadducean point of view that rewards and punishments are experienced in the present life. Nowhere in the biblical narrative (Gen 6–8) does the LORD “repent” that he had destroyed all of humankind, after sparing only Noah and his family. The Zadokites-Sadducees could argue that their system of reward and punishment in this life corresponded well with the destruction of the flood described in the Torah.<sup>48</sup> The Enochians of BP, on the other hand, stressed the end results of the flood narrative; they read the Noachic covenant never again to destroy humankind as an act of repentance on the part of God, to stress humankind’s victimization by supernatural forces rather than humankind’s culpability. *Jubilees* 5.12-19 provided a different answer to this problem; instead of God repenting that he had sent the flood (BP), God made for all creatures “a new and righteous nature . . . so that they might all be righteous” (5.12). This was a point of view on the flood that would develop into the

---

<sup>48</sup>See Gabriele Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History from Ezekiel to Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002) 73-111.



kind of radical pre-determinism that we find at Qumran: “But those he hates, he causes to stray” (CD 2.13). While *Jubilees* more closely resonates with BW on the post-flood condition of human beings,<sup>49</sup> BP suggests an alternative Enochic “correction” of the Zadokite-Sadducean point of view on the punishment of the flood which goes in a different direction from BW and *Jubilees*. BP asserts that the Head of Days, reflecting on the results of the flood, changed his mind to the point that he laments the vanity of the flood: “In vain have I destroyed all who dwell on the earth” (1En 55.1). In BW and *Jubilees* the flood was an opportunity to cleanse the earth of evil and iniquity committed by both the giants and sinful humans, and to make a fresh start with humans (1En 10.20-22). BP argues that the destruction of humans along with the offspring of the fallen watchers was a mistake. By pressing the point to such an extreme the authors of BP clearly have presented their point of view on the divine figure’s repentance over the flood in opposition to the Zadokite-Sadducean point of view.

*2.A.i.g. An Eternal Being*

According to BP the divine figure is eternal. This is one of those characteristics of the divine figure so clearly assumed in BP, that references to it are only incidental. In a section on the astronomical secrets, Enoch sees the storehouses of the wind and the hail and the mist (1En 41.3-4). He also sees the storehouses of the sun and the moon, from which the two lights emerge and to which they return, “and how the one is more

---

<sup>49</sup>Cf. 1En 10.6, 9, 15-22.

praiseworthy than the other” (1En 41.5).<sup>50</sup> The description continues: “And they do not leave the course, and they neither extend nor diminish their course. And they keep faith with one another according to the oath that they have <sworn>” (1En 41.5). The reference to the eternity of the divine figure occurs in the following description of the course of the sun: “And first the sun emerges and completes its path according to the command of the Lord of Spirits—and his name endures forever and ever” (1En 41.6). It may not be a coincidence that the “name” of the Lord of Spirits occurs in such close proximity to the “oath” that has been “sworn” by the sun and the moon to run their courses according to the command of the Lord of Spirits.<sup>51</sup> There is also a connection between the oath and “the secret name” at 1En 69.13-16 where the angel Kasbe’el persuaded the archangel Michael to reveal to him and the other holy ones the secret name, “so that they might make mention of it in the oath.” These holy ones rejoiced “and they blessed and glorified and exalted, because the name of that son of man had been revealed to them” (1En 69.26). This secret name and oath had some sort of magical power over the watchers who had revealed secrets to humans (1En 69.14). The oath was also involved in creation, as 1En 69.16-25 explicitly states: “And <through that oath> the heaven was suspended . . . .” The text is fragmented at this point, but the thought is clear; the oath was involved in

---

<sup>50</sup>This suggests more than just an acknowledgment that the sun’s light is brighter in intensity than the moon’s (cf. 1En 73.3). It also suggests a position that does not just view the sun and the moon making equal contributions to the calendrical ideology of the BP community, but one that favors observations of the movements of the sun over against the moon. This is further suggested by the assertion at 1En 41.8 that “the course of the path of the moon is light to the righteous and darkness to the sinners.” See J.A. Waddell, “Will the Real Judaism Please Stand Up? Ritual Self-Definition As Ideological Discourse from Qumran to Jerusalem.”

<sup>51</sup>Cf. Harry Alan Hahne, *Corruption and Redemption of Creation: Nature in Romans 8.19-22 and Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2006).

creation, as the rest of this tradition states clearly (1En 69.17-25), and as is also suggested by 1En 41.5. The point, however, as regards the nature of the divine figure, is that the eternity of the Lord of Spirits is defined in relation to his creating activity, specifically as he commands the sun and the moon (instruments created to measure time) to run their respective courses. The other reference to the eternal nature of the divine figure is even more incidental than 1En 41.6. At the beginning of the third parable Enoch states that the righteous and the chosen “will seek the light and find righteousness with the Lord of Spirits; (there will be) peace for the righteous in the name of the Eternal Lord” (1En 58.4; cf. 1En 75.3). The eternal nature of the divine figure is simply stated in the name.<sup>52</sup>

Once again, as scant as the evidence in BP may be regarding the nature of the divine figure, a few aspects of the divine figure’s nature may still be identified in terms of a heavenly nature, holiness, foreknowledge, mercy, righteousness, repentance, and eternity.

### **2.A.ii. Functions of the Divine Figure in the *Parables of Enoch***

Concerning the functions of the divine figure in BP, there is more evidence that lends itself to detailed analysis. The purpose of this analysis is to identify specific functions of the divine figure which then may be compared to the functions of the messiah figure in

---

<sup>52</sup>There are eight references to the divine figure as the Lord in BP (1En 60.24; 61.10; 62.1; 63.8; 65.6; 67.3, 8; 68.4). At 1En 60.24, for example, there is a reference to the Lord imbedded in a judgment tradition of the two monsters, Leviathan and Behemoth (1En 60.7-10, 24-25). “These two monsters” were “prepared according to the greatness of the Lord” (1En 60.24).

BP. Such a comparison will help us to understand in precise detail the relationship between the divine figure and the messiah figure in BP. Functions of the divine figure in BP may be identified in terms of creation, revelation of wisdom, divine acts on behalf of humans, worship, and judgment.

#### 2.A.ii.a. *Creation*

One of the most notable functions of the divine figure in Jewish traditions of the Second Temple period is that of creator.<sup>53</sup> In BP there are a few references to the divine figure as creator that lend themselves to analysis. The divine figure controls the astronomical order, commanding the path of the sun (as we have already seen at 1En 41.6), determining whether the lightning flashes for a blessing or for a curse (59.1-2), and sending water to nourish the earth (1En 60.22). There is also a reference to the creation of Adam<sup>54</sup> in the two monsters tradition of 1En 60.7-10 and 24. The separation of the dry land from the waters (Gn 1.9-10; Job 38.8-11) is represented by the separation of the two monsters, Leviathan and Behemoth.<sup>55</sup> Leviathan is used as a metaphor for the ocean, and Behemoth is used as a metaphor for dry land, the beast who occupies “the trackless desert” (1En 60.8). Noah narrates that this desert is “east of the garden where the chosen and righteous dwell, where my great-grandfather was taken up, the seventh from Adam,

---

<sup>53</sup>See, e.g., *1 Enoch* (BW) 5.1-3; *Jubilees* 2; 4Q422 1.i.6-12; 4Q504 viii.1-8; 11Q5 xxvi.9-15; 1QH<sup>a</sup> ix.7-10.

<sup>54</sup>See 2 *Esdras* 3.3-5.

<sup>55</sup>Cf. Job 40.15–41.34; 2 *Esdras* 6.49-52.

the first man whom the Lord of Spirits created” (1En 60.8).<sup>56</sup> BP also refers to the auguring of meteorological events (1En 59), the flashing of lightning “for a blessing or for a curse, as the Lord of Spirits wills” (1En 59.1). This was not unknown to Enochic circles. It is also a curious feature of the Qumran community, as is evidenced in some fragments of the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>57</sup>

#### 2.A.ii.b. *Revelation of Wisdom*

Wisdom is one of the defining paradigms of the Enochic tradition.<sup>58</sup> In BP the divine figure functions as a revealer of wisdom. In the introduction to BP (1En 37.1-5) Enoch delivers “to those who dwell on the earth” the wisdom he has received while in heaven. “This is the beginning of the words of wisdom, which I took up to recount to those who dwell on the earth. Listen, O ancients, and look, you who come after—the words of the Holy One, which I speak in the presence of the Lord of Spirits.” This is an unprecedented wisdom: “Until now there had not been given from the presence of the Lord of Spirits such wisdom as I have received according to my insight” (1En 37.4). The divine figure functions as a giver of wisdom to Enoch. The Holy One has given to Enoch “words” which Enoch speaks “in the presence of the Lord of Spirits,” and “words of wisdom” in the form of three parables which Enoch then “spoke to those who dwell on the earth”

---

<sup>56</sup>The reference to Adam as “the first man” will have implications for the comparative analysis between BP and the letters of Paul in chapter 4 of this dissertation.

<sup>57</sup>See, e.g., 4Q186 and 4Q318.

<sup>58</sup>Cf. Gabriele Boccaccini, “Finding a Place for the Parables of Enoch within Second Temple Jewish Literature,” *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 263-289.

(1En 37.5). The Lord of Spirits is described as having revealed the first parable to Enoch (1En 43.4). The wisdom of the Lord of Spirits reveals the name of the Son of Man to the holy and the righteous (1En 48.7). The Lord of Spirits has given the secrets of wisdom to the Chosen One (1En 51.3). The Lord of Spirits is a revealer of hidden things (1En 52.5). The Most High kept the Son of Man hidden from the beginning and “revealed him to the chosen” (1En 62.7).<sup>59</sup> Near the end of the first parable is appended a polemic against a particular wisdom tradition, possibly the tradition of *Sirach* which specifically locates wisdom in the Torah.<sup>60</sup> According to BP, “Wisdom did not find a place where she might dwell, so her dwelling was in the heaven. Wisdom went forth to dwell among the sons of men, but she did not find a dwelling. Wisdom returned to her place, and sat down among the angels” (1En 42.1-2). And it is precisely among the angels where Enoch is given this wisdom. BP takes a polemical tone: “Iniquity went forth from her chambers, those whom she did not seek she found, and she dwelt among them like rain in a desert and dew in a thirsty land” (1En 42.3).<sup>61</sup> Writing against a particular wisdom tradition in favor of their own, the authors of BP insist that wisdom is on their side. Revealing wisdom to humans

---

<sup>59</sup>There are four references to the divine figure as the Most High in BP (1En 46.7; 60.22; 60.1; 62.7). In a section describing cosmological phenomena (1En 59.1-3 and 60.11-23) the angels have charge of releasing the wind and the rain to water the earth. According to this passage (1En 60.22) the wind and rain are from the Most High to give “nourishment for the land.” Immediately following this section describing cosmological phenomena, there is a section describing a scene of judgment (1En 60.1-10, 24-25). This scene opens with “a mighty quaking” of the “heaven of heavens,” which greatly disturbs “the host of the Most High and the angels” (1En 60.1).

<sup>60</sup>See G. Boccaccini, “Finding a Place for the Parables of Enoch within Second Temple Jewish Literature,” 266-277. H. Kvanvig calls this passage “a parody” of Proverbs 8; see Kvanvig’s “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 202.

<sup>61</sup>Philip S. Alexander suggests that this is a proto-Gnostic tradition. See “Predestination and Free Will in the Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*, 27-49.

is one of the functions of the divine figure in BP.

### 2.A.ii.c. *Worship*

To be worshiped is yet another function of the divine figure which may be assumed on the basis of so much Second Temple period literature.<sup>62</sup> In BP the divine figure receives worship and praise from human and angelic beings (1En 39.9, 12-13; 40.3-4; 57.3), and receives the prayers of the righteous (1En 47.1).<sup>63</sup> The divine figure also receives worship and praise from the mighty and the kings of the earth (63.1-4). These are two different kinds of worship, as the worship from humans and angels is voluntary, while the worship from the kings of the earth, as it is described in BP, is a default, involuntary worship occurring at the judgment.<sup>64</sup> This worship of the mighty and the kings of the earth is an involuntary worship, since it occurs in a context that is antithetical to the worship of the righteous humans and the holy angels. The divine figure is an object of scorn for the kings of the earth who willingly give worship neither to the Lord of Spirits nor the Son of Man (1En 46.7). At 1En 63.1 the “mighty and the kings who possess the earth” have been delivered over to the angels of punishment. These kings beseech the Lord of Spirits for respite from their punishment, so that they may worship the Lord of Spirits and confess their sins (1En 63.5-7). Because the kings are now in a position of having been forced

---

<sup>62</sup>See, e.g., Ps 66.4; 1QS iii.11; 1QS x.1-3; 4Q400-407; 11Q17; 4Q503; Mt 4.10; Lc 4.8; Josephus, *Jewish War* 2.128.

<sup>63</sup>In AB (1En 81.3, 10), BW (1En 10.21), and DV (1En 83.11-84.3) the divine figure receives blessing and praise from angels and human beings, which corresponds to this function of the divine figure in BP.

<sup>64</sup>This form of worship is also described in BW at 1En 27.3-4.

from their power, they are compelled to worship the divine figure whom they refused to worship when they ruled: “Now we know that we should glorify and bless the Lord of the kings, and him who reigns over all kings” (1En 63.4). As the kings look for respite to make confession and glorify the Lord of Spirits, they say: “For in his presence we did not make confession, nor did we glorify the name of the Lord of the kings; Our hope was on the scepter of our kingdom, and <throne of> our glory” (1En 63.7). This function ascribed to the divine figure is unique to the Lord of the kings. The role of the Lord of the kings is that this figure receives worship and praise from the mighty and the kings who have been judged and are under the control of the angels of punishment (1En 63.2).<sup>65</sup>

#### 2.A.ii.d. *Judgment*

Judgment is one of those spheres of activity widely recognized in Second Temple period literature as belonging to the domain of the divine figure.<sup>66</sup> Especially in Enochic literature before BP it should be noted that it is the divine figure, and no one else, who executes judgment.<sup>67</sup> There are three definable aspects of judgment in BP that lend themselves to analysis: the divine figure engages in judgment, executes punishment, and sits on the throne of his glory, an act which is almost always connected to the role of

---

<sup>65</sup>This particular passage (1En 63.1-12) contains traditions similar to those used in the so-called Christ-Hymn of Philippians 2.5-11, and which will be analyzed in more detail in the excursus at the end of this dissertation, “Why Paul Did Not Use Son-of-Man Terminology.”

<sup>66</sup>Cf., e.g., 1En 10.4-12; 16.1; 19.1; 22.4-11; 25.4; 45.2; 54.5-10; 84.4; 90.19-27; 94.9; *Psalms of Solomon* 15.12.

<sup>67</sup>1En 1.9; 90.20-27; 91.7; 94.10-95.2; 97.3-6; 100.4; 108.13. The only possible exception to this is the *Epistle of Enoch* (1En 92.4) where the wording is ambiguous as to whether it is God or the “righteous one” who “will judge in piety and in righteousness.”



judgment in BP. The Lord of Spirits has prepared judgment (1En 60.6). He is righteous in his judgment, withholding mercy from the unrepentant (1En 50.4-5). He executes punishment at the judgment (1En 54.5), and takes vengeance on the host of Azazel for becoming servants of Satan and leading astray those who dwell on the earth (1En 54.6; 55.3).<sup>68</sup> At 1En 67.4-5 the divine figure judges and punishes “those angels . . . who led astray those who dwell on the earth.” The Lord of Spirits has executed the punishment of the flood (1En 54.7), and will execute punishment at the final judgment (1En 60.24-25; 62.10-12; 63.12).

Sitting on the throne in heaven<sup>69</sup> is connected to the role of judgment in BP.<sup>70</sup> 1En 47 refers to the prayers of “the holy ones who dwell in the heights of heaven” (1En 47.2) interceding on behalf of the righteous who were being persecuted by those who “deny the name of the Lord of Spirits” (1En 46.7-8). In response to this angelic intercession, the Head of Days sets in motion his judgment by sitting on “the throne of his glory” (1En

---

<sup>68</sup>Cf. *Jubilees* 4.22; 4Q180 i.7-10.

<sup>69</sup>See Christopher Rowland’s discussion of enthronement in heaven in the context of his analysis of the development of exalted angel traditions, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1982) 94-113. See also the discussion by Darrell Hannah in “The Throne of His Glory: The Divine Throne and Heavenly Mediators in Revelation and the Similitudes of Enoch,” *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 94.1-2 (2003): 68-96; and Richard Bauckham, “The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus,” *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*, 43-69; and Martin Hengel, “‘Sit at My Right Hand!’ The Enthronement of Christ at the Right Hand of God and Psalm 110:1,” *Studies in Early Christology* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1995) 119-225.

<sup>70</sup>In BP there are twelve references to God’s throne in heaven. Only two of these references (1En 47.3 and 60.2) refer to the divine figure sitting on the throne in a context of judgment. One reference simply refers to the throne without describing anyone sitting on it (1En 71.7); this reference to the throne does not come in a context of judgment, but in a context of the final introduction of the eschatological age (1En 71.15). The other nine references have the messiah figure sitting on the throne in a context of judgment. These will be discussed later in this same chapter in the segment on the functions of the messiah figure in BP. On the divine figure sitting on a throne as an act of judgment in DV, cf. 1En 90.20.

47.3).<sup>71</sup> In chapter 60 the Head of Days is mentioned as being seated “on the throne of his glory, and the angels and the righteous were standing around him” (1En 60.2). Enoch is so disturbed by what he sees that he soils himself (1En 60.3). The angel Michael reassures Enoch of God’s mercy for the elect (1En 60.5) and judgment for “the sinners” (1En 60.6), to strengthen Enoch to continue on in the vision.

The wrath of the Lord of Spirits rests upon the kings and the mighty and the exalted of the earth who have persecuted “his children and his chosen ones” (1En 62.11-12; also 41.2 and 45.6); “. . . the wrath of the Lord of Spirits rests upon them, and his sword is drunk with them” (1En 62.12). Chapter 63 contains the confession of the kings and the mighty. They seek respite from their punishment, in order to confess the greatness of the Lord of Spirits, a confession which they failed to make before the judgment. The kings confess: “Our hope was on the scepter of our kingdom and <throne of> our glory. But on the day of our affliction and tribulation it does not save us, nor do we find respite to make confession, that our Lord is faithful in all his deeds and his judgment and his justice, and his judgments have no respect for persons” (1En 63.7-8). In 1En 65 there is a reference to the Lord in one of a series of seemingly unrelated fragmentary Noachic

---

<sup>71</sup>The Head of Days is an epithet for the divine figure that occurs nine times in BP (1En 46.1-2; 47.3; 48.2; 55.1; 60.2; 71.10, 12, 13, 14). The epithet first occurs near the beginning of the second parable. The second parable begins with an introduction that refers to the day of judgment. On that day the “Chosen One will sit on the throne of glory” and he will test the works of the sinners (1En 45.2-3). Heaven and earth will be transformed and the “chosen ones” will be made to dwell on the transformed earth (1En 45.5). The introductory section ends with a contrast between what the Lord of Spirits has in store for the “righteous ones” and what he will do to “the sinners” at the judgment (1En 45.6). It is at this point that Enoch sees the Head of Days and the Son of Man in 1En 46. In this chapter the Head of Days appears to be equated with the Lord of Spirits (1En 46.3) and the Most High (1En 46.7). In chapter 48 Enoch sees “the spring of righteousness” (1En 48.1). This spring of righteousness was surrounded by many springs of wisdom, and the thirsty drank from them and were filled with wisdom (1En 48.1). The passage then reads: “And in that hour that son of man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, and his name, before the Head of Days” (1En 48.2-3). The parallelism indicates an equation of the Lord of Spirits with the Head of Days.

traditions. The first reference to the Lord concerns the divine indictment against humankind. Noah is puzzled by the tilting of the earth and its impending destruction. Noah seeks an explanation from his great-grandfather Enoch, who explains: “A command has gone forth from the presence of the Lord against the inhabitants of the earth, that their end is accomplished” (1En 65.6). According to this Noachic tradition, the Lord has set in motion his judgment against the inhabitants of the earth. In chapter 67 there is a divine oracle about the flood. In this oracle “the word of God” comes to Noah, by which he is told that the angels are making a wooden vessel to preserve “the seed of life.” The oracle concludes with the blessing: “And I will confirm your seed in my presence forever and ever . . . and they will be blessed and be multiplied on the earth, in the name of the Lord” (1En 67.3). Through his judgment the Lord also preserves life. In 1En 67.4–69.1 there is a scene of judgment against “those angels . . . who led astray those who dwell on the earth” (1En 67.7). Their punishment will be meted out in a valley where Noah saw “a great disturbance and troubling of waters” (1En 67.5). The fragment refers to these waters serving the kings and the mighty and having a quality which heals their flesh.<sup>72</sup> Then the fragment explicitly refers to the judgment which will come upon the kings: “For judgment will come upon them because they believe in the lust of their flesh, but they deny the spirit of the Lord” (1En 67.8). The “Lord of Spirits is angry with them, because they act as if they were like the Lord” (1En 68.4).

---

<sup>72</sup>It has been suggested that this refers to Callirhoe, a spa built by Herod the Great to the east of the Dead Sea; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 17.171. See the discussion by Darrell D. Hannah, “The Book of Noah, the Death of Herod the Great, and the Date of the Parables of Enoch,” *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 469-477. But see also David W. Suter’s discussion against the identification of 1En 67.4-13 as a reference to Callirhoe; “Enoch in Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Book of Parables,” *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 423-424.

In addition to punishment at the judgment, the Lord of Spirits also gives mercy (1En 38.6; 50.3); he executes judgment according to his mercy and longsuffering (1En 60.25; 61.13). His mercy is great to the righteous and chosen (1En 61.13). The Lord of Spirits possesses light which, after the judgment, will appear on the faces of the holy, righteous, and chosen (1En 38.4). The Lord of Spirits will abide over the righteous and the chosen ones in heaven (1En 62.13-14). The Lord of Spirits gives eternal life to the righteous and the chosen (1En 62.15-16). This text employs two metaphors for eternal life: “the garment of glory” and “the garment of life.” This contrast of God’s mercy with his judgment also appears in “The Divine Oracle about the Flood” located in chapters 67–68. “And in those days the word of God came to me and said to me, ‘Noah, your lot has come up to me, a lot without blame, a lot of love and uprightness’ (1En 67.1). There is nothing either explicit or implicit in this text about the nature of the divine figure. It reflects a formula familiar to the biblical prophets.<sup>73</sup> It does, however, suggest that one of the functions of the divine figure, as this figure is referred to as God, is to give a specific “word” or message to Noah (1En 67.1). God will protect Noah and his family from the flood, in order to preserve “the seed of life” (1En 67.2-3).

There are a number of functions that may be identified with the divine figure in BP. Functions of the divine figure in BP may be identified in terms of creation, revelation of wisdom, worship, and judgment.

---

<sup>73</sup>Cf., e.g., Jer 1.4; 2.1; Ezek 1.3; 12.1; 13.1; Hosea 1.1; Joel 1.1; etc.

## 2.B. Ambiguous References Either to the Divine Figure or the Messiah Figure

There are two expressions which bring a certain ambiguity with regard to their identification with the divine figure or the messiah figure in BP. Those two designations are “judge” and “light of days.”

There are two references to a figure called the Judge in BP.<sup>74</sup> After Enoch’s vision of the four figures who were “uttering praise before the Lord of Glory” in chapter 40, there is a scene of judgment at 1En 41.1-2, 9.<sup>75</sup> Here Enoch sees the secrets of heaven, how the kingdom is divided and the deeds of humanity are weighed in the balance. Enoch sees the dwelling places of the chosen and the holy ones. Then Enoch sees “all the sinners who deny the name of the Lord of Spirits being driven away from there, and they dragged them off and they could not remain because of the scourge that went forth from the Lord of Spirits.” According to this text, punishment is implemented at the time of judgment by the Lord of Spirits. Then verse 9 reads: “For no angel hinders and no power is able to hinder, for the Judge sees them all and judges them all in their presence.” The connection between the Lord of Spirits who implements punishment in verse 2 and the Judge in verse 9 is thin, but it is logical. Nevertheless, there remains a certain amount of ambiguity as to who the Judge of verse 9 is. Is it the Lord of Spirits or some other heavenly figure? The second text referring to a figure as Judge in BP is 1En 60.6. At 1En 60.2 Enoch sees a vision of the Head of Days seated on his throne, with the angels and the righteous

---

<sup>74</sup>1En 41.9; 60.6.

<sup>75</sup>Nickelsburg and VanderKam move 41.9 to follow 41.1-2, because of “what appears to be a displacement.” *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, 55.

standing around it. Enoch responds to this vision with trembling and fear: “. . . my loins were crushed and my kidneys were loosened, and I fell on my face” (1En 60.3). The angel Michael reassures Enoch and explains what the day of judgment will mean for the elect and the sinners. “And when the day and the power and the punishment and the judgment come, which the Lord of Spirits has prepared for those who do not worship the righteous <judge>, and for those who deny the righteous judgment, and for those who take his name in vain . . . And that day has been prepared for the elect, a covenant, for the sinners a visitation” (1En 60.6). Like 41.9, 60.6 exhibits ambiguity. To whom does “the righteous <judge>” of 60.6 refer? Is it the Lord of Spirits, or is it some other heavenly figure? It is not inconceivable that the Lord of Spirits and the Judge in these passages are two distinct figures. Elsewhere in BP, as we will see below, the Son of Man (who is distinct from the Lord of Spirits) executes judgment (1En 46.4-6; 63.11). This is also true of the Chosen One (likewise distinct from the Lord of Spirits) who will execute judgment at the end (1En 49.4; 55.4; 61.8-9). So it is not at all clear to whom BP refers when the “Judge” is mentioned in 41.9 and 60.6, whether it is the divine figure or the messiah figure.

Johannes Theisoohn refers to a single text (1En 41.9) to support his identification of “Judge” as one of the titles for the Son of Man figure.<sup>76</sup> Theisoohn argues that because the role is entirely consistent with the Son of Man/Chosen One traditions throughout the rest of BP, the title may be applied to the Son of Man figure here. Theisoohn’s argument begs the question. The only figure referred to in the immediate context of the “Judge”

---

<sup>76</sup>*Der auserwählte Richter*, 35.

reference in 1En 41.9 is the Lord of Spirits in the preceding verse (1En 41.2),<sup>77</sup> and is therefore probably to be assigned to this figure.

There is another phrase exhibiting ambiguity as to whether it refers to the divine figure, the messiah figure, or to neither of these figures. There is a single reference to “the light of days” at 1En 50.1. It is not clear whether this is a general reference to “the light of day”<sup>78</sup> dwelling on “the holy and chosen” on the day of judgment, in other words, some sort of “enlightenment” which will be judged to their advantage (1En 50.1), in contrast to “evil” that will be “stored up against the sinners” (1En 50.2). This interpretation is supported by BW (1En 5.6-8), which describes the eschatological reversal of fortune for the chosen: “In the enlightened man there will be light, and in the wise man, understanding” (1En 5.8). However, one manuscript of BP reads “the light of days” as “the ancient of days.”<sup>79</sup> In other words, it interprets this to be a specific figure. Near the beginning of the first parable, “when the Righteous One appears in the presence of the righteous” at the time of judgment, “light appears to the righteous and chosen who dwell on the earth” (1En 38.2). This suggests that the appearance of a specific figure, the Righteous One, is to be correlated (though not specifically identified) with the appearance of “light” in BP. 1En 58.1-6 suggests that it is more than just a general “light of day” enlightenment that will dwell upon the holy and chosen. It is more like an eternal reward of light in contrast to an eternal punishment of darkness. The weight of the evidence

---

<sup>77</sup>If Nickelsburg’s and VanderKam’s reconstruction is to be accepted.

<sup>78</sup>This is suggested by Nickelsburg and Vanderkam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, 64.

<sup>79</sup>See Nickelsburg and Vanderkam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, 64.

points not to a specific figure who is “the Light of Days,” but a “change [that] will occur for the holy and chosen,” a transformation of circumstances in which “glory and honor will return to the holy” and “the righteous will conquer in the name of the Lord of Spirits” (1En 50.1-2).

## **2.C. The Messiah Figure in the *Parables of Enoch***

Having analyzed the nature and functions of the divine figure in BP, this gives us a clear set of data to compare and contrast with the nature and functions of the messiah figure<sup>80</sup> in BP. Such a comparison will clarify precisely who the messiah figure is and what the messiah figure does in relation to the divine figure in BP. BP uses five specific epithets to refer to the same messiah figure—Righteous One, Chosen One, Son of Man, Anointed One, and Name of the Lord of Spirits. Each of these figures is distinct from the divine figure who is the one God.<sup>81</sup>

### **2.C.i. Nature of the Messiah Figure in the *Parables of Enoch***

There is a good amount of evidence on the nature of the messiah figure in BP which lends

---

<sup>80</sup>There are only two instances in BP where a figure is referred to as the Anointed One (See 1En 48.10; 52.4). At 1En 48.10 the distinction between the Anointed One and the divine figure is made explicit. Referring to the kings and the strong who possess the earth, 48.10 reads: “For they have denied the Lord of Spirits and his Anointed One.” Both references to the Anointed One in BP come in contexts of eschatological judgment, and will be discussed in more detail in the following analysis of the functions of the messiah figure.

<sup>81</sup>Helge Kvanvig identifies “four characteristics” of the Son of Man: “(1) he is the one who has righteousness; (2) he reveals the treasures of what is hidden; (3) he is the chosen one by God; (4) his lot is preeminent before the divinity (46:3)”; see Kvanvig, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 189. While Kvanvig is correct in his identification of these “four characteristics,” there is not a distinction between nature and functions of the messiah figure in Kvanvig’s analysis, and there are more details about the messiah figure in BP that Kvanvig leaves out of his analysis.



itself to detailed analysis. As with the divine figure, certain aspects of the nature of the messiah figure may be assumed. It may be assumed, for example, that the messiah figure is a heavenly being. Like the visions of the divine figure, Enoch's visions of the messiah figure come in the context of Enoch's ascent into heaven (1En 39.3-7). That the messiah figure in BP is a heavenly being is not sufficient evidence for asserting that the messiah figure is also divine. And as was pointed out before, neither does the fact that the messiah figure shares specific functions with the divine figure in BP necessarily indicate the divinity of the messiah figure. According to BP, at least in the final form of the document where Enoch is identified with the Son of Man, the messiah figure is both a human being and a heavenly being. The messiah figure is preexistent in relation to creation. The messiah figure is associated with wisdom. The messiah figure is righteous. And the messiah figure is associated with the divine name. In this segment I will also include an analysis of the 'Son of Man' title, as this is a central issue in the scholarly discussion today and is critical for an accurate understanding of the nature of the messiah figure in BP.

### *2.C.i.a. A Human Being*

The evidence in BP that the messiah figure is a human being is to be located at the beginning (1En 37.1) and the end (1En 71.14) of BP.<sup>82</sup> BP begins with a brief genealogy of Enoch, which stresses the patriarch's human nature: "The vision of wisdom that Enoch

---

<sup>82</sup>The following analysis is predicated on the identification of the messiah figure with Enoch at 1En 71.14.

saw—the son of Jared, the son of Mahalalel, the son of Kenan, the son of Enosh, the son of Seth, the Son of Adam” (1En 37.1).<sup>83</sup> Enoch is also referred to as “the seventh from Adam” at 1En 60.8. These texts clearly and explicitly articulate the human nature of Enoch. Near the end of BP the human being Enoch is explicitly identified with the Son of Man. One of the angels who attended the Head of Days during Enoch’s final ascent into heaven (1En 71.8, 13) came to Enoch and said to him: “You are that son of man who was born for righteousness” (1En 71.14). The identification of the human being Enoch with the messiah figure the Son of Man is an explicit statement of the point of view in BP that the heavenly messiah figure is also a human being.

In BP Enoch is clearly presented as a human being, the seventh human generation. Enoch is “the son of Jared, the son of Mahalalel, the son of Kenan, the son of Enosh, the son of Seth, the son of Adam” (1En 37.1). As a human being Enoch is taken into heaven, “snatched up” from the face of the earth by a whirlwind (1En 39.3). There are two events that may be described as Enoch’s heavenly ascents: here at 1En 39.3 and the final series of ascents at 1En 70–71. At one point during the series of visions of the first ascent, Enoch messes himself in an all too graphic display of his corporeal nature. “And great trembling took hold of me, and fear seized me, and my loins were crushed, and my kidneys were loosened, and I fell on my face . . . . For I had not been able to endure the appearance of that host, and its turmoil and the quaking of the heavens” (1En 60.3-4). In direct contrast to his corporeal nature, twice in the narrative describing Enoch’s final series of ascents (1En 71.1, 5), Enoch’s spirit ascends. This is not the case in Enoch’s

---

<sup>83</sup>According to BW, Enoch is a human (1En 15.2).

previous ascent. In the first ascent “a whirlwind snatched me up from the face of the earth and set me down within the confines of the heavens” (1En 39.3). There is no mention of Enoch’s spirit being taken. In many of the visions of BP Enoch states “my eyes saw” (1En 39.6, 10, 13; 41.2, 3; 52.1-2, 6; 53.1; 54.1; 59.1), which further stresses his corporeal nature during the series of visions of the first ascent. This contrasts with “And my spirit saw” of the final series of ascents, when Enoch is stripped of his flesh and made into a heavenly being (1En 71.6).<sup>84</sup> Nowhere during the first ascent does Enoch refer to his “spirit” ascending or his “spirit” seeing. The only phrases used during the first ascent are “my eyes saw” or “I saw.” This subtly, yet clearly, distinguishes the two ascents. During the vision of his final ascent, Enoch’s spirit (apart from his body)<sup>85</sup> sees the Head of Days coming out of the house built of hailstones. Enoch describes the Head of Days whose “head was white and pure as wool” (1En 71.9-12; cp. 46.1). Enoch falls on his face, his flesh melts, his spirit is transformed, and he “blessed and praised and exalted” the Head of Days (1En 71.9-11).<sup>86</sup> And his praise was acceptable to the Head of Days (1En 71.12). As the Head of Days came out of his heavenly house, he was accompanied by the angels Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, and Phanuel, along with “thousands and tens of

---

<sup>84</sup>Matthew Black suggested an “apotheosis” of the Son of Man; see “The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch: Their Date and Contribution to Christological Origins,” in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, James H. Charlesworth, ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 161. James VanderKam writes: “The apotheosis that he experiences in this text is truly remarkable, one that will be difficult to match in the ensuing tradition.” *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia, S.C.: U. of South Carolina, 1995) 135.

<sup>85</sup>Cp. the description of Isaiah’s ascent without a body in the *Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah* 8.14-15. Cp. also Paul’s description of a heavenly ascent at 2Cor 12.1-4 where twice he writes that he did not know whether it happened “in body or out of the body.”

<sup>86</sup>Cp. the description of Enoch (without flesh) in heaven in the *Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah* 9.6-9.

thousands of angels without number” (1En 71.13; cf. 1.3-4, 9). Enoch is then explicitly identified as the Son of Man who was “born for righteousness” and whom “the righteousness of the Head of Days will not forsake” (1En 71.14). Enoch ceases to be a human being in the flesh (his flesh melts) and he is transformed into the preexistent heavenly messiah, the Son of Man.<sup>87</sup> There seems to be no question that during the series of visions of his first ascent and before the final series of ascents, Enoch is a corporeal being endowed with a human body, and that during the final series of ascents Enoch no longer possesses this body. The question, How can a human being be a preexistent heavenly messiah? is answered in BP by stripping Enoch of his human body of flesh and transforming his spirit so that Enoch becomes the heavenly messiah, Son of Man. This is further facilitated by Enoch’s association with wisdom, as I will argue in what follows.

### *2.C.i.b. Identified with Enoch*

We have just seen that the messiah figure in BP is explicitly identified with the patriarch Enoch.<sup>88</sup> As John J. Collins has stated, “The most intriguing question about the Son of Man in the Parables, however, is undoubtedly that of his relation to Enoch.”<sup>89</sup> There are forty-one direct references to Enoch in BP. As was already pointed out above, one of

---

<sup>87</sup>“It should not be forgotten that it is the earthly Enoch who sees what his future role will be, and it is overwhelmingly clear that at the eschaton he will be exalted far above his human form and will become the judge of all.” VanderKam, “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71,” *The Messiah*, 182. Matthew Black also argued in favor of “a quasi-human or a suprahuman dimension in” the Son of Man figure already in Daniel; see his “The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch: Their Date and Contribution to Christological Origins,” 146-147.

<sup>88</sup>See 1En 37.1, 4; 39.2, 3, 6, 8, 14; 52.2; 60.10; 70.1; 71.1, 5, 10, 14.

<sup>89</sup>John J. Collins, “Enoch and the Son of Man: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 221.

these references is an explicit identification of Enoch with the Son of Man at 1En 71.14, which reveals Enoch to be the messiah figure. This identification of Enoch as the messiah figure would have raised the question: How can a human being be a preexistent heavenly messiah?<sup>90</sup> BP attempts to answer this question in the final series of ascents in chapters 70–71.

Martha Himmelfarb has argued that Enoch's ascent in BW elevates him to the status of an angel.

Ascent is widely understood to confer superhuman status on the human being who is privileged to undertake it. In gnostic texts ascent means reunification of the spirit with the divine from which it comes. In the magical papyri the purpose of ascent is often divinization, taking on the power of a god. In the apocalypses the visionary usually achieves equality with the angels in the course of the ascent. This equality is expressed through service in the heavenly temple.<sup>91</sup>

While Himmelfarb's analysis explains Enoch's equation with angels in BW, it does not however explain the tension between Enoch's ascent, interaction with angels, and explicit identification with the Son of Man who is described as a judge of angels in BP.

---

<sup>90</sup>James VanderKam offers a lengthy discussion of the problem presented by the identification of the so-called "preexistence" of the Son of Man with a human being, and he offers several arguments against readings which identify the preexistence of the Son of Man in BP. According to VanderKam the problem presents itself in terms of the question, if the Son of Man in BP is preexistent, and if Enoch is directly identified with the Son of Man (as he is in 71.14), how can a human being be preexistent, and hence how can Enoch be identified with the Son of Man? In my opinion, this is asking the wrong question. The question is rather, how can a human being be identified as a heavenly messiah? BP answers this question in a very specific way: by transforming the human Enoch into a preexistent heavenly being. Helge Kvanvig more accurately reflects the problem posed in BP: "If the figure is the son of Adam and Eve — Eve is certainly referred to in the Ethiopic term — how then could he at the same time be preexistent?" Kvanvig, "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch," 195.

<sup>91</sup>Martha Himmelfarb, "Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple," *SBLSP* 26 (1987): 210-217; esp. 212-213.

According to Himmelfarb, “The Similitudes in its present form suggests the transformation of Enoch into the Son of Man, but this equation appears to be the result of a later redaction of the Similitudes.”<sup>92</sup> Regardless of whether the identification of Enoch with the Son of Man is a later redaction, the fact remains we are left to make sense of it. Whoever the redactor was, and whatever “group” the redactor may have associated with, in order to make such an identification (between the human being Enoch and the messiah Son of Man), this would require more than an elevation of the status of Enoch to an angel.

Near the end of BP in chapter 70 there is a description of Enoch’s ascent just before he is identified with the Son of Man: “while he was living, his name was raised into the presence of that son of man and into the presence of the Lord of Spirits from among those who dwell on the earth. He was raised on the chariots of the wind, and his name departed <from among them>” (1En 70.1-2; cf. 1En 12.1-2). This is a fragment of a merkabah tradition as Enoch “was raised on the chariots of the wind” (1En 70.2).<sup>93</sup> 1En 70.1-2 is also a midrash of Genesis 5.24, “And Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him,” because there is the suggestion in what follows in BP that this is Enoch’s final ascent to heaven. After Enoch was raised on the chariots of the wind “and his name departed from among them” (1En 70.2), the following verse states it plainly: “And from that day, I was not reckoned among them” (1En 70.3). All of BP may be read

---

<sup>92</sup>“Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple,” 214.

<sup>93</sup>See David Suter, *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch*, 14-23. See also Andrei Orlov, “Roles and Titles of the Seventh Antediluvian Hero in the Parables of Enoch,” 111.

as a midrash on Genesis 5.24. Enoch's entire earthly existence, summarized by the phrase in Genesis 5:24a, "Enoch walked with God," is midrashed in 1En 37–69. The following phrase, "and he was not," is midrashed by 1En 70.3-4: "And from that day, *I was not* reckoned among them" (emphasis added). The first-person phrase of 1En 70.3, "I was not," midrashes the third person phrase of Genesis 5.24, "and he was not." And the end of the verse of Genesis 5.24, "for God took him," is midrashed by what follows in 1En 71.1-17. James VanderKam has argued that all the chapters of BP preceding chapters 70–71 reflect events (visions and ascents into heaven) which occurred during Enoch's earthly life, and that chapters 70–71 constitute Enoch's final ascent into heaven.<sup>94</sup> While VanderKam argues that the entire unit of chapters 70–71 constitutes the Enochic interpretation of Genesis 5.24 in terms of Enoch's final ascent, I would argue that chapters 70–71 constitute a sort of telescoping midrash.<sup>95</sup> 1En 70.1-2 is a midrash on the midrash of chapters 37–69, which is followed by the concluding midrash of 70.3-4 and 71 on Enoch's final ascent and transformation into the preexistent heavenly Son of Man.<sup>96</sup>

In chapter 71 Enoch ascends into heaven where he sees the sons of the holy angels wearing white garments and stepping on flames of fire. There Enoch falls on his face before the Lord of Spirits (1En 71.1-2). The archangel Michael takes Enoch by the hand

---

<sup>94</sup>"Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1Enoch 37–71," 177-179. See also VanderKam's comments in *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 141.

<sup>95</sup>The term "midrash" here should be understood as an interpretive expansion on any text considered authoritative by a particular community. It is possible for a text to be a midrash on another text that is already a midrash on a biblical, or any other, text. Hence the term, "telescoping" midrash.

<sup>96</sup>While chapters 70–71 do indeed constitute a complete midrash on Genesis 5.24, 1En 70.1-2 also constitutes a midrash on chapters 37–69, which themselves constitute a midrash on Genesis 5.24a as well as a development of the account in BW. John J. Collins also separates 70.1-2, 70.3-4, and 71.1ff. as three separate literary units. See his "Enoch and the Son of Man," 221.

and raises him up. Michael shows Enoch all the secrets of mercy and righteousness and the ends of heaven (1En 71.3-4). From there Michael takes Enoch's spirit into the heaven of heavens, where Enoch sees a "house built of hailstones, and between those stones were tongues of living fire" (a development of the tradition in BW, 1En 14.8-23). The house was surrounded by Seraphim, Cherubim, and Ophanim. Enoch saw those who do not sleep and who guard the throne of glory. And he saw thousands and thousands of angels surrounding that house, in and out of which went the four archangels, Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, and Phanuel (1En 71.5-8). At some point when the archangels are exiting the house, the Head of Days accompanies them. Enoch falls on his face, his flesh melts, and his spirit is transformed. Enoch then blesses and praises the Head of Days (1En 71.9-12).<sup>97</sup> The entire climaxing vision further escalates in intensity when the identity of the Son of Man is revealed. The "Head of Days came" with the four archangels and thousands of angels without number. "And that angel came to me and greeted me with his voice" (1En 71.13-14). We may ask, to whom does "that angel" refer? since the angel's identity is left unresolved. Certainly not the Head of Days, who is not an angel. Is it one of the four archangels? Which one?<sup>98</sup> The angel who came to Enoch is probably Michael, who has been interacting personally with Enoch during his final ascent and who also has revealed to Enoch all the secrets of heaven (1En 71.3-5; cf. also 60.2-5). "That angel" came to Enoch and said: "You are that son of man who was born for righteousness, and

---

<sup>97</sup>Himmelfarb states: "In most of the later ascent apocalypses the visionary attains his place among the angels by putting on a special garment or joining in the praise the angel offers to God." See "Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple," 213.

<sup>98</sup>Nickelsburg and Vanderkam ask the question without providing a solution. See *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, 95.



righteousness dwells on you, and the righteousness of the Head of Days will not forsake you” (1En 71.14). Enoch and the Son of Man are curiously distinct (1En 70.1), while Enoch is explicitly identified with the Son of Man (1En 71.14). Finally, the righteous who dwell with the Son of Man will have peace, truth and “length of days with that son of man” (1En 71.15-17).

Helge Kvanvig has prepared a careful analysis of 1En 70–71 in response to scholars’ objections to the view that this section is an integral part of the rest of BP. This is an important question because, as James VanderKam has argued, the identity of Enoch with the Son of Man in chapters 70–71 is crucial to our understanding of the various roles and titles of the Son of Man throughout BP. Kvanvig responds to three “obstacles” which have developed in the recent discussion. The first obstacle is that, if Enoch is equated with the Son of Man as 1En 71.14 explicitly states, then throughout the rest of BP Enoch sees himself in heaven, a phenomenon which John Collins claims is an impossibility.<sup>99</sup> Kvanvig has responded to Collins’ objection by comparing the structure of the three parables and chapters 70–71 with Enoch’s ascent in BW (1En 13–14). In 1En 13 Enoch’s role as a visionary is emphasized, while in 1En 14 his role as an intermediary communicating divine judgment is stressed. Enoch’s role as a visionary (1En 13) corresponds with his ascent and visions throughout the three parables of BP (1En 37–70.2), while his role as intermediary of divine judgment is revealed in his final ascent

---

<sup>99</sup>John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995) 177-182. But see the helpful discussion by Maurice Casey, *The Solution to the ‘Son of Man’ Problem* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2007) 110-111, where Casey refers to *TestLev* 7.4–8.1 and Levi’s vision of himself receiving the priestly vestment.



Until now I had been on my face, prostrate and trembling. And the Lord called me with his mouth and said to me, “Come here, Enoch, and hear my word(s).” And one of the holy ones came to me and raised me up and stood me (on my feet) and brought me up to the door. But I had my face bowed down (1En 14.24-25).

This describes Enoch seeing specific actions that he is doing, and that are being done to him by an angel, in the presence of the divine figure, in Enoch’s vision. If Enoch is not seeing himself, then the only other explanation is that this was an actual waking experience and not a vision at all, in which case Enoch would not be able to see himself. He would be describing a real waking experience. As it is, however, the text describes a human seeing objects in a visionary state. If Enoch is able to see all the objects of the vision described in the text, how is it that the only object Enoch is not able to see, according to Collins, is himself? Collins’ solution is to state that “Enoch was a participant in his own dream, and presumably thought (if we may so speak about a fictional character) that he was actually experiencing what he saw.”<sup>103</sup> Collins’ mistake is that he does not make a distinction between the visionary experience of Enoch and Enoch’s reporting of the experience in the actual writing of the text. While it may be true that the “visionary counterpart” is absorbed in the actual experience of the vision, the visionary counterpart becomes a fact of literary creation once the vision is described in words by the one who experienced it, namely, Enoch.

The second obstacle to which Kvanvig responds is the separation of Enoch from the Son of Man at 1En 70.1. According to this objection this renders 70.1 inconsistent

---

<sup>103</sup>“Enoch and the Son of Man,” 218.

with the remainder of the ascent, where Enoch is explicitly identified with the Son of Man (1En 71.14). The text of 1En 70.1 reads as follows:

And after this, while he was living, his name was raised  
 into the presence of that son of man  
 and into the presence of the Lord of Spirits  
 from among those who dwell on the earth.  
 He was raised on the chariots of the wind,  
 and his name departed <from among them>.

Kvanvig describes the problem: “the introduction to the final section clearly keeps Enoch and the Son of Man apart.”<sup>104</sup> Enoch’s “name was raised into the presence of that son of man and into the presence of the Lord of Spirits.” Kvanvig, following the text critical work of Daniel Olson,<sup>105</sup> reads a textual variant in “a series of old manuscripts,” a tradition which R.H. Charles had identified as manuscript u, which allows for the identification of Enoch with the Son of Man in 70.1. The variant may be translated: “And it happened after this, while he was living, that the name of that Son of Man was raised into the presence of the Lord of Spirits.” According to Kvanvig: “If we consider the theology connected to Ethiopic text transmission, where the Son of Man was considered a *typos* of Christ and therefore separate from Enoch, the confusion of the two in 1 En 70:1 is certainly *lectio difficilior*.”<sup>106</sup> While creative, this solution does not appear to solve

---

<sup>104</sup>“The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 201.

<sup>105</sup>Daniel C. Olson, “Enoch and the Son of Man in the Epilogue of the Parables,” *JSP* 18 (1998): 27-38; esp. 30-33.

<sup>106</sup>“The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 202.

anything really, if only for the obvious fact that the explicit identification of Enoch with the Son of Man at 71.14 remains in the text. If the Ethiopic scribes emended the text to separate Enoch and the Son of Man because they had a theological concern regarding the identification of Enoch with the Son of Man at 70.1, then why would the Christian scribes leave the explicit identification of Enoch with the Son of Man at 71.14? And if 1En 70.1-2 should be viewed primarily as following what has gone before, rather than introducing what follows, then the separation of Enoch from the Son of Man in 70.1 seems natural and is entirely consistent with the separation of these two figures throughout the three preceding parables. It may also be objected to Kvanvig's analysis here that, even though the variant may solve the problem of the identification of Enoch with the Son of Man looking forward in the text, nowhere in the preceding parables does the Son of Man live "among those who dwell on the earth." In fact it may be argued that the Son of Man figure will not be revealed among those who dwell on the earth until the time of judgment at the *eschaton* (1En 53.6; 71.16).<sup>107</sup> It should also be noted that the variant readings identified by Olson, instead of an original more difficult reading, appear to be an effort on the part of the scribes to connect the wording of 1En 70.1 with the immediately preceding context, where "the name of that son of man had been revealed" to the angels (1En 69.14, 26). This would then render the present text of 1En 70.1 the *lectio difficilior*, rather than the variant readings associated with manuscript u.<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>107</sup>John J. Collins, "Enoch and the Son of Man," 226; "In the body of the Parables there is no suggestion at all that the Son of Man ever had an earthly career."

<sup>108</sup>John J. Collins also makes a similar argument. "Enoch and the Son of Man," 223-224. See also James VanderKam, "Righteous One," 184.

The third obstacle Kvanvig addresses has to do with the preexistence of the Son of Man in relation to the human being Enoch. Here Kvanvig discusses the connections between the messiah figure and wisdom in BP, and he explores connections with Proverbs and locates the roots of these traditions in a Mesopotamian context.

There seems to be a growing consensus that the figure of Enoch is modeled partly on the seventh antediluvian king Enmeduranki, as he is described in the composition labeled “Enmeduranki and the Diviners.” I have argued in several places that the Mesopotamian background of Enoch also included the *apkallu* tradition. This concerns especially the seventh *apkallu*, who ascended to heaven, like Adapa in the myth, and it concerns the first *apkallu*, who brought humanity the basic knowledge and wrote astronomical and other important compositions under divine inspiration.

If this is the case, there is a double background for the figure of Enoch. He is the seventh patriarch, patterned on the seventh antediluvian king Enmeduranki, who was of human descent. He is, however, also a Jewish counterpart of a primeval *apkallu*, sage and priest. The primeval *apkallu* had its origin in the divine realm and visited mankind. When we first meet Enoch in the Book of the Watchers, he stays with the Watchers and holy ones and is sent to the human world. Thus there are multiple links between the preexistence of the Son of Man in the Parables, the precreational existence of Wisdom in the Proverbs and the Parables, the divine origin of the *apkallu*, and the transcendent abode of Enoch.<sup>109</sup>

While the preexistence of the Son of Man is accepted by Kvanvig (in contrast to VanderKam who seeks to solve the problem by explaining away the passages referring to the Son of Man’s preexistence), the difficulty lies in the identification of a preexistent heavenly being (the messiah figure) with a finite temporal human being (Enoch).

BP’s identification of Enoch with the preexistent heavenly messiah resolves a

---

<sup>109</sup>“The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 206.

specific tension residing in the earlier Enochic tradition of BW. When Enoch ascends to heaven in BW, he sees the “Great Glory” seated on a lofty throne (1En 14.18-20). In spite of Enoch’s statement, “And I was unable to see” (1En 14.19), Enoch sees this. He even describes the apparel of the Great Glory: “. . . his apparel was like the appearance of the sun and whiter than much snow” (1En 14.20). Then Enoch states: “No angel could enter into this house and look at his face because of the splendor and glory, and no human could look at him” (1En 14.21).<sup>110</sup> But if Enoch saw the Great Glory, then he must be more than angelic and more than human.<sup>111</sup> George Nickelsburg describes this section of BW in contrast to the throne vision of Ezekiel 1–2. Nickelsburg points out that Ezekiel is passive in his encounter with the throne chariot, while Enoch takes an active role, moving through a series of “landmarks” on his journey to the holy of holies.<sup>112</sup> When Enoch approaches the throne of the Great Glory, he meets a “boundary” of cherubim. Nickelsburg offers a possible interpretation of this “boundary” of cherubim to be the “guardians” of the divine throne (cp. 1En 71.7). Enoch is not restricted by these guardians. He is invited to come directly to the throne (1En 14.24). In Second Temple period literature, this kind of movement through the heavenly places is typically allowed to beings who are considered in some way to be more than human (cf. the *Ascension of Isaiah*). Nickelsburg comments: “it is paradoxical that Enoch gets as far as he does. . . .

---

<sup>110</sup>Cf. the *Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah* 8.11.

<sup>111</sup>Martha Himmelfarb has argued: “Through his participation in the proceedings of the heavenly court, the prophet Isaiah claims for himself the status of an angel. The author of the Book of the Watchers claims angelic status for Enoch through his service in the heavenly temple.” See “Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple,” 212.

<sup>112</sup>*1 Enoch 1: A Commentary*, 259.

Enoch's is a special case. The whole tradition leads us to suppose that it is his special righteousness that enables him to enter God's presence."<sup>113</sup> BP, on the other hand, attempts to resolve the tension of this paradox by associating Enoch with wisdom and the heavenly Son of Man in such a way that there is ascribed to Enoch (1En 39.8) the same preexistence possessed by both wisdom and the Son of Man.<sup>114</sup>

### *2.C.i.c. A Heavenly Being*

That the messiah figure is a heavenly being may by and large be assumed, as I have already argued on the basis of Enoch's vision coming in the context of his ascent into heaven (1En 39.3-7). However, there is also in this same text explicit evidence that the messiah figure is a heavenly being. A whirlwind snatched Enoch up "from the face of the earth" and set him down "within the confines of the heavens" (1En 39.3). The narrative continues with Enoch's description of the dwellings of angels: "And there I saw another vision—the dwellings of the holy ones, and the resting places of the righteous. There my eyes saw their dwellings with his righteous angels and their resting places with the holy ones" (1En 39.4-5). The narrative then describes what the angels in heaven do; they petition and intercede and pray for the sons of men. The narrative then shifts to Enoch's

---

<sup>113</sup>*I Enoch 1: A Commentary*, 269.

<sup>114</sup>Christopher Rowland resolves this paradox by making the observation that the authors of BP have made a separation between the throne of glory and the divine figure, and instead have seated the messiah figure on the throne of glory. *The Open Heaven*, 106-107. "In their present form the Similitudes not only give evidence of the transference of divine attributes to another heavenly figure but also identify this heavenly figure with Enoch, who, it was thought, had been taken up to heaven by God without seeing death. Thus the problem of anthropomorphism inherent in the divine throne-theophany is neatly side-stepped by separating the throne of glory from God and making its occupant the glorified Enoch."



description of the messiah figure: “And in that place my eyes saw the Chosen One of righteousness and faith . . . . And I saw his dwelling beneath the wings of the Lord of Spirits” (1En 39.6-7). While it may be assumed that the messiah figure is a heavenly being, as I have already argued, this is an explicit statement of the point of view in BP that the messiah figure is a heavenly being.

Further evidence that the messiah figure in BP is a distinct heavenly being occurs at 1En 46.1-8. Chapter 46 begins as a midrash on Ezekiel 1.26-28 and Daniel 7.9-14.<sup>115</sup> The book of Ezekiel begins with the prophet experiencing a heavenly vision. Ezekiel sees “the likeness of a throne and upon the likeness of the throne there was a likeness as an appearance of a human being” (Ezk 1.26). Ezekiel explains the vision in the following terms: “the appearance of the likeness of the glory of YHWH” (Ezk 1.28). In Daniel 7.9-14 there is another description of a heavenly vision. The author writes: “I was looking, until thrones were placed and the ancient of days was seated; his garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head as pure wool” (Dan 7.9). The vision progresses as “one like a son of man was coming and he came to the Ancient of Days and was brought in front of him” (Dan 7.13). This “one like a son of man” does not sit on any of the thrones that were set in place (Dan 7.9). This figure, rather, is “brought in front of” the divine figure, the Ancient of Days. The midrash in BP (1En 46) conflates these two texts (Ezekiel 1 and Daniel 7) by using similar language from each to describe a single event. In BP Enoch sees “one who had a head of days, and his head was like white wool” (1En 46.1). The

---

<sup>115</sup>See Helge Kvanvig, “Throne Visions and Monsters: The Encounter between Danielic and Enochic Traditions,” *ZAW* 117.2 (2005): 249-272.

description of the figure in BP, “head was white like wool,” is almost identical to that of Daniel 7, “the hair of his head as pure wool.” The names however, while similar, are different. In Daniel 7 the divine figure who sits on the throne is the Ancient of Days. In BP the divine figure is “one who had a head of days,” who is then referred to in BP as “the Head of Days” (1En 46.2).<sup>116</sup> According to the midrash in BP, “And with him (the one who had a head of days) was another, whose face was like the appearance of a man” (1En 46.1). The language, “like the appearance of a man,” reflects the language describing the figure of Ezekiel 1.26 who was seated above the likeness of a throne, “a likeness as an appearance of a human being” (~da harmk twmd). The midrash of BP then begins to expand on the biblical texts. The figure “whose face was like the appearance of a man,” also had a face “full of graciousness like one of the holy angels” (1En 46.1). Enoch then asks the angel who is leading him through this vision to give him more information “about that son of man” (1En 46.2), reconnecting the midrash to Daniel 7. Enoch wants to know who this figure is, from where he comes, and “why he went with the Head of Days” (1En 46.2). These questions allow the midrash to expand its description of the Son of Man in Enochic terms beyond the biblical texts. The angel then describes the Son of Man in the following terms: “This is the son of man who has righteousness, and righteousness dwells with him. And all the treasuries of what is hidden he will reveal; for the Lord of Spirits has chosen him, and his lot has prevailed through truth in the presence of the Lord of Spirits forever” (1En 46.3). In addition to the

---

<sup>116</sup>Nickelsburg and VanderKam write: “This verse reflects Dan 7:9, 13, with the term *ancient of days* being changed hereafter to *Head of Days*.” See *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, 59.

functions of the messiah figure described here (which will be analyzed in a following segment), the nature of the messiah figure as both a human being and a heavenly being is explicit.

Evidence that the messiah figure is a heavenly being may also be identified with the statements in BP that the messiah figure was hidden in the presence of the Lord of Spirits. At 1En 48.6 there is the statement with reference to the Son of Man, that “he was chosen and hidden in his (the Lord of Spirit’s) presence before the world was created and forever.” The hiddenness of the Son of Man is reiterated at 1En 62.7: “For from the beginning the Son of Man was hidden, and the Most High preserved him in the presence of his might, and he revealed him to the chosen.” All of this is evidence that the authors of BP considered the messiah figure to be a heavenly being.

### *2.C.i.d. Preexistence*

These same texts that identify the messiah figure as a heavenly being are also adduced by scholars as evidence that the messiah figure in BP is preexistent.<sup>117</sup> At 1En 48.2-7 the Son of Man is “named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, and his name before the Head of Days” (1En 48.2-3).<sup>118</sup> This passage describes the Son of Man in terms of his

---

<sup>117</sup>Andrei Orlov reads the evidence in BP in terms of a preexistent Son of Man in contrast to VanderKam, and Orlov actually refers to the Son of Man as “even possibly a divine being,” although he does not give any further explanation. See James VanderKam “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71,” 179-182; and Andrei Orlov, “Roles and Titles of the Seventh Antediluvian Hero in the Parables of Enoch: A Departure from the Traditional Pattern?” *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 110-136; esp. 128.

<sup>118</sup>This text does not explicitly state what the name is. It may be assumed, however, that the name with which the Son of Man is named is the divine name (*hwhy*), the tetragram. See Charles A. Gieschen, “The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 238-249. The divine name was so revered in Enochic circles (cf. the frequent ellipsis of the divine name in

preexistence: “Even before the sun and the constellations were created, before the stars of heaven were made, his name was named before the Lord of Spirits” (1En 48.3). The evidence limits the Son of Man’s preexistence in BP to a preexistence only in relation to creation, and not an eternal preexistence by which the Son of Man would then be coexistent with or have a nature like the divine figure in BP. Using language similar to that of 1En 48, chapter 62 reads: “For from the beginning the Son of Man was hidden, and the Most High preserved him in the presence of his might, and he revealed him to the chosen. And the congregation of the chosen and the holy will be sown; and all the chosen will stand in his presence on that day” (1En 62.7-8). This statement extends the metaphor by stating explicitly from whom the Son of Man was hidden. The Son of Man was hidden not just “before the world was created” as 1En 48.7 claims, but “from the beginning” of creation he was hidden from those who are not chosen, “the kings and the mighty and all who possess the earth” (1En 62.3-6). It should also be noted that nowhere in BP does it explicitly state that the preexistent messiah figure was created by the divine figure. It only states that the messiah figure “was hidden” and that the divine figure “revealed him.” This is a question for BP that may find its resolution by associating the messiah figure with wisdom.

### *2.C.i.e. Association with Wisdom*

The messiah figure is closely associated with wisdom in BP. In what appears to be the

---

numerous documents found at Qumran) and among other Jewish groups of the late Second Temple period, that it was often referred to with a locution. Cf. also the later evidence of 3 Enoch 12–13 where the name-angel Metatron is referred to as “the lesser YHWH”; translation by P. Alexander in *OTP* 1.265.

redaction of an earlier wisdom tradition,<sup>119</sup> the authors of BP claim that wisdom's dwelling was in heaven.

Wisdom did not find a place where she might dwell,  
 so her dwelling was in the heaven.  
 Wisdom went forth to dwell among the sons of men,  
 but she did not find a dwelling.  
 Wisdom returned to her place,  
 and sat down among the angels.

Iniquity went forth from her chambers,  
 those whom she did not seek she found,  
 and she dwelt among them  
 like rain in a desert  
 and dew in a thirsty land (1En 42.1-2).

The statement that “Wisdom did not find a place where she might dwell, so her dwelling was in the heaven,” is a somewhat unspecific claim in relation to whether the authors of this tradition understood wisdom to be created by the divine figure. “Wisdom went forth” is more suggestive of the Hellenistic point of view that wisdom was an “emanation” of the divine figure, than the claim of the LXX that wisdom was created: “The Lord created me as the beginning of his ways, for his works” (*kurioj ektisen me archn odwh autou/ eij erga autou/*– Prov 8.22). The authors of BP appear to have taken a polemical tone (see 2.A.ii.b. above) against the Zadokite-Sadducean claim that wisdom resides in the Torah. “Wisdom did not find a place where she might dwell, so her dwelling was in the

---

<sup>119</sup>The text of 1En 42.1-2 gives the appearance of having been appended to the end of the first parable of BP (1En 37–44), along with a segment on astronomical secrets (1En 41.3-8; 43.1-4; 41.1), all of which do not appear to fit the rest of the narrative of the first parable.

heaven.” Gabriele Boccaccini describes the polemical nature of this wisdom poem:

The poem of ch. 42 is a direct attack against the sapiential myth of the torah as the earthly embodiment of heavenly wisdom. However, the tradition of Sirach and 1 Baruch may not be the only target. The Enochic poem also denies the suggestion of the Proto-*Epistle of Enoch* and of the sectarian literature of Qumran that on earth a special group of people have received “wisdom” as a permanent possession.<sup>120</sup>

Sapiential Judaism claimed that wisdom was evident in God’s creation. The Zadokite-Sadducean claim was that wisdom resided in the Torah. Gabriele Boccaccini writes:

. . . this does not mean that wisdom and law are identical. Identity is a transitive relationship, in which the two elements bear the same properties. In Sirach, wisdom and law are not interchangeable and their relationship is still conceived in strongly asymmetrical terms.

On the one hand, as Roland E. Murphy noticed, the unity of wisdom and Torah is the result of a one-way process. “Wisdom dwelling among God’s people is concretized in the Torah. It is not the other way around, as though the eternal pre-existent Torah is now identified with Wisdom.”<sup>121</sup>

Boccaccini calls this “the historical embodiment of the heavenly wisdom.” John J.

Collins has taken a similar view with regard to the relationship between wisdom and the Torah in *Sirach*.

---

<sup>120</sup>Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 146.

<sup>121</sup>Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism*, 147. See Roland E. Murphy, “The Personification of Wisdom,” in *Wisdom in Ancient Israel*, John Day, Robert P. Gordon, and H.G.M. Williamson, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1995) 227.

Sirach does not develop the notion of the law as a cosmic principle. There are no poems describing how Torah came forth from the mouth of God or circled the heavens before creation. The point of the identification is to accredit the Torah as the valid concretization (even as the ultimate concretization) of universal wisdom, not to attribute a cosmic role to the Torah itself.<sup>122</sup>

In BP the tradition is somewhat more fluid, locating wisdom in heaven rather than in the created order and allowing for wisdom to find interaction with humans via a mediatorial figure, rather than a canonical text.

The reference to iniquity going forth from her chambers in the second strophe of the poem (1En 42.1-3) is in clear contrast to the movement of wisdom in the first strophe.<sup>123</sup> From the Enochic point of view, it could only make sense that wisdom found no place to dwell in a creation that was totally corrupted by evil. From the Zadokite-Sadducean point of view, on the other hand, the connection between wisdom and Torah was a logical connection. But it was a connection the authors of BP resisted. For the Enochians, wisdom resided in heaven, and it was necessary for a mediatorial figure (Enoch) to mediate preexistent heavenly wisdom to the rest of creation. In the Enochic tradition wisdom is usually defined in relation to righteousness, not iniquity. Helge Kvanvig argues that 1En 42.1-3 reads like a “parody of Proverbs,” and he suggests that the reference to “iniquity” going forth “from her chambers” is “a concealed reference to

---

<sup>122</sup>John J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1997) 61.

<sup>123</sup>Philip S. Alexander may certainly be correct to suggest that this is a proto-Gnostic myth. See Alexander's, “Predestination and Free Will in the Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 27-49.

Enoch.”<sup>124</sup> While Enoch is repeatedly referred to as a righteous person in the Enochic literature (1En 1.2; 12.4; 15.1), the reference to “iniquity” (Enoch) going forth “from her chambers” may conceivably be a vestige of skeptical Wisdom of the second century BCE and the point of view that “there is not a righteous man on earth who does good and never sins” (Eccl 7.20).<sup>125</sup> It is also worth noting that in BP the human Enoch is not referred to as being “righteous” until *after* his transformation that takes place during his final ascent and identification with the messiah Son of Man figure (1En 71.14, 16). While I agree with Kvanvig that we should see an association of the human figure Enoch with heavenly wisdom, Kvanvig presses his analysis too far by *identifying* Enoch with wisdom.

A passage in BP specifically referring to Enoch may be adduced as another piece of evidence for the association of the human figure Enoch with preexistent wisdom. Chapter 39 introduces “the Chosen One of righteousness and faith” whose dwelling is “beneath the wings of the Lord of Spirits” (1En 39.6-7). Enoch sees the Chosen One with his own eyes, along with all the righteous and chosen ones who were blessing and praising the name of the Lord of Spirits. Verse 8 has Enoch say in the first person: “There I wished to dwell, and my spirit longed for that dwelling. There my portion has been from the first, for thus it has been established concerning me in the presence of the Lord of Spirits” (1En 39.8). The characterization of Enoch’s “spirit” longing “for that dwelling” is probably to be connected with the ascent of Enoch’s “spirit” without his body in

---

<sup>124</sup>“The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 202.

<sup>125</sup>There may also be an oblique reference to 1En 32.3-6 and a paradise tradition in BW where the “tree of wisdom” gives fruit that imparts “great wisdom,” and Adam and Eve are described as having received wisdom from the tree of wisdom, but iniquity is not mentioned.



chapter 71. The author (or more likely one of the later redactors) of BP wanted the reader to think that there is a natural connection between the human being Enoch and the messiah figure, the Chosen One. The notion of a pre-determined lot (or “portion”) for Enoch is a familiar concept in the Enochic tradition (cf. 1QapGen 2.19-21). Kvanvig’s analysis draws connections between wisdom’s “dwelling” or “house” (h<sub>tyb</sub>), her “seven pillars,” at Proverbs 9.1 and the sages or “seven primeval *apkallus*” of Mesopotamian myth.<sup>126</sup> In BP Enoch’s “spirit longed for that dwelling” (1En 39.8). Enoch confesses: “There my portion has been from the first” (1En 39.8). The expression “from the first” recalls the Mosaic account of the beginning of creation at Genesis 1.1, *tyvarb*. It also calls to mind Proverbs 8.22-31 and all the temporal expressions there. “<sup>22</sup>YHWH acquired me as the first (*tyvar*) of his acts, before his ancient works. <sup>23</sup>From ancient times I was set up, from the first (*varm*) before the earth (#*ra-ymdqm*).” The phrase, “from the first” in BP with reference to Enoch suggests the use of some form of *var* or *-dq*. There is similar language used with reference to the Son of Man in BP, utilizing the same kinds of temporal clauses. “Even before the sun and the constellations were created, before the stars of heaven were made, his name was named before the Lord of Spirits” (1En 48.3; Prv 8.24-26). This also refers to the hiddenness of the Son of Man before creation. “. . . he was chosen and hidden in his presence before the world was created and forever” (1En 48.6). Then follows the revelation of the Son of Man by wisdom: “And the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits has revealed him to the holy and the righteous; for he has preserved the portion of the righteous” (1En 48.7). This is certainly connected to Enoch in chapter 39 and

---

<sup>126</sup>“The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 204.

Enoch's "portion" which has been "from the first." The hidden nature of the Son of Man "from the beginning" is again referred to in chapter 62. "For from the beginning the son of man was hidden, and the Most High preserved him in the presence of his might, and he revealed him to the chosen" (1En 62.7). The authors of BP must have intended their readers to draw the connections between these passages describing the preexistence of the Son of Man and the description of Enoch in chapter 39, where his "portion has been from the first."

The association of heavenly wisdom with a human being is a startling Enochic innovation in BP. John J. Collins has stated: "It would seem that Parables here developed the identity of the Son of Man well beyond anything that we found in Daniel, by applying to him language that is elsewhere used of wisdom."<sup>127</sup> The fact that the association of heavenly preexistent wisdom with Enoch is by and large an undeveloped concept in BP underscores its novelty to Enochic intellectual speculation. In BW Enoch is a human being who is given privileged access to God's dwelling in heaven (1En 14.8–16.4). In what appears to be an earlier tradition of BP, the messiah figure (with whom Enoch is later identified at 1En 71.14) is "like one of the holy angels" (1En 46.1). The progression of the development in Enochic speculation is from Enoch being a specially privileged or righteous human (BW) to being like one of the holy angels (earlier tradition of BP) to being associated with preexistent wisdom (a later, less developed tradition of BP). (See the illustration in *Table-1*.)

---

<sup>127</sup>"Enoch and the Son of Man," 225.

*Table-1*      Development of Enoch's Status in Enochic Intellectual Speculation

Early Tradition in BW	Second Stage of the Tradition	Final Stage of the Tradition in BP
Enoch as a righteous human being (1En 1.2)	Enoch like the angels (1En 39; 46.1)	Enoch identified with preexistent heavenly messiah figure via wisdom (1En 39.6-8; 42.1-3; 71.14)

Already in the second century BCE *Sirach* had associated wisdom with the Torah (*Sirach* 24.23). In the first century BCE the *Wisdom of Solomon* referred to wisdom as an emanation of God, the image of God's goodness (*WisSol* 7.26). And if the first-century-BCE date for BP is to be accepted (as it is assumed here in agreement with the current consensus of Enoch specialists), Philo had not yet presented his concept of wisdom's identification with the divine *Logos*. These various associations of wisdom—with the Torah, with an emanation of God and the image of God's goodness, and with the divine *Logos*—are philosophical, abstract personifications; they are not yet the kind of concrete association of heavenly wisdom with a specific human being that we find for the first time in BP. Personification of wisdom is not the same as associating wisdom with a specific human being. In Jewish philosophical speculation from this period, wisdom is personified in a number of different ways—as agent of God's creative activity, as the image of God, as the *Logos* of God. But in some circles of Jewish messianic intellectual traditions from this period, wisdom is associated with specific human beings—Enoch in

BP, and Jesus in the Letters of Paul. (See the illustration in *Table-2*.) At no time before BP had wisdom ever been identified, or at least so closely associated, with a human being.<sup>128</sup> The innovation of associating pre-existent heavenly wisdom with the human figure Enoch would then give the BP community the necessary justification for identifying Enoch with the pre-existent heavenly messiah figure, the Son of Man.

*Table-2*      **Philosophical and Messianic Wisdom Associations**

	Source	Wisdom associated w/	Wisdom identified w/
Philosophical Descriptions of Wisdom ( <i>Abstract</i> )	<i>Wisdom Ben Sira</i>	• Torah	
	<i>Wisdom of Solomon</i>	• Emanation of God • Image of God's goodness	
	Philo of Alexandria		• <i>Divine Logos</i> • Image of God
Messianic Descriptions of Wisdom ( <i>Concrete</i> )	<i>Parables of Enoch</i>	• Human Being Enoch	
	<i>Letters of Paul</i>	• Human Being Jesus	
	<i>Gospel of John</i>		• <i>Divine Logos</i> • Human Being Jesus

<sup>128</sup>One might argue that the messiah figure in the *Psalms of Solomon* is associated with wisdom. See *PsSol* 17. It is the extent of the association of the messiah figure with wisdom in BP that indicates an unprecedented level of development in Jewish thought of this period.

2.C.i.f. *A Righteous Being*

The messiah figure in BP is righteous.<sup>129</sup> In BW Enoch is introduced as “a righteous man whose eyes were opened by God” (1En 1.2; cf. 15.1). Enoch is also referred to in BW as “righteous scribe” (1En 12.4). In BP the messiah figure is referred to as the “Righteous One” (1En 38.2), and “the Chosen One of righteousness and faith” (1En 39.6). In this latter reference the Chosen One is described with the curious phrase: “and righteousness will be his days.” In terms of his nature, the Son of Man has righteousness and righteousness dwells with him (1En 46.3; 71.14), suggesting an identification of the Son of Man with the Righteous One. The “spirit of righteousness” is poured out on the Chosen One when he is seated on the throne of glory, and “righteousness is judged in his presence” (1En 62.2-3). The angel Michael reveals to Enoch “all the secrets of righteousness (1En 71.3), before Enoch is identified as the Son of Man. And at the very point where Enoch is identified with the Son of Man, the angel tells Enoch that he “was born for righteousness, and righteousness dwells on you, and the righteousness of the Head of Days will not forsake you” (1En 71.14, 16).

The first reference to a figure called the Righteous One occurs at 1En 38.2, at the beginning of the first parable (1En 38–44). James VanderKam discusses the text critical

---

<sup>129</sup>There are four instances in BP where a specific figure is referred to as the Righteous One (cf. 1En 38.2; 47.1, 4; 53.6). Two of these references are in the same immediate context. There are twenty-five references to a figure known as the Chosen One in BP. The first reference to the Chosen One is at 39.6-7. Enoch experiences an ascent into heaven (1En 39.3) where he sees the dwelling of the Chosen One (1En 39.6-7). The Chosen One’s dwelling is “beneath the wings of the Lord of Spirits (1En 39.7), explicitly identifying the Chosen One and the Lord of Spirits as two distinct figures (cf. 1En 39.7; 40.5; 45.3, 4; 49.2-4; 52.9; 61.8; 62.1-2). The Chosen One is explicitly identified with the Righteous One. In a vision Enoch sees the valley where the kings and the mighty are punished. “And after this, the Righteous and the Chosen One will cause the house of his congregation to appear” (1En 53.6). Here “the Righteous and the Chosen One” refer to one and the same figure.

difficulties of reading “righteous one” at 1En 38.2. The best manuscripts read “righteousness,” which according to VanderKam produces a line which makes little sense: “when righteousness appears before the face of the righteous ones.” According to VanderKam this is why later scribes emended the text to read “righteous one.”<sup>130</sup> The first parable begins with a scene of judgment, when “the congregation of the righteous appears, and the sinners are judged for their sins” (1En 38.1). At this judgment the “Righteous One appears in the presence of the righteous.” There are two curious uses of the phrase “righteous one” near the beginning of the second parable (1En 45–57). In chapter 47 “the blood of the righteous one” arises “from the earth into the presence of the Lord of Spirits” (1En 47.1). What is not clear is whether this refers to the blood of one particular figure. In 47.2 the “holy ones who dwell in the heights of heaven” intercede “in behalf of the blood of the righteous that had been shed.” This suggests some sort of social or political persecution, the object of which would have been the community of BP (see 1En 62.11). The angelic prayer was “that judgment might be executed for *them*, and endurance might not be *their* (lot) forever” (emphases added). This is a plural referent suggesting that “the blood of the righteous one” refers to the collective suffering of a particular community. As the scene progresses, the heavenly court assembles. The angels rejoice that the prayer of the righteous had been heard, and that “the blood of the righteous one had been required in the presence of the Lord of Spirits” (1En 47.4). The ambiguity lends itself to at least four possible readings of this text.

The first possibility is that “the righteous one” is a representative figure of a

---

<sup>130</sup>See “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71,” 170.

suffering “congregation of the righteous” as it is referred to in 1En 38.1 (see also 1En 46.8 and 53.2, 7), in much the same way the suffering servant of Isaiah 53 has been interpreted as a figure representing the entire suffering community of Israel.<sup>131</sup> A second possible reading is that the “righteous one” of 1En 47.1 and 4 is distinct from the righteous community.<sup>132</sup> This would then suggest that the suffering is focused in one specific figure, possibly a prominent leader of the community, and that this figure’s blood was “required in the presence of the Lord of Spirits” as an indictment against those who shed his blood.<sup>133</sup> In this case the “righteous one” is clearly a human being. In BW there is a similar idea at work: humans who had been violated by fallen watchers with “much bloodshed on the earth” petitioned the holy ones (angels) to bring their suit to judgment before the Most High (1En 9.1-11). A third reading is possible and this is the most difficult of the four I am proposing here. The “righteous one” of chapter 47 is the Son of Man figure referred to in chapter 46. In 46.3 the Son of Man is described as having “righteousness, and righteousness dwells with him.” This would suggest a connection

---

<sup>131</sup>James VanderKam opts for this reading of “righteous one” as a collective designation for the suffering of the community. He argues that the context “strongly suggests . . . a collective meaning” for the occurrence of “righteous one” at both 1En 47.1 and 47.4. See “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71,” 170. Cf. also VanderKam’s *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 135. See also Matthew Black’s discussion in “The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch: Their Date and Contribution to Christological Origins,” 160-161.

<sup>132</sup>Matthew Black argues that there is an “oscillation” between plural and singular designations in these verses. See *The Book of Enoch or 1Enoch*, New English Edition, with Commentary and Textual Notes by M. Black in collaboration with J.C. VanderKam, with an Appendix on the Astronomical Chapters (78–82) by O. Neugebauer (Leiden: Brill, 1985) 209.

<sup>133</sup>On this possibility see E. Sjørberg, *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochsbuch* (Skrifter Utgivna av kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet I Lund 41; Lund, 1946) 128-130. This concept of the death of a righteous one indicting those guilty of his death also appears in *WisSol* 4.16–5.8.

between the Son of Man and the figure referred to in chapter 47 as “the righteous one.”<sup>134</sup> The Son of Man is revealed with “the one who had a head of days,” at the judgment of the sinners (1En 45.6–46.1). The theme of judgment is resumed at 47.3–4, where “the Head of Days” has taken his seat “on the throne of his glory,” and the blood of the righteous one has been “required in the presence of the Lord of Spirits.” The Son of Man is described at the beginning of chapter 46 as having a face “like the appearance of a man” (1En 46.1), suggesting that the author of BP thought of the Son of Man figure as a human being, and as a human being capable of suffering. There is nothing in chapter 47 that indicates the suffering of the righteous one to be a “redemptive” suffering. What the blood of 1En 47.4 must signify, according to this reading, is the indictment against those who have rejected the righteous Son of Man and have persecuted the righteous one’s community (cf. 1En 48.10). A fourth reading is possible. References to “the blood of the righteous one” and this blood being “required in the presence of the Lord of Spirits” is a later Christian interpolation, reading back into the text a reference to the execution of Jesus of Nazareth by inserting a specific figure in chapter 47 (the righteous one) and connecting this figure with the Son of Man in chapter 46 via “righteousness” in 46.3. Removal of references to “the blood of the righteous one” in chapter 47 leaves a text that makes sense.

In my opinion the first and the fourth possibilities are the most likely—the first, because nowhere in Jewish literature to this point has the blood of a human messiah

---

<sup>134</sup>James VanderKam suggests this in “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71,” 171.



figure been “required in the presence of the Lord” or in any other way, and the fourth, because later processes of Ethiopic (or possibly earlier Greek) Christian transmissions of the text very easily could have inserted the phrase, in order to draw a closer connection between the text of 1En 46–47 and Jesus of Nazareth. This argument is clarified and strengthened by the fact that the Son of Man epithet first occurs in BP at chapter 46 and appears again immediately following 47.1-4 in 48.1-7 where the Son of Man is named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits. That later Christian scribes might draw by interpolation the connection between the “righteous one” of BP and the Son of Man of the Gospel traditions in such a way seems plausible.

A fourth reference to the Righteous One occurs in chapter 53. The Righteous One is identified with the Chosen One (1En 53.6) in a context of eschatological judgment.<sup>135</sup> Enoch sees the angels of punishments preparing “all the instruments of Satan,” to punish “the kings and the mighty of this earth” (1En 53.3-5). After the kings and the mighty of the earth perish, “the Righteous and Chosen One will cause the house of his congregation to appear” (1En 53.6).

## 2.C.i.g. *The Divine Name*

The epithet “name of the Lord of Spirits” appears to be a reference to the messiah figure in BP.<sup>136</sup> Nowhere in BP is the name explicitly identified. Knowledge of the name is

---

<sup>135</sup>See James VanderKam, “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71,” 171.

<sup>136</sup>I include the Name of the Lord of Spirits in my analysis of the messiah figure in BP because of its apparent identification with the Son of Man. There are twenty-six references to the Name of the Lord of Spirits in BP (with two occurrences in 61.9). See 1En 39.7, 9; 40.6; 41.2; 43.4; 45.1, 2; 46.6, 7, 8; 47.2c;

assumed by the authors of BP. It would seem a fair assumption that this name is the divine name, the tetragram, *hwhy*.<sup>137</sup> It was common in Second Temple period texts to provide some sort of locution in place of the divine name *hwhy*.<sup>138</sup> It seems reasonable to assume that the same practice is employed in BP, since nowhere in BP is the divine name explicitly written.

There are several other references to the divine name in BP, which are not expressed by the locution “name of the Lord of Spirits”—the name of the Lord (39.13; 41.8; 67.3), my glorious name (45.3), “his great name” referring to the Head of Days (55.2), the name of the eternal Lord, which is probably a synonym for the name of the Lord of Spirits (58.4), “your blessed name” and “your name” referring to the name of the Lord of Spirits (61.11-12), and the name of the Lord of the kings (63.7).

Charles Gieschen has given a detailed analysis of the divine name as angelomorphic divine hypostasis. Gieschen points to early references to the divine name, *hwhy* ~v and ~yh| a ~v in the Hebrew Bible and makes the statement: “The phrases . . . appear in a variety of ways which are not always easily understood or categorized.”<sup>139</sup> He points out that the phrases are used in poetic parallelism “as a synonym or alternate title for *hwhy*.” He also gives evidence for a use of the name in an “instrumental sense,” for

---

48.5, 7, 10; 50.2, 3; 53.6; 55.4; 60.6; 61.3, 9, 11, 13; 69.24; 71.17.

<sup>137</sup>See the discussion by Helge Kvanvig, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 185-187.

<sup>138</sup>For examples where ••• is written in the place of the divine name *hwhy* cf. 1QS viii 14; 4Q175; 4Q176; 4Q462. For examples of paleo-Hebrew of the divine name |a see 4Q180 1.1; 4Q183; 4Q267 9 iv.4; 9 v.4; 4Q413; 5Q12 3 4-5. For examples of paleo-Hebrew for the divine name *hwhy* cf. 1Q14 1-5.1, 2; 1Q15; 1QpHab iv 17; vi 14; 4Q161 2-4.6, 9; 8-10.12, 13; 4Q171; 4Q183; 11Q5.

<sup>139</sup>*Angelomorphic Christology*, 71.

example, to ask God's help "by means of his name."<sup>140</sup> The divine name in these texts, according to Gieschen, "is not an hypostasis, but such usage contributed to the development of a Name theology and to its hypostatization in some later texts."<sup>141</sup> Gieschen then identifies texts in the Hebrew Bible where these phrases referring to the divine name are more than synonyms of *hwhy* and are used in more than an instrumental sense: ". . . they appear as independent subjects of divine action. In such cases the Name should be understood as an hypostasis."<sup>142</sup> Gieschen's analysis has a number of implications for the messiah figure in BP. Referring to 1En 48.2, Gieschen concludes that speculation about the Son of Man figure in this text being a preexistent angelomorphic figure is the result of a development stemming from the understanding in some circles that the preexistent divine name had a cosmogenic function.<sup>143</sup> This is detailed in BP at 1En 69, where the earth was created by the instrument of "the oath" which is connected to the "secret name." Gieschen identifies this with the divine name, *hwhy*.<sup>144</sup>

Parallel connections between the name of the Lord of Spirits and the Son of Man

---

<sup>140</sup>*Angelomorphic Christology*, 71.

<sup>141</sup>*Angelomorphic Christology*, 71.

<sup>142</sup>*Angelomorphic Christology*, 71. Here Gieschen references the work of O. Grether, *Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament*, BZAW 64 (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1934) 1-58; and T.N.D. Mettinger, "The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies," *ConBOT* 18 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1982)129-132.

<sup>143</sup>*Angelomorphic Christology*, 77.

<sup>144</sup>See also Jarl Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritans and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism*, *WUNT* 1/36 (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1985) 257-259.

in BP warrant some attention.<sup>145</sup> According to 1En 48.5 the Son of Man will be worshiped by all who dwell on the earth. “All who dwell on the earth will fall down and worship before him, and they will glorify and bless and sing hymns to the name of the Lord of Spirits.” In the first half, the object is “him” referring to the Son of Man of verses 2-4. In the second half the object is “the name of the Lord of Spirits.” The parallelism suggests a synonymous connection between the two objects of each colon (cp. how the Lord of Spirits is worshiped at 1En 57.3).<sup>146</sup> Note how the glorifying and the blessing and the singing of hymns “to the name of the Lord of Spirits” is immediately preceded by all who dwell on the earth falling down and worshiping “before him,” that is, before the messiah figure, the Son of Man. This same kind of parallelism occurs in 1En 46 where the Son of Man is first introduced in BP. The worship of the Son of Man is stated in the negative in this case. The Son of Man “will overturn the kings from their thrones and their kingdoms, *because they do not exalt him or praise him*, or humbly acknowledge whence the kingdom was given to them” (1En 46.4-5; emphasis added). This is paralleled in the immediately following verse: “Darkness will be their (the kings’) dwelling, and worms will be their couch, and they will have no hope to rise from their couches, *because they do not exalt the name of the Lord of Spirits*” (1En 46.6; emphasis added). The first causal phrase, “because they do not exalt him (the Son of Man) or praise him (the Son of Man)”

---

<sup>145</sup>Charles A. Gieschen draws this connection between the name of the Lord of Spirits and the Son of Man figure in BP. See his essay, “The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 238-249.

<sup>146</sup>James VanderKam uses parallelism to argue for a synonymous connection between the prayers of the righteous ones and the blood of the righteous one at 1En 47.1. See “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71,” 170-171.

parallels the second causal phrase, “because they do not exalt the name of the Lord of Spirits.” Again the parallelism between the objects of the two causal phrases suggests a synonymous connection between the Son of Man and the name of the Lord of Spirits.

### *2.C.i.h. The ‘Son of Man’ Title*

The epithet ‘Son of Man’ is clearly identified with the messiah figure in BP. There are numerous references to the Son of Man figure in BP.<sup>147</sup> Any analysis of the messiah figure in BP must be clear about what is meant by the epithet “Son of Man.” The phrase itself is not without ambiguities. Sometimes it is used to refer to a messiah figure. Other times it is used to refer to a single human being (cf. 1En 60.10 where Noah is referred to as “son of man” in a sense similar to Ezekiel’s use of this title),<sup>148</sup> or in the plural to refer to human beings in general (“sons of men”).<sup>149</sup> It is interesting to note that all of these latter references occur in what appear to be earlier traditions which have been redacted into the text of BP—a tradition about wisdom (1En 42.2), and various traditions about the

---

<sup>147</sup>See 1En 46.1-8; 48.2-7; 62.1-8, 9, 14; 63.11; 69.26-29; 70.1; 71.14, 17. It should at least be noted here that there are no uses of the epithet Son of Man anywhere in the first parable (1En 38-44), although VanderKam suggests that there are two puns on “Son of Man” in the genealogy of 37.1. See “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37-71,” 178-179. Helge Kvanvig raises the question of the identity of the Son of Man in chapter 71 by examining the various Ethiopic titles (there are three distinct ones), which are invariably translated into English as the Son of Man. On the basis of these Kvanvig argues that there should be two additional messianic titles associated with BP, namely, “Son of Adam” and “Son of the Mother of the Living.” See Kvanvig’s “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 193-195; esp. 195.

<sup>148</sup>The reference to Noah as “son of man” at 1En 60.10 is a vocative, very much akin to the “son of man” vocatives throughout the entire Book of Ezekiel. Cf., e.g., Ezk 2.1-8; 3.1-11; 4.1; 5.1; 6.1; 7.1; 8.5-17; 11.2, 15; etc.

<sup>149</sup>See the brief discussion by Sabino Chiala, “The Son of Man: The Evolution of an Expression,” *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 153-178; esp. 154-156.

watchers (1En 39.1; 69.6, 8, 12, 13). It should also be noted that the Son of Man was “chosen” by the Lord of Spirits (46.3; 48.6), which suggests an identification of the Son of Man with the Chosen One.<sup>150</sup>

Maurice Casey’s recent analysis of “Son of Man” in BP warrants some attention here.<sup>151</sup> Casey presents several examples of the use of the Aramaic term, (a)ᵛᵛᵛ(a) ᵛᵛ, in Jewish literature from the Hebrew Bible, BW, Targums, the Peshitta, and the Talmuds. Casey concludes from his survey:

Aramaic was an exceptionally stable language in its development over a period of centuries. While in most usages, nouns in the definite or determined state were used in a significantly different way from those in the indefinite or indetermined or absolute state, in generic and some other cases the matter was quite different. The use of either state was optional, for the very good reason that the use of one state or the other cannot affect the meaning of nouns which are being used generically, nor can it affect the meaning of some unique items such as the sun and the moon. The term (a)ᵛᵛᵛ(a) ᵛᵛ is a very general term for man, so many general statements using (a)ᵛᵛᵛ(a) ᵛᵛ may have it in either the definite or indefinite state.

Since (a)ᵛᵛᵛ(a) ᵛᵛ is a general term for human beings as a whole, it may be used with reference to all basic human experiences, including death. (a)ᵛᵛᵛ(a) ᵛᵛ may also be used indefinitely with reference to a particular individual. This use is not however recorded with reference to the speaker, and the only general level of meaning is that the individual is a human being, which may be of central importance or somewhat incidental.

I have found over 30 examples of general statements using (a)ᵛᵛᵛ(a) ᵛᵛ with reference to the speaker, or a group of people including the speaker, or someone else made obvious by the context. . . . It follows that when examples of this idiomatic usage emerge from the reconstruction of Aramaic sources from our Gospel sayings, they should be accepted as genuine examples of this idiom. This

---

<sup>150</sup>See James VanderKam, “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71,” 172.

<sup>151</sup>Maurice Casey, *The Solution to the ‘Son of Man’ Problem*, Library of New Testament Studies 343, Mark Goodacre, ed. (London: T. & T. Clark, 2007) 91-111.

will entail that they have to some extent a kind of general level of meaning.<sup>152</sup>

Casey's methodology, in this section of his analysis at least, is correct. He analyzes the expression, (a)ⲓⲗⲁⲓ ⲓⲃ, linguistically and he reads the expression in the varying contexts in which it appears. The problem with Casey's conclusion, however, is that he has excluded from his analysis (in this particular segment of his book) uses of the term "son of man" in BP. Casey analyzes the "son of man" figure in BP in a later segment of his book.

Before analyzing the "son of man" in BP, Casey surveys the interpretation of Daniel 7.14 in the Syrian Christian tradition and in Jerome's commentary on Daniel. He demonstrates that there were essentially two strands of interpretation of Daniel 7 in early Christian thought, the Syrian tradition that read the "son of man" in 7.14 as a symbol of the people of Israel, and Jerome who read the "son of man" in 7.14 as a messiah figure. After surveying the evidence, including his careful reading of Daniel 7, Casey concludes: "It follows that Daniel 7 itself does not provide any kind of evidence of the existence of a Son of Man Concept in Second Temple Judaism."<sup>153</sup> Casey then analyzes the evidence in BP. He begins his analysis by highlighting what he considers later Christian usage of the term "Son of man" as a conceptual fabrication that reads Gospel references back into BP,

---

<sup>152</sup>*The Solution to the 'Son of Man' Problem*, 80-81. This is the conclusion to Casey's analysis of Aramaic texts containing the expression (a)ⲓⲗⲁⲓ ⲓⲃ on pages 56-81.

<sup>153</sup>*The Solution to the 'Son of Man' Problem*, 82-91; esp. 91.

using as evidence the first English translation of BP by R. Laurence in 1821.<sup>154</sup>

For example, in the first English translation in 1821, Laurence expressed the opinion that this work repeatedly refers to the nature and character of ‘the Messiah’, even though the term *mas(h)ihu* occurs only twice (1En. 48.10; 52.4). This was because the term ‘Messiah’ was so widespread in the Judaeo-Christian tradition that it was the natural term for scholars such as Laurence to use when they sought to label this figure.<sup>155</sup>

By dismissing the importance of the term “messiah” in BP because it “occurs only twice,” Casey establishes quantitative value as part of his methodology for his analysis of the “son of man” expression in BP. This is problematic, however, because in his survey of Aramaic usage in Jewish documents, quantitative value, or number of occurrences in a single document, was not part of his methodology. This renders the methodology Casey employs for his analysis of BP inconsistent with the rest of his approach. Casey then questions the capitalization of the phrase “son of man” in early translations by Laurence, Hoffman, Dillman, and Charles, insisting that their translations read back into the text a later Christianized messianic concept. Casey even quotes R.H. Charles who confidently stated: “‘The Son of Man’ was ‘a definite title’, and ‘the source of the New Testament designation’.”<sup>156</sup> This is the central criticism of Casey’s study. Casey excoriates previous scholars of BP who assumed some connection to the Greek phrase, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*,

---

<sup>154</sup>R. Laurence, *The Book of Enoch the Prophet ... now first translated from an Ethiopic manuscript in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford: Parker, 1821).

<sup>155</sup>*The Solution to the ‘Son of Man’ Problem*, 92.

<sup>156</sup>*The Solution to the ‘Son of Man’ Problem*, 93.



and the Ethiopic “son of man”. Casey even makes the absolute claim: “There is however no evidence that there ever was a Greek version of the *Similitudes of Enoch*.”<sup>157</sup> Casey is quite right about this. He also states: “The Greek versions of some parts of *1 Enoch* are very valuable, but there is no trace of a Greek version of the *Similitudes*.”<sup>158</sup> This is after Casey has claimed that the original text of BP was in Aramaic, basing his assertion on the presence of Aramaic fragments of other Enochic texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls. “There should be no doubt that this source was in Aramaic. We now know from the Dead Sea Scrolls that most of *1 Enoch* was written in Aramaic, because this is the language of the extant fragments.”<sup>159</sup> While Casey is willing to allow for an Aramaic original of BP based on extant fragments of other Enochic texts found at Qumran, even though BP itself was not found at Qumran and even though there are no extant Aramaic fragments of BP, he is not willing to allow for the possibility that there might have been a Greek version of BP with  $\theta \text{ ui} \circ \text{j} \text{ tou/ anqrwpou}$  as a translation of the Aramaic phrase (a)VII(a) rb, and which would have formed the basis for the expression,  $\theta \text{ ui} \circ \text{j} \text{ tou/ anqrwpou}$ , in the canonical Gospels. Casey simply dismisses this, even ridicules it, as a possibility. Casey is inconsistent in his approach on this point. While much of Casey’s analysis focuses on the hard data of Aramaic and Ethiopic sources, Casey’s argument is primarily rhetorical, manipulating the evidence into the corner of his assumption, namely, that the phrase “son of man” in BP is not titular, but only reflects the Aramaic use of (a)VII(a) rb, as a

---

<sup>157</sup>*The Solution to the ‘Son of Man’ Problem*, 93.

<sup>158</sup>*The Solution to the ‘Son of Man’ Problem*, 97.

<sup>159</sup>*The Solution to the ‘Son of Man’ Problem*, 95-96.

generalized reference to a human being, that Casey is willing to allow. Casey then details some of the Ethiopic texts referring to the “son of man” figure, retrofitting these texts into Casey’s “properly reconstructed” version of a possible Aramaic *Grundschrift*.<sup>160</sup> Casey’s conclusion to this entire segment makes the claim:

The study of the *Similitudes of Enoch* has been made very difficult by the fact that it has survived only in Ge‘ez, and in a very corrupt textual tradition at that. Careful study of Aramaic source material which can be recovered from the oldest manuscripts has shown that (a)𐤓(a) 𐤓b was used in the original text of this work in the same way as it is used in extant Aramaic texts, as a normal term for ‘man’.<sup>161</sup>

Casey’s conclusion regarding the “son of man” in BP is problematic for several reasons. Casey demonstrates that he misunderstands that 1 Enoch is a compilation of documents composed between the fourth (probably the fifth) and the first centuries BCE. At the very least Casey has ignored this crucial fact in his analysis of the “son of man” in BP. Casey also does not take into consideration what might be viewed as a development of mediatorial traditions of a growing diversity within Enochic Judaism. While Casey draws on Aramaic evidence in Enochic texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls to define the use of “son of man” in BP, no fragment of BP was found at Qumran, which suggests that its authors were not connected to, and very likely in ideological opposition to, the community that

---

<sup>160</sup>*The Solution to the ‘Son of Man’ Problem*, 97-110.

<sup>161</sup>*The Solution to the ‘Son of Man’ Problem*, 114.

produced the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>162</sup> If the “study of the *Similitudes of Enoch* has been made very difficult by the fact that it has survived only in Ge‘ez,” as Casey claims, this in any case does not excuse us from making sense of the “son of man” expression as we have it in BP. The very premise on which Casey makes his study, that an Aramaic expression, (א)מִן(א) רַב, underlies the Greek expression, ο υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, as we have it in the Gospels, does not prevent Casey from engaging in a detailed, in depth analysis elsewhere in his study. But when it comes to the “son of man” in BP, when the evidence unravels Casey’s thesis, Casey is prepared to ignore the evidence or treat it differently from his treatment of the evidence in other primary sources.

The fact that Casey’s analysis began with the assumption that there can be only one legitimate use of a particular phrase or term, and that there can be no development of its use by different authors at different times (or even in the same period) is problematic. Here one only needs to examine the different uses of the term δικαιοῦν in the Letters of Paul and in the Letter of James (2.24). While Paul insisted that a person is justified apart from the works of the law, James used the term δικαιοῦν to make the claim that a person *demonstrates* by his actions that he has been justified.<sup>163</sup> Casey begins his analysis by presenting the development of later Christian understanding of the phrase “son of man” and how this did not at all correspond to the use of the phrase in earlier Jewish texts. This

---

<sup>162</sup>Much has been made of this observation in the past. The absence of BP from the Dead Sea Scrolls, among other reasons, led Josef T. Milik to date BP much later, early second century CE, than most scholars today will date it. See the discussion by Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*, 131-132, 144-149.

<sup>163</sup>Both of these uses of δικαιοῦν appear in 1 Clement 30.3 and 38.2.

demonstrates the prejudice of Casey's analysis from the beginning. He is certainly correct in the sense that we must not read the theology of later Christian fathers back into earlier Jewish texts. That does not preclude, however, the possibility that there could be different uses of the phrase by different Jewish authors from roughly the same period. Even within BP itself, as demonstrated above, there were three uses of the phrase "son of man," one with reference to an individual human being, one with reference to humanity in general<sup>164</sup> — the only two uses Casey accepts in all texts—and one with reference to the messiah figure. The use of the phrase as a reference to an individual human being or to humanity in general does not preclude the use of the phrase as a reference to the messiah figure.

As detailed as Casey's analysis is, his study still begs the question whether the Aramaic (a)ṣṣ(a) rb can only be a generalized reference to a human being also in BP. In his analysis of 1En 48.2-7a, Casey does mention (only parenthetically) that the preexistence of the "son of man" figure is strongly implied at 1En 48.3, but he uncharacteristically offers no detailed discussion.<sup>165</sup> Preexistence is an attribute that in no way can be admitted as part of ordinary human experience, an attribute of the "son of man" figure in BP that essentially undermines Casey's complex and detailed argument. Casey also ignored a key biblical text midrashed in BP that identifies the "son of man" figure as more than human. Casey does not deal with Ezekiel 1 anywhere in his analysis. Ezekiel 1 describes the prophet's experience by the river Chebar during the exile (Ezk

---

<sup>164</sup>Casey uses 1En 22.3 as evidence for his understanding of 'son of man' throughout BP. *The Solution to the Son of Man Problem*, 63.

<sup>165</sup>*The Solution to the 'Son of Man' Problem*, 101.

1.1). There Ezekiel claims, “I saw visions of God.” The description of the vision begins with “a stormy wind” coming out of the north (Ezk 1.4). It is a theophanic description reminiscent of the glory of YHWH at the time of the exodus from Egypt. Ezekiel describes “a huge cloud and rolling fire, and brightness surrounding it, and in the midst of the fire something like a flash of metal” (Ezk 1.4). There is then a description of “a likeness of four living beings (twyx [bra twmd). And this was their appearance (!hyarm): they had a likeness of a human being (hnhl -da twmd), and each one had four faces, and each one of them had four wings” (Ezk 1.5-6). The text then provides detailed descriptions of the four living creatures, followed by a description of wheels encircled by eyes that accompany the movements of the four creatures. After this there is a description of two levels projected above the heads of the four creatures. “And over the heads of the living beings was the likeness of a firmament ([yqr hyxh yvar-l [ twmdw), flashing like ice, as a spreading flame over their heads, right on top of them” (Ezk 1.22). This is followed by a description of another level above the firmament, inhabited by another figure who is distinct from the four living beings.

And immediately above the firmament which was over their heads there was a likeness of a throne (ask twmd), with the appearance of a sapphire. And above the likeness of the throne (askh twmd) was a likeness with the appearance of a human being (-da harmk twmd) upon it, right on top of it. And I saw a flash of metal with the appearance of fire (va-harmk) within it, around what appeared to be his waste upward, and from what appeared to be his waste downward I saw as to its appearance fire (va-harmk), and brightness around him. Like the appearance of the bow (tvqh harmk) that is in the cloud on a rainy day, so was the appearance of the brightness (hqnk harm !k) all around (Ezk 1.26-28).

Then the prophet makes the identification of what he has just seen with the divine presence: “the appearance itself being a likeness of the glory of YHWH” (twmd harm aw hwhy-dwbk – Ezk 1.28; cf. also 3.12, 23). The repeated references to “a likeness” (twmd) and “what had the appearance of” (harm) was obviously the prophet’s attempt to describe a phenomenon that had no earthly reality. Ezekiel saw “a likeness with the appearance of a human being (-da harmk twmd),” which he equated with “the appearance . . . of a likeness of the glory of YHWH” (hwhy-dwbk twmd harm).

Casey ignored this text in his analysis, even though Ezekiel 1 is one of the central biblical texts, in addition to Daniel 7, for understanding the “son of man” figure in BP. Not only is Ezekiel 1 an essential part of the midrash on the messiah figure in 1En 46, as was pointed out in the analysis above (see 2.C.i.c.), it is also to be considered in what follows in chapters 48 and 49. Following the detailed description of the messiah figure in 1En 46.1-6 is a description of the kings and the strong ones of the earth who are punished by the messiah figure “because they do not exalt the name of the Lord of Spirits” (1En 46.6-8). This is then followed in chapter 47 by the contrasting description of the “prayers of the righteous” and “the holy ones who dwell in the heights of heaven” who were unanimously “glorifying and praising and blessing the name of the Lord of Spirits” (1En 47.1-2c). Following this is a description of a judgment scene and Enoch’s vision of the Head of Days taking his seat on the throne of his glory, “and the books of the living were opened in his presence, and all his host, which was in the heights of heaven, and his court, were standing in his presence” (1En 47.2d-3). This is a midrash of Daniel 7.9-10 which, like 1En 47.2d-3, includes the Ancient of Days (Head of Days in BP) seated on his

throne, the gathering of his court, and the opening of “the books.” Following this judgment scene in chapter 47 is a lengthy and detailed description of the messiah figure in chapter 48. This is introduced by a reference to the “spring of righteousness” and the “many springs of wisdom” and the access the righteous have to this wisdom (1En 48.1).<sup>166</sup> This is then immediately followed by a description of the preexistent “son of man,” who “was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits . . . before the sun and the constellations were created, before the stars of heaven were made” (1En 48.2). The Son of Man figure is then described in strong messianic terms reminiscent of Isaiah (Is 11.2; 49.5-10).

He will be a staff for the righteous,  
that they may lean on him and not fall;  
And he will be the light of the nations,  
and he will be a hope for those who grieve in their hearts.  
All who dwell on the earth will fall down and worship  
before him,  
and they will glorify and bless and sing hymns to the  
name of the Lord of Spirits.  
For this (reason) he was chosen and hidden in his presence  
before the world was created and forever.  
And the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits has revealed him to  
the holy and the righteous;  
for he has preserved the portion of the righteous.  
For they have hated and despised this age of  
unrighteousness;  
Indeed, all its deeds and its ways they have hated in the  
name of the Lord of Spirits.  
For in his name they are saved,  
and he is the vindicator of their lives (1En 48.4-7).

---

<sup>166</sup>Philo, *Fug* 177–201.

The same themes of springs of water and the concept of a figure that is chosen and hidden in Isaiah 49 are also included in 1En 48 in the description of the messiah figure. This is followed by a description of the dejected attitude of the kings and “the strong who possess the earth” at the time of their judgment (1En 48.8-10). This includes the first explicit reference to the “Anointed One” in BP: “And on the day of their distress . . . there will be no one to take them with his hand and raise them. For they have denied the Lord of Spirits and his Anointed One” (1En 48.10). This clearly refers to Psalm 2 where the kings of the earth and the rulers are described as conspiring “against YHWH and against his anointed” (Ps 2.2). Then follows a description of the glory of the Chosen One in the presence of the Lord of Spirits.

For wisdom has been poured out like water,  
 and glory will not fail in his presence forever and ever.  
 For he is mighty in all the secrets of righteousness;  
 and unrighteousness will vanish like a shadow,  
 and will have no place to stand.  
 For the Chosen One has taken his stand in the presence of  
 the Lord of Spirits;  
 and his glory is forever and ever,  
 and his might, to all generations (1En 49.1-2).

Here the statement that “the Chosen One has taken his stand in the presence” of the divine figure is an accurate depiction of the scene in Daniel 7.13-14, where the one like a son of man is summoned to stand before YHWH and is not sitting on one of the thrones in the court of the Ancient of Days. This is notable because in the immediate context of chs. 48 and 49 of BP the Chosen One does not sit on a throne. It is the Head of Days who



is seated on his throne in heaven (1En 47.3). The Chosen one is not seated on the throne until 1En 51.3. It should also be noted that the author of BP had a tendency to conflate the images of Ezekiel 1 and Daniel 7, and that the references to the divine figure's glory in this text are clearly intended to recall the angelomorphic figure of Ezekiel 1.

There appear to be two layers of tradition in the block of material between 1En 45.1–51.5b. One layer of tradition involves the Chosen One. This includes an introduction, three segments that have been separated by a redactor, and a conclusion: introduction (45.1-6 and 46.7-8), segment 1 (47.1-4), segment 2 (48.8-10), segment 3 (50.1-5), and conclusion (51.1-5b). All of these sections are connected by the Chosen One sitting on the throne (1En 45.3 and 51.3), which seems to bookend this part of the second parable. They are also connected by references to the salvation of the persecuted righteous ones and the judgment of the sinners and the unrepentant. All of the sections, 47.1-4, 48.8-10, and 50.1-5, are introduced by the phrase, "In those days . . . ." And the concluding section also is introduced by, "In those days . . . ." These sections, with the introduction to the second parable at 45.1-6, constitute the earlier strand of tradition regarding the Chosen One. It should also be noted that the reference to the "Anointed One" at 1En 48.10 is part of the earlier tradition. Inserted into this earlier strand of tradition regarding the Chosen One are later redactions that link wisdom to the "Son of Man" figure (46.1-6; 48.1-7; 49.1-4). While the Chosen One in the rest of BP is in fact a heavenly figure who sits on the throne of the divine figure and executes judgment, nowhere is the Chosen One referred to as preexistent or connected to wisdom in any way. I take the reference to wisdom going forth from the mouth of the Chosen One as he sits

on the throne in 51.3 to be part of the later redaction that attempted to connect the Son of Man messiah figure with wisdom.<sup>167</sup>

Having established the relationships between these layers of tradition in the first half of the second parable, this brings us back to 1En 49.1-4, especially 49.1-2 where “wisdom is poured out like water” and “the Chosen One has taken his stand in the presence of the Lord of Spirits.” While there is not a direct link to Ezekiel 1 and the glory of YHWH described there, the references to glory and the heavenly figure, the Chosen One, in 1En 49 are strongly suggestive of Ezekiel 1 and the more-than-human heavenly figure described there. Maurice Casey, in his analysis of 1En 62.1-9, acknowledges that the Chosen One is to be equated with the “son of man” figure. “Given the context, it is clear that throughout this passage the term ‘son of man’ refers to the “Chosen One.”<sup>168</sup> The move from “a likeness with the appearance of a human being” in Ezekiel to “one like a son of man” in Daniel to “son of man” in BP is intended to present a messiah figure who possesses all the attributes of Ezekiel 1 and Daniel 7, but who is now identified by the more abbreviated Aramaic (translated into Ethiopic) locution, “son of man.” It is in effect a move from the more generalized Aramaic expression, (a)ṣl(a) rb, to one that has a specialized meaning in BP, without losing the usage of the expression in its general sense elsewhere.

In some respects Casey is guilty of the very thing he criticizes. While Christian

---

<sup>167</sup>This also appears to be what has happened in 1En 39.6-8 where Enoch’s preexistence is connected to the figure of the Chosen One.

<sup>168</sup>*The Solution to the ‘Son of Man’ Problem*, 102.

tradition has read back into the “son of man” expression in BP the christological interpretations of second-century fathers, Casey reads forward into the “son of man” expression in BP only a single, specific use of the phrase (ܐ)ܘܢܢ(ܐ) ܪܒ in other Aramaic texts. Casey has not taken into consideration the important evidence that the “son of man” expression in BP is developed by midrashing Ezekiel 1 as well as Daniel 7.

Regarding the nature of the messiah figure, according to BP the messiah figure is both a human being identified with the patriarch Enoch and a heavenly being. The messiah figure is preexistent in relation to creation. The messiah figure is closely associated with wisdom. The messiah figure is righteous. The messiah figure is connected to the divine name through the epithet “name of the Lord of Spirits.” And the messiah figure is given the titular epithet “Son of Man.”

### **2.C.ii. Functions of the Messiah Figure in the *Parables of Enoch***

Concerning the functions of the messiah figure in BP, there is plenty of evidence that lends itself to detailed analysis. The purpose of this analysis is to identify specific functions of the messiah figure which may be compared to the functions of the divine figure in BP (and which in chapter four of the dissertation will be compared to the functions of the messiah figure in the Letters of Paul). Such a comparison will help us to understand in precise detail the relationship between the messiah figure and the divine figure in BP. Functions of the messiah figure in BP may be identified in terms of revelation of wisdom, salvation, judgment, and worship.

2.C.ii.a. *Revelation of Wisdom*

One of the functions of the messiah figure in BP is the revelation of wisdom to humans. From the beginning of BP it is clear that the author wants the reader to read this as a wisdom text—“The vision of wisdom that Enoch saw . . . This is the beginning of the words of wisdom, which I took up to recount to those who dwell on the earth. . . . let us not withhold the beginning of wisdom. . . . Until now there had not been given from the presence of the Lord of spirits such wisdom as I have received according to my insight” (1En 37.1-5).<sup>169</sup> Surprisingly, after the introductory section there are only a few references to wisdom in BP that are directly related to the messiah figure. The Son of Man will reveal “all the treasures of what is hidden” (1En 46.3; cf. 60.10). The Son of Man is revealed by wisdom (1En 48.7). The spirit of wisdom dwells in the Chosen One (1En 49.3). The Lord of Spirits has given to the Chosen One “all the secrets of wisdom” which “will go forth from the counsel of his mouth” (1En 51.3). Regardless of the fact that wisdom is only rarely mentioned in connection with the messiah figure in BP, the revelation of wisdom to humans is clearly one of the functions of the messiah figure. According to Gabriele Boccaccini it is possible to read the concept of wisdom and its relation to the messiah figure in BP as a response to the earlier traditions about wisdom found in *Sirach* and the *Wisdom of Solomon*. In the *Wisdom of Solomon* wisdom takes a direct salvific role, while in *Sirach* wisdom’s salvific role is indirect, realized through observance of the priestly law. Boccaccini suggests that a “scenario of integration of

---

<sup>169</sup>On wisdom as a conceptual paradigm related to the messiah figure in BP, see G. Boccaccini, “Finding a Place for the Parables of Enoch within Second Temple Jewish Literature,” 274-277.

Sapiential and Messianic Paradigms seems to be the most likely setting for the composition of the Parables of Enoch.”<sup>170</sup> Boccaccini observes that BP preserves “the earlier Enochic tradition that Enoch is the recipient of revelation and the messenger of revealed wisdom for the chosen.” The preservation of the earlier tradition

creates an internal tension within the Enochic system, due to the presence of two mediators (Enoch and the Messiah) who are both in heaven and are both recipients and revealers of wisdom. This tension (and the danger of a disruptive competition between the two revealers) is finally resolved by identifying Enoch with the Son of Man (71.14). Now we can have a better understanding why Enoch received and will reveal wisdom — it is because he is the Messiah.<sup>171</sup>

The identification of Enoch with the Son of Man, in my opinion, does not resolve the tension; it only highlights the tension, as recent scholarly discussion about the relationship between 1En 71.14 and the rest of BP demonstrates. As I have already argued above, the tension is resolved by BP in a more subtle way. In order to identify Enoch with the messiah figure, Enoch must be more than a recipient of revelation who then reveals wisdom to others. BP attempts to make the identification of Enoch with the messiah Son of Man more palpable by attempting to associate the human Enoch with preexistent wisdom. Boccaccini argues: “Although the language of wisdom may have influenced the concept of the preexistence and role of the Son of Man, in the Parables neither the Messiah Son of Man nor Enoch is identified with the divine Wisdom of God. The

---

<sup>170</sup>Boccaccini, “Finding a Place for the Parables of Enoch within Second Temple Jewish Literature,” 276.

<sup>171</sup>Boccaccini, “Finding a Place for the Parables of Enoch within Second Temple Jewish Literature,” 276-277.

heavenly Enoch is the herald and messenger of the divine Wisdom, not its incarnation.”<sup>172</sup> Boccaccini is correct to point out that the association of Enoch with wisdom in BP does not constitute an “incarnation” of wisdom. The language of BP is not an attempt to lower wisdom to dwell among humans (1En 42.1-3). It is an attempt to exalt the human Enoch who must be stripped of his flesh and his spirit transformed (1En 71.11), in order for him finally to attain to his heavenly dwelling (which has been his all along from the beginning). This is the opposite of “incarnation.” Then and only then can Enoch be identified with the messiah figure, the Son of Man (1En 71.14), and consequently function in his role as revealer of wisdom.

*2.C.ii.b. Salvation*

Salvation is another key function of the messiah figure in BP. While this might seem to be an obvious function of the messiah figure in BP, it warrants a brief look. The role of salvation is evident in the description of the messiah figure in chapter 48, where the Son of Man’s name was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits (1En 48.2). This is followed by a description of the messiah figure who is the subject of several statements. (This passage was already quoted above, but it is necessary to quote it again here to make a different point.)

He will be a staff for the righteous,  
that they may lean on him and not fall;

---

<sup>172</sup>Boccaccini, “Finding a Place for the Parables of Enoch within Second Temple Jewish Literature,” 277.

And he will be the light of the nations,  
 and he will be a hope for those who grieve in their hearts.  
 All who dwell on the earth will fall down and worship  
 before him,  
 and they will glorify and bless and sing hymns to the  
 name of the Lord of Spirits.  
 For this (reason) he was chosen and hidden in his presence  
 before the world was created and forever.  
 And the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits has revealed him to  
 the holy and the righteous;  
 for he has preserved the portion of the righteous.  
 For they have hated and despised this age of  
 unrighteousness;  
 Indeed, all its deeds and its ways they have hated in the  
 name of the Lord of Spirits.  
 For in his name they are saved,  
 and he is the vindicator of their lives (1En 48.4-7).

Here, the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits has revealed the messiah figure to the holy and the righteous. This revelation of the messiah figure leads the holy and the righteous to hate the deeds of the age of unrighteousness “in the name of the Lord of Spirits. For in his name they are saved” (1En 48.7).

A similar eschatological judgment scenario is described in chapter 50, where having a repentant disposition is connected to the righteous having salvation “in the name of the Lord of Spirits.”

In those days a change will occur for the holy and chosen,  
 and the light of days will dwell upon them,  
 and glory and honor will return to the holy,  
 On the day of distress, evil will be stored up against the  
 sinners.  
 But the righteous will conquer in the name of the Lord  
 of Spirits;

And he will show (this) to the others,  
 so that they repent and abandon the works of their  
 hands.  
 And they will have honor in the presence of the Lord of  
 Spirits,  
 and in his name they will be saved;  
 and the Lord of Spirits will have mercy on them,  
 for great is his mercy.

But he is upright in his judgment,  
 and in the presence of his glory unrighteousness will not  
 stand;  
 at his judgment the unrepentant will perish in his presence,  
 “And hereafter I will have no mercy on them,” says the  
 Lord of Spirits (1En 50.1-5).

This salvation “in the name of the Lord of Spirits” is a product of the mercy of the Lord of Spirits toward his repentant righteous ones.

One last reference to the salvation of the righteous and the chosen should be examined. This occurs at 1En 62.13, after it is revealed to the kings and the mighty of the earth that the Chosen One is seated on the throne of the divine figure to execute their judgment (1En 62.1-2). The word that goes forth from the mouth of the Chosen One “will slay all the sinners, and all the unrighteous will perish from his presence” (1En 62.2). The kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who possess the earth will experience pain and they will be terrified when they recognize the Chosen One on the throne, and the Chosen One will judge them (1En 62.3-8). Following their judgment, the Lord of Spirits will demand that they depart from his presence, in spite of their petitions for his mercy, and he will deliver them to the angels for punishment (1En 62.9-12; cf. also 63.5-8). This entire scene is described as salvation for the righteous and chosen (1En 62.13).



And the righteous and the chosen will be saved on that day;  
 and the faces of the sinners and the unrighteous they will  
 henceforth not see.  
 And the Lord of Spirits will abide over them,  
 and with that son of man they will eat,  
 and they will lie down and rise up forever and ever (1En 62.13-14).

Based on the evidence we can also say that salvation is one of the functions of the messiah figure in BP. This salvation, in each of the texts cited above, is connected to the messiah figure's role in the eschatological judgment.

#### *2.C.ii.c. Judgment*

The messiah figure in BP functions in the role of judgment. The Righteous One will appear in the presence of the righteous at the time of judgment (1En 38.2). The Chosen One will sit on the throne of glory on "the day of affliction and tribulation" (1En 45.2-3; 51.3; 55.4; 61.8; 62.1-3). The Son of Man sits on the throne of glory (1En 62.5; 69.27, 29). The Chosen One "will judge the things that are secret" (1En 49.1-4; 61.8-9).

Matthew Black referring to 1En 61.8 writes: "for it is in this apocalypse that a truly remarkable development in the 'divine judgment' traditions of Judaism is placed on record: *the Lord of spirits enthrones the Elect Son of Man on the Judgment-Throne*" (emphasis original).<sup>173</sup> Black discusses the development of the messiah figure's session to

---

<sup>173</sup>See Black, "The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch: Their Date and Contribution to Christological Origins," 152-153. Helge Kvanvig discusses the close connections between Daniel 7.1-10, 13-14 and 1En 14.18-25. The use of Daniel 7 and the enthronement motif in BP must be understood as a development via BW. Helge S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, vol. 61 (Oslo: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988) 558-564.

the throne, beginning with 1En 14 where it is God who sits on the throne, to 1En 47.3 and 60.2 where it is the Lord of Spirits/Head of Days who sits on the throne, to the subsequent throne visions in BP where it is the Chosen One or the Son of Man who sits/is seated on the throne. Christopher Rowland also referred to the seating of the messiah figure on the throne in BP as a significant development.

When reference is made to the throne of glory, one is probably right in assuming that this is the throne of God himself, and it is this throne upon which the Son of Man/Elect One sits in judgement over the kings of the earth. The fact that there is a transference of the throne of glory from God to another figure indicates a development of some significance. . . . The transference of the session on the throne of glory is not the only attribute of God taken over by the Son of Man/Elect One. The role of judgement is now exercised by the Son of Man/Elect One (though God still has a part to play in chapter 62.10ff.).<sup>174</sup>

There are two references in BP where it is the divine figure who sits on a throne in heaven. The first reference in BP to the divine figure sitting on a throne in heaven is a midrash on Daniel 7 at 1En 47.3 where Enoch sees “the Head of Days as he took his seat on the throne of his glory.” The books were opened and the judgment took place. The second reference in BP to the divine figure sitting on a throne in heaven is at 1En 60.2 where “the Head of Days was sitting on the throne of his glory.” Both of these references to the divine figure sitting “on the throne of his glory” come in contexts where judgment is taking place.

There are nine references in BP to the messiah figure sitting on a throne in

---

<sup>174</sup>*The Open Heaven*, 105-106.

heaven. The first such reference is at 1En 45.3 where “on that day my Chosen One will sit on the throne of glory” (1En 45.1-3). The second reference in BP to the messiah figure sitting on a throne in heaven is at 1En 51.3. Following the direct speech of the Lord of Spirits at 1En 50.5, chapter 51 continues the speech of the Lord of Spirits in the first person: “For in those days my Chosen One will arise . . . . And the Chosen One, in those days, will sit upon my throne” (1En 51.5a, 3). According to BP the Chosen One explicitly sits on the throne that belongs to the Lord of Spirits. The Chosen One is not just standing before the throne (as is the figure in Daniel 7), nor is it a separate throne. It is the throne of the Lord of Spirits on which the Chosen One sits. BP then describes the role of the Chosen One in terms of “all the secrets of wisdom” going “forth from the counsel of his mouth” (1En 51.3). The third reference is at 1En 55.4 where “my Chosen One . . . will sit on the throne of glory and judge Azazel.” The fourth reference in BP to the messiah figure sitting on a throne in heaven is at 1En 61.8 where “the Lord of Spirits seated the Chosen One upon the throne of glory.” The fifth reference is at 1En 62.2 where “the Lord of Spirits <seated him> [the Chosen One] upon the throne of his glory.” The sixth reference is at 1En 62.3 where “he [the Chosen One] sits on the throne of his glory.” The seventh reference is at 1En 62.5 where the unrighteous will “see that son of man sitting on the throne of glory.” The eighth reference is at 1En 69.27 where “that son of man . . . sat on the throne of his glory.” And the ninth reference in BP to the messiah figure sitting on a throne in heaven is at 1En 69.29 where “that son of man . . . has sat down on the throne of his glory.” An incorruptible eschatological order is initiated because the Son of Man has appeared, and his word will go forth and prevail in the presence of the Lord of

Spirits. All of these references to the messiah figure sitting on a throne in heaven come in contexts where judgment is taking place.

There is one reference to the throne in heaven that does not come in a context of judgment. The twelfth and final reference in BP to a throne in heaven, “the throne of his glory,” is at 1En 71.7 where it is not with reference to anyone sitting on the throne, but with reference to the angels who guard it. We should not necessarily assume that the Head of Days is seated on the throne in this particular context. In other contexts either the divine figure or the messiah figure is depicted as sitting on the throne, in the process of sitting on the throne, or being seated on the throne. 1En 71.7 does not come in a context of judgment, but in the context of the final introduction of the eschatological age (1En 71.15).

Several points may be made of these passages. The Chosen One receives the throne from the Lord of Spirits. This is the same throne on which the Lord of Spirits sits. Unless there are two different thrones on which the Chosen One sits, which does not appear to be the case, the throne of “his glory” refers to the throne of the Lord of Spirits. Therefore, according to BP, the Chosen One and the Lord of Spirits share the same throne. The secrets of wisdom are revealed by the Chosen One from the throne. The Chosen One executes both judgment and punishment from the throne. And according to the throne language in 1En 62, the same figure sitting on the throne is referred to as both the Chosen One and the Son of Man, which would lead us to conclude that BP equates

the two figures.<sup>175</sup>

In chapter 46 there is a scene of judgment in which the Head of Days and the Son of Man play prominent roles in a midrash of Ezekiel 1 and Daniel 7. The midrash expands by explaining the role the Son of Man will play vis-à-vis the kings and the mighty of the earth (1En 46.4-8). “And this son of man whom you have seen—he will raise the kings and the mighty from their couches, and the strong from their thrones. He will loosen the reins of the strong, and he will crush the teeth of the sinners” (1En 46.4). The Son of Man will do this for three reasons: because the kings and the mighty and the strong “do not exalt him or praise him” (1En 46.5), because they commit idolatry (1En 46.7), and “because they persecute the houses of his (the Son of Man’s) congregation” (1En 46.8).<sup>176</sup> Judgment is executed when the Son of Man overthrows kings from their kingdoms because they do not exalt or praise the Son of Man (1En 46.5). These are the ones who “raise their hands against the Most High, and tread upon the earth and dwell on it” (1En 46.7). The statement that the Son of Man overthrows the kings and the mighty “because they do not exalt him or praise him” suggests that the Son of Man is exalted and praised by others, namely, those who belong to the houses of his congregation.

In chapter 62 there is a description of the Son of Man and his role in the judgment. The Lord of Spirits seats the Chosen One (= the Son of Man) “upon the throne of his glory” (1En 62.1-2, 5). The “kings and the mighty and all who possess the earth will bless

---

<sup>175</sup>This is widely recognized. See VanderKam, “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71”; and Matthew Black, “The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch: Their Date and Contribution to Christological Origins,” *The Messiah*, 148-149.

<sup>176</sup>The latter reference, to “the houses of his congregation” provides evidence for a sociologically definable community, a group, that can be identified with the composition of BP.

and glorify and exalt him who rules over all, who was hidden” (1En 62.6). They will do this because “from the beginning the son of man was hidden, and the Most High preserved him in the presence of his might, and he revealed him to the chosen” (1En 62.7). This was probably an Enochic explanation to the objection that according to the Torah there is only one God and God alone is judge. According to the Enochic point of view anyone who failed to recognize the role of the Son of Man in the judgment did so because they were not among “the chosen,” to whom the Most High had revealed the previously hidden Son of Man.

Without a single exception each reference to the Lord in BP occurs in a context of judgment. In chapter 61 the Lord of Spirits seats the Chosen One “upon the throne of glory,” and he summons “all the host of heaven and all the holy ones in the heights and the host of the Lord”—the Cherubin, the Seraphin, and the Ophannin, the angels of power and the angels of principalities, the Chosen One and “the other host who are on the land and over the water on that day” (1En 61.10). The Chosen One, who is seated upon the throne of glory, “will judge all the works of the holy ones in the heights of heaven” (1En 61.8). In chapter 62 the scene of judgment comes back around to the Lord of Spirits seating the Chosen One “upon the throne of his glory” (1En 62.1-2). But before doing this, “the Lord commanded the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who possess the earth . . . ‘Open your eyes and lift up your horns, if you are able to recognize the Chosen One.’”

One of the functions of the messiah figure in BP, which is directly related to the function of judgment, is to punish on the day of judgment those who persecute the

righteous (1En 46.4-6; 62.2; 69.27, 29). The “kings of the earth, and the strong who possess the earth” will be annihilated “because of the deeds of their hands” (1En 48.8-9). On the day of judgment no one will be able to save them, for “they have denied the Lord of Spirits and his Anointed One” (1En 48.10). Scholars adduce Psalm 2 as biblical background for this reference to the Lord of Spirits and his Anointed One.<sup>177</sup> To this should be added Psalm 11 where “YHWH is in his holy temple” and “his throne is in heaven” (Ps 11.4). From this place YHWH executes punishment against the wicked: “He will rain on the evil ones fiery embers and brimstone; a blast of burning wind as a portion” (Ps 11.6). Psalm 11 also connects YHWH with righteousness: “For righteous is YHWH; righteous acts he loves; the upright shall see his face” (Ps 11.7). There are several points of contact between this psalm and BP: temple (1En 71.5-9), throne (1En 47.3), punishment of the wicked (1En 46.1-8; 53.3-5; 63.10), and the righteous who see YHWH’s face (1En 71.9-17).

In chapter 52 Enoch sees “all the secrets of heaven that will take place” (1En 52.2). These secrets are revealed symbolically as six mountains: “a mountain of iron, and a mountain of copper, and a mountain of silver, and a mountain of gold, and a mountain of soft metal, and a mountain of lead.” The six mountains represent sources of strength for those who oppress the righteous. 1En 52.7-8 indicates that the many different kinds of metals represent wealth (gold and silver), war (iron and copper), and cultural innovations

---

<sup>177</sup>James VanderKam points out the allusion to the kings and rulers who “take counsel together against the Lord and his anointed” of Psalm 2.2. See “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71,” 171. See also Johannes Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 225; and Matthew Black, “The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch: Their Date and Contribution to Christological Origins,” 159.

(soft metal and lead), all of which the fallen watchers used to deceive humans (1En 7.1–8.2; 54.6; 64.2; 65.6-8; 67.4-7; 69.6-7). When Enoch asks the angel to explain what he has seen, the angel tells Enoch: “All these things that you have seen will serve the authority of the Anointed One, so that he may be powerful and mighty on the earth” (1En 52.4). The Anointed One will make use of the resources from the six mountains to subvert the powers of the “sinners” who oppress the righteous (1En 53.7). The Anointed One uses his authority to remove the sources of strength from the powerful (the mountains melt like wax before the Chosen One; 1En 52.6; 53.7; cf. also BW 1.6), so that “the righteous will rest from the oppression of the sinners” (1En 53.7). The function of the Anointed One is that he is denied by the kings of the earth, and he has authority to subvert (punish) those who oppress the righteous. The Lord of Spirits, speaking in the first person, addresses the “mighty kings who dwell on the earth.” At the judgment they will be required “to witness my Chosen One, how he will sit on the throne of glory and judge Azazel and all his associates and all his host in the name of the Lord of Spirits” (55.4).<sup>178</sup> It is significant that the Lord of Spirits gives this throne to the Chosen One. “And the Lord of Spirits seated the Chosen One upon the throne of glory and he will judge all the works of the holy ones in the heights of heaven, and in the balance he will weigh their deeds” (61.8). The Chosen One exercises judgment from the throne. The Chosen One also implements punishment from the throne. “And thus the Lord commanded the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who possess the earth,

---

<sup>178</sup>VanderKam refers to this particular role of the Chosen One as coming “into contact with the central Enochic myth.” See *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 138.



and he said, ‘Open your eyes and lift up your horns, if you are able to recognize the Chosen One.’ And the Lord of Spirits <seated him> upon the throne of his glory, and the spirit of righteousness was poured upon him. And the word of his mouth will slay all the sinners, and all the unrighteous will perish from his presence” (62.1-2). After this pronouncement from the Lord of Spirits, the kings of the earth respond accordingly. “And there will stand up on that day all the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who possess the earth. And they will see and recognize that he sits on the throne of his glory; and righteousness is judged in his presence, and no lying word is spoken in his presence” (62.3; cf. 49.4). The text then describes the punishment and the reaction of the kings: “And pain will come upon them as (upon) a woman in labor, when the child enters the mouth of the womb, and she has difficulty in giving birth. And one group of them will look at the other; and they will be terrified and cast down their faces, and pain will seize them when they see that son of man sitting on the throne of glory” (62.4-5). According to this text the kings, who have been called upon by the Lord of Spirits to recognize the Chosen One (1En 62.1-2), see the Son of Man sitting on the throne.

In contrast to the punishment the messiah figure will execute after the judgment, there is also salvation for the righteous. According to BP (1En 38.1-6) the Righteous One appears at the judgment, and coincident with this appearance of the Righteous One is the appearance of light for the chosen righteous ones.<sup>179</sup> After the judgment the Righteous One will cause the house of his congregation to appear and the Chosen One will dwell

---

<sup>179</sup>This appears to be a development of the tradition in BW (1En 1.8; 5.6-8) where light will shine upon the righteous and the chosen when God, the “Great Holy One,” comes forth to execute judgment on all.

among them. Near the beginning of the second parable the Lord of Spirits states: “On that day, I shall make my Chosen One dwell among them, and I shall transform heaven and make it a blessing and a light forever; and I shall transform the earth and make it a blessing” (1En 45.4). At the *eschaton*, when the Lord of Spirits transforms heaven and earth, the Chosen One will dwell among “the chosen ones and those who appeal to my glorious name” (1En 45.3). The Chosen One will arise on the day of salvation (1En 51.5a, 2). The angels will gather the righteous and there will be a resurrection of the dead on the day of the Chosen One (1En 61.5; cf. 51.1). The salvation of the righteous and chosen will be an eschatological feast with the Son of Man (1En 62.13-16). This part of the narrative contains what appears to be a common tradition of eschatological feasting with a number of common elements: an invitation to feast with the host, the elimination of those who are not worthy to participate in the feast, and a garment that makes one worthy to participate (cf. Matt 22.1-13; Lk 14.16-24). In BP the feast represents a reversal of fortune for the righteous and the chosen. Their faces were once “cast down” (1En 62.15), but they have arisen. It is the kings and the mighty whose faces were once exalted and are now cast down (1En 62.9-10, 13; see also 48.8 and 63.11; this same motif of reversal is also in Lk 1.46-55). That the kings and the mighty and the exalted of the earth petition the Son of Man for mercy suggests that they recognize the Son of Man as being capable of showing mercy (1En 62.9). In contrast to the kings and the mighty who once wore elaborate garments to display their own glory, the righteous and the chosen have put on “the garment of glory,” which BP also refers to as “the garment of life from the Lord of Spirits” (1En 62.15-16). A similar tradition connecting the garment with glory occurs in

the *Greek Life of Adam and Eve* where Satan's deception of Adam and Eve causes the two protoplasts to lose their garment of glory (*GLAE* 20.1; 21.2, 6), and hence their favorable position in relation to God. In BP, however, the garment is a metaphor for the glorified condition of the righteous and the chosen who have been "saved" from the "sinners and the unrighteous" (1En 62.13; cf. 48.7).

#### *2.C.ii.d. Worship*

One of the functions of the messiah figure in BP is to receive praise and worship.

There are two, and possibly three, explicit references to the worship of the messiah figure in BP. These three references appear at 1En 40.5, 48.5, and 62.9.

The first reference at 1En 40.5 comes in the context of Enoch ascending into heaven on a whirlwind (1En 39.3), where he sees "the dwellings of the holy ones, and the resting places of the righteous. There my eyes saw their dwellings with his righteous angels. And they were petitioning and interceding and were praying for the sons of men" (1En 39.4-5). This is the place where Enoch first sees the Chosen One (1En 39.6-8). As the angels praise the name of the Lord of Spirits, Enoch also joins in this praise (1En 39.7-10). Enoch then observes "those who sleep not" blessing and praising and exalting the Lord of Spirits with the triple *wdq* (1En 39.12). During this vision Enoch sees "thousands and thousands . . . who were standing before the glory of the Lord of Spirits" (1En 40.1). Enoch then sees four figures positioned on the four sides of the Lord of Spirits (1En 40.2). Each of these four figures was "uttering praise before the Lord of Glory" (1En 40.3). It is the second angel in the description that offers worship to the

Chosen One. “And the second voice I heard blessing the Chosen One” (1En 40.5). This particular text may in fact not be evidence of the worship of the messiah figure in BP, because the entire verse of 40.5 reads: “And the second voice I heard blessing the Chosen One and the chosen ones who depend on the Lord of Spirits.” The blessing the Chosen One receives from the angel is the same blessing that the angel also gives to humans, who are described here as “the chosen ones who depend on the Lord of Spirits.” Consequently, this particular text may not be evidence that the messiah figure is worshiped.

In chapter 48, however, there is an explicit claim by the authors of BP that the messiah figure receives worship from humans. In this chapter there is a detailed description of the messiah figure. Here BP begins its description of the messiah figure by using the metaphor of “springs of wisdom.” “In that place I saw the spring of righteousness, and it was inexhaustible, and many springs of wisdom surrounded it. And all the thirsty drank from them and were filled with wisdom” (1En 48.1). Then follows the description of the naming of the preexistent Son of Man in the presence of the Lord of Spirits (1En 48.2), which is followed by a description of the worship of the messiah figure.

He will be a staff for the righteous,  
 that they may lean on him and not fall;  
 And he will be the light of the nations,  
 and he will be a hope for those who grieve in their hearts.  
 All who dwell on the earth will fall down and worship  
 before him,  
 and they will glorify and bless and sing hymns to the  
 name of the Lord of Spirits (1En 48.4-5).

This is an explicit claim of BP that the messiah figure will receive worship from all humans.

The authors of BP also make the explicit claim that the Son of Man will be worshiped at 1En 62.9. To take this in its context, all the host of heaven and all the holy ones are gathered together to praise the name of the Lord of Spirits. The Chosen One is included in this gathering (1En 61.10). This comes in the context of the enthronement of the Chosen One for judgment in the third parable (1En 61.6-13). Following this the messiah figure, here referred to by both the epithets Chosen One and Son of Man, presides over the judgment (1En 62.1-16). The Lord of Spirits commands “the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who possess the earth” to look upon and recognize the Chosen One, whom the Lord of Spirits has seated on the throne of glory (1En 62.1-2; cf. also 55.4). When these earthly rulers see and recognize the Chosen One “sitting on the throne of glory,” it is the Son of Man they see sitting on the throne (1En 62.3, 5). The “kings and the mighty and all who possess the earth will bless and glorify and exalt him who rules over all, who was hidden” (1En 62.6). This is worship of the Son of Man that takes place after the judgment, not before. This worship does not benefit the kings and the mighty, as 1En 62.9-12 makes clear:

And all the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who rule the earth will fall on their faces in his presence; and they will worship and set their hope on that son of man, and they will supplicate and petition for mercy from him. But the Lord of Spirits himself will press them, so that they will hasten to depart from his presence . . . <And he will deliver them> to the angels for punishment, so that they may exact retribution from them for the iniquity that they did to his children and his chosen ones.

It is only the worship of those to whom the Most High has revealed the Son of Man that the Son of Man actually receives.

If the name of the Lord of Spirits is to be identified with the messiah figure, and the evidence seems to suggest this, then the present analysis should include worship that is also explicitly given to the name of the Lord of Spirits. The righteous and the chosen in heaven praise the name of the Lord of Spirits (1En 39.7). Enoch praises this name (1En 39.9). The name of the Lord of Spirits receives praise from the holy ones in heaven (1En 47.2c). All who dwell on the earth will glorify and bless and sing hymns to the name of the Lord of Spirits (1En 48.5). In BP there is also doxology to the name: “Blessed be the name of the Lord of Spirits” (1En 48.10; 61.11; 63.2-3). The archangel Gabriel prays “in the name of the Lord of Spirits” for those who dwell on the earth (1En 40.6). This is connected with being “in charge of every power” (1En 40.9). The holy ones who dwell on the earth believe in the name of the Lord of Spirits (1En 43.4). The faithful depend on the name of the Lord of Spirits (1En 46.8). And the holy and righteous have hated and despised this age of unrighteousness in the name of the Lord of Spirits and are saved in his name (1En 48.7; 50.2-3). On the other hand, the name of the Lord of Spirits is denied by sinners (41.2; 45.1-2; 46.7), and the strong do not exalt the name of the Lord of Spirits (46.6).

There are four functions of the messiah figure in BP. Functions of the messiah figure in BP may be identified in terms of revelation of wisdom, salvation, judgment, and worship.

## **2.D. Summary and Conclusions**

As small as the evidence in BP may be regarding the nature of the divine figure, a few aspects of the divine figure's nature may still be identified in terms of a heavenly nature, holiness, foreknowledge, mercy, righteousness, repentance, and eternity. Regarding the nature of the messiah figure, on the other hand, according to BP the messiah figure is both a human being identified with the patriarch Enoch and a heavenly being. The messiah figure is preexistent in relation to creation. The messiah figure is associated with wisdom; according to BP the messiah is a human being who was transformed into a preexistent heavenly being via Enoch's association with heavenly wisdom. The messiah figure is righteous. The messiah figure is connected to the divine name through the epithet "name of the Lord of Spirits." And the messiah figure is given the titular epithet "Son of Man."

There are clear similarities between the divine figure and the messiah figure in BP as regards their respective natures. Both figures are heavenly beings. Both figures are righteous. The messiah figure is connected in some way to the divine figure by means of the divine name, but it is not clear precisely what this means in terms of the nature of the messiah figure in BP.

There are also clear differences between the divine figure and the messiah figure in BP as regards their respective natures. While the messiah figure shares a heavenly nature with the divine figure, the authors of BP also understood the messiah figure to be a human being. And while the messiah figure is somehow connected to the divine figure via the divine name and through the epithet "name of the Lord of Spirits," the messiah

figure is not divine, and the divine figure clearly is not a human being.

There are a number of functions that may be identified with the divine figure in BP. The divine figure functions in the role of creator, setting in motion the movements of the sun, the moon, and the stars, controlling astronomical events, and forming the protoplast Adam. The divine figure also functions as revealer of secret and hidden wisdom to humans. The divine figure functions as the object of human and angelic worship, as the Lord of Spirits receives the prayers of the righteous, and he receives worship and praise from human and angelic beings. And the divine figure functions in the role of eschatological judge, sitting on the throne of his glory and executing punishment at the final judgment.

There are four functions of the messiah figure in BP. The messiah figure in BP functions as revealer of the secrets of wisdom to humans. The messiah figure functions in the role of bringing salvation to the righteous from the hands of unrighteous kings and those who oppress the houses of his congregation. The Son of Man sits on the throne of glory, engages in judgment, and executes punishment, exercising his authority to overthrow the kings and the mighty who oppress the righteous. It should be noted that in all previous Enochic books God alone executes judgment. Only in BP is God's judgment delegated to a messiah figure. And the Son of Man is worshiped by all who dwell on the earth.

There are similarities between the divine figure and the messiah figure as regards their respective functions. Both figures preside over the eschatological judgment. Both figures reveal wisdom to humans. And both figures receive worship from angels and



humans.

There are also differences between the divine figure and the messiah figure as regards their respective functions. While the divine figure functions as creator in BP, there are no references at all to the messiah figure functioning as creator.

The following tables (*Table-3* and *Table-4*) show the nature and functions of the divine figure and the nature and functions of the messiah figure in comparison to each other. There are three characteristics of nature that the two figures share according to BP. Both figures dwell in heaven, both figures are righteous, and both figures share the divine name. With regard to functions there are four categories in BP: creation, revelation of wisdom, judgment, and worship. The divine figure and the messiah figure share three of these broader categories: both figures reveal wisdom to humans; both figures preside over the judgment; and both figures are worshiped by angels and by humans. Within these four broader categories, however, the divine figure and the messiah figure share more detailed functions. For example, regarding the judgment, both figures sit on the throne of glory in heaven, and both figures execute punishment after the judgment. The two figures are worshiped by angels and humans. Both figures are worshiped by the kings and the mighty of the earth. And both figures are denied and scorned by the kings and the mighty of the earth.

*Table-3*      **A Comparison of the Nature of the Divine Figure and the Nature of the Messiah Figure in BP**

Nature	Divine Figure	Messiah Figure
divine	!	
heavenly being	!	!
holy	!	
foreknowing	!	
merciful	!	
righteous	!	!
repentance	!	
eternal	!	
human being		!
preexistent		!
associated with wisdom		!
divine name	!	!
like an angel		!

*Table-4*      **A Comparison of the Functions of the Divine Figure and the Functions of the Messiah Figure in BP**

Function	Divine Figure	Messiah Figure
<b>CREATION:</b>		
creator	!	
controls the astronomical order	!	
gives wind and rain to water the earth	!	
<b>REVELATION OF WISDOM:</b>		
revealer of wisdom	!	!
reveals the messiah figure to the chosen	!	
revealed to the chosen		!
<b>SALVATION:</b>		
salvation of the righteous		!
shows mercy to the righteous	!	
preserver of life through the flood	!	
<b>JUDGMENT:</b>		
sits on throne	!	!
seats messiah figure on throne of glory	!	
appears at the judgment	!	!
presides over the judgment	!	!
after the judgment, causes the house of his congregation to appear / resurrection		!
executes punishment after the judgment	!	!
has authority, to have the power and might on the earth, to subvert those who oppress the righteous		!
<b>WORSHIP:</b>		
worshiped by humans & angels	!	!
worshiped by kings & the mighty	!	!
denied and scorned by kings of the earth	!	!
receives the prayers of the righteous	!	

## CHAPTER 3

### THE MESSIAH IN THE LETTERS OF PAUL

#### 3.A. The Divine Figure in the Letters of Paul

While monotheism was one of the more dominant features of the Jewish intellectual landscape of the Second Temple period, the ideological stance of the undisputed Letters of Paul (LP) entails both a divine figure and a messiah figure as two distinct entities in heaven.<sup>180</sup> Before analyzing the messiah figure in LP, it would be helpful first to examine on its own terms the divine figure in LP. A careful examination of the nature and functions of the divine figure in LP will establish without ambiguity the relationship between the divine figure and the messiah figure in Paul's thought, and will further alleviate any ambiguity regarding the nature and functions of the divine figure and the nature and functions of the messiah figure in LP.

---

<sup>180</sup>“Monotheism” is actually a modern designation that reflects later attempts to conceptualize religious experiences as these are described in Jewish texts of the Second Temple period. The literature reveals that the issue is far more complicated than making a blanket statement that all Jews were monotheists. So I acknowledge the difficulty. It is a useful category, however, for recognizing the clear distinction between the divine figure and all other figures, including the messiah figure, in the literature of this period. Cf. the various arguments reflected in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*, Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy E.S. North eds., JSNTSS 263 (London: T. & T. Clark, 2004).

### 3.A.i. Nature of the Divine Figure in the Letters of Paul

There is very little evidence on the nature of the divine figure in LP that lends itself to detailed analysis. To some extent the nature of the divine figure in LP may be assumed. It was not a contested issue during the Second Temple period.<sup>181</sup> A few aspects of the nature of the divine figure in LP may be identified in terms of the uniqueness of the divine figure, the divine figure's deity, the divine figure as a heavenly being, and the righteousness of the divine figure.

#### 3.A.i.a. *The One God*

In three places in LP Paul articulated his concept of monotheism by referring to the divine figure as "one." In a discussion of the giving of the law in Galatians 3, Paul wrote that the law was given through an intermediary. Paul developed his discussion of the law by contrasting the law with the promise God had given to Abraham. Paul specifically referred to the uniqueness of God by stressing the mediatorial role of Moses as the recipient of the law on behalf of the people. "Why therefore the law? It was added on account of transgressions, until the seed came to whom it was promised, having been directed by angels at the hand of an intermediary. Now the intermediary is not [a mediator] of one, but God is one" (o de. mesi:thj enoj ouk estin( o de. qeoj eij estin –

---

<sup>181</sup>Paul used four epithets to refer to the divine figure: 1) qeoj or God, 2) pathr or Father or some combination of God and Father, including abba or 'Abba (the Aramaic version of Father), 3) o ktisaj or creator, and 4) kurioj or Lord; God (Ga 1.4, 20; 1Th 1.3; 3.11, 13; 1Cor 1.1, 3; 8.4; Ro 1.1, 7; 15.6; Phlp 1.2; 2.11); Father or God the Father (Ga 1.1, 3, 4; 1Th 1.1, 3; 3.11, 13; 1Cor 1.3; 8.6; 2Cor 1.2; Ro 1.7; 8.15; 15.6; Phlp 1.2; 2.11); abba o pathr or 'Abba Father (Ga 4.6; Ro 8.15); creator (Ro 1.25); and Lord (Ro 9.28). This is not an exhaustive listing. For complete lists of references to these epithets in LP one should consult a concordance.

Ga 3.19-20). Paul's reference to an "intermediary" is somewhat ambiguous. It is apparently an oblique reference to Moses who received the law on Sinai as an intermediary between God and the people (Ex 20.18-19). The point is this: in Galatians 3 Paul claimed that God was unique in relation to both angels and human beings.

In his discussion of the contrast between faith and the boasting that comes from works of the law in his Letter to the Romans, Paul argued that all are justified apart from works of the law, Jew and Gentile alike (Ro 3.28). Paul then stated that the divine figure is the God of both Jews and Gentiles: "Or is he the God of Jews only? Is he not also the God of Gentiles? Yes, also of Gentiles, since God is one (eij o` qeoj), who will justify the circumcision on the basis of faith and uncircumcision by their faith" (Ro 3.29-30). Paul used the concept of the oneness of the divine figure in order to support his claim that there are not two ways to be justified, one for Jews and one for Gentiles, but that both Jew and Gentile are justified in the same way by the same God. Paul's claim was that both Jew and Gentile are justified by their faith.

In his First Letter to the Corinthians Paul contrasted multiple "gods" and "lords" with the uniqueness of the divine figure. "Therefore, concerning the food of the idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world and that there is no God but one (o`ti outeij qeoj eiv mh. eij). For even if there are so-called gods whether in heaven or on earth, just as there are many gods and many lords, but for us there is one God the Father, from whom are all things even as we [exist] for him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things even as we [exist] through him" (a`l l v hmi`n eij qeoj o` pathr ex ou- ta. panta kai. hmeij eij auton( kai. eij kurioj vhsouj Cristoj di vou- ta. panta kai. hmeij di v autou/

– 1Cor 8.4-6). Here Paul’s claim is that the divine figure is unique among all the “so-called gods” both in heaven and on earth.<sup>182</sup> Paul also contrasted the divine figure with idols in his Letter to the Thessalonians, where Paul referred to the divine figure as living and true, the God to whom the Thessalonians had turned after abandoning idols, implying that the idols were neither living nor true (1Th 1.9; cf. Ro 3.3-4).

R.W.L. Moberly has pointed out that the term “monotheism” is problematic in historical discussions of Israelite religion.<sup>183</sup> Moberly argues that pre-exile religious traditions of Israel were not monotheistic. They were syncretistic and henotheistic. It was only in the post-exilic traditions of Second-Isaiah that a strong monotheism began to exert itself in Jewish thought. By the time of Second-Isaiah monotheism was clearly a central feature of the worship of Israel.<sup>184</sup> This must clearly be taken into account when analyzing texts from the Second Temple period, including LP. As James McGrath stated in his recent book, *The Only True God*: “Paul’s Christology is thus best understood as monotheistic in the sense that Judaism was monotheistic in this period.”<sup>185</sup>

---

<sup>182</sup>This text will be analyzed in more detail below, because it also refers to “one Lord Jesus Christ” and explicitly describes the relationship between the divine figure and the messiah figure in Paul’s thought.

<sup>183</sup>R.W.L. Moberly, “How Appropriate Is ‘Monotheism’ As a Category for Biblical Interpretation?” in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*, 216-234.

<sup>184</sup>See the discussion by James D.G. Dunn in *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 31-38; also the discussion by John J. Scullion in his article, “God in the OT,” in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 2, David Noel Freedman, ed. (New York: Doubleday, 1992) 1042-1043. Also see the discussion by Jouette M. Bassler in her article, “God in the NT,” in *ABD*, vol. 2, 1050-1052, where Bassler correctly describes Paul’s concept of the divine figure as the one God, the only God. Cf. also *Letter of Aristeas* 132; *Wisdom* 13.10-19; Philo *Quis Rerum* 169; *Fragments of Pseudo-Greek Poets*, Sophocles, quoted in Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 5.14.113.2 quoting Hecataeus (*OTP* 2.825); *Sibylline Oracles* 3.629; Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities* 5.112.

<sup>185</sup>James F. McGrath, *The Only True God: Early Christian Monotheism in Its Jewish Context* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, 2009) 54; see the entire section on Paul, 38-54 where McGrath acknowledges the problem that the term “monotheism” is a later, modern scholarly category, but he still

Paul's reference to one God in contrast to many gods and many lords at 1 Corinthians 8.4-6 may on the surface suggest a form of henotheism or monolatry in the first century, or even a form of pluralism like we have in our postmodern twenty-first century western culture, as Moberly suggests.<sup>186</sup> It should be kept in mind, however, that Paul introduced this section with the statement: ". . . concerning the food of the idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world and that there is no God but one." This is the "knowledge" that allows the strong to eat meat sacrificed to idols (the question at issue in 1Cor 8), the knowledge that there really are no idols and there are no other gods, according to Paul's point of view. If anything at all, this constitutes Paul's monotheistic critique of the polytheism, henotheism, and monolatry of his day. The evidence in LP is clear that Paul held a very strong form of Jewish monotheism.

### *3.A.i.b. Deity*

In the first chapter of his Letter to the Romans, Paul described the divine figure as having an invisible nature, divine power, and deity ( $\text{qei}o\text{thj}$ ). "For since the creation of the world his invisible attributes, namely, his eternal power and deity ( $\text{ai}\text{d}o\text{j}$  autou/  $\text{dunamij}$  kai.  $\text{qei}o\text{thj}$ ), have been perceived with understanding in the things [he has] made" (Ro 1.20). In other words, Paul explicitly applied the attribute of divinity to the divine figure. This attribute of divinity for the divine figure, according to Paul, is clearly perceptible through creation. In this same context Paul wrote that the divine figure is immortal, again

---

claims it is useful and demonstrates this from Jewish sources of the period.

<sup>186</sup> "How Appropriate Is 'Monotheism' As a Category for Biblical Interpretation?" 234.



contrasting the divine figure to idols (Ro 1.23).<sup>187</sup>

### 3.A.i.c. *A Heavenly Being*

That the divine figure in LP is a heavenly being is one of those beliefs that is widely assumed in the literature from this period.<sup>188</sup> Sometimes it is explicitly stated. Sometimes it is not. It is not a prominent issue in LP, and there are only two references where Paul alludes to it. In the first chapter of his Letter to the Romans Paul discussed the wrath of God against human “injustice” (Ro 1.18-32). “For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven ( Ἀποκαλύπτται γὰρ ὀργὴ θεοῦ ἀπὸ οὐρανοῦ) against all godlessness and injustice of humans who by [their] injustice suppress the truth” (Ro 1.18). Since this would be a subjective genitive phrase, “wrath of God,” by which God is the one revealing his wrath “from heaven,” it is then logical to read this as Paul’s assumption that the divine figure is in heaven. Paul also alluded to this in Romans 8.34, where he referred to the messiah figure being “at the right hand of God.” In Romans 8 Paul engaged in a rather detailed discussion of God’s foreknowledge and predestination of those who have been given “the same form as the image of his Son” (Ro 8.28-30). This was apparently intended to be encouragement for followers of Jesus who faced some sort of legal dispute or persecution as is evident in what follows: “Who shall bring any accusation against God’s elect?” (Ro 8.33). Whether this is real or metaphorical is unclear. Paul gave his

---

<sup>187</sup>It should be noted that nowhere in the undisputed Letters of Paul is the messiah figure ever referred to as θεός. Romans 9.5 is not an ascription of θεός to the messiah figure, as the doxology Paul uses (εὐλογητός) is exclusively used in his letters with reference to the divine figure; cf. 2Cor 1.3; 11.31; Ro 1.25.

<sup>188</sup>See, e.g., 1En 1.1-4; 14.8-23; Isaiah 66.1; Rev 4.

rhetorical answer to the problem: “God is the one who justifies. Who is there to condemn? Christ Jesus who died, rather who was raised, who also is at the right hand of God (οἱ και, ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ), who also petitions on our behalf” (Ro 8.33-34). Paul’s reference to the messiah figure being “at the right hand of God” is a phrase that refers to a heavenly location. The allusion to Psalm 110.1 makes this clear.<sup>189</sup> “YHWH says to my lord: ‘Sit at my right hand, until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet’” (Ps 110.1). Paul’s concept of the nature of the divine figure, though the references are somewhat oblique, is that the divine figure is a heavenly being.

### *3.A.i.d. A Righteous Being*

Righteousness is another characteristic that Paul attributed to the divine figure. In his Letter to the Romans Paul asserted that the righteousness of the divine figure is revealed in the gospel. “For I am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes, to the Jew first and to the Greek. For the righteousness of God is revealed in it from faith to faith . . .” (Ro 1.16-17). Paul described the righteousness of the divine figure in terms of “the redemption which is in Christ Jesus” (Ro 3.21-26).<sup>190</sup>

But now apart from law the righteousness of God has been manifest, borne

---

<sup>189</sup>Explicit references to Psalm 110.1 and the messiah figure being seated at the right hand of God in early christological texts after Paul include Mk 16.19; Lk 22.69; Ac 2.33; 5.31; 7.55-56; Col 3.1-4; Heb 1.3; 10.12; 12.2; and 1Pt 3.21-22. Cf. also Heb 9.24.

<sup>190</sup>The relationship between the divine figure and the messiah figure in Romans 3 will be given a more detailed analysis below in the section “Functions of the Messiah Figure in the Letters of Paul.”

witness to by the Torah and the prophets, the righteousness of God through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ for all who believe. For there is no distinction, for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, having been justified freely by his grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as an atoning sacrifice through faith in his blood. [This was] for a demonstration of his righteousness for the sake of passing over previously committed sins in the clemency of God, for the demonstration of his righteousness at the present time, in order that he might be righteous and that he might justify by the faithfulness of Jesus.

Paul's concept of righteousness may be viewed in contrast to the way others from this period understood righteousness. The evidence in Second Temple period literature is that some viewed righteousness in terms of how an individual acted in relation to Torah. In the *Psalms of Solomon*, for example, the author states:

Our works are by the choosing and in the power of our soul,  
to do righteousness and injustice is in the works of our hands;  
and in your righteousness you examine human beings (uìòuj anqrwpwn).  
The one who does righteousness stores up life for himself with the Lord,  
and the one who does injustice is himself responsible for the destruction  
of his soul;  
for the Lord's judgments are with righteousness according to a man and  
his household (*PsSol* 9.4-5).<sup>191</sup>

Paul, on the other hand, defined righteousness in terms of God's act of redemption "in Christ Jesus," thus establishing a close tie between the divine figure and the messiah

---

<sup>191</sup>Another clear example is the ending of 4QMMT (4Q398 14–17 ii), where the text reads: "And this will be counted as a virtuous deed (hqdc) of yours, since you will be doing what is righteous and good in His eyes, for your own welfare and for the welfare of Israel." *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader Part 1: Texts Concerned with Religious Law*, Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, eds., with the assistance of Nehemiah Gordon and Derek Fry (Leiden: Brill, 2004) 334-335.

figure on this issue.

While there is very little material in LP that lends itself to detailed analysis, what is clear is that for Paul the divine figure is set apart from all other figures as the one, unique God. The divine figure possesses deity and is a heavenly being. And the divine figure is righteous in terms of the gospel as Paul defined it, redemption “in Christ Jesus.”

### **3.A.ii. Functions of the Divine Figure in the Letters of Paul**

Regarding the functions of the divine figure in LP, as in the Enochic *Book of Parables*, there is more evidence that lends itself to detailed analysis. The purpose of this analysis is to identify specific functions of the divine figure which then may be compared to the functions of the messiah figure in LP. Such a comparison will help us to understand in precise detail the relationship between the divine figure and the messiah figure in LP. Functions of the divine figure in LP may be identified in terms of creation, revelation of wisdom, divine acts in the life of the messiah figure, salvation, being worshiped by humans, and the execution of judgment.

#### *3.A.ii.a. Creation*

One of the functions of the divine figure according to Paul is that of creator. Paul held the common Second-Temple period Jewish belief that the divine figure created all things.<sup>192</sup>

---

<sup>192</sup>See, e.g., *Sirach* 18.1; *Jubilees* 2.1-16; *Wisdom of Solomon* 2.23; 9.1-4; 13.1-9; Philo *Fug* 177; *Quis Rerum* 106; 133-160; 4Q216 Cols. V-VII; 4Q176 Frg.3; 1QH Col V 13-20; 1QH Col VIII 17; 4Q409; 4Q427 Frg 7 Col ii 22-23; *Psalms of Solomon* 18.11-12; *Fragments of Pseudo-Greek Poets*,

In his Letter to the Romans, contrasting human idolatry with the worship of the divine figure, Paul explicitly referred to the divine figure as creator (ton ktisanta – Ro 1.25; 4.17).<sup>193</sup>

For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all godlessness and injustice of humans who by [their] injustice suppress the truth. . . . Therefore God delivered them up in the lusts of their hearts to uncleanness, in order to dishonor their bodies among them; [these are] the ones who exchanged the truth of God for the lie and they worshiped and offered liturgical service to the creature rather than to the creator, who is blessed for ever, amen (Ro 1.18, 24-25).

Werner Foerster wrote the following with reference to Paul's concept of the divine figure as creator:

The narrative of Gn. 1 is summed up in Ps. 33:9 in the words : hwc-awh yhyw rma awh dm[yw. This statement contains a logical impossibility which Pl. makes even more evident in R. 4:17: (katepanti ) ) ) qeou) kal ouhtoj ta mh. onta wj onta. One can call forth only that which already exists. But God calls forth that which does not yet exist. He commands it. And in obedience to this command creation takes place. We must not try to evade the logical inconceivability of this statement by taking the mh. onta as though in some sense they were onta.<sup>194</sup>

First Corinthians 8.4-6 is one of those key passages that gives us clear information about both the divine figure and the messiah figure in Paul's thought. Paul wrote: “. . . for us

---

Sophocles, quoted in Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 5.14.113.2 (OTP 2.825); *Sibylline Oracles* 1.5-37.

<sup>193</sup>See the article on ktizw by Werner Foerster in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 3, Gerhard Kittel, ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965) 1000-1035.

<sup>194</sup>Foerster, *TDNT*, vol. 3, 1010.

there is one God the Father, from whom are all things even as we [exist] for him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things even as we [exist] through him” (1Cor 8.4-6). Paul’s claim echoed the common Second-Temple period Jewish belief that the divine figure created “all things” and humans have their existence “from” the divine figure (ἐκ οὐ- τα. πάντα – cf. 1Cor 11.12).

*3.A.ii.b. Revelation of Wisdom*

Paul claimed that the divine figure reveals secret and hidden wisdom to humans. In his First Letter to the Corinthians Paul wrote rhetorically defending the preaching of the cross as the central component of his message, contrasting “the wisdom of God” with “the wisdom of the world” (1Cor 1.17-31):

For the word of the cross to those who are perishing is foolishness, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God. For it is written, “I will destroy the wisdom of the wise ones, and the intelligence of the sages I will declare invalid.” Where is the wise one? Where is the scribe? Where is the debater of this age? Has not God shown the wisdom of the world to be foolish? For since by the wisdom of God the world did not know God through wisdom, God was well pleased through the foolishness of the proclamation to save those who believe, since Jews ask for signs and Greeks seek wisdom; but we proclaim a crucified messiah, to Jews a scandal and to Gentiles foolishness, but to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God. For the foolishness of God is wiser than human beings, and the weakness of God is stronger than human beings (1Cor 1.18-25).

Paul’s contrast of God’s wisdom and human wisdom brings him to focus on the crucifixion of the messiah figure as the centerpiece of his message to both Jew and

Gentile (cf. also Ga 3.1). Not only for Paul was this message of the cross the power and wisdom of God, but Paul associated the messiah figure himself with the power and the wisdom of God.<sup>195</sup> In chapter 2 Paul developed his argument with specific reference to his experience among the community of Jesus followers in Corinth, reiterating the centrality of the cross for his message:

And when I came to you, brothers, I came not with lofty speech or wisdom proclaiming to you the mystery of God. For I decided not to know anything among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified. . . . my speech and my proclamation were not in persuasive words of wisdom, but in a demonstration of spirit and power, that your faith might not be in the wisdom of human beings but in the power of God (1Cor 2.1-5).

Paul repeatedly contrasted human and divine wisdom in his argument, stressing the centrality of the messiah figure's crucifixion for his message. Paul then wrote: "And we do speak wisdom to the mature, but [it is] a wisdom not of this age or of the rulers of this age, who have been rendered powerless. But we speak the wisdom of God hidden in mystery (αἰ ἰα. ἰ α ἰ α οὐ μὲν γεωυ/ σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ/ τῆν ἀποκρούμενην), which God predestined before the ages for our glory" (1Cor 2.6-7). Paul's claim was that "we speak the wisdom of God hidden in mystery." Paul continued with reference to the wisdom of God, again keeping the crucifixion of the messiah figure in plain view in his argument:

But we speak the wisdom of God. . . which none of the rulers of this age comprehended; for if they had comprehended [it], they would not have crucified

---

<sup>195</sup>This will be analyzed in more detail below in the section on the functions of the messiah figure.

the Lord of glory. But as it is written, “What eye has not seen, and ear has not heard, and in the heart of a human being it has not arisen, what God has prepared for those who love him.” And God has revealed [it] to us through the Spirit (himi/h de. apeka|uyen o' qeoj dia. tou/ pneumatoj – 1Cor 2.7-10).

Paul’s use of “Lord of glory” with reference to the crucifixion of the messiah figure draws on the eschatological theophanic tradition of Third Isaiah.

O that you would tear open the heavens [and] come down,  
 that the mountains would quake from your presence—  
 as fire kindles brushwood  
 [and] fire causes water to boil—  
 to make known your name to your adversaries,  
 that the nations would quiver from your presence.  
 When you did fearful things we did not expect,  
 you came down [and] the mountains quaked from your presence.  
 From ancient time it has not been heard; it has not been perceived by ear;  
 no eye has seen a God besides you, [who] works for those who wait for  
 him (Is 64.1-4; MT 63.19b–64.3).<sup>196</sup>

Paul articulated his concept of God revealing wisdom to humans as having its object in the crucifixion of the messiah figure. Paul used this same language of “revealing” with reference to the messiah figure in his Letter to Galatians. In a context of some of the most detailed autobiographical material in any of his writings, Paul referred to God revealing his son to him. Paul wrote that he received his gospel “through a revelation of Jesus Christ” (di vapokaluyewj Ihsou/ Cristou/ – Ga 1.12). This should be read as an objective genitive. Paul wrote: “But when he who had set me apart from my mother’s

---

<sup>196</sup>Cf. also Isaiah 56.1; 58.6-9; 59.18-19; 60.1-3, 19-22; 63.1-6; 66.15-16.



womb and called me through his grace was well pleased to reveal his son to me . . .”

( *Øte de eudokhsen* ) ) apokaluyai ton uion autou/en emoi,— Ga 1.15-16). The phrase “he who had set me apart” must be a reference to the divine figure, since “his son” is the object of the revelation to Paul.<sup>197</sup>

### *3.A.ii.c. Divine Acts in the Life of the Messiah Figure*

For Paul the divine figure performed specific acts in the life of the messiah figure. Paul asserted that the divine figure “sent forth” the messiah figure. “God sent forth his son.” This is asserted in two places in LP, in Paul’s Letter to the Galatians and Paul’s Letter to the Romans (Ga 4.4; Ro 8.3).<sup>198</sup> According to Paul, the divine figure presented, or “put forward,” the messiah figure to be crucified. The divine figure redeemed those who were under the law by sending his son (Ga 4.4-5). According to Paul the divine figure willed the death of the messiah figure. Paul claimed that it was “the will of our God and Father” that “our Lord Jesus Christ . . . gave himself for our sins, so that he might rescue us from the present evil age” (Ga 1.4). Paul referred to the divine figure sending the messiah figure also in his Letter to the Romans. Paul wrote:

There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has freed you from the law of sin and

---

<sup>197</sup>The textual difficulty is reflected in the critical apparatus of NA 27. At 1 Corinthians 15.8 Paul referred to Jesus appearing to him with no mention of the divine figure revealing Jesus to him. The connection between God’s wisdom and the messiah figure in LP will be treated in more detail below, in the section, “Nature of the Messiah Figure in the Letters of Paul.”

<sup>198</sup>This will be analyzed in more detail below in the section, “Nature of the Messiah Figure in the Letters of Paul.”

death. For the impossibility of the law by which it was weakened through the flesh—God having sent his own Son (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἐαυτοῦ/ uion pemyaj) in the likeness of sinful flesh and with reference to sin condemned sin in the flesh, in order that the righteous requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to flesh but according to the Spirit (Ro 8.1-4).

For Paul the sending of the messiah figure by the divine figure had the dual purpose of condemning sin and fulfilling the just requirement of the law. Also in his Letter to the Romans Paul claimed that the divine figure reveals his own righteousness apart from law, when he justifies those who have faith in the messiah figure, “whom God put forward as an atoning sacrifice through faith in his blood. [This was] for a demonstration of his righteousness” (ὁ ἡγιασμένος υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἵλασθῆναι διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ ἐν ἑαυτῷ δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ— Ro 3.21-26). For Paul the atoning sacrifice (ἵλασθῆναι) was the purpose of the divine figure sending his son. Paul further claimed that the purpose of the divine figure sending the messiah figure to be crucified was to justify both Jews and Gentiles by faith (Ro 3.27-30).

Subsequent to the divine figure’s role in the crucifixion of the messiah figure, the divine figure then has a role in the resurrection of the messiah figure in Paul’s thought. There are several references to this in LP. According to Paul, God the Father raised Jesus Christ from the dead (Ga 1.1; 1Th 1.10; 1Cor 6.14; 15.15; 2Cor 4.14; Ro 4.24; 6.4; 8.11; 10.9).

These events of crucifixion and resurrection of the messiah figure, according to Paul, secured a universal reconciliation between God and sinful humans. Paul argued that

sin alienated humans from God,<sup>199</sup> and that the messiah figure's death and resurrection worked reconciliation between God and humans: “. . . if anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old things have passed; behold, new things have come about. All things are from God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ and gave to us the ministry of reconciliation; that is, God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them” (2Cor 5.17-19). In this same context at 2 Corinthians 5.21, Paul pressed his argument to the point of identifying the messiah figure with human sin: “He made him who did not know sin to be sin in our place, so that we might become the righteousness of God in him.” (ton mh. gnonta amartian uper himwh amartian epoihsen( iha hmeij genwmeqa dikaiosunh qeou/en autw)). Paul claimed that the divine figure intentionally “made” the messiah figure “to be sin,” in order to give his righteousness to humans.

Paul had already made essentially the same claim in his Letter to the Galatians. In the context of discussing the relationship between the faith of Abraham and the works of the law: “Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, becoming a curse for us—for it is written, ‘Cursed is everyone who is hanged on a tree’” (Ga 3.13; Dt 21.23). This is a role in relation to the messiah figure that the divine figure has never had to this point in the history of Jewish thought.

---

<sup>199</sup>The alienation of humans from God on account of sin is also a key concept in the *Greek Life of Adam and Eve*.

*3.A.ii.d. Salvation*

Salvation is one of the key functions of the divine figure in LP. On the issue of salvation Paul wrote to the Philippians that God worked in them: “. . . with fear and trembling work out your own salvation; for it is God who works in you (qej gar estin o energwh en umih), even to will and to work for his good pleasure” (Phlp 2.13; cf. Ga 2.8). The issue of maintaining one’s status in relation to God in order to achieve salvation was also an issue for the Thessalonians. In his first letter Paul made specific claims as to how an individual human being might attain salvation in relationship to the divine figure, and how this right relationship is to be maintained until the day of judgment. Both, according to Paul, are acts of God on behalf of human beings.

For God has not destined us for wrath, but for obtaining salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us in order that whether we are awake or asleep we might live together with him. . . . May the God of peace himself sanctify you completely; and may your spirit and soul and body be kept sound and blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Faithful is the one who calls you, [and] he will do it (1Thes 5.9-10, 23-24).

While salvation is an act of God in Paul’s thought, this text demonstrates that Paul also considered the death of the messiah figure to be instrumental in that act.

*3.A.ii.e. Worship*

Receiving worship from humans is tacitly assumed to be one of the roles attributed to the divine figure in Second Temple period Jewish literature. Not surprisingly Paul also

claimed that the divine figure receives glory (praise) and worship from humans (Ga 1.5, 24; 1Cor 6.20; 10.31; 14.25; 2Cor 1.20; 4.15; 8.19; 9.13; Ro 1.25; 4.20; 11.36; 12.1; 14.11; 15.6; 16.27; Phlp 1.11; 3.3; 4.20). At Philippians 3.3 Paul wrote: “For we are the circumcision, who worship God in spirit (hmejĵ gaŕ esmen hĭ peritomh( oi pneumatĭ qeou/ latreuontej), and boast in Christ Jesus.” In his Letter to the Romans Paul praised the divine figure. He offered a doxology to God the creator (Ro 1.25). The churches of Judea glorified God because Paul converted from persecuting them to preaching the faith they believed (Ga 1.24).

### *3.A.ii.f. Judgment*

According to Paul, one of the prominent roles of the divine figure is final judgment (1Cor 5.13; Ro 2.2-3; 3.6; 9.28; 14.10-12). God’s righteous judgment will be revealed on the day of wrath (Ro 2.5, 16). In his Letter to the Romans Paul claimed that the wrath of God was revealed against sinful humans (Ro 1.18; 2.5-11). According to Paul, God’s wrath has come upon those who oppose Paul’s message (1Thes 2.16; 5.9). So that humans might have the opportunity to escape this judgment, the divine figure is kind and leads humans to repentance (Ro 2.4; 11.22). According to Paul the divine figure will cause destruction. In a discussion of the legal implications of food in his First Letter to the Corinthians, Paul wrote: “‘Food is for the stomach and the stomach is for food,’ but God will destroy the one as well as the other” (1Cor 6.13; cf. Phlp 1.28).

In a context where Paul outlined the contrasting results of God’s judgment for those who obey the truth and those who do not, Paul described the divine figure as a God

who shows no partiality in his judgment (Ro 2.11).<sup>200</sup> In connection with the final judgment, resurrection is another function of the divine figure in Paul's thought. In his earliest letter, Paul made the claim that at the *parousia* the divine figure will bring with Jesus "those who have fallen asleep," meaning he will raise them from the dead (1Th 4.14; Ro 4.17). Paul referred to the resurrection as a means of power to rise above immorality. "The body is not meant for sexual immorality, but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body. And God also raised the Lord and will raise us through his power" (1Cor 6.13-14).

In LP the divine figure assumes several roles. In line with virtually all of Jewish literature from this period, the divine figure is creator. The divine figure reveals secret and hidden wisdom to human beings. For Paul, central to this revelation of wisdom on the part of the divine figure were the crucifixion and resurrection of the messiah figure. The divine figure also enacted events in the life of the messiah figure. According to Paul the divine figure "sent forth" the messiah figure to be crucified, and the divine figure raised the messiah figure from the dead. Paul claimed that through the death and resurrection of the messiah figure, the divine figure reconciled the world to himself. The divine figure effects salvation as a soteriological act on behalf of humans in justification. The divine figure receives worship from humans. And on the day of judgment, in Paul's view, the divine figure will raise the dead and judge humans. These are all functions of the divine figure in Paul's thought according to LP.

---

<sup>200</sup>For other Second Temple period texts that take this view, see e.g., *PsSol* 2.18; *TestJob* 43.13.

### 3.B. Ambiguous References Either to the Divine Figure or the Messiah Figure

There are two ambiguous references in Paul's Letter to the Galatians and one ambiguous reference in Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians. The first ambiguity is located at Galatians 3.5. In the immediate context Paul contrasted works of the law with the hearing of faith by asking a series of four rhetorical questions. The entire series of questions focuses on the way in which the Galatians received the Spirit. "Was it by works of law that you received the Spirit or by faithful hearing?" (Ga 3.2). Alluding to circumcision he asks, "Are you so foolish, having begun with the Spirit, that you are now ending with the flesh?" (Ga 3.3). "Did you experience so many things in vain? If indeed it even is in vain. Therefore, did he who gives to you the Spirit and works miracles among you (ὁ οὖτος ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν) do so by works of law, or by faithful hearing?" (Ga 3.4-5). The ambiguity is in the identification of "he who gives to you the Spirit and works miracles." Is this a reference to the divine figure or the messiah figure? It is impossible to tell taking into account only the evidence in Galatians.<sup>201</sup>

In Galatians 5.1-15 Paul addressed the issue of circumcision, referring to it as "a yoke of slavery" (Ga 5.1). Paul wrote: "I am confident for you in the Lord (ἐγὼ πεποιθῶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν κυρίῳ) that you will have no other opinion" (Ga 5.10). It is ambiguous as to whether this refers to the divine figure or the messiah figure. There is no way of telling which Paul means. While there are a number of references to the Lord Jesus Christ in

---

<sup>201</sup>At 1Thes 4.8 Paul explicitly expressed his view that it is "God, who gives his Holy Spirit to you," that is, to the Thessalonians.

Galatians, this is the only reference to “the Lord” independent of any other identifying epithet. Not even the context alleviates the ambiguity.

At 1Corinthians 4.4 Paul wrote: “The one who judges me is the Lord.” Since Paul used the epithet “Lord” to refer to both the divine figure and the messiah figure, and since for Paul judgment is a function of both the divine figure and the messiah figure (as we shall see in the analysis that follows), it is impossible to discern whether Paul is here referring to the divine figure or the messiah figure. Since there is other evidence that links the messiah figure to the role of eschatological judgment, this specific ambiguity is of no particular consequence.

### **3.C. The Messiah Figure in the Letters of Paul**

Having analyzed the nature and functions of the divine figure in LP, this gives us a clear set of data to compare and contrast with the nature and functions of the messiah figure in LP. Such a comparison will clarify precisely who the messiah figure is and what the messiah figure does in relation to the divine figure in Paul’s thought.<sup>202</sup>

---

<sup>202</sup>Paul used a number of specific epithets for the messiah figure in his letters. Three are the most prominent: Lord, Christ, and son of God (Ga 2.20; 2Cor 1.19; Ro 1.3-4). Often Paul used these in some combination, for example, “Christ Jesus,” or “Jesus Christ,” or “Lord Jesus,” or “Lord Jesus Christ” (1Thes 1.1, 3; 3.13; 5.9, 23; 28; Ga 1.1, 3; 6.14, 18; 1Cor 1.2, 3, 7-8; 6.11; 8.6; 15.57; 2Cor 1.2; 4.6; 13.14; Ro 1.7; 5.1; 13.14; 15.6, 30; 16.20; Phlp 1.2; 3.20; 4.23; Phlm 3, 25). Paul also referred to the messiah figure as “the Lord of glory” (1Cor 2.8); the Son (Ga 1.16; 4.4, 6; 1Th 1.10; 1Cor 1.9; Ro 1.3; 5.10; 8.3); an angel of God (Ga 4.14); Savior (Phlp 3.20); and the Seed (Ga 3.16). Larry Hurtado rightly points out, contra Wilhelm Bousset, that “references to Jesus as ‘Lord’ in Pauline epistles frequently involve allusions to Old Testament passages (e.g., Phil. 2:9-11; 1 Cor. 8:5-6) and appropriation of biblical phrasing (e.g., Rom. 10:9-13). This confirms that the early use of the title in Christian circles derives from Jewish religious vocabulary and not, as Bousset claimed, from its use in mystery cults or emperor veneration.” *Lord Jesus Christ*, 21. Cf. Bousset’s *Kyrios Christos*, 119-152.



### 3.C.i. Nature of the Messiah Figure in the Letters of Paul

There is a good amount of evidence regarding the nature of the messiah figure in LP that lends itself to detailed analysis. Paul made specific assertions about a number of issues related to the nature of the messiah figure in terms of the messiah's humanity, heavenly nature, and preexistence. Paul associated the messiah figure with the wisdom of God.

Paul also made claims regarding a pre-human manifestation of the messiah figure, and the messiah figure's identification with the image and glory of God. Paul clearly used the divine title, *kyrios*, which reflects the divine name, with reference to the messiah figure. He also possibly referred to the messiah figure as an angel. And he made the claim that the messiah figure was without sin. For most of Paul's claims the evidence is explicit in LP; sometimes the evidence is more inferential.

#### 3.C.i.a. *A Human Being*

Paul held that the messiah figure is a human being. Paul referred to Christ as Abraham's "seed" (*kai. tw/ spermati, sou( o j estin Cristoj* – Ga 3.16, 19) in connection with the promise God made to Abraham (Gn 13.14-17; 15.1-6). Christ as "the seed" of Abraham is the physical manifestation of the fulfillment of God's promise to the Gentiles (Ga 3.15-20). That the messiah figure in Paul's thought is a human being Paul also articulated in terms of his birth. Referring to the first coming of the messiah figure Paul wrote: "But when the fullness of the time came, God sent forth his son, born from woman, born under law (*genomenon ek gunai koj( genomenon upo. nomon*), in order that he might redeem those who are under law, so that we might receive the adoption as sons" (Ga 4.4-5). Here the

nature of the messiah figure is clearly human.

Paul also articulated the human nature of the messiah figure in his Letter to the Romans, where he stated that the messiah figure was “born from the seed of David according to flesh” (Ro 1.3), and that the messiah figure was sent by God “in the likeness of sinful flesh” (Ro 8.3). Paul referred to the messiah figure in his Letter to the Romans as a descendant of David, or a Davidic messiah.

Paul, a slave of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, set apart for the gospel of God, which he previously promised through his prophets in holy scriptures, concerning his son, who was born from the seed of David according to flesh, who was defined as son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness by resurrection from the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord . . . (Ro 1.1-4).

According to this introduction to his Letter to the Romans, Paul claimed that the messiah figure literally “was born from the seed of David according to flesh” (peri. tou/ ui'ou/ autou/ tou/ genomenou ek spermatoj David kata. sarka), and that he was “defined as son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness by resurrection from the dead.” For Paul the early tradition that the messiah figure was raised from the dead by the power of the Holy Spirit held significance for setting the messiah figure apart as son of God. For Paul the messiah figure is both son of David according to the flesh and son of God on the basis of his resurrection.<sup>203</sup>

Philippians 2.5-9 should also be adduced as explicit evidence of the humanity of

---

<sup>203</sup>In this period the term “Son of God” had a variety of meanings in different Greco-Roman and Jewish contexts and often referred to a righteous messiah figure. Cf., e.g., *WisSol* 2.12-18. See Jarl Fossum, “Son of God” in *ABD* 6.128-137.

the messiah figure in Paul's thought. "Have this mind among you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God did not consider as something to be held onto being equal with God, but emptied himself by taking the form of a slave, by being born in the likeness of human beings; and having been found in frame as a human he humbled himself by becoming obedient to the point of death, the death of a cross." This early christological hymn also describes the messiah figure in terms of his human nature: "form of a slave," "born in the likeness of human beings," "found in frame as a human."

All of these texts (Ga 3.15-20; Ga 4.4-5; Ro 1.1-4; 8.3; and Phlp 2.5-9) provide explicit evidence that Paul clearly thought of the messiah figure as a human being.

### *3.C.i.b. A Heavenly Being*

Paul used language of "sending" to describe the origin of the messiah figure. In his Letter to the Galatians Paul wrote that the messiah figure was "sent forth" by God (Ga 4.4; Ro 8.3). As I have already pointed out, this is stated in two places in LP, in Paul's Letter to the Galatians and in his Letter to the Romans. At Galatians 4.4 Paul wrote: "But when the fullness of the time came, God sent forth his son (*exapesteilen o' qeoj ton uion autou*), born from woman, born under law, in order that he might redeem those who are under law, so that we might receive the adoption as sons." This particular text refers to a number of issues related to the messiah figure in terms of both nature and function. Here we will only discuss this passage with regard to the nature of the messiah figure.<sup>204</sup> This

---

<sup>204</sup>Functions of the messiah figure based on this particular text will be discussed in more detail below, in the present chapter.

raises several questions. From where did the divine figure send forth the messiah figure? For the divine figure to “send forth” the messiah figure, this implies location, and since it is a tacit assumption of Second Temple period Jewish thought that the divine figure dwells in heaven, this also implies a heavenly nature for the messiah figure (see the discussion in 3.A.i.c. above).<sup>205</sup> This text further implies the preexistence of the messiah figure in relation to being “born from woman, born under law” (genomenon ek gunaikoj (genomenon upo. nomon)). Yet Paul considered Christ to be more than a human messiah figure. “God sent forth his son.” This is accomplished by means of human birth, suggesting that Paul attributed an existence for the messiah figure prior to his human birth, and it also suggests that Paul linked the identity of the messiah figure as son of God to his human birth. Not only does this text explicitly make the claim that “God sent forth his son”; Paul qualified this claim with the temporal phrase, “But when the fullness of the time came” (o[te de. h[ qen to. pl h[rwma tou/ cronou]), suggesting that the messiah figure existed before the sending and was residing in heaven until “the fullness of the time came.”<sup>206</sup> The second text from LP referring to the divine figure “sending” the messiah figure is in Paul’s Letter to the Romans. At Romans 8.3 Paul wrote:

For the impossibility of the law by which it was weakened through the flesh—God having sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh (o[ qeoj ton e[autou/ ui[on pemyaj en omoiwmati sarkoj amarti[aj) and with reference to sin condemned sin in the flesh, in

---

<sup>205</sup>See Simon J. Gathercole, *The Preexistent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006) 28-29.

<sup>206</sup>Cf. *PsSol* 17.21 where the plea is made that the Lord would raise up the Son of David “in the time known to you, O God.” Cf. also *PsSol* 18.5; *2Bar* 29.8–30.1.

order that the righteous requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to flesh but according to the Spirit.” This again begs the question, from where did God send forth his Son? The logical answer is that God had to “send forth” his Son from some specific place. This is further evidence that Paul considered the messiah figure to be a heavenly being.<sup>207</sup>

But the evidence in LP does not just leave us to infer that the messiah figure was a heavenly being in Paul’s thought. Paul made this claim explicitly in a number of places. In his First Letter to the Thessalonians, Paul described the messiah figure as the “son from heaven,” asserting his heavenly nature (1Th 1.10). Paul made this same explicit claim in his First Letter to the Corinthians in the context of his argument regarding Christ as the second Adam, where he wrote that “the second man is from heaven” (1Cor 15.47). With reference to the *parousia* in his Letter to the Philippians Paul claimed that he waited for the messiah figure to come from heaven (Phlp 3.20). Paul wrote in his Second Letter to the Corinthians that he considered Christ to be more than human. He did not take this to the point of referring to the messiah figure as divine. Paul did, however, clearly state that the messiah figure was more than human. “Therefore, from now on we know no one according to flesh; even if we knew Christ according to flesh, but now no longer do we know [him this way]” (2Cor 5.16).

---

<sup>207</sup>Adela Yarbro Collins points to three texts from the LXX (Judg 6.8; Jer 7.25; Ezek 3.5-6) that refer to the divine figure “sending” (εξαποστελιν) prophets to Israel, and she argues that “sending forth” in Galatians does not refer to the messiah figure’s preexistence. Adela Yarbro Collins and John J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008) 107. One text that Collins did not include in her list is Psalm 110.2 (109.2, LXX) where “the Lord will send forth (εξαποστελει) the scepter of your power from Zion.” It is entirely possible, and even more likely, that Paul (and other NT writers) had in mind Psalm 110.2, interpreted messianically, rather than the texts Collins has suggested.

### 3.C.i.c. *Preexistence*

According to Paul the messiah figure is preexistent. This can be inferred from a number of texts in LP. At 1 Corinthians 8.4-6 Paul wrote: “. . . for us there is one God the Father, from whom are all things even as we [exist] for him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things even as we [exist] through him.” In addition to closely associating the messiah figure with the divine figure by playing on the Jewish *Shema*’ as Larry Hurtado has pointed out,<sup>208</sup> Paul expresses the uniqueness of the messiah figure: “one Lord Jesus Christ.” Paul also has claimed here that the messiah figure played a role in creation. While this expresses the role of the messiah figure as agent of God’s creative activity (which will be discussed in more detail below in the section on the functions of the messiah figure), such a role must presuppose that preexistence is part of the nature of the messiah figure in Paul’s thought.<sup>209</sup> Larry Hurtado makes the point that this text supports the view of the early Christian use of the Hebrew Bible to defend the divinity of the historical Jesus as the messiah figure.

However, in Justin (and the Christian tradition he reflects) it is not simply or primarily an academic debate over what one might make of biblical texts. Instead they explore certain theophanic accounts to confirm and celebrate Jesus’ divine status for themselves, and to persuade others to embrace him as divine. For the early Christian handling of these Old Testament texts that Justin exemplifies, the prior and essential basis is the belief that the historic Jesus was the incarnate form of the preexistent and divine Son/Word, through and with whom God created all things. This belief certainly goes back early into first-century Christianity, as attested by such passages as 1 Corinthians 8:4-6, Philippians 2.6-8, Colossians

---

<sup>208</sup>*Lord Jesus Christ*, 114.

<sup>209</sup>Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 325, 465, 576, 647.

1.15-17, Hebrews 1:1-3, and John 1:1-2. Given this belief, it was not so strange for early Christians such as Justin to look for references to the preincarnate Jesus/Son/Word in their Scriptures.<sup>210</sup>

Hurtado is correct to identify 1 Corinthians 8.4-6 as a Pauline text that establishes the preexistence of the messiah figure in Paul's thought. However, it takes the evidence too far to claim that preexistence implies divinity.

James Dunn laments oversimplifying analysis of ascriptions of preexistence to the messiah figure in LP. Dunn writes:

Paul does have a conception of the preexistent Christ. But it is the preexistence of Wisdom now identified by and as Christ. It is the prehistorical existence of Adam as a template on which a vivid Adam christology begins to be drawn. That there is no clear thought of Christ's preexistence independent of such imagery (Wisdom and Adam) is a factor of considerable importance in determining the significance to be given to subsequent statements of Christ's preexistence.<sup>211</sup>

With specific reference to 1 Corinthians 8.6 Dunn acknowledges the preexistence of the messiah figure in Paul's language. "The 'one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things,' clearly existed before the creation of the 'all things (*ta panta*).'"<sup>212</sup>

Philippians 2.7 also refers to the preexistence of the messiah figure, and takes an

---

<sup>210</sup>*Lord Jesus Christ*, 576.

<sup>211</sup>*The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 292.

<sup>212</sup>*The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 267-268.

incipient or proto-incarnational tone.<sup>213</sup> We have already seen that Paul considered the messiah figure to be a human being (see 3.C.i.a. above). We have also seen how Paul considered the messiah figure to be a heavenly being (see 3.C.i.b. above). The combination of evidence in Paul, that the messiah figure is a preexistent heavenly being (1Cor 8.6; 15.47) who was also born as a human being (Ga 3.15-20; 4.4-5; Ro 1.1-4; 8.3; Phlp 2.5-9) suggests an incipient use of language toward a concept like incarnation in Paul's thought. All of these texts have an incipient language of incarnation or a proto-incarnational tone, not in the sense of the more developed language that is typically identified with incarnation of deity as in the Prologue to John's Gospel (1.1-5, 14), but in the sense that Paul clearly conceptualized a preexistent heavenly messiah figure who was "born from woman," in human flesh. In Philippians 2 the messiah figure was in the form of God, but "did not consider as something to be held onto being equal with God, but emptied himself by taking the form of a slave, by being born in the likeness of human beings" (Phlp 2.6-7). Of what did the messiah figure empty himself? This presupposes preexistence. There is clearly a change between "being in the form of God" (*en morfh| qeou/ uparcwn*) and "taking the form of a slave" (*morfhn dou|ou labwn*) or "being born in the likeness of human beings" (*en omoiwmati anqrwpwn genomenoj*). The contrast between "being" and "becoming" virtually leaps off the page. This is an extraordinary contrast that can only be fully explained in terms of preexistence. Dunn, however, has argued: "It cannot be taken for granted that *uparcwn* has a connotation of timelessness

---

<sup>213</sup>Graham Stanton calls it an "incarnational pattern," which he also sees in 2Cor 8.9. See Stanton's essay, "Matthew's Christology and the Parting of the Ways," in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, A.D. 70 to 135*, James D.G. Dunn, ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999) 114.



and so an implication of preexistence; it simply denotes the established state of the one in question at the time his *hgh̄sasqai* was made (cf. Luke 7.25 and the frequent use of the present participle in the sense ‘who is’ or ‘since he is’, etc. . .).”<sup>214</sup> Dunn’s analysis is a possibility, but we should include in the discussion other grammatical possibilities for *uparcwn* at Philippians 2.6. Ernest De Witt Burton described a use of the present participle for the imperfect. “The Present Participle is also sometimes used as an Imperfect to denote a continued action antecedent to that of the principal verb.” Burton also has an example of a more rare use of the present participle which he called, “The Present of Past Action Still in Progress, the action denoted beginning before the action of the principal verb and continuing in progress at the time denoted by the latter.”<sup>215</sup> Blass, DeBrunner, and Funk has a supplementary circumstantial (adverbial) use of the participle. “The logical relation of the circumstantial participle to the rest of the sentence is not expressed by the participle itself (apart from the future participle), but is to be deduced from the context; it can be made clear, however, by the addition of certain particles.”<sup>216</sup> The ambiguity of the present tense participle *uparcwn* leaves us with only one option, to read it in its context.

---

<sup>214</sup>*Christology in the Making*, 310-311 n. 67.

<sup>215</sup>Ernest De Witt Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* 3rd ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898; 1976) 58-59.

<sup>216</sup>Blass, Friedrich, and Albert Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Trans. from the 9th-10th German ed. Robert W. Funk, ed. (Chicago: U. of Chicago, 1961) §416; pp. 214-215.

6 oj en morfhn/ qeou/ uparcwn)  
 ouc arpagmon hghsato  
 to. einai isa qew(  
 7 al la. eauton ekenwsen  
 morfhn dou|ou labwn(  
 en omoiwmati anqrwpwn genomenoj\  
 kai. schmati eureqeij wj anqrwpoj  
 8 etapeinwsen eauton  
 genomenoj uphkoj mecri qanatou(  
 qanatou de. staurou)

6 Who being in the form of God  
 did not consider as something to be held onto  
 being equal with God,  
 7 but he emptied himself  
 by taking the form of a slave,  
 by being born in the likeness of human beings;  
 and having been found in frame as a human  
 8 he humbled himself  
 by becoming obedient to the point of death,  
 the death of a cross.

I take the participles labwn and genomenoj of verse 7 to be instrumental. The *kenosis* of the messiah figure was accomplished “by means of taking the form of a slave” and “by means of being born in the likeness of human beings.” It is also tempting to take uparcwn in verse 6 in a causal sense. “Because he was in the form of God, he did not consider being equal with God as something (he needed) to hold onto.” The hapax legomenon, arpagmoj, in Classical usage means “to seize or to plunder.”<sup>217</sup> And in the New Testament the verb, arpazein, means “to snatch, attack, plunder, or gain control over.”<sup>218</sup> The noun,

---

<sup>217</sup>Liddel and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968).

<sup>218</sup>Bauer, Walter, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, eds.; 3rd ed. rev. by Frederick W. Danker (Chicago: U. of Chicago, 2000).

ἀρπαγμοῖς, denotes “plunder” or “something to hold by force.” Louw and Nida comment: “Since ἀρπαγμοῖς may mean not only ‘to grasp something forcefully which one does not have’ . . . but also ‘to retain by force what one possesses,’ it is possible to translate Phl 2.6 in two quite different ways.”<sup>219</sup> This leaves the ambiguity unresolved, and again it is necessary to consult the context to arrive at a reasonable answer. Verse 7 begins with the particle ἀλλὰ, contrasting what has gone before in verse 6. “But he emptied himself,” assumes that the messiah figure possessed something before the *kenosis*, which occurred at the time when he took “the form of a slave.” In fact the *kenosis* itself was accomplished by means of taking the form of a slave. The verb, ἐκεῖνωσεν, assumes that the messiah figure was something more (or that he possessed more) before the *kenosis* than he was (or possessed) after the *kenosis*. This is also true of the verb, ἐταπεινώσεν, in verse 8. The possession of the messiah figure before his *kenosis* leads us to understand ἀρπαγμοῖς of verse 6 as “something to be held onto (by force).” If verse 6 only reflects the state of the messiah figure like Adam before Adam sinned, then the contrast in verses 7-8 introduced by ἀλλὰ makes absolutely no sense. The contrast with Adam is clearly represented in other ways throughout the hymn, as Dunn also argues.

If the hymn in its present form is based on an Aramaic original, that in itself does not render this discussion moot. It only renders moot the part of the discussion that focuses on the participial relationship between ὑπαρῶν and the main verb, ἦγασατο. If there was an Aramaic *Vorlage* that was the basis for the hymn in its Greek form as Joseph

---

<sup>219</sup>Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, 2nd edition, volume 1, Introduction & Domains (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989) §57.236; p. 584.

Fitzmyer and others have argued, then the participial force of  $\text{upa}\text{rcwn}$  carries less weight with regard to our understanding of the preexistence question in this hymn.

Fitzmyer retrofitted verse 6 with the following Aramaic lines.<sup>220</sup>

yhwtya ahla ~lcb awh  
 llv bvx alw  
 ahlal ywv awhtml

Fitzmyer (as did Levertoff) used the pleonastic form of the first person singular suffix with the existential particle,  $\text{y}\text{t}\text{y}\text{a}$ . This also occurs at Daniel 2.11. The existential particle renders the meaning of the line virtually in terms of a finite verb, which requires a conjunction to introduce the next line (which does not appear in the Greek text because of the participial relationship between  $\text{upa}\text{rcwn}$  and the main verb,  $\text{hghsato}$ ). This leaves the opening statement of the first line as standing on its own and not in a subordinate relationship to another main verb. It should also be noted that this then places the opening line of the hymn in the Greek text,  $\text{o}\text{j}\text{ en morfh/ qeou/ uparcwn}$ , in a position of emphasis that should be connected to the very last line of the hymn, also in a position of emphasis.<sup>221</sup>

In response to Dunn, Hurtado is correct when he writes regarding Philippians 2:

---

<sup>220</sup>Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic Background of Philippians 2:6-11," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50.3 (1988): 470-483.

<sup>221</sup>This will be discussed in more detail in the excursus, "Why Paul Did Not Use 'Son of Man' Terminology."

In particular, how are we to understand verses 6-8, which refer to Christ being “in the form of God” and having been able to demur from exploiting for his own advantage “being equal with God”? Most scholars take these verses to reflect a belief in the personal preexistence and incarnation of Christ. But Dunn contends that they allude to the Genesis accounts of the creation and disobedience of Adam, and that the Philippians passage simply contrasts the self-sacrifice of the human Jesus with the hubris of Adam in reaching for divinity. That is, Philippians 2:6-8 refers solely to the actions of the earthly Jesus, and no preincarnate state is in view. . . . It is true that, when they are suggested by scholars, we can see contrasts between Jesus’ self-humbling in verses 6-8 of this passage and the serpent’s claim that if they eat of the forbidden tree Adam (and Eve) will be “like gods” (LXX: *hōs theoi*) in Genesis 3:1-7. But Dunn’s claim that Philippians 2:6-8 is a clear and direct allusion to the Genesis account and is thus intended to be read simply as “Adam Christology” greatly exceeds the warrants of the passage.<sup>222</sup>

I agree with Hurtado. Dunn’s analysis fails to take into consideration all of the evidence in the text, and it limits our understanding of preexistence in Paul’s thought more than the evidence warrants. On the other hand, where I disagree with Hurtado is that the evidence in Philippians 2 makes it entirely possible to have both a strong Adam christology and preexistence.<sup>223</sup>

In his Second Letter to the Corinthians Paul wrote, “For you know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that for your sake he became poor even though he was rich, in order that you, by his poverty, might become rich” (2Cor 8.9). This echoes the thought of Philippians 2 by asserting that the preexistent messiah figure originally had “something,” but by being born as a human the messiah figure relinquished his claim on whatever it was he had. This probably refers to relinquishing his status as a heavenly being. With

---

<sup>222</sup>*Lord Jesus Christ*, 121.

<sup>223</sup>Again, this argument will be developed in more detail below in the excursus, regarding the intertextuality of Philippians 2 and the Adam traditions in the *Greek Life of Adam and Eve*, and Paul’s Adam christology in Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15.

reference to the 2 Corinthians 8.9 text, James Dunn has argued that this is not a reference to preexistence, but to abasement, referring to Christ's death on the cross, and that we should be cautious about identifying these two texts (Phlp 2 and 2Cor 8) in terms of preexistence.<sup>224</sup>

Larry Hurtado has responded to Dunn by reading 2 Corinthians 8.9 and Philippians 2.6-11 in connection with each other. Hurtado rejects Dunn's claim that the self-impooverishment of 2 Corinthians 8.9 constituted a "one-stage act of abasement," a claim for which there is no evidence in the text, as Hurtado rightly points out. Hurtado is correct when he argues, "What Pauline Christians might have seen as being involved in Christ's self-impooverishment remains an open question." This leads Hurtado to argue that it is necessary to examine other evidence in Paul's Letters regarding Christ's self-abasement, in order better to understand its meaning in 2 Corinthians 8.9.<sup>225</sup>

The evidence in LP indicates that Paul did not just think of the messiah figure as a human being. Paul considered the messiah figure to be both human and a more-than-human preexistent heavenly messiah. The preexistence of the messiah figure in LP is an issue that has been much debated. It should not be a surprise that we find it in LP, however, since the concept did not originate with Paul. As we have seen preexistence is also found with reference to the human Enoch and the messiah figure in the Enochic *Book of Parables*.

---

<sup>224</sup>*The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 291-292.

<sup>225</sup>*Lord Jesus Christ*, 120-121.

3.C.i.d. *Association with the Wisdom of God*

In his First Letter to the Corinthians, Paul closely associated the messiah figure with the wisdom of God. Paul described the messiah figure as both the power and the wisdom of God (1Cor 1.23-24, 30). Paul also referred to the messiah figure as “our righteousness and sanctification and wisdom” (1Cor 1.30). Following the work of several scholars, James Dunn convincingly lays out the precedent for connecting the language of the messiah figure as God’s preexistent agent of creation in 1 Corinthians 8.6 with divine wisdom as God’s preexistent agent of creation in Second Temple period literature.<sup>226</sup>

Clearly, then, Paul was attributing to *Christ* the role previously attributed to divine Wisdom. Indeed, it is entirely consistent with the evidence to conclude that Paul was tacitly identifying Christ with Wisdom, indeed, *as* Wisdom. In thinking of preexistent Wisdom Paul now thought of Christ.<sup>227</sup>

In fact the language Paul used suggests that he explicitly identified the messiah figure with the wisdom of God at 1 Corinthians 1.22-24. “. . . since Jews ask for signs and Greeks seek wisdom; but we proclaim a crucified messiah, to Jews a scandal and to Gentiles foolishness, but to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God” (autoij de. toij klhtoij( loudaiπij te kai. Ellhsin( Criston qeou/ dunamin kai. qeou/ sofian). This suggests a more direct, literal

---

<sup>226</sup>*The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 269-270. Here Dunn draws upon the work of Habermann, von Lips, and Kuschel. Dunn cites as primary evidence: Psalm 104.24; Prov. 3.19; 8.22, 25; *Sirach* 1.4; *Wisdom* 1.6-7; 7.26; 8.5; 9.2; Philo *Leg. All.* 1.43; *Ebr.* 30–31; *Qu. Gen.* 4.97.

<sup>227</sup>*The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 270.

statement of Paul's identification of the messiah figure with the wisdom of God.

The question, however, is: in what sense was Paul identifying the messiah figure with wisdom? Was Paul actually *identifying* the messiah figure with wisdom, or was he making a metaphorical association? It is possible to translate αὐτοῖς ἐκ τοῦ κλητοῦ (ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἑλλησίν) Χριστὸν θεοῦ/δυναμὴν καὶ θεοῦ/σοφίαν in this way: “. . . but to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ *is* the power of God and the wisdom of God” (emphasis added). That, however, does not exclude the possibility that this is a metaphorical association. Adela Yarbro Collins has commented on this passage:

. . . the affirmation that “to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, [we proclaim] Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God” (1 Cor 1:24) does not necessarily imply that Paul identifies Christ here with preexistent, personified wisdom. In the context, the force of the statement is that those who are called do not need human power and wisdom because they share in God's power and wisdom manifested in Christ.<sup>228</sup>

James Dunn approaches the preexistence of the messiah figure in LP through the lens of preexistent wisdom. He argues that the preexistence of the messiah figure in LP is developed around the prehistorical Adam “as a template on which a vivid Adam christology begins to be drawn.” Dunn also writes: “Paul does have a conception of the preexistent Christ. But it is the preexistence of Wisdom now identified by and as Christ.”<sup>229</sup> The problem with Dunn's analysis, as detailed as it is, is that it abstracts these

---

<sup>228</sup>King and Messiah, 111.

<sup>229</sup>The Theology of Paul the Apostle, 292.



concepts until they make absolutely no sense in practical terms as to what they actually meant for Jews in the first century CE.<sup>230</sup> If with Dunn we take Paul's statement literally and identify preexistent wisdom "by and as Christ," then we must also ask what it means to identify the messiah figure with the power of God (see the discussion in 3.C.ii.d. below). We should not say that the messiah figure's identity is defined by, or even reduced to, a set of functions associated with the divine figure. It seems to be more accurate to say that the role the messiah figure played in the gospel, according to Paul, "manifests" or "reveals" the wisdom and power of God.

This requires locating Paul's thought in the context of Second Temple Jewish Sapiential traditions. Gabriele Boccaccini has written of this period:

During the 3rd century, the possibility that Judaism might develop in the Hellenistic world as a form of inclusive monotheism was a feasible and fascinating option, a possibility that — as the events that preceded the Maccabean Revolt would prove — was to find many enthusiastic supporters in Jerusalem, even among the members of the ruling priesthood.<sup>231</sup>

During the early Second Temple period there was a clear distinction between Sapiential Judaism (represented by texts like *Ahiqar*, *Proverbs*, *Job*, *Jonah*, and *Qoheleth*) and Zadokite Judaism (represented by texts like *Ezekiel*, *Nehemiah-Ezra*, Priestly Writing, and *Chronicles*). According to Boccaccini, in the third century BCE Sapiential Judaism

---

<sup>230</sup>See the discussion below in the excursus on the development of Paul's Adam christology in the context of a first-century Jewish soteriological debate.

<sup>231</sup>Gabriele Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism*, 118.

formed a rapprochement with Zadokite Judaism (*Tobit, Sirach*).<sup>232</sup> In this period of rapprochement between Sapiential and Zadokite Judaisms, wisdom continued to be presented as created by God before all things (*Sirach* 1.4; 24.8-9). But in addition to the merging of these two Jewish intellectual traditions, there was also a bifurcation. Part of the Sapiential tradition did not merge in rapprochement with Zadokite Judaism. Part of the Wisdom tradition developed as Hellenistic Judaism (as represented by texts like LXX, *Aristeas*, Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers, *Wisdom of Solomon*). Prior to the merging of Sapiential and Zadokite Judaisms, wisdom was presented in the Sapiential tradition as both a creation of God and a preexistent agent of God's creation (Prov 8–9). Following the merging of these two traditions, nothing on this score changed. Wisdom continued to be cast as a creation of God and the preexistent agent of God's creation. What was added to the tradition during this period of rapprochement was the idea that the tangible manifestation of God's wisdom in the world was now to be viewed as the Torah.

Wisdom will praise herself,  
 and in the midst of her people she will glory.  
 In the assembly of the Most High she will open her mouth,  
 and in the presence of his power she will glory,  
 "As for me, from the mouth of the Most High I came forth  
 and as a mist I covered the earth;  
 As for me, in highest places I made my dwelling,  
 and my throne was in a pillar of cloud;  
 the circle of heaven I alone encircled  
 and in the depth of the abyss I have walked around;  
 in the waves of the sea and in all the earth  
 and among every people and nation I acquired [a possession].  
 With all of these I sought a resting place

---

<sup>232</sup>*Roots of Rabbinic Judaism*, 113-150.

and in whose inheritance I might find lodging.  
 Then the creator of the universe commanded me,  
 and the one who created me brought to rest my tent  
 and he said, "In Jacob set up your dwelling  
 and in Israel receive an inheritance."  
 Before the age, from the beginning, he created me,  
 and as long as there is an age, in no way will I fail.  
 In the holy tent, in his presence I rendered liturgical service  
 and thus in Zion I was established;  
 in the beloved city likewise he brought me to rest,  
 and in Jerusalem is my dominion;  
 so I was rooted in a glorified people  
 in the Lord's portion, his inheritance . . . .  
 All this is the book of the covenant of the Most High God,  
 the Torah which Moses commanded us  
 as an inheritance for the communities of Jacob (*Sirach* 24.1-12, 23).

As Boccaccini describes this: "the Torah of Moses is the historical embodiment of the heavenly wisdom."<sup>233</sup>

Not all the adherents of the Hellenistic Jewish tradition depicted wisdom as a creation of God, even though wisdom was still held to be an agent of God's creation. Neither did this development of Hellenistic Judaism accept the claim that the Torah was the manifestation of God's wisdom. In some traditions of Hellenistic Judaism wisdom was presented as an extension of the identity of the divine figure. *Wisdom of Solomon* describes wisdom as "a mist" or "a breath of the power of God" (atmij gar estin thj tou/ qeou/ dunamewj).

For she is a breath of the power of God,  
 and a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty;

---

<sup>233</sup>*Roots of Rabbinic Judaism*, 146-147.

therefore nothing morally deficient intrudes [itself] into her.  
 For she is a reflection of eternal light  
 and a spotless mirror of the inner working of God  
 and an image of his goodness (*Wisdom* 7.25-26).

In addition to the observation that the beginning of this description of wisdom in *Wisdom of Solomon* reads like a Hellenistic aretology, the most noticeable feature of this description is that wisdom is more than personification as in Proverbs, or the identification of wisdom with Torah as in *Sirach*. Here wisdom is described as some sort of extension of the divine figure's identity or presence, "a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty" (ἀπορροια τῆς του παντοκράτορος δόξης εἰς ἱκρίνην), "a reflection of eternal light" (ἀπαύγασμα γὰρ ἐστὶν φωτὸς αἰδίου), and "an image of his goodness" (εἰκὼν τῆς ἀγαποῦς αὐτοῦ).

The language applied to wisdom in this text is the same language applied to the messiah figure in the New Testament: "power of God" (1Cor 1.24), "glory of the Almighty" (Phlp 2.11), "reflection" (Heb 1.3), "image" (2Cor 4.4; Col 1.15). Paul in particular has adopted this language with reference to the nature of the messiah figure. And if the author of *Wisdom of Solomon* understood wisdom to be more than a creation of the divine figure (Prov 8.22), to be "a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty" or an "outflowing" of the divine figure's presence (as ἀπορροια τῆς ) ) δόξης should probably be understood; cf. *Sirach* 45.3), is this the sense in which we are to take Paul's association of the messiah figure with the wisdom of God? Or at the very least, is this the trajectory of the Jewish intellectual tradition of wisdom that should inform our reading of

Paul's association of God's wisdom with the messiah figure? All of the elements seem to be present, including wisdom as agent of creation (Wis 6.22; 9.9), "the designer of all things" (h̄ gar pantwn tecnitij edidaxen me sofia – Wis 7.21), "the designer of what exists" (Wis 8.6). This wisdom even sits by the throne of the divine figure (Wis 9.4, 10; cf. Ro 8.34; Ps 110; 1En 84.3).

Dunn entertains this as a real possibility.<sup>234</sup> After discussing possibilities for understanding Jewish wisdom (as one of many heavenly beings of a polytheistic Israel and as personification), Dunn writes the following:

The principle alternative to this second view is to regard Wisdom as a "hypostatization" of divine attributes, that is, something occupying "an intermediate position between personalities and abstract beings" or, as we might say, halfway between a person and a personification. This has proved attractive to those who remain impressed by all that is attributed to Wisdom as such and who find talk of "personification" too wooden and inadequate. On the latter point it can be readily conceded that "personification" is inadequate to describe the vividness of Israel's poetry and imagery. But "hypostasis" introduces a concept which only gained the technical theological nuance (for which its use is proposed here) in the third and fourth centuries of the Christian era, and only as a device to resolve a peculiarly Christian dilemma. Its use in the present discussion is anachronistic and imports a distinction which, so far as we can tell, never occurred to first-century Jews.

Would it be fair, then, to argue that the substance of "hypostatization" was already present in the early Jewish talk of Wisdom, even if an appropriate technical term was not yet to hand? Perhaps. But when one appreciates the vigour of Jewish metaphor and is willing to recognize that Wisdom functions as an extended metaphor — and when one observes that the bulk of Jewish opinion sees no difficulty in identifying talk of God's glory and God's wisdom as talk of God's immanence — is recourse to a term like "hypostatization" really necessary? If "personification" is unsatisfactory, let us talk simply of the "metaphor" of Wisdom. But above all, whatever term is used, the point is hard to escape that,

---

<sup>234</sup>Charles Gieschen opts for hypostasis, which he refers to as "angelomorphic divine hypostases." See his analysis in *Angelomorphic Christology*, 70-123.

according to the evidence available to us, Wisdom was universally understood within early Judaism as God's wisdom, as the immanent God in his wise engagement with his creation and his people.<sup>235</sup>

One may point to Hebrews 1.3 where the word *hypostasis* is applied to the messiah figure (οἷ ἠν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτῆρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ). But this is not the same as the developed theological category debated by Christians in the third and fourth centuries CE.<sup>236</sup> Dunn's analysis and his musings about the inadequacies of applying a later theological term like "hypostatization" to Second Temple Jewish conceptualizations of Wisdom are helpful. Also helpful is his suggestion for the use of the term "metaphor" as a more precise way of talking about wisdom in the Second Temple Period. Wisdom, when applied to the messiah figure in LP, more closely approximates the metaphorical descriptions of Hellenistic Judaism than those of *Tobit* or *Sirach*, pressing the metaphor in the direction of presenting the messiah figure as the divine figure's immanence by

---

<sup>235</sup>*The Theology of Paul the Apostle, 270-272*. Christopher Rowland reads the dependance of Daniel 10 on an interpretation of the heavenly figure in Ezekiel 1 as an early "hypostatic development." See *The Open Heaven, 99-100*. "What we find in Daniel 10.5f. then is a broadly based dependence on Ezekiel and especially on the first chapter. It would seem that either Ezekiel 1.26f. or 8.2 has been interpreted and influenced by other aspects of the first chapter of Ezekiel. Such a transference of images to the human figure could well have taken place during a vision when the precise identification of various words and phrases was confused by the overwhelming impression of glory upon the seer. What does emerge from this study of the angelophany in this chapter is that we are dealing here with no ordinary angelic being. It is true that he was sent by God to fulfil a particular function, namely to communicate to Daniel the historical events which are to take place. But the fact that he acts as a divine emissary cannot disguise the exalted language used to describe the angel. R.H. Charles has pointed out the theological complexities which are to be found in these verses, and which are admirably epitomized by the impact which the angelophany makes upon the seer (Dan. 10.9, cf. Ezek. 2.1, 1 Enoch 71.11, Matt. 17.6, and 3 Enoch 16). What we have here is the beginning of a hypostatic development similar to that connected with divine attributes like God's word and wisdom."

<sup>236</sup>See the detailed discussions of hypostasis in the context of the early christological controversies in Leo Donald Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787): Their History and Theology* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1983).

using such terms as glory, image, and power of God. It is also worth noting here that Philo—in a context where he presents *nous*, logic and *paideia*, the opposite of *paideia* in the basest of human behaviors, wisdom, and the divine figure all metaphorically as different springs or sources of wisdom on which human behavior is based—juxtaposed wisdom alongside the divine figure and described wisdom as divine (ἡδὲ ἐστὶν ἡ θεῖα σοφία).<sup>237</sup> It seems to me that it is a better understanding of Paul’s language at 1 Corinthians 1.24 to see metaphor rather than identification with regard to the messiah figure and the wisdom of God.

### 3.C.i.e. *Pre-human*

In addition to a messiah figure who is heavenly, preexistent, and human, Paul conceptualized a sort of pre-human messiah figure who dwelled among God’s people. In First Corinthians Paul midrashed the account of the Israelites wandering in the wilderness after the exodus from Egypt.<sup>238</sup> While the Israelites were at Horeb, the Lord commanded

---

<sup>237</sup>*Fug* 177–201. This specific assertion of Philo’s, that wisdom is divine, is located at *Fug* 195. The boundary between what is human and what is divine, at least as far as the divine participating in the contemplative life of human beings, is somewhat fluid for Philo. In *Quis Rerum* (84) Philo referred to the *nous* that participates in liturgical service to God as divine: οἱ γὰρ νοῦς (οἱ τε μὲν κατὰ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν/εὐχαριστίαν οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπων) ἀλλὰ θεῖος. On divine wisdom in Philo cf. also *Quis Rerum* 127–129, and the divine *logos* at *Quis Rerum* 119. Philo also referred to the jewels on the priestly robe which were engraved with “reminders of divine natures,” θεῖων φύσεων ὑπομνημάτων. So the fluidity of Philo’s language does not make a clear distinction between the one deity and heavenly things that are fashioned for use on earth by humans.

<sup>238</sup>That 1Cor 10.1-4 is midrashic is assumed by many scholars. Cf. E. Earle Ellis, “‘Wisdom’ and ‘Knowledge’ in 1 Corinthians,” in *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity: New Testament Essays*, WUNT (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck, 1978) 209; Karl-Gustav Sandelin, “‘Do not Be Idolaters!’ (1 Cor 10:7),” in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts, Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*, David Hellholm and T. Fornberg, eds. (Oslo: Scandinavian U.P., 1995) 257-273; Anders Eriksson, *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof: Pauline Argumentation in 1 Corinthians* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1998) 167; Wayne A. Meeks, “And Rose Up to Play: Midrash and Paraenesis in 1 Corinthians 10:1-22,” *JSNT* 16 (1982): 64-78; Lamar Cope, “First Corinthians 8–10: Continuity or Contradiction?” *Anglican Theological Review: Supplementary Series II*. Christ and His

Moses to strike a rock in order to provide water for the people (Ex 17.6; Nu 20.7-11). At

1 Corinthians 10.1-4 Paul wrote:

For I do not want you to be ignorant, brothers, that our ancestors all were under the cloud (oi paterej hmwh pantej upo. thn nefelhn hsan), and all passed through the sea, and all were baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea (kai. pantej eij ton Mwušhh ebaptisqhsan en th/ nefelhl kai. en th/ qal assh), and all ate the same spiritual food and all drank the same spiritual drink. For they drank from the spiritual rock following [them], and the rock was Christ” (h pe:tra de. hñ o: Cristoj).

This presupposes the messiah figure in Paul’s thought in some sort of pre-human state. I have consciously chosen to use the expression, “pre-human,” to discuss in this midrash Paul’s description of the messiah figure as a distinct entity before the messiah figure was “born of woman” (Ga 4.4). While the old expression, “Christophany,” has some attraction, it carries with it too much theological freight because of its association with late-modern Christian apologetics regarding the divinity of the messiah figure and its obvious association with the term, “theophany.”<sup>239</sup> The phrase “pre-human” seems to be the most accurate description of what Paul was trying to convey in 1 Corinthians 10.1-4, where he identified the messiah figure with the rock that accompanied the Israelites in their post-exodus wandering. Paul seems to have attempted to describe some sort of middle state for the messiah figure between a heavenly and human nature. It may be

---

Communities: Essays in Honor of Reginald H. Fuller (March 1990): 114-123.

<sup>239</sup>See Orlando T. Dobbin, ed., CRISTOFANEIA. *The Doctrine of the Manifestations of the Son of God under the Economy of the Old Testament*. By the Late Rev. George Balderston Kidd (London: Ward and Co., Paternoster Row, 1852).



worth noting here that Philo opted for a similar sort of middle position in *Quis Rerum*:

To His Word (λογῶν), His chief messenger (τῶν δὲ ἀρχαγγέλων), highest in age and honour, the Father of all has given the special prerogative, to stand on the border and separate the creature from the Creator (ἐἶνα μετὰ τοῦ σταθμοῦ τοῦ γένεσθαι τὸ ἀκρίβητον τοῦ πεποιθημένου). This same Word both pleads with the immortal as suppliant for afflicted mortality and acts as ambassador of the ruler to the subject. He glories in this prerogative and proudly describes it in these words ‘and I stood between the Lord and you’ (Deut. v.5), that is neither uncreated as God, nor created as you (οὐτε ἀγενήτοισιν ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἢ οὐτε γενήτοισιν ὡς ἡμεῖς), but midway between the two extremes, a surety to both sides; to the parent, pledging the creature that it should never altogether rebel against the rein and choose disorder rather than order; to the child, warranting his hopes that the merciful God will never forget His own work. For I am the harbinger of peace to creation from that God whose will is to bring wars to an end, who is ever the guardian of peace.<sup>240</sup>

What is interesting about Philo’s speculation on the divine *Logos* in this text, and its pertinence to 1 Corinthians 10.1-4, is that it comes in a context where Philo mentions the cloud theophany as the Israelites were escaping Egypt.

Still more am I lost in admiration, when I listen to the oracles and learn how the cloud entered in the midst between the hosts of Egypt and Israel (ὅτι τὸ πρὸς εἰσὴν τῶν ἐν τῇ μεσσητῇ τοῦ Αἰγυπτιακῆς καὶ τῆς Ἰσραηλιτικῆς στρατίας) (Ex. xiv. 20). For the further pursuit of the sober and God-beloved race by the passion-loving and godless was forbidden by that cloud, which was a weapon of shelter and salvation to its friends, and of offence and chastisement to its enemies. For on minds of rich soil that cloud sends in gentle showers the drops of wisdom, whose very nature exempts it from all harm, but on the sour of soil, that are barren of knowledge, it pours the blizzards of vengeance, flooding them with a deluge of

---

<sup>240</sup>*Quis Rerum*, 205–206. The translation is that of F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker, *Philo IV*, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Harvard U.P., 1985).

destruction most miserable.<sup>241</sup>

Philo certainly read the “cloud” of Exodus 14 metaphorically, as sending “in gentle showers the drops of wisdom” on “minds of rich soil.” The point I am making here, however, is that like Philo who midrashed Exodus 14.19-20 with reference to the divine *Logos*, Paul also midrashed Exodus 14.19-20 with reference to the messiah figure (adding to his midrash the rock of Exodus 17.6 and Numbers 20.7-11). And both Philo (for the *Logos*) and Paul (for Christ) claimed some sort of middle state, or pre-human state, between the uncreated divine figure and created humans. Philo’s cloud protects, delivers, and showers wisdom on the “God-beloved race” (qeofilej genoj). Paul interpreted the cloud as a baptism “into Moses.” In fact, by taking Paul’s midrash in its broader context one can see that Paul alluded to baptism and the ritual meal of the early Jesus movement in his interpretation of the exodus and the wandering of the Israelites in the wilderness. The broader context is 1 Corinthians 10–11, where Paul warned the Corinthians against engaging in idolatry, and that it is not possible to participate at the altars of pagan sacrifices while also participating in the ritual meal of the community of Jesus followers. Paul claimed that the account of the rock (“spiritual food” and “spiritual drink”) in Exodus 17.6 and Numbers 20.7-11 served as instruction for the Corinthians as to how they were to guard themselves from idolatry. “And these things have become types for us, so that we might not desire evils, as they also desired. Do not become worshipers of idols as some of them [were], just as it is written, ‘The people sat down to eat and to drink and

---

<sup>241</sup>*Quis Rerum*, 203–204.

they rose up to play' . . . . Therefore, my beloved, flee from the worship of idols" (1Cor 10.6-7, 14).

If it is true that Paul used a midrash that was formulated prior to the composition of his First Letter to the Corinthians and then added this midrash to the letter when it was composed, then one can only speculate about its origin. Taken in connection with Paul's own statement at Galatians 2.11-14, the Acts of the Apostles may be taken as reliable evidence that Antioch was the place where Paul spent the early years of his ministry. Antioch was also the community from which Paul launched his missionary journeys (Ac 11.19-30; 13.1-3). The midrash of 1 Corinthians 10.1-4 may have been part of Paul's teaching among the followers of Jesus in Antioch during the early years of his ministry there. Paul refers to the church of Antioch in his Letter to the Galatians and his public confrontation with Peter over the issue of forcing Gentiles to observe the requirements of Torah—circumcision and food laws (Ga 2.11-14). This is the kind of social context (public conflict and confrontation) that to some extent would have formed the faith and memory of this community. In the process of contributing to this formation, Paul very easily could have developed the midrash he would later include in 1 Corinthians 10.1-4. In Galatians 2 Paul referred to Peter as one of the pillars among the apostles of the Jerusalem church (Ga 2.1-10). There was an early Gospel tradition that placed in Peter's mouth the confession that Jesus is "the messiah, the son of the living God" (Mat 16.16-18). Some scholars view this confession of Peter as an early tradition associated with

Q.<sup>242</sup> Around this tradition of Peter's confession there developed Jesus' response: "And I even say to you that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church" (kagw. de, soi legw oti su. ei=Petroj( kai. epi. tauth| th| petra| oikodomhsw mou thn ekkl hsi an). If the followers of Jesus in Antioch were aware of this tradition, and it is likely that they were, then Paul's confrontation with Peter (as Paul described this in Galatians) might have raised the question in the minds of the followers of Jesus in Antioch whether Peter was really what the tradition claimed him to be. And if Peter was not what the tradition claimed he was, "the rock," what did that mean for the promise of the church imbedded in the same tradition? Paul's midrash would have reoriented the focus away from Peter and onto Christ, with the startling assertion, ". . . and the rock was Christ."

The identification of the pre-human messiah figure with the rock of Exodus 17.6 and Numbers 20.7-11, and the suggestion that Paul was punning with reference to Peter is certainly a possibility. The significance of the midrash for the followers of Jesus in Antioch would have been different from the significance it would have had for the Corinthians. The significance of the midrash for the followers of Jesus in Antioch would have been the promise of divine protection from those who were pursuing them (Ac 6.1-9.2; Ex 13.17-14.31), divine providence in an unfamiliar place (Ac 11.19; Ex 16.1-17.7), and an implied polemic that punned on the term "rock" (petroj & petra) elevating Christ over Peter (1Cor 10.4; Mt 16.16-18). The significance of the midrash for

---

<sup>242</sup>Burton Mack, *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q & Christian Origins* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1993) 260-261. James Robinson, however, does not include Matt 16.16-18 in his identification of Q passages. See *The Critical Edition of Q*, James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffman, and John S. Kloppenborg, eds. Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000).

the followers of Jesus in Corinth would have been developed by Paul as a warning against idolatry (1Cor 10.5-11; Ex 32; Num 25.1-18; 21.5-6; 16.14, 49; presented by Paul in that order).

It should also at least be noted that the cloud Paul referred to in 1 Corinthians 10.1-2 was also described as “the cloud of YHWH” (הַעֲנַן יְהוָה) and “the glory of YHWH” (in Hebrew: הַעֲנַן יְהוָה; in LXX: *doxa kuriou*) in the Yahwist tradition of Exodus 40.34-38.<sup>243</sup> The midrash of 1 Corinthians 10.1-4 should probably be taken as one of Paul’s earliest attempts to understand the messiah figure in some pre-human state in the context of Israel’s history.

### *3.C.i.f. Divine Image and Glory*

In connection with the nature and identity of the messiah figure, something should be said about Paul’s concept of the image and the glory of God.<sup>244</sup> In 2 Corinthians 3.4–4.6 Paul provided a rather detailed argument contrasting what he referred to as the old covenant and the new covenant. Paul described the old covenant in terms of the fading glory reflected in the face of Moses. The new covenant, on the other hand, is permanent, and what is permanent must have a greater glory. Paul allegorically applied the veil covering

---

<sup>243</sup>In the excursus at the end of this dissertation I analyze in detail the identification of the messiah figure with the glory (*doxa*) of the divine figure in relation to one of the earliest christological hymns, Philippians 2.6-11, which is probably to be associated with the early community of Jesus followers in Antioch. Peter Stuhlmacher also makes this connection between Antioch and the Christ Hymn of Philippians 2. See “The Understanding of Christ in the Pauline School: A Sketch,” in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, A.D. 70 to 135*, 169.

<sup>244</sup>This will be discussed in more detail with reference to the Hymn of Christ in Philippians 2 in the excursus, where I will offer a possible solution to the problem of the absence of the Son of Man in LP.

Moses' face to the veil that Paul claimed concealed the gospel from those who do not believe. This veil, Paul argued, keeps them from seeing "the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God" (ton fwtismon tou/ euaggel iou thj doxhj tou/ Cristou( oj estin eikwn tou/ qeou/- 2Cor 4.4). Concluding his argument Paul writes: "For we do not preach ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord, and ourselves as your slaves for Jesus' sake. For it is the God who said, 'Out of darkness let light shine,' who has shone in our hearts with the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (oj el amyen en taij kardiaij hmwh proj fwtismon thj gnwsewj thj doxhj tou/ qeou/ en proswpw| Ihsou/ Cristou/- 2Cor 4.5-6). Paul punctuated his argument by claiming that this visible glory of God, that once manifested itself in the face of Moses, is now permanently manifested "in the face of Jesus Christ." As I argued above (see 3.C.i.e.), Paul's understanding of the messiah figure as the glory of the divine figure was informed by the expressions, "the cloud of YHWH" (hwhy !n[) and "the glory of YHWH" (in Hebrew: hwhy dwbk; in LXX: doxa kuriou) in the Yahwist tradition. And Paul's understanding of the messiah figure being the image of God would have been informed by the terms -lc and twnd of the creation account in Genesis 1.26, suggesting that in Paul's thought the messiah figure superceded the protoplast Adam as the image and glory of God.

3.C.i.g. *The Divine Name*

There are at least two references in LP where the messiah figure is identified with the

divine name.<sup>245</sup> In a context of discussing spiritual gifts at 1 Corinthians 12.3 Paul wrote: “Therefore I make known to you that no one speaking by the Spirit of God says ‘Jesus is cursed,’ and no one is able to say ‘Jesus is Lord’ (Κυριος Ἰησους) except by the Holy Spirit.” This primitive confession of the identity of the messiah figure with the divine name also appears in Paul’s Letter to the Romans. “. . . because, if you confess with your mouth that Jesus is Lord (οτι εαν ομολογησῃς εν τω/στοματι, σου κυριον Ἰησου) and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved. . . . For, ‘everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved’” (Ro 10.9, 13). It is possible that the messiah figure in both of these texts has been identified with the divine name of the Hebrew Bible, *hwhy*, which was translated in the Septuagint as *kyrios* (κυριος) or “Lord.”<sup>246</sup>

### *3.C.i.h. Like an Angel*

Paul apparently was also aware of the traditions current in the first century that the messiah figure is “like an angel.” While discussing his personal relationship with the Galatians, Paul wrote that “it was because of an illness of the flesh I preached the gospel to you the first time, and your testing in my flesh you did not despise or reject, but it was as an angel of God that you received me, as Christ Jesus” (ω/γγελον θεου/εδεξασθε, με(

---

<sup>245</sup>The confession in the Hymn of Christ at Philippians 2.11 is not included here, because I do not think this is a reference to the divine name as the object of the confessional statement. This text will be discussed in detail in the excursus.

<sup>246</sup>See Charles Gieschen’s detailed analysis of the divine name in Second Temple period literature, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 70-78.

wj Criston Ihsouh – Ga 4.13-14). This could be taken in two very different ways. It could suggest that Paul thought of the messiah figure in terms of an angel. Or rhetorically, Paul was simply emphasizing his point. Paul reminded the Galatians that they were so receptive to his presence, in spite of his physical condition, that they received him “as an angel of God.” To lay an even stronger emphasis on their willingness to receive him, he then adds to “as an angel of God” the phrase “as Christ Jesus.” Paul used this kind of rhetorical device in a similar way earlier in Galatians (1.8), in the indictment section. Paul wrote: “But even if we or an angel from heaven (kai. ean hmeij h. aggeloj ek ouranou) should proclaim a gospel to you different from that which we [already] preached to you, let him be cursed.” Paul used the juxtaposition of “we” and “angel from heaven” for rhetorical emphasis here, and could have done this also at 4.14. The juxtaposition of the two phrases in 4.14 may be read either way. This text is somewhat ambiguous, and has led scholars to varying conclusions as to whether Paul considered the messiah figure to be an angel. Charles Gieschen has exegeted the phrase, “as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus,”<sup>247</sup> and demonstrates that Paul did refer to the messiah figure as an angel here (at Ga 4.13-14).

### 3.C.i.i. *Without Sin*

In connection with the righteousness of God Paul referred to the messiah figure as being sinless (2Cor 5.21). “He made him who did not know sin to be sin in our place, so that we

---

<sup>247</sup>See the discussion by Charles Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 321-325. Gieschen comes down on the side of Paul referring to Jesus as an angel.



might become the righteousness of God in him” (ton mh. gnonta amartian uper himwh amartian epoihsen( iha hmeij genwmeqa dikaiosunh qeou/en autw)). This is an exceptional statement in LP. The concept of a sinless messiah figure appears in *Psalms of Solomon* (17.36) and *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Judah 24.1; Benjamin 3.8). This concept also appears in later texts in the New Testament like the Letter to the Hebrews (4.15) and First Peter (1.19), but it appears only here in LP.<sup>248</sup>

Based on the evidence in LP, the messiah figure according to his nature is a human being, and the messiah figure is a pre-existent heavenly being. Paul associated the messiah figure with the wisdom of God via intellectual trajectory of Hellenistic Judaism. According to Paul the messiah figure also appeared in the history of Israel in a sort of pre-human state. The messiah figure is the image and glory of God. And the messiah figure, through the epithet “Lord,” is associated with the divine name of the Hebrew Bible (hwh) and the LXX (kurioj). It is also likely that Paul identified the messiah figure as an angel. And the messiah figure, according to Paul, is a human being without sin. Some of these claims are explicit in LP, and some of them may be inferred from the evidence.

### **3.C.ii. Functions of the Messiah Figure in the Letters of Paul**

There is a good amount of evidence regarding the functions of the messiah figure in LP that lends itself to detailed analysis. Paul made explicit statements regarding a number of

---

<sup>248</sup>This concept will have implications for the comparative analysis in chapter 4, and Paul’s participation in the debate with soteriological traditions about Adam discussed in the excursus.

issues related to the functions of the messiah figure in terms of creation, salvation, delivering forgiveness of sins, the messiah figure's association with the power of God, judgment, and receiving worship from humans.

*3.C.ii.a. Agent of Creation*

The messiah figure, according to Paul, was an agent of God's creation. Paul wrote to the Corinthians: “. . . for us there is one God the Father, from whom are all things even as we [exist] for him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things even as we [exist] through him” (di vou ta panta kai hmeij di v autou/– 1Cor 8.4-6). Here Paul's claim is that all things were created through the messiah figure, the “one Lord Jesus Christ,” and that humans have their existence “through” him. Paul offered no more details than this. He only claimed that the messiah figure is an agent of creation. Paul used similar language in Romans 11.33-36, where he wrote with reference to the divine figure:

O the depth of wealth  
 and wisdom and knowledge of God;  
 How unsearchable are his judgments  
 and incomprehensible his ways.  
 For who has known the mind of the Lord?  
 Or who has become his counselor?  
 Or who has given to him (with the expectation that)  
 he will also be repaid?  
 For from him and through him and to him are all things (oti ex autou/ kai di v  
 autou/ kai eij auton ta panta).  
 To him be glory forever, amen.

The same preposition “through” (di a) that Paul used for the messiah figure's role as agent

of God's creation at 1 Corinthians 8.4-6, Paul used with reference to the divine figure's creative activity at Romans 11.33-36. So for Paul there is an overlapping of functions between the messiah figure and the divine figure with reference to creation.

### *3.C.ii.b. Salvation*

Salvation is one of the functions of the messiah figure in Paul's thought. In LP salvation is articulated in terms of the death and resurrection of the messiah figure, and in terms of the messiah figure delivering human beings from God's wrath at the final judgment. Paul also developed his soteriology in some detail around the figure Adam.

The death and resurrection of the messiah figure is a concept of some prominence in LP (1Thes 4.14; 5.10; Ga 2.20-21; 3.1; 1Cor 6.14; 8.11; 15.3-4; 2Cor 5.14-15; 13.4; Ro 1.4; 4.25; 8.34; 14.9). The messiah figure was crucified (1Cor 1.23; 2.2, 8; 2Cor 13.4; Phlp 2.8). In his Letter to the Thessalonians, Paul was very specific about who he thought was responsible for the death of the messiah figure. He made the specific claim that the messiah figure was killed by "the Jews" in Judea.

For you, brothers, have become imitators of the churches of God in Judea which are in Christ Jesus, for you also have suffered the same things by your own countrymen as they also [suffered] at the hands of the Jews, who killed both the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and have persecuted us severely, and do not please God and oppose all men, by preventing us from speaking to the Gentiles so that they might be saved, with the result that the measure of their sins is always being filled up. But wrath has come upon them in the end (1Thes 2.14-15).

The severity of Paul's language here must reflect the resistance he experienced on his first

and second missionary journeys (Ac 14.2, 5, 19; 17.5, 13; 21.21; 25.2-7).<sup>249</sup> The crucifixion of the messiah figure as a historical event was executed by Pontius Pilate, the Roman authority in Jerusalem. The rhetorical force of Paul's argument blames "the Jews" by drawing on a tradition that Jerusalem persecuted its prophets.<sup>250</sup> Paul placed himself in this tradition in his Letter to the Thessalonians in order to push back against his opponents in Thessalonika and thereby give encouragement and support to the Thessalonian community of Jesus followers. This problem notwithstanding, Paul here referred to the suffering of the Thessalonians, and he presented the death of the messiah figure as an example for the Thessalonians to follow in their own suffering.

For Paul the death of the messiah figure is a sacrificial death. Paul referred to Christ's crucifixion in terms of the Passover. "For Christ our Passover lamb has been sacrificed" (1Cor 5.7). Paul linked the death of the messiah figure with human "trespasses," and he linked the resurrection of the messiah figure with God's justification of humans (Ro 4.25).

The death and resurrection of the messiah figure were key concepts for Paul in his Letter to the Romans. In a discussion where he contrasted the law and the Spirit, Paul argued that what the law was not able to accomplish in humans who had sinned by

---

<sup>249</sup>The theory put forward by Bart Ehrman that the account in the Acts of the Apostles—which describes Paul as targeting synagogues with his message while on his missionary journeys—does not reflect Paul's historic experience. Ehrman claims that there is no evidence in Paul's letters to support the account of Acts that Paul actually targeted synagogues. This text in 1 Thessalonians is evidence that the accounts in the Acts of the Apostles are accurate at least generally speaking as regards the resistance Paul encountered from Jewish opponents of his message. See Bart D. Ehrman, *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*, 4th ed. (New York: Oxford, 2008) 310-314.

<sup>250</sup>See, e.g., Matt 5.12; 23.37; Luke 13.34.

breaking the law, God himself did in Christ. After describing in Romans 7 the internal struggle between the mind and the flesh to keep God's law, Paul wrote:

There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has freed you from the law of sin and death. For the impossibility of the law by which it was weakened through the flesh—God having sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and with reference to sin condemned sin in the flesh, in order that the righteous requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to flesh but according to the Spirit (Ro 8.1-4).

This is a central argument for Paul. The death of the messiah figure was necessary in order to fulfill the justice of God required in the law.

Paul articulated his concept of the death and resurrection of the messiah figure in terms of substitutionary reconciliation. As was already pointed out above, Paul took his argument regarding the death of the messiah figure to the point of identifying Christ with human sin: "He made him who did not know sin to be sin in our place, so that we might become the righteousness of God in him" (2Cor 5.21). The claim that the divine figure would intentionally make the messiah figure "to be sin," in order to give his righteousness to humans, is both radical and startling. This is a claim for the role of the messiah figure that had never before been made in the history of Jewish thought.

According to Paul there were specific purposes for the death and resurrection of the messiah figure. Paul claimed that the Lord Jesus Christ "gave himself for our sins in order to deliver us from the present evil age" (Ga 1.3-4; 2.20-21). Paul argued that Christ's death redeemed humans from the curse of the law (Ga 3.13) and reconciled

humans to God (Ro 5.10).

Paul used the figure Adam in two of his letters to describe his view of the soteriological role of the messiah figure. Paul's Adam typology first appears in his First Letter to the Corinthians. In a discussion of the nature of the resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15, Paul wrote: "For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive" (1Cor 15.22). Paul developed his argument by discussing the messiah figure as "the first fruits" of those who will be resurrected "at his coming" (en th| parousia| autou/- 1Cor 15.23). Paul further developed his argument by contrasting what is perishable with what is imperishable, and to illustrate this he highlighted the difference between Adam and Christ at 1 Corinthians 15.42-50.

So also the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in a state of deterioration, it is raised in a state of incorruptibility. It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power. It is sown a physical body, it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a physical body, there is also a spiritual [body]. Thus also it is written, 'The first human Adam became a living soul'; the last Adam [became] a life-giving spirit (egeneto o prwtoj anqrwpoj Adam eij yuchn zwsan( o escatoj Adam eij pneuma zwppoiouh). But it is not the spiritual that is first but the physical, then the spiritual. The first human was from earth, made of dust. The second human is from heaven (o prwtoj anqrwpoj ek ghj coikoj( o deuteroy anqrwpoj ex ouranou). As was the one of dust, so are those who are of the dust; and as is the one from heaven, so are those who are of heaven (kai. oi oij o epouranioj( toioutoi kai. oi epouranioi). And just as we have borne the image of the one of dust, we shall also bear the image of the one from heaven (kai. kaqwj eforesamen thn eikona tou/coikou( foresomen kai. thn eikona tou/epouraniou). And I say this, brothers, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does what deteriorates inherit the state of incorruptibility.<sup>251</sup>

---

<sup>251</sup>A reference to Adam as the "first man" also occurs in BP (1En 60.8).

In the broader context of explaining his view on resurrection, Paul contrasted the messiah figure with Adam by referring to the messiah figure as “the last Adam” and “the one from heaven.”<sup>252</sup>

In Romans 5 Paul again contrasted the messiah figure with Adam. In Romans 5.6-11 Paul introduced this contrast by reiterating what he had already argued in chapter 4, namely, the justification of sinful humans by the blood of Christ which brings salvation from the wrath of God and reconciliation with God. “Therefore, having been justified now by his blood much more shall we be saved through him from the wrath [of God]” (Ro 5.9). At Romans 5.12-14 Paul included Adam in his argument by highlighting Adam’s role of introducing sin into the world.

Therefore just as through one human being sin entered into the world and through sin death [came], and so death spread to all human beings because all sinned . . . . But death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over those who did not sin with the likeness of the trespass of Adam, who is a type of the one who was to come ( Ἀδὰμ οἷς ἐστὶν τύπος τοῦ μελλόντος ).

Paul used a forensic argument. The sin of Adam brings condemnation. The righteous obedience of the messiah figure results in justification, righteousness, acquittal, and eternal life (Ro 5.15-21). The role played by Adam in Paul’s thought is entirely negative.

---

<sup>252</sup>Charles Gieschen claims that Paul is here relying on a contemporaneous “Heavenly Man” tradition. See *Angelomorphic Christology*, 329-331. Gieschen quotes Philo’s *Op* 134-139: “There are two types of men; one a heavenly man, the other earthly.” Gieschen writes: “Philo’s version is merely one example of the many variations of the Ἀνθρώπων tradition. In the *Corpus Hermeticum* and Gnostic literature, the idea of two Adams was used to explain how the body (Jewish influence) of the Earthly Man was formed after the idea (Hellenistic influence) of the Heavenly Man. Although Paul’s direct dependency upon any of the versions of this tradition cannot be traced, nevertheless we can conclude that Paul is conversant with exegesis about a Heavenly Man.”

This is also evident in the almost nihilistic musings about Adam in 4 Ezra:

For the first Adam, burdened with an evil heart, transgressed and was overcome, as were also all who were descended from him. Thus the disease became permanent; the law was in the people's heart along with the evil root, but what was good departed, and the evil remained (4 Ezra 3.21-22)

It would have been better if the earth had not produced Adam, or else, when it had produced him, had restrained him from sinning. For what good is it to all that they live in sorrow now and expect punishment after death? O Adam, what have you done? For though it was you who sinned, the fall was not yours alone, but ours also who are your descendants. For what good is it to us, if an eternal age has been promised to us, but we have done deeds that bring death? And what good is it that an everlasting hope has been promised us, but we have miserably failed? (4 Ezra 7.46-50).<sup>253</sup>

In addition to claiming that Adam was responsible for the introduction of sin and death into the world, Paul claimed that Adam was “a type of the one who was to come.” And yet Paul used Adam as a contrast with the messiah figure. Adam's trespass is not like the gift God gives through Christ. In Romans 5.15-17 Paul argued that, while Adam's one sin brought judgment and condemnation, the free gift of God's grace in Jesus Christ “brings justification.” In Romans 5.18-21 Paul developed the argument by claiming that just as one man's sin resulted in condemnation for all people, so one man's righteous act, namely, the death of Christ, resulted in life for all people. Paul argued that one man's (Adam's) act of disobedience made all people sinners,<sup>254</sup> and that one man's (Christ's) act

---

<sup>253</sup>The translation is that of Bruce M. Metzger in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1, James H. Charlesworth, ed. (New York: Doubleday, 1983) 529, 541.

<sup>254</sup>This role of Adam as the one who caused sin to spread to all humans must be taken as evidence that the messiah figure, even though he was considered by Paul to *be* human, was also considered by Paul to be more than human and thereby a sinless being somehow immune to Adam's ongoing legacy of sin. See



of obedience made all people righteous. Paul then argued that Adam's disobedience introduced sin into the world, while Christ countered Adam's disobedient act with his own act of obedience, restoring God's righteousness for humans affected by Adam's sin (cf. also Ro 11.32; and Phlp 2.8).

What is notable about Paul's Adam typology in relation to the messiah figure is that the only role Adam plays is a negative one. Adam is the source of sin and death.<sup>255</sup> There is no hint in Paul's thought that Adam played a positive role, either as the image of God in relation to the divine figure, or as an exalted human enthroned in heaven who judges humanity as we find in other Jewish literature from this period (see, e.g., *GLAE* and the *Testament of Abraham*).

### 3.C.ii.c. *Forgiveness of Sins*

Forgiveness of sins as a function of the messiah figure in LP is not unprecedented in the history of Jewish thought. Paul would have received this tradition from the early followers of Jesus. This is evident in the way Jesus was described in the Gospel of Mark: "the Son of Man has authority on the earth to forgive sins" (εξουσιαν εχει ο υιος του ανθρωπου αφιεναι αμαρτιας επι της γης – Mark 2.10). Before the early followers of Jesus ascribed this function to the messiah figure, forgiveness of sins was considered solely the prerogative of the divine figure. The biblical Psalms give the fullest expression

---

the discussion in 3.C.i.i. above.

<sup>255</sup>See *TestAb* 8.9-10 where Abraham is reminded "that all those who (spring) from Adam and Eve die."

of this.

Blessed is the one whose transgressions are taken away,  
 whose sin is covered.  
 Blessed is Adam against whom  
 YHWH does not reckon iniquity,  
 and in his spirit there is no deceit.

When I was silent my bones wasted away  
 while I made cries of distress all day.  
 For day and night your hand  
 was heavy against me;  
 my life's fluid was dehydrated  
 by droughts of summer.

My sin I acknowledged to you,  
 and my iniquity I did not conceal;  
 I said, I will confess  
 my transgression to YHWH;  
 and you forgave  
 the guilt of my sin (Ps 32.1-5).

The psalmist confesses sin to the divine figure and receives forgiveness from the divine figure. This is also evident in Psalm 51:

Have mercy on me, O God,  
 according to your lovingkindness;  
 according to the abundance of your compassion  
 wipe away my transgression.  
 Copiously wash me from my iniquity,  
 and from my sin purify me.

For my transgression I know,  
 and my sin is conspicuously with me always.  
 Against you, you alone, have I sinned,  
 and the evil in your eyes I have done,

so that you are right in your verdict  
and pure in your judgment. . . .

Purify me with hyssop and I shall be clean;  
wash me and I shall be whiter than snow.  
Cause me to hear rejoicing and gladness;  
let the bones you have crushed rejoice.  
Hide your face from my sin,  
and all my iniquity blot out (Ps 51.1-9; MT 51.3-11).

The psalmist so relies on the divine figure alone for forgiveness of sins, that he makes the claim, “Against you, you alone, have I sinned.” This forgiveness is pleaded in a liturgical context, as the reference to purging with “hyssop” suggests, and the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrifice with a hyssop branch by the priest (cf. Ex 12.22; Lev 14.1-9, 48-53; Num 19.1-10). The language of making the penitent “whiter than snow” also appears in First Isaiah:

Come now, let us reason together,  
says YHWH;  
though your sins are as scarlet,  
they shall be white as snow;  
though they are red as crimson,  
they shall be as wool (Is 1.18).

Here the role of forgiveness of sins, in the form of an invitation, is given to the divine figure. Psalm 130, while it reads more like an individual prayer of supplication, is really a national prayer for the redemption of Israel.

Out of the depths I cry to you, O YHWH.  
 Lord, hear my voice.  
 Let your ears be attentive  
 to the sound of my prayers for your mercy.

If you, O YH, watch sins,  
 Lord, who could stand?  
 But with you there is forgiveness,  
 so that you may be feared. . . .

O Israel, hope in YHWH.  
 For with YHWH is lovingkindness,  
 and with him is abundant ransom.  
 And he will redeem Israel  
 from all his iniquities (Ps 130).

All of these texts demonstrate the biblical view that forgiveness is given by the divine figure alone. This concept also appears in the *Wisdom of Solomon*:

For the ability to exert great power is with you always,  
 and who will resist the strength of your arm?  
 For like a weight [lifted] out of scales is the whole world before you,  
 and like a drop of morning dew falling to the ground.  
 But you have mercy on all, for you can do all things,  
 and you overlook the sins of humans for [the sake of] repentance  
 (*Wis* 11.21-23; cf. *Ro* 3.25).

This same concept also appears in the *Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers* 11, referring to Almighty God, Master of the whole universe, and Creator of everything, “with you there is the means for taking away sin.”<sup>256</sup> It is also explicit in the Hodayot prayers of Qumran:

---

<sup>256</sup>The translation is that of D.R. Darnell in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 2, James H. Charlesworth, ed. (New York: Doubleday, 1985) 689.

[I give you thanks] for the secrets whi[ch . . . wh]ich have not reached them in [...] [...] and because of the judgment of . . . [. . . th]oughts of wickedness . . . [...] [...] and because of the judgment . . . [. . . You have purified] your servant from all his offences [by the abundance of] your compassion, [as] you [s]aid through the hand of Moses, [forgiving offence,] iniquity, sin, atoning for [wrongs] and unfaithfulness. [Even though you burn] the foundations of mountains and fire [sears] the base of Sheol, those who . . . [...] in your regulations. You [protect] the ones who serve you loyally, [so that] their posterity is before you all the days. You have raised an [eternal] name, [forgiving] offense, casting away all their iniquities, giving them as a legacy all the glory of Adam (-da dwbk lwbk) [and] abundance of days (1QH<sup>a</sup> IV 9-15).<sup>257</sup>

Paul also identified forgiveness of sins as a function of the divine figure. In his discussion of the salvation of Israel in Romans 11, Paul wrote:

For I do not want you to be ignorant, brothers, with regard to this mystery, so that you might not be wise in your own estimation, that a hardening with reference to part of Israel has occurred, until the fullness of the Gentiles has arrived, and so all Israel will be saved, as it is written, “The one who saves will come from Zion, he will remove godlessness from Jacob.” “And this is the covenant [made] by me with them, when I take away their sins” (Ro 11.25-27).

Paul puts himself in line with the best of both biblical and Second Temple traditions when he asserts one of the roles of the divine figure as removing Israel’s sins by quoting First Isaiah (LXX: Is 27.9): “Therefore the lawlessness of Jacob will be removed, and this will be his blessing, when I take away his sin.” Paul quoted Psalm 32.1-2 (also quoted above) at Romans 4.7-8, asserting forgiveness of sins as a role of the divine figure.<sup>258</sup>

---

<sup>257</sup>The translation is that of Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1998) 149.

<sup>258</sup>Cf. also *Sir* 2.11; 28.2; 39.5; 47.11; *1Es* 8.86; *3Macc* 2.19.

Paul seems to have received from the early followers of Jesus the tradition that forgiveness of sins was one of the roles of the messiah figure. This attribution of forgiveness to the messiah figure was an unprecedented move by the earliest pre-Pauline followers of Jesus. This tradition is so widespread throughout the early Jesus movement that Paul most likely inherited it from the early *kerygma* of the church. We can say, however, that the first literary evidence of the tradition appears in Paul's Letter to the Galatians. In the greeting to this letter Paul wrote: "Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins, so that he might rescue us from the present evil age, according to the will of our God and Father" (Ga 1.3-4). This is not at all a developed concept yet in Paul's thought. Paul here has made a connection between the messiah figure's death and the forgiveness of sins.<sup>259</sup> This is more developed in 1 Corinthians 15 where Paul wrote:

And I make known to you, brothers, the gospel which I proclaimed to, which also you received, in which also you stand, through which also you are saved, if you hold fast to whatever word I proclaimed to you, unless you have believed in vain.

For I delivered to you with priority what I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he was raised on the third day according to the scriptures, and that he was seen by Cephas, then by the twelve (1Cor 15.1-5).

While Paul included the same notion that Christ died for sins as he wrote it in Galatians, he adds here that he received this (without pointing out from whom), and that this was

---

<sup>259</sup>The connection between the messiah figure's death and the forgiveness of sins also appears in later texts. See 1Pt 3.18; 1Jn 2.2; 3.5; 4.10; Ap 1.5.

done “according to the scriptures” (again without including which scriptures he was referring to). As Paul developed his argument about the resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15, he also stated: “For if the dead are not raised, Christ has not been raised. And if Christ has not been raised, your faith is useless; you are still in your sins” (1Cor 15.16-17). Paul made the forgiveness of sins contingent on the reality of the messiah figure’s resurrection. It is possible to read Paul’s concept of forgiveness of sins as a function of the messiah figure in a way that is similar to how the concept appears in the *Damascus Document* (CD). In CD XIV 19, when the messiah of Aaron and Israel appears (l arfy l rha xyvm) the peoples’ iniquities will be atoned by “meal and sin offerings” (taj xw hxnmm ~nw[ rpkym). Forgiveness is achieved through sacrifice. This is still different from Paul in the sense that Paul identified Christ’s death as the atoning sacrifice for sin (oh proegeto o` qeoj il asthrion – Ro 3.25). It is not that forgiveness in connection with sacrifice is unprecedented. What is unprecedented in Paul is that the death of the messiah figure is presented as a sacrifice that atones for sin.

### *3.C.ii.d. Association with the Power of God*

First Corinthians 1.24 suggests that Paul was drawing upon two strands of traditions regarding the messiah figure. As we have already seen, Paul metaphorically associated the messiah figure with the wisdom of God (see 3.C.i.d.). Paul also appears to be drawing on traditions about the exertion of the divine figure’s power at the eschatological coming of the messiah figure. First Corinthians 1.22-24 reads: “Jews ask for signs and Greeks seek wisdom; but we proclaim a crucified messiah, to Jews a scandal and to Gentiles

foolishness, but to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God.”

The connection between the power of the divine figure and messianic belief appears in several texts. Two texts in particular that shaped messianic belief in the Second Temple period, but are not in themselves messianic in nature, are Psalm 110 and Daniel 7. Psalm 110 reads:

- 1 YHWH (hwhy) says to my lord (ynda):  
     “Sit at my right hand,  
     until I make your enemies  
     a footstool for your feet.”
- 2 Your strong scepter  
     YHWH (hwhy) sends forth from Zion.  
     Rule among your enemies.
- 3 Your people [will give] freewill offerings  
     on the day of your strength  
     with ornaments of holiness,  
     from the womb of the dawn  
     dew of your youth will belong to you.
- 4 YHWH (hwhy) has sworn  
     and he will not change his mind,  
     “‘You are a priest for ever  
     after the manner of Melchizedek.”
- 5 The Lord (ynda) is at your right hand;  
     on the day of his wrath he shatters kings.
- 6 He will execute judgment among the nations,  
     filling [them with] corpses;  
     he shatters exceedingly  
     as head over the earth.
- 7 From the wady by the way he will drink;  
     therefore he will lift up [his] head.

This is a royal enthronement psalm of David. It’s original reference is to an enthronement



ceremony for Israel's king. This is evident because of the references to the king's throne, his scepter, and his role of ruling. The psalm expresses an exertion of royal power "on the day of his wrath," when the Lord "at your right hand"—a reference to the king as a military commander—"shatters kings" and "will execute judgment among the nations, filling [them with] corpses." The explicit reference to "power" appears in the LXX version of verse 2: *rābdon dunamewj sou eḡapostelei/kurioj ek Siwn*. "The rod of your power the Lord will send forth from Zion." The use of this psalm in later christological interpretations is fairly extensive in the New Testament and other early Christian literature after the first century. Paul also used this text to develop his own understanding of Jesus as the messiah figure (1Cor 15.23-28; Ro 8.34). It also suggests that we should understand Paul's concept of the divine figure "sending forth" the messiah figure (Ga 4.4; Ro 8.3) in light of Psalm 110.2 (LXX, 109.2).

The heavenly visions of Daniel 7–8 describe the exertion of royal power in a context of judgment and eschatological reign. Like Psalm 110, Daniel 7–8 in its original context was not read as a messianic text, as John J. Collins states: ". . . few modern scholars subscribe to the view that the 'one like a son of man' was originally meant to be identified with the messiah. The absence of any clear reference to a royal messiah in the remainder of Daniel would appear to be decisive in that regard."<sup>260</sup> Daniel 7–8 later acquired extensive and developed traditions of messianic interpretation in Second Temple period texts, the New Testament, and in early Christianity after the first century. In Daniel 7 "one like a son of man" came "with the clouds of heaven." This figure "came to the

---

<sup>260</sup>See John J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God*, 78-79.

Ancient of Days and was brought in front of him” (Dan 7.13). It should be noted that here the figure is not seated on any of the thrones that had been set in place prior to this figure’s appearance (Dan 7.9-10). Then the text reads:

And to him was given dominion and honor and kingly authority,  
so that all peoples, nations, and tongues should serve him;  
his dominion is an eternal dominion, which shall not pass away,  
and his kingly authority [is one] that shall not be destroyed (Dan 7.14).

The word Daniel uses for dominion, as it is translated in the LXX, is ἐκουσία. This is authority that is given to this heavenly figure (καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐκουσία). He does not possess it by nature. This authority/dominion is eternal, unimpeachable, without limit as to its scope. It “shall not pass away” (οὐ μὴ ἀρχῆ), and his kingdom “shall not be destroyed.” According to Daniel, however, it does not go unchallenged. John J. Collins writes with reference to the identity of this figure to whom God gives this ἐκουσία: “The ‘one like a son of man’ is not a corporate symbol, but should be identified with the archangel Michael, ‘the Prince of Israel’ in chapters 10–12.”<sup>261</sup> If the “one like a son of man” is the archangel Michael, who is also the prince of chapters 10–12, then this could also be the prince of the host of 8.11 and the prince of princes of 8.25.<sup>262</sup> Chapter 8 describes the opposition of Antiochus IV Epiphanes to the prince of princes.

---

<sup>261</sup>*King and Messiah as Son of God*, 78. Cp. the ‘one like a son of man’ in Dan 7.13 with “one having the appearance of a man” in 10.18, 21.

<sup>262</sup>Although Collins identifies the prince of the host of 8.11 and the prince of princes of 8.25 with God rather than the angel Michael. See John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1993) 333.

And at the end of their kingdom,  
 when the rebellious ones are finished,  
 then there will stand a king of fierce presence  
 who understands riddles.  
 His power shall be vast<sup>263</sup> even [when he is] without his strength  
 and the things beyond his power he will not ruin;  
 and he will prosper even [in all that] he does;  
 and he will destroy mighty ones  
 and the holy people.  
 According to his treachery  
 he shall make deceit to prosper in his hand  
 and in his heart he shall be magnified  
 and with stealth he will he shall destroy many;  
 even against the prince of princes he shall make a stand;  
 it is not [possible for his] hand to be broken (Dan 8.23-25).

What is noteworthy about this text is that the authority of the prince of princes (probably the angel Michael) is defined in opposition to the great power of his enemy.

The Melchizedek text from Qumran (11Q13) should be included among the texts reflecting a mediatorial tradition that includes the exertion of the divine figure's power at the final judgment. This text midrases the proclamation of liberty to the captives of Isaiah 61.2: "Melchizedek . . . will return them to what is rightfully theirs. He will proclaim to them the jubilee, thereby releasing th[em from the debt of a]ll their sins."<sup>264</sup>

What is amazing is that the text substitutes Melchizedek for YHWH in the quote of Isaiah 61.2 in line 9. "For this is the time decreed for 'the year of Melchiz[edek]'s favor."<sup>264</sup> Melchizedek also acts in the role of judge: ". . . [and] by his might he will judge God's

---

<sup>263</sup>The LXX here has *kai. sterewqhsetai h' i'bcuj autou!*

<sup>264</sup>The translation is that of Michael O. Wise in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation. Translated and with Commentary*, Michael Wise, Martin Abegg, Jr., and Edward Cook, eds. (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1996) 455-457.

holy ones and so establish a righteous ki[n]gdom.” Here the text quotes Psalm 82.1: “A godlike being has taken his place in the council of God; in the midst of the divine beings he holds judgment.” Having identified Melchizedek with YHWH by modifying the text of Isaiah 61.2, the implication in the quote of Psalm 82 is that Melchizedek, as  $\text{-yhl a}$ , is superior to all the other angels ( $\text{-yhl a}$ ), as one who executes judgment in the midst of the angels,  $\text{j pvy -yhl a brqb}$ . The text at the end of line 10 and line 11 then quotes Psalm 7.8-9: “Over [it] take your seat in the highest heaven; A divine being will judge the peoples.” The author replaced YHWH ( $\text{hwh}$ ) of Psalm 7.9 with “a divine being” ( $\text{l a}$ ), suggesting again the identification of Melchizedek with YHWH. 11Q13 then describes how Melchizedek will execute God’s vengeance against “the spirits predestined” to Belial. And “he will deliver all the captives from the power ( $\text{dym}$ ) of Belial and from the power ( $\text{dymw}$ ) of all [the spirits predestined to him]” (13).

Melchizedek appears not to be identified with the messiah figure in 11Q13. For the author of 11Q13 an anointed one appears who will be the messenger of Isaiah 52.7. 11Q13 envisions two messengers, “the [An]ointed of the spir[it]” mentioned in Daniel 9.26. After the sixty-two weeks of Daniel 9, this anointed messenger will be “cut off.” 11Q13 mentions another messenger, who appears to be identified with Melchizedek. “The ‘messenger who brings] good news, who announ[ces salvation’] is the one of whom it is wri[tt]en, [‘to proclaim the year of the LORD’s favor, the day of vengeance of our God;] to comfo[rt] all who mourn” (18-19). The author here quoted Isaiah 61.2, a text the author had already applied to Melchizedek. The end of 11Q13 then appears to midrash Daniel 7.13-18 and the “dominion” of one like a son of man that will be restored

to “the saints of the Most High,” who are called “the Sons of Light” in 11Q13. The beginning of the thought is fragmented:

[ . . . dominion] that passes from Belial and ret[urns to the Sons of Light . . .] [ . . . ] by the judgment of God, just as it is written concerning him, [“who says to Zi]on ‘Your divine being reigns’” (Isa. 52:7). [“Zi]on” is [the congregation of all the sons of righteousness, who] uphold the covenant and turn from walking [in the way] of the people. “Your di[vi]ne being” is [Melchizedek, who will del]iv[er them from the po]wer of Belial (l [yl b d[ym]. . . ).

According to 11Q13 the Melchizedek figure has an authority or role that is somewhere between the divine figure and all the other angels. In the way that the author of 11Q13 interprets texts of the Hebrew Bible, the Melchizedek figure is in some paradoxical way identified with YHWH. The Melchizedek figure releases his people from their sins. As a figure that is higher than the other angels, he sits on a heavenly throne and judges the angels. The Melchizedek figure executes the divine figure’s vengeance against Belial and against those who belong to Belial. And he delivers the congregation of the righteous from the power (literally “the hand”) of Belial.

Another text from Qumran warrants our attention on this topic. The Self-Glorification Hymn (4Q491 Frag. 11-12) is part of the War Scroll. This hymn contains a description of an eschatological battle between the sons of light and the army of Belial. It gives specific tactical instructions for the priests to blow the battle trumpets to indicate detailed maneuvers for the archers and the infantry on the battle field. At one point (Frag. 11 col II lines 11-18) the high priest takes a position in front of the battle line to

strengthen the resolve of his army.

[The Hi]gh Prie[st] will approach and ta[ke up position in front of the li]n[e, and will strengthen their hearts with the power of God] (l a trwbgb) [and] their hands in their fight. And [starting to speak he will say: “Go]d [has risen] and the heart of his people he has tested in the crucible, [... your slain,] for from ancient times you heard the mysteri[es of God. You then be strong, and] stand in the breach and do not fe[ar] when ... [...] [...] he is faithful, and his redeeming help [...] [...] the so]ns of truth, to turn aside the heart which melts and strengthens the he[art ...] [...] the fig]ht this day. The God of Israel will humiliate him, [for] a[l]l [...] [...] without it resisting. For to God will belong [the kingsh]ip, and to his people, the salvat[i]on [...] [...] a short time for Belial, and the covenant of God is peace [for I]srael, in all the appointed times [of eternity. *Blank*]<sup>265</sup>

Though part of the text is fragmented, the sense is relatively clear. The language of this text resonates closely with 11Q13 and its description of the conflict with Belial and the end of his power. Fragment 1 of 4Q491c appears to describe the aftermath of the battle. The beginning of the text is too fragmented to understand the subject, but it appears to be the divine figure, God.

[...] has done awesome things marvellously [...] [...] in the streng]th of his power (wtrwbg x[wkb ...]) the just exult, and the holy ones rejoice in [...] in justice [...] he established [I]srael from eternity; his truth and the mysteries of his wisdom (y2rw wtmr[]) in al[l generations ...] might [...] ... [...] ... and the council of the poor for an eternal congregation. [...] the perfect ones of [...] et]ernal; a mighty throne in the congregation of the gods above which none of the kings of the East shall sit, and their nobles no[t ...] silence (?) [...] my glory is in[comparable] and besides me no-one is exalted, nor comes to me, for I reside in [...], in the heavens, and there is no [...] ... I am counted among the gods and my dwelling is in the holy congregation; [my] des[ire] is not according to the flesh, [but] all that is precious to me is in

---

<sup>265</sup>Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, Vol. 2 (4Q274–11Q31) (Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).

(the) glory (of) [...] the holy [dwell]ling. [W]ho has been considered despicable on my account? And who is comparable to me in my glory? Who, like the sailors, will come back and tell? [...] Who bea[rs all] sorrows like me? And who [suffe]rs evil like me? There is no-one. I have been instructed, and there is no teaching comparable [to my teaching ...] And who will attack me when [I] op[en my mouth]? And who can endure the flow of my lips? And who will confront me and retain comparison with my judgment? [... friend of the king, companion of the holy ones ... incomparable, f]or among the gods is [my] posi[tion, and] my glory is with the sons of the king. To me (belongs) [pure] gold, and to me, the gold of Ophir [...] in the holy dwelling, sing for h[im ...] [... exult,] just ones, in the God of [...] in the holy dwelling, sing for h[im ...] [... p]roclaim during the mediation jubilation [...] in eternal happiness; and there is no ... [...] [...] to establish the horn of [his] Mess[iah ...] ([... wxy]vm !rq ~yqhl) [...] to make known his power with strength (xwkb wdy [ydwhl) [...] [...] [...] <sup>266</sup>

The language at the beginning of this fragment appears to refer to the divine figure, who established Israel from eternity. The text refers to “his truth and the mysteries of his wisdom,” which are apparent references to the divine figure. The rhetorical question, “Who is comparable to me in my glory,” recalls the early theophanic tradition of the exodus out of Egypt (Ex 15.11), when the divine figure exerted his power against the enemies who were pursuing his people. It is almost a certainty that “[his] Mess[iah ...],” or “his anointed one,” at the end of this text must be a reference to the High Priest of 4Q491 Frag. 11 col II lines 11-18. Because of the similarity in language with 11Q13, where Melchizedek has a special relationship (if not a direct identification) with the divine figure, we may also see a similar special relationship between the “anointed one” and the divine figure of 4Q491, where the “anointed one,” or the messiah figure, is a physical manifestation of the power of the divine figure on earth. “[...] to establish the

---

<sup>266</sup>García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, Vol. 2, 981.

horn of [his] Mess[iah ...] ([... wxy]vm !rq ~yqhl) [...] to make known his power with strength (xwkb wdy [ydwhl) [...].”

The first-century BCE text, *Psalms of Solomon*, also exhibits similar motifs of the exertion of divine power with reference to a messiah figure.

- 21 See, Lord, and raise up for them the son of David, their king  
 at the time which you yourself choose, O God, to rule over Israel your servant;  
 22 and brace him with strength to break (iṣcun tou/ qrausai) unrighteous rulers,  
 to cleanse Jerusalem from gentiles who trample with destruction,  
 23 in righteous wisdom to drive out sinners from the inheritance,  
 to crush sinful arrogance like a potter’s jar,  
 24 with an iron rod to shatter all their substance,  
 to destroy lawless nations with the word of his mouth,  
 25 at his [mere] threat [to cause] nations to flee from his presence;  
 and he will convict sinners with the thought of their hearts (*PsSol* 17.21-25).

Here there is a reference to power (iṣcuj) similar to that of Daniel 8: “brace him with strength to break unrighteous rulers” (kai. upozwson auton iṣcun tou/ qrausai arcontaj adi Kouj). This text is also drawing from traditions that were ascribing wisdom to the messiah figure. “. . . in righteous wisdom to drive out sinners from the inheritance” (en sofia| dikaiosunhj exwsai amartwlo uj apo. kl hronomij). The following description of the messiah figure then states that he will not rely on human strength, but on supernatural power, which was also hinted at in *PsSol* 17.21-25.

- 32 And he will be over them a righteous king taught by God,  
 and there will not be injustice in his days in the midst of them,  
 because all shall be holy, and their king shall be the Lord’s Messiah.  
 33 For he will not put his hope in horse and rider and bow,



- neither will he amass for himself gold or silver for war  
 and in a multitude he will not gather hopes for a day of war.
- 34 The Lord himself is his king, the hope of whose power is in the hope of God,  
 and he shall have mercy on all the nations [who are] before him in fear.
- 35 For he shall strike the earth with the word of his mouth forever,  
 he will bless the people of the Lord by wisdom with gladness;
- 36 and he himself [will be] pure from sins, in order to rule a great people,  
 to convict rulers and remove sinners by the strength of [his] word.
- 37 And he will not become weak in his days, [as he trusts] in his God,
- for God has made him powerful (dunaton) by the holy spirit  
 and wise in understanding counsel (kai. sofon en boul h| sunesewj)  
 with strength and righteousness (meta. iscupj kai. dikaiosunhj).
- 38 And the blessing of the Lord will be with him in strength (en iscu|),  
 and he will not weaken.
- 39 His hope will be in the Lord. (*PsSol* 17.32-39a).

The references to not relying on “horse and rider and bow” and not putting hope “in a multitude . . . for a day of war” suggest a polemical relationship with the mediatorial traditions in the War Scroll and the Self-Glorification Hymn of Qumran, which do rely on human agency to fight an eschatological war. That the son of David messiah king will not “amass for himself gold or silver for war” also suggests a polemical reference to the messianic traditions of BP (1En 52.1–53.7) where the six mountains, that once served to provide tyrannical human kings with the metal resources they needed to fashion implements of war, will serve the authority of the “anointed one” in his eschatological overthrow of the human kings.<sup>267</sup> In *PsSol* 17 the messiah king is given God’s power, “to destroy the unrighteous rulers,” “to smash the arrogance of sinners,” “with the word of his mouth forever” and “by the strength of his word.”

---

<sup>267</sup>Similar motifs of the exertion of divine power in relation to the eschatological role of the messiah figure appear in later texts like *ApAbr* 31.1-2 and *2Bar* 39–40.

Paul defined the power of God in terms of what he called “the gospel”: “For I am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God for salvation (*δυναμις θεου/ estin eij swthrian*) to everyone who believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. For the righteousness of God is revealed in it (*dikaiosunh gar qeou/ en autw/ apokaluptetai*) from faith to faith, as it is written, ‘And the righteous shall live by faith’” (Ro 1.16-17). This connection between the power of God and the gospel in Paul’s thought, reveals the righteousness of God. Paul asserted this explicitly in Romans 3:

But now apart from law the righteousness of God has been manifest (*dikaiosunh qeou/ pefanerwtai*), borne witness to by the Torah and the prophets, the righteousness of God through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ for all who believe. For there is no distinction, for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, having been justified freely by his grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as an atoning sacrifice through faith in his blood. [This was] for a demonstration of his righteousness (*eij endeixin thj dikaiosunhj autou*) for the sake of passing over previously committed sins in the clemency of God, for the demonstration of his righteousness at the present time, in order that he might be righteous and that he might justify by the faithfulness of Jesus (Ro 3.21-26).

At 1 Corinthians 15.1-4 Paul defined his gospel in terms of the death and resurrection of the messiah figure. This introduces Paul’s defense of his concept of the resurrection (1Co 15.12-28). Paul then linked the messiah figure’s resurrection with the eschatological resurrection of “those who have fallen asleep” (1Co 15.20-23). The resurrection of all humans will occur, according to Paul, at the end (*to. teloj*), when the messiah figure “gives back the kingdom to God the Father, when he destroys every rule and every authority and power” (*ei#ta to. teloj( o#tan paradidw# thn basileian tw# qew# kai. patri(*

o[an katarghsh| pa[an archn kai. pa[an exousian kai. dunamin). At this eschatological resurrection, according to Paul the messiah figure will destroy “every rule and every authority and power.” This is language (exousia and dunamij) that resonates with the earlier Second Temple traditions about the eschatological exertion of divine power at the hand of a messiah figure.

In Philippians 3 Paul boasts about the credentials of his Jewish identity. He does this, however, in a rhetorical sense, in order to replace boasting in his own personal power with the power of the messiah figure’s resurrection (Phlp 3.10). Paul then made the connection with the eschatological resurrection: “But our citizenship is in heaven, from which also we wait for a savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will change our lowly body in conformation to his glorious body according to the inner working of power so that he is able even to subdue all things to himself” (hmwh gar to. politeuma en ouranoi] uparcei( ex ou=kai. swthra apekdecomeqa kurion Ihsouh Criston( o] metaschmatisei to. swma thj tapeinwsewj hmwh summorfon tw| swmati thj doxhj autou/kata. thn energeian tou/ dnasqai auton kai. upotaxai autw| ta. panta – Phlp 3.20-21).

While most of the traditions regarding messianic power leading up to the first century CE ascribe the divine figure’s power to a mediatorial figure or a messiah figure with reference to eschatological judgment (with the exception of Psalm 110 which is an earlier royal enthronement psalm and Daniel 7–9 which is an angelic-power tradition), Paul associated the power of the divine figure with the messiah figure both in terms of the messiah figure’s death and resurrection, and the messiah figure’s eschatological role in executing divine judgment.

### 3.C.ii.e. *Judgment*

Judgment is one of the functions of the messiah figure in LP. This can be broken down into several elements, including *parousia*, execution of judgment, and execution of punishment.

The *parousia* of the messiah figure is an important aspect of judgment in Paul's thought. According to Paul the messiah figure has a future coming (*parousia*; 1Th 2.19; 3.13; 5.23; 1Cor 15.23; 16.22). The *parousia* is a part of the larger concept of Paul's eschatology. Paul believed that the *eschaton* had already arrived: ". . . the end of the ages has come" (1Cor 10.11). The future coming of the messiah figure entails several important elements in Paul's thought. This future coming of the messiah figure is a coming from heaven (1Th 4.15-18). The future coming of the messiah figure from heaven will be accompanied by "all his holy ones" (*meta pantwn twh agiwn autou*— 1Thes 3.13; cf. Zech 14.5: *kai. hkei kurioj o qeoj mou kai. pantej oi agioi met v autou*). In 1 Thessalonians 3.13 it is not clear whether "holy ones" is a reference to angels. The usual use of the term, *agioj*, in LP refers to the members of the communities to whom Paul wrote his letters. Paul referred to this as "the coming of the Lord" (1Thes 4.15; 5.23). Paul wrote that "the Lord himself will descend from heaven with a cry, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trumpet of God" (1Thes 4.16).<sup>268</sup> Paul referred to an

---

<sup>268</sup>There is a tradition in several texts from this period that has the appearance of angels and the blowing of a trumpet to announce the coming of God for judgment. The *Greek Life of Adam and Eve*, a first-century CE document, contains a merkabah theophany which is announced by the blowing of a trumpet (*GLAE* 37–38). The *Apocalypse of Abraham*, a first- to second-century CE document, is a fabricated dialogue between Abraham and the "Eternal Mighty One," with a detailed description of the final judgment. At *ApAb* 30 the Eternal Mighty One outlines for Abraham ten signs of the impending judgment. At *ApAb* 31.1 the "Eternal Mighty One" tells Abraham, "And then I will sound the trumpet out of the air." This text then refers to the sending of "my chosen one, having in him one measure of all my power." The *Testament*

early tradition about the coming of the Lord when he writes that “the day of the Lord comes just like a thief in the night” (1Thes 5.2; cf. Mt 24.43-44; Lc 12.39-40). Paul sometimes referred to this future coming of the messiah figure as the “day of the Lord” or “the day of our Lord Jesus Christ” (1Cor 1.7-8; 3.13; 5.5; 2Cor 1.14; Phlp 1.6, 10; 2.16). Paul also referred to the second coming of the messiah figure as a “revealing of our Lord Jesus Christ” (1Cor 1.7-8). Paul urged the followers of Jesus in Corinth to wait for this day when the messiah figure will be “revealed” (ἀπεκδεχόμενοι τὴν ἀποκαλύψιν τοῦ κυρίου – 1Cor 1.7). At the future coming of the messiah figure according to Paul, the messiah figure will establish the hearts of believers unblamable in holiness before God and deliver them from the wrath to come (1Th 1.10). At this future coming the messiah figure will disclose the purposes of human hearts with the result that every human will receive judgment from God (1Cor 4.5).

As the earliest of Paul’s letters, 1 Thessalonians exhibits several elements of Paul’s thought regarding the messiah figure at his *parousia*. After giving encouragement to the Thessalonians as to how they were to live and treat each other while waiting for the *parousia*, Paul also addressed what appears to have been a specific concern raised by the Thessalonians, namely, what happens to those who die before the *parousia*.

---

*of Abraham* is another first- to second-century CE document with a judgment scene depicting an angel with a trumpet. At *TestAb* 12.10 an angel holds a trumpet and wields fire in the context of a judgment scene. The *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* is a first-century BCE to first-century CE document. In chapters 9–12 *ApZeph* describes a series of three trumpets that are used in the context of judgment. In the *Greek Apocalypse of Ezra* (4.36), a second- to ninth-century CE document, there is only a brief mention of a trumpet in the context of the resurrection of the dead. And in *Questions of Ezra*, Recension B (date unknown) a trumpet is sounded by the angel Gabriel at “the coming of Christ.”

But we do not want you to be ignorant, brothers, about those who have fallen asleep, so that you may not grieve even as the rest who do not have hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, so also through Jesus God will bring with him those who have fallen asleep. For this we say to you by a word of the Lord, that we who are living, who are left until the coming of the Lord, shall not precede those who have fallen asleep. For the Lord himself will descend from heaven with a cry, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trumpet of God, and the dead in Christ will rise first. Then we who are living, who are left, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air. And so we shall always be with the Lord. Therefore comfort each other with these words.

But concerning the times and the seasons, brothers, you do not have a need for us to write. For you yourselves well know that the day of the Lord will come like a thief in the night. When they say, “Peace and safety,” then sudden destruction will come upon them as birth-pains for a pregnant woman, and they will not escape. But you, brothers, are not in darkness, so that the day will overtake you like a thief (1Th 4.13–5.4).

In the process of answering the specific question, what happens to those who die before the *parousia*, Paul gave the Thessalonians several elements of his thought with regard to the expected second coming of the messiah figure. The messiah figure died and rose again. Paul stated this as a condition:  $\epsilon\iota\upsilon\gamma\alpha\rho\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\mu\epsilon\mu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \iota\eta\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\ \alpha\pi\epsilon\gamma\alpha\gamma\epsilon\mu\epsilon\mu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\eta\alpha\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \circ\ \kappa\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\omicron\mu\eta\tau\eta\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \iota\eta\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\ \alpha\chi\epsilon\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\mu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$  “For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, so also through Jesus God will bring with him those who have fallen asleep.” For Paul this death and resurrection of the messiah figure was the basis for belief that God would also raise those who had died. The phrase  $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \iota\eta\sigma\upsilon\upsilon$  “through Jesus,” indicates that Paul thought of the messiah figure as God’s agent or instrument for accomplishing the resurrection of the dead. One should probably note here the similarity of language at 1 Corinthians 8.4-6 where the messiah figure in Paul’s thought is a preexistent agent of creation. What Paul may be hinting at in 1 Thessalonians

is that the messiah figure is the divine figure's agent of a new creation, something Paul defined as being "in Christ" at 2 Corinthians 5.17.

Paul then asserted that his instructions about the resurrection of the dead were given "by a word of the Lord" (*en logw| kuriou*), a reference to the messiah figure. Here Paul claimed that those who are left alive until the coming of the Lord (*oi perileipomenoi eij thn parousian tou kuriou*) will not precede in resurrection those who had already died. Paul then launched into a description of what he thought the *parousia* would entail: descent of the messiah figure from heaven, some sort of audible announcement which he referred to as "a cry" (either by an angel or by the divine figure), "the voice of the archangel," and "the trumpet of God." The "cry" is not in apposition to "the voice of the archangel"; rather it is one in a list of three elements accompanying the messiah figure's descent.

This coming day of the Lord, according to Paul, will be for judgment (1Cor 5.5; 2Cor 1.14). In connection to the *parousia*, according to Paul, the messiah figure is to be the agent of God's judgment. In fact the messiah figure executes both judgment and punishment. In his Second Letter to the Corinthians Paul wrote: "For it is necessary that we all appear before the judgment seat of Christ (*touj gar pantaj hmaj fanerwqhhai dei/ emprosqen tou bhmatou tou Cristou*), in order that each may receive back for the things which he has done through the body, whether good or bad" (2Cor 5.10). It should at least be noted here that this is the only place in LP where the messiah figure sits on a "judgment seat" or judgment throne (cp. Ro 14.10 where it is the divine figure who sits on the judgment throne). This should probably be taken as another allusion to Psalm

110.2 in LP.<sup>269</sup> Paul wrote to the Romans that the messiah figure is the agent through whom “God judges the things hidden by human beings” (Ro 2.16). Paul included himself in this judgment. “I am aware of nothing in myself, but by this I have not been justified; the one who judges me is the Lord. Therefore do not pass any judgment before the proper time, until the Lord comes, who will also bring to light the things hidden by the darkness and will reveal the councils of the heart; and then there will be praise for each one from God” (1Cor 4.4-5). The final judgment also entails the role of the messiah figure in relation to the divine figure. In the end the messiah figure will deliver the kingdom to God the Father after destroying every rule and every authority and power (1Cor 15.24).

With regard to the final judgment one of the roles of the messiah figure is to deliver believers from the coming wrath (1Thes 1.10). Paul also articulated this in terms of believers being destined to salvation through the messiah figure (1Thes 5.9). The messiah figure will make those who believe guiltless “on the day of our Lord Jesus Christ” (1Cor 1.7-8; Phlp 1.6, 10; 2.14-18). According to Paul’s thought this is related to the death of the messiah figure, who died in order to save humans from the wrath of God (Ro 5.6-9). The messiah figure will also transform believers on the final day. According to Paul, the messiah figure “will change our lowly body in conformation to his glorious body according to the inner working of power so that he is able even to subdue all things to himself” (Phlp 3.20-21; cf. 1Cor 15.27-28).

The cultic acts of the early followers of Jesus in Corinth had a sort of now/not yet

---

<sup>269</sup>Darrell Hannah does not include 2Cor 5.10 in his list of Pauline allusions to Psalm 110.2. Cf. “The Throne of His Glory,” 72.



eschatological character. In First Corinthians Paul drew a connection between the communal meal and the *parousia* of the messiah figure. “For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the death of the Lord until he comes” (1Cor 11.26).

### 3.C.ii.f. *Worship*

That the messiah figure was the object of human worship is also one of the functions of the messiah figure in LP. This function of the messiah figure among the early followers of Jesus appears in a number of forms in LP. It appears in certain prayer formulas that draw a close connection between the messiah figure and the divine figure, in invocation formulas, baptism formulas, meal formulas, hymns, and doxologies.<sup>270</sup>

At 1 Corinthians 16.22 we have what is probably the most widely recognized liturgical formula in LP, which Paul would have borrowed from the worship of the earliest followers of Jesus who were still speaking Aramaic. This formula comes at the end of the letter, where Paul greeted various persons by name and he wrote a personal greeting in his own hand. “The greeting is in my hand, Paul. If any one does not love the Lord, let him be cursed. Our Lord, come!” The prayer, “Our Lord come!” is recognized by most scholars to be an Aramaic liturgical prayer, in Greek: *marana qa*. The prayer in Aramaic would be *ata anrm*.<sup>271</sup> This appeal also appears in an early liturgical prayer

---

<sup>270</sup>See the discussion by Larry Hurtado in *Lord Jesus Christ*, 137-153. The discussion here follows Hurtado’s analysis.

<sup>271</sup>Joseph Fitzmyer has claimed that this is evidence that early Jewish followers of Jesus worshiped Jesus as Lord and identified him with YHWH of the Hebrew Bible. See “New Testament Kyrios and Maranatha and Their Aramaic Background” in *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies* (New York: Crossroads, 1981) 218-235. Fitzmyer argues that there is no evidence for an apocoped imperative, consequently Paul’s Greek transliteration of the imperative reflects an elision of the initial aleph.

included in the *Didache*: “Let grace come and let this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David. If anyone is holy, let him come. If anyone is not, let him repent. Our Lord, come (maran aqa). Amen” (*Didache* 10.6). So the presence of marana qa in Paul appears to be more than just a spontaneous appeal, and is more likely the inclusion of a liturgical formula. The fact that Paul left the Aramaic formula untranslated is evidence that it would have been familiar to Paul’s readers, which suggests a Jewish presence within the Christian community of Corinth.<sup>272</sup>

At 1 Corinthians 1.2 Paul addressed the Corinthians as those who “call on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.” While on the surface this might not appear to have any significance for the worship of the messiah figure by humans, according to Hurtado it places the messiah figure in a role the precedent of which in Jewish thought and practice can only be identified with the divine figure. Hurtado includes Romans 10.9-13 as evidence of early worship with reference to the messiah figure. “. . . if if you confess with your mouth that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved. For with the heart it is believed for righteousness, and with the mouth it is confessed for salvation.” Hurtado is correct to link this early confession of Jesus as Lord with worship. Immediately following this text, Paul quoted the prophet Joel: “For the scripture says, ‘Everyone who believes in him will not be put to shame.’ For there is not a distinction between Jew and Greek, since he himself is the Lord of all, giving riches to all who call upon him. For, ‘everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved’” (paf gar ojj an epikaleshtai to onoma kuriou swqhsetai). The last

---

<sup>272</sup>Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 140-141.

quote is from Joel (MT: 3.5; LXX: 2.32). As Hurtado rightly points out, while the context of Joel is eschatological judgment, the usual use of the word “to call upon” (epikal eih) with reference to the Lord in the LXX (hwhy ~vb arq in the Hebrew Bible) has cultic connotations. “In Romans 10:9-13, however, it is clear that Paul refers to ritual acclamation/invocation of *Jesus* in the setting of Christian worship, and that he does so by deliberately using this biblical phrase for worshiping God.”<sup>273</sup> This same confession, that “Jesus is Lord,” is also addressed by Paul at 1 Corinthians 12.1-3 together with spiritual gifts, in a context where he discussed various worship practices. It should also be observed that the object of the confession in Greek at both Romans 10.9 and 1 Corinthians 12.3 is *Kurios Ihsous*, and that the confession itself, instead of “Jesus is Lord,” may have been simply “the Lord Jesus.” Hurtado writes:

Though “to call upon” Jesus was probably initially the specific ritual (collective) confession/acknowledgment of his exaltation as “Lord,” the phrase quickly came to connote the broader devotional praxis of treating Jesus as recipient of liturgical worship through invocation, prayer, and praise. In 1 Corinthians 1:2 Paul refers to Christians everywhere (*en panti topō*) as “all those who call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ,” which both explicitly indicates the christological appropriation of the biblical phrase and also makes this cultic reverence of Jesus the universal description of Christian believers. . . . the appropriation of the biblical expression to describe and understand the ritual reverence of Jesus probably goes back well before Paul’s Gentile mission.<sup>274</sup>

Hurtado then states that “there is simply no parallel for this in any other group of the

---

<sup>273</sup>*Lord Jesus Christ*, 142. James Dunn agrees; see *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 257-258.

<sup>274</sup>*Lord Jesus Christ*, 143.

period in the Jewish tradition.” Here Hurtado makes a reference to BP, and contrasts the reverence for the divine figure expressed in BP with that expressed for the messiah figure in LP.

For example, note the emphasis on the name of God in the “Similitudes” section of *1 Enoch*. There we find numerous references to denying (45.1; 46.7) and glorifying/blessing/extolling (46.6; 48.6; 61.9, 11-12; 63.7) God’s name, and the elect are made victorious through God’s name (50.2-3). In the early Christian groups whose worship life is mirrored and presupposed in the Pauline letters, the name of Jesus plays a comparable role.<sup>275</sup>

Hurtado is quite right that this sort of worship is directed to the divine figure in BP. But what is not clear in BP is the distinction Hurtado makes between the messiah figure and the divine figure with regard to the use of the divine name in BP. In fact, there is some evidence in BP that the messiah figure is associated with the divine name and that the same verbs that are applied to the worship of the divine figure are also applied to the messiah figure in BP (see, e.g., 1En 40.3-5; 48.5; 62.9-12). Consequently, Hurtado’s argument that “there is simply no parallel for this in any other group of the period in the Jewish tradition” simply does not hold. Hurtado’s argument that the intensity of devotion to Christ is unparalleled may be accurate, but his claim that no other messiah figure in Second Temple period Jewish thought received worship is not accurate. This is an important point, because it addresses the relationship between the messiah figure in BP and the messiah figure in LP, which will be the point of comparison in chapter 4 of this

---

<sup>275</sup>*Lord Jesus Christ*, 143.

dissertation.

Paul made explicit statements about a number of issues related to the functions of the messiah figure in LP. The messiah figure is the divine figure's agent of creation, "through whom" all things were created. Salvation is one of the functions of the messiah figure in LP. Paul developed his concept of salvation in terms of the death and resurrection of the messiah figure, an act which delivers humans from God's wrath. Paul also developed his soteriology by contrasting Christ with Adam, ascribing to Adam a wholly negative role of introducing sin and death, a problem which in Paul's view was resolved by the "last Adam," Christ. Paul articulated the death and resurrection of the messiah figure as a propitiatory sacrificial death for the forgiveness of sins. Paul associated the messiah figure with the power of God, which is a development of biblical traditions about the theophanic exertion of God's power against the enemies of his people, and Second Temple traditions regarding the eschatological exertion of God's power for judgment. Paul also placed the messiah figure in the role of judge, occupying the "judgment seat" and executing punishment. Paul also gave various descriptions of the messiah figure in LP as the object of human worship.

### **3.D. Summary and Conclusions**

While there is very little material on the nature of the divine figure in LP that lends itself to detailed analysis, what is clear is that Paul's monotheism led him to write about the divine figure as a being set apart from all others, the unique, only divine God, who

possesses deity and is a heavenly being. Paul also understood the divine figure to be righteous in terms of the gospel, as Paul defined it in the death and resurrection of the messiah figure, and the redemption he claimed was “in Christ Jesus.”

In LP the divine figure assumes several roles according to Paul. In line with virtually all of Jewish literature from this period, the divine figure is creator. The divine figure reveals secret and hidden wisdom to human beings. The divine figure revealed the messiah figure to Paul. The divine figure also acted in the life of the messiah figure, “sending forth” the messiah figure to be crucified and raising the messiah figure from the dead. Paul claimed that the death and resurrection of the messiah figure was the divine figure’s way of reconciling the world to himself. In this way the divine figure plays a role in the salvation of humans. The divine figure receives worship from humans. On the day of judgment the divine figure will raise the dead and judge humans. These are all functions of the divine figure in Paul’s thought according to LP.

Based on the evidence in LP, the messiah figure according to his nature is a human being as well as a pre-existent heavenly being. Paul associated the messiah figure with the wisdom of God, via the intellectual trajectory of Hellenistic wisdom traditions. He also had some sort of concept of the messiah figure in a pre-human form, identifying Christ with “the rock” that “followed” the Israelites as they wandered in the wilderness. For Paul the messiah figure is the image and glory of God. The messiah figure, through the epithet “Lord,” is associated with the divine name of the Hebrew Bible (*hwhy*) and the LXX (*kurioj*). Paul also identified the messiah figure as an angel. And in Paul’s thought the messiah figure was without sin, a concept that Paul appears to have used with

reference to the broader discussion about Adam and the new creation in Christ.

Regarding the functions of the messiah figure, Paul made a number of explicit statements. The messiah figure is an agent of creation. The death and resurrection of the messiah figure are prominent roles in Paul's thought. Paul also made specific soteriological claims about the messiah figure, contrasting the exclusively negative role of Adam and the restorative, redemptive role of Christ in the place of Adam. Paul made the claim that the death and resurrection of the messiah figure was a propitiatory sacrifice for sins that gives humans the forgiveness of sins. In LP the messiah figure is associated with the exertion of God's power, which entailed the event of the messiah figure's death and resurrection and the messiah figure's role in the eschatological judgment. Paul identified final judgment as a role of the messiah figure, which entailed *parousia*, sitting on a throne of judgment, executing judgment, and executing punishment. And Paul included being worshiped by humans as one of the roles of the messiah figure.

The following tables (*Table-5* and *Table-6*) show the nature and functions of the divine figure and the nature and functions of the messiah figure in comparison to each other. There are five characteristics of nature that the two figures share according to LP. Both figures are unique figures for which there is no parallel. Both figures have the divine name. Both are heavenly beings. Both figures are righteous. And both have the divine image and glory. In the undisputed Letters of Paul there is no explicit reference to the deity of the messiah figure. With regard to functions there are five categories in LP that I am using for comparison here: creation, revelation of wisdom, salvation, judgment, and worship. The divine figure and the messiah figure share all five of these broader

categories with differences between the two within each of the five categories. Both figures act in creation. Both figures are involved in the revelation of wisdom, the divine figure as the revealer of wisdom, and the messiah figure as the object of that revelation. Both figures function in the role of salvation. The divine figure sent forth the messiah figure to be crucified. The messiah figure was crucified. The divine figure raised the messiah figure from the dead. The messiah figure participated in this resurrection. The messiah figure also delivers from the future wrath of God. And both figures deliver the forgiveness of sins. With reference to judgment, both figures have a role in this function, and according to Paul they share this function in all of its details. Both figures are worshiped by humans.



*Table-5*      **A Comparison of the Nature of the Divine Figure and the Nature of the Messiah Figure in LP**

Nature	Divine Figure	Messiah Figure
deity	!	
unique	!	!
divine name	!	!
heavenly being	!	!
righteous	!	!
divine image & glory	!	!
human being		!
preexistent		!
associated with wisdom		!
pre-human		!
like an angel		!
without sin		!

*Table-6*      **A Comparison of the Functions of the Divine Figure and the Functions of the Messiah Figure in LP**

Function	Divine Figure	Messiah Figure
<b>CREATION:</b>		
creation	!	!
<b>REVELATION OF WISDOM:</b>		
reveals wisdom	!	
object of divine revelation		!
<b>SALVATION:</b>		
sends messiah figure	!	
crucifixion of messiah figure	!	!
resurrection of messiah figure	!	!
delivers from wrath of divine figure		!
forgiveness of sins	!	!
<b>JUDGMENT:</b>		
sits on throne	!	!
appears at the judgment / <i>parousia</i>	!	!
presides over the judgment	!	!
executes judgment	!	!
executes punishment after the judgment	!	!
resurrection of the dead	!	!
<b>WORSHIP:</b>		
worshiped by humans	!	!
receives prayers	!	!

## CHAPTER 4

### A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE MESSIAH IN THE *PARABLES OF ENOCH* AND THE LETTERS OF PAUL

#### A. Striking Similarities between the *Book of Parables* and the Letters of Paul

The key question this study has attempted to answer is: What is the relationship, if any, between the concept of the messiah figure in the *Book of the Parables of Enoch* and the concept of the messiah figure in the Letters of Paul? A corollary question is: Where does Paul as a Jew fit within the landscape of Jewish intellectual development of messianic traditions of the Second Temple period?

In order to answer the key question, this study has examined the data in BP and LP with regard to the nature and functions of the divine figure and the nature and functions of the messiah figure. In chapter 2 the study focused on the nature and functions of the divine figure and the messiah figure in BP. These findings were summarized and presented in tables (see *Tables 3 & 4*). In chapter 3 the study examined the nature and functions of the divine figure and the messiah figure in LP. These findings were summarized and presented in tables (see *Tables 5 & 6*).

In order to compare the data in BP with the data in LP, I have combined these

tables and present them here (see *Tables 7 & 8*).

*Table-7*      **A Comparison of the Nature of the Divine Figure and the Nature of the Messiah Figure in BP and LP**

Nature	Divine Figure in BP	Divine Figure in LP	Messiah Figure in BP	Messiah Figure in LP
deity		!		
unique		!		!
heavenly being	!	!	!	!
eternal	!			
righteous	!	!	!	!
merciful	!			
human being			!	!
associated with wisdom			!	!
preexistent			!	!
like an angel			!	!
pre-human				!
divine image & glory				!
divine name			!	!
without sin				!

*Table-8*      **A Comparison of the Functions of the Divine Figure and the Functions of the Messiah Figure in BP and LP**

Function	Divine Figure in BP	Divine Figure in LP	Messiah Figure in BP	Messiah Figure in LP
<b>CREATION:</b>				
creator	!	!		!
controls the astronomical order	!			
gives wind and rain to water the earth	!			
<b>REVELATION OF WISDOM:</b>				
revealer of wisdom	!	!	!	
object of divine revelation			!	!
chooses the messiah figure	!			
conceals identity of the messiah figure	!			
reveals the messiah figure to the chosen	!			
revealed to the chosen			!	
<b>SALVATION:</b>				
salvation of the righteous			!	
shows mercy to the righteous	!			
preserver of life through the flood	!			
sends messiah figure		!		
crucifixion of messiah figure		!		!
resurrection of messiah figure		!		!
delivers from wrath of divine figure				!
forgiveness of sins		!		!

Table-8      **A Comparison of the Functions (continued)**

Function	Divine Figure in BP	Divine Figure in LP	Messiah Figure in BP	Messiah Figure in LP
<b>JUDGMENT:</b>				
appears at the judgment / <i>parousia</i>	!	!	!	!
sits on throne	!	!	!	!
seats messiah figure on throne of glory	!			
presides over the judgment	!	!	!	!
executes punishment after the judgment	!	!	!	!
resurrection of the dead		!	!	!
has authority, to have the power and might on the earth, to subvert those who oppress the righteous			!	!
<b>WORSHIP:</b>				
worshiped by humans	!	!	!	!
worshiped by angels	!		!	
worshiped by kings & the mighty	!		!	
denied and scorned by kings of the earth	!		!	
receives the prayers of humans	!	!		!

It is helpful to look at this data only with reference to the messiah figures in BP and LP. The following tables (*Tables 9 & 10*) outline the common conceptual elements between the messiah figures in BP and LP, and whether these elements are preceded or unpreceded in Jewish literature from the Second Temple period. I present the evidence this way (preceded or unpreceded) in order to contextualize the data. I also include in the evidence identified as “preceded” conceptual elements related to any mediatorial figure in heaven that is associated with but distinct from the divine figure, regardless of

whether that power in heaven was characterized as a messiah figure in its respective text; the “one who had the appearance of a man” of Ezekiel 1, the angelic Melchizedek figure of Qumran, and Philo’s *Logos*, for example, are mediatorial figures, but they are not identified in their respective texts as messiah figures.

*Table-9*      **Precedented and Unprecedented Conceptual Elements of Messianic Nature Held in Common by BP and LP**

<i>Nature in common</i>	<i>Precedented or unprecedented?</i>
human being	<u>precedented w.r.t. messiah figures</u> : PsSol 17
heavenly being	<u>precedented w.r.t. mediatorial figures</u> : Ezek 1; Dan 7; 11Q13 <b>UNPRECEDENTED</b> w.r.t. messiah figures
associated with wisdom	<u>precedented w.r.t. mediatorial figures &amp; messiah figures</u> : Philo; PsSol 17 / <i>far more developed in BP &amp; LP</i>
preexistent	<u>precedented w.r.t. mediatorial figures</u> : Prov 8–9 <b>UNPRECEDENTED</b> w.r.t. messiah figures
righteous	<u>precedented w.r.t. messiah figures</u> : PsSol 17 / <i>far more developed in BP &amp; LP</i>
like an angel	<u>precedented w.r.t. mediatorial figures</u> : Dan 7; <i>Sirach</i> ; 11Q13 <b>UNPRECEDENTED</b> w.r.t. messiah figures
divine name	<b>UNPRECEDENTED</b> w.r.t. mediatorial figures and messiah figures

*Table-10*      **Precedented and Unprecedented Conceptual Elements of Messianic Functions Held in Common by BP and LP**

<i>Functions in common</i>	<i>Precedented or unprecedented?</i>
object of divine revelation	<u>precedented w.r.t. mediatorial figures</u> : Prov 2
appears at judgment	<u>precedented w.r.t. messiah figures</u> : PsSol 17
sits on throne	<u>precedented w.r.t. mediatorial figures</u> : WisSol 9.4; EzekTrag <b>UNPRECEDENTED</b> w.r.t. messiah figures
presides over judgment	<b>UNPRECEDENTED</b> w.r.t. mediatorial figures and w.r.t. messiah figures
executes punishment	<u>precedented w.r.t. mediatorial figures and w.r.t. messiah figures</u> : PsSol 17; 11Q13; 4Q491
resurrection of the dead	<b>UNPRECEDENTED</b> w.r.t. mediatorial figures and w.r.t. messiah figures
subverts oppressive rulers	<u>precedented w.r.t. mediatorial figures and w.r.t. messiah figures</u> : PsSol 17; 11Q13
worshiped by humans	<b>UNPRECEDENTED</b> w.r.t. mediatorial figures and w.r.t. messiah figures

The distinction between mediatorial figures and messiah figures of the Second Temple period is critical for understanding the evidence presented here. Not all mediatorial figures in Jewish thought were messiah figures. Moses was described as a human mediatorial figure who was never referred to as a messiah. This was also true of Philo's view of the *Logos* and divine wisdom. Philo never uses the designation "messiah" to describe these figures. The Melchizedek figure at Qumran was in some sense a mediatorial figure, but was not referred to as a messiah. When a nature or function of the



messiah figures in BP and LP are described as precedented or unprecedented, this must be understood with reference to the distinction between Jewish mediatorial figures in general and the messiah figure specifically.

The most striking similarities of conceptual elements with regard to the messiah figure in BP and LP must be approached from a perspective that appreciates the way in which these conceptual elements are combined.<sup>276</sup> Simply listing the conceptual elements or viewing the connections separately can be misleading and will lead to a wrong conclusion. In other words, it would be wrong to conclude that the similar conceptual elements in BP and in LP taken separately simply suggest that Paul's messianic thought is nothing more than a parallel development. The conceptual elements "human being" and "heavenly being" are not in themselves unique with reference to mediatorial figures in the Second Temple period. It is the combination of these two conceptual elements with reference to the messiah figure that is unprecedented in the history of Jewish thought. Add to this combination the attribute of preexistence, an extensively developed association with wisdom, an unprecedented association with the divine name, an unprecedented presiding of the messiah figure over the eschatological judgment, and the unprecedented function of being worshiped by humans, and the combination of messianic conceptual elements in BP becomes even more extraordinary. It is only when these conceptual elements are taken together that we begin to understand the unprecedented

---

<sup>276</sup>It should be noted at this point that the conclusion stated here assumes the current position taken by most specialists of the Enoch literature, that the composition of BP is to be dated sometime between 40 BCE and 70 CE, and that there are traditions about the Son of Man messiah figure that predate its composition. This consensus establishes the messianic traditions of BP, if not the text itself, to a date prior to Paul, or at least contemporaneous with Paul. See the discussion about the date of BP in chapter one.

level of development of messianic thought in BP. Such a level of development precludes any suggestion of coincidental development or parallel development of the same combination of messianic conceptual elements in LP.

#### **4.B. What Is New in Paul**

To this point I have compared, analyzed, and drawn conclusions about the evidence that shows a common set of conceptual elements of messianic traditions shared by BP and LP. What can be said of their differences? With regard to the nature of the messiah figure in LP there are three elements that extend Paul's point of view beyond that of BP. Paul referred to some sort of pre-human state of the messiah figure in 1 Corinthians 10 in his midrash on the rock that followed God's people in the wilderness. "And the rock was Christ." This kind of pre-human state of a mediatorial figure is not unprecedented as something similar to this appears in Philo's description of the *Logos*. Paul also associated the messiah figure with the divine image and glory. This does not appear in BP. The divine image and glory are not unprecedented in Jewish literature, however, as these concepts are applied specifically to the figure Adam in *GLAE* and to priestly liturgical traditions in various other texts like *Sirach 50* and the scrolls of Qumran. Paul further claimed that the messiah figure was without sin. This conceptual element of messianic nature is missing from BP, but again it is not unprecedented in the literature from the period.

There are also a number of functions of the messiah figure in LP that are not present in BP. It is unclear whether the role of the messiah figure as agent of creation is

present in both BP and LP. In BP this role may be associated with the messiah figure via the divine name, but it is an enigmatic association if it is there at all. If it is present in BP then it is clear that the function of the messiah figure as agent of creation is stronger in LP than in BP. In LP this association is explicit. The function of agent of creation is preceded in the wisdom figure of sapiential traditions, and it appears in Philo with reference to the *Logos*. There are three functions of the messiah figure in LP that clearly do not appear in BP. In LP the messiah figure is crucified and raised from the dead. These two functions of the messiah figure have no precedent anywhere in Second Temple Jewish literature. These functions of the messiah figure were, however, central to the early *kerygma* among the earliest followers of Jesus. Paul radicalized these two concepts of the death and resurrection of the messiah figure by combining them with the forgiveness of sins. It is very likely that Paul's concept of a crucified and risen messiah figure was shaped by his so-called conversion experience on the road to Damascus and his interaction with the early followers of Jesus in Damascus immediately following this experience and eventually in Antioch. The point here, however, is that these are startling new concepts in the history of Jewish messianic ideology, especially when placed in contrast to texts like *Psalms of Solomon* 17 or 11Q13 that present exalted images of a reigning human messiah figure or a heavenly being specially endowed by God with authority and power to rule all things. The third difference between BP and LP regarding the functions of the messiah figure is the unprecedented role that Paul claims for the messiah figure in delivering the forgiveness of sins. Prior to Paul the role of forgiveness is attributed in the literature solely to the divine figure. Sometimes this forgiveness is

discussed in terms of the individual's penitential relationship with the divine figure; sometimes it is discussed in terms of the corporate liturgical experience of the people as they participated in the sacrificial system of the temple cult. Paul interpreted the crucifixion and resurrection of the messiah figure in terms of Israel's experience of forgiveness through the temple sacrifices. For Paul forgiveness of sins is given to humans through the death and resurrection of the messiah figure as a propitiatory sacrifice. Paul claimed that the messiah figure "died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures" (1Cor 15.3-4). He never explicitly articulated what these scriptures were.<sup>277</sup> It should also be noted that nowhere did Paul explicitly say that the *Kyrios* has the authority to forgive sins directly. It is always linked to the messiah figure's role in the crucifixion and resurrection. In fact, Paul gives the appearance of consistency with prior tradition of forgiveness of sins. He gives this role to the divine figure, and seems to view the messiah figure as the agent of God's forgiveness (2Cor 5.18-19). The first time after LP that a text attributes the role of forgiveness of sins directly to the messiah figure is in the account of Jesus healing the paralyzed man at Mark 2.1-12: ". . . the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins" (Mark 2.10). This, however, only refers to the literary relationship between LP and Mark 2.1-12 in terms of the conceptual element of forgiveness of sins. The tradition that the messiah figure had the authority to forgive sins would have predated Paul as part of the early *kerygma* about the messiah figure immediately

---

<sup>277</sup>A similar claim appears in an account of a resurrection appearance by the messiah figure at Luke 24.25-27.

following his crucifixion. This claim in its own right constituted a development beyond the Son of Man traditions in BP. So we cannot say that the function of forgiveness of sins was an unprecedented conceptual element that first appeared in the thought of Paul. These differences between BP and LP demonstrate that Paul added to the conceptual elements of messianic ideology that he had adopted from the Enochic Son of Man traditions.

#### **4.C. EXCURSUS: Why Paul Did Not use Son-of-Man Terminology**

If, as this analysis argues, Paul developed his own vision of the messiah figure in LP by drawing upon the unique combination of conceptual elements of messianic traditions in BP, this means Paul would have been familiar with the Son of Man terminology used in those traditions. This raises the key question, then why did Paul not use Son of Man terminology with reference to the messiah figure in LP? This was terminology that many contemporaries of Paul and the early followers of Jesus seem to have had no difficulty using with reference to Jesus. On the surface this gives the impression that Paul, by not using Son of Man terminology, was going against the early pre-Pauline oral *kerygma* of the Jesus movement which was later included in the Gospels. But was Paul really going against the tradition? Paul's use of the same combination of conceptual elements of messianic traditions in BP demonstrates that he was not against the tradition. Then why did he not use Son of Man terminology?

The traditional explanation for the absence of Son of Man terminology in LP is

that Paul wrote to a Gentile context.<sup>278</sup> Since he was writing to a Gentile context, and since the Son of Man messiah figure is essentially a Jewish concept, Paul's Gentile readers would not have understood the epithet. Consequently Paul simply did not use it. I think there is a more plausible explanation, one that locates Paul's christological development in the context of a first-century Jewish soteriological debate which made reference to the biblical figure Adam.

Here it is helpful to read Paul in connection with the Adam traditions contemporary with Paul. The *Greek Life of Adam and Eve* (hereafter *GLAE*) and the so-called *Carmen Christi* or Hymn of Christ in Philippians 2 share terminology that appears not to be accidental. The Greek phrase εἰς δόξαν πατρὸς, typically translated "to the glory of God the Father," appears at the end, as the very last words, of both texts.<sup>279</sup>

The phrase first appears in antiquity only in these two texts.<sup>280</sup> The exact wording of the phrase appears nowhere in the Septuagint or in any other Jewish literature of the Second Temple period. The fact that these two texts, the *Carmen Christi* and *GLAE*,

---

<sup>278</sup>Wilhelm Bousset argued this in *Kyrios Christos*, 121-122. Bousset argued that Paul actually replaced Son of Man terminology with the Son of God, to make the messiah figure more accessible to his Gentile audience.

<sup>279</sup>In a personal correspondence Johannes Tromp suggested that the phrase, εἰς δόξαν πατρὸς, might be a doxological addition of a later Christian scribe. I disagree with Tromp. Jan Dochhorn has demonstrated on the basis of form critical analysis that the phrase, εἰς δόξαν πατρὸς, derives from traditions in the Hebrew Bible. See Jan Dochhorn, *Die Apokalypse des Mose: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 106, Martin Hengel and Peter Schäfer, eds. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005). The assumption of the Jewish character of the phrase is critical for the following analysis.

<sup>280</sup>Later uses of the phrase appear in comments of church fathers on Philippians 2, the *Stromata* of Clement of Alexandria (Book 1 chapter 24 section 159 subsection 6 line 4) and Gregory of Nyssa's *Antirrheticus adversus Appolinarium* (vol. 3,1 page 162 line 5) for example. Gregory of Nyssa was fond of quoting Philippians 2.11; it appears in many of his writings. It also appears in later liturgical texts like the Septuagint Odes (14.28) which are later Christian additions to the Septuagint and which have many affinities with the *Apostolic Constitutions* of the fourth century CE.

share the phrase in precisely the same wording in and of itself means nothing. This fact read in the broader context of a first-century CE Jewish conversation about soteriology, however, lends itself to a more complex and fruitful interpretation on several levels.

*GLAE* is a text that has received a significant amount of attention in recent years.<sup>281</sup> The “Life of Adam and Eve” traditions display a complicated matrix of trajectories of transmission and development in Greek, Latin, Armenian, Georgian, and Slavonic recensions.<sup>282</sup> There has been some debate over the date and provenance of *GLAE*.<sup>283</sup> Marinus de Jonge and Johannes Tromp have argued that it is not possible to determine the provenance beyond the later Christian context in which it was transmitted.<sup>284</sup> This point of view on *GLAE* is too limiting for two reasons. First, the simplest response to de Jonge and Tromp on the issue of the provenance of *GLAE* is that

---

<sup>281</sup>Recent studies include Gary Anderson, Michael Stone, and Johannes Tromp, eds., *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays* (Leiden: Brill, 2000); Marinus de Jonge and Johannes Tromp, eds., *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997); Marinus de Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature: The Case of the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve*, *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* 18 (Leiden: Brill, 2003); Jan Dochhorn, *Die Apokalypse des Mose: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, *Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism* 106 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); Michael D. Eldridge, *Dying Adam with His Multiethnic Family: Understanding the Greek Life of Adam and Eve*, *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* 16 (Leiden: Brill, 2001); Thomas Knittel *Das griechische ‘Leben Adams und Evas’*, *Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism* 88 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002); John R. Levison, *Texts in Transition: The Greek Life of Adam and Eve*, *SBL Early Judaism and Its Literature Series*, Number 16 (Atlanta: Scholars, 2000); Johannes Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Edition*, *Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece* 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

<sup>282</sup>For a helpful synopsis of these texts see Gary A. Anderson and Michael E. Stone, eds., *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, *SBL Early Judaism and Its Literature Series*, Number 05 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1994).

<sup>283</sup>Gary Anderson, for example, is cautious about assigning *GLAE* to either a Jewish or a Christian provenance, arguing that there is not enough evidence to draw a final conclusion on the question. See “Adam and Eve in the ‘Life of Adam and Eve,’” in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*, Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergen, eds. (Harrisburg: Trinity, 1998) 7-32.

<sup>284</sup>*The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature*, 65-78.

we have examples of Jewish texts that were solely preserved and transmitted in later Christian contexts, and yet we still recognize them to be Jewish texts. The works of Philo, Josephus, the Enoch literature, and the so-called *Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers* are the most obvious examples of Jewish literature that was entirely preserved and transmitted within the Christian tradition. So the argument of de Jonge and Tromp, that because *GLAE* was preserved and transmitted in later Christian contexts therefore it is probably of Christian provenance, seems a bit forced.

Second, de Jonge and Tromp have argued that the original language of *GLAE* is probably Greek. This seems to be correct, and has less bearing on the question of provenance. They identify the Greek Life as a collection of earlier traditions, and they conclude that *GLAE* is the earliest of the extant recensions. They concede that if a Hebrew original is discernable in the text, then first-century Judea is the most likely location for the origin of *GLAE*. Tromp and de Jonge write: “We believe that the question of origin is relevant, because it helps to organize our own thoughts about the writing under discussion.”<sup>285</sup> Not only so, but as I have already intimated it also has bearing on the location of provenance, which is a crucial question when we seek to understand this text in relation to other texts, LP for example. Tromp and de Jonge include the argument of Michael Stone who carefully examined a number of alleged Hebraisms in *GLAE*. Stone concluded “that none of the evidence produced leads to the conclusion that *GLAE* was originally written in any other language than Greek.”<sup>286</sup> Tromp and de Jonge have

---

<sup>285</sup>*The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature*, 66.

<sup>286</sup>*The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature*, 67.



conceded, however, that

If it would appear that the Greek text is explicable only on account of certain translation errors, the hypothesis of another original language than Greek may prove useful. No instances are known at present. Moreover, the Greek of *GLAE* may be bad Greek, measured by Classical standards, but it is genuine Greek, containing, for instance, many syntactical constructions that are typical of that language.<sup>287</sup>

If the evidence points to a Greek original, as it appears, this would not rule out the possibility that someone whose primary language was Aramaic and not Greek could very easily have written this text, which might account for the characterization of *GLAE* as “bad Greek.” Tromp and de Jonge do not entertain this possibility.

Based on the foregoing discussion, the Jewish character and pre-70 CE date of *GLAE* are assumed in the present analysis. There is nothing that requires us to read *GLAE* as a later Christian document as de Jonge and Tromp suggest.<sup>288</sup> The absence of any explicit reference or even an indirect allusion to the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 CE further suggests a pre-70 date of composition.

*GLAE* is a midrash on the Genesis 3 narrative of Adam’s disobedience, taking up the story after Adam and Eve were expelled from paradise (*GLAE* 1.1). *GLAE* presents an Adam who has contracted a terminal disease and has reached the end of his life. Adam and Eve recount to their children their disobedience and God’s judgment to expel them

---

<sup>287</sup>*The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature*, 67.

<sup>288</sup>Cf. the study by Jan Dochhorn, *Die Apokalypse des Mose*.

from paradise. Adam demonstrates repentance, which while not a prominent theme is still an important concept in this document for Adam's restoration to paradise (cf. *GLAE* 32).<sup>289</sup> In two of the manuscript recensions<sup>290</sup> Adam demonstrates his repentance by standing up to his neck in the Jordan River for a designated period of forty days.<sup>291</sup> Eve enacts her repentance by standing in the Tigris River for thirty-four days. While Adam and Eve are standing in their respective rivers, Satan disguises himself as a helping angel, and he tempts Adam and Eve a second time. This time the temptation is to abort their acts of repentance. Satan tempts them by telling them the lie that God had already accepted their repentance. The result is that Adam resisted the temptation, while Eve was deceived a second time (cf. 1 Timothy 2.13-14).<sup>292</sup>

According to *GLAE* Adam ultimately dies as a consequence of the disobedience he and Eve committed according to Genesis 3. After Adam dies a group of angels intercede with God on Adam's behalf. The angels plead that because Adam was made in the image of God, God should have mercy on Adam and receive him into his heavenly

---

<sup>289</sup>While *GLAE* 32 is the only place where repentance, μετάνοια, is explicitly stated, the *concept* appears in a number of places in *GLAE*; cf. 6.2; 9.3; 27.1-2; 42.6.

<sup>290</sup>R and M; cf. *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature*, 19.

<sup>291</sup>It is tempting to view this characterization of Adam repenting in the Jordan River as a polemical stance toward early oral traditions about the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan River.

<sup>292</sup>Tromp and de Jonge rightly point out that this narrative of Adam and Eve repenting in the Jordan and Tigris Rivers are probably "secondary additions"; cf. *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature*, 34-35. This does not, however, preclude the fact that there is an unmistakable disposition of repentance on the part of Adam displayed in the oldest form of *GLAE* represented by the earliest Greek text recensions of what de Jonge and Tromp call the "'short' text form . . . represented by DSV (K)PG B." In fact, de Jonge and Tromp conclude that the absence of the penitence narrative of Adam and Eve standing in the two rivers from the earliest Greek text traditions points to the circulation, along with the oldest versions, of "a set of Greek stories about Adam's and Eve's . . . penitence"; cf. *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature*, 43.

paradise. The angels press their appeal to the point of actually claiming that Adam is the image of God (*GLAE* 33.5; 35.2). In the end, the angels' intercession succeeds and God takes Adam into heaven. The text of *GLAE* concludes with the angels praising God with the triple  $\nu\mu\delta\zeta$  of Isaiah 6, holy, holy, holy is the YHWH. The doxology of course is in Greek:  $\alpha\beta\iota\omicron\upsilon\zeta(\ \alpha\beta\iota\omicron\upsilon\zeta(\ \alpha\beta\iota\omicron\upsilon\zeta(\ \kappa\upsilon\tau\iota\omicron\upsilon\zeta\ \epsilon\iota\eta\ \delta\omicron\chi\alpha\omicron\upsilon\ \rho\epsilon\omicron\upsilon/\ \rho\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\zeta)\ \ \text{Amhn}$ . The focus of the present analysis is on the end of the doxology, the phrase  $\epsilon\iota\eta\ \delta\omicron\chi\alpha\omicron\upsilon\ \rho\epsilon\omicron\upsilon/\ \rho\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\zeta$ , "to the glory of God the Father." The purpose of *GLAE* appears to be the presentation of Adam as the prototypical human being, who regains access to God's heavenly paradise by virtue of two things: 1) not only was Adam created in the image of God; he in fact is the image of God, and 2) Adam had a repentant disposition toward God in order to make amends with God for his disobedience and to seek God's mercy.<sup>293</sup>

Tromp and de Jonge have drawn a similar conclusion regarding the purpose of *GLAE*.

We hold, then, that the intention of the authors of *GLAE* was not to interpret the biblical account, and it follows that it was not their intention just to tell the story of the Fall of Adam and Eve either. They tell the story of the origin of death, because it is the perfect contrast to the main theme: immortality and resurrection. Eve's speech about the origin of death (which is inescapable in this world), and the story of Adam's death and burial (being the story of his heavenly survival and of the promise of the eschatological resurrection) form a diptych, in which the diabolically inspired, fatal destiny of all people is contrasted with the hope on the gracious God who may once lead them into Paradise, after all.<sup>294</sup>

---

<sup>293</sup>This sort of tension between the earthly Adam who struggles with his sin and his humanity and the Adam who is the image of God is also discussed by Philo in *Quis Rerum* 55–57, where Philo refers to Adam being impressed with the "divine image" ( $\rho\epsilon\iota\alpha\eta\ \epsilon\iota\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\zeta$ ).

<sup>294</sup>*The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature*, 49.

As I have already argued there appears to be an explicit literary connection between *GLAE* and Philippians 2.6-11 in the phrase, *eij doxan qeou/patroj*, that occurs at the end of both texts. It is the generally accepted view of most New Testament scholars that the *Carmen Christi* was originally an Aramaic hymn that Paul inserted in his Letter to the Philippians.<sup>295</sup> Because of its insertion into the text of his letter to the Philippians, Paul had in mind a purpose for the hymn of Philippians 2.6-11 that was to some extent different from its original composition. In the opening verses of Paul's letter to the Philippians, the thanksgiving section, Paul tells the Philippians that he always thanks God when he remembers them in his prayers. Then he states that "the one who began a good work in you will keep perfecting it until the day of Christ Jesus" (Phlp 1.6), a reference to the *parousia* of Jesus. Paul then referred to the Philippians being pure and blameless on "the day of Christ" at 1.11 (cf. also 2.14-16). In a context where he contrasts earthly with heavenly orientation Paul writes: "For our citizenship is in heaven, from which also we wait for a savior, the Lord Jesus Christ" (3.20). The context of 2.6-11 entails a paraenesis to the Philippians to have unity among themselves and not to have only selfish interests, but to look out for the interests of each other (2.1-4). As Ernst Käsemann has argued, this is more than an ethical exhortation; it is paraenesis that views Jesus as a type of self-denial and humility.<sup>296</sup>

While Käsemann argued that the hymn must be read in a Hellenized Christian

---

<sup>295</sup>The benchmark of earlier scholarship on this text for many years was Ralph P. Martin's *Carmen Christi*, SNTS 4 (London: Cambridge, 1967); this was re-edited as *A Hymn of Christ: Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1997).

<sup>296</sup>"Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2, 5-11," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 47 (1950): 313-60.

context,<sup>297</sup> others have argued for an earlier, pre-Pauline, Aramaic *Vorlage* for the hymn.<sup>298</sup> The question whether this hymn is pre-Pauline or was composed by Paul is to some extent moot, since Paul appropriated the hymn as his own by incorporating it into his argument. It is possible to argue that, if it is pre-Pauline, the hymn reflects christology predating Paul's conversion, or at least predating this particular letter. This would also suggest a pre-Pauline or pre-Philippian context for the soteriological debate that I am suggesting took place between those who were using the Adam traditions reflected in *GLAE* and the early followers of Jesus who were using hymns like the one included in Philippians 2, a debate in which Paul apparently was fully engaged.<sup>299</sup> The fact remains that Paul used the hymn in his argument to the Philippians.

While there are a few scholars who do not accept the premise that Philippians 2.6-11 was originally a Pre-Pauline Aramaic hymn of the early followers of Jesus, the present consensus of scholars is that this is an acceptable premise. If we combine the hymnic character of Philippians 2.6-11 with the Adam typology running through the hymn, in addition to the presence of the phrase *eij doxan qeou patroj* at the end of the hymn, there

---

<sup>297</sup>As did Ernst Lohmeyer, *Der Brief an die Philipper* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1928; 14th ed., rev. by W. Schmauch, 1974). See also Lohmeyer's *Kyrios Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2,5-11* (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse 1927-28 / 4; Heidelberg winter 1928; 2nd ed., 1961).

<sup>298</sup>W.K. Lowther Clarke includes P.P. Levertoff's transliteration of his Aramaic retroversion of Philp 2.5-11 in *New Testament Problems—Essays—Reviews—Interpretations* (New York: Macmillan, 1929). Cf. also P. Grelot, "Deux notes critiques sur Philippiens 2,6-11," *Bib* 54 (1973): 169-186.

<sup>299</sup>See Simon Gathercole, *Where Is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1—5* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002). Gathercole explores first-century Jewish soteriological debate in terms of "boasting" of one's observance of the law.

is then a firm basis for comparing this text with *GLAE*.<sup>300</sup>

Paul's use of Adam-typology in his letters is well-attested in the secondary literature. Ernst Käsemann first recognized the presence of this motif in Philippians 2.5-11 as a development of the Gnostic primal-man redeemer myth, with a descending and ascending Savior.<sup>301</sup> Käsemann argued that the hymn is to be read exclusively in light of a Hellenistic world-view, and that the hymn reflects the stages of the primal-man redeemer's progression through the myth and is not an ethical exhortation as most scholars have understood the hymn. The redeemer is the counter-image of the fallen primal man. So Paul is able to adapt the myth to contrast Christ with Adam—disobedient Adam / obedient Christ. Maurice Casey and James Dunn have also argued that this hymn is to be understood in the light of Adam.<sup>302</sup>

Consequently the present analysis reads the *Carmen Christi* as a hymn with several allusions to Adam, which are set in contrast to Christ. Several scholars have drawn connections between *GLAE* and the letters of Paul, beginning with R. Kabisch in 1905, L.S.A. Wells in R.H. Charles' *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* in 1913, Wedderburn and Livingstone in the 1970s and '80s, and most recently John R. Levison in a 2004 study comparing *GLAE* and Romans 1. Levison actually writes

---

<sup>300</sup>John R. Levison has successfully located other conceptual bases for identifying connections between *GLAE* and the letters of Paul. See Levison's "Adam and Eve in Romans 1.8-25 and the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*," *NTS* 50.4 (October 2004): 519-34.

<sup>301</sup>"Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2, 5-11." Cf. also Ralph P. Martin's analysis, *Carmen Christi: Philippians ii.5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (SNTSMS Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967).

<sup>302</sup>Maurice Casey, *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God: The Origins and Development of New Testament Christology*, (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991) 112. James Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 281-288.

that “Paul and the Greek *Life* spin a similar cloth.”<sup>303</sup>

Looking at Philippians 2.6-11, the first point of comparison between Adam and Jesus in verse 6 is the concept of “being in the form of God” (οἷ ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ/ ὑπαρῶν). A number of New Testament scholars, such as Jarl Fossum and Maurice Casey, have pointed out the semantic overlap between μορφή (“form”), εἰκών (“image”), and δόξα (“glory”).<sup>304</sup> Casey argues that glory is something visibly seen, like a radiance that can be seen at a theophany. Adam lost this because he sinned; Christ now has it.

The assertion that Jesus “did not think equality with God was something to be exploited” (οὐκ ἀρπαγμον ἠγάσato το. εἶναι ἰσα θεῷ) has been much discussed by scholars like James Dunn and Maurice Casey. The phrase further highlights the sharp contrast between Adam and Christ. Jesus and Adam were both in the “form of God.” Beyond this, Adam wanted to be “like God,” while Jesus did not view this as something to be exploited.

A further comparison between Adam and Jesus is the emphasis on Jesus’ humanity in Philippians 2. In verse 7 this is stressed by a parallel construction, with Jesus “being in the likeness of humans and having been found in likeness as a human being.” This pertains positively to both Adam and Jesus.

The sharpest contrast between the two comes in verse 8: “he humbled himself by

---

<sup>303</sup>Adam and Eve in Romans 1.8-25 and the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*,” 533. Levison also quotes L.S.A. Wells who proposed that Paul and the authors of GLAE “moved in the same circle of ideas.”

<sup>304</sup>Maurice Casey, *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God*, 112. Jarl E. Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995); and 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: J.C.B. Mohr, 1985) 269-270.

becoming obedient to the point of death, the death of a cross.” Adam was disobedient even when he knew that his disobedience would result in his death. At Genesis 2.17 God warned Adam, “for on the day you eat from it, you shall surely die.” Adam disobeyed the divine prohibition not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Christ, on the other hand, was obedient and his obedience resulted in his death on a cross.

The upshot of Christ’s obedience was that God exalted him and gave him the name that is above every name (2.9). This contrasts with Adam, who was not exalted by God after his disobedience, but was punished. According to *GLAE* one of the results of Adam’s disobedience was that he lost the glory of God; he ceased to be clothed in God’s glory (*GLAE* 20.1).<sup>305</sup> This connection between sin and the loss of God’s glory is also found in Paul (Ro 3.23). Adam was humiliated and driven from the garden. Jesus, on the other hand, because of his obedience receives the name that is above every name.

In Philippians 2.10-11 Jesus is the one to whom every knee will bow in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue will confess. This is an allusion to Second-Isaiah. In Isaiah 45 YHWH is set in sharp contrast to idols made by human hands. YHWH is identified as the unique God who created the universe and who saves his people with everlasting salvation. At the end of chapter 45 Second-Isaiah prophesied the words of YHWH:

Turn to me and be saved,  
all the ends of the earth,  
for I am God and there is not another.

---

<sup>305</sup>This same tradition appears in the Gnostic *Apocalypse of Adam*.



By myself I have sworn;  
 there has gone forth from my mouth righteousness  
 a word that shall not return;  
 for to me every knee shall bow down,  
 every tongue shall swear an oath.  
 “Only in YHWH” it shall be said of me,  
 “are righteousness and strength”;  
 to him they shall come and be ashamed  
 all whose anger has burned against him.  
 In Yahweh they shall be justified and shall sing his praise,  
 all the seed of Israel (Is 45.22-25).

Isaiah 45 asserts the uniqueness of YHWH in contrast to human idols. The allusion to Isaiah 45 in Philippians 2 should not lead us simply to identify Jesus with YHWH because Philippians 2 uses the word *kyrios* with reference to Jesus and the Septuagint used the word *kyrios*, or Lord, to refer to YHWH. The allusion to Isaiah 45 should lead us to read Philippians 2 as a communal liturgical confession of the uniqueness of Christ over against an Adam whose idolatrous actions rendered him less than God had created him to be. The allusion to Isaiah 45, then, extends the contrast between Adam and the unique obedience of Christ at the beginning of the hymn into the second half of the hymn, where every knee will bow and every tongue will be brought to the point of confessing.

What will they confess? The traditional translation of this verse is “every tongue will confess that Jesus Christ *is* Lord to the glory of God the Father.” It is helpful to look at a number of early translations of this verse by Jerome, Wycliffe, Luther, and Tyndale, to try to understand where this particular translation originates, because they did not all translate this verse in the same way.

In 384 Jerome translated his Latin Vulgate version rendering Philippians 2.11 as:

“... *et omnis lingua confiteatur quia Dominus Iesus Christus in gloria est Dei Patris.*”<sup>306</sup>

Jerome inserted *est* in his translation of the Greek text. To render Jerome’s version in English we have: “and every tongue confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God the Father.”

In 1395 John Wycliffe slavishly rendered Jerome’s Latin Vulgate version, translating into English as follows: “. . . and each tongue acknowledge, that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God the Father.”<sup>307</sup> It is not entirely clear what being “in the glory of God the Father” means. To be “in the glory of God” could possibly refer to a state without sin, which is suggested by *GLAE* (20.1-3) and by Paul in Romans 3.23. If that is in fact the case, then this would further contrast Christ with Adam.

William Tyndale’s 1525 translation departs significantly from Wycliffe’s. Tyndale translated Philippians 2.11 in this way: “. . . and that all tongues should confess that Iesus Christ is the Lord unto the praise of God the father.”<sup>308</sup> Coverdale’s translation of 1535 and the Geneva Bible of 1560 both follow Tyndale’s insertion of the copula between Jesus Christ and Lord, making “Lord” the predicate nominative of the confessional statement, “Jesus Christ *is* Lord.”

One year prior to Tyndale’s translation, in 1524 Martin Luther had already made

---

<sup>306</sup>Jerome, *Biblia Sacra Vulgata*, 4th ed. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994).

<sup>307</sup>John Wycliffe, *The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments, with the Apocryphal Books, in the Earliest English Versions Made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and His Followers*, the Rev. Josiah Forshall and Sir Frederic Madden, eds. (Oxford: Oxford U.P., 1850).

<sup>308</sup>William Tyndale, *The New Testament: the text of the Worms edition of 1526 in original spelling, translated by William Tyndale*, edited for the Tyndale Society by W.R. Cooper, with a preface by David Daniell (London: British Library, 2000).

this move with Philippians 2. Here Luther translated 2.11 as: “und alle Zungen bekennen sollen, daß Jesus Christus der Herr sei, zur Ehre Gottes des Vaters.” In English Luther’s version reads: “And every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is the Lord to the praise of God the Father.” Luther appears to have been the first to reorient the position of “Lord” and place the copula in such a way that it rendered “Lord” as the predicate nominative of “Jesus Christ.”

This understanding of Philippians 2.11 has become a virtual icon of English translation, like the 23<sup>rd</sup> Psalm, the Lord’s Prayer, or the Apostles’ Creed. It has become iconic for its explicit identification of Jesus with YHWH. But is this actually what *kurioj* *Wlsouj* *Cristoj* *eij* *doxan* *qeou/patroj* means?

It is possible to translate Philippians 2.11 in this way:

. . . and every tongue confess that  
Lord Jesus Messiah  
has become the glory of God the Father.

This translation is based in part on the assumption of an Aramaic *Vorlage* for the hymn. Joseph Fitzmyer, and others like Clarke, Levertoff, and Grelot, have argued in favor of such a *Vorlage*. The conspicuous absence of definite articles, copulae, and other Greek particles typical of narrative prose, as well as the absence of an identifiable Greek meter, all are good evidence that Philippians 2.6-11 is translation Greek of what was originally an Aramaic hymn.

In light of the evidence I am arguing that it is not necessary to translate *kurioj*

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as if κυρίου were the predicate nominative of an assumed copula. There is ample evidence in Paul for the use of κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as a self-contained reference to Jesus. There are at least twelve instances of this in Paul's Letters.<sup>309</sup>

Translating Philippians 2.11 as if κυρίου were the predicate nominative of an assumed copula would render this particular passage unique in comparison to all of Paul's uses of the phrase κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ elsewhere. So where does that leave us?

In Biblical Hebrew the grammatical construction -לֹ הָיָה, in Biblical Aramaic the phrase is -לֹ הָוָה, means "to become." In the Septuagint (LXX) the construction is ἐγενετο ) ) ) εἰς + the Accusative, "to become something," the "something" being in the Accusative case. In Philippians 2.11, the poetic hymnic character of the text would allow for the elision of ἐγενετο, as the copula is regularly elided elsewhere (cf. 1 Corinthians 15.45), and just as the assumed copula is elided in the traditional interpretation of Philippians 2.11. In Greek there is no "is" there.

The Greek, ἐγενετο ) ) ) εἰς + Accusative, as a translation of the Biblical Hebrew -לֹ הָיָה, can be seen in the LXX version of Genesis 2.7:

kai. eplasen ō qeoj ton anqrwpon couh̄ apo. thj ghj kai. enefushsen eij to. prosrwpon autou/ pnohn zwhj kai. egeneto ō anqrwpoj eij yuchn zwsan

And God fashioned the man from the dust of the ground and he breathed into his face the breath of life, and the man became a living being.

---

<sup>309</sup>Cf. Romans 7.23; 13.14; 1 Corinthians 1.3; 8.6; 2 Corinthians 1.2; 13.13; Galatians 1.3; 1 Thessalonians 1.1; there are four instances of this alone in Philippians: 1.2; 2.11; 3.20; 4.23.

I include the Hebrew for comparison:

xpyw hmdah-!m rp[ ~dah-ta ~yhla hwhy rcyyw  
 hyx vpiil ~dah yhyw ~yyx tmvni wpyab

Paul's interpretation of Genesis 2.7 at 1 Corinthians 15.45 is an expression of his Adam typology, which predates his use of the hymn in Philippians 2:

ou!twj kai. gegraptai\ egeneto o prwtoj anqrwpoj VAdam eij yuchn zwsan( o  
 escatoj VAdam eij pneuma zwppoiouhA  
 Thus also it is written: the first human, Adam, became a living soul, the last Adam  
 (became) a life-giving spirit.

Notice how *egeneto* is elided in the second half of this sentence. The point is that it is possible for *egeneto* to be missing in the *egeneto* ) ) ) eij + Accusative construction in Paul's writings, which leads us to translate *kurioj Vhsouj Cristoj eij doxan qeou/ patroj* as, "the Lord Jesus Christ has become the glory of God the Father." This reading further leads us to recognize that the contrast between Adam and Christ exists also at the end of the hymn; the evidence suggests that the contrast runs from the beginning through the middle all the way to the end, maintaining the integrity of the hymn in its entirety.

Returning to what appears to be evidence for a soteriological debate in the Adam traditions of *GLAE* and Paul's Letters, Paul further emphasizes that Christ is the image and glory of God in Second Corinthians 4.4-6. Here Paul ties *eikwh* and *doxa* even more closely together with reference to Christ:

o` qeoj tou/aiwwoj toutou etu,flwsen ta nohmata twh apistwn eij to mh. augasai ton fwtismon tou/ euaggelion thj doxhj tou/ Cristou( oj estin eikwn tou/ qeou. . . oti o` qeoj o` eipwn ek skotouj fwj lamyei( oj elamyen en taij kardiaij hmwh proj fwtismon thj gnwsewj thj doxhj tou/ qeou/ en proswpw| Ihsou| Cristou|

. . . the God of this age has blinded the minds of the unbelievers so that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God might not shine forth [for them]. . . For it was the God who said, “Out of darkness light will shine,” who shines in our hearts with the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

Paul explicitly identified Christ as both the image and the glory of God.

According to *GLAE* Adam and Eve no longer wear the glory of God. They lost this glory because they sinned (*GLAE* 20.1–21.6). With this much Paul would agree: “all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God” (Ro 3.23). And yet, because he was made in the image of God, because he himself *was* the image of God according to *GLAE* (33.5; 35.2), Adam is also referred to as the glory of God. But for Paul in Philippians 2, it is no longer Adam who is the image and glory of God. Christ, by his willing obedience and death on the cross, has demonstrated that he is the image and glory of God. Consequently verse 11 of Philippians 2, kurioj Ihsouj Cristoj eij doxan qeou/ patroj should be understood to mean, “the Lord Jesus Christ has become the glory of God the Father.”

This reading of Philippians 2.6-11 in light of the *Greek Life of Adam and Eve* demonstrates three important points regarding Paul’s participation in the development of early christology in the middle of the first century CE. First, it demonstrates Paul’s awareness of early christological formulations (dating between 29/30 and 60 CE) growing out of a first-century Jewish soteriological debate. Second, it demonstrates an interesting

and complex intertextuality between first-century Adam traditions in Jewish texts and Paul's letters, specifically the *Greek Life of Adam and Eve*, 1 Corinthians 15, Romans 1–5, and the *Carmen Christi* of Philippians 2. It is an intentional assimilation of an Adam-typology, a familiar feature of Second Temple period literature in the first century CE, into Paul's arguments. And third, this analysis also demonstrates that Paul and the early followers of Jesus considered their christology to be a supersession of a particular Adam-typology contemporaneous with Paul. While the allusion to Isaiah 45 in Philippians 2.10-11 may indeed associate Jesus with YHWH, this association is not made in the confession of verse 11. It makes more sense to read the confession of verse 11 in light of the Adam-typology running all the way through to the end of the hymn. What is confessed in 2.11 is the belief that Lord Jesus Messiah "has become the glory of God the father" in the place of Adam. This demonstrates Paul's method of a thoroughly supersessive merging of what was already familiar Adam-typology in the first century with his own ideas about *kurioj vhsouj Cristoj*.

Sometime between the death of Jesus in 29/30 CE and the composition of the synoptic gospels a soteriological debate occurred between at least two Jewish groups, those who articulated their soteriology in terms of "Adam" as the prototypical human being according to the traditions that came to be embedded in *GLAE* on the one hand, and early followers of Jesus who articulated their soteriology in terms of a supersessive Adam christology which had Jesus replacing Adam as both the image and "the glory of God the Father" according to Philippians 2.6-11. The Adam group understood "image" of God in terms of a created humanity who enjoyed a special relationship with God on the basis of

being created in God's image and having a repentant disposition toward God (*GLAE* 28.4). Even Jesus, they would have argued, was a part of this same created humanity, with the same special relationship with God, and was subject to the same participation in sin as all other human beings descended from Adam were. This is why we have from the Jesus group the stress on Jesus' obedience in the hymn of Philippians 2 in contrast to Adam's disobedience (*GLAE*), a stress that is then developed into Paul's contrast between Adam's sin and Christ's obedience in Romans 5 and Paul's concept of Jesus' sinlessness in 2 Corinthians 5.21, a concept that appears again later in the Epistle to the Hebrews (4.15).

Philo appears to have written against exalted Adam traditions by arguing that Moses did not write of Adam "being the image of God," but that he wrote of Adam as having been created "according to the image of God." While this may not be a direct polemic against exalted Adam traditions, it comes in the context of Philo's argument that there is not a division between the two forms of reason, the archetypal reason "above us" and the copy "we possess."

Having said what was fitting on these matters, Moses continues, "the birds He did not divide" (Gen. xv. 10). He gives the name of birds to the two words or forms of reason, both of which are winged and of a soaring nature. One is the archetypal reason above us, the other the copy of it which we possess. Moses calls the first the "image of God," the second the cast of that image. For God, he says, made man not "the image of God" but "after the image" (*kalei/de. Mwushj ton men uper himaj eikona qeou( ton de. kaq vhmaj thj eikonoj ekmageion) epoihse gar fhsin o' qeoj ton anqrwpon ouci. eikona qeou( al la. kat veikona)* (Gen. i.27). And thus the mind in each of us, which in the true and full sense is the "man," (*anqrwpoj*) is an expression at third hand from the Maker, while between them is the Reason which serves as model for our reason, but itself is the effigies or



presentment of God (*Quis Rerum* 231).<sup>310</sup>

The entire argument of *GLAE*, Adam's access to paradise after the fall, primarily rests on the concept of Adam "being" the image of God.

In 1 Corinthians 15.20-28, Paul presented the messiah figure in a subordinated role in relation to the divine figure. It is interesting that Paul introduced this argument with a reference to Adam. In relation to the divine figure, according to Paul, the messiah figure, the son himself, will be subjected to God after he delivers the kingdom to God the Father (1Cor 15.28). Paul asserted this in the context of his argument on the resurrection. Paul began this argument by stating the primitive *kerygma* about the messiah figure: "For I delivered to you with priority what I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he was raised on the third day according to the scriptures." This basic assertion about the messiah figure in Paul's thought sets up his argument about the resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15. Paul follows this with his account of a number of resurrection appearances of the messiah figure, which in turn is followed by a detailed rhetorical argument regarding Paul's belief in the factuality of the messiah figure's resurrection. "For if the dead are not raised, neither has Christ been raised; and if Christ has not been raised, your faith is useless; you are still in your sins" (1Cor 15.16-17). Paul follows this with his assertion about the messiah figure delivering the kingdom and subjecting himself to the divine figure.

---

<sup>310</sup>Colson and Whitaker, 399.

But now Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep. For since through a human being death [came], also through a human being is the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive. But each in his own order: the first fruits, Christ, then those who belong to Christ at his coming. Then is the end, when he gives back the kingdom to [his] God and Father, when he destroys all rule and all dominion and power. For it is necessary that he reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death. For all things he has subjected under his feet. And when it says, all things are subjected, it is clear that it is with the exception of the one who subjected all things to him. And when all things are subjected to him, then also the son himself will be subjected to the one who subjected all things to him, in order that God may be all things in all (1Cor 15.20-28).

The primary purpose of this passage is to support Paul's larger argument about the resurrection. However, within this supporting argument Paul has given us what appears to be a very clear statement about his view on the relationship between the divine figure and the messiah figure. This is the first reference of any kind to the figure Adam in any of Paul's letters. Paul's argument makes perfect sense without any reference to Adam; the reference to Adam seems unnecessary. However, the lesser argument within the larger argument on the resurrection clearly brought to Paul's mind the figure Adam. The reference to Adam in the context of Paul's lesser argument about the subjection of the messiah figure to the divine figure fits well within the context of Paul's awareness of a soteriological debate in which any statements about an exalted Adam, or in the case of *GLAE* an Adam restored to his original condition prior to sin, might be taken as a subordination of the messiah figure to Adam. In other words, in 1 Corinthians 15 Paul asserts that it is the divine figure, and the divine figure alone, to whom the messiah figure is subjected, and not Adam.

Exalted Adam traditions in the context of soteriological debate is not just evidenced between *GLAE* and LP. In the Latin Life of Adam and Eve (*Vitae*), a recension of the Life of Adam and Eve traditions that post-dates *GLAE*, the divine figure commands Satan to worship Adam because he is the image of God. While the text actually serves as an aetiology for the fall of Satan, it also provides evidence of Jewish thought that was moving in the direction of an exalted Adam figure. Exalted Adam traditions also appear at Qumran. Crispin Fletcher-Louis has given a detailed analysis of human anthropology at Qumran in priestly liturgical contexts.<sup>311</sup> Fletcher-Louis surveys the literature of the Second Temple period persuasively arguing that within some Jewish circles the creator-created boundary was not as rigid as traditional scholarship has assumed. Human beings, created in the image of God, are set apart from the rest of God's creation. This distinction is reflected in both biblical and extra-biblical liturgical ideology in the way the priesthood is described in various texts. The specific exaltation of Adam that appears in some texts (*GLAE*; *TestAb*) may very well be variations on the divine image and glory traditions Fletcher-Louis has described. In *GLAE*, for example, a suffering and dying Adam is given encouragement to look forward to his exaltation, when he will be seated on the throne of the one who deceived him, Satan, who first made the choice to abandon his throne in rebellion against the divine figure. The *Testament of Abraham* contains a vision of Adam seated on a golden throne and presiding over the entrance of the dead through the gates of heaven and hell (*TestAb* 11). Following this scene is a vision of another figure on another throne, "the one who judged and sentenced souls" (*TestAb* 12.11).

---

<sup>311</sup>*All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

The Commander-in-chief said, “Do you see, all-pious Abraham, the frightful man who is seated on the throne? This is the son of Adam, the first-formed, who is called Abel, whom Cain the wicked killed. And he sits here to judge the entire creation, examining both righteous and sinners. For God said, ‘I do not judge you, but every man is judged by man.’ On account of this he gave him judgment, to judge the world until his great and glorious Parousia.’ And then, righteous Abraham, there will be perfect judgment and recompense, eternal and unalterable, which no one can question. For every person has sprung from the first-formed, and on account of this they are first judged here by his son. And at the second Parousia they will be judged by the twelve tribes of Israel, both every breath and every creature. And, thirdly, they shall be judged by the Master God of all; and then thereafter the fulfillment of that judgment will be near, and fearful will be the sentence and there is none who can release. And thus the judgment and recompense of the world is made through three tribunals. And therefore a matter is not ultimately established by one or two witnesses, but *every matter shall be established by three witnesses*” (*TestAb* 13.1-8).<sup>312</sup>

There are a number of elements in this text that could be described as a more developed concept of judgment, for example, a three-part execution of the judgment. Pertinent to the present discussion, however, is the development of the exalted Adam tradition which has Abel, “the son of Adam,” enthroned in heaven and executing the first judgment. This is the kind of exaltation of Adam, and here “the son of Adam,” that was antithetical to Paul’s concept of Adam in relation to the messiah figure.<sup>313</sup> As we have already noted, Paul only referred to Adam in a negative sense, as a figure who only introduced sin and death to humanity (Ro 5; 1Cor 15), or as a figure whose disobedience is to be contrasted with the obedience of the messiah figure (Phlp 2).

---

<sup>312</sup>The translation is that of E.P. Sanders in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol 1, James H. Charlesworth, ed. (New York: Doubleday, 1983) 889-890. See the discussion of this text by Philip B. Munoa in *Four Powers in Heaven: The Interpretation of Daniel 7 in the Testament of Abraham* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998).

<sup>313</sup>It should not escape our notice that Enoch is referred to as “the son of Adam” in the genealogy at the beginning of BP (1En 37.1).

So what does this mean for Paul's silence with regard to the term "Son of Man"? If Paul knew the conceptual elements of the messianic traditions of BP and even drew upon those traditions to shape his own vision for the messiah figure in LP, why is the terminology, "Son of Man," missing in LP? It is nowhere to be found in any of his letters. If Paul was aware of the Son of Man traditions about Jesus—and it is virtually impossible that he was not, given the extent of the correspondence between BP and LP in terms of the shared combination of conceptual elements of messianic traditions—then why did Paul avoid the terminology? Instead of the traditional claim that Paul's letters were written in a Gentile context where Son of Man language would have made no sense to his readers, I would suggest an answer to this question based on the Jewish context of Paul's Adam christology. Paul avoided using Son of Man terminology with reference to Jesus, because of the first-century soteriological debate over how one achieved eternal life. This was a debate that included a number of different exalted Adam traditions, one of which argued that because Adam was the prototypical human who regained access to paradise, it was possible for any human being, created in the image of God as Adam was, to gain access to the mercy of God and paradise through repentance. And we should carefully note here that there are other Jewish texts from this period that make a similar argument about repentance, the *Psalms of Solomon* and the *Hodayot* from Qumran, for example. Paul, on the other hand, argued that this was not enough. For Paul it was necessary for Christ to replace Adam as the image and glory of God, and for an obedient Christ (the last Adam) to be crucified in order to satisfy God's justice. It was further necessary, according to Paul, for one to be "in Christ" (a prominent Pauline theme) in order to gain access to

God's mercy through the forgiveness of sins. It was precisely because of this soteriological difference between Adam and Jesus that led Paul to avoid using "Son of Man" or "Son of Adam" terminology. By not referring to Jesus as Son of Man or Son of Adam, Paul could then avoid subordinating Jesus to Adam, and thereby avoid the appearance of inconsistency in his argument.

## CHAPTER 5

### CONCLUSIONS

We began this examination of the messiah figure in Paul's thought with the simple statement that Paul was a Jew. And we qualified this with the question, What kind of Jew was he? Since Paul lived at a time when Jewish identity was defined in a context of significant religious diversity, the problem we face today in our attempts to understand Paul entails exploring the various streams of Jewish intellectual traditions in order to contextualize Paul's ideas. This study has demonstrated that at least one facet of Paul's thought, his christology, was heavily influenced by Enochic Son of Man traditions.

If we take on their own terms the various elements of the nature and the functions of the messiah figure held in common by the *Book of the Parables of Enoch* (BP) and the Letters of Paul (LP), then there are four elements of messianic nature that are unprecedented in Jewish literature: the messiah figure is 1) a heavenly being, 2) preexistent, 3) like an angel, and 4) associated with the divine name. There are four functions that are unprecedented in Jewish literature: the messiah figure 1) sits on the throne of judgment, 2) presides at the judgment, 3) raises the dead, 4) and is worshiped by

humans. Every other element of nature and function of the messiah figure held in common by BP and LP have literary precedents. Taken separately the precedented elements of messianic nature and function give the appearance that BP is simply continuing previous traditions. It is the combination of elements that leads to the conclusion that an extraordinary development of messianic thought has occurred in BP. The fact that a human messiah figure, which in itself was not unprecedented in the literature, is now also a preexistent heavenly being who from the throne of the divine figure presides over the eschatological judgment, causes the resurrection of the dead, and is worshiped by humans, this is a striking development of Second Temple period Jewish messianic thought. Such an unprecedented level of development in BP precludes any suggestion of coincidental or parallel development of the same combination of messianic conceptual elements in LP. It must be acknowledged, however, that we cannot say with any certainty that Paul actually knew the text of BP. There is no evidence of direct quotation, like the quote of the *Book of Watchers* in the Letter of Jude.<sup>314</sup>

The evidence leads to the conclusion that Paul must have been familiar with the conceptual elements of the messianic traditions in BP. While Paul developed his concept of the messiah figure well beyond that of BP by adding the functions of crucifixion, resurrection, and forgiveness of sins, again the similarity of the combination of conceptual elements pertaining to both the nature and the functions of the messiah figure that are common to both BP and LP is too striking to dismiss as coincidental or as a parallel development.

---

<sup>314</sup>Jude 14-15 is a direct quote of BW (1En 1.9).



It must also be acknowledged that there are terminological differences regarding the messiah figures in BP and LP. While both BP and LP refer to the messiah figure as “Messiah,” BP refers to the messiah figure as the Chosen One, the Son of Man, and the Righteous One. Paul did not use these epithets for the messiah figure. Paul referred to the messiah figure as *Kyrios* (“Lord”), *Christos* (“Messiah”), son of David, and son of God. Paul never referred to the messiah figure in LP as the Son of Man. Even though there are clear terminological differences regarding the messiah figures in BP and LP, the similarity of combination of conceptual elements is striking and the terminological difference in no way mitigates the conclusion that Paul used the extraordinary combination of conceptual elements of messianic traditions in BP to create his own vision of the messiah figure in LP.

The problem remains, however, to describe the mechanism of transmission between BP and LP. How did Paul receive these Enochic Son of Man traditions? It seems entirely possible that Paul could have received the Son of Man traditions in the context of debate with an ideological opponent, a discussion with a friend or colleague, a sermon in a liturgical context, or the oral interpretation of a text in a scribal community. Here recent studies of orality and literacy in scribal communities of Second Temple Judaism may have some bearing on the question.<sup>315</sup>

The first possibility, debate with an ideological opponent, could have taken place in Paul’s world. The Acts of the Apostles, for example, describes Paul as a willing

---

<sup>315</sup>I rely on the work of Martin S. Jaffee for the discussion that follows; see his *Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism, 200 BCE – 400 CE* (New York: Oxford, 2001).

participant in public debate in Athens (Ac 17.16-34).<sup>316</sup> This, however, is not a strong possibility, simply for the fact that Paul's christology was *positively* influenced by the Enochic traditions. The other suggestions present more attractive possibilities for transmission between BP and LP. Paul very likely received the Son of Man traditions in the context of discussions with friends or colleagues, or by hearing a sermon in a liturgical setting, or by hearing the interpretation of a text in a scribal community. Martin Jaffee suggests that the scribal communities from this period were associated either with the intellectual activities of the priestly authorities of the Jerusalem temple, or with dissident sectarian groups opposed to the temple. Jaffee describes the temple as "the primary employer of various sorts of literary scribes."<sup>317</sup> He also rightly points out that there were "dissident scribes" who were critical of the priestly establishment in Jerusalem and who developed a kind of "revisionist tradition" that questioned the legitimacy of the ruling priesthood. Jaffee's social reconstruction of scribal communities focuses on the second century BCE. His reconstruction, however, is also relevant to the first century BCE and the first century CE. I would nuance Jaffee's description to include intellectual sectarian groups who would have restrained themselves from opposing the temple cult or from criticizing the priesthood, who compromised with the temple authorities in order to enjoy the political and socio-economic protections that the powerful temple institution could provide.<sup>318</sup> I have already pointed out that there is an absence of such criticisms in

---

<sup>316</sup>See also 1Co 1.20 where Paul refers to "the debater of this age."

<sup>317</sup>Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth*, 20.

<sup>318</sup>Josephus gives us a concrete example of such a sectarian social group at *Ant.* 18.18-19.

BP. It is very likely that BP was associated with an apocalyptic community of this kind.

We know that Paul himself was open to the kinds of ecstatic experiences that an apocalyptic community like that of BP would have embraced.<sup>319</sup>

Jaffee is even more specific about the kind of social activity that might have been associated with the oral transmission of a text in this period. The ability to read and write texts created a socially stratified culture. Most individuals did not have facility with reading and writing in this period—including business records, legal contracts, and more complex writings. This created an intellectual elite stratum of literacy where an individual trained in scribal activities would lead a particular community in its reception of a text. Books “commonly functioned as ritual objects whose iconic significance transcended that of the information they preserved.”<sup>320</sup> In other words, the oral transmission of textual traditions would have occurred in liturgical contexts via sermons,<sup>321</sup> or in the context of exegetical exposition, such as in the Jerusalem temple, or in a synagogue, or in some scribal community. Jaffee also describes how the act of reading a book in the context of a gathered community established the book as a locus of power and authority through ceremonial ritual performance. “The book was a locus of power and authority far more than information. . . . And its authority was manifested publicly in and through the human

---

<sup>319</sup>Cf., e.g., Paul’s description of his own heavenly visions at 2Cor 12.1-7.

<sup>320</sup>Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth*, 15-16.

<sup>321</sup>Functional illiteracy was the norm in this period. For the pragmatic legitimacy of this point we need only look as far as our own contemporary religious experience and what amounts to functional illiteracy and ignorance of biblical texts among those who attend religious services. Most religious people receive their knowledge of the Bible as it is read in community gatherings and interpreted in oral sermon deliveries.

voice — often that of an officially appointed communal teacher — that sounded out the text’s words and expounded its mysteries.”<sup>322</sup>

Jaffee applies this analysis to his reading of texts produced by a specific dissident sectarian group from this period, the Dead Sea community. Referring to this community’s “oral-performative transmission of written texts” Jaffee points out that for this community the authority of transmission rested not with connections “over vast stretches of time,” but with the demonstration of “contemporary moments of illumination” and “gifts of prophecy” displayed by its leaders.<sup>323</sup> Jaffee then discusses the practice of oral transmission within the Dead Sea community, with one of the leaders “expounding the Torah” as prescribed in the Community Rule (1QS 6.6-8).

BP must have been associated with a scribal community similar to this, where the authoritative transmission of the text was developed out of ongoing “moments of illumination” or ecstatic experiences.<sup>324</sup> The text of BP contains a single reference to an existing community, “the houses of his congregation,” at 1En 46.8.<sup>325</sup> This is in all

---

<sup>322</sup>Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth*, 17-18.

<sup>323</sup>Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth*, 32. This would also appear to explain the many layers of (redacted) traditions that make up the final form of the text of BP as a literary production of a specific community shaped by ongoing ecstatic interpretive contributions.

<sup>324</sup>It is also interesting to note that the redactors of BP were sensitive to the tension between orality and literacy. At the beginning of BP Enoch is given to say, “it is profitable to speak these things first” (1En 37.3). Later, in one of the Noachic fragments, Noah describes how his great grandfather, Enoch, transmitted the secrets in the Book of Parables: “And after this, my great-grandfather gave me the explanation of all the secrets in a book, and the parables that were given to him, and gathered them for me in the words of the Book of Parables” (1En 68.1). This might suggest a later date for the Noachic material because of its affinity for the literary rather than the oral form of the traditions of BP.

<sup>325</sup>There are three other references to communities in BP, but these are in contexts describing eschatological judgment or the appearance of an end-of-time community after the judgment; cf. “the congregation of the righteous” at 1En 38.1, “the house of his congregation” at 1En 53.6, and “the congregation of the chosen” at 1En 62.8.

probability a reference to an actual social group that may be identified with the oral transmission and literary composition of the messianic traditions of BP. It is possible that Paul may have had contact with one or more of “the houses” of this scribal community. It is not possible to know this with certainty, but neither can it be ruled out.

It is more likely, however, that Paul received Enochic Son of Man traditions through contact with communities of the early Jesus movement. The early Jewish followers of Jesus should be understood as having gathered themselves into a reform movement within Judaism, and not having begun a new religion known as Christianity. This internal Jewish reform movement would not become identifiable as “Christianity” until a “parting of the ways” occurred between this movement and the Pharisaic proto-Rabbinic movement after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE. The early Jesus movement attracted individuals from a wide variety of backgrounds, which included priests and Pharisees according to the Acts of the Apostles. Acts 15 describes an internal debate within the Jesus movement that included a disagreement over Torah interpretation between Paul and a group of Pharisees. Acts 6.7 informs us that “a large group of the priests became obedient to the faith.” The priests who joined the early followers of Jesus would have brought with them the variety of scribal practices described by Jaffee. These “priests” who became a part of the early Jesus movement would have distinguished themselves as a group of individuals who were equipped with the kinds of tools that were necessary for transmitting traditions via events of oral performance and the production of

written texts.<sup>326</sup> Acts 6, however, does not give us enough information to discern whether these were priests coming from the temple authorities or dissident priests of a sectarian group. Acts 5.17-18 suggests that the party of the Sadducees publicly resisted the Jesus movement. According to Acts 9.1-2, Paul himself, before his conversion experience as Saul of Tarsus, was a Pharisee allied with the Sadducean community in active persecution of the early followers of Jesus. This would suggest that the “large group of the priests” mentioned in Acts 6.7 could have been dissident priests who were themselves opposed to the priestly establishment in control of the Jerusalem temple cult. Another possibility is that, as dissidents they were not actually opposed to the priestly establishment (which would correspond to the position of BP), but because of different halakhic interpretations of the Torah the priestly establishment in control of the temple cult excluded the sectarian dissidents from the sacrifices of the temple. Josephus alludes to this kind of a group at *Antiquities* 18.18-19.

Paul’s contact with Enochic Son of Man traditions also may have occurred outside of Jerusalem. The migration of the early Jesus movement from Jerusalem to communities throughout Judea and Samaria is attested in an account that describes the early persecution of the followers of Jesus in which the pre-conversion Saul of Tarsus participated (Ac 8.1-4). Acts 11.19 indicates that this migration of the Jesus movement at this time spread also to Phoenicia and Cyprus and Syrian Antioch. Acts 8.5 refers to the

---

<sup>326</sup>Acts 2.42, e.g., describes oral transmission of apostolic teaching within the early Jesus community. This also has implications for the development and transmission of early gospel traditions that scholars refer to as “Q”. See the informative and helpful discussions by Richard A. Horsley and Jonathan A. Draper in *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1999).

oral transmission of the early *kerygma* among Samaritans. The account of Acts 9 indicates that the movement had spread to Damascus of Syria. This is where Paul first may have come into contact with the Enochic Son of Man traditions, in the early Christian community of Damascus immediately following his conversion experience. “And he was with the disciples in Damascus for some days, and immediately he preached Jesus in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God” (Ac 9.19-20). The immediate context of this same narrative indicates that Paul interacted directly with Jews in Damascus who opposed this message. “But Saul increased all the more in power and he confounded the Jews who were living in Damascus demonstrating that he [Jesus] is the Messiah” (Ac 9.22). Acts 9.28 also claims that Paul moved freely “in and out” among the Jerusalem apostles, where he also might have come into contact with the Son of Man traditions. Paul also had contact with the early followers of Jesus in Syrian Antioch, where Paul and Barnabas spent a year teaching “a large group” of Christians (Ac 11.25-26). The evidence clearly indicates that Paul had close contacts with the earliest followers of Jesus, even companions of Jesus who were direct eyewitnesses of Jesus’ life and first-generation students of his teachings, which would have included the Son of Man traditions that were later included in the written gospels.

This analysis indicates that the concept of the messiah in Paul’s thought and the concept of the messiah in the oral transmission of the earliest communities of the Jesus movement (which were later included in the written gospel accounts) grew out of the same soil. They were developed from the same traditions about the Son of Man that Jesus himself spoke and taught to his disciples. In other words, it is no longer possible to view

Paul's concept of the messiah figure and the view of the messiah figure in the canonical gospels as two distinct and irreconcilable views. The old view that Paul's messiah was shaped by a non-Jewish, Gentile context and that the messiah in the gospels was shaped in a Jewish context is no longer tenable. The wedge must now be considered to have been permanently removed.

In the end it is the combination of conceptual elements of messianic traditions held in common by the *Book of Parables* and the Letters of Paul that leads to the conclusion that Paul was aware of the traditions in the *Book of Parables*, that he was in fact influenced by these traditions. We really cannot say with any certainty that Paul knew the text of the *Parables*, because there is no evidence of direct quotation. Based on the comparative analysis we can say, however, that Paul was familiar with the conceptual elements of the Enochic messiah, and that Paul developed his concept of the *Kyrios* out of the *kerygma* of the early Jesus movement and out of the Son of Man traditions in the *Book of the Parables of Enoch*.

Paul indeed was a Jew. Now we can say with a high degree of certainty from which stream of Jewish intellectual tradition Paul developed his concept of the Messiah. It was from Enoch.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abegg, Martin. "The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?" *DSD* 2 (1995): 125-144.
- Adler, William. "A Dead End in the Enoch Trajectory: A Response to Andrei Orlov." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 137-142.
- Aland, Barbara, ed., et al. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.
- Albani, Matthias. "The 'One Like a Son of Man' (Dan 7:13) and the Royal Ideology." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005. 47-53.
- Alexander, Philip. "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch." Michael E. Stone and T.A. Bergren, eds. *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, 1998. 102-111.
- Anderson, Gary, ed. *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays*. SVTP 15. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan." Gary Anderson, ed. *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays*. SVTP 15. Leiden: Brill, 2000. 83-110.
- . "The Penitence Narrative in the Life of Adam and Eve." Gary Anderson, ed. *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays*. SVTP 15. Leiden: Brill, 2000. 3-42.
- Anderson, Jeff S. "From 'Communities of Texts' to Religious Communities: Problems and Pitfalls." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005. 351-355.
- Arcari, Luca. "A Symbolic Transfiguration of a Historical Event: The Parthian Invasion in Josephus and the Parables of Enoch." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 478-486.
- Aschim, Anders. "Melchizedek and Jesus: 11QMelchizedek and the Epistle to the Hebrews." James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis, eds. *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism. Volume 63. Leiden: Brill, 1999. 129-147.

- Ashton, John. *The Religion of Paul the Apostle*. New Haven and London: Yale, 2000.
- Atkinson, Kenneth. *I Cried to the Lord: A Study of the Psalms of Solomon's Historical Background and Social Setting*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism. Volume 84. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Aune, David E., ed. *Rereading Paul Together: Protestant and Catholic Perspectives on Justification*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006.
- Bakker, Adolphine. "Christ an Angel?" *ZNW* 32 (1933): 255-265.
- Bampfylde, G. "The Prince of Hosts in the Book of Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls." *JSJ* 14 (1983): 129-134.
- Barclay, John M. and Simon J. Gathercole. *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*. Library of New Testament Studies 335. London: T. & T. Clark, 2006.
- Barker, Margaret. *The Great Angel: A Study of Israel's Second God*. London: SPCK, 1992.
- Bassler, Jouette M. *Navigating Paul: An Introduction to Key Theological Concepts*. Philadelphia: Westminster/John Knox, 2006.
- Bauckham, Richard. "The Worship of Jesus in Apocalyptic Christianity." *NTS* 27 (1980-1981): 322-341.
- *God Crucified: Monotheism & Christology in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- "The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus." *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. C. Newman, J. Davila, and G. Lewis, eds. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich. 3rd ed. rev. by Frederick W. Danker. Chicago: U. of Chicago, 2000.
- Bautch, Kelley Coblenz. "Adamic Traditions in the Parables? A Query on 1 Enoch 69:6." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 352-360.
- Begg, Christopher. "Josephus' Portrayal of the Disappearances of Enoch, Elijah and Moses: Some Observations." *JBL* 109 (1990): 691-693.
- Beyerle, Stefan. "'Der mit den Wolken des Himmels kommt,' Untersuchungen zu Traditionsgefüge 'Menschensohn.'" Dieter Sänger, ed. *Gottessohn und Menschensohn. Exegetische Studien zuzwei Paradigmen biblischer Intertextualität*. Biblisch-Theologische Studien 67. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004.
- "'One Like a Son of Man': Innuendos of a Heavenly Individual." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005. 54-58.
- Bird, Michael F. *Are You the One Who Is to Come? The Historical Jesus and the Messianic Question*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2009.
- *The Saving Righteousness of God: Studies on Paul, Justification and the New*

- Perspective*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2007.
- Black, Matthew. "Aramaic Barnâshâ and the 'Son of Man.'" *Expository Times* 95 (1983-1984): 200-206.
- *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*. SVTP 7. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- "The Eschatology of the Similitudes of Enoch." *Journal of Theological Studies* NS 3 (1952): 1-10.
- "The 'Son of Man' in the Teaching of Jesus." *Expository Times* 60 (1948-1949): 32-36.
- Blass, Friedrich, and Albert Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Trans. from the 9th-10th German ed. Robert W. Funk, ed. Chicago: U. of Chicago, 1961.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- ed. *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- "Finding a Place for the Parables of Enoch within Second Temple Jewish Literature." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 263-289.
- "Inner-Jewish Debate on the Tension between Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism," *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*, John M. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole, eds. London: T. & T. Clark, 2006.
- *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- "Response: Texts, Intellectual Movements, and Social Groups." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005. 417-425.
- *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History, from Ezekiel to Daniel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- "The Covenantal Theology of the Apocalyptic Book of Daniel." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005. 39-44.
- ed., and John J. Collins. *The Early Enoch Literature*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 121. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- ed. *The Origins of Enochic Judaism: Proceedings of the First Enoch Seminar, University of Michigan, Sesto Fiorentino, Italy, June 19-23, 2001*. *Henoch* 24.1-2. 2002.
- Bockmuehl, Markus, and James Carleton Paget, eds. *Redemption and Resistance: The Messianic Hopes of Jews and Christians in Antiquity*. London/New York: T. & T. Clark, 2007.
- Borsch, F. *The Son of Man in Myth and History*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967.
- Böttrich, Christfried. "Konturen des 'Menschensohnes' in äthHen 37-71." Dieter Sänger,

- ed. *Gottessohn und Menschensohn. Exegetische Studien zuzwei Paradigmen biblischer Intertextualität*. Biblisch-Theologische Studien 67. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004. 53-90.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Iranaeus*. John E. Steely, trans. Nashville: Abingdon, 1970. German original, 1913.
- Boyarin, Daniel. *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*. University of California, 1994.
- *Borderlines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*. Philadelphia: U. of Pennsylvania, 2004.
- “Was the Book of Parables a Sectarian Document? A Brief Brief in Support of Pierluigi Piovanelli.” Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 380-385.
- Brondos, David A. *Paul on the Cross: Reconstructing the Apostle’s Story of Redemption*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 2006.
- Brooke, George J. “Kingship and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” John Day, ed. *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. JSOTSup 270. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998. 434-455.
- Burkett, Delbert. *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation*. SNTSMS 107. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1999.
- Brodie, Thomas L., Dennis R. MacDonald, and Stanley E. Porter, eds. *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2006.
- Byrne, Brendan. “Sons of God”—“Seed of Abraham”: A Study of the Idea of Sonship of God of All Christians in Paul against the Jewish Background. Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1979.
- Byrskog, S. *Jesus the Only Teacher: Didactic Authority and Transmission in Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism and the Matthean Community*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1994.
- Campbell, Douglas A. *The Quest for Paul’s Gospel: A Suggested Strategy*. London: T. & T. Clark, 2005.
- Campbell, William S. *Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity*. London: T. & T. Clark, 2008.
- Capes, David B., April D. DeConick, Helen K. Bond, and Troy A. Miller, eds. *Israel’s God and Rebecca’s Children: Christology and Community in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Essays in Honor of Larry W. Hurtado and Alan F. Segal. Waco: Baylor University, 2007.
- *Old Testament Yahweh Texts in Paul’s Christology*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992.
- Carr, Wesley. *Angels and Principalities: The Background, Meaning and Development of the Pauline Phrase *hai archai kai hai exousiai**. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1981.
- Carson, D.A., Peter T. O’Brien, and Mark Seifrid, eds. *Justification and Variegated*

- Nomism: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Volume 1. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001.
- Carson, D.A., Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark Seifrid, eds. *Justification and Variegated Nomism: The Paradoxes of Paul*. Volume 2. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004.
- Casey, Maurice. *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God: The Origins and Development of New Testament Christology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991.
- *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7*. London: SPCK, 1979.
- *The Solution to the Son of Man Problem*. Library of New Testament Studies 343. London: T. & T. Clark, 2007.
- "The Use of the Term 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch." *JSJ* 7 (1976): 11-29.
- Charlesworth, James H. "Can We Discern the Composition Date of the Parables of Enoch?" Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 450-468.
- ed. *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983 and 1985.
- "The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel." *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. John J. Collins and George W.E. Nickelsburg, eds. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980. 135-151.
- Chester, Andrew. "Jewish Messianic Expectations, Mediatorial Figures, and Pauline Christology." *Paulus und das antike Judentums*. M. Hengel and U. Heckel, eds. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1991. 17-89.
- *Messiah and Exaltation*. WUNT 207. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- "The Christ of Paul." Markus Bockmuehl, and James Carleton Paget, eds. *Redemption and Resistance: The Messianic Hopes of Jews and Christians in Antiquity*. London/New York: T. & T. Clark, 2007. 109-121.
- Chialà, Sabino. "The Son of Man: The Evolution of an Expression." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 153-178.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro, and John J. Collins. *King and Messiah As Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- "The Secret Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospel of Mark: A Response to Leslie Walck." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 338-342.
- Collins, John J. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- *Daniel with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- "Enoch and the Son of Man: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig."

- Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 216-227.
- and George W. Nickelsburg, eds. *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. SCS 12. Chico, CA: Scholars, 1980.
- *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. Louisville, KY: Westminster-John Knox, 1997.
- “Response: The Apocalyptic Worldview of Daniel.” Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005. 59-66.
- *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- “Stirring up the Great Sea: The Religio-Historical Background of Daniel 7.” *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. A.S. van der Woude, ed. Leuven: Leuven U.P., 1993.
- “The Heavenly Representative: The ‘Son of Man’ in the Similitudes of Enoch.” John J. Collins and George W.E. Nickelsburg, eds. *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. Chico, CA: Scholars, 1980. 111-133.
- *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
- “The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High in the Book of Daniel.” *JBL* 93 (1974): 50-66.
- “The Son of Man in First Century Judaism.” *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992): 448-466.
- Cummins, Stephen Anthony. *Paul and the Crucified Christ in Antioch: Maccabean Martyrdom and Galatians 1 and 2*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 114. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 2001.
- Daly, Robert S.J., ed. *Apocalyptic Thought in Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2009.
- Das, A. Andrew. *Paul and the Jews*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.
- *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001.
- Davis, P.G. “Divine Agents, Mediators, and New Testament Christology.” *JTS* 45 (1994): 479-503.
- Day, John, ed. *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. JSOTSup 270. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.
- Delcor M. “Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews.” *JSJ* 2 (1971): 115-135.
- Dewey, J., ed. *Semeia 65: Orality and Textuality in Early Christian Literature*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1995.
- Dey, Lala Kalyan Kumar. *The Intermediary World and Patterns of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews*. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1975.
- Donaldson, Terence L. *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle’s Convictional World*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1997.
- Donfried, Karl P., and Peter Richardson, eds. *Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

- Dunn, James D.G. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. Second edition. London: SCM, 1989.
- *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians*. Philadelphia: Westminster/John Knox, 1990.
- ed. *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, AD 70 to 135*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- ed. *Paul and the Mosaic Law*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- ed. *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul*. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 2003.
- *The Justice of God: A Fresh Look at the Old Doctrine of Justification by Faith*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- *The New Perspective on Paul, Revised Edition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- *The Theology of Paul's Letter to the Galatians*. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1993.
- Eisenbaum, Pamela. *Paul Was Not a Christian: The Original Message of a Misunderstood Apostle*. New York: Harper, 2009.
- Eldridge, Michael D. *Dying Adam with His Multiethnic Family: Understanding the Greek Life of Adam and Eve*. *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* 16. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Elliger, Kurt, and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1984.
- Eshel, Esti. "The Identification of the 'Speaker' of the Self-Glorification Hymn." D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich, eds. *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. *STDJ* 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999. 619-635.
- Eshel, Hanan. "An Allusion in the Parables of Enoch to the Acts of Matthias Antigonus in 40 B.C.E.?" Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 487-491.
- Fee, Gordon D. *Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin. "4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christology." *DSD* 3 (1996): 236-252.
- *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 42. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- "Heavenly Ascent or Incarnational Presence? A Revisionist Reading of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*." *SBLSP*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998. 367-399.
- *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*. *WUNT* 2.94. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1995.
- "The High Priest As Divine Mediator in the Hebrew Bible: Daniel 7:13 As a Test Case." *SBLSP*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997. 161-193.
- Fossum, Jarl E. *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology*. *NTOA* 30. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1995.
- *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism*. *WUNT* 36. Tübingen: Mohr-

- Siebeck, 1985.
- “The Religionsgeschichtliche Schule: The Quest for Jewish Christology.” *SBLSP*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Fröhlich, Ida. “The Parables of Enoch and Qumran Literature.” Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 343-351.
- Gager, John G. *Reinventing Paul*. New York: Oxford, 2000.
- García Martínez, Florentino, “A ‘Groningen’ Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History,” *RevQ* 14 (1990): 521-541.
- “Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis,” *FO* 25 (1988): 62-136.
- and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- and Julio Treballe Barrera, eds. *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.
- ed. *The Scriptures and the Scrolls*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Gathercole, Simon J. *The Preexistent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- *Where is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul’s Response in Romans 1–5*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Gieschen, Charles A. *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 42. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- “The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch.” Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 238-249.
- Grabbe, Lester. “The Parables of Enoch in Second Temple Jewish Society.” Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 386-402.
- Granerod, Gard. *Abraham and Melchizedek: Scribal Activity of Second Temple Times in Genesis 14 and Psalm 110*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. De Gruyter, 2010.
- Hannah, Darrell D. *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity*. WUNT 2.109. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1999.
- “The Book of Noah, the Death of Herod the Great, and the Date of the Parables of Enoch.” Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 469-477.
- “The Throne of His Glory: The Divine Throne and Heavenly Mediators in Revelation and the Similitudes of Enoch.” *ZNW* 94 (2003): 68-96.
- Hare, Douglas. *The Son of Man Tradition*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath, eds. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1897.
- Hays, Richard B. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul As Interpreter of Israel’s*



- Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Hellerman, Joseph H. *Reconstructing Honor in Roman Philippi: Carmen Christi As Cursus Pudorum*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 132. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 2005.
- Hempel, Charlotte, and Judith M. Lieu, eds. *Biblical Traditions in Transmission*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 111. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976; German ed. 1975.
- Henze, Matthias. "Enoch's Dream Visions and the Visions of Daniel Reexamined." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005. 17-22.
- . "The Parables of Enoch in Second Temple Literature: A Response to Gabriele Boccaccini." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 290-298.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. "Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple," *SBLSP* 26 (1987): 210-217.
- . *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York: Oxford, 1993.
- . "Heavenly Ascent and the Relationship of the Apocalypses and the Hekhalot Literature." *HUCA* 59 (1988): 73-100.
- . "Revelation and Rapture: The Transformation of the Visionary in the Ascent Apocalypses." *Mysteries & Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium*. John J. Collins and James H. Charlesworth, eds. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.
- . *Tours of Hell: An Apocalyptic Form of Jewish and Christian Literature*. Philadelphia: U. of Pennsylvania, 1983.
- Hofius, Otrfied. *Der Christushymnus Philipper 2,6-11: Untersuchungen zu Gestalt und Aussage eines urchristlichen Psalms*. WUNT 17. 2nd ed. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck, 1991.
- . *Der Vorhang vor dem Thron Gottes: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Hebräer 6,19 f. und 10,10 f.* WUNT 14. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck, 1972.
- Hollander, H.W., and Marinus de Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 8. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Horbury, William. *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ*. London: SCM, 1998.
- . *Messianism among Jews and Christians: Biblical and Historical Studies*. London: T. & T. Clark, 2003.
- Horsley, Richard A., and Jonathan A. Draper. *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, 1999.
- Horton, Fred L. Jr. *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. SNTS Monograph Series. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 2005.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *At the Origins of Christian Worship: The Context and Character of Earliest Christian Devotion*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

- *How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God? Historical Questions about Earliest Devotion to Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005
- *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998.
- Jaffee, Martin S. *Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism, 200 BCE – 400 CE*. New York: Oxford, 2001.
- Jervell, Jacob. *Imago Dei: Gen 1,26f. Im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulischen Briefen*. Göttingen Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1960.
- Johnson, Aubrey. *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God*. Cardiff: U. of Wales, 1961.
- Jonge, Marinus de, and A.S. van der Woude. “11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament.” *NTS* 12 (1965–1966): 301-326.
- *Christology in Context: The Earliest Christian Response to Jesus*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988.
- Kelber, Werner. “Jesus and Tradition: Words in Time, Words in Space.” *Semeia* 65: *Orality and Textuality in Early Christian Literature*. J. Dewey, ed. Atlanta: Scholars, 1995.
- Kittel, Gerhard. *The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, trans. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Knibb, Michael, ed. *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions*. *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* 22. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- “Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Scrolls. *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 177-180.
- “The Date of the Parables of Enoch.” *NTS* 25 (1979): 345-359.
- *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.
- ed. *The Septuagint and Messianism*. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.
- “The Structure and Composition of the Parables of Enoch.” Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 48-64.
- Kobelski, Paul J. *Melchizedek and Melchiresha*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981.
- Koch, Klaus. “Questions regarding the So-Called Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig.” Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 228-237.
- Koperski, Veronica. *Knowledge of Christ Jesus My Lord: The High Christology of Philippians 3:7-11*. Louvain: Peeters, 1996.
- Kreitzer, L. Joseph. *Jesus and God in Paul’s Eschatology*. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 19. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Kvanvig, Helge S. *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch*

- Figure and of the Son of Man*. WMANT 61. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.
- “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch.” Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 179-215.
- Lacey, D. R. De. “Jesus as Mediator.” *JSNT* 29 (1987): 101-121.
- Lake, Kirsopp. *The Apostolic Fathers*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard, 1985 and 1992.
- Levison, John R. “Adam and Eve in Romans 1.8-25 and the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*,” *NTS* 50.4 (October 2004): 519-34.
- *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1988.
- *Texts in Transition: The Greek Life of Adam and Eve*. Society of Biblical Literature, Early Judaism and Its Literature 16. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.
- Liddel and Scott. *Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Lim, Timothy H. “The Enochic Circles, the Hasidim, and the Qumran Community.” Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005. 204-206.
- Longenecker, Richard N., ed. *Contours of Christology in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- *Studies in Hermeneutics, Christology and Discipleship*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2004.
- *Studies in Paul: Exegetical and Theological*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2004.
- *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*. Vancouver: Regent, 2001.
- Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene A. Nida, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. 2nd edition. Volume 1, Introduction & Domains. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
- *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Volume 2, Indices. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
- Martin, Ralph P. *A Hymn of Christ: Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1997.
- *Carmen Christi: Philippians 2.5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1967.
- McGrath, James P. *The Only True God: Early Christian Monotheism in Its Jewish Context*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, 2009.
- Mearns, Christopher. “Dating the Similitudes of Enoch.” *NTS* 25 (1979): 360-369.
- Moore, George Foot. “Intermediaries in Jewish Theology: Memra, Shekinah, Metatron.” *HTR* 15 (1922): 41-85.
- Murray-Jones, Christopher R.A. “The Temple Within: The Embodied Divine Image and Its Worship in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish and Christian Sources.” *SBLSP*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1998.
- Müller, Morgens. *The Expression ‘Son of Man’ and the Development of Christology: A History of Interpretation*. London: Equinox, 2008.

- Munoa, Philip B. *Four Powers in Heaven: The Interpretation of Daniel 7 in the Testament of Abraham*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.
- Nanos, Mark D. *The Mystery of Romans*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- Nebe, Gottfried. "The Son of Man and the Angels: Reflections on the Formation of Christology in the Context of Eschatology." *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition*. Henning Graf Reventlow, ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997. 111-131.
- Newman, Carey C. *Paul's Glory-Christology*. Supplements to *NovT* 69. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis, eds. *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism. Volume 63. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Nickelsburg, George W. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- and James C. VanderKam. *1 Enoch: A New Translation Based on the Hermeneia Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.
- *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins: Diversity, Continuity, and Transformation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
- "Discerning the Structure(s) of the Enochic Book of Parables." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 23-47.
- "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee." *JBL* 100 (1981): 575-600.
- and John J. Collins, eds. *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Oegema, Gerbern S. *The Anointed and His People: Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 27. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.
- "The Coming of the Righteous One' in Acts and 1 Enoch." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 250-259.
- Olyan, Saul. *A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993.
- Orlov, Andre A. *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 114. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- "Roles and Titles of the Seventh Antediluvian Hero in the Parables of Enoch: A Departure from the Traditional Pattern?" Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 110-136.
- Otzen, Benedikt. "Michael and Gabriel: Angelological Problems in the Book of Daniel." *The Scriptures and the Scrolls*. Florentino García Martínez, ed. Leiden: Brill,

1992. 114-124.
- Piovanelli, Pierluigi. "A Testimony for the Kings and the Mighty Who Possess the Earth': The Thirst for Justice and Peace in the Parables of Enoch." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 363-379.
- Porter, Stanley E., ed. *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Rahlf's, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. "'Revealed Literature' in the Second Century B.C.E.: Jubilees, 1 Enoch, Qumran, and the Prehistory of the Biblical Canon." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005. 94-98.
- Reventlow, Henning Graf, ed. *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.
- Robinson, James M. *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. San Francisco: Harper, 1978.
- Roo, Jacqueline C.R. de. *Works of the Law at Qumran and in Paul*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2007.
- Sacchi, Paolo. *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 20. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990.
- . *The History of the Second Temple Period*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 285. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.
- Sanders, E.P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977.
- Sänger, Dieter, ed. *Gottessohn und Menschensohn. Exegetische Studien zuzwei Paradigmen biblischer Intertextualität*. Biblisch-Theologische Studien 67. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004.
- Segal, Alan F. "Heavenly Ascent in Hellenistic Judaism, Early Christianity, and Their Environment." *ANRW* 2.23.2 (1980): 1333-1394.
- . *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostacy of Saul the Pharisee*. New Haven: Yale, 1990.
- . "The Risen Christ and the Angelic Mediator Figures in Light of Qumran." *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. James H. Charlesworth, ed. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 302-328.
- . *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism*. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Stendahl, Krister. *Final Account: Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- . *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- Stone, Michael E. "Enoch's Date in Limbo; or, Some Considerations on David Suter's Analysis of the Book of Parables." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 444-449.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and*

- in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*. WUNT 2.70. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.
- “The Parables of Enoch according to George Nickelsburg and Michael Knibb: A Summary and Discussion of Some Remaining Questions.” Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 65-71.
- Suter, David W. “Enoch in Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Book of Parables.” Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 415-443.
- “Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6–16.” *HUCA* 50 (1979): 115-135.
- *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 47. SBL: Scholars, 1979.
- “Why Galilee? Galilean Regionalism in the Interpretation of 1 Enoch 6–16.” *Henoch* 25.2 (2003): 167-212.
- Taylor, Nicholas. *Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem: A Study in Relationships and Authority in Earliest Christianity*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 66. Sheffield: JSOT, 1992.
- Thackeray, H. *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities, Books I–IV*. Cambridge: Harvard, 1961.
- Thompson, Michael B. *The New Perspective on Paul*. Cambridge: Grove, 2002.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. “Jubilees and 1 Enoch and the Issue of Transmission of Knowledge.” Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005. 99-101.
- “Remarks on Transmission and Traditions in the Parables of Enoch: A Response to James VanderKam.” Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 100-109.
- Tromp, Johannes. *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Edition*. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece. Volumen sextum. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- VanderKam, James C. *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*. Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1995.
- *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 16. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.
- “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71.” James H. Charlesworth, ed. *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992. 169-191.
- “The Book of the Parables within the Enoch Tradition.” Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 81-99.
- Venter, Pieter M. “Spatiality in the Second Parable of Enoch.” Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 403-412.
- Vermes, Geza, and Martin Goodman. *The Essenes according to the Classical Sources*.

- Sheffield: JSOT, 1989.
- Waddell, James A. "Will the Real Judaism Please Stand Up? Ritual Self-Definition As Ideological Discourse from Qumran to Jerusalem." *Henoah* 26.1 (aprile 2004): 3-23.
- Walck, Leslie W. "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 299-337.
- Wansbrough, H., ed. *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991.
- Wright, Benjamin G. "The Structure of the Parables of Enoch: A Response to George Nickelsburg and Michael Knibb." Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007. 72-78.
- Wright, N.T. *What St. Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision*. London: SPCK, 2009.