

Leslie W. Walck



# The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and in Matthew



T&T CLARK JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN TEXTS SERIES

**JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN TEXTS IN CONTEXTS  
AND RELATED STUDIES**

**SERIES**

*Executive Editor*

**James H. Charlesworth**

*Editorial Board of Advisors*

**Mordechai Aviam, Michael T. Davis, Casey D. Elledge, Loren L. Johns,  
Amy-Jill Levine, Lee McDonald, Lidija Novakovic, Gerbern Oegema,  
Henry W. Morisada Rietz, Brent A. Strawn**

*This page intentionally left blank*

# The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and in Matthew

Leslie W. Walck



© Leslie W. Walck, 2011

Published by T&T Clark International

*A Continuum imprint*

The Tower Building, 11 York Road, London SE1 7NX

80 Maiden Lane, Suite 704, New York, NY 10038

[www.continuumbooks.com](http://www.continuumbooks.com)

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Leslie W. Walck has asserted his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the Author of this work.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: HB: 978-0-567-02729-0

Typeset by Fakenham Prepress Solutions, Fakenham, Norfolk NR21 8NN

Printed and bound in the United States of America

## ABSTRACT

Depictions of the Son of Man in the Gospel of Matthew and in the *Parables of Enoch* (*Par. En.*) raise questions about their relationship. The meaning and origin of the term “Son of Man” are discussed, as well as the possible influence of *Par. En.* on Matthew. Literary, Redaction, Sociological and Narrative criticisms are employed.

Introductory questions of date, provenance and social setting are addressed for both Matthew and *Par. En.* Dates as early as the early second century BCE and as late as the late third century CE have been proposed for *Par. En.*, but a consensus seems to be growing for the late first century BCE. Therefore Matthew could have known *Par. En.* Sociological methodologies reveal that the author and audience of *Par. En.* may have been members of an ousted ruling elite, opposed to the current administration, and yearning for a just reversal of fortunes.

Sets of characteristics of the Son of Man in *Par. En.* and Matthew are carefully compared. Similarities in vocabulary as well as in the pattern of relationships prove to be intriguing, showing that Matthew and *Par. En.*, in contrast to other writings, share a unique conception of the judgment scene focused on the Son of Man as eschatological judge. This suggests quite strongly the shaping of Matthew’s concept in the direction of *Par. En.*

*This page intentionally left blank*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.....	ix
List of Tables .....	xi
Abbreviations for Ethiopic manuscripts .....	xii
Acknowledgments.....	xiv
<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Subject and Anticipated Results .....	1
1.2 The Son of Man in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> .....	2
1.3 The Son of Man and the Gospel of Matthew .....	8
1.4 The Relationship between the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> and Matthew .....	12
<b>2. DATING, SOURCES AND SOCIAL SETTING OF THE <i>PARABLES OF ENOCH</i>.....</b>	<b>14</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	14
2.2 Dating the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> .....	15
2.3 Sources for the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> .....	23
2.4 The Social Setting of the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> .....	30
<b>3. THE SON OF MAN IN THE <i>PARABLES OF ENOCH</i> .....</b>	<b>50</b>
3.1 Religio-Historical Background.....	50
3.2 Exegesis of <i>1 Enoch</i> 46:1–5 .....	53
3.3 Exegesis of <i>1 Enoch</i> 48:2–7 .....	82
3.4 Exegesis of <i>1 Enoch</i> 62 .....	100
3.5 Exegesis of <i>1 Enoch</i> 63:11 .....	113
3.6 Exegesis of <i>1 Enoch</i> 69:26–29 .....	117
3.7 Exegesis of <i>1 Enoch</i> 70 .....	129
3.8 Exegesis of <i>1 Enoch</i> 71:10–17 .....	139
3.9 Characteristics of the Son of Man in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> .....	156
<b>4. THE SON OF MAN IN THE CONCEPTION OF MATTHEW.....</b>	<b>165</b>
4.1 Introduction to Matthean Passages to be Considered .....	165
4.2 Exegesis of Mt. 10:23.....	167
4.3 Exegesis of Mt. 13:37, 41 .....	170
4.4 Exegesis of Mt. 16:13, 21, 27–28 .....	175
4.5 Exegesis of Mt. 19:28.....	183



4.6	Exegesis of Mt. 24:30–31.....	189
4.7	Exegesis of Mt. 25:31–34, 41, 46 .....	194
4.8	Matthew’s Portrait of the Son of Man.....	221
<b>5.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>226</b>
5.1	Similarities.....	226
5.2	Two Levels of Similarity .....	243
5.3	Other Similarities.....	244
5.4	Other Judgment Scenes .....	246
5.5	Conclusion.....	249
5.6	Prospects for Future Study .....	251
	Bibliography .....	253
	Index .....	261

## PREFACE

The occurrence of the term “Son of Man” in the *Parables of Enoch* has raised scholars’ interests in the possible influence of the parables on the Christian Gospels. With many common features, such as being a heavenly figure, accompanied by clouds, angels, playing a judicial role in an eschatological setting, the term in the Gospels seems to owe something to earlier traditions as represented by Daniel, 4th Ezra, and especially by the *Parables of Enoch*. From the re-discovery of the Book of Enoch in Ethiopia in the 19th century until the present, scholars have debated the possible relationship between Jesus’ use of the term as presented in the Gospels and uses in Daniel, 4th Ezra and the *Parables of Enoch*. R. H. Charles saw a tremendous influence of the Book of Enoch on Christian literature. Others have questioned the likelihood of the influence, especially in connection with the term “Son of Man.” E. Sjöberg, H. E. Tödt, and J. Theisohn in the mid-twentieth century explored the relationship, while others in the later part of the century rejected any influence especially of the *Parables of Enoch* on the Gospels. This contrast proved to be fruitful ground for investigation, and in this study, a slight revision of my 1999 Dissertation, “The Son of Man in Matthew and the Similitudes of Enoch,” I look for positive evidence of the influence of the parables on Matthew.

I wish to bring Literary, Redaction, Sociological and Narrative Criticism to bear on the question to elucidate the relationships. A primary question to be resolved is the dating of the work, for if the parables postdate Matthew, then no influence is possible. Studying the setting of the kings and mighty ones as well as the righteous and elect illuminates possible historical dynamics. An extensive comparison of similarities seems to show that Matthew has shaped the concept of the Son of Man in the direction of the parables.

If the influence of the parables on Matthew is quite plain, then interesting questions are raised about the Gospel, the school that produced and preserved it and the possible influence on Jesus himself.

I direct the reader also to all the work done by the biennial Enoch Seminar, organized by Gabriele Boccaccini and others. I was privileged to be invited to the 3rd Enoch Seminar in June 2005 in Camaldoli, Italy, to which I contributed an essay on Enoch and the Son of Man in the Christian Gospels. The proceedings of that Seminar are published in Boccaccini, Gabriele, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of*

*Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2007.

I wish to thank and acknowledge the suggestions and encouragement of my advisor, James C. VanderKam, and James H. Charlesworth, the editor of this series. I am also grateful for the encouragement of Gabriele Boccaccini and other participants in the Enoch Seminar; it is very much appreciated.

I also wish to thank my family for their continued encouragement, and Colfax Lutheran Church, where I have served as pastor, for their understanding and support.

## LIST OF TABLES

1. Distribution of Demonstrative Adjectives with the terms for “Son of Man” .....	71
2. Occurrences of <i>Manbar</i> /throne in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> .....	124
3. Characteristics of the Son of Man in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> .....	157
4. Other Features Relating to the Son of Man in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> .....	163
5. The Matthean Portrait of the Son of Man .....	222
6. Specific and Detailed Characteristics of the Son of Man Shared by <i>Par. En.</i> and Matthew .....	226
7. Patterns of Relationships of the Son of Man Shared by <i>Par. En.</i> and Matthew .....	227
8. Other Similarities Relating to the Son of Man Shared by <i>Par. En.</i> and Matthew .....	244
9. Features of Judgment Scenes in <i>Parables of Enoch</i> , Matthew and Others .....	248

## ABBREVIATIONS FOR ETHIOPIC MANUSCRIPTS<sup>1</sup>

Eth I	one family of Ethiopic manuscripts, so identified by Flemming, Charles and Knibb. It consists of the following:	
BM 485	British Museum Orient. 485	Early 16th cent.
BM 485a	A duplicate version of 97:6b–108:10 inserted in 91:6 of BM 485.	
BM 491	British Museum Orient. 491	18th cent.
Berl	Berlin manuscript	16th cent.
Abb 35	Abbadanius 35	end of 17th cent.
Abb 55	Abbadanius 55	15th or 16th cent.
Tana 9	Lake Tana manuscript 9	15th cent.
Eth II	a second family of Ethiopic manuscripts, so identified by Flemming, Charles and Knibb. It consists of the following:	
Bodl 4	Bodleian Library, catalogued by Dillmann as no. 4	18th cent.
Bodl 5	Bodleian Library, catalogued by Dillmann as no. 5	18th cent.
Frankfurt MS.	Frankfurt manuscript	18th cent.
Curzon 55	Curzon manuscript 55, also known as BM 8822	18th cent. (?)
Curzon 56	Curzon manuscript 56, also known as BM 8823	18th cent. (?)
BM Add. 24185	British Museum Add. 24185	19th cent.
BM 484	British Museum Orient. 484	18th cent.
BM 486	British Museum Orient. 486	18th cent.
BM 490	British Museum Orient. 490	18th cent.

<sup>1</sup> Taken from Michael A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, Vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 23–27, 53–54. See Knibb and R. H. Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906), xviii–xxi, for fuller descriptions of the manuscripts.

BM Add. 24990	British Museum Add. 24990	18th cent.
BM 492	British Museum Orient. 492	18th cent.
BM 499	British Museum Orient. 499	18th cent.
Ryl	John Rylands University Library Ryland Ethiopic manuscript 23 <sup>2</sup>	18th cent.
Abb 16	Abbadanius 16	18th cent.
Abb 30	Abbadanius 30	18th cent.
Abb 99	Abbadanius 99	19th cent.
Abb 197	Abbadanius 197	19th cent.
Vat 71	Vatican Ethiopic manuscript 71	18th cent.
Munich 30	Munich Ethiopic manuscript 30	18th cent.
Paris 114	Paris Ethiopic manuscript 114	17th cent.
Paris 32	Paris Ethiopic manuscript 32	18th cent.
Garrett MS.	now at Princeton University Library	19th or end of 18th cent.
Westenholz Ms.	at Hamburg Municipal Library	18th cent.
Ull	Ullendorf manuscript	early 18th cent.
British and Foreign Bible Society	British and Foreign Bible Society Ethiopic ms	17th cent.

<sup>2</sup> This is the base text of Knibb's edition, and is characterized by him as "a fine representative of what eventually emerged as the standard text of Enoch." Mistakes in it are rare, although at some point it was systematically corrected, yet in such a way as to be able to establish the original reading.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many need to be acknowledged for their influence, help, support and patience over the time that I have worked on this study in its many stages. First and foremost is my Dissertation Advisor, Prof. James C. VanderKam, who has been unflaggingly supportive and encouraging with what must have seemed a frustratingly slow and easily distracted student. My readers, including Prof. Greg Sterling, Adela Yarbro Collins and John P. Meier as well as other professors and teachers at the University of Notre Dame, have influenced and helped me to varying degrees and all their help has been very much appreciated. My work is much improved because of their input, and yet any shortcomings remain completely my own. I especially thank Professors VanderKam and Ulrich for modeling the best of the scholarly life and for the opportunities they made available to me.

I also wish to thank Dr. James H. Charlesworth, editor of this series, for his accepting this study for inclusion and his encouragement along the way.

Others to be thanked are my wife, Megan, and daughter, Callie, who have patiently endured this process, and are just as relieved as I that this project is finally complete. My parents have also been pleased to see parts of my work, and their support and encouragement has been an important bulwark. I owe many thanks to the Church Council of Colfax Lutheran Church, who had the confidence to grant me a study leave which resulted in significant progress, as well as to the Bishop's office of the Northwest Synod of Wisconsin—ELCA and other church offices for their encouragement.

Another group requiring acknowledgement as influential are all my colleagues along the way, with whom I read Greek, Hebrew, Aramaic and Ethiopic, with whom I discussed some of my ideas, and who shared ideas with me. Those free-wheeling discussions and exchanges of perspectives contributed greatly to my graduate studies, as did the Graduate Student support group that helped me keep healthy perspectives on the experience.

I am ever grateful

Leslie W. Walck

# 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Subject and Anticipated Results

This study is a comparison of the uses of the term “Son of Man” in the Gospel of Matthew and in the *Parables of Enoch* (*Par. En.*).<sup>1</sup> Matthew’s particular use of that term comes to light in the thirteen sayings in which Matthew exhibits a difference from Q or Mark.<sup>2</sup> All the “Son of Man” sayings, both those peculiar to Matthew, and those shared by the other Gospels, exhibit the characteristics of appearing only on Jesus’ lips, and of seeming to be non-revelatory to the narrative audience.<sup>3</sup> The sayings unique to Matthew, like all the others, can be divided amongst Bultmann’s three categories of earthly, suffering, and future sayings.<sup>4</sup> Seven of these sayings are peculiar to Matthew and fall in the category of the future, or the prophetic

<sup>1</sup> This study is based on my dissertation, *The Son of Man in Matthew and the “Similitudes of Enoch,”* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Dissertation Services, 1999), which was submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana., with Dr. James C. VanderKam as my advisor.

<sup>2</sup> Mt 10:23, 13:37, 13:41, 16:13, 16:27, 28, 17:12, 19:28, 24:30, 25:31, 26:2. In Mt 10:32 from Q, and 16:21 from Mk, the third person pronoun appears rather than the term *Son of Man*.

<sup>3</sup> These characteristics have been noted by all the commentators, including Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (I–IX)* (AB 28; New York: Doubleday, 1979) 208; Geza Vermes, “The Use of *בֶּרֶךְ-נֶשֶׂא* / *בֶּרֶךְ-נִשְׂא* in Jewish Aramaic,” Appendix E in *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. ed. M. Black (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967) 310–30; Jack Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story* (2nd ed., Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 95–103; and George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Son of Man,” in David Noel Freedman ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (vol 6; New York-London-Toronto-Sydney-Auckland: Doubleday, 1992), VI.137–50.

<sup>4</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (trans. K. Groebel: London: SCM, 1952) 30; he is followed by Philipp Vielhauer, “Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu,” in *Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament* (Munich: Kaiser, 1965) 57–58; Norman Perrin, *A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974) 60–77; Heinz Eduard Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. Dorothea M. Barton; London: SCM, 1965); A. J. B. Higgins, *The Son of Man in the Teaching of Jesus* (SNTSMS 39; Cambridge-New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980) 2; Barnabas Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels and in the Light of Recent Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983) vii.



and apocalyptic,<sup>5</sup> sayings. Of particular interest is the saying which introduces the description of the Last Judgment (Mt 25:31–46). In *Par. En.*, on the other hand, the term “Son of Man” is one of several used of the eschatological, judicial figure, who is central to the three visions.<sup>6</sup> The figure is unknown to the kings and the powerful, but is the hope of the elect and righteous. Most interesting is the role the Son of Man plays as judge at the eschatological judgment.

Some have seen a clear dependence of Matthew upon *Par. En.* for the concept of the figure who is called the Son of Man,<sup>7</sup> while others have argued against such a dependence.<sup>8</sup> Crucial to this study will be the dating of *Par. En.*, for if *Par. En.* can be dated as preceding Matthew, then dependence can be argued. The anticipated result is that there is a clear, definable, positive relationship between the two documents as revealed in their portrayal of the Son of Man. A great deal of similarity exists between the two documents, especially the image of the Son of Man sitting “upon the throne of his glory,” and judging the mighty of the world. The basis of judgment is the way the mighty and the powerful have treated the poor and disenfranchised. Both images of the eschatological judge include the sending out of angels, and the reversal of fortunes. Further, neither judge is recognized by the mighty and powerful. The condemned plead for mercy in both documents, but none is forthcoming, and they are sent to the place of their punishment. These similarities seem to indicate some kind of a close relationship between the two documents, literary, oral or at the very least, a common tradition shared by the two works. These similarities also merit a detailed examination of the pertinent passages in both *Par. En.* and Matthew.

## 1.2 The Son of Man in the *Parables of Enoch*

### 1.2.1 The *Parables of Enoch*

The Son of Man in *Par. En.* is shaped by the genre of the work. The ‘macrogenre’ of *Par. En.* is clearly apocalypse.<sup>9</sup> Its main theme is judgment day and the destiny of

<sup>5</sup> This is Adela Yarbro Collins’ preferred designation for this group, when categorized according to form and function, in “The Origin of the Designation of Jesus as ‘Son of Man,’” *HTR* 80:4 (1987) 401–403.

<sup>6</sup> James C. VanderKam, “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71,” in J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Messiah* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1992) 174–75.

<sup>7</sup> For example, David R. Catchpole, “The Poor on Earth and the Son of Man in Heaven: A Re-appraisal of Matthew XXV.31–46,” *BJRL* 61 (1979) 355–97; and J. Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter* (SUNT 12; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975) 149–201.

<sup>8</sup> Such as Maurice Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1979); and Douglas R. A. Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991); also see Casey’s subsequent work, *The Solution to the ‘Son of Man’ Problem* (London & New York: T&T Clark International, 2007) 91–111.

<sup>9</sup> John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (New York: Crossroad, 1984) 143–45. See also David W. Suter, “Apocalyptic Patterns in the Similitudes of Enoch,” in Paul J. Achtemeier,

the righteous. It includes the motifs of revelation through vision during an ascent, an angelic guide, concern for the transcendent world and the destiny of humanity, motifs which are typical of apocalyptic writings.<sup>10</sup> It lacks a review of history, however. The frame story, *1 Enoch* 37, 70–71 and the first vision are a reinterpretation of the *Book of the Watchers*, but, instead of fallen watchers being judged, the rulers and the mighty ones are to be judged. Enoch's ascent and his message of judgment from God are reinterpreted for the contemporary situation of the community which was addressed in this work.

*Par. En.* contains three parables or visions (*1 Enoch* 38–44, 45–57, and 58–69). Each one has an introductory chapter presenting the subject of that particular parable. Overall, the theme is the eschatological resting place of the righteous and the wicked, as revealed to Enoch, who has ascended to heaven and is thus able to receive this information.<sup>11</sup>

The first parable (*1 Enoch* 38–44) includes a vision of the resting place of the righteous with the angels and holy ones (*1 Enoch* 39). He sees myriads of angels, and four archangels are before the Lord of Spirits (*1 Enoch* 40). Cosmological secrets are revealed to Enoch (*1 Enoch* 41, 43–44). A portion of a Wisdom poem (*1 Enoch* 42) asserts the opposite of Sirach 24, that wisdom is obscured on earth by iniquity.

The second parable (*1 Enoch* 45–57) is concerned with those who deny the Name of the Lord of the Spirits. They will come neither to heaven nor to earth, but will be judged when the Elect One will sit on his throne of glory (*1 Enoch* 45). The Son of Man is introduced in a clear allusion to Daniel 7:13 (*1 Enoch* 46), and the prayers of the righteous ascend to heaven (*1 Enoch* 47). Wisdom is revealed to Enoch, “poured out like water,” and not withdrawn (*1 Enoch* 48–49). The theme of judgment is addressed again (*1 Enoch* 50–51), more secrets of the heavens are revealed (*1 Enoch* 52), and Enoch sees punishment being prepared for the wicked (*1 Enoch* 53–57).

The third parable (*1 Enoch* 58–69) consists of cosmological mysteries, a vision of the “head of days,” a noachic interpolation (*1 Enoch* 65–67), and the judgment of the fallen angels (*1 Enoch* 68–69).

The function of the work is to provide consolation to the oppressed by raising for them the hope of a future reversal of fortunes. They will be vindicated and their oppressors overturned. In this way, the work helped define boundaries for the group. They were the ones who acknowledged the Lordship of the Son of Man, while the

ed., *SBLSP* (Vol. 1; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1978) 8–12. The pertinent introductory questions of dating, sources and social setting will be addressed in Chapter 2.

<sup>10</sup> John J. Collins, “Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre,” *Semeia* 14 (1979) 9; and Adela Yarbro Collins, “Introduction,” *Semeia* 36 (1986) 2, 7.

<sup>11</sup> Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 143–45. See also James C. VanderKam, *Enoch, A Man for All Generations* (Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1995) 132–42. See also Gabriele Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2007) 23–78.

mighty and the powerful did not, and therefore would be judged. The Son of Man is portrayed as the eschatological judge, who in the end will vindicate them. This portrayal arises out of the apocalyptic genre of the work.

### 1.2.2 The Son of Man in *Par. En.*

Three terms for the Son of Man are used in *Par. En.*<sup>12</sup> They are *walda sab*<sup>3</sup>, *walda be'si*, and *walda 'egwāla 'emma-heyāw*. They are interchangeable, for the same attributes are shared by all three terms. Together with the “Righteous One,” the “Anointed,” and the “Elect One,” they refer to the messianic figure. The term Son of Man has been based on Daniel 7:13, with exegetical developments based on passages in Isaiah and Jeremiah. Some argue that the term in Daniel 7, “one like a son of man” (i.e. a human one) seems to have been a corporate symbol for the people of God who will supplant the four beastly empires.<sup>13</sup> Others argue that the term referred to an angelic patron of Israel.<sup>14</sup> In *Par. En.* the term refers to an individual, who is the final judge.

Four issues have been debated rather extensively regarding the Son of Man: 1) whether the term is a title; 2) Enoch's identification as the Son of Man; 3) the significance of the “hiddenness” of the Son of Man and whether it implies his pre-existence; and 4) the eschatological function of the Son of Man.

#### *Is “Son of Man” a Title?*

Maurice Casey<sup>15</sup> and George Nickelsburg<sup>16</sup> argue that “Son of Man” is not a title in *Par. En.* because the demonstrative is often used with it. The term is also often qualified in other ways, a fact which leads Nickelsburg to suggest that it is a general term for a human being, and that that human being is glorified. The actual titles used of that human one are the “Elect One” or the “Righteous One.”<sup>17</sup> Casey points out that the title the “Elect One” is never used with a demonstrative.

E. Sjöberg agrees in part.<sup>18</sup> He believes that the term is not a formal title in *Par. En.* because of the use of the demonstrative. It has, however, become a “fixed term,” which Sjöberg views as an intermediate step on the way toward becoming a title. By

<sup>12</sup> VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 174–75.

<sup>13</sup> Casey, *Son of Man*, 18, 40–44. Also see the section on the Religio-Historical Background in the next chapter.

<sup>14</sup> John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (HSM 16: Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977) 141–46.

<sup>15</sup> Maurice Casey, “The Use of Term ‘Son of Man’ in the Similitudes of Enoch,” *JSJ* 7 (1976) 11–29. See also Casey, *Solution*, 111.

<sup>16</sup> George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981) 221–22.

<sup>17</sup> Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 215.

<sup>18</sup> E. Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn in Äthiopischen Henochbuch* (Skrifter Utgivna av kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet in Lund 41; Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946).

*1 Enoch* 71, Sjöberg claims, the term has become a title. Matthew Black comes to a similar conclusion.<sup>19</sup>

### *The Identification of Enoch as the Son of Man*

John J. Collins<sup>20</sup> and VanderKam<sup>21</sup> have written on the issue of the identification of Enoch as the Son of Man, and take opposing viewpoints. Collins states the problem succinctly. As the text now stands, *1 Enoch* 71:14 identifies the Son of Man with Enoch. This means, then, that throughout *Par. En.* he sees the Son of Man but does not recognize himself as the Son of Man. Only at the end is this identification revealed to him. If this reading is authentic, then it is the only instance of apocalyptic auto-vision that survives, in which the seer does not recognize himself. But John J. Collins suggests that it is unlikely that Enoch would be viewing himself throughout *Par. En.* without recognizing himself.<sup>22</sup>

Charles' solution was to emend the text of *1 Enoch* 71:14 to the third person instead of the second person.<sup>23</sup> Thus Charles read, "This is the Son of Man..." rather than "You are the Son of Man..." Then he made the necessary changes in the rest of the text to bring it into harmony with the 3rd person rendering. He also suggested that a paragraph, which revealed the identity of the Son of Man, has been lost. But this extensive emendation has no surviving textual basis in any of the manuscripts, and for this reason is to be rejected.

Collins sees three possible solutions. One is that "son of man" in *1 Enoch* 71:14, by which Enoch is referred to, is a non-technical use of the term meaning simply another human spectator (Mowinckel's suggestion). The problem with this suggestion is that the author has not given any indication that this "son of man," Enoch, is different from the term used in the rest of *Par. En.* A second solution is to view Abb 55 (manuscript U) as containing the original reading at *1 Enoch* 70:1. The majority of manuscripts distinguish between Enoch and the "Son of Man" at *1 Enoch* 70:1: "Enoch's name was raised to the Son of Man and to the Lord of Spirits." But this contradicts *1 Enoch* 71:14, which announces that Enoch **is** the Son of Man. Abb 55, Abb 99 and Abb 197 (Charles' manuscripts U, V, and W), however, do not include the words "to the Son of Man and," and thus would remove the contradiction between *1 Enoch* 70:1 and 71:14. The problem with this solution is that, as Collins suggests,

<sup>19</sup> Matthew Black, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: a New English Translation with Commentary and Textual Notes* (Leiden: E. J. Brill; 1985) 207. Under *1 Enoch* 46:2 later, see further my discussion on the demonstrative adjective with the Son of Man and its distribution in Table 1.

<sup>20</sup> John J. Collins, "The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism," *NTS* 38 (1992) 448–66; and *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 151–53.

<sup>21</sup> VanderKam, "Righteous One," 169–91.

<sup>22</sup> John J. Collins, "The Son of Man who has Righteousness," in *SBLSP* (vol. 2, ed. Paul J. Achtemeier; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979) 6. Casey, *Solution*, 91–111, argues that the term **בֶּרֶךְ (א)שֵׁ (א)** refers to Enoch throughout, and cites the example of Levi seeing a future self in a vision at Bethel (*T. Levi* 7.4–8.1)

<sup>23</sup> R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1912) 145.

the omission of the words in Abb 55, 99 and 197 (manuscripts U, V, and W) may be a scribal alteration in order to bring *1 Enoch* 70:1 into harmony with *1 Enoch* 71:14.<sup>24</sup> Thus Collins holds that the majority reading is the original, in which Enoch and the Son of Man are distinguished. The third solution, which Collins held in “The Son of Man who has Righteousness” (1979), is to see *1 Enoch* 71 as a redactional addition at a time later than the writing of the original. This would explain the contradiction between *1 Enoch* 70:1 and 71:14. Further, the alleged pre-existence of the Son of Man in *1 Enoch* 48 makes no allusion to earthly, human existence, which might be expected if Enoch were identified as the Son of Man in the original work. This observation tends to support the view that *1 Enoch* 71 was added later, and altered the original sense. And again, some argue that repetition is usual in apocalyptic literature, so that the repetition of the references to Enoch and to the Son of Man in *1 Enoch* 70 and 71 is appropriate to add nuance to the meaning. But Collins responds that while repetition is frequent in apocalyptic visions, it is not usual in narrative frameworks, where it would occur here. This also militates against the originality of *1 Enoch* 71. The reason for the addition of *1 Enoch* 71, according to Collins, can only be hypothesized, but probably the chapter was added as a later anti-Christian polemic, which presented Enoch rather than Christ as the model to follow.<sup>25</sup> Thus Collins argues that *1 Enoch* 71 is to be seen as a later addition.

VanderKam, on the other hand, argues that *1 Enoch* 70–71 are a natural and expected conclusion to the work, matching the introduction in *1 Enoch* 37. They are not repetitious, but “carefully crafted and tightly unified.”<sup>26</sup> This judgment is based on vocabulary used to reflect the different levels of ascent, and coincides well with ancient exegetical traditions which attributed a double ascent to Enoch, one during his 365 years, and the other at the end of his life.<sup>27</sup> Further the reverse genealogy given for Enoch at *1 Enoch* 37:1 contains two hints at his later elevation to the status of Son of Man: two of his ancestors, Adam and Enos, have names which are synonyms for “human.” Thus the phrases “son of Enos” and “son of Adam” are tantamount to saying “son of man” twice in Enoch’s genealogy, obliquely preparing the reader for Enoch’s identification as the Son of Man in *1 Enoch* 71:14.<sup>28</sup> The conclusion then is that the author did include *1 Enoch* 70–71 as a part of the work, and did intend to make a dramatic identification of Enoch as the Son of Man.

<sup>24</sup> John J. Collins, “The Heavenly Representative: The ‘Son of Man’ in the Similitudes of Enoch,” in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism*, ed. George W. E. Nickelsburg and John J. Collins, SCS12; (Chico, Ca: Scholars Press, 1980) 122. VanderKam notes in “Righteous One,” 184, that Abb 55 (manuscript U) can also be translated as “his name was raised to that of the son of man,” thus preserving the contradiction. Collins, in a more recent article, “The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism,” 453–55, acknowledges the uncertainty regarding the translation and notes that Abb 55 (manuscript U) is capricious in its omissions, citing R. H. Charles, “The Book of Enoch,” *APOT* 2.166.

<sup>25</sup> Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 153.

<sup>26</sup> VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 177, where he refers to Sjöberg’s work.

<sup>27</sup> VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 179.

<sup>28</sup> VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 178.

In his article, “The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism,” (1992)<sup>29</sup> Collins has adjusted his position somewhat. He no longer sees *1 Enoch* 71 as necessarily a redactional addition, although he does recognize redactional seams in the epilogue.<sup>30</sup> Rather the problem may have a different solution: Enoch’s identification at *1 Enoch* 71:14 as the Son of Man who was born to righteousness is not meant to be an identification with *the* Son of Man who has been seen in the visions, but rather is meant simply to be an acknowledgment that Enoch is *a* righteous human being (where “son of man” is taken to mean a human being). He has been translated into the heavenly realms to the presence of the Lord of Spirits and that Son of Man who is seated on the throne. So Collins now understands *1 Enoch* 71 as being original, but as identifying Enoch not with the Son of Man of the visions, but merely as a righteous human being who has been translated to heaven and who now lives in peace forever.

This view is possible, in that the demonstrative is not used here with Son of Man, and one could reasonably have expected it here. Further, Son of Man is a semitic idiom for a human being, and as Collins pointed out, in *1 Enoch* 71:14 Enoch is “born” to righteousness, instead of simply having it, as at *1 Enoch* 46:3. However, the major obstacle to this view remains that there is simply too little in the text to warrant a shift in referent. No other, more major and attention grabbing distinction is made between *the* Son of Man and *a* son of man (i.e. human being) at this point. The whole flow of the narrative points to Enoch’s dramatic identification as the Son of Man. The attributes with which he is spoken of here cohere extremely well with the Son of Man of the visions. He is bathed in righteousness: born for it, it abides with him, and God’s righteousness will not forsake him (*1 Enoch* 71:14). Further, God promises him peace and that all the righteous will be eternally present with him (*1 Enoch* 71:15–16). These attributes all tend to underscore Enoch’s identification as the Son of Man, not merely as one of the righteous humans who are already in heaven. For the reader, the identification of Enoch and the Son of Man is dramatic, but it has been prepared for, as VanderKam argued.<sup>31</sup> For the reader, that Enoch is acclaimed by Michael as just another righteous human, as Collins suggests, is anticlimactic and has not been prepared for by the author.

### *The Hiddenness and Pre-existence of the Son of Man*

The passages which suggest the hiddenness of the Son of Man (*1 Enoch* 48:3, 6, 62:7) are claimed to imply the pre-existence of the Son of Man. But as VanderKam argues, they may not imply that at all.<sup>32</sup> They may rather simply refer to God’s intention and purpose for Enoch, which God has known forever. In *1 Enoch* 48:3 his *name* is named; in *1 Enoch* 48:6, his chosenness and hiddenness suggest that Enoch’s career

<sup>29</sup> Collins, “The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism,” 448–66.

<sup>30</sup> Such as between *1 Enoch* 70:2 and 70:3, where there is a change from third person to first person. In this article he calls chapters 70–71 an “epilogue” instead of referring to them as “epilogues” in his previous work.

<sup>31</sup> VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 178–79. See further my discussion of *1 Enoch* 70–71 later.

<sup>32</sup> VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 179–82.

and heavenly role were foreordained; and in *1 Enoch* 62:7 the word “preserved” is simply parallel to “hidden,” while *’em-qedmu*, “from the beginning” can also simply mean “before the present time” in a general way.<sup>33</sup> These verses certainly suggest the pre-election of but not necessarily the pre-existence of the Son of Man, and thus they need not be impediments to the identification of Enoch as the Son of Man.<sup>34</sup>

### *The Eschatological Function of the Son of Man*

John J. Collins argues that the Son of Man’s function is more than simply sharing the qualities of righteousness and election. It is also to be a support for the earthly righteous by being an eschatological revealer and judge to vindicate the righteous and condemn the wicked.<sup>35</sup> The relationship is based not on “corporate personality” in which the psyches of the leader and the community merge, but on a “representative unity” (Mowinckel’s term), in which the leader symbolically stands for and on behalf of the community. Analogies may be a king, or better, patron deities, who are more powerful than the human community they represent, and who act on their behalf, and sometimes against them. He sees a similar concept in Daniel 10, where the angelic princes of Persia and Greece do battle with Michael, the patron of Israel. The difference in *Par. En.* is that the human community is not identified in national terms, but as the “righteous and elect.” The Son of Man thus is conceived not as a personification of the righteous, but as its heavenly *Doppelgänger*, who represents the persecuted community, but does not participate in its suffering, and so is a symbol of hope and eventual glory and exaltation. He is conceived to be a real being, more real and powerful than the community, and he symbolizes the destiny of the righteous community both in its present hiddenness and future manifestation.

The explicit role given to the Son of Man is to be judge over the kings and the mighty ones, and to condemn them to punishment for their oppression of the “righteous and elect.” This judge, however, is hidden until that final judgment day, and is revealed only to the “righteous and elect.” By this special revelation, he aids in drawing the boundaries for the group, both by acknowledging their present oppressed state, and by giving hope for a future vindication and a reversal of fortunes.

## **1.3 The Son of Man and the Gospel of Matthew**

### *1.3.1 Date and Provenance of Matthew*

The time of the writing of Matthew has been much debated, with dates ranging from pre-70 CE to after 100 CE.<sup>36</sup> While Patristic evidence favors an earlier time, and some

<sup>33</sup> VanderKam, 181, notes that *’em-qedmu* is the best reading, and that G. Beer, “Das Buch Henoch.” APAT vol 2, has translated it with *vorher*.

<sup>34</sup> See further my discussion on *1 Enoch* 48, 62 later.

<sup>35</sup> Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 150.

<sup>36</sup> W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel*

modern scholars argue for a pre-70 CE date, most scholars argue that Matthew is to be dated at the end of the first century. The years 80–95 for the date of Matthew seem best to account for the literary similarities with Mark and Luke, the type of theology exhibited in the work in terms of ecclesiology and christology,<sup>37</sup> and the tensions with other Judaic groups that seem to have developed.<sup>38</sup>

A variety of locations for composition have been proposed for Matthew, including Jerusalem (by those who argue for a pre-70 date), Caesarea Maritima, Phoenicia, Alexandria, East of the Jordan, Edessa, Syria, Antioch,<sup>39</sup> Sepphoris and Tiberias in Galilee.<sup>40</sup> Conclusive evidence is lacking for all of these proposals, but the suggestion that the Gospel was written in Antioch of Syria is most likely and has won the most approval. Peter's prominence in Antioch, the large population of Jews, a number of Jewish synagogues, together with Antioch's status as a center for the Christian gentile mission all favor the suggestion that Antioch is the locale for Matthew. The Gospel was written for Christian Jews, who believed in Jesus, and who were seeking to reform Judaism under the leadership of Jesus, while at the same time welcoming gentile God-fearers.<sup>41</sup>

### 1.3.2 *The Son of Man in Material Special to Matthew*

The use of the Son of Man in the material special to Matthew is only a part of the ongoing modern debate about the origin and meaning of Jesus' use of the term Son of Man. All commentators have noted that in the Gospels the term appears only on

*According to Saint Matthew* (3 vols, ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988ff) section VI, "The Date of Matthew," I.127–38. At the beginning of this section, they include a chart indicating the major positions.

<sup>37</sup> Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, I.131–33.

<sup>38</sup> Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, I.133–38. Donald Senior, *What Are They Saying About Matthew?* (New York/Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press; 1996) 10–20, reports on the developing theories regarding Matthew and formative Judaism in that same period. J. Andrew Overman, *Church and Community in Crisis: The Gospel According to Matthew* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996) 16–19, argues for a Galilean setting in which the Pharisees of formative Judaism are very near and real dialogue partners, against whom Matthew is arguing. Overman sees the Matthean group as still within Judaism, claiming to express the authentic and proper understanding of Torah, which is to be interpreted through the teaching of Jesus. Anthony J. Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian–Jewish Community* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1994) 2, 21, also argues that the Matthean group was still a vital and integral part of the evolving Judaism of the first century CE, and that Matthew hoped "he would prevail and make his program normative for the whole Jewish community." Saldarini, ch. 5, esp. 110–23, convincingly uses theories about sects and deviants to explain how the vituperative polemic in Matthew is directed against the Jewish leadership, not because separation has occurred between Jews and Christians, but out of the hope of winning over the mainstream of Jews to live by Torah as nuanced through Jesus.

<sup>39</sup> Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, Section VII, "The Local Origin of Matthew," I.138–47.

<sup>40</sup> Overman, *Church and Community in Crisis*, 17–19.

<sup>41</sup> Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian–Jewish Community*, 202.



Jesus' lips, and is not revelatory, for the audience does not seem to know anything more about Jesus from his use of it. The history-of-religions approach argues that the term reflects a concept of a heavenly being, which goes back at least to Dan. 7:13. The dialogue between Geza Vermes and Joseph Fitzmyer<sup>42</sup> has opened an ongoing debate over whether Son of Man referred to a pre-existing concept from Judaism, or whether it was simply a modest form of self-designation. The critical issue is whether Jesus used it only of himself in an indirect way, or whether he used it with the content of the heavenly figure in mind. Vermes<sup>43</sup> was able to point to ten instances in early Rabbinic literature where the term was used as a modest way to refer to the speaker himself. Vermes' views have been taken up by Barnabas Lindars<sup>44</sup> and Maurice Casey,<sup>45</sup> who argue that the transformation of the term from a modest form of self-designation to a titular use took place in the early church. It was the early church that created the suffering and apocalyptic sayings to make sense of Jesus' death and continued relevance. Thus the earthly sayings of Jesus are considered to be authentic. Norman Perrin,<sup>46</sup> followed by William Walker,<sup>47</sup> has suggested a possible method in the pesher tradition for how the early church came to create the suffering and future sayings. Douglas R. A. Hare, another voice in this chorus, essentially says that the Son of Man tradition is really no tradition at all, that the term is simply Jesus' favorite, modest form of self-designation.<sup>48</sup> Delbert Burkett examines the history of the argumentation about the nontitular meaning of the term "son of man" and concludes that none of the scholars who argue this position have been convincing. A generic use of "son of man" as argued by Vermes, Casey, Lindars and Hare simply does not fit all the instances.<sup>49</sup> However, the term seems to have been a significant one, for it appears only on the

<sup>42</sup> A concise listing of the relevant articles in the debate can be found in footnote 9 on p. 486 of John R. Donahue, S. J., "Recent Studies on the Origin of 'Son of Man' in the Gospels." in *A Wise and Discerning Heart: Studies Presented to Joseph A. Fitzmyer In Celebration of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, CBQ 48 (1986) 484–98. Casey, *Solution*, 80–115, argues strenuously against the "Son of Man Concept" ever having existed, except in modern scholars' minds.

<sup>43</sup> Vermes, "The Use of בן־בשר־נשׂא in Jewish Aramaic," 310–30. Casey, *Solution*, 56–81, has examined thirty examples of the use of בן־נשׂא(א) as a generic term that sometimes functions as a self-reference.

<sup>44</sup> Barnabas Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man sayings in the Gospels* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983; London: SPCK, 1983) and the articles that preceded this book.

<sup>45</sup> Casey, *Son of Man, passim*. In *Solution*, Casey demonstrates how the term and its use in Greek could be the result of a translation strategy for בן־נשׂא(א) where the expression ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is used as a generic term that could be used as a self-referent, but used only of Jesus, and not the plural.

<sup>46</sup> Norman Perrin, "The Son of Man in Ancient Judaism and Primitive Christianity: A Suggestion," 23–40, and "The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition," 57–83 in *A Modern Pilgrimage*.

<sup>47</sup> William O. Walker, "The Son of Man: Some Recent Developments," CBQ 45 (1983) 584–607.

<sup>48</sup> Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition*. See especially 213–82.

<sup>49</sup> Delbert Burkett, "The Nontitular Son of Man: A History and Critique," NTS 40 (1994) 504–21.

lips of Jesus, and even the strange Greek seems to indicate that the New Testament authors sought to preserve something of the uniqueness of the term. Regardless of which sayings were created by the church, the future sayings, or the earthly sayings, the creator(s) respected the convention that the term appears only on the lips of Jesus. This fact further indicates an awareness of a tradition and of Jesus' unique use of the term.

The opposing arguments are marshalled by Fitzmyer<sup>50</sup> and Adela Yarbro Collins.<sup>51</sup> Fitzmyer argues that Vermes' examples of modest self-designation are not relevant to the New Testament since they are late or non-Palestinian.<sup>52</sup> Yarbro Collins suggests that Jesus did use the term to refer to the figure in Daniel's vision, and that Jesus felt himself to be involved in that ministry, though not identified with that figure. Thus, as Bultmann<sup>53</sup> and Tödt<sup>54</sup> have argued, the authentic sayings are to be discerned amongst the future Son of Man sayings. Further, Seyoon Kim, in a brief but insightful study, hypothesizes and argues that "Jesus may have used the self-designation with the dual purpose of revealing his identity discreetly to those who had ears to hear and hiding it from those who had no ears to hear . . . to reveal himself to be the divine figure who was the inclusive representative (or the head) of the eschatological people of God."<sup>55</sup>

As to the oral nature of the origin of the term, Randall Buth, in a paper delivered at the 1993 Annual Meeting of the SBL in Washington D.C. argued that Jesus could have used that term in a way that immediately would have signaled to his listeners that he was alluding to the figure in Daniel's vision.<sup>56</sup> Buth accepts the argument that the Aramaic phrase is not a title referring to a popular "son-of-man" figure. However, Buth argues that there was a way in which Jesus could refer to the figure in Daniel 7, a way that gave rise to the peculiar idiom in the New Testament. The population at the time, Buth points out, was tri-lingual, able to use *koinē* Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic interchangeably. Buth argues that Greek was the normal language for discourse

<sup>50</sup> See Donahue's references noted earlier.

<sup>51</sup> Yarbro Collins, "The Origin of the Designation of Jesus as 'Son of Man,'" 391–407.

<sup>52</sup> E.g., Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J., "The New Testament Title 'Son of Man' Philologically Considered," in *A Wandering Aramaean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (SBLMS 25; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979) 143–60.

<sup>53</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (tr. John Marsh; rev. ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1968).

<sup>54</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*.

<sup>55</sup> Seyoon Kim, "*The 'Son of Man' as the Son of God* (WUNT 30; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1983) 35–36. Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Matthew As Story* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988) 95–103, observes similarly, that the title "Son of God" serves to identify Jesus for the informed reader and is a confession of faith, while at the same time, "Son of Man" as a public term keeps his identity hidden from the world and its leaders who do not accept him.

<sup>56</sup> Randall Buth, "A More Complete Semitic Background for בן־אדם, Son of Man." The abstract for this paper appears in *AAR-SBL Abstracts, 1993*, 112. The paper itself has not been published, but Buth, a linguist with the *United Bible Societies*, intends to develop it into a monograph. Casey, *Solution*, 116, summarizes his position that Aramaic, not Greek, was used by Jesus in his teaching.

amongst the educated in Palestine, and when Jesus wanted to allude to the figure in Daniel 7, he simply switched to Aramaic to express the term בְּרִישָׁא, and then back to Greek to complete his thought. Thus with complete economy and yet with absolute clarity Jesus expressed his thoughts. The listeners, also being tri-lingual, would have understood completely.<sup>57</sup> According to Buth, the Church sought to preserve that understandability with the unusual (for Greek) rendering, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Hence the unusual turn of phrase is accounted for, and the convention to limit it to the lips of Jesus is explained.

This study, however, will focus on Matthew's particular understanding of the term ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, an understanding which can be discerned in his unique uses of the term. Eleven sayings appear in Matthew which are not present in the other Gospels,<sup>58</sup> Nine of these eleven pertain to the future, coming Son of Man. Three sayings, which use the term "Son of Man" in the other Gospels, appear in Matthew with personal pronouns instead of "Son of Man."<sup>59</sup> As many have noted, these Matthean sayings tend to favor the view that Matthew conceived of the Son of Man as a heavenly eschatological judge.

## 1.4 The Relationship between the *Parables of Enoch* and Matthew

The question regarding the origin of the judicial aspect of Matthew's concept of the Son of Man has aroused some debate. Casey argues that *Par. En.*, *4th Ezra*, and the Christian concept of the Son of Man are not directly related to each other in any way. Each is an exegetical development upon the original vision in Dan 7:13, but they are independent of one another and have been developed in differing directions.<sup>60</sup> Hare has also argued that Matthew does not depend upon *Par. En.*, but that the use of the

<sup>57</sup> There is a ring of authenticity to Buth's suggestion, which I can attest to personally. Growing up bilingually, speaking Neo-Melanesian (Pidgin English) and English in Papua New Guinea, my family and I would frequently find that a particular concept could be expressed better with a particular connotation in Neo-Melanesian. Similarly, and more pertinently, English speaking scholars borrow technical terms from German or French, because English does not have suitable terms. Again, in the medical field sometimes a Latin phrase bestows the aura of a technical status on an unknown medical condition, even though a literal translation of the Latin phrase merely indicates that the condition is unknown. With each of these examples, a foreign term is borrowed to express a particular concept, in the same way Buth suggests the term "Son of Man" came into existence. Some, however, would question how widespread the use of Greek was in Jesus' day, and if he would have used Greek for his conversations, since he was not a member of the elite stratum of society.

<sup>58</sup> Mt. 10:23, 13:37, 13:41, 16:13, 16:27, 28, 17:12, 19:28, 24:30, 25:31, 26:2.

<sup>59</sup> Mt. 5:11/Lk. 6:22, Mt. 10:32/Lk. 12:8 from Q, Mt. 16:21/Mk. 8:31.

<sup>60</sup> Casey, *Son of Man*. David C. Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the gospel of Matthew* (Cambridge: University Press, 1996), 121–23, suggests that Matthew and the author of *Par. En.* had access to some common traditions.

term Son of Man developed in the early church, out of Jesus' use of בר־נִשְׂא as a modest self-designation.<sup>61</sup>

Other scholars argue that there is a significant relationship between Matthew's use of "Son of Man" and that in *Par. En.* Catchpole,<sup>62</sup> and Theisoohn<sup>63</sup> enumerate many themes shared between the two, while Tödt<sup>64</sup> argues that Matthew has shaped his concept of a judicial Son of Man quite clearly in the direction of that found in *Par. En.* The Son of Man in both Matthew and *Par. En.* is seated on the throne of his glory, and angels are present. The scene of enthronement in both carries within it the theme of judgment. All the world is to be judged in both. The world is divided into two groups, some for blessing, and the others for condemnation. Mercy is not granted following the judgment, even though it is sought. The theme of recognition and non-recognition is significant in both works, and judgment in both is dependent on how those with whom the judge identifies were treated. These many common themes and perspectives, these scholars argue, indicate a significant relationship between the two documents.

A review of recent scholarly work on this topic indicates that much is yet to be resolved. Two of the introductory questions on which this study hinges are the question of the dating of *Par. En.*, and its social setting. These topics as well as that of the sources of *Par. En.* are taken up in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 is an examination of the passages in *Par. En.* that utilize the term "Son of Man." Chapter 4 examines the Son of Man sayings in which Matthew's perspective is clearest, and it further highlights the numerous similarities between the conceptions of the Son of Man in the two works. Chapter 5 investigates the similarities between *Par. En.*'s conception of the Son of Man with Matthew's and draws conclusions about the nature of the relationship between *Par. En.* and Matthew, suggesting further avenues of study.

<sup>61</sup> Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition*, 113–82, following Vermes, Lindars, Perrin, and especially Lievestad.

<sup>62</sup> Catchpole, "A Re-appraisal of Matthew XXV.31–46," 378–83.

<sup>63</sup> Theisoohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 149–201.

<sup>64</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 94, 223.

## 2

# DATING, SOURCES AND SOCIAL SETTING OF THE *PARABLES OF ENOCH*

## 2.1 Introduction

Three introductory questions regarding the *Parables of Enoch* must now be addressed. Each is shrouded with aspects of uncertainty due to the ambiguity of the evidence. Nonetheless some insights can be gained by reexamining that evidence.

The first question is the dating of *Par. En.*, a work in which a great paucity of historical allusions exists. Re-examining clues from four aspects of the work and drawing out nuances can result in a fairly confident proposal for the dating of *Par. En.*. The four aspects are:

- 1) a profile of the kings and the mighty ones, the opponents of the righteous;
- 2) the bloodshed for which a plea for vindication is expressed;
- 3) the mention of the Parthians and Medes; and
- 4) the reference to the healing hot springs.

The second introductory question is concerned with the sources of the work. Traditionally three sources have been proposed, but the precise delineation of two of those sources causes some dissatisfaction. Further, there is a certain literary cohesiveness that calls the issue of sources into question.

The third introductory question concerns the social setting, or the milieu, in which *Par. En.* was composed. Two sociological approaches will be applied to *Par. En.* to elucidate the context in which the work was created. One approach is to examine nine Arenas of the Social System as they intersect with Narrative Criticism; and the second is to investigate which levels of Social Stratification are revealed in *Par. En.* Using the insights from these approaches regarding first century Mediterranean society, some conclusions regarding the social status of the author and the group for which the work was written can be reached.

## 2.2 Dating the *Parables of Enoch*

A wide variation of dates has been argued for *Par. En.* R. H. Charles has argued for an early date of 94–79 BCE,<sup>1</sup> interpreting the “kings and the mighty ones” as the later Maccabean princes. But as Jonas Greenfield and Michael Stone<sup>2</sup> and John J. Collins<sup>3</sup> argue, the allusions to the Parthians and Medes and the healing waters of Callirhoe suggest a date after 40 BCE.

Józef T. Milik<sup>4</sup> argued for a date in the extreme opposite direction, around 270 CE, noting the absence of fragments of *Par. En.* from Qumran. But on linguistic, logical and theological grounds, Greenfield and Stone and Knibb<sup>5</sup> have argued against such a late date. Theisohn also has shown the thoroughly Jewish character of the concept of the Son of Man,<sup>6</sup> contradicting Milik’s hypothesis of a Christian influence, as in the *Sibylline Oracles*. Milik’s argument has not been widely accepted.

Christopher L. Mearns<sup>7</sup> argued for a date prior to 40 CE, based on allusions to the *Testament of Abraham (T. Ab.)*, recensions A and B, and messianic expectations in the New Testament, but his position seems to incur far too many assumptions. Against Mearns’ view, E. P. Sanders<sup>8</sup> has argued for a later date for *T. Ab.* and has suggested that its allusions to the New Testament are the result of late redactional activity.

David Suter<sup>9</sup> at one time dated *Par. En.* to the reign of Emperor Gaius (Caligula), 37–41 CE, assigning the major concern in *Par. En.* about bloodshed to that era. J. C. Hindley<sup>10</sup> argued for a date in the early second century, identifying the allusions to the Parthians with Trajan’s Parthian campaigns in 113 CE. Knibb<sup>11</sup> at one time favored a late first-century or early second-century date, due to the absence of fragments from *Par. En.* in Qumran, as well as for other reasons, although more recently he has indicated openness to an earlier date. Many have pointed out that the absence of *Par. En.* in Qumran is most likely purely accidental. Therefore the allusions to bloodshed,

<sup>1</sup> R.H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912) liv-lv, 67. See also the summary of the positions in Christopher L. Mearns, “Dating the Similitudes of Enoch,” *NTS* 25 (1978–79) 360.

<sup>2</sup> Jonas C. Greenfield, and Michael E. Stone, “The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes,” *HTR* 70 (1977) 51–65.

<sup>3</sup> John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (New York: Crossroad, 1984) 142f referring to Josephus, *Ant.* 17.6.5. §§171–73; *J.W.* 1.33.5 §§657–58.

<sup>4</sup> J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976) 89–107.

<sup>5</sup> Michael A. Knibb, “The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review,” *NTS* 25 (1978–79), 344–59.

<sup>6</sup> Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 29–30, 99.

<sup>7</sup> Christopher L. Mearns, “Dating the Similitudes of Enoch,” *NTS* 25 (1978–79), 360–69.

<sup>8</sup> E. P. Sanders, “Testament of Abraham: A New Translation and Introduction,” 869–902 in J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. 1, *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983).

<sup>9</sup> David Winston Suter, “The Measure of Redemption: The Similitudes of Enoch, Nonviolence, and National Integrity,” *SBL 1983 Papers*, 167–76.

<sup>10</sup> J. C. Hindley, “Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch,” *NTS* 14 (1968) 551–65.

<sup>11</sup> Knibb, “The Date of the Parables of Enoch,” 344–59.

the Parthians and the healing hot springs need to be more carefully examined,<sup>12</sup> to discover whether the earlier date for *Par. En.* is defensible. This must now be taken up.

### 2.2.1 Four Elements to be considered

In seeking to narrow the date of *Par. En.*, four elements must be considered. These four elements arise out of the text of the *Par. En.* and they bear on the context in which the *Par. En.* came into existence. The four elements are:

- 1) the identity of the kings and the mighty ones;
- 2) the references to the blood of the righteous that has been shed;
- 3) the threat of the Parthians and the Medes; and
- 4) the reference to the healing hot springs.

These four elements reveal social and historical realities, in a general way, and yet taken together are specific enough that they can narrow the possibilities. *Par. En.* cannot be dated precisely, but these four elements do point in general to a particular period as the most likely date for *Par. En.*

#### *The Kings and Mighty Ones*

A profile of the kings and mighty ones can be drawn from the references to them in *Par. En.* They are wealthy and powerful (*I Enoch* 46:4, 7), which is to be expected in any society. They have denied the Name of the Lord of Spirits (*I Enoch* 45:2, 46:7), and they have raised their hands against the Most High (*I Enoch* 46:7). This suggests that they have rebelled against God in the eyes of the author.<sup>13</sup> They are described as judging or ruling the stars of heaven, which Black suggests may be an allusion to Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who in Dan. 8:10 grew as high as heaven and threw down some of the host and some of the stars of heaven and trampled on them.<sup>14</sup> This allusion would tend to identify the kings and mighty ones as the Seleucids and their successors. But the allusion may also function to cast the contemporary rulers in the same light as Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The allusion may conjure up the mental and emotional images of Antiochus IV and apply them to the contemporaneous kings and mighty ones. Just as Antiochus IV was seen in an unfavorable light as a dangerous, self-aggrandizing tyrant, so the current rulers perhaps were seen in the same way, as dangerous, self-promoting, and insensitive to the religious concerns of the righteous.

These kings and mighty ones are also said to trust in gods which they have made with their own hands (*I Enoch* 46:7). In other words, they are, or at least they are perceived

<sup>12</sup> See a more detailed review of these arguments in my original dissertation, *The Son of Man in Matthew and the "Similitudes of Enoch."*

<sup>13</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 208.

<sup>14</sup> Black favors "rule," *I Enoch*, 208.

to be, idolators. Therefore, either they are not of the Jewish race, or their Jewishness is seriously questioned. Charles, however, has boldly and decisively identified the kings and mighty ones as the later Maccabeans and their followers, the Sadducees. He is able to do this because he posits that “gods,” אֱלֹהִים in a Hebrew *Vorlage*, was corrupted from “deeds,” מַעֲלָלִים. According to Charles then, the kings trust their riches and the ‘deeds’ of their own hands rather than God. Thus he is able to support his identification of the kings and mighty ones as the later Maccabeans, particularly Alexander Jannaeus (103–76 BCE) or Aristobulus II (67–63 BCE) and their supporters, the Sadducees.<sup>15</sup> But there is no definite textual evidence for this and both Black and Knibb<sup>16</sup> translate ‘gods.’ As idolators then, they cannot be seen as Maccabeans, but must be seen as aligned with foreign powers, either Seleucids or Romans.<sup>17</sup>

Further, they have persecuted the faithful and the houses of the congregation of the Lord of Spirits (*I Enoch* 46:8). This most probably resulted in the bloodshed which the righteous pray might be avenged (*I Enoch* 47:2).

These kings and mighty ones, then, are powerful, wealthy rulers, who have persecuted the righteous. They evidently are foreign rulers of some type who deny God and trust in idols. This precludes the Maccabeans, which Charles argued. The Seleucids can also be ruled out, for they are far too early.<sup>18</sup> The Seleucids controlled Palestine in the second century BCE, and Judas Maccabeus wrested the land from them in the mid-second century BCE. That is too early for *Par. En.* because *Par. En.* knows and reinterprets Daniel, which is from the mid-second century BCE. Thus the influence of Daniel on *Par. En.* rules out the Seleucids as fitting the profile of the kings and mighty ones.

Rather, this profile points most favorably to the Romans and their client kings as the ones who oppressed and persecuted the righteous of *Par. En.* The Roman presence began with Pompey’s conquest of Palestine and Jerusalem in 63 BCE. This conquest was accomplished with bloodshed and social upheaval. Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II were vying for control. The Idumean Antipater was seeking his own ends in backing first one and then the other. When Pompey was called in to settle the issue, the followers of Hyrcanus II opened the gates to Pompey, but the followers of Aristobulus II barricaded themselves in the palace and temple area. When Pompey finally broke down the walls after a three-month siege, bloodshed followed, and Hyrcanus II was installed as the High Priest, but merely as a figurehead for the Roman authorities.<sup>19</sup>

All was not yet settled. Antigonus, with the backing of the Parthians was able to wrest control from Hyrcanus II, and through a tortuous series of events, Herod finally

<sup>15</sup> Charles, *Enoch*, 90. The form אֱלֹהִים, idols, worthless ones, is derived from אֱלֹהִים (see BDB 47b); for מַעֲלָלִים see BDB 760b. Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)* (Vol. 1, ed. Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar and Matthew Black; Edinburgh: T&T Clark Ltd, 1973) 219–28, 233–242.

<sup>16</sup> Michael A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) II.132.

<sup>17</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 196.

<sup>18</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 196, suggested either the Seleucids or the Romans.

<sup>19</sup> Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People*, 233–42. Josephus, *Antiquities*, xiv 4, 2–4.



claimed the kingship of Judah, even though he was only half Jewish, in Josephus' view. His reclaiming of Judah was accomplished with much battling and bloodshed. The first period of his reign was further marked by bloodshed as he consolidated his control by wiping out family members whom he suspected of having desires to occupy the throne.<sup>20</sup>

Josephus also provides evidence against Herod for the charge of idolatry. While Herod was fairly sensitive to the religious concerns of Jews in Jerusalem, in the rest of his territory he was eager to promote Hellenistic culture and literature. This included the establishment of the Games<sup>21</sup> in Caesarea, which were a horror to Jews for athletes competed naked. His hellenization of Palestine also included building or rebuilding temples in non-Jewish parts of his kingdom and adorning them with beautiful sculptures.<sup>22</sup> He even had a large golden eagle mounted over the temple gate in Jerusalem, an act which transgressed Jewish sensibilities about graven images. This eagle was finally torn down by zealous Pharisaic teachers and their students in 4 BCE on the rumor of Herod's death. They of course were severely dealt with, being burned alive by the paranoia-racked, but still living, Herod.<sup>23</sup> While Herod accomplished much that was good for Judea, boosting the economy and twice lowering taxes,<sup>24</sup> he also greatly offended Jewish religious sensitivities with his temple building activities in the non-Jewish parts of the Kingdom. This latter fact makes it possible to understand how Herod could be charged with idolatry.

The profile of the kings and mighty ones then points to the Romans and their client kings. Herod in particular seems to fit many of the criticisms expressed in the *Par. En.* This profile then favors dating the *Par. En.* to the second half of the first century BCE.

### *Bloodshed*

A second element for consideration in dating *Par. En.* is the blood of the righteous that has been shed, and which the survivors pray might be avenged (*1 Enoch* 47:2, 4), blood, which has presumably been shed by the kings and the mighty ones.

In reviewing accounts of the history of the period, it will be noted that significant massacres and slaughters of citizens took place under three different rulers during the first century BCE. At the beginning of the century bloodshed was caused by Alexander Jannaeus (103–76 BCE), in the middle of the century Jewish citizens were killed under Pompey (63 BCE), while toward the end of the century, loss of life was caused by the Roman client king, Herod (40–4 BCE).<sup>25</sup>

The blood of the righteous shed under Alexander Jannaeus and Pompey may be part of the cultural background operative in *Par. En.*. Charles, however, has boldly

<sup>20</sup> Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People*, 296–304. Josephus, *Antiquities*, xv–xvi.

<sup>21</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities*, xvi 5,1.

<sup>22</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities*, xv 9, 5; *Wars*, i 21,4

<sup>23</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities*, xvii 6.

<sup>24</sup> Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People*, 315; Josephus, *Antiquities*, xv 10, 4, xvi 2, 5.

<sup>25</sup> These are described by Josephus, *Antiquities* xiii 13, 5; xiv 4, 9, 15; and Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People*, 212–13, 223, 227, 236–39.

and decisively identified the righteous ones as the Pharisaic faction in Palestine, and the kings and mighty ones as the later Maccabeans and their Sadducean supporters,<sup>26</sup> and so would date *Par. En.* to the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (94–79 BCE), or to the reign of Aristobulus II (70–67 BCE).<sup>27</sup> Thus the righteous could be those slaughtered throughout the years of strife in the early part of the first century BCE. This is not the best identification, however, for, as shown earlier, the kings were probably not Maccabean.

A third intriguing possibility is that the blood of the righteous could have been shed by Herod, who was guilty of bloodshed at several different times. One time was when Herod first fled Jerusalem after Phasael's and Hyrcanus II's capture by the Parthians, when he encountered hostile groups of Jews on the way to Masada.<sup>28</sup> Another time may have been after having been confirmed by Caesar and the Roman Senate as the king of Judea. In his reclaiming of the land and wresting it from the grip of Antigonus (40–37 BCE), much Jewish blood was spilled.<sup>29</sup> On either of these expeditions, the flight or the return, an Enochic conventicle might have been in the way and suffered significant loss of life. The bloodshed at the hands of an ambitious Herod together with Herod's later activities which would have confirmed his wickedness in their minds could be the memory which the righteous in *1 Enoch 47* are praying might avenged.

Thus, the blood that has been shed could refer to those Jews who had been killed throughout the first century BCE, both Pharisaic and Sadducean. Or the blood that has been shed could refer to some specific incident that was possibly perpetrated by Herod. In either case, this reference to bloodshed seems to point to the late first century BCE. This is especially intriguing in light of the mention of the healing hot springs, which will be taken up momentarily, and which Josephus reports were visited by Herod toward the end of his life.

### *The Parthians and Medes*

Linking together the Parthians and Medes is the third element that must be considered in seeking to narrow the dating of the *Par. En.* The Parthians and Medes are seen as an instrument of destruction against the land (*1 Enoch 56:5*). The angels of punishment will send their chiefs to the kings of the Parthians and Medes so that they will sweep across the ancient world like lions out of their lairs and wolves out of their dens. They will trample over the land of the elect, but "the city of my righteous ones" (*1 Enoch 56:7*) will be an obstacle to their horses. The Parthians and Medes will incite internecine warfare and mistrust amongst family members, and will be the cause of "corpses without number." The author depicts this as just punishment against the kings and mighty ones and the fallen angels with whom they are associated.

<sup>26</sup> Charles, *1 Enoch*, liv, 72.

<sup>27</sup> Charles, *1 Enoch*, 67.

<sup>28</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities*, xiv 9.

<sup>29</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities*, xiv 15.

This activity of the Parthians and Medes as described in *Par. En.* is difficult to locate historically. Hindley identified it with the conflicts with the Parthians during the time of Trajan's campaign (113–17 CE).<sup>30</sup> But as Black points out, the Parthians did not threaten Jerusalem at that time.<sup>31</sup> Rather, the set of details associated with *I Enoch* 56 seems rather to point to the incursion of Palestine by the Parthians in about 40 BCE, as Herod was attempting to solidify his control of Judea.

Josephus reports that Antigonus (40–37 BCE) was installed with the aid of the Parthians, Pacorus and Barzaphanes. They had swept down into Palestine, Pacorus taking the maritime route and Barzaphanes the midland route, at a time when Antony was occupied in Egypt with Cleopatra and with other military concerns. Hyrcanus II, Herod, and Herod's brother, Phasael, had managed to retain control of Jerusalem, until Antigonus, a cousin of Hyrcanus II, bribed the Parthians with the promise of silver and women. Phasael and Hyrcanus II were enticed to negotiate for peace with Barzaphanes, but then they were taken into captivity. When Herod found out, he escaped from Jerusalem together with his family. Then, when Antigonus could not deliver the women of Herod's family, the Parthians plundered Jerusalem, its temple and the surrounding countryside, which they probably intended to do anyway. Herod meanwhile secured Caesar's and the Roman Senate's confirmation as the king of Judea, and by 37 BCE reconquered Jerusalem and had Antigonus killed by the Romans.<sup>32</sup>

Josephus poignantly summarizes the Hasmonean dynasty as an illustrious, noble family, which bore the dignity of the high priesthood, but which lost control of the government of Judea by their dissension with one another. As a result the government came to Herod, the son of Antipater, a man whom Josephus characterized as of a vulgar family and subject to other kings.<sup>33</sup>

The Parthian presence in Palestine in c.40 BCE seems for the most part to fit the details alluded to in *I Enoch* 56 best. One problem is that Josephus never mentions the Medes in connection with this Parthian campaign. Perhaps, as Black points out,<sup>34</sup> the "Parthians and Medes" in *Par. En.* took the place of the "Medes and Persians" in a formula for the major enemy from the east. Greenfield and Stone, however, note that the inclusion of the "Medes" may be based on reality, as "the rulers of Media Atropatene were vassals of the Parthians during this period."<sup>35</sup> Further, with regard to the reception of the Parthians, they suggest that the group for whom *Par. En.* was written may have considered the Parthians to be abominable, even though the rest of the Jews welcomed them.<sup>36</sup> A second, more significant problem is that Jerusalem did not prove to be an obstacle for the Parthians. They did not even have to lay siege to

<sup>30</sup> Hindley, "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch," 558.

<sup>31</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 222.

<sup>32</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities*, xiv.

<sup>33</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities*, xiv 16, 4.

<sup>34</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 221.

<sup>35</sup> Greenfield and Stone, "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes," 58.

<sup>36</sup> Greenfield and Stone, "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes," 58–59.

it as Pompey had, for they were invited in by Antigonus, on the pretext of quelling strife, but with the purpose of installing Antigonus as ruler. The suggestion that the hilly terrain of the city would be an obstacle or hindrance to the horses seems to miss the point of the line in *1 Enoch* 56:7. Rather the city is said in some way to be a hindrance to their horses. Perhaps this is highly condensed language that means that the political powers in the city were a hindrance to the Parthian warlords on their horses. Or perhaps the term “obstacle” refers somehow to the intrigue and treachery by which Hyrcanus II, Phasael and Herod were removed from Jerusalem. The reference is quite mysterious, but at the very least it suggests quite strongly the *terminus ad quem* for the work, for it probably acknowledges that Jerusalem had not yet been destroyed by the Romans in 68 CE.<sup>37</sup>

Nonetheless, as a whole the description in *1 Enoch* 56 fits the Parthians of this era remarkably well. They plundered the land, “trampling” over it. They incited interfamilial warfare between Antigonus on the one side and Hyrcanus II, Herod and Phasael on the other. They even inspired mistrust through the intrigue carried out on Hyrcanus II and Phasael when they were tricked into a situation where they were captured, while Herod mistrusted the Parthian emissaries, but was unable to persuade Phasael and Hyrcanus II to refuse to accompany them to Barzaphanes. The familial mistrust certainly continued in Herod’s reign as one after another of his sons was accused of treason and executed. Again, much bloodshed ensued and so this third element, the presence of the Parthians, also points to the late first century BCE as the time period in which *Par. En.* was written.

### *The Healing Hot Springs*

In the Noachic interpolation (*1 Enoch* 65–68), reference is made to healing hot springs. The kings and the mighty ones and the exalted shall be served by those waters for the healing of the body (*1 Enoch* 67:8). But ironically, those same waters are their means of punishment (*1 Enoch* 67:13). The way the healing and the punishment are related for the author of *Par. En.* is that the author sees the valley of punishment for the fallen angels and their followers, the kings and the mighty ones, as the subterranean source of these springs, in which the kings and mighty ones bathe (*1 Enoch* 67:4–7). Thus, for now, they enjoy them and seek healing in them, but in time they will be punished by them. Further, the very reason for their being there, the diseases of which they wish to be healed, is also in a sense their punishment.<sup>38</sup>

The author of *Par. En.* also apparently refers to volcanic activity with his reference to “fiery molten (lit. soft) metal” and the sulphurous odors (*1 Enoch* 67:6), and the rivers of fire proceeding along the ravines (*1 Enoch* 67:7). A change in temperature

<sup>37</sup> Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn*, 38, made this observation rather straightforwardly. Milik, Hindley, Knibb and Mearns reexamined it and sought other interpretations, but together with all the elements noted in this presentation, Sjöberg’s conclusion still seems most convincing.

<sup>38</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 242.

is also mentioned, as the water changes from hot to cold, and then finally becomes a fire which will burn forever (*1 Enoch* 67:13).

These references seem to point very clearly to the hot springs near the Dead Sea, Callirhoe and Macherus, which Josephus mentions.<sup>39</sup> Josephus reports that when Herod was seventy years old, his body and mind racked with horrible diseases, on his doctors' orders, Herod sought healing at the hot springs of Callirhoe beyond the Jordan. This took place during the last decade of the first century BCE,<sup>40</sup> but his visit did not seem to help. Josephus also describes the hot springs at Macherus in connection with a siege there by Bassus in 38 BCE.<sup>41</sup> Macherus is a rocky, elevated area, where a fortress had been built. Springs existed there, and were frequented for medicinal purposes. Some of the water was bitter, some was sweet. Some of the water was hot, some was cold, and when they were mixed, it was very pleasant and thought to have a healing effect for strengthening nerves. Josephus mentions that sulphur and alum mines were also in the area.

In general, there is a remarkable confluence of motifs in these descriptions. While the passage in *Par. En.* is not specific enough to be linked directly with Herod, the similarities do favor a familiarity with Herod's and perhaps other nobles' visits to the springs. It must be remembered that the author's purpose in referring to these hot springs is not to give a historical reference for this work, but rather to draw together some appropriate images for the apocalyptic message. Those kings and mighty ones, who now seem to enjoy the springs and seek healing there, will in the end be punished by means of those same springs and their subterranean, volcanic sources. This element, then, of the healing hot springs, combined with a locatable, historical reference to Herod, also suggests a late first century BCE or an early first century CE date for the writing of the *Par. En.*

Even though the reference to the healing hot springs is in the Noachic material, it serves as a *terminus ab quo* for the whole work. However the work was compiled, and whatever the sources may have been for the final redactor, the mention of the hot springs and its probable reference to Herod's visit there provides a date after which the work must have been composed.

## 2.2.2 Results

The dating of *Par. En.* then, can be narrowed by a consideration of these four elements: the kings and mighty ones, the bloodshed, the Parthians and Medes, and the hot springs. These elements reveal social and historical realities in a general way. And yet the realities discerned in these allusions narrow the possibilities for the dating of

<sup>39</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 242 and Greenfield and Stone, "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes," 60.

<sup>40</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities*, xvii 6, 5.

<sup>41</sup> Josephus, *Wars*, vii 6.

*Par. En.* Herod perhaps even served as the model for *Par. En.*'s depiction of the kings and the mighty ones. Herod could be charged with idolatry, and bloodshed. He came to power in conjunction with the Parthian invasion in the middle of the century, and fell prey to intense, tragic, familial mistrust. He also sought relief in the hot springs, but ironically found none, and soon afterward died of his ailments (4 BCE). While Herod might have been the model for the author, he was only a model, since the author betrays no details that are specific enough to link these descriptions directly and only to Herod. Thus, these four elements are helpful in narrowing the dating of *Par. En.*, suggesting that *Par. En.* was written in the late first century BCE or early first century CE.

This dating was confirmed by a broad consensus of scholars at the Third Enoch Seminar in Camaldoli, Italy in June of 2005.<sup>42</sup> As Paolo Sacchi noted in his summary, "in sum, we may observe those scholars who have directly addressed the problem of dating the Parables all agree on a date around the time of Herod . . . given the impressive amount of evidence gathered in support of a pre-Christian origin of the document. The burden of proof has now shifted to those who disagree with the Herodian date. It is now their responsibility to provide evidence that would reopen the discussion."<sup>43</sup>

## 2.3 Sources for the *Parables of Enoch*

The task of separating out the material included in *Par. En.* into its distinct sources at first seems to be a fairly simple operation, but upon closer examination it turns out to be a complex task that depends not only on identifying contradictions and interruptions in the flow of the discourses, but also upon the author/redactor's methods and purposes. Some sources are clearly evident, but others are not. The author/redactor's final product is more meditative and associative than finely crafted so as to remove all illogicalities and inconsistencies.

### 2.3.1 *The Noachic Source*

One source that the author/redactor clearly drew upon was the so-called Noachic source. A putative Book of Noah supplied *1 Enoch* 39:1–2a, 54:7–55:2, 60, and 65:1–69:25.<sup>44</sup> While it is by no means clear that all these passages come from the

<sup>42</sup> See the essays on dating the Parables in Gabriele Boccaccini, *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2007) 415–496.

<sup>43</sup> Paolo Sacchi, "The 2005 Camaldoli Seminar on the Parables of Enoch: Summary and Prospects for Future Research," in Boccaccini, *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 510–511.

<sup>44</sup> Georg Beer, "Das Buch Henoch," in *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (vol. 2; ed. Emil Kautsch; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1900, repr. Hildesheim:

same source, nonetheless these passages do introduce the flood and related ideas to *Par. En.* The incorporation of this source appears to be intrusive and has not been seamless. An example of a definite seam is that in the Third Parable a date of the five hundredth year of Enoch is mentioned. But this is inconsistent with Gen. 5:23 in that Enoch lived on earth only 365 years. Although there is no variant for reading Noah instead of Enoch,<sup>45</sup> Noah is clearly the subject of this passage, as becomes even clearer later in the passage when a reference is made to the Garden, “where my great-grandfather was taken up, the seventh from Adam. . .” (*I Enoch* 60:8). This could only have been spoken accurately by Noah about Enoch, who is listed as the seventh from Adam in Genesis 5, and who was taken up to heaven rather than having died. In the largest body of text from the Noachic source *I Enoch* 65:1–69:25, the author/redactor does not even attempt to conceal its foreign origin. The piece is simply taken over and incorporated into *Par. En.* with the original narrator speaking in the first person, naming himself as Noah (*I Enoch* 65:1, 67:1) and referring by name to his great-grandfather, Enoch (*I Enoch* 65:2, 5, 68:1). These clues reveal that there was at least one Noachic source, upon which the author/redactor drew. Further, the “clumsy”<sup>46</sup> splicing of the Noachic material into the Enochic work suggests something about the author/redactor’s purposes. It appears that the author/redactor was not concerned with smoothing out the illogicalities and inconsistencies, but rather was interested in gathering together instructive material on the theme of the punishment of the kings and mighty ones. It was a method that presented ideas for meditation and encouragement, without being concerned about inconsistencies. These seams then, reveal that a Noachic source was incorporated by the author/redactor into *Par. En.*

### 2.3.2 Other Possible Sources

While the Noachic source is widely accepted, the existence of sources beyond the Noachic source has been widely debated. Beer and Charles confidently assert two further sources, the “Son of Man” source and the “Elect One” source.<sup>47</sup> Sjöberg, however, argues for a literary unity to the work,<sup>48</sup> while Black accepts the multiplicity of sources, but not with nearly as much confidence or precision as Beer and Charles had.<sup>49</sup>

The seminal work by R. H. Charles<sup>50</sup> presents the basic view that beyond the widely accepted Noachic source, there are two other discernible sources for *Par. En.* One source is characterized by the use of the “son of man” for the messianic figure,

Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962), 227; Charles, *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch*, 64; Black, *I Enoch*, 33.

<sup>45</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 184, n. 4.

<sup>46</sup> Charles, *I Enoch*, 64, 118–19; and Black, *I Enoch*, 184.

<sup>47</sup> Beer, “Das Buch Henoch,” 227–28; Charles, *I Enoch*, xlix, 64–65.

<sup>48</sup> Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn*, 25–35.

<sup>49</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 184.

<sup>50</sup> Charles depends on Georg Beer, “Das Buch Henoch,” 224–30, at this point.

and the use of “the angel who went with me” (*mal’aka zayāhawwer meslēya*) for the *angelus interpretis*, while the other source is distinguished by the use of the “Elect One” and “the angel of peace” (*mal’aka salām*). The “Son of Man/Angel who went with me” (SoM/Awho) source and the “Elect One/Angel of Peace” (EO/AP) source include:

SoM/Awho	EO/AP
	38–39
40:3–7	40:1–2, 8–10
	41:1–2, 9
	45
46–48:7	48:8–10
52:3–4	50–52:1–2, 5–9
	53–54:6
	55:3–57
61:3–4	61:1–2, 5–13
62:2–63	62:1
69:26–29	
70–71 <sup>51</sup>	

This view has two significant problems however. One is that the qualifier “who went with me” is used not only of “the angel,” but also of “the angel of peace”! Beer seems to have recognized that the qualifying clause, “who went with me,” is used of both “the angel” and “the angel of peace.” But Charles does not continue to use that qualifier in his outlining of the two sources. Instead he seems to acknowledge its use only with “the angel.” “Who went with me” is used not only of “the angel,” but also of “the angel of peace” at *1 Enoch* 40:8, 53:4, 54:4, and 56:2. For this reason, some doubt must be maintained regarding Charles’ delineation of the sources.

A second reason for being somewhat skeptical about Charles’ delineation of the sources is that the persons by whom Charles distinguishes the sources do not consistently appear only in their respective sources. The following is a list of some of the inconsistencies of Charles’s delineations.

- a) In *1 Enoch* 40, Charles assigns 40:1–2, 8–10 to EO/AP, and 40:3–7 to SoM/Awho. However, in reading these verses, one finds that the “Son of Man” is not mentioned at all, that the “Elect One” (verse 5) is in the wrong source, and that “the angel who went with me” (verse 2) is also in the wrong source. “The Angel of Peace” (verse 8) is mentioned in the correct source.
- b) Chapters 38–39 of *1 Enoch* are attributed to EO/AP by Charles, and the “Elect One” is mentioned in *1 Enoch* 39:6, but “the angel of peace” does not appear at all.
- c) *1 Enoch* 41:1–2, 9 is attributed to EO/AP, but these verses do not refer at all to the “Elect one” or “the angel of peace.”

<sup>51</sup> Beer sees chapters 70–71 as an independent tradition, an appendix to *Par. En.*, 223, 228.



- d) *1 Enoch* 45 is assigned by Charles to EO/AP,<sup>52</sup> but it has no mention of “the angel of peace,” although the “Elect One” does appear in *1 Enoch* 45:3–4.
- e) *1 Enoch* 46–48:7, assigned to SoM/Awho, does include mention of the “Son of Man” (*1 Enoch* 46:2,3,6, 48:2) and “the angel who went with me” (*1 Enoch* 46:2).
- f) *1 Enoch* 48:8–10 (EO/AP) does not mention either the “Elect One” or “the angel of peace,” although the message is congruent with the message of punishment that seems to be characteristic of “the angel of peace.”
- g) *1 Enoch* 49 is not assigned by Charles to either source, but it does make mention of the “Elect One.”
- h) Charles assigns *1 Enoch* 50–52:1–2, 5–9 to EO/AP, and *1 Enoch* 52:3–4 to SoM/Awho. This requires a little fuller comment, especially in relation to the structuring of *1 Enoch* 52. In Chapter 52, Enoch sees a vision of metallic mountains, and asks about them of the angel who is accompanying him. The angel replies that all these things serve the power of the Anointed One (*1 Enoch* 52:4). Then, immediately, “the angel of peace” answers that he should wait a while for all the secrets to be revealed (*1 Enoch* 52:5). But then, in the very next verse, the mountains are explained as melting like wax before the Elect One and becoming powerless before his feet (*1 Enoch* 52:6). Neither shall the mighty and powerful be aided by gold or silver or weaponry when the Elect One appears before the Lord of Spirits (*1 Enoch* 52:7–9).

*1 Enoch* 52:5, the answer of “the angel of peace,” appears to be intrusive and secondary, not belonging with verses 3 and 4, which narrate the question by the seer and the first part of the answer by the accompanying angel. Two factors lead to that conclusion. First, both verse 4 and verse 5 have a narrative introduction to the angel’s response. In verse 4, the narrative flows on from verse 3, with a personal pronoun referring back to “the angel who went with me,” who was mentioned in verse 3. But, in verse 5, a second narrative introduction is given, naming “the angel of peace” as the one who gives the answer. The double narrative introduction to the angelic words is not necessary, and in itself suggests two sources. Second, as it stands, the sequence of verses in *1 Enoch* 52:3–6 is contradictory: the accompanying angel seems to begin an explanation, but then “the angel of peace” urges patience until everything should be revealed. The admonition for patience, however, is followed immediately by an explanation about the melting mountains. The sequence of thought in the verses does not flow well, nor does the answer of “the angel of peace” seem to be integrally connected to the context of the chapter. However, if the answer of “the angel of peace,” verse 5, is omitted, then verse 4 flows smoothly into verse 6, and verses 4 and 6–9 can be seen as making up the answer of the accompanying angel. For these two reasons, it is likely that the answer of “the angel of peace” (v 5) is secondary.

<sup>52</sup> Morna Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967), 36–39, has noticed that the first chapters of each of the parables are an introductory overview of the ensuing parable.

Further, the vision of the mountains (*I Enoch* 52:1–2) appears to be integrally related to the answer of “the angel who went with me” (*I Enoch* 52:3–4). The vision of the metallic mountains (verse 2) took place in the place where Enoch had seen things “in secret” (verse 1), and then Enoch asks of “the angel who went with me” about those things he had seen “in secret” (verse 3). The repetition of “in secret” connects verse 3 integrally with what precedes, contrary to the way Charles has assigned these verses to separate sources. As argued above, verse 5 alone appears to be secondary here, in what is otherwise a smoothly flowing account that encompasses *I Enoch* 52:1–4, 6–9. If this argument is sound, then here is an instance where the Elect One and “the angel who went with me” appear together in the same source, not in distinct sources.

- i) The EO/AP is the supposed source for both *I Enoch* 53–54:6 and 55:3–57, and both figures do appear in these passages.
- j) *I Enoch* 60:24–25 refers to “the Angel of Peace,” but Charles does not assign this passage to EO/AP, but rather sees it as an interpolation<sup>53</sup> in a chapter which otherwise appears to come from a Noachic source.
- k) Charles assigns *I Enoch* 61:1–2, 5–13 to EO/AP, while 61:3–4, which appear to him to be intrusive, he assigns to SoM/Awho. The “angel who was with me” is the angel to whom the seer speaks in verse 2, where according to Charles one should have expected “the Angel of Peace,”<sup>54</sup> who does not appear at all in these passages.
- l) *I Enoch* 69:26–29 and 70–71 are assigned by Charles to SoM/Awho, but in neither of them does “the angel who was with me” appear. Instead, Michael is the *angelus interpres* in *I Enoch* 71.

In numerous instances, then, one of the figures by whom the source is distinguished does not appear, and in several instances, the figure appears in verses assigned to the other source. Because of this problem with Charles’ delineation of the sources, namely that the passages do not always include the figures by which they are differentiated, and that the figures sometimes show up in the wrong source, it can be seen that Charles’ neat schema is not so self-evident or convincing.

### 2.3.3 A More Nuanced Understanding

Two scholars who have dealt with this problem have reacted to Beer and Charles’ position. Sjöberg claims that beyond the Noachic source, *Par. En.* betrays itself to be the work of one hand, and that the difficulties are merely a matter of stylistic variation. Black, on the other hand, accepts the multiple sources, but not with much confidence in the precision with which Beer and Charles had dissected the work.

<sup>53</sup> Charles, *I Enoch*, 118–19.

<sup>54</sup> Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn*, 28.

*Literary Unity*

Erik Sjöberg argues that basically *Par. En.* betrays itself to be a literary unity. On the one hand, Sjöberg critiques Charles and Beer by examining the passages that they believed revealed two separate sources. One example is that of the metallic mountains (*1 Enoch* 52), where both types of *angelus interpretis* are mentioned. Sjöberg suggests that the answer of the *angelus interpretis* here flows from the general to the specific, and he claims that the double answer and the double designation of the *angelus interpretis* are simply stylistic characteristics of the author.<sup>55</sup> Another example is the image of the angels and the cords they take for measuring the righteous (*1 Enoch* 61). Where Beer and Charles had seen the answer of the *angelus interpretis* reflecting two sources, Sjöberg proposes a two-part answer, each part of which is simply one aspect of the whole. Still another example Sjöberg investigates is the apparent inconsistency of the Son of Man being named at two times, one primordially (*1 Enoch* 48:3), and the other during the vision in the presence of the Lord of Spirits (*1 Enoch* 48:2). This apparent contradiction need not be seen as such, Sjöberg claims, arguing from the integrity of the passage which follows. The argument Sjöberg attacks is that verse 3 is intrusive, and that the original passage flows naturally from verse 2 through verses 4–7. Verse 2 speaks of the naming of the Son of Man, and verses 4–7, which according to Sjöberg must be read as a unit, describe the Son of Man as a staff to the righteous, a light to the Gentiles, the hope of those who dwell on earth and who will praise God because of the eternally chosen deliverer, who will be revealed by the Lord of Spirits. Sjöberg then points out that the concept of the Son of Man’s eternal chosenness, which appears in verse 6, matches precisely the idea of his being named primordially (verse 3). This leads Sjöberg to conclude that verse 3 no longer appears to be intrusive, but instead coheres well with the rest of the passage, and therefore should be considered original. Sjöberg explains that the inconsistency of being named twice is only an apparent contradiction brought about by the temporal language. The real point of the passage is the sovereignty of the Son of Man, both in time when judgment is to be enacted, and before time when he was foreordained to this role. The pretemporal naming is similar to the concept in the enthronement psalms, in which the king is spoken of as having been designated as king primordially, or to Jeremiah’s self-perception of having been chosen for the prophetic role before he was born. According to Sjöberg, then, it is highly unlikely that *1 Enoch* 48:3 has been interpolated.<sup>56</sup>

Sjöberg also notices that the two sources are not as distinct as Beer and Charles claimed. Sjöberg notes, for example, that in *1 Enoch* 61:1–2 it is not the Angel of Peace but “the angel who went with me” who is linked with the Elect One in verse 5. This points out the weakness of the double source hypothesis.

On the other hand, Sjöberg argues that the variations in the designations of the *angelus interpretis* are minor and cannot justify positing separate sources.<sup>57</sup> Sjöberg

<sup>55</sup> Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn*, 29.

<sup>56</sup> Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn*, 27.

<sup>57</sup> Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn*, 27.

claims that, aside from the cosmological sections and the Noachic material, the theme of an eschatological judgment against sinners is a unifying theme that occurs in all locations of *Par. En.* Further, there is a literary unity in that all three parables exhibit the same structure, speak of the same fate, and each begins with a prediction which is followed by a vision.<sup>58</sup> Thus, both on the grounds of the weakness of the double source proposition, and on the basis of a unifying structure and theme, Sjöberg argues that *Par. En.* displays a literary unity.

### *Discernible Sources*

Matthew Black believes that sources can be discerned in *Par. En.*, but they are not to be defined with as much precision as Charles's dissection of them. Besides Noah apocalypses, Black accepts a Michael discourse, a "Son of Man" source-tradition and an "Elect One" source-tradition, the last two of which are combined in the composite messianism of the Parables.<sup>59</sup> Further, these source-traditions are not haphazardly compiled. The First Parable imitates the Book of the Watchers, as Milik has shown,<sup>60</sup> since the four archangels of *1 Enoch* 40 in *Par. En.* correspond with those of *1 Enoch* 9–10 in the *Book of the Watchers* (updated to that which was common in the author/redactor's time). Black adds, that the introduction of the Flood material in the Second Parable (*1 Enoch* 54:7–55:2) also follows the lead of the *Book of the Watchers*. There (*1 Enoch* 10:2, 4) the order to imprison the watchers is given in conjunction with the warning to Noah about the coming Flood. Similarly, in the Second Parable, the Flood material is introduced in conjunction with the concept of imprisoning the angels. The artificial "joining" or "stitching" is still evident in the occasional illogicality,<sup>61</sup> but, nonetheless, the work possesses thematic unity because it is dominated by the theme of the Last Judgment. Black, then, perceives *Par. En.* not as "a loose *mixtum compositum* of disparate source traditions, but a work deliberately modeled on the First Vision and called by its author/redactor 'The Second Vision (of Enoch).'"<sup>62</sup> Black has not delineated the putative sources, but does recognize the unified themes of the final version.

### 2.3.4 Conclusions Regarding Sources

While Beer and Charles sought to define clearly the boundaries of the various sources used in *Par. En.*, succeeding scholars have not asserted the delineation of the sources as confidently as Beer and Charles had. Several sources are acknowledged, including the Noachic Source, a Son of Man source, and an Elect One source, but their tradition

<sup>58</sup> Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn*, 33.

<sup>59</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 184.

<sup>60</sup> Milik, *Enoch*, 90; Black, *1 Enoch*, 184.

<sup>61</sup> E.g. at *1 Enoch* 60:1 and 8, as noted earlier, and by Black, *1 Enoch*, 184 and note 5. In this chapter the author/redactor places the speech in Enoch's mouth, but then refers to Enoch as "my great-grandfather . . . the seventh from Adam," words more appropriate to Noah.

<sup>62</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 184–85.

history has not been described.<sup>63</sup> By the time of the final version of *Par. En.*, the Son of Man source and the Elect One source had been amalgamated by the author/redactor, because the Son of Man and the Elect One are treated as the single central messianic figure, with both terms being characterized by the same attributes and actions. The Noachic Source, however, was not blended into the work so neatly, since one of the sections (*1 Enoch* 60) retains irregularities and inconsistencies, while the other (*1 Enoch* 65:1) still retains Noah as its narrator. Part of the enigma and attractiveness of the work is its complex compositional history. Black was probably correct in noting several possible sources, while at the same time observing that the work is not merely a loose mixture of materials. Rather a unifying theme and approach is apparent, the judgment of the oppressors and the vindication of the righteous, which is based on the *Book of the Watchers* and expanded with a wide-ranging use of biblical passages.

## 2.4 The Social Setting of the *Parables of Enoch*

The next area to be investigated is the question of the Social Setting of *Par. En.* By Social Setting is meant the social location of the real author and the intended audience in the period of composition and their relation to the apparent oppressors. In the past a general impression has been elicited from the text regarding the group for whom the work was composed and by whom it was preserved. *Par. En.* has been described as having a Jewish provenance,<sup>64</sup> and as having been possibly composed outside the Qumran community by “a different conventicle from that of Qumran,”<sup>65</sup> which may be why it never found its way into their collection of texts. It has also been suggested that “the ‘community of the righteous’ presupposed in the *Parables* (e.g. 38:1) was using “a quasi-technical term or even title” for itself.<sup>66</sup>

That general impression of the provenance of the work and the characteristics of the group for which it was written can be made more specific by utilizing sociological methodologies. Further light can be shed on the Social Setting of this document by a careful examination of the social perspectives and understandings which are revealed in the work. As Richard Rohrbaugh advises, however, it is important not to be too simplistic in analyzing ancient cultures and the place of particular documents within them.<sup>67</sup> It is not enough to assume upper, middle, and

<sup>63</sup> A note of caution is in order, that none of these supposed sources is preserved elsewhere, not even the Noachic source, although a “Book of Noah” is mentioned in *Jubilees* 10:13, 21:10, as noted by Charles, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*, 106.

<sup>64</sup> For example, George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Enoch” in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary: Volume 2*, edited by David Noel Freedman (New York-London-Toronto-Sydney-Auckland: Doubleday, 1992) II.513.

<sup>65</sup> Collins, “The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism,” 452.

<sup>66</sup> Collins, “The Heavenly Representative,” 116–17; and “The Son of Man who has Righteousness,” 3.

<sup>67</sup> Richard L. Rohrbaugh, “Methodological Considerations in the Debate over the Social Class Status of Early Christians,” in *JAAR* LII/3 (1984), 519–46.

lower classes for ancient societies because that structure is too simplistic for the complexity of ancient cultures. Further the conception of the upper, middle, and lower classes of ancient culture is one dimensional: it considers only the economic factors, whereas ancient societies revolved around honor, shame, authority, and power, as well as wealth.<sup>68</sup> Instead, concepts of how people interact with one another must be employed to recognize the importance of relationships between people, and the power and authority those relationships entailed. For every buyer, there must be a seller, for every debtor, a creditor, for every worker, an employer, and for every person, a family and a host of relationships. Beyond class distinctions, a person's or group's social status must also be examined, acknowledging realities such as birth, gender, heritage, ownership, wealth, education, geographical location, occupational prestige, relationship to the structure of authority, and so on.<sup>69</sup> As the text is examined for these relational clues, a more precise judgment can be made regarding the place in society of *Par. En.*, its author, and the group it represents and by whom it was preserved.

The provenance and social setting of *Par. En.* can be further elucidated by recognizing the refinements for studying a text, which have been introduced by Narrative Criticism. On the authorial side of creating a discourse, the real author can be distinguished from the implied author and from the inscribed author. The implied author is the hypothetical figure who knows the sum total of what the characters, the narrator and implied reader or audience know, and has all their competencies.<sup>70</sup> This means that the implied author is the one who can be described from noticing the whole variety of social details regarding persons, places, technologies, and relationships depicted in the work. The implied author then is hypothetical, but clearly, the implied author is also a part of who the real author is. The real author knows everything the implied author knows, but the real author knows more than is contained in the document for the real author is the one who is actually living and interacting in the society. Thus, discovering the implied author is partially to discover the real author. The inscribed author is also distinct and is the one who speaks in the first person in the discourse. Consequently the knowledge and competencies of the inscribed author may be more limited than those of the implied author. For *Par. En.*, however, the implied author is distinguished from the inscribed author only in a few places. One example is at the beginning of *Par. En. 1 Enoch 37:1* is a statement in which the vision to be reported is ascribed to Enoch, who is spoken of in the third person. Immediately in verse 2, however, Enoch begins speaking, and narrates the visions in the first person. Enoch, then, speaking in the first person, is the inscribed author. Another example in which the implied author is distinguished from the inscribed author is in the Epilog (*1 Enoch 70–71*). Again Enoch is spoken of in the third person. His final ascent is

<sup>68</sup> Rohrbaugh, "Methodological Considerations," 521–22, 529.

<sup>69</sup> Rohrbaugh, "Methodological Considerations," 538.

<sup>70</sup> Vernon K. Robbins, "The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: A Model for Interpretation*, edited by Jerome H. Neyrey (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991), 311.

described. Once again, Enoch, the narrator of the visions and the inscribed author, is viewed as distinct from the implied author. Because, however, there are so few places where the implied author and the inscribed author are distinguished, their knowledge and their competencies appear to be virtually identical.

Discovering the social realities of the implied and inscribed authors of the text then can reveal something of the social status of the real author and the group the real author represents. When the details of the social realities of life are sifted out of the text the social location of the implied author can be determined. As Robbins notes, “a ‘social location’ is a position in a social system which reflects a world view . . . a perception of how things work.”<sup>71</sup> This in turn elucidates a partial view of the social location of the real author.

On the side of the audience, the real reader can be distinguished from the implied reader. The real reader is anyone who reads the work, whether in the first century or the twenty-first. It is self-evident, however, that the real reader of the first century has the advantage over the real reader of the twenty-first century, since the first-century reader is so close in chronological proximity and in mental and social awareness to the situation of the author. The implied reader, however, is the one for whom the author is writing. The implied reader has all the knowledge and competencies that the author assumes about the reader. The implied reader understands all the allusions and references that the author makes, and understands all the tensions and stresses that are dealt with in the text. This implied reader also grasps all the nuances with which the author flavors the discourse. The implied reader, like the implied author, is a hypothetical figure. But the implied reader can partially disclose who the real, first-century readers were, since the real readers and the implied reader exist at virtually the same time, and since the implied reader is modeled by the real author upon the real readers of the time. Thus, again, the social realities reflected in the text elucidate to some extent the social location of the group for whom *Par. En.* was written. Discovering this social location can help to understand *Par. En.* more fully and to see its place in the development of the ideas and convictions that it shares.

Two approaches to discovering the social location of the implied author and the implied reader will be used. The first approach is to follow Robbins’ analysis of the implied author of Luke-Acts, in which Robbins investigates the implied author’s competencies in nine social arenas. The second is to note which of nine social classes which Gerhard Lenski describes is known by the implied author, and in which of those social classes the implied author places the righteous and elect ones for whom *Par. En.* is written.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>71</sup> Robbins, “The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts,” 306.

<sup>72</sup> Gerhard E. Lenski, Chapters 8–9, “Agrarian Societies,” in *Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1966).

### 2.4.1 Arenas of the Social System and the Implied Author

Vernon K. Robbins in his analysis of the social location of the implied author of Luke-Acts examined the intersection of the narrative functions of Luke-Acts with nine arenas of the social system. Robbins is interested in four intra-textual functions of Luke-Acts: 1) the characters and their audiences; 2) the narrator and narratee; 3) the inscribed author and inscribed reader; and 4) the implied author and implied reader.<sup>73</sup> The exhibited knowledge and competencies of the first three of these functions make up the knowledge and competencies of the implied author.<sup>74</sup> Further, Robbins is interested in the intersection of these four intra-textual factors with nine basic arenas of a social system. The nine arenas are:

- a) previous events that may be mentioned or alluded to in the text;
- b) natural environment and resources;
- c) population structure of the society;
- d) technology;
- e) socialization depicting conflict, or relationships to patrons or clients;
- f) artistic, literary, historical or aesthetic allusions;<sup>75</sup>
- g) awareness of foreign affairs;
- h) belief system and ideology; and finally
- i) the political-legal-military system of the day.

The intersection of the narrative functions with these arenas of a social system provides a means to locate the implied author in the social structure of the time. Thus, an examination of *Par. En.* in the light of these nine social arenas can reveal more realities about the identity of the real author and the implied readers.

The implied author of *Par. En.* reveals little interest in *previous events*. Persecution (*I Enoch* 46:8), bloodshed (*I Enoch* 47:2) and possibly Antiochus IV Epiphanes' claim to rule the stars (*I Enoch* 46:7)<sup>76</sup> are a part of the implied author's memory. The invasion of the Parthians and Medes is known (*I Enoch* 56:5). Notoriously difficult to identify with certainty, it seems that the invasion of the mid-first century BCE is meant.<sup>77</sup> The implied author also seems to know of Herod's visit to the hot springs of Callirhoe in the last decade of the first-century BCE (*I Enoch* 67:8–13).<sup>78</sup>

The implied author's knowledge of previous events, however, is not very extensive. No references are made to the Maccabees, or to Pompey's visit, or to the succession

<sup>73</sup> Robbins, "The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts," 309, has used the comprehensive framework for investigating phenomena in the Roman Empire found in the work of T. F. Carney and J. H. Elliot.

<sup>74</sup> Robbins, "The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts," 311.

<sup>75</sup> Robbins, "The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts," 323.

<sup>76</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 208.

<sup>77</sup> See the section on Dating *Par. En.*

<sup>78</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities*, xvii.



of kings before Herod. This paucity, however, is in keeping with his eschatological perspective. The implied author is much more interested in the future reversal of fortunes than in past events. Thus, those previous events play a small role in the *Par. En.*

Under the topic of *Natural Environment and Resources*, the implied author's awareness of geographical space, such as cities, ports or other geographical features would be noted. In the narration, mountains have been seen on a tour of heaven (*I Enoch* 52), as well as mountains in the west (*I Enoch* 67:4). Various metals are associated with these mountains, gold, silver, iron, copper, lead, bronze and tin. This suggests at least a passing knowledge of metallurgy, and a hint that the implied author knew these metals came from ores. Evidently the implied author, through the voice of the narrator, knew something of the Mediterranean Sea, as the narrator refers to the people who dwell on the land, sea, and the islands (*I Enoch* 53:1). The "land and sea and islands" generally refers to the Mediterranean.<sup>79</sup> The implied author evidently knew something of volcanic activity (*I Enoch* 67:5–7) and may possibly be alluding to the Gehinnom Valley and others like it that extended down to the Dead Sea.<sup>80</sup> More specifically, the implied author knows of the hot springs of Macherus and Callirhoe, which Josephus describes, but which *Par. En.* does not name.<sup>81</sup>

None of the details that the implied author reveals is specific enough to locate particular places, except the hot springs. No mining towns are mentioned, no ports are named, and not even the city of Jerusalem is named in connection with the Parthian invasion (*I Enoch* 56:7): it is simply alluded to as the "city of my righteous ones" (*I Enoch* 56:7). Again, this is to be expected, with the implied author's interest in the transcendent realm where true justice is meted out. The earthly realm is simply not important. What little is alluded to seems to indicate the implied author was most familiar with the territory between Jerusalem and the Dead Sea. The implied author does know about the Mediterranean, but does not reveal any great knowledge about it.

In terms of *population structure*, the implied author gives no details. The distinction between male and female is not mentioned, nor are children spoken of, except for the paraphrase for "Son of Man," "that child of woman," whom the kings and mighty ones will see and fear (*I Enoch* 62:5–6). The group of the righteous and elect seems to have been an identifiable group, for they suffered persecution and bloodshed (*I Enoch* 46:8, 47:2–4), and they seek vindication. But the implied author does not reveal any details regarding their numbers or the proportion of men, women and children in the group. Nor is any indication given of the relative size of the group in proportion to the general population. The population of the day is not of much interest to the implied author.

The implied author reveals some knowledge of *technology*. He is aware of palatial furniture, as he acknowledges that the kings and mighty ones sit on couches and thrones (*I Enoch* 46:4). He also seems to know something of the agricultural

<sup>79</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 217.

<sup>80</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 242.

<sup>81</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 242. Josephus, *Antiquities*, xvii 6, 5; and *Wars*, vii 6.

life, in that the metaphor of burning stubble is used to describe the punishment of the kings and mighty ones (*I Enoch* 48:9). Further he alludes to rams and lambs jumping and skipping (*I Enoch* 51:4). Some awareness of metallurgy and sorcery is revealed (*I Enoch* 63:10), and the occupations of iron workers, and idol makers are mentioned (*I Enoch* 53:3–4, 54:3). These allusions to technologies seem to be rather meager, and could just as well be purely literary. No lessons are drawn from details of animal husbandry, planting and harvesting, or even mining. The allusion to these technologies has metaphorical value, but specific knowledge of them seems to bear no relevance to the particular point of the work. However, the author does know of books (*I Enoch* 68:1) and either was a scribe or had access to a scribe since this work is written down and preserved. The fact of the text's survival suggests a significant knowledge of the scribal profession.

*Socialization* refers to self-perception and how one relates to others. The narrator claims a unique wisdom given by God and limited only by human understanding and God's good pleasure (*I Enoch* 37). The attitude the implied author has towards the righteous and elect is very positive: they eventually will be the blessed ones (*I Enoch* 45:5, 50:2). But his attitude towards the sinners and evildoers is that they shall be destroyed (*I Enoch* 45:6, 53:2). The kings are treated in the same manner as the sinners, for no mercy shall be shown to them (*I Enoch* 63, 68:1). Nevertheless, the implied author is well aware of proper etiquette when addressing a king or other socially prominent person. *Proskynesis* and worship are the norm, as the implied author suggests, when the condemned kings and mighty ones beg for mercy (*I Enoch* 62:9, 63:2). These awarenesses show some familiarity in the matter of interacting with social superiors.

The *cultural awareness* of the implied author is quite extensive literarily, but little artistic or aesthetic competency is revealed. Well acquainted with Scripture, alluding to the creation story (*I Enoch* 48:3) and the waters above and below the earth (*I Enoch* 54:8), he distinguishes between the masculine waters above the earth and the feminine waters below the earth, seeing an eventual reunification of all the waters (*I Enoch* 54:8). Characterizing the waters as male and female is an allusion to a Babylonian myth, also referred to in Jerusalem Talmud (Berach ix 2).<sup>82</sup> This indicates quite a high level of education. The implied author also draws upon and interprets the vision of the Head of Days in Daniel 7 (*I Enoch* 46:1–3, 71:10), as well as Nebuchadnezzar's vision of the human figure made up of the different materials in Daniel 2 (*I Enoch* 52). He is aware of the flood story, interpolating a section of a Noachic work into the third parable (*I Enoch* 65–69:25), and he is aware of the etiological meaning of the rainbow (*I Enoch* 55:1–2). The implied author shows quite an interest in the sapiential concern with meteorological phenomena, as he lists the storehouses for the lightning, thunder, wind, clouds, dew, hail, mist, and the sun and the moon, which are revealed to Enoch (*I Enoch* 41, 44, 59, 60, 69:20–23, 71:4). The calendrical calculation of festivals is also a matter of concern (*I Enoch* 44:5),

<sup>82</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 219.

indicating participation in religious decisions. A part of a wisdom song giving a different interpretation from Proverbs 8 is also included (*I Enoch* 42). Matching the knowledge of meteorological phenomena is knowledge of the orders of angels (*I Enoch* 69) and gematria (*I Enoch* 69:13, 71:8). Books are mentioned, indicating education (*I Enoch* 68:1), in particular a heavenly book in which all the names of the righteous are recorded (*I Enoch* 47:3). Not only is the author able to read, but he is also able to write in a skilled manner, drawing on many different scriptural themes. The very existence of the *Par. En.* indicates his ability to write.

All of these allusions indicate that the implied author was quite well versed in Scripture, and quite well-trained as a “scribe.” He was interested in scribal, sapiential matters as well, as indicated by his reference to the meteorological storehouses which are revealed to Enoch. The implied author, and by implication the actual author, was clearly of the scribal, retainer class: he had important skills and has become the spokesperson for the righteous and the elect in speaking out against the kings and mighty ones.

In *foreign affairs* the implied author reveals nothing except the invasion of the Parthians and Medes. Not even there does he refer in any specific way to the generals Pacorus and Barzaphanes, and only alludes in a most inconclusive way to the intrigue in which they tried to trap Hyrcanus II, Herod, and Phasaël in their support of the rival Antigonus II. Matters relating to the Roman Empire, which was establishing its authority over the region at the time, are ignored. The wider world of foreign affairs is of no interest to the implied author of *Par. En.*

The *belief system and ideology* of the implied author of *Par. En.*, on the other hand, is quite full and complete. He believes in the Lord of Spirits, who created the world, and imparts wisdom (*I Enoch* 37:4). Sin is considered to have originated with the fallen watchers (*I Enoch* 64). At the same time, the evildoers, the kings and the mighty ones are followers of Azazel (*I Enoch* 53:5, 54:5, 56:3). He believes that there will be a final judgment (*I Enoch* 38:1), in which the righteous will be vindicated and the sinners and evildoers condemned to eternal punishment. The basis of judgment is their treatment of the righteous and elect (*I Enoch* 62:11). Heaven and earth will also be transformed (*I Enoch* 45:4–5, 50:1) and those who are not powerful now will inherit the earth. The Garden is the place for the righteous to dwell (*I Enoch* 60:8, 23, 61:12). Only in *Par. En.* do the righteous dwell there.<sup>83</sup> Missing is an emphasis on temple sacrifice and on following the Law. The expressed concerns seem to fit the scribal, sapiential concerns of the Second Temple Period.

The implied author of *Sim En.* seems to be quite aware of the *political-legal-military system* of the late first-century BCE. The whole work is directed against the kings and mighty ones, the ruling class of Palestine. The implied author refers to the kings and strong ones who occupy the land (*I Enoch* 48:8), indicating an acquaintance with the land-owning, governing stratum of society. He knows that “gifts and presents and tokens of homage” (*I Enoch* 53:1) need to be paid, to maintain

<sup>83</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 227.

the favor of patrons. Here in *1 Enoch* 53, it is the patrons who are envisioned seeking to win favor from the Elect One, but justly, in the implied author's eyes, it is to no avail: they will not be granted mercy. An allusion is made to government by intrigue, where brother does not trust brother (*1 Enoch* 56:7). The implied author, thus is familiar with the ways of the ruling stratum of society.

The implied author also knows something of punishment and imprisonment. He envisions the kings and mighty ones in the end being punished and imprisoned the same way that they no doubt had punished and imprisoned citizens of the land. Instruments for confining prisoners are mentioned four times. In *1 Enoch* 53:3–4, when the angels of punishment are preparing all the fetters of Satan, Enoch asks for whom the fetters were being prepared. He receives the answer that they are being prepared for “the kings and mighty of this earth, that they may thereby be destroyed (*1 Enoch* 53:3).” The term used is a non-specific term for iron instruments of torture and confinement.<sup>84</sup> Again in *1 Enoch* 54:3–4, in another part of the vision, Enoch sees a deep valley with burning fire. Into this deep valley the kings and potentates are cast, and in it their fetters are being fashioned. These fetters are iron chains of incalculable weight. Again Enoch asks for whom the fetters are being prepared, and he is told that they are for the host of Azazel, so that they can be cast into the depths of hell and covered with rough stones (*1 Enoch* 54:5). Then a little further in the vision (*1 Enoch* 56:1–3), Enoch sees scourges and fetters of iron and bronze, *mašagra xas* in wabert, being prepared for the followers of the associates of Azazel, that they too might be cast into the chasm of the abyss. Finally in the summation of the third parable (*1 Enoch* 69:28), Enoch reports that the Son of Man will effect the destruction of the sinners. The sinners will be bound

<sup>84</sup> There is a certain amount of textual confusion with regard to the term for “iron instruments.” Charles in *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch*, 96–97, uses the term *mabāl'eta*, which has to do with food stuffs or victuals. In the apparatus, however, Charles notes that several manuscripts use *mabā'elata*, or *mabā'elata*, which refer to iron instruments of torture and confinement. J. Fleming, *Das Buch Henoch* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1902) 57, uses *mabā'elata* in the text, and makes no mention of the variants in the apparatus. The Rylands Ethiopic MS. 23, which is the basis for Knibb's, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, preserves an erasure on the manuscript indicating that an erroneous second root letter had first been written but then erased. The resulting word is *mabā'ita*. It is puzzling that, without even commenting on it, Charles in his translation, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*, 105–106, uses the variant, “instruments,” rather than “victuals,” the text he chose to print. Neither Black, *1 Enoch*, nor Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, in their translations comment on the variants; only E. Isaac, in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. James H. Charlesworth, Vol. 1; New York: Doubleday, 1983) 37, adds “victuals” in the footnotes.

Besides the transposition from *b'l* to *bl'*, the root *b'l*, “Lord” (Augustus Dillmann, *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae*, [Lipsiae: Weigel, 1865] 530) is also confused with *'bl* which has to do with making things, and yields the noun *ma'ebal*, “iron instruments.” (Dillmann, *Lexicon*, 983; it can also mean “javelin” or “arrow”). This noun is used in *1 Kings* 6:7, where it refers to the iron tools that were not to be used in the building of Solomon's temple. It is also used at *2 Kings* 16:17, τὰ συγκλείματα in Greek, where it refers to the border or frame of the bases of the laver of the temple. Evidently the frame or border bound the parts of the base together. That binding notion seems to be the sense of the passage in *1 Enoch* 53:3–4 and it is the sense followed by all the commentators.

with chains and imprisoned in their assembling places of destruction. The seer's ideas have a parallel in Ps. 149:8 בַּכְּבִּלֵי בַרְזֵל, "iron fetters" in which kings and nobles will be bound (cf. also Ps. 105:18). Perhaps the author envisions the fulfillment of that verse for the kings and mighty ones whom he opposes. These references also indicate that he knows something of the legal system and the public way decisions would be enacted. The multiplicity of references to fetters, one may speculate, may indicate that the real author either had been imprisoned by the legal system at some point, or was close to someone who had been imprisoned.

The implied author also knows something of the military equipment of the day. While no descriptions of armor are forthcoming, he does allude to horse-mounted soldiers, who found Jerusalem to be an obstacle (*1 Enoch* 56:7). He also knows of warriors riding in chariots (*1 Enoch* 57:1–2). Both these forms of attack would have been terrifying to foot soldiers and they would have seemed to be a far superior power to the local inhabitants. Again one may speculate that, since the implied author knows of these forms of attack, the actual author either witnessed similar events or knew someone who had.

This analysis of *Par. En.* through the use of the nine arenas of a social system reveal that the implied author is fairly knowledgeable in some areas, but quite uninterested in others. He seems to have a wide knowledge of cultural matters. He knows the Hebrew scriptures, and interprets especially the Son of Man image in a way to suit his purposes. The implied author further reveals an extensive interest in sapiential subjects, with the revelation that the storehouses of the meteorological phenomena are shown to Enoch, and with the listing of the angels who are to be punished. He betrays significant familiarity with the political, legal, and military aspects of the social system. He knows how to deal with superiors, and makes the revolutionary claim that earthly kings and rulers are in fact subject to God and to God's judicial representative, the Son of Man, by whom they will be judged. He knows about imprisonment, and perhaps has witnessed attacking armies, which used horses and chariots. While the implied author does not seem to be widely traveled in the Mediterranean, he does seem more familiar with Jerusalem and the Dead Sea environs. He mentions a variety of metals, indicating knowledge of their existence.

The implied author does not, however, seem very interested in foreign affairs, in the make-up of the population of the land, nor in previous events that are a part of a society's heritage. Except for the dealing with superiors and interpreting the Scriptures, these descriptions of the implied author's knowledge of the world are by no means very detailed, and indeed they could be based on literary knowledge rather than practical experience. However, if we may tentatively read these details for furthering our understanding of the implied author, then we may see the real author as a scribe, who felt deep animosity toward and rejection of the current ruling stratum. He foresaw the eventual reversal of their fortunes, if not in this life, then certainly in the life after death. He was not interested in or appreciative of Hellenistic innovations, and would rather support the traditional ways of Scripture study and agrarian life. The knowledge betrayed by the real author indicates that he was a member of

the elites, although at the time of composition, he was part of the ousted group and so opposed the current rulers.

#### 2.4.2 Social Stratification and *Par. En.*

Another way to investigate the social setting of *Par. En.* is to notice details concerning the social classes in which the implied author locates the characters who are a part of the text. Lenski has described in a general way the different strata of an advanced agrarian society. An advanced agrarian society is one of several stages of societal development. It is preceded by the hunter-gatherer society, and the horticultural society. With the technological developments of the plow and the wheel, an advanced agrarian society can develop with a vastly more complex agricultural, political and religious system. Out of this, with further technological advances, an industrial society develops. The Roman empire and the societies it conquered fall within the description of an advanced agrarian society. Lenski provides a macro-view of society, but it is helpful, for this view also takes seriously the relationships between the various groups and strata. Lenski seeks to represent the complexity of society, for he recognizes that the relative power and privilege of any given group depends on its relationship to the other groups in the society. So the social world within the Roman empire, in which the author of *Par. En.* lives, from which he writes, and to which he bears witness, can be investigated from the perspective of Lenski's description. Discovering the social location of the persons mentioned in the text reveals something of the purpose for its having been written. First a brief outline of the social strata of an advanced agrarian society will be presented, then a description of which of those strata are mentioned in *Par. En.* will be offered, and finally a discussion of the social location of the "kings and mighty ones" and the "righteous and elect" will follow.

Lenski describes agrarian societies as he outlines their nine successive strata. He notes that agrarian societies were transformed from horticultural societies by invention of the plow, and the wheel, and by advances in metallurgy. These advances yielded greater and more efficient productivity. Agrarian societies were characterized by great building projects such as pyramids and cathedrals, by greater work efficiency and by advances in military technology. Greater social stratification also developed as individuals became specialized in their contributions to the social fabric. Lenski gives the example of the manufacture of weapons. Artisans made them, while soldiers used them.<sup>85</sup> The development of specialized occupations led to social stratification and the further refinement of the power individuals held over others. Advanced agrarian societies also witnessed the development of widespread urban communities, and a great growth in the volume of trade and commerce. Growth in trade resulted in the emergence of a merchant class. The flow of goods generally went from villages to urban centers, with the villages receiving services, tools and salt in return for

<sup>85</sup> Lenski, "Agrarian Societies," 194.

agricultural surplus. Generally only luxury items were transported between urban centers due to the high cost of transportation, with the net effect being that wealth accumulated in those centers and especially around the highest level of the society. The invention of money and writing was made necessary in order to control and enhance the flow of goods.

An agrarian society was marked by great social inequality. The ruler controlled the most power and wealth, with lower social groups controlling ever diminishing amounts. Since size of holdings was a visible measure of power, rulers engaged in constant warfare in order to gain more lands. Thus, the population of an agrarian society was generally made up of conquered peoples, which resulted in ethnic diversity in the society.<sup>86</sup>

Generally speaking, local cults gave way to the state sponsored cult, or were incorporated into it. Sometimes there were organized conflicts between religious groups as one group was forced out of power and control because another was claiming it.<sup>87</sup>

The top of the extremely steep pyramid was occupied by the ruler. All power, privilege and honor resided in the ruler, due to the economic and military power that the ruler controlled. The ruler was inordinately wealthy, receiving income from conquered lands and from the classes below the ruler. The surplus wealth of the land was all funneled towards the ruler. The ruler's income was four to forty times the wealth of the richest members of the governing class. This inordinate wealth was possible due to the "proprietary theory of the state," in which the state was considered to be the personal property of the ruler and therefore was to be used for personal advantage. The ruler was considered to have full rights to booty, tributes and taxation, and could even confiscate what was desired.<sup>88</sup> The control of land, the government, and the nation thus was highly desirable, for partisan or personal advantage, and the wealth gained from it was not distributed equitably, but channeled into the control of a few. Most struggles were not over principles, but "between opposing factions of the privileged class."<sup>89</sup>

The next stratum of the social pyramid was the governing class. The governing class generally consisted of 2% of the population, and was made up of the aristocracy, who constituted the bureaucracy through which the ruler governed and exploited the land. They shared in the economic surplus of the land, and in return for their privileges of wealth and control, they were responsible for providing military support for the ruler. They realized personal financial gain from their administrative power and at times were exempted from taxes. Wealth followed power in an agrarian society, so that while they did not enjoy as much wealth as the ruler, nevertheless their

<sup>86</sup> Lenski, "Agrarian Societies," 195–96.

<sup>87</sup> Lenski, "Agrarian Societies," 209.

<sup>88</sup> A scriptural example of the right to confiscate may be found in Ahab's coveting and eventual confiscation of Naboth's vineyard (1 Kgs 21). The issue for Elijah, however, is that not even kings could arbitrarily confiscate a subject's land.

<sup>89</sup> Lenski, "Agrarian Societies," 211–14.

income level was much greater than that of the general populace. Often they were land owners, or had been rewarded with lands, which they then felt free to exploit. Sometimes, when they fell out of favor, their wealth and property were confiscated by the ruler, who awarded it to others. This possibility continually made the governing class want to curtail the power of the ruler, and conversely, the ruler continually wanted to keep the governing class in check.<sup>90</sup>

Below the governing class came the retainers, at the third level. They were skilled in actually carrying out the tasks of governing and administering the land. The basic function of the retainer class was to serve the elite in the administration of the land. This stratum consisted of 5–10% of the population, and was made up of soldiers, officials, scribes, servants, and personal retainers. Occasionally they themselves shared in the privileges of the governing class, by controlling personal wealth and power in the administration of the bureaucracy. As a class, they were very important for maintaining the distributive system of the empire and for performing the work of transferring wealth from the peasants to the ruler, but as individuals, they were expendable. Only scribes, with their writing skills, were not expendable in this way, but most members of this class could be easily replaced. Once their services were no longer needed, they descended to one or other of the lower classes.<sup>91</sup>

The next group in the social system, according to Lenski's description, is the merchant class, at the fourth level. The merchant class stood in a market relationship with the elite. They possibly arose out of the ranks of younger sons who did not stand to inherit the family's wealth. Entrepreneurial persons soon recognized the possibility of turning a profit on items that were bountiful in one area but scarce in another. Their relative independence in their own pursuit of wealth freed them up somewhat from the strict authority of the elite, who found them difficult to control and tax fully. Nonetheless, the elite also benefited from their activities in that commodities were readily available.<sup>92</sup>

The class of religious leaders, or priests as Lenski terms them, is at the fifth level. By priests, Lenski means all religious leaders. The priestly class were those who mediated the relationship between God and humanity. Great variety was manifested in this class in different societies. Some religious leaders were married, others were celibate. Some functioned more as teachers, others more as controllers of spiritual resources. In some societies, membership in this class was by heredity, but in others, especially where celibacy was maintained, members were recruited, and sometimes both heredity and recruitment were means for becoming a member. At times they controlled great wealth, if they came from the governing class, and amassed much property, especially if they were favored by the ruler. In other situations they advocated poverty, especially if they came from amongst the lower classes. Sometimes they promoted the ideals of righteousness and justice, as can be seen in

<sup>90</sup> Lenski, "Agrarian Societies," 220–41.

<sup>91</sup> Lenski, "Agrarian Societies," 243–48.

<sup>92</sup> Lenski, "Agrarian Societies," 250–56.



the law codes of Hammurabi and Moses. They might enjoy the respect of the ruler, nobles and peasants, and so be able to encourage a minor redistribution of wealth through charity. But at other times, many members of this class pursued power and wealth in competition with the elite. If they fell out of favor, their wealth and property might be confiscated.

The priestly class and the elite coexisted in a symbiotic relationship. The religious leaders sought influence and power to spread their beliefs, to build temples, and to create art, while the elite needed the blessings of the religious establishment to legitimize their rule. Further, the literacy skills of the religious leaders was needed in the society, so that they became diplomats, clerks, officials and educators. But because religious leaders derived their authority from a source other than the social elite, differences were bound to arise. The most potent weapon the priestly class possessed was the power of bestowing or denying salvation, while a weapon used by the elite was confiscation and persecution.<sup>93</sup>

The peasant class, the sixth level, produced most of the wealth of the society and was its largest component. These people were the ones who actually produced the crops and other products of the land, and most of the tax burden was shifted to them. In the ancient world, they may have been taxed at a rate of 20% or 30% or even 50% of the produce. They might be subject to forced labor, or a time of service to the ruler and generally they lived in miserable poverty at a mere subsistence level. They were considered by the elite to be stupid, or lacking in intelligence, or slaves, and therefore they were exploitable. Often they were foreigners, subjugated during war and relocated to the control of the elite. Occasionally, peasant rebellions occurred, especially if the peasants of a particular region had been trained for war, but generally no lasting social change resulted. As a class they were particularly susceptible to plagues, disasters, inflation, and the whims of the elite. While they were the most numerous group of the society, they were relatively powerless and poverty-stricken.<sup>94</sup>

Artisans, unclean and degraded persons, and expendables formed the lowest three classes of the agrarian society. The artisans, about 3–7% of the population, are thought to have come from the dispossessed peasantry and the non-inheriting sons of families, if they were unsuccessful in joining the merchant class. Their income level was less than that of the peasants, and they were laborers for merchants, producing manufactured goods. Generally, they were a despised segment of the society.

The unclean or degraded persons made up about 10% of the population. They were porters, laborers, and prostitutes, and they barely were able to sustain themselves.

The expendables were the criminals and beggars. They also made up about 10% of the population, but were treated as deviants. In their outcast state, they gravitated to the urban areas.<sup>95</sup>

<sup>93</sup> Lenski, "Agrarian Societies," 256–66.

<sup>94</sup> Lenski, "Agrarian Societies," 273–6.

<sup>95</sup> Lenski, "Agrarian Societies," 281.

These nine classes were not so much layers as continuous gradations. Some of the members of one class may overlap with members of another class in their control of wealth and power. Because the society was mostly a conquered society, with individuals being largely replaceable, downward mobility was common. As people fell out of favor, they fell into the lower classes. By and large, the whole government was organized to channel wealth and power to the upper echelons of the society. In that social dynamism, individuals and their clients and retainers could easily have their status drastically changed in a relatively short time.<sup>96</sup>

*Social Classes Reflected in Par. En.*

A number of these social classes are alluded to in *Par. En.*, but some are not. The supreme, earthly ruler, the emperor or Caesar, is never mentioned. It seems to me, however, that the social location of the ruler is allocated to the divine being in the spiritual realm. The Lord of Spirits, like the supreme, earthly ruler, holds all power to judge, to vindicate and to accord status to those who are judged. The Lord of Spirits is worthy of worship, and all inhabitants of heaven, angels and the righteous and holy, bow down, praise, exalt, and bless the Lord of Spirits (*I Enoch* 38:4–14, 40, 61:9–12). Further, the Lord of Spirits is worthy of the worship of all peoples on earth (*I Enoch* 48:4–5). The kings and mighty ones, who are judged by God, fall down and worship and beg for mercy (*I Enoch* 62–63). God is said to be merciful, and willing to accommodate those who repent (*I Enoch* 50:3–4, 61:13), but the kings and mighty ones are unable to obtain mercy (*I Enoch* 50:5, 63). These powers indicate that for the author of *Par. En.*, God has taken the place of the supreme, earthly ruler.

Members of Lenski's governing class are mentioned in *Par. En.* The "mighty ones," and the "powerful and strong ones" are differing designations for this group. They are distinguished by being currently wealthy and powerful, and possessors of the earth, but they are also capable of losing their power and status. They can be destroyed and handed over to others (*I Enoch* 38:5, 48:8–10, 53:5). In other words, they can be demoted and stripped of their authority and privilege. The members of this governing class are also called "kings!" They may be powerful for a time, but they can be cast down from their thrones and reduced to wormy beds like the peasant and lower classes (*I Enoch* 46:4–6, 62:10, 63:11–12). For a short time they are the possessors of the earth (*I Enoch* 38:4, 62:1, 63:1),<sup>97</sup> but they shall be handed over to others (*I Enoch* 48:9). They will bow down and praise the Son of Man, who is the viceroy of the Lord of Spirits, and petition and supplicate before him (*I Enoch* 62:9). But when judgment is rendered, they will leave the presence of the judge with heavy hearts and downcast faces (*I Enoch* 62:10, 63:11). They will be seen to be replaceable, for the elect of the Son of Man will exchange places with them, and exult

<sup>96</sup> Lenski, "Agrarian Societies," 289.

<sup>97</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 195, 235, identifies them with foreign oppressors of Israel. However, this does not seem likely. The argument above suggests that they are local rulers and governors, who support and who are supported by the Romans.

over those who formerly oppressed them (*1 Enoch* 62:11–12). In the transformed world order, the righteous and elect will be in the presence of the Son of Man, eat and sleep in his presence and wear never-fading garments of glory (*1 Enoch* 62:14–16), but those who are presently powerful shall be punished. The kings and mighty ones, then, are members of the ruling elite.

The retainer class is spoken of in *Par. En.* also. This class is represented by those who have the skills of using pen and ink. Those skills are decried in the list of angels who are to be punished. *Penemue* is credited with instructing humanity in writing with ink and paper (*1 Enoch* 69:10). It is curiously ironic, that even as this author uses those same skills to preserve his ideas and insights, he condemns them as the work of a fallen angel. Perhaps the reason is that he sees reading and writing as diverting human attention from its true vocation of being righteous and pure (*1 Enoch* 69:11).

The religious leaders, or priestly class, are also spoken of by this author. On the one hand, medical skills for discerning diseases are criticized along with their instructor, *Kasdeya*' (*1 Enoch* 69:12). On the other hand, those who are thirsty for wisdom are mentioned as dwelling amongst the righteous and holy and elect (*1 Enoch* 48:1). This may be the only hint at any social structure for the group who are designated as the righteous and elect. The conception seems to be that a few of that group are thirsty for wisdom, and may drink their fill at the fountain of wisdom. But not everyone drinks from it, only some amongst them. Drinking from the fountain of wisdom would seem to refer metaphorically to those who are religious leaders, interested in sapiential matters.

The only other social class referred to by this author is the artisan class. The members of this class are spoken of disdainfully, and connected with the kings and mighty ones whom the author vehemently opposes. The members of this class are the iron-workers who make fetters (*1 Enoch* 53:3–4, 54:3), and the idol-makers (*1 Enoch* 53:2, 68:4–5) who supply the kings and mighty ones.

The other classes are not mentioned. No merchants are spoken of, no peasants or their activities, nor are any of the lowest classes of unclean or expendables mentioned. This seems to suggest that while the implied author revealed knowledge of wider arenas of activity, such as shepherding (*1 Enoch* 51:4), the characters of whom he speaks are not of those classes. Where they do fit in the society must now be examined.

#### *The Social Location of the Kings and of the Righteous and Elect*

As noted above, in the perception of the author of *Par. En.*, the kings and mighty ones belong to the governing class. The kings, although they bear a title which would seem to elevate them to the ruler class, are nonetheless spoken of with the same attributes as the governing class. The author conceives of the kings as temporary. They can be demoted. This suggests that the author saw them as those client kings who were set up or supported by the Romans to maximize the proceeds from Palestine to Rome. That they are depicted as bowing down to the heavenly judge also places them in the governing class in Palestine, for that governing class in Palestine also owed allegiance to a higher ruler, the emperor, clients of the supreme, earthly ruler. In other

words, they are members of the ruling aristocracy, and in the end, and most importantly in the author's view, they will recognize their subservience to the divine ruler.<sup>98</sup>

Now the righteous and the elect must be investigated. Three terms are used to designate this group in various combinations. The three terms are "righteous," "elect," and "holy." The most basic combination seems to be "righteous and elect," another combination is "holy, righteous and elect," and a third combination is "righteous and holy." The three combinations occur in all three parables. The three terms are also used individually in all three parables. Another combination, "holy and elect," is used once in the second parable (*I Enoch* 50:1). The variety in terminology, nevertheless, designates a single group, and no distinctions are drawn between the various designations.

Several interesting features emerge from examining this group. The term "elect" seems to be the least specific. It can refer to those who are chosen or who follow a particular leader. Further it is used of both the elect of the Son of Man, and of the followers of the kings and mighty ones who are to be punished (*I Enoch* 56:1–4). The elect and beloved of the kings and mighty ones shall be punished and cast into the underground chambers along with their kings.

The possessive pronoun "my" is used of the righteous and elect in the second parable. These words are put into the mouth of God, and so the possessive is used. The land of "my elect" will be trampled on (*I Enoch* 56:6) and the city of "my righteous" shall be an obstacle (*I Enoch* 56:7) to the Parthians and Medes. The kings and strong ones shall be given over into the hands of "my elect ones" (*I Enoch* 48:9). Thus the "elect" are urban, and will be able to manage wealth when it is returned to them.

Further, light is said to shine on them. The light of the Lord of Spirits will shine on their faces (*I Enoch* 38:4) and they will be radiant, full of blessing and praise for the Name of the Lord of Spirits (*I Enoch* 39:7). The righteous shall be in the light of the sun for the former darkness shall pass away (*I Enoch* 58:3, 6), and the light of days shall remain on the holy and elect (*I Enoch* 50:1). The light seems to refer to their future blessedness in contrast to the bleakness of their present existence.

The righteous and elect are also said to depend on God. The Righteous One will appear before them, and their works depend on the Lord of Spirits (*I Enoch* 38:2, 40:5, 46:8). The Son of Man will be like a staff for them, on which they can depend,

<sup>98</sup> The designation, "kings and mighty ones," or "mighty kings," (*I Enoch* 38:5) may come from Ps 135:10 cf. Black, *I Enoch*, 196. There the psalmist rejoices that the Lord slew the mighty kings, מַלְכֵי־אֲמֹרִיטַיִם, Sihon, king of the Amorites, and Og, king of Bashan. In Pss. 136:17–20, the psalmist is thankful that great and famous kings (again Sihon and Og are named) have been smitten and slain. Further, the psalmist is thankful that the Lord handed over their lands and heritage to Israel (Pss. 135:12, 136:21–22). This double theme, the destruction of kings and the handing over of their possessions to others, matches the ideas of the author of *Par. En.* in regard to the kings and mighty ones. A further similarity is that both Psalms 135 and 136 and the author of *Par. En.* speak of kings in the plural. In both cases the kings are merely temporary, and will be replaced. They are not the supreme, earthly rulers, for they can be deposed by God. It seems likely, then, that one of the sources of ideas for the author of *Par. En.* for the kings of whom he speaks is the words about kings in Psalms 135 and 136.

and be held secure so as not to fall (*1 Enoch* 48:4). At the judgment, the angels will measure the righteous with cords, so that they may support themselves on God (*1 Enoch* 61:3). Even the righteous who are dead will return and stay themselves on the day of the Elect One (*1 Enoch* 61:5). These righteous will be dependent on God for their continued status.

Significantly, there will also be a reversal of status for them. At the current time they are oppressed (*1 Enoch* 53:7, 62:11), but in the future they will have rest and peace (*1 Enoch* 58:4) and vengeance will be executed on their behalf. They will be vindicated, and will be given the status of those who now possess the earth. The elect shall stand before the heavenly judge, vindicated and honored to do so, while the kings and mighty will fall down as supplicants (*1 Enoch* 62:8–9). They will exult over the kings (*1 Enoch* 62:12) and the kings and strong ones shall be given over into their hands (*1 Enoch* 48:9). The mighty kings shall be destroyed, and given over into the hands of the righteous and holy (*1 Enoch* 38:5). While the kings and mighty ones are banished from earth to the place of their punishment, the elect ones will be given a place of privilege and honor in a transformed earth (*1 Enoch* 45:5). Thus they will enjoy a reversal of status.

It will be the privilege of the righteous and elect to have the Son of Man revealed to them. The Son of Man is hidden before all ages (*1 Enoch* 48:6), but is the future judge, and is revealed to his elect (*1 Enoch* 48:7, 62:7). This is a privilege not accorded to the kings and mighty ones (*1 Enoch* 62:3). Another privilege of the righteous and elect is that the secrets of the heavens will be available to them. Enoch saw all the storehouses of the winds and lightning and thunder and rain during his tour of heaven. By writing it down, Enoch made it available to them (*1 Enoch* 40–44).

The righteous and elect will also have a special dwelling place. Their dwelling place is actually located in three different realms. One is in heaven, where they will join the angels in offering their petitions (*1 Enoch* 39:4–5, 45:6). They are even said to dwell beneath the wings of the Lord of Spirits (*1 Enoch* 39:7). A second dwelling place is the transformed and renewed earth (*1 Enoch* 51:5). It will be renewed, with all the forces of oppression removed. The third dwelling place for the righteous and elect is said to be the Garden (*1 Enoch* 60:8, 23, 61:12), where many meteorological secrets are revealed. The idyllic existence is something greatly anticipated.

The social location of the righteous and elect now can be narrowed by looking at the characteristics attributed to them. One revealing detail is that some of them are dead, and shall be raised up to have their righteousness acknowledged (*1 Enoch* 61:5). This is a fascinating detail, for three places of death are mentioned. Some have been destroyed by the desert, *wa-ʿella tahagʷlu ʿem-badw*. Biblical parallels may be instructive. One may recall the words in Dan. 12:2 about many who sleep in the dust of the earth and who shall awake, some to everlasting life, and others to shame and everlasting contempt. In Dan. 12:2, the idea of the desert is not explicit, but the idea of being raised to everlasting life is also present in *1 Enoch* 61:5. People are spoken of as perishing in the wilderness in Num 14:29 as a result of their lack of trust in God's guidance during the wilderness wanderings. But they perish as punishment for their

wickedness. That particular nuance is not contained in *I Enoch* 61:5. The idea of the righteous being raised to eternal life from their deaths in the desert then does not have a precise parallel in Biblical literature.

Others have been devoured by fish in the sea, *wa-ella tabal'u 'em'āšāta bahr*. The only biblical reference to a person being devoured by a fish is Jonah. He is thrown into the sea to stop the storm and is swallowed by the fish (Jon. 1:17). Then he is spit up after three days (Jon. 2:10). Jonah, however, is not portrayed as having died. The story depends on Jonah's being alive in the belly of the fish. In *I Enoch* 61:5, the sense is that those who have died in the sea will be raised. So, there may be some similarity between this verse in *I Enoch* and Jonah, but the parallel is not very precise.

Still others have been devoured by wild beasts, *wa'em'arāwit*. One parallel to this might be the report by Joseph's brothers to their father that Joseph had perished as the prey of wild beasts (Gen. 37:20). Another parallel idea may be the reference in the "Animal Apocalypse" (*I Enoch* 89:68–69) to the sheep who are destroyed by wild animals because of the incompetence of the shepherds. Here the seer laments the death of the sheep, or the people of Israel, and this may be fairly close to the idea expressed here in *Par. En*. However, the mention of the sheep does not include the idea of resurrection. Isaiah and Jeremiah often consign people to be consumed by wild beasts (e.g. Isa. 18:6, Jer 15:3, 16:4, 19:7). However, these deaths are predicted as judgments against them, and birds of prey are part of the horrific death. Here in *I Enoch* the birds of prey are not considered to have been part of the death of the righteous, nor is death suffered as judgment. Death in this scene is either because of the dangers of travel, or because of oppression by the kings and the mighty during travel.<sup>99</sup>

These three types of death, while they seem to reflect allusions to literary sources, do not in fact have precise parallels in Biblical literature. Rather, the reference to these three types of death would seem to indicate that some members of this group were travelers. They have lost their lives in their dangerous travels, in the desert, on the sea, or in the wilderness. Possibly these travelers were merchants, and yet no merchant class activities, such as buying or selling or transporting goods are mentioned in this connection. If they are not merchants, then perhaps they are people with means enough to be able to travel, possibly from the governing class or their retainers. If the reference to loss of life in the desert, on the sea, or by wild beasts is reflective of the real life, then the righteous and elect seem to have been a part of the upper echelon. Another reason for travel may have been that they were exiled,<sup>100</sup> and perhaps met their fate on the way. If they were exiles because of their opposition to the current regime, they would have been a kind of "shadow government," members of the governing class, or their retainers, such as scribes, clerks, or other administrative officials.

<sup>99</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 232.

<sup>100</sup> Suggested to me by Prof. J. Neyrey.

This social location is also affirmed by the depiction of their joyously and gladly joining in the worship of God by the angels. They know how to be supplicants. They know how to worship and honor and praise patrons. And they know how to look with disdain on future supplicants, the erstwhile kings and mighty ones. Thus, they appear to be rivals to those currently in power.

Further, they will be clothed in never-fading garments of glory, which will never grow old (*1 Enoch* 62:15–16). Like the kings now, they will be splendidly garbed then.

Again, it is significant that they are promised a dwelling place on a transformed earth (*1 Enoch* 45:5, 51:5). Not only is heaven to be transformed, but earth also will be renewed. The righteous and elect look forward to life before God in heaven, but they are also promised a dwelling place on the blessed, transformed, renewed earth. They will be joyful, and move about freely upon it (*1 Enoch* 51:5). But sinners and evildoers<sup>101</sup> shall be prohibited from setting foot there (*1 Enoch* 45:5–6). This may indicate a reversal of their present status. Possibly the righteous and elect now suffer from having had their lands confiscated. They may be a part of a group of normally wealthy inhabitants of the environs of the ancient city, as David A. Fiensy has described.<sup>102</sup> Fiensy argues that this group of landed aristocracy were Jewish and that they owned modest homes. These homes, however, were lavishly decorated with fine pottery, frescoes and mosaics. Further, they owned lands and probably slaves to work the lands. Some of their land was nearby, but for some of their land they were absentee landlords. This was precisely the group that could have their lands and homes confiscated on the accession of a new ruler. They could fall victim to downward mobility,<sup>103</sup> until a new ruler established himself and their fortunes were reversed. If that background is a part of the social situation of the righteous and elect, then the promise of dwelling on a transformed, renewed earth without being hindered by sinners and evildoers would be very meaningful. This group then possibly looked forward to having their status reversed and their lands returned, together with its power and prestige.

Finally, they have great interest in the meteorological secrets. Enoch was shown those secrets in the dwelling place of the righteous in the Garden (*1 Enoch* 60:7–25). It was religious leaders who had such sapiential interests.

The picture emerging from these details is a picture of ousted members of the governing class. The righteous and elect have all the skills and interests of the governing class. They are looking forward to that great day when the covenant is enacted, when the sinners are condemned (*1 Enoch* 60:6) and they are restored to their rightful status. Currently, they are victims of downward mobility, but they

<sup>101</sup> “Sinners” and “evildoers” seem to be pejorative, judgmental synonyms for the kings and mighty ones.

<sup>102</sup> David A. Fiensy, *The Social History of Palestine in the Herodian Period: The Land is Mine* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity, Vol. 20; Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1991) 49–55.

<sup>103</sup> Lenski, “Agrarian Societies,” 289.

are looking ahead to vindication and restoration. Not only are they members of the secular governing class, but they are also religious leaders, ready and anxious to establish the lordship of God in opposition to the current kings and mighty ones.

### *2.4.3 Conclusions Regarding Social Setting*

These two approaches to investigating the social setting of *Par. En.* have produced complementary results.

The examination of the social location of the implied author, revealed that the author is familiar with the environs of Jerusalem and the Dead Sea. His thorough grasp of Scripture, his interest in sapiential matters and his scribal skills place him at least in the retainer class or amongst the class of religious leaders, as does his familiarity with the political, legal, and military arenas of the social system.

The social location of the implied author is consistent with the social location of the main characters as described by the author. The kings and mighty ones are the ruling elite, knowing how to pay homage to superiors, and how to oppress others. But the righteous and elect are of the very same class, with the same skills and interest. Because they are not in power at present, they look forward to a reversal of status, if not in this life, then in the life to come. The work, then, protests against the current state of affairs, and it encourages the righteous and elect as they await their transformation.



## 3

# THE SON OF MAN IN THE *PARABLES OF ENOCH*

### 3.1 Religio-Historical Background

Daniel 7 is the only place in existing literature chronologically prior to the *Par. En.* in which a figure called the Son of Man appears. In Daniel 7 two divine figures appear, the Ancient of Days, and the one like a son of man, כִּבְרֵ אֱנוֹשׁ, who arrives on the clouds and is presented to the Ancient of Days. In *1 Enoch* 46 the Head of Days accompanied by the one with a human appearance is observed by the seer, who asks his interpreting angel who that Son of Man is, where he came from and why he accompanies the Head of Days. These are questions that occupy much of the rest of the *Par. En.* and entertain the modern scholar as well. Before investigating in depth the figure of the Son of Man in *Par. En.*, a comment must be made concerning the origins of this figure in Daniel 7.

Ever since Gunkel in 1895, scholars have sought an adequate explanation for the origin and development of the extra-biblical ideas found in Daniel 7 in relation to the figure of the Son of Man. The quest has been centered on the beasts arising out of the sea and the Son of Man accompanied by clouds. As John J. Collins says, the imagery “alludes to a fuller narrative whose prototype must be sought outside the Hebrew Bible.”<sup>1</sup> Five areas have been mined for possible sources for these motifs.

<sup>1</sup> John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993) 280. In reaction to Arthur J. Ferch, *The Son of Man in Daniel Seven* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983) Collins helpfully discusses the preliminary issues (pp. 281–82). a) The search for parallels is not meant to posit that the figures in the Jewish texts *are* identical with those figures adduced from extra-biblical texts, but simply to elucidate the background and milieu from which particular characteristics may have been borrowed. b) The parallels do not have to correspond completely, but just enough to make the allusion clear. An example is Mark 13:26, where the Son of Man is spoken of as coming on the clouds: the verse does not incorporate all the details of Dan. 7:13, but only enough to make the allusion clear. c) The prototypes suggested need not be immediate, but may have been mediated, for such suggestions are considered provisional until more precise parallels are found. This is especially true for Daniel 7 and the proposed Canaanite background as there are 1000 years between the Canaanite mythological texts and the visions of Daniel. d) The use of the background material need not be congenial at all with the purposes of the author, but may have been taken over in order to assert the supremacy of

One possible area of influence has been thought to be Iranian literature, from which the figure of Gayomart emerges as a possible source for the idea of the Son of Man.<sup>2</sup> Gayomart, a primordial human being, was slain, descended to the underworld, and was to be raised at the end of time. Some think he was to be reincarnated as the savior, Shaoshyant. But this is unhelpful for illuminating Daniel 7, for the Son of Man is not a primordial figure, nor is he slain, nor does he descend to the underworld.<sup>3</sup> Confusing the issue, the figure of Gayomart was a composite construct based on scattered references in the *Gathas* and in the *Bundahishn*, which is a great compendium of Zoroastrian theology that includes some ancient material but some that is later than the first century CE.<sup>4</sup> Further, as Collins points out, the figure of the Son of Man in the Jewish context, who is supposed to be prefigured in the Gayomart/Shaoshyant figure, is a composite conglomerate of separate and distinct figures from Daniel, 4 Ezra, and *Par. En.*, and it is highly unlikely “that the composite portrait (had) any historical validity.”<sup>5</sup> Added to all of this is the realization that the concept sheds no light on the motifs of the beasts rising out of the sea and the figure riding on the clouds, which are contained in Daniel 7. Thus this feature of Iranian literature is not helpful in elucidating the motifs in Daniel 7.

Hugo Gressmann (1929) sought to draw out similarities between the Sun god of Egypt and the Ancient of Days of Daniel 7, but the similarities are too insubstantial.<sup>6</sup>

Babylonian literature has been investigated for similarities with the Daniel 7 material. Gunkel sought connections in the *Enuma Eliš* epic, but this has not stood the test of time.<sup>7</sup> More recently, Kvanvig (1988) in *Roots of Apocalyptic* has proposed the Babylonian document, “Vision of the Netherworld” as a possibility, for in it there are hybrid animals, the god Nergal on a throne and a judgment scene.<sup>8</sup> However, the patterns of relationship in the “Vision of the Netherworld” are too different from those of Daniel 7: the hybrid animals number 15, not four; the judgment is of the

Israel’s God. For example, Daniel is cast as a Babylonian wise man in the first chapters of Daniel, but not in order to agree with Babylonian wisdom, but rather to claim that Daniel and Daniel’s God are superior to Babylon’s wise men and gods. These preliminary issues put the quest for the origin and development of Danielic ideas in their proper perspective.

<sup>2</sup> Collins, *Daniel*, 282–83; Ferch, *Son of Man*, 49–54; Carstens Colpe, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, in Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, eds., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. VIII (trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972) 408. See also Boccaccini, *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 155–259, for essays on the Son of Man from the 2005 Enoch Seminar in Camaldoli, Italy.

<sup>3</sup> Ferch, *Son of Man*, 49–54.

<sup>4</sup> Collins, *Daniel*, 282–83.

<sup>5</sup> Collins, *Daniel*, 283.

<sup>6</sup> Ferch, *Son of Man*, 48–49. Collins, *Daniel*, 283, rightly dismisses the possible Egyptian connection in a single sentence. Colpe, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, 409, also considers the Egyptian connection untenable.

<sup>7</sup> Ferch, *Son of Man*, 44–47. See also Colpe, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, 409.

<sup>8</sup> Collins, *Daniel*, 284–86; Helge S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; 1988), 389–441.

visionary, not the fourth beast as in Daniel 7; and the kingdom is not given to Nergal, as it is to the Son of Man, for it is already his; and finally the setting for the “Vision” is hell, not Heaven.<sup>9</sup> These patterns of relationship are too disparate to be of help in elucidating the motifs in Daniel 7.

Ferch investigates the possibility that the source material for the ideas surrounding the Son of Man is to be found in the Biblical parallels.<sup>10</sup> While the concept of the Davidic Messiah and the concept of the Son of Man share some traits, such as dominion, being served by the people, and an everlasting kingdom, Ferch points out that the differences are too great. Similarly, instances of the Son of Man (כִּבְרִיּוֹן) in Job 25:4–6, Ps 8:4, and Job 15:18 are too dissimilar to be helpful in understanding the concept in Daniel 7. Then Ferch examines the structure and unity of Daniel 7, and concludes that it has a complex chiasmic structure and is internally coherent (thus arguing against those who posit an independent source for Dan. 7:9–10 and 13–14), and that it is essentially the creation of its author.<sup>11</sup> While this may be true, it does not explain the source and reason for the inclusion of the ideas of the beasts arising out of the sea, and of the image of the Son of Man arriving with the clouds. Further, the complex chiasmic structure does not preclude the possibility of the author of Daniel 7 borrowing ideas and concepts from traditional materials. Thus Ferch’s hypothesis does not advance the inquiry into the background and origin of the concept of the Son of Man.

Colpe argues against four figures in Judaism as sources for the Son of Man concept.<sup>12</sup> 1) Rabbinic Judaism entertains the concept of a glorified Adam as the initiator of a new eon, but does not view that glorified Adam as a redeemer. 2) Later views of *Adam Qadmōnī* envision a gigantic Adam encompassing the whole earth, but again the soteriological aspect is missing. 3) The heavenly man of Philonic Judaism has a cosmic dimension, but lacks the individuality of the Son of Man. 4) Nor does the Son of Man appear to be a manifestation of σοφία. Thus, Colpe argues, Judaism is not a likely source for the Son of Man concept.

The best candidate for an adequate background for the motifs of Daniel 7 (until texts closer to the time of the composition of Daniel 7 are discovered) is the Baal cycle of Canaanite mythology.<sup>13</sup> Most pertinent are the similar patterns of thought. Baal is often and clearly associated with the clouds, as is the Son of Man. El in Canaanite mythology is called *ʾabu šnm*, or “father of years,”<sup>14</sup> which is quite similar in conception to Daniel’s “Ancient of Days.” Further, there is opposition between the sea,

<sup>9</sup> Collins, *Daniel*, 286.

<sup>10</sup> Ferch, *Son of Man*, 78–82.

<sup>11</sup> Ferch, *Son of Man*, 108–85.

<sup>12</sup> Colpe, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, 410–412; he also rejects Gnosticism and its precursors as a suitable antecedent to the Son of Man concept, 412–15.

<sup>13</sup> Collins, *Daniel*, 286–91. See also Colpe, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, 415–19; Nickelsburg, “Son of Man,” 137–38; and Norman Perrin, “Son of Man” in *IDBSup* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976) 883.

<sup>14</sup> Collins acknowledges other possibilities for translating the title, such as the “father of the exalted ones,” or the “father of mortals,” or the “father of Shunem (supposedly one of the gods),” but holds that none is as likely as “father of years.”

which is the source for the chaos and conflict, and the rider of the clouds. In Canaanite mythology the challenge to Baal comes from the sea, while in Daniel 7 the four beasts, to whom the Son of Man is opposed, arise out of the sea. In both texts, everlasting dominion is bestowed, but both figures remain subordinate to the high God.<sup>15</sup> While the multiple gods of the Canaanite myth do not appear in Daniel 7, and while there is no concern for house-building in Daniel 7 as there is in the Canaanite myth, and while there is no idea of the Son of Man dying and reviving as Baal does in the yearly cycle,<sup>16</sup> nonetheless the patterns of relationship are complete enough to conclude that this is the most adequate background for the ideas contained in Daniel 7.

The author of Daniel 7, while being creative and reinterpreting the mythic elements, seems to have drawn on the Canaanite mythology for ideas not otherwise attested in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>17</sup> In turn, the author of *Par. En.* has been creative in reinterpreting the Danielic vision. The portrayal of the Son of Man in *Par. En.* is now to be examined.

### 3.2 Exegesis of 1 Enoch 46:1–5

*1 Enoch* 46:1–5 is situated very near the beginning of the Second Parable, and contains the first description of the Son of Man in *Par. En.* The Second Parable of *Par. En.* is introduced by a brief chapter (45), which presents an overview of the subject-matter of the Second Parable.<sup>18</sup> This Second Parable, according to *1 Enoch* 45, describes the fate of sinners (45:2), the vision of the Elect One sitting on the throne of glory (45:3), and the eventual satisfaction of the righteous ones (45:4–6). In *1 Enoch* 46:1–5, then, the vision itself begins with a description of two heavenly figures.

#### 3.2.1 1 En. 46:1<sup>19</sup>

*ʾWa-baheyya reʾiku za-lotu reʾsa mawāʿel wa-reʾsu kama ḏamr ṣaʿādā wa-meslēhu kāleʾ ʿza-gaṣṣu kama reʾyata sabʾ wa-meluʾ ʿṣagā gaṣṣu kama ʾaḥadu em-malāʾekt qeddusān.*

And there I saw one who had a head of days, and his head was white like wool, and with him was another, whose face had the appearance of a man, and his face was full of grace like one of the holy angels.

<sup>15</sup> Here Collins disagrees with Colpe, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, who sees a rivalry between El and Baal that only is resolved with the transfer of dominion from El to Baal.

<sup>16</sup> Ferch, *Son of Man*, 65–77, points out these differences.

<sup>17</sup> Collins, *Daniel*, 294.

<sup>18</sup> Morna D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the background of the term “Son of Man” and its use in St Mark’s Gospel* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967), 38. Hooker notices that each of the three parables is introduced by an introductory chapter or prologue.

<sup>19</sup> Text and Translation are taken from Michael A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*. See also Casey’s Aramaic reconstruction of this passage in *Solution*, 91–111.

## Variants

<sup>1</sup>*Wa-baheyya*/and there: BM 485, BM 491, the uncorrected text of Abb 35, Abb 55 and Tana 9 all omit *wa-*, a conjunction which helps the narrative flow more smoothly.

<sup>2</sup>*za-gaṣṣu kama re'yata sab'*/whose face had the appearance of a man: Berl has *kama gaṣṣa sab' gaṣṣu*/like the face of a human was his face. Charles characterizes Berl, or *q* in his enumeration of manuscripts, as “teeming” with errors, and yet it “contains a larger number of unique original readings than any other used in [his] text.”<sup>20</sup> Neither Knibb nor Charles follows Berl at this point and in terms of content both versions say the same thing. Instead of *za-gaṣṣu*, Abb 35 simply has *gaṣṣu*, omitting the relative pronoun. Perhaps Abb 35 read *wa-meslēhu kāle'* as the end of a sentence, in which case the relative pronoun was not needed grammatically. Charles notes that Abb 35 is highly corrected, and hardly ever stands alone as preserving the original text.<sup>21</sup> Again content is not significantly altered by this variant.

<sup>3</sup>*ṣagā*/grace: BM 491 has *ṣegā*, merely a difference in orthography.

## Notes

46:1 *Baheyya*/there:

This scene unfolds in heaven, to which the seer has been transported in his vision. Not only does he claim that he was transported to the ends of heaven by a storm-wind which snatched him up out of earth (*I Enoch* 39:3), but also the Parables are presented as an expansion and reiteration of Enoch's ascent and journeys in the *Book of the Watchers*, chapters 14–36. Further the presence of the interpreting angel and the Chief of Days affirms the heavenly setting.

46:1 *Re'sa mawā'el*/head of days:

This name for God, *re'sa mawā'el*, “Head of Days,” occurs only in the Second Parable and in the concluding chapter and it apparently depends on the *nomen dei* in Dan. 7:9, עֵתִיק יְיָ, Ancient of Days. It is less frequent than the more regular “Lord of Spirits.” Its appearance in the visions seems to be generated by ideas which are inspired by Daniel 7.<sup>22</sup> The *nomen dei* is unique to *Par. En.*<sup>23</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch*, xxiii.

<sup>21</sup> Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch*, xxiii–xxiv.

<sup>22</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 193; VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 187, considers that the same is true for the four designations of the “Son of Man” figure, that they are conditioned by the Biblical passages that are in the background.

<sup>23</sup> Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 16, notes that “Head of Days (*re'sa mawā'el*)” as a name for God is found only in *Par. En.* just as “Ancient of Days” is found only in Daniel 7. Abraham Even-Shoshan, ed., *A New Concordance of the Old Testament* (Jerusalem: “Kiryat Sepher” Publishing House Ltd., 1983), reveals no instances of ראש הימים in the Hebrew Bible.

*Re'sa*/head has the bivalent meanings both of the “supreme one” or “sum total,” and of the physical head of a person.<sup>24</sup> R. H. Charles understands it in the sense of “sum total,” and so translates “sum of days,” which he sees as equivalent to “the Everlasting.”<sup>25</sup> This he views as parallel to “the Ancient of Days” in Dan. 7:9. Further, he considers that the phrase is used most appropriately in connection with the Son of Man, for the two figures are seen as correlative, since in *I Enoch* 46:2 the seer wonders why the Son of Man *went with* the head of days. Lars Hartman thinks that this first portion of the description is a quotation of Dan. 7:9, with the terms “clearly borrowed from Daniel’s vision of God and the Son of Man.”<sup>26</sup> Hartman fails to comment, however, on the difference between Daniel’s “Ancient of Days” and Enoch’s “Head of Days.” Norman Porteous concurs that the Ethiopic phrase was “modelled” on Dan. 7:9, and meant “the Eternal,”<sup>27</sup> as does John Collins.<sup>28</sup>

While it is generally agreed that the Ethiopic expression corresponds to Daniel’s, it is by no means clear how עֲתִיָּקִי יְמִיָּן, “Ancient of Days” became *re'sa mawā'el*, “Head of Days.” This *nomen dei* occurs in *Par. En.* nine times, and each time, in differing syntactical contexts, the term is the same.<sup>29</sup> Two Ethiopic manuscripts do preserve the name of God altered to conform to the Danielic form at *I Enoch* 46:2 (in Ryl 23) and 47:3 (in Ull), but, as Matthew Black points out, that simply means scribes of these manuscripts correctly recognized the connection with Daniel 7, not that an original reading has been preserved.<sup>30</sup> The task of investigating this change in terminology is hampered by two significant obstacles. One is that no Hebrew/Aramaic or Greek version of *Par. En.* exists at the present time, and so there is no earlier textual control to help in determining when or how the change might have taken place. The second is that the text of *I Enoch* was not fixed in antiquity, either

<sup>24</sup> Dillmann, *Lexicon*, 294–95, includes *caput, summum, supremum, princeps*.

<sup>25</sup> Charles, *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch*, 85.

<sup>26</sup> Lars Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted, Coniectanea Biblica* (Upsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1966), 119. Hartman helpfully discriminates the relative importance of the various parallel passages, by setting out the passage in one column, and then dividing Biblical references for the passage, or phrases within it, into five further columns. Italics in the passage and a Biblical reference in the first column indicate a quotation. The 2nd col. of passages indicates influence of the Biblical passage on the Enochic passage; the 3rd, that the motif is present in both; the 4th, that the motif in *I Enoch* resembles the Biblical passage; and the 5th, that the Enochic passage contains examples of phraseology similar to those in the Biblical passage. Hartman italicizes the phrase, “head of days,” and lists Dan. 7:9 in the first column of passages.

<sup>27</sup> Norman Porteous, *Daniel* (2nd, rev. ed.; London: SCM Press, 1979), 107.

<sup>28</sup> Collins, *Daniel*, 302.

<sup>29</sup> *I Enoch* 46:2, 47:3, 48:2, 55:1, 60:2, 71:10, 12, 13, 14. The term which is more frequent throughout the whole of *Par. En.*, “Lord of Spirits,” also occurs in close proximity to “Head of Days” in these chapters.

<sup>30</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 192.

in the Aramaic stage,<sup>31</sup> or the Greek stage,<sup>32</sup> and so subtle changes or theologically motivated alterations could have been introduced at any time. Nevertheless, several admittedly speculative possibilities present themselves as to how the change in terminology might have happened.

Charles sees simply a semantic similarity between Daniel's עֵתֵיקִיּוֹמִין, "Ancient of Days" and *re'sa mawā'el*, "Head of Days" found in *Par. En.*<sup>33</sup> The former means the Everlasting, and similarly *re'sa mawā'el*, "sum of days," or "Everlasting." The Ethiopic form for Charles is simply the semantic and functional equivalent of the Semitic concept.

Black investigates the difference between these two terms for God in *Par. En.* and Daniel, and notes two possibilities.<sup>34</sup> One explanation might be that in a Greek version ἀρχαῖος ἡμερῶν was changed to ἀρχὴ τῶν ἡμερῶν under the influence of passages such as Isa. 41:4, Rev 21:6, 22:13. Ἀρχὴ τῶν ἡμερῶν then would simply have been translated into *re'sa mawā'el*, "Head of Days," with "head" having the significance of "beginning, source." According to this possibility, the significant change came as a scribal error during the inner-Greek transmission of the text.

Black, however, prefers a second explanation, which he admits is improbable at first glance, for it depends upon a "scribal blunder." If the Greek which was being translated into Ethiopic was ὁ παλαιὸς τῶν ἡμερῶν, the scribe may have misread—or misheard—κεφάλαιον τῶν ἡμερῶν. This, then, would have been translated *re'sa mawā'el*, "Head of Days." Interestingly, there is support for this proposal in the Septuagintal version of Dan. 7:9. The clause, עֵתֵיקִיּוֹמִין יָבֵט appears as καὶ παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν ἐκάθητο. This form would fit Black's proposal perfectly, for the καὶ παλαιός could conceivably be misread or misheard as κεφάλαιος.<sup>35</sup> In this case the error would have taken place either as a case of inner-Greek corruption, or during translation into the Ethiopic language.

A fourth possibility is that the change occurred via Syriac. The translation of the Bible into Ethiopic is thought to have taken place between the fourth and sixth centuries CE with the help of Syriac-speaking monks.<sup>36</sup> In Syriac, the term עֵתֵיקִיּוֹמִין

<sup>31</sup> J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrān Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 288–89, shows that there were significant variations between manuscripts in the astronomical book.

<sup>32</sup> James C. VanderKam, "The Textual Base for the Ethiopic Translation of 1 Enoch" in *Working with No Data: Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin* (David M. Golomb ed.; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 251. He points out that significant variations exist between the different available Greek versions of the Book of the Watchers. It seems likely that Greek was an intermediary language for the transmission of the work into Ethiopic. Scholarly opinion for the most part has accepted the hypothesis that the Ethiopic version is a tertiary translation of the original. Since no Greek *Vorlage* exists, or an Aramaic *Urschrift* for *Par. En.* it is impossible to claim certainty about the base language for the Ethiopic version of *Par. En.* Knibb, "The Date of the Parables of Enoch," 351, argues the opposite case for *Par. En.*, that it can be traced back to a Semitic *Vorlage*.

<sup>33</sup> Charles, *1 Enoch*, 85.

<sup>34</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 192–93.

<sup>35</sup> No textual evidence in the LXX exists for this proposal.

<sup>36</sup> VanderKam, "The Textual Base for the Ethiopic Translation of 1 Enoch," 251; E. Ullendorff,

is translated 'tyq ywmt'. The monks presumably were aware of the Aramaic and Greek sense of the term, but in an exegetical-interpretive move they emphasized the idea of supremacy and so facilitated the translation to *re'sa mawā'el*.

At some later time in the transmission history of the Biblical material (*Par. En.* was considered Scripture in the Abyssinian church) the change could have been implemented. A revision standardizing the translation could have been done, without regard for what appeared in the *Vorlage*.<sup>37</sup>

Three of these possibilities depend on some sort of scribal error or alteration in transmission. The two possibilities Black discusses depend either on inner-Greek corruption or on a translation error. Unfortunately, none of *Par. En.* has survived in Greek, with the result that there is no textual evidence for the possibilities Black proposes. Nor is there any textual evidence in the Septuagint at Dan. 7:9 for the kind of confusion Black suggests, that καὶ παλαιός could have been misread or misheard as κεφάλαιος. So, because of the absence of textual evidence, Black's hypothesis remains speculative.

Further, according to Black's view, the "scribal blunder" would have had to extend to the other occurrences of the *nomen dei*. For the "blunder" to be carried through, the combination καὶ παλαιός would have to appear in the base text each time the name for God is used, otherwise the translator would recognize the error and make appropriate corrections. The Name of God, *re'sa mawā'el*, "Head of Days," however, appears consistently, in various kinds of syntactic contexts.<sup>38</sup> Thus the "scribal blunder" could have worked only the first time (*I Enoch* 46:2), where the conjunction "and" (-ו, καί, *wa-*), appears. In the other instances, the error would have come to light and been corrected, unless a later scribe for reasons of consistency carried the "blunder" through. In this case, other semantic considerations are present (see below). Black's hypothesis of a "scribal blunder," however, appears to be untenable.

The consistency with which the name of God appears, then, suggests that the change in terminology did not take place at the level of "scribal blunder." An error or a translation mistake would have been caught at subsequent occurrences of the term and corrected consistently. The consistency of the *nomen dei* does suggest that the change in terminology was a deliberate choice either on the part of the author or on the part of the translator or on the part of a later revisor. If it was the author, קַעַר and אַעַר overlapped significantly in meaning, as Charles suggested (the first possibility noted above). If it was a translator, the change could have taken place either at the Aramaic to Greek stage, or at the Greek to Ethiopic stage. קַעַר/παλαιός/ἀρχαίος and *re'sa* share a sufficient area in their ranges of meaning to warrant

*Ethiopia and the Bible* (The Schweich Lectures, 1967; London: Oxford for the British Academy, 1968), 36–62; Ullendorf cites A. Rahlfs, "Die äthiopische Bibelübersetzung" in *Septuaginta-Studien* I–II (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), 659–81.

<sup>37</sup> Suggested to me in private conversation by Eugene Ulrich.

<sup>38</sup> *I Enoch* 46:2, 47:3, 48:2, 55:1, 60:2, 71:10, 12, 13, 14.



translating קַדְמִיָּה/παλαίος/ἀρχαίος as *re'sa*. The shared area of meaning would be “sum total” in Aramaic,<sup>39</sup> “eminent” in Hebrew,<sup>40</sup> “time-honored, venerable” or “from the beginning” in Greek,<sup>41</sup> and “sum, supreme, chief” in Ethiopic.<sup>42</sup> If, on the other hand, it was a revisor after the translation was made, and the goal was to standardize unevenness in that translation, the revisor could have been influenced by a passage like Isa. 41:4, where in a context of judgment, God claims to be the first and the last אֲנִי יְהוָה רִאשׁוֹן וְאַחֵר אֲנִי הוּא. The God who speaks in Isa. 41:4 is the God who is named in Daniel 7, and so the name could have been brought into conformity with the words of God in Isaiah. The presumably Christian revisor would also have been aware of God’s words in Rev. 21:6 and 22:13, where God says I am the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος. Again, in an apocalyptic work that draws heavily on Daniel 7, as *Par. En.* did, terminology is used of God that draws on the idea of beginning rather than antiquity (though both ideas are closely related). This could have been further affirmation for a revisor to make the name of God in *Par. En.* consistent. In all likelihood, for such a hypothetical revisor and even for a translator, *re'sa mawā'el*, “Head of Days” would have been a legitimate, faithful rendition of the name of God and would not have been considered a deliberate alteration or change in God’s name. Because of the consistency with which the term is used, the transformation from עֵתִיק יוֹמִין, “Ancient of Days” to *re'sa mawā'el*, “Head of Days” seems to have been deliberate, rather than in error. Thus, in the absence of textual evidence for Black’s proposal, Charles’ suggestion of semantic and functional equivalence is most satisfying as to how the עֵתִיק יוֹמִין, “Ancient of Days” in Dan 7:9 became the *re'sa mawā'el*, “Head of Days” in *1 Enoch* 46:1, with the possibility that a later revisor further standardized the *nomen dei*.

46:1 *Wa-re'su kama ḡamr ṣa'ādā*/his head was white like wool:

This description of God conflates two aspects of the description of God from Daniel 7. In Dan 7:9, the divine being is depicted as wearing garments that were white as snow (לְבוּשָׁה כְּתֵלַגְחוּר), while the hair of the head of God is like pure wool (רֵאשָׁה כְּעֵמֶר נֶקֶף). But those two separate similes in Daniel are coalesced into one in *Par. En.* For Jerome, the whiteness in appearance indicates fairness, uprightness, and maturity in judgment;<sup>43</sup> James A. Montgomery sees the white, hoary hair as “betokening (God’s) venerableness, while the white vesture indicates unsullied majesty.”<sup>44</sup> André Lacocque

<sup>39</sup> Francis Brown, S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), רֵאשׁ head, chief, sum, 1112.

<sup>40</sup> Brown, Driver and Briggs, *Lexicon*, עֵתִיק eminent, surpassing choice, 801.

<sup>41</sup> H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996) 251, 1290.

<sup>42</sup> Dillmann, *Lexicon*, includes *caput, summum, supremum, princeps*, 294–95.

<sup>43</sup> Gleason L. Archer Jr., tr., *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958), 78.

<sup>44</sup> James A. Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel* (ICC 19; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927), 298.

sees the whiteness of clothing in Dan. 7:9 as indicating God's innocence and purity, while the white hair implied by the similarity to wool indicates God's experience and thus God's trustworthiness.<sup>45</sup> Collins notes that white hair is not attributed to God in the Hebrew Bible, but that this passage in *Par. En.* about God's white hair is modelled on Daniel 7.<sup>46</sup> All of these qualities of fairness, uprightness, maturity in judgment, venerableness, unsullied majesty, purity, and trustworthiness, which are conveyed in Daniel's two comparisons that God wears garments that were white as snow, and that God's hair is like pure wool, are to be attributed also to God in *Par. En.* through this single metaphorical description that God has hair that is white like wool.<sup>47</sup>

46:1 *Wa-meslēhu kāle'*/and with him was another

*za- gaššu kama re'yata sab'*/whose face had the appearance of a man:

The mention of another heavenly being in the scene with God matches Dan. 7:13,<sup>48</sup> in which a human-like figure (כבֶּרֶשׁ אֱנוֹשׁ אֲהִיהֶ הַרוּחַ) approaches the Ancient of Days with the clouds of heaven (עַם עֲנַנֵי שָׁמַיִם), is presented before the Ancient of Days, and is given dominion, glory and kingship. But here in *Par. En.* there is merely a concise but clear allusion to the human-like figure.<sup>49</sup> The form *walda sab'*, "son of man" is not even used here in vs 1, but only later, in vs 2 is it employed for the first time. Because the allusion to Dan. 7:13 is so concise, and yet, as the rest of the passage makes clear, so precise, it would seem that the image from Dan. 7:13 was very familiar to author and readers alike.

According to Hartman, these words are a continuation of a quotation of Daniel 7. Hartman indicates this by putting the citation in his first column, and by italicizing the words.<sup>50</sup> If it is a quotation, it is an extremely truncated quotation, for missing from *1 Enoch* 46:1 are the mention of clouds, the approach and presentation to the divine figure, and the gift of dominion, glory and kingship. In *1 Enoch* 46:1 a second, noteworthy figure is simply mentioned as being in the scene along with the divine figure. Rather than a quotation, this seems to be an extremely economical, but absolutely clear allusion to Dan 7:13.

Theisohn, on the other hand, argues that *Par. En.* depends not on Daniel 7 but upon a *Vorlage*, upon which Daniel 7 also drew.<sup>51</sup> He points out that many similarities exist between Daniel 7 and *1 Enoch* 46, 47, but that significant differences also can be noted. Similarities include the presence of two figures, the terminology for "the

<sup>45</sup> André Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979), 142.

<sup>46</sup> Collins, *Daniel*, 302.

<sup>47</sup> In Rev 1:14, it is the Son of Man who is described as having head and hair that are white as white wool and white as snow.

<sup>48</sup> Perrin, "Son of Man," *IDBSup*, 833–34; Nickelsburg, "Son of Man," *ABD* VI.138–40.

<sup>49</sup> Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, chapter 2, notes that Dan 7:13 appears to be reflecting an enthronement ceremony for the one like a son of man, while *1 Enoch* 46 presumes the status of the Son of Man. Missing from *1 Enoch* 46 are the arrival of the Son of Man on the clouds, and his being given dominion, glory and kingship.

<sup>50</sup> Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 118.

<sup>51</sup> Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 14–23.

one like a son of man,” the description of the Ancient of Days/Head of Days, and the heavenly setting. Structurally the visions are also similar, beginning with the note that the seer saw a vision.<sup>52</sup> The judicial role of the Ancient of Days, the open books of judgment, a description of the throne, and the presence of the angelic host are common to Daniel 7 and *1 Enoch* 47.<sup>53</sup> However, Thiesohn notes significant differences.<sup>54</sup> *1 Enoch* 46 seems to be much shorter, and has the appearance of a summary,<sup>55</sup> omitting the details of the throne (which are introduced in *1 Enoch* 47), the obvious courtroom setting, the clouds and the motion of coming to the Head of Days. In *1 Enoch* 46 the Son of Man is already present with the Head of Days, rather than being presented. Further, *1 Enoch* 46 includes a comparison to the graciousness of the angels, which Daniel 7 does not. Thiesohn also detects a difference in the roles of the Son of Man in the two passages. The author of Daniel 7, he observes, has cast the Son of Man as “eschatological Lord,”<sup>56</sup> while in *1 Enoch* his role is judicial. He surmises that *1 Enoch* preserves the judicial role assigned to the Son of Man in the *Vorlage*, while Daniel 7 has reinterpreted the Son of Man by limiting the judicial role to the Ancient of Days.

These similarities and differences observed by Thiesohn, however, can be explained in a simpler way. Thiesohn himself describes the depiction of the scene in *1 Enoch* 46 as being like a summary. In a summary the major details are repeated, but not necessarily all of them. Here the two figures are noted with some details of description, but other details are omitted or developed. Second, the author may have concentrated on the part of Daniel’s vision at the point after which the presentation of the Son of Man has taken place. The two figures are already together, so the motion of coming is not necessary.<sup>57</sup> Third, what role does an “eschatological Lord” have but to participate in the judgment? The “Lord” in a courtroom is the judge. The Elect One, an alternative term for this figure, is clearly involved in judging (*1 Enoch* 45:3), and so reducing the role of the Son of Man to “eschatological Lord” is no reduction at all. Further, the comparison to the angels can be attributed to the creativity of this author, who, as we shall see below, filled out Daniel’s vision with characteristics from Isaiah and Jeremiah. Since angels regularly populate heavenly courtrooms, it is not a big step to envision angels in this scene. Finally, rather than positing a no-longer-existing source, which was used by both authors, it is better to view the evidence as indicating that *Par. En.* is a development of Daniel 7, given the differing purposes and historical situations of each author. The points of contact are numerous enough to give the real audience of *Par. En.* the necessary context, while at the same time encouraging them to recognize a new message in a new historical setting. Thus it seems to me

<sup>52</sup> Thiesohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 15–16.

<sup>53</sup> Thiesohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 20–21.

<sup>54</sup> Thiesohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 16–17.

<sup>55</sup> Thiesohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 16, “nimmt sich wie eine Zusammenfassung aus.”

<sup>56</sup> Thiesohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 30, “endzeitlichen Herrscher.”

<sup>57</sup> Nickelsburg, “Son of Man,” ABD VI.139, also notes that in *Par. En.* “no mention is made, as in Daniel, of the Son of Man coming with the clouds of heaven.”

that the author of *Par. En.* precisely and concisely alludes to Daniel 7, but is intent on conveying an updated apocalyptic message to his readership. Therefore it is not necessary to posit a different *Vorlage*, but simply to affirm the conciseness and precision of the author's allusion to Daniel 7.

The presence of two central heavenly beings is noteworthy and seems to originate ultimately in the Canaanite sources on which the Danielic and Enochic literature drew.<sup>58</sup> While the Ugaritic myths are not thoroughly reproduced, this variation from the monotheistic view of God seems to have its roots in the Canaanite pantheon. The conflict between El and Baal is nowhere in view either in Daniel 7 or in *Par. En.*, nor are any of the minor players in the Canaanite drama. Nonetheless, the presence of two figures, the ancient one and the human-like one, is illuminated by the ancient Canaanite backdrop.

Further, one of the heavenly beings is described as being human-like in appearance. This human-like appearance of a heavenly figure, however, is not unique to Daniel 7 and *Par. En.* In the vision of Ezekiel 1 the very figure of God is spoken of in a comparative and allusive way so typical of apocalyptic literature, where seated on "the likeness of a throne" (דְמוּתֵהָ כִסֵּא) was "a likeness as it were of a human figure" (דְמוּתָהּ כַּמְרֹאֶה אָדָם), who is to be understood as God (Ezek. 1:26). In Dan. 8:15 and 9:21, Daniel sees a figure with a human appearance (כַּמְרֹאֶה גִבּוֹר) who is addressed as "Gabriel," man of God. In Dan. 10:5, 18, and 12:6–7, Daniel sees human figures dressed in linen, that is, interpreting angels who comforted him after the fearful visions he saw. In Ezekiel 8–10, the prophet is accompanied by a human-like angelic interpreter, as is Zechariah in Zech. 1:9–11 (the angel is standing amongst the myrtle trees) and 2:5. Accompanying interpreting angels in human form are also spoken of by Enoch in the Animal Apocalypse (*1 Enoch* 87:2, 90:14). Angels appear in human form in other areas of the Biblical narrative as well: Gen. 18:2, where Abraham welcomes three men who announce the birth of a son; Josh 5:13, where Joshua is met by a "commander of the army of the Lord" outside of Jericho; and Judg. 13:6, 9, 16, where Manoah and his wife, before the birth of Samson, encounter an angel, whom Manoah does not at first recognize as an angel of God. As Collins observes, habitually in late prophetic and early apocalyptic writings, angels are represented by human figures.<sup>59</sup> These representations of God and of angels in a human-like appearance illustrate the frequency of heavenly beings described in human terms, and so the human appearance of the heavenly figure in Dan. 7:13 and *1 Enoch* 46:1 is not at all unusual.

46:1 *Wa- melu' šagā gaššu*/and whose face was full of grace:

The word for grace, *šagā*, is listed by Dillmann as meaning *gratia* (charm, kindness, thankfulness<sup>60</sup>), *favor* (favor, goodwill), *benignitas* (kindness, generosity), χαρις

<sup>58</sup> See the section on the Religio-Historical Background at the beginning of this chapter.

<sup>59</sup> Collins, *Daniel*, 306.

<sup>60</sup> Translations of the Latin words are taken from D. P. Simpson, *Cassell's New Compact*

(favor, graciousness, goodwill, thankfulness), but for *I Enoch* 46:1 in particular, *suavitas* (pleasantness, sweetness), and *venustas* (loveliness, attractiveness, charm) are listed. Dillmann's special entry for *I Enoch* 46:1 may seem to prejudge the issue as to whether the description of the human-like figure has to do merely with appearance or whether it may indicate something of his character. A search of biblical passages, however, for the phrase "full of grace (מלאי חסד, מלאי חן)" yields no comparable usage in scripture. The nearest phrase, רב חסד, appears quite often in the Psalms and the prophets, but it always describes the character of God, who abounds in steadfast love (חסד), not God's face.<sup>61</sup> Thus the phrase, *wa-melu' sagā gaššu*, seems to refer to the physical appearance of the figure, rather than to that one's qualities as being full of God's favor, kindness and goodwill.

46:1 *Kama` ahadu em-malā`ekt qeddusān*/like one of the holy angels:

A search of Even-Shoshan reveals that there are no parallels for this phrase in the Hebrew Bible. Lamech, in col. 2 of the Genesis Apocryphon wonders if his offspring's conception was due to the Watchers and the Holy Ones, ומן קדשין, or the Nephilim. The implication of his worry is that he looked like one of the angels. But this similarity is not very precise. A partial similarity exists in Acts 6:15, where Stephen, as he is being interrogated by the council, is said to have a face like the face of an angel (τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ πρόσωπον ἀγγέλου). Here the comparison is directly between a human face and an angelic face, while in *I Enoch* 46:1, the comparison is between the face of a human-like, heavenly figure and the angels. Two other scriptural passages give a description of an angelic face. In Dan. 10:6, and repeated in *Joseph and Aseneth* 14:9, the angel's face is likened to lightning (ופניו כמראה ברק). A slightly different description of an angelic face is found in Rev 10:1, where the seer sees an angel whose face is like the sun (τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος). The brightness of the angelic faces is consistent with the brightness of the glory surrounding God in heaven.

The comparison of the face of the human-like, heavenly figure to that of the angels may tend to suggest that the human-like, heavenly figure is one of the angels. This, however, is not likely, because then the comparison would have no point: the author simply would have identified the figure as an angel. Further, this figure, who in the next verse is called *walda sab'*, "Son of Man," is ranked higher than the angels, and distinguished from them, particularly from Michael in *I Enoch* 60:4–5, 69:14, 71:3, and from the four archangels in 71:8, 9, 13.<sup>62</sup> Thus, even though he is compared

*Latin-English English-Latin Dictionary* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1963), while translations of the Greek words are taken from Liddell and Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon* (in one of its several forms; Oxford: Clarendon Press).

<sup>61</sup> Even-Shoshan lists Exod. 34:6, Num. 14:18, Neh. 9:17, 13:22, Pss. 5:8, 69:14, 86:5, 15, 103:8, Joel 2:13, Jonah 4:2. Black, *I Enoch*, 206, includes some representatives of that list, but adds John 1:14, equating *melu' sagā* with πλήρης χάριτος.

<sup>62</sup> Collins, *Daniel*, 80, referring also to Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 94–113.

to the angels, this human-like, heavenly figure is not to be considered one of the angels.

Hartman, drawing out a reference made by Charles,<sup>63</sup> notices that David is compared to the angels in several places, and that this adoption of the Davidic epithet probably was deliberate in order to ascribe to the human-like, heavenly figure a messianic connotation.<sup>64</sup> For example, Achish, a Philistine king, when telling David that others mistrusted him, says, “You are blameless. . . as an angel of God” (במלאך אלהים, 1 Sam. 29:9). Again, a woman of Tekoa, sent by Joab to David to convince him to be merciful to Absalom, in her pleading says that David “the king is like the angel of God” (במלאך האלהים, 2 Sam 14:17, 20) in judging between good and evil and that he has the wisdom of the angel of God (בכחמת מלאך אלהים). Similarly, Mephibosheth in 2 Sam 19:28, also pleading for mercy, likens David to the angel of God (במלאך אלהים). Hartman points out that Zechariah, foreseeing victory for Judah, likens the house of David to the angel of the Lord (במלאך יהוה, Zech. 12:8). This, Hartman claims, is a late text consciously adopting the Davidic epithet. In a similar way, Hartman argues, the author of *Par. En.* uses this angelic comparison deliberately to allude to Davidic messianic hopes, so that in some way the hopes of his community might be tied to the hopes of restoration that a Davidic messiah might bring about.

Several aspects, however, militate against Hartman’s analysis. One is that the form of the comparison is different. Only one term, במלאך, is common to both the image in *Par. En.* and the passages in 1 and 2 Samuel. In *Par. En.*, the phrase is *kama ’ahadu em-malā’ekt qeddusān*/like one of the holy angels, while in the passages from 1 and 2 Samuel, the phrase is במלאך אלהים/like an angel of God. In the phrase in *Par. En.* the reference to “angels” is plural, a number is included, and there is no reference to God, while in the passages in 1 and 2 Samuel, the reference to the angels is singular, no number is used, and the divinity is mentioned. Therefore the imprecision of the form of this comparison is not conducive to seeing either a quotation or in this case even an allusion.

Another factor is that the direction and nature of the comparison in each case are different. In *Par. En.* the appearance of a heavenly being, the Son of Man, is compared first to a human and then to the angels, while in the passages from 1 and 2 Samuel a human being, David, is compared to an angel. Further in *Par. En.* it is the facial appearance that is compared to the angels, while in 1 and 2 Samuel it is the whole person of David that is compared to an angel. Thus, the direction and nature of the comparison are different and not conducive to seeing a quotation or an allusion.

Finally, the purpose of the comparison is different. In *Par. En.* the comparison straightforwardly adds to the description of the Son of Man, while in the passages of 1 and 2 Samuel, the comparison is manipulative and meant to draw out a favor from David on behalf of the one expressing David’s likeness to an angel of God. For all these

<sup>63</sup> Charles, *1 Enoch*, 85–86.

<sup>64</sup> Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 119.

reasons, Hartman's suggestion that the angelic comparison is meant to awaken Davidic connotations and messianic hopes can be seen to be creative but in the end unlikely.

1 *Enoch* 46:1, however, has the function of introducing the vision in which the hopes of the community are tied to the human-like, heavenly figure. In a concise but precise allusion to Dan 7:9, 13, the author transports the reader to the heavenly scene where God and God's judicial partner are ready to pass judgment on the enemies of the community. The brevity of the descriptions of God and the human-like figure are enough to emphasize the purity, innocence, venerableness, fairness and absolute power and authority of those in charge of the judicial process, while at the same time affirming the eventual positive out-come of the judgment for the faithful community. Despite indications in the real world to the contrary, the message is that God is in charge and will save and restore the righteous and faithful.

### 3.2.2 1 En. 46:2

*Wa-tase*<sup>7</sup>*elkewwo* <sup>4</sup>*la*<sup>7</sup>*aḥadu* <sup>7</sup>*em-malā*<sup>7</sup>*ekt qeddusān za-yāhawwer meslēya*  
<sup>5</sup>*wa-kwello* <sup>6</sup>*xebu*<sup>7</sup>*āta* <sup>7</sup>*za-*<sup>7</sup>*ar*<sup>7</sup>*ayani ba*<sup>7</sup>*enta* <sup>8</sup>*zeku walda sab*<sup>7</sup> *mannu* <sup>9</sup>*we*<sup>7</sup>*etu*  
*wa-*<sup>7</sup>*em-*<sup>7</sup>*aytē yekawwen we*<sup>7</sup>*etu* <sup>10</sup>*ba*<sup>7</sup>*enta ment mesla* <sup>11</sup>*re*<sup>7</sup>*sa mawā*<sup>7</sup>*el yaḥawwer*  
 And I asked one of the holy angels, who went with me, and who showed me all the secrets, about that Son of Man who he was, and whence he was, and why he went with the Head of Days

#### Variants

<sup>4</sup>*la*<sup>7</sup>*aḥadu* <sup>7</sup>*em-malā*<sup>7</sup>*ekt qeddusān*/one of the holy angels: Eth I, Bodl 5 and the uncorrected hand of Ryl omit *qeddusān* (the corrector of Ryl has inserted it interlinearly).

Ull reads *la-mal*<sup>7</sup> aka *salām*/to the angel of peace, but this is probably secondary.

Charles prefers *la-mal*<sup>7</sup> ak/to the angel, to reflect a single *angelus interpretis*.

<sup>5</sup>*wa-kwello*/and all: Ull and Bodl 4 omit *wa-*; Charles notes that Vat 71 omits *wa-kwello*.

<sup>6</sup>*xebu*<sup>7</sup>*āta*/secrets: Berl reads *rā*<sup>7</sup>*yāta*, visions.

<sup>7</sup>*za-*<sup>7</sup>*ar*<sup>7</sup>*ayani*/who showed me: BM 485, the uncorrected hand of Abb 35 and Abb 55 have *za-yār*<sup>7</sup>*eyani*/who would show me, the causative subjunctive, while the corrected hand of Abb 35 has *za-*<sup>7</sup>*ār*<sup>7</sup>*eyani*, an orthographic variant.

<sup>8</sup>*zeku walda sab*<sup>7</sup>/that Son of Man: Tana 9 has *za-tawalda* <sup>7</sup>*em-sab*<sup>7</sup>/who was born of man; BM 491 has *weluda*.

<sup>9</sup>*we*<sup>7</sup>*etu*/he (is): omitted by Ull and four other manuscripts.

<sup>10</sup>*ba*<sup>7</sup>*enta ment mesla*/why with: BM 485 and Abb 55 omit *ment mesla*, which then might mean "concerning the Head of Days;" BM 491, Berl and Tana 9 omit *ment* alone and the original hand of Abb 35 omits *ba*<sup>7</sup>*enta ment*/why; all the variants seem to be corruptions that make the question harder to read.

<sup>11</sup>*re*<sup>7</sup>*sa mawā*<sup>7</sup>*el*/Head of Days: Ryl1 has preserved *beluya mawā*<sup>7</sup>*el*/Ancient of Days, and as Knibb points out this is very similar to Dan. 7:9. It is likely to have been

changed by a scribe who saw the connection to Dan 7:9 rather than preserving an original reading.<sup>65</sup> Ryl2 obelized the word and put *re'sa* in the margin in conformity with the rest of the manuscripts; Berl omits it.

### Notes

46:2 *la'ahadu 'em-malā'ekt qeddusān*/one of the holy angels. The accompanying angel is a frequent and usual figure in apocalyptic literature. The earliest representations of an *angelus interpres* in the Hebrew Bible are the seraphim who spoke to Isaiah (Isa. 6:7) and the spirit who volunteers to entice Ahab (1 Kgs 22:21).<sup>66</sup> The angel of peace in *Par. En.* is usually traced to the envoys of peace (מלאכי שלום) in Isa. 33:7, *T. Dan* 6:5, *T. Asher* 6:6, *T. Benj.* 6:1.<sup>67</sup> The role of the interpreting angel is very prominent in Zechariah, while in Ezekiel 40–48 an angelic tour guide is depicted.<sup>68</sup> Gabriel becomes an interpreting angel in Dan. 9:21, and this role may be referring back to the role of the interpreting angel in Dan. 7:16.<sup>69</sup>

The *angelus interpres* is portrayed in *1 Enoch* as conversing with the seer and showing the seer the sights and secrets of heaven. A variety of angels accompany Enoch in the various parts of the book. In *The Book of the Watchers*, Uriel (19:1–2), Raphael (22:3–13), Raguel (23:3–4) and Michael (24:5–25:6) explain the sights to Enoch on his journey in heaven. Some of the sights he sees are explained as places of punishment and confinement for the fallen angels and their followers, while others are places of blessing, where the Lord sits on the throne (25:3) and where the righteous will enjoy plenty (25:5, 26–32). In the *Astronomical Book* (72–82), only one interpreting angel, Uriel, is present, while in the *Dream Visions* (83–90) surprisingly no *angelus interpres* is present. Similarly, chapters 91–107 make no mention of an *angelus interpres*, while in the final chapter (108), again a vision, “one of the holy angels who was with me,” is present to interpret the visions. In *Par. En.* sometimes an unnamed angel and other times the “angel of peace” accompany the seer, while in the Third Parable Michael also appears to interpret aspects of the visions. The unnamed angel offers a message of hope for the righteous (see *1 Enoch* 46:2, 52:6–9, 61:3–13) while the “angel of peace” relates messages concerning the punishment which has been prepared for the oppressors. Ironically, the message of this *angelus interpres* conveys condemnation, not peace, to the kings and mighty ones, but their demise produces peace for the righteous and elect (see *1 Enoch* 53:4–5, 54:4–5, 56:2–3, 60:4). Often meteorological and cosmological secrets are interpreted,<sup>70</sup> but Michael in the

<sup>65</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 192.

<sup>66</sup> Collins, *Daniel*, 311.

<sup>67</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 200; Charles *1 Enoch*, 77.

<sup>68</sup> Collins, *Daniel*, 311; see also Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 200.

<sup>69</sup> Collins, *Daniel*, 311.

<sup>70</sup> Michael J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran* (JSOT 11; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 93, notes that angelic control of the meteorological and cosmological secrets implies an “orderliness and integration of the cosmos.” See also Michael E. Stone, “Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature” in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God; Essays on the Bible and*



concluding vision declares Enoch's lofty status as the Son of Man (*1 Enoch* 71:14). The effect of the *angelus interpres* is to make the seer's message trustworthy.<sup>71</sup>

46:2 *wa-kwello xebu'āta za-'ar'ayani*/and who showed me all the secrets. This is a typical qualifying clause frequently used of the *angelus interpres* (40:2, 8; 43:3; 46:2; 60:11). It is used of both "the angel" (40:2; 43:3; 46:2) and "the angel of peace" (40:8), as well as of "the other angel" (60:112). The word *xebu'* is an adjective but can be used as a substantive, especially in the plural. While the clause is used of the *angelus interpres*, the concept of revealing secrets appears quite frequently throughout *Par. En.*, and seems to be one of the ways of describing the major subject matter of the work. Comments on the revealed secrets can be divided into three areas: personages connected with the secrets, topics related to the secrets, and secrets in the context of other ancient literature.

*Various Persons and the Secrets.* Various personages are connected with the ideas of secrets being revealed. The most obvious personages associated with the revelation of secrets, as already noted, are the interpreting angels. They reveal the heavenly secrets to the seer through speech, through showing, and through written material. Mostly the interpreting angels converse with the seer, explaining the sights seen and sharing information that relates to the vision. Once "the angel of peace," while encouraging the seer to be patient, also speaks of the necessity of waiting until the secrets are revealed (52:5). Michael also reveals secrets by showing Enoch all the secrets of mercy, the secrets of righteousness, and the secrets of the ends of heaven and the storehouses of the stars and luminaries (71:3–4), acting as a tour guide. In the Noachic section, Noah is instructed by Michael in the secrets that were preserved in the book of Enoch (68:1). Here is an example of the revelation of secrets being mediated through a book, which, of course, is also true of the *Par. En.* itself.<sup>72</sup> So the secrets are revealed through speech, through showing, and through written material, by the agency of an *angelus interpres*.

Another kind of personage connected with the secrets is the fallen angels. In the *Book of the Watchers*, the fallen watchers have inappropriately revealed secrets to humanity, and so they receive God's condemnation (16:3) This idea reappears in *Par. En.*, in the Noachic section, where Noah hears from Enoch that a command has gone

*Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*, ed. Frank Moore Cross, Werner E. Lemke, and Patrick D. Miller, Jr. (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.; 1976), 414–52, who notices that meteorological and cosmological secrets form part of traditional materials that appear in several different apocalypses.

<sup>71</sup> Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 77, notes that the function of the interpreting angels is that as they "move around the universe, confidently explaining its mysteries," they convey to the reader an awareness "that the world and its future are firmly under divine control," and that derivatively, Enoch's word is also trustworthy.

<sup>72</sup> Outside of *Par. En.*, when Enoch reassures Lamech that Noah is indeed his son, and not one of the sons of the watchers, Enoch appeals for authority to the secrets (*mešīrāta*) which the holy ones had revealed to him (106:19). The word for "secret" is different from that used throughout *Par. En.*, but the concept is the same.

out from God regarding humanity who have learned from the secrets of the angels and perpetrated inappropriate activities such as sorcery, magical spells, and idolatry (65:6). In the list of angels, in the Noachic section, the angels and their wrongdoings are specified. *Pēnēmue* is accused of having taught humanity the secrets of sophistry (or the “secrets of wisdom”) in an inappropriate manner (69:8) and of having taught them to write with pen and ink (69:9–12),<sup>73</sup> which was not fitting and yielded the result of human destruction. *Kasbeel* is also accused of seeking to discover from Michael the hidden Name, so that he might use it in an oath, which would cause his fellow fallen watchers, who had revealed the secrets to humanity, to tremble before him (69:14–16). Thus sometimes heavenly secrets can be inappropriately revealed, as the fallen watchers had done with detrimental effects for the humans who learned those secrets.

The counterpart to the *angelus interpres* who reveals secrets is the seer to whom they are revealed. In the course of the report of the visions, Enoch mentions several times that he has seen secrets in his visions (41:1,3; 52:2; 59:1–3), and once he queries the angel about the secrets he has seen (52:3).<sup>74</sup> These secrets relate to judgment, to the forces of nature, and to the vision of the metallic mountains. That the seer sees secrets is to be expected, and is simply a corollary of the concept that the *angelus interpres* reveals them.

Another personage benefiting from the revealed secrets is the divine figure. The secrets about the righteous and those about sinners are informative for the divine judge in the judgment that is about to take place (38:3). The Elect One will judge without fear of reversal because the secrets are known to him (49:2, 4), while the Son of Man will reveal the treasures of that which is hidden for the demise of the kings and mighty ones and for the benefit of the righteous and elect (46:3). The divine judgment that follows from revealing the secrets resounds throughout the heavens, and Michael claims to shudder in fear because of both the severity of it and its appropriateness (68:2, 5). The idea is surely not that the divine figure did not know what was formerly a secret and could not judge until the secret had been revealed, but rather that those secrets about the righteous and about the sinners justify the severity and appropriateness of it. In this sense, the secrets also benefit the divine judge.

Finally, in some instances, the secret things are appropriate for humans to know. In contrast to the secrets revealed by the fallen watchers, which were not meant to be known by humans, some secrets are for human benefit. The righteous will revel in the secrets of wisdom from the mouth of the Elect One (51:3), and they are to seek out the secrets of righteousness (58:5). Even the kings and mighty ones, as they are being judged and as they cry out for mercy, wish that every secret thing may be brought to light that God might be glorified (63:3). Indeed, *Par. En.* itself reveals the knowledge that blessing is in store for the righteous and that punishment is waiting

<sup>73</sup> Ironically, the authors of *Par. En.* and the Noachic source both are using the very technology that is decried in this passage.

<sup>74</sup> In the Dream-Vision (83:7), Enoch also reassures Methuselah by recounting for him the vision he had seen regarding the secrets about the sins of the earth and how it would sink into the abyss to destruction.

for the wicked. While this may appear to be a secret to the righteous because they are oppressed and in their oppression they have no knowledge of it, it is precisely the message the seer brings for their hope and encouragement. The whole purpose is to reveal this great truth, and it is an appropriate secret to be revealed as well as to be sought out.

*The Subject Matter of the Secrets.* The subject matter of the secrets includes a wide range of topics. One aspect of the revealed secrets is the cosmological and meteorological working of the universe. Enoch sees the secrets of the thunder and lightning, the winds and the clouds and the dew (41:3; 59:1–3; 60:11–22), and Michael also shows him similar secrets (71:4). These forces of nature were mysterious to the ancient mind, and for a seer to have their secrets revealed to him was a mark of great knowledge that authenticated his message. He had truly been privy to heavenly workings.<sup>75</sup>

Another area of the contents of the revealed secrets is the area of the knowledge of future events and how judgment relates to it. As already noted, part of the basis for judgment is the secrets of the sinners and the secrets of the righteous. In these cases the use of the genitive indicates the quality of sinfulness or of righteousness, rather than individual actions carried out by sinners or the righteous. There is secret knowledge in the heavens that Enoch has seen which will lead to the judgment of the wicked (38:3). There is secret knowledge regarding righteousness which will not be contradicted, by which the Elect One will judge (49:2, 4). There is the secret knowledge of future events which are destined to happen on earth (52:2), of how kingdoms will be divided and how the actions of individuals are weighed in the balance (41:1). This knowledge is secret, because it flies in the face of the reality that the community is facing, yet Enoch brings hope and encouragement through the revelation of such secrets, since the judgment will condemn the wicked and the oppressors and vindicate the righteous.

Sometimes these secrets are described in terms that connect them with virtues. There are secrets of wisdom. Wisdom topics are revealed to the delight of the righteous (51:3), and the creation of the world and its foundation are subjects of the oath that *Kasbeel* would use (69:16–25). Because nature is securely bound by oath under the control of the angels, humans may live in peace. Secrets of righteousness (49:2) will be a blessing for the righteous, and they are to seek them out (58:5). Michael revealed the secrets of righteousness as well as the secrets of mercy to Enoch as he was translated (71:3).

Occasionally, the secrets of the cosmological and meteorological working of the universe are noted in conjunction with the secrets of the judgment and future events (41:1–9; 60:11; 71:3–4). While the revelation about judgment and the reversal of fortunes seems to be the major emphasis of *Par. En.*, the claim that the seer also knows the cosmological and meteorological secrets authenticates the major emphasis.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. again, Stone, “Lists of Revealed Things,” 414, 435, who sees these secrets as a part of traditional lists of revealed things that were the subject matter of apocalyptic speculation.

The relation between the two areas of secret knowledge seems to be that if the seer knows one area, then surely his knowledge is trustworthy in the other area as well. Thus, while sometimes only the cosmological and meteorological secrets are mentioned, and at other times secrets about the judgment are claimed, actually the two are conjoined with the first area authenticating the second area.<sup>76</sup>

When the secrets revealed by the fallen watchers are discussed, they refer to knowledge and skills given to humans in their earthly life (16:3; 65:6; 69:8). These secrets were not to be revealed to humanity and their revelation came about inappropriately.

*The Revelation of Secrets in early Jewish Literature.* As noted above, *Par. En.* is written from the perspective that some secrets have been inappropriately revealed, while others are appropriate for dissemination. Both these views can be found in the Hebrew Bible and related ancient literature as well, and the revelations to Enoch are an expected feature within apocalyptic literature. The Deuteronomic view, that secret things belonged to God, and revealed things belonged to humans for their living under the Torah (Deut. 29:28), expressed a pre-apocalyptic understanding that some knowledge was to be left uninvestigated as God's domain, while revealed knowledge was to be used for proper living. The prophets were seen as the mediators of the revelation of God's plans (Amos 3:7), and, like Ezekiel, they were to declare all they had seen to the house of Israel (Ezek 40:4; cf. Zech 1:9; Mic 7:15). That prophetic mandate to declare God's plans to the people then became the rationale the apocalyptic writers claimed in order to authenticate their messages: they were revealing what God wanted them to reveal. The motif of revealed secrets occurs in both Wisdom Literature and Apocalyptic Literature. The types of revealed secrets include the cosmological and meteorological secrets (see Sirach 4:18, 45:15–21), the interpretations of dreams (Dan. 2:22, 27, 29, 30), as well as the revelation of the future course of events (2 Macc. 12:41; 2 Esdras 10:38, 14:5). Surprisingly, the specific mention of secrets being revealed occurs quite rarely. Few authors say explicitly that secrets are being revealed. The exceptions are the dream interpretations of Daniel 2 and the visions of *Par. En.*, where as noted above, the revealing of secrets is associated with the interpreting angels as well as with the seer. The function of revealing secrets, however, is a major feature of apocalyptic literature in general, that the individual seers are sharing revealed secrets, and that those secrets are appropriate for humans to know and are beneficial for them in the crises of their lives. Thus *Par.*

<sup>76</sup> Stone, "Lists of Revealed Things," 414, 435, suggests the lists that include the cosmological and meteorological secrets as coming either at the high point of the visionary experience or as summaries of the subject matter revealed to the seer. In *1 Enoch*, the cosmological and meteorological secrets function as summaries in such a way as to authenticate the message of the seer regarding judgment. *1 Enoch* 22 can also be referred to as having a similar dynamic. On the tours of heaven the seer is shown four hollows, in which the souls of people who have had various types of life and death are kept until the final judgment. The hollows are a part of the universe, as if to claim that just recompense is a certainty, especially for those who have been oppressed or persecuted in this life.

*En.* makes it explicit that secrets are being revealed to Enoch, secrets that will benefit the community, while at the same time it recognizes that some secrets such as those revealed by the fallen watchers ought not to have been revealed (cf. Deut 29:28). For *Par. En.*, the revelation of the cosmological and meteorological secrets authenticates Enoch's revelation of the secrets regarding the judgment of the oppressors and the reversal of fortunes for the righteous.

46:2 *ba'enta zeku walda sab'*/about that Son of Man:

As noted in the Introduction earlier, three terms for the Son of Man are used in *Par. En.*,<sup>77</sup> *walda sab'*, *walda be'si*, and *walda 'egwāla 'emma-heyāw*. As many have noted, the terms occur in the following locations: *walda sab'* occurs only in the Second Parable, at *1 Enoch* 46:2, 3, 4, and 48:2; *walda be'si* occurs in the Third Parable and the concluding chapters, at *1 Enoch* 62:5, 69:29 (twice), and 71:14; *walda 'egwāla 'emma-heyāw* occurs most frequently (eight times), also in the Third Parable and the concluding chapters, at *1 Enoch* 62:7, 9, 14, 63:11, 69:26, 27, 70:1, 71:17.<sup>78</sup> The three terms appear to be synonymous, for the components of each term seem to be used in synonymous ways in the translation into Ethiopic of the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament.<sup>79</sup> As VanderKam has suggested, the term used in each particular instance may depend somewhat on the context and the passages being alluded to from the Hebrew Bible.<sup>80</sup> Together with the "Righteous One," the "Anointed," and the "Elect One," they refer to the messianic figure, who is the final judge. Here in *1 Enoch* 46:2 the term used is *walda sab'*. It also occurs at 46:3, 4, and 48:2. The context of the verse shows clearly that this term is derived from Dan 7:13, although the preposition indicating comparison has been lost. In Dan 7:13, the figure is referred to as כְּבֶרֶךְ אִנְשׁ, "one like a son of man," i.e. someone of human-like appearance, whereas here in *1 Enoch* 46:2, the figure is straightforwardly *zeku walda sab'*, that Son of Man, who had just been seen in the vision. In 46:1 the author indicated that the second figure had a human-like appearance, but here in this verse, with the use of the demonstrative, that second figure is now described as that Son of Man.

The use of a demonstrative adjective with the term "Son of Man" is a curious oddity of *Par. En.*, and various attempts to understand its significance have been made. It is even more curious when one notes that the term "Elect One" never occurs with a demonstrative, and that the term "Lord of Spirits" occurs occasionally but not always with a demonstrative.<sup>81</sup> A demonstrative adjective occurs with the term "Son of Man" 11 out of 16 times (see Table 1). Here at *1 Enoch* 42:6 the use of the

<sup>77</sup> VanderKam, "Righteous One," 174–5. See Colpe's thorough article, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, TDNT VIII, 400–477, esp. 423–26, for its appearances in *1 Enoch*.

<sup>78</sup> For example, Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, 86, VanderKam, "Righteous One," 174–75, and Black, *1 Enoch*, 206.

<sup>79</sup> Charles, *1 Enoch*, 86.

<sup>80</sup> VanderKam, "Righteous One," 187.

<sup>81</sup> E.g. Casey, "The Use of the Term 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch," 14–17; many other scholars have noted and commented upon this phenomenon.

demonstrative adjective *zeku*, “that,” is completely appropriate, as it functions to refer back to the human figure just seen in *1 Enoch* 46:1.

Table 1 shows the following uses of the demonstrative adjective:

- a) *zeku*, “that,” occurs at 46:2 and 48:2 in the Second Parable, and at 62:5, 9, 14, and 63:11 in the Third Parable;
- b) *zentu*, “this,” occurs only once, in the Second Parable at 46:4 in the angel’s answer to Enoch’s question regarding the “Son of Man” he had just seen.
- c) *we’etu*, “that,” occurs at 69:26, 29 (twice), 70:1 and 71:17; and
- d) and five times, the term “Son of Man” occurs without a demonstrative adjective, at 46:3, 60:10, 62:7, 69:27, and 71:14.

**Table 1**  
**Distribution of Demonstrative Adjectives with the Terms for “Son of Man”**

Parable	<i>1 Enoch</i>	Demonstrative or qualifier	<i>walda sab’</i>	<i>walda be’si(t)</i>	<i>walda ’eg’āla ’emma heyāw</i>	
2nd	46:2	<i>zeku</i>	•			
	46:3	—	•			
	46:4	<i>zentu</i>	•			
	48:2	<i>zeku</i>	•			
3rd	60:10	— ( <i>’anta we’etu</i> )	• (as a Vocative)			
	62:5	<i>la-zeku</i>		• (in Eth. I)		
				<i>walda be’sit</i> (in Eth. II)		
	62:7	—			•	
	62:9	<i>la-zeku</i>			•	
	62:14	<i>zeku</i>			•	
	63:11	<i>zeku</i>			•	
	69:26	<i>we’etu</i>			•	
	69:27	—			•	
	69:29	<i>we’etu</i>		•		
	69:29	<i>we’etu</i>		•		
	Epilogue	70:1	<i>we’etu</i>			•
		71:14	—		•	
71:17		<i>we’etu</i>			•	

In the latter three occurrences a demonstrative is not used because they are in close proximity to occurrences with a demonstrative. The first two occurrences, however, require comment. At *1 Enoch* 46:3 a demonstrative pronoun does appear, *zentu we’etu walda sab’za-lotu kona šedq*, “this is the Son of Man who has righteousness.<sup>82</sup> It forms the first part of the angel’s response to Enoch regarding the “Son of Man” he had just seen. But this is a different use of the demonstrative from the other

<sup>82</sup> The word *we’etu* can also function as a demonstrative, “that,” but in this instance it probably is to be understood as the pronominal equivalent of the verb “to be,” since in the other instances of the demonstrative with “Son of Man” the demonstrative is *zeku*.



In Hebrew and Aramaic the term *בן אדם* is an idiomatic way of referring to a member of the human race.<sup>89</sup> As many have pointed out,<sup>90</sup> the rendering of this term into other languages has resulted in the appearance of non-idiomatic expressions, such as *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* in Greek, which literally means “the son of the man” and betrays itself as being “a translation or a mistranslation of a Semitic idiom.”<sup>91</sup> Since Ethiopic is a Semitic language, the translation of the construct term carries the same idea of a member of the human race.

In *Par. En.*, however, there is the added dimension that this human figure is also a particular figure, with a particular function in the heavenly court, as seen in the vision. Further the term in *Par. En.* carries messianic overtones. Adela Yarbro Collins argues that already in Dan. 7:13, which is the origin of the term in *Par. En.*, the concept of *בן אדם* is an allusion to the son of man in Psalm 8 and related psalms, where the term was interpreted messianically at the time Daniel was composed and read.<sup>92</sup> She goes on to point out that even though *Par. En.* and 4 Ezra 13 are literarily independent, they both treat the Son of Man messianically. Further *Par. En.* uses four terms for the messianic figure, the “Righteous One,” the “Anointed,” the “Elect One,” as well as “that Son of Man,” but these terms are used to refer to the same figure.<sup>93</sup> Adela Yarbro Collins then concludes that the independent uses of Dan. 7:13 in 4 Ezra and *Par. En.* indicate that “a tradition had developed prior to the composition of both works that the ‘one like a son of man’ in Daniel 7 should be understood as the messiah.”<sup>94</sup> If that is true, then it must also be asserted that, not only had the interpretive tradition developed that the figure of Daniel 7 should be understood messianically, but also the concept of the Son of Man as a heavenly, messianic figure had developed. It was no longer just a symbolic metaphor for an angelic being or for the saints of God, but had become an individualized member of the heavenly court, who was the subject of such interpretations. Both the Son of Man in *Par. En.* and the figure in 4 Ezra are manifestations of that developing concept of the Son of Man.

The function of this verse then is to narrow further the interest of the author. Where in the first verse the vision presents the Head of Days as the main figure of the vision, with the human-like figure in a secondary position of accompanying the Head of Days, this verse focuses on the second figure and refers to him as “that Son

<sup>89</sup> In *Par. En.*, the plural form, *weluda sab*, appears in 69:6, 14, for example, referring to humanity in general. See also Casey, *Solution*, 55. His whole first chapter, “The State of Play,” 1–55, proposes that translation techniques or strategies need to be taken seriously for the solution. He argues that the term in the Parables can only be understood in the general sense referring to a member of the human race. See especially p. 97.

<sup>90</sup> Colpe, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, 401–402; Yarbro Collins, “The Origin of the Designation of Jesus as ‘Son of Man,’” 391–92.

<sup>91</sup> Yarbro Collins, “The Origin of the Designation of Jesus as ‘Son of Man,’” 394.

<sup>92</sup> Adela Yarbro Collins, “The Apocalyptic Son of Man Sayings,” in *The Future of Early Christianity*, ed. Birger Pearson (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1991), 221–24.

<sup>93</sup> Yarbro Collins, “The Apocalyptic Son of Man Sayings,” 224; see also VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 185–86.

<sup>94</sup> Yarbro Collins, “The Apocalyptic Son of Man Sayings,” 224.



of Man.” The focus has shifted now to the Son of Man, who takes center stage as the seer asks questions concerned with his identity, origins and purpose.

46:2 *mannu we<sup>3</sup>etu wa-<sup>2</sup>em-<sup>2</sup>aytē yekawwen we<sup>3</sup>etu ba<sup>3</sup>enta ment mesla re<sup>3</sup>sa mawā<sup>c</sup>el yaḥawwer/who he was, and whence he was, and why he went with the Head of Days:*

As Daniel asks the interpreting angel (Dan. 7:16) concerning the visions he saw, so the seer of *Par. En.* asks the interpreting angel concerning the Son of Man, who he was, where he was from, and why he was accompanying the Head of Days. The set of three questions is not found in the Hebrew Bible, and therefore can be seen as an explanatory expansion on the subject of the query regarding the Son of Man. While the *angelus interpres* begins to answer these questions in the next verse, they are also precisely the questions that are answered throughout the rest of *Par. En.* These questions set out the programmatic flow of the rest of the discourse, and raise curiosity in the reader’s mind about who this heavenly human figure really is. The Son of Man is revealed to be the eschatological judge, who has been hidden in the heavens, and who accompanies the Head of Days in order to carry out judgment.

### 3.2.3 1 En. 46:3

<sup>12</sup>Wa-<sup>2</sup>awše<sup>2</sup> ani wa-yebēlani zentu we<sup>3</sup>etu walda sab<sup>3</sup> za-lotu kona <sup>13</sup>šedq wa-šedq meslēhu <sup>14</sup>xādara <sup>15</sup>wa-k<sup>w</sup>ello mazāgebta <sup>16</sup>za-xebu<sup>2</sup> we<sup>3</sup>etu yekaššet <sup>17</sup>esma <sup>18</sup>egzi <sup>19</sup>a <sup>20</sup>manāfest <sup>21</sup>kiyāhu <sup>22</sup>xāreya <sup>23</sup>wa-za-keflu kwello mo<sup>2</sup>a baqedma <sup>24</sup>egzi<sup>2</sup> a manāfest ba-ret<sup>c</sup> <sup>25</sup>la-<sup>c</sup>ālam.

And he answered me and said to me, “This is the Son of Man, who has righteousness, and with whom righteousness dwells;<sup>95</sup> and he will reveal all the treasures of that which is secret, for the Lord of Spirits has chosen him and through uprightness his lot has surpassed all before the Lord of Spirits forever.

#### Variants

<sup>12</sup>Wa-<sup>2</sup>awše<sup>2</sup> ani/And he answered me: Ull and Curzon 56 omit the *wa-/and*.

<sup>13</sup>šedq/righteousness: Berl Abb 55 and Tana 9 have *šedqā*.

<sup>14</sup>xādara/dwells: Berl omits.

<sup>15</sup>wa-k<sup>w</sup>ello mazāgebta. .yekaššet/he will reveal all the treasures: This is the wording of Ryl, with *k<sup>w</sup>ello* accusative singular and *mazāgebta* accusative plural. BM 485 has *wa-k<sup>w</sup>ellomu mazāgebta. .yekaššet*/he will reveal all the treasures, with the suffix of *k<sup>w</sup>ellomu* and *mazāgebta* accusative plural. BM 491 has *wa-k<sup>w</sup>ello mazgebta. .yekaššet*/he will reveal all the treasures, an orthographical variant of Ryl’s reading. Berl has *wa-k<sup>w</sup>ellu mazāgebt. .yekaššet*/he will reveal all the treasures, with *k<sup>w</sup>ellu* in the nominative singular and *mazāgebt* in the nominative

<sup>95</sup> Literally: “to him became righteousness, and righteousness dwelt with him.”

plural. Tana 9 puts it in the passive, *wa-k<sup>w</sup>ello mazāgebt...yetkaššat*/and all the treasures...will be revealed, with *k<sup>w</sup>ello* in the accusative singular and *mazāgebt* in the nominative plural. The variations in case and number are examples of the flexibility of Ethiopic grammar, in which case and number do not appear always to agree strictly.

<sup>16</sup>*za-xebu*<sup>7</sup>/that which is secret: BM 491 has *za-xebu<sup>7</sup>a*, which makes it agree in case, though not in number, with *mazāgebt*.

<sup>17</sup>*manāfest*/Spirits: BM 485 has *manfasāt*, an orthographical variant.

<sup>18</sup>*kiyāhu...manāfest*: Berl omits the whole clause due to homoioteleuton.

<sup>19</sup>*xāreya*/has chosen: Tana 9 has *xadara*/he dwelt, perhaps an aural error.

<sup>20</sup>*wa-za-keftu k<sup>w</sup>ello*/and his lot...all: many manuscripts omit *k<sup>w</sup>ello*, while three manuscripts have *wa-za-k<sup>w</sup>ello*/and everything.

<sup>21</sup>*la-<sup>6</sup>alam*/forever: Abb 5, Ull, Bodl 4 have *za-la-<sup>6</sup>alam*/which is forever. Adding the relative pronoun attributes eternity to *ret<sup>6</sup>*/uprightness, rather than to the triumph (*mo<sup>3</sup>a*) of the Son of Man's lot. Tana 9 has *za-lā<sup>6</sup>la*/which is upon him.

### Notes

46:3 *Wa-<sup>3</sup>awše<sup>2</sup>ani wa-yebēlani*/And he answered me and said to me:

As the interpreting angel responded to Daniel's questions (Dan. 7:16), so the *angelus interpretes* answers Enoch's questions.

46:3 *zentu we<sup>2</sup>etu walda sab<sup>3</sup>*/'This is the Son of Man

*zalotu kona šedq*/who has righteousness:

Now a series of characteristics of the Son of Man begins. Here *we<sup>2</sup>etu* is not a demonstrative adjective; rather it functions as the verb "to be." "This is..."<sup>96</sup>

The first of the qualities ascribed to the Son of Man is righteousness, *šedq*, a cognate of Hebrew צדק (ה). The Son of Man is said to have righteousness, which recalls the claim of Jeremiah, that a righteous branch (צמח צדיק) will be raised up for David, and that as king, he will deal wisely (והשכיל) and execute justice and righteousness (ועשה משפט וצדקה) Jer. 23:5–6, cf. Jer. 33:15–16. Isaiah also ascribes righteousness to the king הן לצדק ימלך מלך (Isa. 32:1) and is confident that the heir apparent<sup>97</sup> to the throne of David will rule with justice and righteousness, להכין אותה ולסעדה במשפט ובצדקה (Isa. 9:6 [7]) ascribing righteousness to his judgment, ושפט בצדק, as a belt round his waist, ויהיה צדק אזור מתניו (Isa. 11:4, 5).<sup>98</sup> Righteousness is an important quality of the rule of the Davidic king whom both Jeremiah and Isaiah heralded, and similarly it is the chief property of the Son of Man.<sup>99</sup>

<sup>96</sup> Charles, *I Enoch*, 87, and see above.

<sup>97</sup> Many surmise that this heralds the birth of Hezekiah; see George Buchanan Gray, *The Book of Isaiah* Vol. 1 (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912), 166.

<sup>98</sup> Charles, *I Enoch*, 88; Black, *I Enoch* 197, 208.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 119, but see the discussion above in the Notes on *I Enoch* 46:1 regarding the Davidic overtones in the comment on the face of the human-like

46:3 *wa-šedq meslēhu xādara*/and with whom righteousness dwells:

Further, righteousness is said to dwell with the Son of Man. The apparent Biblical parallels to this idea are not very satisfying.<sup>100</sup> In Isa. 32:16, justice and righteousness are seen to dwell (רָשַׁב וְשָׁכַן) even in the wilderness or the fruitful field when the Spirit is poured out, so that the people may live in peace and quietness, while in Isa. 1:21, Isaiah mourns the loss of faithfulness and righteousness from the city.<sup>101</sup> In both those parallels, righteousness dwells in a field or a city, not a person as in *Par. En.* Perhaps the author is also alluding to a contrast with wisdom. Wisdom was not able to find a dwelling place on earth (*I Enoch* 42), and so returned to heaven.<sup>102</sup> But righteousness does dwell with the Son of Man, insuring just judgments.<sup>103</sup>

46:3 *wa-k'ellomu mazāgebtu za-xebu*<sup>7</sup>/and... all the treasures of that which is hidden: In *Par. En.*, *mazāgebtu* are generally storehouses that store up the cosmological and meteorological forces, such as the wind,<sup>104</sup> rain, hail, snow,<sup>105</sup> thunder and lightning (e.g. *I Enoch* 41:4–5, 69:23).<sup>106</sup> Here, they store divine secrets, which it will be the privilege of the Son of Man to reveal. Cyrus, the Lord's anointed, is also given “the treasures of darkness and the hoards in secret places” by God (Isa. 45:3).<sup>107</sup> This metaphor has abundant biblical precedent. And as noted above, the seer is to be trusted regarding the revelation of the hidden treasures, since the revelation of natural secrets authenticates the revelation of the spiritual, judicial secrets

figure being full of grace like one of the holy angels. See also Casey, *Solution*, 99, where he draws out that Enoch even surpassed Noah in the quality of righteousness.

<sup>100</sup> Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 120, sees the parallels between *I Enoch* 46:3 and Isa. 1:21, 32:16 as tenuous, saying that “the association may only be assessed as possible.”

<sup>101</sup> Charles, *I Enoch*, 88; Black, *I Enoch*, 208.

<sup>102</sup> Manson, “The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels,” 131, finds relevance in Sir 24:7–12, where Wisdom is commanded by the Creator to dwell in Jacob, “an honoured people.” Manson points out that in Sirach wisdom is identified with the Torah, and the Torah with the righteousness of God, in which case the text is interesting. The lack of a dwelling place in *I Enoch* 42 is more immediate, and so the contrast between the people and the Son of Man is more striking.

<sup>103</sup> In Scripture, righteousness is imagined in a variety of metaphors. Righteousness can kiss, look down on and go before someone (Pss. 89:10, 11, 13); righteousness sometimes is an article of clothing worn by a priest (Pss. 132:9), a belt (Isa. 11:5) a breastplate (Isa. 59:17), or a robe (Isa. 61:10, Job 29:14); the image of a ruler also is used of righteousness (Isa. 60:17), as well as the image of a plant springing up (Isa. 61:11). While righteousness does not seem to have been objectified or personified to the extent that Wisdom was, these passages are examples of metaphorical images used of righteousness in a way similar to what is done here with the image of righteousness dwelling with the Son of Man.

<sup>104</sup> Cf. Jer. 10:13, 51:16, וַיִּצְאֵרְוֶהָ מֵאֲצִרְתָּיו, “he brings the wind out from his storehouses” cf. also Ps. 135:7. In Ps. 33:7 the deeps are in storehouses, תְּהוֹמוֹת תְּהוֹמוֹת. In Isa. 33:6, the fear of the Lord is his treasure, יִרְאֵת יְהוָה הִיא אֲצִרְוֹ.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. Job 38:22, הֲבָאתָ אֶל-אֲצִירֹת שֶׁלֵּג וְאֲצִירֹת בְּרֶד תִּרְאֶה, “Have you entered the storehouses of the snow or have you seen the storehouses of the hail?” Cf. Sir. 43:14 and Prov. 2:4.

<sup>106</sup> Dillmann, *Lexicon*, 878, lists words that indicate different kinds of storage compartments or units, rather than anything contained in them like treasure.

<sup>107</sup> Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 120.

46:3 *we'etu yekaššet*/he will reveal:

Whereas the *angelus interpres* was showing (*'ar'aya*) the seer all the secrets, now the Son of Man is said to reveal (*kašata*) the treasures of that which is hidden. Throughout *Par. En.*, a distinction seems to be maintained regarding the knowledge that angels show (*'ar'aya*) in contrast to divine information that is revealed (*kašata*). Heavenly secrets revealed by the angels, whether appropriately or not, are shown (*'ar'aya*). The secrets appropriately revealed are those shown (*'ar'aya*) to Enoch and others (e.g. 40:8, 43:3, 46:2, 60:11, 69:14, 71:3, 4), while the secrets that should not have been revealed are shown (*'ar'aya*) by the fallen angels (69:1) such as the secrets of war, evil and the gematria of the oath (69:6, 12, 13). But divine information is revealed (*kašata*), such as the secrets to Enoch (38:3), the revelation through the cord-measures (61:5), the deeds of the righteous and elect (61:13), the revelation of the Son of Man to the elect (62:7, 69:26), and here (46:3) the revelation by the Son of Man of the hidden things.<sup>108</sup> This consistency suggests that the hidden things to be revealed by the Son of Man are not simply heavenly information which the angels also have access to and could show, but they are divine information, inaccessible to the angels, and consciously and deliberately revealed by the divine figure.

46:3 *'esma 'egzi'a manāfest kiyāhu xāreya*/for the Lord of Spirits has chosen him: *'egzi'a manāfest*/the Lord of Spirits is the usual name for God, appearing 104 times in *Par. En.*, evidently a favorite of at least the final redactor. It is possibly derived from the term “Lord of Hosts,” since the hosts of heaven are the spirits,<sup>109</sup> although its origin has several possibilities. It may possibly depend on an expression like יהוה אלהי רוחות לכל בשר, “The Lord, the God of the spirits of all flesh” (Num. 16:22, 27:16). Or it may be taken over from an expression like ὁ τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης ἐξουσίας δυνάστης, “The ruler of spirits and all powers” (2 Macc. 3:24). Another possibility might be “The Father of Spirits” (τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων, Heb. 12:9), a term which might have been current at the time of the composition of *Par. En.*, or its origin may lie in a description like “Lord of every Spirit” (אדון לכל רוח, 1QH 10.8) which is found in Qumran. As Black points out, it is unlikely that the author of *Par. En.* created a new title for God since so much of the material is derived from biblical and traditional sources. Most likely, “Lord of Spirits” was an acceptable translation, or even an acceptable interpretative translation, for “Lord of hosts.” As Black also points out, confirmation of this may be present in the Trisagion of Isa. 6:3 quoted in *1 Enoch* 39:12, “Those who sleep not bless thee, they stand before thy glory saying holy, holy holy is the Lord of Spirits: he fills the earth with spirits.” The virtual equivalence between “hosts” and “spirits” may be traced to the world-view of the author, whose universe was populated with angelic beings and disembodied spirits. This was the case in Qumran as well, where “hosts of his spirits” (צבא רוחיו) and “hosts of his angels” (צבא מלאכיו) are parallel expressions (1QM 12:7–8). *'egzi'a manāfest*/the

<sup>108</sup> Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn*, 111–112.

<sup>109</sup> See Charles, *1 Enoch*, 69, note on 37:2, and Black, *1 Enoch*, 189–92.

Lord of Spirits, then, may be an interpretative translation from Hebrew (יהוה צבאות) or Aramaic (מַרְאֲרֵי הַחַיִּים), or it may even reflect an interpretative translation from a Greek version, κύριος τῶν πνευμάτων, where “hosts” was understood as angelic beings.

The Son of Man is “*xāreya*/chosen,” which is consistent with the title “Chosen One” or “Elect One.”<sup>110</sup>

46:3 *wa-za-keflu k'ello mo'a ba-qedma 'egzi'a manāfest ba-ret'la-ālam*/and through uprightness his lot has surpassed all before the Lord of Spirits forever (or “his portion has completely triumphed before the Lord of Spirits in truth forever”): Black considers this an unusual turn of phrase. Concretely, the land was apportioned out to the tribes of Israel (חֶלֶק cf. Josh. 18:5–7), and metaphorically, adultery (Ps 50:18) and idolatry (Isa. 57:6, Psa. 17:14), as well as God’s punishment of them (Isa. 17:14, Job. 27:13) are also a person’s portion, or chosen course of life. The portion (*kefl*) of the Son of Man seems to refer to the chosen course of action, or purpose, or cause of the Son of Man.<sup>111</sup> This cause is victorious before God, unlike the cause of the righteous and elect, who are now suffering under oppression on earth, and its victory will bring about the promised reversal of fortunes.

### 3.2.4 1 En. 46:4–5

4 <sup>22</sup>*wa-zentu* <sup>23</sup>*walda sab* <sup>24</sup>*za-re'ika* <sup>25</sup>*yānašše'omu la-nagašt wa-la-xāyālān*  
<sup>26</sup>*em-meskābātihomu wa-la-senu'ān* <sup>27</sup>*em-manābertihomu* <sup>28</sup>*wa-yefatteḥ leg'āmāta*  
<sup>29</sup>*senu'ān* <sup>30</sup>*wa-yādaqeq* <sup>31</sup>*asnāna xāte'ān*.

5 <sup>29</sup>*wa-yegafatte'omu la-nagašt* <sup>30</sup>*em-manābertihomu* <sup>31</sup>*wa-em-mangeštomu*  
<sup>32</sup>*esma* <sup>33</sup>*i-yālē* <sup>34</sup>*elewwo* <sup>35</sup>*wa-i-yesēbbeḥewwo wa-i-yegannyu* <sup>36</sup>*em-eytē*  
*tawehbat lomu mangešt*.

4 And this Son of Man whom you have seen will rouse the kings and the powerful from their resting-places, and the strong from their thrones, and will loose the reins of the strong, and will break the teeth of the sinners.

5 And he will cast down the kings from their thrones and from their kingdoms, for they do not exalt him, and do not praise him, and do not humbly acknowledge whence (their) kingdom was given to them.

<sup>110</sup> Charles, *I Enoch*, 88, see Charles’s notes on 38:2, 40:4; Black, *I Enoch*, 197, 208; VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 172–74, 189. The title “Elect One” has evidently come from the chosen servant motif of Deutero-Isaiah, cf. Isa. 41:8, “But you, Israel, my servant, Jacob, whom I have chosen. . .”

וְאַתָּה יְשׁוּעָאֵל עַבְדִּי יַעֲקֹב אֲשֶׁר בְּחַרְתִּיךָ,

Isa. 41:9, “You are my servant, I have chosen you. . .”

עַבְדִּי אֲתָהּ בְּחַרְתִּיךָ,

and Isa. 42:1, Here is my servant, . . . my chosen, בְּחַרְתִּי. . .

<sup>111</sup> Charles, *I Enoch*, 88; Black, *I Enoch*, 208. *Kefl* could be a translation of either גֹּרֶל (lot, portion, as in Josh. 19:51; Black’s choice) or חֶלֶק (portion, tract, territory, as in Gen. 14:24). See further, Dillmann, *Lexicon*, 878.

## Variants

- <sup>22</sup>*wa-zentu*/and this: omitted by Tana 9; Abb 35 and Curzon 56 add *we<sup>3</sup>etu*.
- <sup>23</sup>*walda*/son: omitted by the original hand of Abb 35.
- <sup>24</sup>*za-re<sup>3</sup>ika*/whom you have seen: the corrector of Ryl has *za-re<sup>3</sup>iko* (2nd masc. sing with a 3rd masc. sing. suffix), while Tana 9 has *za-re<sup>3</sup>iku*/whom I saw, possibly a scribal emendation reverting to first person narrative; the original hand of Ryl and all other manuscripts have *za-re<sup>3</sup>ika*/whom you saw, taking this as a continuation of the comments by the *angelus interpres*.
- <sup>25</sup>*yānašše<sup>3</sup>omu*/he will rouse them: Knibb notes that Tana 9 prefixes *za-*; Charles noted that Curzon 55 and Munich 30 also prefix *za-*. Charles<sup>112</sup> has a speculative note about *1 Enoch* 46:5 being originally a marginal correction for *1 Enoch* 46:4. As Charles himself points out, the note assumes both a Hebrew text and a manuscript with marginal notes. Both Knibb and Black ignore the suggestion. Charles' case does appear to be unlikely, since the textual evidence as it now exists does not support the hypothesis.
- <sup>26</sup>*wa-yefatteḥ leg<sup>w</sup>āmāta*/and he will loose the reins: Berl has the singular *leg<sup>w</sup>āma*/rein, while Abb 55 omits the verb *yefatteḥ*/he will loose.
- <sup>27</sup>*šenu<sup>c</sup>ān*/of the strong: Tana 9 has *šenu<sup>c</sup>āna*, thus modifying "reins;" Ryl apparently has a verse break after this word rather than three words later after *xāte<sup>3</sup>ān*.
- <sup>28</sup>*wa-yādaqeq*/and will break: Tana 9 has *wa-yāwadeq*/and will make collapse.
- <sup>29</sup>*wa-yegafatte<sup>c</sup>omu*/and he will cast them down: BM 491 has *wa-yegafte<sup>c</sup>omu*, the subjunctive, "and may he cast them down."
- <sup>30</sup>*em-manābertihomu*/from their thrones: BM 485 and BM 491 have *manābertihomu ba-diba manābertihomu*/their thrones upon their thrones; Abb 35 has *em-manābertihomu ba-diba menbārātihomu*/from their thrones upon their foundations; Tana 9 has *em-diba manābertihomu*/from upon their thrones.
- <sup>31</sup>*wa<sup>2</sup>em-mangeštomu*/and from their kingdoms: BM 485 has the longer form before the suffix, *wa<sup>2</sup>em-mangeštihomu*.
- <sup>32</sup>*esma<sup>3</sup>i-yālē<sup>c</sup> elewwo*/for they do not exalt him (causative): BM 491 and Berl have *esma<sup>3</sup>i-yāl<sup>c</sup> elewwo*/since they may not exalt him (causative subjunctive), perhaps influenced by *1 Enoch* 62–63 where the kings plead for more time to exalt the Lord of Spirits, but to no avail; Tana 9 has *wa<sup>2</sup>i-yāl<sup>c</sup> alewwo*.
- <sup>33</sup>*wa<sup>2</sup>i-yesēbbeḥewwo*/and they do not praise him: BM 485 has *wa<sup>2</sup>i-yesēbbeḥ*/and he will not praise (3rd sing. masc.) without a suffix, imperfect; Berl has *wa<sup>2</sup>i-yesēbbeḥu*/and they will not praise (3rd pl. masc.) without a suffix, imperfect; Tana 9 has *wa<sup>2</sup>i-sabbeḥewwo*/and they did not praise him (3rd pl. masc.) with a suffix, in the perfect rather than the imperfect.
- <sup>34</sup>*em<sup>2</sup>eytē*/whence: BM 485 adds the copula *we<sup>3</sup>etu*.

## Notes

46:4 *wa-zentu walda sab<sup>3</sup>za-re<sup>3</sup>ika*/and this Son of Man whom you have seen:

<sup>112</sup> Charles, *1 Enoch*, 86–87.

The statement refers back to the vision of 46:1, and so the use of the demonstrative *zentu*/this is appropriate (see above on 46:2). For *walda sab*<sup>7</sup> see earlier on 46:2 also.

46:4 *yānašše<sup>3</sup> omu*/he will rouse them:

Several themes in the passage have similarities with Isaiah 14, the taunt against the king of Babylon. In Isa. 14:9, the prophet says that even Sheol will raise the kings from their thrones to taunt the king of Babylon, while the seer in *1 Enoch* 46:4 envisions the kings and the powerful being roused from their resting places and the strong from their thrones by the Son of Man. The uncomfortable vision of maggots and worms covering their beds is common to both (Isa. 14:11, *1 Enoch* 46:6), while the Babylonian king's aspiration to rule above the stars (Isa. 14:13) is similar to the kings' claim to rule the stars (*1 Enoch* 46:5). Nonetheless, the king of Babylon is laid low (Isa. 14:3–23) and similarly the kings are cast down from their thrones and kingdoms (*1 Enoch* 46:5). These similarities indicate that the taunt against the king of Babylon in Isaiah 14 may have provided some of the ideas for the author of *Par. En.* in envisioning the Son of Man overthrowing the kings and the mighty ones in *1 Enoch* 46.

46:4 *wa-yefatteh leg<sup>w</sup>āmāta šenu<sup>c</sup>ān*/and he will loose the reins of the strong:

The idea of releasing the reins means disarming or taking away the power and control of the strong. A scriptural precedent for this phrase could not be found. Charles refers to it as a “strange phrase,” while Black suggests “loosen the loins,” seeing מִתְּנֵי עֲצוּמִים = “reins of the strong” as a possible misreading of מִתְּנֵי עֲצוּמִים = “loins of the strong.” This expression means to demoralize and probably also to disarm<sup>113</sup> which may perhaps derive from Isa. 45:1, where Cyrus, the anointed (a title also applied to the Son of Man figure), subdues the kings and strips them of their robes.<sup>114</sup> Without textual warrant the emendation is intriguing, but not certain.

46:4 *wa-yādaqeq<sup>3</sup> asnāna xāte<sup>3</sup>ān*/and he will break the teeth of the sinners:

The motif of breaking the teeth of the sinners may be a desired punishment for the wicked, similar to the plea in Pss. 3:8[7] and 58:7[6], where the wish is also expressed that the teeth of the wicked may be broken.

46:5 *wa-yegafatte<sup>c</sup> omu*/and he will cast down:

(For the profile of the kings and mighty ones, see the section on dating *Par. En.* in the previous chapter.) The power of the Son of Man to turn the current ruling elite out of office is highlighted here. The theme of overthrowing the unrighteous rulers is also expressed in passages like Isa. 14:9, Sir. 10:14, and Dan. 5:20, to which Lk. 1:52 may also possibly be alluding.<sup>115</sup>

<sup>113</sup> Charles, *1 Enoch*, 87; Black, *1 Enoch*, 208.

<sup>114</sup> “The Anointed” is another title applied to the Son of Man figure in *1 Enoch* 48:10 and 52:4, as VanderKam points out in “Righteous One,” 171.

<sup>115</sup> Charles, *1 Enoch*, 88; Black, *1 Enoch*, 208; Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 121–23.

### 3.2.5 Summary of the Exegesis of 1 En. 46:1–5

This passage reveals that the figure of the Son of Man is taken from a concise, but very precise allusion to Dan. 7:9, 13, and to the two heavenly figures envisioned there. The possibility of two heavenly figures seems to have been prepared for by the Canaanite mythology of Baal and El, although the conflict between those two gods in no way is preserved in this passage. Here the Son of Man is accompanying the Head of Days, and is given center stage by the author. He is described as being very attractive, and like one of the holy angels in appearance. The Son of Man is characterized by righteousness, which is also a characteristic of the future royal figures envisioned by Isaiah and Jeremiah. Thus a nuance of the royal messiah is added to the conception of the Son of Man, and while Daniel 7 provides the base for the vision, it is filled out with other material, especially from Isaiah and Jeremiah.<sup>116</sup> Further, the Son of Man has the privilege to reveal certain secrets, on par with the revelation of divine information. This adds the nuance of an extremely close contact with the divinity to the conception of the Son of Man. Finally, the power to overthrow the kings and the mighty, the current ruling elite, is ascribed to the Son of Man. Implicit in this power is the verdict that the kings and the mighty are corrupt, and that the Son of Man is acting with divine authority in overturning them.<sup>117</sup>

And so based on Daniel 7, and filled out with characteristics from Isaiah and Jeremiah, 1 Enoch 46 attributes to the Son of Man:

- a) heavenly status, but without the motion of coming;
- b) righteousness;
- c) a revelatory function;
- d) chosenness; and
- e) the judicial role with full authority to overthrow the kings and mighty ones, who deny the name of the Lord of Spirits and who persecute the righteous.

Narratologically, the questions raised by the seer about the identity, origin and purpose of the Son of Man arouse the curiosity of the implied reader. The answer is to be found, both in the angel's immediate response in describing the righteousness, revelatory privilege, and power of the Son of Man (46:3–5), and in the course of the whole work as the judging activity of the Son of Man is more fully explored. The questions also look forward to the climactic identification of the seer, Enoch, with the very Son of Man whom Enoch now sees for the first time in these verses.

The function of this passage is to introduce the hope found in the interpretation of Dan. 7:13, where the ultimate salvation of the nation is the focus. As in the time of the

Charles's concern about the first line of either vs 5 or vs 6 being a dittography of the other seems misplaced. The two ideas complement each other in a parallel manner.

<sup>116</sup> 1 Enoch 46:1–5 reveals that the author apparently knew and drew on several prophetic passages for the development of the concept of the Son of Man: Dan. 7, Isa. 9:6[7], 11:4, 5, 14, 32:1, Jer. 23:5–6, 33:15–16.

<sup>117</sup> Colpe, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, 425–26.



writing of the Book of Daniel the hope of salvation for the nation was centered in the human-like figure, so now again, in the time of the composition of *Par. En.*, the hope of salvation from corrupt rulers and the desire for the vindication of the righteous and elect ones are pinned on this human-like figure, who is now called the Son of Man.

### 3.3 Exegesis of 1 Enoch 48:2–7

*1 Enoch* 48:2–7 reveals further developments in the figure of the Son of Man in *Par. En.*, and two issues are raised. One is the issue of how extensive the influence of Deutero-Isaiah is, and the other is the issue of the pre-existence of the Son of Man.<sup>118</sup>

Theisohn has shown the similarities between *1 Enoch* 48 and Isaiah 49. He sees significant parallels on two levels.<sup>119</sup> The first level is specific similarities in terminology:

<i>1 Enoch</i> 48:2	called by the Lord of Spirits	Isaiah 49:1	the Lord called me
vs 2	named before the Chief of Days	vs 1	named in the
			mother's womb
vs 4	light to the nations	vs 6	light to the nations
vs 5	prostration to worship	vs 7	kings and
			princes prostrate
			themselves
vs 6	chosen	vs 7	chosen
vs 6	hidden	vs 2	hidden in the hand
			and in the quiver.

The second level includes thematic similarities between the two passages:

- a) parallelism of thought units is used throughout both passages;
- b) pre-birth selection is present in both;
- c) the idea of salvific return is evident in both;
- d) worship and praise are mentioned in both;
- e) the order of the similarities is the same in both, except for the idea of hiddenness; and
- f) the concept of the "light to the nations" is used in the same context and with the same meaning.

Theisohn further points out that only *1 En* 48:3, 6b have no parallels in Isaiah 49. All these similarities indicate for Theisohn that the author of *Par. En.* had Isaiah 49 in mind when developing this passage.

<sup>118</sup> VanderKam, "Righteous One," 189–90.

<sup>119</sup> Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 119–21.

Grelot, however, is unconvinced.<sup>120</sup> He dismisses Theisohn's observations as being more thematic than verbal. He claims that while isolated terms may be similar, concepts are not developed and the parallelism is not precise. He points out that the naming of the Son of Man is described in the context of creation, while the naming of the Servant of God is put in terms of being in the mother's womb. Further, the concept of hiddenness is imprecise, because the metaphor of the arrow in the quiver does not appear in *1 Enoch* 48, but Theisohn himself acknowledges this. The most precise parallel, the role of being the light to the nations, is mentioned but not commented on by Grelot, except to say that it is not further developed. Grelot refuses to see that the similarities Theisohn has enumerated necessarily prove dependence.

Grelot appears to be too harsh. These brief reminiscences of Isaiah 49 are very similar in style and quality to the allusions to Daniel 7 in *1 Enoch* 46: concise and precise. Similarly in *1 Enoch* 48 the author alludes concisely and precisely to the chosen servant passages of Deutero-Isaiah.

My study of the passages in question indicates that grounds exist for including Isaiah 42 as source material, just as surely as Isaiah 49.<sup>121</sup> As is well known, contemporary scholarship identifies four Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah: Isa. 42:1–4, 49:1–6, 50:4–9, and 52:13–53:12, in which terms like “servant” and “chosen” are used.<sup>122</sup> To be sure, similar language is used in connection with the nation. Deutero-Isaiah describes Jacob, or Israel, as the “servant,” עַבְדֵי, and “chosen,” בְּחִיר (Isa. 44:1,

<sup>120</sup> Pierre Grelot, *Les Poèmes du Serviteur* (Paris: Cerf, 1981), 133–37.

<sup>121</sup> Billerbeck and Müller have already noticed the influence of Isaiah 42, as acknowledged by both Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 117 and Grelot, *Les Poèmes du Serviteur*, 133. See also J. Jeremias, πᾶσι θεοῦ, *TDNT*, V.687–88.

<sup>122</sup> See e.g. James Muilenberg, *Isaiah: Chapter 40–66* (*IB*, Vol. 5; New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1956), 383, 406–8, presenting Bernhard Duhm's theory, with a discussion of subsequent adjustments. The precise boundaries of these poems have been debated, but are roughly as delineated above. George A. F. Knight, *Deutero-Isaiah: A Theological Commentary on Isaiah 40–55* (New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1965), 12. John L. McKenzie, *Second Isaiah* (Anchor Bible 20; New York: Doubleday, 1968), xv–xvi, xxxviii–lv; McKenzie believes the four songs do not form a literary unit, and are to be detached from their context as well as from each other. Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66* (London: SCM Press, 1969), 11, 20–21. Pierre Grelot, *Les Poèmes du Serviteur*, 17, 21–73. R. N. Whybray, *The Second Isaiah* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 66–81. Herbert Haag, *Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterocesaja* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1985), 4–8. John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 34–66* (Word, vol. 25; Waco: Word, 1987), 117, identifies the servant as three different entities: Israel as the Servant of Yahweh, the Persian king (Cyrus, Darius or Artaxerxes) as the Servant of Yahweh, or obedient worshippers as the servants of Yahweh. He is able to distinguish between the different identities because he has added “stage directions,” as it were, to the corpus, imagining it to be a dramatic reading, and indicating who the various speakers are at different points. It is difficult to evaluate his proposal, but on the surface it appears to be subjective and overly complex. It probably is safer to distinguish only between voice and number, because that is self-evident in the text. Paul D. Hanson, *Isaiah 40–66* (Interpretation; Louisville: John Knox Press, 1995), 40–41; Hanson delights in the “multivalence of the symbolism” (of the servant) seeing the servant as “a catalyst for reflection on the nature of the response demanded of those who have received a call from God.” Hence Hanson chooses not to pin down the identity of the servant either as an

24; 45:4; 41:8, 9).<sup>123</sup> It appears, however, that the author of *Par. En.* has limited himself, drawing particularly on Isaiah 42 and 49. These two passages speak of the servant as an individual and they use the adjective “chosen.” The passages where the nation seems to be meant are not alluded to. Perhaps in the author’s mind the two passages from Isaiah 42 and 49 constituted a unit depicting a single chosen servant, who has a mission of restoring the people. These two passages, then, form the basis for this poem in *1 Enoch* 48, which is about the naming of the Son of Man and his salvific purpose. The utilization of these two passages will become evident in the notes below.

*1 Enoch* 48:2–8 is a poem with seven tripartite verses. An outline of the structure of the poem is presented below, with a summary of the thought-units of each verse. The progression of ideas through the poem indicates that the versification of the text does not quite match the structure of the poem. The importance of outlining the poem in this way is to show that, because of the structure, certain disputable elements are integral rather than intrusive.

<i>Verse in text</i>	<i>Structure</i>	<i>Summary of thought-units</i>
1 En. 48:2	a	naming of the Son of Man
	b	in the presence of the Lord of Spirits
	b	before the Chief of Days
3	c	before the sun and the constellations were created
	c	before the stars were made
	a & b	he was named before the Lord of Spirits
4	d	hope for the righteous
	e	light to the Gentiles
	d	hope for the troubled
5	f	worship
	f	glorify, bless and celebrate
6	g	Son of Man chosen and hidden
7	h	to be revealed to the holy and righteous
	h	will preserve the righteous
	i	because they loathe unrighteousness

individual, royal or otherwise, or as the nation, since that would be “a violation of the poetic tenor of the servant passages.”

<sup>123</sup> In these passages the servant is addressed in the second person singular, yet the identification of the servant as the nation is clear from the context. In the so-called Servant Songs, the servant is also addressed in the second person singular, yet an individual can be understood from the context.

	i	they loathe the ways of the unrighteous
	j	they will be saved
	j	they will be avenged
8	k	the kings of the earth will be downcast
	k	so will the strong of the land
	l	they shall not be saved.

This poem, as it is preserved, further elucidates the figure of the Son of Man, particularly in terms of pre-existence. N. Messel, however, believes that vs 3 (pre-mundane naming) and 4c (the light to the nations) are interpolations and vs 6 is incomprehensible due to extensive corruption.<sup>124</sup> This, in effect, excises the notion of pre-existence. But Messel has simply asserted that verses 3 and 4c are interpolations, and has not provided careful argumentation. Such an assertion simplifies the problems associated with the text, but does not seem to be very well founded. It is better to retain the verses and seek to understand them in their setting. Subsequent scholars have not accepted Messel's assertion, and instead have focused on the nature of the pre-existence of the Son of Man.

### 3.3.1 1 En. 48:2–3

2 *Wa-baye*<sup>1</sup>*eti* <sup>1</sup>*sa*<sup>2</sup>*āt* *tašawwe*<sup>3</sup>*ā* <sup>2</sup>*zoku* <sup>3</sup>*walda sab*<sup>3</sup> *ba-xaba* <sup>4</sup>*egzi*<sup>4</sup>*a manāfest*  
<sup>4</sup>*wa-semu* <sup>5</sup>*maqđema re*<sup>5</sup>*sa mawā*<sup>6</sup>*el.*

3 <sup>6</sup>*Wa-za*<sup>6</sup>*enbala* <sup>7</sup>*yetfaṭṭar* <sup>8</sup>*ḏaḥay* <sup>8</sup>*wa-ta*<sup>9</sup>*amer* <sup>9</sup>*za*<sup>10</sup>*enbala* <sup>10</sup>*yetgabbaru*  
<sup>11</sup>*kawākebta samāy wa-semu tašawwe*<sup>11</sup>*ā ba-qedma* <sup>12</sup>*egzi*<sup>12</sup>*a manāfest.*

2 And at that hour that Son of Man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, and his name (was named) before the Head of Days.

3 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.

#### Variants

<sup>1</sup>*sa*<sup>2</sup>*āt*/hour: Abb 35 has <sup>1</sup>*elat*/day.

<sup>2</sup>*zoku*/that: BM 485, BM 491, Berl, Abb 35, and Tana 9 all transpose *zoku* to a position after *walda sab*<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>3</sup>*walda*/son: Tana 9 has *welud*/son, a plural form used in the singular sense (see Lambdin, 442). Tana 9, which displays variants 2 & 3, might be translated: “at that hour that one was named as the offspring of man ( or “Son of Man”) before. . .”

<sup>4</sup>*wa-semu*/and his name: BM 485 has *wa-sema* (without the possessive pronoun); Berl has <sup>4</sup>*esma*/because; Tana 9 has *semu*/his name (without the conjunction). Ryl has a verse-break before *wa-semu*.

<sup>124</sup> N. Messel, *Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden Henochs* (ZAWBeih. 35; Giessen, 1922), 50.

<sup>5</sup>*maqdema*/before: Tana 9 has *ba-qedma*/before; *maqdema* is usually an adverb, “beforehand,” so *ba-qedma*, the preposition would be expected, and Tana 9 has preserved it.

<sup>6</sup>*Wa-za’enbala*/even before: Ryl has the letter “n” written interlinearly. Tana 9 has *wa-’enbala*, without appreciable semantic difference.

<sup>7</sup>*yetfaṭṭar*/were created: the whole Eth I family of manuscripts has *tetfaṭṭar*, 3rd fem. sing. or 2nd masc. sing. passive subjunctive.

<sup>8</sup>*wa-ta’amer*/and the constellations: Abb 55 omits; BM 485 has *wa-tā’amer*; Berl and Tana 9 have *wa-ta’amra*. This clause in Berl and Tana 9 then would be translated, “Even before the sun was created and known. . .” or possibly, “Even before the sun was created, it (i.e. the name) was known.”

<sup>9</sup>*za’enbala*/before: BM 485, BM 491, Berl, and Tana 9 have *’enbala*; Abb 55, the corrector of Abb 35, Ull, and two other manuscripts have *wa-za’enbala*/and before. The presence or absence of *wa-* or *za-* does not make an appreciable difference in meaning.

<sup>10</sup>*yetgabbaru*/were made: Berl and Tana 9 have *yetgabbar*, the singular instead of the plural, which is a frequent phenomenon in Ethiopic.

<sup>11</sup>*kawākebt*/stars: Abb 55 has *kawākebt*, without the construct marker *-a-*, but semantically similar.

### Notes

48:2 *taṣawwe’ā zeku walda sab’*/that Son of Man was named;

48:3 *wa-semu taṣawwe’ā*/his name was named:

In the Bible the naming of a person or object establishes or develops a relationship, sometimes of domination, sometimes of possession, and sometimes of purpose or mission.<sup>125</sup> Here the sense is that the Son of Man is named, called, or designated to a purpose or mission. The outline of this mission begins in this passage.<sup>126</sup> Just as Cyrus was named by God and given a title (Isa. 45:3–4) and as the chosen servant of the Lord was called from birth and given his name (Isa. 42:6; 49:1; cf. Isa. 43:1, 7; 44:5; 45:3; 48:12), so here the Son of Man is named, or designated, for a basic, life-shaping purpose.<sup>127</sup>

Messel understands this issue differently.<sup>128</sup> The naming of the Son of Man for Messel is not to be understood as appointing him as the Son of Man. Rather, Messel,

<sup>125</sup> Hans Bietenhard, ὄνομα, *TDNT* 5.252–54, 266–67; Manson, “The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch, and the Gospels,” 123–45, esp. 133–34; Black, *I Enoch*, 210. Examples illustrating these ways of understanding naming are Adam’s naming the animals (Genesis 2) in terms of domination, God’s name being named over Israel results in their becoming his possession (Isa. 63:19), and Isaiah’s children’s names (Isaiah 7) in terms of purpose or mission.

<sup>126</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 210.

<sup>127</sup> Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, 44, also notices the suspense built into the narrative thread. Like a good detective novel, the reader does not hear the name until it is disclosed at the end.

<sup>128</sup> Messel, *Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden Henochs*, 50–55.

having declared verse 3 to be an interpolation, emphasizes the courtroom imagery. He suggests that the angels, who are the courtiers in this image, merely remind the king, God, of the availability of the Son of Man, and in this sense “name” him. Narratively, however, Messel must assume too much. The courtroom scene may be justifiable as being assumed. But for the angels to function as courtiers reminding the king of the Son of Man, there must be a further assumption that the king has asked for a volunteer, and that there is some mission the king needs the volunteer to accomplish. Messel is reminded of the call of Isaiah, and so envisions this scene in similar terms. But to do so, he must import too many assumptions for which there is no justification in the text. He has sought to transform this description of a vision into a call narrative, and it simply is not warranted. Because too much must be assumed in Messel’s understanding, his view must be rejected.

For notes on the term Son of Man, see notes on 46:1, 2.

48:2 *baye’eti sa’āt*/at that hour:

This is not the formula used by the author to mark off significant statements, *ba-we’etu mawā’ell*/in those days, as at *1 Enoch* 47:1, 48:8, which is comparable to “And on that day. . .” or “After this/that. . .” This is a different expression, *baye’eti sa’āt*/at that hour. It may have an impact similar to the Aramaic phrase, כְּבִה־שְׁעֵהָ, found in Dan. 3:6, 15; 4:30; and 5:5. It may mean, “in that instant,” or “at that very moment.” Thus Charles may be close to the mark when he suggests that the reference to the hour refers to the time of the vision.<sup>129</sup> Messel distinguishes between two possibilities: the hour referred to is either the moment of the seer’s vision or the moment of the future fulfilment of the vision. He has already eliminated the pre-mundane moment, since he believes verses 3 and 4c are interpolations.<sup>130</sup> Since the phrase is not used with a verb indicating the seer’s experience (as it is in *1 Enoch* 39:2, 9), Messel argues that the hour referred to indicates the future time of the unfolding moment of salvation. Black has justifiable grounds for suggesting that the hour referred to in *1 Enoch* 48:2 is before the creation of the sun and the constellations, because in *1 Enoch* 48:3 the concept is repeated, explicitly stating that the naming of the Son of Man took place before the creation of the sun and constellations.<sup>131</sup>

However, with the pan-chronic notion of time that is apparent in apocalypticism, it is most likely that the author envisioned the seer beholding the vision of the naming of the Son of Man as being before creation, and yet seeing it in the present rather than the past tense. While apocalyptic writers pay attention to the sequence of events through time, their apprehension of time appears to be synchronic, seeing past, present and future all as though in the present. Thus, here the author is describing a vision during the lifetime of Enoch, but it is a vision that encompasses and reveals

<sup>129</sup> Charles *1 Enoch*, 93.

<sup>130</sup> Messel, *Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden Henochs*, 50, has simply asserted that verses 3 and 4c are interpolations without arguing the case. This is too drastic, and so my position is that verses 3 and 4c must be included in the considerations.

<sup>131</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 210, also suggests that this expression is unique.

all time, including the time before the creation of the sun and stars when the Son of Man was named. In this case, the naming of the Son of Man, then, occurs both at the time of Enoch's vision and before creation, yet it is the same time, not two separate events.

48:2 *'egzi'a manāfest/Lord of Spirits...re'sa mawā'el/Head of Days:*

Both *nomina dei* appear here. Rather than seeing the appearance of the second name as a redactional expansion, it is probably appropriate to see it as a doubled thought in a poetic passage, which displays a complex tripartite structure (as outlined above). As is usual in Hebrew poetry, the verses of this passage contain two complementary thoughts. But the format of complementary thoughts in this poem is complicated by doubling either the first or the second thought. For example, in verse 2, the naming of the Son of Man is the first thought, and the second thought is of being in the presence of God; and this second thought is doubled. In verse 3, the first thought is the creation of heavenly entities, and the second thought is the naming of the Son of Man. Here the first thought is doubled. In verse 4, the first thought is hope for the righteous, which is doubled, but in the third stich of the verse, and the second thought is of this figure's role as the light to the Gentiles. Verses 5 and 6 together make up a tristich, verse 7 contains two stanzas and verse 8 a single stanza with the tripartite structure. Hence the second appearance of God's name, using the alternate form, fits into the structural pattern of the passage.

48:3 *Wa-za'ebala yetfaṭṭar ḏaḥay wa-ta'amer za'ebala yetgabbaru kawākebta samāy/Even before the sun and the constellations were created, before the stars of heaven were made:*

The eternal, transcendent purpose of the Son of Man is emphasized by proclaiming that it was ordained even before the sun, the constellations and the stars were created. If the sun, the constellations, and the stars are guides for arranging life's activities, then the forensic, revelatory purpose of the Son of Man is prior even to that. Thus the community can be consoled, since they know the saving purpose of the Son of Man has greater weight and authority than even the astrological powers. The logical precedence is uppermost here, rather than the temporal (see comments on pre-existence below). The constellations/*ta'amer* may refer to the signs of the zodiac, or the constellations,<sup>132</sup> or more likely they refer to the calendrical signs of certain stars appearing in the sky in conjunction with certain festivals or seasons.<sup>133</sup> This is

<sup>132</sup> Charles, *1 Enoch*, 93.

<sup>133</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 210; Otto Neugebauer, *Ethiopic Astronomy and Computus* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1979; Heft 22, Band 347), 216, does not refer to this verse in his treatment of Ethiopic calendrical calculations, but he does note that "Nowhere in our material can one find references to constellations (zodiacal or otherwise) or to single fixed stars or planets except in texts that depend on Arabic sources." While stars are mentioned often and in great numbers, they are treated more as celestial decoration, and sometimes thought of in terms of a military type of organization representing the angels. In

slightly more specifically related to the calendrical and purity concerns of the rest of *1 Enoch*, and so is a more precise interpretation.<sup>134</sup>

Another close connection between this poem and the chosen servant passages of Isaiah can be noted in the reference to creation. The naming of the Son of Man is said to be before the creation of the sun, the constellations and the stars. References to creation also occur in the chosen servant passage of Isaiah 42. Here God is described as the one who created the heavens and who has chosen the servant (Isa. 42:5 cf. 44:24; 45:7). Although Isaiah does not note the priority of the chosen servant to the heavens, nonetheless it is interesting that creation is alluded to in the context of the chosen servant. Similarly, the author of *Par. En.* places the naming of the Son of Man in the context of creation.

### 3.3.2 1 En. 48:4–5

4 <sup>12</sup>Ye<sup>3</sup>etu yekawwen batra la-šādeqān <sup>13</sup>wa-qeddusān kama botu <sup>14</sup>yetmarg<sup>w</sup>azu  
<sup>15</sup>wa-<sup>3</sup>i-yedaqu <sup>16</sup>wa-we<sup>3</sup>etu <sup>17</sup>berhāna <sup>3</sup>ahzāb <sup>18</sup> <sup>19</sup>wa-we<sup>3</sup>etu yekawwen tasfā  
la-<sup>3</sup>ella <sup>20</sup>yahammu <sup>21</sup>ba-lebbomu.

5 <sup>22</sup>Yewaddequ wa-yesaggedu qedmēhu k<sup>w</sup>ellomu <sup>3</sup>ella yaxādderu <sup>23</sup>diba yabs  
<sup>24</sup> <sup>25</sup>wa-yebārekewwo wa-yesēbehewwo wa-yezēmoru <sup>26</sup>lotu la-sema <sup>3</sup>egzi<sup>3</sup>a  
manāfest.

4 He will be a staff to the righteous and holy, that they may lean on him and not fall, and he (will be) the light of the nations, and he will be the hope of those who grieve in their hearts.

the Astronomical chapters of *1 Enoch*, 72–82, the constellations, the zodiac and the planets are conspicuously absent, which Neugebauer characterizes as a primitive level of astronomical observation. There the material delineates “gates” through which the sun, moon and winds proceed. However, since this material in chapter 48 is translated from an original Semitic work, *ta’amer* may convey an astronomical term that may have been rather mysterious to the Ethiopian translators.

<sup>134</sup> Perhaps, however, Berl and Tana 9 have preserved the original (see Variants above): “Before the sun was created, it (i.e. his name) was known.” The attractive feature of this reading is that then there are four parallel clauses:

“And at that hour that one was named as the Son of Man before the Lord of Spirits.  
His name (Berl: Because he) was before the Head of Days.  
Even before the sun was created, it (i.e. his name) was known;  
Before the stars of heaven were made, his name was named before the Lord of Spirits.”

Further, the idea of constellations would be eliminated by this reading, which would be more consistent with the absence of references to constellations in Ethiopic literature (see Neugebauer, *Ethiopic Astronomy and Computus* 216). The unlikely aspects of the reading from Tana 9 are that one would expect a repetition of (wa-) *semu*, as in 48:2b and 48:3b; and that the clause is inordinately short compared to its context. The reading of Ryl is the *lectio difficilior*, and therefore to be preferred. Nonetheless the reading of Tana 9 is extremely interesting.



5 All those who dwell upon the dry ground will fall down and worship before him, and they will bless, and praise, and celebrate with psalms the name of the Lord of Spirits.

### Variants

<sup>12</sup>*We<sup>3</sup>etu/He*: Tana 9 has *wa-we<sup>3</sup>etu*, adding the conjunction.

<sup>13</sup>*wa-qeddusān*/and holy: BM 485, BM 491, Berl, the original hand of Abb 35, Abb 55 and Tana 9 omit this word; the corrector of Abb 35, Ull and two other manuscripts have *wa-la-qeddusān* repeating the preposition.

<sup>14</sup>*yetmarg<sup>w</sup>azu*/they may lean: the whole Eth I family and five other manuscripts have *yetmaragg<sup>w</sup>azu* using the imperfect instead of the subjunctive. A purpose clause is expressed with *kama* + subjunctive. Knibb refers the reader to 61:3, 5.

<sup>15</sup>*wa-<sup>2</sup>i-yedaqu*/and not fall: BM 491 and Tana 9 have *wa-<sup>2</sup>i-yewaddequ* (cf. 48:5), the imperfect rather than the subjunctive. One would expect both this verb and the previous one to be subjunctive following *kama* in a purpose clause rather than imperfect. In Ryl *ye-* is inserted supralinearly, probably by a corrector. Following this word in Ryl there is a verse break.

<sup>16</sup>*wa-we<sup>3</sup>etu*/and he: Here in contrast to note 12 above, Tana 9 has *we<sup>3</sup>etu*.

<sup>17</sup>*berhāna<sup>3</sup> aḥzāb*/the light of the nations: Berl has *berhāna la-<sup>3</sup>aḥzāb*, making use of the preposition *la*, which can mean “to.”

<sup>18</sup>*wa-we<sup>3</sup>etu*/and he: Tana 9 has *we<sup>3</sup>etu*, omitting the conjunction (cf. notes 12 and 16).

<sup>19</sup>*wa-we<sup>3</sup>etuyekawwen*/and he will be: Abb 55 omits the pronoun, having *wa-yekawwen*.

<sup>20</sup>*yaḥammu*/who grieve: BM 485, BM 491, the original hand of Abb 35, Abb 55 and Tana 9 have *yaḥammemu*.

<sup>21</sup>*ba-lebbomu*/in their hearts: Berl has *wa-ba-lebbomu*, adding the conjunction.

<sup>22</sup>*Yewaddequ*/they will fall down: BM 485 and Tana 9 have *yedaqu*, the subjunctive.

<sup>23</sup>*diba*/upon: BM 491, Berl, Abb 35 (it is questionable whether a second hand inserted a correction here), Abb 55, Bodl 5, the original hand of Ryl and five other manuscripts have *westa* (“in, into, to”) here.

<sup>24</sup>*wa-yebārekewwo*/and they will bless: Ull omits the conjunction *wa-*.

<sup>25</sup>*wa-yebārekewwo wa-yesēbeḥewwo*/and they will bless, and praise: The order of these two verbs is reversed by BM 485, BM 491, Abb 35, Abb 55 and Tana 9.

<sup>26</sup>*lotu la-sema<sup>3</sup> egzi<sup>3</sup>a*/the name of the Lord: BM 491 and Tana 9 omit *lotu*; Berl (over an erasure) has *la-semu<sup>3</sup> egzi<sup>3</sup>a*; Abb 35 has *lotu la-<sup>2</sup>egzi<sup>3</sup>a*; BM 485 and Abb 55 have *la-<sup>2</sup>egzi<sup>3</sup>a*. Although there seems to be quite a variation with this phrase, the different variations are really rather minor. Sometimes the indirect object in the dative sense can be expressed through a simple prepositional phrase, such as *la-<sup>2</sup>egzi<sup>3</sup>a*/to the Lord of (in Abb 55), or it can be expressed in a double phrase, in which the preposition first has the pronominal ending and then it is repeated with the indirect object, as in Abb 35, *lotu la-<sup>2</sup>egzi<sup>3</sup>a* (lit.: to him to the Lord of) or in Ryl, *lotu la-sema<sup>3</sup> egzi<sup>3</sup>a* (lit.: to it to the name of the Lord of).<sup>135</sup> The presence of

<sup>135</sup> This is discussed by Lambdin, *Introduction to Classical Ethiopic*, §20.2 p 83 (cf. the *qatalo la-neguš* construction, §15.3 p 64.)

*sem(a)*/name used in conjunction with the *nomen dei* is synonymous with the use of the *nomen dei* without *sem(a)*.

### Notes

48:4 *berhāna* <sup>ʾ</sup>*ahzāb*/the light of the nations.

This phrase is unique to *1 Enoch* 48:4 and to the chosen servant passages of Isa. 42:6 and 49:6.<sup>136</sup> The chosen servant is to be a beacon to the nations regarding God's saving and restoring of the chosen people, and similarly in *1 Enoch* the chosen Son of Man will be a light to the Gentiles regarding the restoration of the righteous and holy.<sup>137</sup>

48:4 *We*<sup>3</sup>*etu yekawwen batra*/He will be a staff

*la-šādeqān wa-qeddusān*/to the righteous and holy

*kama botu yetmarg*<sup>w</sup>*azu wa-<sup>ʾ</sup>i-yedaqu*/that they may lean on him and not fall:

The image of the staff for the righteous and holy makes use of an image similar to that used in the shepherd's staff, *בַּשֵּׁנֶה*, of Ps 23:4,<sup>138</sup> or the staff of life (bread and water) that was taken from the people during the siege of Jerusalem (Isa. 3:1). The people's trust in Egypt as a reliable staff was misplaced, for it was nothing more than a broken reed which would pierce the hand, as Sennacherib's commander taunted King Hezekiah (Isa. 36:6). Probably a contemporary metaphor, that same image is taken by the author of *Par. En.* and applied to the trustworthiness and reliability of the Son of Man for the righteous and holy. Just as the old or feeble are steadied by a staff or a cane, so the holy and righteous, who are currently enfeebled and weak due to oppression, can rely on the Son of Man for strength and stability. The strength and support for the Son of Man, in turn, is probably the same as for the Servant, who is

<sup>136</sup> See Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 119, who graphically illustrates the dependence upon Isaiah 49. It appears to me, however, that Isaiah 42 has also greatly influenced the author in this poem.

<sup>137</sup> Messel, *Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden Henochs*, 54, has declared vs 3 to be an interpolation, and vs 4 to refer to God, and therefore the phrase, "the light of the nations" to be not applicable to God, but rather to be seen as a Christian gloss. Muilenberg, *Isaiah: 40–66*, 468–69, 568–69, identifies the servant who is to be the light to the nations as Israel in both Isa. 42:6 and 49:6, even though the second singular suffix is used at Isa. 42:6 (*וְיִצְרֶךָ* וְיִתְקַן), and despite some grammatical confusion at Isa. 49:6 (how can Israel restore Israel, unless God is seen as the ultimate subject? see esp 568–69). Knight, *Deutero-Isaiah*, 185–86, sees light and salvation as parallel, made possible by God and manifest through the servant. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66*, 100, sees Israel as the focus here (Isa. 42:6) and Israel is to be the covenant through which "the nations are to experience light, illumination and salvation." At Isa. 49:6, however, Westermann sees an individual as the Servant, possibly connected somehow with Deutero-Isaiah, as the instrument of God to bring salvation to the ends of the earth. Watts, *Isaiah 34–66*, 187, believes Darius, the Persian King, is meant to be the restorer of Israel and the beacon to the nations, an identification that is not accepted by most scholars. Hanson, *Isaiah 40–66*, 47, sees Israel as "the instrument through which nations come to share the light of God's salvation."

<sup>138</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 210.

strengthened, helped and upheld by God (Isa. 41:10). This image carries comfort and encouragement for the readers.<sup>139</sup>

The image of being a staff to the righteous and the hope of those who are troubled conveys the salvific purpose of the Son of Man. The salvific purpose of the chosen servant of Isaiah is to bring forth justice (Isa. 42:1, 7, 16) and through his activity the Lord's salvation will reach to the ends of the earth (Isa. 49:6). Although the images are different, the purpose is the same, to accomplish the salvation of the people.

48:4 *tasfā la-`ella yaḥammu ba-lebbomu*/the hope of those who grieve in their hearts: The author extends the purpose of the Son of Man by describing the Son of Man as the hope for those who grieve in their hearts, or are broken-hearted. This bears a striking resemblance to the purpose of the Servant, who is to bind up the broken-hearted, *לחבש לנשברי־לב* (Isa. 61:1).<sup>140</sup>

48:5 *Yewaddequ wa-yesagedu qedmēhu*/they will fall down and worship before him:

Worship by the earth's inhabitants is noted. They will fall down and worship, glorify, bless and praise in song the Name of the Lord of Spirits. Similarly in the chosen servant passages of Isaiah, worship and song are noted as the reaction to God's salvific activity through the chosen servant (Isa. 42:10–12; 49:13 cf. 43:23 where the heavens and the depths praise the redeemer). Again the Isaianic influence is apparent.

A very similar prediction is made of the Davidic king in Qumran: the gentiles "shall come before thee and worship thee" (1QSb 5.28; cf. Isa. 60:10).<sup>141</sup>

48:5 *k<sup>w</sup>ellomu `ella yaxādderu diba yabs*/all those who dwell upon the dry ground: As the dry land will be refreshed with streams (cf. Isa. 44:3), and as God will renew and make the desert productive, a place where people may dwell in peace and security (cf. Isa. 32:16–18), so in *I Enoch* 48:5, those who dwell on dry land will be secure enough to worship the Son of Man.

48:5 *yebārekewwo wa-yesēbeḥewwo*/they will bless and praise, *wa-yezēmori lotu la-sema `egzi`a manāfest*/and celebrate with psalms the name of the Lord of Spirits:

Isaiah reports that the people rejoiced with song for the renewal the Lord brought (cf. Isa. 41:16b), and they are urged to sing a new song in response to the new things God is doing through the Servant (cf. Isa. 42:10). Similarly, the righteous and holy for whom *Par. En.* is written will respond with songs and praise for the name of the Lord of Spirits.

<sup>139</sup> See Knight, *Deutero-Isaiah*, 54–55.

<sup>140</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 210.

<sup>141</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 210.

As Theisohn has pointed out,<sup>142</sup> Isaiah 49 is the basis for this passage, but Isaiah 42 and nearby passages that include the idea of praise and song have also been incorporated. Throughout Deutero-Isaiah, praise for God is a pertinent theme, and so it is appropriate for our author to include that same theme also.<sup>143</sup>

### 3.3.3 1 En. 48:6–7

6 <sup>27</sup>Wa-ba-<sup>28</sup>enta-ze <sup>28</sup>kona xeruya wa-xebu<sup>29</sup> a <sup>29</sup>ba-qedmehu <sup>30</sup>em-qedma yetfaṭṭar  
 ‘ālam wa-<sup>31</sup>eska <sup>31</sup>la-<sup>32</sup>ālam.

7 <sup>32</sup>Wa-kašato <sup>33</sup>la-qeddusān wa-šādeqān <sup>34</sup>tebab la-<sup>35</sup>egzi<sup>36</sup> a manāfest <sup>36</sup>esma  
 ‘āqaba kefālomu la-šādeqān <sup>37</sup>esma šal<sup>38</sup>ewwo wa-mannanewwo <sup>38</sup>la-zentu  
 ‘ālam za-<sup>39</sup>ammadā <sup>39</sup>wa-k<sup>40</sup>ello megbāro <sup>40</sup>wa-fenāwihu ḏal<sup>41</sup>u <sup>41</sup>ba-semu  
 la-<sup>42</sup>egzi<sup>43</sup> a manāfest <sup>42</sup>esma ba-sema zi<sup>44</sup>ahu yedexxenu <sup>43</sup>wa-faqādē kona  
 la-ḥeywatomu.

6 And because of this he was chosen and hidden before him before the world was created, and forever.

7 But the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits has revealed him to the holy and the righteous, for he has kept safe the lot of the righteous, for they have hated and rejected this world of iniquity, and all its works 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 one who will require their lives.

#### Variants

<sup>27</sup>Wa-ba-<sup>28</sup>enta-ze/And because of this: BM 485, BM 491, Abb 35, Abb 55 and Tana 9 omit the conjunction wa-.

<sup>28</sup>kona xeruya/he was chosen: Tana 9 reverses the order of these two words.

<sup>29</sup>ba-qedmehu—la-<sup>31</sup>ālam/before him—forever: Berl has <sup>29</sup>em-qedma <sup>31</sup>ālam  
 ba-qedmehu/prior to the world before him.

<sup>30</sup>em-qedma/before: Bm 485, Abb 35, and Abb 55 have za<sup>30</sup>enbala/before; BM 491 and Tana 9 have <sup>30</sup>enbala/before.

<sup>31</sup>la-<sup>32</sup>ālam/forever: Bodl 5 and five other manuscripts add ba-qedmehu/before him; two manuscripts add qedmehu/before him.

<sup>32</sup>Wa-kašato/but...has revealed him: BM 491 has the medio-passive wa-takašta/but he was revealed; Tana 9 has wa-kašata lomu/but he revealed to them.

<sup>33</sup>la-qeddusān wa-šādeqān/to the holy and the righteous: corrected Ryl and Tana 9 agree as printed above; Abb 35, Abb 55, Ull, and BM Add. 24990 have la-šādeqān wa-la-qeddusān; the original text of Ryl, and all other manuscripts have la-qeddusān wa-la-šādeqān;

<sup>142</sup> Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 119–21.

<sup>143</sup> Westermann, *Isaiah: 40–66*, 14. Another major theme is the admonition, “Fear not!” אַל תִּירָא, Westermann, *Isaiah: 40–66*, 13.

- <sup>34</sup>*tebab*/wisdom: BM 485, Abb 55, and Tana 9 have *wa-tebabu*, adding the possessive personal pronoun, as is idiomatically common. Berl has *wa-la-tebab*, treating *tebab*/wisdom as an indirect object, along with “the holy and the righteous.”
- <sup>35</sup>*la-zentu*/this: BM 485, BM 491, Abb 35, Abb 55, Tana 9, Bodl 5 and nine other manuscripts have *la-ze*/this, which is simply a shorter form of the demonstrative.
- <sup>36</sup>*wa-k<sup>w</sup>ello*/and all (acc.): Berl has *wa-k<sup>w</sup>ellu*/and all (nom.).
- <sup>37</sup>*wa-fenāwihu*/and its ways: Abb 55 omits this phrase.
- <sup>38</sup>*ba-semu la-<sup>3</sup>egzi<sup>3</sup>*/in the name of the Lord: Berl has *ba-sema<sup>3</sup> egzi<sup>3</sup>*, construct form.
- <sup>39</sup>*esma*/for: BM 485 omits the word. Corrected Ryl has an erasure after this word. The erasure occurs at the beginning of the next line, where a blank space now exists. Knibb does not comment on it. The space could accommodate a repetition of *esma*. If this is the case, this would explain the corrector’s erasing it.
- <sup>40</sup>*wa-faqādē*/and desire (and he is the one who will require): BM 485 has *wa-ba-faqādu*/and of his own accord; Berl has *wa-faqād*/and the desire; Tana 9 and three other manuscripts have *wa-faqādu*/and his desire. Black, *I Enoch*, 211, connects *faqādē* and ἐκδικητῆς, and translates “and he (i.e. the Lord of Spirits) will become the avenger of their lives” (see Dillmann, *Lexicon*, 1362).

### Notes

48:6 *xeruya*/chosen:

The “Chosen One” or “Elect One” is another of the designations for the figure who is also called the Son of Man, and so in this poem the chosenness of the Son of Man is expressed through the adjective *xeruy*.<sup>144</sup> This concept seems to have been a key trigger for the author of *Par. En.* in choosing biblical material for the development of the Son of Man in this poem. The concept of chosenness for the servant is used by Isaiah to refer to the nation of Israel in 41:8–9, 44:1–2 and 45:4, but to an individual in 42:1, 49:7.<sup>145</sup> God upholds the chosen servant and put his spirit upon him to bring forth justice.<sup>146</sup> This concept informs the portrayal of the Son of Man in *Par. En.* to a very deep, core level. As the Isaianic chosen servant is to reestablish justice for the

<sup>144</sup> VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 172–74 notes the many occurrences of this designation. G. Schrenk, ἐκλεκτός, *TDNT* vol. IV; 183–4, notes the narrowing that has occurred in apocalyptic literature in the usage of this term. Traditionally it had been used of the nation of Israel as whole to refer to their being the elect or chosen of God, but in apocalyptic literature it has been narrowed to refer to the select in-group who are considered to be the righteous remnant, in contrast to the outsiders who are considered to be wicked and apostate. The Elect One as a single figure is the representative of the elect ones, and has the same characteristics of righteousness, hiddenness and eventual revelation to the wicked at a proper time.

<sup>145</sup> Grelot, *Les Poèmes du Serviteur*, 132, argues that the concept of being chosen is spread too broadly throughout the Old Testament to claim that the Servant Songs are the foundation for *I Enoch* 48. However, when taken in conjunction with the other allusions to the Servant Songs, chosenness stands out as a major similarity.

<sup>146</sup> Muilenberg, *Isaiah: 40–66*, 464; Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66*, 94; McKenzie, *Second Isaiah*, 37.

exiles, so the Enochic chosen Son of Man is to reestablish justice for the righteous and elect and holy.

48:6 *xebu*<sup>3</sup>/hidden:

*Par. En.* depicts the Son of Man as “hidden.”<sup>147</sup> The nearest concept in the chosen servant passages is the claim that God has hidden, **הַחֵבֵי אֲנִי** (the root of *xebu*<sup>3</sup> is a cognate of **חָבַא**), the servant in the shadow of his hand, like an arrow hidden, **הַסֵּתֵרֵנִי**, in a quiver (Isa. 49:2), as noted by Theisohn.<sup>148</sup> Both the Son of Man and the chosen servant are hidden, but both are very real. The hiddenness of God’s activities is also expressed in the Isa. 45:15, “God is hidden,” **אֱלֹהִים מְסֻתָּהר**. The idea being expressed in Isaiah 45 is that God’s actions and plans were hidden from view, both from the exiles in Babylon and from the world at large, until the rise of Cyrus to power. Then it became clear to the prophet and was revealed to the world. Similarly the Son of Man is hidden until his revelation to the righteous as well as to the oppressors.

48:7 *kašato*/revealed him:

The hidden Son of Man is to be revealed to the righteous and holy. This idea of the revelation of the previously hidden is also contained in Isaiah’s proclamation of God’s salvific activities for the restoration of Israel. God announces what was previously hidden (Isa. 48:6). What has been in planning (the rise of Cyrus in Isaiah 45) was to be brought out into the open. Further the prostration of kings and princes before the chosen servant of God implies that he has been revealed to them in Isa. 49:7. This hiddenness of divine activity followed by its revelation found in Isaiah 45, 48 and 49 seems to have informed the concept of the hidden Son of Man who is to be revealed to the holy and righteous.

48:7 <sup>3</sup>*esma* <sup>3</sup>*āqaba kefāloru la-šādeqān*/for he has kept safe the portion of the righteous:

The Son of Man’s purpose is to restore the righteous and keep safe their portion. This is a justice issue, an issue of the reversal of fortunes, a salvific matter. The redemptive purpose of the Son of Man has a conceptual counterpart in the purpose of the chosen servant of Isaiah. In Isa. 42:3 the prophet claims that the servant will preserve the poor and lowly, for he will not break a bruised reed or quench a dimly burning wick. His activity will include the release of prisoners (Isa. 42:7) and his task will be to raise up the tribes of Jacob, to restore the survivors of Israel, as well as to be a light to the nations (Isa. 42:6, 49:6). Thus the function of the Son of Man is essentially the same as that of the chosen servant: the restoration of the righteous.

<sup>147</sup> S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1956), 385–7.

<sup>148</sup> Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter* 119–21. Muilenberg, *Isaiah: 40–66*, 567, understands that “God protected his servant and hid him in secret until the time appointed for his service.” Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66*, 208, emphasizing the parallelism of the verse, believes that the hiddenness forms part of the servant’s equipment. Knight, *Deutero-Isaiah*, 180–81, envisions the hiddenness to be for the purpose of training.

### 3.3.4 The Son of Man and the Servant in Isaiah

Theisohn has graphically illustrated that *1 Enoch* 48 is greatly influenced by Isaiah 49.<sup>149</sup> But closer study has revealed that both Isaiah 42 and Isaiah 49 provide many points of similarity. These extensive similarities suggest that this author has depended on both chosen servant passages (Isa. 42:1–9 and Isa. 49:1–7) for the development of the Son of Man in *1 Enoch* 48.<sup>150</sup>

- a) The Son of Man is named before the Lord of Spirits before time (*1 Enoch* 48:2–3), while the servant recounts having been called and named before birth (Isa. 42:6; 49:1, 5; cf. Isa. 43:1, 7; 44:24; 45:3, 4; 48:12; Jer. 1:5).
- b) The naming of the Son of Man is put in the context of references to creation (1 En. 48:3) and the commissioning of the chosen servant is done in the context of references to creation (Isa. 42:5; cf. Isa. 43:1, 7; 44:24; 45:7).
- c) The Son of Man is to be the light of the Gentiles (*1 Enoch* 48:4), as was the servant (Isa. 42:6; 49:6). This seems to be a direct quotation. It may also be tempting to see it as an interpolation by a later hand. The tripartite structure of the passage noted above, however, militates against that possibility. In this verse, the idea of being a light to the Gentiles is the second, but undoubted thought of the verse.
- d) Both figures have a salvific purpose. In *1 Enoch* 48:4 the imagery used is of a staff to lean on, while in Isa. 42:1, 7, 16 it is of preserving a dimly burning wick and not breaking a bruised reed.
- e) Prostration in worship by earth's inhabitants before the Son of Man (*1 Enoch* 48:5) is taken from the prostration by kings and princes before the servant (Isa. 49:7).
- f) Singing and celebration in praise of God's salvation (*1 Enoch* 48:5) echo the songs of joy in the heavens (Isa. 49:13; cf. Isa. 44:23; 54:1). Isaiah's audience is also commanded to break forth into songs of praise over the activity of the chosen servant (Isa. 42:10–12).
- g) The chosenness of the Son of Man (*1 Enoch* 48:6) mirrors the words of God to the servant that God, the faithful Holy One of Israel, has chosen the servant (Isa. 42:1; 49:7; cf. Isa. 44:1, 43:10).

<sup>149</sup> Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter* 119–21.

<sup>150</sup> VanderKam, "Righteous One," 189–90, observes seven elements taken from Deutero-Isaiah: 1) the epithet "Righteous One," 2) the description "Chosen One," 3) pre-existence/ chosen from the womb, 4) judgment of the oppressors, 5) the phrase, "light to the nations," 6) the verb *tala'āla* for the exaltation of the servant, 7) the occurrence of "anointed" (Cyrus in Isa. 45:1) and "son of man" (in Isa. 51:12, where it is merely a poetic parallel to אֲנִי). Frederick Houk Borsch, *The Son of Man in Myth and History* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967), 154, however, does not believe dependency must be postulated. Deutero-Isaiah can be seen as drawing on the same background. But, to allow that the author of *Par. En.* may have "borrowed an expression or two" surely does not do justice to the extensive use of Deutero-Isaiah's concepts.

- h) And the hiddenness of the Son of Man (*1 Enoch* 48:6) matches the servant's having been hidden by God like an arrow in the quiver (Isa. 49:2), to be revealed at the appropriate time (*1 Enoch* 48:7, Isa. 49:7 implies revelation).
- i) Even the reaction of the earthly authorities, the kings and mighty ones, is similar in that they offer obeisance to the chosen one (*1 Enoch* 48:8; Isa. 49:7).

It is curious to note the absence of any quotations or allusions to the suffering servant song (Isa. 52:13–53:12). It has been noted that the Son of Man is not a “suffering” servant,<sup>151</sup> and there may be a simple reason. The servant in Isaiah suffers vicariously and through his wounds the nation is healed and their sins forgiven. One literary reason for this absence may be that the adjective “chosen” is not used of the suffering servant. Perhaps this indicates that for the author of *Par. En.*, the suffering servant was not considered the same as the chosen servant. Since the author of *Par. En.* was considering the Son of Man as the “Chosen One” the characteristics of the suffering servant perhaps were not mined for helpful concepts and ideas. We have seen that this author apparently distinguished between the chosen servant as the nation and the chosen servant as an individual, and drew mainly upon the passages in which the chosen servant is an individual. Therefore it is consistent to surmise that, since the suffering servant was not described also as “chosen,” the suffering servant was not considered for the development of the figure of the Son of Man.

The characteristics associated with the Son of Man in *1 Enoch* 48, however, are clearly drawn from both Isaiah 42 and 49, passages which portray the chosen servant as an individual. By applying these characteristics and ideas concerning the chosen servant of God, the author is developing the purpose of the Son of Man in terms of having the same roles and functions as the chosen servant. As salvation and restoration accompany the chosen servant, so the Son of Man will accomplish the salvation and restoration of the righteous community for whom *Par. En.* was written.

### 3.3.5 The Son of Man and Pre-existence

*1 Enoch* 48:2–7, together with *1 Enoch* 62:7, has formed the basis for the debate concerning the pre-existence of the Son of Man in the conception of the author. It has been argued that because the Son of Man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits before the sun, the constellations and the stars were created (*1 Enoch* 48:2–3), and because the Son of Man had been chosen and hidden from everlasting (*1 Enoch* 48:6), the author's belief that the Son of Man enjoyed a pre-mundane existence is implied.<sup>152</sup> This conclusion, however, rests upon a strictly chronological

<sup>151</sup> E.g. Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn*, 128–32; Colpe, ὁ υἱός, 426; VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 190.

<sup>152</sup> Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 370–73; Maurice Casey, “The Use of Term ‘Son of Man’ in the Similitudes of Enoch,” 12–13, 28 and *Son of Man*, 99–112; Chrys C. Caragounis, *The Son of Man* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1986), 114–15; R. G. Hamerton-Kelly,



arrangement of the events. According to the order of creation, the sun and the stars, i.e. the means whereby time can be organized, were created chronologically prior to the earth and its inhabitants. If the Son of Man is said to be named before the sun and stars were created, then this implies a pre-mundane existence: hence the Son of Man is pre-existent. This argument may be too literalistic. Manson, followed by VanderKam, posits an existence for the Son of Man in the mind of God.<sup>153</sup> This view understands the naming to be concerned more with purpose and mission than with ontology. The revelatory and judicial purpose of the Son of Man existed from everlasting, rather than the actual, ontological existence of the figure.

It may be appropriate to push the understanding even further. The apocalyptic nature of *Par. En.*, while it is strongly motivated by the reality in time of the oppressed existence of the righteous community, nonetheless employs a multivalent mode of thought<sup>154</sup> that mixes heaven and earth, as well as the past, the present, and the future. Hooker notes insightfully, “apocalyptic (literature) by its very nature held together what was at once present and future, that which was already in existence, but yet still had to take place.”<sup>155</sup> Heavenly reality influences earthly events, and “future earthly events exist already as heavenly realities.”<sup>156</sup> This perspective holds that the chronological order of events is of little concern, since God, who is above all time, is in control of all time and of the earthly events that take place in time. This view perceives that all time exists at once for God, and so in the heavenly realm, even though words are present that sometimes indicate temporal precedence, their temporal sense here is less important than their meaning in terms of an expression of authority. Here the Son of Man precedes the sun and stars in regard to authority,

*Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man: A Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1973), 17–18. Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn*, 83–101 and Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 128–39, also discuss the issue and favor the ontologically pre-existent understanding. Messel, *Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden Henochs*, 52–55, however, takes the position that verse 3 is an interpolation, and that verse 6 is so corrupt that all that can be gleaned from verse 6 is that the Son of Man was hidden from the beginning. He suggests the “beginning” is not the beginning of time (i.e. pre-mundane existence) but the beginning of Israel’s memory. Further the naming of the Son of Man refers not to his pre-mundane appointment but to the angels in the kingly court refreshing the memory of the supreme king as to the Son of Man’s availability. Thus Messel, in a dubious way, defines pre-existence out of the passage altogether.

<sup>153</sup> Manson, “The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels,” 136, points out that the Hebrew and Jewish mind had no qualms about believing in the pre-mundane existence of Israel either. He cites *Ber. R.* 1. 2b, where six things were thought to have preceded creation: some were actually created, e.g. the Torah and the Throne of Glory, while others were only planned, e.g. the Patriarchs and the nation of Israel, which then existed only in the mind of God. See also VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 179–82.

<sup>154</sup> Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 39, 11–17, used the term “multivalent” in discussing “the allusive and evocative power of apocalyptic symbolism,” and this, it seems to me, is a very helpful way of expanding our concepts to grasp what the ancient writers were seeking to convey.

<sup>155</sup> Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, 43.

<sup>156</sup> Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, 43.

more so than in chronology. Furthermore, the naming of a king as God's son was an honorific way of bestowing or claiming authority and was not to be understood as literal. A similar claim is made by the Sumerian and Babylonian kings. They claimed that they were named by God before time, but this was a means of glorifying and solidifying their claim to the throne, rather than positing actual pre-existence.<sup>157</sup> Here attributing pre-mundane existence to the Son of Man is a way of expressing his authority, power, and honor. Understanding apocalyptic literature in this polyvalent way, in which all time is perceived synchronically in the heavenly realm, removes the difficulty of literalistic limits and the necessity of positing an existence in the mind of God. It is a poetic, honor-bestowing mode of discourse that fits well with the apocalyptic concern to show that the representative of the righteous is powerful enough to reverse the oppression that the righteous and elect ones are suffering.

### 3.3.6 Summary of the Exegesis of 1 En. 48:2–7

This passage, then, adds to the picture taken from Daniel 7. In *1 Enoch* 46 the author took the image of the one like a son of man from Daniel 7. Here the author takes another image, that of the chosen servant of God from Isaiah 42 and 49, and applies the attributes of the chosen servant to the Son of Man, while not incorporating the Isaianic complex of the servant as the nation, or as suffering. Thus, besides accompanying the Head of Days, the Son of Man is further revealed to have the role and function of the chosen servant. The figure of the Son of Man, then, as based on the chosen servant, is further developed in *1 Enoch* 48 in the following ways:

- a) named from eternity;
- b) named before the Lord of Spirits;
- c) a support for the righteous;
- d) the light to the Gentiles;
- e) source of hope;
- f) worthy of worship and celebrated with great joy;
- g) hidden;
- h) revealed to his followers; and
- i) his followers are called "righteous/elect/holy".

The Son of Man, like the chosen servant, is named to the high purpose of saving the community, and so is worthy of worship. Great joy accompanies his appointment, although the chosenness of the Son of Man is hidden from the oppressors of the righteous community. Furthermore, comments about creation refer not to ontological pre-existence, but to the high purpose, authority and honor to which the Son of Man has been named.

<sup>157</sup> Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn*, 88–90; Manson, "The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels," 140.

### 3.4 Exegesis of 1 Enoch 62

Chapter 62 brings the reader to a more immediate investigation of the judgment of the kings and the mighty ones. The vision describes a still future event, but in this chapter of the Third Parable a more detailed and explicit account of the judgment of the oppressors is described. Their acknowledgment of the Son of Man on the throne, their plea for mercy, and their reaction are narrated.

The passage begins with a challenge to the kings to recognize the Elect One, but then the references to this judicial figure are made with four instances of two different forms of the term “Son of Man.” As the passage opens, the kings and the mighty ones are startled to see the judge on the throne, and they fall down in worship and praise. The author announces condemnation through the image of childbirth, and the vindication of the righteous and elect through the image of feasting at table with the Son of Man. Because the kings and the mighty ones had oppressed the righteous and elect, reversal of their fortunes follows. Whereas the kings and the mighty ones had feasted sumptuously, lorded it over the righteous and elect, and been clothed in luxurious garments, they are now described as falling down and worshipping that Son of Man, their faces downcast, destined to become a spectacle of punishment for the righteous and elect. In contrast, the righteous and elect shall be raised up, they shall cease to be downcast, they shall feast with the Son of Man, and they shall be clothed with glorious, non-aging garments, which symbolically are the gift of eternal life from the Lord of Spirits.

The passage has five major themes:

- 62:1–3 Vision of the Judge on the Throne
- 62:4–5 Pain of Judgment
- 62:6–9 Hopes Set on that Son of Man
- 62:10–12 Punishment of the Mighty Kings
- 62:13–16 Blessedness of the Righteous and Elect.

The judicial figure appears five times in this chapter, first as the Elect One, and then as the Son of Man. The change from “Elect One” to “Son of Man” perhaps has been occasioned by the use of the image of the pain of childbirth. The two terms, however, are used synonymously, and the judicial function of the figure is evident for both the wicked and the righteous.<sup>158</sup>

The themes of the chapter are investigated below, with a fuller examination of the verses in which the term “Son of Man” appears.

<sup>158</sup> VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 185–86.

### 3.4.1 1 En. 62:1–3 Vision of the Judge on the Throne

In the first portion of this chapter, the kings, the mighty, the exalted and those who possess the earth are commanded to acknowledge the Elect One, if they can. Narratively, the author is presenting an irony: the ones who are accustomed to all the power and to the authority to command others are now being commanded by the Lord of Spirits. This prepares the reader for their imminent condemnation.

In *1 Enoch* 62:2 a significant textual problem exists. All the manuscripts preserve the text, *wa-nabara 'egzi'a manāfest diba manbara sebhātihū*/the Lord of Spirits sat upon the throne of his glory. Scholars have suggested one of two emendations, even though the textual evidence as it now stands does not present support for it. Charles, following Dillmann, emends the text to read *wa-'anbaro 'egzi'a manāfest diba manbara sebhātihū*/the Lord of Spirits placed him (i.e. the Elect One mentioned in verse 1) upon the throne of his glory.<sup>159</sup> Black, however, emends the text by following *Liber Nativitatis Tom.* 41,59: και εκαθισε ο εκλεκτος [ο κυριος των πνευματων] επι του θρονου της δοξης αυτου./and the Elect One sat on the throne of his glory.<sup>160</sup>

Professor James C. VanderKam has also suggested in private communication that this may be an instance of misreading, if the original was in unpointed Hebrew. Perhaps  $\text{בשׂו}$  was in the *Vorlage*, intended to be read as the *Hiphil*, “he caused to sit,”  $\text{בשׂו}$ . But it may have been misread as the *Qal*, “he sat,”  $\text{בשׂו}$ , since both forms use the same consonants. This would easily explain how the received Ethiopic text could indicate that the Lord of Spirits is sitting on the throne. If it was misread in this way, it would further support Dillman’s emendation.

Emendation of this textual problem is also warranted since the appearance of the Lord of Spirits on the throne drastically interrupts the flow of the passage. The passage has started with a focus upon the Elect One/Son of Man, and in verse 5 the figure (now referred to as “that Son of a Woman”) is seated upon the throne of his glory. Further, in *1 Enoch* 49:3, the fuller allusion to the indwelling of the spirit of righteousness from Isa. 11:3, the spirit is said to be dwelling in the Elect One. Yet again, the Elect One has already been depicted as sitting on his throne in the future (*1 Enoch* 51:3) and as being placed on the throne of glory by the Lord of Spirits (*1 Enoch* 61:8). For all these reasons, it appears that emendation is necessary at *1 Enoch* 62:2. Further, the text as it has been preserved in extant manuscripts, with the Lord of Spirits sitting on the throne, can be explained as having been corrupted due to the theological motivation of preserving the supremacy of the Lord of Spirits. Black’s suggestion is less satisfying, for it requires positing a scribal error in the Greek text from which he takes his suggestion. VanderKam’s suggestion is more satisfying, since it requires only one word,  $\text{בשׂו}$ , in a Hebrew *Vorlage* that can be read two ways,

<sup>159</sup> Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch*, 112. This is also the conclusion reached by Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn*, 166 and Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 87.

<sup>160</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 235, 357, where he suggests that ο κυριος των πνευματων is a scribal or translator’s emendation.

as a *Hiphil*, which fits the sense of the passage, or as a *Qal*, which disrupts the flow of the passage. Therefore, Dillmann's suggestion of emending *nabara*, "sat," to *'anbaro*, "placed him," is preferable.

The Elect One sitting on the throne of his glory resumes the image of the heavenly courtroom scene of Dan. 7:9, where the thrones are placed for the Ancient of Days and the human-like one who is to be presented.<sup>161</sup> Theisohn has noted that the occurrences of the glorious throne display some variations of expression. The verb can be perfect, imperfect or causative, and the possessive pronoun may be present or absent. These variations in terminology indicate to Theisohn that the references to the throne have not reached a technical, fixed state. Further, he investigates the Biblical and intertestamental background, and discovers a similar variation. The constitutive elements of the throne include a) being within a vision, b) a venue for depicting God, c) being seated, and d) including in the vision the hosts around the throne. Foundational texts are 1 Kings 22 and Isaiah 6. Pss. 110:1, 5–6 is also critical in that it presents an enthronement scene, in which God has set the davidic king upon the throne next to God, and set him in judicial opposition to competing kings. Thus, Theisohn attaches the monarchical connotation to the concept of the judicial figure upon the throne.<sup>162</sup> (See further on *1 Enoch* 69:27, 29.)

The power and authority of the Elect One upon the throne is filled out by resuming an allusion to Isa. 11:2–4. This Isaianic concept has been alluded to more fully in *1 Enoch* 49:3, where the Spirit of Righteousness is seen to be dwelling in the Elect One. Here in *1 Enoch* 62:2, only two ideas from Isa. 11:2–4 are incorporated, but this is enough to allude concisely and precisely to the Isaianic passage. That the Spirit of righteousness is poured out on the Elect One is an idea that is similar to the Spirit of the Lord resting upon the shoot of the stump of Jesse.<sup>163</sup> Further, the idea of sinners being slain by the word of his mouth echoes the judgment rendered by Jesse's descendant in Isa. 11:4, in which he judges in righteousness (ושפט בצדק), smites the earth with the rod of his mouth (והכה ארץ בשבט פיו), and slays the wicked (ימית רשע). Again, the destruction of the unrighteous perhaps echoes the destruction of the kingdom of the tenth horn in Dan. 7:26, and the destruction of Edom, Moab, the Ammonites, the Egyptians and the Assyrians in Isa. 11:5–6. Through these royal characteristics, the status and authority of the Elect One upon the throne are enhanced.

<sup>161</sup> See Collins and other commentaries on *Daniel* for the background to the image of the thrones. See also Matthew Black, "The Throne-Theophany Prophetic Commission and the 'Son of Man': A Study in Tradition History," in Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs, eds., *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity; Essays in Honor of William David Davies* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976) 57–73, who discusses Enoch's appearance before the throne as a commissioning.

<sup>162</sup> Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 87–98. Matthew Black, "The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch," in J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Messiah* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 150–55, also discusses the thrones. See further on *1 Enoch* 69:27, 29.

<sup>163</sup> It is also a subtle carryover from the previous passage on the Son of Man, *1 Enoch* 48, where the allusions referred to the chosen servant upon whom the spirit rested in Isa. 42:1.

While the Elect One sits, the kings, the mighty, the exalted and those who possess the earth stand out of respect for the one upon the throne (*1 Enoch* 62:3).<sup>164</sup> Now they recognize him, and truthful judgment is passed.<sup>165</sup>

### 3.4.2 *1 En.* 62:4–5 Pain of Judgment

The reaction of the kings, the mighty, the exalted and those who possess the earth is expressed in terms of the pain of childbirth. That image also appears in Isa. 13:6–8, 21:3 and 26:17.<sup>166</sup> Isa. 13:8 appears to be the best possibility for the source of the allusion in *1 Enoch* 62:4–5. Isa. 21:3, on the one hand, seems unlikely as the source, for it is in the context of the prophet himself reacting to the horror of the message he has been given, and on the other, Isa. 26:17 also appears to be unlikely as the source, since it refers to the people of Judah themselves reeling under the punishment God has sent. In Isa. 13:6–8, however, the subject of the pain is the Babylonian people, an enemy oppressor, who is to be condemned. Further, the image of people looking aghast at each other appears both in Isa. 13:8 and *1 Enoch* 62:5. So in both Isa. 13:8 and *1 Enoch* 62:5 the same image is used, and it is used in the same way: the pain is extreme, inevitable and unstoppable.<sup>167</sup> These similarities in image and usage suggest that the author of *Par. En* is alluding to Isa. 13:6–8. *1 Enoch* 62:5 includes a reference to the judicial figure.

*Wa-yerē<sup>7</sup> ʿeyu<sup>1</sup> manfaqomu la-manfaqomu<sup>2</sup> wa-yedanaggeḏu wa-yātēḥḥetu gaṣṣomu<sup>3</sup> wa-ye<sup>3</sup> exxezomu<sup>4</sup> ḥemām soba<sup>5</sup> yerē<sup>7</sup> eyewwo<sup>6</sup> la-zeku<sup>3</sup> walda be<sup>3</sup> sit<sup>8</sup> enza yenabber diba manbara sebḥatihu.*

And one half of them will look at the other and they will be terrified, and will cast down their faces and pain will take hold of them when they see that Son of a Woman sitting on the throne of his glory.

#### *Variants*

<sup>1</sup>*manfaqomu*/one half of them: Berl omits. This was possibly omitted by parablepsis, and does not change the sense. Since only one manuscript omits it, it is not very significant.

<sup>164</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 235.

<sup>165</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 213. No idle, deceitful speech is made. Black points out the similarity with the expression דבר רק in Dt. 32:47.

<sup>166</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 235–6, also points to 1QH 3.8ff and Wis 5:1ff as using the same image. In 1QH 3.8ff the personal distress of the author is compared to the pain of childbirth, while Wis 5:1ff reflects the opposition between the righteous and the unrighteous, but not with the metaphor of childbirth.

<sup>167</sup> The only way in which the metaphor breaks down is in the outcome of the pain. Where the mother giving birth will eventually experience the joy of a new child, the suffering of the kings and the mighty ones will continue into condemnation. It is the righteous, who will experience the joy of salvation. This breakdown also applies to the use of the image in connection with the Babylonians in Isa. 13:8.

<sup>2</sup>*wa-yedanaggeḏu*/they will be terrified: Abb 55 omits, possibly by homoiarchton, as three verbs all in close proximity begin with *wa-ye-* or *wa-yā-*.

<sup>3</sup>*wa-ye' exxezomu ḥemām soba yerē'* *eyewwo la-zeku*/and pain will take hold of them when they see that. . .: Abb 55 has *wa-yerē'* *eyewwo la-we'etu*, possibly by homoiarchton.

Taking variants 2 and 3 together, Abb 55 reads: “and one half of them will look at the other and they will cast down their faces and they will see that Son of Man. . .” Abb 55 omits the verb “terrified” and the clause about pain, which suggests that perhaps the scribal intention was merely to shorten, or perhaps to de-emphasize the emotional aspects of the reactions of the kings and mighty ones.

<sup>4</sup>*ḥemām*/pain: BM 485 has *ḥemāma*/pain, in the accusative, which is probably a simple scribal error.

<sup>5</sup>*yerē'* *eyewwo*/they will see him: BM 485 has *yerē'* *eyu*/they will see. The pronominal suffix has been lost, which does not change the meaning but is less smooth. Tana 9 reads *re'yewwo*/they saw him, changing the tense into the past tense.

<sup>6</sup>*la-zeku*/that yonder: Tana 9 has *zeku*, omitting the resumptive preposition *la-*, and probably having changed the accusative to a nominative (see next Variant).

<sup>7</sup>*walda be'sit*/child of woman: BM 485 has *wald be'si*/son (of) humanity, having changed the gender to masculine, and not using the construct form. Berl Abb 35 Abb 55 have *walda be'si*, similar to BM 485, but using the construct form. Tana 9 has *weluda sab'*/sons of man, having changed the whole phrase to the plural. Charles' edition reads *walda be'si*/son of humanity, though he notes other manuscripts that agree with the reading of Ryl. The reading of Ryl, *walda be'sit*/child of woman, is to be preferred as the *lectio difficilior* (see note below). The other variants can be explained as conforming the term to a more familiar form. Casey, however, in *Solution*, 103, argues that another translator has used his/her favorite term, and therefore the reading should be *walda sab'*. However, Casey may have erroneously cited Tana 9 as having *walda sab'*. According to Knibb's transcription, Tana 9 has pluralized the term, as noted.

Taking variants 5, 6, and 7 together, Tana 9 seems to have changed the object into the subject, reading “those yonder humans (sons of man, i.e. the kings and the mighty ones) saw him (i.e. the Elect One of 62:1).”

<sup>8</sup>*enza*/when: BM 491 has *wa-enza*/and when, which has the effect of separating the two “when-” clauses into parallel and equal events, rather than subordinating the sitting on the throne to the child of woman being seen. It may heighten the pain of the seeing, but probably is not original.

### Notes

62:5 *Wa-yerē'* *eyu manfaqomu la-manfaqomu*/And one half of them will look at the other:

Looking at each other in terror is a part of the reaction of the kings and mighty ones. This mutual glancing at each other in panic is also mentioned in Isa. 13:8.

Being downcast has also been described earlier, as the kings and mighty ones begin to understand the condemnation against them. In *1 Enoch* 46:6 and 48:8, they are portrayed as downcast with shame. In contrast in *1 Enoch* 62:15, the righteous and elect will cease to be downcast as their fortunes are reversed.

62:5 *zeku walda be'sit*/that Son of a Woman:

The designation for the judicial figure here is unusual (see Variant note 7 above) This is the preferred reading, because it is the *lectio difficilior*.<sup>168</sup> As Black notes, a similar expression for a child of woman (ילוד אשה) occurs in Job 15:14, 25:4, where the context is also the confrontation with mighty potentates who are put to shame. The unusual term, that Son of a Woman/*zeku walda be'sit*, has probably been chosen in an effective rhetorical move, by the image of the pain of childbirth. The logic of the passage is that as a child being born to a woman causes her pain, so will this human, judicial figure in the heavenly court cause pain to the kings and mighty ones. One who was deemed insignificant as a newborn baby, even to the point of being unknown, turns out to be the eschatological judge with the power to vindicate and to condemn. The juxtaposition of the newborn child, that Son of a Woman/*zeku walda be'sit* and the judicial throne of glory accentuates the terror of the kings and the mighty ones.

62:5 *diba manbara sebhatihu*/on the throne of his glory:

For comments about the throne see above on *1 Enoch* 62:2 and below on *1 Enoch* 69:27, 29.

### 3.4.3 *1 En.* 62:6–9 Hopes Set on that Son of Man

As the scene develops, the kings and the mighty burst into song and praise. Perhaps the irony of this development is meant to highlight the desperate straits in which the kings and the mighty perceive themselves to be. Perhaps their motivation is a frantic attempt to reverse a shortcoming. Perhaps the author is affirming that praise and exaltation is always appropriate, no matter the source. However, as in *1 Enoch* 63:4–8, where the primary desire of the kings and mighty appears to be to correct a failing, so that is probably the primary sense here also. Part of the effect of this development is that the righteous and elect can be vindicated, for now finally their oppressors join them in properly praising and exalting the one on the throne.

*1 Enoch* 62:7 is the first of two verses in this passage that refer to the Son of Man.

<sup>1</sup>esma <sup>1</sup>em-qedm <sup>2</sup>xebu<sup>3</sup>a <sup>3</sup>kona walda <sup>4</sup>egwāla <sup>4</sup>emma-heyāw wa-<sup>5</sup>āqabo le<sup>6</sup>ul  
<sup>5</sup>ba-qedma xāyly <sup>6</sup>wa-kašato la-xeruyān.

For from the beginning the Son of Man was hidden, and the Most High kept him in the presence of his power, and revealed him (only) to the chosen.

<sup>168</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 235–36.



## Variants

- <sup>1</sup>*em-qedm*/from the beginning: BM 485 has *em-qedmu*; BM 491 has *em-qadimu*; Abb 55, Tana 9 and the Garrett manuscript have *em-qedma*, which may be simply an assimilation to the more familiar form of the phrase; all of these are variations of a phrase referring to the beginning of time, with overtones of creation (the same phrase is used in 1 John 1:1).
- <sup>2</sup>*xebu*<sup>3</sup>*a*/hidden: Berl, Abb 55 and Tana 9 have *xebu*<sup>3</sup>/hidden. The reading in Ryl has the accusative form in a predicate position after *kona*/become, while the variant has the nominative form.
- <sup>3</sup>*kona*/become: BM 485 omits, without a significant change in meaning.
- <sup>4</sup>*emma-heyāw*/mother of the living: Berl has *emm-heyāw*/mother of the living.
- <sup>5</sup>*ba-qedma xāylu*/in the presence of his power: Abb 55 has *ba-xāylu*/in his power. The “d” of *ba-qedma* is written supralinearly in Ryl.
- <sup>6</sup>*wa-kašato*/and revealed him: BM 491 Berl, Tana 9 have *wa-kašata*/he revealed (omitting the pronominal suffix). Tana 9 adds *la-qeddušān wa-* before *la-xeruyān*: “to the righteous and to the elect.” This is the fuller phrase, used frequently elsewhere, and so here it is to be seen as a unifying addition to the original reading. Further, BM 491 has an expansion: *wa-kašata la-xeruyān la-ella westa moqeh*/and he revealed the chosen ones to those in prison. It seems unlikely that a clause like this could have been accidentally dropped; therefore, it is more likely to be a gloss in BM 491, possibly influenced by 1 Peter 3:19.

## Notes

62:7 *xebu*<sup>3</sup>*a kona walda* *eg*<sup>w</sup>*āla emma-heyāw*/the Son of Man was hidden: The hiddenness of the Son of Man is consistent with *1 Enoch* 48:6 (see comments there). The term used for the Son of Man here, *walda* *eg*<sup>w</sup>*āla emma-heyāw*, is the more formal term, which is used throughout the New Testament. His revelation to the elect is also consistent with *1 Enoch* 48:6–7. (See, too, my comments on the Pre-existence of the Son of Man in the section on *1 Enoch* 48.)

62:8 In contrast to the kings and mighty ones who praise the one on the throne once it is too late, the righteous and elect are said to be sown and to stand before him. Black suggests that the image of sowing is taken from Isa. 40:24.<sup>169</sup> But in that passage, the image is of a tender shoot that cannot withstand the tempest of destruction. Here, the image seems to refer more to the surety of rootedness for the community of the righteous. They are securely grounded in their relationship with the judge on the throne. Further, they are said to stand before the Elect One on that day (of judgment), presumably in gratefulness, joy and respect, in contrast to the kings and mighty who bow down and are driven out of the presence of the Son of Man in fear and shame (*1 Enoch* 62:9-10). Therefore, the image of the root of Jesse standing as a signal to the

<sup>169</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 236. He also notes that the image of the righteous as a planting has already appeared in *1 Enoch* 10:16.

nations (Isa. 11:10) is a more likely source for this image. Both ideas of rootedness and standing appear in Isa. 11:10 and *I Enoch* 62:8.

*I Enoch* 62:9 is the second verse in this passage that refers to the Son of Man.

*Wa-yewaddequ* <sup>1</sup>*k<sup>w</sup>ellomu* <sup>2</sup>*nagašt* <sup>3</sup>*azzizān wa-le<sup>u</sup>ulān* <sup>3</sup>*wa-<sup>2</sup>ella* <sup>4</sup>*yemallekewwā la-yebs* <sup>5</sup>*ba-qedmēhu* <sup>6</sup>*ba-gaššomu*. *Wa-yesaggedu* <sup>7</sup>*wa-yessēfawewwo* <sup>8</sup>*la-zeku walda* <sup>9</sup>*eg<sup>w</sup>āla* <sup>9</sup>*ma-heyāw wa-yāstabaqq<sup>w</sup>e<sup>e</sup>ewwo* <sup>10</sup>*wa-yese<sup>3</sup>* <sup>11</sup>*meḥrata* <sup>1</sup>*em-xabēhu*.

And all the mighty kings, and the exalted, and those who rule the dry ground, will fall down before him on their faces and worship;<sup>170</sup> and they will set their hope upon that Son of Man, and will entreat him, and will petition for mercy from him.

### Variants

<sup>1</sup>*k<sup>w</sup>ellomu*/all of them: Ull adds *qedmēhu*/before him in front of *k<sup>w</sup>ellomu*, perhaps to be more precise. Abb 55 omits *k<sup>w</sup>ellomu* possibly to de-emphasize slightly the universality of the author's views.

<sup>2</sup>*nagašt* <sup>3</sup>*azzizān wa-le<sup>u</sup>ulān*/the mighty kings, and the exalted: (The translation more accurately should be "the mighty and exalted kings.") Curzon 56 and BM 484 omit *nagašt*, reading "the mighty and the exalted." Bodl 5 and Vat 71 omit <sup>3</sup>*azzizān*, which leaves "the kings and the exalted." *nagašt wa-<sup>3</sup>azzizān wa-le<sup>u</sup>ulān* is preserved by BM 485, BM 491, Abb 35, Berl (<sup>3</sup>*āzzizān*), Tana 9 and two other manuscripts, "the kings and the mighty and the exalted," which is the usual phrase. *nagašt* <sup>3</sup>*azzizān* also occurs at *I Enoch* 62:6 and 63:1, where extensive variants also exist.

<sup>3</sup>*wa-<sup>2</sup>ella*/and those who: BM 485 has *la-<sup>2</sup>ella*; Tana 9 has *wa-la-<sup>2</sup>ella*.

<sup>4</sup>*yemallekewwā*/they rule it (the dry ground): Tana 9 has *yemallekewwo*, changing the suffix from feminine to masculine. The suffix refers ahead to *la-yebs*, which is treated as both masculine and feminine.

<sup>5</sup>*ba-qedmēhu*/before him: Abb 55 omits; BM 485 has *wadqu qedmēhomu*/they fell before them, changing the verb from imperfect to perfect and the antecedent from singular, i.e. the Son of Man, to plural, which probably indicates prostration before both the Son of Man and the Head of Days. Berl has *ba-qedmēhomu*/before them.

<sup>6</sup>*ba-gaššomu*. *Wa-yesaggedu*/on their faces. And they will worship: Ryl preserves a verse break between these two words. Tana 9 reads *ba-gaššomu yesaggedu*/on their faces they will bow down; Abb 55 reads *wa-yesaggedu ba-gaššomu*/and they will bow down on their faces.

<sup>170</sup> In his translation, Knibb has not observed the verse break in Ryl. Black's translation (*I Enoch*, 60) and Charles's edition (*The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch*, 113) appear to recognize a sense break where Ryl has a verse break. Knibb understands *yesaggedu* to be in apposition to *yewaddequ*, while Black links *yesaggedu* and *yessēfawewwo* in the same sense unit, and Charles presents a line break after *ba-gaššomu*. In the end this is a rather minor point of translation style.

<sup>7</sup>*wa-yessēfawewwo*/and they will set their hope on him: BM 485, Abb 35, Abb 55 and Tana 9 have *wa-yessēfawu*, having dropped the suffix which looks ahead to the object. Berl has *wa-yesēbbehu wa-yessēfawu*/they will praise and they will set their hope on, an expansion which perhaps heightens the worship of the kings and mighty ones.

<sup>8</sup>*la-zeku*/that: Berl and Abb 55 omit *la-*.

<sup>9</sup>*ma-heyāw*/mother of the living: Berl has <sup>9</sup>*emm-heyāw*, while all other manuscripts have <sup>9</sup>*emma-heyāw*. See Variant note 4 in 62:7.

<sup>10</sup>*wa-yese*<sup>10</sup>*elu*/they will petition for: BM 485, Berl and Curzon 56 have *wa-yese*<sup>10</sup>*elewwo*, having added the pronominal suffix, which looks ahead to the object.

<sup>11</sup>*mehrata* <sup>11</sup>*em-xabēhu*/mercy from him: Berl and two other manuscripts have *mehrata ba-xabēhu*; BM 485, BM 491, Abb 35 and Tana 9 have *xab*<sup>11</sup>*hu mehrata*; Abb 55 omits <sup>11</sup>*em-xab*<sup>11</sup>*hu*.

### Notes

62:9 *wa-yessēfawewwo la-zeku walda* <sup>9</sup>*eg*<sup>9</sup>*āla ma-heyāw*/and they will set their hope upon that Son of Man

Again the more formal form of the term for the Son of Man is used (see comments on *I Enoch* 62:7). He is the focus of the urgent pleas of the mighty of this earth. Setting their hopes on the Lord, as the mighty kings here set their hopes on the Son of Man, is urged in passages like Isa. 40:31, in which those who do shall be lifted up as an eagle's wings, and Pss. 37:9, 34, in which the righteous are encouraged to wait on the Lord. Here, however, an ironic contrast is being developed by the author of *Par. En*, since the mighty kings will not receive mercy (*I Enoch* 63:8).

Other scriptural passages also counsel what the mighty kings are portrayed as doing here, repenting, pleading for mercy and setting their hope upon the divine one. Ps. 42:6(5) asks, "Why are you cast down, O my soul, and why are you disquieted within me? Hope in God; for I shall again praise him." Ps. 33:18 promises the Lord's protection to those who hope in his steadfast love, while the psalmist claims to hope in God alone in Ps. 62:5 and proclaims the Lord as "my hope, my trust" in Ps. 71:5. Again in Ps. 130:7 Israel is admonished to hope in the Lord, for with the Lord there is steadfast love and redemption (cf. Ps. 147:11). Isaiah also encourages his listeners in Isa. 30:18 by proclaiming that the Lord will show mercy, for the Lord is a God of justice, and therefore those who wait for him are blessed. Again Isaiah admonishes the wicked to forsake their way and return to the Lord, for God will have mercy and abundantly pardon (Isa. 55:7).

While the mighty kings are described as pleading for mercy and setting their hope on the divine one, precisely what scripture admonishes, the author of *Par. En* believes the opposite, as far as the oppressors are concerned. The theological conviction displayed here is similar to that in Prov. 10:28, that the righteous will be gladdened but the expectation of the wicked will come to nothing. Psalm 37 also expresses the viewpoint of this author. Psalm 37 as a whole expresses themes that are remarkably similar to the themes of *Par. En*: it admonishes trust in God, committing one's ways to the Lord and avoiding evil; vindication is promised for the righteous and condemnation

for the wicked. Possession of the earth is promised to the righteous who wait upon the Lord (vs 9, 11, 22, 29, 34), while the wicked, despite their wealth, will be destroyed and vanish like smoke (vs 9, 10, 15, 17, 20, 34, 36, 38). While Psalm 37 does not appear to form the literary basis for this chapter of *Par. En*, it does express very similar thoughts and perspectives. In this case the apocalyptic motif of the condemnation of the wicked without hope of mercy is consistent with the dichotomy between the righteous and the wicked in Wisdom literature (e.g. Prov. 10:28 and Psalm 37). It is also consistent with the dichotomy present in the image of Two Spirits controlling humankind in Qumran's *The Rule of the Community* (1QS III–IV) and with the opposition between the “sons of light” and the “sons of darkness” in *The War Scroll* (1QM I, XIII).<sup>171</sup>

A prophecy of condemnation without hope of mercy is also contained in Ezek. 28:11–19.<sup>172</sup> One of three prophecies against Tyre in Ezekiel 27–28, it contains some of the same themes as *1 Enoch* 62. Tyre<sup>173</sup> was known for its wealth and economic power, yet it was unfaithful to its treaties with Israel, preferring to offer tribute to the invading armies of Egypt, Babylon and Assyria rather than uphold its part of the defensive treaties signed with Israel. Ezekiel is so incensed by this faithlessness that he foretells Tyre's destruction in drastic, dramatic terms. Tyre, according to Ezekiel, was haughty, wealthy and powerful according to earthly standards, but their error was that they trusted in the power of their own wealth rather than in God. This is precisely what the author of *Par. En* has charged against the kings and the mighty ones and those who possess the earth. The haughtiness of the rulers of Tyre over against trusting in God would lead to their destruction, they would lose their wealth, power and prestige, and they would become a spectacle of horror (Ezek. 28:17–19). No possibility of mercy is evident in Ezekiel's outlook and he portrays their destruction as being due to their deliberate neglect of God. These themes also occur in *1 Enoch* 62–63 and *passim*. The similarities are not close or precise enough to warrant an argument for literary dependence, but they do reflect a similar dualistic viewpoint: eventually the wicked will be condemned and the righteous vindicated.

### 3.4.4 1 En. 62:10–12 Punishment of the Mighty Kings

Brief notes may be made on these verses.<sup>174</sup>

- a) “Lord of Spirits” is a frequent *nomen dei* used in all sections of *Par. En*, and plausibly derived from the Hebrew “Lord of hosts,” יהוה צבאות, or Aramaic

<sup>171</sup> See also the discussion on dualism in apocalyptic literature in David C. Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996), 35–41.

<sup>172</sup> Suggested to me by Prof. James C. VanderKam.

<sup>173</sup> Thomas L. McClellan, “Tyre,” in Paul J. Achtemeier, ed., *The HarperCollins Bible Dictionary* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers; 1985, 1996), 1181–82.

<sup>174</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 236.

מַרְאֵי רוּחַוַחַת/חַיְלוּתָא.<sup>175</sup> (See also the discussion on the exegesis of *1 Enoch* 46:1 on the name “Head of Days” and *1 Enoch* 46:3 on “Lord of Spirits.”) Here in *1 Enoch* 62:10, the divine name is preceded by the demonstrative, in one of the few instances in which a demonstrative is used with “Lord of Spirits.”

- b) The mighty kings will be so pressured or frightened by the Lord of Spirits that they will depart in fear, faces filled with shame and darkness, as was already suggested in *1 Enoch* 46:6 and *1 Enoch* 48:8. The image of faces filled with shame and darkness is reiterated in *1 Enoch* 63:11 (see comments there). Several scriptural passages reveal a similar image. For example, Ps. 83:17 contains precisely the same image. In the context of a lament, the psalmist prays that the enemies might be destroyed by God, that their faces might be filled with shame מִלֵּא פְנֵיהֶם קִלְוִן, and that they might perish in disgrace. Dan. 12:2 also refers to the shame on the faces of the condemned, while Jer. 51:51 admits to shame covering the faces of the exiles. The Babylonians in Isaiah’s oracle are warned that they will have feeble hands, their hearts will melt and they will be dismayed when the day of the Lord comes (Isa. 13:6–10). Charles has noted a similarity with 4 Ezra. 7:55.<sup>176</sup> There the condemned plead for mercy, while acknowledging their sin with faces blacker than darkness. He further suggests that Neh. 2:11 and Joel 2:6 may serve as the source for this idea of dark faces. His suggestion shares the understanding of the translators of the Authorized Version, who translated קָבְצוּ פִאֲרוֹר as “gather darkness.” By way of contrast, BDB suggests “grow pale.” The meaning is unclear because the terminology is rare. But in any case, Ps. 83:17, together with the author’s creativity, seems to be the more likely source for this idea. These passages show that the reaction of the oppressors in *1 Enoch* 62:10–12 is consistent with scriptural views.

The reaction of faces filled with shame and darkness is also a part of the reversal of fortunes promised to the righteous. The righteous who till now have been downcast will rejoice (*1 Enoch* 62:15). The kings and mighty ones, however, who so far have had the power, wealth and pride of heads held high will now be cast down and filled with shame.

- c) The angels of punishment, into whose hands the mighty kings are given over, have been previously noticed as preparing iron fetters for the kings and the mighty of the earth (*1 Enoch* 53:3–5), as well as preparing scourges and fetters for their followers (*1 Enoch* 56:1–3).
- d) The kings and the mighty ones will be punished for the wrong they have done to the children and the chosen ones of the Lord of Spirits. Their treatment of the righteous and elect will be the basis for the condemnation (cf. Mt. 25:41–46).
- e) The wrath of God resting upon the wicked and the sword drunk with destruction are common metaphors reflected also in Isa. 13:9, 34:5, 7 and Jer. 46:10 (cf. also Isa. 13:15 for a sword as the instrument of God’s wrath).

<sup>175</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 189–92.

<sup>176</sup> Charles, *1 Enoch*, 124.

### 3.4.5 1 En. 62:13–16 Blessedness of the Righteous and Elect

The chapter concludes with a depiction of the state of blessedness of the righteous on that day of judgment. Finally their fortunes will be reversed. The day of condemnation for the mighty kings will be a day of salvation and restoration for the righteous and elect (*1 Enoch* 62:13). *1 Enoch* 62:14 speaks of dwelling with that Son of Man.

<sup>1</sup>Wa-<sup>2</sup>egzi<sup>3</sup>a manāfest dibēhomu <sup>4</sup>yaxādder wa-mesla zeku walda <sup>5</sup>eg<sup>w</sup>āla  
<sup>3</sup>ma-<sup>4</sup>heyāw <sup>4</sup>yaxādderu wa-yeballe<sup>6</sup>u wa-yesakkebu wa-yetnašše<sup>7</sup>u la<sup>8</sup> ālama<sup>9</sup> ālam.  
 And the Lord of Spirits will remain over them, and with that Son of Man they will dwell, and eat, and lie down, and rise up for ever and ever.

#### Variants

<sup>1</sup>Wa-/and: omitted in BM 485 and two other manuscripts.

<sup>2</sup>yaxādder/will dwell: Ryl preserves a verse break after this word.

<sup>3</sup>ma-<sup>4</sup>heyāw/mother of the living: all other manuscripts have <sup>3</sup>emma-<sup>4</sup>heyāw, the more normal form (see Variant 4 in 62:7).

<sup>4</sup>yaxādderu wa-/they will dwell and: omitted in BM 485, BM 491, Berl, Abb 35, Abb 55, the original hand of BM 492 and Tana 9 (Tana 9 retains wa-).

#### Notes

62:14 *yaxādderu*/they will dwell:

It is promised that the Lord of Spirits will remain with the righteous and elect and that they will dwell with the Son of Man. A yearning for God to return and dwell in Zion with the servants of the Lord is a late prophetic motif (e.g. Isa. 57:5, 65:9, Joel 4:17, 21, Zeph. 3:12–13, Zech. 2:10–14, 8:3, 8) and it forms part of the hopes of the community of *Par. En* as well. The blessedness of the righteous and elect is emphasized in the meal with the Son of Man, dwelling in his presence, being clothed in garments of never-fading glory (*1 Enoch* 62:15–16). These images of feasting echo the feast of salvation in Isa. 25:6–8, cf. Isa. 65:13, which is promised after the destruction of the enemy. The garments perhaps echo the proclaimed salvation of Isa. 61:10, where again the context is the reversal of fortunes brought about by the Lord. In Isaiah 61, the proclamation of liberty from prison (Isa. 61:1), the day of God's vengeance (Isa. 61:2), and the gladness and praise (Isa. 61:3) are themes shared with *1 Enoch* 62.

### 3.4.6 Summary of the Study of *1 Enoch* 62

As noted at the beginning of the study of *1 Enoch* 62, the focus of the passage has been brought to a more immediate investigation of the judgment of the kings and mighty ones. This shift brings with it a shift in the biblical allusions, and the source material for the developing this passage appears to have been Isaiah 10–13, in which

several motifs are useful to the author. First, there is the opposition to the kings and the mighty of the earth. The admonition and encouragement of Isaiah to be unafraid of the Assyrians and Egyptians (Isa. 10:24, 11:15–16) as well as the Philistines, Edom, Moab and the Ammonites (Isa. 11:14) are paralleled in *1 Enoch* 62 in which the kings, the mighty, the exalted and those who possess the earth are condemned and sent away fearful, to the encouragement of the righteous and elect.

Then an allusion to the power of the spirit of God in Isa. 11:2, made in a fuller way in *1 Enoch* 49:3, is resumed more briefly and concisely in *1 Enoch* 62:2. Almost all of Isa. 11:2 was cited in *1 Enoch* 49:3, but in *1 Enoch* 62:2 only two characteristics are referred to, the pouring out of the spirit of righteousness and the slaying of the wicked by the word of the mouth of the one on the throne. This is sufficient to reestablish the power and the authority of the Son of Man to judge and condemn the kings and the mighty ones.

Third, there is an interest in the Isaianic prophecies about the remnant, since the author of *Par. En* is also interested in both the condemnation of the kings and the mighty ones as well as the effect on the righteous. The remnant of Isaiah are the righteous of *Par. En*, and they shall rejoice (Isa. 12:1–6, *1 Enoch* 62:12) and be restored (Isa. 11:11–12, *1 Enoch* 62:13–16). Just as the root of Jesse shall stand as a signal to the nations (Isa. 11:10), the congregation of the elect shall stand before the judge while the mighty kings fall down to worship (*1 Enoch* 62:8).

Fourth, in both Isa. 13:6–22 and *1 Enoch* 62:4–5 the same image is used in the same way for the reaction of the condemned. The pain and agony of the condemned is likened to the pain of childbirth: there is no respite from it; the outcome is inevitable; but where the birth of a child issues in joy for the mother, the pain and anguish of the condemned endures into eternity. It is the righteous remnant who experience the joy. The cause of the pain, however, for the condemned in both Isaiah and *1 Enoch* 62 is their condemnation and imminent destruction before the judge. The image then functions in the same way in both passages.

The reference to childbirth apparently has generated the transformation of the designation of the judicial figure in *1 Enoch* 62:5 to “that Son of a Woman,” *zeku walda be’sit*. This is the textually preferred designation, and while it is unusual, it functions rhetorically in a very effective way to emphasize the tremendous fall of the erstwhile kings and mighty ones. This form may also be influenced by the reference to the child playing over the hole of the asp and on the adder’s den (Isa. 11:8). Further, these references to a child may have suggested to the translators the use of the more formal term for the Son of Man in the rest of the chapter, *walda ’egwāla ’emma-heyāw*, literally, the Son of the Mother of the living (*1 Enoch* 62:7, 9, 14).

In this chapter, then, as Black has suggested, the author has boldly brought together themes of the remnant and the condemnation of the oppressors in Isaiah 10–13 with the judgment themes of Daniel 7 and the judicial figure of Daniel 7 with the Davidic figure of Isaiah 11.<sup>177</sup> Daniel 7 forms the basis of the vision, but in the Third Parable,

<sup>177</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 189.

when the focus has shifted to the punishment of the kings, the scene is further developed through the use of ideas taken from Isaiah 10–13. A judicial figure judging oppressors occurs in both Daniel 7 and Isaiah 10–13. In *1 Enoch* 62 the Son of Man is described as sitting on the throne of his glory, having righteousness poured out on him, having the power to judge the wicked and slay them, and at the same time to vindicate the righteous and elect, so that they experience a glorious reversal of fortunes in feasting and garments. Further, this figure who had been hidden from the kings and mighty ones, is now revealed to them as he had been to the righteous and elect.

Developing the scene of judgment for the kings and the mighty ones in *1 Enoch* 62, the author has revealed several more features about this Son of Man:

- a) that he is seated upon the throne of his glory;
- b) that he is finally revealed to and recognized by the kings and the mighty;
- c) that he has power to inflict pain, terror and shame, so that darkness fills the faces of the kings and the mighty; and
- d) that the righteous will enjoy salvation, which entails dwelling with that Son of Man and feasting and receiving glorious, non-fading garments.

### 3.5 Exegesis of *1 Enoch* 63:11

*1 Enoch* 63 completes the judgment scene depicted in the previous chapter and it drives home conclusively that there will be no mercy for the kings and the mighty ones, who are held in such bitter enmity by the righteous and elect. Chapters 62 and 63 appear to be a unit. At the beginning (62:1) and at the end (63:12), virtually identical references to the mighty, the kings, the exalted and those who possess the earth are found. Further, thematically, the two chapters are concerned with the same subject matter, the judgment of the kings and the mighty ones and their reaction to their condemnation. Thus 62:1 and 63:12 serve as an *inclusio* around the passage.

*1 Enoch* 63 is made up of two narrative verses and four speeches. The first narrative verse (63:1) describes how the kings and the mighty ones will seek mercy from the angels of punishment that they might fall down in worship and confess their sins before the Lord of Spirits. The second narrative verse (63:11) contains the reference to that Son of Man and describes how the faces of the kings and the mighty ones will be filled with darkness and shame, and how they will be driven away to suffer the consequences of the judgment against them.

Three of the speeches are on the lips of the kings and the mighty ones, while the fourth is a divine statement. Ironically the kings and the mighty ones seek to praise God, acknowledging their lack of praise previously, their misplaced trust, and the ultimate justice of God's judgment. The first speech (63:2–4) begins with a six-fold address to God and acknowledgment of God's power, knowledge and righteousness. They admit that they have now learned that the Lord over all kings is to be glorified,



and that they must join in that glorification. In the second speech (63:5-9), the kings and the mighty ones acknowledge the guilt of not praising God and the guilt of their trusting in their own scepter rather than in God's power. They also confess the fairness and justice of God's judgment against them. In the third speech (63:10), they lament that their ill-gotten gains cannot save them from the flames of Sheol. The fourth speech (63:12) is uttered by the Lord of Spirits, who reaffirms the judgment and seals the fate of the kings and the exalted and those who possess the earth.

The verse under consideration here is *1 Enoch* 63:11. It is a narrative verse that occurs near the end of the passage and mentions "that Son of Man." It echoes quite clearly a similar verse (62:10) in the previous chapter. The two verses share the ideas of the kings and the exalted being expelled from the presence of the Son of Man, and having shame-filled, darkened faces. That Son of Man is the judge before whom the kings and the mighty have pleaded their case, to no avail.

### 3.5.1 1 En. 63:11

<sup>1</sup>*Wa-<sup>3</sup>em-dexra-ze yemalle<sup>3</sup> gaṣṣomu<sup>2</sup> ṣelmata<sup>3</sup> wa-xāfrata ba-qedma zeku<sup>4</sup> walda<sup>3</sup> eg<sup>w</sup>āla<sup>3</sup> ṣ<sup>3</sup>emma-ḥeyāw<sup>6</sup> wa-<sup>3</sup>em-qedma gaṣṣu<sup>7</sup> yessaddadu wa-sayf<sup>8</sup> yaxāder qedma<sup>9</sup> gaṣṣu mā<sup>3</sup> kalēhomu.*

And after this their faces will be filled with darkness and shame before that Son of Man, and they will be driven from before him, and the sword will dwell amongst them before him.

#### *Variants*

<sup>1</sup>*Wa-<sup>3</sup>em-dexra-ze*/and after this: Ull has *wa-<sup>3</sup>em-dexra*/and afterwards.

<sup>2</sup>*ṣelmata*/darkness: Tana 9 omits.

<sup>3</sup>*wa-xāfrata*/and shame: Bm 485 omits; Tana 9 preserves *xāfrat*/shame, i.e. not the accusative form. Taking notes 2 and 3 together, Tana 9 reads "after this their faces will be full of shame."

<sup>4</sup>*walda*/son: *walda* is written supralinearly in Ryl.

<sup>5</sup>*emma-ḥeyāw*/mother of the living: Berl has <sup>3</sup>*emm-ḥeyaw*. See similar variants in *1 Enoch* 62.

<sup>6</sup>*wa-<sup>3</sup>em-qedma*/from before: Bm 485 has transposed two letters, *wa-me<sup>3</sup>-qedma*; BM 491 has substituted a preposition, *wa-ba-qedma*, with no change in meaning.

<sup>7</sup>*yessaddadu*/they will be driven out: Ryl preserves a verse break after this word.

<sup>8</sup>*yaxāder*/will dwell: Tana 9 has *la-yexder*/let a sword dwell, having changed the verb to subjunctive.

<sup>9</sup>After *gaṣṣu*/his face (i.e. before him), BM 485 adds *yaxāder*/it will dwell, presumably to clarify the doubling of the prepositional phrases: "The sword will dwell before him; it will dwell amongst them."

## Notes

63:11 *yemalle*<sup>3</sup> *gaṣṣomu ṣelmata wa-xāfrata*/their faces will be filled with darkness and shame:

As noted above on *1 Enoch* 62:10, a similar idea occurs in Ps. 83:14–19, esp. 17. In the context of a lament, the psalmist prays that the enemies might be destroyed by God, that their faces might be filled with shame *מלא פניהם קלון*, and that they might perish in disgrace. Here in *1 Enoch* 63:11 the author claims that the kings and the mighty ones, who are the enemies and oppressors of the righteous and elect, are being condemned to everlasting punishment in disgrace, and that “their faces will be filled darkness and shame.”

There is also probably a concise yet precise allusion to Daniel’s prayer of lament and penitence (Dan. 9:4–19; see later). Both Daniel in Daniel 9 and the kings and the mighty ones in *1 Enoch* 63 plead for mercy. Daniel acknowledges that he and the people are shame-faced (*ולנו בשתהפנין*), while the kings and the mighty ones will have their faces filled with darkness and shame (*yemalle*<sup>3</sup> *gaṣṣomu ṣelmata wa-xāfrata*/ *מלא פניהם השך ובשת*). While Daniel’s prayer is answered with a vision of mercy, the prayer of the kings and the mighty ones is answered to the effect that no mercy will be forthcoming for them.

All of this acknowledges that the judgment brought about by the Son of Man is indeed fair, just, and binding, to the consolation of the righteous and elect.

63:11 *yessaddadu*/driven out:

Here the kings and the mighty ones are driven out from the divine presence: in contrast, in Dan. 9:7, Daniel prays also on behalf of all those who have been driven out by God to the various lands of the Mediterranean. The prayer of Daniel is that they will be brought back; but in *1 Enoch* 63:11 the kings and the mighty ones will be driven out to their eternal condemnation.

63:11 *sayff*/sword:

The sword, noted also in 62:12, symbolizes the eternal condemnation passed upon the oppressors of the righteous. The combination of the noun *sayff*/sword, an inanimate object, with the verb *yaxāder*/dwell, usually used of animate beings, is curious. *Sayff* sword here probably refers back to the phrase in *1 Enoch* 62:12 *maṭbāhtu la-’egzi’ a manāfest*, and therefore is a personification of the Lord of Spirits. As such, it is an image of enduring condemnation. Connotations may include the sword that is drunk with the blood of the slain enemy (Isa. 34:6), and the sword held by the guardian angel after Adam and Eve had been expelled from the Garden (Gen. 3:24). A similar idea is expressed in 2 Sam. 12:10, where David is warned that since he had cut down Uriah the Hittite with the sword of the Ammonites, the sword would never depart from his household, i.e. it would remain before him. So, the sword symbolizes the judgment against those with whom God is displeased. These citations indicate that the image is a fairly common biblical image,<sup>178</sup> and while none of them may have been alluded to by the author of *Par. En.*, nonetheless the image was familiar to him.

<sup>178</sup> See also multiple uses of the image of the sword of judgment in Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

*1 Enoch 63 and Daniel 9*

Two allusions to the prayer of lament and penitence<sup>179</sup> in Daniel 9 have been noted above, and more are noteworthy. A comparison of *1 Enoch* 63 with Daniel 9 yields many fascinating, contrasting points of contact. In Daniel 9, the righteous Daniel vicariously confesses the sins of the nation to God, but in *1 Enoch* 63 the kings and the mighty ones, the wicked oppressors of the righteous, plead for mercy for themselves and confess their own sins before the Lord of Spirits. Daniel addresses God with a three-part address (Dan. 9:4), but the kings and the mighty ones use a six-fold address, followed by an acknowledgment of God's power, glory, and unfathomable knowledge (*1 Enoch* 63:3). Both Daniel and the kings and the mighty ones confess God's righteousness (Dan. 9:7, 14, *1 Enoch* 63:3), and both confess guilt. Daniel admits the guilt of rebellion and disobedience (Dan. 9:5, 11, 14, 15, 16) and the error of not listening to God's servants the prophets (Dan. 9:6), while the kings and the mighty ones admit the guilt of not giving thanks to God, of not glorifying the name of the Lord of Spirits, or his works, and of trusting in their own scepter and power. They admit that their ill-gotten gains cannot save them from their fiery destiny.

Further, while Daniel acknowledges that righteousness belongs to God, and that they are shamefaced, לך ארני החדקה ולנו בשת הפנים (Dan. 9:7,8), in *1 Enoch* 63:11 the faces of the kings and the mighty ones will be filled with darkness and shame *yemalle' gassomu selmata wa-xāfrata*/ובשת פניהם חשך ובשת. The implication in Daniel 9 is that the shame will be removed, while in *Par. En.*, the shame and darkness is everlasting for the kings and the mighty ones.

Similarly, while Daniel is praying on behalf of all those who have been driven out, near or far (Dan. 9:7), the kings and the mighty ones will suffer the fate of being driven out (*1 Enoch* 63:11). For Daniel, those driven out will be recalled, as from Egypt (Dan. 9:5), but for *Par. En.*, the kings and the mighty ones have reached the point of no return.

These many points of contact are made the more interesting by the contrasting outcomes of each prayer. The outcome of Daniel's prayer of confession is that he is given a vision of mercy (Dan. 9:24–27). The outcome of the plea of the kings and the mighty ones is that no mercy is forthcoming. Even when the oppressors seek mercy at the last, their former sins are so heinous that none is available. This again functions to console the righteous and elect as they suffer in the present under the oppression of the kings and the mighty ones, whose fate is being revealed. And so the promised

<sup>179</sup> In Daniel 9, the prayer of lament and penitence is a traditional prayer that has a definite form and structure. Prayed by a high priest or other intermediary, it includes an address to God, a communal confession of wrongdoing, an "affirmation of God's justice," and a petition for mercy, that is based not on "Israel's merit but for God's own sake." This type of prayer is characterized by "a strongly Deuteronomistic theology." Other examples of such a prayer can be found in post-exilic Jewish literature, such as Ezra. 9:6–15; Neh. 1:5–11, 9:5–37; Psalm 79; Bar. 1:15—3:8; the *Prayer of Azariah* and the *Words of the Heavenly Luminaries* from Qumran. See Collins, *Daniel*, 349–350, 359. See also Smith-Christopher, Daniel L., *The Book of Daniel (New Interpreters Bible, Vol. VII; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 122.*

reversal of fortunes also extends to the plea for mercy. The plea of the righteous and elect will be answered with salvation, as *Par. En.* reveals; the plea of the kings and the mighty ones in the end will be answered with condemnation for their past treatment of the righteous and elect.

### 3.5.2 Summary of the Study of 1 Enoch 63

Two main points come through this narration of the last judgment. One is that insincere, last-minute praise and confession are ineffective. Indeed, in *1 Enoch* 62–63 it is too late for mercy. The condemned plead for mercy (62:9) but do not receive it, and they acknowledge that they do not deserve it (63:8). In *1 Enoch* 50, mercy appears to be available for the Gentiles before the judgment takes place (*1 Enoch* 50:2), but once judgment is in process, then it is too late: none shall be forthcoming (*1 Enoch* 50:5). For the righteous and elect, God's mercy and compassion are great and God is long-suffering (*1 Enoch* 61:13). But for the kings and the mighty no mercy is available, because they have not acknowledged the Lord of Spirits (*1 Enoch* 46:6, 7; 48:10; 63:7; cf. 67:8) and they have oppressed the righteous and elect (*1 Enoch* 46:8; 62:11). By the time the kings and the mighty acknowledge the authority of the judge in the judgment process, it is too late for mercy (*1 Enoch* 62:9–10; 63:4, 11).

The other point is that God's judgment is just, complete and fair, as will be acknowledged even by the condemned. The function of a passage like this is to illustrate graphically and vividly to the righteous and elect that their oppression will end, and they will enjoy salvation in the presence of the Son of Man. Their oppressors, however, will be shamed in everlasting, non-reversible condemnation.

The author of *Par. En.*, in the course of developing this scene, reveals four additional characteristics of the Son of Man:

- a) that a request is made to him;
- b) that the judged will plead for mercy;
- c) that no mercy will be forthcoming; and
- d) that his judgment is fair, which is acknowledged even by those who are condemned, the kings and the mighty ones.

## 3.6 Exegesis of 1 Enoch 69:26–29

The four verses of *1 Enoch* 69:26–29 gather together many of the salient features of the understanding of the Son of Man in *Par. En.* The verses refer to the great joy of those to whom the Son of Man is revealed, for he will permanently remove sinners and their deeds. But these verses are not in their original setting. The antecedents of the verbs in vs 26 are uncertain, and according to the sense of the passage they certainly do not refer back to the meteorological forces mentioned in the previous

verses. The textual problems contained in these verses further confirm the uncertainty about them in the minds of the scribes who transmitted them (see Variants). Nevertheless, in this one passage, many key characteristics of the concept of the Son of Man in *Par. En.* are gathered together.

These verses are not “at home in their present context,”<sup>180</sup> because the antecedent of the verbs of blessing, praising and exulting cannot be identified. It is not the meteorological forces of verses 23–25.<sup>181</sup> Those forces in verses 23–25 are the nearest possible subject, and they are said to bless, praise and extol, however, they bless, praise and extol the name of the Lord of Spirits. Black also points out that the antecedent of the verbs of blessing, praising and extolling in these verses cannot be the fallen watchers and satans of the earlier part of *1 Enoch* 69, since they are the ones falling under judgment. Finally, verse 26 indicates that the reason for the joy and praise is that the name of the Son of Man has been revealed to the subject of the verbs of blessing, praising and exulting. That subject can only be the righteous and elect, as *1 Enoch* 48:7 and 62:7 have already indicated. Because no acceptable antecedent is present, *1 Enoch* 69:26–29 as they are presented after the Noachic section are not in their original setting.

When one examines other possible settings, none can be found. One possibility is the material immediately preceding the Noachic section, *1 Enoch* 64:2, which is a brief note about the fallen watchers suffering in that place of punishment. But here again, the antecedent would be wrong. Another possibility is *1 Enoch* 63:12, which gives an apt summarizing statement by God regarding the judgment upon the kings and mighty ones. In *1 Enoch* 62–63, the judgment of the sinners and the joy of the righteous and elect is under discussion, but *1 Enoch* 63:12 provides a fitting and sufficient conclusion to that section. Thus Black, following Charles and Dillmann, is right in suggesting that the current location of these verse is not original, and that some intervening material has been lost, or it has been replaced by the Noachic material.<sup>182</sup> Nevertheless, the editorial characterization of them as the “Close” of the third parable is appropriate.<sup>183</sup>

These verses draw together many of the salient and important characteristics of the concept of the Son of Man in *Par. En.* His name is said to be revealed (*1 Enoch* 62:26), and he is described as sitting upon the throne of his glory (*1 Enoch* 69:27, 29). He is given total authority for judgment over the wicked, and is the cause of their destruction (*1 Enoch* 69:27–28). These characteristics of the Son of Man are most pertinent to the implied readers, because it reassures them of their eventual vindication and the punishment of their current oppressors.

<sup>180</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 249.

<sup>181</sup> Charles, *1 Enoch*, 140, considers vs 22–24 to be an interpolation. He probably is right, because the verses appear simply to fill out those realities that are dependent upon the oath under discussion.

<sup>182</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 249; Charles, *1 Enoch*, 140.

<sup>183</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 66; Charles, *1 Enoch*, 140.

## 3.6.1 1 En. 69:26–29 (according to Ryl)

26 *Wa-konomu feššehā* <sup>1</sup>*ābiya wa-bāraku wa-sabbehu* <sup>2</sup>*wa-‘āl’ālu ba’enta za-takašta lomu* <sup>3</sup>*semu la-we’etu* <sup>4</sup>*walda* <sup>5</sup>*egwāla* <sup>6</sup>*emma-heyāw.*

26 And they had great joy, and they blessed and praised and exulted because the name of that Son of Man had been revealed to them.

27 <sup>7</sup>*wa-nabara diba manbara sebhatihu* <sup>8</sup>*wa-re’su la-kwennanē* <sup>9</sup>*tawehba lotu la-walda* <sup>10</sup>*egwāla* <sup>11</sup>*emma- heyāw*<sup>59</sup> *wa-yāxālef wa-yāmāsen xāte’āna* <sup>12</sup>*em-gaššā la-medr.*<sup>9</sup>

27 And he sat on the throne of his glory and the whole judgment was given to the Son of Man, and he will cause the sinners to pass away and be destroyed from the face of the earth.

28 <sup>13</sup>*wa-’ella* <sup>14</sup>*ashatewwo la-‘ālam ba-sanāsel yet’assaru* <sup>15</sup>*wa-ba-māxbaromu* <sup>16</sup>*za-musenā* <sup>17</sup>*yet’addawu* <sup>18</sup>*wa-k’ellu megbāromu yaxālef* <sup>19</sup>*em-qedma gašša medr.*

28 And those who led astray the world will be bound in chains, and will be shut up in the assembly-place of their destruction, and all their works will pass away from the face of the earth.

29 <sup>20</sup>*Wa-’em-ye’zē* <sup>21</sup>*i-yekawwen za-yemāsen* <sup>22</sup>*esma* <sup>23</sup>*we’etu walda be’si tare’ya wa-nabara diba* <sup>24</sup>*manbara sebhatihu* <sup>25</sup>*wa-k’ellu* <sup>26</sup>*ekuy* <sup>27</sup>*em-qedma gaššu yaxālef* <sup>28</sup>*wa-yahawwer* <sup>29</sup>*wa-yenaggeru la-we’etu walda* <sup>30</sup>*be’si wa-yešanne’* <sup>31</sup>*ba-qedma* <sup>32</sup>*egzi’a manāfest. ze-we’etu* <sup>33</sup>*messalē. .za-hēnok.*

29 And from then on there will be nothing corruptible for that Son of Man has appeared and has sat on the throne of his glory, and everything evil will pass away and go from before him; and the word of that Son of Man will be strong before the Lord of Spirits.<sup>184</sup> This is the third parable of Enoch.

Because Tana 9 has some significant variation from Ryl in these verse, it is appropriate to present the reading of Tana 9 as well for purposes of comparison, as reconstructed from Knibb’s apparatus.

## 3.6.2 1 En. 69:26–29 (according to Tana 9)

26 *Wa-konomu feššehā* <sup>1</sup>*ābiy wa-bāraku wa-sabbehu* <sup>2</sup>*wa-‘āl’ālu ba’enta za-takašta lomu* <sup>3</sup>*semu la-we’etu* <sup>4</sup>*egwāla* <sup>5</sup>*emma-heyāw.*

26 And their joy was great, and they blessed and praised and exulted because revealed to them was the name of that Son of Man.

27 <sup>6</sup> (omission) <sup>7</sup>*wa-’i-yaxallef wa-’i-yemāsen* <sup>8</sup>*em-qedma gašša medr.*<sup>9</sup>

27 (omission) And he will not pass away or perish from the face of the earth.

<sup>184</sup> Ryl has “and they will speak to that Son of Man and he will be strong before the Lord of Spirits.” See Variant note 24.

28 <sup>11</sup>wa-<sup>3</sup>ella <sup>12</sup>ašhatewwo la-<sup>4</sup>ālam ba-sanāsel yet<sup>3</sup> assaru <sup>13</sup>wa-ba-māxbaromu <sup>14</sup>za-musenā <sup>15</sup>yet<sup>6</sup> āddaw <sup>16</sup>k<sup>w</sup>ellu megbāromu yaxālef<sup>17</sup> <sup>17</sup>em-qedma gašša medr.

28 And those who led the world astray will be bound in chains and will be shut up in their assembly-place of destruction all their works will pass away from the face of the earth.

29 <sup>18</sup>Wa-<sup>2</sup>em-ye<sup>3</sup> zē <sup>19</sup>i-yekawwen ze-musenā <sup>20</sup>esma <sup>20</sup>we<sup>3</sup> etu walda be<sup>3</sup> si tare<sup>3</sup> ya wa-nabara diba <sup>21</sup>manbara sebhatihu <sup>22</sup>wa-k<sup>w</sup>ellu <sup>23</sup>ekuy<sup>3</sup> <sup>23</sup>em-qedma gaššu yaxālef <sup>23</sup>wa-yaḥawwer <sup>24</sup>wa-yenagger la-we<sup>3</sup> etu walda <sup>26</sup>be<sup>3</sup> si wa-yešanne<sup>24</sup> <sup>24</sup>ba-qedma <sup>25</sup>egzi<sup>3</sup> a manāfest.

ze-we<sup>3</sup> etu <sup>27</sup>messalē šāles za-hēnok.

29 And from now on there will be nothing corruptible for that Son of Man has appeared and has sat on the throne of his glory and every evil thing will pass away from before him and depart and speak to that Son of Man and he will be strong before the Lord of Spirits.

This is the third parable of Enoch.

### Variants

<sup>1</sup>ābiya/great: BM 485 and Tana 9 have <sup>1</sup>ābiy/great, which is nominative, not accusative.

<sup>2</sup>wa-<sup>4</sup>āl<sup>4</sup> ālu/and they exulted: BM 485 omits, perhaps because of homoioteleuton.

<sup>3</sup>semu/his name: Berl has *sem*/name, dropping the pronominal ending.

<sup>4</sup>walda/son: BM 491, Abb 35, Abb 55 and Tana 9 omit, possibly through homoioteleuton with *we<sup>3</sup> etu*.. There is probably no change in meaning, given the context, nor is there any other location in which *walda*/son is intentionally omitted, which suggests that its omission is accidental here.

<sup>5</sup>wa-nabara...<sup>5</sup>emmaḥeyāw/And he sat...Son of Man: Tana 9 omits the whole sentence, probably due to homoioteleuton, as the eye of the scribe skipped from *walda eg<sup>w</sup>āla* <sup>5</sup>emma-ḥeyāw in v 26 to the occurrence of the same term in vs 27.

<sup>6</sup>wa-re<sup>3</sup>su/and the whole: BM 485 has *wa-re<sup>3</sup>sa*/and the whole, which is possibly a variant of the feminine form of the possessive pronominal suffix. Berl and Abb 35 have *wa-re<sup>3</sup>sā*, which is the more usual form of the feminine possessive suffix. Abb 55 has *wa-re<sup>3</sup>s*, having dropped the pronominal suffix. Gender agreement in Ethiopic does not seem to be consistent, but these manuscripts treat *kwennanē*/authority as feminine (see variant 7 also).

<sup>7</sup>tawehba/was given: Eth I reads *tawehbat* (feminine not masculine). This family of manuscripts, some of which are the manuscripts in note 6 above, has treated *kwennanē* as feminine.

<sup>8</sup>emma-ḥeyāw/Mother of the living: Berl has <sup>8</sup>emm-ḥeyāw.

<sup>9</sup>wa-yāxālef wa-yāmāsen xāte<sup>3</sup> āna <sup>9</sup>em-gaššā la-medr/and he will cause the sinners to pass away and perish from the face of the earth: BM 485, BM 491, Abb 35 and Abb 55 have: *wa-yaxālef wa-yemāsen* (Abb 35: *wa-yāmāsen*) <sup>9</sup>em-qedma gašša medr. The object, *xāte<sup>3</sup> āna*/the sinners, is omitted, and the verbs are not causative. Berl has *wa-xalafu* <sup>9</sup>em-qedma gaššu xate<sup>3</sup> ana medr: “and the sinners of the earth passed away from before his face.”

An explanatory comment is needed on the extensive difference between Ryl and Tana 9 in verse 27. Tana 9 has *wa-<sup>3</sup>i-yaxallef wa-<sup>3</sup>i-yemāsen <sup>3</sup>em-qedma gaṣṣā medr*: and he will not pass away or be destroyed from the face of the earth. Tana 9, as noted in Variants 5 and 9, preserves extensive differences from Ryl. These differences are probably a case of textual corruption in which the first part of verse 27 has dropped out due to homoioteleuton (see Variant note 5), along with the loss of the object of the sentence, *xāte<sup>3</sup>āna*/the sinners. Subsequent modification to make it fit the new context necessitated the alteration of the verbs from causative to intransitive and the addition of the negative.<sup>185</sup>

<sup>10</sup>*em-gaṣṣā la-medr*/from the face of the earth: Bodl 5 and 5 mss have *<sup>3</sup>em-gaṣṣa medr*, omitting *la-* and the anticipatory suffix.

<sup>11</sup>*wa-<sup>2</sup>ella*/and those: Abb 35 has *<sup>3</sup>ella*, having omitted *wa-/and*.

<sup>12</sup>*aṣhatewwo*/they led (the world) astray: BM 491, possibly the original hand of Ryl and 4 mss have *<sup>3</sup>aṣhatewwomu*, changing the suffix to plural.

<sup>13</sup>*wa-ba-māxbaromu*/and in their assembly-place: Ull, 2 mss have *wa-māxbaromu*/and their assembly-place, omitting *ba-*. This changes the subject from “those who led the world astray” to “their assembly-place.” Thus, it is not the fallen watchers who are shut up, but the place where they carried out their wickedness as well as the watchers. This intensification seems to be secondary rather than original.

<sup>14</sup>*za-musenā*/of destruction: BM 491 has *za-ba-musenā*/which is in destruction.

<sup>15</sup>*yet<sup>2</sup> aḏḏawu*/they will be shut up: BM 491 and Abb 55 have *za-yet<sup>3</sup> aḏḏawu*, an orthographic alternative; Abb 35, Tana 9 and Ull have *yet<sup>3</sup> aḏḏaw*, while BM 485 and Berl have *za-yet<sup>3</sup> a ṣṣaw*, also orthographic alternatives; the last two forms are singular, but this is not unusual in Ethiopic.

<sup>16</sup>*wa-k<sup>w</sup>ellu*/and all: BM 485 and Berl have *wa-k<sup>w</sup>ello*, the accusative and adverbial form; Tana 9 has simply *k<sup>w</sup>ellu*, omitting *wa-*.

<sup>17</sup>*em-qedma gaṣṣa*/from the face of: two manuscripts have *<sup>3</sup>em-gaṣṣa*, omitting the preposition *qedma*.

<sup>18</sup>*Wa-<sup>2</sup>em-ye<sup>2</sup> zē*/and from now on: Bodl 5 and 4 mss have *wa-<sup>2</sup>em-ye<sup>2</sup> zē-sa*/and from now on, then.

<sup>19</sup>*i-yekawwen za-yemāsen*/there will be nothing corruptible: BM 491 has *za-yekawwen <sup>3</sup>i-yemāsen*. The negative has simply been transferred to the other word, without a change of meaning. Tana 9 has *<sup>3</sup>i-yekawwen ze-musenā*/there will not be this destruction.

<sup>20</sup>*we<sup>2</sup> etu*/that: BM 491 and Berl omit this demonstrative.

<sup>21</sup>*manbara*/throne: Berl omits.

<sup>22</sup>*wa-k<sup>w</sup>ellu*/and every: Berl has *wa-k<sup>w</sup>ello*; see Variant note 16.

<sup>23</sup>*wa-yaḥawweru*/and (everything evil) will go: Berl has *wa-yaḥawweru*/and they will go. Berl has understood *wa-yaḥawweru* and *wa-yenaggeru* as going together, seeing unnamed people as going and speaking to that Son of Man (cf. Variant note 25).

<sup>185</sup> Suggested to me by Prof. James C. VanderKam.



- <sup>24</sup>*wa-yenaggeru la-we'etu walda be'si wa-yeṣanne* /and they will speak to that Son of Man and he will be strong: Bodl 5 and 3 mss have *wa-nagaru la-we'etu walda* (Bodl 5 omits *walda*) *be'si* (BM 492 has *be'sit*) *yeṣanne* /and the word of that Son of Man (Bodl 5 simply has “that man”; BM 492 has “that Son of a Woman”) will be strong. . . Abb 35 and 3 mss have *wa-nagaru la-we'etu walda be'si wa-yeṣanne* having added a conjunction to *yeṣanne*. Since *nagaru* may be either a third singular noun with a third singular suffix (“the word of,” as in Bodl 5) or the third masculine plural of the verb *nagara*, Abb 35 may preserve the meaning “and they spoke to that Son of Man and he will be strong.” A marginal *wa-nagaru* appears in Ryl. Knibb and Black in their translations accept the text preserved in Bodl 5.
- <sup>25</sup>*wa-yenaggeru* /and they will speak: Tana 9 and Bodl 4 have *wa-yenagger*. This reading indicates a singular subject, possibly to be translated as, “every evil one will speak to that Son of Man” (cf. Variant note 23).
- <sup>26</sup>*be'si* /of man: BM 485 and BM 492 (see Variant 24) have *be'sit* /of woman. The feminine form here may have been influenced by the use of the more formal form of the title that includes the feminine element *'emm* /mother earlier in the passage (vv 26, 27).
- <sup>27</sup>*messālē* . . /the . . . parable: Ryl<sup>2</sup> and 4 manuscripts have *messālē*, an orthographic correction. BM 485 and Tana 9 have *mesla šāles* /the third parable (*mesla* can be the preposition “with,” or possibly an alternate form of the noun; its occurrence here is a corruption of *messālē*). Abb 55 has *meslu šāles*, which includes the 3rd sing pronominal suffix referring to Enoch. BM 491, Berl, Abb 35, Bodl 5, Ryl<sup>1</sup>(?), Ull and other Eth II mss have *messālē šāles* /the third parable, an appealing reading, since Ryl has a blank (erased?) space after *messālē*. The whole sentence may be a colophon added during transmission after translation, since many of the New Testament books similarly have introductions and conclusions added to the text (cf. Acts 1:1). A similar sentence also concludes the Second Parable.

### Notes

69:26 *za-takašta lomu semu la-we'etu walda 'eg'āla 'emma-heyāw* /The name of that Son of Man had been revealed to them:

This is the second half of a twin characteristic of the Son of Man. The Son of Man has been both hidden and revealed: hidden from the kings and mighty ones, but revealed to the righteous and elect (see Notes on 48:6–7, 62:7).

The first aspect of this twin characteristic is that the Son of Man is hidden, hidden from eternity (*I Enoch* 48:6, 62:7) and hidden from “the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who possess the earth” (*I Enoch* 62:3). His hiddenness from eternity is to be understood as being in the mind of God. God’s plans and ultimate will are to be carried out through the judicial action of the Son of Man, but that will not be perceivable until the final judgment. Hence the Son of Man and his role in God’s will is hidden, unknown to the oppressors. The dismay of the kings is that in the end they will recognize him (*I Enoch* 62:3), when he sits on his glorious, powerful throne. They will be terrified and overcome with pain (*I Enoch* 62:5) and shame

(*1 Enoch* 62:10), and they will lament that they no longer have the opportunity to offer proper worship and respect (*1 Enoch* 62:2, 4). Their pleading for a respite, in order to praise, glorify and extol the Son of Man, emphasizes how the Son of Man, who is their final, omnipotent judge, has been hidden from them.

The second aspect of this twin characteristic is that the name of the Son of Man has been revealed. His naming to a position and a purpose took place before creation (*1 Enoch* 48:2–3) and from that perspective, his being revealed to the holy and righteous as avenger and Savior (*1 Enoch* 48:7) was still in the future. From the perspective of the vision of that future judgment (*1 Enoch* 61:2), when the vision of the angels and the cords is explained, the name of the Son of Man has already been revealed to the righteous and elect (*1 Enoch* 62:7). When the vision of that judgment is reported (*1 Enoch* 62–63), then the name of the Son of Man has finally been revealed also to the kings and mighty ones, as the Elect One/Son of Man sits in judgment upon them. For the righteous and elect it will be a day of salvation and therefore joy, for their vindication will be total and their fortunes will be reversed (*1 Enoch* 62:13–16).

The revelation of the name of the Son of Man and the revelation of the Son of Man himself are one and the same. This is evident because both the Son of Man and his name are “named” in *1 Enoch* 48:2–3 without distinguishing between them, and both the Son of Man and his name are revealed in *1 Enoch* 62:7 and 69:26. No distinction is made between the Son of Man and the name of the Son of Man. Similarly, the Lord of Spirits and the name of the Lord of Spirits are both praised (*1 Enoch* 61:9) and revealed to the righteous and elect (*1 Enoch* 61:13) without any distinction being made between them. The name of the person represents the power and authority of that figure.

Another dimension of the revelation of the Son of Man and his name is that the revelation is accomplished through *Par. En.* itself. Repeatedly, Enoch is shown secrets of the heavenly world, which he in turn reveals through his reports. Even the revelation of the Son of Man has been narrated suspensefully in *Par. En.* At first, simply a second figure in the heavenly court is noted (*1 Enoch* 46:2), then the seer asks who he is (*1 Enoch* 46:3), and finally the angel describes him as the Son of Man who has righteousness (*1 Enoch* 46:4), and whose identity will continue to be revealed throughout the rest of the work. This narrative both mirrors and leads the implied reader in his or her own discovery about this human-like figure, who is to become known as the Son of Man/Elect one, the savior of the community of the righteous and elect. In this way, the author of *Par. En.* actually takes on Enoch’s roles as the reporter of revealed secrets. This revelation is meant to console and encourage the righteous and elect, until the day comes when the change will take place, when the kings and mighty ones are judged, and the light of salvation never fades (*1 Enoch* 50:1).

69:27, 29 *wa-nabara diba manbara sebhatihu*/and he sat upon the throne of his glory. Two expressions are found in *Par. En.* for the throne (see also Notes on *1 Enoch* 62:2). One is simply the noun, *manbar*/throne, with or without the possessive pronoun; while the other is the construct phrase, *manbara sebhat*/the throne of glory (without the possessive pronoun), or *manbara sebhatihu*/the throne of his glory (with the possessive

pronoun). Three different figures are described as being seated on the throne, with the Son of Man figure represented by two designations (see Table 2), the Chief of Days, the Elect One, the Son of Man, and the kings/the mighty/the strong, who are turned out of their thrones. The distribution of the references to the throne is as follows.

No references to the throne are made in the First Parable (*I Enoch* 38–44).

In the Second Parable (*I Enoch* 45–57), the Elect One occupies the throne of glory/*manbara sebhat* (no possessive, *I Enoch* 45:3, 55:4<sup>186</sup>), and his throne/*manbaru* (*I Enoch* 51:3). But the Chief of Days occupies the throne of his glory/*manbara sebhatihu* (*I Enoch* 47:3)<sup>187</sup>. By contrast, the Elect One stands/...before the Lord of Spirits (*I Enoch* 47:3), in a passage that extols the Elect One for wisdom, understanding, knowledge and power, with which the Elect One is infused (*I Enoch* 49:3) and in which his judgment according to the wishes of the Lord of Spirits is affirmed (*I Enoch* 49:4).<sup>188</sup>

**Table 2**  
**Occurrences of Manbar/Throne in the Parables of Enoch**

Term used	Parable	Occupant:			
		Chief of Days	Elect One	Son of Man	Kings/Mighty /Strong
<i>Manbara/Throne</i>	1	-	-	-	-
	2	-	51:3	-	46:4, 5; 56:5
	3	-	-	-	-
<i>Manbara sebhat/</i> Throne of glory	1	-	-	-	-
	2	-	45:3	-	-
	3	-	-	-	-
<i>Manbara sebhatihu/</i> Throne of his glory	1	-	-	-	-
	2	47:3	55:4 (my)	-	-
	3	60:2	61:8; 62:2,* 3	62:5; 69:27, 29	-

\*All manuscripts read that the Lord of Spirits sat on the throne, but emendation to “the Lord of Spirits seated him (i.e. the Elect One) on the throne of his glory” is warranted. See Note on *I Enoch* 62:2.

<sup>186</sup> A textual problem exists with the reference to the throne in 55:4. The Lord of Spirits challenges the mighty kings who occupy the earth to behold “my Elect One as he sits on the throne of glory and judges Azazel” and his associates. Eth I (with the exception of Berl), the older text-type, which Knibb and Charles evaluate as being generally more trustworthy, have this reading without the possessive pronoun, while Eth II and Berl have the first person singular possessive pronoun attached, *sebhateya/my* glory. The Eth I reading is preferable, since the Eth II reading can be explained plausibly as a scribal addition in light of the recognition that the Lord of Spirits is speaking in this passage and would presumably be speaking about his own throne (the opposite argument, that the possessive was original and was dropped in order to avoid the appearance of having someone other than God sit on God’s throne, is less persuasive).

<sup>187</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 205.

<sup>188</sup> These verses function almost as the commissioning of the Elect One, similar to the Son of Man being named (48:2–3, 6) and being commissioned as the light of the Gentiles and the hope of the troubled (48:4), the avenger of the righteous (48:7). See Black, “The Throne-Theophany Prophetic Commission” for this possibility.

The kings/mighty/strong are said to be dethroned by the Son of Man (*1 Enoch* 46:4, 5), or aroused from their thrones to invade the territory of the righteous and elect by the angels (*1 Enoch* 56:5). These, however, are earthly thrones and do not play a part in understanding the heavenly throne. These thrones are the only ones referred to in the plural.

In the Third Parable (*1 Enoch* 58–69), the Chief of Days is depicted as sitting on the throne of his glory/*manbara sebhatihu* (*1 Enoch* 60:2) in a recasting of the vision in Dan 7:9. Here the seer experiences again that heavenly vision and is overwhelmed (*1 Enoch* 60:3). Michael assures him that while God's mercy has been in effect until then, the judgment of the oppressors will soon be accomplished (*1 Enoch* 60:5–6). In this retelling of the vision, the Chief of Days occupies the throne.

Later in the Third Parable, the seer reports that the Lord of Spirits placed/ *'anbara* the Elect One upon the throne of glory/*manbara sebhat* (*1 Enoch* 61:8).<sup>189</sup> Still later, the Lord of Spirits challenges the kings, the mighty, the exalted, and those who possess the earth to acknowledge the one who sits upon the throne of his glory/*manbara sebhatihu* (*1 Enoch* 62:2), which they do (*1 Enoch* 62:3).<sup>190</sup> The session of the Elect One upon the throne (clearly in *1 Enoch* 61:8 and as emended in 62:2) functions as an indication of his authorization to judge and it will be recognized as such by the oppressors, in the author's point of view.

The Son of Man is envisioned as sitting upon the throne of his glory/*manbara sebhatihu* (*1 Enoch* 62:5, no variants).<sup>191</sup> This reference is in close proximity to the Elect One sitting on the throne (as emended), and is as close as the author comes

<sup>189</sup> Here again Eth. I reads *sebhat*/glory, while Eth. II reads *sebhatihu*/his glory; see the footnote on the textual problem at 55:4 above.

<sup>190</sup> In these two instances no textual variants are noted by Knibb or Charles: both Eth I and Eth II preserve this reading. The manuscript witnesses however are unanimous in saying that the Lord of Spirits is sitting on the throne at 62:2, not the Elect One. Charles, *1 Enoch*, 123, emends the text to read "The Lord of Spirits placed/ *'anbara* him (i.e. the Elect One) on the throne of his glory," while Black, *1 Enoch*, 59, 235, emends the text to read that the Elect One was sitting on the throne, arguing that the sense of the passage demands this. Although both suggestions are difficult to accept, since the textual evidence is unanimous, Charles' suggestion is more persuasive textually, for it would be easier to understand how a scribe very early in the transmission process could omit the *'alep* from *'anbara* and change it to *nabara* than to understand the change from the Elect One/*xeruy* to the Lord of Spirits/ *'egzi'a manāfest*. Knibb, *1 Enoch*, vol. 2, 150, translates the text as it stands, in which case a change of referent must be understood somewhere between verse 2 and verse 5, for in verse 5 the kings and mighty ones see "that Son of a Woman" on the throne. (See also Note on *1 Enoch* 62:2 above.)

<sup>191</sup> Here the term Son of Man (literally Son of a Woman/*walda be'sit*, which is probably original) is used because of the influence of the childbirth image used in 62:4. The kings and mighty ones will suffer pain like a woman in childbirth, for as the child causes pain to its mother, so will this Son of Man (Son of a Woman) cause pain in judgment to the kings and mighty ones, when they see him sitting on the throne of his glory. They acknowledge his lordship, however, through worship and praise and acknowledge the justice of his judgment (see Notes at 62:5).

to making an explicit identification between the Elect One and the Son of Man.<sup>192</sup> Finally the Son of Man is again revealed to be sitting on the throne of his glory/*manbara sebhatihu* (*1 Enoch* 69:27, 29; see Variant note 21).

This evidence shows the unevenness in *Par. En.* with regard to the occupant of the throne. Black is of the opinion that the reading of Eth II at *1 Enoch* 55:4, “my throne,” referring to the Lord of Spirits, cannot be correct since the Elect One “sits on his own throne and not on the throne of the Lord of Spirits,” and that the reading of the four manuscripts “on the right hand of my glorious throne” is theologically more correct.<sup>193</sup> While the reading of Eth. I, without the possessive, is preferable textually (see above), Black’s suggestions that there are more than one throne is questionable. Nowhere in *Par. En.* is the throne in heaven spoken of in the plural (the kings and mighty ones on earth have plural thrones), and whenever persons are mentioned as being in proximity to the one sitting on the throne, they are depicted as standing (e.g. the council in *1 Enoch* 47:3 and the angels and the righteous in *1 Enoch* 60:2; contrast the image of the disciples sitting on twelve thrones, Mt. 19:28). Nowhere in *Par. En.* is the heavenly court depicted as having more than one throne. The foundational vision in Dan. 7:9–14 depicts thrones in the plural set in place, but *Par. En.* is vague on that question. Theisohn has argued that the references to a throne refer to a single throne, and that the throne is God’s.<sup>194</sup> Further he points out, there is biblical precedent for God setting another upon the throne in Ps. 132:11, Dan. 4:37, Job 36:5–6. Most interestingly, Ps. 110:1, 5–6 includes not only the enthronement of the king by God, but also includes the concepts of righteousness, a judicial role, and opposition to enemy kings, ideas which *Par. En.* also connects together.<sup>195</sup> The major difference, which Theisohn does not note, is that in those biblical passages, an earthly kingdom is explicitly being confirmed, while in *Par. En.* heaven is the locale envisioned. This in itself is not problematic, because the concern of the author is to show that the current oppressive regime is to be toppled. The visions of Micaiah ben Imlah in 1 Kings 22, Isaiah in Isaiah 6 and Enoch in *1 Enoch* 14 also inform the concept in *Par. En.*, as they share the characteristics of the throne scene being in a vision and populated by the heavenly hosts standing in the presence of God (1 Kgs 22:19, Isa. 6:2, *1 Enoch* 14:22).<sup>196</sup>

This image of sitting upon the throne for righteous judgment bears many similarities with Ps. 9:4–11. God is said to sit on the throne righteously judging, *יִשְׁבֵּת לְכִסֵּא שׁוֹפֵט צָדִק* (Ps. 9:5[4]). The Lord has destroyed the wicked *אֲבֹדֵת רָשָׁע* (Ps. 9:6[5]). The enemy is routed and the memory of them is wiped out (Ps. 9:7[6]). The throne has been established for judgment, *כּוֹנֵן לְמִשְׁפַּט כִּסֵּא* (Ps. 9:8[7]), and the

<sup>192</sup> As noted previously, VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 185–86, has shown that the four terms are synonymous in the way they function.

<sup>193</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 220.

<sup>194</sup> Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 85–89.

<sup>195</sup> Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 89–98.

<sup>196</sup> Black, “The Throne-Theophany Prophetic Commission,” 57–73, esp. 70, suggests that the sense in *1 Enoch* 71 is a call scene, pre-dating the Parables themselves.

Lord judges the world in righteousness וְהוּא שֹׁפֵט תְּבֵל בְּצֶדֶק (Ps. 9:9[8]). In Ps. 9:4–11 the concepts of the throne, judgment, and righteousness, as well as the eradication of the wicked, come together, as they do in *1 Enoch* 69:27–29. Rather than dependency, however, the two passages probably illustrate a shared conception about the purpose of the throne of judgment.

The introduction of the throne is an essential part of the concept of the judicial role of the Elect One/Son of Man. The authority of the Elect One/Son of Man to judge and the incontrovertibility of his judgment are enhanced by the depiction of the Elect One/Son of Man seated on the judgment throne. The whole image reaffirms the hope and encouragement being communicated to the community of the righteous and elect.

69:27 *wa-re'su la-kwennanē*/the sum of judgment:

This is a puzzling expression, since it can be taken as the sum/whole of judgment (Dillmann, Black, Knibb), or as the beginning of judgment.<sup>197</sup> The phrase וְהוּא שֹׁפֵט תְּבֵל does not occur in the Hebrew Bible, but the word שֹׁפֵט can have a fairly broad range of meaning. It can mean the literal head of a person or animal; it can mean the top of a crag, a tower, a stronghold, ears of grain, the head of a bed; it can refer to a chief leader or the first in a series, the beginning of time, or the choicest spices or joy.<sup>198</sup> The cognate in Ethiopic has a similarly broad range of meaning.<sup>199</sup>

Not far in the background of these words are the visions of Daniel 7–12, which are concerned with the historical rise and fall of empires. Judgment against the kings is also mentioned, as well as the outcome for “all the saints.” In the vision of Dan. 7:9–10, the Ancient of Days is introduced and described as taking his seat, a fiery throne with flaming wheels. Myriads serve him, as the court sits in judgment with the books open (Dan. 7:10). It is a scene that depicts total and absolute power for judgment. The vision continues with the introduction of the human-like one, who is presented to the Ancient of Days, and who is given dominion over “all peoples, nations and languages” (Dan. 7:14). The dominion and kingship bestowed on him also include the concept of total and absolute authority for judgment. Even though the totality of judgment is not mentioned explicitly, the whole scene is dependent on the reality that the Ancient of Days and the human-like one do have total and absolute authority in this judicial setting.

This setting enables the author of *Par. En.* to attribute “the whole of judgment” to that Son of Man. This author makes explicit what in Daniel 7 was implicit, that the Son of Man has total authority in judgment. Dan. 7:10, 26 refer to the heavenly court sitting in judgment upon the kingdoms, noting that the saints will be given dominion over earthly events. In Daniel 7 the focus of the visions is upon the overthrow of the kingdoms, and how long the demise of the kings will take. In *Par. En.*, however, the

<sup>197</sup> A similarly ambiguous expression using *re's* is found at *1 Enoch* 37:2–3 about the beginning or sum of wisdom, *wa-ze re'su la-nagara tebab*.

<sup>198</sup> *BDB*, 910–11.

<sup>199</sup> Dillmann, *Lexicon*, 294–95.

focus is not on how long it will take, but on the absolute nature of the destruction of the sinners (*1 Enoch* 69:27, 29), and on the joy of the elect (*1 Enoch* 69:26).

The absoluteness of judgment is attributed to the Son of Man because it is an implicit part of the vision in Daniel 7, upon which this exposition is based. The absoluteness of judgment is expressed in terms of the total joy of the righteous and the total destruction of the wicked, because the author is concerned to give hope and encouragement to the community, and to reassure them that eventually their fortunes will be reversed.

This phrase also could be taken in the sense of “the beginning of judgment” being given to the Son of Man (*re’s* has this sense in the title for God, “Head of Days,” as the ancient one who has existed since the beginning of time). Here, however, it cannot be only the beginning of judgment, for this is already the conclusion to the Third Parable. Therefore the meaning of the phrase must include not only the beginning, but also the totality of judgment. The sense must be that all judgment, starting from the beginning and continuing all the way into eternity, and extending to the broadest spectrum of humanity, has been given to the Son of Man. The idea of the totality of judgment, then, seems to be the most likely sense of this phrase.

67:27, 29: *wa-yāxālef wa-yāmāsen xāte’ āna*/he will cause the sinners to pass away and be destroyed. . . :

This idea must be considered in connection with Ps 9:4-11. The psalmist proclaims that the Lord sits on the throne judging righteously, that God has destroyed the wicked (עֲבָרֵי רָשָׁע Ps. 9:6), and that their very memory has perished (אֲבַר זִכְרָם Ps 9:7). As already frequently noted, the judicial picture in *Par. En.* is based on Daniel 7, with the Ancient of Days seated upon the throne for judgment. But this image is complemented by other scriptural motifs. In Psalm 9, righteousness, judgment against the kings, and the destruction of the wicked enacted from the judgment throne are all present, as they are in *1 Enoch* 69:26–29. The throne, then, possibly functioned as the bridge for the author for incorporating the idea of the complete destruction of the wicked in his exposition of Daniel 7.

62:29 according to Ryl:

*wa-yenaggeru la-we’etu walda be’si wa-yeṣanne’ ba-qedma ’egzi’a manāfest*/and they will speak to that Son of Man and he will be strong before the Lord of Spirits;

69:29 according to Berl 5 *et al.* (see Variant note 24 above):

*wa nagaru la-we’etu walda be’si yeṣanne’ ba-qedma ’egzi’a manāfest* The word of that Son of Man will be strong before the Lord of Spirits:

As Knibb and Black in their translations indicate, the text is corrupt and the readings preserved by Berl 5 and three other manuscripts, as well as BM 492 (which uses the term “Son of a Woman”) should be followed.<sup>200</sup> The reading of Ryl, “and they (i.e.

<sup>200</sup> Contra Casey, *Solution*, 106, where he suggests a change of subject from the “son of man

sinners) will speak to that Son of Man” should be rejected because it introduces a serious break in the narrative flow of the scene. The Son of Man has been depicted as sitting on the throne, passing judgment, having them shackled, led away and confined to their place of destruction, so that all evil is removed. But then at this point Ryl portrays them speaking to the Son of Man, when they have already been put away—this is disruptive. For this reason, the reading of Berl 5 *et al.* is preferable, for it allows the scene to be concluded with the word of the Son of Man being confirmed before the Lord of Spirits.

Some biblical passages express a similar idea regarding the strength of the divine word. Dan. 7:14 implies the eternal confirmation of the Son of Man’s word through the concept of the abiding dominion and kingship of the human-like one, and Isa. 55:11 also expresses the efficacy of the word of the Lord, which will not return empty. If קוים (*hip’il*) is proposed in the original Hebrew for *yešanne*<sup>6</sup>,<sup>201</sup> then a verse like Isa. 44:26 provides a parallel, in which God confirms the word of his servant, מקוים דבר עבדו.

### 3.6.3 Summary of the Study of 1 En. 69:26–29

This closure to the Third Parable reiterates many of the characteristics of the Son of Man. The joy and praise of those who are vindicated are reported. The revelation of the Son of Man and his authority to judge are repeated, along with his sitting on the throne. The wicked are to be bound in chains and they are to be confined forever, while their accomplishments will be wiped out. Evil will no longer exist. Three new characteristics of the Son of Man are added from this passage:

- a) that the word of the Son of Man before the Lord of Spirits is strong and incontrovertible,
- b) that the Son of Man is the means for the destruction of evil; and
- c) that this judge has worldwide jurisdiction.

## 3.7 Exegesis of 1 Enoch 70

Chapter 70 is a short chapter of four verses, drawing the reader back to the narrative frame of Enoch’s translation. His vehicle was the chariots of the spirit, and he is presented to the Lord of Spirits. A brief allusion is made to cords for measuring the righteous (cf. 1 Enoch 61:1–7) and to the holding place for the spirits of the righteous

sitting on a throne” to “God.” His suggestion is awkward and unexpected. A change of subject here should use a name rather than just a pronoun.

<sup>201</sup> As Black, *1 Enoch*, 250, suggests.



(1 Enoch 22:9). Several critical issues, textual and literary, are associated with this chapter.

### 3.7.1 1 En. 70:1–4

1 *Wa-kona* <sup>1</sup>*em-dexra-ze* <sup>2</sup>*tala*<sup>6</sup>*āla semu* *heyāw* <sup>3</sup>*ba-xabēhu la-we*<sup>7</sup>*etu*<sup>3</sup> *walda* <sup>4</sup>*egwāla* <sup>4</sup>*emma-heyāw* <sup>5</sup>*ba-xaba* <sup>6</sup>*egzi*<sup>7</sup>*a manāfest* <sup>8</sup>*em-*<sup>9</sup>*ella yaxādderu diba yebs.*

1 And it came to pass after this (that), while he was living, his name was lifted, from those who dwell upon the dry ground to the presence of that Son of Man, and to the presence of the Lord of Spirits.

2 <sup>6</sup>*Wa-tal*<sup>6</sup>*āla* <sup>7</sup>*ba-saragalāta* <sup>8</sup>*manfas wa-waḏ*<sup>9</sup>*a* <sup>9</sup>*sem ba-mā*<sup>6</sup>*kalomu.*

2 And he was lifted on the chariots of the spirit, and his name vanished among them.

3 *Wa-*<sup>2</sup>*em-ye*<sup>3</sup>*eti* <sup>4</sup>*elat* <sup>10</sup>*i-tashebku* *ba-mā*<sup>6</sup>*kalomu wa-*<sup>2</sup>*ānbarani* <sup>11</sup>*ba-mā*<sup>6</sup>*kala kel*<sup>2</sup>*ē* <sup>12</sup>*manāfest* <sup>13</sup>*ba-mā*<sup>6</sup>*kala mas*<sup>4</sup> *wa-*<sup>5</sup>*ārab* *ba-xaba naš*<sup>6</sup>*u* <sup>14</sup>*āxbalāta malā*<sup>7</sup>*ekt kama yesferu lita makāna la-xeruyān* <sup>15</sup>*wa-la-ṣādeqān*

3 And from that day I was not counted amongst them, and he placed me between two winds, between the north and the west, where the angels took the cords to measure for me the place for the chosen and the righteous.

4 *Wa-ba-heyya re*<sup>3</sup>*iku* <sup>16</sup>*abawa* <sup>17</sup>*qadamta wa-ṣādeqān*<sup>16</sup> <sup>18</sup>*ella* <sup>9</sup>*em-*<sup>6</sup>*ālam* *ba-we*<sup>7</sup>*etu makān yaxādderu.*

4 And there I saw the first fathers and the righteous who from (the beginning of) the world dwelt in that place.

#### Variants

<sup>1</sup>*em-dexra-ze*/after this: Abb 55 has *wa-*<sup>2</sup>*em-dexra*/and afterwards (cf. Variant note 1 in 1 Enoch 63:1).

<sup>2</sup>*tala*<sup>6</sup>*āla*/was lifted: Abb 55 and Tana 9 have *talā*<sup>6</sup>*ala.*

<sup>3</sup>*ba-xabēhu la-we*<sup>7</sup>*etu*/to the presence of that: Abb 55 omits *ba-xabēhu*, with the implication that it is not the name that is raised to the Son of Man, but the name of that son of man (i.e., a human being, Enoch?) that is raised, while alive, to the Lord of Spirits. This would prepare much more consistently for the later identification of Enoch and the Son of Man in ch. 71. BM 485 has *ba-xaba la-we*<sup>7</sup>*etu*/in the presence of that; Berl has *ba-xaba we*<sup>7</sup>*etu*/in the presence of that; Tana 9 has *ba-qedma ba-xaba la-we*<sup>7</sup>*etu*/before, in the presence of that. Possibly *ba-xabēhu/ba-xaba* has been inserted under the influence of *heyāw ba-xaba* later in the verse,<sup>202</sup> and Abb 55 probably retains the original reading. The most natural rendering of the sense in which the name of a human being is raised to the Son of Man, thus distinguishing between the one raised and the Son of Man, would be Berl, *ba-xaba we*<sup>7</sup>*etu*/in the presence of that; without the *la-*. (Tana 9 adds a preposition

<sup>202</sup> Casey, “The Use of the Term ‘Son of Man’ in the Similtudes of Enoch,” 26, footnote 48.

- redundantly.) The remainder of the manuscripts retain the *la-*, which is probably a trace of the original reading. *La-* is a particle that can indicate a direct object, an indirect object, or even possession. If Abb 55 retains the original sense, then *la-* functions in the possessive sense, meaning the name of that son of man was lifted to the presence of the Lord of Spirits (see Notes below for further comment).
- <sup>4</sup>*emma-heyāw*/of the mother of the living (literally): Berl, as usual, has *emm-heyaw* (cf. Variant note 4 in chapter 63).
- <sup>5</sup>*ba-xaba*/to the presence of : BM 485, Abb 35, Tana 9 have *wa-ba-xaba*/and to the presence of, while Berl has *wa-xaba*/and to the presence of. If *ba-xabēhu* (see note 3) is an insertion, then the addition of the conjunction *wa-* is explanatory, clarifying the grammar, since the Son of Man and the Lord of Spirits are never identified in *Par. En*.
- <sup>6</sup>*wa-talā'āla*/and he was lifted: Berl, Abb 55 and Tana 9 have *wa-talā'āla* (see Variant note 2 above). Abb 35 adds *semu*/his name simply to clarify the subject of the verb.
- <sup>7</sup>*ba-saragalāta*/on the chariots: BM 485 has *ba-saragalāt*/on chariots, the non-construct form; Berl and Munich 30 have *ba-saragalā*/on a chariot, in the singular.
- <sup>8</sup>*manfas*/of the spirit: Abb 55 has *manfasu*/of his spirit. Abb 55 (see Variant note 3 above) has the understanding that it is the name of a son of man ( a human being) that is being raised, and thus here attributes to that son of man the ownership of this supernatural means of transportation: “his chariots of the spirit.”
- <sup>9</sup>*sem*/name: BM 491, Tana 9 and Ull have *semu*/his name, clarifying the grammar, while Berl and Munich 30 have *semo*/his name in the accusative, obscuring the grammatical construction of the sentence, and evidently in error.
- <sup>10</sup><sup>2</sup>*i-tashebku*/I was not pulled, dragged: BM 485 has *i-tehasabku*/I was not reckoned; Berl, Abb 35, Tana 9 and BM 4861 have *i-taxāsabku*/I was not reckoned (where *-xa-* has been substituted for *-ha-*); Abb 55 has *i-tasabbāhku*/I was not praised. Consonants have been interchanged, but of the three possibilities *i-tehasabku*/I was not reckoned makes the most sense in the context.
- <sup>11</sup>*ba-mā'kala*/between: Berl, Tana 9, and Bodl 5 have *mā'kala*/amongst/in the midst of, simply another form of the same preposition.
- <sup>12</sup>*manāfest*/winds: Tana 9 has *nafāsāt*/winds.
- <sup>13</sup>*ba-mā'kala*/between: Berl has *ba-mā'la*/above/on high(?); Tana 9 has *ba-mā'ka*, both of which are corruptions.
- <sup>14</sup><sup>2</sup>*axbalāta*/the cords: Eth I and 3 mss have *ahbāla*/the cords, an orthographic alternative.
- <sup>15</sup>*wa-la-šādeqān*/and the righteous: Ull has *wa-šādeqān*/and the righteous, omitting *la-*, which is a particle that can be used to indicate an object, and indirect object, or even possession; its omission does not alter the sense of the phrase.
- <sup>16</sup><sup>2</sup>*abawa qadamta wa-šādeqān*/the first fathers and the righteous: An alternate translation is, “the first and righteous fathers,” if the accusative ending is on

both adjectives.<sup>203</sup> Berl and Tana 9 <sup>ʾ</sup>*abaw qadamta wa-ṣādeqān*, a reading which omits the accusative ending, showing more clearly that *qadamta* and *ṣādeqān* both modify <sup>ʾ</sup>*abaw*. Three other manuscripts have <sup>ʾ</sup>*abaw qadamta wa-ṣādeqāna*, this reading omits the accusative ending where it had been on <sup>ʾ</sup>*abawa qadamta*, but adds it to *wa-ṣādeqān*, which makes it clear that the righteous are a second group.

<sup>17</sup>*qadamta*/ancient: BM 485, BM 491, Abb 55 have *wa-qadamta*/and the ancients, this reading suggests a three-fold object, the fathers, the ancients, and the righteous. This does not change the sense radically, but perhaps the scribe who introduced this reading had three separate referents in mind.

<sup>18</sup><sup>ʾ</sup>*ella*/who: BM 491 has <sup>ʾ</sup>*ellu*/these.

Given the variants noted above, it is appropriate to offer a critically sensitive version of chapter 70 that takes these conclusions into account.

### *Critically Sensitive Transliteration and Translation*

1 *Wa-kona* <sup>1</sup>*em-dexra-ze* <sup>2</sup>*tala* <sup>ʿ</sup>*āla semu heyāw* <sup>3</sup>*la-we* <sup>ʾ</sup>*etu* <sup>3</sup>*walda* <sup>ʾ</sup>*eg* <sup>w</sup>*āla* <sup>4</sup>*emma-heyāw* <sup>5</sup>*ba-xaba* <sup>ʾ</sup>*egzi* <sup>ʾ</sup>*a manāfest* <sup>ʾ</sup>*em-* <sup>ʾ</sup>*ella yaxādderu diba yebs.*

1 And it came to pass after this the name of that Son of Man was raised, while alive, to the presence of the Lord of Spirits from those who dwell on earth.

2 <sup>6</sup>*Wa-tal* <sup>ʿ</sup>*āla* <sup>7</sup>*ba-saragalāta* <sup>8</sup>*manfas wa-waḍ* <sup>ʾ</sup>*a* <sup>9</sup>*sem ba-mā* <sup>ʿ</sup>*kalomu.*

2 And he was raised on chariots of the spirit and the name came out from amongst them.

3 *Wa-* <sup>ʾ</sup>*em-ye* <sup>ʾ</sup>*eti* <sup>ʿ</sup>*elat* <sup>10</sup><sup>ʾ</sup>*i-tehasabku ba-mā* <sup>ʿ</sup>*kalomu wa-* <sup>ʾ</sup>*ānbarani* <sup>11</sup>*ba-mā* <sup>ʿ</sup>*kala kel* <sup>ʾ</sup>*ē* <sup>12</sup>*manāfest* <sup>13</sup>*ba-mā* <sup>ʿ</sup>*kala mas* <sup>ʿ</sup>*wa-* <sup>ʿ</sup>*ārab ba-xaba naš* <sup>ʿ</sup>*u* <sup>14</sup>*āxbalāta malā* <sup>ʾ</sup>*ekt kama yesferu lita makāna la-xeruyān* <sup>15</sup>*wa-la-* <sup>ʿ</sup>*ṣādeqān*

3 And from that day I was not reckoned amongst them, and he seated me between two winds, between the north and the west, where the angels took the cords to measure for me the place of the elect and the righteous.

4 *Wa-ba-heyya re* <sup>ʾ</sup>*iku* <sup>16</sup>*abawa* <sup>17</sup>*qadamta wa-ṣādeqān* <sup>16</sup> <sup>18</sup><sup>ʾ</sup>*ella* <sup>ʾ</sup>*em-* <sup>ʿ</sup>*ālam ba-we* <sup>ʾ</sup>*etu makān yaxādderu.*

4 And there I saw the first fathers and the righteous who from eternity were dwelling in that place.

### *Notes*

The major issue of *1 Enoch 70* is the significance of the figure of the Son of Man. Does the term “Son of Man” refer to a second heavenly figure in this passage, as it has throughout *Par. En.* thus far, or is it a term that refers to a human being, Enoch specifically? This question depends in part on the evaluation of the textual variant <sup>3</sup>*ba-xabēhu la-we* <sup>ʾ</sup>*etu*/into the presence of that . . . , noted above. While the majority

<sup>203</sup> Suggested to me by Prof. James C. VanderKam.

of witnesses conceive of someone's name being raised to the Son of Man and to the Lord of Spirits, one important manuscript understands that the name of the Son of Man is raised to the Lord of Spirits. The issue of the significance of the Son of Man must also be approached from the perspective of the literary character of chapter 70 within *Par. En.*, whether it is integral to *Par. En.*,<sup>204</sup> or whether it is an older tradition from which *Par. En.* developed,<sup>205</sup> or whether it is intrusive like the Noachic material is. Thus, to discover the significance of the Son of Man in chapter 70, the issue must be discussed from the perspectives of both textual criticism and literary criticism.

*The textual problem of 1 Enoch 70:1.* The major problem with this verse is a textual one. The majority of witnesses include the prepositional phrase *ba-xabēhu*, "to the presence of," before the Son of Man, indicating that the Son of Man is in heaven and the name of an earthly being is raised to the Son of Man and the Lord of Spirits. Abb 55, however, omits the prepositional phrase *ba-xabēhu* with the implication that it is the name of a son of man, i.e. a human being, that is raised to the Lord of Spirits.<sup>206</sup> Three considerations are important to resolving this textual problem: the first is the reliability of Abb 55; the second is the question of the grammatical issues involved; and the third is the question of which reading is the *lectio difficilior*.

The textual question involves the reliability of Abb 55, which has been described by Charles in this way:

This MS. would form a good third to *g* and *q* but that it is so imperfect after chapter lxxxiii, for nearly one-seventh of the entire book is omitted in the course of lxxxiii–cviii. These omissions are made in the most capricious way, sometimes words, sometimes phrases, sometimes whole sentences and paragraphs are excised to the entire destruction of the sense. Notwithstanding as *u* is a valuable MS. I have most faithfully recorded all its omissions and changes. In chapter i–xxxii it alone preserves the true text in iii (note 23), iv (note 33), xxi.7 (note 40).<sup>207</sup>

According to Charles, Abb 55 is capricious and extensive in its omissions, but only after chapter 83, while in chapters 3, 4, and 21, it alone preserves what Charles considers to be original readings.<sup>208</sup> The implication is that for *1 Enoch* 37–71, Abb 55 must be seen as worthy of serious consideration and its reading here as possibly original.

<sup>204</sup> VanderKam, "Righteous One," pp. 177–79.

<sup>205</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 250.

<sup>206</sup> Casey, "The Use of the Term 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch," 25, indicates that according to Fleming and Rademacher, Abb 99 (W) and Abb 197 (V) also support this reading.

<sup>207</sup> Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1906), p. xxiv. In Charles' designations, *u* refers to Abb 55, *g* to BM 485, *q* to Berl. The list of manuscripts collated by Charles is on pp. xviii–xxi.

<sup>208</sup> On the basis of part of Charles's comment, Collins, "The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism," 454, suggests that the reading in Abb 55 may be a simple mechanical error, and implies that it therefore is to be rejected. However, according to Charles' comments, prior to chapter 83, Abb 55 is a valuable manuscript.

Grammatically, the prepositional phrase *ba-xabēhu* appears to be intrusive. Two grammatical problems arise because of the presence of *ba-xabēhu* in the sentence, and suggest that the phrase is a scribal emendation. One problem is the presence of the particle *la-* before *we'etu*. The particle *la-* is often used in possessive constructions or as the indicator of the indirect object. If *ba-xabēhu* is original, *la-* is not needed,<sup>209</sup> as is illustrated later in the sentence with *ba-xaba 'egzi'a manāfest/to* the presence of the Lord of Spirits. *Ba-xaba/ba-xabēhu* does not need *la-* for the clause to make sense grammatically.<sup>210</sup> If *ba-xabēhu*, then, is omitted, as in Abb 55, the clause makes perfect grammatical sense: “the name of that son of man was raised while alive.” The other grammatical problem raised by the presence of *ba-xabēhu* is that the conjunction *wa-* is missing from the part of the sentence referring to the Lord of Spirits. Usually a connecting *wa-* is present to indicate the presence of two beings. Without the connecting *wa-*, the construction would appear to place the Lord of Spirits in apposition to the Son of Man, but that does not make sense in the theoretical construct of the scene. The Son of Man and the Lord of Spirits have always been clearly distinguished, and so the connecting *wa-* is expected. As it turns out, BM 485, Abb 35, Tana 9 and Berl do preserve *wa-*, but as noted in Variant 5 above, it probably was added in an explanatory way in reaction to the presence of *ba-xabēhu*. If, however, *ba-xabēhu* is not original, then the sentence (without *wa-*) makes perfect grammatical sense in this regard also, reporting that the name of that son of man was raised to the Lord of Spirits.

Grammatically, then, the prepositional phrase *ba-xabēhu* appears to be intrusive, and with its removal, two grammatical problems are solved. This also supports the reading of Abb 55 as being original.

The third aspect of addressing the textual problem is the question of which is the easier reading. The argument has been made that the omission in Abb 55 was motivated by a desire to bring *1 Enoch* 70:1 into theological conformity with *1 Enoch* 71:14, where Enoch is identified as the Son of Man by the archangel Michael. From a different perspective, however, the insertion of *ba-xabēhu* can be seen to be the easier reading, and its absence as the *lectio difficilior*. That perspective is to notice the immediate context of the verse. It immediately follows *1 Enoch* 69:26–29, in which the Son of Man has been imagined to be sitting on the throne of glory in the presence of the Lord of Spirits. With this mental construct in mind, any scribe coming to a sentence that included the term Son of Man would certainly tend to expect that the Son of Man referred to the heavenly figure just described, and therefore that the absence of the preposition was a mistake to be corrected.<sup>211</sup> Thus, in approaching *1 Enoch* 70, it is easy to understand that a scribal insertion might be made in order to

<sup>209</sup> Berl omits *la-* from *we'etu*.

<sup>210</sup> Occasionally, however, *la-* does occur with prepositions, even though it is not needed. Thus it can not be claimed categorically that *la-* is either out of place in or essential to the grammatical construction.

<sup>211</sup> Casey, “The Use of the Term ‘Son of Man’ in the Similitudes of Enoch,” 26, footnote 48.

maintain the presence of the Son of Man in the heavenly scene, rather than suddenly to be confronted by an earthly son of man being raised to the heavenly arena.

Black<sup>212</sup> has suggested that the scribal insertion of *ba-xabēhu* was due to a Christian, theological concern. For a Christian scribe, the term Son of Man would have been “theologically loaded,” referring to Christ. The insertion of the prepositional phrase would be a simple way to solve the theological problem. However, as Collins points out,<sup>213</sup> no theological correction was made at *1 Enoch* 71:14, when Enoch is explicitly addressed as the Son of Man by Michael. The more likely explanation is that the insertion of *ba-xabēhu* in *1 Enoch* 70:1 was made on contextual rather than theological grounds.

Given the immediate context, the *lectio difficilior* is the reading without the prepositional phrase, as preserved in Abb 55.

Thus for this chapter the three considerations of the textual problem weigh in favor of the reading preserved in Abb 55.<sup>214</sup> For this passage, Abb 55 is worthy of serious consideration, as its egregious imperfections do not begin until *1 Enoch* 83. The reading without *ba-xabēhu* clears up the minor grammatical oddities of having *la-* before *we`etu walda `egwāla `emma-heyāw*/that Son of Man and of not having *wa-* before *ba-xaba `egzi`a manāfest*/to the presence of the Lord of Spirits. And, finally, given the context of *1 Enoch* 69:26–29, in which the Son of Man and the Lord of Spirits are distinguished in the heavenly scene, the reading of Abb 55, which shifts the referent of “Son of Man” from the heavenly figure to a human being, is the more difficult and therefore the preferable reading. The probabilities involved in the textual aspect of the issue, then, favor the reading of Abb 55, that here, the term *walda `egwāla `emma-heyāw* refers to a human being (Enoch), who is raised while still alive to the presence of the Lord of Spirits. The term, which had been used of the heavenly figure, is now used in its general sense of meaning a human figure. This change in referent is a bold but characteristic feature of the author’s skill in using and applying his ideas for the benefit of the audience. The term, which had been used to refer to the eschatological judge, now is used in its general sense to apply to Enoch and this is done in preparation for the identification of Enoch as the Son of Man (*1 Enoch* 71:14).<sup>215</sup>

*Literary Integrity.* The other avenue of approaching the question of the significance of the Son of Man in *1 Enoch* 70:1 is to examine its literary integrity. Is *1 Enoch* 70 intrusive, like the Noachic material, or is it basically consistent with the rest of *Par*:

<sup>212</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 250.

<sup>213</sup> Collins, “The Son of Man in First Century Judaism,” 454.

<sup>214</sup> Casey, “The Use of the Term ‘Son of Man’ in the Similitudes of Enoch,” 25–27 and *Solution* 107–108, argues along these same lines. Black, *1 Enoch*, 67, 250, concludes the same thing and translates the text this way. In a recent article, Daniel C. Olson, “Enoch and the Son of Man in the Epilogue of the Parables,” *JSP* 18 (1998) 27–38, makes the same conclusion, drawing into the evidence some new manuscript support.

<sup>215</sup> VanderKam, “Righteous One,” p. 178–79 also notices the subtle identification of Enoch and the Son of Man apparent in the genealogy of 37:1, in which Enoch is called the son of *Adam* (Hebrew for ‘man’), and the son of *Enosh* (Aramaic for ‘man’).

*En.*? Three positions have been suggested. Black has suggested that chapter 70 is an older tradition, out of which the rest of *Par. En.* was developed. He characterizes it as having “little in common with chapter 69” and reading “like a quite independent piece of text.”<sup>216</sup> Others have suggested that *1 Enoch* 70–71 form an epilogue to *Par. En.*, not closely connected, with the implication that they may be a later addition.<sup>217</sup> VanderKam, on the other hand, views *1 Enoch* 70–71 as an epilogue that contains a narrative account of Enoch’s final ascent.<sup>218</sup>

Black’s position that *1 Enoch* 70 has little in common with the rest of *Par. En.*<sup>219</sup> does not appear to be tenable. *1 Enoch* 70, because it is so brief, has no allusions to the kings and mighty ones, the judicial role for the Son of Man, or the terms “Elect One,” “Anointed One,” or many other major ideas, nevertheless, it does make an allusion to a specific part of the second parable, and it does use much of the same language as is used in the rest of *Par. En.* The mention of the place where the angels took the cords to measure the place of the elect and righteous refers directly to *1 Enoch* 61:1–2 where that specific part of the vision is narrated.

A careful study of the passage in comparison with the rest of *Par. En.*, reveals that there is much common terminology between *1 Enoch* 70 and the rest of *Par. En.* Two types of phraseology emerge from *1 Enoch* 70. One is the type of wording that connects parts of the discourse together. Phrases like *’em-dexra-ze*/after this, and *baheyya re’iku*/there I saw, and the *nomen dei*, *’egzi’a manāfest*/the Lord of Spirits, are present in *1 Enoch* 70 and are frequent expressions used throughout *Par. En.* They even appear in Noachic sections, suggesting some attempt to weave those sections into the fabric of *Par. En.* Such phrases indicate the hand of the author. Other phrases are those which are not so frequent in *Par. En.*, but they are completely usual for the author. The stock phrase, *wa-kona*/and it came to pass, occurs also at *1 Enoch* 57:1, 60:4, and in the future tense at *1 Enoch* 39:1, 52:7. Further the term for chariots/*saragalāta* appears at *1 Enoch* 57:1, 2, and the use of *sem*/name to stand for the person also occurs at *1 Enoch* 46:7, 48:2, 3. While this less frequent phraseology does not seem to appear in the Noachic sections, it does reveal a common mode of expression for *1 Enoch* 70 with the rest of *Par. En.*

Further, the subject matter of the chapter does fit well with the rest of *Par. En.* The idea of Enoch’s translation, alluding to Elijah’s translation (2 Kings 2:11), begins to bring the discourse to an end, with a resumption of the narrative framework. As noted above, the cords for measuring the righteous and elect have already been a part of the vision (*1 Enoch* 61:1–2). Seeing the inhabitants of heaven has also been mentioned at *1 Enoch* 39:4–13 and 41:2. In terms of content, the chapter has material in common with the rest of *Par. En.*

<sup>216</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 250.

<sup>217</sup> E.g. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 151–53; Daniel, 81; Colpe, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, 426; Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 234, n. 80, and 211, n. 17.

<sup>218</sup> VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 178–79. Similarly, Casey, “The Use of the Term ‘Son of Man’ in the Similitudes of Enoch,” 26.

<sup>219</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 250.

Two other stylistic habits noticeable in chapter 70 are also consistent with those found in earlier parts of *Par. En.* The first is the manner of alluding to other passages. The author alludes to other passages without using citations or introductory formulae, yet the allusions are clear and concise. Examples are the allusion to God and to the human-like heavenly figure of Daniel 7 that is made in *1 Enoch* 46:1–3, and the allusion to the chosen servant of Isaiah 42 and 49 made in *1 Enoch* 48. In *1 Enoch* 70 several allusions can be identified: the allusion in *1 Enoch* 70:2 to Elijah's translation in 2 Kings 2, the allusion to the measuring cords of *1 Enoch* 61:1–7 found in *1 Enoch* 70:3, and the place of waiting for the righteous souls in *1 Enoch* 22:9 found in *1 Enoch* 70:4. The other stylistic habit is the unannounced switch from third person narrative to first person discourse. This is found between verses 2 and 3 of *1 Enoch* 70. Enoch's ascent is being described, and then, without introduction, Enoch is reporting it in the first person. Theisohn has pointed out several instances where there is a change in speaker that is not announced, such as, *1 Enoch* 45:2–45:3, 48:8–48:9, and 54:6–55:3.<sup>220</sup> This appears to be characteristic of the style of the author, rather than evidence of redactional seams,<sup>221</sup> and is evident in both the body of the work and its epilogue.

These linguistic, conceptual and stylistic similarities, then, militate against the view that *1 Enoch* 70–71 are not integral to *Par. En.* from the literary point of view. To the contrary, the epilogue appears to be coherent and consistent with the rest of *Par. En.* VanderKam argues cogently for the literary integrity of the epilogue.<sup>222</sup> The visions have now ended, and the narrative frame is resumed. According to ancient exegetes, and as Jub 4:17–25 makes clear, Enoch experienced two ascents: one during his lifetime (*1 Enoch* 39), after which he returned and reported his visions, and the second at the end of his life (*1 Enoch* 70–71), after which he did not return (see further, below on *1 Enoch* 71:10–17). VanderKam builds on Sjöberg's earlier work, which argued for a close parallelism between *Par. En.* and earlier descriptions of Enoch's ascent in the *Book of the Watchers*. As both Sjöberg and VanderKam notice, the parallelism extends to the two stages in the final ascent. *1 Enoch* 70, when the first person narrative begins, relates the first ascent. *1 Enoch* 71 narrates the two stages of the second ascent. Two distinctive verbs are used in *1 Enoch* 71:1, 5 to describe Enoch's ascent. The verb *tala'āla* is the same verb used of exaltation in Isa. 52:13, while *kabata* is the verb used by the Ethiopic Bible to describe God's taking Enoch in Gen. 5:24. These verbs lend credence to the hypothesis that the epilogue is a cohesive, coherent, integrated ending to *Par. En.*

*The significance of the Son of Man.* If it has been shown that *1 Enoch* 70 is integral to the work, and if the textual problem in *1 Enoch* 70:1 has been resolved to support the reading of Abb 5, then the question of the significance of the Son of Man can be concluded. In this passage, even though the formal term of *we'etu walda*

<sup>220</sup> Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 87.

<sup>221</sup> Collins, "The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism," 453.

<sup>222</sup> VanderKam, "Righteous One," 177–79.



'*egwāla 'emma-heyāw* is used, it is applied to the human figure of the seer, Enoch. Enoch that particular human being, “son of man” in the general sense, is raised to the Lord of Spirits while still alive (following the reading of Abb 55). The use of that term here in *1 Enoch* 70:1 is rich with pregnant irony, for just a few verses later in *1 Enoch* 71:14, Enoch, the translated human being (son of man) is explicitly told that he is the Son of Man of the visions, the eschatological judicial figure, who had been the subject of those visions. The earthly figure in *1 Enoch* 70:1 is being described in terms that prepare the reader for his later identification as the heavenly figure. In the narrative development, the figures of the human seer and the heavenly judge are being brought closer together.

70:2 *ba-saragala\ta manfas/on* chariots of the spirit:

This description contrasts with the other accounts of Enoch's ascent in this work. In Gen. 5:24 Enoch simply walks (יִהְיֶה לֵךְ) with God and God takes him (לִקְחָה). In *1 Enoch* 14:8 winds bore him aloft, while in *1 Enoch* 71 he is said to be carried off (*tetkabbat*), going up (*te'reg*) to the heavens. The phrase *1 Enoch* 70:2, however, is reminiscent of the accounts of several other ancient ascents. One is 2 Kgs 2:2, 11, which narrates Elijah's ascent in a whirlwind after a chariot of fire drawn by fiery horses separates him from Elisha. In *The Lives of the Prophets* 21, however, Elijah is understood to have been taken up in the fiery chariot, not the whirlwind, and in *Joseph and Aseneth* 17, a heavenly visitor also departs from Aseneth in a fiery chariot. Job's soul ascends in a great, gleaming chariot (*Testament of Job* 52), while his body is prepared for burial. The latest account chronologically is again of Enoch's ascent in *3 Enoch* 6, in which a fiery chariot drawn by fiery horses transports Enoch to the Shekinah. These pseudepigraphic accounts are roughly contemporaneous with *1 Enoch* (except for *3 Enoch*), and they indicate that chariotry was a meaningful and viable image for departure from earth, whether spiritual or bodily.<sup>223</sup>

70:2 *wa-wad'a sem ba-mā'kalomu* and his name vanished amongst them:

The name stands for the whole person. Enoch's vanishing from earth is a further allusion to Gen. 5:24, where Enoch is said to be no more (וְלֹא נִמְצָא) after God took him. His absence from earth is also noted in *1 Enoch* 12:1 where no one knew where he had been taken up, or where he was, or what happened to him. Black prefers to understand *wad'a* in terms of נִצָּן, in the sense of his fame being spread far and wide amongst all people.<sup>224</sup> This seems unlikely, however, because the next verse seems to further the idea of disappearance, since it notes that Enoch was no longer counted amongst mortals.

<sup>223</sup> Enoch's translation according to the Hebrew Bible, like Elijah's, did not involve death, while all the others noted were the result of death.

<sup>224</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 250.

70:3 *wa-ʿānbarani ba-mā<sup>c</sup>kala kel'ē manāfest/* and he placed me between two winds:

This may be an allusion to Enoch's journeys, in which he saw the gates of the north winds and the gates of the west winds (*1 Enoch* 34–35) or it may be an allusion to Enoch's being transported to the west, where he saw the four storage hollows for the souls of human beings, one of which was reserved for the righteous (*1 Enoch* 22). The latter is perhaps more likely since the angels' measuring cords for the righteous (*1 Enoch* 61:1–7) are also alluded to in this same verse.

### 3.7.3 Summary of the Study of *1 Enoch* 70

Since the term, *we'etu walda ʿegwāla ʿemma-ḥeyāw*, here refers to the human being, Enoch (if Abb 55 preserves the original text, as I have argued), no new characteristics can be enumerated.<sup>225</sup> His ascent on chariots of the spirit is reiterated and concise allusions to previous visions are made. Narratively, as noted above, this brief chapter suspensefully brings Enoch's identification as the Son of Man one step closer.

## 3.8 Exegesis of *1 Enoch* 71:10–17

Since *1 Enoch* 71:10–17 is an ascent account, and before it is studied in depth, a comparison of the ascent accounts in *1 Enoch* will be reviewed.

### 3.8.1 The Ascent Accounts of *1 Enoch*

Chapters 70 and 71 bear many striking similarities with chapters 12 and 14 of the *Book of the Watchers (BW)*,<sup>226</sup> but they also exhibit significant differences. Both the chapters from the *BW* and those from *Par. En.* narrate two ascents for Enoch and they narrate two stages in the second ascent. The first ascent is narrated in chapters 12 and

<sup>225</sup> Even if Abb 55 is not original and Enoch is lifted alive to the heavenly Son of Man and to the Lord of Spirits, the only characteristic of the Son of Man discernible here is the heavenly status, and that has already been noticed and incorporated into the list of characteristics in connection with *1 Enoch* 46.

<sup>226</sup> Charles, *1 Enoch*, 142, believes that 14:18 was used by the author of 71:5–8, while Black, *1 Enoch*, 251, suggests that “chapter 14 has provided a model for chapter 71.” Charles considers that both parts of the second ascent must refer to a period before Enoch's final translation, since it would not be possible for Michael to show Enoch what the interpreting angel had already shown. The strict logicity of Charles' position, however, fails to acknowledge the polyvalent nature of apocalyptic language. The genre of the work does not require that chronological order be preserved. It seems much more appropriate to consider the accounts of the ascents in chapters 70–71 to be a reiteration of those traditions, but not necessarily in chronological order.

70, and the second, in chapters 14 and 71, with the first stage being found in 14:8–14 and 71:1–4, and the second stage being narrated in 14:15–25 and 71:5–17.<sup>227</sup> The similarities and differences between these two sets of chapters raise two questions. One question concerns how the two accounts of Enoch’s translation to the heavens are related to each other. The second question pertains to the relationship between chapters 70–71 and the rest of *Par. En.* We look first at the similarities and then the differences. Some conclusions about the relationships of chapters 70–71 to *BW* and to *Par. En.* will then be offered.

### *The First Ascent*

Enoch’s first ascent is narrated in *I Enoch* 12 (*Book of the Watchers*) and in *I Enoch* 70 (*Par. En.*). In *I Enoch* 12, Enoch is said to have been taken up (*takabta*) so that none of earth’s inhabitants knew “where he was or what happened to him” (12:1). There he encountered the watchers, who enlisted him to take God’s word of judgment back to the fallen watchers. This episode has its closest parallels to *I Enoch* 70, in which Enoch is described as being raised up (here the verb is *tala‘āla*, however) on chariots of the spirit, so that he was no longer reckoned amongst humanity. In this account he is placed in the region where the angels took the cords to measure out the place for the elect and righteous, and in that region he also sees the righteous ancestors. Three similarities between the two accounts are evident:

- a) his being taken up to heaven;
- b) the comments that earth’s inhabitants did not know what happened to him; and
- c) the mention of the presence of angels.

Several major differences also arise:

- a) different verbs are used of his ascent (*takabta* in 12:1, which is also used in Gen. 5:24,<sup>228</sup> and *tala‘āla* in 70:1, 2);<sup>229</sup>
- b) *Par. En.* mentions the chariots of the spirit (or wind: *manfas* can mean either), while *BW* does not mention any means of conveyance until 14:8 (in the second account of the ascent), where winds are said to carry the seer aloft;

<sup>227</sup> It is unclear in *BW* if two separate ascents are being narrated or if chapter 14 is an exposition of the sights seen in the ascent of chapter 12. Chapter 12 is presented as a concise report that Enoch was taken to heaven, while chapter 14 is said to be a vision that is being reported of Enoch’s ascent. Nowhere in either 12 or 14 is it explicitly said that Enoch experienced two ascents. But neither is it explicitly said that chapter 14 is an explanation or expansion of the ascent of chapter 12. Similarly chapters 70 and 71 are not linked explicitly either as two separate ascents, or as chapter 71 being an explanation of chapter 70. Although it is not absolutely clear, I have construed each narrative as presenting two ascents, with the second ascent having two stages.

<sup>228</sup> Charles, *I Enoch*, 142; Black, *I Enoch*, 251.

<sup>229</sup> VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 178.

- c) the purpose of the angels in the separate accounts is different. In *BW* the angels enlist Enoch to take back the judgment against the fallen watchers, while in *Par. En.* the mention of angels is an allusion to 61:2–4, in which the angels are measuring out a place for the righteous and elect. These are two distinct purposes that have opposite concerns, and reveal the distinct purposes of the respective authors; and
- d) *Par. En.* mentions that Enoch sees the righteous ancestors dwelling there, while *BW* does not mention any detail like this.

*I Enoch* 70 changes the nature of the purpose of the angels and includes the sight of the righteous ancestors because it was written with a purpose that is different from that of chapter 12. For *BW*, the purpose was to announce judgment upon the promoters of evil in the world, while for *Par. En.* the purpose is not only to announce condemnation to the oppressors, but also explicitly to offer hope to the righteous and elect. It can offer hope to the oppressed, because it can claim that the angels have selected the place for the righteous and elect and because it can claim that the righteous ancestors are already there. This is a development from the purpose of the ascent account in chapter 12, but does not detract from the overall similarity between the two accounts.

### *The Second Ascent*

The accounts of the second ascent are contained in chapters 14 and 71, and in each chapter two stages are discernible. In chapter 14, the two stages are described in terms of the seer seeing two houses, while in chapter 71 the seer is described as being translated (*takabta*) both in 71:1 and in 71:5, and as being taken to the heavens (*samāyāt*) in 71:1 and to the heaven of heavens (*samāya samāyāt*) in 71:5. The pattern of proceeding from the first house to the second house in chapter 14 is matched in chapter 71 by the destination first being merely the heavens and then being a second or higher level of the heaven of heavens.

Some of the similarities between the two accounts are present in the parallel stage of the ascent. In 14:8–15 the seer is borne by the winds, sees a house of hailstones and fire, and falls to his face in horror and trembling. In 71:1–4 the seer's spirit is translated, he sees the sons of the holy angels treading on flames of fire, wearing white garments, with the light of their faces being like snow. The seer also falls on his face before the divine figure. The descriptions of fire and snow or ice are common to both accounts, but in 14:8–14 they are applied to the house, while in 71:1–5 they are applied to the angels. The angel Michael is named in 71:3, but not in 14:8–14, and Michael's activity of showing the seer all the secrets of heaven is present in 71:3–4, as a summary of the three parables or visions in *Par. En.*, but this activity is not a part of the account in 14:8–14.

The similarities of the first stage are:

- a) the seer's being taken up to heaven;
- b) the use of fire and ice or snow to describe the sights there;

- c) the prostration of the seer; and
- d) the general impression of brightness.

The differences in the first stage are:

- a) the winds are described as the vehicle in *BW*, but not in *Par. En.*;
- b) the tessellated paving stones and snow floor in 14:10 are not noted in *Par. En.*;
- c) the application of fire and ice or snow to describe the house in *BW* but they are part of the description of the angels in *Par. En.*;
- d) the emotional reaction of horror and trembling of *BW* is not included in *Par. En.* until the second stage of the account;
- e) the amazing house is the focus in *BW*, while in *Par. En.* it is the angels treading on fire (71:1);
- f) the streams of fire are described as shining like hyacinth in 71:2, but not in *BW*;
- g) Michael is named in 71:3, but not in 14:8–14;
- h) Michael's activity of showing the seer all the secrets of heaven is present in 71:3–4, but not in 14:8–14; and
- i) the storehouses are mentioned in 71:3–4 (referring back to chapters 18, 44, for example), but not in *BW*.

In the second stage of each account, more similarities are noticeable. In 14:15–25 the second house, which now is all of fire, is seen, and it has a lofty, glittering throne, from which flowed streams of fire and upon which the Great One sat. It is surrounded by a circle of fire and by myriads of angels. The seer lies prostrate and trembling. In 71:5–17, an icy, fiery house is seen, encircled by fire. Innumerable angels guard the throne of glory, on which sits the Chief of Days. The seer falls prostrate, weak with fear.

The similarities of the second stage are:

- a) a fiery house is seen;
- b) a throne is present;
- c) the divine figure is seated upon the throne;
- d) fire encircles the house;
- e) myriads of angels are present;
- f) the seer lies prostrate, with fear; and
- g) again, brilliance pervades the vision.

The differences in the second stage are:

- a) in *BW* the house is made only of fire, but in *Par. En.*, the house is fire and ice;
- b) in *BW* the throne is described as fiery and glittering, with streams of fire flowing from it, while in *Par. En.*, the usual term for the throne, the throne of his glory, is used, with no further description;

- c) the terms for the divine figure are different, in *BW* the term “the Great One” is used (14:20), while in *Par. En.*, both terms for God used in *Par. En.* are employed, “the Lord of Spirits” (71:7), and “the Chief of Days” (71:10, 12); and
- d) varieties of angels are named in *Par. En.*, the Cherubim, who are present in 14:11 in the upper story of the house, are mentioned along with the Seraphin and Ophannin (71:7) as well as the four archangels (71:9,13).

Interestingly many of the similarities in the two accounts come not from the parallel stage of the ascent, but from the opposite stage. The description of the house being built of hailstones and tongues of fire and encircled by fire occurs in the first stage in *BW* 14:9, but that description is part of the second stage in *Par. En.* 71:5. Likewise the fear of the seer is already present in the first stage in *BW* 14:9, but not attributed to him until the second stage in *Par. En.* 71:11, although in both accounts the seer’s fear follows his seeing the throne. Cherubim are the only angels mentioned in *BW*, and they are mentioned in the first stage as inhabiting the upper story of the house of fire and hailstones (14:11), while in *Par. En.* they are noted in the second stage (71:7) along with Seraphin and Ophannin guarding the throne.

The similarities and differences between the two accounts reveal something of the methods and purposes of the author of *Par. En.* The similarities serve to indicate the source of the images of the ascents, and through them the author alludes precisely yet concisely to the original account in *BW*. And yet the author has significantly altered that account. The use of the verbs *takabata* and *tala’āla* allude clearly back to *BW* 12 and 14, as well as Gen. 5:24. And when the author uses *tala’āla* together with the chariot, the account of Elijah’s translation in 2 Kings is alluded to as well. The details of the house built of hailstones and fire allude precisely and concisely to *BW* 14, yet in *Par. En.* instead of there being two houses, the structure is compressed into one. Further, the names used for the divine figure and the description of the throne reflect the preferences of the author. The mention of the classes of angels as well as the names of the four archangels possibly reflects the development in angelology during the time between the composition of the two works, but their function in the accounts reflects the distinct purposes of the authors. In *BW* the angels function merely as part of the glorious, awe-filled scene, which is described in order to announce judgment upon the perpetrators of evil. But in *Par. En.*, the author’s purpose is rather to offer hope to the righteous and elect, and to elevate Enoch to a favored status, which reflects the favored place of the righteous and elect in *Par. En.* The angels, then, function in *Par. En.* to secure the place of the righteous and elect (70:3), and the archangel Michael serves to facilitate the elevating of Enoch to the status of being the Son of Man (71:14). This manner of precise but concise allusion has already been noticed in the allusion to Daniel 7 found in *1 Enoch* 46:1, as well as in the uses of other biblical passages. Similarly, the purpose of the author of *Par. En.* has been consistent throughout the work. It can be said, then, that the author’s method of composition has been applied to *1 Enoch* 14, just as it was to Daniel 7 and the other biblical passages which are incorporated into the work, and the purpose has

consistently been not only to announce judgment to the evildoers but also to proclaim hope to the righteous and elect.

We now examine the final passage, the identification of the Son of Man in the presence of the Head of Days and the four archangels.

### 3.8.2 1 En. 71:10–17

10 <sup>1</sup>Wa-meslēhomu <sup>2</sup>re<sup>3</sup>sa maḥalā <sup>3</sup>wa-re<sup>4</sup>su kama ḍamr ḍa<sup>5</sup>ādā <sup>4</sup>wa-neṣuḥ wa-lebsu <sup>5</sup>za<sup>6</sup>-<sup>7</sup>i-yettaragg<sup>8</sup>am.

10 And with them was the Head of the Oath, his head white and pure like wool, and his garments were indescribable.

11 wa-wadaqqu ba-gaṣṣeya <sup>6</sup>wa-k<sup>7</sup>ellu ṣegāya tamaswa wa-manfaseya tawallaṭa wa-ṣārāxku ba-qāl <sup>6</sup>ābiy ba-manfasa xāyl <sup>7</sup>wa-bārakku <sup>8</sup>wa-sabbāḥkewwo wa-<sup>9</sup>āl<sup>10</sup>alku.

11 And I fell upon my face, and my whole body melted, and my spirit was transformed; and I cried out in a loud voice in the spirit of power, and I blessed and praised him and exalted.

12 <sup>9</sup>wa-<sup>2</sup>ellā barakatāt <sup>3</sup>ella <sup>10</sup>waḍ<sup>11</sup>ā <sup>12</sup>em <sup>13</sup>qfiya <sup>14</sup>konā <sup>15</sup>šemurāta <sup>16</sup>ba-qedma zeku re<sup>17</sup>sa mawā<sup>18</sup>el.

12 And these blessings which came out from my mouth were pleasing before that Head of Days.

13 Wa-maṣ<sup>19</sup>a we<sup>20</sup>etu re<sup>21</sup>sa mawā<sup>22</sup>el mesla mika<sup>23</sup>ēl <sup>24</sup>wa-gabre<sup>25</sup>ēl rufā<sup>26</sup>ēl <sup>27</sup>wa-fānu<sup>28</sup>ēl <sup>29</sup>wa-<sup>30</sup>ā<sup>31</sup>lāf <sup>32</sup>te<sup>33</sup>lefita <sup>34</sup>wa-<sup>35</sup>lāfāt <sup>36</sup>malā<sup>37</sup>ekt <sup>38</sup>ella <sup>39</sup>albomu x<sup>40</sup>elq<sup>41</sup>a.

13 And that Head of Days came with Michael and Gabriel, Raphael and Phanuel and thousands and ten thousands of angels without number.

14 wa-maṣ<sup>42</sup>a xabēya <sup>43</sup>we<sup>44</sup>etu mal<sup>45</sup>ak wa-ba-qālu <sup>46</sup>ammexāni wa-yebēlani <sup>47</sup>anta <sup>48</sup>we<sup>49</sup>etu walda be<sup>50</sup>si za-tawaladka <sup>51</sup>la-ṣedq <sup>52</sup>wa-ṣedq lā<sup>53</sup>lēka xādara wa-ṣedqu la-re<sup>54</sup>sa mawā<sup>55</sup>el <sup>56</sup>i-yaxādegaka.

14 And that angel came to me and greeted me with his voice, and said to me: “You are the Son of Man who were born to righteousness, and righteousness has remained over you, and the righteousness of the Head of Days will not leave you.”

15 wa-yebēlani <sup>25</sup>yeṣēwe<sup>26</sup> laka <sup>27</sup>salāma <sup>28</sup>ba-semu la-<sup>29</sup>alam za-yekawwen <sup>30</sup>esma <sup>31</sup>em-heyya <sup>32</sup>waḍ<sup>33</sup>a salām <sup>34</sup>em-feṭrata <sup>35</sup>alam wa-kama-ze yekawwen laka la<sup>36</sup>alam wa-la<sup>37</sup>alama<sup>38</sup>alam.

15 And he said to me, “He proclaims peace to you in the name of the world which is to come, for from there peace has come out from the creation of the world; and so you will have it forever and forever and ever.”

16 <sup>30</sup>wa-k<sup>31</sup>ellu <sup>32</sup>yekawwen wa-yahawwer diba <sup>33</sup>fenoteka <sup>34</sup>enza ṣedq <sup>35</sup>i-yaxādegaka <sup>36</sup>la<sup>37</sup>alam <sup>38</sup>meslēka yekawwen māxdarihomu <sup>39</sup>wa-meslēka keṭlomu <sup>40</sup>wa-<sup>41</sup>emennēka <sup>42</sup>i-yetlēlayu <sup>43</sup>la<sup>44</sup>alam wa-la<sup>45</sup>alama<sup>46</sup>alam.

16 And all [this will happen and he] will walk according to your way, inasmuch as righteousness will never leave you; their dwelling will be with you and with

you their lot, and they will not be separated from you forever and forever and ever.

17 <sup>40</sup>*wa-kama-ze* <sup>41</sup>*yekawwen nuxā mawā<sup>c</sup>el mesla we<sup>3</sup>etu walda <sup>3</sup>eg<sup>w</sup>āla <sup>3</sup>emma-ḥeyāw wa-salām yekawwen la-šādeqān* <sup>42</sup>*wa fenotu retu<sup>c</sup> la-šādeqān* <sup>43</sup>*ba-sema <sup>3</sup>egzi<sup>a</sup> manāfest* <sup>44</sup>*la-<sup>c</sup>ālama <sup>c</sup>ālam.*

17 And so there will be length of days with that Son of Man, and the righteous will have peace, and the righteous will have an upright way, in the name of the Lord of Spirits forever and ever.”

### Variants

<sup>1</sup>*Wa-meslēhomu*/And with them: Tana 9 omits the conjunction.

<sup>2</sup>*re<sup>3</sup>sa maḥalā*/the Head of the Oath: Ryl<sup>2</sup>, Curzon 56 and BM 484 have this reading.

The Eth I family, Bodl 5, Ull, and the other Eth II manuscripts have *re<sup>3</sup>sa mawā<sup>c</sup>el*/the Head of Days, one of the two *nomina dei* in *Par. En.* It is likely that a confusion of consonants had taken place in the transmission of the text in the original language. אבות ימינו/ancient of days may have been misread as אבות ימינו/ancient of the oath in the *Vorlage*. The Eth I family and the rest of Eth II corrected it back to the more usual form of the divine name. In Ryl the word *maḥalā* /oath is clearly a correction, suggesting that *re<sup>3</sup>sa mawā<sup>c</sup>el*/the Head of Days was written first, either because it was in the *Vorlage* or because it was the usual form expected by the scribe, but then it was corrected either by the original scribe in proofreading the text or by a correcting hand checking it against another manuscript. At both levels of transmission, the confusion of Aramaic consonants and the correction in Ryl, it is likely that *re<sup>3</sup>sa maḥalā* was a corruption of *re<sup>3</sup>sa mawā<sup>c</sup>el*.

<sup>3</sup>*wa-re<sup>3</sup>su*/and his head: BM 485, BM 491, Berl, Abb 35, Abb 55, add *kona*/was.

<sup>4</sup>*wa-neṣuḥ*/and pure: Berl has *wa-neṣuḥa*.

<sup>5</sup>*za-<sup>2</sup>i-yettaragg<sup>w</sup>am*/(which) were indescribable: Abb 35 and Abb 55 omit *za-*.

<sup>6</sup>*wa-k<sup>w</sup>ellu šegāya*/and my whole body: Berl has *wa-k<sup>w</sup>ello šegāya*, using the accusative form of *k<sup>w</sup>ellu*.

<sup>7</sup>*wa-bārakku*/and I blessed: Berl has *wa-bārakkewwo*/and I blessed him, adding the pronominal suffix.

<sup>8</sup>*wa-sabbāḥkewwo*/and I praised him: Ryl<sup>2</sup>, Berl, and BM Add 24185 have this form, which has the pronominal suffix added, in Ryl supralinearly. BM 485, BM 491, Abb 35, Abb 55, Bodl 5, Ryl<sup>1</sup>, Ull and other Eth II manuscripts have the form without the suffix: *wa-sabbāḥku*/and I praised. Berl is consistent in presenting the pronominal suffix on both verbs. Tana 9 has a truncated corruption: *wa-sabbāḥ*.

<sup>9</sup>*wa-<sup>3</sup>ellā barakatāt*/and these blessings: BM 485, BM 491, Berl, Abb 55, and Tana 9 (*barakata*) have *wa-<sup>3</sup>elleku barakat*/and those blessing; the plural demonstrative *<sup>3</sup>elleku*/those is used instead of *<sup>3</sup>ellā*/these, but with the singular noun *barakat*. Abb 35 has *wa-zeku barakat*/and that blessing.

<sup>10</sup>*waq<sup>2</sup>ā*/came out (fem. pl.): BM 485, Berl, Abb 35, Abb 55, Bodl 5, Ull, and 7 other manuscripts have *waq<sup>2</sup>a*/came out (masc. sing.); all these manuscripts also



have the singular noun *barakat*. BM 491 and 3 other manuscripts have *waḏʿu/* came out (masc. pl.). The variations are not very significant since *barakat* can be either masc. or fem., and since it also can be understood either as a plural or as a collective singular.

Knibb reports, “Tana 9 jumped from *waḏʿā* to 78.8b, but began again with 72.1 after reaching 82.20” (*I Enoch*, I.212). This indicates that Tana 9 completely omitted 71:12b–17.

<sup>11</sup>*konā/were* (fem. pl.): Berl, Abb 55, BM Add. 24185 all read *kona/were* (masc. sing.). They are consistent in changing the verb to the correct number and to the masculine gender.

<sup>12</sup>*šemurāta/pleasing* (pl.): Berl has *šemura/pleasing* (sing.), being most consistent grammatically in these verses.

<sup>13</sup>*ba-qedma/before*: BM 485, BM 491, and Berl have the alternate preposition *qedma*.

<sup>14</sup>*wa-gabreʿel ruḏāʿel/and Gabriel, Raphael*: Berl, Abb 35, Abb 55, and Vat 71 have *wa-gabreʿel wa-ruḏāʿel/and Gabriel and Raphael*, adding the conjunction. BM 485, BM 491 have *wa-ruḏāʿel wa-gabreʿel/and Raphael and Gabriel*, having transposed these two names.

<sup>15</sup>*wa fānuʿel/and Phanuel*: BM 485 and BM 491 have a major addition from 71:8b–12b:

*wa-malʿekt qedduṣān ʿella malʿelta samāyāt wa-yebawweʿu wa-yewaḏḏeʿu ʿemenna weʿetu bēt wa-mikāʿel wa-ruḏāʿel wa-gabreʿel wa-fānuʿel (BM 485 omits wa-fānuʿel) wa-bezuxān qedduṣān ʿella ʿalbomu xʿalqʿa (BM 491 has xʿelqʿi) wa-meslēhomu reʿsa mawāʿel wa-kona reʿsu kama ḏamr ṣaʿādā neṣuḥa (BM 491 has neṣuḥ) wa-lebsu za-ʿi-yetaraggʿamu*

and holy angels who are above the heavens and they were entering and going out of that house and Michael and Raphael and Gabriel and Phanuel (BM 485 omits “and Phanuel”) and many holy ones who are without number and with them was the Head of Days, and his head was like wool, white and pure and his clothes were indescribable.

*wa-wadaqqu ba-gaṣṣeya wa-kʿellu šegāya tamaswa wa-manfaseya tawallāta wa-šarāxku ba-qāl ʿābiy ba-manfasa xāyl wa-bārakku wa-sabbāḥku wa-ʿalʿalku wa-ʿelleku barakat ʿella waḏʿa ʿemenna ʿafuya*

And I fell on my face, and my whole body melted and my spirit was transformed, and I cried out in a loud voice, in the spirit of power, and I blessed and praised and exalted, and those blessings which came from my mouth

The addition in BM 491 ends here, BM 485 continues:

*konā šemurāta ba-qedma zeku reʿsa mawāʿel wa-mašʿa weʿetu reʿsa mawāʿel mesla mikāʿel wa-ruḏāʿel wa-gabreʿel wa fānuʿel*

were pleasing before that Head of Days. And that Head of Days came with Michael and Raphael and Gabriel and Phanuel.

Berl also has an addition from 71:8b–9a:

*wa-malā'ekt qeddusān 'ella mal'elta samāy wa-yewadde'u 'emenna we'etu bēt  
wa-mikā'el wa-gabre'el wa-fānu'el*  
and holy angels who are above the heaven and they were going out of that house and  
Michael and Gabriel and Phanuel

Abb 35 has an addition in the upper margin from 71:8b:

*wa-malā'ekt qeddusān 'ella mal'elta wa-yewadde'u 'emenna we'etu bēt*  
and holy angels who are above and they were going out of that house

The additions in BM 485, BM 491 and Berl are probably cases of homoioteleuton, triggered by *wa-fānu'el* and Phanuel. The addition in the upper margin of Abb 35 perhaps was an attempt to correct Abb 35 to another manuscript that included the lengthy addition, but it was probably cut short once the nature of the addition was realized.

<sup>16</sup>*wa-<sup>3</sup>a' lāf te' lefita <sup>3</sup>a' lāfāt malā'ekt 'ella 'albomu x<sup>w</sup>elq<sup>w</sup>a* and thousands and ten thousands of angels without number: BM 491 omits this clause.

<sup>17</sup>*wa-<sup>3</sup>a' lāf* and thousands: BM 485, Berl, Abb 35 and Abb 55 have <sup>3</sup>*a' lāf*, omitting the conjunction *wa-/and*.

<sup>18</sup>*te' lefita*/myriads: BM 485, Berl, Abb 35, Abb 55, and 4 other manuscripts add the conjunction *wa-/and*.

<sup>19</sup>*a' lāfāt*/myriads: BM 485 omits.

<sup>20</sup>*malā'ekt*/angels: Abb 55 and Bodl 4 omit.

<sup>21</sup>*we'etu mal'ak*/that angel: Abb 55 omits this explicit subject of the verbs of coming, greeting, and speaking. BM 485, BM 491 and Abb 35 omit *mal'ak*/angel. Both the presence and the absence of this subject are problematic. The presence of *we'etu mal'ak* "that angel" is problematic because the demonstrative has no antecedent. Black felt it necessary to clarify that Michael is the angel to whom the author intended to refer by putting "Michael" in parentheses in the translation.<sup>230</sup> Its absence raises the interesting possibility that in these manuscripts, the subject of these verbs is *we'etu re'sa mawā'el*/that Head of Days, back in verse 13. In BM 485, BM 491, and Abb 35 where the demonstrative *we'etu* is preserved, the identification of the Head of Days as the subject is more likely. The *lectio difficilior* is the reading without the explicit angelic subject, because it is likely that in the transmission history a subject was introduced to rectify an awkward sentence, and to correct what was considered to be a mistaken notion that God would address a human being.

<sup>22</sup>*we'etu/are*: Ull has *be'si*/man. This change was possibly introduced in order to make even more explicit that Enoch, a human being, was being granted this lofty status.

<sup>23</sup>*la-šedq*/to righteousness: BM 491, Berl and 8 mss have *ba-šedq*/in righteousness.

<sup>24</sup>*wa-šedq*/and righteousness: BM 485 and Curzon 55 omit, leaving a corrupt text that is difficult to understand. Its omission is probably due to homoioteleuton with the previous phrase, and unlikely to be original.

<sup>230</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 68.

- <sup>25</sup>*yeṣēwe*<sup>3</sup> *laka*/He will proclaim to you: BM 491 has *yeṣēwe*<sup>6</sup> *āka*/He will call to you, expressing the direct object through a suffix, with no change in meaning.
- <sup>26</sup>*salāma*/peace (acc.): BM 491 and Berl have *salām*/peace (nom.). BM 491 and Berl evidently understand “peace” to be proclaimed as a greeting, rather than as a promise, which would fit better with the reading noted for BM 491 in Variant 25.
- <sup>27</sup>*ba-semu la-<sup>6</sup>ālam*/in the name of the world: Abb 55 omits these words, so that the remaining words might be translated: “peace that is to come.”
- <sup>28</sup>*esma*<sup>7</sup> *em-heyya*/because from there: Abb 55 has *wa-<sup>2</sup>em-heyya*/and from there.
- <sup>29</sup>*waḏ<sup>2</sup>a salām*/peace has come out: Berl has *maṣ<sup>2</sup>a salāma*/peace came. The *-a* ending on *salām* is perhaps merely a mistake, rather than a change in case; the use of a different verb is merely the use of a less specific synonym.
- <sup>30</sup>*wa-k<sup>w</sup>ellu*/and all: Berl has *wa-k<sup>w</sup>ello*/and completely.
- <sup>31</sup>*yekawwen wa-yahawwer*/[this will happen and he] will walk: three manuscripts prefix *za-* to the clause, which confuses the grammar; BM 485, BM 491, Abb 35, and Abb 55 have only *yahawwer*/he will walk, while Berl has only *yaxadder*/he will dwell: these latter two variants omit *yekawwen*, which is frequent in this passage and may have been inserted inadvertently. The original reading probably was that of BM 485, BM 491, Abb 35, and Abb 55, as followed by Knibb and Black.<sup>231</sup>
- <sup>32</sup>*fenoteka*/your way: Berl has the correct case, the accusative: *fenotaka*.
- <sup>33</sup>*enza ṣedq*/inasmuch as righteousness: BM 491 and Berl have *enta ṣedq*/which righteousness, having substituted the relative pronoun for the conjunction; Abb 55 has *wa-ṣedq*/and righteousness, making the clause parallel to the previous one rather than subordinate.
- <sup>34</sup>*i-yaxādegaka*/it will never leave you: Bodl 5 has *i-yaxādeka*, having omitted a consonant in error.
- <sup>35</sup>*la-<sup>6</sup>ālam*/forever: BM 485 has made the phrase match the other occurrences in these verses by doubling it: *la<sup>6</sup>ālama<sup>6</sup>ālam*.
- <sup>36</sup>*meslēka*/with you: Bodl 5 and three manuscripts have *wa-meslēka*/and with you.
- <sup>37</sup>*wa-meslēka*/and with you: BM 491 Abb 35, and BM 492 add *yekawwen*/there will be, making the clause parallel to the previous one, but not changing the meaning.
- <sup>38</sup>*wa-<sup>2</sup>emennēka*/and...from you: Bodl 5 has *wa-<sup>2</sup>i-<sup>2</sup>emennēka*/and not from you, doubling the negative, presumably for emphasis.
- <sup>39</sup>*la-<sup>6</sup>ālam wa-la-<sup>6</sup>ālama<sup>6</sup>ālam*/forever and forever and ever: Ull has *la-<sup>6</sup>ālama<sup>6</sup>ālam*/forever and ever.
- <sup>40</sup>*wa-kama-ze*/and so: Berl has *wa-<sup>2</sup>i-kama-ze*/and not in this way, adding the negative.
- <sup>41</sup>*yekawwen*/there will be: BM 485 unnecessarily prefixes the conjunction, *wa-yekawwen*/and there will be.
- <sup>42</sup>*wa fenotu retu<sup>6</sup> la-ṣādeqān*/and the righteous will have an upright way: Berl and the Frankfurt manuscript omit this clause due to homoioteleuton; BM 485, Abb 35, Abb 55 have *wa-fenota retu<sup>6</sup>a la ṣādeqān*/and the straight way [will be] for the

<sup>231</sup> Knibb *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.167 and Black, *I Enoch*, 68.

righteous; BM 491 has *wa-fenota ret<sup>c</sup> la-šādeqān*/and the way of justice [will be] for the righteous; Ull has *wa-fenot retu<sup>c</sup> yekawwen la-šādeqān*/and a straight way will belong to the righteous; the reading of Ryl appears most likely to be original, with each of the others, except the omission, being attempts at improvement.

<sup>43</sup>*ba-sema ʿegzi<sup>a</sup>*/in the name of the Lord: Ull, making the grammar more idiomatic with the use of the pronominal suffix and *la-*, has *ba-semu la-ʿegzi<sup>a</sup>*.

<sup>44</sup>*la-ʿālama ʿālam*/forever and ever: Abb 55 adds *ʿamēn*/Amen; Berl, filling out the phrase to be consistent with the previous two occurrences, has *la-ʿālam wa-la-ʿālama ʿālam*.

### Notes

71:10 *re<sup>a</sup>sa maḥala*/Head of the Oath

As noted in the Variants above, this is probably an error (see below) for *re<sup>a</sup>sa mawā<sup>e</sup>l*/Head of Days, as the majority of manuscripts have preserved. The divine figure is said to be a part of the vision, which is populated by myriads of angels and by the four archangels. The Head of Days is described as having a head that was like wool, white and pure, and as having indescribable garments. The question arises as to the relation of this description of the divine figure to those in *1 Enoch* 46:1, Dan. 7:9, and *1 Enoch* 14:20 (see Notes on 46:1). Here in 71:10 the Head of Days is described: *wa-re<sup>a</sup>su kama ḍamr ḍa<sup>a</sup>ādā wa-neṣuḥ*/and his head was white and pure like wool, *wa-lebsu za-<sup>a</sup>i-yetaragg<sup>w</sup>am*/and his garments were indescribable. In *1 Enoch* 46:1, the divine figure is precisely but concisely described: *wa-re<sup>a</sup>su kama ḍamr ḍa<sup>a</sup>ādā*/and his head was white like wool. This is very brief, and the ideas of purity and indescribable garments are absent. Meanwhile the description in Dan. 7:9 is fuller than either *1 Enoch* 71:10 or 46:1, and slightly different. In Dan. 7:9, the Ancient of Days has garments that are white like snow, and hair that is like wool. The two images of whiteness in Dan. 7:9 have been combined by the author of *Par. En.* into one image and applied to the head of the divine figure. Further, where the images of *1 Enoch* 46:1 and Dan. 7:9 infer God's purity through the use of the color white, the author at *1 Enoch* 71:10 states God's purity explicitly.

The author has also been influenced by the description of the deity in *1 Enoch* 14:20, since that passage is clearly alluded to in this chapter (see the introductory comments to this passage). In *1 Enoch* 14:20, the raiment of the Great One on the throne is said to be *za-yebareh ʿem-ḍaḥay wa-yedḍa<sup>c</sup>ādu ʿem-k<sup>w</sup>ellu barad*/ἤλιου λαμπρότερον καὶ λευκότερον πάσης χιόνης/brighter than the sun, and whiter than any snow.<sup>232</sup> In *1 Enoch* 14:20, the description of the raiment may have been influenced by Ps 104:2, where God is said to be clothed in light. No angels, and certainly no other humans, were able to view God,<sup>233</sup> but Enoch was commanded to come into God's presence, and so the description of God in *BW* is able to surpass the previous

<sup>232</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 33, 149–50.

<sup>233</sup> VanderKam, James C. *Enoch, A Man for All Generations* (Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), 47–48.

descriptions in Dan 7:9 and Ps. 104:2. This superior vision of God is emphasized in *I Enoch* 14:20 by the use of the comparative “brighter than the sun, and whiter than any snow.” Further in *I Enoch* 14:21, no human or angel is permitted to see God’s face, but Enoch is commanded to go into God’s presence, and hear God’s voice (*I Enoch* 14:24). He respectfully paid honor by prostrating himself before God’s presence (*I Enoch* 14:25), but then is commanded to come closer (*I Enoch* 15:1), and by implication was able to look directly into the face of God, while receiving God’s judgment upon the fallen watchers. This close-up view of God (*I Enoch* 14:20–15:1), then, may have given the author of *Par. En.* the rationale for improving yet again the previous descriptions of God from Dan 7:9 and Ps. 104:2. The description of God has been developed by noting God’s purity explicitly, and by claiming that a description of God’s clothing was beyond the capability of human words.

Thus the relationship between these descriptions of God can be understood as one of progressive development and intensification. In *I Enoch* 14:20, the two elements of the description in Dan 7:9, the garments white like wool and the hair like snow, have been augmented with the brightness of being clothed in light claimed in Ps. 104:2. In *I Enoch* 46:1, the elements are combined and intensified with the use of the comparative, and finally in *I Enoch* 71:10, the quality of purity that was implied in the previous descriptions is made explicit, and the description of the clothing is put outside the realm of human language. It is clear from a comparison of these passages that the description of God has progressively developed and intensified.

The curious alteration of the *nomen dei* from *re’sa mawā’el*/Head of Days to *re’sa maḥalā*/Head of the Oath may have taken place in an easily understandable manner. At the translation stage, there may have been an orthographically ambiguous form (perhaps a form of  $\text{מִשָּׁחַ}$ /oath<sup>234</sup> for  $\text{יָמִים}$ /days) that was translated either into Greek as κεφάλαιος ὄρκου, or into Ethiopic as *re’sa maḥalā*/Head of the Oath. In some of the subsequent copies the *nomen dei* was probably corrected to its more usual form *re’sa mawā’el*/Head of Days, or perhaps in another translation at this point, the more usual form was used, accounting for the majority reading. However, the corrupted form, *re’sa maḥalā*/Head of the Oath, may have survived<sup>235</sup> because it contains a reasonable allusion back to *I Enoch* 69:13–25. There, in a passage that is difficult to determine textually,<sup>236</sup> Kasbeel is depicted as guilty of having revealed the oath to the angels and desiring to reveal it to humanity as well. Black has interestingly explained the two cryptic renditions of the oath as instances of gematria for two names of God, AKA for  $\text{יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$  and BIQA for  $\text{יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ}$ .<sup>237</sup> The passage goes on in *I Enoch* 69:15–25 to explain that the oath has to do with creation and its foundation.<sup>238</sup> Thus the alteration

<sup>234</sup> Charles-F. Jean and Jacob Hofstijzer, *Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l’ouest* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965) 108, 145.

<sup>235</sup> In Ryl, the form *maḥalā*/Oath is a correction of something that had been written first.

<sup>236</sup> Knibb, *Enoch*, 2.162–3.

<sup>237</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 247–8; cf. Knibb *Enoch*, 2.162.

<sup>238</sup> Contra Knibb, *Enoch*, 2.162, who believes that vv 15–25 should be regarded as a secondary addition.

of the *nomen dei* may have been justified in the scribal transmitter's mind as a way to draw in the supreme authority of God over creation, and thus over evil and the perpetrators of evil as well. This kind of interpretive move is not beyond the capability of the author, as can be seen in the author's argument that as Enoch was privy to the cosmological secrets of heaven, so Enoch was trustworthy with regard to the condemnation of the kings and mighty ones. While this may account for the survival of the variant in part of the tradition, the more likely and simpler explanation is confusion in the Aramaic stage or in its translation into Greek.

71:14 *we'etu mal'ak*/that angel:

(See Variant note 21.) If *mal'ak*/angel is an addition to specify a subject, where in the previous verse there are a multitude of possible subjects, or to avoid the image of God approaching a mortal, then the possibility that the Head of Days is the subject of this sentence must be considered. The narrative introduction to the direct speech of this verse is rather long, suggesting that something momentous is about to be said. While the voice of God is heard elsewhere in *Par. En.*,<sup>239</sup> no one else is said in this formal way to greet the seer. The verb *'ammexāni* "he greeted me" is quite rare in *Par. En.*, and this verse is the only place that Dillmann gives as an example of its usage.<sup>240</sup> The verb seems to convey an idea of respect through a formal greeting. It is also used in Lk 1:40 when Elizabeth greets Mary, and in Romans 16 it is used repeatedly to extend greetings to a long list of fellow workers in Rome. Where it might possibly be expected in *Par. En.*, such as for the pleading of the kings and mighty ones in *1 Enoch* 63:1, it is not used. The verb also seems to be used for the one who initiates an interchange, but it is not so used at *1 Enoch* 60:5, when Michael addresses the terrified seer. While it does not seem to be used elsewhere in *Par. En.*, it nonetheless seems to indicate that a momentous interchange is about to take place.

71:14 *'anta*/You:

There are no textual variants to support Charles' thorough-going emendations in this passage.<sup>241</sup> He posits that a section describing the Son of Man in the third person was lost, and the remaining text emended to read in the second person. Without textual support for the emendation, the sentence must be understood as being addressed to Enoch.

<sup>239</sup> In chapter 45, it appears to be God speaking in the first person, although it is never said so explicitly; in chapter 55, the Chief of Days repents of destroying the inhabitants of the earth, sets a sign in the heavens, and expresses condemnation for the host of Azazel and the mighty kings; in chapter 62, the Lord of Spirits addresses the kings and mighty ones; in 65:10–12 (Noachic section), Enoch reports God's condemnation of the wicked and fallen angels; in 67:1–3, the Lord is speaking to Noah, warning of the imminent flood, but also conveying the news that angels are building him a boat.

<sup>240</sup> Dillmann, *Lexicon*, 734.

<sup>241</sup> Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, 144–45; Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 151, makes the point that Charles' emendations are unwarranted, as do many other commentators.

71:14 *ʾanta weʾetu walda beʾsi*/You are the Son of Man:

Here *weʾetu* could function either as the demonstrative or as the verb “to be.”<sup>242</sup> Another translation of this sentence is suggested by John J. Collins,<sup>243</sup> “you are a son of man,” i.e. a human being, understanding *weʾetu* as a verb. This is a legitimate translation of the words, since Ethiopic does not use articles, definite or indefinite, nor capital letters. This translation could also be proposed in order to keep *1 Enoch* 71:14 consistent with the idea that a living human being was presented to the Son of Man and the Head of Days at *1 Enoch* 70:1. In response to this proposal, however, I have argued that *1 Enoch* 70:1 should be read according to Abb 55, which preserves a text that would suggest that Enoch is a son of man (i.e. a human being) who is being presented to the Head of Days (see my comments at *1 Enoch* 70:1). Here, at *1 Enoch* 71:14, on the other hand, to read *walda beʾsi* as a generic human being rather than the particular heavenly figure referred to repeatedly throughout the work, is to set aside the rest of the verse and its context. The qualities of being born for righteousness, of righteousness remaining with him, and of not being abandoned by the Head of Days, are all strongly reminiscent of the introduction of the heavenly figure in *1 Enoch* 46:3, 62:2, 14 (as further developed below). As the direct speech continues, the content of verse 16 can only be understood as applying to the heavenly figure, but no hint at redirecting the speech from one referent to another is made. Seen in context, then, Collin’s suggestion does not appear to be tenable. Further, as M. Black noticed, it is surprising that no Christian scribe (until R. H. Charles) emended the text to remove the scandal of the Enoch—Son of Man identification.<sup>244</sup> The understanding that is simplest, most direct, and most true to the narrative flow is that this sentence, *ʾanta weʾetu walda beʾsi*, is addressed to Enoch and identifies him as the Son of Man, the heavenly figure referred to repeatedly throughout the work.

The term used here at *1 En.* 71:14 to refer to the heavenly figure is *walda beʾsi*/Son of Man. It is also used twice in 69:29, and, although the preferred reading at *1 Enoch* 62:5 is *walda beʾsit*/Son of a Woman, *walda beʾsi* is the form witnessed to by the majority of manuscripts at that point (see Variant and Notes at 62:5). Can any reason be discerned for the use of this term (in one of its variations) here at *1 En.* 71:14 rather than “Elect One,” “Anointed One,” or “Righteous One?”

In this verse, the *walda beʾsi* is totally and completely associated with righteousness. In Ethiopic, as in Hebrew and Aramaic, righteousness has both the sense of moral uprightness and the sense of being aligned with the cause of justice and rightness. Righteousness here is attributed to the *walda beʾsi* in three related but distinguishable ways: 1) The Son of Man was born to righteousness; 2) righteousness

<sup>242</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 206, claims that here is a clear case where it is not a demonstrative.

<sup>243</sup> Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 151.

<sup>244</sup> Black, “The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch,” 164–64, where he suggests that cabalistic perspectives may have influenced the development in *1 Enoch* of Enoch being identified with the Son of Man. Black, “The Throne-Theophany,” 70, holds that this is a “call” scene. Borsch, *The Son of Man in Myth and History*, 151–53, suggests this identification is a normal part of an enthronement perception, that the earthly king *becomes* a heavenly being.

abides upon the Son of Man (*ṣedq la<sup>c</sup>lēka xādara*); and 3) the righteousness of the Head of Days will not forsake the Son of Man.

Further, these three ways in which righteousness is spoken of in relation to the figure can be matched in other parts of the work.

First, he is said here to be born to righteousness (*tawaladka la-ṣedq*): at *1 Enoch* 46:3, it is said that righteousness belongs to the Son of Man (*lotu kona ṣedq*). Righteousness is the first quality attributed to this figure.

Second, righteousness remains, abides, or dwells with the Son of Man (*ṣedq lā<sup>c</sup>lēka xādara*): at *1 Enoch* 46:3, it is said that righteousness dwells with the Son of Man (*ṣedq meslēhu xādara*). At *1 Enoch* 62:2 the spirit of righteousness is said to be poured on the one upon the throne (*wa-manfasa ṣedq taka<sup>c</sup>wa dibēhu*), and that one is then called *walda be<sup>3</sup>si*/Son of a Woman (*1 Enoch* 62:5). Righteousness is thought of as a constantly present attribute.

Third, it is promised that the righteousness of the Head of Days will not forsake the Son of Man (*wa-ṣedqu la-re<sup>3</sup>sa mawā<sup>c</sup>el<sup>3</sup>i-yaxādegaka*, repeated at 71:16). Similarly, at *1 Enoch* 39:7, it is promised that righteousness will not fail. At *1 Enoch* 46:3, it is promised that the cause of the Son of Man will triumph in uprightness (*keflu k<sup>w</sup>ello mo<sup>3</sup>a...ba-ret<sup>c</sup>*). In *1 Enoch* 58:6, it is said that the light of uprightness will be established forever (*wa-berhāna ret<sup>c</sup> teṣanne<sup>c</sup> la-<sup>c</sup>ālam*). The attribute of righteousness, then, will not be removed.

These three attributions of righteousness are related in that they all attribute righteousness to the Son of Man, but they are distinguishable in that righteousness is attributed to the Son of Man at the beginning of life, throughout life, and into eternity. The establishment of righteousness is the Son of Man's purpose, the presence of righteousness is the Son of Man's sustenance and strength, and the triumph of righteousness is the result promised to the Son of Man. The past, the present, and the future of the Son of Man are enveloped in righteousness.

This thorough attribution of righteousness in *1 Enoch* 71:14 is most closely related to the attribution of righteousness to the *walda sab<sup>3</sup>* in 46:3 and to the Elect One/*walda be<sup>3</sup>si* in 62:2, 5. These attributes are the ones associated with the Son of Man when he is first introduced in *1 Enoch* 46:2–3. So now, with the re-introduction of the court-room scene, with the Head of Days on the throne with a white head, it is appropriate to use the related term and the associated attributes.<sup>245</sup> In effect, by attributing righteousness to Enoch in this way, the author is emphasizing that Enoch

<sup>245</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 207, notes that *sab<sup>3</sup>* = ἄνθρωπος, that *be<sup>3</sup>si* = ἄνθρωπος, and that *walda<sup>3</sup>eg<sup>w</sup>āla<sup>3</sup>emma-heyāw* is the traditional biblical term. He suggests that the three different translations stem from three different translators or editors, with the traditional biblical term being evidence of an editor who corrected the two more primitive forms in most cases, but not all. Nevertheless, no real difference in meaning can be inferred since the *Vorlage* for each of them must have been ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, מן הַאָדָם, אָבִי (א) בֶּן. Here, however, the question is not so much why this particular form of the term was used, but rather why this term, the Son of Man, was used instead of the Elect One, or the Anointed One, or the Righteous One.



is the same Son of Man who figured so prominently throughout the work. So, the context of re-introducing the court-room scene of Daniel 7 has influenced the author to use *walda be'si* here as opposed to “Elect One,” “Anointed One,” or “Righteous One.”

71:15 *salāma ba-semu la-‘ālam za-yekawwen*/peace in the name of the world which is to come:<sup>246</sup>

The hope of everlasting peace is expressed several times in Isaiah. In Isa. 26:1–6 peace is hoped for along with a hope for the reversal of fortunes, in Isa. 32:17–18 peace is seen as the effect of the reign of a righteous king, while in Isa. 54:9–10 the promise of everlasting peace is compared to the rainbow in the covenant with Noah. All three of these ideas associated with the hope for peace are important in *Par. En.* as well. The hoped for reversal of fortunes is pervasive (e.g. *1 Enoch* 38:5, 45:5–6, 50:2, 51:5, 58:2–6, 62:10–16); the righteousness of the eschatological judge is a strong component of the concept of the Son of Man (e.g. 71:14, 46:3; and also of the Elect One; further its cognate adjective is used in a titular way of this figure); and the presence of the Noachic material indicates the importance to the author of *Par. En.* of God’s covenant with Noah with its sign of the rainbow (55:2).

Ezek. 37:24–28 in covenant imagery also expresses hope for everlasting peace. David, or a descendant of David, is envisioned as king over an obedient, faithful people, who will live in the land of their heritage, where God’s sanctuary will be set down forever.

Aside from the notion of peace, no other motifs from Isaiah and Ezekiel connected with peace appear in *1 Enoch* 71:15. It appears, then, that while the author of *1 Enoch* 71:15 expresses the hope for everlasting peace as Isaiah and Ezekiel do, the author is not dependent on any of the passages cited. The context of covenant, obedience and sanctuary for that hope in Ezek. 37:24–28 plays no part in *1 Enoch* 71:15. The ideas of the reversal of fortunes, the righteous rule, and the rainbow connection in Isaiah that are associated with the hope for peace are important to the author of *Par. En.*, but they are not expressed as an aspect of the hope for peace in relationship with this verse. A preliminary conclusion, then, is that the hope for everlasting peace expressed in *1 Enoch* 71:15 is not couched in clear biblical allusions.

71:16 *wa-k<sup>w</sup>ellu . . . yaḥawwer (etc.)* And all . . . will walk . . . :

As in verse 14, where righteousness was ascribed to the Son of Man at the beginning of his life, throughout his life, and for eternity, so here it is ascribed to his followers as they walk in his way, dwell with him, and have their portion upheld by him. The idea of dwelling with the Son of Man has been expressed in *1 Enoch* 48:4, 62:14, where they will experience the presence of the Lord of Spirits, and will eat, lie down, and

<sup>246</sup> Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, 145 views this as the earliest use of the rabbinical expression העולם הבא.

rise up with the Son of Man forever. Part of the future blessedness of the righteous is that they will dwell in a blessed state of affairs with the Son of Man. That the portion of the righteous will be upheld is an idea that has been expressed earlier as well (cf. *1 Enoch* 39:6,7; 46:3; 47:4, and especially 48:7, where it is said that their portion will be preserved). The encouragement for the community who are called righteous is that their cause and their hope will be upheld and will be victorious in the end. This verse, then, brings together in a concise, schematic way the blessings for the righteous that have been expressed earlier, and they are expressed here in connection with the blessed righteousness of the Son of Man. Both the Son of Man and his followers will share eternally the blessings of righteousness.

71:17 *yekawwen nuxā mawā' el mesla we'etu walda 'egwāla 'emma-heyāw*/there will be length of days with that Son of Man:

The fortunes of the righteous in relationship with the Son of Man will be long-lasting, peaceful and upright forever. Length of days is explicitly denied to the giants, the offspring of the fallen watchers (*1 Enoch* 10:9), and implicitly denied to the kings and mighty ones (*1 Enoch* 62:10–11, 63:11). This long-lasting blessedness is promised earlier in *Par. En.* to the righteous. In *1 Enoch* 58:3, 6, eternal life and days without end are foreseen for the righteous and elect and holy ones. In *1 Enoch* 62:13–16, it is promised to the righteous that:

- a) they shall never behold sinners again;
- b) the Lord of Spirits shall abide with them;
- c) they shall eat, lie down, and rise up, i.e. dwell, with that Son of Man/*we'etu walda 'egwāla 'emma-heyāw* forever;
- d) they shall cease to be downcast; and
- e) they shall be clothed in non-fading, never-aging garments of glory. This is all promised in the context of never-ending blessedness.

The particular form of the term “Son of Man” may also depend somewhat on the setting. Just one form is surmised to have existed in the original, but four appear in the Ethiopic rendition. In *1 Enoch* 69:26–27, this form of the term Son of Man, *we'etu walda 'egwāla 'emma-heyāw*, is used in the context of his sitting upon the throne with authority to judge sinners. In *1 Enoch* 62:9 and 63:11, it is used in the context of sinners being driven out forever. It appears, then, that this form, *we'etu walda 'egwāla 'emma-heyāw*, bears the connotations of 1) authority over sinners, and 2) never-ending blessedness for the righteous. Perhaps it is the association with the length of days, the never-ending blessedness, that governs the use of this more formal form of the name here.

By way of contrast, at *1 Enoch* 71:14, where Enoch is identified as the Son of Man/*walda be'si*, the characteristic of righteousness is uppermost (see note on *1 Enoch* 71:14). The quality of righteousness is closely connected to the term Son of Man/*walda sab'* in *1 Enoch* 46:3 and to the Elect One/Son of a Woman/*walda*

*be'sit* in *1 Enoch* 62:2, 5.<sup>247</sup> The form of the term used in *1 Enoch* 71:14, then, may be influenced by the subject matter of righteousness.

It appears, then, in the transmission of the text in Ethiopic, the use of particular forms of the term is influenced by the context. In *1 Enoch* 71:14, *walda be'si*/Son of Man is used because of the association with righteousness, while in *1 Enoch* 71:17, *we'etu walda 'eg'āla 'emma-ḥeyāw*/that Son of the Mother of Life is used because of the association with the length of days. This fluidity may also be dependent to some extent on different levels of editorial revision, for as Black points out,<sup>248</sup> the *Vorlage* of all the terms must have been  $\text{בן הַאָדָם}$  or  $\text{בַּר (ש)נֶשֶׁא}$ . In a sense, the variety of terms is an inner-Ethiopic problem, that may have its solution in a mechanical method of revision or the solution may lie in a literary understanding of the connotations of the particular forms of the term. The solution explored here is the latter.

### 3.8.3 Summary of attributes of the Son of Man in *1 Enoch* 71

The figure of the Son of Man, then, in the concluding chapter of the work, draws together many of the pertinent themes of the work as a whole. Righteousness is closely associated with the Son of Man and his followers, as well as the authority to judge sinners, and long-lasting life. The blissful results of the reversal of fortunes is portrayed for the righteous, and this portrayal offers hope and consolation to the community which is considered righteous in this work.

Three new features are added in the Epilogue to the portrayal of the Son of Man:

- a) angels are in the presence of the Son of Man;
- b) those angelic attendants have bright garments; and
- c) everlasting blessedness is in store for the righteous.

## 3.9 Characteristics of the Son of Man in the *Parables of Enoch*

At this point it is appropriate to summarize the main characteristics of the figure of the Son of Man and attempt to synthesize the significance of the author's use of the scriptural sources. Table 3 summarizes the characteristics and features of the Son of Man in the *Parables of Enoch*.

<sup>247</sup> *walda sab'* occurs only in the Second Parable and *walda be'si* only in the Third Parable and in the concluding chapters. *walda be'sit*/Son of a Woman, is the preferred reading at 62:5, although the majority of witnesses read *walda be'si*/Son of Man.

<sup>248</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 207. Black suggests the different forms are due to two different translators and a reviser who did not complete a thorough revision.

Table 3  
 Characteristics of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch

Characteristic or feature	1 Enoch 46	48:2–8	62–63	69:26–29	70–71
1. heavenly status*	•	•	•		•
2. righteousness	•	(implied)	•		•
3. revelatory function	•				
4. chosenness	•	•			
5. judicial role	•		•	•	
6. named from eternity		•			
7. named before the Lord of Spirits		•			
8. a support for righteous		•			
9. a light to the Gentiles		•			
10. source of hope for righteous		•			
11. worthy of worship		•	•		
12. hidden		•	•		
13. revealed to followers		•	•	•	
14. followers called “righteous/holy/elect”		•	•		
15. seated upon the throne of his glory			•	•	
16. inflicts pain, terror and shame			•		
17. finally revealed to and recognized by the kings and the mighty			•		
18. request by kings and mighty			•		
19. no mercy forthcoming			•		
20. righteous to enjoy salvation			•		•
21. fairness in judgment			•		
22. the Word of the Son of Man is strong and incontrovertible				•	
23. means of destruction of evil				•	
24. worldwide jurisdiction				•	
25. angels in presence of Son of Man					•
26. bright garments of angelic attendants					•
27. everlasting blessedness for the righteous					•

\*But without the motion of coming.

### 3.9.1 1 Enoch 46.

In the Second Parable the Son of Man is described as having a comely, human appearance, yet to be like one of the angels (*1 Enoch* 46:1). Righteousness belongs to him and dwells with him (*1 Enoch* 46:3). The Son of Man will reveal what has been hidden, and enjoys the status of having been chosen by the Lord of Spirits (*1 Enoch* 46:3), so that his purpose to overthrow the kings and mighty ones is consonant with that of the Lord of Spirits (*1 Enoch* 46:4–5). The main scriptural source for this vision is Dan. 7:9, 13, but it is a precise, concise allusion to that passage. Where Dan. 7:13 uses the comparative form כְּבָרִי אֱנִשׁ, *Par. En.* speaks directly of the heavenly figure (*zeku walda sab*<sup>7</sup>). In Daniel 7, this figure is presented to the Ancient of Days and given authority, whereas in *Par. En.* the Son of Man’s

presence and authority are assumed to be a part of the heavenly context. The quality of righteousness, his revelatory function and his status of being chosen derive from Isaiah and Jeremiah. Isaiah ascribes righteousness to the king (Isa. 32:1) who will rule in righteousness (Isa. 9:6[7], cf. Isa. 11:3–5). Jeremiah echoes the idea of the justice and righteousness of the Davidic descendant (Jer. 23:5–6, 33:15–16). Implicit in the judgment scene of Daniel 7, but explicit in Isaiah and Jeremiah, is the authority to depose rulers. That authority and purpose are clearly stated in *Par. En.* (Sir 10:14 states a similar function for the Lord).

So, based on Daniel 7 and filled out with attributes from Isaiah and Jeremiah, *1 Enoch* 46 attributes to the Son of Man:

- 1) heavenly status, but without the motion of coming;
- 2) righteousness;
- 3) a revelatory function;
- 4) chosenness; and
- 5) the judicial role with full authority to overthrow the kings and mighty ones, who deny the name of the Lord of Spirits and who persecute the righteous.

### 3.9.2 *1 Enoch* 48

In *1 Enoch* 48:2–7 the Son of Man is named (or designated for a purpose, *1 Enoch* 48:2–3) before the Lord of Spirits, from eternity. He is a support for the righteous, the light of the Gentiles and the hope of those who are troubled (*1 Enoch* 48:4). Worship and celebration will be offered by earth's inhabitants (*1 Enoch* 48:5). The chosenness of the Son of Man is reiterated, but attenuated by the claim that he is also hidden (*1 Enoch* 48:6). Nonetheless he is to be revealed to his followers, the holy and righteous.

This passage draws heavily on both Isa. 42:1–9 and Isa. 49:1–7, 13, in which the chosen servant of the Lord is called and named before birth, is to be the light of the Gentiles, and will be worshipped by kings and princes with celebration. The servant is both “chosen” and hidden in the shadow of the Lord's hand, like an arrow in the quiver.

*1 Enoch* 48:2–7, then, drawing on Isaiah 42 and 49, adds to the Son of Man the attributes of being:

- 6) named from eternity;
- 7) named before the Lord of Spirits;
- 8) a support for the righteous;
- 9) a light to the Gentiles;
- 10) the source of hope for the righteous;
- 11) worthy of worship;
- 12) hidden;

- 13) revealed to followers; and  
 14) followed by those who are called “righteous/holy/elect.”

### 3.9.3 1 Enoch 62–63

In the Third Parable, chapters 62–63 may be summarized together. These chapters emphasize the juridical role of the Son of Man, who will judge in righteousness, destroy evil, and cause the pain of judgment to come upon the kings and mighty ones. The pain of judgment is emphasized by the use of the image of childbirth, which in turn influences the particular form of the designation for this figure, Son of a Woman (*1 Enoch* 62:4–5). He has been seated on the throne of his glory (*1 Enoch* 62:5), and while he was hidden from the kings and mighty ones, he was revealed to the righteous and elect (*1 Enoch* 62:7). In this passage, however, he is revealed to the kings, the mighty and those who possess the earth, as the Elect One, and they recognize him (*1 Enoch* 62:1–3).<sup>249</sup> They are shocked to see that “Son of a Woman” seated on the throne of his glory (62:5), but when they see him, they fall on their faces before him, worship him, and plead for mercy from him who is now called “that Son of Man” (*1 Enoch* 62:9). They make a request for a brief respite that they too may worship appropriately, pay honor to the Lord of Spirits and confess their sins (*1 Enoch* 63:1). Even though they plead for mercy, however, none is forthcoming (*1 Enoch* 62:9–10; 63:4, 11, cf. 50:5), whereas the righteous and elect enjoy the feast, the garments, the liberty, and the joy of salvation (*1 Enoch* 62:14). These ideas seem to have been drawn specifically from various parts of Isaiah, mainly Isaiah 10–13 and 61:

- the judgment with justice and the slaying of the wicked from Isa. 11:2–4;
- the pain of judgment likened to childbirth from Isa. 13:8;
- the rootedness of the community from Isa. 11:10;
- the proclamation of liberty from Isa. 61:1–3; and
- the glorious garments from Isa. 61:10.

Other themes, while not precise allusions, have a thoroughly scriptural perspective:

- the joyous feast (cf. Isa. 25:6–8, 65:13);
- placing hope in God (cf. Isa. 40:31; Ps 37:9, 34);
- pleading for mercy (cf. Ps 33:18, 42:6, 62:5, 71:5, 130:7, 147:11);
- punishment for the wicked (cf. Prov 10:28, Psalm 37, Ezek 28:11–19);
- the sword of punishment (cf. Isa. 13:9, 15, 34:5, 7; Jer 46:10); and

<sup>249</sup> G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), 72, notes the importance of recognition in the judgment scene. Since the Son of Man was not known to them before, Nickelsburg argues, they must have recognized him in the righteous and elect who have been aligned with him.

- the yearning to dwell with God (cf. Isa. 57:5, 65:9, Joel 4:17, 21, Zeph 3:12–13, Zech 2:10–14).

The author has melded together qualities of several savior-figures, or figures who effect salvation or judgment, such as the stump of Jesse and the servant of the Lord.<sup>250</sup>

Further the pleading on the part of the kings and mighty ones for mercy in *1 Enoch* 63 bears many interesting points of contact with the intercessory prayer of lament and penitence found in Daniel 9. That prayer is offered by a righteous person, with a positive outcome, whereas in *Par. En.*, with thorough irony, the author puts the prayer on the lips of the wicked, and the just outcome is condemnation for the oppressors. The reaction of the kings and mighty when they see the Son of Man on the throne is shame filling their faces, a concept that is very similar to Ps. 83:17, in which the poet of the lament pleads that the enemies be destroyed and their faces be filled with shame.

*1 Enoch* 62–63 expand the attributes of the Son of Man by adding:

- 15) that he is seated upon the throne of his glory;
- 16) that he is finally revealed to and recognized by the kings and the mighty;
- 17) that he has the power to inflict pain, terror and shame, so that darkness fills their faces;
- 18) that a request is made to him;
- 19) that the judged will plead for mercy but none will be forthcoming;
- 20) that the righteous will enjoy salvation; and
- 21) his fairness in judgment, which is acknowledged even by those who are condemned, the kings and the mighty ones.

### 3.9.4 *1 Enoch* 69:26–29

The closing of the Third Parable (*1 Enoch* 69:26–29) reiterates some key characteristics of the Son of Man. His name is to be revealed, he is to be given total and incontrovertible authority, and his session upon the throne of glory is repeated. The Son of Man's word is declared strong before the Lord of Spirits, and he will be the means of the destruction of evil. The righteous judgment of the kings from the throne is similar to that expressed in Ps. 9:4–11. Total authority is attributed to the Son of Man in this judicial setting, whereas in Daniel 7 dominion and kingdom have been given to him in an honorific way. Three new qualities are added from this passage:

- 22) that the word of the Son of Man before the Lord of Spirits is strong and incontrovertible;

<sup>250</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 189.

- 23) that the Son of Man is the means for the destruction of evil; and
- 24) that this judge has worldwide jurisdiction.

### 3.9.5 1 Enoch 70–71

The Epilogue, chapters 70–71, completes the portrait of the Son of Man in *Par. En*. It reaffirms the righteousness of the Son of Man (*1 Enoch* 71:14) and his protection for the righteous as their secure dwelling place. Through him they will enjoy everlasting blessedness (*1 Enoch* 71:16–17). Angels also appear in myriad numbers as part of the heavenly courtroom scene (*1 Enoch* 71:8, 13) and their garb is bright and luminescent (*1 Enoch* 71:1). While angels have appeared throughout the work, preparing the place of punishment (e.g. *1 Enoch* 53:3, 54:6, 56:1) and gathering the elect from all over the world (*1 Enoch* 61), here in the epilogue they are more closely connected with the Son of Man, for they are part of the heavenly scene in which the Son of Man is disclosed. Even though they are not explicitly called “his” angels, they can be understood as being available at the Son of Man’s beck and call, since the Son of Man is in a position of vicegerent in this heavenly scene. Three new features are added in the Epilogue:

- 25) angels in the presence of the Son of Man;
- 26) the bright garments of the angelic attendants; and
- 27) everlasting blessedness for the righteous.

### 3.9.6 Other Salient Features

Other features that complement the portrait of the Son of Man must also be noted. The descriptions of those who surround the Son of Man and the effects of his judgment also comprise the conceptions with which the author worked.

One is the fate of the condemned. The kings and mighty ones are condemned and their place of confinement is described. They are consigned to a fiery fate, in a deep burning valley that had been prepared for Azael and his host (*1 Enoch* 54:1, 5, 63:10; cf. also 67:7, 12–13 in the Noachic section). Fetters were also prepared to bind them.

Another feature is the radiance of the vindicated. In the heavenly realm all is brightness and glory, and in eternity the righteous and elect will also be radiant with the light of the Lord as of the sun (*1 Enoch* 38:4, 39:7, 51:5, 58:3). There righteousness will “shine like the sun” and the darkness of evil will be destroyed (*1 Enoch* 58:5–6).

Resurrection, for the purpose of facing judgment, is another interesting feature of this depiction of the Son of Man. The earth will give back what had been entrusted to it, and Sheol will give back what had been committed to it (*1 Enoch* 51:1). The righteous and holy will then be chosen out from amongst those resurrected



(*I Enoch* 51:2) and they are promised a joyful and satisfying life with the Elect One (*I Enoch* 51:5). Later the resurrection theme appears again, focusing on the elect who have been lost. They will be gathered from widely scattered areas, as two angels take long cords to measure and gather up the righteous (*I Enoch* 61:1–3). All that is hidden in the depths of the earth will be revealed, a possible allusion to Sheol, where elect ones who possibly lost their lives in flight from oppressors might be.<sup>251</sup> They have been destroyed in the desert, lost at sea (“devoured by the fish of the sea”) and slain by wild beasts. But they will return and find security in the Elect One, for “none can be destroyed” (*I Enoch* 61:5). Resurrection is envisioned for those aligned with the Son of Man, for they will be gathered to enter into a life of satisfaction and joy, which contrasts markedly with their current oppressed status.

Still another salient feature of this portrait is the stark contrast between the righteous and the oppressors. A clear dichotomy exists between them throughout the work, both before and after judgment. Before the judgment the righteous are downcast and oppressed, while the kings and the mighty enjoy wealth, power and prestige. After judgment, however, their fortunes are reversed, as the clear dichotomy continues.

The basis of the judgment against the kings and mighty is worth noting. Judgment is executed against them because of their denial of the Lord of Spirits (*I Enoch* 46:7) and, more interestingly, because of their treatment of the righteous. Those who are aligned with the judge have been persecuted (*I Enoch* 46:8), their blood has been shed, they have suffered long at the hands of the oppressors, and therefore judgment will be executed on their behalf (*I Enoch* 47:2). While the kings and the mighty seek mercy, to no avail (*I Enoch* 62–63), nonetheless, they agree with the fairness of the judgment (*I Enoch* 63:8)!

In keeping with the apocalyptic context of this work, the author envisions a reversal of fortunes. The kings and mighty, who possess the earth, will lose their power and status (*I Enoch* 38:4–5) and be destroyed (*I Enoch* 45:6). They will be given over into the hands of the righteous and elect, with the result that no trace of them will survive (*I Enoch* 48:9–10). They will be filled with shame and handed over to the angels of punishment (*I Enoch* 62:9–12, 63:11), consigned to eternal destruction, imprisoned (*I Enoch* 69:27–28), in fetters (*I Enoch* 53:4–5), in a deep, burning valley (*I Enoch* 54). On the other hand, the vindicated will be blessed. Not only will those who are found to be righteous enjoy everlasting life with the Son of Man, but they will also take over the earth and live on it in peace, free from the oppression of the kings and mighty ones (*I Enoch* 45:5–6, 48:7–10). Glory and honor and life shall return to them (*I Enoch* 50:1–2, 62:13–16), and they are promised fortunes, power and prestige which were formerly enjoyed by the kings and the mighty. This promised reversal of fortunes is a significant and prominent feature of the portrayal of the judicial power of the Son of Man.<sup>252</sup>

<sup>251</sup> Black, *I Enoch*, 232, suggests allusions to Isa. 14:15, Zech 11:7, 14, and Ps 18:6.

<sup>252</sup> James C. VanderKam, *Enoch, A Man for All Generations* (Columbia, South Carolina:

So the following salient features are added to this portrait (see Table 4):

- 28) fiery fate of the condemned (*1 Enoch* 54:1, 5, 63:10; cf. also 67:7, 12–13 in the Noachic section);
- 29) that fiery fate was prepared for Azazel (*1 Enoch* 54:1);
- 30) fetters for the condemned;
- 31) radiance of the vindicated (*1 Enoch* 38:4, 39:7, 51:5, 58:3, 5–6);
- 32) resurrection;
- 33) the elect will be gathered (*1 Enoch* 61:5);
- 34) and the elect will be gathered from widely scattered areas: from the depths of the earth, from the desert, the sea, from death (*1 Enoch* 61:5, cf. 51:1);
- 35) clear dichotomy between the righteous and the oppressors *passim*;
- 36) the basis of judgment will be the treatment the righteous have received at the hands of the kings and mighty ones (*1 Enoch* 62:11; cf. 46:8); and
- 37) reversal of fortunes (*1 Enoch* 38:4–5; 45:5–6; 48:7–10; 50:1–2; 62:9–16; 63:11; 69:27–28).

**Table 4**  
*Other features relating to the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch*

Characteristic or feature	Passages where found
28. fiery fate of the condemned	54:1, 5, 63:10; cf. also 67:7, 12–13 in the Noachic section
29. fate was prepared for Azazel	54:5
30. fetters for the condemned	53:4–5
31. radiance of the vindicated	38:4, 39:7, 51:5, 58:3, 5–6
32. resurrection	51:1
33. the elect will be gathered	61:5
34. gathered from widely scattered areas*	61:5
35. clear dichotomy between righteous and condemned	<i>passim</i>
36. basis of judgment**	62:11; cf. 46:8
37. reversal of fortunes	38:4–5; 45:5–6; 48:7–10; 50:1–2; 62:9–16; 63:11; 69:27–28

\* they will be gathered from the depths of the earth, the desert, and the sea.

\*\* the treatment the righteous have received at the hands of the kings and mighty ones.

### 3.9.7 Use of Scripture

These passages reveal the profundity of the author’s familiarity with Scripture. The visions of *Par. En.*, at their foundation, depend on Dan. 7:9, 13, but the portrait of the Son of Man is filled out by the incorporation of ideas like the notion of davidic

roots found in Isaiah 9, 10–13 and Jeremiah 23 and 33, the chosen servant passages in Isaiah 42 and 49, as well as the plea for mercy in Daniel 9. Some have been borrowed straightforwardly, others have been drawn in ironically. Many other scriptural-sounding motifs are incorporated into the work as well, ideas that are also expressed in the Psalms, Proverbs, the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Joel, Zephaniah and Zechariah (see especially the section on *1 Enoch* 62–63 above). The power of God, the servant of the Lord, and the davidide stump of Jesse are mined for qualities and characteristics that will expand the salvific and judicial aspects of the concept of the Son of Man. This new figure is conceived of not as a metaphorical representation of the nation, but as an individual, representing the righteous and elect in the heavenly realm, and embodying their hope for vindication and a reversal of fortunes. He is a savior, a judge, a chosen servant, hidden to some but revealed to others. His character is composite, fully consonant with scripture, as shown by the variety of passages upon which the author drew, yet integrated to be encouragement and consolation for the righteous and elect.<sup>253</sup>

<sup>253</sup> James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQ Monograph; 16; Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association, 1984), 190; and *Enoch, A Man for All Generations*, 142. Borsch, *The Son of Man in Myth and History*, 154, however, is satisfied to say that Deutero-Isaiah merely drew on the same background concepts.

## 4

# THE SON OF MAN IN THE CONCEPTION OF MATTHEW

## 4.1 Introduction to Matthean Passages to be Considered

We now turn to the Son of Man passages in the Gospel of Matthew. Matthew has preserved thirty Son of Man sayings, most of which have been taken over from Mark or Q.<sup>1</sup> Using Bultmann's categories, thirteen are sayings referring to the future, coming Son of Man, ten refer to Jesus' passion, and seven relate to his earthly activity.<sup>2</sup> Eleven sayings are unique to Matthew,<sup>3</sup> of which nine pertain to the future, coming Son of Man. Three sayings from Mark and Q that contain the term, "Son of Man" are found in Matthew with personal pronouns instead of "Son of Man."<sup>4</sup> Of the eleven sayings unique to Matthew, the term "Son of Man" has been added to six Markan sayings in which "Son of Man" had not been present and one from Q.<sup>5</sup> Further, of those eleven, four Son of Man sayings are found only in Matthew, not having been redacted from Mark or Q.<sup>6</sup>

The nine future, coming Son of Man sayings that are unique to Matthew hold the most promise for finding relationships with the Enochic material. The earthly sayings and the suffering sayings can be excluded *a priori* since the Enochic view of the Son of Man is of a future, non-suffering figure. Therefore, the nine sayings unique to Matthew will be the core of this study. Beyond these, Matthew displays some very interesting redactional activity and scholars have attempted to discern Matthew's purpose and motivation in making these changes.<sup>7</sup> For this reason, Mt. 16:13, and

<sup>1</sup> Mark has 14, while Luke has 25.

<sup>2</sup> Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II.50–51; Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, 30; he is followed by Vielhauer, "Gottesreich und Menschensohn," 57–58; see also Caragounis, *The Son of Man*, 145–47, for a slightly different organization of the sayings.

<sup>3</sup> Mt. 10:23, 13:37, 13:41, 16:13, 16:27, 28, 17:12, 19:28, 24:30, 25:31, 26:2.

<sup>4</sup> Mt. 5:11//Lk. 6:22, Mt. 10:32//Lk. 12:8, and Mt. 16:21//Mk 8:31.

<sup>5</sup> Mt. 16:13//Mk 8:27, Mt. 16:27//Mk 8:38, Mt. 16:28//Mk 9:1, Mt. 17:12//Mk 9:13, Mt. 24:30//Mk 13:25–26, Mt. 26:2//Mk 14:1, and from Q, Mt. 19:28//Lk. 18:29–30.

<sup>6</sup> Mt. 10:23, 13:37, 41, 25:31.

<sup>7</sup> Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 15–19, acknowledges the importance of the changes Matthew

21 are included in this study, because they reveal an interesting aspect of Matthew's reworking of the Son of Man concept, even though they do not fit the future, coming category.

The Matthean passages to be investigated on the Son of Man are the following:

Mt. 10:23 This verse is a word of encouragement from Jesus to the disciples when they are being sent on a mission to the towns and cities of Israel, when Jesus promises them that the Son of Man will come before that tour is complete.

Mt. 13:37, 41 These verses are from the Interpretation of the Parable of the Wheat and the Weeds (Mt. 13:24–30). The sower of the good seed is interpreted as the Son of Man, who will send his angels to gather and destroy the causes of evil so that the righteous will shine like the sun.

Mt. 16:13, 21, cf. 26:2 These verses are a part of the passion predictions. Matthew sets the whole passion narrative under the dignity of the title of the Son of Man.<sup>8</sup> In Mt. 16:13, at the beginning of the passion narrative, Jesus asks the disciples about people's perception of the Son of Man. In the parallel synoptic passages (Mk 8:27 and Lk. 9:18) the personal pronoun is used, but in Matthew the term "Son of Man" appears. In contrast, in Mt. 16:21, Matthew removes the term "Son of Man" from the source passage of Mk 8:31/Lk. 9:22 and replaces it with the personal pronoun. This redactional activity indicates his identification of Jesus and the Son of Man. Mt. 26:2 also plays an important role since it recalls the tone for the passion narrative as being set under the dignity of the person of the Son of Man.

Mt. 16:27, 28 In Mt. 16:27, the Son of Man is envisioned as coming to repay evildoers, while in Mt. 16:28, he is envisioned as coming in his kingdom. These occurrences of the term Son of Man in these two chapters of the passion narrative are obvious alterations by Matthew of the received material from Mark, and thus they yield significant insight into Matthew's concept of the Son of Man.

Mt. 19:28 Here the Son of Man is seen as sitting on the throne and promising his followers that they will sit on twelve thrones judging the tribes of Israel (cf. Lk. 22:28 for the feasting motif and the twelve thrones of judgment). This saying is appended to the encounter of the rich young ruler with Jesus.

Mt. 24:30–31 Matthew speaks of the sign of the Son of Man, cf. Mk 13:26–27 and Lk. 21:27. Quotations from Dan. 7:13 and Zech. 12:10–14 are included in the vision of the Son of Man coming on or with the clouds. Significant redactional activity

has introduced for deducing Matthew's views, but also argues that Matthean acceptance of Mark or Q without change is just as pertinent to gaining a full picture of his views.

<sup>8</sup> Colpe, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, VIII.460.

in Mt. 24:30–31 contributes to understanding Matthew’s concept of the Son of Man.

Mt. 25:31 In this verse the Son of Man comes in glory with the angels, sits on his glorious throne and exercises the final judgment.

A preliminary, synthetic overview of these passages already yields some important similarities to the *Par. En.* passages. Both Matthew and *Par. En.* (as well as Mark and Luke) share the use of Daniel 7 for their understanding of the figure of the Son of Man. Both foresee an overthrow of those currently in power, and a reversal of fortunes. For both the suffering of the righteous is a major concern, and for both part of the function of the statements about the Son of Man is to bring consolation and hope to the followers. These similarities in the concept, identity, role, and purpose of the Son of Man will be more closely examined and expanded in the rest of this chapter, as the Matthean passages are exegeted.

## 4.2 Exegesis of Mt. 10:23

Mt 10:23 is the word of encouragement from Jesus to the disciples when they are being sent on a mission to the towns and cities of Israel. Jesus promises them that the Son of Man will come before that tour is complete. A situation of rejection and persecution also exists, since the disciples are characterized as fleeing from one town to the next.<sup>9</sup>

### 4.2.1 Mt. 10:23<sup>10</sup>

ὅταν δὲ διώκωσιν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν· ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ τελέσητε τὰς πόλεις τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

When they persecute you in one town, flee to the next; for truly, I tell you, you will not have gone through all the towns of Israel before the Son of Man comes.

#### *Variants*

ἑτέραν CDLΘ0171, the Majority group and other manuscripts have αλλην.<sup>11</sup> ἀμὴν DLΘ0171 and others before ἀμὴν add καν (or εαν δε) εν τη αλλη (or εκ ταυτης) διωκωσιν υμας φευγετε εις την αλλην (or ετεραν). It appears

<sup>9</sup> Hans-Theo Wrege, *Das Sondergut des Matthäusevangelium* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1991), 54–55.

<sup>10</sup> The transcription is taken from Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (27th Edition; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft; 1993). The translation is taken from *The New Oxford Annotated Bible (NRSV)*, edited by Bruce M. Metzger and Roland E. Murphy (New York: Oxford University Press; 1991). Variants can be consulted in the apparatus in Nestle-Aland<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> For a fuller listing of witnesses, see the apparatus of Nestle-Aland<sup>27</sup>.

that this clause, rather than having dropped out because of homoioteleuton (αλλην . . . αλλην), is an explanatory expansion, and not original.<sup>12</sup> τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ B and D omit τοῦ ἄν omitted by the original hand of  $\aleph$  and B and a few others;  $\text{O}^{\text{u}}$  is read by a corrector of  $\aleph$  and a few others, but CDLW $\Theta$ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33, the Majority text and others have preserved ἄν to make the sentence more grammatically correct.

### Notes

The source of this verse has been debated with widely differing conclusions. It does not have a parallel in either Mk or Lk., and so some have seen it as an authentic saying of Jesus,<sup>13</sup> or as a Matthean composition,<sup>14</sup> or perhaps a pre-Matthean tradition from his special source which has been edited by Matthew,<sup>15</sup> or perhaps a logion from Q.<sup>16</sup> The verse does have many Matthean themes and expressions, such as the theme of persecution (διώκωσιν), the interest in the cities (πόλεις) of Israel, the theme of flight (φεύγετε), the idea of completing the mission (τελέσητε).<sup>17</sup> But it also bears the marks of coming from a different context, in that neither ταύτη nor ἑτέρων have an immediate antecedent. Besides that, the verb of “coming” is used, rather than the verb of “returning.” Since Matthew identifies Jesus as the Son of Man,<sup>18</sup> the verb of

<sup>12</sup> Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (United Bible Societies; 1971) 28.

<sup>13</sup> Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest for the Historical Jesus* (New York: MacMillan, 1968), 358–61, considers this verse to be authentic and it is his starting point for his understanding of the self-conception of Jesus.

<sup>14</sup> Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution* (2nd ed., Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994), 194; Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition*, 141–45. Gundry concludes that this verse bears the marks of being “from the pen of Matthew” since the phrase “cities of Israel” is very similar to the phrase “cities of the Samaritans” in Mt. 10:5, which he has already determined to be a Matthean composition.

<sup>15</sup> Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II.187–92. M. Eugene Boring, *Matthew (New Interpreters Bible, Vol. VIII; Nashville: Abingdon, 1995)*, 259, believes it to be “an oracle of an early Christian prophet giving instructions for the conduct of Christian missionaries under duress.” Heinz Geist, *Menschensohn und Gemeinde: Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung zur Menschensohnprädikation im Matthäusevangelium* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1986), 227–30. See also Casey, *Solution*, 230–233.

<sup>16</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 60–62; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II.187–92 say that it cannot be determined whether this saying derived originally from Special Matthean material or from Q. Since it has no parallel in Luke, it cannot be stated for certain that it is from Q, although Tödt treats it as a very good possibility that it came from Q, since it is consistent with the “genuine” (i.e. future) sayings in speaking of a coming Son of Man. Tödt considers this to be a post-Easter, prophetic saying, that was respected as the Word of Jesus himself, for it has a very narrow range of space and time: only the cities of Israel are to be included, and only a brief time is envisioned.

<sup>17</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 194, has pointed this out.

<sup>18</sup> In Mt. 16:13, Mt. replaces the “I” of Mk 8:27 with the “Son of Man,” and in Mt. 16:21, Mt replaces the “Son of Man” of Mk 8:31 with “he,” referring to Jesus in the third person.

“returning” would be expected,<sup>19</sup> but instead he says that the mission would not be completed until the Son of Man came (ὡς ἄν ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου). Further, the verse does bear some similarities with the saying in Mk 9:1 about some not tasting death until the kingdom of God has come, and so it may be a kingdom saying that has been edited into a Son of Man saying.<sup>20</sup> Regardless of its source, it has been redacted by Matthew and placed in this context, and therefore it yields some insight into Matthew’s concept of the Son of Man.

The saying is in the context of a missionary discourse.<sup>21</sup> The purpose of the discourse was to offer encouragement and consolation<sup>22</sup> to the missionaries in the face of persecution,<sup>23</sup> and to justify the continuance of that mission alongside the mission to the gentiles.<sup>24</sup> It does this by drawing connections between the ministry of Jesus and the ministry of his disciples.<sup>25</sup>

Within that context, and although the saying is brief, two characteristics of Matthew’s view of the Son of Man can be discerned. One is that the Son of Man is coming in the future. The mission of going throughout the cities of Israel will not be completed until the Son of Man comes. The Son of Man is a future, coming figure. The second characteristic has to do with his activity. The Son of Man will come in order in some way to counter those who are persecuting the disciples. Persecution is present in the context also, for earlier (10:17–22) they are forewarned of opposition and rejection, as well as trial and martyrdom. The extent and manner of the coming Son of Man’s opposition to the persecutors are not revealed in this verse. This opposition between the Son of Man and persecutors or oppressors is also found in a passage like Mt. 25:31–46, the description of the Last Judgment. Matthew most clearly identifies Jesus with the Son of Man<sup>26</sup>, but here in 10:23, more is implied than the human Jesus who walked and talked in Galilee. The Son of Man is an eschatological figure.<sup>27</sup> And further, the mention of Beelzebul (10:25) indicates that even a wider context is being appealed to, the context of the cosmic battle between good and evil. In that context the Son of Man is the representative of the good, and in this way can function to provide

<sup>19</sup> Only Jn 14:3 speaks of Jesus coming again.

<sup>20</sup> Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II.187–92.

<sup>21</sup> Dorothy Jean Weaver, *Matthew’s Missionary Discourse: A Literary Critical Analysis* (JSNT 38; Sheffield: JSOT; 1990) 100–102. Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 262, note 84.

<sup>22</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 60–62.

<sup>23</sup> Graham N. Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 126, 213.

<sup>24</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 194.

<sup>25</sup> Weaver, *Matthew’s Missionary Discourse*, 102.

<sup>26</sup> As noted above, in Mt 16:13, Mt. replaces the “I” of Mk 8:27 with the “Son of Man,” and in Mt. 16:21, Mt. replaces the “Son of Man” of Mk 8:31 with “he,” referring to Jesus in the third person.

<sup>27</sup> Francis Wright Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew: Translation, Introduction and Commentary* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1981), 245; Weaver, *Matthew’s Missionary Discourse*, 202, note 139, sees the eschatological implication of the concept of the Son of Man as further indicating that Jesus will be the chief actor at the end of the age.



hope, encouragement and consolation to the disciples,<sup>28</sup> for his coming will be the end of this evil era, and the beginning of a new and blessed era.

Theisoohn detects no influence from *Par. En.* on this verse.<sup>29</sup>

#### 4.2.2 Features of the Son of Man in Mt. 10:23

These two characteristics then, are evident in this verse. One is that the Son of Man is conceived to be a future, coming, eschatological figure.

The other is that the Son of Man stands in opposition to those who oppose the disciples.

### 4.3 Exegesis of Mt. 13:37, 41

In the chapter of parables (Matthew 13), Jesus tells the Parable of the Weeds (Mt. 13:24–30), and then in response to the disciples' query about the meaning of it, he offers an interpretation (Mt. 13:36–43), in which the parable is allegorized. The sower of the good seed is interpreted as the Son of Man (13:37), the field is the world, the seeds are the righteous, and the prediction is made that the Son of Man will send his angels to gather and destroy the causes of evil so that the righteous would shine like the sun.

#### 4.3.1 Mt. 13:37, 41

<sup>37</sup>ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· ὁ σπεύρων τὸ καλὸν σπέρμα ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου,

<sup>37</sup>He answered, "The one who sows the good seed is the Son of Man;"

<sup>41</sup>ἀποστελλεῖ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ, καὶ συλλέξουσιν ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ σκάνδαλα καὶ τοὺς ποιούντας τὴν ἀνομίαν.

<sup>41</sup>The Son of Man will send his angels, and they will collect out of his kingdom all causes of sin and all evildoers.

#### *Variants*

In verse 37, the term ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in an eleventh-century manuscript, 28, is replaced with ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, while Epiphanius simply records ὁ θεός.

No variants for Mt. 13:41 are noted in Nestle-Aland<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>28</sup> Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News According to Matthew* (David E. Green, tr., Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975), 243. Ulrich Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Zurich und Braunschweig: Benziger Verlag GmbH, 1990), 113–17.

<sup>29</sup> Theisoohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 262–63, note 84.

## Notes

The Interpretation of the Parable of the Weeds (Mt. 13:36–43) is almost universally considered to be a Matthean creation<sup>30</sup>. The language and vocabulary is Matthean<sup>31</sup> and the point of the interpretation seems to fit Matthew's situation, while it omits the exhortation to patience found in the original parable.<sup>32</sup> Matthew has recast the parable through this interpretation into "an allegorical description of the Last Judgment, a warning against false security."<sup>33</sup>

The interpretation consists of three parts:<sup>34</sup> a) the narrative introduction, with a switch in venue from the crowds outside to the house; b) the list of equivalences for an allegorical interpretation, in which the Sower of the good seed is identified as the Son of Man; and c) the miniature apocalypse,<sup>35</sup> in which the Son of Man is said to send his angels to root out the causes of evil in his kingdom so that the righteous will shine like the sun.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 187, writing in 1931 says it is undoubtedly secondary, and similar to interpretations in Rabbinic work. J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (rev. ed., London: SCM Press; 1963), 81, also deems it to be the work of Matthew, and is followed by Tödt, *Son of Man*, 69. J. D. Kingsbury, *The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13: A Study in Redaction Criticism* (London: SPCK; 1969), 10, clearly sees the interpretation as Matthew applying the parable to his own time and situation, just as Jesus used the parable originally in the time to which he belonged. Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 183, follows Jeremias, and seeks to discover the source of the few traditional items in the passage. John P. Meier, *Matthew* (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1980), 150, sees signs that the interpretation is "more Matthean than traditional" in the view expressed that the Son of Man is the risen Jesus exercising his role as world ruler until the judgment. Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 311, also agrees that Mt. 13:36–43 is the work of Mt because of the unique set of linguistic characteristics that Jeremias pointed out, and because the interpretation misses the central exhortation to patience found in the original parable. Gundry, *Matthew*, 271–75, views it as Matthean, as does U. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Vol. 2; Benziger Verlag/Neukirchener Verlag; 1990), 338, who views it as a secondary and selective interpretation of the Parable of the Weeds. Hare, *Son of Man*, 150, agrees that it is widely acknowledged to be a Matthean product, and Jan Lambrecht, S.J., *Out of the Treasure: The Parables in the Gospel of Matthew* (Louvain: Peeters Press/Eerdmans; 1991), 151, 169, considers Mt 13:36–43 to be redactional due to both the themes and the vocabulary, as do Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II.426, and Boring, *Matthew*, 310. Casey, *Solution*, 234–35.

<sup>31</sup> Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 81–85, is found to be convincing by Beare, *Matthew*, 311, Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II.426, and Tödt, *Son of Man*, 69. Jeremias lists a great number of words that pervade not only this interpretation of the parable, but the whole Gospel, thus eliminating the possibility that the interpretation is a tradition received by Matthew.

<sup>32</sup> All the commentators acknowledge that the interpretation in 13:36–43 omits an explicit reference to the exhortation to patience which seems to be the point of the original parable in 13:24–30, but in Gundry's view, *Matthew*, 274–75, the absence of the exhortation to patience is automatically answered in the reference to the final judgment, with the implicit recommendation to the readers to wait until then.

<sup>33</sup> Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 85; Tödt, *Son of Man*, 70.

<sup>34</sup> Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 426–31; Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 206.

<sup>35</sup> Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 81, notes only these last two parts.

<sup>36</sup> As Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 184, 186, 188, points out, Mt. 13:41 bears similarities with other Matthean passages: the angels being involved in judgment is also expressed

The interpretation also seems to reveal a three-part view of the role of the Son of Man. The Son of Man, identified as the sower of good seed, has a role of sowing the word of God, or God's kingdom, on earth. Secondly, the Son of Man has the role of ruling over an interim kingdom before the final judgment when God's kingdom comes fully into being. And thirdly, the Son of Man has the role of judging in that final judgment, and of sending out the angels to root out the causes of evil and all evildoers. In this role, the fate of those judged is final and eternal. As the weeds are collected and burned, so sin and evil will be rooted out and disposed of, with weeping and gnashing of teeth.<sup>37</sup>

Hare, with his methodological approach that presumes little understanding by the author concerning the connotations of the term Son of Man, treats 13:37 and 13:41 distinctly, erring in several regards. First, he claims that Mt. 13:37, the identification of the sower with the Son of Man, carries no apocalyptic content.<sup>38</sup> As an isolated statement, it does not, but as soon as one admits that it is the first in a series of seven allegorical equivalences leading up to an apocalyptic interpretation of the Parable of the Weeds, then one can no longer deny the apocalyptic overtones in Mt. 13:37. Within its context, the identification of the sower with the Son of Man obviously carries the connotation that the eschatological judgment is being alluded to.

Further, Hare seems to accept Lindars' intimation that the Gospel of Thomas 57, a version of the Parable of the Weeds, indicates that God was originally identified with the Sower, and that "Son of Man" is a Matthean substitution. However, when the Gospel of Thomas 57 is consulted, it is clearly seen to be a version of the original parable, not its interpretation, and so when it refers to the "Kingdom of the Father" it is properly expressing ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν (Mt. 13:23, given Matthew's reticence about using the *nomen dei*). But because the Gospel of Thomas 57 reflects the original parable, it cannot be called into service to make intimations about the interpretation. Thus, Hare is improperly drawing the Gospel of Thomas 57 into the argument.

Again, in commenting upon Mt. 13:41, Hare notes that neither Tödt nor Theisohn has been able specifically to identify any one passage in *Par. En.* that Matthew is dependent upon for his concept of the Son of Man sending out his angels.<sup>39</sup> He also

in Mt. 13:49; the angels being identified as "his" (i.e. the Son of Man's) is also found at Mt. 16:27, 24:31 (see below), the only other two places in the New Testament; the kingdom being called "his" also appears at Mt. 16:28; the angels being sent (ἀποστελλεῖ) appears almost identically in Mt. 24:31, except that in Mt. 13:41 they "collect out" (συλλέξουσιν) while in Mt. 24:31 they "gather" (ἐπισυνάξουσιν). Further, Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 189–90, notes that in Mt. 13:42 ἡ κάμινος τοῦ πυρός is one of two occurrences in the whole New Testament, the other being at Mt. 13:50 (κάμινος, in different phraseology, also appears in Rev. 1:15, 9:2), and that ἐκλάμπειν in Mt. 13:43 is a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament (although the root verb, λάμπειν, is used by Mt. to describe Jesus' appearance in the Transfiguration in Mt. 17:2).

<sup>37</sup> Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 78–79, points out that this interpretation of the parable is thoroughly dualistic in perspective, with no allowance for any middle ground.

<sup>38</sup> Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition*, 150–51.

<sup>39</sup> Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition*, 152–55.

points out that Mt. 13:41 seems to owe more to Mk 13:26–27, in which the Son of Man is seen to come on the clouds, accompanied by angels who will gather the elect, than to any one passage in *Par. En.* But Hare errs in holding them to identify any one passage. Tödt's point is that the pattern and conception of the Son of Man, and angels who are his agents and entourage, are present in *Par. En.* in ways very similar to the ways they are present in Matthew.<sup>40</sup> Theisohn makes a similar point.<sup>41</sup> He argues that only a few ideas in the interpretation of the parable can be found in the original parable and that therefore the other material must come from elsewhere. He accepts Jeremias' argument that much of the language is Matthean, but seeks to locate the source for other motifs, and makes a case for *Par. En.* as the most likely candidate.<sup>42</sup> Included in *Par. En.* are the themes of the radiance of the righteous, the fiery fate of the condemned, and the angels being involved in carrying out the punishment. This set of features is common only to Mt. 13:40–43 and to *Par. En.*, and does not occur elsewhere.<sup>43</sup> While precise quotations may not be evident, nonetheless the pattern of relationships is clearly the same and it points to the fact that a precise and concise allusion is being made to *Par. En.* in the Interpretation of the Parable.

Therefore Hare's criticism is off the mark. He points out that Theisohn is not able to point to a precise passage from which Matthew is drawing his material, and that in *Par. En.* the Son of Man never sends out the angels. Indeed, in *1 Enoch* 54:6 it is the Lord of Spirits who has sent them out to execute punishment. But Hare's criticism is based on a standard that would apply to precise quotations. What Theisohn has made clear is that while a precise quotation may not be discernable, nonetheless an allusion to *Par. En.* can be claimed on the basis of the many similarities in the pattern of relationships that exist in the two works.

The foregoing discussion shows that the pattern of the conception of the Son of Man surrounded by angels, who are also agents of judgment, betrays strong similarity with *Par. En.* The angels being in the presence of the Head of Days and surrounding the throne is expressed most explicitly in *1 Enoch* 40:1, in which a vision of the Lord of Spirits and the four archangels is introduced, and in the vision of the final ascent in *1 Enoch* 71, where myriads of angels populate the scene. The angels acting as agents of judgment appear in *1 Enoch* 56:1–5, in which angels with scourges are foreseen to gather the wicked and cast them into the abyss of the valley where they

<sup>40</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 92, 223.

<sup>41</sup> Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 183–201.

<sup>42</sup> Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 190–97, 266, note 119, considers Dan. 3:6, Mal. 3:19 and Ps. 21:10 as possible candidates because they contain the idea of a fiery furnace, but he notes that these verses are unlikely to have influenced Mt. 13:41 because they contain none of the other motifs. He also considers Dan. 12:3 and *1 Enoch* 104:2 because they contain the idea of heavenly radiance, however they do not attribute this directly to the righteous or make the comparison with the sun. Again the similarity is not as satisfactory as that found in the various passages of *Par. En.* (*1 Enoch* 58:3, 39:7, cf. 38:4, 50:1). 4 Ezra 7:97 is also acknowledged as containing similar ideas, but is excluded as having been composed too late to influence the Gospel of Matthew.

<sup>43</sup> Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 197.

will suffer with the kings and the mighty ones (cf. *1 Enoch* 62:11–12). The angels in *1 Enoch* 61:1–9 gather the righteous and elect, even from their deaths in the sea, the desert, and the wilderness, and restore them to the presence of the Elect One and the Lord of Spirits where they praise God forever, and are clothed in radiant garments and feast in joy and peace (*1 Enoch* 62:13–16). While the sending of the angels is not specifically attributed to the Son of Man in *Par. En.*, nor are they ever said specifically to be “his,” Hare is wrong to conclude that Matthew could not have known *Par. En.* or the conception of the Son of Man contained therein. More likely is the possibility that Matthew was aware of the whole conception of the Son of Man in the presence of the Head of Days as a second divine figure, who has responsibilities for judgment, and angels at his disposal, and that Matthew took the elements and expressed them in a way that specifically draws out the relationship between the Son of Man and the angels, and envisions them as being sent by the Son of Man in his juridical role.<sup>44</sup>

The characteristics of the Son of Man revealed in this interpretation of the Parable of the Weeds seem to come from Matthew’s own understanding of that figure. The Son of Man in this interpretation is an eschatological figure with a role to play in the final judgment. He is surrounded by angels, who perform at his behest. In the interpretation, there seems to be no chance for repentance since the weeds, the wicked and the causes of evil simply are gathered up and destroyed. Although an exhortation to patience is the central point of the original parable, that perspective is missing in the interpretation: here, instead, the affirmation is made that the wicked will finally be destroyed as a result of the promised judgment. A striking feature of *Par. En.* is that a blatant dichotomy exists between the righteous and the wicked. Their fates in the final judgment are clear and opposed to each other. This is evident in *1 Enoch* 63 where the kings and the mighty ones put themselves at the mercy of the Lord of Spirits, but no mercy is forthcoming. Similarly in Mt. 13:42–43, the wicked are thrown into the furnace to perish and the righteous are promised that they will shine like the sun. The Son of Man in Mt. 13:36–43, as he does in *Par. En.*, executes a merciless judgment.

#### 4.3.2 Features of the Son of Man found in Mt. 13:36–43

The features identifiable in Mt. 13:36–43 that are associated with the Son of Man are as follows:

- a) the implied vindication of his followers, and the reversal of their fortunes and status;
- b) ἀποστελλεῖ, sends;

<sup>44</sup> Simply to push the connection back to Mk 13:26–27, as Hare does, is not to show that there is no connection between Mt and *Par. En.* The connection can still be shown, and Mt, in saying more concisely than Mk that the Son of Man sent the angels in 13:41, also shows his familiarity with *Par. En.* and the conceptions of the Son of Man there.

- c) τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ, *his* angels;
- d) συλλέξουσιν, they will collect out or gather all causes of sin and evildoers;
- e) ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ, *his* kingdom, i.e. royal role;
- f) δίκαιοι is used as a term for the followers of the Son of Man;
- g) ἐκλάμψουσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, the followers will shine like the sun;
- h) εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός, a fiery fate is prepared for persecutors;
- i) the Son of Man has a judicial role;
- j) a clear dichotomy exists between the righteous and the wicked;
- k) there is no possibility of mercy for the wicked;
- l) eternal punishment is decreed; and
- m) bliss is promised to the righteous.

#### 4.4 Exegesis of Mt. 16:13, 21, 27–28

In Mt. 16:13, 21, 27–28 Matthew sets the whole passion narrative under the dignity of the title of the Son of Man.<sup>45</sup> In Mt. 16:13, at the beginning of the passion narrative, Jesus asks the disciples about people’s perception about the Son of Man. In the parallel synoptic passages (Mk 8:27 and Lk. 9:18) the personal pronoun is used, but in Mt. 16:13 the term “Son of Man” appears, a fact which indicates that for the author Jesus and the Son of Man were clearly identified. Similarly, in Mt. 16:21, Matthew has replaced the term “Son of Man” with the personal pronoun, where the source passage, Mk 8:31, had used it. This again indicates Matthean identification of Jesus with the Son of Man. Then in Mt. 16:27–28, the Son of Man is envisioned as coming to repay evildoers and as coming in his kingdom. These occurrences of the term “Son of Man” in Matthew 16 reflect obvious Matthean redaction of the received material from Mark, and thus they can yield significant insight into Matthew’s concept of the Son of Man.<sup>46</sup>

##### 4.4.1 Mt. 16:13, 21

<sup>13</sup> Ελθὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὰ μέρη Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου ἠρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγων· τίνα λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;

<sup>45</sup> Colpe, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, 8.460. Mt. 26:2 also plays an important role since it recalls the tone for the passion narrative as being set under the dignity of the person of the Son of Man.

<sup>46</sup> Geist, *Menschensohn und Gemeinde*, 127–43, sees the Markan structure carried over into Matthew’s Gospel, but with evidence of Matthean redaction and reflection upon the Christological import of the passage. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt. 8–17)*, 2.453, 487, also recognizes Mark 8 as the source for this material.

<sup>13</sup>Now when Jesus came into the district of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, “Who do people say that the Son of Man is?”

<sup>21</sup> Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς δεικνύειν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα ἀπελθεῖν καὶ πολλὰ παθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι.

<sup>21</sup>From that time on, Jesus began to show his disciples that he must go to Jerusalem and undergo great suffering at the hands of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and on the third day be raised.

### *Variants*

In Mt. 16:13, between τίνα and λέγουσιν, με is added by D L Θ f<sup>1,13</sup> 33, the Majority text and some of the versions and church fathers. This would appear to be due to the influence of the parallel synoptic passages. The text as presented above is witnessed to by **8** B, others of the versions and Origen. C and W read με τίνα.<sup>47</sup>

### *Notes*

In Mt. 16:13, Matthew has inserted τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, where the parallel passages simply have με (Mk 8:27 τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι...and Lk. 9:18 τίνα με οἱ ὄχλοι λέγουσιν εἶναι...),<sup>48</sup> while in 16:21 Matthew has used the pronoun αὐτὸν in place of τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Mk 8:31=Lk. 9:22 ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν). The insertion of the term in vs 13 and its replacement in vs 21 indicate that for Matthew, Jesus is identified as the Son of Man.<sup>49</sup> This identification must have been operative for the copyists also, since no variants are preserved for the term or its replacement. Matthew further has added εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα ἀπελθεῖν, but omitted καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι, which appears in Mk 8:31 and Lk. 9:22 after πολλὰ παθεῖν.

Again, in Mt. 10:32, Matthew has replaced “Son of Man” (Lk. 12:8) with “I”: “every one who acknowledges me before others, I will acknowledge before my Father who is in heaven...” In the parallel passage in Lk. 12:8, “the Son of Man will also acknowledge before the angels of God” those who acknowledge Jesus before others. Matthew may be concerned about one of two matters: either Jesus and the Son of Man are so clearly identified for Matthew that a substitution of “I” for “Son of Man” is done with ease, or Matthew is concerned to avoid presenting the Son of Man

<sup>47</sup> See other variants for these two verses in Nestle-Aland<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>48</sup> Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II.604.

<sup>49</sup> Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1975), 115, and *Matthew As Story*, 95–103, where he argues that “Son of Man” is a public title used in the context of opposition, and the personal pronoun is used with regard to insiders such as Peter, whose “evaluative point of view...is in accord with the evaluative point of view of God.” Cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II.51, who agree with Kingsbury’s emphasis on the “Son of Man” as a public title.

as merely an advocate rather than the eschatological judge. In either case, Mt. 10:32 shows Matthew's clear identification of Jesus with the Son of Man.<sup>50</sup>

Matthew's insertion of τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in Mt. 16:13 is problematic, as commentators have noted.<sup>51</sup> If the term is meaningful for Jesus and his disciples as having any messianic content, then the question, "Who do people say the Son of Man is?" becomes tautologous: the answer is contained in the question itself.<sup>52</sup> But Tödt notes that Matthew has changed the episode into an announcement of the period of the church. Peter's confession and Jesus' blessing upon him are perhaps a resurrection appearance that has been inserted into the confession narrative to function as the inauguration of the faith as expressed in the post-Easter church.<sup>53</sup> Thus the language is laden with meaning for the informed reader, and the appearance of the term here in vs 13 functions as "an emphatic heading" to the Passion Narrative.<sup>54</sup> Its appearance again at the beginning of the actual events of the Passion in Mt. 26:2 affirms this usage, for Matthew "understands this name to be a title of dignity."<sup>55</sup> Through the use of this name, the whole passion of Christ is put under the dignity of the Son of Man with its transcendent and judicial connotations.

Kingsbury, followed by France, sees the term here in Mt. 16:13 as being the prime example of Jesus' use of it as a self-referent in a public, non-confessional, adversarial setting.<sup>56</sup> It is a term which sets Jesus apart from those who would oppose and reject him, and in this way the question is not tautologous. The term has no meaning for the narrative audience, the general populace, although for the informed reader it has great ironic impact. When the audience is the general public, the term is used, and it reveals nothing of who Jesus is. But in the very next verse, Matthew preserves the personal pronoun, when Jesus asks the disciples who *they* think he is, because now the narrative audience is an intimate, close one, and they are growing in their understanding and commitment to him.

Meier sees the use of the term in Mt. 16:13 and its absence in Mt. 16:21 as very significant to Matthew's development of christology.<sup>57</sup> In his narrative technique,

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Tödt's discussion of this verse in *Son of Man*, 89–90.

<sup>51</sup> E.g. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II.617.

<sup>52</sup> Beare, *Matthew*, 352; Hare, *Son of Man Tradition*, 129.

<sup>53</sup> The blessing seems to be pre-Matthean and Semitic in origin since it contains the pun on the name of Peter (Πετρος/πέτρα; or פֶּטְרָא, which works more accurately), and since it uses semiticisms such as "Simon bar Jona," "flesh and blood," "binding" and "loosing," and "the gates of hell," as Bultmann points out, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 138–40, 258–59; see also Harrington, *Matthew*, 250; Boring *Matthew*, 8.345; but Gundry, *Matthew*, 330–33, argues against an Aramiac substratum.

<sup>54</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 150. Boring, *Matthew*, 8.344, views the confession in Matthew as "ecclesiastical" separating "the new community he is forming from those who oppose and reject it."

<sup>55</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 150.

<sup>56</sup> Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*, 114–15; Kingsbury, *Matthew: As Story*, 100–102; R. T. France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher* (Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1989), 289.

<sup>57</sup> John P. Meier, *The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church, and Morality in the First Gospel* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), 109–120.



Matthew has established that Jesus is the Son of Man through the use of the earthly sayings about having nowhere to lay his head (Mt. 8:20) and his coming as a drunkard and glutton in contrast to the asceticism of John the Baptizer (Mt. 11:19), and through the insertion of the name into the question of Mt. 16:13, where the source in Mk 8:27 simply has the pronoun. Then in the subsequent conversation with Peter, in Meier's view, Matthew explores the range of meaning of the term. For the first time in the gospel Matthew has brought together the two titles of Messiah and Son of the living God in Peter's confession (Mt. 16:16). Meier sees the title of Messiah as a fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy, the scion of David, and one who was destined to sit on the throne at the last day. Similarly, the title "Son of God" is seen as a liturgical, enthronement formula, used of one who is standing on the side of God. These two titles, brought into close proximity in Peter's confession, illuminate for Matthew's narrative the term "Son of Man," which was used in the opening question. The Son of Man who has been seen in the earthly sayings as deprived and as serving others, while at the same time hiding his divine transcendence, is illuminated by Matthew now as also being the Messiah and the Son of God. With a "dense concentration of Christological thought" the Son of Man is conceived of as having powerful transcendence hidden in deprivation and service, as embodying the mystery of the dying and rising servant, and as being the judge who will come in glory.<sup>58</sup>

That Peter should have confessed his faith in this way is seen by Matthew as a revelation. Meier makes a connection between the revelation to Peter, who is portrayed in the narrative as "a mere untutored child," and the revelation of the hidden Son of Man by the Most High to the elect and righteous ones in *1 Enoch* 62:7, 46:1, 48:1–7. There the Son of Man is described as being hidden, but revealed only to the elect and righteous for their encouragement in the present oppressive situation in which they find themselves.<sup>59</sup> The location of this confession at Caesarea Philippi also seems to be significant. This location seemed to have had an ancient reputation for being a place where revelations took place, as Nickelsburg has argued.<sup>60</sup> Enoch and Levi also experienced revelations there, as described in the Book of the Watchers (*1 Enoch* 13:7) and in the Testament of Levi. Narratively, the author of *Par. En.* does not change the location, but simply says that Enoch received a second vision, "a vision of Wisdom" (*1 Enoch* 37:1). Thus the revelation in *1 Enoch* concerning the Son of Man is also located in the region of Caesarea Philippi.

<sup>58</sup> Meier, *The Vision of Matthew*, 110; In a contrasting view, Gundry, *Matthew*, 329, suggests that Matthew in moving the term up to 16:13 has shifted the emphasis in the definition of Christ away from the Son of Man as in Mark 8 towards the concept of the Son of God. While the title "Son of God" is a prominent one in Matthew's Gospel, and seems to have been a confession of Matthew's community, as Gundry's understanding affirms, it seems that Meier has the fuller comprehension of what Matthew is accomplishing through his careful use of the terms "Son of Man," "Messiah," and "Son of God."

<sup>59</sup> Meier, *The Vision of Matthew*, 111, note 108.

<sup>60</sup> G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *JBL* 100 (1981), 575–600.

Meier sees Mt. 16:21 as the “linchpin” in the development of the christological understanding contained in the Son of Man in Matthew’s account. Although the term “Son of Man” has been taken out, where it was present in the source text (Mk 8:31), once again its replacement with a personal pronoun simply affirms that for Matthew, the Son of Man and Jesus are identical. The concept of the Son of Man is progressing in Matthew’s narrative technique from what is known about him, as the earthly Son of Man in Mt. 16:13, to what is in the process of being revealed, that he is the glorious, judicial Son of Man coming on the clouds with his entourage of angels in Mt. 16:28. That progression includes the suffering foretold in Mt. 16:21, which in Meier’s view, is the “corridor” in Matthew’s christology from lowly earthly status to eschatological glory.<sup>61</sup> The inclusion of Jeremiah as one of the guesses of the people in Mt 16:14 (Jeremiah is absent from Mark) supports the recognition that in Matthew’s view the Son of Man comes to bring judgment, since both Jesus and Jeremiah were prophets of judgment, who spoke against the temple and who were killed.<sup>62</sup> As Schweizer summarizes, “for Mark the title “Son of Man” implies Jesus’ lowliness, humility, and suffering; for Matthew it signifies the reverse—Jesus’ universal authority and power, for the time inhabiting flesh.”<sup>63</sup>

Hare argues against the term Son of Man having any messianic content for Matthew, and sees Mt. 16:13 as being evidence for that view.<sup>64</sup> He argues that the term is simply one of modest self-designation for Jesus. This view is based on the difficulty that if the term does have messianic content, then the question contains its own answer, and so is a nonsensical question, which ought not to be attributed to Matthew’s literary technique. Hare also criticizes Tödt for trying to explain the question as not a genuine question within the narrative structure. He sees Tödt’s view as ascribing to Matthew an abnormal use of language. He would rather say that the content of the term has not yet been disclosed to the narrative audience, but then, Hare adds, there is no other place where that content is disclosed. Given these aspects, then, Hare agrees with Lindars, that one cannot equate the Son of Man with the suffering Christ, and concludes that in this passage the term Son of Man is Jesus’ modest self-designation, and cannot be understood as simply synonymous with “the Christ, the Son of the Living God” (Mt. 16:16).<sup>65</sup>

But Hare has misunderstood both Tödt and Matthew. Tödt has not said that the question is not a genuine question that simply introduces the title to the passion narrative. Tödt has gone much further to say that Matthew deliberately altered the

<sup>61</sup> Meier, *The Vision of Matthew*, 115–16, and *Matthew*, 184–85. In contrast to that view, Gundry, in *Matthew*, 337, argues that the use of the personal pronoun in 16:21 instead of the term Son of Man has the effect of attaching the suffering, dying and rising again to the idea of the Messiah, instead of to the concept of the Son of Man.

<sup>62</sup> Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II.618–19.

<sup>63</sup> Schweizer, *Matthew*, 336. Mt. 13:21 is also an instance in which Matthew avoids using the term “Son of Man” directly in the context of suffering.

<sup>64</sup> Hare, *Son of Man Tradition*, 129.

<sup>65</sup> Hare, *Son of Man Tradition*, 131.

Markan account so that it is no longer simply a narration of questions leading up to Peter's confession. Matthew's account has become an announcement of the faith of the church, the post-Easter faith, in a resurrected Christ, who is the judge of the world. That confession is contained and affirmed in Peter's words, and it is foreshadowed in the use of the term Son of Man in the opening words of the conversation, albeit couched as a question. To the uninformed reader, they lead into a deeper understanding of Jesus as the Son of Man, as illuminated by the titles Messiah and Son of God. For the informed reader, they foreshadow the fullness of Jesus' redemptive activity as Messiah, Son of God, and judicial Son of Man in glory.<sup>66</sup> In other words, the language is laden with meaning at several levels, not just the literal level, and this pregnant language is observable in the rest of the Gospel of Matthew, as well as in the other Gospels.

#### 4.4.2 Mt. 16:27–28

<sup>27</sup> μέλλει γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεσθαι ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ, καὶ τότε ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν πράξιν αὐτοῦ. <sup>28</sup> ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἰσὶν τινες τῶν ὧδε ἐστῶτων οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσονται θανάτου ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ.

27 "For the Son of Man is to come with his angels in the glory of his Father, and then he will repay everyone for what has been done.

28 Truly I tell you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom."

#### *Variants*

Mt 16:27: τὴν πράξιν τα εργα is the reading of  $\aleph^* f^1$  and some of the versions.

Mt 16:28: ὅτι ὅτι is omitted by CDW  $f^1$  and the Majority text, but is present in  $\aleph\text{BL}\Theta f^{13}$  and other witnesses.

τῶν ὧδε ἐστῶτων W Γ have ὡδε εστωτες; a few witnesses have τῶν ὡδε εστηκῶτων; but the text as presented is preserved by  $\aleph\text{BCDL}\Theta f^{1,13}$  and others.

#### *Notes*

Verse 27 is considerably altered from the Markan source in Mk 8:38.<sup>67</sup> The ideas of shame have been removed, and the idea of judgment has been made very explicit through the quotation of Ps. 62:13 (12) and Prov. 24:12 (in italics in the text above). Mk 8:38 quotes Jesus as saying that whoever is ashamed of Jesus and his words in

<sup>66</sup> Geist, *Menschensohn und Gemeinde*, 133–34, has further noted that the question about the Son of Man's identity is reminiscent of the seer's question to the interpreting angel in *1 Enoch* 46:2 concerning who that Son of Man was and why he was with the Head of Days.

<sup>67</sup> Meier, *The Vision of Matthew*, 119–20; Meier, *Matthew*, 186–88; Beare, *Matthew*, 360; Gundry, *Matthew*, 340; Casey, *Son of Man*, 164; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II.674–75.

this age will experience a similar status of being shameful in the eyes of the Son of Man in the age to come. The age to come is characterized in Mk 8:38 as when the Son of Man comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels. Matthew has removed the idea of reciprocal shame, and intensified the picture of the coming Son of Man by making the coming judgment explicit. Matthew has added the possessive pronoun to the idea of the entourage of angels, intimating that they are under the authority of the Son of Man. This has the effect of elevating the status of the Son of Man and making his authority and power explicit, in a manner similar to that already expressed in Mt. 13:41, where the Son of Man has sent his angels to gather the elect.<sup>68</sup> In Daniel 7:13–14, 4 Ezra 13, and *Par. En.* the angels have not been noted as being under the authority of the Son of Man.<sup>69</sup> They are simply a part of the heavenly scene. But this is a development in Matthew, which may have come about because of the implication that if the Son of Man is the end-time judge, then surely the angels who gather the elect and the damned for judgment are under his authority. Thus, the presence of the possessive pronoun may be due to Matthew's accentuation of the element of judgment. The emphasis on judgment is also made explicit through the quotation of Ps. 62:13 (12) and Prov. 24:12 (cf. Sir. 35:22–23).<sup>70</sup> Again, the repayment exacted from sinners according to what they have done is not explicit in Daniel 7, 4 Ezra, or *Par. En.* In *Par. En.*, however, a huge step has been made toward connecting the judgment of the kings and mighty ones as repayment for their behavior. The condemnation of the kings and mighty ones is based on their denial of the Lord of Spirits (*1 Enoch* 46:6–7, 63:7) and their oppression of the righteous and elect (*1 Enoch* 46:8). While the idea of repayment for sins may not be explicit in so many words in *Par. En.*, it is implicit. Matthew has taken it a step further and made it an explicit detail of the judgment by the Son of Man by quoting Ps. 62:13 (12) and Prov. 24:12. Sinners are to be repaid for what they have done.

In Mt. 16:28, Matthew has replaced the kingdom of God coming with power, which is found in Mk 9:1, with the Son of Man coming in his kingdom. This has the effect of making the statement look forward to the Parousia and judgment by the Son of Man.<sup>71</sup> Meier goes further to note that the appearances of the term Son of Man in Mt. 16:13 and again in Mt. 16:28 act as an “arch” over the whole discussion.

<sup>68</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 340. The addition of the personal pronoun is also noted by Schweizer, *Matthew*, 347, who recognizes a shift towards the Son of Man being viewed as “Judge, and Lord of God’s Kingdom.”

<sup>69</sup> Hare, *Son of Man Tradition*, 156, notes the absence of this motif in those writings but its presence in Matthew, and agrees with Higgins that this concept is totally un-Jewish. See Higgins, *Jesus and the Son of Man*, 106, note 1. Without suggesting why the personal pronoun may have been added, Hare simply notes that it is not present in what normally is considered to be possible predecessor concepts of the Son of Man.

<sup>70</sup> Noted by Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 326, and Gundry, *Use of the Old Testament*, 138. Gundry notes that in the Septuagint, both passages use τὰ ἔργα instead of τὴν πρᾶξιν as Matthew has done.  $\aleph^* f^1$  and some of the versions have apparently attempted to correct the text to the Septuagint by reading τὰ ἔργα instead of τὴν πρᾶξιν.

<sup>71</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 340; Casey, *Son of Man*, 187; Schweizer, *Matthew*, 347.

In this conversation, the content of the name of the Son of Man has been filled out from being a term that signifies a mysterious figure who has been combining glorious power with lowly service, to a fully developed concept of the Son of Man as the glorious judge who will come to exercise his rule.<sup>72</sup> The earthly ministry of Jesus is referred to in Mt. 16:13, his suffering servant role in Mt. 16:21,<sup>73</sup> and his judicial glory in Mt. 16:27–28.<sup>74</sup>

Harrington opines that the passion prediction in Mt 16:21–28 had the “effect of claiming that Jesus knew what awaited him . . . and that he embraced his sufferings and was even in control of the events around him.”<sup>75</sup> Further, the alterations introduced by Matthew, as compared to his source material in Mark, appear to emphasize the aspects of the concept of the Son of Man that include the power and majesty of the eschatological judge, who has the authority to exercise judgment upon humanity in accordance with their actions and to command the angels. As Schweizer notes the appearance of the term “Son of Man” at both the beginning, vs 13, and at the end, vs 28, provides a “framework for the entire section. The question about the Son of Man (vs 13) is finally answered by reference to the judgment”<sup>76</sup> which the Son of Man will carry out. This chapter then advances the understanding of the Son of Man in Matthew’s Gospel, and the term is seen to be full of content, and not merely a modest self-designation.

#### 4.4.3 Features of the Son of Man in Matthew 16

From these verses then, the features of the Son of Man in Matthew’s conception can be summarized as follows. Features previously noted are his coming, his goal of reversing fortunes and status for his followers, having the angels and the kingdom under his authority, and concomitantly, his judicial role. Features added to the portrait are:

- a) it is implied that he is hidden to outsiders, because of the use of the term “Son of Man,” which does not convey any content to the hostile audience;
- b) on the other hand, the occurrences of the term “Son of Man” progressively reveal to the insiders the nature of Jesus character as the Son of Man;
- c) in this episode, Mt. 16:14–17, Jesus is called “Christ” (anointed) in close proximity to the term “Son of Man;”
- d) in this episode, Mt. 16:14–17, Jesus is also called “Son of the living God;”
- e) Jesus begins speaking of his suffering;
- f) the Son of Man is mentioned in connection with the glory of his father, ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ; and finally

<sup>72</sup> Meier, *The Vision of Matthew*, 116.

<sup>73</sup> The designation “Son of Man” is only implicit in Mt. 16:21, since Matthew has replaced it with the pronoun, when compared to the source text.

<sup>74</sup> Meier, *Matthew*, 179; cf. Beare, *Matthew*, 360; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, II.674.

<sup>75</sup> Harrington, *Matthew*, 252.

<sup>76</sup> Schweizer, *Matthew*, 347.

- g) judgment according to deeds is mentioned through the quotation of Ps. 62:13(12) and Prov. 24:12.

## 4.5 Exegesis of Mt. 19:28

In Mt 19:28 the Son of Man is seen as sitting on the throne and promising his followers that they will sit on twelve thrones judging the tribes of Israel (cf. Lk 22:28 for the feasting motif and the thrones of judgment). In Matthew this saying is appended to the incident of the rich young ruler coming to Jesus.

### 4.5.1 Mt 19:28

28<sup>ο</sup> δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὑμεῖς οἱ ἀκολουθήσαντές μοι ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ, ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ, καθήσεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.

28 Jesus said to them, “Truly I tell you, at the renewal of all things, when the Son of Man is seated on the throne of his glory, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.”

#### Variants

καθήσεσθε is read by  $\aleph$ BCD<sup>c</sup>LWΔΘ0281<sup>vid</sup>f<sup>13</sup>28 and many others; καθισσεσθε is read by D\*KΓ and others, while καθεσθησεσθε is read by Zf<sup>1</sup> and a few others.

καὶ ὑμεῖς is read by BCWΘ0281f<sup>13</sup>33 and the Majority text, while καὶ αὐτοὶ is read by the earlier Nestle text and  $\aleph$ DLZf<sup>1</sup> and a few others.

#### Notes

Taken from Q, Matthew’s version of this saying is considerably altered from that found in Lk. 22:28–30.<sup>77</sup> Luke has set this saying in the midst of the Last Supper Discourse, and the notion of Jesus’ followers sitting on thrones judging the tribes of Israel is connected with feasting at the messianic banquet in the kingdom. Matthew, however, has included this idea in the discussion about the rewards for having left everything to follow Jesus.<sup>78</sup> This verse is part of the discussion with the disciples following the conversation initiated by the rich young ruler who was seeking to know what he must do to be saved (cf. Mk 10:17–31).

<sup>77</sup> E.g. Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 161–74; Gundry, *Matthew*, 391–94; Geist, *Menschensohn und Gemeinde*, 238–41; Boring, *Matthew*, 8.389; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.54–56. See also Fred W. Burnett, “Παλιγγενεσία IN MATT. 19:28: A WINDOW ON THE MATTHEAN COMMUNITY?” *JSNT* 17 (1983), 62–63.

<sup>78</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 392. Boring, *Matthew*, 389–90 and footnote 438, points out that as compared to Mk 10:17–31 Matthew has “rearranged the speaking parts to get this neat back-and-forth of rabbinic dialogue.”

The idea of the disciples judging Israel is connected to the image of the Son of Man sitting on his glorious throne in the renewal of the age.<sup>79</sup> The contrast in settings for the saying in Matthew and Luke indicates that it was probably an independent saying, which Matthew has adapted from Q. Some scholars hold that it was created by the early church, possibly by second generation Christians, who had become concerned with governance in the church,<sup>80</sup> while others believe that the reference to judging Israel refers to the Judaism with which they were in conflict, and that encouragingly, “at the eschaton Jesus and his disciples will be revealed to be the most important persons amongst the Jewish people.”<sup>81</sup> Gundry notes that the Lukan concept of Jesus’ kingdom granted by the Father is expressed by Matthew in terms of the glorious throne of the Son of Man, and that this is a typical assimilation on Matthew’s part, utilizing a parallel concept.<sup>82</sup> The Matthean incorporation of this image into this discussion on rewards for discipleship indicates that the concepts it conveys formed a part of the Matthean view of the Son of Man.

Several elements of this saying need to be considered.

*The Throne.* The first is the general image of sitting upon a glorious throne for the purpose of judging. Found also at Mt. 25:31 (see below),<sup>83</sup> this image has been shown by Theisohn not to have been developed out of Christian sources.<sup>84</sup> Rather, this image, while rare, is present in pre-Christian literature.<sup>85</sup> The Testament of Abraham 8:5 has a man, Adam, sitting on a throne of great glory, while at T. Ab 12:4, a wondrous man, Abel, is sitting on a terrifying throne between two gates. In Sir 47:11 a throne of glory is mentioned with reference to the great and glorious King David.

As Theisohn has pointed out, a biblical precedent for God setting another upon the throne can be found in Ps. 132:11, Dan. 4:37, Job 36:5–6.<sup>86</sup> In Ps. 110:1, 5–6 the concepts of righteousness, a judicial role, and opposition to enemy kings are found

<sup>79</sup> For *παλιγγενεσία* see Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 165; Tödt, *Son of Man*, 91; Gundry, *Matthew*, 392; Schweizer, *Matthew*, 389–90; Geist, *Menschensohn und Gemeinde*, 239; Davies & Allison, *Matthew*, III.57–58; Burnett, “Παλιγγενεσία IN MATT. 19:28,” 60–72; J. Duncan M. Derrett, “Palingensia (Matthew 19.28)” *JSNT* 20 (1984), 51–58; David C. Sim, “The Meaning of *παλιγγενεσία* in Matthew 19:28,” *JSNT* 50 (1993), 3–12.

<sup>80</sup> Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 163; Tödt, *Son of Man*, 63–64; Beare, *Matthew*, 400; Boring, *Matthew*, 8.391.

<sup>81</sup> Harrington, *Matthew*, 281. Burnett, “Παλιγγενεσία IN MATT. 19:28,” 63–64, notes that this scene of the disciples on thrones seems to be in tension with the request for pre-eminent positions in Mt. 20:20–28, especially with Jesus’ claim that he cannot grant a seat at his right hand to anyone. Burnett believes that Mt. 19:28 was included to reduce tensions over hierarchy amongst the disciples in his own community, to equalize the status of all twelve, and to emphasize the future, eschatological nature of their function.

<sup>82</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 392; cf. Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 161–74.

<sup>83</sup> A throne is mentioned five times in Matthew: at 5:34 and 23:22, it is God’s throne; at 19:28 and 25:31, the Son of Man is depicted as sitting upon a throne; at 19:28, the disciples are on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

<sup>84</sup> Theisohn *Der auserwählte Richter*, 153–58.

<sup>85</sup> See Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.54.

<sup>86</sup> Theisohn *Der auserwählte Richter*, 85–89; see also 158–59 where Theisohn also refers to 1 Sam. 2:8, Jer 17:12, 14:21, and Isa. 22:23, none of which relate to the Son of Man tradition, however.

in connection with the enthronement of the king by God.<sup>87</sup> Ps. 9:4–9 also connects judgment, the throne, and judging in righteousness, although there the concepts are attributed to God, as a model for human judgment.<sup>88</sup>

The image of the Son of Man sitting upon the throne of his glory also implies his royal status. Although not explicitly called a king in this passage, the kingly role is implicit.

The image of a judicial figure on a throne is found in the *Par. En.* as well.<sup>89</sup> The Elect One is portrayed as being on the throne (45:3, 51:3, 55:4, 61:8) and the kings and mighty ones are to recognize his authority. In *1 Enoch* 62:2, the Elect One again is envisioned to be upon the throne, but now it is described as being “the throne of his glory” (*manbara sebhatihu*), while at *1 Enoch* 69:27, 29 the Son of Man is identified as sitting on the throne of his glory (*manbara sebhatihu*). The Elect One and the Son of Man can be seen as differing names for the same figure, since they share all the same characteristics.<sup>90</sup> Moreover the Elect One, who is depicted on the throne in *1 Enoch* 62:2, later in vs 9 is identified as the Son of Man. The major function of the enthroned Son of Man is to carry out the judgment of the wicked and the salvation of the righteous.<sup>91</sup> Thus the image of the Son of Man on the throne in Mt 19:28 is very similar to that found in *Par. En.*<sup>92</sup>

*The use of αὐτοῦ.* A second element is the use of the possessive pronoun “his” (αὐτοῦ) of the glorious throne (ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ). This is a Semitic construct expression with the possessive pronoun.<sup>93</sup> Daniel 7 is generally acknowledged to be a source for this image of the Son of Man upon the throne; however, in Daniel 7, while thrones are mentioned, and while the court is said to be sitting in judgment, neither the one like a son of man nor the court is said explicitly to be seated on thrones. Only the Ancient of Days takes a seat on his throne. On the other hand, *1 Enoch* 69:27–29 does explicitly portray the Son of Man as sitting upon a throne, and furthermore, the throne is said to be the throne of his glory (*manbara sebhatihu*). The characterization of the throne as the throne of his glory seems to be a development in *Par. En.* on

<sup>87</sup> Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 89–98.

<sup>88</sup> See the exegesis of *1 Enoch* 69:26–29.

<sup>89</sup> Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn*, 62–80; Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 206, considers this to be an Enochic attribute of the Son of Man.

<sup>90</sup> See VanderKam, “Righteous One” 174–75.

<sup>91</sup> Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn*, 75–80.

<sup>92</sup> Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 159–61. I. H. Marshall, “The Synoptic Son of Man Sayings in Recent Discussion,” *NTS* XII (1965–66), 335–36, argues against Vielhauer’s claim in “Gottesreich und Menschensohn” that the Kingdom of God and the Son of Man are mutually irreconcilable concepts, since they are not brought together in Jewish sources, nor are they directly linked in Jesus’ teaching. Admitting that the Son of Man in connection with the Kingdom of God is rare, nonetheless, Marshall shows that the linking does occur. In Dan 7:13 the “one like a son of man” receives “dominion and glory and kingdom.” Whether “son of man” is understood individually or corporately in Dan 7:13, the connection with the kingdom is present. Further in *1 Enoch* 69:26–28, Marshall points out, kingship is clearly implied in the image of the Son of Man sitting on a throne, eradicating sinners from the earth.

<sup>93</sup> F. H. Borsch, “MARK XIV.62 AND I ENOCH LXII.5,” *NTS* XIV (1967–68), 567, note 3.



the passage from Daniel 7, in conjunction with the concepts from the other biblical passages noted above. In Mt. 19:28, the same phrase is used, preserved in the Semitic construct form, and it includes the possessive pronoun. This appears then to be a direct quotation of that phrase.<sup>94</sup>

*Thrones for the Followers of Christ.* A third element to be noted is the development that the followers of Christ are also seated on thrones and passing judgment. In *Par. En.* there is no explicit mention of anyone, except the Chief of Days and the Elect One/Son of Man sitting on the throne. Judgment is not shared with anyone, for it is the role of the Lord of Spirits and the Elect One/Son of Man. The angels do not share in the act of declaring judgment, although they do carry it out. The righteous and elect enjoy the benefits of judgment, but they do not pass judgment. Further, in the biblical passages mentioned above, a human king is set upon the throne, but the idea of a council sitting upon thrones, judging the people, is not present. This idea is partially found in contemporary or later writings. Two locations may be mentioned: Rev 3:21, where a place on a throne is promised to one whom the resurrected Christ chooses, and *1 Enoch* 108:12, where God is said to promise that each faithful one will be seated upon the throne of his honor.<sup>95</sup>

*Influences on the Development of Mt 19:28.* Perhaps, then, the Q saying (Mt 19:28) is a development of implications from two sources coming together. One idea that may inform this image is the interpretation of the vision of Daniel 7 in which the saints of the Most High are given dominion over the gentiles. This suggests that the followers have a governing and judicial role, although it is over gentiles, not Israel as in Mt. 19:28. A second influence may be the implications in *Par. En.*, that the reversal of fortunes for the righteous and elect will include judging the former oppressors (*1 Enoch* 46:5), even as they lie down, rise up, and feast with the Son of Man (*1 Enoch* 62:14–15). This sharing in a glorious existence with the Son of Man may also have led to their sharing a judicial role as well, with the idea of being seated

<sup>94</sup> Caragounis, *The Son of Man*, 171. Borsch, “MARK XIV.62 AND I ENOCH LXII.5,” 567, also notices that the language of Mt. 19:28 and 25:31 “lies much closer to the Enochian phraseology than anything in Mark.” He sees the Matthean phraseology as “witness to a form of ‘tradition’ apart from what Mark has preserved.” Just as likely, in my opinion, is that Matthew has quoted *Par. En.* in using this phrase due to his interest in shaping the Son of Man concept in the mold of the Enochic Son of Man. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.45–55, also “wonder” whether Matthean phraseology here “betrays a knowledge of the Similitudes of Enoch.” Again, a quotation seems more likely. Ulrich Luz, “The Son of Man in Matthew: Heavenly Judge or Human Christ,” *JSNT* 48 (1992), 8, however, is of the opinion that Matthew was not familiar with *Par. En.* and that the references to a throne are simply part of Matthew’s “‘biblical’ language,” similar to references to God’s throne. He further concludes, 17–19, that Matthew gives no hint of knowing any apocalyptic background to the term, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, but rather that it was a term used to identify Jesus with his followers, while at the same time pointing ahead to his eschatological exaltation.

<sup>95</sup> Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.55–56, also recall the Mosaic delegation of authority to twelve leaders over the twelve tribes of Israel, as well as the yearning in benediction 18 of the *Shimoneh Esreh*, “Restore our judges as in former times.”

upon thrones in glory.<sup>96</sup> The Q saying (Mt. 19:28), then, regarding the enthronement of the followers of the Son of Man may be a development, influenced by these two notions.

*Hare's Treatment of Mt. 19:28.* Hare discusses Mt. 19:28 at some length and goes to great pains to drive a wedge between *Par. En.* and Matthew.<sup>97</sup> He acknowledges that most scholars see this verse as evidence of Matthean redaction, especially with regard to the image of the Son of Man on his glorious throne. He also admits to at least an indirect influence of *Par. En.* on Matthew and agrees that there is a fascinating coincidence in the use of apocalyptic imagery in *Par. En.* and Matthew. But he continues to insist that this verse provides no evidence that Matthew had "direct knowledge of the Similitudes."<sup>98</sup> He offers several cautionary comments. First, he notes correctly that more often "the Chosen One" is described as sitting on the throne rather than the Son of Man, intimating that the Son of Man on the throne need not have influenced Matthew. But as VanderKam has shown<sup>99</sup> the terminology and characteristics of this figure in *Par. En.* are fully interchangeable, and this would have been obvious to ancient readers as well as modern. Besides, as Hare recognizes, *Par. En.* does explicitly portray the Son of Man on the throne at *1 Enoch* 69:29. Since the precise image exists in *Par. En.*, it is possible that Matthew was influenced by it.

Second, Hare cautions that the differences between Matthew and *Par. En.*, such as the addition of  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$  and the linguistic function of the term (in *Par. En.* to refer to the main character in the third person, in Matthew, only on the lips of Jesus as a self-designation), ought to point elsewhere for the source of the Matthean concept to passages such as Sir. 47:11, Pss. Sol. 17:28 and 4 Ezra 13:31. But the point of the interest in this verse is precisely the conjunction of the term "Son of Man" and the image of the glorious throne. Nowhere else in ancient literature are the two conjoined in such a way as they are in *Par. En.* and Matthew. Sir. 47:11 does mention a glorious throne, but it is attributed to David, whose sin has been removed and whose royalty is affirmed. Notably, the throne is not the Son of Man's. Further, the throne is glorious, but it is in Israel, not in the heavenly realm. *Psalms of Solomon* 17 does speak of the Messiah having a judicial role, but no throne is mentioned in conjunction with judgeship. Similarly 4 Ezra 13 reveals a vision of a human figure from the sea flying on the clouds. This human figure is the son of the Most High, all nations shall appear before him, and vindication of the righteous and reproof of the wicked will take place. But there is no reference to a throne. Again, the phraseology of "throne of glory" (with or without the possessive pronoun) is not found elsewhere with such precision. For example, *T. Ab.* 8:5 (recension B) speaks of a throne of great glory, 11:6 (recension A), a throne of gold, and 12:4 (recension A) a terrifying throne. Thus, while Hare acknowledges a possible indirect influence of *Par. En.* upon Mt. 19:28, he feels

<sup>96</sup> Matthew, then, in utilizing this saying has apparently added the number twelve, to specify that Jesus' disciples are to be so honored.

<sup>97</sup> Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition*, 162–67.

<sup>98</sup> Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition*, 164.

<sup>99</sup> VanderKam, "Righteous One" 174–75.

there may be a closer relationship elsewhere. When the alternate possible influences are examined, however, his protestations that these other passages must be considered only serves to highlight how precise the similarity is between *Par. En.* and Matthew. This examination simply heightens the probability of Enochian influence on Matthew.

Third, and justifiably, Hare seeks to explain why Matthew altered the Q saying (first person in Lk. 22:28–30) and chose wording that includes the Son of Man on his glorious throne. Adhering to his minimalist convictions, he allows that the verse only refers to Jesus' promise that he will be associated with his disciples in the coming judgment of Israel and that a satisfactory answer to Matthew's editorial activity may be impossible to provide.<sup>100</sup> Unfortunately Hare has defined away a very viable and satisfactory option. Not only do *Par. En.* and Matthew share the same terminology but they share the same understanding of the purpose of the image—the Son of Man sits on his glorious throne for purpose of judgment. The evidence indeed points to an extremely close connection between *Par. En.* and Matthew.

#### 4.5.2 *Characteristics of the Son of Man*

The saying in Mt. 19:28, then, seems to arise out of biblical and pseudepigraphical sources. Matthew has put the saying in the context of the encounter with the rich young ruler, and made it express the rewards for discipleship, in contrast to Luke's image of the messianic banquet. Further, Matthew has connected those rewards with the image of the Son of Man sitting on the throne of his glory. That image seems to be drawn from several influences, but most specifically from *1 Enoch* 69:27, 29, where the Son of Man and “the throne of his glory” are specifically connected. The effect is to depict the Son of Man as judge and ruler.<sup>101</sup>

Mt. 19:28 repeats several characteristics of the Son of Man already noted in previous passages and presents two new features. In Mt. 19:28, the opposition of the Son of Man to persecutors is implied in the image (cf Mt. 10:23), as well as vindication for his followers and a reversal of fortunes and status (cf Mt 13:36–43 and 16:27–28). A clear dichotomy between the righteous and the wicked is also implied (cf Mt. 13:36–43), and his judicial role is portrayed (cf Mt. 13:36–43 and 16:27–28). Sitting upon a throne also implies that this figure has a royal status (cf Mt. 13:36–43, 16:27–28; see also 16:19 [Jesus offering the keys of the kingdom to Peter]).

New features that Mt. 19:28 brings to the Matthean portrayal of the Son of Man are:

- a) sitting on the throne of his glory; and
- b) participation of his followers in the role of judging.

<sup>100</sup> Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition*, 166–67.

<sup>101</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 91, distinguishes between judge and “ruler” in the sense of Dan. 7:13, but it appears to be better to consider that the Son of Man is both judge and ruler, since part of the ruler's responsibility is to judge.

## 4.6 Exegesis of Mt. 24:30–31

In Mt. 24:23–31 it is apparent that the term Son of Man was introduced by Matthew in the first part of verse 30, since it does not appear in the parallel passages of Mk 13:21–27 and Lk. 21:25–28. Jesus quotes Dan. 7:13 and envisions the Son of Man coming on or with the clouds. Matthean additions, when compared to Mark, are the reference to the sign of the Son of Man, to mourning by the people of earth (alluding to Zech. 12:10–14), the mention of the trumpet, and the addition of the personal pronoun “his.” It is appropriate, then, to expect that this passage reveals something of Matthew’s understanding of the Son of Man.

### 4.6.1 Mt. 24:30–31

<sup>30</sup>καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν οὐρανῶ, καὶ τότε κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς· <sup>31</sup>καὶ ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ μετὰ σάλπιγγος μεγάλης, καὶ ἐπισυνάξουσιν τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπ’ ἄκρων οὐρανῶν ἕως [τῶν] ἄκρων αὐτῶν.<sup>102</sup>

<sup>30</sup>Then the sign of the Son of Man will appear in heaven, and then all the tribes of the earth will mourn, and they will see ‘the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven’ with power and great glory. <sup>31</sup>And he will send out his angels with a loud trumpet call, and they will gather his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.

#### Variants

In Mt 24:30, ἐν οὐρανῶ is represented by  $\aleph$  B L  $\Theta$  700; ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ is read by  $Wf^{1,13}$  33 and the Majority text; while τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς is read by D.

The word order of τότε κόψονται is reversed by D  $\Theta f^{1,13}$ , while κόψονται only is preserved by  $\aleph^*$  and some others.

In vs 31, the words σάλπιγγος μεγάλης are preserved in  $\aleph$  L W  $\Delta$   $\Theta f^1$  700.892\* and others; σαλπιδος φωνῆς μεγάλης is read by B  $f^{13}$  33, the Majority text and others; σαλπιδος καὶ φωνῆς μεγάλης is read by D 1241 and others.

Instead of ἄκρων οὐρανῶν, ἄκρων τῶν οὐρανῶν is read by  $\Theta f$  13 700 and a few others.

<sup>102</sup> In vs 31, Matthean additions to the Markan original are: καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν οὐρανῷ, as well as κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ, and τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Changes from Mk 13:26–27 are ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν and the addition of the word πολλῆς to δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης. An imprecise quotation of Dan. 7:13 is also present: τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Further it can be surmised that Matthew added the words κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ as an allusion to Zech. 12:10–14.

Again, [τῶν] is preserved by B Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33.700.892 and a few others, while it is omitted by the major witnesses:  $\aleph$  D L W and the Majority text.

At the end of vs 31, ἀρχομένων δε τούτων γινεσθαι αναβλεψατε και επαρατε τας κεφαλαις υμων, διοτι εγγιζει η απολυτρωσις υμων is added by D 1093 and the Old Latin witnesses under the influence of Lk. 21:28.

### Notes

Presuming Matthew's use of Mark in compiling his Gospel, several significant alterations can be noted.<sup>103</sup> Specifically, Matthew has added the first portion regarding the appearance of the sign of the Son of Man in the heavens and the mourning of all the tribes of the earth. Matthew has also amplified the glory of the scene by noting that the clouds are of heaven (τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) and adding the word "great" (πολλῆς) to the notion of glory. Further Matthew has added the note concerning the trumpet call and the possessive pronoun, αὐτοῦ, to both the "angels" and the "elect."<sup>104</sup> These Matthean differences reveal interesting aspects of Matthew's portrayal of the Son of Man, and so five significant differences between Matthew's version of this passage and the Markan version must be investigated. They are:

- a) the appearance of the sign of the Son of Man;
- b) the mourning of the tribes of earth;
- c) the change of preposition from ἐν to ἐπί before the clouds and the addition of τοῦ οὐρανοῦ;
- d) the addition of the third person possessive pronoun αὐτοῦ to the angels and to the elect; and
- e) the mention of the trumpet call.

Three basic questions must be asked of these changes. First, what sources have been used, and secondly, what reasons can be deduced for such changes? Thirdly, does a similar combination of sources exist in another location in the New Testament?

*The Sign of the Son of Man τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.* As numerous commentators have noticed,<sup>105</sup> before the citation of Dan 7:13 about the Son of

<sup>103</sup> Most would say that Matthew has followed his Markan source, but altered it in significant ways, e.g. Harrington, *Matthew*, 336; Tödt, *Son of Man*, 80, and Robert Horton Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), 52–54. France, *Matthew-Evangelist & Teacher*, 41–49, claims to be less certain about the Two-Source hypothesis, although the Griesbach Theory is also untenable. He believes that a more complex process must be understood, allowing for the introduction of oral material in the composition of the Gospel. See also Casey's discussion in *Solution*, 212–217.

<sup>104</sup> In Mk 13:27, αὐτοῦ is also present in some witnesses after ἀγγέλους, but probably not original. After ἐκλεκτοῦς, αὐτοῦ is questionable, even though Nestle-Aland<sup>27</sup> includes it in the text, but in square brackets. It may have been added in both locations due to the influence of this verse, Mt. 24:31.

<sup>105</sup> Harrington, *Matthew*, 338; Tödt, *Son of Man*, 80; Gundry, *Matthew*, 488; Beare, *Matthew*, 471; Hare, *Son of Man Tradition*, 170; Boring, *Matthew*, NIB, VIII.444; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.359; Colpe, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, *TDNT*, VIII.437.

Man coming with the clouds, Matthew has added a reference to the sign of the Son of Man.<sup>106</sup> The content of the sign of the Son of Man has been hotly debated, with some taking the view that a heavenly portent of some kind, a light, a banner, or the cross, was envisioned,<sup>107</sup> while most of modern scholarship views the genitive as appositive, understanding that the sign *is* the Son of Man himself.<sup>108</sup> This understanding is supported by the comparison with the sign of Jonah (Mt. 12:41, Lk 11:32). Just as Jonah was himself the sign by which the people of Nineveh were brought to repentance, so the sign of the Son of Man can be seen as the appearance the Son of Man himself, coming to bring judgment to the nations of the world. The appearance of a sign or signal before that gathering in of the people is also found in Isa. 11:12, 49:22, Deut. 30:4. In these passages the sign or standard is a military image that accompanies the gathering in of the people and it is envisioned in connection with the idea of the restoration of the scattered people of Israel. Thus, while the imagery alludes to a military situation, with a military standard visibly present, it has also become a metaphor for something powerful, unmistakable, and redemptive.<sup>109</sup>

*Mourning by the Tribes of Earth κόψονται πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς.* Following the image of the military situation, Matthew introduces another allusion filled with judgment. Alluding to Zech. 12:10–14,<sup>110</sup> Matthew reveals that in his view, the coming of the Son of Man will be accompanied by mourning by all the tribes of the earth. This mourning will be generated by the judgment the Son of Man will enact. Matthew has “considerably altered”<sup>111</sup> the Markan version, in which the implication is that the coming of the Son of Man will be a day of rejoicing. For Matthew, however, that day will be accompanied by mourning in the face of judgment.<sup>112</sup> This indicates

<sup>106</sup> *Didache* 16:6 repeats this reference to the sign of the Son of Man.

<sup>107</sup> T. F. Glasson, “The Ensign of the Son of Man (Matt. XXIV, 30),” *JTS* 15 (1964) 299–300; Harrington, *Matthew*, 338. Colpe, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, *TDNT*, VIII.437, argues the sign was a banner; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.359–60, outline the various views, and then argue for the cross. Beare, *Matthew*, 471, notes that patristic interpretation favored an appearance of the cross and that in iconography Jesus often is envisioned as arising from the dead brandishing a cross.

<sup>108</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 80; Meier, *Matthew*, 287; Gundry, *Matthew*, 488; Beare, *Matthew*, 471; Hare, *Son of Man Tradition*, 173; Lambrecht, *Out of the Treasure*, 258; Boring, *Matthew*, NIB VIII.444.

<sup>109</sup> Schweitzer, *Matthew*, 455–56, reviews all the allusions and ends up suggesting that the sign was not meant to be understood literally as a portent, the cross, or a light, but that it was metaphorical, referring to the reality of God’s final victory that is beyond words.

<sup>110</sup> Gundry, *Use of the OT*, 52–54; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.360.

<sup>111</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 80.

<sup>112</sup> Lambrecht, *Out of the Treasure*, 259, notes that Matthew’s universality is apparent in the reference to all the tribes being judged. This universality also appears in the description of the Last Judgment in Mt. 25:31–46, as all people are to appear before the throne. See also Meier, *Matthew*, 287, and Boring, *Matthew*, NIB VIII.444. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 81, also sees that the judgment is for everyone in the omission of the use of the concept of the “pierced one” from Zech. 12:10. Jesus’ enemies who pierced him are not the only ones who will be judged, but everyone. The absence of the allusion to the “pierced one” also emphasizes the Son of Man’s authority to judge, according to Tödt.

that Matthew “wishes to emphasize the judgment which will be initiated by the appearing of the Son of Man.”<sup>113</sup>

While one cannot know precisely Matthew’s motivation for adding the reference to mourning, it appears that it reveals his interest in the judgment which the Son of Man will initiate. Associated with this interest is the question of what influenced Matthew to introduce this theme to what in Mark appears to be a day of rejoicing. Matthew seems to have the view that the coming of the Son of Man will mean judgment. This judgment will be vindication for some, since the metaphor of the sign is a redemptive image for the scattered righteous who will be gathered together. But this judgment will be condemnation for others, who will mourn as a result of it. Matthew is concerned to show both outcomes for the sake of the currently oppressed righteous ones.

Another first century work, *Par. En.*, envisions a judging Son of Man. The righteous and elect of that Son of Man will rejoice at the judgment he enacts (e.g. *I Enoch* 62:13–16), but those who are condemned, the kings and the mighty ones, will be dismayed, downcast in face, and filled with shame (*I Enoch* 46:6; 48:8; 62:4, 5, 10; 63:11).

Hare claims that while eschatological fear is common in *Par. En.*, there is no parallel in *Par. En.* to the verb κόψονται “they will mourn” in Mt 24:30 or כָּסְפוּ of Zech 12:10.<sup>114</sup> While in the narrow sense he is correct, in a broader sense it is an inappropriate conclusion. *Par. En.*, as just noted, has several ways of indicating the reaction of the kings and the mighty ones and their followers to the judgment of the Son of Man. All of those reactions of being filled with shame, of being downcast, of having their faces filled with darkness, together with their reaction to the judgment itself, can be neatly and concisely summarized in Zechariah’s characterization of mourning. While it is agreed that Matthew has alluded to Zechariah, it is also apparent that in content the allusion is highly consistent with the concept presented in *Par. En.* This may be an instance, then, of Matthew’s having been influenced by *Par. En.*’s portrayal of the Son of Man,<sup>115</sup> and as a consequence of choosing the passage from Zechariah to illustrate people’s reactions. It is very possible in this way that Matthew has intentionally shifted the concept of the Son of Man he received towards that found in *Par. En.*

*On the Clouds of Heaven ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.* The change in Mt. 24:30 of preposition from ἐν to ἐπὶ before the clouds and the addition of τοῦ οὐρανοῦ again seem to underline Matthew’s shift of the concept of the Son of Man towards that in *Par. En.* Matthew uses ἐπὶ in harmony with the Septuagint of Dan. 7:13<sup>116</sup>. The addition of τοῦ οὐρανοῦ also is in harmony with the Septuagint.

<sup>113</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 81.

<sup>114</sup> Hare, *Son of Man*, 173–74. Further, in Matthew, it is all the tribes of earth who mourn, not the kings and mighty ones, although the followers of the kings and mighty ones are present in the accounts of *Par. En.* These followers would certainly be included in Zechariah’s “all tribes” which Matthew envisions.

<sup>115</sup> Contra Hare, *Son of Man Tradition*, 174.

<sup>116</sup> Gundry, *Use of the OT*, 52–54.

This addition may also, however, have been influenced conceptually on Matthew's part. The Markan version omits the reference to the heavens in connection with the clouds, which in Matthew's mind may have been misleading. Matthew may have added the reference to heavenly clouds in order to underline the heavenly origin of the Son of Man. While this addition paints more completely the picture of the power and glory of the Son of Man as related to Daniel 7,<sup>117</sup> it also matches the heavenly origin of the Son of Man conceptualized in *Par. En.*

"His" Angels and "His" Elect τούς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ . . . τούς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ. The addition of the third person possessive pronoun αὐτοῦ qualifying the angels and the elect is a small but significant change by Matthew.<sup>118</sup> Mark has envisioned that the angels gather in the elect, but Matthew has added the detail that the angels, as well as the elect, belong to the Son of Man, and changes the verb to the plural to reflect that change.<sup>119</sup> This has the effect of underlining the sovereignty of the Son of Man, and attributing power and authority to him over the angels of heaven.<sup>120</sup> That the Son of Man is envisioned as having an entourage of angels at his behest again is consistent with the view that a shift towards the conceptualization of the Son of Man in *Par. En.* has taken place.

*The Loud Trumpet Call* μετὰ σάλπιγγος μεγάλης. The mention of the trumpet call appears to be an allusion to a passage such as Isa. 27:13.<sup>121</sup> The trumpet together with the signal is also found in Isa. 18:3, where the people are encouraged to look when they see it and listen when they hear it.<sup>122</sup> Further, in the tenth benediction of the *Shemoneh Esreh* the trumpet, the ensign and the gathering of the people from the four corners of the earth are all found together.<sup>123</sup> It appears to be an apocalyptic motif that Matthew thought appropriate to introduce into his picture of the coming Son of Man.

*Another Similar Interpretation.* Several commentators point out that a similar combination of passages occurs with the concept of the coming Son of Man in Rev. 1:7, with a similar "inexact rendering" of the verses alluded to.<sup>124</sup> Gundry also graphically points out that the order of the citations of Dan. 7:13 and Zech. 12:10 is reversed. This indicates that the combination of the two passages as applied to the

<sup>117</sup> Gundry, *Use of the OT*, 54.

<sup>118</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 489.

<sup>119</sup> Some witnesses to Mk 13:27 add αὐτοῦ to both ἀγγέλους and ἐκλεκτοὺς, but probably under the influence of Mt. 24:31. Nestle-Aland<sup>27</sup> omits it after ἀγγέλους, but includes it in square brackets (indicating that the editors are unconvinced of its originality) after ἐκλεκτοὺς.

<sup>120</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 82; Meier, *The Vision of Matthew*, 171; Harrington, *Matthew*, 339; Davies & Allison, *Matthew*, III.363; Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 76.

<sup>121</sup> Harrington, *Matthew*, 336; Gundry, *Matthew*, 489. A trumpet blast is also mentioned in *Didache* 16:6.

<sup>122</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 488 notes this passage, as well as Jer. 4:21, 6:1, 5:27, and 1QM 2:15–4:17.

<sup>123</sup> Beare, *Matthew*, 471; Hare, *Son of Man Tradition*, 170, and Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.363, point out this similarity.

<sup>124</sup> E.g. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 81; Gundry, *Use of the OT*, 52–54; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.360; Meier, *Matthew*, 287; Hare, *Son of Man Tradition*, 173.



coming Son of Man had taken place before the composition of either Revelation or Matthew, and was known to both, but that the authors of the Gospel and the Revelation used this combination independently of one another.<sup>125</sup>

#### 4.6.2 Characteristics of the Son of Man in Mt. 24:30–31

Several characteristics of the Son of Man in Mt. 24:30–31 have already been noted, such as his coming, his opposition to persecutors, his vindication of his followers, his judicial role, his sending angels who are “his,” and his coming “in glory.” This passage, however, adds several new features as well. They are:

- a) the idea that all the nations of the world, *πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς*, are to be affected by the Son of Man;
- b) the image of coming on the clouds, *ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*;
- c) the concept that the elect, as well as the angels, are “his,” *αὐτοῦ*;
- the notion that the elect are “gathered,” *ἐπισυνάξουσιν*; and
- e) the perspective that the elect are to be gathered from the whole world, “from the four winds,” *ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων*.

The last two features have not been discussed above, since they are taken over from the parallel passage in Mk 13:27. However, they are also consistent with the conceptualization of the Son of Man in *Par. En.*<sup>126</sup>

### 4.7 Exegesis of Mt. 25:31–34, 41, 46

The final Son of Man saying that is unique to Matthew is part of the conclusion to the Apocalyptic Discourse of chapters 24–25. The Son of Man is depicted in an eschatological, judicial role, accompanied by angels, seated on a throne as a king. The criterion for judgment is the way the ones being judged have treated the poor and needy, with whom the king identifies himself.

<sup>125</sup> See also Adela Yarbro Collins, “The ‘Son of Man’ Tradition and the Book of Revelation,” in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, edited by James H. Charlesworth (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 536–68.

<sup>126</sup> The idea of gathering the elect from the four winds is consistent with the image portrayed in *Par. En.*, where in *1 Enoch* 61 the angels with measuring cords are sent off to “reveal all that is hidden in the depths of the earth, Those who have been destroyed by the desert, And those who have been devoured by the fish of the sea and by wild beasts.” They will return to the presence of the Elect One. The exact terminology is not repeated by Matthew, but the concept of being gathered from the whole world is the same.

### 4.7.1 Redactional and Form-critical Considerations

#### *Redaction Criticism*

This highly studied and debated pericope<sup>127</sup> has several fascinating issues, but the one that concerns this topic most directly is the question of its redactional status. What is its form? What is its origin? Is it a legitimate source for elucidating Matthew's shaping of the concept of the Son of Man?

The first fact to be recognized is that this passage, as well as the whole chapter from which it comes, is unique to Matthew.<sup>128</sup> On that basis alone, it deserves attention. Further, when asking the redactional-critical questions, it must be admitted that, strictly speaking, all that can be said absolutely is that it is unique to Matthew, and anything beyond that observation is in the realm of conjecture. The most cautious conclusion is that it was composed by Matthew,<sup>129</sup> but that cautious conclusion is perhaps too simple and unsatisfying.

Beyond the observation that this passage is unique to Matthew, several details can be observed, which possibly shed light on its redactional history. Several discrepancies have been highlighted in an attempt to show that part of the pericope is a Matthean composition, while the rest of it has been adapted from elsewhere and redacted. Some of the discrepancies noted are:<sup>130</sup>

- a) in verse 31, the central figure is called the Son of Man, while in verses 34, 40, the central figure is termed a king;
- b) in verses 32–33 the comparison of the shepherd separating the sheep from the goats is used to describe the judgment process, but in verses 34–36 shepherding themes do not reappear;

<sup>127</sup> Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People*, 207. See also John R. Donahue, S.J., "The 'Parable' of the Sheep and the Goats: A Challenge to Christian Ethics," *Theological Studies* 47(1986), 3–8, for an excellent summary of the interpretational issues of the pericope. See also Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.416–35. Cf. also Catchpole, "A Re-appraisal of Matthew XXV.31–46," 355–56.

<sup>128</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 511, states that Matthew is "responsible for the description of the sheep and goats." He sees all of Mt. 25:31–46 as a Matthean creation, which is completely harmonious with other themes in the Gospel. Schweizer, *Matthew*, 475, sees two options for the origins of the pericope: either it was a Matthean invention or a direct discourse of Jesus. He argues against seeing it as coming from the mouth of Jesus because Jesus probably did not identify himself with the eschatological judicial king since he only looked ahead to the coming kingdom; nor does Schweizer see Jesus identifying himself with the poor.

<sup>129</sup> Gray, Sherman W., *The Least of My Brothers: Matthew 25:31–46; A History of Interpretation*, Atlanta: Scholars Press; 1989, 351–52, 355.

<sup>130</sup> Lambrecht, *Out of the Treasure*, 265–66 notes three sets of discrepancies: the transition from shepherd and sheep to the king and people, the shift from Son of Man to king, and the shift from a corporate to an individual perspective in the course of the passage. Like a good teacher, Lambrecht outlines two types of explanation, one in which Matthew is seen as redacting a prior tradition, and the other in which Matthew is seen as composing the whole, using traditional elements. He presents the first fairly, but prefers the second (282). I found myself more convinced by his presentation of the first than by his preference for the second.

- c) in verse 32, a gender change is noted where the first reference to the judged is neuter plural, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, while the second reference is masculine plural, αὐτούς; this also seems to reflect a shift from the corporate perspective to an individualistic perspective; and
- d) the content of verse 31 fits extremely well with the portrait of the Son of Man already developed in the Gospel, an observation which suggests that this verse came from the pen of the evangelist; but some of the concepts in the rest of the passage do not fit so neatly: (i) an emphasis, unusual for Matthew, on justification by works, and (ii) two *hapax legomena*, the term κατηγορούμενοι, “accursed,” (vs 41) and the mention of κόλασιν αἰώνιον, the “eternal punishment,” (vs 46) to which the condemned are consigned.

All these items, it is argued, suggest that there is a redactional seam somewhere between verse 31 and verse 34.<sup>131</sup> The suggestion is that verse 31 came from Matthew’s pen,<sup>132</sup> but the rest of it, or most of it, came from a tradition taken over by Matthew.<sup>133</sup> But the crucial question is where the redactional seam lies. If it cannot be placed precisely, then another explanation must sought.

Several locations may be possible. One possibility suggested by items a), b), and d) is that the seam lies between verses 33 and 34. This is attractive because the scene definitely shifts to a courtroom presided over by a king. In vs 34 the conversation is between the king and the judged. The king pronounces the judgment, and both the righteous and the condemned, who address the king as “Lord,” express surprise at their fate. Upon closer examination, however, this location is impossible, for in verse 34, the judged have already been separated. This separation is crucial to the judgment scene and mention of it must have been included with verses 34–46, in order to introduce in a meaningful way the comments by the king and the ones who are having judgment passed on them. Therefore a line must be sought earlier in the passage. The separation to the left and to the right has already been introduced by ἀφορίσαι αὐτούς and illustrated by the shepherd comparison of verses 32–33. This observation would make it attractive to locate the redactional seam between verse 31 and verse 32.

Item c) above, however, the observation that there is a gender change and a change in perspective from a corporate view to an individualized point of view, supports

<sup>131</sup> Of those who posit a pre-Matthean tradition, vs 34 is seen as the beginning of that tradition, although certain Mattheanisms, such as τότε, δεῦτε, κληρονομήσαι, and τοῦ πατρός μου, indicate Matthew’s editing, Lambrecht, *Out of the Treasure*, 267–68.

<sup>132</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 73 agrees with Jeremias, saying, “we may infer... that Matthew himself stylized v. 31 as an introduction.” He notes the close relation of vs 31 with Mt. 16:27, 19:28. Lambrecht, *Out of the Treasure*, 267–8, also recognizes the Matthean quality of the passage, though it was not necessarily created *ex nihilo*, suggesting that this passage could be a development out of passages like Mt. 16:27, 19:28, and Mt. 13, with its judgment motif in the Parables of the Weeds and the Fisherman’s Net.

<sup>133</sup> Schweizer, *Matthew*, 475, sees the first half of Mt. 25:31 as coming from Mk 8:38, and the rest being adapted from Mt. 19:28.

locating the seam after verse 32a.<sup>134</sup> But in that case, αὐτοὺς needs an antecedent, and that antecedent is aptly found precisely in πάντα τὰ ἔθνη in verse 32a. It is difficult to place much weight on item c) anyway, because the sentence as it stands is acceptable Greek. Besides, it is unlikely that a shift from a corporate to an individual perspective is even involved here, because the verb, συναχθήσονται, of which πάντα τὰ ἔθνη is the subject, is already plural, whereas grammatically in Greek a singular is expected with a neuter plural subject. The shift from the neuter, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, to the masculine, αὐτοὺς, thus does not reflect a redactional shift from corporate to individual, for it appears that many individuals are in view all along.<sup>135</sup>

This, then, necessitates considering the possibility of locating the redactional seam after verse 31. The problem raised by this location, however, is that now αὐτοῦ, the one before whom the nations are gathered, needs an antecedent. This antecedent is logically the Son of Man in vs 31. Bultmann, in order to preserve the narrative integrity of the tradition and to explain the presence of two terms, “Son of Man” and “king,” has suggested that the Son of Man coming in glory with his angels is a redactional substitution for an original “God” or “king” in the first sentence of the pericope.<sup>136</sup> This indeed appears to be likely, and Bultmann’s point is well taken, that an original sentence with “God” or “king” is needed to begin the pericope. Whatever the subject of that sentence may have been, it would have provided the antecedent for αὐτοῦ in verse 32. Therefore it is extremely unlikely that a redactional seam can be located between verses 31 and 32.

The attempt to locate the redactional seam precisely has thus proved futile. None of the possible locations has proved feasible. Bultmann’s hypothesis that this was originally a single, comprehensive tradition, and that Matthew has redactionally introduced “Son of Man” into it is most likely.<sup>137</sup> In this case, verses 31–46 must be seen as a whole. Further, if the reference to the “Son of Man” did replace “God” or “king” in verse 31, then it nicely serves Matthew’s purpose of further shaping the concept of the Son of Man in royal terms.

Then what of the Mattheanisms and the two *hapax legomena*? There are two

<sup>134</sup> Lambrecht, *Out of the Treasure*, 267–68, notes that several exegetes argue that 31–32a “seem to be completely Matthean.”

<sup>135</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 512 believes that the shift to αὐτοὺς implies that the judgment is of individuals, not nations.

<sup>136</sup> Bultmann, R., *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 124; Colpe, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, *TDNT* VIII.461. Gundry, *Matthew*, 513, notes that the “king” in this passage cannot refer to God, as the king refers to God as “my father.”

<sup>137</sup> Lambrecht, *Out of the Treasure*, 272–73, summarizes this position as the “common interpretation,” in which it is believed that a pre-Matthean tradition can be recovered, but that it has been radically redacted by Matthew. In the original parable, the king represented God, the nations represented all people, and the “least of these” represented anyone without prestige or status, while in Matthew’s reworking, the king is Jesus, the nations are the gentiles only, and the “least of these” are Christian missionaries. Thus the original parable was about radical love, but in Matthew’s re-working it becomes a “Parousia Discourse.”

Lambrecht himself, 282, cautiously concludes that the pericope is a Matthean composition that relies heavily on traditional material, and that it is strongly influenced by the memory of Christ, “who committed himself unconditionally to his destitute brothers and sisters.”

possibilities for explaining these details: either the passage is wholly Matthean,<sup>138</sup> or the passage is a prior tradition that has been heavily redacted by Matthew. The two *hapax legomena* could be seen as unique instances of Matthean terminology, but it is more likely that they should be seen as evidence of an older tradition, even though one cannot be absolutely certain about this. The clear Mattheanisms, on the other hand, indicate that Matthew has definitely redacted it.<sup>139</sup> The introductory verse with the insertion and descriptions of the Son of Man appears to be Matthean. Further, clear Mattheanisms are the uses of “then”<sup>140</sup>, “righteous”<sup>141</sup>, “my father”<sup>142</sup>, and “Truly I tell you. . .”<sup>143</sup> Thus the evidence supports fairly conclusively that Mt. 25:31–46 is a prior tradition, which Matthew has heavily redacted.<sup>144</sup>

### *The Nature of the Prior Tradition*

Then the question arises as to whether the prior tradition was Jewish or Christian.<sup>145</sup> In favor of seeing it as a Christian tradition is the self-identification of the king with “the least of these my brothers.” This, it is argued, is a particularly Christian concept, which is supported by the concept of the incarnation<sup>146</sup> and by Matthew’s emphasis on the name “Emmanuel,” “God with us.”<sup>147</sup> Bultmann suggests that the pericope is a Christian adaptation of a Jewish tradition, in which “the name of God was replaced by the title Son of Man,” since the ones being judged are not specifically Christian.<sup>148</sup>

<sup>138</sup> Gray, *The Least of My Brothers*, 351–52, 355.

<sup>139</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 511–16, notes all the Mattheanisms in detail in his study of this pericope. Lambrecht, *Out of the Treasure*, 268, also notes these evidences of “Matthean redactional intervention.”

<sup>140</sup> Mt uses τότε 89 times, Mk 6, and Lk. 12.

<sup>141</sup> 13 times in Mt. without a synoptic parallel, nine times in Lk., once shared by Mt. and Lk.

<sup>142</sup> Mt. uses “my father” fifteen times, Lk. two times, and they share an instance, Mt. 11:27 = Lk. 10:22.

<sup>143</sup> Mt. uses the clause twenty-three times without parallel, and another seven instances that are paralleled in Mk or Lk.; Mk uses it seven times without parallel, and another seven instances that are paralleled in Mt. or Lk.; Lk uses it five times without parallel, and shares it twice with Mt. or Mk.

Some see the presence of δεῦτε and κληρονομήσατε as Mattheanisms, but this is not as clear, since Mt. uses δεῦτε four times without parallel, but Mk uses it three times; and Mt. uses κληρονομήσατε three times without parallel, and Mk uses it once. These statistics do not point clearly enough to these terms as Mattheanisms.

<sup>144</sup> This is also the conclusion of Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.417–18.

<sup>145</sup> Lambrecht, *Out of the Treasure*, 270, summarizes the conclusions of several scholars to the effect that the pericope fits well with Jesus’ teaching and could be ascribed to Jesus himself in a Jewish or Jewish-Christian milieu, since Jesus does not speak of himself, but of God, since he exhorts his listeners to a radical love of neighbor, and since it coheres well with Jesus’ views on the inescapability of judgment, the absence of any awareness of reward-righteousness, and the precedence of love over law.

<sup>146</sup> Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 493.

<sup>147</sup> Meier, *Matthew*, 304.

<sup>148</sup> Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 123–24. Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 493, also suggests that the presence of the Son of Man in verse 31 is due to a Christian adaptation of a possibly original “king.”

He also claims that the “specifically Christian content of the passage does not lie in the moral, but... in the identification of the person of the judge with the needy.”<sup>149</sup> Tödt argues that the solidarity of the king with the needy is a reflection of Jesus’ messianic activity on earth as portrayed by Matthew.<sup>150</sup> But he rejects Bultmann’s conjecture that it arose out of a Jewish tradition, instead agreeing with T.W. Manson and J. Jeremias in crediting it to “the Master Himself” since it contains “features of such startling originality.”<sup>151</sup> The Jewish concept of a transcendent, unapproachable God, whom humans dare not lay eyes upon, it is said, tends to militate against the Jewishness of the tradition. Further, the list of acts of mercy excludes lament for and the burial of the dead and care for widows and orphans, which are included in Jewish lists of the most important acts a person can do.<sup>152</sup>

In favor of accepting this tradition as of Jewish origin, however, are several rabbinic passages, two of which can be mentioned. Davies and Allison see a “striking analogy” in *Midr. Ps.* on 118:17, in which the gate of Yahweh is open for those who have fed the hungry, given drink to the thirsty, clothed the naked, brought up orphans, given alms and practiced works of love.<sup>153</sup> M. Tann. 15:9<sup>154</sup> even represents God as being identified with the needy, “God says to Israel, ‘My children, when you have given food to the poor, I account it as though you have given food to me.’” Here, even though it is only a comparison, with the use of “as though,” clearly the idea of God in some way being the recipient of acts done to the needy is present.<sup>155</sup> Similarly, in *Par. En.*, the divine vice-gerent, the Elect One/Righteous One/Son of Man, acts as avenger, vindicator, and champion for the righteous oppressed (e.g. *1 Enoch* 47:2,

<sup>149</sup> Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 405, in the *addenda*. This is surely inaccurate, since in the *Par. En.* the Son of Man identifies with the oppressed to the extent of passing judgment on the oppressors for their treatment of the righteous oppressed (e.g. *1 Enoch* 47:2, 4), and no one except Milik claims *Par. En.* is Christian. The identification extends to the epithets used: “righteous” and “elect” are used both of the Son of Man and of the oppressed. Further, the Son of Man acts on God’s behalf and is the avenger and vindicator of the oppressed, their champion both for judgment and for their blessed existence in his presence after their vindication (*1 Enoch* 62:13–16).

Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 493, notes that while in many prayers God is addressed as king, it is unlikely that God would be conceived of as being in the poor and needy, and that therefore it is likely that this identification is a Christian motif.

<sup>150</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 75.

<sup>151</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 74; Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 249; Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 145. While Jesus certainly displayed “startling originality,” that alone cannot be conclusive evidence that this tradition originated with Jesus.

<sup>152</sup> Schweizer, *Matthew*, 477.

<sup>153</sup> Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 418.

<sup>154</sup> Even though this midrash on Deut. 15:9 post-dates the New Testament, many concepts and convictions in early Rabbinism do reflect first-century thought. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 74, agrees that the one standard of love for the judgment was already present in Judaism.

<sup>155</sup> Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 124, has found numerous parallels in Jewish, Mandaean, Egyptian, and Persian literature, in which God is identified with humans through their behavior in which they imitate God’s merciful acts. One similar notion in Hebrew Scripture is Prov. 19:17, “Whoever is kind to the poor lends to the Lord, and will be repaid in full.”

4, 62:13–16). Further, just as Christians can countenance both a transcendent and immanent God, so the concept of God in Jewish thought is broad enough to countenance both a transcendent God and a God who identifies with the poor. Again, the list of merciful acts is not meant to be exhaustive,<sup>156</sup> but representative. Therefore it is possible that Matthew took over and redacted a prior Jewish tradition.<sup>157</sup>

### *Form Criticism*

The form of the passage is also debated, though somewhat mildly, as compared to its redaction. Since it does not explicitly use any words of comparison, such as “The Kingdom of heaven is like...” or “It is as when...” one may argue that the passage is not strictly a parable, but rather a prophetic description or a narration of the actual expected events of the eschatological judgment.<sup>158</sup> Further, the Son of Man is never spoken of as a character in a parable. If the passage is understood to narrate future events, then its interpretation is approached in a specific way, for it becomes important to know who is being judged: the world in general, or just a certain portion of the world, such as Gentiles only, or non-Christian Gentiles only.<sup>159</sup> It also becomes important to know who “the least of these my brothers” are: the needy in general, or Christians in particular, or Christian missionaries specifically.<sup>160</sup> These types of inter-

<sup>156</sup> Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People*, 218–21, argues that the very make-up of the list, as compared to other lists, narrows it to Christians, who can be assured “that the nations would ultimately be judged on the basis of their treatment of Christians.” He believes that the absence of “widows and orphans” in particular, indicates that Matthew has purposefully truncated a traditional list. He does admit, though, that in the original form, this list may have “formed the core of a pre-Matthean ‘universalist’ tradition.” If Matthew were concerned to limit the recipients of this care to the disciples, however, it seems to me he would have used the term οἱ μικροί rather than its superlative form.

<sup>157</sup> Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 496, notes that there is “surprisingly little that is specifically Christian.” There is no forgiveness of sins, no grace of God, the invitation into the kingdom is based on deeds, not on the forgiveness of sins, there is no trace of saving faith, no trace of trying to serve Christ, no mercy to the accused, and while there is justice, it is without mercy. Somewhat patronizingly he concludes that this is more likely Jewish in origin. Perhaps more accurately it can be concluded that this reflects an apocalyptic viewpoint, whether Jewish or Christian!

<sup>158</sup> Floyd V. Filson, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London: A&C Black; 2nd Edition, 1971) 266, calls it a “description of the last judgment,” while Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 492, says it is an apocalyptic vision. Schweizer, *Matthew*, 475, considers it to be not a parable, but an account of the judgment of the world, while Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.418, describe it as “not a parable but ‘a word-picture of the Last Judgement’.”

<sup>159</sup> Filson, *Matthew*, 267, takes the unusual position that this implies the resurrection of the dead, so that all humanity may be judged – an extreme universalist position. Meier, *Matthew*, 303, and “Nations or Gentiles in Matthew 28:19,” *CBQ* 39 (1977), 94–102 argues that πάντα τὰ ἔθνη refers to all the nations, including the Jewish nation, not just the Gentiles.

<sup>160</sup> Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People*, 214–18, argues that for Matthew οἱ μικροί are the disciples of Jesus in Mt. 18:6, 10, 14, and that ἐνὶ τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων in Mt. 25: 40, 45 (cf. Mt 10:42) is very similar, and therefore means the same. Lambrecht, *Out of the Treasure*, 278–9, however, argues cogently and convincingly that τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων is “referring back (*specifically*) to the six types of needy people just mentioned; they are “the

pretation have been categorized as “universalist” or “particularist,”<sup>161</sup> and scholars who view this pericope as a narration of the end-times are roughly equally divided about its universal or particular application.<sup>162</sup>

social category of poor, needy people.” Part of his argument is that οἱ μικροί even varies in meaning: in Mt. 10:42, it refers to Christian missionaries, who are “strong in faith,” while in 18:6 it refers to “vulnerable, weak and marginal Christians,” who are “not so strong in faith.” Donahue, “The ‘Parable’ of the Sheep and the Goats,” 25–28, argues that “the least of the brethren” should be understood as Christian missionaries, who need to be treated mercifully. But within the evangelistic outlook of the Gospel, the challenge to the Church is to share the Good News, and so the persecuted missionaries are precisely the means by which the world is saved, since Christ is present in them. He goes on, then (page 30), virtually to expand that category to all the needy, for “justice is constituted by acts of loving-kindness and mercy to those in need,” since through proclamation God’s will is disclosed. The missionaries, it appears, are representative of all the needy, and mercy is expected by God to be shown to both the missionaries and the needy in general. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.428–30, list five possible options for interpreting who the “least of these my brothers” are, and conclude that the phrase must be understood in the universalist sense of everyone who may be in need.

<sup>161</sup> Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People*, 208–12, uses the terms “universalist” and “particularist.” As Stanton describes the variety of positions, he sees the nub of the dispute as the question of whether the pericope is “concerned with the attitude of the world in general to the needy, or . . . the world’s attitude to the church. . .?” and the answer depends on the interpretation of “all nations” and “the least of these my brethren,” 209. Stanton himself argues for the particularist position. While this is a crucial question for the understanding of the pericope, it actually lies outside the purview of my concern here, which is the redactional character of the pericope. See also Ulrich Luz, “The Final Judgment (Matt 25:31–46): An Exercise in ‘History of Influence’ Exegesis,” 271–310, in *Treasures New and Old: Contributions to Matthean Studies*, edited by David R. Bauer and Mark Allen Powell (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

<sup>162</sup> Gray, *The Least of My Brothers*, 348–49. Gundry, *Matthew*, 511, 514, takes the universalist approach, as does Schweizer, *Matthew*, 475–77. France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*, 264, interprets the “least” as being synonymous with μαθητής, and thus referring specifically to Christians rather than humanity in general. Meier, *Matthew*, 304, appreciates the “stunning universalism” of this passage, which he believes “must not be blunted.” Similarly, Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 493. Harrington, *Matthew*, 358–60, takes the “particularist” view, that the nations refers only to Gentiles, and that the least of the brethren refers to Christian missionaries, since he claims Matthew presumes two judgments. Harrington’s arguments that two judgments were a part of ancient thought, however, do not appear to be convincing. He cites Mt. 19:28 as an instance of Matthew envisioning a Jewish judgment, for they will be judged by the twelve on their thrones, and in contrast, he says Mt. 25:31–46 illustrates the Gentile judgment under the Son of Man. However, this seems to stretch the details too far, and to ignore the universalizing effect of using πάντα of the nations. His other citations supporting two judgments are not convincing either: 1 Cor. 6:2–3 refers to the saints judging the world, but this is not two judgments, and the pattern is different from what he claims for Mt. 19:28 and 25:31–46, since Paul sees the saints, not the Son of Man, judging the world. Similarly his use of 1 Peter 4:17, in which judgment is to begin with the household of God, does not fit his pattern either, since here the judgment begins with Christians, not Jews, and the contrast is between Christian and non-Christian, not Jew and Gentile. Further, the use of the word “begin” indicates not two judgments but one, a process with a beginning and an ending. Finally the other Jewish writings he cites all could be construed as referring only to one final judgment, except for T. Ben 10:8–9 which refers to judgment upon the Jews first, and then upon the nations in like manner. Thus



This passage has parabolic qualities, to the extent that it is the concluding pericope<sup>163</sup> of Matthew's apocalyptic discourse.<sup>164</sup> Donahue points out that it functions "as a parable in its realism and engaging quality" while needing to be interpreted within its apocalyptic context, and so he terms it an "apocalyptic parable."<sup>165</sup> Apocalyptic discourse is highly metaphorical, whether explicit words of comparison are present or not. The vivid imagery must be understood according to its background, and so the interpretation of apocalyptic discourse must proceed on the basis of its literary, metaphorical qualities. Harrington rightly notes that whether this passage is called a parable or not depends on one's definition of a parable; he calls it a "judgment scene," and notes that it follows three parables.<sup>166</sup> As noted above, none of the Son of Man sayings is part of an explicit parable, but even so they must be interpreted according to the metaphors present. The Son of Man is not literally expected to arrive on clouds, but rather the clouds are understood metaphorically. Similarly in Mt. 25:31–46, the qualities attached to the Son of Man must be interpreted metaphorically and parabolically. Although the passage is often called the "Parable of the Last Judgment," it is more accurately a "depiction" or a "description," part of an apocalyptic discourse that should be interpreted according to the allusions and metaphors present.<sup>167</sup>

Harrington's arguments for his particularist interpretation do not appear to be convincing. Cf. Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People*, 213. Lambrecht, *Out of the Treasure*, 273–79, even though he sees this pericope as a revelatory discourse rather than a parable, concludes that it is to be interpreted universalistically.

<sup>163</sup> Donahue, "The 'Parable' of the Sheep and the Goats," 11, calls it "a solemn conclusion to the final of Matthew's five great discourses, the 'apocalyptic testament.'"

<sup>164</sup> Meier, *Matthew*, 302, does not consider this passage to be a parable, but sees it as "the unveiling of the truth which lay behind all the great parables of chaps. 24–25," and in *The Vision of Matthew*, 177, he acknowledges its parabolic elements, but prefers to see it as a "straightforward depiction" of the last day. Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 492, agrees that it is not a parable, but is an "apocalyptic vision of the Last Judgement." Gray, *The Least of My Brothers*, 351–52, accuses many modern exegetes of not taking seriously enough the parabolic nature of 25:31–46, of forgetting that this passage is a Matthean *Sondergut*, and of not taking seriously enough its similarity with *1 Enoch*.

<sup>165</sup> Donahue, "The 'Parable' of the Sheep and the Goats," 10, 30 where he describes the apocalyptic horizon as:

a view of history and human life from God's side. It also offers a solution to the problem of theodicy, that is, why evil people flourish and why the innocent suffer. Apocalyptic affirms that the sufferings and injustice which mar this world will be bearable because the order of justice will be restored. Sin and evil will be unmasked and goodness rewarded. Simply put, the world will be made "right" again. Matthew adopts this perspective, since the parable of the Sheep and the Goats reveals the actions which should have been normative in the world.

<sup>166</sup> Harrington, *Matthew*, 357.

<sup>167</sup> Catchpole, "A Re-appraisal of Matthew XXV.31–46," 379–82, defines it more narrowly as a "recognition scene." This is based on Nickelsburg's discovery of the recognition scene in *1 Enoch* 62 as argued in *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*, 62–66, 70–75. Elements of the scene are the exaltation of formerly persecuted people and the judgment of the persecutors.

The form-critical and redactional considerations, then, lead to the conclusion that this passage is a valid source for investigating Matthew's shaping of the concept of the Son of Man.<sup>168</sup> While conclusions cannot be absolutely certain, we have seen that Matthew probably took over a prior tradition and heavily redacted it. Further, it is possible that it came out of a Jewish background rather than Christian, and its parabolic qualities must be pursued, rather than a strictly literal interpretation. The concept of the Son of Man, with the qualities attached to it, then, reflects Matthew's authorial handiwork, and Matthew's shaping of it.

#### 4.7.2 Mt. 25:31–34, 41,46

<sup>31</sup> Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ, τότε καθίσει ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ.<sup>32</sup> καὶ συναχθήσονται ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ ἀφορίσει αὐτοὺς ἀπ' ἀλλήλων, ὥσπερ ὁ ποιμὴν ἀφορίζει τὰ πρόβατα ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρίφων,<sup>33</sup> καὶ στήσει τὰ μὲν πρόβατα ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ, τὰ δὲ ἐρίφια ἐξ εὐωνύμων.<sup>34</sup> τότε ἐρεῖ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῖς ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ· δεῦτε οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρὸς μου, κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου....

<sup>31</sup>“When the Son of Man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him, then he will sit on the throne of his glory.<sup>32</sup> All the nations will be gathered before him, and he will separate people one from another as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats,<sup>33</sup> and he will put the sheep at his right hand and the goats at the left.<sup>34</sup>

Then the king will say to those at his right hand, ‘Come, you that are blessed by my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world...’

<sup>41</sup>τότε ἐρεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἐξ εὐωνύμων· πορεύεσθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ [οἱ] κατηραμένοι εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον τὸ ἡτοιμασμένον τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἄγγελοις αὐτοῦ... .

<sup>41</sup>Then he will say to those at his left hand, “You that are accursed, depart from me into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels...”

<sup>46</sup>καὶ ἀπελεύσονται οὗτοι εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον, οἱ δὲ δίκαιοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

<sup>46</sup>“And these will go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life.”

#### Variants

In vs 31, ἀγιοι is added before ἄγγελοι by A W f<sup>13</sup> the Majority text and some of the versions, while ~~ⲛ~~ B D L Θ f<sup>1</sup> and many other important witnesses do not add ἀγιοι. (See Nestle-Aland<sup>27</sup> for a fuller listing.)

<sup>168</sup> Catchpole, “A Re-appraisal of Matthew XXV.31–46,” 387, concludes that the pericope is pre-Matthean, including the mention of the Son of Man, and that in it we find “echoes of the authentic voice of Jesus himself.”

In vs 32, instead of συναχθήσονται, A W Γ Δ *f*<sup>1</sup> and many others read the singular, συναχθήσεται, in agreement with the neuter plural subject, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.

In vs 33, in **8**, αὐτοῦ is placed after εὐωνύμων, instead of after δεξιῶν, while it is omitted by A and a few others.

In vs 41, the definite article, [οἱ] is omitted by previous editions of Nestlé, **8** B L and a few others, but it is present in A D W Θ 067vid *f*<sup>1.13</sup> and the Majority text.

Again in vs 41, the words, τὸ ἡτοιμασμένον, are read in the dative by F (a ninth-century manuscript) and a few others; ο ἡτοιμασεν ο πατηρ μου is read by D *f*<sup>1</sup> and a few translations and commentators. The text as presented is supported by the Papyrus manuscript #45, **8** A B L W Θ 067.0128. *f*<sup>13</sup> 33, the Majority text and others.

In vs 46, κόλασιν is rendered *ignem* in some old Latin manuscripts, probably under the influence of vs 41.

### Notes

This description of the Last Judgment is the most important passage for this study. It incorporates most of the pertinent features of the Son of Man, and as the following analysis and conclusion will show, it bears the most similarity with the concept of the Son of Man in the *Parables of Enoch*. In the following discussion, the features and characteristics of the Son of Man displayed in this pericope will be explored and their prior occurrences in the Gospel noted.

### *Mt. 25:31: Five Significant Themes*

In Mt. 25:31 the confluence of five significant themes takes place. The figure of the Son of Man, the motion of “coming,”<sup>169</sup> the attribute of glory, the presence of angels, and the session of the Son of Man upon his glorious throne all come together. The presence of all five of these significant themes occurs nowhere else in Matthew or in the other two synoptic gospels.

*Cf. Mt 24:30–31.* Four of the themes from Mt. 25:31 are present in Mt. 24:30–31: the Son of Man, “coming,” “glory,” and “angels.” The latter verses are concerned with the Son of Man being seen coming on the clouds with power and glory and sending his angels to gather the elect from the four corners of the earth. Parallels in the synoptics are Mk 13:26–27 and Lk. 21:27. While Luke has edited Mark’s account by omitting various details, such as the sending of the angels to gather the elect, Matthew has edited the Markan version by adding details. The sign of the Son of Man, the mourning by the tribes of the earth, and the auditory image of the mighty trumpet blast have been incorporated into this verse (see above on Mt. 24:30–31).

<sup>169</sup> Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 492 notices that the theme of the coming of the Son of Man “has been ringing... throughout these closing chapters,” like lightning (24:27), on clouds (24:30), at an unknown time (24:36–42), unforeseen like a thief (24:43), as a day of reckoning (24:45–51), and that it may be delayed (24:48, 25:5, 19).

Significantly, Matthew also adds the possessive pronoun αὐτοῦ to the mention of the angels. Of the four times Matthew speaks of the angels in the presence of the Son of Man, he adds the possessive pronoun in three of them (Mt. 24:31// Mk 13:27, Mt. 16:27//Mk 8:38//Lk. 9:26, and Mt. 13:41; at Mt 25:31 the possessive pronoun does not appear, although the phrase μετ' αὐτοῦ does). The parallel synoptic passages do not include the possessive pronoun.<sup>170</sup> The addition of the possessive pronoun is significant for Matthew's conception of the scene, for it exalts the power of the Son of Man by suggesting that the Son of Man has authority over the angels: they are "his" angels. In Mark and Luke, on the other hand, the Son of Man is a heavenly figure alongside the angels, and not explicitly over the angels, since no possessive pronoun is used. Tödt suggests that Matthew "intensifies the transcendent sovereignty and power of the Son of Man" by characterizing the angels as "his."<sup>171</sup> The entourage of angels in Matthew is well understood to be the Son of Man's.

With the setting of "glory"/δόξη in Mt. 25:31,<sup>172</sup> Matthew again uses the possessive pronoun and refers to the Son of Man "in his glory"/ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ (where αὐτοῦ refers to the Son of Man). In Mt. 24:30//Mk 13:26, however, Matthew does not include the possessive pronoun with reference to "glory"/δόξα. The only editing of Mark in this phrase is to move the adjective πολλῆς to a position after δόξη rather than after δυνάμεως, where it appears in Mark. Luke does the same as Matthew, perhaps for stylistic reasons.

*Cf. Mt 16:27.* These same four themes, the Son of Man, "coming," "glory," and "angels," are also found in Mt. 16:27. This verse bears some striking resemblances to Mk 8:38//Lk. 9:26, but it is evident that Matthew has edited it significantly, for the juridical role of the Son of Man is made explicit. In Mk 8:38//Lk. 9:26 parallelism on shame is preserved: the one who is ashamed of the Son of Man on earth will be treated with shame in heaven. In Mt. 16:27, however, the first part of the parallelism, "whoever is ashamed of me and my words," (Lk. 9:26a, cf. Mk 8:38a) is omitted, and the words about the Son of Man coming in glory with the angels are put into an explicit judicial setting by adding the quotation of Ps 62:13, "and he will repay to each according to their deeds."<sup>173</sup> As compared to Mark and Luke, Matthew has elevated the status of the Son of Man from witness to judge.<sup>174</sup> Further, Matthew

<sup>170</sup> At Mk 13:27, there are some witnesses for the inclusion of the possessive pronoun, but they probably have been influenced by Mt. 24:31.

<sup>171</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 94. Filson, *Matthew*, 267, agrees, noting that the angels "mark his (the Son of Man's) unique role." Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 493, also comments that whereas previously the angels were sent, here they simply accompany the Son of Man as a "heavenly escort of honour."

<sup>172</sup> Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.420.

<sup>173</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 85, 86; cf. Prov. 24:12, Eccl. 32:24, 1 Enoch 45:3, 46

<sup>174</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 89–90, this elevation is clearly evident when Mt 10:32 is compared with Lk. 12:8, where Matthew has replaced "Son of Man" with "I," which Tödt believes is due to Matthew's desire not to portray Jesus in a role of advocate but rather in a role of eschatological judge.

has again attached the possessive pronoun to the angels, where Mark and Luke refer simply to the “holy angels.”<sup>175</sup> As noted above, this also elevates the status of the Son of Man to a position of authority over, rather than equivalence to, the angels.

*Cf. Mt 13:41.* In the Interpretation of the Parable of the Weeds (Mt. 13:41), which is unique to Matthew, two themes are present. The Son of Man and “his angels” (with the significant presence of the possessive pronoun noted above) are explicitly connected with details in the parable. The themes of glory and judgment are present implicitly in the interpretation, since the setting seems to be a heavenly courtroom, and the outcome of the angels’ action includes fire, weeping and gnashing of teeth, which are usual for the condemned. Gundry and Ingo Broer note a significant difference between the picture of the Son of Man in Mt. 25:31 and Mt. 13:41. In Mt. 25:31, the Son of Man actively separates, while in Mt. 13:41, 49, 24:31 the angels are sent out to gather and separate.<sup>176</sup> This again indicates Matthew’s intensification and elevation of the figure of the Son of Man. Matthew gives explicit expression to the authority of the Son of Man.

*Cf. Mt. 19:28.* The fifth theme of Mt. 25:31, θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ, is paralleled only at Mt. 19:28 in the synoptics (see above on Mt. 19:28). The closest parallel to Mt. 19:28 is Lk. 22:30, which refers only to the idea of the Twelve sitting on thrones judging Israel, for Luke has omitted the idea of the Son of Man sitting on his glorious throne. Aside from the Twelve sitting on thrones, God’s throne is referred to at Mt. 5:34, 23:22 and the throne of David in Lk. 1:32. Thus Matthew is unique in the Gospels in picturing the Son of Man on a throne.<sup>177</sup>

It is apparent, then, that Matthew, even in the introduction to this climactic parable, where the scene is set for the judicial activity, has shaped the concept of the Son of Man in the direction of his role as a judge. Using themes that have occurred previously in the Gospel, he brings these five themes, the Son of Man, “coming,” the attribute of glory, the presence of angels, and the session of the Son of Man upon his glorious throne, together into a coherent picture of the Son of Man as the eschatological judge.

<sup>175</sup> At Mt. 16:27, Matthew’s phrase, “his angels,” it must be recognized, is ambiguous. The antecedent of the possessive pronoun may be “the Son of Man” or “his father,” to whom the glory is attributed. But if that were the case, then the awkward circumstance would exist where two instances of αὐτοῦ occur in close proximity and refer to two different antecedents. The αὐτοῦ of τοῦ πατρός would refer to the Son of Man, while the αὐτοῦ of τῶν ἀγγέλων would refer to τοῦ πατρός. It is better to think of both instances of αὐτοῦ as referring to the Son of Man, so that here also the angels are under the direct authority of the Son of Man, as at Mt. 25:31, and Mt. 24:30–31.

<sup>176</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 512; Ingo Broer, “Das Gericht des MS über die Völker Auslegung von Mt. 25, 31–46” in *Bibel und Leben* 11 (1970), 278; Lambrecht, *Out of the Treasure*, 269.

<sup>177</sup> Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 206; Revelation has a clear reference to the “one like a Son of Man” (Rev. 1:13) being given a place on God’s throne (Rev. 3:21) amongst the numerous references to the throne of God. Schweizer, *Matthew*, 475, also notes Matthew’s uniqueness in this regard. See exegesis of Mt. 19:28 above and Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.420–21.

*Mt. 25:32–33: Four Significant Themes*

In Mt. 25:32–33 four significant themes for this study emerge.

πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. This phrase also appears at Mt. 24:9, 14, and 28:19, for a total of four times. These occurrences refer to all humanity, and it is likely that each reference is inclusive of the Jews either as perpetrators of persecution (24:9, cf. 10:22) or as people worthy of receiving the Good News (24:14, 28:19). The noun, τὰ ἔθνη without πάντα, appears in the plural eight times, three of which are in quotations from Isaiah, which Matthew alone uses (4:15, 12:18, 12:21).<sup>178</sup> From the context of each of the eight passages, it is likely the noun refers only to Gentiles. Three times the noun appears in the singular (21:43, and twice in 24:7), referring to an individual, unspecified nation, which could be Jewish or non-Jewish or even a new creation of all peoples, both Jew and Gentile.<sup>179</sup> Here in 25:32 πάντα τὰ ἔθνη is interpreted basically in three ways by commentators.<sup>180</sup>

- a) It is interpreted as Gentiles only, based on the eleven uses of the noun without πάντα.<sup>181</sup> It is argued that since the noun refers to Gentiles in those cases it also must mean the same when πάντα is added. The expansion to “all Gentiles” merely is explicitly stating that there will be no exceptions in this judgment. In effect this makes the use of πάντα virtually meaningless. As noted above, however, most of the plural uses of the noun are from other sources, Isaiah, Q, or Mark, and only two are unique to Matthew. Further, the singular uses of the noun by no means refer to Gentiles only, but could include Jews. Particularly in Mt 21:43 the noun seems more likely to refer to Jews since it is their leaders who are being criticized in that passage. Therefore, Harrington’s narrow interpretation of the parable is unsatisfactory.
- b) According to Gray, about half the scholars interpret πάντα τὰ ἔθνη as all humanity.<sup>182</sup> They recognize that τὰ ἔθνη in Matthew refers for the most part to

<sup>178</sup> The other five times are 6:32 (paralleled in Lk. 12:30), 10:5, 18 (both in Matthew alone, as part of the mission charge to the disciples), 20:19, 25 (paralleled in Mk 10:33//Lk. 18:32 and Mk 10:42//Lk. 22:25).

<sup>179</sup> Mt. 21:43 is a part of Matthew’s explanation of the Parable of the Wicked Tenants (21:33–41), and so the nation referred to here is not necessarily a non-Jewish one. Since the current leadership of Israel is being criticized in the explanation, it is more likely that the Jewish nation is to be understood as the nation which should bear fruits befitting the kingdom or that it will be a new nation, composed of both Jew and Gentile.

<sup>180</sup> Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.422–23, discern six options.

<sup>181</sup> Harrington, *Matthew*, 355. Harrington also believes that Matthew envisioned two judgments, one for the Jews and one for the Gentiles, to which 25:31–46 refers, but as noted above his evidence is unconvincing. Cf. Douglas R. A. Hare, *Matthew* (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1993), 288–91.

<sup>182</sup> Gray, *The Least of My Brothers*, 356–57; cf. also Filson, *Matthew*, 266; Tödt, *Son of Man*, 76; Gundry, *Matthew*, 511; Meier, “Nations or Gentiles in Matthew 28:19,” 94–102, Meier, *Vision of Matthew*, 177, Meier, *Matthew*, 303; Beare, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 493; Lambrecht, *Out of the Treasure*, 275–76; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.422, out of the six options they present, prefer to understand “all nations” as all humanity, and list many commentators, ancient, medieval and modern, as agreeing.

Gentiles, but that the addition of πάντα includes the Jews, so that all humanity is meant. Those who see a prior tradition that has been redacted by Matthew see πάντα τὰ ἔθνη as having a universal sense in the tradition, while in the Matthean redaction it is narrowed to the Gentiles.<sup>183</sup> The widest interpretation of the text, however, is the plain sense of the text, both in the original tradition and in the Matthean redaction. Arguing for a narrower interpretation is splitting hairs, and Matthew can be expected to have been more explicit.

- c) Stanton narrows the interpretation even further. He agrees that πάντα τὰ ἔθνη refers to both Jews and Gentiles, but he excludes Christians from the judgment, since ἔθνη is never used to refer to Christians in Matthew.<sup>184</sup> But as noted above, Mt 21:43 refers to a nation that produces fruits befitting the kingdom. This may be the Jewish nation, since it is the Jewish leadership that is being criticized, but the kind of nation is not specified, and so it could include Christians. Stanton's interpretation, then, is also a special reading of the text that is unwarranted.

Both positions a) and c), that narrow the interpretation plead for a special reading of the words, and Matthew can be expected to have been more explicit if he meant a) or c). In a) πάντα is rendered virtually meaningless, and in c) excluding the Christians from judgment may be comforting for Christians, but then who are the righteous who are rewarded? Harrington suggests that Matthew here is acknowledging the existence of non-Jews who were also non-Christians, and explaining that they can be saved by acts of mercy towards Christians, even though they themselves are not Christians.<sup>185</sup> Harrington acknowledges that the salvation of the Gentiles or non-believers is a 20th-century concern, but that does not mean it was a problem Matthew encountered or attempted to resolve.<sup>186</sup> Thus the interpretation of πάντα τὰ ἔθνη as referring to all people, including both Jews and Christians, is most plausible.<sup>187</sup> As Meier points out, "the cleavage between good and bad thus goes through the whole of humanity; it does not run neatly between the church and unbelievers."<sup>188</sup>

Συναχθήσονται. This verb is used in parables and in descriptions of gathering events, such as gathering fish (Mt. 13:30, 47) and gathering in the harvest (e.g. Mt. 3:12, 6:26)<sup>189</sup>, or people gathering together (Mt. 13:2, 18:20, 26:3, 57, 27:17, 27, 62). It is also used in parables that have an eschatological perspective and in apocalyptic passages in which sinners and righteous are gathered from afar (Mt. 22:1–14,

<sup>183</sup> See Lambrecht's summary in *Out of the Treasure*, 272–3. See also Donahue's helpful argument in "The 'Parable' of the Sheep and the Goats," 14–16, in which he draws in Lukan and Pauline support for evangelism to all nations, not just the "Gentiles." He also sees a universalist thrust in Mt. 13:38, 16:27, 24:9–14, 30, and 28:16–20.

<sup>184</sup> Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People*, 212–14.

<sup>185</sup> Harrington, *Matthew*, 359–60.

<sup>186</sup> Donahue, "The 'Parable' of the Sheep and the Goats," 14.

<sup>187</sup> Catchpole, "A Re-appraisal of Matthew XXV.31–46," 389, arrives at this conclusion based on the variety of occurrences of ἔθνοι.

<sup>188</sup> Meier, *The Vision of Matthew*, 177.

<sup>189</sup> Cf. Jer. 40:10, 12, Mic. 4:12.

25:14–30).<sup>190</sup> Here in Mt. 25:32 the term is used again in an eschatological, judicial setting.

Καὶ ἀφορίσει αὐτοὺς ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων. In this pericope the Son of Man carries out the separation of judgment from one another, in contrast to Mt. 13:41–43, 49–50, where it is carried out by the angels.<sup>191</sup> As noted above, Matthew’s perspective here enhances and elevates the status of the Son of Man in Matthew’s depiction.

Ὁ ποιμὴν. The comparison in Mt. 25:33–34 of the shepherd separating his flock to the right and to the left is illustrative of the final judgment. The right is the place of honor, and the left, the place of dishonor.<sup>192</sup> Schweizer suggests that the model for this comparison may be Ezek. 34:17–30, where the prince separates the weak and strong sheep. The point of Ezekiel’s parable is that incompetent shepherds will be replaced.<sup>193</sup> But as Schweizer points out, two major differences exist between Matthew’s and Ezekiel’s parables. Matthew speaks of the king, where Ezekiel speaks of the prince. More importantly the purposes of the parables are different. In Ezekiel incompetent shepherds are to be replaced, while for Matthew, the shepherd is the unassailable authority whose responsibility is to separate the flock. For Ezekiel the parable is judgment upon the leaders of the nation, while for Matthew, the judgment is the eschatological, divine judgment of all the people.

The shepherd image is used again at Ezek. 34:12. The prophet uses the comparison of God, “As shepherds seek out their flocks when they are amongst their scattered flocks, so I will seek out my sheep.” But here the image is of the shepherd gathering in the scattered flock. It is an image of salvation and renewal, not of passing out judgment. Similarly at Ezek. 34:17, the image of God judging between sheep and sheep, rams and goats is within the context of the image being used to denounce the leadership, not to describe a general judgment upon the people.

Thus it is unlikely that Ezekiel’s parable was a model for Matthew, since the intent and thrust of the parables in each are so fundamentally different. While there is an extensive use of this imagery in Ezek. 34, there are no close parallels with Mt. 25:31–46. It is more likely that the shepherd and flock imagery in Matthew is drawn from common observations of pastoral practice.<sup>194</sup>

<sup>190</sup> Cf. a similar concept with the use of קָדַם in Pss. 102:22, 106:47, 107:3, 147:2, Isa. 43:5, 9, 56:8, 66:18, Jer. 31:8, 10, 32:37, Ezek. 11:17, 20:34, 41, 28:25, Hos. 1:11, Mic. 2:12, 4:6, 12, Zeph. 3:19.

<sup>191</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 512; Broer, “Das Gerechte des MS,” 278.

<sup>192</sup> Filson, *Matthew*, 267. See also J. M. Court, “Right and Left: The Implications for Mt. 25.31-46,” *NTS* 31 (1985), 223–33, who sees the “least” as Christian missionaries, and that the possibility of persecution gives rise to the stark dichotomy between the righteous and the condemned, with no possibility of crossover.

<sup>193</sup> Schweizer, *Matthew*, 476.

<sup>194</sup> Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 493–94; Beare also notes the similarity in Plato, *Republic* X.614C, which describes souls bound for the Elysian Fields taking the road to the right, while those bound for Tartarus go to the left. Harrington, *Matthew*, 356, also notes



*Mt. 25:34: Four Significant Themes*

In Mt. 25:34 four details further develop Matthew's portrait of the Son of Man.

Ὁ βασιλεὺς. Here for the first time in this parable, the judge is called the king, τότε ἐρεῖ ὁ βασιλεὺς, making the Son of Man's royal role explicit. The switch in terminology from "Son of Man" to "king" is usually taken as evidence for a redactional seam being present here. But as shown above, the integrity of the pericope argues against any seam, so that the redactional evidence supports Matthean editorial activity rather than the splicing together of two traditions. Jesus, identified in Matthew's Gospel as the Son of Man, is here portrayed as king, pronouncing judgment, and this "shows the Father's association with him in ruling the kingdom."<sup>195</sup> The king is not identified with God, since the king calls God "my Father,"<sup>196</sup> but the motif of kingship continues a motif begun in infancy, when the Christ child was sought as the king of the Jews (Mt. 1:1, 20, 2:2, 13–14). Christ's kingship is now brought to full glory as he is portrayed as the eschatological judge.<sup>197</sup>

The Son of Man's stature as "king" has already been hinted at in the Gospel. A kingdom was ascribed to the Son of Man in Mt. 13:41 (no synoptic parallels), in which the angels of the Son of Man are said to be sent to gather up and take out all causes of evil from his kingdom. The kingdom is specifically ascribed to the Son of Man. Further in Mt. 16:28 some of those present are promised that they will not taste death until they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.<sup>198</sup> Since Matthew has significantly redacted the verse, when it is compared to the source text in Mk 8:38–9:1//Lk. 9:26–27, it can be seen as having advanced the concept of the Son of Man in Matthew to include the judicial role. Here also, the kingdom is ascribed specifically to the Son of Man. Finally, also worthy of consideration is Mt. 20:21, in which Jesus is addressed by the mother of the sons of Zebedee. She ascribes to him a kingdom, by asking that her sons may have a place of honor in it. Matthew has specified that it is a "kingdom" here, for in the source text, Mk 10:37, Zebedee's wife asks for a place for her sons in regard to Jesus' future glory, ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου.<sup>199</sup>

the common shepherding practice; cf. also Schweizer, *Matthew*, 476. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.423–24, note the commercial value of sheep over goats, but that the goats probably were not a pre-Christian symbol of evil. That they symbolize the wicked in this passage reiterates the surprises to be encountered at the final judgment.

<sup>195</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 512. Catchpole, "A Re-appraisal of Matthew XXV.31–46," makes the important observation that kingship necessarily involves judging, and therefore the enthronement and judging mentioned earlier likewise imply the kingly status of the judge.

<sup>196</sup> Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 494.

<sup>197</sup> Harrington, *Matthew*, 356. Schweizer, *Matthew*, 475, points out that God is called "king" in eschatological contexts in the Old Testament, in passages such as Isa. 24:23, 33:22, Zeph. 3:15, Obad. 2, Zech 14:16–17, cf. Pss. 47, 96, 96–97, 99. Donahue, "The 'Parable' of the Sheep and the Goats," 20–22, points out that of the synoptics Matthew makes the most of Jesus' kingship.

<sup>198</sup> See the section above on Mt. 16:28.

<sup>199</sup> Even though the terminology of the "Son of Man" is not present in Mt. 20:21, Matthew has definitely identified Jesus and the Son of Man, so that the passage is pertinent.

But Matthew portrays her asking for a place for her sons in his kingdom, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου. So in Mt. 20:21 also, Matthew has elevated the role of Jesus to being the ruler of a kingdom. These three passages, then, Mt. 13:41, 16:28, and 20:21, have prepared the reader for the Son of Man being identified as a “king” in this description of the Last Judgment.

Οἱ εὐλογημένοι. The king pronounces the blessing for those on the right and invites them in, δεῦτε οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρὸς μου.<sup>200</sup> The passive participle of εὐλογέω is also used at Jesus’ triumphal entry (Mt. 21:9//Mk 11:10//Lk. 12:13) quoting Ps 118:26, and the same verse is quoted again in the Lament over Jerusalem (Mt. 23:39//Lk. 13:35). A similar invitation, in which the one addressed is called blessed, is issued by Rebekah to Abraham’s servant, “Come, O blessed of the Lord!” בּוֹא בְרִיךְ יְהוָה (Gen. 24:31). When Abimelech settles a quarrel with Isaac, he also calls Isaac one blessed of the Lord, אִתְּהָ עָתִידָהּ בְרִיךְ יְהוָה (Gen. 26:29). The phrase appears to be fairly rare in Scripture, but is completely appropriate in this context.

Κληρονομήσατε. Since the kingdom is the destiny of the righteous, they are invited to inherit it, κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν.<sup>201</sup> Matthew envisages the righteous as shining in the kingdom of their father (Mt. 13:43). He also proclaims that it is the meek who are to inherit the earth (Mt. 5:5), and the faithful disciple, who follows at the expense of family, who will inherit eternal life (Mt. 19:29). Here it is the righteous who are invited into the kingdom prepared for them, while the accursed are to be consigned to a fiery torment.

*1 Enoch* 62 also displays the pattern of the wicked being cursed and the righteous being blessed. The righteous will rejoice when the judgment takes place and they will enjoy life in the presence of the Son of Man (*1 Enoch* 62:13–16, cf. *1 Enoch* 58). In *Par. En.* the idea of inheriting is not explicit, but the blessed life in the presence of the Son of Man is definitely destined. Further, while his domain may not be termed a kingdom that has been prepared, the judge in *Par. En.* does have royal qualities, and his existence has been hidden since the creation (*1 Enoch* 48:3). Thus the royal, everlasting and blessed qualities are found to be shared by *Par. En.* and in Mt. 25:31–46.

Ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς κόσμου. The kingdom has been prepared for the righteous since the beginning of time, ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. This promise indicates to those who are suffering that the promised kingdom is a present reality, not simply an uncertain hope.<sup>202</sup> It underlines the certainty of the promise, and is typically Jewish.<sup>203</sup> Wisdom

<sup>200</sup> δεῦτε and πατρὸς are favorite Matthean terms; Gundry, *Matthew*, 512.

<sup>201</sup> κληρονομήσατε and ἡτοιμασμένον are favorite Matthean terms, according to Gundry, *Matthew*, 512. ἡτοιμασμένον echoes Mt. 20:23, in which Jesus says that the seats at his right and at his left are promised to those for whom they have been prepared.

<sup>202</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 513.

<sup>203</sup> Schweitzer, *Matthew*, 477; see also Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.425.

also is claimed to have been created at the beginning of the world (Prov. 8:22–31), and such a beginning was also attributed to the Torah (*m. ṢAbot* 5:6).<sup>204</sup>

The phrase ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου is found elsewhere only at Mt. 13:35, where it is in a quotation from Ps 78:2. Its occurrence here may also be a sign that this pericope rests on a prior tradition, since the phrase appears nowhere else, except in that quotation.

A similar idea does occur in other apocalyptic settings, however. It occurs in Rev 13:8 and 17:8, where it is said that the names of the righteous have been written in the Book of Life since the foundation of the world. A similar phrase is found in *I Enoch* 69:16, where it is claimed that “the heavens were suspended before the world was created,” and again that waters come from springs in the mountains “from the creation of the world unto eternity” (*I Enoch* 69:17). In an apocalyptic framework, the phrase indicates certainty and reliability in the face of overwhelming uncertainty.

#### *Mt 25:41, 46: Five Significant Themes*

In Mt. 25:41, 46 five themes indicate the power and authority exercised by Matthew’s Son of Man.

Κατηραμένοι. As a vocative plural, κατηραμένοι/accursed is a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament, although the concept does occur. Its appearance in Matthew’s Gospel in this location supports the contention that Matthew here has redacted a prior tradition.<sup>205</sup> In the New Testament, the concept occurs infrequently, but both the verbal and the noun forms appear. The verb, καταράσμαι, is used by Peter to describe the words Jesus uttered against the fig tree (Mk 11:21) and by Jesus and Paul to urge blessing rather than cursing upon one’s enemies (Lk. 6:28, Rom. 12:14). The Letter of James, however, acknowledges that the untamable tongue does sometimes curse (Jas. 3:9–10). The noun, κατάρα (and cognates), is used by Paul to proclaim that Christ has freed humanity from the curse of the law (Gal. 3:10–13) while the author of the Letter to the Hebrews uses it in a metaphor comparing those who do not produce expected fruits with ground that produces weeds and thistles and is in danger of coming under a curse (Heb. 6:8). In the Hebrew Scriptures, the concept is more frequent. For example, in Deuteronomy 27–30, the people are warned of being cursed if they do not obey the law, and specific acts are explicitly cursed (Deut. 27:15–26). They are also warned that they will be cursed by being overrun by enemies, who will consume all their goods, with the result that they will be left desolate (Deut. 28:15–46, 47–68). Included amongst the many horrors they will suffer is serving their conquering enemies “in hunger and thirst, in nakedness and lack of everything” (Deut. 28:48). Jeremiah resumes the Deuteronomist’s warning and warns Jerusalem that it will be made desolate and it will become an object of cursing (Jer. 24:9, 25:18, 26:6, 42:18, 44:22). The concept of being cursed clearly has Biblical

<sup>204</sup> Harrington, *Matthew*, 356.

<sup>205</sup> See the notes above in the introductory material to this pericope.

precedent, and being cursed is even linked with hunger, thirst and nakedness, as it is in Mt. 25:41–46. But the nature of the relationship is different. In the Deuteronomic passages mentioned, the state of being cursed is a consequence of not obeying Torah, and hunger, thirst, nakedness, desolation, being conquered and humiliated are the means by which the curse is effected. In Matthew, by way of contrast, the state of being cursed is a consequence of not showing mercy and kindness to those who are hungry, thirsty or naked, and torment in eternal fire is the means by which the curse is effected. Because the relationship between being cursed and being hungry, thirsty and naked is not at all similar, Deuteronomy cannot be seen as having influenced the motif of being cursed in Matthew. All that can be said is that being cursed does have Biblical precedent.

Gundry notes that those who are addressed as “accursed” in Mt. 25:41 stand in sharp contrast to those who are called “blessed” in verse 34.<sup>206</sup> In a similar way, the righteous and elect in *Par. En.* stand in sharp contrast to the kings and mighty ones who are under condemnation. The condemned will be bound, shamed and punished, while the blessed will enjoy a sumptuous life in the presence of the Son of Man and the Lord of Spirits for eternity (*1 Enoch* 62:9–16). Beare notes that the curse is by no means arbitrary, for they have brought doom upon themselves by their failure to respond to those in need.<sup>207</sup> Similarly in *Par. En.*, the condemned kings and mighty ones, even while they plead for mercy, acknowledge that they have brought their doom upon themselves (*1 Enoch* 63:8). They had not glorified the Name of the Lord of Spirits, nor had they acknowledged the Lord’s authority (*1 Enoch* 63:7). They had also persecuted the faithful and shed their blood (*1 Enoch* 46:8, 47:2). Gundry further notes that the confession by the condemned of calling the judge “Lord” (Mt. 25:44) does not reflect any allegiance in their previous lives.<sup>208</sup> It is a final but ineffective and desperate appeal, enhanced with the hollow use of a term of respect. A similar plea for mercy is uttered by the kings and mighty ones at their condemnation, when they realize, “We have now learned that we should glorify and bless the Lord of kings and him who rules over all kings” (*1 Enoch* 63:4). Their respectful plea is hollow, just as the plea of the accursed in Mt. 25:44 is devoid of respect. These details, then, show that the similarities are greater between Mt. 25:31–46 and *Par. En.* than between Mt. 25:31–46 and Deuteronomy and Jeremiah.

Τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον. This is probably a concept that derived ultimately from Persian and Greek influence.<sup>209</sup> Fire is frequently envisaged as punishment in Matthew (3:12,

<sup>206</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 515.

<sup>207</sup> Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 495.

<sup>208</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 515.

<sup>209</sup> Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 495 notes that the imagery of fire is frequently used by Matthew of “the future punishment for sin,” although “it has no background in ancient Hebrew thought.” Its usage may have resulted from Iranian influence; by the first century BCE the valley of Hinnom typified “a place of fiery torment.” Punishment by fire also occurs frequently in other judgment narrations as noted in the concluding chapter below.

5:22, 18:8, 9). In *Par. En.*, eternal fire is also a part of the punishment in store for the condemned. The kings and mighty ones will be cast into a deep valley with burning fire (*1 Enoch* 54:1–2, 6). They also acknowledge that their ill-gotten gains would not prevent them “from going down to the grave (or) from the flames of the pit of Sheol” (*1 Enoch* 63:10). This detail also indicates a similarity with the view of *Par. En.*

Ἡτοιμασμένον τῷ διαβόλῳ. The eternal fire, according to this pericope, is prepared for the Devil and his angels, τὸ ἡτοιμασμένον τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ. While the righteous go to the kingdom that has been prepared for them, the accursed depart for the punishment prepared not for them, but for the Devil and his angels.<sup>210</sup> A similar idea is found in Revelation 20, where the Devil is cast into a lake of fire (20:10), and where even death, Hades and those whose names are not written in the Book of Life are thrown into that lake of fire (Rev. 20:14–15). As just noted in *Par. En.*, the kings and potentates are to be cast into a deep valley of fire in *1 Enoch* 54:1–2, but that deep valley of fire and eternal punishment were prepared for Azazel, one of the leading fallen watchers, and his host (*1 Enoch* 54:3–5). Again, this detail, of the one for whom the eternal fire has been prepared, bears a striking resemblance to the vision in *Par. En.*

Εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον. The condemned are delivered into eternal punishment, εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον. The term κόλασιν is used only at 1 John 4:18 and Mt. 25:46 in the New Testament. Since the term appears nowhere else in Matthew, it can be seen as support for the hypothesis that Matthew has redacted a prior tradition. The eternity of the punishment again is similar to the eternal punishment awaiting the kings and mighty ones in *Par. En.* There is to be no one to raise them up again (*1 Enoch* 48:10), and their being bound and destroyed will in effect be eternal (*1 Enoch* 53:5, 54:5–6).<sup>211</sup>

Οἱ δίκαιοι. While the king calls the ones on his right, “blessed of my father,” οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρός μου, the narrator of the parable calls them “righteous,” οἱ δίκαιοι (Mt. 25:37, 46). The righteous are the ones with whom the protagonist of the parable identifies, for they are also called “the least of these my brethren, τούτων τῶν ἀδελφῶν τῶν ἐλαχίστων, and he judges in their favor based on the treatment they have received. The followers of the Son of Man are also called “righteous,” οἱ δίκαιοι in the Interpretation of the Parable of the Weeds (Mt. 13:36–43). The righteous are promised that they will shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father (Mt. 13:43; cf. Mt. 13:49). In the wider context of Matthew’s Gospel, in Jesus’ pronouncements, the term is used both pejoratively and positively. Jesus says he did not come to call the righteous, but sinners (Mt. 9:13//Mk 2:17), while in comments about receiving him (Mt. 10:40; cf. Mt. 18:5//Mk 9:37//Lk. 9:48), he adds that those who receive a righteous person because he/she is righteous will receive a righteous

<sup>210</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 515.

<sup>211</sup> Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.432, note the absence of any delight in the punishment of others that is found in other apocalyptic works.

person's reward (Mt. 10:41). He criticizes the religious leaders for merely appearing to be righteous (Mt. 23:28), but he also criticizes them for spilling righteous blood (Mt. 23:35). Interestingly, in the two parabolic passages describing the Son of Man and judgment, the followers of the Son of Man are called righteous (Mt. 13:43, 25:37, 46), otherwise Jesus' followers are not called righteous. Jesus himself, however, seeks to fulfil righteousness in seeking baptism (Mt. 3:15) and blesses those who hunger and thirst after righteousness as well as those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake (Mt. 5:6, 10). This indicates that an important attribute of Jesus' followers will be their righteous endeavors. In the Psalms, Proverbs and prophetic writings, righteousness is an important attribute of God as well as those who seek to do God's will. In *Par. En. (passim)*, the ones with whom the Son of Man identifies are called "righteous," "holy" and "elect/chosen."

### 4.7.3 Conclusion to the Exegesis of Matthew 25:31–46

#### *Redactional and Form-critical Results*

Gray argues for the most cautious approach, pointing out that since no synoptic parallels exist, the only certain conclusion is that the pericope is Matthew's composition.<sup>212</sup> Other scholars argue that the pericope is Matthew's creation, but that Matthew has incorporated a prior tradition, and that it coheres well with themes expressed in other passages.<sup>213</sup> Others see the pericope as a prior tradition that Matthew has heavily redacted.<sup>214</sup> Because a redactional seam between Matthew's composition and the prior tradition cannot be precisely discerned, the best view is that the pericope is a prior tradition that Matthew has extensively edited. In this case, verse 31 is to be understood as the original introductory verse to the pericope, but redacted by Matthew to include the figure of the "Son of Man." The pericope is also to be understood and interpreted as a parable, even though no specific term of comparison is present, and it is best understood as coming from an originally Jewish tradition, rather than arising out of a specifically and exclusively Christian context. With the use of this parable Matthew has dramatically confirmed the portrayal of the Son of Man as being an eschatological judge.

#### *Characteristics of the Son of Man*

Mt. 25:31–46 draws together some important themes and characteristics of Matthew's portrayal of the Son of Man. Verse 31 brings together in one place five important themes that do not appear together in one pericope in any other Matthean or Synoptic passage: the term "Son of Man," the motion of "coming," the attribute of "glory," his being accompanied by "his angels," and his being seated upon the "throne of his glory." The "coming," the "glory," and the "angels" have already been connected with a judicial

<sup>212</sup> Gray, *The Least of My Brothers*, 351–52, 355.

<sup>213</sup> E.g. Gundry, *Matthew*, 515.

<sup>214</sup> E.g. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 124.

Son of Man in 16:27, where it is said that the Son of Man will repay humanity for their deeds, quoting Ps. 62:13. That judgment is being portrayed here in this parable in Mt. 25:31–46. With the addition of the possessive pronoun to the angels, Matthew has elevated the status of the Son of Man from equivalence to the angels to authority over them. In this context it is also noted that the Devil has authority over angels, illustrating the apocalyptic dualism of the parable. Again, the presence of the angels confirms the juridical setting, since the angels are also the ones to carry out the judgment in the Interpretation of the Parable of the Weeds (Mt. 13:37–43) by casting the wicked out into torment where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth. Matthew’s unique contribution to the figure of the Son of Man, however, is to portray him as sitting upon his glorious throne, another judicial attribute, which also elevates him to the level of the deity.

Verses 32–33 contain more themes that affirm the judicial role of the Son of Man. It is best to interpret “all nations” that are gathered before him in its universal sense, since the evidence for Matthew’s presuming two judgments, one for the Jews and one for Gentiles, is scanty and unconvincing. The verbs συναχθήσονται and ἀφορίσει also carry bold judicial connotations, and of course the shepherd comparison, drawn from observed life, illustrates eschatological judgment.

In verse 34, the judicial figure is called ὁ βασιλεὺς, bringing the royal dimension to the fore, with its judicial overtones. First the righteous are invited into the blessings prepared for them, and then (vs 41–46) the condemned are consigned to the fate prepared for the Devil and his angels since the creation.<sup>215</sup> In each case, it is an eternal fate to which the judged are being consigned.

These distinctive characteristics of the Son of Man and the actions attributed to him clearly define the Son of Man as the eschatological judge in Matthew’s view.

*Similarities between Mt. 25:31–46 and Par. En.*

The similarities between Mt. 25:31–46 and *Par. En.* are also striking.<sup>216</sup>

*Sitting on the Throne of his Glory.* The image of the Son of Man sitting in judgment on the throne of his glory is common to both works. In *1 Enoch* 69:27, 29, the Son of Man is depicted as sitting on the throne of his glory, with the authority to judge, which will result in the destruction of sinners. In *1 Enoch* 61:8 the Lord of Spirits placed the Elect One, which is one of the designations for the Son of Man, on the throne of glory in order to judge all the works of those above, who bless and praise the Lord of Spirits. The Elect One also sits on the throne of his glory in judgment upon the kings and mighty ones of the earth (*1 Enoch* 62:1–2), who shall be pained and terrified to see him (*1 Enoch* 62:5, cf.

<sup>215</sup> Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, III.432, point out that the last line of the passage, in which the condemned are sent to their fate and the righteous invited to theirs, is an editorial comment, and is “antithetical parallelism” based on LXX Dan. 12:2–3, in which some of those who sleep in the dust shall rise to everlasting life, but others to reproach, dispersion or eternal shame.

<sup>216</sup> Catchpole, “A Re-appraisal of Matthew XXV.31–46,” 380–81, outlines 12 parallels between Mt 25:31–46 and *1 Enoch* 62–63.

*I Enoch* 55:4) for they are to be consigned to everlasting punishment (*I Enoch* 62:11). This powerful image of the Son of Man upon the throne is common to both works.

*Judgment for All.* In both works the concept of a general judgment is common. In Matthew “all nations” are gathered before the Son of Man to be judged, while in *Par. En.* all who dwell on earth shall fall down and worship before him (*I Enoch* 48:5). The Son of Man will be revealed to the righteous as their avenger (*I Enoch* 48:7) but the kings and the mighty ones shall be judged because they have persecuted and oppressed the righteous (*I Enoch* 46:8, 62:11). They are also to be punished for having led astray those who dwell on earth (*I Enoch* 54:6) and for having wrought unrighteousness in the earth (*I Enoch* 54:10). Further, *I Enoch* 62:3 claims that all the kings and mighty ones who possess the earth shall stand before the Elect One to be judged. In both works, then, the idea of an all-inclusive judgment is present.

*Clear Dichotomy.* A third notion that is common to both is the concept of separation to eternal reward and to eternal condemnation. In Mt. 25:34 the righteous go to the kingdom prepared for them, while the cursed go to the torment prepared for the Devil and his angels (vs 41). Throughout the parable there is a clear dichotomy between the righteous and the wicked. They are separated to right and the left, and there is no possibility of changing the verdict. There is no possibility of crossover from one group to the other, for they are as different as sheep and goats. In *Par. En.*, the righteous and elect are welcomed into the presence of the Lord of Spirits where they enjoy the bliss of life with the Son of Man (*I Enoch* 62:13-16), while the kings and mighty ones are consigned to eternal fiery torment (*I Enoch* 62:9-12, 69:27). Here too a clear dichotomy exists between righteous and wicked, with no possibility of crossover from one category to the other.<sup>217</sup>

*Hidden, Revealed, Lack of Mercy.* The ignorance of the judged with respect to the judge is another common feature of the accounts. In Mt. 25:31–46, both the blessed and the cursed are surprised that the Son of Man (king/judge) is identified with the poor and needy.<sup>218</sup> They inquire of the Son of Man (king/judge), “When, Lord, did we see you . . .?” In the symmetry of the narrative, both the ones on the right and the ones on the left, both the vindicated and the condemned, request clarification. The condemned make their request in the sense that had they known, they surely would have served him. They plead ignorance, and in their pleading, implicitly plead for

<sup>217</sup> Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 64–66, notes that one of the functions of apocalyptic literature is Identification and Legitimization. As distinctions are made and clear boundaries drawn, the group for whom the work was written becomes more clear in its identity and feels that it is legitimate. In both *Par. En.* and Matthew the clear dichotomy between the righteous and the wicked functions in this way.

<sup>218</sup> Donahue, “The ‘Parable’ of the Sheep and the Goats,” 20, makes the powerful observation that in the telling of this parable Matthew is disclosing to his Church, which is a mixed body of good and evil, “that the exalted Son of Man was hidden in the least of the brethren, who are both poor and powerless. Here Matthew not only crowns the picture throughout the Gospel of Jesus as the humble servant, but also instructs the Church in what sense the risen Lord is ‘God with us.’”



mercy, for another chance. But to both the condemned and the vindicated, the Son of Man (king/judge) is revealed in “the least of these my brethren.” Reward is promised to those who served the Son of Man through the least ones, and condemnation without hope of mercy is passed on those who did not. In *Par. En.* the righteous and elect also have the Son of Man revealed to them (*1 Enoch* 48:6–7, 62:7), but the kings and mighty are terrified to recognize the Son of Man (“that child of woman”) as their judge (*1 Enoch* 62:5). The hollowness of the respect paid by the condemned rings out in both. In Mt. 25:44 the condemned address the judge as “Lord,” even though nothing in their previous lives indicated they exhibited that respect,<sup>219</sup> and the kings and mighty ones plead respectfully for mercy that they might honor and glorify the judge, acknowledging the judge’s authority over them, even though it is now too late (*1 Enoch* 63:4). But mercy is not forthcoming in either Matthew or *Par. En.* The condemned are simply consigned to punishment (*1 Enoch* 68:4, cf. 62:9–11, 63:11).

*Criterion for Judgment.* The criterion by which judgment is made is also very similar in the two works. In Mt. 25:31–46, both the blessed and the cursed are judged on the basis of their treatment of the poor and needy, with whom the Son of Man identifies himself. In *Par. En.* the righteous are invited to their eternal reward because of their loyalty, while the kings and mighty ones are condemned for their persecution and oppression of the righteous and elect (*1 Enoch* 46:8, 62:11), with whom the Son of Man has identified himself as champion. The identification of the Son of Man with the oppressed is expressed through the qualities of righteousness and election. The oppressed are called the “righteous and elect” and righteousness is said to belong to the Son of Man (*1 Enoch* 46:3). The Son of Man is also known as the “Righteous One” and the “Elect One.” When the Elect One rules, the elect shall be blessed (*1 Enoch* 51:5). Further, the Lord of Spirits, for whom the Son of Man is a judiciary agent, takes up the cause of the oppressed (*1 Enoch* 47, 48:7). Hence the Son of Man clearly identifies himself with the oppressed and disenfranchised, who call themselves the “righteous and elect,” and so the basis for the judgment of the condemned is the way in which they have treated the ones with whom the Son of Man identifies himself.<sup>220</sup>

*Fiery Fate.* The characterization of punishment as taking place in fiery torment is an image that is common to both. In Mt. 25:41 the cursed are sent to fiery torment, while in *Par. En.* several passages describe their fiery punishment. In *1 Enoch* 48:9 the holy

<sup>219</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 515.

<sup>220</sup> The position of Harrington, Hare, and others, that “the least of these my brethren” refers to Christian missionaries, who are intimately associated with the judge, would make for an even tighter similarity with *Par. En.* But Hare fails to recognize this similarity since he does not believe that Matthew’s conception of the Son of Man depends on *Par. En.* at all. However, as I argued above, “the least of these my brethren” probably should not be interpreted so narrowly. Nonetheless, the criterion for judgment in Matthew 25 remains remarkably similar to that in *Par. En.*, since the way the condemned have treated those with whom the Son of Man identifies himself is the basis for their being condemned.

are promised that they shall see the kings of the earth burn like stubble in a field. Further, in *1 Enoch* 54:1, 6 the seer envisions a deep valley with burning fire, into which the kings and potentates are cast. Besides the torment of fire they are fettered with iron chains (*1 Enoch* 53:3, 54:3) and covered with stones (*1 Enoch* 54:5). The hot springs also become an image for the destruction of the fallen angels and for the kings, for the seer foresees that the springs will change and burn forever (*1 Enoch* 67:7, 13).

*Punishment Prepared for Satan and his Angels.* Finally, the perception that the place of punishment was prepared for Satan and his angels is common to both. The condemned are consigned to a place that was not prepared for them, but because of their allegiance they are sent there, to a place prepared for the forces of evil.<sup>221</sup> In *Par. En.* the punishment of the burning valley and the fetters has been prepared for Azazel and his host (*1 Enoch* 54:5). The burning sulphurous, molten springs are punishment for the fallen angels, of which Azazel is one, who have revealed iniquity to humanity (*1 Enoch* 67:4–7). Those springs will also be waters of punishment for the kings and the mighty (*1 Enoch* 67:12–13). The kings and mighty ones are to be punished in fiery torment because they have become subject to Satan and have led humanity astray (*1 Enoch* 54:6). Thus while the fiery valley was prepared for the fallen angels, the kings and the mighty shall be consigned to them as well because of their allegiance.

The similarity between the two texts extends not only to the idea that the place of torment was prepared for another, but also to the idea of the multitude of the ones for whom it was prepared, the Devil and his angels. In *1 Enoch* 54:5, “the host of Azazel” is plural. At *1 Enoch* 55:4 the Elect One will sit in judgment upon “Azazel and all his associates and all his host.” The “Devil and all his angels” (Mt. 25:41) bears a striking resemblance to “Azazel and all his associates and all his host” (*1 Enoch* 55:4).

These similarities are striking and extensive. They indicate at the least a shared conception of the fate of the wicked before the enthroned Son of Man. Both authors express a very similar conception of the eschatological, judicial Son of Man.

### *Summary of Characteristics*

The description of the Last Judgment (Mt. 25:31–46) is a very important passage for elucidating Matthew’s conception of the Son of Man. Many characteristics and features of the Son of Man, both previously exhibited in the Gospel and new ones in this passage, are evident. First the characteristics noted in previous parts of the Gospel will be summarized, and then the new features revealed in this passage will be presented.

*Characteristics Previously Noted.* Many features are included in this Parable that have been noted in previous Son of Man passages.

- a) the attribute of coming (ἐλθῆναι), cf. Mt. 10:23, 16:27–28, 24:30–31;
- b) the attribute of glory (ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ), cf. Mt 16:27–28, 24:30–31;

<sup>221</sup> Gundry, *Matthew*, 515, notes this distinction in his comment on Mt. 25:41.

- c) the presence of angels (πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ), cf. Mt. 13:36–43, 16:27–28, 24:30–31;
- d) sitting on his glorious throne (καθίσει ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ), cf. Mt. 19:28;
- e) judging all nations (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη), cf. Mt. 24:30–31;
- f) action of gathering (συναχθήσονται), cf. Mt. 13:36–43, 24:30–31;
- g) his judicial role in separating wicked from righteous (ἀφορίσει), cf. Mt. 13:36–43, 16:27–28, 19:28, 24:30–31;
- h) his royal role made explicit in his being termed a king (ὁ βασιλεὺς), cf. Mt. 13:36–43, 16:19 (Jesus promises the keys of the kingdom to Peter), 16:27–28, and implied in 19:28;
- i) eternal bliss is promised for his followers, cf. Mt. 13:36–43;
- j) a fiery fate is in store for the condemned (τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον), cf. Mt. 13:36–43;
- k) eternal punishment is decreed (εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον), cf. Mt. 13:36–43;
- l) the judgment will be based on the deeds of the judged, cf. Mt. 16:27–28;
- m) the followers of the Son of Man are called “righteous” (οἱ δίκαιοι), cf. Mt. 13:36–43.

The parable further depicts the following patterns of relationship between the judge and the judged:

- n) opposition to persecutors;
- o) vindication for his followers with a reversal of fortunes and status;
- p) a clear dichotomy between the righteous and the wicked; and
- q) no possibility for mercy exists for the wicked;
- r) hidden to outsiders: the condemned do not recognize him, until he reveals himself to them in judgment; and
- s) revealed to insiders: in this parable the vindicated do not recognize him either, until he reveals himself to them.

*Characteristics Newly Revealed.* Several characteristics consonant with the portrayal of the Son of Man are also revealed in this parable. They are:

- a) the Son of Man is compared to the shepherd (ὁ ποιμὴν);
- b) the vindicated are termed “blessed” (οἱ εὐλογημένοι);
- c) the righteous are invited to “inherit” (κληρονομήσατε) the kingdom;
- d) the kingdom was prepared since the beginning of time (ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου);
- e) the wicked are cursed (κατηραμένοι);
- f) the punishment of the wicked was prepared for the Devil and his angels (ἡτοιμασμένον τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἄγγελοις αὐτοῦ);
- g) a question is posed to the Son of Man/judge/king by both the vindicated and the condemned; and
- h) the Son of Man is finally revealed to and recognized by both the vindicated and the condemned.

This final passage presents the fullest picture of the Son of Man and his activities. Twenty-seven characteristics have been noted in it altogether, nineteen characteristics had been noted in previously studied passages, while eight fresh characteristics are revealed in this pericope. The passage with the next most numerous characteristics is the Interpretation of the Parable of the Weeds, with thirteen that have been noted, eleven of which also occur in the Parable of the Last Judgment. Interestingly, both these passages are unique to Matthew, and bear clear fingerprints of his editorial and authorial activity. Together they reveal an almost complete portrait of Matthew's Son of Man.

## 4.8 Matthew's Portrait of the Son of Man

After having studied the unique Matthean Son of Man sayings, it becomes possible to discern the portrait of the Son of Man with which Matthew the author worked as he wrote his story of the life and ministry of Jesus. The nuances and connotations that Matthew expressed become identifiable from the Matthean sayings. Table 5 indicates the major traits of the Matthean portrait of the Son of Man.

Matthew's portrait envisions the Son of Man coming on the clouds, accompanied by angels, whom he sends out to gather the elect from the four corners of the earth. He comes to fulfill a judicial role,<sup>222</sup> and will be seen by all the world. He is predisposed to judge against the persecutors and to vindicate those with whom he identifies. The judgment is based on a clear opposition between the oppressed righteous and the persecutors, and the treatment the righteous receive at the hands of the persecutors, with the result being a reversal of fortunes and status. The kingdom belongs to the Son of Man,<sup>223</sup> as do the angels<sup>224</sup> and the elect, and the judgment he executes is final, with no possibility of mercy for the condemned. As royal judge, the Son of Man is characterized by glory, and is seated upon a glorious throne; his followers will also share in the judicial role. The Son of Man is unknown by the condemned, until they are judged, and then they are surprised that the Son of Man was not known to them, but was hidden amongst the lowly of the earth. On the other hand, the Son of Man is revealed to the followers, not only in the judgment event, but also in the narrative itself, in which the term Son of Man is used by Jesus as a public, non-revelatory self-description, but with his intimate associates, the disciples who are insiders, the term is replaced by the first person personal pronoun (see especially Mt. 16:13, 15). The followers are called both "his elect" and "the righteous," and they are promised that they will shine like the sun, while the condemned are consigned to a fiery fate.

<sup>222</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 69–80, has shown that the Matthean emphasis is on the judicial role of the coming Son of Man

<sup>223</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 69–73, 86, 90.

<sup>224</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 82, 86.

*Table 5*  
*The Matthean Portrait of the Son of Man*

Matthean Trait, Characteristic or Feature	Mt. 10: 23	13: 36–43	16: 13, 21	16: 27–28	19: 28	24: 30–31	25: 31–46	Synoptic parallel
1. ἔλθῃ comes/coming	•	-	-	•	-	•	•	• <sup>a</sup>
2. in opposition to persecutors	•	-	-	-	implied	•	•	-
3. vindication of followers, and reversal of fortunes and status	implied	•	-	•	implied	implied	•	-
4. ἀποστελεῖ sending	-	•	-	-	-	•	-	• <sup>b</sup>
5. τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ <b>his</b> angels	-	•	-	•	-	•	• w/o pronoun	• <sup>c</sup>
6. ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ <b>his</b> kingdom, i.e. royal role	-	•	• w/o pron	•	implied	-	• w/o pronoun	-
7. συλλέξουσιν/ ἐπισυνάξουσιν/ συναχθήσονται gathering	-	•	-	-	-	•	•	• <sup>d</sup>
8. δίκαιοι as term for the followers of the Son of Man	-	•	-	-	-	-	•	-
9. ἐκλάμψουσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος shine like the sun	-	•	-	-	-	-	-	-
10. εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός fiery fate for persecutors	-	•	-	-	-	-	•	-
11. judicial role	-	•	-	•	•	•	•	-
12. clear dichotomy between righteous and wicked	-	•	-	-	implied	-	•	-
13. no possibility of mercy for the wicked	-	•	-	-	-	-	•	-
14. eternal punishment is decreed	-	•	-	-	-	-	•	-
15. bliss promised to the righteous	-	•	-	-	-	-	•	-
16. hidden to outsiders	-	-	implied	-	-	-	•	-
17. revealed to insiders	-	-	•	-	-	-	•	-
18. Son of Man called Christ	-	-	•	-	-	-	-	• <sup>e</sup>
19. Son of Man called the Son of the living God	-	-	•	-	-	-	-	-
20. παθεῖν suffer	-	-	•	-	-	-	-	• <sup>f</sup>
21. ἐν τῇ δόξῃ in glory	-	-	-	•	-	•	•	• <sup>g</sup>
22. θρόνος δόξης αὐτοῦ throne of his glory	-	-	-	-	•	-	•	-
23. judgment according to deeds	-	-	-	•	-	-	•	-

Table 5 (contd.)

Matthean Trait, Characteristic or Feature	Mt. 10: 23	13: 36–43	16: 13, 21	16: 27–28	19: 28	24: 30–31	25: 31–46	Synoptic parallel
24. judicial role for followers	-	-	-	-	•	-	-	• <sup>b</sup>
25. πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς/πάντα τὰ ἔθνη all nations of earth	-	-	-	-	-	•	•	-
26. ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ on the clouds	-	-	-	-	-	•	-	• <sup>i</sup>
27. τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ his elect	-	-	-	-	-	•	-	• <sup>j</sup>
28. ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων from the four winds	-	-	-	-	-	•	-	• <sup>k</sup>
29. ὡσπερ ὁ ποιμὴν like the shepherd	-	-	-	-	-	-	•	-
30. οἱ εὐλογημένοι blessed	-	-	-	-	-	-	•	-
31. κληρονομήσατε inherit	-	-	-	-	-	-	•	-
32. ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου kingdom prepared since beginning of time	-	-	-	-	-	-	•	-
33. κατηραμένοι cursed	-	-	-	-	-	-	•	-
34. ἤτοιμασμένον τῷ διαβόλῳ fiery fate prepared for Satan	-	-	-	-	-	-	•	-
35. request by the condemned	-	-	-	-	-	-	•	-
36. finally revealed and recognized	-	-	-	-	-	-	•	-

<sup>a</sup> cf. Mt. 20:28//Mk 10:45; Mk 8:38//Lk. 9:26; Mk 13:26; Mt. 24:44//Lk. 12:40; Lk. 18:8, 19:10.<sup>b</sup> cf. Mk 13:27.<sup>c</sup> cf. Mk 8:38//Lk. 9:26.<sup>d</sup> cf. Mk 13:27.<sup>e</sup> cf. Mk 8:29//Lk. 9:20. In neither Mk or Lk, however, does Jesus refer to himself as the Son of Man.<sup>f</sup> cf. Mk 8:31//Lk. 9:22; but in Mt. 16:21 “Son of Man” is replaced with the personal pronoun αὐτόν.<sup>g</sup> cf. Mk 13:26//Lk. 21:27; Mk 8:38//Lk. 9:26.<sup>h</sup> cf. Lk. 18:30<sup>i</sup> cf. Mk 13:26//Lk. 21:27; Mt 26:64//Mk 14:62//Lk. 22:69.<sup>j</sup> cf. Mk 13:27, where the possessive pronoun, αὐτοῦ, is not used, although some manuscripts insert it.<sup>k</sup> cf. Mk 13:27.

In none of the coming Son of Man sayings does the Son of Man play a role of advocate. In Matthew the Son of Man does not appear before a judge on behalf of the righteous. In Mark and Luke, the role of advocate is given to the Son of Man, but in Matthew the role of the Son of Man has been elevated to that of judge and king. This is most clear when Mt. 16:27 is compared with Mk 8:38//Lk. 9:27. Mark and Luke preserve the comment about the Son of Man being ashamed at the final judgment of those who had been ashamed of him (ἐπαίσχυνη̅ με/ ἐπαίσχυθη̅σεται αὐτόν). In that scenario, the Son of Man evidently will appear before a judge and advocate for or against those who on earth have allied themselves with or against him. But in Mt. 16:27 there is no longer any hint of advocacy. It has been redacted out, for Matthew only admits to the Son of Man coming with his angels in the glory of the Father to enact judgment.<sup>225</sup> The Son of Man is depicted as having authority in the kingdom over the angels, as well as over those who are brought before him in judgment.

As can be seen from Table 5, many of the characteristics of the Son of Man are present also in one of the other synoptic Gospels. The ideas of coming on the clouds with angels is present in the Markan and Lukan Son of Man, as is the image of sending the angels to collect the elect. But the development apparent in Matthew's portrait is that the angels are under the authority of the Son of Man: they are "his!"<sup>226</sup> Similarly the concept of the Kingdom of God is present in synoptic sayings, but calling it the Son of Man's is a Matthean development. Further, those gathered from the four winds are called the "elect" in Mk 13:27, but they are "his elect," i.e. the Son of Man's, in Mt. 24:31.<sup>227</sup> The attribute of glory is also found in Mark and Luke, but the picture of the Son of Man sitting upon the glorious throne is uniquely Matthean, and is a development supporting Matthew's elevation of the Son of Man to the role of eschatological judge.<sup>228</sup> The reference to the throne of his glory is in all likelihood a quotation of the Enochic description.<sup>229</sup>

Table 5 helps to identify which traits have been uniquely developed by Matthew. The angels are put under the authority of the Son of Man, the kingdom and the elect are called "his," and he is envisioned as seated upon a glorious throne. The additions Matthew has made to the synoptic portrait are that his followers are called "righteous"<sup>230</sup> and they will shine like the sun, while a fiery fate awaits the perse-

<sup>225</sup> At Mt. 10:32–33//Lk. 12:8–9 advocacy is preserved with the use of ὁμολογῶ and ἀρνώμαι, acknowledging and denying. Q apparently had "Son of Man" at this point, but Matthew has dropped "Son of Man" in favor of the first person pronoun. It is apparent that Matthew has redacted both Mt. 16:27 and Mt. 10:32–33 to avoid casting the Son of Man as an advocate. Cf. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 90.

<sup>226</sup> Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 200.

<sup>227</sup> The textual variant of adding αὐτοῦ in Mk 13:27 does not have a very secure basis: αὐτοῦ was more than likely added under the influence of Mt. 24:31.

<sup>228</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 80, 94.

<sup>229</sup> See the exegesis of Mt 19:28 above. Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 158–61; Caragounis, *The Son of Man*, 171.

<sup>230</sup> In Mk 2:17 and Lk. 5:32 (followed by Mt. 9:13) the "righteous" are clearly NOT followers of Jesus.

cutors. In Matthew's portrayal the Son of Man has been elevated to a judicial role,<sup>231</sup> and his close associates even participate in the judgment.<sup>232</sup> A clear dichotomy exists between the righteous and the wicked, with no hope of mercy. The Son of Man is hidden to outsiders, but revealed to insiders, and judgment will be based upon the deeds of those judged.

Table 5 also shows a significant concentration of these unique Matthean traits in the pericopes that are unique to Matthew. The Interpretation of the Parable of the Weeds (Mt. 13:36–43) and the Parable of the Last Judgment (Mt. 25:31–46) are found only in Matthew, and they display twenty-nine of the thirty-six traits I have noted in the Matthean portrait. Of those twenty-nine, five are shared with the synoptics, leaving twenty-four unique to Matthew. Of the seven traits not appearing in these two passages, six are shared with Mark and/or Luke (albeit altered), and so only one is unique to Matthew. Thus the preponderance of unique Matthean traits in the portrayal of the Son of Man is found in Mt. 13:36–43 and Mt. 25:31–46.

While not all the traits identified in this study are uniquely Matthean, the unique Matthean traits are quite impressive. The elevation of the Son of Man to the judicial role is affirmed by his session on the throne, as is his authority over the angels, as well as the finality of the sentence he passes. The clear dichotomy between righteous and wicked, with no hope of compromise, and even their characterization as “righteous” or “wicked” is noteworthy, as is the view that the outsiders are not cognizant of his identity, while the insiders have this privileged information revealed to them. The blessed will inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world, while the cursed will enter a fiery fate prepared for the Devil and his angels. The question of clarification reveals that no mercy will be forthcoming for the condemned and that the Son of man has been hidden in the lowly. These characteristics are a coherent development of the portrait of the Son of Man that is found in Mark and Q. They emphasize Matthew's shaping of the concept to that of being an eschatological judge. It is likely that Matthew was influenced rather significantly in this portrayal of the Son of Man. Examining in greater detail the parallels with the portrait found in the *Parables of Enoch*, which were treated in Chapter 3, will be the subject of Chapter 5, the concluding chapter.

<sup>231</sup> Cf. Lk. 21:36, where a possible judgment theme arises, as some are expected to “stand before” the Son of Man; this passage, however, is a warning to the disciples, the insiders, not to the oppressors.

<sup>232</sup> Luke has twelve thrones also, but the context is the messianic banquet, not judgment.



# 5

## CONCLUSION

### 5.1 Similarities

In this chapter we compare the results of the detailed examination of the Son of Man passages in the *Parables of Enoch* and the pertinent passages in the Gospel of Matthew. From Chapter 3, Tables 3 and 4 summarize the characteristics and features of the portrait of the Son of Man in *Par. En.*, while Table 5 in Chapter 4 outlines the characteristics and features operating in the Matthean portrait.

At this point, the task is to work from the Enochic portrait and to notice which features also appear in Matthew's Gospel. Since the characteristics and features of the two portrayals fall into two types of similarities, they will be presented in two Tables. The first type of similarity is the strong verbal similarities in details, noted in Table 6; the second type, the similarities in presuppositions, implications and the pattern of relationships, and these comprise Table 7. While all the similarities noted in Table 7 are explicit in the Enochic passages that have been presented, in the Matthean material many are found in the passages studied in detail in the previous chapter, and

*Table 6*  
*Specific and Detailed Characteristics of the Son of Man*  
*Shared by Par. En. and Matthew*

Characteristic or Feature	<i>1 Enoch</i>	Matthew
1. heavenly status	46, 48:2–8, 62–63, 70–71	13:36–43, 16:24–28, 19:28, 24:30, 25:31–46
2. judicial role	46, 62–63, 69:26–29	13:36–43, 16:27, 19:28, 24:30 25:31
3. followers called “righteous”	48:2–8, 62–63	13:36–43, 25:31–46
4. followers called “elect”	48:2–8, 62–63 <i>et passim</i>	24:30–31
5. seated upon throne of his glory	62:5, 69:27, 29	19:28, 25:31
6. no mercy for condemned	62–63	13:36–43, 25:31–46
7. promise of eternal bliss for the righteous	62:13–16, 71:16–17	13:43, 25:34, 46
8. worldwide jurisdiction	69:27 (cf. 46:1–3, 48:2–8 62:3, 5, 9)	24:30, 25:32
9. brightness of inhabitants of heaven	71:1, cf. 58:1,4,6	13:43

some in the wider context of the Gospel as a whole.<sup>1</sup> Through the exploration of these similarities, the literary relationship of Matthew to *Par. En.* will become clearer.

### 5.1.1 1 Enoch 46

In *1 Enoch* 46, five features have been highlighted as significant to the portrait of the Son of Man.

#### 5.1.1.1 Heavenly Status

The heavenly status of the Son of Man is evident in *1 Enoch* 46. The scene is set in the heavenly realms, and the Chief of Days is seen as well as another with a human

**Table 7**  
**Patterns of Relationships of the Son of Man**  
**Shared by Par. En. and Matthew**

Characteristic or Feature	<i>1 Enoch</i>	Matthew
1. righteousness	46:3, 48:2–8 (implied) 62:2–3, 71:14, 16	13:41–43, 16:27, 25:37, 46
2. revelatory role	46:3	13:36, 25:31–46
3. chosenness	46:3, 48:6	c.f. 12:18, quoting Isa. 42:1
4. named from eternity (i.e. purpose and pre-existence)	48:2–8	25:34 c.f. 1:18–25, 12:18–21 quoting Isa. 42:1–4
5. support for the righteous	48:4	c.f. 11:28–29
6. light for the Gentiles	48:4	c.f. 5:14, 16
7. worthy of worship	48:5, 62:6	c.f. 2:2, 11, 8:2, 9:18, 14:33, 15:25, 20:20, 28:9
8. hiddenness	48:6, 62:7	16:13–15 (implied), 25:31–46
9. revealed to insiders	48:7, 62:7, 69:26	16:13–15, 25:31–46

<sup>1</sup> Since Matthew identifies the Son of Man and Jesus quite closely, features relating to the Son of Man may appear in passages not explicitly associated with the term “Son of Man.” The identification of Jesus and the Son of Man by Matthew has been argued above in the previous chapter in the section on Matthew 16. The identification between Jesus and the Son of Man appears most clearly in 16:13, 15, where Jesus first asks his disciples, “Who do people say the Son of Man is?” and then asks the disciples again, “Who do you say that I am?” Further, when this passage is compared to its synoptic parallel in Mk 8:27–33, it is also evident that Matthew identified Jesus and the Son of Man, for Matthew inserts the term in Mt. 16:13 in place of the personal pronoun which is found in Mk 8:27, but then replaces it with the personal pronoun in Mt. 16:21 as compared to Mk 8:31. This is clear evidence that for Matthew Jesus and the Son of Man are one and the same.

*Table 7 (contd.)*

<b>Characteristic or Feature</b>	<b><i>1 Enoch</i></b>	<b>Matthew</b>
10. inflicts pain, terror and shame	62:4–5, 10	8:12, 13:42, 50, 22:13, 24:51, 25:30; 24:30 (c.f. Zech. 12:10–14)
11. finally revealed and recognized by the kings and the mighty	62:3, 63:4	25:31–46
12. request by the condemned	62:9, 63:5	25:44
13. fairness of judgment	63:8–9	25:31–46
14. word is strong and incontrovertible	69:26–29	13:36–43, 24:30–31, 25:31–46
15. causes the destruction of evil	69:26–29, cf. 48:8, 63, 53:3–5, 54:1–5	13:36–43, 25:31–46, cf. 13:47–50
16. angels in presence of Son of Man “his” in Matthew	71:8–14	13:41, 16:27, 24:31, 25:31

countenance. This feature is explicit in *1 Enoch* 48:2–8, 62–63, 70–71 also, as may be expected, since the visions are set in heaven.

In the Son of Man passages unique to Matthew, the heavenly status is present in some, and can only be assumed in others. In Mt. 10:23, the Son of Man is said to come, ἕως ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, but it is not explained from where he comes. Here then, the heavenly status of the Son of Man is not evident.

In Mt. 13:36–43, however, the heavenly status of the Son of Man is clear. In verses 41–43, the Son of Man has divine authority to judge, and dispatches his angels to cast out all causes of sin and evildoers so that the righteous may shine in the kingdom of their Father. The setting is the eschatological judgment and the Son of Man’s heavenly status is clear.

In Mt. 16:13–23, the setting is the earthly location where Jesus asks his disciples what they think of him. The first question regarding others’ thoughts about him utilizes the term “Son of Man,” but the second, more direct question to the disciples themselves is cast with a personal pronoun. With both questions, the earthly setting of the narrative is explicit. In the continuation of the discussion, however, as Jesus explains the implications of following to Jerusalem, the Son of Man reappears in Jesus’ words as coming from the glory of his Father with his angels (16:24–28). The divine glory and the presence of the angels indicate that for Matthew, the Son of Man has a heavenly status and origin.

In Mt. 19:28 Jesus speaks of the Son of Man sitting upon his glorious throne. This reference makes clear the heavenly status of the Son of Man.

In Mt. 24:30, the sign of the Son of Man is said to be in the heavens, and he is said to be coming on the clouds of heaven with glory and power. These attributes emphasize the heavenly status of the Son of Man.

Finally in Mt. 25:31–46 the heavenly status of the Son of Man is clear. He is said to be sitting on his glorious throne accompanied by angels in verse 31. Since all nations are to be brought to him for judgment, an earthly setting cannot be in the

mind of the author, since no earthly setting could be large enough. A heavenly scene is in mind, in which size and space are plastic and modifiable. Further, the kingdom to be inherited by the righteous is pre-mundane. As vice-gerent to God, dispensing this eternal vindication, the Son of Man has heavenly status.

In four of the six scenes under scrutiny, the heavenly status of the Son of Man is plain. This qualifies heavenly status as a precise similarity between *Par. En.* and Matthew, so it appears in Table 6.<sup>2</sup>

### 5.1.1.2 Righteousness of the Son of Man

Righteousness is also an explicit feature in the Enochic portrait of the Son of Man. Righteousness belongs to him and dwells with him, and is the qualification for his being able to judge the kings and the mighty (*1 Enoch* 46:3). His righteousness is also implied in *1 Enoch* 48:2–8, since he is with the Chief of Days and is the support for the righteous of earth whose portion he will preserve. The spirit of righteousness is poured over the Elect One, later called the Son of Man, as he sits on the throne of his glory (*1 Enoch* 62:2), and he is acknowledged by the condemned kings and mighty ones as having a righteousness beyond reckoning (*1 Enoch* 63:3). Again in the concluding vision, the Son of Man is characterized by righteousness: he is born for it, it abides upon him, and it will not forsake him (*1 Enoch* 71:14, 16).

Righteousness is not attributed explicitly to the Son of Man in Matthew's Gospel, but the Son of Man can be seen to have righteousness based upon the pattern of relationships that holds true for this author. The Son of Man cannot abide evil and has it cast out (Mt. 13:41–42). He will repay human beings for what they have done (Mt. 16:27), and this is carried out on the basis of righteousness. The heavenly status of the Son of Man (see above) and his being in the presence of the Godhead also indicate his righteousness. Most importantly, the ones with whom the Son of Man identifies are called "righteous" (Mt. 13:43, 25:37, 46). This pattern of relationships supports the conclusion that the Son of Man in Matthew's Gospel is conceived of as having righteousness, just as the Son of Man in *Par. En.* has righteousness. This similarity between the concept of the Son of Man in the two works then is included in Table 7, as a quality that is part of the pattern of relationships in which the Son of Man is portrayed.

### 5.1.1.3 Revelatory Role

Further a revelatory role is explicitly attributed to the Son of Man in *1 Enoch* 46:3, where the author envisions the Son of Man revealing all the treasures of what is hidden. The balance of the work, then, is devoted to revealing various kinds of information, from meteorological secrets to the outcome of the eschatological judgment.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Of itself, however, this precise similarity is insufficient to establish a link between *Par. En.* and Matthew, for this same feature appears in Mark and Luke.

<sup>3</sup> This revelatory function appears explicitly only in the first Son of Man passage, but since the rest of the work indeed functions to reveal heavenly secrets, and since Enoch is supposedly the one who reveals this information through this work, the mention of the revelatory

While a revelatory role is not explicitly attributed to the Son of Man in the passages under consideration from Matthew's Gospel, Jesus, as the Son of Man in Matthew's mind, functions in such a way as to reveal heavenly truth. Specifically, in Mt. 13:36, the disciples ask Jesus to explain or make clear to them, διαισάφῃσον, the meaning of the Parable of the Weeds, which Jesus proceeds to do, functioning in a way that reveals heavenly truth. Similarly, in Mt. 25:31–46, in the process of separating the righteous from the unrighteous, the Son of Man reveals to the judged their fate and to the world the outcome of the final judgment. In terms of making the outcome of judgment known, the Parable of the Last Judgment functions in the same way as the visions of *Par. En.* do. Both reveal to the interested readership the outcome of the heavenly judgment and its effect on them. Since for Matthew, Jesus is in effect identified as the Son of Man,<sup>4</sup> a revelatory role can be assigned to the Son of Man, at the level of the presuppositions of the author and in the way the author has presented the pattern of relationships. Both *Par. En.* and Matthew have the purpose of revealing heavenly truths and they both present the primary character functioning as a revealer of heavenly truths. This attribute of having a revelatory role, then, appears in Table 7.

#### 5.1.1.4 Chosenness

The chosenness of the Son of Man is stated explicitly in *1 Enoch* 46:3. The Son of Man has been chosen by the Lord of Spirits. He is also described as “chosen” in *1 Enoch* 48:6. “Chosenness” is related to another designation for this figure in this work, the “Elect One.”<sup>5</sup> In the latter passage the Son of Man's chosenness is mentioned in connection with his hiddenness. The chosenness and hiddenness of the Son of Man have to do with God's eternal purposes for him, which comprise, in part, being authorized to carry out the final judgment upon the kings and the mighty.

While chosenness is not explicitly attributed to the Son of Man in Matthew, it is part of the pattern of relationships which Matthew presumes concerning the figure. The concept of being chosen is applied to Jesus by Matthew in Mt. 12:18 by way of quoting Isa. 42:1, “Behold my servant, whom I have chosen...” And since, for Matthew, Jesus and the Son of Man are identified,<sup>6</sup> chosenness can also be understood of the Son of Man. As a part of the pattern of relationships, then, the Son of Man's chosenness is listed in Table 7.

#### 5.1.1.5 Judicial Role

The judicial role of the Son of Man is quite evident in these works. In *1 Enoch* 46, 62–63 and 69:26–29, the scene is judicial. In *1 Enoch* 62–63 the role is especially evident, as the condemned kings and mighty ones plead for mercy (*1 Enoch* 62:9). In *1 Enoch* 69:27, sitting upon the throne and receiving the sum of judgment bear witness to the judicial responsibility of the Son of Man.

function then becomes a hint or a foreshadowing of the concluding scene in which Enoch, the seer, is proclaimed to be and identified as the Son of Man.

<sup>4</sup> See the first footnote of this chapter.

<sup>5</sup> Black, *1 Enoch*, 208.

<sup>6</sup> See the first footnote of this chapter.

The judicial role of the Son of Man is also a prominent feature of Matthew's portrayal. It appears in Mt. 13:36–43, as the Son of Man consigns the wicked to a fiery fate. This role is also apparent in Mt. 16:27 in which the Son of Man will repay persons for what they have done, and in Mt. 19:28 in the image of sitting upon the glorious throne. In the apocalyptic material in Mt. 24:30, the mourning of the tribes of earth entails the judicial aspect of the coming of the Son of Man, and in Mt. 25:31 the content of the parable is explicitly judicial. These judicial features are clear in Matthew's portrayal of the Son of Man, and as compared to the other synoptic Gospels, they appear to be a deliberate shaping by the author of the concept of the Son of Man in this direction.<sup>7</sup> The judicial role of the Son of Man, then, is a close and precise parallel between the two works and is listed in Table 6.

### 5.1.2 1 Enoch 48:2–8

*1 Enoch* 48:2–8 presents twelve features of the portrait of the Son of Man. Three have been noted already in *1 Enoch* 46: his heavenly status, his righteousness and his chosenness. Similarities in Matthew's portrait of the Son of Man must now be sought for the nine new features, some of which can be considered together.

#### 5.1.2.1 Named

In *1 Enoch* 48:2–8, the Son of Man is said to be “named from eternity,” and to be “named before the Lord of Spirits.” This naming has to do with the eternal and divine purpose and mission of the Son of Man, which is to save the righteous community and to be a light to the Gentiles (cf. Isaiah 49). It is precisely what Harnack describes as everything of real value existing in heaven perpetually, having an actual existence in the mind of God that precedes earthly, physical existence; it is an “ideal pre-existence,” or an existence in the “noetic cosmos” of Philo.<sup>8</sup> As Hamerton-Kelly recognizes, the idea of pre-existence thus must be sensitive to the context of each particular text.<sup>9</sup> Having examined pertinent texts, Hamerton-Kelly refines the idea of pre-existence to signify that an entity “had a real existence before its manifestation on earth, either in the mind of God or in heaven.”<sup>10</sup> As he further notes, *Par. En.* has perhaps the most significant discourse on the pre-existence of the Son of Man,<sup>11</sup> with the result that subsequent literary reference to the Son of Man entails pre-existence.

In Matthew's Gospel, while the naming of the Son of Man is not mentioned, the naming of Jesus is, in Matthew's birth narrative, and his salvific mission and purpose

<sup>7</sup> Tödt, *Son of Man*, 92.

<sup>8</sup> Adolf Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 2nd ed. (Freiburg i. B. 1888) I, 710–711, as followed by Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man*, 1–3, 20–21.

<sup>9</sup> Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man*, 5.

<sup>10</sup> Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man*, 11.

<sup>11</sup> Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man*, 17–18.

are made clear, both in the name “Jesus” and in the name “Emmanuel” (Mt. 1:18–25). This child is to be the one through whom God saves, and through whom God is with humanity. Further Jesus’ divine purpose is expressed in the quotation of Isa. 42:1–4 in Mt 12:18–21, where Matthew acknowledges Jesus to be the one chosen to proclaim justice and lift up the weak and downtrodden. Matthew has also included from Mark the salvific purpose of being a ransom for many (Mt. 20:28/Mk 10:45).

The idea of pre-existence is also embedded in the presuppositions of Matthew’s narrative. Hamerton-Kelly calls attention to several texts which seem to assume the “ideal pre-existence” of the Son of Man. He suggests that the Son of Man portrayed as sitting on a throne in heaven surrounded by the twelve on their thrones in Mt. 19:28 implies pre-existence in heaven. But in Mt. 19:28 the vision is clearly of a future scene, not a pre-existent one, and so this passage does not help with Hamerton-Kelly’s case.<sup>12</sup> That the kingdom prepared for the elect (Mt. 25:34) has been prepared from the foundation of the world, however, does imply pre-existence in heaven before earthly manifestation. Further, simply the notion of the “coming” of the Son of Man in these sayings implies an existence somewhere before his earthly manifestation.<sup>13</sup> Likewise, the Matthean concept of the fulfillment of scripture presumes a pre-existent plan, at least in the mind of God, and since the Son of Man was envisioned as essential to that plan of salvation, the pre-existence of the Son of Man is also a part of that world view, even though it may not be explicitly stated.<sup>14</sup>

Thus the salvific purpose of the Son of Man, the naming, and the notion of pre-existence are common to both *Par. En.* and Matthew. The naming of the Son of Man is not narrated in Matthew, but the naming of Jesus is, and further, connotations of pre-existence can be found in the Matthean world view and in the pattern of relationships. This feature, then, appears in Table 7.

### 5.1.2.2 *Support and Source of Hope*

The Son of Man is portrayed as a staff upon which the righteous may lean and a source of hope for those who are troubled in *1 Enoch* 48:4. These precise concepts do not appear in the Son of Man passages that have been examined in the previous chapter, but in Mt. 11:28–29, Jesus does invite all who are weary and heavy-laden to come to him for rest. Hamerton-Kelly points out the influence of the Wisdom tradition on this saying, recognizing that Matthew is presenting Christ as Wisdom<sup>15</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Pointed out to me by Prof. James C. VanderKam.

<sup>13</sup> Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man*, 71.

<sup>14</sup> Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man*, 76–77. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 284–85, is surely wrong then to claim that pre-existence is not a part of the concept of the Son of Man. As noted above, the concept is not explicit in the sayings themselves, but that does not rule it out as being a part of the concept. By association with other passages in the Gospel, as noted above, and by simply noting that the Son of Man, when he comes, comes from somewhere, pre-existence can be seen to be presumed about the Son of Man.

<sup>15</sup> Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man*, 68. This identification of Jesus with pre-existent Wisdom provides another example of Matthew’s view that Jesus, the Son of Man, is pre-existent.

inviting all to take on his yoke; c.f. Sir. 51:23ff and 24:19ff, Prov. 1:20 ff and 8:1 ff. This quality then, occurring in both works as a feature of the pattern of relationships, appears in Table 7.

5.1.2.3 *A Light for the Gentiles*

This concept, taken over from Isa. 49:6, also appears in the portrait of the Son of Man in *1 Enoch* 48:4. Being the light to the Gentiles is not connected directly by Matthew to Jesus/Son of Man, but in the birth narrative, Matthew illustrates that Jesus is a light to the Gentiles, by telling the story of the Sages following the star. The heavenly light guides them to Jesus, the source of spiritual illumination.<sup>16</sup> Further, in Mt. 5:14, 16, the hearers of the Sermon on the Mount are told that they are the light of the world and that they are to let their light shine. Since the Gentiles are included in “the world,” the followers of the Son of Man are a light for the Gentiles, and by extension so is the Son of Man whom they emulate. This feature, then, is also listed in Table 7, in the pattern of relationships.

5.1.2.4 *Worthy of Worship*

That the Son of Man is worthy of worship by both the righteous and the oppressors is acknowledged in *1 Enoch* 48:5 and *1 Enoch* 62:6. This feature elevates the Son of Man to divine status, although having a human countenance.

In Matthew’s Gospel, several people are described as worshipping Jesus. While in the literal sense προσεκυνέω means to kneel or bow down, Matthew seems to have intentionally chosen to use this word instead of the terminology found in the synoptic parallels in order to emphasize the connotation of worshipping. The magi worship, προσεκύνησαν, Jesus/Son of Man (Mt. 2:2, 11; this incident is unique to Matthew). A leper (Mt. 8:2) and the ruler (Mt. 9:18, named Jairus in Mk 5:21–43 and Lk. 8:40–56) worship, προσεκυνεῖ, Jesus.<sup>17</sup> Again, the disciples in the boat worship (προσεκύνησαν) Jesus as the Son of God after witnessing him walk on the water

<sup>16</sup> Suggested to me by Prof. James C. VanderKam.

<sup>17</sup> Mt seems to have intentionally introduced the idea of worship, προσεκυνεῖ (Mt 8:2) by the leper, for Mk 1:40 has γουσιπετῶν and Lk 5:12 has πεσῶν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον. Similarly Mt emphasizes the ruler’s worship, προσεκυνεῖ (Mt 9:18), where Mk 5:22 has πίπτει πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ and Lk 8:41 has πεσῶν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Ἰησοῦ. In the literal sense, προσεκυνεῖ is of course a synonym for the terminology found in Mark and Luke, but the strong connotation of worship is apparent in Matthew’s deliberate choice of the verb προσεκυνέω. It is interesting to note some of the varying ways this verb is translated into English. Below is a chart of the passages being discussed showing the differences:

	KJV	RSV	NRSV	NAB
Mt 2:2, 11	worship	worship	pay homage	pay homage
Mt 8:2	worshipped	knelt	knelt	did homage
Mt 9:18	worshipped	knelt	knelt	knelt down
Mt 14:33	worshipped	worshipped	worshipped	did homage
Mt 15:25	worshipped	knelt	knelt	did homage
Mt 20:20	worshipping	kneeling	kneeling	did homage
Mt 28:9, 17	worshipped	worshipped	worshipped	did homage, worshipped



(Mt. 14:33),<sup>18</sup> and the Syro-phoenician woman also worships him, προσεκυεῖ, while begging for help for her daughter (Mt. 15:25).<sup>19</sup> The mother of the sons of Zebedee worships him, προσκυνοῦσα, asking for a favor (Mt. 20:20),<sup>20</sup> while the women at the empty tomb worship (προσεκύνησαν) the risen Christ, as do the disciples on the mountain (Mt 28:9, 17).<sup>21</sup> While Matthew never says that the Son of Man is worthy of worship, nonetheless he illustrates Jesus/Son of Man being worshipped, and so this feature also is an implicit, subtle part of Matthew's depiction of the Son of Man, part of the pattern of relationships, and therefore it appears in Table 7.

#### 5.1.2.5 *Hiddenness*

Another significant feature of the Son of Man in *Par. En.* is his hiddenness, an apocalyptic feature explaining why the Son of Man has not been hitherto known. The Son of Man is described as having been hidden in *1 Enoch* 48:6 and 62:7.

The hiddenness of the Son of Man is implied in Matthew's portrayal. In Mt. 16:13–15 the Son of Man is hidden from the general populace and from those who are potentially or actually hostile to Christ, as argued by Kingsbury.<sup>22</sup> Further in Mt. 25:31–46, the Son of Man/King as the eschatological judge is known neither to the condemned nor the righteous at the time of judgment. His identity had been hidden from them. In the discourse between the Son of Man/King and the judged, however, it does become clear by whom they are being judged.

The hiddenness of the Son of Man, then, is explicit in *Par. En.*, but a part of the pattern of relationships in Matthew. Therefore this feature appears in Table 7.

#### 5.1.2.6 *Revealed*

The complementary feature to the hiddenness of the Son of Man is the declaration that he is revealed to the righteous, who are those with whom the Son of Man identifies. In *1 Enoch* 48:7, the holy and righteous are promised that the Son of Man will be revealed to them by the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits, while in *1 Enoch* 62:7 the Son of Man, though hidden, is revealed by the Most High to the elect, who will be vindicated when they stand before him at the judgment. *1 Enoch* 69:26 indicates that the vindicated rejoiced, blessed, glorified and extolled [the deity] because the name of the Son of Man had been revealed to them. Their joy is due to their vindication, the

<sup>18</sup> Mk 6:51 simply reports that they were astonished, καὶ λίαν ἐκ περισσοῦ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο.

<sup>19</sup> Mk 7:25 has προσέπεσεν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.

<sup>20</sup> Mk 10:35 does not even have the idea of falling down before the feet of him, indicating Matthew's deliberate addition of *proskynesis*, or worship.

<sup>21</sup> These scenes are unique to Mt.

<sup>22</sup> Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*, 114–15. This hiddenness is clearest in Mt. 16:13–15, where Jesus first asks who the people think the Son of Man is (potentially hostile audience) and then who the disciples (intimate, inner-circle audience) think he (the first singular accusative pronoun) is. The Son of Man is hidden to the people in general but revealed to the inner circle.

condemnation of the sinners and the ultimate ascent of the Son of Man to a position of authority and power on the throne of his glory (*1 Enoch* 69:27–29).

In Matthew the same feature, i.e. the Son of Man being revealed to the righteous, is discernible. In Mt. 16:13–15, the implication is that while the Son of Man is not known to the people in general, he is known to his own inner circle, the disciples, and that is why the term Son of Man is replaced with the personal pronoun in Jesus' second question about his identity. As Kingsbury has argued,<sup>23</sup> the term "Son of Man" occurs on Jesus' lips only when a hostile audience is present, but in the same context a personal pronoun is used when the inner circle alone is in focus. This narratological observation indicates that the revelation of the Son of Man to the righteous is an operative principle in Matthew's portrayal of the Son of Man. Similarly in the Parable of the Last Judgment (Mt. 25:31–46), the Son of Man/King is revealed to the vindicated in "the least of these my brothers." He is also revealed to the condemned at the same time in the context of their judgment.

In neither passage, Mt. 16:13–15 nor Mt. 25:31–46, is joy a feature that accompanies the revealing of the Son of Man. Joy was quite obvious in the Enochic passages but is not incorporated into the Matthean passages.

In both works, some confusion is present about the timing of the revelation of the Son of Man. In *1 Enoch* 48, the revelation appears to be before the final judgment, in order to give his own courage and hope. Revelation before the final judgment is also apparent in Matthew's choice of the pronoun in Mt. 16:15. But the revelation of the Son of Man to the righteous appears to be at the final judgment in *1 Enoch* 62, when the judicial Son of Man is also revealed to the kings and the mighty. And in Mt. 25:31–46, because of the surprise of both condemned and blessed, this is the case there as well.

Since the revealing of the Son of Man is not explicit in Matthew but observed, as a matter of the pattern of relationships, this feature is listed in Table 7.

### 5.1.2.7 Terms Describing Followers

Those with whom the Son of Man is identified in *Par. En.* are pointedly called "the righteous," or "the elect," or "the holy." This occurs throughout the work to emphasize the alignment between them and the Son of Man, in whom righteousness dwells, who is holy, and who is also called "the Elect One." It can be observed quite plainly that the followers of the Son of Man are called "the righteous" in both *1 Enoch* 48 and 62–63, as well as throughout the work.

Those with whom the Son of Man is identified are also called "the righteous," and "his elect" in Matthew's Gospel.<sup>24</sup> Both in the Interpretation of the Parable of the Weeds (Mt. 13:36–43) and in the description of the Last Judgment (Mt. 25:31–46)

<sup>23</sup> Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*, 114–15.

<sup>24</sup> Mt. 24:31 has "his elect" τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ, while the parallel passage at Mk 13:27 has "the elect" τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς, although significant witnesses add the possessive pronoun, and Nestle-Aland<sup>27</sup> has included it in the text in square brackets. As argued above, I consider the addition of the possessive pronoun to be an assimilation to Matthew's version.

those whom the Son of Man favors are called δίκαιοι/the righteous. In Mt. 24:31, the ones who are gathered on the day of the Son of Man are called “his elect.” While the use of the term δίκαιοι fits well with Matthew’s concern for ἡ δικαιοσύνη, it also matches the usage of the term in *Par. En.* Further, the use of the term τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς, taken over from the Markan parallel (Mk 13:27), is more than a coincidental similarity with the usage in *Par. En.*

The followers’ being called “righteous” and “elect” are quite striking verbal similarities between the two works, and so they are listed in Table 6.

### 5.1.3 1 Enoch 62–63

Several characteristics and features of the Son of Man from previous passages are repeated in *1 Enoch* 62–63 (see Table 3), but I have noted seven further characteristics that this passage introduces.

#### 5.1.3.1 The Throne of his Glory

The Son of Man is depicted as sitting upon the throne of his glory (*manbara sebhatihu*) in the second and third parables.<sup>25</sup> The Chief of Days and the Elect One/Son of Man<sup>26</sup> are depicted on the throne in a judicial role. In *1 Enoch* 62–63 the oppressors, who have been turned out of their thrones, acknowledge their judge, the Elect One/Son of Man, on the throne of his glory. This image of the throne emphasizes the judicial authority the Son of Man has over them, and the appropriateness of the divine judgment against them. Session upon the throne is a visual image that effectively attributes honor, glory, and authority second only to the Chief of Days. It indicates that the Son of Man is acting on behalf of and with the full authority of the Chief of Days.

In the Matthean material, “the throne of his glory” appears in connection with the Son of Man in Mt. 19:28 and 25:31. In both instances the judicial role is being emphasized. The full authority of the Son of Man to judge on behalf of the divinity is illustrated, and the judgment is passed down on behalf of God. When compared with the other Synoptics, it can be seen that the qualifier “of glory” is unique to Matthew, as is the use of the possessive pronoun. As noted in the previous chapter in the sections on Mt. 19:28 and 25:31, this phrase, “the throne of his glory,” is a semiticism. Other occurrences of the image of a figure other than God sitting on the divine throne can be found in early Jewish literature (see above), but not in precisely this form. This phrase then, θρόνος δόξης αὐτοῦ, appears convincingly to be a quotation of *manbara sebhatihu* from *Par. En.*<sup>27</sup>

Since the similarity is so close and precise, this feature appears in Table 6.

<sup>25</sup> For the distribution of these passages and a discussion of the origins and significance of this image, see the sections above on *1 Enoch* 69:26–29 and Mt 19:28.

<sup>26</sup> That the terms “Son of Man,” “Elect One” and “Anointed One” refer to the same being has been shown by VanderKam in “Righteous One,” 169–91.

<sup>27</sup> So also Caragounis, *The Son of Man*, 171 and my discussion of Mt. 19:28, 25:31.

### 5.1.3.2 *Inflicting Pain, Terror and Shame*

The Son of Man as eschatological judge inflicts pain, terror and shame upon the kings and the mighty in *1 Enoch* 62:4–5, 10 owing to the judgment against them. This issues ultimately in their being consigned to a fiery fate (see below).

The pain, terror and shame inflicted on the oppressors appears in Matthew in two ways. One is through the refrain ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων (there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth; Mt. 8:12, 13:42, 50, 22:13, 24:51, 25:30). The pain, terror and shame of the oppressors also appear in Matthew's claim that all the tribes of earth shall mourn at the sign of the Son of Man (κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς, Mt. 24:30, cf. also Zech 12:10–14). It was argued above that this note on the mourning of the tribes is part of the way in which Matthew shapes the description of the coming of the Son of Man on the clouds in the direction of *Par. En*. This similarity, while not precise and explicit, is nonetheless strong and fits in the category of the pattern of the relationships (see Table 7).

### 5.1.3.3 *Recognized at the Last*

That the Son of Man is finally revealed to and recognized by the kings and the mighty ones is a feature of the portrait that appears in *1 Enoch* 62–63 as well. At their final judgment, the Son of Man as eschatological judge is at last revealed to them in this scene. They are asked to see and recognize him, and in response they glorify, bless and extol him (*1 Enoch* 62:3, 6, 63:4). This feature appears to function narratively in that the judged need to know by whom they are being judged, and it functions as a consolation to the righteous, who can be satisfied that justice will be served and those who receive it will know full well why and by whom.

The revelation of the Son of Man also appears in Matthew's description of the Last Judgment (Mt. 25:31–46). All nations are gathered before the Son of Man/King, and his identity is revealed to them. Not only is the judge revealed to the wicked in the description through their being gathered before him, but his identity is further explicated to them in his identification with the poor and downtrodden whom the wicked have mistreated. The necessity of the condemned having to ask when they had mistreated him indicates that he had been hidden from them, but was now being revealed to them. Since this is a description of the *last* judgment, the revelation in Matthew's *schema* is a *final* revelation. Because the description does not explicitly state it, their recognition of him is only implicit.

This feature fits as a similarity in patterns of relationship between the two works, and so it appears in Table 7.

### 5.1.3.4 *Request by the Condemned*

In the judgment scene in *1 Enoch* 62–63, the kings and the mighty ones make a request, not only for mercy but also for more time in which to honor the Son of Man. Narratively, this request is part of their acknowledging the appropriateness of the judgment against them, and it functions to confirm the correctness of it. It also functions to affirm for the righteous the propriety of their yearning for justice.

A request on the part of the condemned is also a feature of Matthew's description of the Last Judgment (Mt. 25:31–46). The condemned ask for clarification, and the implication is that they too desire mercy from the hand of the judge, hoping to rely on their own ignorance as a mitigating factor.

That a request is made in both works is significant, even though it is not for precisely the same thing. This feature, then, since it is not close and precise, is listed in Table 7.

#### 5.1.3.5 *No Mercy Forthcoming*

The next detail of the judgment scene is also shared by both works. In the scene in which the kings and the mighty plead for mercy and acknowledge the authority of the Son of Man to pass judgment in *1 Enoch* 62–63, no mercy is forthcoming. As they had not had mercy on the righteous and elect, so mercy will not be shown to them. Vengeance will be executed upon them since they had oppressed the righteous (*1 Enoch* 62:11), and since they had not glorified the Lord of Spirits but trusted in their own scepters, so their condemnation was justified, even in their own eyes (*1 Enoch* 63:7–9). No mercy is forthcoming for them.

Similarly in Mt. 13:36–43, the Interpretation of the Parable of the Weeds, it is clear that no mercy is possible for the wicked. They will simply be gathered up and thrown into the fiery furnace. Again in the description of the Last Judgment (Mt. 25:31–46), it is a foregone conclusion that the ones on the left are there because of their treatment of the poor and downtrodden. Because they have not acted with compassion, mercy is not available for them, and they are simply commanded to enter into their fate.

The unavailability of mercy in the portrait of the Son of Man is a very close and precise functional similarity between the two works, and so it appears in Table 6.

#### 5.1.3.6 *Salvation for the Righteous*

Again, the salvation to be enjoyed by the righteous is a feature common to both portraits. In *1 Enoch* 62:13–16, the righteous are promised that they shall be saved, and shall dwell with the Son of Man, share in heavenly feasting and be garbed in glorious and permanent heavenly garments. The salvation to be enjoyed by them will last for ever and is described in terms of a banquet. In *1 Enoch* 71:16–17 the righteous are promised an eternal dwelling with the Son of Man, as well as peace and righteousness.

Eternal, heavenly bliss is also promised to the righteous in Matthew's depiction of the Son of Man. In the Interpretation of the Parable of the Weeds, the righteous will shine like the sun (Mt. 13:43), while in the description of the Last Judgment, they are invited to inherit the kingdom prepared for them and to enter into eternal life (Mt. 25:34, 46). Dwelling in eternal bliss is promised to them.

This bright, blissful promise is a feature, then, that is a close and precise similarity between the two portraits of the Son of Man, and therefore it appears in Table 6.

### 5.1.3.7 Fairness of Judgment

The fairness of the judgment against them is explicitly acknowledged by the kings and the mighty ones in *Par. En.* In *1 Enoch* 63:8–9 they say, “. . . our Lord is true in all his works, and in his judgments and his justice. . . and all our sins are justly reckoned up.” This is explicit acknowledgment that the judgment is fair.

In Matthew this acknowledgment is not explicit, but in the narrative framework of the Parable (or description) of the Last Judgment (Mt. 25:31–46) the fairness of the judge is implicit, not only because he is the eschatological judge, but also because the condemned do not protest their fate. For the narrator, the fairness of the judgment is assumed.

Since this feature is apparent in the pattern of relationships in Matthew, but explicit in *Par. En.*, it appears in Table 7.

## 5.1.4 1 Enoch 69:26–29

Six features of the Enochic Son of Man were highlighted in *1 Enoch* 69:26–29, three of which have already been compared to the Matthean portrait, and three of which must now be compared. Already included in previous passages are the features of the Son of Man having a judicial role, of being revealed to his followers, and of being seated on his throne of glory. Three further features from this passage can now be compared with the Matthean depiction.

### 5.1.4.1 A Strong and Incontrovertible Word

The word of the Son of Man is strong in the sense that it is effective, incontrovertible, trustworthy and reliable. The plea of the condemned kings in *1 Enoch* 63 confirms the irreversible nature of the Son of Man’s judgment. Further the confirmation by the Lord of Spirits in *1 Enoch* 63:12 verifies that the word of the Son of Man stands and is to stand without possibility of appeal. The irreversibility of the judicial word of the Son of Man further functions to provide great consolation, hope and trust on the part of the vindicated.

The Son of Man’s word is not described as being strong and incontrovertible in Matthew; however in the description of the Last Judgment (Mt. 25:31–46) the ruling of the Son of Man/King functions in this strong and incontrovertible manner. Neither the condemned nor the righteous sway the judgment either way. They ask a question of clarification, but when the answer is given there is no suggestion that the ruling does not stand. The judge’s word is final and irreversible. A similar finality holds true for the judgment of the Son of Man in the Interpretation of the Parable of the Weeds (Mt. 13:36–43). The weeds are simply gathered up and thrown into the fiery furnace. The irreversibility of the Son of Man’s word is also implied in the mourning of the tribes of the earth at the coming of the Son of Man (Mt. 24:30–31). There is no question but that the word of this Son of Man will be absolutely effective and that it will be obeyed.

The incontrovertibility of the Son of Man's word, then, is a feature that is common to both the portrait of the Son of Man in *Par. En.* and in Matthew. It is a parallel feature at the level of the pattern of relationships, and so is listed in Table 7.

#### 5.1.4.2 *The Destruction of Evil*

In this passage the Son of Man is displayed as the one by whom the destruction of evil will be accomplished. In *1 Enoch* 69:27, the totality of judicial authority is assigned to the Son of Man, and this leads to his being the cause of the destruction and eradication of sinners. It is promised that the oppressors will be completely destroyed and all evil will be eradicated (*1 Enoch* 69:28–29). The theme is explicit in this passage, but it has been broached in earlier passages. The aura of total authority appeared in the first passage to mention the Son of Man (*1 Enoch* 46), simply in his accompanying the Chief of Days. The anguish on the faces of the oppressors (*1 Enoch* 48:8) hints at their final condemnation, and their unsuccessful plea for mercy, as well as their acknowledgment of the justice of his judgment (*1 Enoch* 63) affirms the finality of their fate. The fiery fate that awaits them (see below) and the deep valley in which they will be incarcerated for eternity (*1 Enoch* 53:3–5, 54:1–5) also presume the eradication of the evil they have perpetrated from the earth. This theme of the eradication of evil through the judicial authority of the Son of Man pervades the whole work, and is meant to bring hope to the oppressed.

The destruction of evil is not expressed so explicitly in Matthew, although hints of it are present. In the two unique Matthean passages already noted in this study, the Interpretation of the Parable of the Weeds (Mt. 13:36–43) and the description of the Last Judgment (Mt. 25:31–46), the utter separation of the wicked from the righteous presumes the absolute authority of the Son of Man over the wicked. The irreversibility of the judgment against them and their consignment to eternal condemnation also supports the notion of the final eradication of evil. This motif is also present in the Parable of the Net (Mt 13:47–50), in which an irreversible separation takes place and the evil are thrown into a fiery furnace. The image depicts the utter destruction of evil.

Although the motif is not stated in Matthew as explicitly as it is in *Par. En.*, the final and complete destruction of evil appears to be presumed, especially in the Interpretation of the Parable of the Weeds (Mt. 13:36–43) and the description of the Last Judgment (Mt. 25:31–46). Therefore it is appropriate to list this feature in Table 7.

#### 5.1.4.3 *Worldwide Jurisdiction*

The worldwide jurisdiction of the Son of Man becomes explicit in this passage as well. In *1 Enoch* 69:27 the author has included four indications that the authority of the Son of Man stretches across the earth. First, it is said that “the sum of judgment” or the totality of judgment is given to him, indicating that he has complete and absolute authority. Second, the author promises that sinners will be “destroyed from off the face of the earth.” Again the view is worldwide. Third, the vision of being bound in chains is applied to those “who have led the world astray.” If the oppression has been worldwide,

then the authority to imprison is worldwide. And fourthly, the promise is repeated that the oppressive deeds of the condemned will “vanish from the face of the earth.” While these expressions are all figurative, the authority of the Son of Man in the author’s view is absolute, complete and worldwide. This kind of complete, worldwide authority has the effect of bolstering the confidence, hope and perseverance of the oppressed.

The cosmic authority of the Son of Man has already been hinted at in earlier passages describing the Son of Man. The heavenly setting evident in the appearance (*1 Enoch* 46:1-3), naming (*1 Enoch* 48:2-7) and enthronement (*1 Enoch* 62:3, 5) of the Son of Man suggest his worldwide authority implicitly. Further, the kings are not specifically identified with a particular country, but are described in a generic manner as “the kings of the earth” (*1 Enoch* 48:8), “those who possess the earth” (*1 Enoch* 62:3) or “those who rule the earth” (*1 Enoch* 62:9). This generic description of the oppressors also implies the worldwide jurisdiction of the Son of Man. Both the setting of the scenes as well as the general way in which the oppressors are described imply the worldwide dominion of the Son of Man in the author’s view.

The worldwide jurisdiction of the Son of Man is explicit in Matthew’s Gospel. One passage in which this is evident is the note about all the tribes of earth mourning (κόψονται πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς, Mt. 24:30) at the sign of the Son of Man (cf. Zech 12:10-14). This is an addition to the Markan description of the Son of Man coming on the clouds (Mk 13:26). As argued previously, the addition of this note indicates that the scene has been shaped by Matthew under Enochic influence. In the description of the Last Judgment also it is explicitly stated that all nations will be gathered before the Son of Man/King (καὶ συναχθήσονται ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, Mt 25:32). Again the worldwide dominion of the Son of Man is explicit. Both references here in Matthew, like those in *Par. En.*, are figurative and are intended to show the complete and absolute authority of the Son of Man. Further, the cosmic authority of the Son of Man is also implicitly supported by the Matthean characterization of his heavenly status. Because this similarity is so close and precise, it is listed in Table 6.

## 5.1.5 1 Enoch 70–71

### 5.1.5.1 The Presence of Angels

The role of the angels as attendants in the presence of the Son of Man finally becomes explicit in *1 Enoch* 70–71. The interpreting angel had accompanied Enoch on his tours, and angels had been described as carrying out divine decisions, but now finally they become a part of the entourage of the Son of Man. Myriads of angels surround the glorious throne and the Head of Days (*1 Enoch* 71:7–10), and finally as Enoch is identified as that Son of Man (*1 Enoch* 71:14), they become his.

In Matthew, the angels are explicitly “his” (i.e. the Son of Man’s).<sup>28</sup> Three times the possessive pronoun referring to the Son of Man is used of the angels: Mt. 13:41,

<sup>28</sup> Theisoohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 200.



16:27, and 24:31; in the latter two occurrences, Matthew has added the possessive pronoun as compared to Mark and Luke. The addition of the possessive pronoun referring to the Son of Man may appear to be a simple matter, but in comparison with Mark and Luke, who never use the possessive pronoun of the angels, it is striking indeed. While in Mt. 25:31 the angels are not called “his,” they do accompany him as an entourage. It appears here that Matthew has understood that in the vision of *1 Enoch* 71 the divine entourage is also the Son of Man’s, and Matthew has made that understanding explicit with the addition of the possessive pronoun.

Since, however, this is not explicit in both works, but is a development in Matthew based upon the scene in *Par. En.*, it must be listed in Table 7, as a feature of the pattern of relationships.

#### 5.1.5.2 Heavenly Brightness

In this final vision of *Par. En.*, the inhabitants of heaven are gloriously bright, as the divine figure is bathed in light. Not only are the sons of the holy angels treading on flames, but their garments are white and their appearance like snow. Similarly, in the First Parable, the vision of the Elect One in heaven includes innumerable righteous and elect who are “radiant like the brightness of fire” (*1 Enoch* 39:7) Again, in the opening words of the Third Parable, the righteous are described as being in the light of the sun, having found light and righteousness, which shall shine like the sun (*1 Enoch* 58:1, 4). Light shall be inexhaustible (*1 Enoch* 58:6). This opening chapter of the Third Parable<sup>29</sup> focuses on the expected outcome of the fate of the righteous. Taken with the vision of the heavenly palace, the whole scene in the author’s mind is filled with brightness and light, as the comparisons to the sun and snow indicate. The inhabitants of heaven are bathed in glorious brightness (c.f. also *1 Enoch* 38:4, 39:7, 51:5). While in *1 Enoch* 71, it is clearly angels who are referred to as bright like snow, in *1 Enoch* 39 and 58, it is the human righteous who are promised this gloriously bright existence. When their reward comes to fruition, they will join the watchers in their glorious brightness.

This perception of brightness for the heavenly occupants also occurs in Matthew’s description of the righteous. In the Interpretation of the Parable of the Weeds, the righteous are promised that they shall shine like the sun (ἐκλάμψουσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, Mt. 13:43). Here the expectation of brightness is the same as that found in *Par. En.*, and even the simile with the sun is the same.<sup>30</sup> This is a close and precise similarity between the two works, and so it is listed in Table 6.

<sup>29</sup> Hooker, Morna D., *The Son of Man in Mark*, 38. Hooker sees the opening chapter of each Parable as a prologue providing a broad outline of the contents of the following vision.

<sup>30</sup> Matthew’s description has some similarity also with Dan. 12:3, where the wise will shine like the brightness of the sky and those who lead others to righteousness will shine like the stars forever. This similarity is not as close as that with *1 Enoch* 71, 39, and 58. There are also other references to the brightness of the inhabitants of heaven. *4<sup>th</sup> Ezra* 7:97, a late first-century CE work, is very similar to Mt. 13:43. Examples of later works that envision the brightness of the heavenly realms and its inhabitants are the following: *2 Enoch* 1 describes

## 5.2 Two Levels of Similarity

Tables 6 and 7 reveal two levels of similarity between the two works. The detailed characteristics of the Son of Man listed in Table 6 are shared by both works and are close and precise. The heavenly status and judicial role of the Son of Man are presented explicitly in both works. Those with whom the Son of Man identifies are called “righteous” and “elect” in both works, although “elect” is also found in the synoptic parallel. Very intriguing is the description of the throne as the “throne of his glory.” As noted above, this phrase is common only to *Par. En.* and Matthew. Other references to a throne do occur in Scripture and in the pseudepigrapha, but rarely, and never with the qualification, δόξης αὐτοῦ, “of his glory.”<sup>31</sup> So this phrase, *manbara sebhatihu*, is the clearest, precise example of a concept shared by the two works. Further, the relationship between the condemned and the Son of Man is the same in both works. The Son of Man had not been known or recognized by the condemned, but finally at their judgment he is revealed to them and his authority is worldwide. They make a final request, but no mercy is forthcoming. Eternal bliss, however, is promised to the righteous, who will enter into the brightly lit realms of the Son of Man.

Just as evident as well is the pattern of relationships that exists, as noted in Table 7. Even though not explicitly stated, the same pattern of relationships does exist in both works. The righteousness of the Son of Man is stated in *Par. En.* but implicit in Matthew, as is his revelatory role. Again, his chosenness is explicit in the Son of Man passages in *Par. En.*, but is found in Matthew by way of quoting Isaiah 42. His pre-existence, which is combined with his being named before the Lord of Spirits for a salvific purpose is explicit in *Par. En.*, but presumed in Matthew. The features of being a support for the righteous, a light for the Gentiles, and worthy of worship are all explicit in the Son of Man passages in *Par. En.*, but are to be found in the wider context of the Gospel of Matthew as a whole. His hiddenness, as well as his being revealed to the righteous, are explicitly stated in *Par. En.*, but illustrated in Matthew. His effect on the condemned, inflicting pain, terror and shame, and yet being acknowledged as fair and right in his judgment, are also explicit in *Par. En.*, but implicit in Matthew. The incontrovertibility of the judicial decision is stated in *Par. En.*, but illustrated in Matthew, as is the Son of Man being the cause of the destruction of evil.

One difference between *Par. En.* and Matthew, which could be seen as a development by Matthew of an Enochic motif is the use of the possessive pronoun in the references to the angels. Neither Mark nor Luke ascribed ownership of the angels to the Son of Man, while Matthew does, in effect elevating the status of the Son of Man to that of authority over the angels. This corroborates his divine status, which

two huge figures with faces shining like the sun; 2 *Enoch* 19 portrays the angels in the 6th heaven as having faces more radiant than the sun; 2 *Enoch* 20 speaks of the immeasurable light in the 7th heaven; and 3 *Enoch* 12 expands on the brightness of Metatron/Enoch’s garments.

<sup>31</sup> Sir. 47:11 does tell of David’s throne as θρόνον δόξης.

is conveyed through the image of the Son of Man seated on his glorious throne with judicial authority.

These two levels of similarity, the close and precise verbal similarities and the similarities in the pattern of relationships, are extensive and impressive. Combining these two Tables, twenty five features are shared by the two works. The use of the terms “righteous” and “elect” and the appearance of “the throne of his glory” are striking. The heavenly status, the judicial role, the revelation to and the recognition by the kings and the mighty ones, the request by the condemned and the denial of mercy, as well as the worldwide jurisdiction all indicate a similarity in the way the characters function.

### 5.3 Other Similarities

There are other similarities from other parts of *Par. En.* that are worth noting, for they are also expressed in the Matthean Son of Man passages. These further similarities are tabulated in Table 8.

**Table 8**  
*Other Similarities relating to the Son of Man*  
*Shared by Par. En. and Matthew*

Characteristic or Feature	<i>Par. En.</i>	Matthew
1. fiery fate of the condemned	54:1, 5, 53:4–5, 63:10, cf also 67:7, 12–13 in the Noachic section	13:42, cf also 13:50, 25:41
2. fate prepared for Azazel/the Devil	54:5	25:41, c.f. Rev 4:10
3. clear dichotomy between righteous and condemned	<i>passim</i>	13:36–43, 25:31–46, c.f. 19:28
4. basis of judgment: treatment of righteous by oppressors	62:11, cf 46:8	25:31–46
5. anticipated reversal of fortunes	38:4–5; 45:5–6; 48:7–10; 50:1–2; 62:9–16; 63:11; 69:27–28	13:36–43, 16:27–28, 25:31–46, implied in 10:23, 19:28, 24:30–31

#### 5.3.1 Other Similarities between *Par. En.* and Matthew

##### 5.3.1.1 Fiery Fate

One feature found in *Par. En.* is the fiery fate of the condemned. They are to be consigned to a deep fiery valley, bound in fetters. Four angels will cast them into this fiery furnace, a punishment that was prepared for Azazel, one of the fallen watchers, and his hosts (see *1 Enoch* 54:1, 5, 53:4–5, 63:10, cf also 67:7, 12–13 in the Noachic section). This expected punishment for the oppressors would have given the righteous great hope and strength to endure the oppressive measures perpetrated against them.

Interestingly Matthew also speaks of a fiery fate for the condemned in Mt 13:36–43

and 25:31–46.<sup>32</sup> Matthew foresees that the angels of the Son of Man will cast the wicked into a furnace of fire (εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός, 13:42, cf also Mt 13:50), while in the description of the Last Judgment, the wicked will be sent into eternal fire (εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον, 25:41). The fiery fate of the condemned indicates a shared perception by these two authors.

### 5.3.1.2 Fate Prepared for Azazel/Devil

While the fiery fate of the wicked may also depend on contemporaneous ideas about Gehenna, the more surprising similarity is that this fate was prepared for evil transcendent beings, the host of Azazel in *1 Enoch* 54:5 and the Devil and his angels in Mt. 25:41 (ἡτοιμασμένον τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ). These are striking similarities.

### 5.3.1.3 A Clear Dichotomy

Throughout *Par. En.* a clear dichotomy exists between the righteous and the wicked: on the social level, on the spiritual level, and on the level of their fate following judgment. Socially the wicked are high-ranking, while the righteous are oppressed. Spiritually the wicked are aligned with Azazel, and the righteous with the Son of Man. And eschatologically, the wicked are bound for punishment, the righteous for bliss. A similar dichotomy exists in the Matthean judgment parables, where a clear distinction exists narratively between the righteous and the wicked and where no hope of mercy for the wicked is expressed. Further, the punishment of the wicked and the bliss that is promised for the righteous are sharply distinguished. This clear dichotomy between the two groups is a very striking similarity in the two works.<sup>33</sup>

### 5.3.1.4 Basis of Judgment

Further, the basis of judgment hinges on the same dynamic in both works. For Mt. 25:31–46, the basis of judgment is explicitly and concisely stated: the wicked are condemned on the basis of their treatment of those with whom the Son of Man identifies. They refused meat, drink, clothing and visitation to “the least of these my brethren,” those identified with the Son of Man, and therefore they are condemned. While never so concisely stated in *Par. En.*, the same principle functions as the basis for judgment. The wicked will be delivered to the punishing angels because they have oppressed the Son of Man’s elect (*1 Enoch* 62:11, cf 46:8). They will be consigned to eternal punishment, on the basis of how they have treated the righteous and elect, while the righteous and elect are destined for eternal bliss with the Son of Man. Thus, the same basis for judgment is operative in both works.

<sup>32</sup> See Theisohn’s discussion in *Der auserwählte Richter*, 192–95.

<sup>33</sup> The group of Jesus’ followers whom Matthew addresses seems to be a mixed group of righteous and sinners, as can be seen in the instructions on how to deal with unrepentant sinners in Matthew 18 and in the parable about the wedding garment in Matthew 22. The absence of even the possibility of mercy is therefore all the more striking in Mt. 13:36–43 and 25:31–46.

### 5.3.1.5 Reversal of Fortunes

All this leads to the anticipated reversal of fortunes. In both works the oppressed are vindicated and rewarded with eternal life and with the restoration of their fortunes on earth, while the oppressors, formerly powerful, are humbled and punished.

## 5.4 Other Judgment Scenes

When judgment scenes in other, roughly contemporary or later works are reviewed, the distinctiveness of the *Par. En.* and Matthew is highlighted. Reviewing other judgment scenes from the first and second centuries CE may reveal the usual motifs and ideas that were shared by the culture of Hellenistic Judaism and early Christianity in distinction from those exhibited in *Par. En.* and Matthew.

A judgment scene that has already been acknowledged to have influenced *Par. En.* is Dan. 7:9–14, where a throne with fiery flames and burning wheels is seen, along with the Ancient of Days on that throne, surrounded by multitudes of angels. Books are opened, one of the beasts is destroyed and its body burned in fire, and then the human-like one is presented and given dominion, honor, glory and kingship. In Ezek. 1:26–28, the glorious sight of the throne is seen, but not in context of judgment. Similarly in Revelation 4–5, elders on twenty four thrones are seen, surrounded by singing angels. Glory and honor abound, but judgment is not the setting, rather the revelation of the contents of the sealed scroll is in focus. Revelation 20 includes a judgment scene in which thrones are present and the authority to judge is bestowed on the occupants of those thrones. The devil is first thrown into a pit for a thousand years, and later after a thousand years of freedom, is consumed by fire from heaven and thrown into a lake of fire. The sea, Death and Hades give up their dead for judgment, and books are open in which the deeds of the judged are written. Those not written in the Book of Life are thrown into the lake of fire along with Satan, the beast, the false prophet, Death and Hades. The fate of the righteous is not explained explicitly, nor is the basis of judgment clarified.<sup>34</sup>

The *Testament of Abraham* 12–13 (1st–2nd c.CE) also reports on a judgment scene. This account includes a three part judgment, first by Abel (introduced as a Son of God) seated on a terrifying throne, then by the twelve tribes of Israel, and finally by God. Included here also are fiery looking angels, and a huge book for judgment, measuring six cubits by ten cubits. Scribal angels are present to record the deeds of those who are judged and weigh them against the righteousness of God. Fire will test the judged: the righteous will be shown to be impervious to fire and so will be saved, while the wicked will be consumed by fire and consigned to punishment in

<sup>34</sup> G.K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1999), 1037, points out, however, that one may discern the implied basis of judgment for the righteous. They are written in the Book of Life, and so are saved, because they have identified with the Lamb's purpose, activities and death, which presumably, in Beale's mind, includes kindness and compassion toward the poor and oppressed. But this is only implicit, not explicit.

fire. Another work, the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* (1st c.BCE–1st c.CE) appears to envision each individual having two manuscripts, one with shortcomings and failings, and the other presumably filled with good deeds (chapter 7). There follows a lacuna in the text, but presumably the two manuscripts are then weighed to determine the individual's fate. In the *Greek Apocalypse of Ezra* 4:9 (2nd–9th c.CE) Herod suffers on a fiery throne. The *Sibylline Oracles* 2:196–338 (150 CE) report an extensive and vivid judgment scene. Here a blazing river of fire consumes everything, the stars fall, the souls of humans gnash their teeth, brimstone, fire and ash cover everything and there is a cessation of birds flying, sea creatures swimming, ships sailing and oxen plowing. Then the four archangels lead the souls to judgment. God, the universal ruler, is the judge seated on the heavenly throne, with Christ on his right hand and Moses, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joshua, Daniel, Elijah, Habakkuk and Jonah all in attendance. When they pass through the river of fire, the righteous are saved, and the impious, who are guilty of a long list of impieties, are destroyed. The angels are equipped with whips of flame and fiery chains, and even though the condemned plead for mercy, God turns away, so that no mercy is available. Again, God is conceived of as the judge and the basis of judgment is the impiety of the judged.

When these other, roughly contemporary judgment scenes<sup>35</sup> are reviewed, the uniqueness and similarity to each other of *Par. En.* and Matthew are highlighted. In these other judgment scenes, God is most often the judge (Daniel 7, Revelation 20, *T. Ab.* 13, *Sib. Or.* 2:196–338, 4:40–45). Fire is very frequently associated with the scene, as well as with the punishment (Daniel 7, Revelation 20, *T. Ab.* 13, *Apoc. Elijah* 5:22–39, *Grk Apoc. of Ezra, Sib. Or.* 4:40–45), while *Sib. Or.* 2:196–338 describes the great assize in volcanic imagery. Angels often are involved (Daniel 7, Revelation 20, 4–5) to record people's deeds (*T. Ab.* 13), or they have fiery whips and chains to herd people through the river of fire to judgment (*Sib. Or.* 2:196–338). A book or manuscript (sometimes more than one) is often associated with judgment to determine the fate of the individual. Satan is usually cast into a pit or lake of fire (Revelation 20, *Apoc. Elijah* 5:22–39). And *Sib. Or.* 2:196–338 reports a request by the judged for mercy, but none is forthcoming. These are the more common and expected motifs that accompany judgment scenes. Table 9 shows all the characteristics which were identified in *Par. En.* and Matthew (Tables 6, 7, and 8), as well as those occurring in the other judgment scenes just described.

A review and comparison of these characteristics, then, further points out the distinctiveness of the scenes from *Par. En.* and Matthew. Many features are shared with *Par. En.* and Matthew, but some are not and they are quite significant. Most arresting is the figure doing the judging: in all the other scenes God is the judge, although in *T. Ab.* 12–13 first Abel and then the twelve tribes of Israel are also

<sup>35</sup> See further M. Rist, "Eschatology of Apoc. and Pseudep.," *IDB* 2.133–35 and Richard H. Hiers, "Day of Judgment," *ABD* 2.79–82. See also Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life In Intertestamental Judaism*, 28–42, especially 38, Table 1, where several judgment scenes are analyzed and found to include witnesses, a book, post-mortem judgment and certain consequences of judgment.

involved. In *Par. En.* and Matthew, however, it is the Son of Man/Elect One who is on the throne executing judgment by the authority of God. Further, while thrones are frequent (but not ubiquitous), nowhere else is it termed a “throne of his glory.” The dynamic of being hidden and then revealed is not a part of the other judgment scenes, while it is an important dynamic in *Par. En.* and Matthew. The motifs of being named from eternity, being a support for the righteous and a light to the Gentiles do not occur in other judgment scenes. The fact that the punishment had been prepared beforehand for the forces of evil is not highlighted in the other judgment scenes. The final motif that is quite significant and distinctive about *Par. En.*’s and Matthew’s presentation is the basis for judgment. In the other scenes, the criterion for judgment is always the deeds of the person being judged, whether the good outweigh the bad. But in *Par. En.* and Matthew, the criterion for judgment is the treatment of the righteous, with whom the judge identifies in a redemptive way. These motifs apparently are not very common in ancient judgment scenes, but they are distinctive to the conception of the last judgment in *Par. En.* and Matthew.

**Table 9**  
**Features of Judgment Scenes in Parables of Enoch, Matthew and others**

Characteristic or Feature	<i>1 Enoch</i> and Mt.	Dan. 7	Rev. 20	<i>T.Ab.</i> 12–13	<i>Apoc.</i> <i>Elijah</i>	<i>Apoc.</i> <i>Zeph.</i>	<i>G.Apoc.</i> <i>Ezra</i>	<i>Sib.</i> <i>Or. 2</i>
1. heavenly status	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
2. judicial role	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
3. followers called “righteous”	•		•	•	•			•
4. followers called “elect”	•							
5. seated upon throne of his glory	•							
6. finally revealed and recognized by the kings and the mighty	•							
7. request by the condemned	•							•
8. no mercy for condemned	•	•	•	•				•
9. promise of eternal bliss for the righteous	•							•
10. worldwide jurisdiction	•							
11. brightness of inhabitants of heaven	•		•	•				•
12. righteousness	•	•	•	•				•
13. revelatory role	•							
14. chosenness	•							
15. named from eternity (i.e. purpose and pre-existence)	•							
16. support for the righteous	•							
17. light for the Gentiles	•							
18. worthy of worship	•	•	•					
19. hiddenness	•							
20. revealed to insiders	•							

Table 9 (contd.)

Characteristic or Feature	<i>1 Enoch</i> and Mt.	Dan. 7	Rev. 20	<i>T.Ab.</i> 12–13	<i>Apoc.</i> <i>Elijah</i>	<i>Apoc.</i> <i>Zeph.</i>	<i>G.Apoc.</i> <i>Ezra</i>	<i>Sib.</i> <i>Or. 2</i>
21. inflicts pain, terror and shame	•							•
22. fairness of judgment	•		•	•		•		
23. word is strong and incontrovertible	•	•	•					•
24. causes the destruction of evil	•	•	•	•	•			•
25. angels present	•	•	•	•	•	•		•
26. fiery fate of the condemned	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
27. fate prepared for Azazel/the Devil	•							
28. clear dichotomy between righteous and condemned	•	•	•	•				•
29. basis of judgment: treatment of righteous by oppressors	•							
30. anticipated reversal of fortunes	•							

## 5.5 Conclusion

This study has revealed several types of similarities between the figure of the Son of Man as portrayed in *Par. En.* and the figure portrayed in Matthew, especially in the figure of the eschatological judge, the Son of Man. A comparison of Matthew, *1 Enoch* and a number of other judgment-scene depictions of roughly the same time period has also shown several important distinctions that set Matthew and *1 Enoch* apart from the others. These similarities and distinctions, while not rising to the level of proof that Matthew was literarily dependent upon *Par. En.*, nonetheless are extensive and intriguing. Is it possible that Matthew knew of and was familiar with *Par. En.*? One can observe Matthew's shaping of the figure of the Son of Man in that direction in the passages he received from the traditions of Mark and Q, as Tödt observed. The comparison with the synoptics has also revealed Matthew's deliberate molding of the figure of the Son of Man further in the direction of an eschatological judge. Two passages in Matthew, the Interpretation of the Parable of the Weeds (Mt. 13:36–43) and the description of the Last Judgment (Mt. 25:31–46), clearly reveal Matthew's hand, and his conception of the Son of Man. In these two passages the greatest concentration of Enoch-like characteristics and features is found. While literary dependence may not be claimed, it has been shown that *Par. En.* and Matthew do share a common conception of the last judgment, especially in comparison with the other judgment scenes from roughly the same time period. The extent of the similar features that do not appear elsewhere makes it tantalizingly possible that Matthew knew *Par. En.* with its conception of the final judgment. Further, even though Matthew did not borrow



vocabulary from or quote *Par. En.*, aside from the probable quotation of “throne of his glory,” it is very possible that Matthew allowed the Parables to shape his portrayal of the Son of Man. Because so many features Matthew has incorporated do not appear in other contemporary literature, it is likely that he knew and used *Par. En.* in particular, along with his other sources for the story of Jesus.

This study has also shown that the hypothesis put forward by Douglas R. A. Hare is untenable. Following Lievestad and others, Hare argues that the term “Son of Man” was merely a modest, circumlocutionary self-designation, and that Matthew was unaware of any meaning other than that. But at precisely those points where Matthew has unique material (i.e. Mt. 13:36–43 and 25:31–46), the similarities with *Par. En.* are the greatest, and the shaping of Jesus in the direction of *Par. En.* the clearest. At these points Matthew has incorporated Enoch-like characterizations of the Son of Man into his narrative. Because they are like another work’s characterization of the Son of Man, Matthew is shown to have deliberately shaped his conception of the Son of Man in that direction. At precisely these points, Hare is the weakest. He can claim only that Matthew had no in-depth understanding of the content of the self-designation. His claims are unconvincing.

Part of Hare’s argument is that the term is meaningless. Aside from being a modest self-designation, Hare notes that the audience in the narrative does not seem to understand what is meant by it. And yet that very feature, that the narrative audience is unaware, is precisely a narrative technique to illustrate the hiddenness of the Son of Man! And even the disciples, when the term was used in the narrative, apparently did not understand either, but that is precisely the narrative purpose, to reveal the hitherto hidden Son of Man. Matthew’s goal is to reveal to the real audience, the readers and hearers of the text, the identity of Christ, not only as prophet, teacher, Son of God, and son of David, but also as the eschatological Son of Man in whose hands is the judgment of the world. Thus the ignorance of the narrative audience, the crowds and the disciples, is actually a technique used by the author to reveal convincingly the completeness of the characterization of Jesus.

Hare’s approach was to work backwards, unpeeling the layers of tradition. He used the image of peeling away the layers of an onion. Just as when one peels away the layers of an onion one ends up with nothing, so, it seems, Hare has peeled away and ended up with nothing except many bits and pieces of tradition that may even produce tears of frustration. Hare’s approach has virtually pre-determined his results. A more apt image for this study would be an apple. When an apple is cut crossways through the middle, several layers or rings are distinguishable, from the skin, through the flesh of the apple to the seeds in the core. Those seeds, however, indicate that the apple had a prehistory, that it developed out of a blossom, which was attached to a twig, on a tree, with roots. This image of the apple, with its connectedness to the ground is a more apt image for Matthew’s portrayal of the Son of Man. He was very aware of the content of the term; otherwise the two unique Matthean passages under discussion here would not have been presented the way they are. The similarities and distinctions presented above may not prove conclusively that Matthew was literarily

dependent upon *Par. En.*, but in a dynamic, creative manner Matthew has incorporated Enoch-like characteristics into his presentation of the Son of Man, and these characteristics have been shown to exist distinctively in *Par. En.* and Matthew.

## 5.6 Prospects for Future Study

Enochic studies certainly have enjoyed a renaissance in the last couple of decades, as evidenced by the bi-annual Enoch Seminars, organized by Gabrielle Boccaccini and others. A significant consensus seems to have developed about certain matters regarding the Book of Parables. Particularly, the matter of dating seems to have settled for many scholars as being somewhere at the end of or soon after Herod the Great's reign. As James H. Charlesworth says, "dating the Parables of Enoch to the time of Herod the Great and the Herodians has become conclusive."<sup>36</sup> This widely accepted consensus means that the Parables of Enoch are pre-Christian and need to be considered for possible influence on the writings of the New Testament.

My work, I believe, has shown that the writer of Matthew's Gospel almost certainly knew of it and shaped the "Son of Man" statements of Jesus in that direction. This conclusion in turn raises the question of whether the other Gospel writers were also aware of it. Is that knowledge confined to the later evangelists, or can it also be discerned in Q, Mark and the Gospel of Thomas?<sup>37</sup> The field will benefit from further in-depth study of these questions.

The study of the influence of the Parables of Enoch on the Gospel of Matthew, and the on the Gospels generally, then naturally leads to questions about Jesus' own knowledge of those ideas. Was Jesus the one to combine the end-time judicial concept of the Son of Man from the Parables with the suffering servant themes of Isaiah? Is Maurice Casey, *The Solution to the 'Son of man' Problem*, despite his sometimes overly self-assured style, on to something with his argument that Jesus did use *bar (a)nash(a)* as a modest means of self-reference in oppositional situations? Did this use then evolve, with Jesus' growing self-awareness and rising opposition, into an understanding of his future role as end-time judge, or was this evolution due to Jesus' early, post-Easter followers?<sup>38</sup> And what does this reveal about the influences on Jesus himself? John the Baptist with his Essene-like perspective is acknowledged in the Gospels. Isaiah's prophecies are another. Did he also converse with scholars in the Enochic Movement in Galilee?<sup>39</sup> Does this mean that the proposals of R. H. Charles

<sup>36</sup> James H. Charlesworth, "Can We Discern the Composition Date of the Parables of Enoch?" in Boccaccini, *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 467. See also Paolo Sacchi's summary, "The 2005 Camaldoli Seminar on the Parables of Enoch: Summary and Prospects for Future Research," 505, 510–511.

<sup>37</sup> Charlesworth, "Composition Date," 466.

<sup>38</sup> J. Harold Ellens, *Jesus as the Son of Man, the Literary Character: A Progression of Images* (Claremont, CA: Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, 2003).

<sup>39</sup> Charlesworth, "Composition Date," 466–467.

that the Parables most certainly influenced early Christian writings and theology, a century later, are seen not to be jumping to easy conclusions, but as accurate insights?

This renaissance of interest in Enochic studies, I believe, opens up these exciting areas for future research.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## The Bible

- Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Edited by K. Elliger and W. Rudolph. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983.
- Novum Testamentum Graece*. Edited by Eberhard and Erwin Nestle, Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce Metzger. 27th Edition; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.
- The New Oxford Annotated Bible (NRSV)*. Edited by Bruce M. Metzger and Roland E. Murphy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

## Reference Works

- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.
- Dillmann, Augustus. *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopiae*. Lipsiae: Weigel, 1865.
- Even-Shoshan, Abraham, ed. *A New Concordance of the Old Testament*. Jerusalem: "Kiryat Sepher" Publishing House Ltd., 1983.
- Jean, Charles-F., and Jacob Hoftijzer. *Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.
- Liddell, H. G., and R. Scott. *Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Metzger, Bruce. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. United Bible Societies, 1971.
- Simpson, D. P. *Cassell's New Compact Latin-English English-Latin Dictionary*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1963.

## Secondary Literature

- Archer, Gleason L., Jr., translator. *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958.
- Beale, G. K. *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1999.
- Beare, Francis Wright. *The Gospel According to Matthew: Translation, Introduction and Commentary*. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1981.

- Beer, Georg. "Das Buch Henoch." In *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, vol. 2, edited by Emil Kautsch. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1900, reprinted by Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962.
- Bietenhard, Hans. ὄνομα. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 5, edited by Gerhard Friedrich, translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 242–83. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1967.
- Black, Matthew. *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch; a New English Translation with Commentary and Textual Notes*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985.
- . "The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch." In *The Messiah*, edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 150–55. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- . "The Throne-Theophany Prophetic Commission and the 'Son of Man': A Study in Tradition History." In *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity; Essays in Honor of William David Davies*, edited by Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs, 57–73. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2007.
- Boring, M. Eugene. *Matthew. New Interpreters Bible*, Vol. VIII. Nashville: Abingdon, 1995.
- Borsch, F. H. "MARK XIV.62 AND I ENOCH LXII.5." *NTS* XIV (1967–68), 565–67.
- Borsch, Frederick Houk. *The Son of Man in Myth and History*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.
- Broer, Ingo. "Das Gericht des MS über die Völker Auslegung von Mt. 25, 31–46" in *Bibel und Leben* 11 (1970), 273–95.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Rev. ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.
- . *Theology of the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1952.
- Burkett, Delbert. "The Nontitular Son of Man: A History and Critique." *NTS* 40 (1994), 504–21.
- Burnett, Fred W. "Παλιγγενεσία IN MATT. 19:28: A WINDOW ON THE MATTHEAN COMMUNITY?" *JSNT* 17 (1983), 60–72.
- Buth, Randall. "A More Complete Semitic Background for בֶּרֶךְ אֱנֹשׁ, Son of Man." In *AAR-SBL Abstracts*, 1993, 112.
- Caragounis, Chrys C. *The Son of Man*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1986.
- Casey, Maurice. *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7*. London: SPCK, 1979.
- . *The Solution to the "Son of Man" Problem*. London & New York: T&T Clark International, 2007.
- . "The Use of Term 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch." *JSJ* 7 (1976), 11–29.
- Catchpole, David R. "The Poor on Earth and the Son of Man in Heaven: A Re-appraisal of Matthew XXV.31–46." *BJRL* 61 (1979), 355–97.

- Charles, R. H. *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.
- . *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1912.
- . *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1906.
- Charlesworth, James H., editor. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 volumes. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination*. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- . *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*. HSM 16. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- . *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- . “The Heavenly Representative: The ‘Son of Man’ in the Similitudes of Enoch.” In *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism*, edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg and John J. Collins, 111–33. Chico, Ca: Scholars Press, 1980.
- . “Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre,” *Semeia* 14 (1979).
- . “The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism.” *NTS* 38 (1992), 448–66.
- . “The Son of Man who has Righteousness.” In *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers*. vol. 2, edited by Paul J. Achtemeier; 1–13. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Colpe, Carstens. ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 8, edited by Gerhard Friedrich, translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 400–477. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972.
- Court, J. M. “Right and Left: The Implications for Mt 25.31–46.” *NTS* 31 (1985), 223–33.
- Davidson, Michael J. *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Davies, W. D., and Dale C. Allison Jr. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. 3 vols. ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988, 1991 & 1997.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. “Palingensia (Matthew 19.28).” *JSNT* 20 (1984), 51–58.
- Donahue, John R., S. J., “The ‘Parable’ of the Sheep and the Goats: A Challenge to Christian Ethics.” *Theological Studies* 47 (1986), 3–31.
- . “Recent Studies on the Origin of ‘Son of Man’ in the Gospels.” In *A Wise and Discerning Heart: Studies Presented to Joseph A. Fitzmyer In Celebration of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. *CBQ* 48 (1986), 484–98.
- Ellens, J. Harold. *Jesus as the Son of Man, The Literary Character: A Progression of Images*. Claremont, CA: Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, 2003.
- Ferch, Arthur J. *The Son of Man in Daniel Seven*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1983.
- Fiensy, David A. *The Social History of Palestine in the Herodian Period: The Land is Mine*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity, vol. 20. Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1991.

- Filson, Floyd V. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. London: A&C Black; 2nd Edition, 1971.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke (I–IX)*. AB 28; New York: Doubleday, 1979.
- . “The New Testament Title ‘Son of Man’ Philologically Considered.” In *A Wandering Aramaean: Collected Aramaic Essays*, 143–60. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Fleming, J. *Das Buch Henoch*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1902.
- France, R. T. *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1989.
- Geist, Heinz. *Menschensohn und Gemeinde: Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung zur Menschensohnprädikation im Matthäusevangelium*. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1986.
- Glasson, T. F. “The Ensign of the Son of Man (Matt. XXIV, 30).” *JTS* 15 (1964), 299–300.
- Gray, George Buchanan. *The Book of Isaiah*. Vol. 1. ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912.
- Gray, Sherman W. *The Least of My Brothers: Matthew 25:31–46; A History of Interpretation*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Greenfield, Jonas C., and Michael E. Stone. “The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes.” *HTR* 70 (1977), 51–65.
- Grelot, Pierre. *Les Poèmes du Serviteur*. Paris: Cerf, 1981.
- Gundry, Robert H. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*. Second edition. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994.
- . *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew’s Gospel*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.
- Haag, Herbert. *Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterоjesaja*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1985.
- Hamerton-Kelly, R. G. *Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man: A Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1973.
- Hanson, Paul D. *Isaiah 40–66*. Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1995.
- Hare, Douglas R. A. *Matthew*. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1993.
- . *The Son of Man Tradition*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Harrington, Daniel J. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Hartman, Lars. *Prophecy Interpreted, Coniectanea Biblica*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1966.
- Hiers, Richard H. “Day of Judgment.” In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Vol. 2, edited by David Noel Freedman, 79–82. New York-London-Toronto-Sydney-Auckland: Doubleday, 1992.
- Higgins, A. J. B. *The Son of Man in the Teaching of Jesus*. SNTSMS 39. Cambridge-New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Hindley, J. C. “Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch.” *NTS* 14 (1968), 551–65.

- Hooker, Morna D. *The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the background of the term "Son of Man" and its use in St Mark's Gospel*. Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967.
- Jeremias, Joachim.  $\pi\alpha\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$   $\theta\epsilon\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}$ . In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 6, edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 655–717. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972.
- . *The Parables of Jesus*. Rev. ed., London: SCM Press; 1963.
- Kim, Seyoon. "The 'Son of Man'" as the Son of God. Tübingen: J.C.B.Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1983.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *Matthew As Story*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- . *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1975.
- . *The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13: A Study in Redaction Criticism*. London: SPCK; 1969.
- Knibb, Michael A. "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review." *NTS* 25 (1978–79), 344–59.
- . *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*. 2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Knight, George A. F. *Deutero-Isaiah: A Theological Commentary on Isaiah 40–55*. New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1965.
- Kvanvig, Helge S. *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*. WMANT; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.
- Lacocque, André. *The Book of Daniel*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979.
- Lambrecht, Jan, S. J. *Out of the Treasure: The Parables in the Gospel of Matthew*. Louvain: Peeters Press/Eerdmans; 1991.
- Lenski, Gerhard E. *Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1966.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels and in the Light of Recent Research*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Zurich und Braunschweig: Benziger Verlag GmbH, 1990.
- . "The Final Judgment (Mt. 25:31–46): An Exercise in 'History of Influence' Exegesis." In *Treasures New and Old: Contributions to Matthean Studies*, edited by David R. Bauer and Mark Allen Powell, 271–310. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- . "The Son of Man in Matthew: Heavenly Judge or Human Christ," *JSNT* 48 (1992), 3–21.
- Manson, T. W. "The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels." In *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*, edited by M. Black, 121–45. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962.
- Marshall, I. H. "The Synoptic Son of Man Sayings in Recent Discussion." *NTS* XII 1965–66. 327–51.



- McClellan, Thomas L. "Tyre." In *The HarperCollins Bible Dictionary*, edited by Paul J. Achtemeier, 1181–82. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1985, 1996.
- McKenzie, John L. *Second Isaiah*. Anchor Bible 20. New York: Doubleday, 1968.
- Mearns, Christopher L. "Dating the Similitudes of Enoch." *NTS* 25 (1978–79), 360–369.
- Meier, John P. *Matthew*. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1980.
- . "Nations or Gentiles in Matthew 28:19." *CBQ* 39 (1977), 94–102.
- . *The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church, and Morality in the First Gospel*. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.
- Messel, N. *Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden Henochs*. ZAWBeih. 35; Giessen, 1922.
- Milik, Józef T. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Montgomery, James A. *The Book of Daniel*. International Critical Commentaries 19. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927.
- Mowinckel, S. *He That Cometh*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1956.
- Muilenberg, James. *Isaiah: Chapter 40–66*. Interpreters Bible, vol. 5. New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1956.
- Neugebauer, Otto. *Ethiopic Astronomy and Computus*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1979; Heft 22, Band 347.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. "Enoch." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 2, edited by David Noel Freedman, 508–16. New York-London-Toronto-Sydney-Auckland: Doubleday, 1992.
- . "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee." *JBL* 100 (1981), 575–600.
- . *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.
- . *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. Cambridge, Mass., 1972.
- . "Son of Man." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Vol. 6, edited by David Noel Freedman, 137–50. New York-London-Toronto-Sydney-Auckland: Doubleday, 1992.
- Olson, Daniel C. "Enoch and the Son of Man in the Epilogue of the Parables." *JSP* 18 (1998), 27–38.
- Overman, J. Andrew. *Church and Community in Crisis: The Gospel According to Matthew*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996.
- Perrin, Norman. *A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- . "Son of Man." In *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, supplemental volume, edited by Keith Crim, 833–36. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976.
- . "The Son of Man in Ancient Judaism and Primitive Christianity: A Suggestion." In *A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology*, 23–40. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- . "The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition." In *A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology*, 57–83. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- Porteous, Norman. *Daniel*, 2nd, rev. ed. London: SCM Press, 1979.

- Porton, Gary G. "Midrash." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 4, edited by David Noel Freedman, 818–22. New York-London-Toronto-Sydney-Auckland: Doubleday, 1992.
- Rahlf's, A. "Die äthiopische Bibelübersetzung." In *Septuaginta-Studien I-II*, 2nd ed., 659–81. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.
- Rist, M. "Eschatology of Apoc. and Pseudep." In *The Interpreters' Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. 2, edited by George Arthur Buttrick, 133–35. New York/Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Robbins, Vernon K. "The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts." In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: A Model for Interpretation*, edited by Jerome H. Neyrey, 305–332. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991.
- Rohrbaugh, Richard L. "Methodological Considerations in the Debate over the Social Class Status of Early Christians." In *JAAR* LIII/3 (1984), 519–46.
- Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- Saldarini, Anthony J. *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Sanders, E. P. "Testament of Abraham: A New Translation and Introduction." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. 1, *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 869–902. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983.
- Schrenk, G. ἐκλεκτός. In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 4, edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 181–92. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1967.
- Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*. Vol. 1, edited by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar and Matthew Black. Edinburgh: T&T Clark Ltd, 1973.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *The Quest for the Historical Jesus*. New York: MacMillan, 1968.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *The Good News According to Matthew*, translated by David E. Green. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975.
- Senior, Donald. *What Are They Saying About Matthew?*. New York/Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1996.
- Sim, David C. *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- . "The Meaning of παλιγγενεσία in Matthew 19:28." *JSNT* 50 (1993), 3–12.
- Sjöberg, Erik. *Der Menschensohn in Äthiopischen Henochbuch*. Skrifter Utgivna av kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet in Lund 41. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1946.
- Smith-Christopher, Daniel L., *The Book of Daniel*. *New Interpreters Bible*, Vol. VII. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.
- Stanton, Graham N. *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993.
- Stone, Michael E. "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature." In *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God; Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*, edited by Frank Moore Cross, Werner E. Lemke, and Patrick D. Miller, Jr., 414–452. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1976.

- Suter, David W. "The Measure of Redemption: The Similitudes of Enoch, Nonviolence, and National Integrity." In *SBL 1983 Papers*, 167–76. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1983.
- . "Weighed in the Balance: The Similitudes of Enoch in Recent Discussion." In *Religious Studies Review* 7 (1981), 217–21.
- Theisohn, Johannes. *Der auserwählte Richter*. SUNT 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.
- Tödt, Heinz Eduard. *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*. London: SCM, 1965.
- Ullendorf, E. *Ethiopia and the Bible*. The Schweich Lectures, 1967. London: Oxford for the British Academy, 1968. 36–62.
- VanderKam, James C. *Enoch, A Man for All Generations*. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.
- . *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. *CBQ* Monograph; 16. Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association, 1984.
- . "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71." In *The Messiah*, edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 169–191. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1992.
- . "The Textual Base for the Ethiopic Translation of 1 Enoch." In *Working with No Data: Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin*, edited by David M. Golomb, 247–62. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987.
- Vermes, Geza. "The Use of *בר נשא* / *בר נש* in Jewish Aramaic." Appendix E in Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 310–30. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.
- Vielhauer, Philipp. "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu." In *Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament*, Munich: Kaiser, 1965.
- Walker, William O. "The Son of Man: Some Recent Developments." *CBQ* 45 (1983), 584–607.
- Watts, John D. W. *Isaiah 34–66*. Word, Vol. 25. Waco: Word, 1987.
- Weaver, Dorothy Jean. *Matthew's Missionary Discourse: A Literary Critical Analysis*. JSNT 38; Sheffield: JSOT, 1990.
- Westermann, Claus. *Isaiah 40–66*. London: SCM Press, 1969.
- Whybray, R. N. *The Second Isaiah*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983.
- Wrege, Hans-Theo. *Das Sondergut des Matthäusevangelium*. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1991.
- Yarbro Collins, Adela. "The Apocalyptic Son of Man Sayings." In *The Future of Early Christianity*, edited by Birger Pearson, 220–28. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1991.
- . "Introduction," *Semeia* 36 (1986).
- . "The Origin of the Designation of Jesus as 'Son of Man'." *HTR* 80:4 (1987), 391–407.
- . "The 'Son of Man' Tradition and the Book of Revelation." In *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, edited by James H. Charlesworth, 536–68. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

# INDEX

- Abel 184, 246, 247  
Adam 6, 24, 29, 52, 86, 115, 184  
advanced agrarian society 39  
Alexander Jannaeus 17, 18, 19  
allusions 14, 15, 22, 32, 33, 35, 36, 47, 83, 94, 97,  
102, 111, 116, 136, 137, 139, 154, 159, 162,  
191, 202  
Ammonite(s)  
Ammon 102, 112, 115  
Ancient of Days 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 64,  
102, 127, 128, 149, 157, 185, 246  
angel(s) 2, 3, 13, 19, 21, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 36, 37,  
38, 43, 44, 46, 48, 50, 54, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65,  
66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 74, 75, 77, 81, 87, 88, 97, 110,  
113, 115, 123, 125, 126, 130, 132, 136, 139, 140,  
141, 142, 143, 144, 146, 147, 149, 150, 151, 156,  
157, 161, 162, 166, 167, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174,  
175, 176, 179, 180, 181, 182, 186, 189, 190, 193,  
194, 197, 203, 204, 205, 206, 209, 210, 214, 215,  
216, 217, 219, 220, 221, 222, 224, 225, 228, 241,  
242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 249  
*angelus interpres* 25, 27, 28, 64, 65, 66, 67, 74, 75,  
77, 79  
Animal Apocalypse 47, 61  
Anointed 4, 26, 70, 73, 80, 136, 152, 153, 154, 236  
anti-Christian polemic 6  
Antigonus 17, 19, 20, 21, 36  
Antiochus IV Epiphanes 16, 33  
Antony 20  
apocalypse 2  
apocalyptic 171  
*Apocalypse of Zephaniah* 247  
apocalyptic 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 22, 58, 61, 65, 68, 69,  
87, 94, 98, 99, 109, 139, 162, 172, 186, 187,  
193, 200, 201, 202, 208, 212, 214, 216, 217,  
231, 234  
appearance 50, 54, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 70, 73, 81,  
88, 101, 102, 124, 157, 171, 177, 182, 190, 191,  
212, 241, 242, 244  
archangel(s) 3, 29, 62, 143, 144, 149, 173, 247  
Arenas 14, 33  
Aristobulus II 17, 19  
aristocracy 40, 45, 48  
artisan(s) 39, 42  
ascent 3, 6, 31, 54, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 143,  
173, 235  
Assyria 109  
astrological 88  
*Astronomical Book* 65  
author/redactor 23, 24, 29, 30  
authority 31, 36, 41, 42, 43, 64, 66, 81, 88, 98, 99,  
101, 102, 112, 117, 118, 120, 123, 127, 129, 151,  
155, 156, 157, 158, 160, 179, 181, 182, 185,  
186, 191, 193, 205, 206, 209, 212, 213, 216, 218,  
224, 225, 228, 235, 236, 238, 240, 241, 243, 244,  
246, 248  
Azazel 36, 37, 124, 151, 163, 214, 219, 244, 245,  
249  
Baal 52, 53, 61, 81  
Babylon 50, 80, 95, 109  
Babylonian 35, 50, 51, 80, 99, 103  
Barzaphanes 20, 21, 36  
beasts 47, 50, 51, 52, 53, 246  
Beelzebul 169  
blessedness 45, 111, 155, 156, 157, 161  
blessing 13, 45, 65, 67, 68, 118, 145, 177, 211, 212  
blood 16, 18, 19, 115, 162, 177, 213, 215  
bloodshed 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 33, 34  
Book of Life 212, 214, 246  
*Book of the Watchers*  
BW 3, 29, 30, 54, 56, 65, 66, 137, 139, 140, 178  
booty 40  
brightness 62, 142, 150, 161, 226, 242, 248  
bronze 34, 37  
bureaucracy 40, 41  
Caesar 19, 20, 43  
Caesarea Philippi 176, 178  
Caligula 15  
call 83, 87, 126, 148, 152, 161, 189, 190, 193, 214,  
218  
Callirhoe 15, 22, 33, 34  
Canaanite 50, 52, 53, 61, 81  
Canaanite mythology 52, 53, 81  
cast down 43, 78, 80, 103, 104, 108, 110  
celibacy 41  
chariots 38, 129, 130, 131, 132, 136, 138, 139, 140

- Cherubim 143  
 Chief of Days 54, 82, 84, 124, 125, 142, 143, 151,  
 186, 227, 229, 236, 240  
 chosen 28, 45, 74, 75, 77, 78, 82, 83, 84, 86, 89, 91,  
 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 102, 105, 106, 110,  
 130, 137, 157, 158, 161, 164, 215, 230, 232, 233  
 chosenness 7, 28, 81, 94, 96, 99, 157, 158, 227, 230,  
 231, 243, 248  
 christology 9, 177, 179  
 Cleopatra 20  
 clouds 35, 50, 51, 52, 53, 59, 60, 68, 166, 173, 179,  
 187, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 202, 204, 221,  
 223, 224, 228, 237, 241  
 coming 12, 29, 50, 60, 69, 81, 134, 147, 157, 158,  
 165, 166, 168, 169, 170, 175, 178, 179, 180, 181,  
 182, 186, 188, 189, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196,  
 197, 204, 205, 206, 210, 212, 215, 219, 221, 222,  
 224, 228, 231, 232, 237, 239, 241  
 condemnation 13, 65, 66, 100, 101, 103, 105, 108,  
 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 117, 141, 151, 160,  
 181, 192, 213, 217, 218, 235, 238, 240  
 consolation 3, 115, 156, 164, 167, 169, 170, 237,  
 239  
 constellations 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 97  
 copper 34  
 cosmological 3, 29, 65, 68, 69, 70, 76, 151  
 cosmological mysteries 3  
 cosmological secrets 3  
 courtroom 60, 87, 102, 161, 196, 206  
 covenant 48, 91, 154  
 Cyrus 76, 80, 83, 86, 95, 96  
  
 Daniel's prayer 115, 116  
 dating of *Par. En* 2, 13, 14, 23  
 Davidic Messiah 52  
 Dead Sea 22, 34, 38, 49  
 deep valley 37, 214, 219, 240  
 degraded 42  
 demonstrative 4, 5, 7, 70, 71, 72, 75, 80, 94, 110, 121,  
 145, 147, 152  
 desert 46, 47, 92, 162, 163, 174, 194  
 devil 203, 246  
 dew 35, 68  
 dichotomy 109, 162, 163, 174, 175, 188, 209, 217,  
 220, 222, 225, 244, 245, 249  
 dominion 52, 53, 59, 127, 129, 160, 185, 186, 241,  
 246  
 downcast 43, 85, 100, 105, 110, 155, 162, 192  
 downward mobility 43, 48  
*Dream Visions* 65  
 dry land 92  
 dwelling 44, 46, 48, 76, 101, 102, 111, 113, 132, 141,  
 144, 154, 161, 238  
  
 eagle 18, 108  
 earthly 6  
 earthly sayings 10, 11, 165, 178  
 economic factors 31  
 Edom 102, 112  
  
 Egypt 20, 51, 91, 109, 116  
 El 52, 53, 61, 81  
 elect 2, 8, 19, 32, 34, 35, 36, 39, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47,  
 48, 49, 65, 67, 77, 78, 82, 94, 95, 99, 100, 105,  
 106, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118, 122,  
 123, 125, 127, 128, 132, 136, 140, 141, 143, 144,  
 155, 157, 159, 161, 162, 163, 164, 173, 174, 178,  
 181, 186, 189, 190, 192, 193, 194, 199, 204, 213,  
 215, 217, 218, 221, 223, 224, 226, 232, 234, 235,  
 236, 238, 242, 243, 244, 245, 248  
 Elect One 3, 4, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 37, 46, 53,  
 60, 67, 68, 70, 72, 73, 78, 94, 100, 101, 102, 103,  
 104, 106, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 136, 152, 153,  
 154, 155, 159, 162, 174, 185, 186, 194, 199, 216,  
 217, 218, 219, 229, 230, 235, 236, 242, 248  
 elites 39  
 emendation 5, 79, 80, 101, 124, 134, 151  
 emperor 43, 44  
 Emperor Gaius 15  
 Enochic conventicle 19  
 enthronement 13, 28, 59, 102, 126, 152, 178, 185,  
 187, 210, 241  
 enthronement psalms 28  
*Enuma Eliš* 51  
 Epilogue 71, 72, 135, 156, 161  
 eschatological 2, 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 29, 34, 60, 105, 135,  
 138, 154, 169, 170, 172, 174, 177, 179, 182, 184,  
 186, 192, 194, 195, 200, 205, 206, 208, 209, 210,  
 215, 216, 219, 224, 225, 228, 229, 234, 237, 239,  
 249, 250  
 eternal life 47, 100, 155, 203, 211, 238, 246  
 eternity 75, 99, 112, 122, 128, 132, 153, 154, 157,  
 158, 161, 212, 213, 214, 227, 231, 240, 248  
 etiquette 35  
 everlasting life 46, 162, 216  
 evildoers 35, 36, 48, 144, 166, 170, 172, 175, 228  
 expendables 42, 44  
 Ezekiel 61, 65, 69, 72, 109, 115, 154, 164, 209  
  
 face 54, 59, 61, 62, 68, 75, 114, 119, 120, 121, 141,  
 144, 146, 150, 169, 191, 192, 212, 240, 241  
 familiarity with Scripture 163  
 fate of the condemned 161, 163, 173, 244, 245, 249  
 feasting, feasted 100, 111, 113, 166, 182, 183, 238  
 festivals 35, 88  
 fetters 37, 38, 44, 110, 162, 163, 219, 244  
 fiery fate 161, 163, 173, 175, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224,  
 225, 231, 237, 240, 244, 245, 249  
 fire 21, 22, 37, 138, 141, 142, 143, 203, 206, 213,  
 214, 219, 242, 245, 246, 247  
 Flood 29  
 forced labor 42  
 fortunes 38, 48, 100, 105, 111, 123, 128, 154, 155,  
 162, 174, 182, 246  
 frame story 3  
 future 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 34, 45, 46, 48, 66, 68, 69,  
 81, 87, 98, 100, 101, 123, 136, 153, 155, 165,  
 166, 168, 169, 170, 184, 200, 210, 213, 232,  
 251, 252

- future sayings 1, 10, 11  
 Gabriel 61, 65, 144, 146, 147  
 Garden 24  
 garments 44, 48, 58, 59, 100, 111, 113, 141, 144, 149, 150, 155, 156, 157, 159, 161, 174, 238, 242  
 Gayomart 51  
 Gehinnom Valley 34  
 gematria 36, 77, 150  
 glory 8, 44, 48, 59, 62, 77, 101, 111, 116, 124, 125, 155, 159, 161, 167, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 184, 185, 187, 188, 189, 190, 193, 194, 197, 203, 204, 205, 206, 210, 215, 216, 219, 221, 222, 224, 228, 236, 243, 246  
 gnashing of teeth 172, 206, 216, 237  
 goats 195, 203, 209, 217  
 gold 26, 34, 187  
 governing class 40, 41, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49  
 government 20, 37, 40, 43, 47  
 grammatical 91, 131, 133, 134, 135  
 guilt 114, 116  
  
 Hades 214, 246  
 hailstones 141, 143  
*hapax legomena* 196, 197, 198  
 Hasmonean 20  
 Head of Days 3, 35, 50, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 64, 73, 74, 81, 85, 88, 89, 99, 107, 110, 128, 144, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 173, 174, 180, 241  
 Head of the Oath 144, 145, 149, 150  
 healing hot springs 14, 16, 19, 21, 22  
 Heaven 2, 36, 52, 62, 65, 192  
 heavenly book 36  
 heavenly realms 7, 227, 242  
 heavenly status 81, 139, 157, 158, 226, 227, 228, 229, 231, 241, 243, 244, 248  
 Hebrew poetry 88  
 hell 37, 52, 177  
 Hellenistic 18, 38, 246  
 hellenization 18  
 Herod 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 33, 34, 36, 247, 251  
 Hezekiah 75, 91  
 hidden 8, 11, 46, 67, 74, 76, 77, 82, 84, 93, 95, 97, 99, 105, 106, 113, 122, 123, 157, 158, 159, 162, 164, 178, 182, 194, 211, 217, 220, 221, 222, 225, 229, 234, 237, 248, 250  
 hiddenness 4, 7, 8, 82, 83, 94, 95, 97, 106, 122, 227, 230, 234, 243, 248, 250  
 homioiarchton 104, 120  
 homoioteleuton 75, 120, 121, 147, 148, 168  
 honor 31, 40, 46, 48, 99, 150, 159, 162, 186, 209, 210, 218, 236, 237, 246  
 horticultural 39  
 hunter-gatherer 39  
 Hyrceanus II 17, 19, 20, 21, 36  
  
 ice 141, 142  
  
 idol makers 35  
 idolators 17  
 idolatry 18, 23, 67, 78  
 Idumean Antipater 17  
 implied author 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 44, 49  
 implied reader 31, 32, 33, 81, 123  
 imprisonment 37, 38  
 influence of Deutero-Isaiah 82  
 inherit, inheritance 36, 41, 203, 211, 220, 223, 225, 238  
 inscribed author 31, 32, 33  
 intended audience 30  
 iron 34, 35, 37, 38, 44, 110, 219  
 irony 101, 105, 138, 160  
  
 Jerusalem 9, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 34, 35, 38, 49, 54, 91, 176, 211, 212, 228  
 John the Baptizer 178  
 Jonah 47, 62, 191, 247  
*Joseph and Aseneth* 62, 138  
 Judas Maccabeus 17  
 judge 2, 8, 13, 43, 60, 67, 100, 103, 221, 236, 237, 239, 247, 248  
 judicial, juridical 4, 8, 12, 43, 44, 46, 68, 70, 74, 105, 106, 112, 113, 114, 117, 123, 125, 127, 129, 135, 138, 154, 155, 156, 159, 161, 162, 164, 177, 178, 180, 181, 182, 188, 191, 199, 205, 206, 209, 210, 211, 213, 215, 216, 217, 218, 220, 224, 225, 228, 229, 234, 236, 237, 238, 239, 246, 247, 249, 251  
 judgment 2, 3, 6, 13, 28, 30, 43, 47, 51, 58, 67, 68, 69, 70, 74, 75, 76, 100, 102, 103, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 140, 141, 143, 144, 150, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 173, 174, 179, 180, 181, 182, 185, 186, 188, 191, 192, 195, 196, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 215, 216, 217, 219, 220, 221, 224, 225, 228, 230, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 243, 245, 247, 248, 249, 250  
 basis for judgment 2, 36, 68, 162, 163, 194, 218, 220, 221, 222, 225, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249  
 judgment day 2, 29, 36, 46, 51, 60, 64, 67, 68, 69, 96, 100, 106, 111, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 123, 125, 126, 127, 128, 159, 161, 162, 166, 171, 172, 173, 174, 181, 182, 191, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 209, 211, 213, 216, 218, 221, 224, 225, 228, 229, 230, 234, 235, 237, 238, 239, 243, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250  
 Judgment, Last 2, 8, 29, 117, 122, 167, 169, 171, 191, 202, 204, 211, 219, 221, 225, 230, 235, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 245, 249, 250  
 judicial 2, 12, 13, 38, 60, 64, 76, 81, 98, 100, 102, 103, 105, 112, 113, 122, 126, 127, 128, 136, 138, 157, 158, 160, 162, 164, 175, 177, 179, 180, 182, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 194, 195, 205, 206, 209, 210, 215, 216, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 225, 226, 230, 231, 235, 236, 239, 240, 243, 244, 248, 251

- justice 34, 41, 75, 76, 92, 94, 95, 96, 108, 113, 114,  
116, 125, 149, 152, 158, 159, 200, 202, 232, 237,  
239, 240
- Kasbeel* 67, 68, 150
- Kasdeya* 44
- king 8, 18, 19, 20, 28, 35, 45, 63, 75, 80, 83, 87, 92,  
97, 99, 102, 126, 152, 154, 158, 185, 186, 194,  
195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 203, 209, 210, 211, 214,  
217, 218, 220, 224
- kingdoms 68, 78, 79, 80, 127
- kings 2, 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24,  
34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48,  
49, 65, 67, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 85, 95, 96, 97, 99,  
100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109,  
110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 122,  
123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 136, 151, 155, 157,  
158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 174, 181, 184, 185,  
192, 213, 214, 216, 217, 218, 219, 228, 229, 230,  
235, 237, 238, 239, 241, 244, 248
- kings and mighty ones 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21,  
22, 23, 24, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 43, 44, 45, 46,  
48, 49, 65, 67, 80, 81, 97, 100, 103, 104, 105,  
106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116,  
117, 118, 122, 123, 125, 126, 136, 151, 155, 157,  
158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 174, 181, 185, 192,  
213, 214, 216, 217, 218, 219, 229, 230, 237,  
239, 244
- lake of fire 214, 246, 247
- lament 110, 114, 115, 116, 123, 139
- landlords 48
- lead 26, 29, 34, 68, 109, 180, 203, 242, 247
- lectio difficilior* 89, 104, 105, 133, 134, 135, 147
- legal system 38
- light of the nations 89, 90, 91
- light to the Gentiles 28, 84, 88, 91, 96, 99, 157, 158,  
231, 233, 248
- lightning 35, 46, 62, 68, 76, 204
- literary integrity 135, 137
- literary unity 24, 28, 29
- locations 9, 70, 72, 186, 190, 196, 197
- Lord of Spirits 3, 5, 7, 16, 17, 26, 28, 36, 43, 45, 46,  
54, 55, 70, 72, 74, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 84, 85, 88,  
89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 109, 110,  
111, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 123,  
124, 125, 126, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134,  
135, 136, 138, 139, 143, 145, 151, 154, 155, 157,  
158, 159, 160, 162, 173, 174, 181, 186, 213, 216,  
217, 218, 230, 231, 234, 238, 239, 243
- luxury 40
- Maccabees 17, 19
- Macherus 22, 34
- Mediterranean 14, 34, 38, 115
- merchant class 39, 41, 42, 47
- mercy 2, 35, 37, 43, 63, 66, 67, 68, 100, 107, 108,  
109, 110, 113, 115, 116, 117, 125, 157, 159, 160,  
162, 164, 174, 175, 199, 200, 208, 213, 218, 220,  
221, 222, 225, 226, 230, 237, 238, 240, 243, 244,  
245, 247, 248
- Messiah 2, 3, 23, 51, 102, 178, 179, 180, 187, 194, 251
- messianic 4, 15, 24, 30, 63, 64, 70, 73, 177, 179, 183,  
188, 199, 225
- metallic mountains 26, 27, 28, 67
- meteorological 35, 36, 38, 46, 48, 65, 68, 69, 70, 76,  
117, 118, 229
- Michael 7, 8, 15, 17, 27, 29, 53, 62, 65, 66, 67, 68,  
125, 134, 135, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 146, 147,  
151, 171
- mighty and powerful 2, 4, 26
- military equipment 38
- Moab 102, 112
- Most High 16, 105, 178, 186, 187, 234
- mourning 189, 190, 191, 192, 204, 231, 237, 239, 241
- multivalent 98
- myriads 3, 142, 147, 149, 173
- Name 3, 16, 45, 57, 67, 92, 213
- named 7, 28, 34, 45, 58, 82, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 96, 97,  
99, 123, 124, 141, 142, 143, 157, 158, 227, 231,  
233, 243, 248
- narrative 1, 6, 7, 26, 33, 50, 54, 61, 79, 86, 87, 113,  
114, 123, 129, 136, 137, 138, 140, 151, 152, 166,  
171, 175, 177, 178, 179, 197, 217, 221, 228, 231,  
232, 233, 239, 250
- Narrative Criticism 14, 31
- narrator 24
- Nebuchadnezzar 35
- Nergal 51, 52
- no mercy 115, 116, 117, 174, 238, 247
- Noachic 3, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 35, 66, 67, 72,  
118, 133, 135, 136, 151, 154, 161, 163, 244
- Noah 23, 24, 29, 30, 66, 75, 151, 154
- nobles 22, 38, 42
- nomen dei* 54, 55, 57, 58, 91, 109, 136, 150, 151, 172
- officials 41, 42, 47
- one like a son of man 4, 50, 59, 60, 70, 73, 99, 185
- Ophannin 143
- oppressed 3, 8, 17, 44, 46, 68, 69, 98, 100, 117, 141,  
162, 192, 199, 217, 218, 221, 238, 240, 241,  
245, 246
- oppressors 3, 30, 43, 65, 68, 70, 95, 96, 99, 100, 105,  
108, 110, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117, 118, 122, 125,  
141, 160, 162, 163, 169, 186, 199, 225, 233, 236,  
237, 240, 241, 244, 246, 249
- Pacorus 20, 36
- pain of childbirth 100, 103, 105, 112
- Palestine 12, 17, 18, 19, 20, 36, 44, 48
- pan-chronic notion of time 87
- Parthians 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 33, 36, 45
- Parthians and Medes 14, 15, 19, 20, 22, 33, 36, 45
- passion prediction 182
- patrons 33, 37, 48
- pattern of relationships 173, 226, 229, 230, 232, 233,  
234, 235, 239, 240, 242, 243, 244

- peace 7, 20, 25, 26, 46, 64, 65, 66, 68, 76, 92, 144,  
 145, 148, 154, 162, 174, 238  
*Penemue* 44  
 persecution 34, 42, 167, 168, 169, 207, 209, 218  
 personal retainers 41  
 Peter's confession 177, 178, 180  
 Phanuel 144, 146, 147  
 Phasael 19, 20, 21, 36  
 Philistines  
   Philistine 112  
 Pompey 17, 18, 21, 33  
 post-Easter faith 180  
 potentates 37, 105, 214, 219  
 poverty 41, 42  
 power 23, 26, 31, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 48, 49, 64,  
   80, 81, 95, 98, 99, 101, 102, 105, 106, 109, 110,  
   112, 113, 114, 116, 123, 124, 127, 144, 146, 160,  
   162, 164, 167, 179, 181, 182, 189, 193, 204, 205,  
   212, 228, 235  
 praise 28, 43, 45, 48, 78, 79, 82, 90, 92, 93, 96, 100,  
   105, 106, 108, 111, 113, 117, 118, 123, 125, 129,  
   174, 216  
 prayer of lament and penitence 116, 160  
 pre-existence 4, 6, 7, 8, 82, 85, 88, 96, 97, 99, 227,  
   231, 232, 243, 248  
*Pre-existence* 7, 97, 106, 231, 232  
 priests 41, 176  
 privilege 39, 40, 43, 46, 76, 81  
*proskynesis* 35  
 prostration 82, 95, 96, 107, 142  
 provenance 30, 31  
 punishment 2, 3, 8, 19, 21, 24, 26, 35, 36, 37, 46, 65,  
   67, 78, 80, 100, 103, 110, 113, 115, 118, 159,  
   161, 162, 173, 175, 196, 203, 213, 214, 217, 218,  
   219, 220, 222, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248  
 purpose 7, 11, 21, 22, 39, 63, 68, 74, 78, 81, 84, 86,  
   88, 90, 92, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 123, 127, 141, 143,  
   153, 157, 158, 161, 165, 167, 169, 184, 188, 197,  
   227, 230, 231, 232, 243, 246, 248, 250  
  
 Rabbinic Judaism 52  
 radiance of the vindicated 161, 163  
 Raguel 65  
 Raphael 65, 144, 146  
 real author 30, 31, 32, 33, 38  
 real reader 32  
 recognition 13, 124, 159, 179, 202, 237, 244  
 redactional 6, 7, 15, 88, 137, 165, 166, 171, 195, 196,  
   197, 198, 201, 203, 209, 215  
 redemptive 95, 180, 191, 192, 248  
 religious leaders 41, 42, 44, 48, 49, 215  
 remnant 94, 112  
 request 117, 157, 159, 160, 184, 217, 223, 228, 237,  
   238, 243, 244, 247, 248  
 restoration 49, 63, 91, 95, 97, 111, 191, 246  
 Resurrection, resurrected 159, 161, 162, 202, 247  
 retainers 41, 43, 47  
 revealed 2, 3, 5, 8, 14, 26, 28, 30, 35, 36, 44, 46, 49,  
   66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 74, 77, 84, 93, 95, 96, 97, 99,  
   105, 106, 113, 116, 117, 118, 119, 122, 123, 126,  
   150, 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 164, 169, 174, 178,  
   179, 184, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 225,  
   227, 228, 234, 235, 237, 239, 243, 248, 249  
 revelation 3, 8, 38, 66, 68, 69, 70, 76, 77, 81, 94, 95,  
   97, 106, 123, 129, 178, 235, 237, 244, 246  
 revelatory role 227, 229, 230, 243, 248  
 reversal of fortunes 2, 3, 8, 34, 68, 70, 78, 95, 110,  
   111, 113, 117, 154, 156, 162, 163, 164, 167, 186,  
   188, 220, 221, 222, 244, 246, 249  
 review of history 3  
*Re'sa* 54, 55  
 righteous 2, 7  
   righteous and holy 3, 7, 8, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 28,  
   30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 39, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49,  
   53, 64, 65, 67, 68, 70, 75, 77, 78, 81, 82, 84, 88,  
   89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 103, 105,  
   106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 116, 117,  
   118, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130,  
   131, 132, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145,  
   148, 149, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161,  
   162, 163, 164, 166, 167, 170, 171, 173, 174, 175,  
   178, 181, 185, 186, 187, 188, 192, 196, 198, 199,  
   203, 208, 209, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217,  
   218, 220, 221, 222, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229,  
   230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239,  
   240, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249  
 Righteous One 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 45, 54, 70, 73, 78, 80, 82,  
   94, 96, 97, 98, 100, 126, 133, 135, 136, 137, 140,  
   152, 153, 154, 185, 187, 199, 218, 236  
 righteousness 7, 8, 41, 46, 66, 67, 68, 71, 74, 75, 76,  
   81, 94, 101, 102, 112, 113, 116, 123, 126, 127,  
   128, 144, 147, 148, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157,  
   158, 159, 161, 184, 185, 198, 215, 218, 227, 229,  
   231, 235, 238, 242, 243, 246, 248  
 Roman 17, 18, 19, 20, 33, 36, 39  
 Romans 17, 18, 20, 21, 43, 44, 151  
 rulers 3, 16, 17, 18, 20, 38, 39, 40, 43, 45, 80, 82,  
   109, 158  
 ruling class 36  
  
 Sadducees 17  
 salvation 42, 81, 82, 87, 91, 92, 96, 97, 103, 111,  
   113, 117, 123, 157, 159, 160, 185, 208, 209,  
   232, 238  
 salvific 82, 84, 92, 95, 96, 164, 231, 232, 243  
 sapiential 35, 36, 38, 44, 48, 49  
 Satan 37, 219, 223, 246, 247  
 sayings 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 165, 168, 178, 202, 221,  
   224, 232  
 scepter 114, 116  
 scourges 37, 110, 173  
 scribal 6, 35, 36, 49, 56, 57, 79, 101, 104, 124, 134,  
   135, 151  
 scribe 35, 36, 38, 56, 57, 65, 120, 125, 132, 134, 135,  
   145, 152  
 scribes 41, 47, 55, 118, 176  
 sea 34, 47, 50, 51, 52, 53, 162, 163, 174, 187, 194,  
   246, 247



- seam 24, 196, 197, 209, 215  
 secrets 3, 26, 46, 48, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 76,  
 77, 81, 123, 141, 142, 151, 229  
 Seleucids 16, 17  
 self-designation 10, 11, 13, 179, 182, 187, 250  
 self-referrent 177  
 Sennacherib 91  
 Septuagint 57, 181, 192  
 Seraphin 143  
 servant 78, 83, 84, 86, 89, 91, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99,  
 102, 129, 137, 158, 160, 164, 178, 182, 211, 217,  
 230, 251  
 Servant Songs 83, 84, 94  
 servants 41, 83, 111, 116  
 shame 31, 46, 105, 106, 110, 113, 114, 115, 116, 122,  
 157, 160, 162, 180, 181, 192, 205, 216, 228, 237,  
 243, 249  
 Shaoshyant 51  
 sheep 47, 195, 203, 209, 217  
 shepherd 91, 195, 196, 203, 209, 216, 220, 223  
*Sibylline Oracles* 15, 247  
 sign of the Son of Man 189, 191, 204, 241  
 silver 20, 26, 34  
 similarities 2, 9, 13, 22, 51, 59, 60, 80, 82, 83, 96,  
 103, 109, 126, 137, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 167,  
 169, 171, 173, 213, 216, 219, 225, 226, 227, 236,  
 244, 245, 249, 250, 251  
 sinners 29, 35, 36, 37, 48, 53, 67, 68, 78, 80, 102,  
 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 128, 129, 155, 156, 181,  
 185, 208, 214, 216, 235, 240, 245  
 snow 58, 59, 76, 141, 142, 149, 150, 242  
 social arenas 32, 33  
 social location 30, 32, 33, 39, 43, 46, 48, 49  
 social setting 2, 13, 14, 30, 31, 39, 49  
 social status 14, 31, 32  
 social stratification 14  
 social system 14, 33  
*Socialization* 35  
 soldiers 38, 39, 41  
 Son of a Woman 101, 103, 105, 112, 122, 125, 128,  
 152, 153, 155, 156, 159  
 son of Adam 6, 135  
 son of Enos 6  
 Son of God 11, 178, 180, 234, 246, 250  
 Son of Man 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15,  
 16, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 34, 37, 38, 43, 44,  
 45, 46, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64,  
 66, 67, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80,  
 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 91, 92, 94, 95,  
 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107,  
 108, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120,  
 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130,  
 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 143,  
 144, 145, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158,  
 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168,  
 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178,  
 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188,  
 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198,  
 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 209,  
 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219,  
 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229,  
 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239,  
 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 248, 249, 250, 251  
 Son of the Mother of Life 156  
 sorcery 35, 67  
 sources 2, 13, 14, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30,  
 45, 47, 50, 52, 61, 77, 88, 156, 184, 185, 186,  
 188, 190, 207, 250  
 source-traditions 29  
 sovereignty 28, 193, 205  
 sower 166, 170, 171, 172  
 staff 28, 45, 89, 91, 92, 96, 232  
 stars 16, 33, 66, 80, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 97, 98, 242,  
 247  
 stars of heaven 16, 85, 88, 89  
 storehouses 35, 36, 38, 46, 66, 76, 142  
 stylistic habits 137  
 suffering sayings 165  
 suffering servant 97  
 Sumerian 99  
 sun 35, 45, 62, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 97, 98, 149,  
 150, 161, 166, 170, 171, 173, 174, 175, 214, 221,  
 222, 224, 238, 242  
 supplicants 46, 48  
 sword 110, 114, 115, 159  
  
 Talmud 35  
 taxation 40  
*technology* 33, 34, 39, 67  
 temple 18, 42  
*Testament of Abraham* 15, 184, 246  
*Testament of Job* 138  
 textual 5, 17, 33, 37, 55, 56, 57, 58, 79, 80, 101, 118,  
 121, 124, 125, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135, 137,  
 151, 224  
*The Lives of the Prophets* 138  
*The Rule of the Community* 109  
*The War Scroll* 109  
 throne of glory 3, 13, 53, 101, 102, 103, 105, 123,  
 124, 125, 113, 118, 119, 120, 126, 134, 142, 157,  
 159, 160, 183, 184, 185, 187, 188, 203, 215,  
 216, 222, 224, 226, 229, 235, 236, 239, 243, 244,  
 248, 250  
 thrones 34, 43, 78, 79, 80, 102, 124, 125, 126, 166,  
 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 201, 206, 225, 232,  
 236, 246, 248  
 thunder 35, 46, 68, 76  
 tin 34  
 title 4  
 torture 37  
 Trajan 15, 20  
 tributes 40  
 trumpet 189, 190, 193, 204  
 Tyre 109  
  
 Ugaritic 61  
 unclean 42, 44  
 Uriel 65

- valley of punishment 21
- vindication 8, 14, 30, 34, 49, 82, 100, 108, 118, 123,  
164, 174, 187, 188, 192, 194, 199, 220, 222,  
229, 234
- vision(s) 2, 3, 6, 7, 31, 32, 50, 54, 60, 61, 64, 65, 67,  
69, 74, 126, 127, 137, 138, 139, 141, 163, 228,  
230
- voice 10, 34, 83, 144, 146, 150, 151, 203
- volcanic activity 21, 34
- walda* 4, 59, 62, 64, 70, 71, 74, 75, 79, 80, 85, 86,  
104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 111, 112, 114, 119, 120,  
122, 125, 128, 130, 132, 135, 137, 139, 144, 145,  
152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157
- watchers 3, 29, 36, 66, 67, 69, 70, 118, 121, 140, 141,  
150, 155, 214, 242, 244
- wealth 31, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 109, 110, 162
- weapons 26, 39
- white 54, 58, 59, 141, 144, 146, 149, 150, 153, 242
- wicked 3, 8, 68, 80, 94, 100, 102, 108, 109, 110, 112,  
113, 116, 118, 126, 127, 128, 129, 151, 159, 160,  
173, 174, 175, 185, 187, 188, 209, 211, 216, 217,  
219, 220, 222, 225, 231, 237, 238, 240, 245,  
246
- wild beasts 47, 162, 194
- winds 46, 68, 88, 130, 131, 132, 138, 139, 140, 141,  
142, 189, 194, 223, 224
- Wisdom 3, 68, 69, 76, 97, 109, 178, 211, 231, 232
- wool 54, 58, 59, 144, 146, 149, 150
- worldwide 129, 157, 161, 226, 240, 241, 243, 244,  
248
- worship 35, 43, 48, 82, 84, 90, 92, 96, 99, 100, 107,  
108, 112, 113, 123, 125, 157, 158, 159, 217, 227,  
233, 234, 243, 248
- writing 6, 8, 22, 32, 40, 41, 44, 46, 82, 171
- zodiac 88
- Zoroastrian theology 51