

James A. Waddell



The Messiah

With Greek and Latin Fragments,
English Translation, Introduction,
and Concordances



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

THE MESSIAH

A Comparative Study of the Enochic Son of Man and the Pauline Kyrios

James A. Waddell



Published by T&T Clark International
A Continuum imprint
The Tower Building, 11 York Road, London SE1 7NX
80 Maiden Lane, New York, NY 10038

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.

© by James A. Waddell, 2011

James A. Waddell 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

eISBN: 9780567420114

Material from *1 Enoch: A New Translation* by George W.E. Nickelsburg and James VanderKam copyright © 2004 Fortress Press, reproduced by permission of Augsburg Fortress Publishers. All rights reserved.

Typeset and copy-edited by Forthcoming Publications Ltd. (www.forthpub.com)

For Lisa

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	x
Acknowledgments.....	xi
Abbreviations	xv
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.0 Initial Remarks.....	1
1.1 The Problem this Study Addresses	2
1.2 History of Research	3
1.3 Methodology.....	16
1.4 Mediatorial Figures in Second Temple Judaism	19
1.5 Dating the <i>Parables of Enoch</i>	22
2. THE DIVINE FIGURE IN THE <i>PARABLES OF ENOCH</i>.....	28
2.0 The Divine Figure in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i>	28
2.1 Nature of the Divine Figure in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i>	29
2.1.1 A Heavenly Being	29
2.1.2 A Holy Being.....	32
2.1.3 Foreknowledge	33
2.1.4 A Merciful Being	34
2.1.5 A Righteous Being	35
2.1.6 Repentance	35
2.1.7 An Eternal Being.....	36
2.2 Functions of the Divine Figure in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i>	37
2.2.1 Creation.....	38
2.2.2 Revelation of Wisdom	38
2.2.3 Worship.....	40
2.2.4 Judgment	41
2.3 Ambiguous References Either to the Divine Figure or the Messiah Figure.....	44
2.4 Summary and Conclusions	46

3. THE MESSIAH IN THE <i>PARABLES OF ENOCH</i>.....	48
3.0 The Messiah Figure in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i>	48
3.1 Nature of the Messiah Figure in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i>	49
3.1.1 A Human Being	49
3.1.2 Identified with Enoch	51
3.1.3 A Heavenly Being	60
3.1.4 Preexistence	62
3.1.5 Association with Wisdom	63
3.1.6 A Righteous Being	69
3.1.7 The Divine Name	72
3.1.8 The “Son of Man” Title	75
3.2 Functions of the Messiah Figure in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i>	85
3.2.1 Revelation of Wisdom	85
3.2.2 Salvation	87
3.2.3 Judgment	89
3.2.4 Worship.....	96
3.3 Summary and Conclusions	101
4. THE DIVINE FIGURE IN THE LETTERS OF PAUL	104
4.0 The Divine Figure in the Letters of Paul	104
4.1 Nature of the Divine Figure in the Letters of Paul	104
4.1.1 The One God	105
4.1.2 Deity	107
4.1.3 A Heavenly Being	108
4.1.4 A Righteous Being	108
4.2 Functions of the Divine Figure in the Letters of Paul	110
4.2.1 Creation.....	110
4.2.2 Revelation of Wisdom	111
4.2.3 Divine Acts in the Life of the Messiah Figure.....	113
4.2.4 Salvation	115
4.2.5 Worship.....	116
4.2.6 Judgment	116
4.3 Ambiguous References Either to the Divine Figure or the Messiah Figure.....	117
4.4 Summary and Conclusions	118
5. THE MESSIAH IN THE LETTERS OF PAUL	119
5.0 The Messiah Figure in the Letters of Paul.....	119
5.1 Nature of the Messiah Figure in the Letters of Paul	119
5.1.1 A Human Being	120
5.1.2 A Heavenly Being	121
5.1.3 Preexistence.....	123

5.1.4	Association with the Wisdom of God.....	129
5.1.5	Pre-human	136
5.1.6	Divine Image and Glory.....	140
5.1.7	The Divine Name	141
5.1.8	Like an Angel	141
5.1.9	Without Sin	142
5.2	Functions of the Messiah Figure in the Letters of Paul.....	143
5.2.1	Agent of Creation.....	143
5.2.2	Salvation	144
5.2.3	Forgiveness of Sins	149
5.2.4	Association with the Power of God.....	153
5.2.5	Judgment	163
5.2.6	Worship.....	166
5.3	Summary and Conclusions	169
5.4	EXCURSUS: A CLOSER LOOK AT ROMANS 9.5: DID PAUL REFER TO JESUS AS θεός?	172
6.	A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE MESSIAH IN THE <i>PARABLES OF ENOCH</i> AND THE LETTERS OF PAUL.....	178
6.0	Summary of the Problem this Study Addresses	178
6.1	Comparative Analysis	178
6.2	Striking Similarities between the <i>Book of Parables</i> and the Letters of Paul	183
6.3	What is New in Paul	184
6.4	EXCURSUS: WHY PAUL DID NOT USE “SON-OF-MAN” TERMINOLOGY	186
7.	CONCLUSIONS	202
7.0	Final Remarks	202
7.1	Conclusions	202
7.2	Sociological Analysis: Making Sense of the Data.....	203
	Bibliography.....	210
	Index of References.....	226
	Index of Authors	239

LIST OF TABLES

1. Development of Enoch’s Status in Enochic Intellectual Speculation.....	67
2. Philosophical and Messianic Wisdom Associations	68
3. A Comparison of the Nature of the Divine Figure and the Nature of the Messiah Figure in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i>	102
4. A Comparison of the Functions of the Divine Figure and the Functions of the Messiah Figure in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i>	103
5. A Comparison of the Nature of the Divine Figure and the Nature of the Messiah Figure in the Letters of Paul	171
6. A Comparison of the Functions of the Divine Figure and the Functions of the Messiah Figure in the Letters of Paul	171–72
7. A Comparison of the Nature of the Divine Figure and the Nature of the Messiah Figure in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> and the Letters of Paul	179
8. A Comparison of the Functions of the Divine Figure and the Functions of the Messiah Figure in the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> and the Letters of Paul.....	179–81
9. Precedented and Unprecedented Conceptual Elements of Messianic Nature Held in Common by the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> and the Letters of Paul	182
10. Precedented and Unprecedented Conceptual Elements of Messianic Functions Held in Common by the <i>Parables of Enoch</i> and the Letters of Paul.....	182

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project is a revised version of my dissertation completed for the University of Michigan in the spring of 2010. It is the culmination of many years of study. I first became interested in Second Temple Judaism during my undergraduate years in the Classics Department of the University of Nebraska in Lincoln at the urging of my mentor John D. Turner. It was while studying Classical languages in the mid-1980s that James Charlesworth's two-volume *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* first appeared. I learned of its publication a year before it came into print. I placed my order immediately at the university bookstore and patiently waited. When the first volume arrived in 1983 I was happy to find that the wait was richly rewarded. As I ran through its pages my interest in and love for Second Temple Judaism only deepened. I had an almost identical experience with volume two, which arrived nearly a year later.

I express my deep appreciation to my mentor, Gabriele Boccaccini, who guided me through the years of my doctoral studies. His expansive knowledge, his methodological clarity, and his brilliant insights into the cultural remains of Second Temple Judaism have been an invaluable gift to me. When I began my studies at the University of Michigan I did not anticipate the depth and the breadth of substance I was about to experience. There are vivid memories of our small graduate seminars huddled around the table in Gabriele's office in the Frieze Building in Ann Arbor, meetings that were scheduled for three hours, but always continued on for four and sometimes five hours, the only regret being that we even had to stop at all. I have a tendency to focus on minutia, while Gabriele has the extraordinary gift of being able to piece together massive amounts of information into real coherent historic possibilities. While he did not actually rescue me from my love for digging around in the minute details

of ancient texts, he did however succeed to some degree at least in teaching me to think more broadly. We also made several trips together to Israel and Italy to explore the material culture of Jews and Christians in the Graeco-Roman world, filled with vigorous discussions and debates, and a wealth of memories. When it came time to write this dissertation, Gabriele was careful not to impose his ideas on my research. It was a truly liberating and empowering experience, one that resulted in a dissertation that is a very clear reflection of my own research and ideas. I will always cherish Gabriele's kindness as a human being, his warm hospitality, and our friendship that has developed over the years.

I also wish to thank Jim Charlesworth for accepting the manuscript for publication in the Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies series with T&T Clark. It is a natural complement to the work of Leslie Walck on the Enochic Son of Man and the canonical Gospels. Walck's volume on the Son of Man in the *Parables of Enoch* and the Gospel of Matthew was just published by T&T Clark in the same series. Matthew Novenson completed his dissertation for Princeton Theological Seminary roughly the same time I was completing mine. His research also demonstrates clear connections between Enochic messianic traditions and the messianism of the early Jesus movement. J. Harold Ellens completed his dissertation on the Son of Man in the Enochic tradition and the Gospel of John at Michigan in 2009. There is a growing awareness among New Testament scholars that research in Second Temple Judaism, and more narrowly studies in Enochic traditions, are invaluable for understanding the origins and development of the formative ideas of the early Jesus movement. Mention of Jim Charlesworth cannot go without briefly telling the story of our first meeting. The two of us were attending the original gathering of the Enoch Seminar in Florence, Italy in the summer of 2001. We were both staying at the same villa not far from where the seminar was meeting. It was hot, and I was enjoying a glass of cold water in the cool shade of a tree on the terrace. Jim walked up, grabbed my glass of water, took a deep quaff, and said, "Friends don't ask."

The members of my dissertation committee offered solid contributions and guidance for my work and for this I am deeply grateful. Not only did I enjoy years of research in the field of Second Temple Judaism with Gabriele Boccaccini, but as chair of my committee he guided me through the laborious details of completing the dissertation. Brian Schmidt made invaluable comments on my use of the Hebrew Bible, and on the tensions that exist in our understanding of Jewish messianism in diverse contexts of henotheistic and monotheistic beliefs in antiquity. Ray Van

Dam pointed me in the direction of exploring the socio-historical mechanisms of orality and literacy for the transmission of traditions in the Second Temple period, a direction that holds promise for further development of this study. Charles Gieschen brought his widely known expertise on the divine name and christology. All of these scholars have proved to be mentors and friends.

I also wish to thank Jack Levison and Johannes Tromp for their kind and extraordinarily helpful private conversations and correspondence with me regarding the Adam traditions and the importance of these traditions for understanding Paul. Both of these scholars are very detailed and exacting in their methodology and they have helped me to refine and clarify my argument.

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

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

I wish also to thank my colleagues of the Enoch Seminar. They are too many to mention all of their names, but I especially think it appropriate to single out a few of them whose work I engage in this book—Gabriele Boccaccini, Al Baumgarten, Jim Charlesworth, John Collins, Michael Knibb, Helge Kvanvig, George Nickelsburg, Andrei Orlov, Paolo Sacchi, David Suter, and Jim VanderKam. Many thanks to my friends and Enoch Seminar colleagues Daniel Assefa and Pierpaolo Bertalotto for their kind assistance with the Ethiopic transliterations.

I first became acquainted with Hanan and Esti Eshel through the Enoch Seminar. The intensity of their scholarship has always been tempered by their warm kindness and friendship. Hanan’s recent death was a blow to the academic world of Second Temple Judaism, and especially to the close-knit community of the Enoch Seminar. Hanan’s valuable scholarly contributions will be sorely missed, but even more we will miss his friendship in our midst.

The second volume of the Hermeneia commentary on *1 Enoch* by George Nickelsburg and Jim VanderKam was in the final stages of preparation just before its publication when my own manuscript for the present study was completed. Consequently I unfortunately was not able to consult the Nickelsburg and VanderKam commentary on *1 Enoch* for its valuable insights on the *Parables of Enoch*. Nevertheless I look forward to reading this commentary for the purpose of revising and expanding my arguments related to the Enochic literature.

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

I extend my gratitude to Dominic Mattos, Senior Editor, and Anna Turton, Editorial Assistant, both of Continuum/T&T Clark, and Duncan Burns of Forthcoming Publications, who copy-edited the manuscript and prepared the indices. They addressed the preparation of this book with the highest professionalism and made the editorial process a real pleasure. I am very grateful.

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

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Astronomical Book
ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i>
APOT	<i>The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. Oxford, 1913
ATR	<i>Anglican Theological Review</i>
BP	Book of the <i>Parables of Enoch</i>
BW	Book of the Watchers
BZAW	Beihefte zur <i>ZAW</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CD	Damascus Document
ConBOT	Coniectanea biblica, Old Testament
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DSD	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
DV	Dream Visions
ExpT	<i>Expository Times</i>
FO	<i>Folia Orientalia</i>
GLAE	<i>The Greek Life of Adam and Eve</i>
Henoch	<i>Henoch: Studies in Judaism and Christianity from Second Temple to Late Antiquity</i>
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period</i>
JSJSup	Supplements to <i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period</i>

<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LP	Letters of Paul
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et orbis antiquus
<i>OTP</i>	<i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> . Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York, 1983, 1985
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Verteris Testamenti Graece
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SNTS	Society of New Testament Studies
SNTSMS	Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, 1964–76
<i>TS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
TSAJ	Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism
TUGAL	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
<i>VC</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>WZKM</i>	<i>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZTK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

1

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Initial Remarks

Paul was a Jew. He lived at a time when being a Jew meant defining oneself in a context of remarkable diversity. Consequently, the simple statement, “Paul was a Jew,” does not really tell us all there is to know. As in the case of the historical Jesus, the problem of Paul’s Jewish identity cannot be understood apart from the complicated realities of Jewish diversity during the Second Temple period. What kind of Jew was Paul? Was he a Hellenistic Jew? A Pharisee? A Sadducee? An Enochic Jew? Maybe he was a sophisticated combination of all these very different Jewish ideological points of view. Unlike Jesus, whose association with John the Baptizer is the only element that sheds some light on his formative years, Paul explicitly and repeatedly referred in his letters to his “earlier life in Judaism” (Gal 1:13). Paul identified himself as a Pharisee, advancing beyond his peers in the ancestral traditions. He identified himself in the most detailed terms, “with circumcision on the eighth day, from the people of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of Hebrews, according to law a Pharisee, according to zeal persecuting the church, according to the righteousness that is by the law becoming blameless” (Phil 3:5–6). His so-called conversion experience has led scholars for centuries to speak of Paul as a “former Jew,” but this was not Paul’s self-understanding. Whatever his experience was on the road to Damascus,¹ it did not put Paul out of Judaism. It did not cancel his Jewish identity. It only shifted his association from one Jewish group to

¹ Acts 9:1–30; 22:1–21; 26:1–23. These three accounts of Paul’s “conversion” on the road to Damascus are very different when compared with Paul’s own sparse references to what happened at Gal 1:16 and 1 Cor 15:8. Rather than an experience of “conversion,” Paul’s language indicates he understood the experience as a prophetic call.

another, from Pharisaic Judaism to the Jesus movement.² Paul was a Jew before his defining experience. He remained a Jew after this experience. Even in the heat of conflict with other Jews, Paul never denied his Jewish identity, nor did he understand his new participation in the Jesus movement to be in opposition to his Jewish identity. As Gabriele Boccaccini has argued, Paul's literary output was a participation in an "inner Jewish debate in Second Temple Judaism."³

We also know that Paul, as his letters reveal, possessed an intellect of considerable complexity. His writings have been the focus of controversy and debate for nearly two thousand years. This has been the case not only within the Judaism of his own time, but also within the nascent Jesus movement contemporary to Paul and as this movement developed in the decades immediately after Paul. Paul's life and writings provide evidence not only of conflicts with other Jewish groups, but also with groups (or at least individuals) within the Jesus movement that did not agree with his positions.

1.1 The Problem this Study Addresses

This study proposes a contribution to the history of Pauline studies and the ongoing scholarly debate by examining Paul's place in the development of Jewish thought with respect to messiah figures between the second century B.C.E. and the first century C.E. The key problem this study proposes to address is: What is the relationship, if any, between the concept of the messiah figure in the *Book of the Parables of Enoch* and the concept of the messiah figure in the Letters of Paul? In other words, is there a relationship between the Enochic Son of Man and the Pauline

² And even then, Paul continued to identify himself as a Pharisaic Jew. Cf. Alan F. Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990). See also the more recent and provocative discussion by Pamela Eisenbaum, *Paul Was Not a Christian: The Original Message of a Misunderstood Apostle* (New York: HarperCollins, 2009).

³ Gabriele Boccaccini, "Inner-Jewish Debate on the Tension between Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism," in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment* (ed. John M. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole; London: T&T Clark, 2006), 9–26. In this essay Boccaccini develops his view that Paul was engaging in an inner-Jewish debate around the concept of the origin of evil and how this concept is developed differently in the literature from this period. Were human beings the victims of a supernatural origin of evil or were they responsible for evil in the world? Second Temple period Jewish texts offer a variety of answers to this question. See also Gabriele Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 220–22.

Kyrios? A corollary question is: Where does Paul as a Jew fit within the landscape of Jewish intellectual development of messianic ideology of the Second Temple period?

1.2 History of Research

In 1913 Wilhelm Bousset presented his influential study, *Kyrios Christos*.⁴ In this study Bousset argued from a history of religions perspective that the identification of the historical Jesus as *Kyrios Christos* developed as a result of Gentile cultic veneration. Bousset's analysis led him to conclude with regard to the term *Kyrios*, "that the primitive Palestinian community was not acquainted with this designation."⁵ This, however, was Bousset's leading assumption. Bousset's assumption about the Pauline *Kyrios*, that it was largely a development out of a Hellenized, Graeco-Roman Gentile environment of cultic veneration, owes its fundamental distinctions to the earlier nineteenth-century work of F. C. Baur. Baur's analysis had already driven a significant wedge between "Jewish" and "Gentile" Christianity by applying the Hegelian model which pitted Paul's "Gentile Christianity" against the early Jewish followers of Jesus in Judaea.⁶ Baur's model shaped scholarly opinion about Paul for nearly a century, and Bousset fits within this development of the history of research on Paul.

In 1977 E. P. Sanders transformed the debate about Paul with his study, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*.⁷ The beginning premise of Sanders' analysis was that Paul was a Jew, and that his literary work should be understood in the context of other Jewish literature from the period describing Jewish identity. By using a kind of common-denominator approach, Sanders concluded that all forms of Second Temple Judaism

⁴ Wilhelm Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913; rev. ed., 1921).

⁵ Wilhelm Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus* (Eng. trans. from 4th German ed., 1965; trans. John E. Steely; Nashville: Abingdon, 1970), 11.

⁶ Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche* (Tübingen: L. F. Fues, 1863); *Vorlesungen über Neutestamentliche Theologie* (Leipzig: L. F. Fues, 1864); *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, His Life and Work, His Epistles and Doctrine: A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1876); *The Church History of the First Three Centuries* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1878).

⁷ E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977).

had to be considered variants of a common theological framework he defined as “covenantal nomism.” Although, as Sanders claimed, Paul ultimately broke with this framework by replacing the Torah with Christ as the new center of Judaism, Sanders rightly identified Paul as a Jewish intellectual rather than the founder of a Hellenized form of Christianity. Sanders’ work sparked an entirely new trajectory of the conversation known as the New Perspective on Paul,⁸ which has focused mainly on the question of soteriology. The New Perspective has had profound implications for issues pertaining to christology, and raises important questions that are also at the center of the present study, for example, the relationship between wisdom and the messiah figure, the preexistence of the messiah figure, and Paul’s Adam typology. One of the key problems

⁸ See, e.g., David E. Aune, ed., *Rereading Paul Together: Protestant and Catholic Perspectives on Justification* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006); Jouette M. Bassler, *Navigating Paul: An Introduction to Key Theological Concepts* (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 2006); Michael F. Bird, *The Saving Righteousness of God: Studies on Paul, Justification and the New Perspective* (Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 2007); James D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (2d ed.; London: SCM, 1989); Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1990); Dunn, ed., *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, AD 70 to 135* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992); Dunn, *The Justice of God: A Fresh Look at the Old Doctrine of Justification by Faith* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993); Dunn, *The Theology of Paul’s Letter to the Galatians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997); Dunn, ed., *Paul and the Mosaic Law* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001); Dunn, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Dunn, *The New Perspective on Paul, Revised Edition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007); Eisenbaum, *Paul Was Not a Christian*; Segal, *Paul the Convert*; Stanley Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997); Michael B. Thompson, *The New Perspective on Paul* (Cambridge: Grove, 2002); N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992); Wright, *What St. Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997); Wright, *Paul in Fresh Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005); Wright, *Justification: God’s Plan and Paul’s Vision* (London: SPCK, 2009). Critical responses to the New Perspective on Paul include D. A. Carson, Peter T. O’Brien, and Mark Seifrid, eds., *Justification and Variegated Nomism: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001); D. A. Carson, Peter T. O’Brien, and Mark Seifrid, eds., *Justification and Variegated Nomism: The Paradoxes of Paul*, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004); A. Andrew Das, *Paul and the Jews* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2003); Das, *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2001); Simon J. Gathercole, *Where is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul’s Response in Romans 1–5* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

in the study of Paul's concept of the messiah is the question of monotheism. This is a problem that will also be addressed here.

Apart from the entire trajectory of the New Perspective on Paul a discussion has developed around the question of Jewish monotheism in the Second Temple period and whether there is evidence in the New Testament for belief in the divinity of Jesus among his earliest followers. Maurice Casey has argued that messianic ideology developed within social subgroups on the fringes of mainstream Jewish identity in the Second Temple period.⁹ These developments, according to Casey, were limited by the rigid constraints of monotheism. He calls this limitation "real and pervasive."¹⁰ Casey argues that "Enoch and Wisdom were developed with special vigour, reaching an exceptionally high status with unique functions."¹¹ Casey's argument maintains a strict monotheism as a prominent feature of Jewish identity in the Second Temple period, and he must marginalize as fringe "subgroups" the communities and individuals behind texts that included in their "monotheism" two powers in heaven—Enoch, Melchizedek (11Q13), and Philo, for example.¹² Casey argues that the divinity of Jesus first appears in the late first century with the Gospel of John, and that what was needed in the later development of the Jesus movement to turn Jesus into a full deity was Gentile perception.¹³

James Dunn also holds that belief in the divinity of Jesus first appeared in the late first century with the Gospel of John. He argues that there is a clearly perceptible development of christology in the canonical Gospels themselves, one which indicates a movement from an early understanding

⁹ Casey, *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God: The Origins and Development of New Testament Christology* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1991), 92.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Casey points to evidence in Rabbinic sources to argue that the two-powers concept was heretical, that it constituted "unusual developments," and was "on the fringes of Judaism." But to make this claim Casey must value the Rabbinic sources over other sources that do in fact hold the two-powers concept. Here Casey cites *b. Hag.* 14a and 15, *b. Sanh.* 38b, and *Mek. Bah* 5, which represent critical views of the two-powers claim as "heretics (minim)." Casey writes: "Thoughts of this kind have always occurred on the fringes of the Jewish community. As the identity factor of monotheism has intensified, they have more clearly led to exclusion from that community." See *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God*, 91. While it is not clear that the two-powers concept was actually on the fringes of Jewish identity during the Second Temple period, Casey's point is well taken that during and after the second century C.E. Rabbinic Judaism began to define itself over against the two-powers ideology as it was promulgated within the early Jesus movement.

¹³ Casey, *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God*, 114–15.

of Jesus' eschatological sonship during his earthly ministry, which was greatly enhanced after his resurrection, to a concept of a preexistent divine sonship of the incarnate Christ in the Gospel of John.¹⁴ With reference to Paul, Dunn writes: "In assessing Paul's christology... and in theologizing further on the basis of it, a central fact remains primary: that Paul's christology was not seen as a threat to Israel's inherited monotheism by his Jewish contemporaries, nor was it intended by Paul himself as a complete redefinition of that monotheism."¹⁵ Dunn's claim is that while Paul pressed the boundaries of Jewish monotheism of his day, he did not transgress those boundaries. Referring to N. T. Wright's phrase, "christological monotheism," Dunn writes:

...the Paul who wrote the great doxology of Rom. 11:33–36 evidently never entertained the slightest thought or intention of abandoning his inherited faith in God as one. We see a faith more sharply (and more controversially) defined. Whether a redefinition in terms of a phrase like 'christological monotheism' best restates that faith remains an item for the ongoing dialogue. We see tensions within the monotheism so defined. But these were tensions which could not be coped with as beliefs in other gods had been coped with. Rather, they stimulated an elaboration of the older tension between Creator God transcendent and Spirit of God immanent, a process which eventuated in the Christian conceptualization of God as triune. The point here, however, is that the tensions were *within* the monotheism and not destructive of it. Paul, we may be confident, would never have accepted as a restatement of his theology anything which departed from or denied the fundamental affirmation that God is one.¹⁶

Dunn is absolutely correct to view Paul's christology in terms of a controversial tension within Jewish monotheism. It might better be articulated in terms of an internal Jewish debate about the nature and functions of the messiah figure in relation to the one God.

The current debate has turned in the direction of a discussion as to whether devotion among the earliest followers of Jesus constituted worship of Jesus as God.¹⁷ In a 1999 essay titled "The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus,"¹⁸ Richard Bauckham surveys the literature from the

¹⁴ Dunn, *Christology in the Making*; see esp. 60–64.

¹⁵ Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 293.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 718. Cf. N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant*, 114.

¹⁷ The works credited with stimulating this debate are by Alan F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1977); Richard Bauckham, "The Worship of Jesus in Apocalyptic Christianity," *NTS* 27 (1981): 322–41; Larry Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988).

¹⁸ Richard Bauckham, "The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus," in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on*

Second Temple period that indicates human and mediatorial participation in divine activities, such as session on the throne of God by the Son of Man in the *Parables of Enoch* and by Moses in the *Exagoge of Ezekiel the Tragedian*. Bauckham also survey's New Testament evidence for devotion given to Jesus among the early followers of Jesus, reading the evidence in the context of Jewish monotheism in the Second Temple period. Bauckham concludes,

Examination of New Testament texts which offer theological rationale for the worship of Jesus thus confirms our argument. Worship is given to Jesus precisely as recognition of characteristics of the divine identity which were regarded in Second Temple Judaism as distinguishing the uniqueness of the one God. The worship of Jesus serves to focus in conceptuality, as well as making most obvious in religious practice, the inclusion of Jesus in the unique identity of the one God of Jewish monotheism. It was not only the natural religious response of Jewish Christians to the status they perceived the exalted Jesus to have and to the role he played in their religious experience and life. It was also reflectively understood in the context of Jewish monotheistic understanding of God.¹⁹

Bauckham's assessment of the evidence has led him to conclude that the early followers of Jesus included Jesus "in the unique identity of the one God of Jewish monotheism." This is essentially the same argument Bauckham had already made in 1998.²⁰ More recently, Bauckham has argued that the "earliest Christology was already the highest Christology."²¹ The argument for the inclusion of Jesus in the identity of the unique God is not entirely unlike the view held by Charles Gieschen, who reads the evidence of Jesus' relation to the divine name as the inclusion of Jesus in the mystery of the unique God.²² If we take into

the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus (ed. Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis; JSJSup 63; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 43–69.

¹⁹ Bauckham, "The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus," 69.

²⁰ Richard Bauckham, *God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998). See James D. G. Dunn's critique of Bauckham's use of language of "identity" for Jesus and God in *Did the First Christians Worship Jesus? The New Testament Evidence* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 141–44.

²¹ Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified; and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), x, 184, 285.

²² Charles Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (Leiden: Brill, 1998). See also the discussion in David B. Capes, *Old Testament Yahweh Texts in Paul's Christology* (WUNT 2/47; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr; Paul Siebeck, 1992).

consideration that the earliest evidence in the New Testament (Paul) indicates that the Lord Jesus Christ has become (identified with/equated with) the glory of God the Father, then there may be something to the arguments set forth by Bauckham and Gieschen.²³

Larry Hurtado argues that texts describing devotion to Jesus in the earliest years of the Jesus movement give evidence that the early followers of Jesus believed in the divinity of Jesus. Based on the evidence in the New Testament, Hurtado has pointed out the binitarian nature of worship in the earliest communities of the Jesus movement.²⁴ Hurtado has called this a “mutation” in Jewish monotheistic practice “that was unparalleled among other known religious groups that identified themselves with the biblical/Jewish tradition.”²⁵ Hurtado contends for “the specific phenomena of early ‘Christ devotion’, which...do collectively constitute a distinctive pattern of binitarian devotion in which Christ is included with God as a recipient of devotion that can properly be understood as worship.”²⁶ For Hurtado it is the “constellation” of devotional practices, or “the collective force of the phenomena that constitutes the ‘mutation’ in monotheistic practice.”²⁷ On this point I tend to agree with Hurtado, as it is not the individual elements themselves that constitute the significance of the phenomena but the extraordinary and unique combination of the elements that must be acknowledged as constituting a development of monotheistic worship as a core of Jewish identity. In the present analysis it is not the individual elements of messianic traditions themselves that mean anything, but the extraordinary combination of these elements in both the *Parables of Enoch* and the Letters of Paul that constitutes a significant development. I find Hurtado’s argument to be less convincing, however, when he claims that Jewish texts such as the Latin *Vitae Adae et Evae* (13–14) or the *Parables of Enoch* (1 En. 48:5; 62:9) are “only literary phenomena” while the evidence in the New Testament demonstrates what he calls “devotional *praxis* of the early Christian movement.”²⁸ This certainly demonstrates the bias in Hurtado’s argument. While the evidence in the *Parables of Enoch* is certainly literary, it is also clear that passages referring to the messiah figure as the

²³ See my discussion of the Christ Hymn of Phil 2 and the Lord Jesus Christ becoming the glory of God the Father in Chapter 6 (§6.4).

²⁴ Larry Hurtado, *At the Origins of Christian Worship: The Context and Character of Earliest Christian Devotion* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 70–74.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 71–72.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 72.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 73–74.

object of human worship appear in eschatological contexts, and there is nothing in these texts that would lead us to conclude that the author(s) of the *Parables* expected anything less than a future revelation of the Son of Man in which this figure would actually be worshiped.

Hurtado develops his argument by examining the evidence in Paul and the LXX:

...Paul and other New Testament authors can refer to Christians as those who ritually ‘call upon’ (*epikaloumai*) Jesus as Lord, which indicates that the liturgical action connoted by this expression was early seen as constitutive and denotative of Christian devotional life... Indeed, in 1 Corinthians 1:2b, Paul specifies Jesus by name as the Lord who is invoked and makes the cultic action in question the blanket description of believers (see also, e.g., Acts 9:14, 21; 22:16; 2 Tim. 2:22). In the Old Testament, to ‘call upon the name of the Lord’ (in the LXX rendered consistently by the middle forms of *epikaleo*) is a ritual action of worship... The adoption of this Old Testament phrase, which there refers to cultic devotion to God, to designate cultic devotion to Jesus is a striking linguistic appropriation. But the phenomenon to which the phrase refers, the incorporation of Jesus as recipient of organised cultic devotion in early Christian congregations, is an even more daring and remarkable development. Indeed, the adoption/adaptation of the Old Testament cultic expression to connote devotion to Jesus is probably to be seen as indicating that these early Christians intended a direct association and analogy between their devotion to Jesus and the Old Testament cultic devotion to *Yahweh*.²⁹

Probably the most compelling argument with regard to whether the New Testament contains evidence that the earliest followers of Jesus expressed devotion to him as a divine being is to be located here. This, in my opinion, is about as close as the earliest evidence in the New Testament comes: the association of Jesus with the divine name (cf. Rom 10:9–10).

In 2003 and again in 2005 Hurtado advanced his argument for cultic devotion to Jesus as a divine being in the early Jesus movement by stating that this devotion was unique, well beyond any of the other Second Temple period evidence.³⁰ Hurtado argues: “...instead of an evolutionary/incremental model, we have to think in terms of something more adequate. What we have suggested in the evidence is a more explosively quick phenomenon, a religious development that was more like a

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 78–79.

³⁰ Larry Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids; Eerdmans, 2003). See also Hurtado, *How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God? Historical Questions about Earliest Devotion to Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005).

volcanic eruption.”³¹ In light of the evidence and conclusions that I provide in the present study, this particular point of Hurtado’s is not as obvious as it may seem. If, as I argue below, the extraordinary combination of conceptual elements of messianic ideology that appears in the *Parables of Enoch* is to be taken into consideration at all (as I think it must be!), then it is entirely plausible that the “explosion” of early devotion to Jesus that Hurtado insists upon is really an echo of Enochic devotion to the Son of Man.

James Dunn has recently responded to Larry Hurtado and Richard Bauckham. Dunn’s approach and findings, however, are more reserved, and he seems to be less enthusiastic about the implications of his findings. Dunn writes, for example,

The first answer to our question, “Did the first Christians worship Jesus?,” would therefore seem to be, “Generally no,” or “Only occasionally,” or “Only with some reserve.”

All the same, the fact that such worship language is used in reference to Jesus, even if only occasionally, is very striking. This would have been entirely unusual and without precedent in the Judaism of the time. For Christians to understand themselves and define themselves as “those who invoke the name of the Lord Jesus Christ” in prayer must have marked them and their religious devotion as distinctive both within Palestine and in the wider Mediterranean world.³²

While I think Dunn’s caution is overstated (but understandable), I offer the same criticism of Dunn as of Hurtado above. The *Parables of Enoch* offer clear antecedent evidence for Jewish worship of a messiah figure.

The question regarding the divinity of Jesus is not a historical problem. It is a theological problem. On the other hand, whether Paul or the early followers of Jesus held to the divinity of Jesus and whether this is reflected in the earliest evidence of worship and devotion in the New Testament is a historical question and it deserves the careful attention it has received in recent years. That question, however, is not the primary focus of the present study. While I do address the problem of Rom 9:5, a text whose meaning lacks consensus in the secondary literature (no doubt due to the density of Paul’s ambiguity), the analysis and findings presented here are oriented toward understanding antecedents and developments of Second Temple period messianic traditions, particularly as these appear in the Enoch literature and the Letters of Paul. There is no

³¹ Hurtado, *How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God?*, 25.

³² Dunn, *Did the First Christians Worship Jesus?*, 28; see also 15–16 and 103–7, where Dunn discusses the phrase, “to call upon,” as it was used with reference to Jesus.

theologically apologetic agenda attached to the investigation that makes up the pages of this book. Regardless of whether one takes a position on the divinity of Christ, it remains to make sense of the evidence and conclusions presented here.

More needs to be said about the contribution of Larry Hurtado. In 2003 Hurtado published an important volume on devotion to Jesus among the earliest followers of Jesus in the first century. Hurtado challenged the foundational thesis of Bousset, that worship of Jesus developed in the Hellenistic context of early Christianity.³³ Hurtado presents his argument based on three premises. First,

... a noteworthy devotion to Jesus emerges phenomenally early in circles of his followers, and cannot be restricted to a secondary stage of religious development or explained as the product of extraneous forces. Certainly the Christian movement was not hermetically sealed from the cultures in which it developed, and Christians appropriated (and adapted for their own purposes) words, conceptual categories, and religious traditions to express their faith. But devotion to Jesus was not a late development. So far as historical inquiry permits us to say, it was an immediate feature of the circles of those who identified themselves with reference to him.³⁴

The fundamental flaw in this premise is that Hurtado does not take into sufficient consideration the extraordinary plurality of Judaism in the first century C.E. and the role this plurality played in the formation of the early Jesus movement. Hurtado assumes that the phenomenon of devotion to Jesus as a messiah figure was a unique “explosion.” His qualification of this claim, that “the Christian movement was not hermetically sealed,” is puzzling, especially in light of his discussion of the worship of a messiah figure in the *Parables of Enoch*. Referring to Crispin Fletcher-Louis’ work,³⁵ Hurtado rightly argues that a clearer distinction could be made between various forms of reverence “expected for, and rather freely given to, any superior person or being, whether human or

³³ Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 19–26.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 2.

³⁵ See the following works by Crispin Fletcher-Louis: *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002); “Heavenly Ascent or Incarnational Presence? A Revisionist Reading of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*,” in *SBL Seminar Papers 1998* (SBLSP 37; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 367–99; “The High Priest as Divine Mediator in the Hebrew Bible: Daniel 7:13 as a Test Case,” in *SBL Seminar Papers 1997* (SBLSP 36; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 161–93; “4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christology,” *DSD* 3 (1996): 236–52; *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT 2/94; Tübingen: Mohr–Siebeck, 1995).

heavenly.”³⁶ Hurtado also rightly points out that the references to worship of the messiah figure in the *Parables of Enoch* are not intended as worship of the divine figure:

Read in their contexts, the references in *1 Enoch* 48:5, 62:1–9 to the obeisance given by all the inhabitants of the earth and by the mighty kings and rulers to the Son of Man/Elect One simply envision the eschatological acknowledgment of this figure as God’s appointed one who will gather the elect and subdue the haughty kings and nations who have not acknowledged the true God and who have oppressed the Jewish righteous. There is no reason given...in *1 Enoch* to take the prophesied reverential actions as “worship” of any of these figures as a divine being.³⁷

Hurtado is quite right to understand these texts as not extending “worship” in the “hard” sense, as he calls it, to figures that are not divine. However, Hurtado enhances his argument by ignoring the evidence in the *Parables of Enoch* that suggests worship of a figure that is more than the typical reverential treatment of important humans like kings and high priests. The evidence in *1 En.* 48, for example, suggests that the language used with reference to the worship of the messiah figure in the *Parables of Enoch* is the same language used elsewhere with reference to the worship of the divine figure in the *Parables of Enoch*.³⁸

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

³⁶ Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 38.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 38–39.

³⁸ This will be discussed in Chapter 3 (§3.2.4).

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

Second, devotion to Jesus was exhibited in an unparalleled intensity and diversity of expression, for which we have no true analogy in the religious environment of the time. There is simply no precedent or parallel for the level of energy invested by early Christians in expressing the significance of Jesus for them in their religious thought and practice. The full pattern of devotion to Jesus that we examine in this book is not one example of a class of analogous religious phenomena in comparable groups, but is instead truly remarkable in the history of religions, justifying (indeed, requiring) a special effort to understand it in historical terms. Toward that end I propose a model of the historical forces and factors that shaped and propelled early devotion to Jesus...³⁹

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

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

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

³⁹ Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 2–3.

Messiah,” “Word,” “Image”). In their devotional practices as well (for example, in their patterns of prayer and worship), they characteristically sought to express a rather full veneration of Jesus in ways that also affirmed the primacy of God “the Father.”⁴⁰

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

Hurtado also tackles the “Son of Man” issue that is current in the scholarly debate. Was the phrase “Son of Man” used in the Gospel traditions in a titular sense, or is it only used as a self-referential designation for Jesus or as a generic reference to a human being? Referring to the problems related to the “Son of Man” debate as “thorny issues and questions,” Hurtado writes: “The most frequent expression that is often taken as a title is ‘the son of man’. But, as recent studies have shown, the expression was not an established title in pre-Christian Jewish texts.”⁴¹ But this is not the case, as the present analysis will demonstrate. The expression “Son of Man” in the *Parables of Enoch* simply cannot be a self-referential locution or a general reference to a human being. In order to prove that the “Son of Man” epithet was not used in a titular sense in the *Parables of Enoch*, it is incumbent on those who make this claim to demonstrate two things. First, it must be demonstrated that the other designations for the messiah figure in the *Parables of Enoch*—“Chosen One,” “Righteous One,” and “Messiah”—are also not used in a titular sense, because they are all used interchangeably with the phrase “Son of

⁴⁰ Ibid., 3.

⁴¹ Ibid., 250–51; see also 290–316.

Man” and refer to the same figure. Second, it is not only a linguistic problem, as most of the studies have focused their analyses in this way.⁴² It is a matter of the role the “Son of Man” figure is given to play in the text, and that the Son of Man figure in the *Parables of Enoch* actually is more than a human being—he is also a preexistent heavenly being.

Maurice Casey has made a comprehensive analysis of the “Son of Man” phrase in Jewish literature from the period.⁴³ In Chapter 2 of the present study I will interact in some detail with Casey’s analysis. It is enough to point out here that Casey is inconsistent in the application of his methodology to the evidence in the *Parables of Enoch* and this warrants some attention. This seems to be a common theme in the scholarly literature; the *Book of the Parables of Enoch* is either not taken seriously as a text reflecting messianic ideology that predates the New Testament, or the evidence in the *Parables* is minimized in some way that either enhances the status or the uniqueness of the evidence in the New Testament or renders the evidence in the New Testament in a non-titular sense. The present analysis takes the evidence in the *Parables of Enoch* on its own terms, without imposing prior assumptions on the text.

It should also be pointed out that there are a number of scholars in recent years who have developed the christological discussion along the lines of angelomorphic christology and angelomorphic anthropology. Building on the work of Jarl Fossum,⁴⁴ these scholars have added to the debate a good deal of valuable evidence from the sources regarding the nature of the messiah figure in Jewish thought from this period. The most glaring methodological issue, as I will discuss in more detail in the present chapter (§1.4, below), is that a fluid boundary between the creator and the created in some texts does not warrant that we should necessarily expect this same ideological stance across the board. Sometimes

⁴² Cf. the most recent contribution by Geza Vermes, who has engaged in the Son of Man debate for nearly five decades; see “The Son of Man Debate Revisited (1960–2010),” in his *Jesus in the Jewish World* (London: SCM, 2010), 236–55. Cf. also Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “The New Testament Title ‘Son of Man’ Philologically Considered,” in *A Wandering Aramaean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), 143–60.

⁴³ Maurice Casey, *The Solution to the “Son of Man” Problem* (LNTS 343; London: T&T Clark, 2007).

⁴⁴ See the following works by Jarl E. Fossum: *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (NTOA 30; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995); “The New Religionsgeschichtliche Schule: The Quest for Jewish Christology,” *SBL Seminar Papers 1991* (SBLSP 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 638–46; *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism* (WUNT 36; Tübingen: Mohr–Siebeck, 1985).

conclusions are pressed beyond what the evidence allows.⁴⁵ Sometimes terminology is used that reflects later theological development.⁴⁶

It will be readily apparent to some, but not to most, that the present analysis builds on the work of the Enoch Seminar, an international consortium of specialists from a broad spectrum of disciplines. While all of these scholars are established in their respective fields, they have come together to make their own unique contributions to a newly revived study of the Enoch literature. The Enoch Seminar is made up of such scholars as Gabriele Boccaccini, James H. Charlesworth, John J. Collins, Michael Knibb, George Nickelsburg, and James C. VanderKam. The influence of the Enoch Seminar on the present study will be readily apparent, although there are conclusions here with which some, I am sure, will disagree. The consensus arrived at by the Enoch Seminar at its 2005 meeting in Camaldoli, Italy, that the *Parables of Enoch* can be dated to the end of the first century B.C.E. or the beginning of the first century C.E. is a critical conclusion that has gone by and large unnoticed by many New Testament scholars today.⁴⁷ It is critical because it brings to the fore once again the importance of the *Parables of Enoch* for the study of the New Testament and Christian origins, and it is especially critical for our understanding of the messiah figure in the New Testament.

1.3 Methodology

When I was a child growing up in rural west-central Missouri, my cousins and I would ride our bikes along the old road in front of their family's home in the country. Not far from their home was an old country schoolhouse where my father and uncle attended school when they were small boys. Of course, we had the usual parental warnings to stay away from the old dilapidated structure, the windows of which were all broken and the doors were off their hinges. And of course, as young boys do, we rode our bikes there and we went inside to explore. I remember an old portrait of George Washington hanging on the wall in

⁴⁵ For example, Crispin Fletcher-Louis uses the second-century B.C.E. text, the *Exagoge of Ezekiel the Tragedian* (86–89), and the reference to the stars bowing down to Moses in heaven, as an example of a human being who is worshiped. See Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 7, 70, 101, 344. This will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

⁴⁶ Charles Gieschen, for example, uses the language of “hypostasis” to refer to earlier theophanic manifestations of God's glory and the divine name. See Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 51–123.

⁴⁷ See the discussion on the date of the *Parables of Enoch* in the present chapter (§1.5).

the main room of the schoolhouse. But the rest of the inside was pretty much empty. Nothing remained but the old portrait, symbolizing allegiance to a national identity that had long ago left the building. The outer structure of the building was still sound. It was built of old bricks that were all intact. I did not give it much thought then, but the old farmhouse was made of bricks too, probably bricks that were made from the same earth and the same material that went into the manufacture of the old schoolhouse bricks. The same kind of bricks were used to build both structures, but they were put together in such a way as to produce different buildings with some similar and some different functions.

The history of ideas is something like this. Individual conceptual elements of messianic ideology in a text are like bricks before they have been mortared into the wall of a building. Taken individually these conceptual elements—like preexistence, heavenly nature, agent of creation—do not really mean much. Some of the conceptual elements of messianic ideology in the *Parables of Enoch* have literary precedents. Some of them are unprecedented and are unique. Merely to examine the sources to find precedents and parallels does not really mean much. We have to ask what the individual elements mean for a particular author or text. So again, it is not the individual elements that give us an accurate understanding of the kind of ideology a particular author of a text has in mind. It is how the author combined the elements to construct a text's ideology; this makes all the difference. Arthur Lovejoy called the individual conceptual elements of a text "unit-ideas."⁴⁸ According to Lovejoy, unit-ideas in one intellectual system may be compared to the unit-ideas in another system. This in turn allows us to understand the formative relationships between the two systems. In the present study I refer to what Lovejoy calls "unit-ideas" as conceptual elements of messianic ideology. These unit-ideas are only the building blocks; they are not yet the building. Different individuals and groups in the Second Temple period used these building blocks in different ways. This takes us beyond mere comparison of parallel elements to understanding the actual development of these ideas.⁴⁹ By comparing the conceptual elements of messianic

⁴⁸ See the following works by Arthur O. Lovejoy: *The Great Chain of Being: The Study of the History of an Idea* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936); "The Historiography of Ideas," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 78 (1938): 529–43; "Reflections on the History of Ideas," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 1 (1940): 3–23.

⁴⁹ See the methodological discussion by Gabriele Boccaccini in "Finding a Place for the Parables of Enoch within Second Temple Jewish Literature," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 263–66. See also Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of*

ideology in the *Parables of Enoch* with the conceptual elements of messianic ideology in the Letters of Paul, even if (and especially when) they piece the conceptual elements together in different ways to form different systems, this will better help us to understand the development of messianic ideology in Second Temple Judaism between the second century B.C.E. and the first century C.E.

The primary sources that have been used in this study are the *Book of the Parables of Enoch* (hereafter BP) and the Letters of Paul (hereafter LP). BP is one of a collection of five books identified as *First Enoch*.⁵⁰ This collection of five books ranges in date from the fourth to the first centuries B.C.E., and possibly into the first century C.E. (see the discussion on the date of BP below in the present chapter). BP contains numerous references to a messiah figure called “Son of Man,” “Chosen One,” “Righteous One,” and “Messiah.” This study also uses as its primary source documents the undisputed Letters of Paul. These undisputed letters are 1 Thessalonians, Galatians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Philippians, Romans, and Philemon. The use of Philemon in this study is virtually non-existent, as there are no references to Paul’s messianic ideology anywhere in this letter. In all the other undisputed letters, however, Paul made numerous references to a messiah figure, whom he called “Christ” (or “Messiah”), “*Kyrios*” (or “Lord”), “son of David,” and “son of God.” As I have already stated, the problem this study addresses is: What is the relationship, if any, between the concept of the messiah figure in BP and the concept of the messiah figure in LP? In Chapter 2 I examine the nature and functions of the divine figure in BP. In Chapter 3 I examine the nature and functions of the messiah figure in BP, in order to gain a clear understanding of the relationship between the divine figure and the messiah figure in the thought of the author(s) of BP. In Chapter 4 I examine the nature and functions of the divine figure in LP. In Chapter 5 I examine the nature and functions of the messiah figure in LP, again in order to gain a clear understanding of the relationship between the divine figure and the messiah figure in the thought of Paul. In Chapter 6 I offer a comparative analysis of the nature and functions of the messiah figure in BP and the nature and functions of the messiah

Scientific Revolutions (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962; 2d ed. 1979); Ian G. Barbour, *Myths, Models and Paradigms: The Nature of Scientific and Religious Language* (London: SCM, 1974).

⁵⁰ *The Book of the Watchers* (fourth to third century B.C.E.); the *Astronomical Book* (fourth to third centuries B.C.E.); *Dream Visions* (200–165 B.C.E.); the *Epistle of Enoch* (second century B.C.E.); and *the Parables of Enoch* (c. 40 B.C.E. to 70 C.E.).

figure in LP. And in the conclusion in Chapter 7 I pull together the analysis and draw out the implications of the research for our understanding of Paul's concept of the messiah.

1.4 Mediatorial Figures in Second Temple Judaism

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

A mediatorial figure is any being that moves across the boundary between the creator and the created. Mediatorial figures are described in the literature from this period in various ways. Some are human. Some are angelic, heavenly beings. Some mediators serve a revelatory function. Some mediators act as the agent of divine eschatological punishment. Some mediatorial figures are described with the characteristic of preexistence. Some are not. A messiah figure is a mediator who is given the explicit epithet “messiah” in a given text. While all messiah figures are mediators, not all mediatorial figures are messiahs. The specific conceptual elements of nature and functions of the messiah figure in BP and the messiah figure in LP will be addressed in the following analysis.

The literature from this period demonstrates a complex variety of expressions for describing interactions between the divine figure and humans. Some of these expressions describe descents of heavenly mediatorial figures (some of which are characterized as divine) making contact with humans. Some expressions describe exalted human mediatorial figures who ascend to make contact with the divine figure, while others describe various combinations of these two basic movements of mediatorial figures between the creator and the created. Enoch, for example, moves back and forth between the earthly and the heavenly realms. The variety of expressions for the nature and functions of mediatorial figures

in Second Temple period texts is extraordinarily complex and a challenge to navigate. Consequently, it comes as no surprise that this is still an open question among scholars today.

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

The same complexity applies to messiah figures. On the one hand there are divine beings that act in the unprecedented role of agent of creation. These divine beings, such as Philo's divine *Logos* and divine wisdom, have direct involvement as mediatorial figures in human affairs. On the other hand there are created beings who were exalted to unprecedented levels and given divine functions. For example, Dan 7 describes a heavenly angelic mediatorial figure who is given military power and dominion to rule. The figure of Dan 7 is not explicitly referred to in the text as a messiah figure, but because this figure has some of the functions of a messiah figure (e.g. eschatological authority to reign) BP and later Christian traditions would interpret the one like a son of man in Daniel to be a messiah figure. From the first-century B.C.E., *Pss. Sol.* 17 and 18 describe a human messiah figure who is given special power to defeat unrighteous kings and to have an eternal reign as Son of David, the Lord Messiah.

The extraordinary diversity of expressions for mediatorial figures and messiah figures suggests a development of these concepts. This development began already in the exilic period with Ezek 1 and the heavenly figure described in this text as the glory of God (a figure that also would later be interpreted by the author[s] of BP as a messiah figure). The question for scholarship today is: Should a fluidity of language with reference to mediatorial figures in some Second Temple period texts lead us to read all Jewish texts from this period as having a softened boundary between the creator and the created, even to the extent that the boundary no longer exists? This is an open question among scholars today. While scholars such as Crispin Fletcher-Louis would say the boundary was fluid, other scholars strongly disagree. Kevin Sullivan has argued the point that while it was possible for movement to occur across the boundary between humans and angels as this is described in the literature of Second Temple Judaism, the boundary between the creator (with all

divine attributes) and the created was not fluid.⁵¹ Richard Bauckham also holds this view, asserting that, “Jewish monotheism clearly distinguished the one God and all other reality.”⁵² Rather than a fluidity between the creator and the created, Charles Gieschen sees in the literature of the period a fluidity between the divine figure and the messiah figure.⁵³ Gieschen takes the position that the messiah figure, at least in Paul’s thought, was included in the mystery of YHWH via the divine name. It comes as no surprise that the diversity of Jewish views on the relationship between messiah figures and the divine figure in the Second Temple period is reflected in the diversity of views in the literature of contemporary scholarship on christology.

This question has implications for our understanding of the development of christology. The language of mediatorial figures and messiah figures exhibits a high degree of fluidity. In some texts the boundary between the created and the divine figure remained firmly in place. In some texts the boundary between the created and the divine figure is not so firmly set. Philo’s description of Moses as θεός (*Mos.* 1.158) or the *Logos* as a second God (*QG* 2.62) come immediately to mind; these are texts that should not be dismissed as only marginal expressions of Jewish thought (although Philo actually considered the *Logos* to be an archangel that was neither created nor uncreated). To complicate things a bit further, it is a fair point to make that in some texts there is a fluid boundary between the messiah figure and the divine figure. So, it should not be tacitly assumed that all messiah figures were excluded from participation in the unique identity of the divine figure simply by virtue of having a human nature. And aside from the inferences in LP and the rest of the New Testament that the messiah figure is included in the unique identity of the divine figure or included in the mystery of the divine figure via the divine name,⁵⁴ there were no unambiguously explicit ascriptions of divinity given to any messiah figures before the Gospel of John where the divine *Logos* (καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, John 1:1) is unambiguously and explicitly identified with the Messiah Jesus. In the Gospel of John the boundary is in effect eliminated. So, the question really is more complicated than a simple distinction between creator and created.

⁵¹ Kevin P. Sullivan, *Wrestling with Angels* (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

⁵² Bauckham, *God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology*, 4.

⁵³ Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*.

⁵⁴ As Richard Bauckham and Charles Gieschen have argued. See also James F. McGrath’s critique of Bauckham’s argument in *The Only True God: Early Christian Monotheism in Its Jewish Context* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2009), 12–15. McGrath’s argument again demonstrates the complexity of the problem as it is reflected in the sources.

Before 70 C.E. the evidence suggests a plurality of understandings of the interaction between the creator and created beings via a variety of mediatorial figures. The presence of mediatorial figures made the concept of monotheism in Second Temple Judaism very dynamic and diverse, and directly impacted the messianic ideal, as similar conceptual elements tended to be transferred from mediatorial figures to the various messiah figures from this period. The *Book of the Parables of Enoch* and the Letters of Paul will therefore be studied here not only in relation to competing messianic traditions, but also in the broader context of mediatorial figures in Second Temple Judaism.

1.5 Dating the *Parables of Enoch*

Something should be said about the date of the Enochic *Book of Parables*. When the Aramaic fragments of *1 Enoch* were found at Qumran it was immediately apparent that BP was not represented among the fragments. This, along with the assumption that the Son of Man traditions in BP were a later response to the Son of Man traditions in the canonical Gospels, led Josef Milik to conclude that BP should be dated to the late third century C.E.⁵⁵ While Milik's view did not gain wide acceptance, it generally influenced scholars' views of BP as a later, less significant text of little relevance for New Testament studies, because scholars assumed that it postdated the canonical Gospels. Only recently has specific research on the date of BP created a shift in the scholarly consensus among specialists of the Enoch literature. This consensus establishes the messiah traditions of BP, if not the text itself, to a date prior to Paul.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 89–98; see also Milik's "Problèmes de la littérature hénochique à la lumière des fragments araméens de Qumrân," *HTR* 64 (1971): 333–78.

⁵⁶ See the following articles in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*: David W. Suter, "Enoch in Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Book of Parables," 415–43; Michael E. Stone, "Enoch's Date in Limbo; or, Some Considerations on David Suter's Analysis of the Book of Parables," 444–49; James H. Charlesworth, "Can We Discern the Composition Date of the Parables of Enoch?," 450–68; Darrell D. Hannah, "The Book of Noah, the Death of Herod the Great, and the Date of the Parables of Enoch," 469–77; Luca Arcari, "A Symbolic Transfiguration of a Historical Event: The Parthian Invasion in Josephus and the Parables of Enoch," 478–86; Hanan Eshel, "An Allusion in the Parables of Enoch to the Acts of Matthias Antigonus in 40 B.C.E.?, " 487–91. See also the following earlier attempts to date BP with varying results: R. H. Charles, *APOT* 2:171; Jonas C. Greenfield and Michael E. Stone, "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes," *HTR* 70 (1977): 51–65; J. C. Hindley, "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch," *NTS* 14 (1968): 551–65; Michael A. Knibb, "The Date

Because until now there has been no comprehensive, detailed tradition-historical analysis of BP that would give us a clearer grasp of the historical development of the redaction history of the text, at this point in the state of the research the best tool we have for dating BP is historical allusion. Scholars have identified a number of historical allusions in BP. The mention of “the Parthians and Medes” at *1 En.* 56:5 has been identified by scholars as a reference to the events of 40 B.C.E., which then suggests a date of composition shortly after this. Something more may be added to the recent attempts to date BP by historical allusion. Chapters 56–57 of BP give us interesting details that indicate they are referring to specific historical events. *First Enoch* 56:5–8 has been identified as a reference to the Parthian invasion of Judaea in 40 B.C.E. The evidence, however, suggests that the text is referring to different battles. Verse 5 reads: “In those days, the angels will assemble themselves, and hurl themselves toward the East against the Parthians and Medes.” The Parthian campaign of 40 B.C.E. was a movement of Parthian forces from the East toward the West, not an attack “toward the East.” Military movement “toward the East against the Parthians and Medes” is more suggestive of the Roman triumvir Crassus who led his army against the Parthians at Carrhae in 53 B.C.E. The historian Dio Cassius provides some of the details of this disastrous campaign.⁵⁷ The end result was wholesale slaughter of the Roman army under Crassus’ command, Crassus himself being killed in the battle. This massive Parthian defeat of Crassus at Carrhae included the slaughter of some 24,000 Roman soldiers with 10,000 led captive to Margiana.⁵⁸ This is also suggested in the text of BP (*1 En.* 56:7–8): “Until the number of corpses will be enough due to their slaughter, and their punishment will not be in vain. In those days, Sheol will open its mouth, and they will sink into it. And their destruction will be at an end; Sheol will devour the sinners from the presence of the chosen.” The dislike for the victims expressed in this text corresponds to the harsh treatment the Jewish people received at the hands of Crassus. Flavius Josephus relates what happened when Crassus assumed the governorship of Syria succeeding Gabinius in 54 B.C.E.: “Crassus came to receive the governorship of Syria as successor [of Gabinius]. To finance

of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review,” *NTS* 25 (1978–79): 344–59; Christopher L. Mearns, “Dating the Similitudes of Enoch,” *NTS* 25 (1978–79): 360–69.

⁵⁷ Dio Cassius, *Roman History* 40.21–28. This event is also described in Plutarch’s *Life of Crassus* 23–33.

⁵⁸ M. Cary and H. H. Scullard, *A History of Rome: Down to the Reign of Constantine* (3d ed.; New York: St. Martin’s, 1975), 256–57. According to Plutarch it was 20,000 killed and 10,000 captured; see Plutarch’s *Life of Crassus* 31.

his campaign against the Parthians he stripped the Jerusalem temple of its gold, and he seized the two thousand talents of silver that Pompey had left. And when he crossed the Euphrates, both he and his army perished.”⁵⁹ Immediately following Crassus’ defeat at Carrhae, the Parthians seized the opportunity to retaliate. According to Josephus: “After the death of Crassus, when the Parthians rushed forward to cross into Syria, Cassius cut them off, since he had already fled to that province. When he secured Syria, he advanced to Judaea, and taking Tarichaeae he enslaved thirty thousand Jews, and he killed Peitholaus because he was organizing the rebellious faction of Aristobulus.”⁶⁰ This seems to correspond to what is described in *1 En.* 56:5–6:

They will stir up the kings and a spirit of agitation will come upon them, and it will rouse them from their thrones. They will break out like lions from their lairs, and like hungry wolves in the midst of their flocks. They will go up and trample the land of his chosen ones, and the land of his chosen ones will be before them as a threshing floor and a (beaten) path; but the city of my righteous ones will be a hindrance to their horses.

First Enoch 57:1–2 continues the narrative of BP:

After that I saw another host of chariots and men riding in them, and they came on the winds from the East and the West toward the South, and the noise of the rumbling of their chariots was heard. When this commotion took place, the holy ones took note from heaven, and the pillars of the earth were shaken from their bases.

The phrase “After that” changes the temporal frame of reference and lends credence to the suggestion that chs. 56 and 57 describe different historical events. The reference to chariots coming “from the East and the West toward the South” suggests a historical allusion to the alliance between the Roman Quintus Labienus and the Parthian Pacorus I in 40 B.C.E. Labienus formed an alliance with the Parthians and secured the support of most of the Roman garrisons in Syria.⁶¹ From Syria Labienus

⁵⁹ Josephus, *War* 1.179. Parthian contempt for Crassus is evident in Dio’s description of the way the victors treated Crassus’ corpse, by pouring molten gold into his mouth; Dio Cassius, *Roman History* 40.26.

⁶⁰ Josephus, *War* 1.180. Cassius’ escape to Syria is described in Dio Cassius, *Roman History* 40.25. Dio claims that the Parthians made a small invasion in 52 that was easily repulsed by the Roman quaestor Cassius Longinus, then another campaign of more considerable force in 51, but they were only able to press their retaliation as far as Antioch where they were turned back, again by the quaestor Cassius Longinus; Dio Cassius, *Roman History* 40.28–29.

⁶¹ On the alliance between Labienus and Pacorus, see Dio Cassius, *Roman History* 48.24.4–26.4.

launched a successful campaign against Octavian's territories in Asia Minor,⁶² while Pacorus focused his efforts southward along the coast and into Judaea. Josephus described the Parthian invasion of Syria and Judaea in 40 B.C.E. in terms that are very similar to the events described in *1 En.* 57. The invasion southward was led by Pacorus, the son of the Parthian king Orodes II. Pacorus' forces were accompanied by the forces of the satrap Barzaphranes. The invasion took a two-pronged approach, with Pacorus' forces advancing southward along the coast in the West, and Barzaphranes' forces advancing southward through the interior, to the East of Pacorus. This would correspond to the description in BP: "...they came on the winds from the East and the West toward the South" (*1 En.* 57:1). Josephus described the strategy of the invasion: "And in two years both Pacorus, the son of the [Parthian] king, and Barzaphranes the Parthian satrap, controlled Syria... while Pacorus went along the coast, the satrap Barzaphranes advanced through the interior."⁶³ The purpose of the invasion was to usurp the throne of John Hyrcanus II and give it to his nephew Antigonus, the son of Hyrcanus' now deceased brother and political rival Aristobulus.⁶⁴ Antigonus, the last of the Hasmonean ruling party, allied himself with Pacorus in order to depose John Hyrcanus II from his position as high priest. According to Josephus, after the Parthian forces established themselves in Syria, Antigonus sent an emissary to Jerusalem to invite Hyrcanus to meet with him in Galilee. Hyrcanus and his advisor Phasael willingly accepted Antigonus' invitation to meet, against the vigorous objections of Herod. After their meeting, under the ruse of sending Hyrcanus and Phasael away with gifts, Antigonus intercepted them on their way back to Jerusalem and had them put in chains. Josephus describes how Antigonus "bit off the ears" of his uncle John Hyrcanus in order to render him permanently disqualified for the office of high priest.⁶⁵ It is not improbable that "the holy ones taking note from heaven, and the pillars of the earth were shaken from their bases" (*1 En.* 57:2) refers to the Jerusalem priesthood

⁶² Quintus Labienus was also an "ally to Brutus and Cassius"; see Dio Cassius, *Roman History* 48.24.4–5.

⁶³ Josephus, *Ant.* 14.330–32. See also *War* 1.248–49.

⁶⁴ Dio Cassius confused Aristobulus with his son Antigonus and erroneously reported that it was Aristobulus who was allied with Pacorus and who sought to depose Hyrcanus in 40 B.C.E.; see Dio Cassius, *Roman History* 48.26.2. According to Josephus, Aristobulus was poisoned by Pompey's associates already in 49 B.C.E.; see Josephus, *War* 1.184.

⁶⁵ Josephus, *Ant.* 14.330–66. See also *War* 1.248–70. When Hyrcanus fell at his feet, Antigonus literally "mutilated the ears with his teeth" (*War* 1.270): ...ὁ δὲ Ὑρκανοῦ μὲν προσπερόντος αὐτὸς τὰ ὦτα λαβᾶται τοῖς ὀδοῦσιν...

and the crisis precipitated by Antigonus when he rendered his uncle unfit to exercise the high priesthood. John Hyrcanus was then taken in exile to Babylon.

This episode of Antigonus violently deposing Hyrcanus may also appear at *1 En.* 46. Here the Son of Man “will raise the kings and the mighty from their couches, and the strong from their thrones” (*1 En.* 46:4). This is very similar to *1 En.* 56:5 where the angels “will stir up the kings, and a spirit of agitation will come upon them, and it will rouse them from their thrones.” The difference is that in ch. 46 the Son of Man “will loosen the reins of the strong, and he will crush the teeth of the sinners. He will overturn the kings from their thrones and their kingdoms” (*1 En.* 46:4–5), while in ch. 56 the kings “will go up and trample the land of his chosen ones” (*1 En.* 56:6). Both have an eschatological flavor, but ch. 46 seems to describe what will happen after the war depicted in ch. 56. The connection with Antigonus appears near the end of ch. 46, after the kings have been shamed in defeat by the Son of Man. *First Enoch* 46:7–8 reads:

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

The language of those “who †judge† the stars of heaven” suggests a reference to Babylonian astronomical ideology. The word “judge” may reflect some form of κρίνειν, which can mean to judge, or διακρίνειν, which can refer to discerning astronomical signs.⁶⁶ It is also possible that those who “raise their hands against the Most High” refers to the violent taking of the temple compound and its treasures by the Parthians in 40 B.C.E. and the mutilation of John Hyrcanus II by his tyrannical nephew Antigonus. The reference to those who “tread upon the earth and dwell on it” appears to parallel *1 En.* 56:6: “They will go up and trample the land of his chosen ones, and the land of his chosen ones will be before them as a threshing floor and a (beaten) path.” “And they persecute the

⁶⁶ Cf. Matt 16:3. This, of course, is assuming a Greek version of BP, of which there is no direct evidence. The Greek translation of other Enoch literature suggests the probability that this would have been the case for BP as well.

houses of his congregation” (*I En.* 46:8) corresponds to Josephus’ description of the Parthian plunder of Judaea during this campaign.

The possibility that those who “raise their hands against the Most High” is a reference to Antigonus’ usurpation of Hyrcanus’ high priestly office is especially appealing if it is taken in connection with the fact that there are no explicit references to the temple, nor are there any hints of anti-priestly polemics anywhere in BP. It is also the case that no fragment of BP was found at Qumran, a community that did engage in anti-Second Temple polemic, as is well known. It is entirely possible that the community responsible for producing BP was in some way a part of the mainstream Essene movement that retained some contact with the Jerusalem temple.⁶⁷ If this is the case, then it is not in any sense a stretch of the imagination that the author(s) of BP might have considered an attack on the high priest in some sense to be an attack on the Most High. Crispin Fletcher-Louis’ analysis of Sir 50 identifies the high priest with the Most High God.⁶⁸ I would nuance Fletcher-Louis’ point to suggest that the high priest was not actually considered God on earth, but God’s agent whose sins also needed to be atoned,⁶⁹ and that an attack against the high priest in some sense would have been considered tantamount to an attack against the divine figure, the Most High.

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

⁶⁷ I have argued elsewhere that the mainstream Essenes maintained contact with the Jerusalem temple; see “Will the Real Judaism Please Stand Up? Ritual Self-Definition as Ideological Discourse from Qumran to Jerusalem,” *Henoah* 26 (2004): 3–23, esp. 11–13. See Josephus, *Ant.* 18.18–19. See also Florentino García Martínez, “A ‘Groningen’ Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History,” *RevQ* 14 (1990): 521–41; García Martínez, “Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis,” *FO* 25 (1988): 62–136; García Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera, eds., *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 83–96. See also Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 21–49.

⁶⁸ Fletcher-Louis, “The High Priest as the Embodiment of God’s Glory,” in *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 72–84.

⁶⁹ Cf. Heb 5:1–3.

THE DIVINE FIGURE IN THE *PARABLES OF ENOCH*

2.0 The Divine Figure in the *Parables of Enoch*

Monotheism constitutes one of the more dominant distinguishing characteristics of Jewish identity during the Second Temple period.¹ Maurice Casey has stated the issue in the following way, “In the second Temple period, Jews gradually committed themselves to a strict form of monotheism according to which only the LORD himself was regarded as genuinely God...we must regard Jewish monotheism as a boundary marker of the Jewish community.”² Alongside Jewish monotheism in texts from this period one finds references to two powers in heaven.³ The ideological stance of BP entails both a divine figure and a messiah figure as two separate entities in heaven. The intellectual landscape of the Second Temple period was of course not as neat and tidy as a simple identification of two powers in heaven. There were several different messianic views, most of which differed with regard to the nature and the roles of the various messiah figures, while also adhering to “a strict form of monotheism.”

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

¹ Cf. Newman, Davila, and Lewis, eds., *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*.

² M. Casey, “Monotheism, Worship and Christological Development in the Pauline Churches,” in Newman, Davila, and Lewis, eds., *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*, 214–33, esp. 214.

³ Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*; Daniel Boyarin, “Two Powers in Heaven; Or, the Making of a Heresy,” in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel* (ed. Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 331–70; and Daniel Boyarin, “The Gospel of the Memra: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John,” *HTR* 94, no. 3 (2001): 243–84.

2.1 Nature of the Divine Figure in the *Parables of Enoch*

There is very little evidence on the nature of the divine figure in BP that lends itself to detailed analysis.⁴ To some extent the nature of the divine figure in BP may be assumed. The nature of the divine figure was not a contested issue during the Second Temple period. Monotheism, for example, was an assumption held by virtually every self-identifying Jewish group. Consequently, what evidence there is in BP regarding the nature of the divine figure almost reads as if it were written incidentally. As scant as the evidence in BP may be regarding the nature of the divine figure, a few aspects of the divine figure's nature may still be identified in terms of a heavenly nature, holiness, foreknowledge, mercy, righteousness, repentance, and eternity.

2.1.1 A Heavenly Being

Since virtually all references to the divine figure come in the context of Enoch's ascent and visions of heaven (with the exception of the introduction and the Noachic fragments), at the very least it may be assumed that this figure is divine and dwells in heaven. This assumption, however, does not yet distinguish the divine figure from other heavenly figures (e.g. angels or the messiah figure). These distinctions must be analyzed on the basis of other evidence in BP; for example, other aspects of the nature and functions of the divine figure in comparison and contrast to the other heavenly figures. The divine figure is the unique, only God who dwells in heaven.⁵ Angels, on the other hand, are neither unique nor divine. They are heavenly beings who were created by God. The messiah figure is also a heavenly being, who appears to be unique among all the other heavenly beings in BP. What distinguishes the divine figure from the messiah figure in BP is the characteristic of divinity.⁶ There is no

⁴ BP uses eight distinct epithets to refer to the same divine figure. Taking these in the order they appear in the text, they are "Holy One," "Lord of Spirits," "Lord of Glory," "Head of Days," "Most High," "the Lord," "Lord of the Kings," and "God." In BP there is a single occurrence of the epithet "God." This comes in the context of the Noachic fragments near the end of BP. "The Divine Oracle about the Flood" of chs. 67–68 begins: "And in those days the word of God came to me and said to me, 'Noah, your lot has come up to me, a lot without blame, a lot of love and uprightness'" (1 En. 67:1).

⁵ Cf. *T. Ab.* 1:3.

⁶ The expression for the divine figure that predominates in BP is "the Lord of Spirits" (*ʿēgzīʾa manāʾfēst*). Cf. 1 En. 37:2, 4 // FIRST PARABLE 38:2, 4, 6; 39:7–9, 12;

evidence in BP that the messiah figure is divine. There are, however, connections between the divine figure and the messiah figure in terms of shared functions (both act as judge, for example); but shared functions do not indicate that the two entities share the same nature. In other words, that the messiah figure in BP functions in a role that is also attributed to the divine figure in no way demonstrates that the messiah figure is also divine. Such sharing of roles only indicates that the divine figure has given authority to the messiah figure to function in a particular role that is usually identified with the divine figure, and nothing more than this may be asserted. As Maurice Casey has argued, “The transference of items from God to an intermediary figure is...a significant part of their development, and does not imply their deification.”⁷

That the divine figure dwells in heaven may be inferred from what BP states about Enoch speaking “the words of the Holy One in the presence of the Lord of Spirits” (*1 En.* 37:2). Enoch states, “Until now there had not been given from the presence of the Lord of Spirits such wisdom as I have received according to my insight” (37:4). The words of wisdom Enoch speaks he has received “from the presence of the Lord of Spirits,” suggesting that the Holy One, whose words Enoch speaks “in the presence of the Lord of Spirits,” dwells in heaven. Further evidence in BP that the divine figure dwells in heaven is Enoch’s heavenly vision. After he ascends to heaven (39:3) Enoch sees the dwellings of the righteous ones “with his righteous angels and...with the holy ones” (39:4–5). It is “in that place” that Enoch sees the Chosen One (39:6), of whom Enoch then states: “And I saw his dwelling beneath the wings of

40:1–7, 10; 41:2, 6, 7; 43:4 // SECOND PARABLE 46:3; 47:1, 2, 4; 48:2–3, 7, 10; 49:2; 50:3, 5; 51:3; 52:5; 54:5, 6, 7; 55:3; 57:3 // THIRD PARABLE 58:4, 6; 59:1, 2; 60:6, 8, 24, 25; 61:5, 8, 9, 13; 62:2, 10, 12, 14, 16; 63:1–2, 12; 65:9, 11; 66:2; 67:8; 68:4; 69:24, 29 // 70:1; 71:2. The only place the epithet “Lord of Spirits” occurs in Enochic literature is in BP. The expression occurs dozens of times, far more than any other expression for the divine figure in BP. For the Lord of Spirits there is an association with, but clear distinction from, the messiah figure. The “Chosen One” dwells “beneath the wings of the Lord of Spirits” (*1 En.* 39:6–7). The Lord of Spirits chooses the Son of Man (*1 En.* 46:3). And the Lord of Spirits seats the Chosen One upon the throne of glory (*1 En.* 61:8; 62:2). The Lord of Spirits is identified with YHWH of Hosts of First Isaiah. This is highlighted by the watchers singing the triple קדוּשׁ of Isa 6:3 to the Lord of Spirits (*1 En.* 39:12). See Matthew Black, “Two Unusual Nomina Dei in the Second Vision of Enoch,” in *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke* (ed. William C. Weinrich; 2 vols.; Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1984), 1:53–59.

⁷ Casey, “Monotheism, Worship and Christological Development in the Pauline Churches,” 225.

the Lord of Spirits” (39:7). The single occurrence of the name “Lord of Glory” in BP (40:3) further demonstrates that the divine figure dwells in heaven.⁸ Enoch sees the Lord of Spirits surrounded by four angelic

⁸ There is a single instance in BP where the divine figure is referred to as “Lord of Glory” (*1 En.* 40:3). In ch. 39 Enoch ascends into heaven, where he sees the dwellings of the righteous angels (39:5), and where he also sees with his own eyes the Chosen One (39:6). The righteous angels in heaven and Enoch praise the name of the Lord of Spirits (39:7, 9). In ch. 40 Enoch’s vision intensifies; he sees thousands and thousands “standing before the glory of the Lord of Spirits” (40:1). Enoch sees four figures “on the four sides of the Lord of Spirits” (40:2); “And I heard the voices of those four figures uttering praise before the Lord of Glory” (40:3). Immediately following this is a reference to each of the four figures and the one to whom each figure gives praise: “The first voice blesses the Lord of Spirits forever and ever. The second voice I heard blessing the Chosen One and the chosen ones who depend on the Lord of Spirits.” The question then is: To which of these figures does the name “Lord of Glory” refer? Does it refer to the Lord of Spirits or to the Chosen One? Two passages in the immediate context suggest that the Lord of Glory is a reference to the Lord of Spirits. At 39:12 direct reference is made to the Lord of Spirits and those who stand in his presence: “Those who sleep not bless you, and they stand in the presence of your glory; And they bless and praise and exalt, saying, ‘Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Spirits, he fills the earth with spirits.’” The second passage is 40:1, where thousands and thousands, an “innumerable and incalculable” number, “were standing before the glory of the Lord of Spirits.” Both passages refer to standing in the presence of the glory of the Lord of Spirits. This suggests that “Lord of Glory” at 40:3 is a reference to the Lord of Spirits, rather than the Chosen One.

There are two references in the *Astronomical Book* to the Lord of Glory. At *1 En.* 75:3 “the Lord of eternal glory” has placed the angel Uriel “over all the heavenly luminaries.” In 81:1–3 Enoch is shown the heavenly tablets: “From that time forward I blessed the great Lord, the king of glory forever, as he had made every work of the world.” That the Lord of eternal glory and the king of glory are references to God are clear from the fact that this figure is responsible for making “every work of the world.” In the *Book of Watchers* there are several references to the Lord of Glory. Three passages will suffice to illustrate its meaning in the *Book of Watchers*. In *1 En.* 24 the archangel Michael shows Enoch seven mountains. The seventh mountain rose above the other six; it was like the seat of a throne and was encircled by fragrant trees. Among these trees one stood out, having “a fragrance sweeter smelling than all spices.” Enoch inquires about the fragrance of the tree, and Michael answers Enoch: “This high mountain that you saw, whose peak is like the throne of God, is the seat where the Great Holy One, the Lord of glory, the King of eternity, will sit, when he descends to visit the earth in goodness” (25:3). Referring to the fragrant tree, Michael tells Enoch that “no flesh has the right to touch it until the great judgment... And it will be transplanted to the holy place, by the house of God, the King of eternity” (25:4–5). The parallels between the Lord of glory, the King of eternity, and God demonstrate that the phrase “Lord of glory” in the *Book of Watchers* refers to God. At 25:7 the God of

figures, the archangels Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, and Phanuel, whose roles are explicitly stated at 40:1–10. “And I heard the voices of those four figures uttering praise before the Lord of Glory” (40:3). That the divine figure dwells in heaven is a characteristic that by and large may be assumed, as the visions Enoch sees take place after his ascent into heaven (39:3).

2.1.2 A Holy Being

The divine figure in BP is holy. Following his first ascent into heaven (*I En.* 39:3), Enoch sees “the dwellings of the holy ones, and the resting places of the righteous” (39:4–5). These dwellings are “with his righteous angels” who “were petitioning and interceding and were praying for the sons of men” (39:5). Enoch then sees the Chosen One (the first appearance of this figure in BP), whose dwelling is “beneath the wings of the Lord of Spirits” (39:6–7). There the righteous and chosen “praised the name of the Lord of Spirits.” Enoch joins in this praise: “In those days I praised and exalted the name of the Lord of Spirits with blessing and praise, for he has established me for blessing and praise according to the good pleasure of the Lord of Spirits” (39:9–10). Here BP expands with more detail the role of Enoch blessing God in the *Book of Watchers* (hereafter BW) (cf. 12:3; 25:7; 27:1; 34:4): “And for a long time, my eyes looked at that place, and I blessed him and praised him, saying, ‘Blessed is He [*sic*], and may he be blessed from the beginning and forever’” (39:10). At this point Enoch then includes in his blessing an assertion of the divine figure’s limitless presence: “And in his presence there is no limit” (39:11). Following this is a section in which the watchers join in this praise (*I En.* 39:12–13). The Lord of Spirits is explicitly identified with the YHWH of Hosts of First Isaiah (Isa 6:1–3). In the context of the prophet’s call, First Isaiah reports a throne vision during which Isaiah saw YHWH seated on a throne in heaven. The prophet reports that he saw the seraphim speaking antiphonally: “And one called out to another and said: ‘Holy, holy, holy is YHWH of Hosts (קדוש קדוש קדוש יהוה צבאות); all the earth is filled with his glory.’” In BP the watchers “bless and praise and exalt, saying, ‘Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Spirits, he fills the earth with spirits’” (*I En.* 39:12). While this text explicitly identifies the Lord of Spirits with the YHWH of Hosts of First Isaiah, and by this identification ascribes the holiness of YHWH of

glory is equated with the King of eternity. And at 26:3 this same connection is made between the Lord of glory and the King of eternity, which again identifies the Lord of glory with the divine figure in the *Book of Watchers*. It is widely accepted that BP is by and large dependent on the *Book of Watchers*.

Hosts to the divine figure in BP, the divine figure in BP simply by virtue of the name Holy One can be understood to be holy in nature (*1 En.* 37:2; cf. also 9:4).⁹

2.1.3 Foreknowledge

In the blessing of the divine figure in ch. 39 Enoch includes an assertion of the divine figure's foreknowledge: "He knew before the age was created what would be forever, and for all generations that will be"

⁹ There is a single instance in BP (*1 En.* 37:2) where the divine figure is referred to as "the Holy One" (*qedus*). Comparing the beginning of BP (37:2) with the beginning of BW (1:2), Helge Kvanvig points out that the divine name, Holy One, "is seldom used in the Enochic writings (93:11; 104:9)." See Kvanvig, "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch," in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 179–215; see esp. 180. In the introduction to BW, a figure is referred to as the Holy One: "Enoch, a righteous man whose eyes were opened by God, who had the vision of the Holy One and of heaven, which he showed me" (1:2). In this text "God" and "the Holy One" could conceivably be two different figures; consequently this text does not resolve the ambiguity. Immediately following the introduction of BW, there is a theophany describing the coming of God from heaven: "The Great Holy One will come forth from his dwelling, and the eternal God will tread from thence upon Mount Sinai" (1:4). The parallelism suggests the equation of the "Great Holy One" with "the eternal God." The progression of first coming forth "from his dwelling" and then to "tread from thence upon Mount Sinai" connects the two subjects of the two actions; the "Great Holy One" is "the eternal God" (cf. also *Dream Visions, 1 En.* 84:1–2; hereafter abbreviated DV). At 10:1 "the Most High declared, and the Great Holy One spoke." The parallelism equates the Great Holy One with the Most High. There is a scholarly consensus that there is literary dependence of BP on BW. Consequently, it makes sense to take the reference to "the Holy One" and to "the Lord of Spirits" at 37:2 to be a dual reference to a single divine figure. On the literary dependence of BP on BW see, for example, 39:1–2 where the "seed" of "the chosen and holy...becoming one with the sons of men," refers to the miscegenation of the fallen watchers of 14:24–16:4. See also 39:2 where the sentence "Enoch received books of jealous wrath and rage" probably includes a reference to BW. If the usage of BP depends at all on BW, this being a reasonable assumption as BW preceded BP in composition, then the single reference to the Holy One in BP is a reference to God. See the essay by James C. VanderKam, "The Book of Parables within the Enoch Tradition," in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 81–99; see esp. 84–91. See also Helge Kvanvig's analysis of a direct line of development from BW to BP in "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch," 179–85. And see George W. E. Nickelsburg's comments in favor of BP's development of traditions in BW in *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108* (Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 7.

(*1 En.* 39:11; cf. 9:11 where BW also attributes foreknowledge to the divine figure).¹⁰ BP includes foreknowledge as part of the nature of the divine figure.

2.1.4 A Merciful Being

The divine figure in BP is merciful. In a scene depicting the change that will occur at the *eschaton*, “On the day of distress, evil will be stored up against the sinners. But the righteous will conquer in the name of the Lord of Spirits” (*1 En.* 50:2). Apparently at this point BP refers to a group or a sociologically definable community that is not identified with the community that produced BP: “And he will show (this) to the others, so that they repent and abandon the works of their hands. And they will have honor in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, and in his name they will be saved; and the Lord of Spirits will have mercy on them, for great is his mercy” (50:2–3). It is not clear precisely who “the others” are; they appear to be distinct from those who are identified as “the sinners,” against whom “evil will be stored up” in the end. But what is clear is that the “others” are not connected to the BP community before the *eschaton*.¹¹ The point, however, as far as the nature of the divine figure in BP is concerned, is that the Lord of Spirits is merciful. The divine figure gives mercy specifically to the righteous, and he withholds mercy from “the unrepentant” (50:4–5). The merciful nature of the divine figure is stated in a number of other passages in BP. Following the Leviathan/Behemoth tradition at 60:7–10 and 24, there is a fragmented text containing “a snarl of duplications and omissions,”¹² which refers to the punishment of the Lord of Spirits resting “on them” (60:24). It is impossible to determine to whom this refers. Immediately following this the text reads: “When the punishment of the Lord of Spirits rests upon them, afterwards will be the judgment according to his mercy and longsuffering” (60:25). Following this is the enthronement of the Chosen One who “will judge all the works of the holy ones in the heights of heaven”

¹⁰ This is also a characteristic of the divine figure in DV (*1 En.* 84:3).

¹¹ This is reminiscent of the “you,” “we,” “they” distinctions and the motif of persuasion explicit in 4QMMT. That the BP community may have been part of the mainstream Essene movement and not as radicalized as the Qumran community might explain why BP is open to entertaining the possibility that “the others” (the Qumran יהודים? the Pharisees?) will repent and be saved in the end. While this reconstruction cannot be defended with any certainty, it is an interesting and attractive possibility.

¹² George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), 76.

(61:6–9). The Lord of Spirits “will summon all the host of heaven and all the holy ones in the heights” who “bless and glorify and exalt” the Lord of Spirits (61:10–13). BP then asserts: “For great is the mercy of the Lord of Spirits, and he is slow to anger” (61:13). In BP the merciful nature of the divine figure is exclusively understood in terms of eschatological judgment.

2.1.5 *A Righteous Being*

It is also explicitly stated in BP that the divine figure is righteous. After asserting the greatness of his mercy (*1 En.* 50:3), the text states: “But he is righteous in his judgment, and in the presence of his glory unrighteousness will not stand; at his judgment the unrepentant will perish in his presence, ‘And hereafter I will have no mercy on them,’ says the Lord of Spirits” (*1 En.* 50:4–5; cf. also *1 En.* 61:9; Ps 9:4; Tob 3:2). According to BP the righteousness of the divine figure is defined with reference to his judgment against the unrighteous.

2.1.6 *Repentance*

The divine figure in BP is capable of repenting. In a digression on the flood, “the Head of Days repented” that he had obliterated all who dwell on the earth (*1 En.* 54:7–55:2). This is a point of view that is consistent within Enochic Judaism, that the punishment for evil would be executed ultimately at the end of time, in contrast to the Zadokite–Sadducean point of view that rewards and punishments are experienced in the present life. Nowhere in the biblical narrative (Gen 6–8) does YHWH “repent” that he had destroyed all of humankind, after sparing only Noah and his family. The Zadokites–Sadducees could argue that their system of reward and punishment in this life corresponded well with the destruction of the flood described in the Torah.¹³ The Enochians of the BP community, on the other hand, stressed the end results of the flood narrative; they read the Noachic covenant never again to destroy humankind as an act of repentance on the part of God, in order to stress humankind’s victimization by supernatural forces rather than humankind’s complicity. *Jubilees* 5:12–19 provided a different answer to this problem; instead of God repenting that he had sent the flood (BP), God made for all creatures “a new and righteous nature... so that they might all be righteous” (*Jub.* 5:12). This was a point of view on the flood that would develop into the kind of radical pre-determinism that we find at Qumran: “But those he

¹³ See Gabriele Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History from Ezekiel to Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 73–111.

hates, he causes to stray” (CD 2:13). While *Jubilees* more closely resonates with BW on the post-flood condition of human beings,¹⁴ BP suggests an alternative Enochic “correction” of the Zadokite–Sadducean point of view on the punishment of the flood which moves in a different direction from BW and *Jubilees*. BP asserts that the Head of Days, reflecting on the results of the flood, changed his mind to the point that he laments the vanity of the flood: “In vain have I destroyed all who dwell on the earth” (*1 En.* 55:1). In BW and *Jubilees* the flood was an opportunity to cleanse the earth of evil and iniquity committed by both the giants and sinful humans, and to make a fresh start with humans (*1 En.* 10:20–22). BP argues that the destruction of humans along with the offspring of the fallen watchers was a mistake. By pressing the point to such an extreme the authors of BP clearly have presented their point of view on the divine figure’s repentance over the flood in opposition to the Zadokite–Sadducean point of view.

2.1.7 An Eternal Being

According to BP the divine figure is eternal. This is one of those characteristics of the divine figure so clearly assumed in BP that references to it are only incidental. In a section on the astronomical secrets, Enoch sees the storehouses of the wind and the hail and the mist (*1 En.* 41:3–4). He also sees the storehouses of the sun and the moon, from which the two lights emerge and to which they return, “and how the one is more praiseworthy than the other” (41:5).¹⁵ The description continues: “And they do not leave the course, and they neither extend nor diminish their course. And they keep faith with one another according to the oath that they have <sworn>” (41:5). The reference to the eternity of the divine figure occurs in the following description of the course of the sun: “And first the sun emerges and completes its path according to the command of the Lord of Spirits—and his name endures forever and ever” (41:6). It may not be a coincidence that the “name” of the Lord of Spirits occurs in such close proximity to the “oath” that has been “sworn” by the sun and

¹⁴ Cf. *1 En.* 10:6, 9, 15–22.

¹⁵ This suggests more than just an acknowledgment that the sun’s light is brighter in intensity than the moon’s (cf. *1 En.* 73:3). It also suggests a position that does not just view the sun and the moon making equal contributions to the calendrical ideology of the BP community, but one that favors observations of the movements of the sun over against observations of the moon. This is further suggested by the assertion at *1 En.* 41:8 that “the course of the path of the moon is light to the righteous and darkness to the sinners.” See Waddell, “Will the Real Judaism Please Stand Up?”

the moon to run their courses according to the command of the Lord of Spirits.¹⁶ There is also a connection between the oath and “the secret name” at 69:13–16 where the angel Kasbe’el persuaded the archangel Michael to reveal to him and the other holy ones the secret name, “so that they might make mention of it in the oath.” These holy ones rejoiced “and they blessed and glorified and exalted, because the name of that son of man had been revealed to them” (69:26). This secret name and oath had some sort of magical power over the watchers who had revealed secrets to humans (69:14). The oath was also involved in creation, as 69:16–25 explicitly states: “And <through that oath> the heaven was suspended...” The text is fragmented at this point, but the thought is clear; the oath was involved in creation, as the rest of this tradition states clearly (69:17–25), and as is also suggested by 41:5. The point, however, as regards the nature of the divine figure, is that the eternity of the Lord of Spirits is defined in relation to his creating activity, specifically as he commands the sun and the moon (instruments created to measure time) to run their respective courses. The other reference to the eternal nature of the divine figure is even more incidental than 41:6. At the beginning of the third parable Enoch states that the righteous and the chosen “will seek the light and find righteousness with the Lord of Spirits; (there will be) peace for the righteous in the name of the Eternal Lord” (58:4; cf. 75:3). The eternal nature of the divine figure is simply stated in the name.¹⁷

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

2.2 Functions of the Divine Figure in the *Parables of Enoch*

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

¹⁶ Cf. Harry Alan Hahne, *Corruption and Redemption of Creation: Nature in Romans 8:19–22 and Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (New York: T&T Clark, 2006).

¹⁷ There are eight references to the divine figure as the Lord (’ēgzīʾ) in BP (*1 En.* 60:24; 61:10; 62:1; 63:8; 65:6; 67:3, 8; 68:4). At 60:24, for example, there is a reference to the Lord imbedded in a judgment tradition of the two monsters, Leviathan and Behemoth (60:7–10, 24–25). “These two monsters” were “prepared according to the greatness of the Lord” (60:24).

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

2.2.1 Creation

One of the most notable functions of the divine figure in Jewish traditions of the Second Temple period is that of creator.¹⁸ In BP there are a few references to the divine figure as creator that lend themselves to analysis. The divine figure controls the astronomical order, commanding the path of the sun (as we have already seen at *1 En.* 41:6), determining whether the lightning flashes for a blessing or for a curse (59:1–2), and sending water to nourish the earth (60:22). There is also a reference to the creation of Adam (see 2 *Esd* 3:3–5) in the two monsters tradition of *1 En.* 60:7–10 and 24. The separation of the dry land from the waters (Gen 1:9–10; Job 38:8–11) is represented by the separation of the two monsters, Leviathan and Behemoth.¹⁹ Leviathan is used as a metaphor for the ocean, and Behemoth is used as a metaphor for dry land, the beast who occupies “the trackless desert” (*1 En.* 60:8). Noah narrates that this desert is “east of the garden where the chosen and righteous dwell, where my great-grandfather was taken up, the seventh from Adam, the first man whom the Lord of Spirits created” (60:8).²⁰ BP also refers to the auguring of meteorological events (ch. 59), the flashing of lightning “for a blessing or for a curse, as the Lord of Spirits wills” (59:1). This was not unknown to Enochic circles (cf. the *Astronomical Book* [hereafter AB]; e.g. 76:4). It is also a curious feature of the Qumran community, as evidenced in some fragments of the Dead Sea Scrolls.²¹

2.2.2 Revelation of Wisdom

Wisdom is one of the defining paradigms of the Enochic tradition.²² In BP the divine figure functions as a revealer of wisdom. In the introduction to BP (*1 En.* 37:1–5) Enoch delivers “to those who dwell on the earth” the wisdom he has received while in heaven: “This is the beginning of the

¹⁸ See, e.g., *1 En.* (BW) 5:1–3; *Jub.* 2; 4Q422 1 i 6–12; 4Q504 viii 1–8; 11Q5 xxvi 9–15; 1QH^a ix 7–10.

¹⁹ Cf. Job 40:15–41:34; 2 *Esd* 6:49–52.

²⁰ The reference to Adam as “the first man” resonates with Paul’s reference to Christ as the “last Adam” at 1 Cor 15:45, and will have implications for the comparative analysis of BP and LP in Chapter 6.

²¹ See, e.g., 4Q186 and 4Q318.

²² Cf. Boccaccini, “Finding a Place,” 263–89.

words of wisdom, which I took up to recount to those who dwell on the earth. Listen, O ancients, and look, you who come after—the words of the Holy One, which I speak in the presence of the Lord of Spirits.” From the perspective of the author(s) this is an unprecedented wisdom: “Until now there had not been given from the presence of the Lord of Spirits such wisdom as I have received according to my insight” (37:4). The divine figure functions as a giver of wisdom to Enoch. The Holy One has given to Enoch “words” which Enoch speaks “in the presence of the Lord of Spirits,” and “words of wisdom” in the form of three parables which Enoch then “spoke to those who dwell on the earth” (37:5). The Lord of Spirits is described as having revealed the first parable to Enoch (43:4). The wisdom of the Lord of Spirits reveals the name of the Son of Man to the holy and the righteous (48:7). The Lord of Spirits has given the secrets of wisdom to the Chosen One (51:3). The Lord of Spirits is a revealer of hidden things (52:5). The Most High kept the Son of Man hidden from the beginning and “revealed him to the chosen” (62:7).²³ Near the end of the first parable is appended a polemic against a particular wisdom tradition, possibly the tradition of Sirach which specifically locates wisdom in the Torah.²⁴ According to BP, “Wisdom did not find a place where she might dwell, so her dwelling was in the heaven. Wisdom went forth to dwell among the sons of men, but she did not find a dwelling. Wisdom returned to her place, and sat down among the angels” (42:1–2). And it is precisely among the angels where Enoch is given this wisdom. BP takes a polemical tone: “Iniquity went forth from her chambers, those whom she did not seek she found, and she dwelt among them like rain in a desert and dew in a thirsty land” (42:3).²⁵ Writing against a particular wisdom tradition, the author(s) of BP insisted that wisdom is on the side of the BP community. Revealing wisdom to humans is one of the functions of the divine figure in BP.

²³ There are four references to the divine figure as the Most High in BP (*1 En.* 46:7; 60:1, 22; 62:7). In a section describing cosmological phenomena (59:1–3 and 60:11–23) the angels have charge of releasing the wind and the rain to water the earth. According to this passage (60:22), the wind and rain are from the Most High to give “nourishment for the land.” Immediately following this section describing cosmological phenomena, there is a section describing a scene of judgment (60:1–10, 24–25). This scene opens with “a mighty quaking” of the “heaven of heavens,” which greatly disturbs “the host of the Most High and the angels” (60:1).

²⁴ See Boccaccini, “Finding a Place,” 266–77. Kvanvig calls this passage “a parody” of Prov 8; see Kvanvig’s “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 202.

²⁵ Philip S. Alexander suggests that this is a proto-Gnostic tradition. See “Predestination and Free Will in the Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Barclay and Gathercole, eds., *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*, 27–49.

2.2.3 Worship

To be worshiped is yet another function of the divine figure which may be assumed on the basis of so much Second Temple period literature.²⁶ In BP the divine figure receives worship and praise from human and angelic beings (*I En.* 39:9, 12–13; 40:3–4; 57:3), and receives the prayers of the righteous (47:1).²⁷ The divine figure also receives worship and praise from the mighty and the kings of the earth (63:1–4). These are two different kinds of worship, as the worship from humans and angels is voluntary, while the worship from the kings of the earth, as it is described in BP, is a default, involuntary worship occurring at the judgment.²⁸ This worship of the mighty and the kings of the earth is an involuntary worship, since it occurs in a context that is antithetical to the worship of the righteous humans and the holy angels. The divine figure is an object of scorn for the kings of the earth who willingly give worship neither to the Lord of Spirits nor to the Son of Man (46:7). At 63:1 the “mighty and the kings who possess the earth” have been delivered over to the angels of punishment. These kings beseech the Lord of Spirits for respite from their punishment, so that they may worship the Lord of Spirits and confess their sins (63:5–7). Because the kings are now in a position of having been forced from their power, they are compelled to worship the divine figure whom they refused to worship when they ruled: “Now we know that we should glorify and bless the Lord of the kings, and him who reigns over all kings” (63:4). As the kings look for respite to make confession and glorify the Lord of Spirits, they say: “For in his presence we did not make confession, nor did we glorify the name of the Lord of the kings; Our hope was on the scepter of our kingdom, and <throne of> our glory” (63:7). This function ascribed to the divine figure is unique to the Lord of the kings. The role of the Lord of the kings is that this figure receives worship and praise from the mighty and the kings who have been judged and are under the control of the angels of punishment (63:2).²⁹

²⁶ See, e.g., Ps 66:4; 1QS iii 11; x 1–3; 4Q400–407; 4Q503; 11Q17; Matt 4:10; Luke 4:8; Josephus, *War* 2.128.

²⁷ In AB (*I En.* 81:3, 10), BW (10:21), and DV (83:11–84:3) the divine figure receives blessing and praise from angels and human beings, which corresponds to this function of the divine figure in BP.

²⁸ This form of worship is also described in BW at *I En.* 27:3–4.

²⁹ This particular passage (*I En.* 63:1–12) contains traditions similar to those used in the so-called Christ-Hymn of Phil 2:5–11, and which will be analyzed in more detail in the Excursus at the end of Chapter 6 (§6.4).

2.2.4 Judgment

Judgment is one of those spheres of activity widely recognized in Second Temple period literature as belonging to the domain of the divine figure.³⁰ Especially in Enochic literature before BP it should be noted that it is the divine figure, and no one else, who executes judgment.³¹ There are three definable aspects of judgment in BP that lend themselves to analysis: the divine figure engages in judgment, executes punishment, and sits on the throne of his glory, an act which is almost always connected to the role of judgment in BP. The Lord of Spirits has prepared judgment (*1 En.* 60:6). The divine figure is righteous in his judgment, withholding mercy from the unrepentant (50:4–5). The divine figure executes punishment at the judgment (54:5), and takes vengeance on the host of Azazel for becoming servants of Satan and leading astray those who dwell on the earth (54:6; 55:3).³² At 67:4–5 the divine figure judges and punishes “those angels...who led astray those who dwell on the earth.” The Lord of Spirits has executed the punishment of the flood (54:7), and will execute punishment at the final judgment (60:24–25; 62:10–12; 63:12).

Sitting on the throne in heaven³³ is connected to the role of judgment in BP.³⁴ *First Enoch* 47 refers to the prayers of “the holy ones who dwell

³⁰ Cf., e.g., *1 En.* 10:4–12; 16:1; 19:1; 22:4–11; 25:4; 45:2; 54:5–10; 84:4; 90:19–27; 94:9; *Pss. Sol.* 15:12.

³¹ *1 En.* 1:9; 90:20–27; 91:7; 94:10–95:2; 97:3–6; 100:4; 108:13. The only possible exception to this is the *Epistle of Enoch* (92:4) where the wording is ambiguous as to whether it is God or the “righteous one” who “will judge in piety and in righteousness.”

³² Cf. *Jub.* 4:22; 4Q180 i 7–10.

³³ See Christopher Rowland’s discussion of enthronement in heaven in the context of his analysis of the development of exalted angel traditions, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1982), 94–113. See also the discussion by Darrell Hannah in “The Throne of His Glory: The Divine Throne and Heavenly Mediators in Revelation and the Similitudes of Enoch,” *ZNW* 94 (2003): 68–96; Bauckham, “The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus”; and Martin Hengel, “‘Sit at My Right Hand!’ The Enthronement of Christ at the Right Hand of God and Psalm 110:1,” in *Studies in Early Christology* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1995), 119–225.

³⁴ In BP there are twelve references to God’s throne in heaven. Only two of these references (*1 En.* 47:3 and 60:2) refer to the divine figure sitting on the throne in a context of judgment. One reference simply refers to the throne without describing anyone sitting on it (71:7); this reference to the throne does not come in a context of judgment, but in a context of the final introduction of the eschatological age (71:15). The other nine references have the messiah figure sitting on the throne in a

in the heights of heaven” (47:2) interceding on behalf of the righteous who were being persecuted by those who “deny the name of the Lord of Spirits” (46:7–8). In response to this angelic intercession, the Head of Days sets in motion his judgment by sitting on “the throne of his glory” (47:3).³⁵ In ch. 60 the Head of Days is mentioned as being seated “on the throne of his glory, and the angels and the righteous were standing around him” (60:2). Enoch is so disturbed by what he sees that he soils himself (60:3). The angel Michael reassures Enoch of God’s mercy for the elect (60:5) and judgment for “the sinners” (60:6), to strengthen Enoch to continue on in the vision.

The wrath of the Lord of Spirits rests upon the kings and the mighty and the exalted of the earth who have persecuted “his children and his chosen ones” (62:11–12; also 41:2 and 45:6); “...the wrath of the Lord of Spirits rests upon them, and his sword is drunk with them” (62:12). Chapter 63 contains the confession of the kings and the mighty. They seek respite from their punishment, in order to confess the greatness of the Lord of Spirits, a confession which they failed to make before the judgment. The kings confess: “Our hope was on the scepter of our kingdom and <throne of> our glory. But on the day of our affliction and tribulation it does not save us, nor do we find respite to make confession, that our Lord is faithful in all his deeds and his judgment and his justice, and his judgments have no respect for persons” (63:7–8). In ch. 65 there is a reference to the Lord in one of a series of seemingly unrelated

context of judgment. These will be discussed in Chapter 3 in the segment on the functions of the messiah figure in BP. On the divine figure sitting on a throne as an act of judgment in DV, cf. 90:20.

³⁵ The Head of Days is an epithet for the divine figure that occurs nine times in BP (*1 En.* 46:1–2; 47:3; 48:2; 55:1; 60:2; 71:10, 12, 13, 14). The epithet first occurs near the beginning of the second parable. The second parable begins with an introduction that refers to the day of judgment. On that day the “Chosen One will sit on the throne of glory” and he will test the works of the sinners (45:2–3). Heaven and earth will be transformed and the “chosen ones” will be made to dwell on the transformed earth (45:5). The introductory section ends with a contrast between what the Lord of Spirits has in store for the “righteous ones” and what he will do to “the sinners” at the judgment (45:6). It is at this point that Enoch sees the Head of Days and the Son of Man in *1 En.* 46. In this chapter the Head of Days appears to be equated with the Lord of Spirits (46:3) and the Most High (46:7). In ch. 48 Enoch sees “the spring of righteousness” (48:1). This spring of righteousness was surrounded by many springs of wisdom, and the thirsty drank from them and were filled with wisdom (48:1). The passage then reads: “And in that hour that son of man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, and his name, before the Head of Days” (48:2–3). The parallelism indicates an equation of the Lord of Spirits with the Head of Days.

fragmentary Noachic traditions. The first reference to the Lord concerns the divine indictment against humankind. Noah is puzzled by the tilting of the earth and its impending destruction. Noah seeks an explanation from his great-grandfather Enoch, who explains: “A command has gone forth from the presence of the Lord against the inhabitants of the earth, that their end is accomplished” (65:6). According to this Noachic tradition, the Lord has set in motion his judgment against the inhabitants of the earth. In ch. 67 there is a divine oracle about the flood. In this oracle “the word of God” comes to Noah, by which he is told that the angels are making a wooden vessel to preserve “the seed of life.” The oracle concludes with the blessing: “And I will confirm your seed in my presence forever and ever...and they will be blessed and be multiplied on the earth, in the name of the Lord” (67:3). Through his judgment the Lord also preserves life. In 67:4–69:1 there is a scene of judgment against “those angels...who led astray those who dwell on the earth” (67:7). Their punishment will be meted out in a valley where Noah saw “a great disturbance and troubling of waters” (67:5). The fragment refers to these waters serving the kings and the mighty and having a quality that heals their flesh.³⁶ Then the fragment explicitly refers to the judgment which will come upon the kings: “For judgment will come upon them because they believe in the lust of their flesh, but they deny the spirit of the Lord” (67:8). The “Lord of Spirits is angry with them, because they act as if they were like the Lord” (*1 En.* 68:4). Acting “as if they were like the Lord” suggests a link to the deception of Adam and Eve perpetrated by the serpent in the Garden of Eden—“you will be like God” (Gen 3:5).

In addition to punishment at the judgment, the Lord of Spirits also gives mercy (*1 En.* 38:6; 50:3); he executes judgment according to his mercy and longsuffering (60:25; 61:13). His mercy is great to the righteous and chosen (61:13). The Lord of Spirits possesses light which, after the judgment, will appear on the faces of the holy, righteous, and chosen (38:4). The Lord of Spirits will abide over the righteous and the chosen ones in heaven (62:13–14). The Lord of Spirits gives eternal life to the righteous and the chosen (62:15–16). This text employs two metaphors for eternal life: “the garment of glory” and “the garment of life.” This contrast of God’s mercy with his judgment also appears in “The Divine Oracle about the Flood” located in chs. 67–68: “And in

³⁶ It has been suggested that this refers to Callirhoe, a spa built by Herod the Great to the east of the Dead Sea; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 17.171. See the discussion by Hannah, “The Book of Noah,” 469–77. But see also David W. Suter’s discussion against the identification of *1 En.* 67:4–13 as a reference to Callirhoe; “Enoch in Sheol,” 423–24.

those days the word of God came to me and said to me, ‘Noah, your lot has come up to me, a lot without blame, a lot of love and uprightness’ (67:1). There is nothing either explicit or implicit in this text about the nature of the divine figure. It reflects a formula familiar to the biblical prophets.³⁷ It does, however, suggest that one of the functions of the divine figure, as this figure is referred to as God, is to give a specific “word” or message to Noah (67:1). God will protect Noah and his family from the flood in order to preserve “the seed of life” (67:2–3).

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

2.3 Ambiguous References Either to the Divine Figure or the Messiah Figure

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

There are two references to a figure called the “judge” in BP.³⁸ After Enoch’s vision of the four figures who were “uttering praise before the Lord of Glory” in *1 En.* 40, there is a scene of judgment at 41:1–2, 9.³⁹ Here Enoch sees the secrets of heaven, how the kingdom is divided and the deeds of humanity are weighed in the balance. Enoch sees the dwelling places of the chosen and the holy ones. Then Enoch sees “all the sinners who deny the name of the Lord of Spirits being driven away from there, and they dragged them off and they could not remain because of the scourge that went forth from the Lord of Spirits.” According to this text, punishment is implemented at the time of judgment by the Lord of Spirits. Then v. 9 reads: “For no angel hinders and no power is able to hinder, for the Judge sees them all and judges them all in their presence.”

³⁷ Cf., e.g., Jer 1:4; 2:1; Ezek 1:3; 12:1; 13:1; Hos 1:1; Joel 1:1; etc.

³⁸ *1 En.* 41:9; 60:6.

³⁹ Nickelsburg and VanderKam (*1 Enoch: A New Translation*, 55) move 41:9 to follow 41:1–2, because of “what appears to be a displacement.”

The connection between the Lord of Spirits who implements punishment in v. 2 and “the Judge” in v. 9 is thin, but it is logical. Nevertheless, there remains a certain amount of ambiguity as to who the “Judge” of v. 9 is. Is it the Lord of Spirits or some other heavenly figure? The second text referring to a figure as judge in BP is 60:6. At 60:2 Enoch sees a vision of the Head of Days seated on his throne, with the angels and the righteous standing around it. Enoch responds to this vision with trembling and fear: “. . . my loins were crushed and my kidneys were loosened, and I fell on my face” (60:3). The angel Michael reassures Enoch and explains what the day of judgment will mean for the elect and the sinners: “And when the day and the power and the punishment and the judgment come, which the Lord of Spirits has prepared for those who do not worship the righteous <judge>, and for those who deny the righteous judgment, and for those who take his name in vain. . . And that day has been prepared for the elect, a covenant, for the sinners a visitation” (60:6). Like 41:9, 60:6 exhibits ambiguity. To whom does “the righteous <judge>” of 60:6 refer? Is it the Lord of Spirits, or is it some other heavenly figure? It is not inconceivable that the Lord of Spirits and the judge in these passages are two distinct figures. Elsewhere in BP the Son of Man (who is distinct from the Lord of Spirits) executes judgment (46:4–6; 63:11).⁴⁰ This is also true of the Chosen One (likewise distinct from the Lord of Spirits) who will execute judgment at the end (49:4; 55:4; 61:8–9). So it is not at all clear to whom BP refers when the “Judge” is mentioned in 41:9 and 60:6, whether it is the divine figure or the messiah figure.

Johannes Theisohn refers to *I En.* 41:9 to support his identification of “Judge” as one of the titles for the Son of Man figure.⁴¹ Theisohn argues that because the role is entirely consistent with the Son of Man/Chosen One traditions throughout the rest of BP, the title may be applied to the Son of Man figure here. While it is true that the role of judge is given to the messiah figure elsewhere in BP, by assigning 41:9 to the messiah figure Theisohn’s argument begs the question. The only figure referred to in the immediate context of the “Judge” reference in 41:9 is the Lord of Spirits in the preceding verse (41:2),⁴² and is therefore probably to be assigned to this figure.

⁴⁰ See the analysis in Chapter 3 (§3.2.3).

⁴¹ Johannes Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter: Untersuchungen zum traditionsgeschichtlichem Ort der Menschensohngestalt der Bilderreden des Äthiopischen Henoch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 35.

⁴² If Nickelsburg’s and VanderKam’s reconstruction is to be accepted.

There is another phrase exhibiting ambiguity as to whether it refers to the divine figure, the messiah figure, or to neither of these figures. There is a single reference to “the light of days” at *1 En.* 50:1. It is not clear whether this is a general reference to “the light of day”⁴³ dwelling on “the holy and chosen” on the day of judgment, in other words, some sort of “enlightenment” which will be judged to their advantage (50:1), in contrast to “evil” that will be “stored up against the sinners” (50:2). This interpretation is supported by BW (5:6–8), which describes the eschatological reversal of fortune for the chosen: “In the enlightened man there will be light, and in the wise man, understanding” (5:8). However, one manuscript of BP replaces “the light of days” with “the ancient of days.”⁴⁴ In other words, it interprets this to be a specific figure. Near the beginning of the first parable, “when the Righteous One appears in the presence of the righteous” at the time of judgment, “light appears to the righteous and chosen who dwell on the earth” (38:2). This suggests that the appearance of a specific figure, the Righteous One, is to be correlated (though not specifically identified) with the appearance of “light” in BP. *First Enoch* 58:1–6 suggests that it is more than just a general “light of day” enlightenment that will dwell upon the holy and chosen. It is more like an eternal reward of light in contrast to an eternal punishment of darkness. The weight of the evidence points not to a specific figure who is “the Light of Days,” but a “change [that] will occur for the holy and chosen,” a transformation of circumstances in which “glory and honor will return to the holy” and “the righteous will conquer in the name of the Lord of Spirits” (50:1–2).

2.4 Summary and Conclusions

There is very little evidence in BP regarding the nature of the divine figure. What little evidence there is may be identified in terms of the divine figure’s heavenly nature, holiness, foreknowledge, mercy, righteousness, repentance, and eternity. The divine figure’s heavenly nature may seem obvious, and appears in BP only incidentally. The divine figure’s holiness is explicitly stated when the angels sing the triple קדוש of Isa 6 and identify YHWH of Hosts with the Enochic Lord of Spirits. The divine figure’s foreknowledge is explicitly stated, consistent with the divine figure described in BW. The divine figure’s mercy and righteousness are defined in terms of eschatological judgment. The divine

⁴³ This is suggested by Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, 64.

⁴⁴ See *ibid.*

figure is capable of repenting, as it is explicitly stated in the Noachic tradition that the divine figure repented that he had sent the flood to destroy human beings, a very particular point of view on the supernatural origin of evil within the Enochic tradition that was clearly in opposition to the Zadokite–Sadducean view that humans fully deserved the destruction of the flood. And the nature of the divine figure entails eternity, a characteristic that is only incidentally mentioned.

The functions associated with the divine figure in BP are functions typically associated with the divine figure in other Second Temple period literature. There are no surprises in this regard. The divine figure is identified as the creator who also controls the movements of the astronomical order for blessings and curses—sun, moon, planets, and stars. The divine figure is the revealer of wisdom. Enoch is the recipient of this unprecedented wisdom. It is a heavenly wisdom that opposed the tradition of Sirach, which viewed the Torah as the embodiment of wisdom. For BP wisdom is closely associated with the messiah figure (which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 3). The wisdom tradition in BP opposed the position of Sirach, because of the Enochic view that all of creation had been corrupted by a supernatural origin of evil, and that wisdom could not be associated with such a corrupted creation. Being the object of human and angelic worship is so unambiguously a function of the divine figure in Second Temple period literature, it is not a surprise that it appears among the functions of the divine figure in BP as well. This function of the divine figure in BP is expressed in a variety of ways, including worship, praise, blessing, exaltation, and glorification. To preside at the judgment and to execute punishment also clearly are functions of the divine figure in BP. This function of the divine figure, however, is not unprecedented in the Second Temple period.

None of the aspects of the nature or the functions of the divine figure in BP are exceptional when viewed in the broader context of other Second Temple period Jewish intellectual traditions. With regard to the nature and functions of the divine figure, BP essentially presents nothing new. Ambiguous references in BP that refer to a “judge” and the “light of days” resting on “the holy and the chosen” at the *eschaton* are essentially non-consequential for the present analysis.

Having analyzed the nature and functions of the divine figure in BP, this gives us a clear set of data to compare and contrast with the nature and functions of the messiah figure in BP. Such a comparison will clarify precisely who the messiah figure is and what the messiah figure does in relation to the divine figure in BP.

THE MESSIAH IN THE *PARABLES OF ENOCH*

3.0 The Messiah Figure in the *Parables of Enoch*

Conceptual elements of messianic ideology appear in a rich and complex variety of Jewish intellectual traditions of the Second Temple period. But it is not the individual elements themselves that define these various traditions. Rather, it is the plurality of ways in which the conceptual elements are combined that give unique definition to the individual systems. This is especially evident in BP. BP uses five specific epithets to refer to the same messiah figure¹—Righteous One (*ṣādēq*),² Chosen One (*xēruy*), Son of Man (*walda sabʿ*),³ Anointed One (*masih*), and Name of the Lord of Spirits (*sēm ʾēgziʾa manāfēst*). The evidence also indicates that the

¹ There are only two instances in BP where a figure is referred to as “the Anointed One” (*masih*; see *I En.* 48:10; 52:4). At 48:10 the distinction between the Anointed One and the divine figure is made explicit. Referring to the kings and the strong who possess the earth, 48:10 reads: “For they have denied the Lord of Spirits and his Anointed One.” Both references to the Anointed One in BP come in contexts of eschatological judgment, and will be discussed in more detail in the following analysis of the functions of the messiah figure.

² At *I En.* 38:2 there is actually a better textual tradition in the Ethiopic for reading “righteousness” (*ṣēdeq*) rather than “righteous one” (*ṣādēq*). Cf. James C. VanderKam, “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71,” in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 170.

³ There are actually three designations for the Son of Man figure in BP: *walda sabʿ* (plural), “son of humankind”; *walda bēʿsi* (singular), “son of man”; and *walda ʾēgʾāla ʾēmma-ḥēyāw*, “the son of the offspring of the mother of the living.” All of these epithets are rendered in English translations of BP as “son of man.” The last epithet is the most common in BP.

author(s) of BP understood the messiah figure to be distinct from the divine figure who is the one God.⁴

3.1 Nature of the Messiah Figure in the *Parables of Enoch*

There is a good amount of evidence on the nature of the messiah figure in BP that lends itself to detailed analysis. As with the divine figure, certain aspects of the nature of the messiah figure may be assumed. It may be assumed, for example, that the messiah figure is a heavenly being. Like the visions of the divine figure, Enoch's visions of the messiah figure come in the context of Enoch's ascent into heaven (*1 En.* 39:3–7). That the messiah figure in BP is a heavenly being is not sufficient evidence for asserting that the messiah figure is also divine. And, as was pointed out before, neither does the fact that the messiah figure shares specific functions with the divine figure in BP necessarily indicate the divinity of the messiah figure. According to BP, at least in the final form of the document where Enoch is identified with the Son of Man, the messiah figure is both a human being and a heavenly being. The messiah figure is preexistent in relation to creation. The messiah figure is associated with wisdom. The messiah figure is righteous. And the messiah figure is associated with the divine name. In this chapter I will also include an analysis of the “Son of Man” title, as this is one of the central issues in the scholarly discussion today and is critical for an accurate understanding of the nature of the messiah figure in BP.

3.1.1 *A Human Being*

The evidence in BP that the messiah figure is a human being is to be located at the beginning (*1 En.* 37:1) and the end (71:14) of BP.⁵ BP begins with a brief genealogy of Enoch, which stresses the patriarch's human nature, the sixth human generation after Adam: “The vision of

⁴ Helge Kvanvig identifies “four characteristics” of the Son of Man: “(1) he is the one who has righteousness; (2) he reveals the treasures of what is hidden; (3) he is the chosen one by God; (4) his lot is preeminent before the divinity (46:3)”;

see Kvanvig, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 189. While Kvanvig is correct in his identification of these “four characteristics,” he does not distinguish between nature and functions of the messiah figure, and there are more details about the messiah figure in BP that Kvanvig leaves out of his analysis.

⁵ The following analysis is predicated on the identification of the messiah figure with Enoch at *1 En.* 71:14.

wisdom that Enoch saw—the son of Jared, the son of Mahalalel, the son of Kenan, the son of Enosh, the son of Seth, the Son of Adam” (37:1).⁶ Enoch is also referred to as “the seventh from Adam” (counting inclusively) at 60:8. These texts clearly and explicitly articulate the human nature of Enoch. Near the end of BP the human being Enoch is explicitly identified with the Son of Man. One of the angels who attended the Head of Days during Enoch’s final ascent into heaven (71:8, 13) came to Enoch and said to him: “You are that son of man who was born for righteousness” (71:14). The identification of the human being Enoch with the messiah figure the Son of Man is an explicit statement of the point of view in BP that the heavenly messiah figure is also a human being.

As a human being Enoch is taken into heaven, “snatched up” from the face of the earth by a whirlwind (*1 En.* 39:3). There are two events that may be described as Enoch’s heavenly ascents: here at 39:3 and the final series of ascents at chs. 70–71. At one point during the series of visions of the first ascent, Enoch messes himself in an all too graphic display of his corporeal nature: “And great trembling took hold of me, and fear seized me, and my loins were crushed, and my kidneys were loosened, and I fell on my face... For I had not been able to endure the appearance of that host, and its turmoil and the quaking of the heavens” (60:3–4). In direct contrast to his corporeal nature, twice in the narrative describing Enoch’s final series of ascents (71:1, 5), Enoch’s spirit ascends. This is not the case in Enoch’s previous ascent. In the first ascent “a whirlwind snatched me up from the face of the earth and set me down within the confines of the heavens” (39:3). There is no mention of Enoch’s spirit being taken. In many of the visions of BP Enoch states “my eyes saw” (39:6, 10, 13; 41:2, 3; 52:1–2, 6; 53:1; 54:1; 59:1), which further stresses his corporeal nature during the series of visions of the first ascent. This contrasts with “And my spirit saw” of the final series of ascents, when Enoch is stripped of his flesh and is transformed into a heavenly being (71:6).⁷ Nowhere during the first ascent does Enoch refer to his “spirit” ascending or his “spirit” seeing. The only phrases used during the first ascent are “my eyes saw” or “I saw.” This subtly, yet clearly, distinguishes the two ascents. During the vision of his final ascent, Enoch’s

⁶ According to BW, Enoch is a human (*1 En.* 15:2).

⁷ Matthew Black suggested an “apotheosis” of the Son of Man; see “The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch: Their Date and Contribution to Christological Origins,” in Charlesworth, ed., *The Messiah*, 161. James C. VanderKam (*Enoch: A Man for All Generations* [Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1995], 135) writes: “The apotheosis that he experiences in this text is truly remarkable, one that will be difficult to match in the ensuing tradition.”

spirit (apart from his body)⁸ sees the Head of Days coming out of the house built of hailstones. Enoch describes the Head of Days whose “head was white and pure as wool” (71:9–12; cf. 46:1). Enoch falls on his face, his flesh melts, his spirit is transformed,⁹ and he “blessed and praised and exalted” the Head of Days (71:9–11).¹⁰ And his praise was acceptable to the Head of Days (71:12). As the Head of Days came out of his heavenly house, he was accompanied by the angels Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, and Phanuel, along with “thousands and tens of thousands of angels without number” (71:13; cf. 1:3–4, 9). Enoch is then explicitly identified as the Son of Man who was “born for righteousness” and whom “the righteousness of the Head of Days will not forsake” (71:14). Enoch ceases to be a human being in the flesh (his flesh melts) and he is transformed into the preexistent heavenly messiah, the Son of Man.¹¹ There seems to be no question that during the series of visions of his first ascent and before the final series of ascents, Enoch is a corporeal being endowed with a human body, and that at some point during the final series of ascents Enoch no longer possesses this body. The question “How can a human being be a preexistent heavenly messiah?” is answered in BP by stripping Enoch of his human body of flesh and transforming his spirit so that Enoch becomes the heavenly messiah Son of Man. This is further facilitated by Enoch’s association with wisdom, as I will argue in the present chapter (cf. §3.1.5).

3.1.2 *Identified with Enoch*

We have just seen that the messiah figure in BP is explicitly identified with the patriarch Enoch.¹² This identification warrants a more detailed analysis. As John J. Collins has stated, “The most intriguing question

⁸ See the description of Isaiah’s ascent without a body in the *Mart. Ascen. Isa.* 8:14–15. See also Paul’s description of a heavenly ascent at 2 Cor 12:1–4 where twice he writes that he did not know whether it happened “in body or out of the body,” indicating that both were considered possible.

⁹ This is most strange. How can Enoch’s flesh melt, if it is Enoch’s spirit that the angel is leading on this heavenly ascent? This is probably a redactor’s oversight.

¹⁰ See the description of Enoch (without flesh) in heaven in the *Mart. Ascen. Isa.* 9:6–9.

¹¹ VanderKam (“Righteous One,” 182) writes: “It should not be forgotten that it is the earthly Enoch who sees what his future role will be, and it is overwhelmingly clear that at the eschaton he will be exalted far above his human form and will become the judge of all.” Black also argued in favor of “a quasi-human or a supra-human dimension” in the Son of Man figure already in Daniel; see his “The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch,” 146–47.

¹² See *1 En.* 37:1, 4; 39:2, 3, 6, 8, 14; 52:2; 60:10; 70:1; 71:1, 5, 10, 14.

about the Son of Man in the Parables, however, is undoubtedly that of his relation to Enoch."¹³ There are 41 direct references to Enoch in BP. As was already pointed out above, one of these references is an explicit identification of Enoch with the Son of Man at *1 En.* 71:14, which reveals Enoch to be the messiah figure. This identification of Enoch as the messiah figure would have raised the question: How can a human being be a preexistent heavenly messiah?¹⁴ BP (or at least a later redactor of BP) attempts to answer this question in the final series of ascents in chs. 70–71.

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

Ascent is widely understood to confer superhuman status on the human being who is privileged to undertake it. In gnostic texts ascent means reunification of the spirit with the divine from which it comes. In the magical papyri the purpose of ascent is often divinization, taking on the power of a god. In the apocalypses the visionary usually achieves equality with the angels in the course of the ascent. This equality is expressed through service in the heavenly temple.¹⁵

While Himmelfarb's analysis explains Enoch's equation with angels in BW, it does not however explain the tension between Enoch's ascent, interaction with angels, and explicit identification with the Son of Man who is described as a judge of angels in BP. According to Himmelfarb, "The Similitudes in its present form suggests the transformation of Enoch into the Son of Man, but this equation appears to be the result of a

¹³ John J. Collins, "Enoch and the Son of Man: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig," in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 221.

¹⁴ James VanderKam offers a lengthy discussion of the problem presented by the identification of the so-called preexistence of the Son of Man with a human being, and he offers several arguments against readings which ascribe preexistence to the Son of Man in BP. According to VanderKam, the problem presents itself in terms of the question, if the Son of Man in BP is preexistent, and if Enoch is directly identified with the Son of Man (as he is in 71:14), how can a human being be preexistent, and hence how can Enoch be identified with the Son of Man? In my opinion, this is asking the wrong question. The question is rather: How can a human being be identified as a heavenly messiah? BP answers this question in a very specific way: by transforming the human Enoch into a preexistent heavenly being. Helge Kvanvig more accurately reflects the problem posed in BP: "If the figure is the son of Adam and Eve—Eve is certainly referred to in the Ethiopic term—how then could he at the same time be preexistent?"; see Kvanvig, "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch," 195.

¹⁵ Martha Himmelfarb, "Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple," *SBLSP* 26 (1987): 210–17, esp. 212–13.

later redaction of the Similitudes.”¹⁶ Regardless of whether the identification of Enoch with the Son of Man is a later redaction, the fact remains we are left to make sense of it. The question whether it was an early BP community or a later BP community that made the identification is of no real significance. Whoever the redactor was, and whatever “group” the redactor may have associated with, in order to make such an identification (between the human being Enoch and the messiah Son of Man), this would require more than an elevation of the human being Enoch to the status of an angel.

Near the end of BP, in ch. 70, there is a description of Enoch’s ascent just before he is identified with the Son of Man: “while he was living, his name was raised into the presence of that son of man and into the presence of the Lord of Spirits from among those who dwell on the earth. He was raised on the chariots of the wind, and his name departed <from among them>” (70:1–2; cf. 12:1–2). This is a fragment of a merkabah tradition as Enoch “was raised on the chariots of the wind” (70:2).¹⁷ *First Enoch* 70:1–2 is also a midrash of Gen 5:24, “And Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him.” *First Enoch* 70:1–2 should be considered a midrash of Gen 5:24 because there is the suggestion in what follows in BP that this is Enoch’s final ascent to heaven. After Enoch was raised on the chariots of the wind “and his name departed from among them” (70:2), the following verse states it plainly: “And from that day, I was not reckoned among them” (70:3). All of BP may be read as a midrash on Gen 5:24. Enoch’s entire earthly existence, summarized by the phrase in Gen 5:24a, “Enoch walked with God,” is midrashed in *I En.* 37–69. The following phrase, “and he was not,” is midrashed by *I En.* 70:3–4: “And from that day, *I was not* reckoned among them” (emphasis added). The first-person phrase of 70:3, “I was not,” midrashes the third person phrase of Gen 5:24, “and he was not.” And the end of Gen 5:24, “for God took him,” is midrashed by what follows in *I En.* 71:1–17. James C. VanderKam has argued that all the chapters of BP preceding chs. 70–71 reflect events (visions and ascents into heaven) which occurred during Enoch’s earthly life, and that chs. 70–71 constitute Enoch’s final ascent into heaven.¹⁸ While VanderKam argues that the

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 214.

¹⁷ See David Suter, *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch* (SBLDS 47; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1979), 14–23. See also Andrei Orlov, “Roles and Titles of the Seventh Antediluvian Hero in the Parables of Enoch,” in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 111.

¹⁸ VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 177–79. See also VanderKam’s comments in *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 141.

entire unit of chs. 70–71 constitutes the Enochic interpretation of Gen 5:24 in terms of Enoch’s final ascent, I would argue that chs. 70–71 constitute a sort of telescoping midrash.¹⁹ *First Enoch* 70:1–2 is a midrash on the midrash of chs. 37–69, which is followed by the concluding midrash of 70:3–4 and 71 on Enoch’s final ascent and transformation into the preexistent heavenly Son of Man.²⁰

In ch. 71 Enoch ascends into heaven where he sees the sons of the holy angels wearing white garments and stepping on flames of fire. There Enoch falls on his face before the Lord of Spirits (71:1–2). The archangel Michael takes Enoch by the hand and raises him up. Michael shows Enoch all the secrets of mercy and righteousness and the ends of heaven (71:3–4). From there Michael takes Enoch’s spirit into the heaven of heavens, where Enoch sees a “house built of hailstones, and between those stones were tongues of living fire” (a development of the tradition in BW, 14:8–23). The house was surrounded by Seraphim, Cherubim, and Ophanim. Enoch saw those who do not sleep and who guard the throne of glory. And he saw thousands and thousands of angels surrounding that house, in and out of which went the four archangels, Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, and Phanuel (71:5–8). At some point when the archangels are exiting the house, the Head of Days accompanies them. Enoch falls on his face, his flesh melts, and his spirit is transformed. Enoch then blesses and praises the Head of Days (71:9–12).²¹ The entire climaxing vision further escalates in intensity when the identity of the Son of Man is revealed. The “Head of Days came” with the four archangels and thousands of angels without number. “And that angel came to me and greeted me with his voice” (71:13–14). We may ask, “To whom does ‘that angel’ refer?” since the angel’s identity is left unresolved. Certainly not the Head of Days, who is not an angel. Is it one

¹⁹ The term “midrash” here should be understood as an interpretive expansion on any text considered authoritative by a particular community. It is possible for a text to be a midrash on another text that is itself already a midrash on a biblical, or any other, text. Hence the term “telescoping” midrash.

²⁰ While chs. 70–71 do indeed constitute a complete midrash on Gen 5:24, *I En.* 70:1–2 also constitutes a midrash on chs. 37–69, which themselves constitute a midrash on Gen 5:24a as well as a development of the account in BW. John J. Collins also separates 70:1–2; 70:3–4, and ch. 71 as three separate literary units. See his “Enoch and the Son of Man,” 221.

²¹ Himmelfarb (“Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple,” 213) states: “In most of the later ascent apocalypses the visionary attains his place among the angels by putting on a special garment or joining in the praise the angel offers to God.”

of the four archangels? Which one?²² The angel who came to Enoch is probably Michael, who has been interacting personally with Enoch during his final ascent and who also has revealed to Enoch all the secrets of heaven (71:3–5; cf. also 60:2–5). “That angel” came to Enoch and said: “You are that son of man who was born for righteousness, and righteousness dwells on you, and the righteousness of the Head of Days will not forsake you” (71:14). Enoch and the Son of Man are curiously distinct (70:1), while Enoch is explicitly identified with the Son of Man (71:14). Finally, the righteous who dwell with the Son of Man will have peace, truth, and “length of days with that son of man” (71:15–17).

Helge Kvanvig has prepared a careful analysis of *1 En.* 70–71 in response to scholars’ objections to the view that this section is an integral part of the rest of BP. This is an important question because, as VanderKam has argued, the identity of Enoch with the Son of Man in chs. 70–71 is crucial to our understanding of the various roles and titles of the Son of Man throughout BP.²³ Kvanvig responds to three “obstacles” that have developed in the recent discussion. The first obstacle is: if Enoch were equated with the Son of Man as 71:14 explicitly states, then throughout the rest of BP Enoch sees himself in heaven, a phenomenon that John Collins claims is an impossibility.²⁴ Kvanvig has responded to Collins’ objection by comparing the structure of the three parables and chs. 70–71 with Enoch’s ascent in BW (chs. 13–14). In ch. 13 Enoch’s role as a visionary is emphasized, while in ch. 14 his role as an intermediary communicating divine judgment is stressed. Enoch’s role as a visionary (ch. 13) corresponds with his ascent and visions throughout the three parables of BP (37:1–70:2), while his role as intermediary of divine judgment is revealed in his final ascent (70:3–4 and 71).²⁵ Kvanvig candidly states: “in both cases Enoch sees himself in a heavenly location

²² Nickelsburg and VanderKam ask the question without providing a solution; see their *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, 95.

²³ On this point I agree with VanderKam. The human nature of the messiah Son of Man figure, for example, cannot be understood apart from the identification of Enoch with the Son of Man at *1 En.* 71:14.

²⁴ John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 177–82. But see the helpful discussion by Casey, *The Solution to the “Son of Man” Problem*, 110–11, where Casey refers to *T. Lev.* 7:4–8:1 and Levi’s vision of himself receiving the priestly vestment.

²⁵ See Kvanvig’s essay, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 200–201. Kvanvig’s analysis is one of the reasons I identify the two halves of ch. 70 (vv. 1–2 and vv. 3–4) as separate midrashes.

in a role related to the judgment of the sinners and the salvation of humankind. He is called to deal with the root causes of evil.”²⁶ While Collins has objected to this reading of BW by Kvanvig,²⁷ I think Kvanvig is correct to interpret the evidence in BW as Enoch seeing himself as a visionary counterpart. At 14:8, for example, Enoch does in fact see himself:

In the vision it was shown to me thus:
 Look, clouds in the vision were summoning me, and mists
 were crying out to me;
 and shooting stars and lightning flashes were hastening
 me and speeding me along.

It seems clear from what is presented here that Enoch saw, in “the vision” what “was shown to me,” clouds and mists. These are objects Enoch sees. These objects take an anthropomorphic role, “summoning” Enoch and “crying out to” Enoch. In his vision Enoch sees the clouds and he sees the mist. This is not the same as if Enoch, in a waking state, saw clouds or mists in the sky or on the horizon. This is a vision, probably also described as a dream state at *1 En.* 13:8. Enoch himself is the indirect object of the actions ascribed to the clouds and mists. Later in the vision, Enoch is addressed by the Lord:

Until now I had been on my face, prostrate and trembling. And the Lord called me with his mouth and said to me, “Come here, Enoch, and hear my word(s).” And one of the holy ones came to me and raised me up and stood me (on my feet) and brought me up to the door. But I had my face bowed down. (14:24–25)

This describes Enoch seeing specific actions that he is doing, and that are being done to him by an angel, in the presence of the divine figure, in Enoch’s vision. If Enoch is not seeing himself, then the only other explanation is that this was an actual waking experience and not a vision at all, in which case Enoch would not be able to see himself. He would be describing a real waking experience. As it is, however, the text describes a human seeing objects in a visionary state. If Enoch is able to see all the objects of the vision described in the text, how is it that the only object Enoch is not able to see, according to Collins, is himself? Collins’ solution is to state that “Enoch was a participant in his own dream, and presumably thought (if we may so speak about a fictional character) that he was actually experiencing what he saw.”²⁸ The difficulty with Collins’

²⁶ Kvanvig, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 201.

²⁷ Collins, “Enoch and the Son of Man,” 218, 223.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 218.

objection is that he does not make a distinction between the visionary experience of Enoch and Enoch's reporting of the experience in the actual writing of the text (that is, to speak of an author writing in the name of a fictional character). While it may be true that the "visionary counterpart" is absorbed in the actual experience of the vision, the visionary counterpart becomes a fact of literary creation once the vision is described in words by the one who experienced it, namely, Enoch (or again in fact, the author writing in the name of Enoch). The act of literary composition creates even more distance between the scribe (Enoch) and the scribe's object: all of the details described in the vision, Enoch himself included.

The second obstacle to which Kvanvig responds is the separation of Enoch from the Son of Man at *1 En.* 70:1. According to the objection, this renders 70:1 inconsistent with the remainder of the ascent, where Enoch is explicitly identified with the Son of Man (71:14). The text of 70:1–2 reads as follows:

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

Kvanvig describes the problem: "the introduction to the final section clearly keeps Enoch and the Son of Man apart."²⁹ Enoch's "name was raised into the presence of that son of man and into the presence of the Lord of Spirits." Kvanvig, following the text-critical work of Daniel Olson,³⁰ reads a textual variant in "a series of old manuscripts," a tradition which R. H. Charles had identified as manuscript u, which allows for the identification of Enoch with the Son of Man at *1 En.* 70:1. The variant may be translated: "And it happened after this, while he was living, that the name of that Son of Man was raised into the presence of the Lord of Spirits." According to Kvanvig: "If we consider the theology connected to Ethiopic text transmission, where the Son of Man was considered a *typos* of Christ and therefore separate from Enoch, the confusion of the two in 1 En 70:1 is certainly *lectio difficilior*."³¹ While creative, this solution does not appear to solve anything really, if only for the obvious fact that the explicit identification of Enoch with the Son of

²⁹ Kvanvig, "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch," 201.

³⁰ Daniel C. Olson, "Enoch and the Son of Man in the Epilogue of the Parables," *JSP* 18 (1998): 27–38, esp. 30–33.

³¹ Kvanvig, "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch," 202.

Man at 71:14 remains in the text. If the Ethiopic scribes emended the text to separate Enoch and the Son of Man because they had a theological concern regarding the identification of Enoch with the Son of Man at 70:1, then why would the Christian scribes leave the explicit identification of Enoch with the Son of Man at 71:14? And if 70:1–2 should be viewed primarily as following what has gone before, rather than introducing what follows, then the separation of Enoch from the Son of Man in 70:1 seems natural and is entirely consistent with the separation of these two figures throughout the three preceding parables. It may also be objected to Kvanvig’s analysis here that, even though the variant may solve the problem of the identification of Enoch with the Son of Man looking forward in the text, nowhere in the preceding parables does the Son of Man live “among those who dwell on the earth.” In fact, it may be argued that the Son of Man figure will not be revealed among those who dwell on the earth until the time of judgment at the *eschaton* (53:6; 71:16).³² It should also be noted that the variant readings identified by Olson, instead of an original more difficult reading, appear to be an effort on the part of the scribes to connect the wording of 70:1 with the immediately preceding context, where “the name of that son of man had been revealed” to the angels (69:14, 26). This would then render the present text of 70:1 the *lectio difficilior*, rather than the variant readings associated with manuscript u.³³

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

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

³² Collins, “Enoch and the Son of Man,” 226: “In the body of the Parables there is no suggestion at all that the Son of Man ever had an earthly career.”

³³ Collins (“Enoch and the Son of Man,” 223–24) also makes a similar argument. See also VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 184.

If this is the case, there is a double background for the figure of Enoch. He is the seventh patriarch, patterned on the seventh antediluvian king Enmeduranki, who was of human descent. He is, however, also a Jewish counterpart of a primeval *apkallu*, sage and priest. The primeval *apkallu* had its origin in the divine realm and visited mankind. When we first meet Enoch in the Book of the Watchers, he stays with the Watchers and holy ones and is sent to the human world. Thus there are multiple links between the preexistence of the Son of Man in the Parables, the pre-creational existence of Wisdom in the Proverbs and the Parables, the divine origin of the *apkallus*, and the transcendent abode of Enoch.³⁴

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

BP's identification of Enoch with the preexistent heavenly messiah resolves a specific tension residing in the earlier Enochic tradition of BW. According to BW, when Enoch ascends to heaven he sees the "Great Glory" seated on a lofty throne (*1 En.* 14:18–20). In spite of Enoch's statement, "And I was unable to see" (14:19), Enoch sees this. He even describes the apparel of the Great Glory: "...his apparel was like the appearance of the sun and whiter than much snow" (14:20). Then Enoch states: "No angel could enter into this house and look at his face because of the splendor and glory, and no human could look at him" (14:21).³⁵ But if Enoch saw the Great Glory, then he must be more than angelic and more than human.³⁶ George Nickelsburg describes this section of BW in contrast to the throne vision of Ezekiel 1–2. Nickelsburg points out that Ezekiel is passive in his encounter with the throne chariot, while Enoch takes an active role, moving through a series of "landmarks" on his journey to the holy of holies.³⁷ When Enoch approaches the throne of the Great Glory, he meets a "boundary" of cherubim. Nickelsburg offers a possible interpretation of this "boundary" of cherubim to be the "guardians" of the divine throne (cf. *1 En.* 71:7). Enoch is not restricted by these guardians. He is invited to come directly

³⁴ Kvanvig, "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch," 206.

³⁵ Cf. the *Mart. Ascen. Isa.* 8:11.

³⁶ Himmelfarb ("Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple," 212) has argued: "Through his participation in the proceedings of the heavenly court, the prophet Isaiah claims for himself the status of an angel. The author of the Book of the Watchers claims angelic status for Enoch through his service in the heavenly temple."

³⁷ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary*, 259.

to the throne (*1 En.* 14:24). In Second Temple period literature this kind of movement through the heavenly places is typically allowed to beings who are considered in some way to be more than human (cf. the *Ascension of Isaiah*). Nickelsburg comments: “it is paradoxical that Enoch gets as far as he does... Enoch’s is a special case. The whole tradition leads us to suppose that it is his special righteousness that enables him to enter God’s presence.”³⁸ BP, on the other hand, attempts to resolve the tension of this paradox by associating Enoch with wisdom and the heavenly Son of Man in such a way that there is ascribed to Enoch (39:8) the same preexistence possessed by both wisdom and the Son of Man (see the discussion in the present chapter, §3.1.4 and §3.1.5).³⁹

3.1.3 A Heavenly Being

That the messiah figure is a heavenly being may by and large be assumed, as I have already argued on the basis of Enoch’s vision coming in the context of his ascent into heaven (*1 En.* 39:3–7). However, there is also in this same text explicit evidence that the messiah figure is a heavenly being. A whirlwind snatched Enoch up “from the face of the earth” and set him down “within the confines of the heavens” (39:3). The narrative continues with Enoch’s description of the dwellings of angels: “And there I saw another vision—the dwellings of the holy ones, and the resting places of the righteous. There my eyes saw their dwellings with his righteous angels and their resting places with the holy ones” (39:4–5). The narrative then describes what the angels in heaven do; they petition and intercede and pray for the sons of men. The narrative then shifts to Enoch’s description of the messiah figure: “And in that place my eyes saw the Chosen One of righteousness and faith... And I saw his dwelling beneath the wings of the Lord of Spirits” (39:6–7). While it may be assumed that the messiah figure is a heavenly being, as I have already argued, this is an explicit statement of the point of view in BP that the messiah figure is a heavenly being.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 269.

³⁹ Rowland (*The Open Heaven*, 106–7) resolves this paradox by making the observation that the authors of BP have made a separation between the throne of glory and the divine figure, and instead have seated the messiah figure on the throne of glory: “In their present form the Similitudes not only give evidence of the transference of divine attributes to another heavenly figure but also identify this heavenly figure with Enoch, who, it was thought, had been taken up to heaven by God without seeing death. Thus the problem of anthropomorphism inherent in the divine throne-theophany is neatly side-stepped by separating the throne of glory from God and making its occupant the glorified Enoch.”

Further evidence that the messiah figure in BP is a distinct heavenly being occurs at *I En.* 46:1–8. Chapter 46 begins as a midrash on Ezek 1:26–28 and Dan 7:9–14.⁴⁰ The book of Ezekiel begins with the prophet experiencing a heavenly vision. Ezekiel sees “the likeness of a throne and upon the likeness of the throne there was a likeness as an appearance of a human being” (Ezek 1:26). Ezekiel explains the vision in the following terms: “the appearance of the likeness of the glory of YHWH” (Ezek 1:28). In Dan 7:9–14 there is another description of a heavenly vision. The author writes: “I was looking, until thrones were placed and the Ancient of Days was seated; his garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head as pure wool” (Dan 7:9). The vision progresses as “one like a son of man was coming and he came to the Ancient of Days and was brought in front of him” (Dan 7:13). This “one like a son of man” does not sit on any of the thrones that were set in place (Dan 7:9). This figure, rather, is “brought in front of” the divine figure, the Ancient of Days. The midrash in BP (*I En.* 46) conflates these two texts (Ezek 1 and Dan 7) by using similar language from each to describe a single event. In BP Enoch sees “one who had a head of days, and his head was like white wool” (*I En.* 46:1). The description of the figure in BP, “head was white like wool,” is almost identical to that of Dan 7, “the hair of his head as pure wool.” The names, however, while similar, are different. In Dan 7 the divine figure who sits on the throne is the Ancient of Days. In BP the divine figure is “one who had a head of days,” who is then referred to in BP as “the Head of Days” (*I En.* 46:2).⁴¹ According to the midrash in BP, “And with him (the one who had a head of days) was another, whose face was like the appearance of a man” (46:1). The language, “like the appearance of a man,” reflects the language describing the figure of Ezek 1:26 who was seated above the likeness of a throne, “a likeness as an appearance of a human being” (דְמוּת כְּמֵרֶאֱהָ אָדָם). The midrash of BP then begins to expand on the biblical texts. The figure “whose face was like the appearance of a man,” also had a face “full of graciousness like one of the holy angels” (*I En.* 46:1). Enoch then asks the angel who is leading him through this vision to give him more information “about that son of man” (*I En.* 46:2), reconnecting the midrash to Dan 7. Enoch wants to know who this figure is, from where he comes, and “why he went with the Head of Days” (*I En.* 46:2). These questions allow the

⁴⁰ See Helge Kvanvig, “Throne Visions and Monsters: The Encounter between Danielic and Enochic Traditions,” *ZAW* 117 (2005): 249–72.

⁴¹ Nickelsburg and VanderKam (*I Enoch: A New Translation*, 59) write: “This verse reflects Dan 7:9, 13, with the term *ancient of days* being changed hereafter to *Head of Days*.”

midrash to expand its description of the Son of Man in Enochic terms beyond the biblical texts. The angel then describes the Son of Man in the following terms: “This is the son of man who has righteousness, and righteousness dwells with him. And all the treasuries of what is hidden he will reveal; for the Lord of Spirits has chosen him, and his lot has prevailed through truth in the presence of the Lord of Spirits forever” (46:3). In addition to the functions of the messiah figure described here (which will be analyzed in a following segment), the nature of the messiah figure as both a human being and a heavenly being is explicit.

Evidence that the messiah figure is a heavenly being may also be identified with the statements in BP that the messiah figure was hidden in the presence of the Lord of Spirits. At 48:6 there is the statement with reference to the Son of Man, that “he was chosen and hidden in his (the Lord of Spirits’) presence before the world was created and forever.” The hiddenness of the Son of Man is reiterated at 62:7: “For from the beginning the Son of Man was hidden, and the Most High preserved him in the presence of his might, and he revealed him to the chosen.” All of this is evidence that the authors of BP considered the messiah figure to be a heavenly being.

3.1.4 Preexistence

These same texts that identify the messiah figure as a heavenly being are also adduced by scholars as evidence that the messiah figure in BP is preexistent.⁴² At *1 En.* 48:2–7 the Son of Man is “named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, and his name before the Head of Days” (48:2–3).⁴³ This passage describes the Son of Man in terms of his preexistence:

⁴² Andrei Orlov reads the evidence in BP in terms of a preexistent Son of Man in contrast to James VanderKam, and Orlov actually refers to the Son of Man as “even possibly a divine being,” although he does not give any further explanation. See VanderKam “Righteous One,” 179–82; and Orlov, “Roles and Titles,” 110–36, esp. 128.

⁴³ This text does not explicitly state what the name is. It may be assumed, however, that the name with which the Son of Man is named is the divine name (יהוה), the tetragram. See Charles A. Gieschen, “The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 238–49. The divine name was so revered in Enochic circles (cf. the frequent ellipsis of the divine name in numerous documents found at Qumran) and among other Jewish groups of the late Second Temple period, that it was often referred to with a locution. Cf. also the later evidence of *3 En.* 12–13 where the name-angel Metatron is referred to as “the lesser YHWH”; translation by Philip S. Alexander in James H. Charlesworth, ed., *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (New York: Doubleday, 1983), 1:265.

“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” (48:3). The evidence limits the Son of Man’s preexistence in BP to a preexistence only in relation to creation, and not an eternal preexistence by which the Son of Man would then be coexistent with or have a nature like the divine figure in BP. Using language similar to that of *1 En.* 48, ch. 62 reads: “For from the beginning the Son of Man was hidden, and the Most High preserved him in the presence of his might, and he revealed him to the chosen. And the congregation of the chosen and the holy will be sown; and all the chosen will stand in his presence on that day” (62:7–8). This statement extends the metaphor by stating explicitly from whom the Son of Man was hidden. The Son of Man was hidden not just “before the world was created” as 48:7 claims, but “from the beginning” of creation he was hidden from those who are not chosen, “the kings and the mighty and all who possess the earth” (62:3–6). It should also be noted that nowhere in BP is it explicitly stated that the preexistent messiah figure was created by the divine figure. It is only stated that the messiah figure “was hidden” and that the divine figure “revealed him.” This is a question for BP that may find its resolution by associating the messiah figure with wisdom.

3.1.5 *Association with Wisdom*

The messiah figure is closely associated with wisdom in BP. In what appears to be the redaction of an earlier wisdom tradition,⁴⁴ the author(s) of BP claimed that wisdom’s dwelling was in heaven:

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

Iniquity went forth from her chambers,
 those whom she did not seek she found,
 and she dwelt among them
 like rain in a desert
 and dew in a thirsty land. (*1 En.* 42:1–2)

⁴⁴ The text of *1 En.* 42:1–2 gives the appearance of having been appended to the end of the first parable of BP (*1 En.* 37–44), along with a segment on astronomical secrets (*1 En.* 41:3–8; 43:1–4; 44:1), all of which do not appear to fit the rest of the narrative of the first parable.

The statement that “Wisdom did not find a place where she might dwell, so her dwelling was in the heaven,” is a somewhat unspecific claim in relation to whether the authors of this tradition understood wisdom to be created by the divine figure. “Wisdom went forth” is more suggestive of the Hellenistic point of view that wisdom was an “emanation” of the divine figure, than the claim of the LXX that wisdom was created: “The Lord created me as the beginning of his ways, for his works” (κύριος ἔκτισεν με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ, Prov 8:22). The authors of BP appear to have taken a polemical tone (see §2.2.2 above) against the Zadokite–Sadducean claim that wisdom resides in the Torah: “Wisdom did not find a place where she might dwell, so her dwelling was in the heaven.” Gabriele Boccaccini describes the polemical nature of this wisdom poem:

The poem of ch. 42 is a direct attack against the sapiential myth of the torah as the earthly embodiment of heavenly wisdom. However, the tradition of Sirach and 1 Baruch may not be the only target. The Enochic poem also denies the suggestion of the Proto-Epistle of Enoch and of the sectarian literature of Qumran that on earth a special group of people have received “wisdom” as a permanent possession.⁴⁵

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

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

On the one hand, as Roland E. Murphy noticed, the unity of wisdom and Torah is the result of a one-way process. “Wisdom dwelling among God’s people is concretized in the Torah. It is not the other way around, as though the eternal pre-existent Torah is now identified with Wisdom.”⁴⁶

Boccaccini calls this “the historical embodiment of the heavenly wisdom.” John J. Collins has taken a similar view with regard to the relationship between wisdom and the Torah in Sirach:

⁴⁵ Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 146. Cf. Sir 24:1–12, 23.

⁴⁶ Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism*, 147. See Roland E. Murphy, “The Personification of Wisdom,” in *Wisdom in Ancient Israel* (ed. John Day, Robert P. Gordon, and H. G. M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 227.

Sirach does not develop the notion of the law as a cosmic principle. There are no poems describing how Torah came forth from the mouth of God or circled the heavens before creation. The point of the identification is to accredit the Torah as the valid concretization (even as the ultimate concretization) of universal wisdom, not to attribute a cosmic role to the Torah itself.⁴⁷

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

The reference to iniquity going forth from her chambers in the second strophe of the poem (*I En.* 42:1–3) is in clear contrast to the movement of wisdom in the first strophe.⁴⁸ From the Enochic point of view it could only make sense that wisdom found no place to dwell in a creation that was totally corrupted by evil. From the Zadokite–Sadducean point of view, on the other hand, the connection between wisdom and Torah was logical, but it was a connection the author(s) of BP resisted. For the Enochians, wisdom resided in heaven, and it was necessary for a mediatorial figure (Enoch) to mediate preexistent heavenly wisdom to the rest of creation. In the Enochic tradition wisdom is usually defined in relation to righteousness, not iniquity. Helge Kvanvig argues that 42:1–3 reads like a “parody of Proverbs,” and he suggests that the reference to “iniquity” going forth “from her chambers” is “a concealed reference to Enoch.”⁴⁹ While Enoch is repeatedly referred to as a righteous person in the Enochic literature (*I En.* 1:2; 12:4; 15:1), the reference to “iniquity” (Enoch) going forth “from her chambers” may conceivably be a vestige of skeptical Wisdom of the second century B.C.E. and the point of view that “there is not a righteous man on earth who does good and never sins” (*Ecccl* 7:20).⁵⁰ It is also worth noting that in BP the human Enoch is not referred to as being “righteous” until *after* his transformation that takes place during his final ascent and identification with the messiah Son of Man figure (*I En.* 71:14, 16). While I agree with Kvanvig that we

⁴⁷ John J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 61.

⁴⁸ Alexander (“Predestination and Free Will,” 27–49) may certainly be correct to suggest that this is a proto-Gnostic myth.

⁴⁹ Kvanvig, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 202.

⁵⁰ There may also be an oblique reference to *I En.* 32:3–6 and a paradise tradition in BW where the “tree of wisdom” gives fruit that imparts “great wisdom,” and Adam and Eve are described as having received wisdom from the tree of wisdom, but iniquity is not mentioned.

should see an association of the human figure Enoch with heavenly wisdom, Kvanvig presses his analysis too far by *identifying* Enoch with wisdom.

A passage in BP specifically referring to Enoch may be adduced as another piece of evidence for the association of the human figure Enoch with preexistent wisdom. Chapter 39 introduces “the Chosen One of righteousness and faith” whose dwelling is “beneath the wings of the Lord of Spirits” (39:6–7). Enoch sees the Chosen One with his own eyes, along with all the righteous and chosen ones who were blessing and praising the name of the Lord of Spirits. Verse 8 has Enoch say in the first person: “There I wished to dwell, and my spirit longed for that dwelling. There my portion (*kefleya*) has been from the first, for thus it has been established concerning me in the presence of the Lord of Spirits” (39:8). The characterization of Enoch’s “spirit” longing “for that dwelling” is probably to be connected with the ascent of Enoch’s “spirit” without his body in ch. 71. The author(s) (or more likely one of the later redactors) of BP wanted the reader to think that there is a natural connection between the human being Enoch and the messiah figure, the Chosen One. The notion of a pre-determined lot (or “portion”—*keff*) for Enoch is a familiar concept in the Enochic tradition (cf. 1QapGen ii 19–21). Kvanvig’s analysis draws connections between wisdom’s “dwelling” or “house” (ביתיה), her “seven pillars,” at Prov 9:1 and the sages or “seven primeval *apkallus*” of Mesopotamian myth.⁵¹ In BP Enoch’s “spirit longed for that dwelling” (*1 En.* 39:8). Enoch confesses: “There my portion has been from the first” (39:8). The expression “from the first” recalls the Mosaic account of the beginning of creation at Gen 1:1, בראשית. It also calls to mind Prov 8:22–31 and all the temporal expressions there. “YHWH acquired me as the first (ראשית) of his acts, before his ancient works. From ancient times I was set up, from the first (מראש) before the earth (בוקדמי-ארץ)” (Prov 8:22–23). The phrase, “from the first” in BP with reference to Enoch suggests the use of some form of ראש or קדם. There is similar language used with reference to the Son of Man in BP, utilizing the same kinds of temporal clauses. “Even before the sun and the constellations were created, before the stars of heaven were made, his name was named before the Lord of Spirits” (*1 En.* 48:3; Prov 8:24–26). This also refers to the hiddenness of the Son of Man before creation: “...he was chosen and hidden in his presence before the world was created and forever” (*1 En.* 48:6).

Then follows the revelation of the Son of Man by wisdom: “And the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits has revealed him to the holy and the

⁵¹ Kvanvig, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 204.

righteous; for he has preserved the portion (*keflomu* > *keff*) of the righteous” (*I En.* 48:7). This is certainly connected to Enoch in ch. 39 and Enoch’s “portion,” which has been “from the first.” The hidden nature of the Son of Man “from the beginning” is again referred to in ch. 62: “For from the beginning the son of man was hidden, and the Most High preserved him in the presence of his might, and he revealed him to the chosen” (*I En.* 62:7). The authors of BP must have intended their readers to draw the connections between these passages describing the preexistence of the Son of Man and the description of Enoch in ch. 39, where his “portion (*kefleya* > *keff*) has been from the first” (39:8).

The association of heavenly wisdom with a human being is a startling Enochic innovation in BP. John J. Collins has stated: “It would seem that Parables here developed the identity of the Son of Man well beyond anything that we found in Daniel, by applying to him language that is elsewhere used of wisdom.”⁵² The fact that the association of heavenly preexistent wisdom with Enoch is by and large an undeveloped concept in BP underscores its novelty to Enochic intellectual speculation. In BW Enoch is a human being who is given privileged access to God’s dwelling in heaven (*I En.* 14:8–16:4). In what appears to be an earlier tradition of BP, the messiah figure (with whom Enoch is later identified at 71:14) is “like one of the holy angels” (46:1). The progression of the development in Enochic speculation is from Enoch being a specially privileged or righteous human (BW) to being like one of the holy angels (earlier tradition of BP) to being associated with preexistent wisdom (a later, less developed tradition of BP). (See the illustration in Table 1.)

Table 1
Development of Enoch’s Status in Enochic Intellectual Speculation

<i>Early Tradition (BW)</i>	<i>Second Stage of the Tradition (BP)</i>	<i>Final Stage of the Tradition (BP)</i>
Enoch as a righteous human being (<i>I En.</i> 1:2)	Enoch like the angels (<i>I En.</i> 39; 46:1)	Enoch identified with preexistent heavenly messiah figure via wisdom (<i>I En.</i> 39:6–8; 42:1–3; 71:14)

Already in the second century B.C.E. Sirach had associated wisdom with the Torah (Sir 24:23). In the first century B.C.E. the Wisdom of Solomon referred to wisdom as an emanation of God, the image of God’s goodness (Wis 7:26). And if the first-century B.C.E. date for BP is to be

⁵² Collins, “Enoch and the Son of Man,” 225.

accepted (as it is assumed here in agreement with the current consensus of Enoch specialists), Philo had not yet presented his concept of wisdom's identification with the divine *Logos*. These various associations of wisdom—with the Torah, with an emanation of God and the image of God's goodness, and with the divine *Logos*—are philosophical, abstract personifications; they are not yet the kind of concrete association of heavenly wisdom with a specific human being that we find for the first time in BP. Personification of wisdom is not the same as associating wisdom with a specific human being. In Jewish philosophical speculation from this period, wisdom is personified in a number of different ways—as agent of God's creative activity, as the image of God, as the *Logos* of God. Yet in some circles of Jewish messianic intellectual traditions from this period, wisdom is associated with specific human beings—Enoch in BP, and Jesus in LP. (See the illustration in Table 2.) At no time before BP had wisdom ever been identified, or at least so closely associated, with a human being.⁵³ The innovation of associating preexistent heavenly wisdom with the human figure Enoch would then give the BP community the necessary justification for identifying Enoch with the preexistent heavenly messiah figure, the Son of Man.

Table 2
Philosophical and Messianic Wisdom Associations

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

⁵³ One might argue that the messiah figure in the *Psalms of Solomon* is associated with wisdom. See *Pss. Sol.* 17. It is the extent of the association of the messiah figure with wisdom in BP that indicates an unprecedented level of development in Jewish thought of this period.

3.1.6 A Righteous Being

The messiah figure in BP is righteous.⁵⁴ In BW Enoch is introduced as “a righteous man whose eyes were opened by God” (*1 En.* 1:2; cf. 15:1). Enoch is also referred to in BW as “righteous scribe” (12:4). In BP the messiah figure is referred to as the “Righteous One” (38:2), and “the Chosen One of righteousness and faith” (39:6). In this latter reference the Chosen One is described with the curious phrase: “and righteousness will be his days.” In terms of his nature, the Son of Man has righteousness and righteousness dwells with him (46:3; 71:14), indicating an identification of the Son of Man with the Righteous One. The “spirit of righteousness” is poured out on the Chosen One when he is seated on the throne of glory, and “righteousness is judged in his presence” (62:2–3). The angel Michael reveals to Enoch “all the secrets of righteousness (71:3), before Enoch is identified as the Son of Man. And at the very point where Enoch is identified with the Son of Man, the angel tells Enoch that he “was born for righteousness, and righteousness dwells on you, and the righteousness of the Head of Days will not forsake you” (71:14, 16).

The first reference to a figure called the Righteous One occurs at *1 En.* 38:2, at the beginning of the first parable (chs. 38–44). VanderKam discusses the text-critical difficulties of reading “righteous one” at 38:2. The best manuscripts read “righteousness,” which according to VanderKam produces a line which makes little sense: “when righteousness appears before the face of the righteous ones.” According to VanderKam, this is why later scribes emended the text to read “righteous one.”⁵⁵ The first parable begins with a scene of judgment, when “the congregation of the righteous appears, and the sinners are judged for their sins” (38:1). At this judgment the “Righteous One appears in the presence of the right-

⁵⁴ There are four instances in BP where a specific figure is referred to as the Righteous One (cf. *1 En.* 38:2; 47:1, 4; 53:6). Two of these references are in the same immediate context. There are 25 references to a figure known as the Chosen One in BP. The first reference to the Chosen One is at 39:6–7. Enoch experiences an ascent into heaven (39:3) where he sees the dwelling of the Chosen One (39:6–7). The Chosen One’s dwelling is “beneath the wings of the Lord of Spirits (39:7), explicitly identifying the Chosen One and the Lord of Spirits as two distinct figures (cf. 39:7; 40:5; 45:3, 4; 49:2–4; 52:9; 61:8; 62:1–2). The Chosen One is explicitly identified with the Righteous One. In a vision Enoch sees the valley where the kings and the mighty are punished: “And after this, the Righteous and the Chosen One will cause the house of his congregation to appear” (53:6). Here “the Righteous and the Chosen One” refer to one and the same figure.

⁵⁵ See VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 170.

eous.” There are two curious uses of the phrase “righteous one” near the beginning of the second parable (chs. 45–57). In ch. 47 “the blood of the righteous one” arises “from the earth into the presence of the Lord of Spirits” (47:1). What is not clear is whether this refers to the blood of one particular figure. In 47:2 the “holy ones who dwell in the heights of heaven” intercede “in behalf of the blood of the righteous that had been shed.” This suggests some sort of social or political persecution, the object of which would have been the community of BP (see 62:11). The angelic prayer was “that judgment might be executed for *them*, and endurance might not be *their* (lot) forever” (emphases added). This is a plural referent suggesting that “the blood of the righteous one” refers to the collective suffering of a particular community. As the scene progresses, the heavenly court assembles. The angels rejoice that the prayer of the righteous had been heard, and that “the blood of the righteous one had been required in the presence of the Lord of Spirits” (47:4). The ambiguity lends itself to at least four possible readings of this text.

The first possibility is that “the righteous one” is a representative figure of a suffering “congregation of the righteous,” as it is referred to in *1 En.* 38:1 (see also *1 En.* 46:8 and 53:2, 7), in much the same way the suffering servant of Isa 53 has been interpreted as a figure representing the entire suffering community of Israel.⁵⁶ A second possible reading is that the “righteous one” of *1 En.* 47:1 and 4 is distinct from the righteous community.⁵⁷ This would then suggest that the suffering is focused in one specific figure, possibly a prominent leader of the community, and that this figure’s blood was “required in the presence of the Lord of Spirits” as an indictment against those who shed his blood.⁵⁸ In this case the

⁵⁶ VanderKam opts for this reading of “righteous one” as a collective designation for the suffering of the community. He argues that the context “strongly suggests... a collective meaning” for the occurrence of “righteous one” at both *1 En.* 47:1 and 47:4. See VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 170. Cf. also VanderKam’s *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 135. See also Black’s discussion in “The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch,” 160–61.

⁵⁷ Black draws attention to the fact that there is an “oscillation” between plural and singular designations in these verses. See *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (New Eng. ed., with Commentary and Textual Notes by M. Black in collaboration with J. C. VanderKam, with an Appendix on the Astronomical Chapters [78–82] by O. Neugebauer; SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 209.

⁵⁸ On this possibility, see E. Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochsbuch* (Skrifter Utgivna av kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet I Lund 41; Lund: Gleerup, 1946), 128–30. This concept of the death of a righteous one indicting those guilty of his death also appears in Wis 4:16–5:8. There apparently was a tradition in this period that referred to the “blood of righteous Abel”; cf. Gen 4:9–10; Matt 23:35; and Heb 12:24.

“righteous one” is clearly a human being. In BW there is a similar idea at work: humans who had been violated by fallen watchers with “much bloodshed on the earth” petitioned the holy ones (angels) to bring their suit to judgment before the Most High (*I En.* 9:1–11). A third reading is possible and this is the most difficult of the four I am proposing here. The “righteous one” of ch. 47 is the Son of Man figure referred to in ch. 46. In 46:3 the Son of Man is described as having “righteousness, and righteousness dwells with him.” This would suggest a connection between the Son of Man and the figure referred to in ch. 47 as “the righteous one.”⁵⁹ The Son of Man is revealed with “the one who had a head of days,” at the judgment of the sinners (45:6–46:1). The theme of judgment is resumed at 47:3–4, where “the Head of Days” has taken his seat “on the throne of his glory,” and the blood of the righteous one has been “required in the presence of the Lord of Spirits.” The Son of Man is described at the beginning of ch. 46 as having a face “like the appearance of a man” (46:1), suggesting that the author of BP thought of the Son of Man figure as a human being, and as a human being capable of suffering. There is nothing in ch. 47 that indicates the suffering of the righteous one to be a “redemptive” suffering. What the blood of 47:4 must signify, according to this reading, is the indictment against those who have rejected the righteous Son of Man and have persecuted the righteous one’s community (cf. 48:10). A fourth reading is possible. References to “the blood of the righteous one” and this blood being “required in the presence of the Lord of Spirits” is a later Christian interpolation, reading back into the text a reference to the execution of the historical Jesus by inserting a specific figure in ch. 47 (the righteous one) and connecting this figure with the Son of Man in ch. 46 via “righteousness” in 46:3. Removal of references to “the blood of the righteous one” in ch. 47 leaves a text that makes sense.

In my opinion the first and the fourth possibilities are the most likely—the first, because nowhere in Jewish literature to this point has the blood of a human messiah figure been “required in the presence of the Lord” or in any other way, and the fourth, because later processes of Ethiopic (or possibly earlier Greek) Christian transmissions of the text very easily could have inserted the phrase, in order to draw a closer connection between the text of *I En.* 46–47 and the historical Jesus. This argument is clarified and strengthened by the fact that the Son of Man epithet first occurs in BP at ch. 46 and appears again immediately following 47:1–4 in 48:1–7 where the Son of Man is named in the presence

⁵⁹ VanderKam suggests this in “Righteous One,” 171.

of the Lord of Spirits. That later Christian scribes might have drawn by interpolation the connection between the “righteous one” of BP and the Son of Man of the canonical Gospel traditions in such a way seems plausible.

A fourth reference to the Righteous One occurs in ch. 53. The Righteous One is identified with the Chosen One (*1 En.* 53:6) in a context of eschatological judgment.⁶⁰ Enoch sees the angels of punishment preparing “all the instruments of Satan,” to punish “the kings and the mighty of this earth” (53:3–5). After the kings and the mighty of the earth perish, “the Righteous and Chosen One will cause the house of his congregation to appear” (53:6).

3.1.7 The Divine Name

The epithet “name of the Lord of Spirits” (*sēm ʾēgziʾa manāfēst*) appears to be a reference to the messiah figure in BP.⁶¹ Nowhere in BP is the name explicitly identified. Knowledge of the name is assumed by the authors of BP. It would seem a fair assumption that this name is the divine name, the tetragram, יהוה.⁶² It was common in Second Temple period texts to provide some sort of locution in place of the divine name יהוה.⁶³ It seems reasonable to assume that the same practice is employed in BP, since nowhere in BP is the divine name explicitly written.

There are several locutions for the divine name in BP—“the name of the Lord” (*1 En.* 39:13; 41:8; 67:3); “my glorious name” (45:3); “his great name,” referring to the Head of Days (55:2); “the name of the eternal Lord,” which is probably a synonym for the name of the Lord of Spirits (58:4); “your blessed name” and “your name,” referring to the name of the Lord of Spirits (61:11–12); and “the name of the Lord of the kings” (63:7).

⁶⁰ See *ibid.*

⁶¹ I include the Name of the Lord of Spirits in my analysis of the messiah figure in BP because of its apparent identification with the Son of Man. There are 26 references to the Name of the Lord of Spirits in BP (with two occurrences in 61:9). See *1 En.* 39:7, 9; 40:6; 41:2; 43:4; 45:1, 2; 46:6, 7, 8; 47:2c; 48:5, 7, 10; 50:2, 3; 53:6; 55:4; 60:6; 61:3, 9, 11, 13; 69:24; 71:17.

⁶² See the discussion by Kvanvig, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 185–87.

⁶³ For examples where ⋯ is written in the place of the divine name יהוה, cf. 1QS viii 14; 4Q175; 4Q176; 4Q462. For examples of paleo-Hebrew of the divine name אה, see 4Q180 i 1; 4Q183; 4Q267 9 iv 4, v 4; 4Q413; 6Q12 iii 4–5. For examples of paleo-Hebrew for the divine name יהוה, cf. 1Q14 i–v 1, 2; 1Q15; 1QpHab iv 17; vi 14; 4Q161 2–4 6, 9; 8–10 12, 13; 4Q171; 4Q183; 11Q5.

Gieschen has given a detailed analysis of the divine name as angelomorphic divine hypostasis. Gieschen points to early references to the divine name, שם יהוה and שם אלהים, in the Hebrew Bible and makes the statement: “The phrases...appear in a variety of ways which are not always easily understood or categorized.”⁶⁴ He points out that the phrases are used in poetic parallelism “as a synonym or alternate title for יהוה.” He also gives evidence for a use of the name in an “instrumental sense,” for example, to ask God’s help “by means of his name.”⁶⁵ The divine name in these texts, according to Gieschen, “is not an hypostasis, but such usage contributed to the development of a Name theology and to its hypostatization in some later texts.”⁶⁶ Gieschen then identifies texts in the Hebrew Bible where these phrases referring to the divine name are more than synonyms of יהוה and are used in more than an instrumental sense: “...they appear as independent subjects of divine action. In such cases the Name should be understood as an hypostasis.”⁶⁷ Gieschen’s analysis has a number of implications for the messiah figure in BP. Referring to *1 En.* 48:2, Gieschen concludes that speculation about the Son of Man figure in this text being a preexistent angelomorphic figure is the result of a development stemming from the understanding in some circles that the preexistent divine name had a cosmogenic function.⁶⁸ This is detailed in BP at *1 En.* 69, where the earth was created by the instrument of “the oath” which is connected to the “secret name.” Gieschen identifies this with the divine name, יהוה.⁶⁹

Parallel connections between the name of the Lord of Spirits and the Son of Man in BP warrant careful attention.⁷⁰ According to *1 En.* 48:5 the Son of Man will be worshiped by all who dwell on the earth. “All who dwell on the earth will fall down and worship before him, and they will glorify and bless and sing hymns to the name of the Lord of Spirits.” In the first half, the object is “him,” referring to the Son of Man of vv. 2–4. In the second half the object is “the name of the Lord of Spirits.” The

⁶⁴ Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 71.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ *Ibid.* Here Gieschen references the work of O. Grether, *Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament* (BZAW 64; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1934), 1–58; and T. N. D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (ConBOT 18; Lund: Gleerup, 1982), 129–32.

⁶⁸ Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 77.

⁶⁹ See also Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord*, 257–59.

⁷⁰ Gieschen draws this connection between the name of the Lord of Spirits and the Son of Man figure in BP. See his essay, “The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 238–49.

parallelism suggests a synonymous connection between the two objects of each colon (cp. how the Lord of Spirits is worshiped at 57:3).⁷¹ Note how the glorifying and the blessing and the singing of hymns “to the name of the Lord of Spirits” is immediately preceded by all who dwell on the earth falling down and worshiping “before him,” that is, before the messiah figure, the Son of Man. *First Enoch* 48:2–7 is filled with references to the Son of Man figure, as both the subject and the object of active verbs. In fact, this passage begins with the explicit “naming” of the Son of Man in the presence of the Lord of Spirits (48:2–3). The evidence is very strong in ch. 48 for the identification of the Son of Man figure with the Name of the Lord of Spirits. This same kind of parallelism occurs in ch. 46 where the Son of Man is first introduced in BP. The worship of the Son of Man is stated in the negative in this case. The Son of Man “will overturn the kings from their thrones and their kingdoms, *because they do not exalt him or praise him*, or humbly acknowledge whence the kingdom was given to them” (46:4–5; emphasis added). This is paralleled in the immediately following verse: “Darkness will be their (the kings’) dwelling, and worms will be their couch, and they will have no hope to rise from their couches, *because they do not exalt the name of the Lord of Spirits*” (46:6; emphasis added). The first causal phrase, “because they do not exalt him (the Son of Man) or praise him (the Son of Man)” parallels the second causal phrase, “because they do not exalt the name of the Lord of Spirits.” Again the parallelism between the objects of the two causal phrases suggests a synonymous connection between the Son of Man and the Name of the Lord of Spirits.

This understanding of the Name of the Lord of Spirits, as an epithet for the messiah figure, would have implications for understanding the many other occurrences of the expression in BP. In *1 En.* 39:6–8, for example, Enoch sees the dwelling of the Chosen One “beneath the wings of the Lord of Spirits.” The focus of this part of the vision of Enoch’s first ascent is on the Chosen One and his dwelling. Enoch also sees “the righteous and chosen” whose “mouths were full of blessing, and their lips praised the name of the Lord of Spirits. And righteousness did not fail before him, nor did truth fail before him.” The connection between “righteousness” and “truth” and the “name of the Lord of Spirits” also occurs in ch. 71 where righteousness and truth characterize the figure Enoch who has just been identified with the messiah Son of Man figure (71:14–17): “You are that son of man who was born for righteousness,

⁷¹ VanderKam (“Righteous One,” 170–71) uses parallelism to argue for a synonymous connection between the prayers of the righteous ones and the blood of the righteous one at *1 En.* 47:1.

and righteousness dwells on you, and the righteousness of the Head of Days will not forsake you” (71:14); “And thus there will be length of days with that son of man, and there will be peace for the righteous, and the path of truth for the righteous, in the name of the Lord of Spirits forever and ever” (71:17). Identifying the messiah figure with “the name of the Lord of Spirits” in this way offers new and interesting possibilities for interpreting the messiah figure in BP both in terms of nature and functions.

3.1.8 *The “Son of Man” Title*

The epithet “Son of Man” is clearly identified with the messiah figure in BP. There are numerous references to the Son of Man figure in BP.⁷² Any analysis of the messiah figure in BP must be clear about what is meant by the epithet “Son of Man.” The phrase itself is not without ambiguities. Sometimes it is used to refer to a messiah figure. Other times it is used to refer to a single human being (cf. *1 En.* 60:10 where Noah is referred to as “son of man” in a sense similar to Ezekiel’s use of the phrase),⁷³ or in the plural to refer to human beings in general (“sons of men”).⁷⁴ It is interesting to note that all of these latter references to human beings in general occur in what appear to be earlier traditions which have been redacted into the text of BP—a tradition about wisdom (42:2), and various traditions about the watchers (39:1; 69:6, 8, 12, 13). It should also be noted that the Son of Man was “chosen” by the Lord of Spirits (46:3; 48:6), which indicates an identification of the Son of Man with the Chosen One.⁷⁵

⁷² See *1 En.* 46:1–8; 48:2–7; 62:1–8, 9, 14; 63:11; 69:26–29; 70:1; 71:14, 17. It should at least be noted here that there are no uses of the epithet Son of Man anywhere in the first parable (*1 En.* 38–44), although VanderKam (“Righteous One,” 178–79) suggests that there are two puns on “Son of Man” in the genealogy of 37:1. Kvanvig raises the question of the identity of the Son of Man in ch. 71 by examining the various Ethiopic titles (there are three distinct ones), which are invariably translated into English as the Son of Man. On the basis of these Kvanvig argues that there should be two additional messianic titles associated with BP, namely, “Son of Adam” and “Son of the Mother of the Living.” See Kvanvig’s “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” 193–95, esp. 195.

⁷³ The reference to Noah as “son of man” at *1 En.* 60:10 is a vocative, very much akin to the “son of man” vocatives throughout the entire book of Ezekiel. Cf., e.g., Ezek 2:1–8; 3:1–11; 4:1; 5:1; 6:1; 7:1; 8:5–17; 11:2, 15, etc.

⁷⁴ See the brief discussion by Sabino Chialà, “The Son of Man: The Evolution of an Expression,” in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 153–78, esp. 154–56.

⁷⁵ See VanderKam, “Righteous One,” 172.

Casey's analysis of "Son of Man" in BP warrants some attention here.⁷⁶ Casey presents several examples of the use of the Aramaic term, בר (א)נש(א), in Jewish literature from the Hebrew Bible, BW, Targums, the Peshitta, and the Talmuds. Casey concludes from his survey:

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

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

I have found over 30 examples of general statements using בר (א)נש(א) with reference to the speaker, or a group of people including the speaker, or someone else made obvious by the context... It follows that when examples of this idiomatic usage emerge from the reconstruction of

⁷⁶ Casey, *The Solution to the "Son of Man" Problem*, 91–111. There is an impressive bibliography of Casey's work on the phrase "son of man." See the following works by P. M. Casey: "The Son of Man Problem," *ZNW* 67 (1976): 147–54; "The Use of the Term 'son of man' in the Similitudes of Enoch," *JSJ* 7 (1976): 11–29; "The Corporate Interpretation of 'one like a son of man' at the Time of Jesus," *NovT* 18 (1976): 167–80; *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1980); "Aramaic Idiom and Son of Man Sayings," *ExpT* 96 (1984–85): 233–36; "The Jackals and the Son of Man (Matt. 8:20/Luke 9:58)," *JSNT* 23 (1985): 3–22; "General, Generic and Indefinite: The Use of the Term 'Son of Man' in Aramaic Sources and in the Teaching of Jesus," *JSNT* 29 (1987): 21–56; "Method in Our Madness, and Madness in Their Methods: Some Approaches to the Son of Man Problem in Recent Scholarship," *JSNT* 42 (1991): 17–43; "The Use of the Term בר (א)נש(א) in the Aramaic Translations of the Hebrew Bible," *JSNT* 54 (1994): 87–118; "Idiom and Translation: Some Aspects of the Son of Man Problem," *NTS* 41 (1995): 164–82; *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel* (SNTSMS 102; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); *An Aramaic Approach to Q: Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke* (SNTSMS 122; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); "Aramaic Idiom and the Son of Man Problem: A Response to Owen and Shepherd," *JSNT* 25 (2002): 3–32; "The Aramaic Background of Mark 9:11: A Response to J. K. Aitken," *JTS* 55 (2004): 92–102.

Aramaic sources from our Gospel sayings, they should be accepted as genuine examples of this idiom. This will entail that they have to some extent a kind of general level of meaning.⁷⁷

Casey's methodology, in this section of his analysis at least, is correct. He analyzes the expression $\text{בר } (\text{א})\text{נש } (\text{א})$ linguistically and he reads the expression in the varying contexts in which it appears. The problem with Casey's conclusion, however, is that he has excluded from his analysis (in this particular segment of his book) uses of the term "son of man" in BP. Casey analyzes the "son of man" figure in BP in a later segment of his book, indicating the special treatment he wishes to give the expression as it occurs in BP.

Before analyzing the "son of man" in BP, Casey surveys the interpretation of Dan 7:14 in the Syrian Christian tradition and in Jerome's commentary on Daniel. He argues that there were essentially two strands of interpretation of Dan 7 in early Christian thought, the Syrian tradition that read the "son of man" in Dan 7:13–14 as a symbol of the people of Israel, and Jerome who read the "son of man" in Dan 7:13–14 as a messiah figure. After surveying the evidence, including his careful reading of Dan 7, Casey concludes: "It follows that Dan 7 itself does not provide any kind of evidence of the existence of a Son of Man Concept in Second Temple Judaism."⁷⁸ While this conclusion of Casey's is accurate to the extent that it is applied to the actual text of Dan 7, it makes no sense to apply the findings of his exegesis of Dan 7 more broadly to include "Second Temple Judaism." Casey then analyzes the evidence in BP. He begins his analysis by highlighting what he considers later Christian usage of the term "son of man" as a conceptual fabrication that reads Gospel references back into BP, using as evidence the first English translation of BP by R. Laurence in 1821:⁷⁹

For example, in the first English translation in 1821, Laurence expressed the opinion that this work repeatedly refers to the nature and character of 'the Messiah', even though the term *mas(h)ihu* occurs only twice (*1 En.* 48:10; 52:4). This was because the term 'Messiah' was so widespread in the Judaeo-Christian tradition that it was the natural term for scholars such as Laurence to use when they sought to label this figure.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ Casey, *The Solution to the "Son of Man" Problem*, 80–81. This is the conclusion to Casey's analysis of Aramaic texts containing the expression $\text{בר } (\text{א})\text{נש } (\text{א})$ on pp. 56–81.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 82–91, esp. 91.

⁷⁹ R. Laurence, *The Book of Enoch the Prophet...Now First Translated from an Ethiopic Manuscript in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford: Parker, 1821).

⁸⁰ Casey, *The Solution to the "Son of Man" Problem*, 92.

By dismissing the importance of the term “messiah” in BP because it “occurs only twice,” Casey establishes quantitative value as part of his methodology for his analysis of the “son of man” expression in BP. This is problematic, however, because in his survey of Aramaic usage in Jewish documents, quantitative value, or the number of occurrences in a single document, was not part of his methodology. This renders the methodology Casey employs for his analysis of BP inconsistent with the rest of his approach. Casey then questions the capitalization of the phrase “son of man” in early translations by Laurence, Hoffman, Dillman, and Charles, insisting that their translations read back into the text a later Christianized messianic concept. Casey even quotes R. H. Charles, who confidently stated: “‘The Son of Man’ was ‘a definite title’, and ‘the source of the New Testament designation.’”⁸¹ This actually is the central criticism of Casey’s study. Casey excoriates previous scholars of BP who assumed some connection between the Greek phrase ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and the Ethiopic “son of man.” Casey even makes the absolute claim: “There is however no evidence that there ever was a Greek version of the *Similitudes of Enoch*.”⁸² Casey is quite right about this. He also states: “The Greek versions of some parts of *1 Enoch* are very valuable, but there is no trace of a Greek version of the *Similitudes*.”⁸³ This is after Casey has claimed that the original text of BP was in Aramaic, basing his assertion on the presence of Aramaic fragments of other Enochic texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls: “There should be no doubt that this source was in Aramaic. We now know from the Dead Sea Scrolls that most of *1 Enoch* was written in Aramaic, because this is the language of the extant fragments.”⁸⁴ While Casey is willing to allow for an Aramaic original of BP based on extant fragments of other Enochic texts found at Qumran, even though BP itself was not found at Qumran and even though there are no extant Aramaic fragments of BP, he is not willing to allow for the possibility that there might have been a Greek version of BP with ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου as a translation of the Aramaic phrase בְּרַ (א)נְשׂ(א) (א), and which would have formed the basis for the expression ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in the canonical Gospels. Casey simply dismisses this, even ridicules it, as a possibility. Casey is inconsistent in his approach on this point. While much of Casey’s analysis focuses on the hard data of Aramaic and Ethiopic sources, Casey’s argument is primarily rhetorical, manipulating the evidence in defense of his assumption,

⁸¹ Ibid., 93.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Ibid., 97.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 95–96.

namely, that the phrase “son of man” in BP is not titular, but only reflects the Aramaic use of בֵּר (א)נִשְׂ(א) , as a generalized reference to a human being. This is the only possible meaning of the phrase that Casey is willing to allow. Casey then details some of the Ethiopic texts referring to the “son of man” figure, retrofitting these texts into what Casey calls his “properly reconstructed” version of a possible Aramaic *Grundschrift*.⁸⁵ Casey’s conclusion to this entire segment makes the claim:

The study of the *Similitudes of Enoch* has been made very difficult by the fact that it has survived only in Ge‘ez, and in a very corrupt textual tradition at that. Careful study of Aramaic source material which can be recovered from the oldest manuscripts has shown that בֵּר (א)נִשְׂ(א) was used in the original text of this work in the same way as it is used in extant Aramaic texts, as a normal term for ‘man’.⁸⁶

Casey’s conclusion regarding the “son of man” in BP is problematic for several reasons. First, Casey demonstrates that he misunderstands that *I Enoch* is a compilation of documents composed between the fourth (probably the fifth) and the first centuries B.C.E. At the very least, Casey has ignored this crucial fact in his analysis of the “son of man” in BP. Casey also does not take into consideration what might be viewed as a development of mediatorial traditions of a growing diversity within Enochic Judaism. While Casey draws on Aramaic evidence in Enochic texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls to define the use of “son of man” in BP, no fragment of BP was found at Qumran, which suggests that its authors were not connected to, and very likely were in ideological discontinuity with, the community that produced the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁸⁷ If the “study of the *Similitudes of Enoch* has been made very difficult by the fact that it has survived only in Ge‘ez,” as Casey claims, this in any case does not excuse us from making sense of the “son of man” expression as we have it in BP. The very premise on which Casey makes his study, that an Aramaic expression בֵּר (א)נִשְׂ(א) underlies the Greek expression $\acute{\omicron}\ \upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\delta\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, as we have it in the Gospels, does not prevent Casey from engaging in a detailed, in-depth analysis elsewhere in his study. But when it comes to the “son of man” in BP, when the evidence unravels Casey’s thesis, Casey is prepared to ignore the evidence or treat it differently from his treatment of the evidence in other primary sources.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 97–110.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 114.

⁸⁷ Much has been made of this observation in the past. The absence of BP from the Dead Sea Scrolls, among other reasons, led Josef T. Milik to date BP to the late third century C.E., much later than most scholars today will date it. See the discussion by Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 131–32, 144–49.

The fact that Casey's analysis began with the assumption that there can be only one legitimate use of a particular phrase or term, and that there can be no development of its use by different authors at different times (or even in the same period) is problematic.⁸⁸ Casey begins his analysis by presenting the development of later Christian understanding of the phrase "son of man" and how this did not at all correspond to the use of the phrase in earlier Jewish texts. This demonstrates the beginning prejudice of Casey's analysis. He is certainly correct in the sense that we must not read the theology of later Christian fathers back into earlier Jewish texts. That does not preclude, however, the possibility that there could be different uses of the phrase by different Jewish authors from roughly the same period. Even within BP itself, as demonstrated above, there were three uses of the phrase "son of man," one with reference to an individual human being, one with reference to humanity in general⁸⁹—the only two uses Casey accepts in all texts—and one with reference to the messiah figure. The use of the phrase as a reference to an individual human being or to humanity in general does not preclude the use of the phrase as a titular reference to the messiah figure.

As detailed as Casey's analysis is, his study still begs the question whether the Aramaic **בֶּר (א)נְשִׁי (א)** can only be a generalized reference to a human being also in BP. In his analysis of *1 En.* 48:2–7a, for example, Casey does mention (only parenthetically) that the preexistence of the "son of man" figure is strongly implied at 48:3, but he uncharacteristically offers no detailed discussion.⁹⁰ Preexistence is an attribute that in no way can be admitted as part of ordinary human experience, an attribute of the "son of man" figure in BP that essentially undermines Casey's complex and detailed argument. Casey also ignored a key biblical text midrashed in BP that identifies the "son of man" figure as more than human. Casey does not deal with Ezek 1 anywhere in his analysis. Ezekiel 1 describes the prophet's experience by the River Chebar during the exile (Ezek 1:1). There Ezekiel claims, "I saw visions of God." The description of the vision begins with "a stormy wind" coming out of the north (Ezek 1:4). It is a theophanic description reminiscent of the glory

⁸⁸ Here one only needs to examine the different uses of the term *δικαιοῦν* in the Letters of Paul and in the Letter of James (2:24). While Paul insisted that a person is justified apart from the works of the law, James used the term *δικαιοῦν* to make the claim that a person *demonstrates* by his actions that he has been justified. Both of these uses of *δικαιοῦν* appear in 1 Clem 30:3 and 38:2. I am grateful to David Maxwell for pointing out the Clement references.

⁸⁹ Casey (*The Solution to the "Son of Man" Problem*, 63) uses *1 En.* 22:3 as evidence for his understanding of 'son of man' throughout BP.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 101.

of YHWH at the time of the exodus from Egypt. Ezekiel describes “a huge cloud and rolling fire, and brightness surrounding it, and in the midst of the fire something like a flash of metal” (Ezek 1:4). There is then a description of “a likeness of four living beings (דמוות ארבע חיות). And this was their appearance (מראיהן): they had a likeness of a human being (דמוות אדם להנה), and each one had four faces, and each one of them had four wings” (Ezek 1:5–6). The text then provides detailed descriptions of the four living creatures, followed by a description of wheels encircled by eyes that accompany the movements of the four creatures. After this there is a description of two levels projected above the heads of the four creatures: “And over the heads of the living beings was the likeness of a firmament (ודמוות על-ראשי החיה רקיע), flashing like ice, as a spreading flame over their heads, right on top of them” (Ezek 1:22). This is followed by a description of another level above the firmament, inhabited by another figure who is distinct from the four living beings:

And immediately above the firmament which was over their heads there was a likeness of a throne (דמוות כסא), with the appearance of a sapphire. And above the likeness of the throne (דמוות הכסא) was a likeness with the appearance of a human being (דמוות כמראה אדם) upon it, right on top of it. And I saw a flash of metal with the appearance of fire (כמראה-אש) within it, around what appeared to be his waist upward, and from what appeared to be his waist downward I saw as to its appearance fire (כמראה-אש), and brightness around him. Like the appearance of the bow (כמראה הקשת) that is in the cloud on a rainy day, so was the appearance of the brightness (כן מראה הננה) all around. (Ezek 1:26–28)

Then the prophet makes the identification of what he has just seen with the divine presence: “the appearance itself being a likeness of the glory of YHWH” (הוא מראה דמוות כבוד-יהוה), Ezek 1:28; cf. also Ezek 3:12, 23). The repeated references to “a likeness” (דמוות) and “what had the appearance of” (מראה) was obviously the prophet’s attempt to describe a phenomenon that had no earthly reality. Ezekiel saw “a likeness with the appearance of a human being (דמוות כמראה אדם),” which he equated with “the appearance...of a likeness of the glory of YHWH” (מראה דמוות כבוד-יהוה).

Casey ignored this text in his analysis, even though Ezek 1 is one of the central biblical texts, in addition to Dan 7, for understanding the “son of man” figure in BP. Not only is Ezek 1 an essential part of the midrash on the messiah figure in *1 En.* 46, as was pointed out in the analysis above (see §3.1.3), it is also to be considered in what follows in chs. 48 and 49. The detailed description of the messiah figure in *1 En.* 46:1–6 includes the language, “whose face was like the appearance of a man,”

language that resonates immediately with Ezek 1:26, “a likeness with the appearance of a human being.” Following this is a description of the kings and the strong ones of the earth who are punished by the messiah figure “because they do not exalt the name of the Lord of Spirits” (*1 En.* 46:6–8). This is then followed in ch. 47 by the contrasting description of the “prayers of the righteous” and “the holy ones who dwell in the heights of heaven” who were unanimously “glorifying and praising and blessing the name of the Lord of Spirits” (*1 En.* 47:1–2c). Following this is a description of a judgment scene and Enoch’s vision of the Head of Days taking his seat on the throne of his glory, “and the books of the living were opened in his presence, and all his host, which was in the heights of heaven, and his court, were standing in his presence” (*1 En.* 47:2d–3). This is a midrash of Dan 7:9–10 which, like *1 En.* 47:2d–3, includes the Ancient of Days (Head of Days in BP) seated on his throne, the gathering of his court, and the opening of “the books.” Following this judgment scene in ch. 47 is a lengthy and detailed description of the messiah figure in ch. 48. This is introduced by a reference to the “spring of righteousness” and the “many springs of wisdom” and the access the righteous have to this wisdom (*1 En.* 48:1).⁹¹ This is then immediately followed by a description of the preexistent “son of man,” who “was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits...before the sun and the constellations were created, before the stars of heaven were made” (*1 En.* 48:2). The Son of Man figure is then described in strong messianic terms reminiscent of Isaiah (Isa 11:2; 49:5–10):

He will be a staff for the righteous,
 that they may lean on him and not fall;
 And he will be the light of the nations,
 and he will be a hope for those who grieve in their hearts.
 All who dwell on the earth will fall down and worship before him,
 and they will glorify and bless and sing hymns to the name of the Lord
 of Spirits.
 For this (reason) he was chosen and hidden in his presence
 before the world was created and forever.
 And the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits has revealed him to
 the holy and the righteous;
 for he has preserved the portion of the righteous.
 For they have hated and despised this age of unrighteousness;
 Indeed, all its deeds and its ways they have hated in the
 name of the Lord of Spirits.
 For in his name they are saved,
 and he is the vindicator of their lives. (*1 En.* 48:4–7)

⁹¹ Cf. Philo, *Fug.* 177–201.

The same themes of springs of water and the concept of a figure that is chosen and hidden in Isa 49 are also included in *1 En.* 48 in the description of the messiah figure. This is followed by a description of the dejected attitude of the kings and “the strong who possess the earth” at the time of their judgment (48:8–10). This includes the first explicit reference to the “Anointed One” in BP: “And on the day of their distress...there will be no one to take them with his hand and raise them. For they have denied the Lord of Spirits and his Anointed One” (48:10). This clearly refers to Ps 2, where the kings of the earth and the rulers are described as conspiring “against YHWH and against his anointed” (Ps 2:2). Then follows a description of the glory of the Chosen One in the presence of the Lord of Spirits:

For wisdom has been poured out like water,
and glory will not fail in his presence forever and ever.
For he is mighty in all the secrets of righteousness;
and unrighteousness will vanish like a shadow,
and will have no place to stand.
For the Chosen One has taken his stand in the presence of
the Lord of Spirits;
and his glory is forever and ever,
and his might, to all generations. (*1 En.* 49:1–2)

Here the statement that “the Chosen One has taken his stand in the presence” of the divine figure is an interpretive depiction of the scene in Dan 7:13–14, where the one like a son of man is summoned to stand before YHWH and is not sitting on one of the thrones in the court of the Ancient of Days. This is notable because in the immediate context of chs. 48 and 49 of BP the Chosen One does not sit on a throne. It is the Head of Days who is seated on his throne in heaven (*1 En.* 47:3). The Chosen One is not seated on the throne until *1 En.* 51:3 (with the reference to the Chosen One sitting on the throne in *1 En.* 45:3 looking forward to 51:3). It should also be noted that the author of BP had a tendency to conflate the images of Ezek 1 and Dan 7, and that the references to glory in this text are intended to recall the angelomorphic figure of Ezek 1 and this figure’s manifestation of the *chabod* YHWH. The author(s) of BP clearly intended this figure to be understood as more than human.

There appear to be two layers of tradition in the block of material between *1 En.* 45:1–51:5b. One layer of tradition involves the Chosen One. This includes an introduction, three segments that have been separated by a redactor, and a conclusion: introduction (45:1–6 and 46:7–8), segment 1 (47:1–4), segment 2 (48:8–10), segment 3 (50:1–5), and

conclusion (51:1–5b). All of these sections are connected by the Chosen One sitting on the throne (45:3 and 51:3), which seems to bookend this part of the second parable. They are also connected by references to the salvation of the persecuted righteous ones and the judgment of the sinners and the unrepentant. All of the sections, 47:1–4, 48:8–10, and 50:1–5, are introduced by the phrase, “In those days...” And the concluding section also is introduced by, “In those days...” These sections, with the introduction to the second parable at 45:1–6, constitute the earlier strand of tradition regarding the Chosen One. It should also be noted that the reference to the “Anointed One” (*masih*) at *1 En.* 48:10 is part of the earlier tradition. Inserted into this earlier strand of tradition regarding the Chosen One are later redactions that link wisdom to the “Son of Man” figure (46:1–6; 48:1–7; 49:1–4). While the Chosen One in the rest of BP is in fact a heavenly figure who sits on the throne of the divine figure and executes judgment, nowhere is the Chosen One referred to as preexistent or connected to wisdom in any way. I take the reference to wisdom going forth from the mouth of the Chosen One as he sits on the throne in 51:3 to be part of the later redaction that attempted to connect the Son of Man messiah figure with wisdom.⁹²

Having established the relationships between these layers of tradition in the first half of the second parable, this brings us back to *1 En.* 49:1–4, especially 49:1–2 where “wisdom is poured out like water” and “the Chosen One has taken his stand in the presence of the Lord of Spirits.” While there is not a direct link to Ezek 1 and the glory of YHWH described there, the references to glory and the heavenly figure, the Chosen One, in *1 En.* 49 are strongly suggestive of Ezek 1 and the more-than-human heavenly figure described there. Maurice Casey, in his analysis of *1 En.* 62:1–9, acknowledges that the Chosen One is to be equated with the “son of man” figure: “Given the context, it is clear that throughout this passage the term ‘son of man’ refers to the ‘Chosen One.’”⁹³ The move from “a likeness with the appearance of a human being” in Ezekiel to “one like a son of man” in Daniel to “son of man” in BP is intended to present a messiah figure who possesses all the attributes of Ezek 1 and Dan 7, but who is now identified by the more abbreviated Aramaic (translated into Ethiopic, probably via Greek) locution, “son of man.” It is in effect a move from the more generalized Aramaic expression, **בַּר אֱנוֹשׁ (א)**, to one that has a specialized meaning in BP, without losing the usage of the expression in its general sense elsewhere.

⁹² This also appears to be what has happened in *1 En.* 39:6–8, where Enoch’s preexistence is connected to the figure of the Chosen One.

⁹³ Casey, *The Solution to the “Son of Man” Problem*, 102.

In some respects Casey is guilty of the very thing he criticizes. While Christian tradition has read back into the “son of man” expression in BP the christological interpretations of second-century fathers, Casey reads forward into the “son of man” expression in BP only a single, specific use of the phrase **בַּר אֱנוֹשׁ** in other Aramaic texts. Casey has not taken into consideration the important evidence that the “son of man” expression in BP is developed by midrashing Ezek 1 as well as Dan 7, and that the Son of Man figure in BP is clearly more than just a human being. He is also a preexistent heavenly messiah figure who functions as the eschatological judge (see below). So, the problem is not as simple as determining whether the Aramaic phrase **בַּר אֱנוֹשׁ** can mean in general a human being. We must also take into consideration all of the elements of the nature and the functions of the Son of Man in BP. Taken together, these are what should lead us to conclude that “Son of Man” is a title in BP.

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

3.2 Functions of the Messiah Figure in the *Parables of Enoch*

Concerning the functions of the messiah figure in BP, there is plenty of evidence that lends itself to detailed analysis. The purpose of this analysis is to identify specific functions of the messiah figure which may be compared to the functions of the divine figure in BP (and which in Chapter 6 will be compared to the functions of the messiah figure in the Letters of Paul). Such a comparison will help us to understand in precise detail the relationship between the messiah figure and the divine figure in BP. Functions of the messiah figure in BP may be identified in terms of revelation of wisdom, salvation, judgment, and worship.

3.2.1 Revelation of Wisdom

One of the functions of the messiah figure in BP is the revelation of wisdom to humans. From the beginning of BP it is clear that the author wants the reader to read this as a wisdom text—“The vision of wisdom that Enoch saw (*rāya tēbab za-rēya henok*)... This is the beginning of

the words of wisdom, which I took up to recount to those who dwell on the earth... [L]et us not withhold the beginning of wisdom... Until now there had not been given from the presence of the Lord of Spirits such wisdom as I have received according to my insight” (*1 En.* 37:1–5).⁹⁴ Surprisingly, after the introductory section there are only a few references to wisdom in BP that are directly related to the messiah figure. The Son of Man will reveal “all the treasures of what is hidden” (46:3; cf. 60:10). The Son of Man is revealed by wisdom (48:7). The spirit of wisdom dwells in the Chosen One (49:3). The Lord of Spirits has given to the Chosen One “all the secrets of wisdom” which “will go forth from the counsel of his mouth” (51:3). Regardless of the fact that wisdom is only rarely mentioned in connection with the messiah figure in BP, the revelation of wisdom to humans is clearly one of the functions of the messiah figure. According to Boccaccini, it is possible to read the concept of wisdom and its relation to the messiah figure in BP as a response to the earlier traditions about wisdom found in Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon. In the Wisdom of Solomon wisdom takes a direct salvific role, while in Sirach wisdom’s salvific role is indirect, realized through observance of the priestly law. Boccaccini suggests that a “scenario of integration of Sapiential and Messianic Paradigms seems to be the most likely setting for the composition of the Parables of Enoch.”⁹⁵ Boccaccini observes that BP preserves “the earlier Enochic tradition that Enoch is the recipient of revelation and the messenger of revealed wisdom for the chosen.” The preservation of the earlier tradition

creates an internal tension within the Enochic system, due to the presence of two mediators (Enoch and the Messiah) who are both in heaven and are both recipients and revealers of wisdom. This tension (and the danger of a disruptive competition between the two revealers) is finally resolved by identifying Enoch with the Son of Man (71:14). Now we can have a better understanding why Enoch received and will reveal wisdom—it is because he is the Messiah.⁹⁶

The identification of Enoch with the Son of Man, in my opinion, does not resolve the tension; it only highlights the tension, as recent scholarly discussion about the relationship between *1 En.* 71:14 and the rest of BP demonstrates. As I have already argued above (cf. §3.1.5), the tension is resolved by BP in a more subtle way. In order for Enoch to be identified with the messiah figure, Enoch must be more than a recipient of

⁹⁴ On wisdom as a conceptual paradigm related to the messiah figure in BP, see Boccaccini, “Finding a Place for the Parables of Enoch,” 274–77.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 276.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 276–77.

revelation who then reveals wisdom to others. BP attempts to make the identification of Enoch with the messiah Son of Man more palpable by attempting to associate the human Enoch with preexistent wisdom. Boccaccini argues: “Although the language of wisdom may have influenced the concept of the preexistence and role of the Son of Man, in the Parables neither the Messiah Son of Man nor Enoch is identified with the divine Wisdom of God. The heavenly Enoch is the herald and messenger of the divine Wisdom, not its incarnation.”⁹⁷ Boccaccini is correct to point out that the association of Enoch with wisdom in BP does not constitute an “incarnation” of wisdom. The language of BP is not an attempt to lower wisdom to dwell among humans (42:1–3). It is an attempt to exalt the human Enoch, who must be stripped of his flesh and whose spirit must be transformed (71:11), in order for him finally to attain to his heavenly dwelling (which has been his all along from the beginning). This is the opposite of “incarnation.” Then and only then can Enoch be identified with the messiah figure, the Son of Man (71:14), and consequently function in his role as revealer of wisdom.

3.2.2 *Salvation*

Salvation is another key function of the messiah figure in BP. While this might seem to be an obvious function of the messiah figure in BP, it warrants a brief look. The role of salvation is evident in the description of the messiah figure in *1 En.* 48, where the Son of Man’s name was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits (48:2). This is followed by a description of the messiah figure who is the subject of several statements. (This passage was already quoted above, but it is necessary to quote it again here to make a different point.) *First Enoch* 48:4–7 reads:

He will be a staff for the righteous,
 that they may lean on him and not fall;
 And he will be the light of the nations,
 and he will be a hope for those who grieve in their hearts.
 All who dwell on the earth will fall down and worship before him,
 and they will glorify and bless and sing hymns to the
 name of the Lord of Spirits.
 For this (reason) he was chosen and hidden in his presence
 before the world was created and forever.
 And the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits has revealed him to
 the holy and the righteous;
 for he has preserved the portion of the righteous.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 277.

For they have hated and despised this age of unrighteousness;
 Indeed, all its deeds and its ways they have hated in the
 name of the Lord of Spirits.
 For in his name they are saved,
 and he is the vindicator of their lives.

Here, the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits has revealed the messiah figure to the holy and the righteous. This revelation of the messiah figure leads the holy and the righteous to hate the deeds of the age of unrighteousness “in the name of the Lord of Spirits. For in his name they are saved” (48:7).

A similar eschatological judgment scenario is described in ch. 50, where having a repentant disposition is connected to the righteous having salvation “in the name of the Lord of Spirits.” *First Enoch* 50:1–5 reads:

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

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

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

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

One last reference to the salvation of the righteous and the chosen should be examined. This occurs at *1 En.* 62:13, after it is revealed to the kings and the mighty of the earth that the Chosen One is seated on the throne of the divine figure to execute their judgment (62:1–2). The word that goes forth from the mouth of the Chosen One “will slay all the sinners, and all the unrighteous will perish from his presence” (62:2). The kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who possess the earth will experience pain and they will be terrified when they recognize the Chosen One on the throne, and the Chosen One will judge them (62:3–8). Following their judgment, the Lord of Spirits will demand that they depart from his presence, in spite of their petitions for his mercy, and he will deliver them to the angels for punishment (62:9–12; cf. also

63:5–8). This entire scene is described as salvation for the righteous and chosen (62:13). *First Enoch* 62:13–14 reads:

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

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

3.2.3 Judgment

The messiah figure in BP functions in the role of judgment. The Righteous One will appear in the presence of the righteous at the time of judgment (*1 En.* 38:2). The Chosen One will sit on the throne of glory on “the day of affliction and tribulation” (45:2–3; 51:3; 55:4; 61:8; 62:1–3). The Son of Man sits on the throne of glory (62:5; 69:27, 29). The Chosen One “will judge the things that are secret” (49:1–4; 61:8–9).

Matthew Black, referring to 61:8, writes: “for it is in this apocalypse that a truly remarkable development in the ‘divine judgment’ traditions of Judaism is placed on record: *the Lord of spirits enthrones the Elect Son of Man on the Judgment-Throne.*”⁹⁸ Black discusses the development of the messiah figure's session to the throne, beginning with ch. 14, where it is God who sits on the throne, to 47:3 and 60:2, where it is the Lord of Spirits/Head of Days who sits on the throne, to the subsequent throne visions in BP where it is the Chosen One or the Son of Man who sits/is seated on the throne. Christopher Rowland also referred to the seating of the messiah figure on the throne in BP as a significant development:

⁹⁸ See Black, “The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch,” 152–53 (emphasis original). Helge Kvanvig discusses the close connections between Dan 7:1–10, 13–14 and *1 En.* 14:18–25. The use of Dan 7 and the enthronement motif in BP must be understood as a development via BW. Helge S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1988), 558–64. See also Matthew Black, “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* (ed. Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), 57–73.

When reference is made to the throne of glory, one is probably right in assuming that this is the throne of God himself, and it is this throne upon which the Son of Man/Elect One sits in judgement over the kings of the earth. The fact that there is a transference of the throne of glory from God to another figure indicates a development of some significance... The transference of the session on the throne of glory is not the only attribute of God taken over by the Son of Man/Elect One. The role of judgement is now exercised by the Son of Man/Elect One (though God still has a part to play in chapter 62.10ff.).⁹⁹

There are two references in BP where it is the divine figure who sits on a throne in heaven. The first reference in BP to the divine figure sitting on a throne in heaven is a midrash on Dan 7 at *1 En.* 47:3 where Enoch sees “the Head of Days as he took his seat on the throne of his glory.” The books were opened and the judgment took place. The second reference in BP to the divine figure sitting on a throne in heaven is at *1 En.* 60:2, where “the Head of Days was sitting on the throne of his glory.” Both of these references to the divine figure sitting “on the throne of his glory” come in contexts where judgment is taking place.

There are nine references in BP to the messiah figure sitting on a throne in heaven. The first such reference is at *1 En.* 45:3, where “on that day my Chosen One will sit on the throne of glory” (45:1–3). The second reference in BP to the messiah figure sitting on a throne in heaven is at 51:3. Following the direct speech of the Lord of Spirits at 50:5, ch. 51 continues the speech of the Lord of Spirits in the first person: “For in those days my Chosen One will arise... And the Chosen One, in those days, will sit upon my throne” (51:5a, 3). According to BP the Chosen One explicitly sits on the throne that belongs to the Lord of Spirits. The Chosen One is not just standing before the throne (as is the figure in Dan 7), nor is it a separate throne. It is the throne of the Lord of Spirits on which the Chosen One sits. BP then describes the role of the Chosen One in terms of “all the secrets of wisdom” going “forth from the counsel of his mouth” (51:3). The third reference is at 55:4, where “my Chosen One...will sit on the throne of glory and judge Azazel.” The fourth reference in BP to the messiah figure sitting on a throne in heaven is at 61:8, where “the Lord of Spirits seated the Chosen One upon the throne of glory.” The fifth reference is at 62:2, where “the Lord of Spirits <seated him> [the Chosen One] upon the throne of his glory.” The sixth reference is at 62:3, where “he [the Chosen One] sits on the throne of his glory.” The seventh reference is at 62:5, where the unrighteous will “see that son of man sitting on the throne of glory.” The eighth reference is at

⁹⁹ Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 105–6.

69:27, where “that son of man...sat on the throne of his glory.” And the ninth reference in BP to the messiah figure sitting on a throne in heaven is at 69:29, where “that son of man...has sat down on the throne of his glory.” An incorruptible eschatological order is initiated because the Son of Man has appeared, and his word will go forth and prevail in the presence of the Lord of Spirits. All of these references to the messiah figure sitting on a throne in heaven come in contexts where judgment is taking place.

There is one reference to the throne in heaven that does not come in a context of judgment. The twelfth and final reference in BP to a throne in heaven, “the throne of his glory,” is at 71:7, where it is not with reference to anyone sitting on the throne, but with reference to the angels who guard it. We should not necessarily assume that the Head of Days is seated on the throne in this particular context. In other contexts either the divine figure or the messiah figure is depicted as sitting on the throne, in the process of sitting on the throne, or being seated on the throne. *First Enoch* 71:7 does not come in a context of judgment, but in the context of the final introduction of the eschatological age (71:15).

Several points may be made of these passages. The Chosen One receives the throne from the Lord of Spirits. This is the same throne on which the Lord of Spirits sits. Unless there are two different thrones on which the Chosen One sits, which does not appear to be the case, the throne of “his glory” refers to the throne of the Lord of Spirits. Therefore, according to BP, the Chosen One and the Lord of Spirits share the same throne. The secrets of wisdom are revealed by the Chosen One from the throne. The Chosen One executes both judgment and punishment from the throne. And according to the throne language in *I En.* 62, the same figure sitting on the throne is referred to as both the Chosen One and the Son of Man, which would lead us to conclude that BP equates the two figures.¹⁰⁰

In *I En.* 46 there is a scene of judgment in which the Head of Days and the Son of Man play prominent roles in a midrash of Ezek 1 and Dan 7. The midrash expands by explaining the role the Son of Man will play vis-à-vis the kings and the mighty of the earth (*I En.* 46:4–8). “And this son of man whom you have seen—he will raise the kings and the mighty from their couches, and the strong from their thrones. He will loosen the reins of the strong, and he will crush the teeth of the sinners” (46:4). The Son of Man will do this for three reasons: because the kings and the mighty and the strong “do not exalt him or praise him” (46:5), because

¹⁰⁰ This is widely recognized. See VanderKam, “Righteous One”; and Black, “The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch,” 148–49.

they commit idolatry (46:7), and “because they persecute the houses of his (the Son of Man’s) congregation” (46:8).¹⁰¹ Judgment is executed when the Son of Man overthrows kings from their kingdoms because they do not exalt or praise the Son of Man (46:5). These are the ones who “raise their hands against the Most High, and tread upon the earth and dwell on it” (46:7). The statement that the Son of Man overthrows the kings and the mighty “because they do not exalt him or praise him” suggests that the Son of Man is exalted and praised by others, namely, those who belong to the houses of his congregation.

In ch. 62 there is a description of the Son of Man and his role in the judgment. The Lord of Spirits seats the Chosen One (= the Son of Man) “upon the throne of his glory” (62:1–2, 5). The “kings and the mighty and all who possess the earth will bless and glorify and exalt him who rules over all, who was hidden” (62:6). They will do this because “from the beginning the son of man was hidden, and the Most High preserved him in the presence of his might, and he revealed him to the chosen” (62:7). This was probably an Enochic explanation to the objection that according to the Torah there is only one God and God alone is judge. According to the Enochic point of view, anyone who failed to recognize the role of the Son of Man in the judgment did so because they were not among “the chosen,” to whom the Most High had revealed the previously hidden Son of Man.

Without a single exception each reference to the Lord in BP occurs in a context of judgment. In *1 En.* 61 the Lord of Spirits seats the Chosen One “upon the throne of glory,” and he summons “all the host of heaven and all the holy ones in the heights and the host of the Lord”—the Cherubin, the Seraphin, and the Ophannin, the angels of power and the angels of principalities, the Chosen One and “the other host who are on the land and over the water on that day” (61:10). The Chosen One, who is seated upon the throne of glory, “will judge all the works of the holy ones in the heights of heaven” (61:8). In ch. 62 the scene of judgment comes back around to the Lord of Spirits seating the Chosen One “upon the throne of his glory” (62:1–2). But before doing this, “the Lord commanded the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who possess the earth... ‘Open your eyes and lift up your horns, if you are able to recognize the Chosen One.’”

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

¹⁰¹ The latter reference, to “the houses of his congregation,” provides evidence for a sociologically definable community, a group, that can be identified with the composition of BP.

those who persecute the righteous (*I En.* 46:4–6; 62:2; 69:27, 29). The “kings of the earth, and the strong who possess the earth” will be annihilated “because of the deeds of their hands” (48:8–9). On the day of judgment no one will be able to save them, for “they have denied the Lord of Spirits and his Anointed One” (48:10). Scholars adduce Ps 2 as biblical background for this reference to the Lord of Spirits and his Anointed One.¹⁰² To this should be added Ps 11, where “YHWH is in his holy temple” and “his throne is in heaven” (Ps 11:4). From this place YHWH executes punishment against the wicked: “He will rain on the evil ones fiery embers and brimstone; a blast of burning wind as a portion” (Ps 11:6). Psalm 11 also connects YHWH with righteousness: “For righteous is YHWH; righteous acts he loves; the upright shall see his face” (Ps 11:7). There are several points of contact between this psalm and BP: temple (*I En.* 71:5–9), throne (47:3), punishment of the wicked (46:1–8; 53:3–5; 63:10), and the righteous who see YHWH’s face (71:9–17).

In *I En.* 52 Enoch sees “all the secrets of heaven that will take place” (52:2). These secrets are revealed symbolically as six mountains: “a mountain of iron, and a mountain of copper, and a mountain of silver, and a mountain of gold, and a mountain of soft metal, and a mountain of lead.” The six mountains represent sources of strength for those who oppress the righteous. *First Enoch* 52:7–8 indicates that the many different kinds of metals represent wealth (gold and silver), war (iron and copper), and cultural innovations (soft metal and lead), all of which the fallen watchers used to deceive humans (7:1–8:2; 54:6; 64:2; 65:6–8; 67:4–7; 69:6–7). When Enoch asks the angel to explain what he has seen, the angel tells Enoch: “All these things that you have seen will serve the authority of the Anointed One, so that he may be powerful and mighty on the earth” (52:4). The Anointed One will make use of the resources from the six mountains to subvert the powers of the “sinners” who oppress the righteous (53:7). The Anointed One uses his authority to remove the sources of strength from the powerful (the mountains melt like wax before the Chosen One; 52:6; 53:7; cf. also BW, 1:6), so that “the righteous will rest from the oppression of the sinners” (53:7). The function of the Anointed One is that he is denied by the kings of the earth, and he has authority to subvert (punish) those who oppress the righteous. The Lord of Spirits, speaking in the first person, addresses the

¹⁰² VanderKam points out the allusion to the kings and rulers who “take counsel together against the Lord and his anointed” of Ps 2:2. See “Righteous One,” 171. See also Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 225; and Black, “The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch,” 159.

“mighty kings who dwell on the earth.” At the judgment they will be required “to witness my Chosen One, how he will sit on the throne of glory and judge Azazel and all his associates and all his host in the name of the Lord of Spirits” (55:4).¹⁰³ It is significant that the Lord of Spirits gives this throne to the Chosen One: “And the Lord of Spirits seated the Chosen One upon the throne of glory and he will judge all the works of the holy ones in the heights of heaven, and in the balance he will weigh their deeds” (61:8). The Chosen One exercises judgment from the throne. The Chosen One also implements punishment from the throne. “And thus the Lord commanded the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who possess the earth, and he said, ‘Open your eyes and lift up your horns, if you are able to recognize the Chosen One.’ And the Lord of Spirits <seated him> upon the throne of his glory, and the spirit of righteousness was poured upon him. And the word of his mouth will slay all the sinners, and all the unrighteous will perish from his presence” (62:1–2). After this pronouncement from the Lord of Spirits, the kings of the earth respond accordingly: “And there will stand up on that day all the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who possess the earth. And they will see and recognize that he sits on the throne of his glory; and righteousness is judged in his presence, and no lying word is spoken in his presence” (62:3; cf. 49:4). The text then describes the punishment and the reaction of the kings: “And pain will come upon them as (upon) a woman in labor, when the child enters the mouth of the womb, and she has difficulty in giving birth. And one group of them will look at the other; and they will be terrified and cast down their faces, and pain will seize them when they see that son of man sitting on the throne of glory” (62:4–5). According to this text, the kings, who have been called upon by the Lord of Spirits to recognize the Chosen One (62:1–2), see the Son of Man sitting on the throne.

Crispin Fletcher-Louis has indicated that the seating of Moses on the divine figure’s throne in the *Exagoge of Ezekiel the Tragedian* (68–89), a second-century B.C.E. text, is part of the elevation of Moses that results in his being worshiped. Fletcher-Louis even argues that the session of Moses on the throne takes place in heaven.¹⁰⁴ The *Exagoge*, however, describes a throne on earth, on Mount Sinai, not in heaven. And the progression of the poem leaves the impression that this is a divine

¹⁰³ VanderKam (*Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 138) refers to this particular role of the Chosen One as coming “into contact with the central Enochic myth.”

¹⁰⁴ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 344. Fletcher-Louis even goes so far as to claim that the *Exagoge* refers to Moses as divine, an exaggeration that appears nowhere in this text. See *ibid.*, 70.

approval of a human throne and rule, a very different concept from that of BP, where a preexistent heavenly messiah figure, who is also a human being, is given to sit on the throne of the divine figure for the purpose of judging angels and humans, and then to execute divine punishment at the *eschaton*.

In contrast to the punishment the messiah figure will execute after the judgment, there is also salvation for the righteous. According to BP (*1 En.* 38:1–6), the Righteous One appears at the judgment, and coincident with this appearance of the Righteous One is the appearance of light for the chosen righteous ones.¹⁰⁵ After the judgment the Righteous One will cause the house of his congregation to appear and the Chosen One will dwell among them. Near the beginning of the second parable the Lord of Spirits states: “On that day, I shall make my Chosen One dwell among them, and I shall transform heaven and make it a blessing and a light forever; and I shall transform the earth and make it a blessing” (45:4). At the *eschaton*, when the Lord of Spirits transforms heaven and earth, the Chosen One will dwell among “the chosen ones and those who appeal to my glorious name” (45:3). The Chosen One will arise on the day of salvation (51:5a, 2). The angels will gather the righteous and there will be a resurrection of the dead on the day of the Chosen One (61:5; cf. 51:1). The salvation of the righteous and chosen will be an eschatological feast with the Son of Man (62:13–16). This part of the narrative contains what appears to be a common tradition of eschatological feasting with a number of common elements: an invitation to feast with the host, the elimination of those who are not worthy to participate in the feast, and a garment that makes one worthy to participate (cf. Matt 22:1–13; Luke 14:16–24). In BP the feast represents a reversal of fortune for the righteous and the chosen. Their faces were once “cast down” (*1 En.* 62:15), but now they are lifted up. It is the kings and the mighty whose faces were once exalted and are now cast down (62:9–10, 13; see also 48:8 and 63:11).¹⁰⁶ That the kings and the mighty and the exalted of the earth petition the Son of Man for mercy suggests that they recognize the Son of Man as being capable of showing mercy (62:9). In contrast to the kings and the mighty who once wore elaborate garments to display their own glory, the righteous and the chosen have put on “the garment of

¹⁰⁵ This appears to be a development of the tradition in BW (*1 En.* 1:8; 5:6–8) where light will shine upon the righteous and the chosen when the divine figure, the “Great Holy One,” comes forth to execute judgment on all.

¹⁰⁶ This same kind of reversal between the oppressor and the oppressed is also a principal motif of Mary’s Magnificat at Luke 1:46–55. There are many examples of this motif in Second Temple period literature. Cf., e.g., 4Q491 8–10 i; 1QM xiv 4–19.

glory,” which BP also refers to as “the garment of life from the Lord of Spirits” (62:15–16). A similar tradition connecting the garment with glory occurs in the *Greek Life of Adam and Eve* where Satan’s deception of Adam and Eve causes the two protoplasts to lose their garment of glory (*GLAE* 20:1; 21:2, 6), and hence their favorable position in relation to God. In BP, however, the garment is a metaphor for the glorified condition of the righteous and the chosen who have been “saved” from the “sinners and the unrighteous” (*1 En.* 62:13; cf. 48:7).

3.2.4 Worship

One of the functions of the messiah figure in BP is to receive praise and worship. There are two, and possibly three, explicit references to the worship of the messiah figure in BP. These three references appear at *1 En.* 40:5; 48:5, and 62:9.

The first reference, at 40:5, comes in the context of Enoch ascending into heaven on a whirlwind (39:3), where he sees “the dwellings of the holy ones, and the resting places of the righteous. There my eyes saw their dwellings with his righteous angels. And they were petitioning and interceding and were praying for the sons of men” (39:4–5). This is the place where Enoch first sees the Chosen One (39:6–8). As the angels praise the name of the Lord of Spirits, Enoch also joins in this praise (39:7–10). Enoch then observes “those who sleep not,” blessing and praising and exalting the Lord of Spirits with the triple קרוש (39:12). During this vision Enoch sees “thousands and thousands...who were standing before the glory of the Lord of Spirits” (40:1). Enoch then sees four figures positioned on the four sides of the Lord of Spirits (40:2). Each of these four figures was “uttering praise before the Lord of Glory” (40:3). It is the second angel in the description that offers worship to the Chosen One: “And the second voice I heard blessing the Chosen One” (40:5). This particular text may in fact not be evidence of the worship of the messiah figure in BP, because the entire verse of 40:5 reads: “And the second voice I heard blessing the Chosen One and the chosen ones who depend on the Lord of Spirits.” The blessing the Chosen One receives from the angel is the same blessing that the angel also gives to humans, who are described here as “the chosen ones who depend on the Lord of Spirits.” Consequently, this particular text may not necessarily be evidence that the messiah figure is worshiped.

In *1 En.* 48, however, there is an explicit claim by the authors of BP that the messiah figure receives worship from humans. In this chapter there is a detailed description of the messiah figure. Here BP begins its description of the messiah figure by using the metaphor of “springs of

wisdom”: “In that place I saw the spring of righteousness, and it was inexhaustible, and many springs of wisdom surrounded it. And all the thirsty drank from them and were filled with wisdom” (48:1). Then follows the description of the naming of the preexistent Son of Man in the presence of the Lord of Spirits (48:2), which is followed by a description of the worship of the messiah figure who is referred to in terms of “the name of the Lord of Spirits” (cf. §3.1.7):

He will be a staff for the righteous,
that they may lean on him and not fall;
And he will be the light of the nations,
and he will be a hope for those who grieve in their hearts.
All who dwell on the earth will fall down and worship before him,
and they will glorify and bless and sing hymns to the
name of the Lord of Spirits. (48:4–5)

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

The authors of BP also make the explicit claim that the Son of Man will be worshiped at *I En.* 62:9. To take this in its context, all the host of heaven and all the holy ones are gathered together to praise the name of the Lord of Spirits. The Chosen One is included in this gathering (61:10). This comes in the context of the enthronement of the Chosen One for judgment in the third parable (61:6–13). Following this the messiah figure, here referred to by both the epithets Chosen One and Son of Man, presides over the judgment (62:1–16). The Lord of Spirits commands “the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who possess the earth” to look upon and recognize the Chosen One, whom the Lord of Spirits has seated on the throne of glory (62:1–2; cf. also 55:4). When these earthly rulers see and recognize the Chosen One “sitting on the throne of glory,” it is the Son of Man they see sitting on the throne (62:3, 5). The “kings and the mighty and all who possess the earth will bless and glorify and exalt him who rules over all, who was hidden” (62:6). This is worship of the Son of Man that takes place after the judgment, not before. This worship does not benefit the kings and the mighty, as 62:9–12 makes clear:

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

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

If the name of the Lord of Spirits is to be identified with the messiah figure, and the evidence seems to suggest this, then the present analysis should include worship that is also explicitly given to the name of the Lord of Spirits. The righteous and the chosen in heaven praise the name of the Lord of Spirits (*1 En.* 39:7). Enoch praises this name (39:9). The name of the Lord of Spirits receives praise from the holy ones in heaven (47:2c). All who dwell on the earth will glorify and bless and sing hymns to the name of the Lord of Spirits (48:5). In BP there is also doxology to the name: “Blessed be the name of the Lord of Spirits” (48:10; 61:11; 63:2–3). The archangel Gabriel prays “in the name of the Lord of Spirits” for those who dwell on the earth (40:6). This is connected with being “in charge of every power” (40:9). The holy ones who dwell on the earth believe in the name of the Lord of Spirits (43:4). The faithful depend on the name of the Lord of Spirits (46:8). And the holy and righteous have hated and despised this age of unrighteousness in the name of the Lord of Spirits and are saved in his name (48:7; 50:2–3). On the other hand, the name of the Lord of Spirits is denied by sinners (41:2; 45:1–2; 46:7), and the strong do not exalt the name of the Lord of Spirits (46:6).

Crispin Fletcher-Louis refers to the second-century B.C.E. text, *Exagoge of Ezekiel the Tragedian* (68–89), as an example of a human figure being worshiped by angels. The text describes a vision Moses experienced, in which Moses sees the divine figure (described as a man) seated on a throne above Mount Sinai. The figure on the throne summons Moses to approach. He gives Moses his crown and scepter and the great honor of sitting on the throne. The poet then describes how Moses surveys the cosmos, the earth beneath and the heaven above, and how at Moses’ feet a multitude of stars (angels) fell down, and then they passed by Moses in ranks in a sort of military parade. Fletcher-Louis argues that the reference to the stars falling down at the feet of Moses is an example of a human being who is worshiped.¹⁰⁷ The problem with the view that the *Exagoge of Ezekiel the Tragedian* is a text that reflects an understanding of a human being that is worshiped by angels is that the author himself did not see it this way. The author of the *Exagoge* actually had Moses’ father-in-law, Raguel, interpret the vision, of Moses sitting on God’s throne and having the stars fall down at his feet, to mean that Moses would have an *earthly* reign among human beings, and that he would rule and govern on earth (*Ezek. Trag.* 82–86). This is nothing like

¹⁰⁷ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 7, 70, 101, 344.

the kind of eschatological worship that the messiah figure will receive according to BP.

There is a variety of language for worship in BP that must be taken into consideration. In BP the divine figure receives blessing (*bāraka*)¹⁰⁸ and praise or glory (*sabbāḥa*)¹⁰⁹ from humans. The divine figure is exalted (*la'āla*)¹¹⁰ by humans, and is worshiped (*sagada*)¹¹¹ by humans. In BP all of this same language is applied to the name of the Lord of Spirits,¹¹² but there is added to the name of the Lord of Spirits the language of singing hymns (*yezēmmēru*, *1 En.* 48:5) and sanctifying (*qaddesot*, *1 En.* 61:9, 12). Likewise this same language is applied to the messiah figure in BP.¹¹³ There are two texts referring to the blessing, glorifying, exalting, and worship of either the divine figure or the messiah figure, but the contexts are ambiguous as to which figure is being described.¹¹⁴

The evidence indicates that the same language used for worship of the divine figure is also used for the messiah figure. One might balk at this suggestion, given the hard reality that BP only exists in a later Ethiopic translation. However, there is language used for worship in BP that clearly reflects language used in the book of Daniel. The expression “to fall down and worship” is used with reference to both the divine figure and the messiah figure in BP. At *1 En.* 48:5, “All who dwell on the earth will fall down (*yewadequ* > *wadqa* or *wadaqa*) and worship (*yesagedu* > *sagada*) him,” the context indicating that this is a reference to the messiah figure (cf. 62:9). At 57:3, the holy ones in heaven “all fell down (*yewadequ* > *wadqa* or *wadaqa*) and worshiped (*yesagedu* > *sagada*) the Lord of Spirits.” To “fall down and worship” (48:5; 57:3; 63:1) reflects the language of Dan 3, where King Nebuchadnezzar commanded the people to fall down and worship the golden image he had set up on the

¹⁰⁸ *1 En.* 39:10, 12, 13; 40:4; 63:2, 4; 71:11, 12.

¹⁰⁹ *1 En.* 39:10, 12; 40:3; 41:7; 63:2, 4, 5; 69:24; 71:11.

¹¹⁰ *1 En.* 39:12; 71:11.

¹¹¹ *1 En.* 57:3; 63:1.

¹¹² The name of the Lord of Spirits receives blessing (*bāraka*, *1 En.* 39:7, 9, 13; 47:2c; 48:5; 61:9, 11, 12) and praise or glory (*sabbāḥa*, 39:7, 9; 47:2c; 48:5; 61:9, 11, 12; 63:7; 69:24) from humans; the name of the Lord of Spirits is exalted (*la'āla*, 39:9; 46:6; 61:9, 11, 12; 69:24) by humans.

¹¹³ The messiah figure receives blessing (*bāraka*, *1 En.* 40:5; 61:6; 62:6) and praise or glory (*sabbāḥa*, 51:3; 61:6; 62:6) from humans. The messiah figure is exalted (*la'āla*, 61:6; 62:6) by humans. And the messiah figure is worshiped (*sagada*) by humans (62:9).

¹¹⁴ *1 En.* 60:6; 69:26.

plain of Dura in the province of Babylon. The Aramaic expression is תפלין ותסגדון (MT: Dan 3:5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 15, 28; 8:17; cf. also Judg 13:20; Job 1:20; 1 Chr 29:20; Ps 72:11). The Greek expression is προσκύετε προσκυήσατε (LXX: Dan 3:5). The Ethiopic text of BP reflects either a translation of a Hebrew or Aramaic text (more likely Aramaic as in Dan 3), or a translation of a Greek text which itself would have been a translation of a Hebrew or Aramaic text. So, if it is not possible to draw a conclusion based on the Ethiopic text of BP, it is possible to draw the conclusion based on an established formula for worship that appears in Dan 3. The conclusion we may draw on the basis of the evidence in BP is that the same language for worship applied to the divine figure is also applied to the messiah figure. This is a surprising development in the history of Second Temple period thought, as worship was only given to the divine figure prior to the appearance of BP. This also indicates that Larry Hurtado's claim, that the worship of Jesus as a unique and explosive innovation of the early followers of Jesus was completely unprecedented in the literature, is not an accurate claim.¹¹⁵

There are four functions of the messiah figure in BP. Functions of the messiah figure in BP may be identified in terms of revelation of wisdom, salvation, judgment, and worship. The Messiah figure is both a revealer of wisdom and closely associated with wisdom. The motif of the messiah figure being concealed and revealed by the divine figure is very similar to the way wisdom is treated by the divine figure, as wisdom is only revealed to the chosen and the righteous in much the same way that the messiah figure is hidden from the unrighteous but revealed to the righteous. The function of salvation is primarily associated with the messiah figure in contexts of eschatological judgment, where the oppressed are saved from the oppression of unrighteous kings. The assignment of the role of judgment to a messiah figure who sits on the throne of the divine figure is unprecedented and renders BP exceptional among the Jewish intellectual traditions of the Second Temple period. That the messiah figure is given to sit on God's throne, execute judgment, and administer punishment is an absolutely extraordinary development combining conceptual elements of messianic traditions that had never been combined before BP. This is also true of the function of worship in connection to the messiah figure in BP. In no other text prior to BP is a messiah figure worshiped by humans or angels.

¹¹⁵ Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 38–39.

3.3 Summary and Conclusions

There is a good amount of evidence in BP regarding the nature of the messiah figure. According to BP the messiah figure is both a human being identified with the patriarch Enoch and a heavenly being. The messiah figure is preexistent in relation to creation. The messiah figure is associated with wisdom; according to BP the messiah is a human being who was transformed into a preexistent heavenly being via Enoch's association with heavenly wisdom. The messiah figure is righteous. The messiah figure is connected to the divine name through the epithet "name of the Lord of Spirits." And the messiah figure is given the titular epithet "Son of Man."

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

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

There are also clear differences between the divine figure and the messiah figure in BP as regards their respective natures. While the messiah figure shares a heavenly nature with the divine figure, the authors of BP also understood the messiah figure to be a human being. And while the messiah figure is somehow connected to the divine figure via the divine name and through the epithet "name of the Lord of Spirits," the messiah figure is not divine, and the divine figure clearly is not a human being.

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

There are also differences between the divine figure and the messiah figure as regards their respective functions. While the divine figure

functions as creator in BP, there are no references at all to the messiah figure functioning as creator. As I have already pointed out, there seems to be a connection between the messiah figure and the divine name in BP, and while the divine name functions in the role of creation via the secret oath revealed to the angels at *1 En.* 69, because of the obscurity of the evidence it can only be a tentative conclusion that the messiah figure in BP functions as an agent of creation.

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

Table 3
***A Comparison of the Nature of the Divine Figure
and the Nature of the Messiah Figure in Parables of Enoch***

<i>Nature</i>	<i>Divine Figure</i>	<i>Messiah Figure</i>
divine	•	
heavenly being	•	•
holy	•	
foreknowing	•	
merciful	•	
righteous	•	•
repentance	•	
eternal	•	
human being		•
preexistent		•
associated with wisdom		•
divine name	•	•
like an angel		•

Table 4
A Comparison of the Functions of the Divine Figure
and the Functions of the Messiah Figure in Parables of Enoch

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

THE DIVINE FIGURE IN THE LETTERS OF PAUL

4.0 The Divine Figure in the Letters of Paul

While monotheism was one of the more dominant features of the Jewish intellectual landscape of the Second Temple period, the ideological stance of the undisputed Letters of Paul entails both a divine figure and a messiah figure as two distinct entities in heaven.¹ Before analyzing the messiah figure in LP, it would be helpful first to examine on its own terms the divine figure in LP. A careful examination of the nature and functions of the divine figure in LP will establish without ambiguity the relationship between the divine figure and the messiah figure in Paul's thought, and will further alleviate any ambiguity regarding the nature and functions of the divine figure and the nature and functions of the messiah figure in LP.

4.1 Nature of the Divine Figure in the Letters of Paul

There is very little evidence on the nature of the divine figure in LP that lends itself to detailed analysis. To some extent the nature of the divine figure in LP may be assumed. It was not a contested issue during the

¹ "Monotheism" is actually a modern designation that reflects later attempts to conceptualize religious beliefs and experiences as these are described in Jewish texts of the Second Temple period. The literature reveals that the issue is far more complicated than making a blanket statement that all Jews were monotheists. So I acknowledge the difficulty. It is a useful category, however, for recognizing the clear distinction between the divine figure and all other figures, including the messiah figure, in the literature of this period. Cf. the various arguments reflected in Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy E. S. North, eds., *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism* (JSNTSup 263; London: T&T Clark, 2004).

Second Temple period.² A few aspects of the nature of the divine figure in LP may be identified in terms of the uniqueness of the divine figure, the divine figure's deity, the divine figure as a heavenly being, and the righteousness of the divine figure.

4.1.1 *The One God*

In three places in LP Paul articulated his concept of monotheism by referring to the divine figure as "one." In a discussion of the giving of the law in Gal 3, Paul wrote that the law was given through an intermediary. Paul developed his discussion of the law by contrasting the law with the promise God had given to Abraham. Paul specifically referred to the uniqueness of God by stressing the mediatorial role of Moses as the recipient of the law on behalf of the people: "Why therefore the law? It was added on account of transgressions, until the seed came to whom it was promised, having been directed by angels at the hand of an intermediary. And while the intermediary is not [a mediator] of one, God is one (ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν, ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἷς ἔστιν)" (Gal 3:19–20). Paul's reference to an "intermediary" is somewhat ambiguous. It is apparently an oblique reference to Moses, who received the law on Sinai as an intermediary between God and the people (Exod 20:18–19). The point is this: in Gal 3 Paul claimed that God was unique in relation to both angels and human beings.

In his discussion of the contrast between faith and the boasting that comes from works of the law in his Letter to the Romans, Paul argued that all are justified apart from works of the law, Jew and Gentile alike (Rom 3:28). Paul then stated that the divine figure is the God of both Jews and Gentiles: "Or is he the God of Jews only? Is he not also the God of Gentiles? Yes, also of Gentiles, since God is one (εἷς ὁ θεός), who will justify the circumcision on the basis of faith and uncircumcision by their faith" (Rom 3:29–30). Paul used the concept of the oneness of the divine figure in order to support his claim that there are not two ways to

² As I have already indicated, what was contested was the relationship between the divine figure and the messiah figure. Paul used four epithets to refer to the divine figure: (1) θεός or God, (2) πατήρ or Father or some combination of God and Father, including ἀββα or *Abba* (the Aramaic expression for Father), (3) ὁ κτίσας or creator, and (4) κύριος or Lord; God (Gal 1:4, 20; 1 Thess 1:3; 3:11, 13; 1 Cor 1:1, 3; 8:4; Rom 1:1, 7; 15:6; Phil 1:2; 2:11); Father or God the Father (Gal 1:1, 3, 4; 1 Thess 1:1, 3; 3:11, 13; 1 Cor 1:3; 8:6; 2 Cor 1:2; Rom 1:7; 8:15; 15:6; Phil 1:2; 2:11); ἀββα ὁ πατήρ or *Abba* Father (Gal 4:6; Rom 8:15); creator (Rom 1:25); and Lord (Rom 9:28). This is not an exhaustive listing. For complete lists of references to these epithets in LP one should consult a concordance.

be justified, one for Jews and one for Gentiles, but that both Jew and Gentile are justified in the same way by the same God. Paul's claim was that both Jew and Gentile are justified by their faith.

In his First Letter to the Corinthians Paul contrasted multiple "gods" and "lords" with the uniqueness of the divine figure: "Therefore, concerning the food of the idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world and that there is no God but one (ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς). For even if there are so-called gods whether in heaven or on earth, just as there are many gods and many lords, but for us there is one God the Father, from whom are all things even as we [exist] for him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things even as we [exist] through him" (ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ, 1 Cor 8:4–6). Here Paul's claim is that the divine figure is unique among all the "so-called gods" both in heaven and on earth.³ Paul also contrasted the divine figure with idols in his Letter to the Thessalonians, where Paul referred to the divine figure as living and true, the God to whom the Thessalonians had turned after abandoning idols, implying that the idols were neither living nor true (1 Thess 1:9; cf. Rom 3:3–4).

R. W. L. Moberly has pointed out that the term "monotheism" is problematic in historical discussions of Israelite religion.⁴ Moberly argues that pre-exilic religious traditions of Israel were not monotheistic. They were syncretistic and henotheistic. It was only in the post-exilic traditions of Second-Isaiah that a strong monotheism began to exert itself in Jewish thought. By the time of Second-Isaiah, monotheism was clearly a central feature of the worship of Israel.⁵ This must clearly be taken into account when analyzing texts from the Second Temple period, including

³ This text will be analyzed in more detail below in Chapter 5, because it also refers to "one Lord Jesus Christ" and explicitly describes the relationship between the divine figure and the messiah figure in Paul's thought.

⁴ R. W. L. Moberly, "How Appropriate is 'Monotheism' as a Category for Biblical Interpretation?," in Stuckenbruck and North, eds., *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*, 216–34.

⁵ See the discussion by Dunn in *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 31–38; also the discussion by John J. Scullion in his article "God in the OT," *ABD* 2:1042–43. Also see the discussion by Jouette M. Bassler in her article, "God in the NT," *ABD* 2:1050–52, where Bassler correctly describes Paul's concept of the divine figure as the one God, the only God. Cf. also *Letter of Aristaeus* 132; Wis 13:10–19; Philo, *Quis Rerum* 169; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 5.14.113.2 quoting Hecataeus (*OTP* 2:825); *Sibylline Oracles* 3.629; Josephus, *Ant.* 5.112.

LP. As James McGrath stated in his recent book, *The Only True God*: “Paul’s Christology is thus best understood as monotheistic in the sense that Judaism was monotheistic in this period.”⁶

Paul’s reference to one God in contrast to many gods and many lords at 1 Cor 8:4–6 may on the surface suggest a form of henotheism or monolatry in the first century, or even a form of pluralism like we have in our postmodern twenty-first-century Western culture, as Moberly argues.⁷ It should be kept in mind, however, that Paul introduced this section with the statement: “...concerning the food of the idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world and that there is no God but one.” This is the “knowledge” that allows the strong to eat meat sacrificed to idols (the question at issue in 1 Cor 8), the knowledge that there really are no idols and there are no other gods, according to Paul’s point of view. If anything at all, this constitutes Paul’s monotheistic critique of the polytheism, henotheism, and monolatry of his day. The evidence in LP is clear that Paul held a very strong form of Jewish monotheism.

4.1.2 *Deity*

In the first chapter of his Letter to the Romans, Paul described the divine figure as having an invisible nature, divine power, and deity (θειότης): “For since the creation of the world his invisible attributes, namely, his eternal power and deity (αἰδός αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θειότης), have been perceived with understanding in the things [he has] made” (Rom 1:20). In other words, Paul explicitly applied the attribute of divinity to the divine figure. This attribute of divinity for the divine figure, according to Paul, is clearly perceptible through creation. In this same context Paul wrote that the divine figure is immortal, again contrasting the divine figure to idols (Rom 1:23).⁸

⁶ McGrath, *The Only True God*, 54; see the entire section on Paul (pp. 38–54) where McGrath acknowledges the problem that the term “monotheism” is a later, modern scholarly category, but he still claims it is useful and demonstrates this from Jewish sources of the period.

⁷ Moberly, “How Appropriate is ‘Monotheism’?,” 234.

⁸ It should be noted that nowhere in LP is the messiah figure unambiguously referred to as θεός. Rom 9:5 is problematic, as is evidenced in the secondary literature. It is difficult to claim that this is an ascription of θεός to the messiah figure, as the doxology Paul used (εὐλογητός) is exclusively used in his letters with reference to the divine figure; cf. 2 Cor 1:3; 11:31; Rom 1:25. This, however, only begs the question, and requires a more thorough analysis; see the Excursus in Chapter 5 (§5.4).

4.1.3 A Heavenly Being

That the divine figure in LP is a heavenly being is one of those beliefs that is widely assumed in the literature from this period.⁹ Sometimes it is explicitly stated. Sometimes it is not. It is not a prominent issue in LP, and there are only two references where Paul alludes to it. In the first chapter of his Letter to the Romans Paul discussed the wrath of God against human “injustice” (Rom 1:18–32). Romans 1:18 reads: “For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven (Ἐποκαλύπτεται γὰρ ὀργὴ θεοῦ ἀπὸ οὐρανοῦ) against all godlessness and injustice of humans who by [their] injustice suppress the truth.” Since this would be a subjective Genitive phrase, “wrath of God,” by which God is the one revealing his wrath “from heaven,” it is then logical to read this as Paul’s assumption that the divine figure is in heaven. Paul also alluded to this in Rom 8:34, where he referred to the messiah figure being “at the right hand of God.” In Rom 8 Paul engaged in a rather detailed discussion of God’s foreknowledge and predestination of those who have been given “the same form as the image of his Son” (Rom 8:28–30). This was apparently intended to be encouragement for followers of Jesus who faced some sort of legal dispute or persecution as is evident in what follows: “Who shall bring any accusation against God’s elect?” (Rom 8:33). Whether this is real or metaphorical is unclear. Paul gave his rhetorical answer to the problem: “God is the one who justifies. Who is there to condemn? Christ Jesus who died, rather who was raised, who also is at the right hand of God (ὄχι καὶ ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ), who also petitions on our behalf” (Rom 8:33–34). Paul’s reference to the messiah figure being “at the right hand of God” is a phrase that refers to a heavenly location. The allusion to Ps 110:1 makes this clear.¹⁰ Psalm 110:1 reads: “YHWH says to my lord: ‘Sit at my right hand, until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet.’” Paul’s concept of the nature of the divine figure, though the references are somewhat oblique, is that the divine figure is a heavenly being.

4.1.4 A Righteous Being

Righteousness is another characteristic that Paul attributed to the divine figure. In his Letter to the Romans Paul asserted that the righteousness of the divine figure is revealed in the gospel: “For I am not ashamed of the

⁹ See, e.g., *I En.* 1:1–4; 14:8–23; Isa 66:1; Rev 4.

¹⁰ Explicit references to Ps 110:1 and the messiah figure being seated at the right hand of God in early christological texts include Mark 16:19; Luke 22:69; Acts 2:33; 5:31; 7:55–56; Col 3:1–4; Heb 1:3; 10:12; 12:2; and 1 Pet 3:21–22. Cf. also Heb 9:24.

gospel, for it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes, to the Jew first and to the Greek. For the righteousness of God is revealed in it from faith to faith..." (Rom 1:16–17). Paul described the righteousness of the divine figure in terms of "the redemption which is in Christ Jesus" (Rom 3:21–26).¹¹ Romans 3:21–26 reads:

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

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

Our works are by the choosing and in the power of our soul,
to do righteousness and injustice is in the works of our hands;
and in your righteousness you examine human beings (ἐν ἰσότητι ἀνθρώπων).
The one who does righteousness stores up life for himself with the Lord,
and the one who does injustice is himself responsible for the destruction
of his soul;
for the Lord's judgments are with righteousness according to a man and
his household. (*Pss. Sol.* 9:4–5)¹²

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

¹¹ The relationship between the divine figure and the messiah figure in Rom 3 will be given a more detailed analysis in Chapter 5 (§5.2).

¹² Another clear example is the ending of 4QMMT (4Q398 14–17 ii 31–32), where the text reads: "And it will be counted for you as a righteous act (צדקה), since you are doing what is right and good before him, for your good and for the good of Israel." Cf. Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. Vol. 5, Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* (DJD X; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 62. Cf. also Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, eds., with the assistance of Nehemiah Gordon and Derek Fry, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader Part 1: Texts Concerned with Religious Law* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 334–35.

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

4.2 Functions of the Divine Figure in the Letters of Paul

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

4.2.1 Creation

One of the functions of the divine figure according to Paul is that of creator. Paul held the common Second Temple period Jewish belief that the divine figure created all things.¹³ In his Letter to the Romans, contrasting human idolatry with the worship of the divine figure, Paul explicitly referred to the divine figure as creator (τὸν κτίσαντα—Rom 1:25; 4:17).¹⁴ Romans 1:18, 24–25 reads:

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

¹³ See, e.g., Sir 18:1; *Jub.* 2:1–16; Wis 2:23; 9:1–4; 13:1–9; Philo, *Fug.* 177; *Quis Rerum* 106, 133–60; 1QH v 13–20, viii 17; 4Q176 3; 4Q216 v–vii; 4Q409; 4Q427 7 ii 22–23; *Pss. Sol.* 18:11–12; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 5.14.113.2 (*OTP* 2:825); *Sib. Or.* 1:5–37.

¹⁴ See the article on κτίζω by Werner Foerster in *TDNT* 3:1000–1035.

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

The narrative of Gn. 1 is summed up in Ps. 33:9 in the words: **הוּא אָמַר וַיְהִי הוּא-צִוֶּה וַיֵּעָמַד**. This statement contains a logical impossibility which P. makes even more evident in R. 4:17: (κατέναντι...θεοῦ) καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα. One can call forth only that which already exists. But God calls forth that which does not yet exist. He commands it. And in obedience to this command creation takes place. We must not try to evade the logical inconceivability of this statement by taking the μὴ ὄντα as though in some sense they were ὄντα.¹⁵

First Corinthians 8:4–6 is one of those key passages that gives us clear information about both the divine figure and the messiah figure in Paul's thought. Paul wrote: "...for us there is one God the Father, from whom are all things even as we [exist] for him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things even as we [exist] through him" (1 Cor 8:4–6). Paul's claim echoed the common Second Temple period Jewish belief that the divine figure created "all things" and humans have their existence "from" the divine figure (ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα; cf. 1 Cor 11:12).

4.2.2 *Revelation of Wisdom*

Paul claimed that the divine figure reveals secret and hidden wisdom to humans. In his First Letter to the Corinthians Paul wrote rhetorically, defending the preaching of the cross as the central component of his message, contrasting "the wisdom of God" with "the wisdom of the world" (1 Cor 1:17–31). First Corinthians 1:18–25 reads:

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

¹⁵ Ibid., 3:1010.

Paul's contrast of God's wisdom and human wisdom brings him to focus on the crucifixion of the messiah figure as the centerpiece of his message to both Jew and Gentile (cf. also Gal 3:1). Not only for Paul was this message of the cross the power and wisdom of God, but Paul associated the messiah figure himself with the power and the wisdom of God.¹⁶ In ch. 2 Paul developed his argument with specific reference to his experience among the community of Jesus followers in Corinth, reiterating the centrality of the cross for his message:

And when I came to you, brothers, I came not with lofty speech or wisdom proclaiming to you the mystery of God. For I decided not to know anything among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified... [M]y speech and my proclamation were not in persuasive words of wisdom, but in a demonstration of spirit and power, that your faith might not be in the wisdom of human beings but in the power of God. (1 Cor 2:1–5)

Paul repeatedly contrasted human and divine wisdom in his argument, stressing the centrality of the messiah figure's crucifixion for his message. Paul then wrote: "And we do speak wisdom to the mature, but [it is] a wisdom not of this age or of the rulers of this age, who have been rendered powerless. But we speak the wisdom of God hidden in mystery (*ἀλλὰ λαλοῦμεν θεοῦ σοφίαν ἐν μυστηριῶ τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην*), which God predestined before the ages for our glory" (1 Cor 2:6–7). Paul's claim was that "we speak the wisdom of God hidden in mystery." Paul continued with reference to the wisdom of God, again keeping the crucifixion of the messiah figure in plain view in his argument:

But we speak the wisdom of God... which none of the rulers of this age comprehended; for if they had comprehended [it], they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. But as it is written, "What eye has not seen, and ear has not heard, and in the heart of a human being it has not arisen, what God has prepared for those who love him." And God has revealed [it] to us through the Spirit (*ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος*). (1 Cor 2:7–10)

Paul's use of "Lord of glory" with reference to the crucifixion of the messiah figure draws on the eschatological theophanic tradition of Third Isaiah:

O that you would tear open the heavens [and] come down,
that the mountains would quake from your presence—
as fire kindles brushwood
[and] fire causes water to boil—

¹⁶ This will be analyzed in more detail below in Chapter 5, in the section on the functions of the messiah figure in LP.

to make known your name to your adversaries,
 that the nations would quiver from your presence.
 When you did fearful things we did not expect,
 you came down [and] the mountains quaked from your presence.
 From ancient time it has not been heard; it has not been perceived by ear;
 no eye has seen a God besides you, [who] works for those who wait for
 him. (Isa 64:1–4; MT 63:19b–64:3)¹⁷

Paul articulated his concept of God revealing wisdom to humans as having its object in the crucifixion of the messiah figure. Paul used this same language of “revealing” with reference to the messiah figure in his Letter to the Galatians. In a context of some of the most detailed autobiographical material in any of his writings, Paul referred to God revealing his son to him. Paul wrote that he received his gospel “through a revelation of Jesus Christ” (δι’ ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Gal 1:12). This should be read as an objective Genitive. Paul wrote: “But when he, who had set me apart from my mother’s womb and called me through his grace, was well pleased to reveal his son to me...” (“Ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν [ὁ θεός] ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί, Gal 1:15–16).¹⁸ The phrase “he who had set me apart” must be a reference to the divine figure, since “his son” is the object of the revelation to Paul.¹⁹

4.2.3 *Divine Acts in the Life of the Messiah Figure*

For Paul the divine figure performed specific acts in the life of the messiah figure. Paul asserted that the divine figure “sent forth” the messiah figure: “God sent forth his son.” This is asserted in two places in LP, in Paul’s Letter to the Galatians and Paul’s Letter to the Romans (Gal 4:4; Rom 8:3).²⁰ According to Paul, the divine figure presented, or “put forward,” the messiah figure to be crucified. The divine figure redeemed those who were under the law by sending his son (Gal 4:4–5). According to Paul, the divine figure willed the death of the messiah

¹⁷ Cf. also Isa 56:1; 58:6–9; 59:18–19; 60:1–3, 19–22; 63:1–6; 66:15–16.

¹⁸ There are text-critical issues here, which is reflected in the critical apparatus of NA 27. ὁ θεός does not appear in the oldest version of the text in P⁴⁶ (second century), but it does appear in Sinaiticus (fourth century), Alexandrinus, Bezae, the Majority Text, and others. Regardless of the presence of ὁ θεός, the subject is clearly the divine figure.

¹⁹ At 1 Cor 15:8 Paul referred to Jesus appearing to him with no mention of the divine figure revealing Jesus to him. The connection between God’s wisdom and the messiah figure in LP will be treated in more detail below in Chapter 5 (§5.1.4).

²⁰ This will be analyzed in more detail below in Chapter 5 (§5.1.2).

figure. Paul claimed that it was “the will of our God and Father” that “our Lord Jesus Christ...gave himself for our sins, so that he might rescue us from the present evil age” (Gal 1:4). Paul referred to the divine figure sending the messiah figure also in his Letter to the Romans. Paul wrote:

There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has freed you from the law of sin and death. For what could not be [done] by the law, in that it was weakened through the flesh—God [did] having sent his own Son (ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας) in the likeness of sinful flesh and with reference to sin he condemned sin in the flesh, in order that the righteous requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to flesh but according to the Spirit. (Rom 8:1–4)

For Paul the sending of the messiah figure by the divine figure had the dual purpose of condemning sin and fulfilling the just requirement of the law. Also in his Letter to the Romans Paul claimed that the divine figure reveals his own righteousness apart from law, when he justifies those who have faith in the messiah figure, “whom God put forward as an atoning sacrifice through faith in his blood. [This was] for a demonstration of his righteousness” (ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, Rom 3:21–26). For Paul the atoning sacrifice (ἱλαστήριον) was the purpose of the divine figure sending his son. Paul further claimed that the purpose of the divine figure sending the messiah figure to be crucified was to justify both Jews and Gentiles by faith (Rom 3:27–30).

Subsequent to the divine figure’s role in the crucifixion of the messiah figure, the divine figure then has a role in the resurrection of the messiah figure in Paul’s thought. There are several references to this in LP. According to Paul, God the Father raised Jesus Christ from the dead (Gal 1:1; 1 Thess 1:10; 1 Cor 6:14; 15:15; 2 Cor 4:14; Rom 4:24; 6:4; 8:11; 10:9).

These events of crucifixion and resurrection of the messiah figure, according to Paul, secured a universal reconciliation between God and sinful humans. Paul argued that sin alienated humans from God,²¹ and that the messiah figure’s death and resurrection worked reconciliation between God and humans: “...if anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old things have passed; behold, new things have come about. All things are from God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ and

²¹ The alienation of humans from God on account of sin is also a key concept in the *Greek Life of Adam and Eve*.

gave to us the ministry of reconciliation; that is, God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them” (2 Cor 5:17–19). In this same context at 2 Cor 5:21, Paul pressed his argument to the point of identifying the messiah figure with human sin: “He made him who did not know sin to be sin in our place, so that we might become the righteousness of God in him” (τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ). Paul claimed that the divine figure intentionally “made” the messiah figure “to be sin,” in order to give his righteousness to humans.

Paul had already made essentially the same claim in his Letter to the Galatians, in the context of discussing the relationship between the faith of Abraham and the works of the law: “Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, becoming a curse for us—for it is written, ‘Cursed is everyone who is hanged on a tree’” (Gal 3:13; cf. Deut 21:23). This is a role in relation to the messiah figure that the divine figure has never had to this point in the history of Jewish thought.

4.2.4 *Salvation*

Salvation is one of the key functions of the divine figure in LP. On the issue of salvation Paul wrote to the Philippians that God worked in them: “...with fear and trembling work out your own salvation; for it is God who works in you (θεὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν), even to will and to work for his good pleasure” (Phil 2:13; cf. Gal 2:8). The issue of maintaining one’s status in relation to God in order to achieve salvation was also an issue for the Thessalonians. In his Letter to the Thessalonians Paul made specific claims as to how an individual human being might attain salvation in relationship to the divine figure, and how this right relationship is to be maintained until the day of judgment. Both, according to Paul, are acts of God on behalf of human beings:

For God has not destined us for wrath, but for obtaining salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us in order that whether we are awake or asleep we might live together with him... May the God of peace himself sanctify you completely; and may your spirit and soul and body be kept sound and blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Faithful is the one who calls you, [and] he will do it. (1 Thess 5:9–10, 23–24)

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

4.2.5 Worship

Receiving worship from humans is tacitly assumed to be one of the roles attributed to the divine figure in Second Temple period Jewish literature (see the discussion in §2.2.3, above). Not surprisingly Paul also claimed that the divine figure receives glory (praise) and worship from humans (Gal 1:5, 24; 1 Cor 6:20; 10:31; 14:25; 2 Cor 1:20; 4:15; 8:19; 9:13; Rom 1:25; 4:20; 11:36; 12:1; 14:11; 15:6; 16:27; Phil 1:11; 3:3; 4:20). At Phil 3:3 Paul wrote: “For we are the circumcision, who worship God in spirit (ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἐσμεν ἡ περιτομή, οἱ πνεύματι θεοῦ λατρεύοντες), and boast in Christ Jesus.” In his Letter to the Romans Paul praised the divine figure. He offered a doxology to God the creator (Rom 1:25). The churches of Judaea glorified God because Paul converted from persecuting them to preaching the faith they believed (Gal 1:24).

4.2.6 Judgment

According to Paul, one of the prominent roles of the divine figure is final judgment (1 Cor 5:13; Rom 2:2–3; 3:6; 9:28; 14:10–12). God’s righteous judgment will be revealed on the day of wrath (Rom 2:5, 16). In his Letter to the Romans Paul claimed that the wrath of God was revealed against sinful humans (Rom 1:18; 2:5–11). For Paul, God’s wrath has come upon those who oppose Paul’s message (1 Thess 2:16; 5:9). So that humans might have the opportunity to escape this judgment, the divine figure is kind and leads humans to repentance (Rom 2:4; 11:22). According to Paul, the divine figure will cause destruction. In a discussion of the legal implications of food in his First Letter to the Corinthians, Paul wrote: “‘Food is for the stomach and the stomach is for food,’ but God will destroy the one as well as the other” (1 Cor 6:13; cf. Phil 1:28).

In a context where Paul outlined the contrasting results of God’s judgment for those who obey the truth and those who do not, Paul described the divine figure as a God who shows no partiality in his judgment (Rom 2:11).²² In connection with the final judgment, resurrection is another function of the divine figure in Paul’s thought. In First Thessalonians, Paul made the claim that at the *parousia* the divine figure will bring with Jesus “those who have fallen asleep,” meaning he will raise them from the dead (1 Thess 4:14; Rom 4:17). Paul referred to the resurrection as a means of power to rise above immorality: “The body is not meant for sexual immorality, but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body. And God also raised the Lord and will raise us through his power” (1 Cor 6:13–14).

²² For other Second Temple period texts that take this view, see, for example, *Pss. Sol.* 2:18; *T. Job* 43:13.

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

4.3 Ambiguous References Either to the Divine Figure or the Messiah Figure

There are two ambiguous references in Paul’s Letter to the Galatians and one ambiguous reference in Paul’s First Letter to the Corinthians. The first ambiguity is located at Gal 3:5. In the immediate context Paul contrasted works of the law with the hearing of faith by asking a series of four rhetorical questions. The entire series of questions focuses on the way in which the Galatians received the Spirit: “Was it by works of law that you received the Spirit or by faithful hearing?” (Gal 3:2). Alluding to circumcision he asks, “Are you so foolish, having begun with the Spirit, that you are now ending with the flesh?” (3:3). “Did you experience so many things in vain? If indeed it even is in vain. Therefore, did he who gives to you the Spirit and works miracles among you (ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν) do so by works of law, or by faithful hearing?” (3:4–5). The ambiguity is in the identification of “he who gives to you the Spirit and works miracles.” Is this a reference to the divine figure or the messiah figure? It is impossible to tell taking into account only the evidence in Galatians.²³

In Gal 5:1–15 Paul addressed the issue of circumcision, referring to it as “a yoke of slavery” (Gal 5:1). Paul wrote: “I am confident for you in the Lord (ἐγὼ πέποιθα εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν κυρίῳ) that you will have no other opinion” (5:10). It is ambiguous as to whether this refers to the divine

²³ At 1 Thess 4:8 Paul explicitly expressed his view that it is “God, who gives his Holy Spirit to you,” that is, to the Thessalonians.

figure or the messiah figure. There is no way of telling which Paul means. While there are a number of references to the Lord Jesus Christ in Galatians, this is the only reference to “the Lord” independent of any other identifying epithet. Not even the context alleviates the ambiguity.

At 1 Cor 4:4 Paul wrote: “The one who judges me is the Lord.” Since Paul used the epithet “Lord” to refer to both the divine figure and the messiah figure, and since for Paul judgment is a function of both the divine figure and the messiah figure (as we shall see in the analysis that follows), it is impossible to discern whether Paul is here referring to the divine figure or the messiah figure. Since there is other evidence that links the messiah figure to the role of eschatological judgment, this specific ambiguity is of no particular consequence.

4.4 Summary and Conclusions

While there is very little material on the nature of the divine figure in LP that lends itself to detailed analysis, what is clear is that Paul’s monotheism led him to write about the divine figure as a being set apart from all others, the unique, only divine God, who possesses deity and is a heavenly being. Paul also understood the divine figure to be righteous in terms of the gospel as Paul defined it in the death and resurrection of the messiah figure, and the redemption he claimed was “in Christ Jesus.”

In LP the divine figure assumes several roles according to Paul. In line with virtually all of Jewish literature from this period, the divine figure is the creator of all things. The divine figure reveals secret and hidden wisdom to human beings. The divine figure revealed the messiah figure to Paul. The divine figure also acted in the life of the messiah figure, “sending forth” the messiah figure to be crucified and raising the messiah figure from the dead. Paul claimed that the death and resurrection of the messiah figure was the divine figure’s way of reconciling the world to himself. In this way the divine figure plays a role in the salvation of humans. The divine figure receives worship from humans. On the day of judgment the divine figure will raise the dead and judge humans. These are all functions of the divine figure in Paul’s thought according to LP.

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

5

THE MESSIAH IN THE LETTERS OF PAUL

5.0 The Messiah Figure in the Letters of Paul

The Second Temple period is characterized by a rich diversity of mediatorial and messianic traditions—Adam, Enoch, Melchizedek, Moses, a variety of angels and archangels, the *Logos*, wisdom. Paul should be understood as having contributed to this extraordinarily diverse landscape of Jewish intellectual traditions.¹

5.1 Nature of the Messiah Figure in the Letters of Paul

There is a significant amount of evidence regarding the nature of the messiah figure in LP that lends itself to detailed analysis. Paul made

¹ Paul used a number of specific epithets for the messiah figure in his letters. Three are the most prominent: Lord (κύριος), Christ (χριστός), and son of God (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ); see, e.g., Gal 2:20; 2 Cor 1:19; Rom 1:3–4. Often Paul used these in some combination, for example, “Christ Jesus,” or “Jesus Christ,” or “Lord Jesus,” or “Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Thess 1:1, 3; 3:13; 5:9, 23, 28; Gal 1:1, 3; 6:14, 18; 1 Cor 1:2, 3, 7–8; 6:11; 8:6; 15:57; 2 Cor 1:2; 4:6; 13:14; Rom 1:7; 5:1; 13:14; 15:6, 30; 16:20; Phil 1:2; 3:20; 4:23; Phlm 3, 25). Paul also referred to the messiah figure as the Lord of glory (1 Cor 2:8); the Son (Gal 1:16; 4:4, 6; 1 Thess 1:10; 1 Cor 1:9; Rom 1:3; 5:10; 8:3); an angel of God (Gal 4:14); Savior (Phil 3:20); and the Seed (Gal 3:16). The epithet “Lord” is the most common in LP. James Dunn writes: “*Kyrios* was Paul’s favourite title for the exalted Jesus.” See Dunn, *Did the First Christians Worship Jesus?*, 103. Larry Hurtado rightly points out, contra Wilhelm Bousset, that “references to Jesus as ‘Lord’ in Pauline epistles frequently involve allusions to Old Testament passages (e.g. Phil. 2:9–11; 1 Cor. 8:5–6) and appropriation of biblical phrasing (e.g. Rom. 10:9–13). This confirms that the early use of the title in Christian circles derives from Jewish religious vocabulary and not, as Bousset claimed, from its use in mystery cults or emperor veneration.” See Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 21; and Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 119–52.

specific assertions about a number of issues related to the nature of the messiah figure in terms of the messiah's humanity, heavenly nature, and preexistence. Paul associated the messiah figure with the wisdom of God. Paul also made claims regarding a pre-human manifestation of the messiah figure, and the messiah figure's identification with the image and glory of God. Paul clearly used the divine title, *kyrios*, which reflects the divine name, with reference to the messiah figure. He also possibly referred to the messiah figure as an angel. Paul also made the claim that the messiah figure was without sin. For most of Paul's claims the evidence is explicit in LP; sometimes the evidence is more inferential.

5.1.1 *A Human Being*

Paul held that the messiah figure is a human being. Paul referred to Christ as Abraham's "seed" (καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου, ὅς ἐστιν Χριστός, Gal 3:16, 19) in connection with the promise God made to Abraham (Gen 13:14–17; 15:1–6). Christ as "the seed" of Abraham is the physical manifestation of the fulfillment of God's promise to the Gentiles (Gal 3:15–20). That the messiah figure in Paul's thought is a human being Paul also articulated in terms of his birth. Referring to the first coming of the messiah figure, Paul wrote: "But when the fullness of the time came, God sent forth his son, born from woman, born under law (γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμου), in order that he might redeem those who are under law, so that we might receive the adoption as sons" (Gal 4:4–5). Here the nature of the messiah figure is clearly human.

Paul also articulated the human nature of the messiah figure in his Letter to the Romans, where he stated that the messiah figure was "born from the seed of David according to flesh" (Rom 1:3), and that the messiah figure was sent by God "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (Rom 8:3). Paul referred to the messiah figure in his Letter to the Romans as a descendant of David, or a Davidic messiah:

Paul, a slave of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, set apart for the gospel of God, which he previously promised through his prophets in holy scriptures, concerning his son, who was born from the seed of David according to flesh, who was defined as son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness by resurrection from the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord... (Rom 1:1–4)

According to this introduction to his Letter to the Romans, Paul claimed that the messiah figure literally "was born from the seed of David according to flesh" (περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα), and that he was "defined as son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness by resurrection from the dead."

For Paul the early tradition that the messiah figure was raised from the dead by the power of the Holy Spirit held significance for setting the messiah figure apart as son of God. For Paul the messiah figure is both son of David according to the flesh and son of God on the basis of his resurrection.²

Philippians 2:5–9 should also be adduced as explicit evidence of the humanity of the messiah figure in Paul’s thought:

Have this mind among you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God did not consider being equal with God as something to be exploited, but he emptied himself by taking the form of a slave, by being born in the likeness of human beings; and having been found in frame as a human he humbled himself by becoming obedient to the point of death, the death of a cross.

This early christological hymn also describes the messiah figure in terms of his human nature: “form of a slave...born in the likeness of human beings...found in frame as a human.”

All of these texts (Gal 3:15–20; 4:4–5; Rom 1:1–4; 8:3; and Phil 2:5–9) provide explicit evidence that Paul clearly thought of the messiah figure as a human being.

5.1.2 *A Heavenly Being*

Paul used language of “sending” to describe the origin of the messiah figure. In his Letter to the Galatians Paul wrote that the messiah figure was “sent forth” by God (Gal 4:4; Rom 8:3). As I have already pointed out, this is stated in two places in LP, in Paul’s Letter to the Galatians and in his Letter to the Romans. At Gal 4:4 Paul wrote: “But when the fullness of the time came, God sent forth his son (ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ), born from woman, born under law, in order that he might redeem those who are under law, so that we might receive the adoption as sons.” This particular text refers to a number of issues related to the messiah figure in terms of both nature and function. Here we will only discuss this passage with regard to the nature of the messiah figure.³ This raises several questions. From where did the divine figure send forth the messiah figure? For the divine figure to “send forth” the messiah figure, this implies location, and since it is a tacit assumption of Second Temple

² In this period the term “Son of God” had a variety of meanings in different Graeco-Roman and Jewish contexts and often referred to a righteous messiah figure. Cf., e.g., Wis 2:12–18. See Jarl Fossum, “Son of God,” *ABD* 6:128–37.

³ Functions of the messiah figure based on this particular text will be discussed in more detail below, in the present chapter (§5.2.4).

period Jewish thought that the divine figure dwells in heaven, this also implies a heavenly nature for the messiah figure (see the discussion above in §4.2.3).⁴ This text further implies the preexistence of the messiah figure in Paul's thought by connecting the motif of God "sending" his son with the messiah figure's birth, "born from woman, born under law" (γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον). Paul considered Christ to be more than a human messiah figure. "God sent forth his son." This is accomplished by means of human birth, suggesting that Paul attributed an existence for the messiah figure prior to his human birth. Not only does this text explicitly make the claim that "God sent forth his son"; Paul qualified this claim with the temporal phrase, "But when the fullness of the time came" (ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου), further suggesting that the messiah figure existed temporally before the sending and was residing in heaven until "the fullness of the time" had arrived.⁵ The second text from LP referring to the divine figure "sending" the messiah figure is in Paul's Letter to the Romans. At Rom 8:3 Paul wrote: "For what could not be [done] by the law, in that it was weakened through the flesh—God [did] having sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh (ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιωμάτι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας) and with reference to sin he condemned sin in the flesh, in order that the righteous requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to flesh but according to the Spirit." This again raises the question, from where did God send forth his Son? The logical answer is that God had to "send forth" his Son from some specific place. This is further evidence that Paul considered the messiah figure to be a heavenly being.⁶

⁴ See Simon J. Gathercole, *The Preexistent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 28–29.

⁵ Cf. *Pss. Sol.* 17:21, where the plea is made that the Lord would raise up the Son of David "in the time known to you, O God." Cf. also *Pss. Sol.* 18:5; 2 *Bar.* 29:8–30:1.

⁶ Adela Yarbro Collins points to three texts from the LXX (Judg 6:8; Jer 7:25; Ezek 3:5–6) that refer to the divine figure "sending" (ἐξαποστέλλειν) prophets to Israel, and she argues that "sending forth" in Galatians does not refer to the messiah figure's preexistence. Adela Yarbro Collins and John J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 107. One text that Yarbro Collins did not include in her list is Ps 110:2 (LXX 109:2) where "the Lord will send forth (ἐξαποστελεῖ) the scepter of your power from Zion." It is entirely possible, and even more likely, that Paul (and other New Testament writers) had in mind Ps 110:2, interpreted messianically, rather than the texts Yarbro Collins has suggested. The connection Paul made between sending the son of God and his birth in Gal 4, it seems to me, clinches this.

But the evidence in LP does not just leave us to infer that the messiah figure was a heavenly being in Paul's thought. Paul made this claim explicit in a number of places. In his First Letter to the Thessalonians, Paul described the messiah figure as the "son from heaven," asserting his heavenly nature (1 Thess 1:10). Paul made this same explicit claim in his First Letter to the Corinthians in the context of his argument regarding Christ as the second Adam, where he wrote that "the second man is from heaven" (1 Cor 15:47). With reference to the *parousia* in his Letter to the Philippians, Paul claimed that he waited for the messiah figure to come from heaven (Phil 3:20). Paul wrote in his Second Letter to the Corinthians that he considered Christ to be more than human. He did not take this to the point of referring to the messiah figure as divine. Paul did, however, clearly state that the messiah figure was more than human. "Therefore, from now on we know no one according to flesh; even if we knew Christ according to flesh, but now no longer do we know [him this way]" (2 Cor 5:16).

5.1.3 *Preexistence*

According to Paul the messiah figure is preexistent. This can be inferred from a number of texts in LP. At 1 Cor 8:4–6 Paul wrote: "...for us there is one God the Father, from whom are all things even as we [exist] for him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things even as we [exist] through him." In addition to closely associating the messiah figure with the divine figure by playing on the Jewish *Shema*,⁷ as Larry Hurtado has pointed out,⁷ Paul expressed the uniqueness of the messiah figure: "one Lord Jesus Christ." Paul also has claimed here that the messiah figure played a role in creation. While this expresses the role of the messiah figure as agent of God's creative activity (which will be discussed in more detail below in the section on the functions of the messiah figure), such a role must presuppose that preexistence is part of the nature of the messiah figure in Paul's thought.⁸ Larry Hurtado makes the point that this text supports the view of the early Christian use of the Hebrew Bible to defend the divinity of the historical Jesus as the messiah figure:

However, in Justin (and the Christian tradition he reflects) it is not simply or primarily an academic debate over what one might make of biblical texts. Instead they explore certain theophanic accounts to confirm and celebrate Jesus' divine status for themselves, and to persuade others to

⁷ Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 114.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 325, 465, 576, 647.

embrace him as divine. For the early Christian handling of these Old Testament texts that Justin exemplifies, the prior and essential basis is the belief that the historic Jesus was the incarnate form of the preexistent and divine Son/Word, through and with whom God created all things. This belief certainly goes back early into first-century Christianity, as attested by such passages as 1 Corinthians 8:4–6, Philippians 2:6–8, Colossians 1:15–17, Hebrews 1:1–3, and John 1:1–2. Given this belief, it was not so strange for early Christians such as Justin to look for references to the preincarnate Jesus/Son/Word in their Scriptures.⁹

Hurtado is correct to identify 1 Cor 8:4–6 as a Pauline text that establishes the preexistence of the messiah figure in Paul’s thought. However, it takes the evidence too far to claim that preexistence implies divinity. As we have already seen, the Enochic messiah Son of Man was also considered a preexistent being by the author(s) of BP, but there is no evidence in BP that the author(s) also viewed the Enochic messiah figure to be divine (see above, §3.1.4).

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

Paul does have a conception of the preexistent Christ. But it is the preexistence of Wisdom now identified by and as Christ. It is the prehistorical existence of Adam as a template on which a vivid Adam christology begins to be drawn. That there is no clear thought of Christ’s preexistence independent of such imagery (Wisdom and Adam) is a factor of considerable importance in determining the significance to be given to subsequent statements of Christ’s preexistence.¹⁰

With specific reference to 1 Cor 8:6, Dunn acknowledges the preexistence of the messiah figure in Paul’s language: “The ‘one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things,’ clearly existed before the creation of the ‘all things (*ta panta*).’”¹¹

Philippians 2:7 also refers to the preexistence of the messiah figure, and takes an incipient or proto-incarnational tone.¹² We have already seen that Paul considered the messiah figure to be a human being (see §5.1.1, above). We have also seen how Paul considered the messiah figure to be a heavenly being (see §5.1.2, above). The combination of

⁹ Ibid., 576.

¹⁰ Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 292. See also R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man: A Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).

¹¹ Ibid., 267–68.

¹² Graham Stanton calls it an “incarnational pattern,” which he also sees in 2 Cor 8:9. See Stanton’s essay, “Matthew’s Christology and the Parting of the Ways,” in Dunn, ed., *Jews and Christians*, 114.

evidence in Paul, that the messiah figure is a preexistent heavenly being (1 Cor 8:6; 15:47) who was also born as a human being (Gal 3:15–20; 4:4–5; Rom 1:1–4; 8:3; Phil 2:5–9), suggests an incipient use of language toward a concept like incarnation in Paul’s thought. All of these texts have an incipient language of incarnation or a proto-incarnational tone, not in the sense of the more developed language that is typically identified with incarnation of deity as in the Prologue to John’s Gospel (John 1:1–5, 14), but in the sense that Paul clearly conceptualized a preexistent heavenly messiah figure who was “born from woman,” in human flesh. In Phil 2 the messiah figure was in the form of God, but “did not consider being equal with God as something to be exploited, but he emptied himself by taking the form of a slave, by being born in the likeness of human beings” (Phil 2:6–7). Of what did the messiah figure empty himself? This presupposes preexistence of some kind. There is clearly a change between “being in the form of God” (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων) and “taking the form of a slave” (μορφὴν δούλου λαβών) or “being born in the likeness of human beings” (ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος). The contrast between “being” and “becoming” virtually leaps off the page. This is an extraordinary contrast that can only be fully explained in terms of preexistence. Dunn, however, has argued: “It cannot be taken for granted that ὑπάρχων has a connotation of timelessness and so an implication of preexistence; it simply denotes the established state of the one in question at the time his ἡγήσασθαι was made (cf. Luke 7:25 and the frequent use of the present participle in the sense ‘who is’ or ‘since he is’, etc....).”¹³

Dunn’s analysis must be granted as a possibility, but we should include in the discussion other grammatical possibilities for ὑπάρχων at Phil 2:6. Ernest De Witt Burton described a use of the present participle for the imperfect: “The Present Participle is also sometimes used as an Imperfect to denote a continued action antecedent to that of the principal verb.” Burton also has an example of a rarer use of the present participle, one which he called, “The Present of Past Action Still in Progress, the action denoted beginning before the action of the principal verb and continuing in progress at the time denoted by the latter.”¹⁴ Blass, DeBrunner, and Funk has a supplementary circumstantial (adverbial) use of the participle: “The logical relation of the circumstantial participle to the rest of the sentence is not expressed by the participle itself (apart from the future participle), but is to be deduced from the context; it can

¹³ Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 310–11 n. 67.

¹⁴ Ernest De Witt Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* (3d ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1976 [repr. of the 3d ed., 1898]), 58–59.

be made clear, however, by the addition of certain particles.”¹⁵ The ambiguity of the present tense participle ὑπάρχων leaves us with only one option, to read it in its context:

- 6 ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων.
οὐχ ἄρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο
τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ,
7 ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν
μορφὴν δούλου λαβών,
ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος·
καὶ σχήματι ἐύρεθεις ὡς ἄνθρωπος
8 ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν
γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου,
θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ.
- 6 Who being in the form of God
did not consider as something to be exploited
being equal with God,
7 but he emptied himself
by taking the form of a slave,
by being born in the likeness of human beings;
and having been found in frame as a human
8 he humbled himself
by becoming obedient to the point of death,
the death of a cross.

I take the participles λαβών and γενόμενος of v. 7 to be instrumental. The *kenosis* of the messiah figure was accomplished “by means of taking the form of a slave” and “by means of being born in the likeness of human beings.” It is also tempting to take ὑπάρχων in v. 6 in a causal sense: “Because he was in the form of God, he did not consider being equal with God as something (he needed) to hold onto.” The *hapax legomenon* ἄρπαγμός in Classical usage means “to seize or to plunder.”¹⁶ And in the New Testament the verb ἀρπάζειν means “to snatch, attack, plunder, or gain control over.”¹⁷ The noun, ἄρπαγμός, denotes “plunder” or “something to hold by force.” Louw and Nida comment: “Since ἄρπαγμός may mean not only ‘to grasp something forcefully which one does not

¹⁵ Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (trans. from the 9th–10th German; ed. Robert W. Funk; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), §416, pp. 214–15.

¹⁶ H. G. Liddell, R. Scott and H. S. Jones, *Greek–English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968).

¹⁷ Walter Bauer, *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (ed. William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich; 3d ed.; rev. Frederick W. Danker; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

have'...but also 'to retain by force what one possesses,' it is possible to translate Phil 2:6 in two quite different ways."¹⁸ This leaves the ambiguity unresolved, and again it is necessary to consult the context to arrive at a reasonable answer. Verse 7 begins with the particle ἀλλά, contrasting what has gone before in v. 6. "But he emptied himself," assumes that the messiah figure possessed something before the *kenosis*, which occurred at the time when he took "the form of a slave." In fact, the *kenosis* itself was accomplished by means of taking the form of a slave. The verb ἐκένωσεν indicates that the messiah figure was something more (or that he possessed more) before the *kenosis* than he was (or possessed) after the *kenosis*. This is also true of the verb ἐταπείνωσεν in v. 8. That the messiah figure existed as (or possessed) something more before his *kenosis* leads us to understand ἀρπαγμός of v. 6 as "something to be held onto (by force)" or "something to be exploited." If v. 6 only reflects the state of the messiah figure like Adam before Adam sinned, then the contrast in vv. 7–8 introduced by ἀλλά makes absolutely no sense. The contrast with Adam is clearly represented in other ways throughout the hymn, as Dunn also argues.

If the hymn in its present form is based on an Aramaic original, that in itself does not render this discussion moot. It only renders moot the part of the discussion that focuses on the participial relationship between ὑπάρχων and the main verb, ἠγήσατο. If there was an Aramaic *Vorlage* that was the basis for the hymn in its Greek form, as Joseph Fitzmyer and others have argued, then the participial force of ὑπάρχων carries less weight with regard to our understanding of the preexistence question in this hymn.

Fitzmyer retrofitted v. 6 with the following Aramaic lines:

הוא בצלם אלהא איתוהי
ולא חשב שלל
למהוא שוי לאלהא¹⁹

Fitzmyer (as did Levertoff) used the pleonastic form of the first person singular suffix with the existential particle, איתו. This also occurs at Dan 2:11. The existential particle renders the meaning of the line virtually in terms of a finite verb, which requires a conjunction to introduce the next line (which does not appear in the Greek text because of the participial

¹⁸ Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, *Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. Vol. 1, *Introduction and Domains* (2d ed.; New York: United Bible Societies, 1989), §57.236, p. 584.

¹⁹ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic Background of Philippians 2:6–11," *CBQ* 50 (1988): 470–83.

relationship between ὑπάρχων and the main verb, ἡγήσατο). This leaves the opening statement of the first line standing on its own and not in a subordinate relationship to another main verb. It should also be noted that this then places the opening line of the hymn in the Greek text, ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, in a position of emphasis that should be connected to the very last line of the hymn, also in a position of emphasis.²⁰

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

In particular, how are we to understand verses 6–8, which refer to Christ being “in the form of God” and having been able to demur from exploiting for his own advantage “being equal with God”? Most scholars take these verses to reflect a belief in the personal preexistence and incarnation of Christ. But Dunn contends that they allude to the Genesis accounts of the creation and disobedience of Adam, and that the Philippians passage simply contrasts the self-sacrifice of the human Jesus with the hubris of Adam in reaching for divinity. That is, Philippians 2:6–8 refers solely to the actions of the earthly Jesus, and no preincarnate state is in view...

It is true that, when they are suggested by scholars, we can see contrasts between Jesus’ self-humbling in verses 6–8 of this passage and the serpent’s claim that if they eat of the forbidden tree Adam (and Eve) will be “like gods” (LXX: *hōs theoi*) in Genesis 3:1–7. But Dunn’s claim that Philippians 2:6–8 is a clear and direct allusion to the Genesis account and is thus intended to be read simply as “Adam Christology” greatly exceeds the warrants of the passage.²¹

I agree with Hurtado. Dunn’s analysis fails to take into consideration all of the evidence in the text, and it limits our understanding of preexistence in Paul’s thought more than the evidence warrants. The evidence in Phil 2 makes it entirely possible to have both a strong Adam christology and preexistence.²²

In his Second Letter to the Corinthians Paul wrote, “For you know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that for your sake he became poor even though he was rich, in order that you, by his poverty, might become rich” (2 Cor 8:9). This echoes the thought of Phil 2 by asserting that the pre-existent messiah figure originally had “something,” but by being born as a human being the messiah figure relinquished his claim on whatever it was he had. At the very least this must refer to Paul’s understanding that

²⁰ This will be discussed in more detail in the Excursus in Chapter 6 (§6.4).

²¹ Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 121.

²² Again, this argument will be developed in more detail in the Excursus in Chapter 6 (§6.4), where I will discuss the intertextuality of Phil 2 and the Adam traditions in the *Greek Life of Adam and Eve*, and Paul’s Adam christology in Rom 5 and 1 Cor 15.

the messiah figure relinquished his status as a heavenly being. With reference to the 2 Cor 8:9 text, James Dunn has argued that this is not a reference to preexistence, but to abasement, referring to Christ's death on the cross, and that we should be cautious about identifying these two texts (Phil 2 and 2 Cor 8) in terms of preexistence.²³

Larry Hurtado has responded to Dunn by reading 2 Cor 8:9 and Phil 2:6–11 in connection with each other. Hurtado rejects Dunn's claim that the self-impoverishment of 2 Cor 8:9 constituted a "one-stage act of abasement," a claim for which there is no evidence in the text, as Hurtado rightly points out. Hurtado is correct when he argues, "What Pauline Christians might have seen as being involved in Christ's self-impoverishment remains an open question." This leads Hurtado to argue that it is necessary to examine other evidence in Paul's Letters regarding Christ's self-abasement, in order better to understand its meaning in 2 Cor 8:9.²⁴

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

5.1.4 Association with the Wisdom of God

In his First Letter to the Corinthians, Paul closely associated the messiah figure with the wisdom of God. Paul described the messiah figure as both the power and the wisdom of God (1 Cor 1:23–24, 30). Paul also referred to the messiah figure as "our righteousness and sanctification and wisdom" (1 Cor 1:30). Following the work of several scholars, James Dunn convincingly lays out the precedent for connecting the language of the messiah figure as God's preexistent agent of creation in 1 Cor 8:6 with divine wisdom as God's preexistent agent of creation in Second Temple period literature:²⁵

²³ Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 291–92.

²⁴ Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 120–21.

²⁵ Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 269–70. Here Dunn draws upon the work of Habermann, von Lips, and Kuschel. Dunn cites as primary evidence: Ps 104:24; Prov 3:19; 8:22, 25; Sir 1:4; Wis 1:6–7; 7:26; 8:5; 9:2; Philo, *Leg. All.* 1.43; *Ebr.* 30–31; *QG* 4.97.

Clearly...Paul was attributing to *Christ* the role previously attributed to divine Wisdom. Indeed, it is entirely consistent with the evidence to conclude that Paul was tacitly identifying Christ with Wisdom, indeed, *as* Wisdom. In thinking of preexistent Wisdom Paul now thought of Christ.²⁶

In fact, the language Paul used suggests that he explicitly identified the messiah figure with the wisdom of God at 1 Cor 1:22–24: “...since Jews ask for signs and Greeks seek wisdom; but we proclaim a crucified messiah, to Jews a scandal and to Gentiles foolishness, but to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God” (αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς, Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἑλλῆσιν, Χριστὸν θεοῦ δύναμιν καὶ θεοῦ σοφίαν). This suggests a more direct, literal statement of Paul’s identification of the messiah figure with the wisdom of God.

The question, however, is: In what sense was Paul identifying the messiah figure with wisdom? Was Paul actually *identifying* the messiah figure with wisdom, or was he making a metaphorical association? It is possible to translate αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς, Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἑλλῆσιν, Χριστὸν θεοῦ δύναμιν καὶ θεοῦ σοφίαν in this way: “we proclaim a crucified messiah, to Jews a scandal and to Gentiles foolishness, but to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, the messiah [we proclaim] *is* the power of God and the wisdom of God” (emphasis added). That, however, does not exclude the possibility that this is a metaphorical association. Adela Yarbro Collins has commented on this passage:

...the affirmation that “to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, [we proclaim] Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God” (1 Cor 1:24) does not necessarily imply that Paul identifies Christ here with preexistent, personified wisdom. In the context, the force of the statement is that those who are called do not need human power and wisdom because they share in God’s power and wisdom manifested in Christ.²⁷

James Dunn approaches the preexistence of the messiah figure in LP through the lens of preexistent wisdom. He argues that the preexistence of the messiah figure in LP is developed around the prehistoric Adam figure “as a template on which a vivid Adam christology begins to be drawn.” Dunn also writes: “Paul does have a conception of the preexistent Christ. But it is the preexistence of Wisdom now identified by and as Christ.”²⁸ The problem with Dunn’s analysis, as detailed as it is, is that it abstracts these concepts until they make absolutely no sense in practical

²⁶ Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 270.

²⁷ Yarbro Collins, *King and Messiah*, 111.

²⁸ Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 292.

terms as to what they actually meant for Jews in the first century C.E.²⁹ If with Dunn we take Paul's statement literally and identify preexistent wisdom "by and as Christ," then we must also ask what it means to identify the messiah figure with the power of God (see the discussion in §5.2.4, below). We should not say that the messiah figure's identity is defined by, or even reduced to, a set of functions associated with the divine figure. It seems to be more accurate to say that the role the messiah figure played in the gospel, according to Paul, "manifests" or "reveals" the wisdom and power of God.

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

During the 3rd century, the possibility that Judaism might develop in the Hellenistic world as a form of inclusive monotheism was a feasible and fascinating option, a possibility that—as the events that preceded the Maccabean Revolt would prove—was to find many enthusiastic supporters in Jerusalem, even among the members of the ruling priesthood.³⁰

During the early Second Temple period there was a clear distinction between Sapiential Judaism (represented by such texts as *Ahiqar*, Proverbs, Job, Jonah, and Qoheleth) and Zadokite Judaism (represented by such texts as Ezekiel, Nehemiah–Ezra, Priestly Writing, and Chronicles). According to Boccaccini, in the third century B.C.E. Sapiential Judaism formed a rapprochement with Zadokite Judaism (Tobit, Sirach).³¹ In this period of rapprochement between Sapiential and Zadokite Judaisms, wisdom continued to be presented as created by God before all things (Sir 1:4; 24:8–9). But in addition to the merging of these two Jewish intellectual traditions, there was also a bifurcation. Part of the Wisdom tradition did not merge in rapprochement with Zadokite Judaism. Part of the Wisdom tradition developed as Hellenistic Judaism (as represented by texts such as the LXX, *Aristeas*, Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers, Wisdom of Solomon). Prior to the merging of Sapiential and Zadokite Judaisms, wisdom was presented in the Sapiential tradition as both a creation of God and a preexistent agent of God's creation (Prov 8–9). Following the merging of these two traditions, nothing on this score changed. Wisdom continued to be cast as a creation of God and the preexistent agent of

²⁹ See the discussion below in the Excursus in Chapter 6 (§6.4) on the development of Paul's Adam christology in the context of a first-century Jewish soteriological debate.

³⁰ Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism*, 118.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 113–50.

God's creation. What was added to the tradition during this period of rapprochement was the idea that the tangible manifestation of God's wisdom in the world was now to be viewed as the Torah:

Wisdom will praise herself,
 and in the midst of her people she will glory.
 In the assembly of the Most High she will open her mouth,
 and in the presence of his power she will glory,
 "As for me, from the mouth of the Most High I came forth
 and as a mist I covered the earth;
 As for me, in highest places I made my dwelling,
 and my throne was in a pillar of cloud;
 the circle of heaven I alone encircled
 and in the depth of the abyss I have walked around;
 in the waves of the sea and in all the earth
 and among every people and nation I acquired [a possession].
 With all of these I sought a resting place
 and in whose inheritance I might find lodging.
 Then the creator of the universe commanded me,
 and the one who created me brought to rest my tent
 and he said, 'In Jacob set up your dwelling
 and in Israel receive an inheritance.'
 Before the age, from the beginning, he created me,
 and as long as there is an age, in no way will I fail.
 In the holy tent, in his presence I rendered liturgical service
 and thus in Zion I was established;
 in the beloved city likewise he brought me to rest,
 and in Jerusalem is my dominion;
 so I was rooted in a glorified people
 in the Lord's portion, his inheritance..."
 All this is the book of the covenant of the Most High God,
 the Torah which Moses commanded us
 as an inheritance for the communities of Jacob. (Sir 24:1–12, 23)

As Boccaccini describes this, "the Torah of Moses is the historical embodiment of the heavenly wisdom."³²

Not all the adherents of the Hellenistic Jewish tradition depicted wisdom as a creation of God, even though wisdom was still held to be an agent of God's creation. Neither did this development of Hellenistic Judaism accept the claim that the Torah was the manifestation of God's wisdom. In some traditions of Hellenistic Judaism wisdom was presented as an extension of the identity of the divine figure. Wisdom of Solomon describes wisdom as "a mist" or "a breath of the power of God" (ἀτμίς γάρ ἐστίν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως):

³² Ibid., 146–47.

For she is a breath of the power of God,
 and a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty;
 therefore nothing morally deficient intrudes [itself] into her.
 For she is a reflection of eternal light
 and a spotless mirror of the inner working of God
 and an image of his goodness. (Wis 7:25–26)

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

The language applied to wisdom in this text is the same language applied to the messiah figure in the New Testament: "power of God" (1 Cor 1:24), "glory of the Almighty" (Phil 2:11), "reflection" (Heb 1:3), "image" (2 Cor 4:4; Col 1:15). Paul in particular has adopted this language with reference to the nature of the messiah figure. And if the author of Wisdom of Solomon understood wisdom to be more than a creation of the divine figure (Prov 8:22), to be "a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty" or an "outflowing" of the divine figure's presence (as ἀπόρροια τῆς...δόξης should probably be understood; cf. Sir 45:3), is this the sense in which we are to take Paul's association of the messiah figure with the wisdom of God? Or at the very least, is this the trajectory of the Jewish intellectual tradition of wisdom that should inform our reading of Paul's association of God's wisdom with the messiah figure? All of the elements seem to be present, including wisdom as agent of creation (Wis 6:22; 9:9), "the designer of all things" (ἡ γὰρ πάντων τεχνίτις ἐδίδαξέν με σοφία, Wis 7:21), "the designer of what exists" (Wis 8:6). This wisdom even sits by the throne of the divine figure (Wis 9:4, 10; cf. Rom 8:34; Ps 110; *I En.* 84:3).

Dunn entertains this as a real possibility.³³ After discussing possibilities for understanding Jewish wisdom (as one of many heavenly beings of a polytheistic Israel and as personification), Dunn writes the following:

³³ Charles Gieschen opts for hypostasis, which he refers to as "angelomorphic divine hypostases." See his analysis in *Angelomorphic Christology*, 70–123.

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

Would it be fair, then, to argue that the substance of “hypostatization” was already present in the early Jewish talk of Wisdom, even if an appropriate technical term was not yet to hand? Perhaps. But when one appreciates the vigour of Jewish metaphor and is willing to recognize that Wisdom functions as an extended metaphor—and when one observes that the bulk of Jewish opinion sees no difficulty in identifying talk of God’s glory and God’s wisdom as talk of God’s immanence—is recourse to a term like “hypostatization” really necessary? If “personification” is unsatisfactory, let us talk simply of the “metaphor” of Wisdom. But above all, whatever term is used, the point is hard to escape that, according to the evidence available to us, Wisdom was universally understood within early Judaism as God’s wisdom, as the immanent God in his wise engagement with his creation and his people.³⁴

³⁴ Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 270–72. Christopher Rowland (*The Open Heaven*, 99–100) reads the dependence of Dan 10 on an interpretation of the heavenly figure in Ezek 1 as an early “hypostatic development”: “What we find in Daniel 10.5f. then is a broadly based dependence on Ezekiel and especially on the first chapter. It would seem that either Ezekiel 1.26f. or 8.2 has been interpreted and influenced by other aspects of the first chapter of Ezekiel. Such a transference of images to the human figure could well have taken place during a vision when the precise identification of various words and phrases was confused by the overwhelming impression of glory upon the seer. What does emerge from this study of the angelophany in this chapter is that we are dealing here with no ordinary angelic being. It is true that he was sent by God to fulfil a particular function, namely to communicate to Daniel the historical events which are to take place. But the fact that he acts as a divine emissary cannot disguise the exalted language used to describe the angel. R.H. Charles has pointed out the theological complexities which are to be found in these verses, and which are admirably epitomized by the impact which the angelophany makes upon the seer (Dan. 10.9, cf. Ezek. 2.1, 1 Enoch 71.11, Matt. 17.6, and 3 Enoch 16). What we have here is the beginning

One may point to Heb 1:3 where the word *hypostasis* is applied to the messiah figure (ὅς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ). But this is not the same as the developed theological category debated by Christians in the third and fourth centuries C.E.³⁵ Dunn's analysis and his musings about the inadequacies of applying a later theological term like "hypostatization" to Second Temple Jewish conceptualizations of wisdom are helpful. Also helpful is his suggestion for the use of the term "metaphor" as a more precise way of talking about wisdom in the Second Temple period. Wisdom, when applied to the messiah figure in LP, more closely approximates the metaphorical descriptions of Hellenistic Judaism than those of Tobit or Sirach, pressing the metaphor in the direction of presenting the messiah figure as the divine figure's immanence by using such terms as "glory," "image," and "power of God." It is also worth noting here that Philo—in a context where he presents *nous*, logic and *paideia*, the opposite of *paideia* in the basest of human behaviors, wisdom, and the divine figure all metaphorically as different springs or sources of wisdom on which human behavior is based—juxtaposed wisdom alongside the divine figure and described wisdom as divine (ἢδ' ἐστὶν ἡ θεία σοφία).³⁶ It seems to me that it is a better understanding of Paul's language at 1 Cor 1:24 to see visible manifestation rather than identification with regard to the messiah figure and the wisdom of God. As was pointed out before, the way in which Paul connected wisdom and the messiah figure was to make the act of salvation in the death and resurrection of Christ to be the concrete demonstration of God's wisdom to humans.

of a hypostatic development similar to that connected with divine attributes like God's word and wisdom."

³⁵ See the detailed discussions of hypostasis in the context of the early christological controversies in Leo Donald Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325–787): Their History and Theology* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1983).

³⁶ Philo, *Fug.* 177–201. This specific assertion by Philo, that wisdom is divine, is located at *Fug.* 195. The boundary between what is human and what is divine, at least as far as the divine participating in the contemplative life of human beings, is somewhat fluid for Philo. In *Quis Rerum* (84) Philo referred to the *nous* that participates in liturgical service to God as divine: ὁ γὰρ νοῦς, ὅτε μὲν καθαρῶς λειτουργεῖ θεῷ, οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπινος, ἀλλὰ θεῖος. On divine wisdom in Philo, cf. also *Quis Rerum* 127–29, and the divine *Logos* at *Quis Rerum* 119. Philo also referred to the jewels on the priestly robe which were engraved with "reminders of divine natures," θείων φύσεων ὑπομνήματα. So the fluidity of Philo's language does not make a clear distinction between the one deity and heavenly things that are fashioned for use on earth by humans.

5.1.5 Pre-human

In addition to a messiah figure who is heavenly, preexistent, and human, Paul conceptualized what I will call a sort of pre-human messiah figure who dwelled among God's people. In First Corinthians Paul midrashed the account of the Israelites wandering in the wilderness after the exodus from Egypt.³⁷ While the Israelites were at Horeb, the Lord commanded Moses to strike a rock in order to provide water for the people (Exod 17:6; Num 20:7–11). At 1 Cor 10:1–4 Paul wrote:

For I do not want you to be ignorant, brothers, that our ancestors all were under the cloud (οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν πάντες ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλῃν ἦσαν), and all passed through the sea, and all were baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea (καὶ πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσθησαν ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ), and all ate the same spiritual food and all drank the same spiritual drink. For they drank from the spiritual rock following [them], and the rock was Christ (ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ Χριστός).

This presupposes the messiah figure in Paul's thought to have existed in some sort of pre-human state. I have consciously chosen to use the expression "pre-human" to discuss this midrash and Paul's description of the messiah figure as a distinct entity before the messiah figure was "born of woman" (Gal 4:4). While the old expression, "Christophany,"

³⁷ That 1 Cor 10:1–4 is midrashic is assumed by many scholars. Cf. E. Earle Ellis, "'Wisdom' and 'Knowledge' in 1 Corinthians," in *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity: New Testament Essays* (WUNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1978), 45–62, see also 156, 209; Karl-Gustav Sandelin, "'Do not Be Idolaters!' (1 Cor 10:7)," in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in their Textual and Situational Contexts, Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman* (ed. David Hellholm and T. Fornberg; Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995), 257–73; Anders Eriksson, *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof: Pauline Argumentation in 1 Corinthians* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1998), 167; Wayne A. Meeks, "And Rose Up to Play: Midrash and Paraenesis in 1 Corinthians 10:1–22," *JSNT* 16 (1982): 64–78; Lamar Cope, "First Corinthians 8–10: Continuity or Contradiction?," *ATR: Supplementary Series II. Christ and His Communities: Essays in Honor of Reginald H. Fuller* (March 1990): 114–23. Some scholars do not accept that 1 Cor 10:1–4 is midrashic. See B. J. Oropeza, "Laying to Rest the Midrash: Paul's Message on Meat Sacrificed to Idols in Light of the Deuteronomistic Tradition," *Biblica* 79 (1998): 57–68; Oropeza, *Paul and Apostacy: Eschatology, Perseverance, and Falling Away in the Corinthian Congregation* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 56–58; David G. Horrell, "Theological Principle of Christological Praxis? Pauline Ethics in 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1," *JSNT* 67 (1997): 95–96; Khiok-Khng Yeo, *Rhetorical Interaction in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10: A Formal Analysis with Preliminary Suggestions for a Chinese, Cross-Cultural Hermeneutic* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 156–58.

has some attraction, it carries with it too much theological freight because of its association with late-modern Christian apologetics regarding the divinity of the messiah figure and its obvious association with the term, “theophany.”³⁸ The phrase “pre-human” seems to be the most accurate description of what Paul was trying to convey in 1 Cor 10:1–4, where he identified the messiah figure with the rock that accompanied the Israelites in their post-exodus wandering. Paul seems to have attempted to describe some sort of middle state for the messiah figure between a heavenly and human nature. It may be worth noting here that Philo opted for a similar sort of middle position for the *Logos* in *Quis Rerum*:

To the archangel (τῷ δὲ ἀρχαγγέλω), even the most ancient Logos (λόγῳ), the Father who has begotten the universe gave a remarkable gift, to stand as a boundary and separate the creature from the one who has created (ἵνα μεθόριος στὰς τὸ γινόμενον διακρίνη τοῦ πεποιηκότος). The same [Logos] is on the one hand a suppliant of the ever anxious mortal with the immortal, and on the other hand is ambassador of the ruler to the obedient. He rejoices in the gift and exalting it he tells [about it] saying, “and I stood in the middle between the Lord and you” (Deut 5:5), being neither uncreated as God, nor created as you (οὔτε ἀγέννητος ὡς ὁ θεὸς ὧν οὔτε γενητὸς ὡς ὑμεῖς), but between the extremes, pledging to both, to the father for trust that the creature would not altogether rebel and turn away, choosing disorder in the place of order, and to the child for the confidence that the merciful God would never overlook his own work. For I send a messenger [to announce] peaceful things to creation from the God who is known to purge wars and to be the perpetual guardian of peace.³⁹

What is interesting about Philo’s speculation on the divine *Logos* in this text, and its pertinence to 1 Cor 10:1–4, is that it comes in a context where Philo mentions the cloud theophany as the Israelites were escaping Egypt:

And yet more am I amazed, when hearing the oracles I learn again how the cloud entered between the Egyptian and the Israelite hosts (ὄν τρόπον εἰσῆλθεν ἡ νεφέλη μέση τῆς τε Αἰγυπτιακῆς καὶ τῆς Ἰσραηλιτικῆς στρατιᾶς [cf. Exod 14:20]). For the cloud did not allow the self-controlled and God-beloved nation to be pursued by the passion-loving and godless; [it was] a weapon of shelter and salvation for friends, but [a weapon of] defense against and punishment for enemies. For on thriving minds [the cloud] gently showers wisdom, which by nature is unmoved by all

³⁸ See Orlando T. Dobbin, ed., ΧΡΙΣΤΟΦΑΝΕΙΑ: *The Doctrine of the Manifestations of the Son of God under the Economy of the Old Testament*. By the Late Rev. George Balderston Kidd (London: Ward & Co., Paternoster Row, 1852).

³⁹ *Quis Rerum* 205–6. For the Greek text, cf. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, *Philo IV* (LCL; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1985).

evil, but on the wretched and sterile of knowledge it snows drifts of retribution, bringing [against them] a destructive [and] most pitiable cataclysm.⁴⁰

Philo certainly read the “cloud” of Exod 14 metaphorically, as gently sprinkling wisdom on “thriving minds.” The point I am making here, however, is that like Philo who midrashed Exod 14:19–20 with reference to the divine *Logos*, Paul also midrashed Exod 14:19–20 with reference to the messiah figure (adding to his midrash the rock of Exod 17:6 and Num 20:7–11). And both Philo (for the *Logos*) and Paul (for Christ) claimed some sort of middle state, Paul also claiming a pre-human state, between the uncreated divine figure and created humans. Philo’s cloud protects, delivers, and showers wisdom on the “God-beloved nation” (θεοφιλὲς γένος). Paul interpreted the cloud as a baptism “into Moses.” In fact, by taking Paul’s midrash in its broader context one can see that Paul alluded to baptism and the ritual meal of the early Jesus movement in his interpretation of the exodus and the wandering of the Israelites in the wilderness. The broader context is 1 Cor 10–11, where Paul warned the Corinthians against engaging in idolatry, and that it is not possible to participate at the altars of pagan sacrifices while also participating in the ritual meal of the community of Jesus followers. Paul claimed that the account of the rock (“spiritual food” and “spiritual drink”) in Exod 17:6 and Num 20:7–11 served as instruction for the Corinthians as to how they were to guard themselves from idolatry: “And these things have become types for us, so that we might not desire evils, as they also desired. Do not become worshipers of idols as some of them [were], just as it is written, ‘The people sat down to eat and to drink and they rose up to play’... Therefore, my beloved, flee from the worship of idols” (1 Cor 10:6–7, 14).

If it is true that Paul used a midrash that was formulated prior to the composition of his First Letter to the Corinthians and then added this midrash to the letter when it was composed, then one can only speculate about its origin. Taken in connection with Paul’s own statement at Gal 2:11–14, the Acts of the Apostles may be taken as reliable evidence that Antioch was the place where Paul spent the early years of his ministry. Antioch was also the community from which Paul launched his missionary journeys (Acts 11:19–30; 13:1–3). The midrash of 1 Cor 10:1–4 may have been part of Paul’s teaching among the followers of Jesus in Antioch during the early years of his work there. Paul referred to the church of Antioch in his Letter to the Galatians and his public confrontation with Peter over the issue of forcing Gentiles to observe the requirements of

⁴⁰ *Quis Rerum* 203–4.

Torah—circumcision and food laws (Gal 2:11–14). This is the kind of social context (public conflict and confrontation) that to some extent would have formed the faith and memory of this community. In the process of contributing to this formation, Paul very easily could have developed the midrash he would later include in 1 Cor 10:1–4. In Gal 2 Paul referred to Peter as one of the pillars among the apostles of the Jerusalem church (Gal 2:1–10). The gospel tradition in which Peter confessed that Jesus is “the messiah, the son of the living God” (Matt 16:16–18) provides an interesting parallel.⁴¹ In Matthew’s Gospel, Jesus responded to Peter with the words, “And I also say to you that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church” (καὶ γὰρ δέ σοι λέγω ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν). If the followers of Jesus in Antioch were aware of this tradition, and it is likely that they were, then Paul’s confrontation with Peter in Antioch (as Paul described this in Galatians) might have raised the question in the minds of the followers of Jesus in that community whether Peter was really what the tradition claimed him to be. And if Peter was not what the tradition claimed he was, “the rock,” what did that mean for the promise of the church imbedded in the same tradition? Paul’s midrash in 1 Cor 10:1–4 would have reoriented the focus away from Peter and onto Christ, with the startling assertion, “...and the rock was Christ.”

The identification of the pre-human messiah figure with the rock of Exod 17:6 and Num 20:7–11, and the suggestion that Paul was punning with reference to Peter is certainly a possibility. The significance of the midrash for the followers of Jesus in Antioch would have been different from the significance it would have had for the Corinthians. The significance of the midrash for the followers of Jesus in Antioch would have been the promise of divine protection from those who were pursuing them (Acts 6:1–9:2; Exod 13:17–14:31), divine providence in an unfamiliar place (Acts 11:19; Exod 16:1–17:7), and an implied polemic that punned on the term “rock” (πέτρος - πέτρα) elevating Christ over Peter (1 Cor 10:4; Matt 16:16–18). The significance of the midrash for the followers of Jesus in Corinth would have been developed by Paul as a warning against idolatry (1 Cor 10:5–11; cf. Exod 32; Num 25:1–18; 21:5–6; 16:14, 49, presented by Paul in that order).

⁴¹ James Robinson does not include Matt 16:16–18 in his identification of Q passages. See James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffman, and John S. Kloppenborg, eds., *The Critical Edition of Q* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000). While Matt 16:16–18 may not be identified by scholars as an early saying attributable to the historical Jesus, it is entirely possible that the tradition was developing by the time Paul wrote 1 Corinthians, at least 25 years after Jesus’ death.

It should also at least be noted that the cloud Paul referred to in 1 Cor 10:1–2 (also mentioned by Philo in the text cited above) was described as “the cloud of YHWH” (ענן יהוה) and “the glory of YHWH” (MT: כבוד יהוה; LXX: δόξα κυρίου) in the Yahwist tradition of Exod 40:34–38.⁴² The midrash of 1 Cor 10:1–4 should probably be taken as one of Paul’s earliest attempts to understand the messiah figure in some pre-human state in the context of Israel’s history.

5.1.6 Divine Image and Glory

In connection with the nature and identity of the messiah figure, something should be said about Paul’s concept of the image and the glory of God.⁴³ In 2 Cor 3:4–4:6 Paul provided a rather detailed argument contrasting what he referred to as the old covenant and the new covenant. Paul described the old covenant in terms of the fading glory reflected in the face of Moses. The new covenant, on the other hand, is permanent, and what is permanent must have a greater glory. Paul allegorically applied the veil covering Moses’ face to the veil that Paul claimed concealed the gospel from those who do not believe. This veil, Paul argued, keeps them from seeing “the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God” (τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ, 2 Cor 4:4). Concluding his argument Paul writes: “For we do not preach ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord, and ourselves as your slaves for Jesus’ sake. For it is the God who said, ‘Out of darkness let light shine,’ who has shone in our hearts with the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ” (ὅς ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 2 Cor 4:5–6). Paul punctuated his argument by claiming that this visible glory of God, that once manifested itself in the face of Moses, is now permanently manifested “in the face of Jesus Christ.” As I argued above (see §5.1.5), Paul’s understanding of the messiah figure as the glory of the divine figure was informed by the expressions, “the cloud of YHWH” (ענן יהוה) and “the glory of

⁴² In the Excursus at the end of Chapter 6 (§6.4) I analyze in detail the identification of the messiah figure with the glory (δόξα) of the divine figure in relation to one of the earliest christological hymns, Phil 2:6–11, which is probably to be associated with the early community of Jesus followers in Antioch. Peter Stuhlmacher also makes this connection between Antioch and the Christ Hymn of Phil 2. See Stuhlmacher’s “The Understanding of Christ in the Pauline School: A Sketch,” in Dunn, ed., *Jews and Christians*, 169.

⁴³ This will be discussed in more detail with reference to the Hymn of Christ in Phil 2 in the Excursus to Chapter 6 (§6.4), where I will offer a possible solution to the problem of the absence of the Son of Man in LP.

YHWH” (MT: כְּבוֹד יְהוָה; LXX: δόξα κυρίου) in the Yahwist tradition. And Paul’s understanding of the messiah figure being the image of God would have been informed by the terms צֶלֶם and דְמוּת of the creation account in Gen 1:26, indicating that in Paul’s thought the messiah figure superseded the protoplast Adam as the image and glory of God.

5.1.7 *The Divine Name*

There are at least two references in LP where the messiah figure is identified with the divine name.⁴⁴ In a context of discussing spiritual gifts at 1 Cor 12:3, Paul wrote: “Therefore I make known to you that no one speaking by the Spirit of God says ‘Jesus is cursed,’ and no one is able to say ‘Jesus is Lord’ (Κύριος Ἰησοῦς) except by the Holy Spirit.” This primitive confession of the identity of the messiah figure with the divine name also appears in Paul’s Letter to the Romans: “...because, if you confess with your mouth that Jesus is Lord (ὅτι ἂν ὁμολογήσης ἐν τῷ στόματί σου κύριον Ἰησοῦν) and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved... For, ‘everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved’” (Rom 10:9, 13). It is possible that the messiah figure in both of these texts has been identified with the divine name of the Hebrew Bible, יְהוָה, which was translated in the Septuagint as *kyrios* (κύριος) or “Lord.”⁴⁵

5.1.8 *Like an Angel*

Paul apparently was also aware of the traditions current in the first century that the messiah figure is “like an angel.” While discussing his personal relationship with the Galatians, Paul wrote that “it was because of an illness of the flesh I preached the gospel to you the first time, and your testing in my flesh you did not despise or reject, but it was as an angel of God that you received me, as Christ Jesus” (ὡς ἄγγελον θεοῦ ἐδέξασθέ με, ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, Gal 4:13–14). This could be taken in two very different ways. It could suggest that Paul thought of the messiah figure as an angel. Or, rhetorically, Paul was simply emphasizing his point. Paul reminded the Galatians that they were so receptive to his presence, in spite of his physical condition, that they received him “as an angel of God.” To lay an even stronger emphasis on their willingness to receive him, he then adds to “as an angel of God” the phrase “as

⁴⁴ The confession in the Hymn of Christ at Phil 2:11 is not included here, because I do not think this is a reference to the divine name as the object of the confessional statement. This text will be discussed in detail in the Excursus to Chapter 6 (§6.4).

⁴⁵ See Gieschen’s detailed analysis of the divine name in Second Temple period literature in his *Angelomorphic Christology*, 70–78.

Christ Jesus.” Paul used this kind of rhetorical device in a similar way earlier in Galatians (1:8), in the indictment section. Paul wrote: “But even if we or an angel from heaven (καὶ ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ) should proclaim a gospel to you different from that which we [already] preached to you, let him be cursed.” Paul used the juxtaposition of “we” and “angel from heaven” for rhetorical emphasis here, and could have done this also at 4:14.⁴⁶ The juxtaposition of the two phrases in 4:14 may be read either way. This text is somewhat ambiguous and has led scholars to varying conclusions as to whether Paul considered the messiah figure to be an angel. Charles Gieschen has exegeted the phrase, “as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus,”⁴⁷ and argues that Paul did refer to the messiah figure as an angel here (at Gal 4:13–14).

5.1.9 Without Sin

In connection with the righteousness of God Paul referred to the messiah figure as being sinless: “He made him who did not know sin to be sin in our place, so that we might become the righteousness of God in him” (τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ, 2 Cor 5:21). This is an exceptional statement in LP. The concept of a sinless messiah figure appears in *Psalms of Solomon* (17:36) and *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (*T. Jud.* 24:1; *T. Benj.* 3:8). This concept also appears in later texts in the New Testament, such as the Letter to the Hebrews (4:15) and 1 Peter (1:19), but it appears only here in LP.⁴⁸

Based on the evidence in LP, the messiah figure according to his nature is a human being, and the messiah figure is a preexistent heavenly being. Paul associated the messiah figure with the wisdom of God via the intellectual trajectory of Hellenistic Judaism. According to Paul the messiah figure also appeared in the history of Israel in a sort of pre-human state. The messiah figure is the image and glory of God. And

⁴⁶ This same kind of rhetorical device appears at *Didache* 11:1, which refers to teachers being received “as the Lord,” similar to what Paul wrote. In this sense it simply means being received in Christ’s place, and supports the interpretation that reads the evidence in Galatians in such a way that Paul was only intensifying his rhetoric and not referring to Jesus as an angel.

⁴⁷ See the discussion by Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 321–25. See also Adolphine Bakker, “Christ an Angel? A Study of Early Christian Docetism,” *ZNW* 32 (1933): 255–65, and Margaret Barker, *The Great Angel: A Study of Israel’s Second God* (London: SPCK, 1992).

⁴⁸ This concept will have implications for the comparative analysis in Chapter 6, and Paul’s participation in the debate with soteriological traditions about Adam discussed in the Excursus, below (§6.4).

through the epithet “Lord” in the primitive confession of the early Jesus movement, the messiah figure is associated with the divine name of the Hebrew Bible (יהוה) and the LXX (κύριος). It is also possible that Paul identified the messiah figure as an angel. And the messiah figure, according to Paul, is a human being without sin. Some of these claims are explicit in LP, and some of them may be inferred from the evidence.

5.2 Functions of the Messiah Figure in the Letters of Paul

There is a good amount of evidence regarding the functions of the messiah figure in LP that lends itself to detailed analysis. Paul made explicit statements regarding a number of issues related to the functions of the messiah figure in terms of creation, salvation, delivering forgiveness of sins, the messiah figure’s association with the power of God, judgment, and receiving worship from humans.

5.2.1 *Agent of Creation*

The messiah figure, according to Paul, was an agent of God’s creation. Paul wrote to the Corinthians: “...for us there is one God the Father, from whom are all things even as we [exist] for him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things even as we [exist] through him” (δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι’ αὐτοῦ, 1 Cor 8:4–6). Here Paul’s claim is that all things were created through the messiah figure, the “one Lord Jesus Christ,” and that humans have their existence “through” him. Paul offered no more details than this. He only claimed that the messiah figure is an agent of creation. Paul used similar language in Rom 11:33–36, where he wrote with reference to the divine figure:

O the depth of wealth
and wisdom and knowledge of God;
How unsearchable are his judgments
and incomprehensible his ways.
For who has known the mind of the Lord?
Or who has become his counselor?
Or who has given to him (with the expectation that)
he will also be repaid?
For from him and through him and to him are all things (ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ
δι’ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα).
To him be glory forever, amen.

The same preposition “through” (διὰ) that Paul used for the messiah figure’s role as agent of God’s creation at 1 Cor 8:4–6, Paul used with

reference to the divine figure's creative activity at Rom 11:33–36.⁴⁹ So, for Paul, there is an overlapping of functions between the messiah figure and the divine figure with reference to creation.

5.2.2 *Salvation*

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

The death and resurrection of the messiah figure is a concept of some prominence in LP (1 Thess 4:14; 5:10; Gal 2:20–21; 3:1; 1 Cor 6:14; 8:11; 15:3–4; 2 Cor 5:14–15; 13:4; Rom 1:4; 4:25; 8:34; 14:9). The messiah figure was crucified (1 Cor 1:23; 2:2, 8; 2 Cor 13:4; Phil 2:8). In his First Letter to the Thessalonians, Paul was very specific about who he thought was responsible for the death of the messiah figure. He made the specific claim that the messiah figure was killed by "the Jews" in Judaea:

For you, brothers, have become imitators of the churches of God in Judaea which are in Christ Jesus, for you also have suffered the same things by your own countrymen as they also [suffered] at the hands of the Jews, who killed both the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and have persecuted us severely, and do not please God and oppose all men, by preventing us from speaking to the Gentiles so that they might be saved, with the result that the measure of their sins is always being filled up. But wrath has come upon them in the end. (1 Thess 2:14–15)

The severity of Paul's language here must reflect the resistance he experienced on his first and second missionary journeys (Acts 14:2, 5, 19; 17:5, 13; 21:21; 25:2–7).⁵⁰ The crucifixion of the messiah figure as a historical event was executed by Pontius Pilate, the Roman authority in Jerusalem. The rhetorical force of Paul's argument blames "the Jews" by

⁴⁹ Cf. *Ap. Const.* 7.34.1–8; 8.12.8–22.

⁵⁰ Bart Ehrman supports the theory that the account in the Acts of the Apostles—which describes Paul as targeting synagogues with his message while on his missionary journeys—does not reflect Paul's historic experience. Ehrman claims that there is no evidence in Paul's letters to support the account of Acts that Paul actually targeted synagogues. This text in 1 Thessalonians is evidence that the accounts in the Acts of the Apostles are accurate at least generally speaking as regards the resistance Paul encountered from Jewish opponents of his message—"preventing us from speaking to the Gentiles." See Bart D. Ehrman, *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings* (4th ed.; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 310–14.

drawing on a tradition that the religious authorities in Jerusalem had persecuted the prophets.⁵¹ Paul interpreted his own experience in light of this tradition, in order to push back against his opponents in Thessalonika and thereby give encouragement and support to the Thessalonian community of Jesus followers. This problem notwithstanding, Paul here referred to the suffering of the Thessalonians, and he presented the suffering of the Jewish followers of Jesus in Judaea and the death of the messiah figure as examples for the Thessalonians to follow in their own suffering.

For Paul the death of the messiah figure is a sacrificial death. Paul referred to Christ's crucifixion in terms of the Passover: "For Christ our Passover lamb has been sacrificed" (1 Cor 5:7). Paul linked the death of the messiah figure with human "trespasses," and he viewed God's justification of humans as the direct result of the resurrection of the messiah figure (Rom 4:25).

The death and resurrection of the messiah figure were key concepts for Paul in his Letter to the Romans. In a discussion where he contrasted the law and the Spirit, Paul argued that what the law was not able to accomplish in humans who had sinned by breaking the law, God himself did in Christ. After describing in Rom 7 the internal struggle between the mind and the flesh to keep God's law, Paul wrote:

There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has freed you from the law of sin and death. For what could not be [done] by the law, in that it was weakened through the flesh—God [did] having sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and with reference to sin he condemned sin in the flesh, in order that the righteous requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to flesh but according to the Spirit. (Rom 8:1–4)

This is a central argument for Paul. The death of the messiah figure was necessary in order to fulfill the justice of God required in the law.

Paul articulated his concept of the death and resurrection of the messiah figure in terms of substitutionary reconciliation. As was already pointed out above, Paul took his argument regarding the death of the messiah figure to the point of identifying Christ with human sin: "He made him who did not know sin to be sin in our place, so that we might become the righteousness of God in him" (2 Cor 5:21). The claim that the divine figure would intentionally make the messiah figure "to be sin," in order to give his righteousness to humans, is both radical and startling.

⁵¹ See, e.g., Matt 5:12; 23:37; Luke 13:34.

This is a claim for the role of the messiah figure that had never before been made in the history of Jewish thought.

According to Paul there were specific purposes for the death and resurrection of the messiah figure. Paul claimed that the Lord Jesus Christ “gave himself for our sins in order to deliver us from the present evil age” (Gal 1:3–4; 2:20–21). Paul argued that Christ’s death redeemed humans from the curse of the law (Gal 3:13) and reconciled humans to God (Rom 5:10).

Paul used the figure Adam in three of his letters to describe his view of the soteriological role of the messiah figure. Paul’s Adam typology first appears in his First Letter to the Corinthians. In a discussion of the nature of the resurrection in 1 Cor 15, Paul wrote: “For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive” (1 Cor 15:22). Paul developed his argument by discussing the messiah figure as “the first fruits” of those who will be resurrected “at his coming” (ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ, 1 Cor 15:23). Paul further developed his argument by contrasting what is perishable with what is imperishable, and to illustrate this he highlighted the difference between Adam and Christ at 1 Cor 15:42–50:

So also the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in a state of deterioration, it is raised in a state of incorruptibility. It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power. It is sown a physical body, it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a physical body, there is also a spiritual [body]. Thus also it is written, “The first human Adam became a living soul”; the last Adam [became] a life-giving spirit (ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἄδὰμ εἰς ψυχήν ζῶσαν, ὁ ἔσχατος Ἄδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν). But it is not the spiritual that is first but the physical, then the spiritual. The first human was from earth, made of dust. The second human is from heaven (ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός, ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ). As was the one of dust, so are those who are of the dust; and as is the one of heaven, so are those who are of heaven (καὶ οἶος ὁ ἐπουράνιος, τοιοῦτοι καὶ οἱ ἐπουράνιοι). And just as we have borne the image of the one of dust, we shall also bear the image of the one of heaven (καὶ καθὼς ἐφορέσαμεν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ χοϊκοῦ, φορέσομεν καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανοῦ). And I say this, brothers, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does what deteriorates inherit the state of incorruptibility.⁵²

In the broader context of explaining his view on resurrection, Paul contrasted the messiah figure with Adam by referring to the messiah figure as “the last Adam,” “the second human...from heaven,” “the one of heaven.”⁵³

⁵² A reference to Adam as the “first man” also occurs in BP (*I En.* 60:8).

⁵³ Gieschen claims that Paul is here relying on a contemporaneous “Heavenly Man” tradition. See his *Angelomorphic Christology*, 329–31. Gieschen quotes Philo’s

In Rom 5 Paul again contrasted the messiah figure with Adam. In Rom 5:6–11 Paul introduced this contrast by reiterating what he had already argued in ch. 4, namely, the justification of sinful humans by the blood of Christ which brings salvation from the wrath of God and reconciliation with God: “Therefore, having been justified now by his blood much more shall we be saved through him from the wrath [of God]” (Rom 5:9). At Rom 5:12–14 Paul included Adam in his argument by highlighting Adam’s role of introducing sin into the world:

Therefore just as through one human being sin entered into the world and through sin death [came], and so death spread to all human beings because all sinned... But death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over those who did not sin with the likeness of the trespass of Adam, who is a type of the one who was to come (Ἀδάμ ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος).

Paul used a forensic argument. The sin of Adam brings condemnation. The righteous obedience of the messiah figure results in justification, righteousness, acquittal, and eternal life (Rom 5:15–21). The role played by Adam in Paul’s thought is entirely negative. This is also evident in the almost nihilistic musings about Adam in *4 Ezra*:

For the first Adam, carrying an evil heart, transgressed and was conquered, but also are all who are born from him. And the weakness (*infirmitas*) was made permanent; and the law was with the people’s heart along with the evil root, and that which is good separated itself, and evil remained. (*4 Ezra* 3:21–22)

So it would have been better that the earth had not given Adam or, when it had already given him, to restrain him so that he would not sin. For what is the advantage for everyone to live in the present in sadness and that the dead hope for punishment? O Adam, what is this you have done? For though you are the one who sinned, the fall was not made yours alone, but ours who have come from you. For what is the advantage for us, if we have the promise of an eternal age, but we have done genuinely mortal acts? And what good is it if a perpetual hope has been offered to us, but we are in fact made to be distressingly ineffective? (*4 Ezra* 7:116–20)⁵⁴

Opif. 134–39, 147: “There are two types of men; one a heavenly man, the other earthly.” Gieschen writes: “Philo’s version is merely one example of the many variations of the Ἀνθρωπος tradition. In the *Corpus Hermeticum* and Gnostic literature, the idea of two Adams was used to explain how the body (Jewish influence) of the Earthly Man was formed after the idea (Hellenistic influence) of the Heavenly Man. Although Paul’s direct dependency upon any of the versions of this tradition cannot be traced, nevertheless we can conclude that Paul is conversant with exegesis about a Heavenly Man.”

⁵⁴ For the Latin text, see A. Frederik Klijn, ed., *Der lateinische Text der Apokalypse des Esra* (TUGAL 131; Berlin: Akademie, 1983). As Michael Stone rightly points

In addition to claiming that Adam was responsible for the introduction of sin and death into the world, Paul claimed that Adam was “a type of the one who was to come.” And yet Paul used Adam as a contrast with the messiah figure. Adam’s trespass is not like the gift God gives through Christ. In Rom 5:15–17 Paul argued that, while Adam’s one sin brought judgment and condemnation, the free gift of God’s grace in Jesus Christ “brings justification.” In Rom 5:18–21 Paul developed the argument by claiming that just as one man’s sin resulted in condemnation for all people, so one man’s righteous act, namely, the death of Christ, resulted in life for all people. Paul argued that one man’s (Adam’s) act of disobedience made all people sinners,⁵⁵ and that one man’s (Christ’s) act of obedience made all people righteous. Paul then argued that Adam’s disobedience introduced sin into the world, while Christ countered Adam’s disobedient act with his own act of obedience, restoring God’s righteousness for humans affected by Adam’s sin (cf. also Rom 11:32; and Phil 2:8).

What is notable about Paul’s Adam typology in relation to the messiah figure is that the only role Adam plays is a negative one. Adam is the source of sin and death.⁵⁶ There is no hint in Paul’s thought that Adam played a positive role, either as the image of God in relation to the divine figure, or as an exalted human enthroned in heaven who judges humanity as we find in other Jewish literature from this period (see, e.g., the *Greek Life of Adam and Eve* and the *Testament of Abraham*).

Paul also used the biblical figure Adam to describe the soteriological role of the messiah figure in his letter to the Philippians. While the actual name “Adam” does not appear in the Christ Hymn of Phil 2:6–11, it is widely recognized that there is a distinct contrast between Adam and Christ in this hymn. Christ’s refusal to exploit his nature as image of God contrasts with Adam’s desire to be like God. Christ’s obedience

out, the origin of the evil heart is not explicitly stated in *4 Ezra*. See Stone’s discussion of this in *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 63–67. Cf. also *4 Ezra* 3:20.

⁵⁵ This role of Adam as the one who caused sin to spread to all humans must be taken as evidence that the messiah figure, even though he was considered by Paul to be human, was also considered by Paul to be more than human and thereby a sinless being somehow immune to Adam’s ongoing legacy of sin. See the discussion in §5.1.9, above.

⁵⁶ See *T. Abr.* 8:25–26 where Abraham is reminded “that all those who are from Adam and Eve have died.” See Michael E. Stone, ed., *The Testament of Abraham: The Greek Recensions* (Texts and Translations 2; Pseudepigrapha Series 2; Missoula: SBL, 1972), 18–19.

contrasts with Adam's disobedience. Christ's exaltation after his obedience contrasts with Adam's punishment after his disobedience.⁵⁷ Again, for Paul the only contribution Adam makes to the soteriological question is a negative one.

5.2.3 *Forgiveness of Sins*

Forgiveness of sins as a function of the messiah figure in LP is not unprecedented in the history of Jewish thought. Paul would have received this tradition from the early followers of Jesus. This is evident in the way Jesus was described in the Gospel of Mark: "the Son of Man has authority to forgive sins on the earth" (ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, Mark 2:10). Before the early followers of Jesus ascribed this function to the messiah figure, forgiveness of sins was considered solely the prerogative of the divine figure. The biblical Psalms give the fullest expression of this:

Blessed is the one whose transgressions are taken away,
whose sin is covered.

Blessed is Adam against whom
YHWH does not reckon iniquity,
and in his spirit there is no deceit.

When I was silent my bones wasted away
while I made cries of distress all day.

For day and night your hand
was heavy against me;
my life's fluid was dehydrated
by droughts of summer.

My sin I acknowledged to you,
and my iniquity I did not conceal;
I said, I will confess
my transgression to YHWH;
and you forgave
the guilt of my sin. (Ps 32:1–5)

The psalmist confesses sin to the divine figure and receives forgiveness from the divine figure. Note the explicit reference to Adam, clearly a metaphor for all of humanity. The presence of "deceit" in Ps 32 in connection to Adam probably refers to the account in Gen 3 where Adam

⁵⁷ See the Excursus in Chapter 6 (§6.4) for a detailed critical and sociological analysis of Phil 2:6–11 and Adam's role in the soteriological question Paul was addressing.

attempted to hide from the divine figure after he sinned and he refused to take responsibility for his action by blaming Eve.⁵⁸ That forgiveness is the sole function of the divine figure is also evident in Ps 51:

Have mercy on me, O God,
 according to your lovingkindness;
 according to the abundance of your compassion
 wipe away my transgression.
 Copiously wash me from my iniquity,
 and from my sin purify me.

For my transgression I know,
 and my sin is conspicuously with me always.
 Against you, you alone, have I sinned,
 and the evil in your eyes I have done,
 so that you are right in your verdict
 and pure in your judgment...

Purify me with hyssop and I shall be clean;
 wash me and I shall be whiter than snow.
 Cause me to hear rejoicing and gladness;
 let the bones you have crushed rejoice.
 Hide your face from my sin,
 and all my iniquity blot out. (Ps 51:1–9; MT 51:3–11)

The psalmist so relies on the divine figure alone for forgiveness of sins, that he makes the claim, “Against you, you alone, have I sinned.” This forgiveness is pleaded in a liturgical context, as the reference to purging with “hyssop” suggests the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrifice with a hyssop branch by the priest (cf. Exod 12:22; Lev 14:1–9, 48–53; Num 19:1–10). The language of making the penitent “whiter than snow” also appears in First Isaiah:

Come now, let us reason together,
 says YHWH;
 though your sins are as scarlet,
 they shall be white as snow;
 though they are red as crimson,
 they shall be as wool. (Isa 1:18)

Here the role of forgiveness of sins, in the form of an invitation, is given to the divine figure. Psalm 130, while it reads more like an individual prayer of supplication, is really a national prayer for the redemption of Israel:

⁵⁸ The motif of deception is prominent in the *Greek Life of Adam and Eve*. In this document Eve is presented as conspiring with Satan to deceive Adam.

Out of the depths I cry to you, O YHWH.
 Lord, hear my voice.
 Let your ears be attentive
 to the sound of my prayers for your mercy.

If you, O YH, watch sins,
 Lord, who could stand?
 But with you there is forgiveness,
 so that you may be feared...

O Israel, hope in YHWH.
 For with YHWH is lovingkindness,
 and with him is abundant ransom.
 And he will redeem Israel
 from all his iniquities. (Ps 130)

All of these texts demonstrate the biblical view that forgiveness is given by the divine figure alone. This concept also appears in the Wisdom of Solomon:

For the ability to exert great power is with you always,
 and who will resist the strength of your arm?
 For like a weight [lifted] out of scales is the whole world before you,
 and like a drop of morning dew falling to the ground.
 But you have mercy on all, for you can do all things,
 and you overlook the sins of humans for [the sake of] repentance.
 (Wis 11:21–23; cf. Rom 3:25)

This same concept also appears in the *Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers* 11: “Almighty eternal God, master of the universe, creator and presider over that which exists...with you there is the atoning offering for sin” (παρὰ σοὶ ὁ ἱλασμός ἐστίν).⁵⁹ It is also explicit in the Qumran Hodayot prayers:

I give you thanks, O Lord, for from hidden things that [...] that they do not cause them to go astray in [...] and from judgment unjust times and evil devices [...] and from judgment [...] your servant from all his sins [...] and with the abundance of your compassion, just as you spoke by the hand of Moses, to forgive rebellion, iniquity, sin, and to atone for iniquity and treachery. For the foundations of the mountains quake and fire is kindled in Sheol below, [...] your judgments [...] to your servants in faithfulness [...] descendants to be in your presence all the days and a name [...] you have established, to forgive every rebellion and to send away all their iniquities and to give them as a possession together with all the glory of Adam (בְּכֹל כְּבוֹד אָדָם) also many days. (1QH^a iv 9–15)⁶⁰

⁵⁹ *Ap. Const.* 8.9.8–9.

⁶⁰ Cf. D. Barthélemy and Josef T. Milik, eds., *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD I; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955). Cf. also Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, eds., with the assistance of Nehemiah Gordon and Derek Fry, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader Part 5: Poetic and Liturgical Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 4–5. See also *Pss. Sol.* 9:6–7.

The author of this prayer indicates that the forgiveness of the divine figure entails that the divine figure gives to humans a restoration of Adam's glory before he sinned. Paul also identified forgiveness of sins as a function of the divine figure. In his discussion of the salvation of Israel in Rom 11, Paul wrote:

For I do not want you to be ignorant, brothers, with regard to this mystery, so that you might not be wise in your own estimation, that a hardening with reference to part of Israel has occurred, until the fullness of the Gentiles has arrived, and so all Israel will be saved, as it is written, "The one who saves will come from Zion, he will remove godlessness from Jacob." "And this is the covenant [made] by me with them, when I take away their sins." (Rom 11:25–27)

Paul puts himself in line with the best of both biblical and Second Temple traditions when he asserts one of the roles of the divine figure as removing Israel's sins by quoting First Isaiah (LXX: Isa 27:9): "Therefore the lawlessness of Jacob will be removed, and this will be his blessing, when I take away his sin." Paul quoted Ps 32:1–2 (also above) at Rom 4:7–8, asserting forgiveness of sins as a role of the divine figure.⁶¹

Paul seems to have received from the early followers of Jesus the tradition that forgiveness of sins was one of the roles of the messiah figure. This attribution of forgiveness to the messiah figure was an unprecedented move by the earliest pre-Pauline followers of Jesus. This tradition is so widespread throughout the early Jesus movement that Paul most likely inherited it from the *kerygma* of the early community, probably in Judaea or Antioch. We can say, however, that the first literary evidence of the tradition appears in Paul's Letter to the Galatians. In the greeting to this letter Paul wrote: "Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins, so that he might rescue us from the present evil age, according to the will of our God and Father" (Gal 1:3–4). This is not at all a developed concept yet in Paul's thought. Paul here has made a connection between the messiah figure's death and the forgiveness of sins.⁶² This is more developed in 1 Cor 15, where Paul wrote:

And I make known to you, brothers, the gospel which I proclaimed to you, which also you received, in which also you stand, through which also you are saved, if you hold fast to whatever word I proclaimed to you, unless you have believed in vain.

⁶¹ Cf. also Sir 2:11; 28:2; 39:5; 47:11; 1 Esd. 8:86; 3 *Macc.* 2:19.

⁶² The connection between the messiah figure's death and the forgiveness of sins also appears in later texts. See 1 Pet 3:18; 1 John 2:2; 3:5; 4:10; Rev 1:5.

For I delivered to you with priority what I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he was raised on the third day according to the scriptures, and that he was seen by Cephas, then by the twelve. (1 Cor 15:1–5)

While Paul included the same notion that Christ died for sins as he wrote it in Galatians, he adds here that he received this (without indicating from whom), and that this was done “according to the scriptures” (again without including which scriptures he was referring to). As Paul developed his argument about the resurrection in 1 Cor 15, he also stated: “For if the dead are not raised, Christ has not been raised. And if Christ has not been raised, your faith is useless; you are still in your sins” (1 Cor 15:16–17). Paul made the forgiveness of sins contingent on the reality of the messiah figure’s resurrection. It is possible to read Paul’s concept of forgiveness of sins as a function of the messiah figure in a way that is similar to the concept as it appears in the *Damascus Document* (CD). At CD xiv 19, when the messiah of Aaron and Israel appears (משיח אהרן וישראל) the iniquities of the people will be atoned by a means that is “better than meal and sin offerings” (ויכפר עוונם ממנחה וחטת).⁶³ Forgiveness historically was achieved through sacrifice. According to the author(s) of CD the appearance of the messiah of Aaron and Israel would bring about forgiveness by a means more effective than sacrifice. This is still different from Paul in the sense that Paul identified Christ’s death as the atoning sacrifice for sin (ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἰλαστήριον, Rom 3:25). It is not that forgiveness in connection with sacrifice is unprecedented. What is unprecedented in Paul is that the death of the messiah figure is presented as a sacrifice that atones for sin.

5.2.4 *Association with the Power of God*

First Corinthians 1:24 suggests that Paul was drawing upon two strands of traditions regarding the messiah figure. As we have already seen, Paul described the messiah figure as a visible manifestation of the wisdom of God (see §5.1.4 above). Paul also appears to be drawing on traditions about the exertion of the divine figure’s power at the eschatological coming of the messiah figure. First Corinthians 1:22–24 reads: “Jews ask for signs and Greeks seek wisdom; but we proclaim a crucified messiah, to Jews a scandal and to Gentiles foolishness, but to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God.”

⁶³ Cf. Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. Vol. 13, The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)* (DJD XVIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 72–73.

The connection between the power of the divine figure and messianic belief appears in several texts. Two texts in particular that shaped messianic belief in the Second Temple period, but are not in themselves messianic in nature, are Ps 110 and Dan 7. Psalm 110 reads:

- 1 YHWH (יהוה) says to my lord (אדני):
 “Sit at my right hand,
 until I make your enemies
 a footstool for your feet.”
- 2 Your strong scepter
 YHWH (יהוה) sends forth from Zion.
 Rule among your enemies.
- 3 Your people [will give] freewill offerings
 on the day of your strength
 with ornaments of holiness,
 from the womb of the dawn
 dew of your youth will belong to you.
- 4 YHWH (יהוה) has sworn
 and he will not change his mind,
 “You are a priest for ever
 after the manner of Melchizedek.”
- 5 The Lord (אדני) is at your right hand;
 on the day of his wrath he shatters kings.
- 6 He will execute judgment among the nations,
 filling [them with] corpses;
 he shatters exceedingly
 as head over the earth.
- 7 From the wady by the way he will drink;
 therefore he will lift up [his] head.

This is a royal enthronement psalm of David.⁶⁴ Its original reference is to an enthronement ceremony for Israel’s king. This is evident because of the references to the king’s throne, his scepter, and his role of ruling. The psalm expresses an exertion of royal power “on the day of his wrath,” when the Lord “at your right hand”—a reference to the king as a military commander—“shatters kings” and “will execute judgment among the nations, filling [them with] corpses.” The explicit reference to “power” appears in the LXX version of v. 2: ῥάβδον δυνάμεώς σου ἐξαποστελεῖ κύριος ἐκ Σιων (“The rod of your power the Lord will send forth from

⁶⁴ Hans-Joachim Kraus dates this psalm to the early monarchic period. See his discussion of this psalm in his *Psalms 60–150: A Commentary* (trans. Hilton C. Oswald; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989), 343–54. See also Kraus, *Theology of the Psalms* (trans. Keith Crim; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986), 111–19. Cf. also Artur Weiser, *The Psalms: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962), 692–97.

Zion”). The use of this psalm in later christological interpretations is fairly extensive in the New Testament and other early Christian literature after the first century. Paul also used this text to develop his own understanding of Jesus as the messiah figure (1 Cor 15:23–28; Rom 8:34). It also suggests that we should understand Paul’s concept of the divine figure “sending forth” the messiah figure (Gal 4:4; Rom 8:3) in light of Ps 110:2 (LXX: 109:2).

The heavenly visions of Dan 7–8 describe the exertion of royal power in a context of judgment and eschatological reign. Like Ps 110, Dan 7–8 in its original context was not read as a messianic text, as John J. Collins states: “...few modern scholars subscribe to the view that the ‘one like a son of man’ was originally meant to be identified with the messiah. The absence of any clear reference to a royal messiah in the remainder of Daniel would appear to be decisive in that regard.”⁶⁵ Daniel 7–8 later acquired extensive and developed traditions of messianic interpretation in Second Temple period texts, the New Testament, and in early Christianity after the first century. In Dan 7 “one like a son of man” came “with the clouds of heaven.” This figure “came to the Ancient of Days and was brought in front of him” (Dan 7:13). It should be noted that here the figure is not seated on any of the thrones that had been set in place prior to this figure’s appearance (Dan 7:9–10). Then the text reads:

And to him was given dominion and honor and kingly authority, so that all peoples, nations, and tongues should serve him; his dominion is an eternal dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingly authority [is one] that shall not be destroyed. (Dan 7:14)

The word Daniel uses for dominion, as it is translated in the LXX, is ἐξουσία. This is authority that is given to this heavenly figure (καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία). He does not possess it by nature. This authority/dominion is eternal, unimpeachable, without limit as to its scope. It “shall not pass away” (οὐ μὴ ἀρθῆ), and his kingdom “shall not be destroyed.” According to Daniel, however, it does not go unchallenged. John J. Collins writes with reference to the identity of this figure to whom God gives this ἐξουσία: “The ‘one like a son of man’ is not a corporate symbol, but should be identified with the archangel Michael, ‘the Prince of Israel’ in chapters 10–12.”⁶⁶ If the “one like a son of man” is the archangel Michael, who is also the prince of chs. 10–12, then this could also be the

⁶⁵ See Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God*, 78–79.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 78. Cf. the ‘one like a son of man’ in Dan 7:13 with “one having the appearance of a man” in 10:18, 21.

prince of the host of 8:11 and the prince of princes of 8:25.⁶⁷ Chapter 8 describes the opposition of Antiochus IV Epiphanes to the prince of princes:

And at the end of their kingdom,
 when the rebellious ones are finished,
 then there will stand a king of fierce presence
 who understands riddles.
 His power shall be vast⁶⁸ even [when he is] without his strength
 and the things beyond his power he will not ruin;
 and he will prosper even [in all that] he does;
 and he will destroy mighty ones
 and the holy people.
 According to his treachery
 he shall make deceit to prosper in his hand
 and in his heart he shall be magnified
 and with stealth he shall destroy many;
 even against the prince of princes he shall make a stand;
 it is not [possible for his] hand to be broken. (Dan 8:23–25)

It is noteworthy that in this text the authority of the prince of princes (probably the angel Michael) is defined in opposition to the great power of his enemy.

The Melchizedek text from Qumran (11Q13) should be included among the evidence reflecting a mediatorial tradition that includes the exertion of the divine figure's power at the final judgment. This text midrashes the proclamation of liberty to the captives of Isa 61:2 in lines 5–6: "...and they are the inheritan[ce of Melchize]dek who will cause them to return to what is theirs. And he will announce liberty to them to set them free [...] all their iniquities."⁶⁹ What is amazing is that the text substitutes Melchizedek for YHWH in the quote of Isa 61:2 in lines 9–10:

For it is the time for "the year of the favor of Melchizedek" and of his host, the nation of the holy ones of God for the administration of judgment, just as it is written about him in the songs of David who said, "A divine being (אלהים) shall stand in the assembly of God (אל),"⁷⁰ [and] "in the midst of the gods he shall judge."

⁶⁷ Collins identifies the prince of the host of 8:11 and the prince of princes of 8:25 with God rather than the angel Michael. See John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1993), 333.

⁶⁸ The LXX here has καὶ στερεωθήσεται ἡ ἰσχὺς αὐτοῦ.

⁶⁹ Cf. Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, eds., *Qumran Cave 11* (DJD XXIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 221–41. Cf. also Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, eds., with the assistance of Nehemiah Gordon and Derek Fry, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader Part 2: Exegetical Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 24–27.

Here 11Q13 (possibly alluding to Dan 7 by identifying the Melchizedek figure with the one like a son of man who was brought before the Ancient of Days in a standing posture) indicates Melchizedek acts in the role of judge, a role that we have seen was reserved for the divine figure before the Second Temple period. This text also has included a quote from Ps 82:1. Having identified Melchizedek with YHWH by modifying the text of Isa 61:2, the implication in the quote of Ps 82 is that Melchizedek, as אלהים, is superior to all the other angels (אלהים), as one who executes judgment in the midst of the angels, בקרב אלהים ישפט. The text at the end of line 10 and line 11 then quotes Ps 7:8–9: “And over it to the heights return. A divine being (אל) will judge the peoples.” The author of 11Q13 replaced YHWH (יהוה) of Ps 7:9 with “a divine being” (אל), suggesting again the identification of Melchizedek with YHWH. 11Q13 then describes how Melchizedek will execute God’s vengeance against Belial and “the spirits of his lot” in line 13: “And Melchizedek will establish the vengeance of the judgments of God and on that day he will deliver them from the power (מיד) of Belial and from the power (ימיד) of all the spirits of his lot.” According to 11Q13 Melchizedek acts as both judge and the executor of the punishment that results from the judgment, which is reminiscent of the roles the messiah figure is given to play in BP.

Melchizedek appears not to be identified with the messiah figure in 11Q13. For the author of 11Q13 an anointed one appears who will be the messenger of Isa 52:7. 11Q13 envisions two messengers. One is referred to as “the anointed of the spirit” (משיח הרוח) at line 18, also mentioned in Dan 9:26. After the 62 weeks of Dan 9, this anointed messenger will be “cut off” (יכרת). 11Q13 (lines 18–20) mentions another messenger, who appears to be identified with Melchizedek: “And the messenger of good announcing salvation is the one concerning whom it is written, ‘to comfort the afflicted.’” The author here quoted Isa 61:2, a text the author had already applied to Melchizedek. The end of 11Q13 then appears to midrash Dan 7:13–18 and the “dominion” of one like a son of man that will be restored to “the saints of the Most High,” who are called “the Sons of Light” in 11Q13. The beginning of the thought is fragmented:

[...] turned away from Belial and returns [...] with the judgment of God, just as it is written concerning him, saying to Zion, “Your God reigns” (Isa 52:7). “Zion” is the assembly of all the sons of righteousness, who establish the covenant, who turn from walking in the path of the people. Your divine being is [...] Melchizedek, who will deliver them from the power of Belial (מיד בליעל).

According to 11Q13 the Melchizedek figure has an authority or role that is somewhere between the divine figure and all the other angels. In the

way that the author of 11Q13 interprets texts of the Hebrew Bible, the Melchizedek figure is in some paradoxical sense identified with YHWH. The Melchizedek figure releases his people from their sins. As a figure who is higher than the other angels, he judges the angels. The Melchizedek figure executes the divine figure's vengeance against Belial and against those who belong to Belial. And he delivers the congregation of the righteous from the power (literally "the hand") of Belial.

Another text from Qumran warrants our attention on the topic of messianic power. The Self-Glorification Hymn (4Q491c 11–12) is not part of the War Scroll, although it has been numbered with fragments that have been identified as versions of the War Scroll. The War Scroll contains a description of an eschatological battle between the sons of light and the army of Belial. It gives specific tactical instructions for the priests to blow the battle trumpets to indicate detailed maneuvers for the archers and the infantry on the battle field. At one point (4Q491a 11 ii 11–18) the high priest takes a position in front of the battle line to strengthen the resolve of his army:

And the High Priest will come near and stand in front of the battle-line, and he will strengthen their heart with his exceptional valor (בגבורות) (פלאי) and he will steel their resolve (ואמץ את ידיהמה) for the battle. Then he will chant⁷⁰ and say: "God has risen to examine the heart of his people in the crucible. Do not [...] from your slain, for from ancient times you have listened to the mysteries of God. And as for you, be strong and stand in the breach, and do not be afraid when God strengthens [...] faithful and his ransom will help [...] sons of truth, and to remove the heart that melts [and] to strengthen the heart [...] the battle this day the God of Israel will humiliate him, for all [...] there is not a place to stand. For God the kingdom and for his people salvation [...] quickly for Belial. And the covenant of God is peace for Israel in all the times of eternity [...]."⁷¹

Though part of the text is fragmented, the sense is relatively clear. The language of this text resonates closely with 11Q13 and its description of the conflict with Belial and the end of his power.

⁷⁰ Cf. Jer 51:14 for a context in which a chant (ענה) is done as a victory song in the context of a battle's aftermath. This would suggest that the high priest's chant in 4Q491a is a proleptic victory chant intended to strengthen the troops. This is supported by what is stated in the immediate context, that the God of Israel is about to humiliate the enemy.

⁷¹ Cf. Maurice Baillet, ed., *Qumrân Grotte 4, III (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD VII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 12–44. Cf. also Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, with the assistance of Nehemiah Gordon and Derek Fry eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader Part 1: Texts Concerned with Religious Law* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 248–65. Cf. also 4Q491 10 ii.

The Self-Glorification Hymn (4Q491c 1) is erroneously catalogued with the Cave 4 fragments of the War Scroll, but should rather be associated with the Thanksgiving Hymns from Cave 1 and Cave 4.⁷² The beginning of the text is too fragmented to understand the subject, but it appears to be the divine figure, God.

[...] wonderful things [...] in the power of his strength (בכוח גבורתו) the righteous cry aloud and the holy ones rejoice [...] in justice [...] Israel. He established from ancient times his truth and the mysteries of his shrewdness (ורויו ערמתו) in all [...] strength [...] and the council of the poor for an eternal assembly [...] perfect of [...] eternal. A mighty throne in the assembly of the gods on which none of the kings of ancient times will sit and their nobles will not [...] like me [...] my glory there is nothing to resemble, and no one is exalted besides me, and no one comes along with me, for I dwell in [...] in the heavens, and there is no one [...] I am reckoned with the gods and my place is in the holy assembly. My desire is not according to the flesh [...] all that is precious to me is in the glory of the holy dwelling. Who has been considered despised by me? And who is like [me] in my glory? There is no one who sails on the sea who will return and tell [...] Who will [...] troubles like me? And who endures all evil with me? There is no one. I have been taught, but the teaching does not compare [with my teaching]. And who will attack me when I open my mouth? And who can endure the utterance of my lips. And who will accuse me and compare with my judgment? [...] For I am reckoned with the gods and my glory is with the sons of the king. Neither [...] nor the gold of Ophir [...] Righteous ones with the gods of [...] in the holy dwelling sing [...] Cause [yourselves] to be heard with the appropriate ringing cry [...] with joy forever. And there is no [...] to cause to arise the horn of his anointed ([...] להקים קרן משיח) [...] to make known his power with strength (להודיע ידו בכוח) [...]⁷³

The language at the beginning of this fragment appears to refer to the divine figure, who established Israel from eternity. The text refers to “his truth and the mysteries of his shrewdness,” which are apparent references to the divine figure. The rhetorical question “who is like [me] in my glory?” recalls the early theophanic tradition of the exodus out of Egypt (Exod 15:11), when the divine figure exerted his power against the

⁷² See the comments by Martin Abegg, Jr., in Michael Wise, Martin Abegg, Jr., and Edward Cook, eds. and trans., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996), 67–68.

⁷³ Cf. Baillet, ed., *Qumrân Grotte 4, III*, 12–44. Cf. also Parry and Tov, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader Part 1*, 254–57. Cf. also Esti Eshel, “The Identification of the ‘Speaker’ of the Self-Glorification Hymn,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 619–35.

enemies who were pursuing his people. It is possible to see a connection between “his anointed” at the end of this text with the reference to the High Priest of 4Q491a 11 ii 11–18. Because of the similarity in language with 11Q13, where Melchizedek has a special relationship (if not a direct identification) with the divine figure, we may also see a similar special relationship between the “anointed one” and the divine figure of 4Q491c, where the “anointed one,” or the messiah figure, is a physical manifestation of the power of the divine figure on earth: “to cause to arise the horn of his anointed ([...] *קרן מן יחו*) [...] to make known his power with strength ([...] *להודיע ידו בכוח*) [...].”

The first-century B.C.E. text, *Psalms of Solomon*, also exhibits similar motifs of the exertion of divine power with reference to a messiah figure:

- 21 See, Lord, and raise up for them the son of David, their king
at the time which you yourself choose, O God, to rule over Israel your
servant;
- 22 and brace him with strength to break (*ἰσχὺν τοῦ θραῦσαι*) unrighteous
rulers,
to cleanse Jerusalem from Gentiles who trample with destruction,
- 23 in righteous wisdom to drive out sinners from the inheritance,
to crush sinful arrogance like a potter’s jar,
- 24 with an iron rod to shatter all their substance,
to destroy lawless nations with the word of his mouth,
- 25 at his [mere] threat [to cause] nations to flee from his presence;
and he will convict sinners with the thought of their hearts. (*Pss. Sol.*
17:21–25)

Here there is a reference to power (*ἰσχὺς*) similar to that of Dan 8: “brace him with strength to break unrighteous rulers” (*καὶ ὑπόζωσον αὐτὸν ἰσχὺν τοῦ θραῦσαι ἄρχοντας ἀδίκους*). This text is also drawing from traditions that were ascribing wisdom to the messiah figure: “...in righteous wisdom to drive out sinners from the inheritance” (*ἐν σοφίᾳ δικαιοσύνης ἐξῶσαι ἁμαρτωλοὺς ἀπὸ κληρονομίας*). The following description of the messiah figure then states that he will not rely on human strength, but on supernatural power, which was also hinted at in *Pss. Sol.* 17:21–25:

- 32 And he will be over them a righteous king taught by God,
and there will not be injustice in his days in the midst of them,
because all shall be holy, and their king shall be the Lord’s Messiah.
- 33 For he will not put his hope in horse and rider and bow,
neither will he amass for himself gold or silver for war
and in a multitude he will not gather hopes for a day of war.
- 34 The Lord himself is his king, the hope of whose power is in the hope of
God,
and he shall have mercy on all the nations [who are] before him in fear.

- 35 For he shall strike the earth with the word of his mouth forever,
 he will bless the people of the Lord by wisdom with gladness;
 36 and he himself [will be] pure from sins, in order to rule a great people,
 to convict rulers and remove sinners by the strength of [his] word.
 37 And he will not become weak in his days, [as he trusts] in his God,
 for God has made him powerful (δυνατόν) by the holy spirit
 and wise in understanding counsel (καὶ σοφὸν ἐν βουλή συνέσεως)
 with strength and righteousness (μετὰ ἰσχύος καὶ δικαιοσύνης).
 38 And the blessing of the Lord will be with him in strength (ἐν ἰσχύϊ),
 and he will not weaken.
 39 His hope will be in the Lord. (*Pss. Sol.* 17:32–39a)

The references to not relying on “horse and rider and bow” and not putting hope “in a multitude...for a day of war” suggest a polemical relationship with the mediatorial traditions in the War Scroll and the Self-Glorification Hymn of Qumran, which do rely on human agency to fight an eschatological war. That the son of David messiah king will not “amass for himself gold or silver for war” also suggests a polemical reference to the messianic traditions of BP (*1 En.* 52:1–53:7) where the six mountains that once served to provide tyrannical human kings with the metal resources they needed to fashion implements of war, will serve the authority of the “anointed one” in his eschatological overthrow of the human kings.⁷⁴ In *Pss. Sol.* 17 the messiah king is given God’s power, “to destroy the unrighteous rulers,” “to smash the arrogance of sinners,” “with the word of his mouth forever” and “by the strength of his word.”

Paul defined the power of God in terms of what he called “the gospel”: “For I am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God for salvation (δύναμις γὰρ θεοῦ ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν) to everyone who believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. For the righteousness of God is revealed in it (δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται) from faith to faith, as it is written, ‘And the righteous shall live by faith’” (*Rom* 1:16–17). This connection between the power of God and the gospel in Paul’s thought reveals the righteousness of God. Paul asserted this explicitly in *Rom* 3:

But now apart from law the righteousness of God has been manifest (δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται), borne witness to by the Torah and the prophets, the righteousness of God through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ for all who believe. For there is no distinction, for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, having been justified freely by his grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God put

⁷⁴ Similar motifs of the exertion of divine power in relation to the eschatological role of the messiah figure appear in later texts such as *Ap. Abr.* 31:1–2 and *2 Bar.* 39–40.

forward as an atoning sacrifice through faith in his blood. [This was] for a demonstration of his righteousness (εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ) for the sake of passing over previously committed sins in the clemency of God, for the demonstration of his righteousness at the present time, in order that he might be righteous and that he might justify by the faithfulness of Jesus. (Rom 3:21–26)

At 1 Cor 15:1–4 Paul defined his gospel in terms of the death and resurrection of the messiah figure. This introduces Paul’s defense of his concept of the resurrection (15:12–28). Paul then linked the messiah figure’s resurrection with the eschatological resurrection of “those who have fallen asleep” (15:20–23). The resurrection of all humans will occur, according to Paul, at the end (τὸ τέλος), when the messiah figure “gives back the kingdom to God the Father, when he destroys every rule and every authority and power” (εἶτα τὸ τέλος, ὅταν παραδιδῶ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ, ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν, 15:24). At this eschatological resurrection, according to Paul, the messiah figure will destroy “every rule and every authority and power.” This is language (ἐξουσία and δύναμις) that resonates with the earlier Second Temple traditions about the eschatological exertion of divine power at the hand of a messiah figure.

In Phil 3 Paul boasts about the credentials of his Jewish identity. He does this, however, in a rhetorical sense, in order to replace boasting in his own personal power with the power of the messiah figure’s resurrection (3:10). Paul then made the connection with the eschatological resurrection: “But our citizenship is in heaven, from which also we wait for a savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will change our lowly body in conformation to his glorious body according to the inner working of power so that he is able even to subdue all things to himself” (ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει, ἐξ οὗ καὶ σωτῆρα ἀπεκδεχόμεθα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ὃς μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ δύνασθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, 3:20–21).

While most of the traditions regarding messianic power leading up to the first century C.E. ascribe the divine figure’s power to a mediatorial figure or a messiah figure with reference to eschatological judgment (with the exception of Ps 110, which is an earlier royal enthronement psalm, and Dan 7–9, which is an angelic-power tradition), Paul associated the power of the divine figure with the messiah figure both in terms of the messiah figure’s death and resurrection, and the messiah figure’s eschatological role in executing divine judgment.

5.2.5 Judgment

Judgment is one of the functions of the messiah figure in LP. This can be broken down into several elements, including *parousia*, presiding over the judgment, and execution of punishment.

The *parousia* of the messiah figure is an important aspect of judgment in Paul's thought. According to Paul, the messiah figure has a future coming (παρουσία, 1 Thess 2:19; 3:13; 5:23; 1 Cor 15:23; 16:22). The *parousia* is a part of the larger concept of Paul's eschatology. Paul believed that the *eschaton* had already arrived: "...the end of the ages has come" (1 Cor 10:11). The future coming of the messiah figure entails several important elements in Paul's thought. This future coming of the messiah figure is a coming from heaven (1 Thess 4:15–18). The future coming of the messiah figure from heaven will be accompanied by "all his holy ones" (μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ, 1 Thess 3:13; cf. Zech 14:5, LXX: καὶ ἦξει κύριος ὁ θεός μου καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι μετ' αὐτοῦ).

In 1 Thess 3:13 it is not clear whether "holy ones" is a reference to angels. The usual use of the term ἅγιος in LP refers to the members of the communities to whom Paul wrote his letters. This is a good indication that Paul has embedded in his letter an earlier tradition about the eschatological coming of the messiah figure accompanied by angels. Paul referred to this as "the coming of the Lord" (1 Thess 4:15; 5:23). Paul wrote that "the Lord himself will descend from heaven with a cry, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trumpet of God" (1 Thess 4:16).⁷⁵ Paul referred to an early tradition about the coming of the Lord

⁷⁵ There is a tradition in several texts from this period that has the appearance of angels and the blowing of a trumpet to announce the coming of God for judgment. The *Greek Life of Adam and Eve*, a first-century C.E. document, contains a merkabah theophany which is announced by the blowing of a trumpet (*GLAE* 37–38). The *Apocalypse of Abraham*, a first- to second-century C.E. document, is a fabricated dialogue between Abraham and the "Eternal Mighty One," with a detailed description of the final judgment. At *Ap. Ab.* 30 the Eternal Mighty One outlines for Abraham ten signs of the impending judgment. At *Ap. Ab.* 31:1 the "Eternal Mighty One" tells Abraham, "And then I will sound the trumpet out of the air." This text then refers to the sending of "my chosen one, having in him one measure of all my power." The *Testament of Abraham* is another first- to second-century C.E. document with a judgment scene depicting an angel with a trumpet. At *T. Abr.* 12:10 an angel holds a trumpet and wields fire in the context of a judgment scene. The *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* is a first-century B.C.E. to first-century C.E. document. In chs. 9–12 *Ap. Zeph.* describes a series of three trumpets that are used in the context of judgment. In the *Greek Apocalypse of Ezra* (4:36), a second- to ninth-century C.E. document, there is only a brief mention of a trumpet in the context of the resurrection of the dead. And in *Questions of Ezra*, Recension

when he writes that “the day of the Lord comes just like a thief in the night” (1 Thess 5:2; cf. Matt 24:43–44; Luke 12:39–40). Paul sometimes referred to this future coming of the messiah figure as the “day of the Lord” or “the day of our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Cor 1:7–8; 3:13; 5:5; 2 Cor 1:14; Phil 1:6, 10; 2:16). Paul also referred to the second coming of the messiah figure as a “revealing of our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Cor 1:7–8). Paul urged the followers of Jesus in Corinth to wait for this day when the messiah figure will be “revealed” (ἀπεκδεχομένους τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τοῦ κυρίου, 1 Cor 1:7). At the future coming of the messiah figure, according to Paul, the messiah figure will establish the hearts of believers unblamable in holiness before God and deliver them from the wrath to come (1 Thess 1:10). At this future coming the messiah figure will disclose the purposes of human hearts with the result that every human will receive judgment from God (1 Cor 4:5).

First Thessalonians exhibits several elements of Paul’s thought regarding the messiah figure at his *parousia*. After giving encouragement to the Thessalonians as to how they were to live and treat each other while waiting for the *parousia*, Paul also addressed what appears to have been a specific concern raised by the Thessalonians, namely, what happens to those who die before the *parousia*:

But we do not want you to be ignorant, brothers, about those who have fallen asleep, so that you may not grieve even as the rest who do not have hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, so also through Jesus God will bring with him those who have fallen asleep. For this we say to you by a word of the Lord, that we who are living, who are left until the coming of the Lord, shall not precede those who have fallen asleep. For the Lord himself will descend from heaven with a cry, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trumpet of God, and the dead in Christ will rise first. Then we who are living, who are left, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air. And so we shall always be with the Lord. Therefore comfort each other with these words.

But concerning the times and the seasons, brothers, you do not have a need for us to write. For you yourselves well know that the day of the Lord will come like a thief in the night. When they say, “Peace and safety,” then sudden destruction will come upon them as birth-pains for a pregnant woman, and they will not escape. But you, brothers, are not in darkness, so that the day will overtake you like a thief. (1 Thess 4:13–5:4)

In the process of answering the specific question, what happens to those who die before the *parousia*, Paul gave the Thessalonians several elements of his thought with regard to the expected second coming of the

B (date unknown) a trumpet is sounded by the angel Gabriel at “the coming of Christ.”

messiah figure. The messiah figure died and rose again. Paul stated this as a condition: εἰ γὰρ πιστεύομεν ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἀνέστη, οὕτως καὶ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς κοιμηθέντας διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἄξει σὺν αὐτῷ (“For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, so also through Jesus God will bring with him those who have fallen asleep”). For Paul this death and resurrection of the messiah figure was the basis for belief that God would also raise those who had died. The phrase διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (“through Jesus”) indicates that Paul thought of the messiah figure as God’s agent or instrument for accomplishing the resurrection of the dead. One should probably note here the similarity of language at 1 Cor 8:4–6 where the messiah figure in Paul’s thought is a preexistent agent of creation. What Paul may have been hinting at in 1 Thessalonians is that the messiah figure is the divine figure’s agent of a new creation, something Paul defined as being “in Christ” at 2 Cor 5:17.

Paul then asserted that his instructions about the resurrection of the dead were given “by a word of the Lord” (ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου), a reference to the messiah figure. Here Paul claimed that those who are left alive until the coming of the Lord (οἱ περιλειπόμενοι εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ κυρίου) will not precede in resurrection those who had already died. Paul then launched into a description of what he thought the *parousia* would entail: descent of the messiah figure from heaven, some sort of audible announcement which he referred to as “a cry” (either by the messiah figure himself, by an angel, or by the divine figure), “the voice of the archangel,” and “the trumpet of God.” The “cry” may be in apposition to “the voice of the archangel”; or it may be one in a list of three elements accompanying the messiah figure’s descent.

This coming day of the Lord, according to Paul, will be for judgment (1 Cor 5:5; 2 Cor 1:14). In connection to the *parousia*, according to Paul, the messiah figure is to be the agent of God’s judgment. In fact, the messiah figure executes both judgment and punishment. In his Second Letter to the Corinthians Paul wrote: “For it is necessary that we all appear before the judgment seat of Christ (τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ), in order that each may receive back for the things which he has done through the body, whether good or bad” (2 Cor 5:10). It should at least be noted here that this is the only place in LP where the messiah figure sits on a “judgment seat” or judgment throne (cp. Rom 14:10 where it is the divine figure who sits on the judgment throne). This should probably be taken as another allusion to Ps 110:1 (LXX: Ps 109:1) in LP.⁷⁶ Paul wrote to the Romans that the

⁷⁶ Darrell Hannah does not include 2 Cor 5:10 in his list of Pauline allusions to Ps 110:1. Cf. his “The Throne of His Glory,” 72.

messiah figure is the agent through whom “God judges the things hidden by human beings” (Rom 2:16). Paul included himself in this judgment: “I am aware of nothing in myself, but by this I have not been justified; the one who judges me is the Lord. Therefore do not pass any judgment before the proper time, until the Lord comes, who will also bring to light the things hidden by the darkness and will reveal the counsels of the heart; and then there will be praise for each one from God” (1 Cor 4:4–5). The evidence in LP is clear that the final judgment also entails the role of the messiah figure in relation to the divine figure. In the end the messiah figure will deliver the kingdom to God the Father after destroying every rule and every authority and power (1 Cor 15:24).

With regard to the final judgment, one of the roles of the messiah figure is to deliver believers from the coming wrath (1 Thess 1:10). Paul also articulated this in terms of believers being destined to salvation through the messiah figure (1 Thess 5:9). The messiah figure will make those who believe guiltless “on the day of our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Cor 1:7–8; Phil 1:6, 10; 2:14–18). According to Paul’s thought, this is related to the death of the messiah figure, who died in order to save humans from the wrath of God (Rom 5:6–9). The messiah figure will also transform believers on the final day. According to Paul, the messiah figure “will change our lowly body in conformation to his glorious body according to the inner working of power so that he is able even to subdue all things to himself” (Phil 3:20–21; cf. 1 Cor 15:27–28).

The cultic acts of the early followers of Jesus in Corinth had a sort of now/not yet eschatological character. In First Corinthians Paul drew a connection between the communal meal and the *parousia* of the messiah figure. “For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the death of the Lord until he comes” (1 Cor 11:26).

5.2.6 Worship

To be the object of human worship is also one of the functions of the messiah figure in LP. This function of the messiah figure among the early followers of Jesus appears in a number of forms in LP. It appears in certain prayer formulas that draw a close connection between the messiah figure and the divine figure, in invocation formulas, baptism formulas, meal formulas, hymns, and doxologies.⁷⁷

At 1 Cor 16:22 we have what is probably the most widely recognized liturgical formula in LP, which Paul would have borrowed from the

⁷⁷ See the discussion by Hurtado in *Lord Jesus Christ*, 137–53. The discussion here follows Hurtado’s analysis.

worship of the earliest followers of Jesus who were still speaking Aramaic. This formula comes at the end of the letter, where Paul greeted various persons by name and he wrote a personal greeting in his own hand: “The greeting is in my hand, Paul. If any one does not love the Lord, let him be cursed. Our Lord, come!” The prayer “Our Lord come!” is recognized by most scholars to be an Aramaic liturgical prayer, in Greek: *μαράνα θά*. The prayer in Aramaic would be *מרנא אחא*.⁷⁸ This appeal also appears in an early liturgical prayer included in the *Didache*: “Let grace come and let this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David. If anyone is holy, let him come. If anyone is not, let him repent. Our Lord, come (*μαρὰν ἀθά*). Amen” (*Didache* 10:6). So the presence of *μαράνα θά* in Paul appears to be more than just a spontaneous appeal, and is more likely the inclusion of a liturgical formula. The fact that Paul left the Aramaic formula untranslated is evidence that it would have been familiar to Paul’s readers, which also suggests a Jewish presence within the church of Corinth.⁷⁹

At 1 Cor 1:2 Paul addressed the Corinthians as those who “call on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.” While on the surface this might not appear to have any significance for the worship of the messiah figure by humans, according to Hurtado it places the messiah figure in a role the precedent of which in Jewish thought and practice can only be identified with the divine figure. Hurtado includes Rom 10:9–13 as evidence of early worship with reference to the messiah figure: “...if you confess with your mouth that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved. For with the heart it is believed for righteousness, and with the mouth it is confessed for salvation.” Hurtado is correct to link this early confession of Jesus as Lord with worship. Immediately following this text, Paul quoted the prophet Joel: “For the scripture says, ‘Everyone who believes in him will not be put to shame.’ For there is not a distinction between Jew and Greek, since he himself is the Lord of all, giving riches to all who call upon him. For, ‘everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved’” (*πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσεται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται*). The last quote is from Joel

⁷⁸ Joseph Fitzmyer has claimed that this is evidence that early Jewish followers of Jesus worshiped Jesus as Lord and identified him with YHWH of the Hebrew Bible. See Fitzmyer’s “New Testament Kyrios and Maranatha and Their Aramaic Background,” in *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 218–35. Fitzmyer argues that there is no evidence for an apocoped imperative, consequently Paul’s Greek transliteration of the imperative reflects an elision of the initial *aleph*.

⁷⁹ Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 140–41.

(MT: 3:5; LXX: 2:32). As Hurtado rightly points out, while the context of Joel is eschatological judgment, the usual use of the word “to call upon” (ἐπικαλεῖν) with reference to the Lord in the LXX (קרא בשם יהוה in the Hebrew Bible) has cultic connotations: “In Romans 10:9–13, however, it is clear that Paul refers to ritual acclamation/invocation of *Jesus* in the setting of Christian worship, and that he does so by deliberately using this biblical phrase for worshipping God.”⁸⁰ This same confession, that “Jesus is Lord,” is also addressed by Paul at 1 Cor 12:1–3 together with spiritual gifts, in a context where he discussed various worship practices. It should also be observed that the object of the confession in Greek at both Rom 10:9 and 1 Cor 12:3 is Κύριος Ἰησοῦς, and that the confession itself, instead of “Jesus is Lord,” may have been simply “the Lord Jesus.” Hurtado writes:

Though “to call upon” Jesus was probably initially the specific ritual (collective) confession/acknowledgment of his exaltation as “Lord,” the phrase quickly came to connote the broader devotional praxis of treating Jesus as recipient of liturgical worship through invocation, prayer, and praise. In 1 Corinthians 1:2 Paul refers to Christians everywhere (*en panti topō*) as “all those who call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ,” which both explicitly indicates the christological appropriation of the biblical phrase and also makes this cultic reverence of Jesus the universal description of Christian believers... [T]he appropriation of the biblical expression to describe and understand the ritual reverence of Jesus probably goes back well before Paul’s Gentile mission.⁸¹

Hurtado then states that “there is simply no parallel for this in any other group of the period in the Jewish tradition.” Here Hurtado makes a reference to BP, and contrasts the reverence for the divine figure expressed in BP with that expressed for the messiah figure in LP:

For example, note the emphasis on the name of God in the “Similitudes” section of *1 Enoch*. There we find numerous references to denying (45:1; 46:7) and glorifying/blessing/extolling (46:6; 48:6; 61:9, 11–12; 63:7) God’s name, and the elect are made victorious through God’s name (50:2–3). In the early Christian groups whose worship life is mirrored and presupposed in the Pauline letters, the name of Jesus plays a comparable role.⁸²

Hurtado is quite right that this sort of worship is directed to the divine figure in BP. But what is not clear in BP is the distinction Hurtado makes between the messiah figure and the divine figure with regard to the use of

⁸⁰ Ibid., 142. Dunn agrees; see his *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 257–58.

⁸¹ Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 143.

⁸² Ibid.

the divine name in BP (see §3.1.7, above). In fact, there is some evidence in BP that the messiah figure is associated with the divine name and that the same verbs that are applied to the worship of the divine figure are also applied to the messiah figure in BP (see, e.g., *1 En.* 48:5; 62:9–12). Consequently, Hurtado’s argument that “there is simply no parallel for this in any other group of the period in the Jewish tradition” simply does not hold. Hurtado’s argument that the intensity of devotion to Christ is unparalleled should be questioned in light of the evidence of the extraordinary combination of conceptual elements of messianic traditions that occurs in BP. Call it an explosion of messianic ideology if you like (to use Hurtado’s language!). This is an important point, because it addresses the relationship between the messiah figure in BP and the messiah figure in LP, which will be the point of comparison in Chapter 6 of the present study.

Paul made explicit statements about a number of issues related to the functions of the messiah figure in LP. The messiah figure is the divine figure’s agent of creation, “through whom” all things were created. Salvation is one of the functions of the messiah figure in LP. Paul developed his concept of salvation in terms of the death and resurrection of the messiah figure, an act which delivers humans from God’s wrath. Paul also developed his soteriology by contrasting Christ with Adam, ascribing to Adam a wholly negative role of introducing sin and death, a problem which in Paul’s view was resolved by the “last Adam,” Christ. Paul articulated the death and resurrection of the messiah figure as a propitiatory sacrificial death for the forgiveness of sins. Paul associated the messiah figure with the power of God, which is a development of biblical traditions about the theophanic exertion of God’s power against the enemies of his people through the agency of mediatorial and messiah figures, and Second Temple traditions regarding the eschatological exertion of God’s power for judgment, again through the agency of various mediatorial and messiah figures. Paul also placed the messiah figure in the role of judge, occupying the “judgment seat” and executing punishment. And Paul provided various descriptions of the messiah figure in LP as the object of human worship.

5.3 Summary and Conclusions

Based on the evidence in LP, the messiah figure according to his nature is a human being as well as a preexistent heavenly being. Paul associated the messiah figure with the wisdom of God via the intellectual trajectory of Hellenistic wisdom traditions. He also had some sort of concept of the messiah figure in a pre-human form, identifying Christ with “the rock”

that “followed” the Israelites as they wandered in the wilderness. For Paul the messiah figure is the image and glory of God. The messiah figure, through the epithet “Lord,” is associated with the divine name of the Hebrew Bible (יהוה) and the LXX (κύριος). Paul also may have identified the messiah figure as an angel. And in Paul’s thought the messiah figure was without sin, a concept that Paul appears to have used with reference to the broader discussion about Adam and the new creation in Christ.

Regarding the functions of the messiah figure, Paul made a number of explicit statements. The messiah figure is God’s agent of creation. The death and resurrection of the messiah figure are prominent roles in Paul’s thought. Paul also made specific soteriological claims about the messiah figure, contrasting the exclusively negative role of Adam and the restorative, redemptive role of Christ in the place of Adam. Paul made the claim that the death and resurrection of the messiah was a propitiatory sacrifice for sins that gives humans the forgiveness of sins. In LP the messiah figure is associated with the exertion of God’s power, which entailed the event of the messiah figure’s death and resurrection and the messiah figure’s role in the eschatological judgment. Paul identified final judgment as a role of the messiah figure, which entailed *parousia*, sitting on a throne of judgment, executing judgment, and executing punishment. And Paul included being worshiped by humans as one of the roles of the messiah figure.

The following tables (Tables 5 and 6) show the nature and functions of the divine figure in LP and the nature and functions of the messiah figure in LP in comparison to each other. There are five characteristics of nature that the two figures share according to LP. Both figures are unique figures for which there is no parallel. Both figures have the divine name. Both are heavenly beings. Both figures are righteous. And both have the divine image and glory. In the undisputed Letters of Paul there is no completely unambiguous and explicit reference to the deity of the messiah figure,⁸³ although there is evidence that Paul understood the messiah figure in some way to participate in the unique identity of the divine figure via the divine name. With regard to functions there are five categories in LP that I am using for comparison here: creation, revelation of wisdom, salvation, judgment, and worship. The divine figure and the messiah figure share all five of these broader categories, with differences existing between the two within each of the five categories. Both figures act in creation. Both figures are involved in the revelation of wisdom, the

⁸³ See the Excursus below (§5.4) on Rom 9:5. This is the only possible exception in LP.

divine figure as the revealer of wisdom, and the messiah figure as the object of that revelation. Both figures function in the role of salvation. The divine figure sent forth the messiah figure to be crucified. The messiah figure was crucified. The divine figure raised the messiah figure from the dead. The messiah figure participated in this resurrection. The messiah figure also delivers from the future wrath of God. And both figures deliver the forgiveness of sins. With reference to judgment, both figures have a role in this function, and according to Paul they share this function in all of its details. Both figures are worshiped by humans.

Table 5
*A Comparison of the Nature of the Divine Figure
and the Nature of the Messiah Figure in the Letters of Paul*

<i>Nature</i>	<i>Divine Figure</i>	<i>Messiah Figure</i>
deity	•	
unique	•	•
divine name	•	•
heavenly being	•	•
righteous	•	•
divine image and glory	•	•
human being		•
preexistent		•
associated with wisdom		•
pre-human		•
like an angel		•
without sin		•

Table 6
*A Comparison of the Functions of the Divine Figure
and the Functions of the Messiah Figure in the Letters of Paul*

<i>Function</i>	<i>Divine Figure</i>	<i>Messiah Figure</i>
Creation:		
creation	•	•
Revelation of Wisdom:		
reveals wisdom	•	
object of divine revelation		•
Salvation:		
sends messiah figure	•	
crucifixion of messiah figure	•	•

<i>Function</i>	<i>Divine Figure</i>	<i>Messiah Figure</i>
resurrection of messiah figure	•	•
delivers from wrath of divine figure		•
forgiveness of sins	•	•
Judgment:		
sits on throne	•	•
appears at the judgment / <i>parousia</i>	•	•
presides over the judgment	•	•
executes judgment	•	•
executes punishment after the judgment	•	•
resurrection of the dead	•	•
Worship:		
worshiped by humans	•	•
receives prayers	•	•

5.4 Excursus: A CLOSER LOOK AT ROMANS 9:5: DID PAUL REFER TO JESUS AS θεός?

Did Paul refer to Jesus as God (θεός) at Rom 9:5? This is a question that has a long history in the secondary literature.⁸⁴ Interestingly, in more recent studies of Pauline christology the question, if not entirely ignored, is delicately sidestepped.⁸⁵ At the risk of sounding over critical, the secondary literature exhibits a significant degree of ambivalence on the question, some accepting the ascription of θεός to the messiah figure in Paul's thought,⁸⁶ some not.⁸⁷ The ambivalence is no doubt owing to the

⁸⁴ The first person who appears to have raised the question in lengthy detail arguing against the doxology's reference to Christ was Ezra Abbot in "On the Construction of Romans ix. 5," *Journal for the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* (1881): 87–154. Participating with Abbot in this discussion was Timothy Dwight, "On Romans ix. 5," *Journal for the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* (1881): 22–55.

⁸⁵ One would expect a comprehensive treatment of Rom 9:5 in Hurtado's extraordinary work, *Lord Jesus Christ*; in this study there is no treatment of Rom 9:5 at all. See also Hurtado, *How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God?*, where again one would expect some treatment of Rom 9:5, especially based on its title; it is surprisingly absent.

⁸⁶ Cf. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant*, 237–38, where Wright accepts the ascription of θεός to Christ in Rom 9:5. So also Wright in *Paul in Fresh Perspective*, 92–93, 127. Ben Witherington, III, argues that Rom 9:5 refers to Jesus as θεός with regard to "the category of Deity." See Witherington's "Jesus as the Alpha and Omega of New Testament Thought," in *Contours of Christology in the New Testament* (ed. Richard N. Longenecker; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 25–46, esp. 35–36. Cf. also Richard N. Longenecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish*

density of Paul's grammar and syntax. No one should be surprised by this. However, it seems reasonable to examine Rom 9:5 and the undisputed Pauline letters again on this question.

Romans 9:5 appears in the broader context of Paul's discussion of his understanding of the identity of Israel and Israel's inclusion in the promises of God. It is necessary to quote the immediate context in order to analyze the meaning of Rom 9:5:

Ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ ψεύδομαι, συμμαρτυρούσης μοι τῆς συνειδήσεώς μου ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, ὅτι λύπη μοί ἐστιν μεγάλη καὶ ἀδιάλειπτος ὁδύνη τῇ καρδίᾳ μου. ἠὺχόμην γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα, οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται, ὧν ἡ υἰοθεσία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ αἱ διαθήκαι καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία καὶ ἡ λατρεία καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι, ὧν οἱ πατέρες καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.
(Rom 9:1–5)

There are essentially two possible translations of Rom 9:5.⁸⁸ The two possibilities are presented in italics below:

Christianity (Vancouver: Regent, 1970), 138. Likewise Douglas J. Moo, "The Christology of the Early Pauline Letters," in Longenecker, ed., *Contours of Christology in the New Testament*, 169–92, esp. 190. Leon Morris also argued that the last part of Rom 9:5 referred to Christ in his commentary, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 349–51.

⁸⁷ Cf. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 255–57, where Dunn argues on the basis of theology, rather than grammar and context, that Paul could not have referred to Jesus as θεός at Rom 9:5; and see Dunn, *Did the First Christians Worship Jesus?*, 132–33. Cf. Casey, *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God*, 135–36; Casey concedes that the meaning of Rom 9:5 that ascribes θεός to the messiah figure "is perhaps to be regarded as the more probable. The grammatical structure of the sentence favours it"; yet Casey rejects the ascription of θεός to the messiah figure in Rom 9:5. See also Marinus de Jonge, *Christology in Context: The Earliest Christian Response to Jesus* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988), 122–23; de Jonge argues that subordination of Jesus to God in Paul's letters indicates that Rom 9:5 should be read as a doxology to God and not as a reference to the divinity of Jesus. See also Calvin Roetzel, *Paul: The Man and the Myth* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1999), 126. Roetzel adopts the position that the end of Rom 9:5 is a doxology with no antecedent. So also A. J. M. Wedderburn, *The Reasons for Romans* (ed. John Riches; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988), 113.

⁸⁸ The classical treatment of Rom 9:5 is in the commentary by Sanday and Headlam, who nuance the verse into four possible translations. The two presented here drive at the heart of the problem. See William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (5th ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1980), 233–38. Sanday and Headlam come down on the side of the doxology referring to Christ. Abbot, in "On the Construction of Romans ix. 5," 89–90, offered seven possibilities and hinted at others he did not pursue. Abbot then writes: "The question of chief interest is whether in this passage the Apostle has called Christ *God*."

Translation 1:

I speak the truth in Christ, I am not lying, as my conscience bears witness for me in the Holy Spirit, that I have great grief and unceasing anguish in my heart. For I pray that I myself would be cut off from the Messiah for the sake of my brothers, my fellow kinsmen according to the flesh, who are Israelites, whose is the adoption and the glory and the covenants and the giving of the law and the liturgical service and the promises, whose are the fathers and *from whom is the Messiah according to the flesh, who is over all God, blessed forever, amen.*

Translation 2:

I speak the truth in Christ, I am not lying, as my conscience bears witness for me in the Holy Spirit, that I have great grief and unceasing anguish in my heart. For I pray that I myself would be cut off from the Messiah for the sake of my brothers, my fellow kinsmen according to the flesh, who are Israelites, whose is the adoption and the glory and the covenants and the giving of the law and the liturgical service and the promises, whose are the fathers and *from whom is the Messiah according to the flesh. He who is over all God be blessed forever, amen.*

Since the meaning of Rom 9:5 appears to hinge on whether the definite article of the phrase ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας has an antecedent (translation 1), or whether it is an independent doxology grammatically separate from what has gone before (translation 2), the goal of the following analysis is to determine precisely what Paul meant in Rom 9:5 by examining two parallel texts in LP and by taking a broader look at Paul's usage of relative pronouns and definite articles used as relative pronouns in subordinate relative clauses, to see whether Paul was inclined or disinclined to use antecedents with relative pronouns and definite articles in subordinate relative clauses.

Limiting the scope of this brief excursus to the undisputed Letters of Paul (LP), I have examined Paul's use of relative pronouns and definite articles used as relative pronouns in subordinate relative clauses. The results are mixed. Paul used relative pronouns in subordinate clauses both with antecedents⁸⁹ and without antecedents.⁹⁰ Paul also used definite articles as relative pronouns in subordinate relative clauses

⁸⁹ Cf. Gal 1:5, 7, 23; 2:2, 4, 10, 18, 20; 3:10, 16; 4:9, 19, 24, 26; 5:10, 17, 19, 21; 6:7, 14; 1 Thess 1:10; 2:13; 5:24; 1 Cor 1:8, 9, 30; 2:7, 8, 16; 3:5, 11, 14; 4:5, 7, 17; 5:1; 6:5, 18, 19; 8:6 (2×), 11; 10:11, 13, 16 (2×); 11:23, 24; 15:1, 2, 6, 9, 10 (2×), 15, 31; 2 Cor 1:4, 6, 10 (2×); 2:3, 4; 3:6; 4:4, 6; 5:4, 10; 8:18, 22; 9:2; 10:1, 2, 8, 13; 11:4 (3×), 15; 12:4, 13; 13:3, 10; Rom 1:2, 5, 6, 9, 25, 27; 2:6, 29; 3:8, 25, 30; 4:6, 7 (2×), 8, 16, 17, 18, 24, 25; 5:2 (2×), 11, 12, 14; 6:17, 21; 7:6; 8:3, 15, 34 (2×); 9:4 (2×), 5 (2×), 23, 24; 10:8, 13; 11:2; 14:15; 15:18; 16:5, 6, 12, 17, 27; Phil 1:28; 2:5, 6, 15, 20; 3:8, 12, 18, 19, 20, 21; 4:3, 8, 9, 10; Phlm 5, 10, 12, 13.

⁹⁰ Cf. Gal 1:8, 9; 6:12, 16; 1 Cor 2:9, 13; 4:6; 6:24; 7:1, 36, 37, 39; 10:13, 15, 20, 29; 11:21, 23, 27; 12:8, 28; 14:37; 15:3, 10, 36, 37; 16:2; 2 Cor 1:13, 17; 2:10 (2×); 10:18; 11:12 (2×), 17, 21; 12:6, 17; Rom 2:1, 23; 4:21; 6:16; 7:15 (3×), 16, 19 (2×), 20; 8:24, 25, 29, 30 (3×), 32; 9:15 (2×), 18 (2×), 21 (2×); 10:14 (2×); 11:7; 12:3; 14:2, 5 (2×), 21, 22; 16:2; Phil 3:7; 4:11.

both with antecedents⁹¹ and in a small handful of cases without antecedents.⁹² There are a few instances in which Paul used the relative pronoun as a substantive.⁹³ There are also several instances in which Paul used the definite article as a substantive.⁹⁴

If it had been the case that Paul only used relative pronouns or definite articles as relative pronouns in subordinate relative clauses with antecedents, then we might easily conclude that Rom 9:5 should be understood in terms of translation 1 above. However, because the results are mixed, on the basis of examining relative pronouns and definite articles used as relative pronouns in subordinate relative clauses, Paul's language in Rom 9:5 is ambiguous and does not allow us to make a final determination between translation 1 or translation 2.

There are two texts in LP that provide close parallels to Rom 9:5. The first is 2 Cor 11:31:⁹⁵

ὁ θεός καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ οἶδεν, ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας...

The God and father of our Lord Jesus knows, who is blessed forever...

In this text the antecedent of ὁ ὢν is ὁ θεός.⁹⁶ To take this as evidence that Paul only used εὐλογητός with reference to God simply begs the question, since the question we are attempting to answer is precisely whether Paul in Rom 9:5 referred to Jesus as θεός.⁹⁷ What 2 Cor 11:31 has in common with Rom 9:5 is ὁ ὢν...εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. The structure of 2 Cor 11:31 indicates that Paul used ὁ ὢν...εὐλογητός εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας with an antecedent. If this is in fact the case, then Rom 9:5 must be understood in terms of translation 1 above, since ὁ ὢν takes a masculine singular antecedent, which can only be ὁ Χριστός in Rom 9:5.⁹⁸

⁹¹ Cf. Gal 1:1, 4, 11, 15; 2:3, 9, 20; 3:13, 17, 21; 5:14; 1 Thess 1:8; 2:14, 15; 4:5, 8, 13, 15, 17; 1 Cor 1:2, 18; 2:11, 12; 4:17; 12:6; 2 Cor 1:1, 4, 9, 18, 19; 4:6; 5:5; 7:14; 8:1, 4; 11:3, 28, 31; Rom 1:15; 2:14; 8:39; 9:6; 15:31; 16:11; Phil 1:1, 11; 2:9, 13; 3:6, 9, 11, 19; 4:7; Phlm 11.

⁹² Cf. Gal 2:8; 1 Cor 4:6; Rom 6:10 (2×); 8:33, 34.

⁹³ Cf. 1 Cor 4:6; Rom 6:16 (2×); Phil 3:16.

⁹⁴ Cf. Gal 4:5, 21, 23 (2×), 29 (2×); 5:10, 24; 6:8 (2×); 1 Cor 2:11, 12; 4:6; 7:34 (2×); 10:24 (2×); 13:11; 2 Cor 5:10; 11:30; 12:14; Rom 2:7, 8, 14; 8:5; 9:7 (4×); 15:17; Phil 1:27; 2:4, 19, 21, 23.

⁹⁵ Sanday and Headlam call 2 Cor 11:31, "a passage which in some respects an exact parallel" to Rom 9:5; see their *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 235.

⁹⁶ This was also the judgment of Dwight in "On Romans ix. 5," 24. However, Dwight was also honest about acknowledging the ambiguity: "The grammatical presumption, to which we have referred, is not so strong as to be practically decisive of the question."

⁹⁷ Dunn argues that εὐλογητός is only used with reference to God. See Dunn's *Did the First Christians Worship Jesus?*, 26.

⁹⁸ Newman and Nida write: "Although there are strong grammatical arguments to the contrary, the UBS textual committee prefers the reading represented in the TEV, principally on the basis that Paul elsewhere never calls Christ God." In other words, Newman and Nida opt for the end of Rom 9:5 as an independent doxology

The second grammatical parallel to Rom 9:5 is Phil 3:19. Philippians 3:17–19 reads:

Συμμιμηταί μου γίνεσθε, ἀδελφοί, καὶ σκοπεῖτε τοὺς οὕτω περιπατοῦντας καθὼς ἔχετε τύπον ἡμᾶς. πολλοὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦσιν οὐδὲς πολλακίς ἔλεγον ἡμῖν, νῦν δὲ καὶ κλαίων λέγω, τοὺς ἐχθροὺς τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὧν τὸ τέλος ἀπώλεια, ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἡ κοιλία καὶ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῶν, οἱ τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες.

Become imitators of me, brothers, and watch those who walk thus just as you have an example in us. For many, whom I have often said to you, and now also say while weeping, walk as enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end is destruction, whose god is their belly and (whose) glory is in their shame, who think about earthly things.

Unlike 2 Cor 11:31, Phil 3:19 is conceptually different from Rom 9:5. The grammar, however, is very similar. Philippians 3:19 and Rom 9:5 have genitive plural relative pronouns (ὧν), and Phil 3:19 ends with a clause containing a definite article and a participle, the definite article being used as a relative pronoun taking an antecedent. This, taken together with the more closely similar construction of 2 Cor 11:31, strongly indicates that the phrase ὁ ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας in Rom 9:5 is to be understood in terms of translation 1 above.⁹⁹ Based on the combination of grammar and usage in LP, we can confidently say that Paul intentionally referred to Jesus as God (θεός) at Rom 9:5.

It remains, however, to make sense of it. There seem to be two basic possibilities.¹⁰⁰ Did Paul refer to Jesus as θεός in the same sense that Philo referred to Moses as θεός (*Mos.* 1.158), or in the sense that 11Q13 referred to the mediatorial Melchizedek figure as אלהים? Philo clearly maintained a distinction between the creator and the created, but also used divine language in order to give Moses an exalted status above all other human beings. Or was Paul's use of θεός with reference to Jesus more an ontological assertion? Since nowhere else in the undisputed Pauline letters can it be demonstrated that Paul explicitly referred to Jesus as θεός, should we view this claim at Rom 9:5 as a development of Paul's thought? Paul certainly had a high christology before writing Romans, holding the messiah figure to be both a human and a heavenly being, a preexistent agent of God's creation, the eschatological judge who sits on a judgment throne executing judgment and final punishment, and in some way participating in the mystery of God via the divine name (יהוה / κύριος). As was stated already in Chapter 1 (§1.2), the issue of the divinity of Jesus is a

with no antecedent. See Barclay M. Newman and Eugene A. Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Romans* (London: UBS, 1973), 179–80.

⁹⁹ Sanday and Headlam expressed caution here, yet wrote: "...there is no impossibility either in the word or the ideas expressed by the word occurring so early." See their *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 237.

¹⁰⁰ Maurice Casey has basically discussed these two possibilities already. See Casey's *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God*, 135–36, 162–78, in effect arguing that Paul's Jewish monotheism would have prevented him from referring to Jesus as God.

theological question. It is not a historical question. And the theological question is not the concern of the present study. On the other hand, whether Paul or the early followers of Jesus held to the divinity of Jesus in some sense or used language of divinity with reference to Jesus in some sense, and whether this is reflected in the earliest evidence in the New Testament, is a historical question. In the end, from a purely historical point of view, we must say that there is not enough evidence to relieve us of the ambiguity of Rom 9:5.

6

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

6.0 Summary of the Problem this Study Addresses

The problem this study has attempted to address may be stated in the form of the question: What is the relationship, if any, between the concept of the messiah figure in the *Book of the Parables of Enoch* and the concept of the messiah figure in the Letters of Paul? A corollary question is: Where does Paul as a Jew fit within the landscape of Jewish intellectual development of messianic traditions of the Second Temple period?

In order to arrive at an answer to these questions, this study has examined the data in BP and LP with regard to the nature and functions of the divine figure and the nature and functions of the messiah figure. In Chapters 2 and 3 the study focused on the nature and functions of the divine figure and the messiah figure in BP. These findings were summarized and presented in tables (see Tables 3 and 4). In Chapters 4 and 5 the study examined the nature and functions of the divine figure and the messiah figure in LP. These findings were summarized and presented in tables (see Tables 5 and 6).

6.1 Comparative Analysis

In order to compare the data in BP with the data in LP, I have combined these tables and present them here (see Tables 7 and 8).

Table 7
A Comparison of the Nature of the Divine Figure and the Nature of the Messiah Figure in the Parables of Enoch and the Letters of Paul

<i>Nature</i>	<i>Divine Figure in BP</i>	<i>Divine Figure in LP</i>	<i>Messiah Figure in BP</i>	<i>Messiah Figure in LP</i>
deity		•		
unique		•		•
heavenly being	•	•	•	•
eternal	•			
righteous	•	•	•	•
merciful	•			
human being			•	•
associated with wisdom			•	•
preexistent			•	•
like an angel			•	•
pre-human				•
divine image and glory				•
divine name			•	•
without sin				•

Table 8
A Comparison of the Functions of the Divine Figure and the Functions of the Messiah Figure in the Parables of Enoch and the Letters of Paul

<i>Function</i>	<i>Divine Figure in BP</i>	<i>Divine Figure in LP</i>	<i>Messiah Figure in BP</i>	<i>Messiah Figure in LP</i>
Creation:				
creator	•	•		•
controls the astronomical order	•			
gives wind and rain to water the earth	•			
Revelation of Wisdom:				
revealer of wisdom	•	•	•	

<i>Function</i>	<i>Divine Figure in BP</i>	<i>Divine Figure in LP</i>	<i>Messiah Figure in BP</i>	<i>Messiah Figure in LP</i>
object of divine revelation			•	•
chooses the messiah figure	•			
conceals identity of the messiah figure	•			
reveals the messiah figure to the chosen	•			
revealed to the chosen			•	
Salvation:				
salvation of the righteous			•	
shows mercy to the righteous	•			
preserver of life through the flood	•			
sends messiah figure		•		
crucifixion of messiah figure		•		•
resurrection of messiah figure		•		•
delivers from wrath of divine figure				•
forgiveness of sins		•		•
Judgment:				
appears at the judgment / <i>parousia</i>	•	•	•	•
sits on throne	•	•	•	•
seats messiah figure on throne of glory	•			
presides over the judgment	•	•	•	•

<i>Function</i>	<i>Divine Figure in BP</i>	<i>Divine Figure in LP</i>	<i>Messiah Figure in BP</i>	<i>Messiah Figure in LP</i>
executes punishment after the judgment	•	•	•	•
resurrection of the dead		•	•	•
has authority, to have the power and might on the earth, to subvert those who oppress the righteous			•	•
Worship:				
worshiped by humans	•	•	•	•
worshiped by angels	•		•	
worshiped by kings and the mighty	•		•	
denied and scorned by kings of the earth	•		•	
receives the prayers of humans	•	•		•

It is helpful to look at the data only with reference to the messiah figures in BP and LP. The following tables (Tables 9 and 10) outline the conceptual elements of messianic traditions held in common by the messiah figures in BP and LP, and whether these elements are preceded or unpreceded in Jewish literature from the Second Temple period. I present the evidence this way (preceded or unpreceded) in order to contextualize the data. I also include in the evidence identified as “preceded” conceptual elements related to any mediatorial figure in heaven that is associated with but distinct from the divine figure, regardless of whether that power in heaven was characterized as a messiah figure in its respective text; the “one who had the appearance of a man” of Ezek 1, the angelic Melchizedek figure of Qumran, and Philo’s *Logos*, for example, are mediatorial figures, but they are not identified in their respective texts as messiah figures.

Table 9
***Precedented and Unprecedented Conceptual Elements of Messianic Nature
 Held in Common by the Parables of Enoch and the Letters of Paul***

<i>Nature in common</i>	<i>Precedented or unprecedented?</i>
human being	precedented for messiah figures: <i>Pss. Sol. 17</i>
heavenly being	precedented for mediatorial figures: Ezek 1; Dan 7; 11Q13 UNPRECEDENTED for messiah figures
associated with wisdom	precedented for mediatorial figures and messiah figures: Philo; <i>Pss. Sol. 17 / far more developed in BP and LP</i>
preexistent	precedented for mediatorial figures: Prov 8–9 UNPRECEDENTED for messiah figures
righteous	precedented for messiah figures: <i>Pss. Sol. 17 / far more developed in BP and LP</i>
like an angel	precedented for mediatorial figures: Dan 7; Sirach; 11Q13 UNPRECEDENTED for messiah figures
divine name	UNPRECEDENTED for mediatorial figures and messiah figures

Table 10
***Precedented and Unprecedented Conceptual Elements of Messianic Functions
 Held in Common by the Parables of Enoch and the Letters of Paul***

<i>Functions in common</i>	<i>Precedented or unprecedented?</i>
object of divine revelation	precedented for mediatorial figures: Prov 2
appears at judgment	precedented for messiah figures: <i>Pss. Sol. 17</i>
sits on throne	precedented for mediatorial figures: Wis 9:4; <i>Ezek. Trag.</i> UNPRECEDENTED for messiah figures
presides over judgment	UNPRECEDENTED for mediatorial figures and for messiah figures
executes punishment	precedented for mediatorial figures and for messiah figures: <i>Pss. Sol. 17; 11Q13; 4Q491</i>
resurrection of the dead	UNPRECEDENTED for mediatorial figures and for messiah figures
subverts oppressive rulers	precedented for mediatorial figures and for messiah figures: <i>Pss. Sol. 17; 11Q13</i>
worshiped by humans	UNPRECEDENTED for mediatorial figures and for messiah figures

The distinction between mediatorial figures and messiah figures of the Second Temple period is critical for understanding the evidence presented here. Not all mediatorial figures in Jewish thought were messiah figures. Moses was described as a human mediatorial figure who was never referred to as a messiah. This was also true of Philo's view of the *Logos* and divine wisdom. Philo never used the designation "messiah" to describe these figures.¹ The Melchizedek figure at Qumran was in some sense a mediatorial figure, but was not referred to as a messiah. When a nature or function of the messiah figures in BP and LP are described as preceded or unprecedented, this must be understood with reference to the distinction between Jewish mediatorial figures in general and messiah figures specifically.

6.2 Striking Similarities between the *Book of Parables* and the Letters of Paul

The most striking similarities of conceptual elements with regard to the messiah figures in BP and LP must be approached from a perspective that appreciates the way in which these conceptual elements are combined.² Simply listing the conceptual elements or viewing the connections separately can be misleading and will lead to a wrong conclusion. In other words, it would be wrong to conclude that the similar conceptual elements in BP and in LP taken separately simply suggest that Paul's messianic thought is nothing more than a parallel development. The conceptual elements "human being" and "heavenly being" are not in themselves unique with reference to mediatorial figures in the Second Temple period. It is the combination of these two conceptual elements with reference to the messiah figure that is unprecedented in the history of Jewish thought. Add to this combination the attribute of preexistence, an extensively developed association with wisdom, an unprecedented association with the divine name (with the possible exception of the Melchizedek figure in the Dead Sea Scrolls), an unprecedented presiding of the messiah figure over the eschatological judgment, and the unprece-

¹ This is a well known fact. See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The One Who Is to Come* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 129–30.

² It should be noted at this point that the conclusion stated here assumes the current position taken by most specialists of the Enoch literature, that the composition of BP is to be dated sometime between 40 B.C.E. and 70 C.E., and that there are traditions about the Son of Man messiah figure that predate its composition. This consensus establishes the messianic traditions of BP, if not the text itself, to a date prior to Paul, or at least contemporaneous with Paul. See the discussion about the date of BP in Chapter 1 (§1.5).

dented function of being worshiped by humans, and the combination of conceptual elements of messianic traditions in BP becomes even more extraordinary. It is only when these conceptual elements are taken together that we begin to understand the unprecedented level of development of messianic thought in BP. Such a level of development precludes any suggestion of coincidental development or parallel development of the same combination of messianic conceptual elements in LP.

6.3 What is New in Paul

To this point I have analyzed, compared, and drawn conclusions about the evidence that shows a common set of conceptual elements of messianic traditions shared by BP and LP. What can be said of their differences? With regard to the nature of the messiah figure in LP there are three elements that extend Paul's point of view beyond that of BP. Paul referred to some sort of pre-human state of the messiah figure in 1 Cor 10 in his midrash on the rock that followed God's people in the wilderness: "And the rock was Christ." This kind of pre-human state of a mediatorial figure is not unprecedented as something similar to this appears in Philo's description of the *Logos*. Paul also associated the messiah figure with the divine image and glory. This does not appear in BP. The divine image and glory are not unprecedented in Jewish literature, however, as these concepts are applied specifically to the figure Adam in the *Greek Life of Adam and Eve* and to priestly liturgical traditions in various other texts, such as Sir 50 and the scrolls of Qumran. Paul further claimed that the messiah figure was without sin. This conceptual element of messianic nature is missing from BP, but again it is not unprecedented in the literature from the period.

There are also a number of functions of the messiah figure in LP that are not present in BP. It is unclear whether the role of the messiah figure as agent of creation is present in both BP and LP. In BP this role may be associated with the messiah figure via the divine name, but it is an enigmatic association if it is there at all. If it is present in BP then it is clear that the function of the messiah figure as agent of creation is more strongly attested in LP than in BP. In LP this association is explicit. Functioning as agent of creation is preceded in the wisdom figure of sapiential traditions, and it appears in Philo with reference to the *Logos*. There are three functions of the messiah figure in LP that clearly do not appear in BP. In LP the messiah figure is crucified and raised from the dead. These two functions of the messiah figure have no precedent anywhere in Second Temple Jewish literature. These functions of the

messiah figure were, however, central to the *kerygma* of the earliest followers of Jesus. Paul radicalized these two concepts of the death and resurrection of the messiah figure by combining them with the forgiveness of sins. It is very likely that Paul's concept of a crucified and risen messiah figure was shaped by his so-called conversion experience on the road to Damascus and his interaction with the early followers of Jesus in Damascus immediately following this experience and eventually in Antioch. The point here, however, is that these are startling new concepts in the history of Jewish messianic ideology, especially when placed in contrast to such texts as *Pss. Sol.* 17–18 or 11Q13, both of which present exalted images of a reigning human messiah figure or a heavenly being specially endowed by God with authority and power to rule all things. The third difference between BP and LP regarding the functions of the messiah figure is the unprecedented role that Paul claims for the messiah figure in delivering the forgiveness of sins. Prior to Paul the role of forgiveness is attributed in the literature solely to the divine figure. Sometimes this forgiveness is discussed in terms of the individual's penitential relationship with the divine figure; sometimes it is discussed in terms of the corporate liturgical experience of the people as they participated in the sacrificial system of the temple cult. Paul interpreted the crucifixion and resurrection of the messiah figure in terms of Israel's experience of forgiveness through the temple sacrifices. For Paul, forgiveness of sins is given to humans through the death and resurrection of the messiah figure as a propitiatory sacrifice. Paul claimed that the messiah figure "died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures" (1 Cor 15:3–4). He never explicitly articulated what these scriptures were.³ It should also be noted that nowhere did Paul explicitly say that the *Kyrios* has the authority to forgive sins directly. For Paul, it is always linked to the messiah figure's role in the crucifixion and resurrection. In fact, on this point Paul gives the appearance of consistency with prior tradition of forgiveness of sins. He gives this role to the divine figure, and seems to view the messiah figure as the agent of God's forgiveness (2 Cor 5:18–19). The first time after LP that a text attributes the role of forgiveness of sins directly to the messiah figure is in the account of Jesus healing the paralyzed man at Mark 2:1–12: "...the Son of Man has authority to forgive sins on earth" (Mark 2:10). This, however, only refers to the literary relationship between LP and Mark 2:1–12 in terms of the conceptual element of forgiveness of sins. The

³ A similar claim appears in an account of a resurrection appearance by the messiah figure at Luke 24:25–27.

tradition that the messiah figure had the authority to forgive sins would have predated Paul as part of the early *kerygma* about the messiah figure immediately following his crucifixion. This claim in its own right constituted a development beyond the Son of Man traditions in BP. So, we cannot say that the function of forgiveness of sins was an unprecedented conceptual element that first appeared in the thought of Paul. These differences between BP and LP demonstrate that Paul added three specific elements of messianic function to the conceptual elements of messianic ideology that he had adopted from the Enochic Son of Man traditions.

6.4 EXCURSUS: WHY PAUL DID NOT USE SON OF MAN TERMINOLOGY

If, as this analysis argues, Paul developed his own vision of the messiah figure in LP by drawing upon the unique combination of conceptual elements of messianic traditions in BP, this means Paul would have been familiar with the Son of Man terminology used in those traditions. Consequently, this raises an important question: Why did Paul not use Son of Man terminology with reference to the messiah figure in LP? This was terminology that many contemporaries of Paul and the early followers of Jesus seem to have had no difficulty using with reference to Jesus. On the surface this gives the impression that Paul, by not using Son of Man terminology, was going against the early pre-Pauline oral *kerygma* of the Jesus movement which was later included in the Gospels. But was Paul really going against the tradition? Paul's use of the same combination of conceptual elements of messianic traditions in BP demonstrates that he was not against the tradition. Then why did he not use Son of Man terminology with reference to Jesus?

The traditional explanation for the absence of Son of Man terminology in LP is that Paul wrote to a Gentile context.⁴ Since he was writing to a Gentile context, and since the Son of Man messiah figure is essentially a Jewish concept, Paul's Gentile readers would not have understood the epithet. Consequently, Paul simply did not use it. I think there is a more plausible explanation, one that locates Paul's christological development in the context of a first-century Jewish soteriological debate, a debate that made reference to the biblical figure Adam.

Here it is helpful to read Paul in connection with the Adam traditions contemporary with Paul. The *Greek Life of Adam and Eve* (hereafter *GLAE*) and the *Carmen Christi* or Hymn of Christ in Phil 2 share terminology that appears not to be accidental. The Greek phrase εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς, typically translated "to the glory of God the Father," appears at the end, as the very last words, of both texts.⁵

⁴ Wilhelm Bousset argued this in *Kyrios Christos*, 121–22. Bousset argued that Paul actually replaced Son of Man terminology with the Son of God, to make the messiah figure more accessible to his Gentile audience.

⁵ In a personal correspondence Johannes Tromp suggested that the phrase εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς might be a doxological addition of a later Christian scribe. I disagree

The phrase first appears in antiquity only in these two texts.⁶ The exact wording of the phrase appears nowhere in the Septuagint or in any other Jewish literature of the Second Temple period. The fact that these two texts, the *Carmen Christi* and *GLAE*, share the phrase in precisely the same wording in and of itself means nothing. This fact read in the broader context of a first-century C.E. Jewish conversation about soteriology, however, lends itself to a more complex and fruitful interpretation on several levels.

GLAE is a text that has received a significant amount of attention in recent years.⁷ The “Life of Adam and Eve” traditions display a complicated matrix of trajectories of transmission and development in Greek, Latin, Armenian, Georgian, and Slavonic recensions.⁸ There has been some debate over the date and provenance of *GLAE*.⁹ Marinus de Jonge and Johannes Tromp have argued that it is not possible to determine the provenance beyond the later Christian context in which it was preserved

with Tromp. Jan Dochhorn has demonstrated on the basis of form-critical analysis that the phrase εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς derives from traditions in the Hebrew Bible. See Jan Dochhorn, *Die Apokalypse des Mose: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (TSAJ 106; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005). The assumption of the Jewish character of the phrase is critical for the following analysis.

⁶ Later uses of the phrase appear in comments of church fathers on Phil 2, the *Stromata* of Clement of Alexandria (1.24.159.6) and Gregory of Nyssa’s *Antirrheticus adversus Appolinarium* (3.1) for example. Gregory of Nyssa was fond of quoting Phil 2:11; it appears in many of his writings. It also appears in later liturgical texts like the *Septuagint Odes* (14:28), which are later Christian additions to the LXX and which have many affinities with the *Apostolic Constitutions* of the fourth century C.E.

⁷ Recent studies include Gary Anderson, Michael Stone, and Johannes Tromp, eds., *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays* (Leiden: Brill, 2000); Marinus de Jonge and Johannes Tromp, eds., *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997); Marinus de Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature: The Case of the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve* (SVTP 18; Leiden: Brill, 2003); Dochhorn, *Die Apokalypse des Mose*; Michael D. Eldridge, *Dying Adam with His Multiethnic Family: Understanding the Greek Life of Adam and Eve* (SVTP 16; Leiden: Brill, 2001); Thomas Knittel, *Das griechische “Leben Adams und Evas”* (TSAJ 88; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002); John R. Levison, *Texts in Transition: The Greek Life of Adam and Eve* (SBL Early Judaism and Its Literature Series 16; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2000); Johannes Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Edition* (PVTG 6; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

⁸ For a helpful synopsis of these texts, see Gary A. Anderson and Michael E. Stone, eds., *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve* (SBL Early Judaism and Its Literature Series 5; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994).

⁹ Gary Anderson, for example, is cautious about assigning *GLAE* to either a Jewish or a Christian provenance, arguing that there is not enough evidence to draw a final conclusion on the question. See Anderson’s “Adam and Eve in the ‘Life of Adam and Eve,’” in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergen; Harrisburg: Trinity, 1998), 7–32.

and transmitted.¹⁰ This point of view on *GLAE* is too limiting for two reasons. First, the simplest response to de Jonge and Tromp on the issue of the provenance of *GLAE* is that we have examples of Jewish texts that were solely preserved and transmitted in later Christian contexts, and yet we still recognize them to be Jewish texts. The works of Philo, Josephus, the Enoch literature, and the so-called *Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers* are the most obvious examples of Jewish literature that was entirely preserved and transmitted within the Christian tradition. So the argument of de Jonge and Tromp—that because *GLAE* was preserved and transmitted in later Christian contexts therefore it is probably of Christian provenance—seems a bit forced.

Second, de Jonge and Tromp have argued that the original language of *GLAE* is probably Greek. This seems to be correct, and has some bearing on the question of provenance. They identify *GLAE* as a collection of earlier traditions, and they conclude that *GLAE* is the earliest of the extant recensions. They concede that if a Hebrew original is discernable in the text, then first-century Judaea is the most likely location for the origin of *GLAE*. Tromp and de Jonge write: “We believe that the question of origin is relevant, because it helps to organize our own thoughts about the writing under discussion.”¹¹ Not only so, but as I have already intimated it also has bearing on the location of provenance, which is a crucial question when we seek to understand this text in relation to other texts, LP for example. Tromp and de Jonge include the argument of Michael Stone, who carefully examined a number of alleged Hebraisms in *GLAE*. Tromp and de Jonge conclude “that none of the evidence produced leads to the conclusion that *GLAE* was originally written in any other language than Greek.”¹² Tromp and de Jonge have conceded, however, that

If it would appear that the Greek text is explicable only on account of certain translation errors, the hypothesis of another original language than Greek may prove useful. No instances are known at present. Moreover, the Greek of *GLAE* may be bad Greek, measured by Classical standards, but it is genuine Greek, containing, for instance, many syntactical constructions that are typical of that language.¹³

If the evidence points to a Greek original, as it appears, this would not rule out the possibility that someone whose primary language was Aramaic and not Greek could very easily have written this text, which might account for the characterization of *GLAE* as “bad Greek.” Tromp and de Jonge do not entertain this possibility.

Based on the foregoing discussion, the Jewish character and pre-70 C.E. date of *GLAE* are assumed in the present analysis. There is nothing that requires us to read *GLAE* as a later Christian document as de Jonge and Tromp suggest.¹⁴ The absence of any explicit reference or even an indirect allusion to the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 C.E. further suggests a pre-70 date of composition.

¹⁰ De Jonge and Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature*, 65–78.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 66.

¹² *Ibid.*, 67. See Michael Stone, *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1992).

¹³ De Jonge and Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature*, 67.

¹⁴ Cf. the study by Doehorn, *Die Apokalypse des Mose*.

GLAE is a midrash on the Gen 3 narrative of Adam's disobedience, taking up the story after Adam and Eve were expelled from paradise (*GLAE* 1:1). *GLAE* presents an Adam who has contracted a terminal disease and has reached the end of his life. Adam and Eve recount to their children their disobedience and God's judgment to expel them from paradise. Adam demonstrates repentance, which while not a prominent theme is still an important concept in this document for Adam's restoration to paradise (cf. *GLAE* 32).¹⁵ In two of the manuscript recensions¹⁶ Adam demonstrates his repentance by standing up to his neck in the Jordan River for a designated period of forty days.¹⁷ Eve enacts her repentance by standing in the Tigris River for thirty-four days. While Adam and Eve are standing in their respective rivers, Satan disguises himself as a helping angel,¹⁸ and he tempts Adam and Eve a second time. This time the temptation is to abort their acts of repentance. Satan tempts them by telling them the lie that God had already accepted their repentance. The result is that Adam resisted the temptation, while Eve was deceived a second time.¹⁹

According to *GLAE* Adam ultimately dies as a consequence of the disobedience he and Eve committed according to Gen 3. After Adam dies a group of angels intercede with God on Adam's behalf. The angels plead that because Adam was made in the image of God, God should have mercy on Adam and receive him into his heavenly paradise. The angels press their appeal to the point of actually claiming that Adam is the image of God (*GLAE* 33:5; 35:2). In the end, the angels' intercession succeeds and God takes Adam into heaven. The text of *GLAE* concludes with the angels praising God with the triple קדוש of Isa 6, "holy, holy, holy is YHWH." The doxology of course is in Greek: ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος, κύριος εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς. Ἀμήν. The focus of the present analysis is on the end of the doxology, the phrase εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς, "to the glory of God the Father." The purpose of *GLAE* appears to be the presentation of Adam as the prototypical human being, who

¹⁵ While *GLAE* 32 is the only place where repentance, μετανοία, is explicitly stated, the concept appears in a number of places in *GLAE*; cf. 6:2; 9:3; 27:1–2; 42:6.

¹⁶ R and M; cf. de Jonge and Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature*, 19.

¹⁷ It is tempting to view this characterization of Adam repenting in the Jordan River as a polemical stance toward early oral traditions about the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan River.

¹⁸ Cf. 2 Cor 11:14.

¹⁹ Cf. 1 Tim 2:13–14, where Eve is described as having been "thoroughly deceived." De Jonge and Tromp rightly point out that this narrative of Adam and Eve repenting in the Jordan and Tigris Rivers is probably the result of "secondary additions"; cf. their *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature*, 34–35. This does not, however, preclude the fact that there is an unmistakable disposition of repentance on the part of Adam displayed in the oldest form of *GLAE* represented by the earliest Greek text recensions of what de Jonge and Tromp call the "short" text form...represented by DSV (K)PG B." In fact, de Jonge and Tromp conclude that the absence of the penitence narrative of Adam and Eve standing in the two rivers from the earliest Greek text traditions points to the circulation, along with the oldest versions, of "a set of Greek stories about Adam's and Eve's...penitence"; cf. *ibid.*, 43.

regains access to God's heavenly paradise by virtue of two things: (1) not only was Adam created in the image of God, he in fact is the image of God; and (2) Adam had a repentant disposition toward God in order to make amends with God for his disobedience and in order to seek God's mercy.²⁰

Tromp and de Jonge have drawn a similar conclusion regarding the purpose of *GLAE*:

We hold, then, that the intention of the authors of *GLAE* was not to interpret the biblical account, and it follows that it was not their intention just to tell the story of the Fall of Adam and Eve either. They tell the story of the origin of death, because it is the perfect contrast to the main theme: immortality and resurrection. Eve's speech about the origin of death (which is inescapable in this world), and the story of Adam's death and burial (being the story of his heavenly survival and of the promise of the eschatological resurrection) form a diptych, in which the diabolically inspired, fatal destiny of all people is contrasted with the hope on the gracious God who may once lead them into Paradise, after all.²¹

GLAE was written to provide an answer to the question: How can any human being, who has been burdened with Adam's legacy of sin, ultimately gain access to God's paradise?

As I have already argued, there appears to be an explicit literary connection between *GLAE* and Phil 2:6–11 in the phrase εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός that occurs at the end of both texts. It is the generally accepted view of most New Testament scholars that the *Carmen Christi* was originally an Aramaic hymn that Paul inserted in his Letter to the Philippians.²² Because of its insertion into the text of his Letter to the Philippians, Paul had in mind a purpose for the hymn of Phil 2:6–11 that was to some extent different from its original composition.²³ In the opening verses of Paul's letter to the Philippians, the thanksgiving section, Paul tells the Philippians that he always thanks God when he remembers them in his prayers. Then he states that "the

²⁰ This sort of tension between the earthly Adam who struggles with his sin and his humanity and the Adam who is the image of God is also discussed by Philo in *Quis Rerum* 55–57, where Philo refers to Adam being impressed with the "divine image" (θεΐας εἰκόνας).

²¹ De Jonge and Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature*, 49.

²² The benchmark of earlier scholarship on this text for many years was Ralph P. Martin's *Carmen Christi: Philippians 2.5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (SNTS 4; London: Cambridge University Press, 1967); this was re-edited as *A Hymn of Christ: Philippians 2:5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1997).

²³ This text should be read in terms of its two contexts, the context of the original Aramaic hymn which is the basis of my present argument, and the context of Paul's Letter to the Philippians. The latter context is described convincingly by Joseph H. Hellerman in terms of the Roman colonization of Philippi. See Hellerman's *Reconstructing Honor in Roman Philippi: Carmen Christi as Cursus Honorum* (SNTSMS 132; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

one who began a good work in you will keep perfecting it until the day of Christ Jesus" (Phil 1:6), a reference to the *parousia* of Jesus. Paul then referred to the Philippians being pure and blameless on "the day of Christ" at 1:11 (cf. also 2:14–16). In a context where he contrasts earthly with heavenly orientation, Paul writes: "For our citizenship is in heaven, from which also we wait for a savior, the Lord Jesus Christ" (3:20). The context of 2:6–11 entails a paraenesis to the Philippians to have unity among themselves and not to have only selfish interests, but to look out for the interests of each other (2:1–4). As Ernst Käsemann has argued, this is more than an ethical exhortation; it is paraenesis that views Jesus as a type of self-denial and humility.²⁴

While Käsemann argued that the hymn must be read in a Hellenized Christian context,²⁵ others have argued for an earlier, pre-Pauline, Aramaic *Vorlage* for the hymn.²⁶ The question whether this hymn is pre-Pauline or was composed by Paul is to some extent moot, since Paul appropriated the hymn as his own by incorporating it into his argument. It is possible to argue that, if it is pre-Pauline, the hymn reflects christology predating Paul's conversion, or at least predating this particular letter. This would also indicate a pre-Pauline or pre-Philippians context for the soteriological debate that I am suggesting took place between those who were using the Adam traditions reflected in *GLAE* and the early followers of Jesus who were using hymns like the one included in Phil 2, a debate in which Paul apparently was fully engaged, as is evidenced by his arguments on the basis of Adam typology in 1 Cor 15 and Rom 5.²⁷ The fact remains that Paul used the hymn in his argument to the Philippians.

While there are a few scholars who do not accept the premise that Phil 2:6–11 was originally a Pre-Pauline Aramaic hymn of the early followers of Jesus, the present consensus of scholars is that this is an acceptable premise. If we combine the hymnic character of Phil 2:6–11 with the Adam typology running through the hymn, in addition to the presence of the phrase εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς at the end of the hymn, there is then a firm basis for comparing this text with *GLAE*.²⁸

Paul's use of Adam typology in his letters is well-attested in the secondary literature. Ernst Käsemann first recognized the presence of this motif in Phil 2:5–11

²⁴ Ernst Käsemann, "Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2, 5–11," *ZTK* 47 (1950): 313–60.

²⁵ As did Ernst Lohmeyer, *Der Brief an die Philipper* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1928; 14th ed.; rev. W. Schmauch, 1974). See also Lohmeyer's *Kyrios Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2,5–11* (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse 1927–28 / 4; Heidelberg: Winter, 1928; 2d ed., 1961).

²⁶ W. K. Lowther Clarke includes P. P. Levertoff's transliteration of his Aramaic retroversion of Phil 2:5–11 in *New Testament Problems—Essays—Reviews—Interpretations* (New York: Macmillan, 1929). Cf. also P. Grelot, "Deux notes critiques sur Philippiens 2,6–11," *Bib* 54 (1973): 169–86.

²⁷ See Gathercole, *Where is Boasting?* Gathercole explores first-century Jewish soteriological debate in terms of "boasting" of one's observance of the law.

²⁸ John R. Levison has successfully located other conceptual bases for identifying connections between *GLAE* and the letters of Paul. See Levison's "Adam and Eve in Romans 1:8–25 and the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*," *NTS* 50 (2004): 519–34.

as a development of the Gnostic primal-man redeemer myth, with a descending and ascending Savior.²⁹ Käsemann argued that the hymn is to be read exclusively in light of a Hellenistic world-view, and that the hymn reflects the stages of the primal-man redeemer's progression through the myth and is not an ethical exhortation as most scholars have understood the hymn. The redeemer is the counter-image of the fallen primal man. So Paul is able to adapt the myth to contrast Christ with Adam—disobedient Adam / obedient Christ. Maurice Casey and James Dunn have also argued that this hymn is to be understood in the light of Adam.³⁰

Consequently, the present analysis reads the *Carmen Christi* as a hymn with several allusions to Adam, which are set in contrast to Christ. I would argue that Phil 2 must also be read in connection to *GLAE*. Several scholars have drawn connections between *GLAE* and the letters of Paul, beginning with R. Kabisch in 1905, L. S. A. Wells in R. H. Charles' *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* in 1913, Wedderburn and Livingstone in the 1970s and '80s, and most recently John R. Levison in a 2004 study comparing *GLAE* and Rom 1. Levison actually writes that "Paul and the Greek *Life* spin a similar cloth."³¹

Looking at Phil 2:6–11, the first point of comparison between Adam and Jesus in v. 6 is the concept of "being in the form of God" (ὅς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων). A number of New Testament scholars, such as Jarl Fossum and Maurice Casey, have pointed out the semantic overlap between μορφή ("form"), εἰκῶν ("image"), and δόξα ("glory").³² Casey argues that glory is something visibly seen, like a radiance that can be seen at a theophany. Adam lost this because he sinned; Christ now has it.

The assertion that Jesus "did not think equality with God was something to be exploited" (οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ) has been much discussed by scholars like James Dunn and Maurice Casey. The phrase further highlights the sharp contrast between Adam and Christ. Jesus and Adam were both in the "form of God." Beyond this, Adam wanted to be "like God," while Jesus did not view this as something to be exploited.

A further comparison between Adam and Jesus is the emphasis on Jesus' humanity in Phil 2. In v. 7 this is stressed by a parallel construction, with Jesus "being in the likeness of humans and having been found in likeness as a human being." This pertains positively to both Adam and Jesus.

The sharpest contrast between the two comes in v. 8: "he humbled himself by becoming obedient to the point of death, the death of a cross." Adam was disobedient even when he knew that his disobedience would result in his death. At Gen 2:17 God warned Adam, "for on the day you eat from it, you shall surely die." Adam disobeyed the divine prohibition not to eat from the tree of the knowledge of good

²⁹ Käsemann, "Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2, 5–11." Cf. also Martin's analysis, *Carmen Christi*.

³⁰ Casey, *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God*, 112; Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 281–88.

³¹ Levison, "Adam and Eve in Romans 1:8–25 and the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*," 533. Levison also quotes L. S. A. Wells, who proposed that Paul and the authors of *GLAE* "moved in the same circle of ideas."

³² Casey, *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God*, 112; Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*; Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord*, 269–70.

and evil. Adam died because of his disobedience. Christ, on the other hand, was obedient and his obedience resulted in his death on a cross.

The upshot of Christ's obedience was that God exalted him and gave him the name that is above every name (2:9). This contrasts with Adam, who was not exalted by God after his disobedience, but was punished. According to *GLAE* one of the results of Adam's disobedience was that he lost the glory of God; he ceased to be clothed in God's glory (*GLAE* 20:1).³³ This connection between sin and the loss of God's glory is also found in Paul (Rom 3:23). Adam was humiliated and driven from the garden. Jesus, on the other hand, because of his obedience receives the name that is above every name.

In Phil 2:10–11 Jesus is the one to whom every knee will bow in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue will confess. This is an allusion to Second Isaiah. In Isa 45 YHWH is set in sharp contrast to idols made by human hands. YHWH is identified as the unique God who created the universe and who saves his people with everlasting salvation. At the end of ch. 45 Second Isaiah prophesied the words of YHWH:

Turn to me and be saved,
all the ends of the earth,
for I am God and there is not another.
By myself I have sworn;
there has gone forth from my mouth righteousness
a word that shall not return;
for to me every knee shall bow down,
every tongue shall swear an oath.
“Only in YHWH” it shall be said of me,
“are righteousness and strength”;
to him they shall come and be ashamed
all whose anger has burned against him.
In YHWH they shall be justified and shall sing his praise,
all the seed of Israel. (Isa 45:22–25)

Isaiah 45 asserts the uniqueness of YHWH in contrast to human idols. The allusion to Isa 45 in Phil 2 should not lead us only to identify Jesus with YHWH because Phil 2 uses the word *kyrios* with reference to Jesus and the Septuagint used the word *kyrios*, or Lord, to refer to YHWH. We should understand the name that is above every name (2:9) to be Jesus.³⁴ The allusion to Isa 45 should lead us to read Phil 2 as a communal liturgical confession of the uniqueness of Christ over against an Adam whose idolatrous actions rendered him less than God had created him to be. The allusion to Isa 45, then, extends the contrast between Adam and the unique obedience of Christ at the beginning of the hymn into the second half of the hymn, where every knee will bow and every tongue will be brought to the point of confessing.

³³ This same tradition appears in the Gnostic *Apocalypse of Adam*.

³⁴ C. F. D. Moule also reads Phil 2:9 in this way; cf. “Further Reflexions on Philip-pians 2:5–11,” in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce on His 60th Birthday* (ed. W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1970), 264–76, esp. 270.

What will they confess? The traditional translation of this verse is “every tongue will confess that Jesus Christ *is* Lord to the glory of God the Father.” It is helpful to look at a number of early translations of this verse by Jerome, Wycliffe, Luther, and Tyndale to try to understand where this particular translation originates, because they did not all translate this verse in the same way.

In 384 Jerome translated his Latin Vulgate version rendering Phil 2:11 as: “...*et omnis lingua confiteatur quia Dominus Iesus Christus in gloria est Dei Patris.*”³⁵ Jerome inserted *est* in his translation of the Greek text. To render Jerome’s version in English we have: “and every tongue confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God the Father.”

In 1395 John Wycliffe slavishly rendered Jerome’s Latin Vulgate version, translating into English as follows: “...and each tongue acknowledge, that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God the Father.”³⁶ It is not entirely clear what being “in the glory of God the Father” means. To be “in the glory of God” could possibly refer to a state without sin, which is suggested by *GLAE* (20:1–3) and by Paul in Rom 3:23. If that is in fact the case, then this would further contrast Christ with Adam.

William Tyndale’s 1525 translation departs significantly from Wycliffe’s. Tyndale translated Phil 2:11 in this way: “...and that all tongues should confess that Iesus Christ is the Lord unto the praise of God the father.”³⁷ Coverdale’s translation of 1535 and the Geneva Bible of 1560 both follow Tyndale’s insertion of the copula between Jesus Christ and Lord, making “Lord” the predicate nominative of the confessional statement, “Jesus Christ *is* Lord.”

In 1524, one year prior to Tyndale’s translation, Martin Luther had already made this move with Phil 2. Here Luther translated 2:11 as: “und alle Zungen bekennen sollen, daß Jesus Christus der Herr sei, zur Ehre Gottes des Vaters.” In English Luther’s version reads: “And every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is the Lord to the praise of God the Father.” Luther appears to have been the first to reorient the position of “Lord” and place the copula in such a way that it rendered “Lord” as the predicate nominative of “Jesus Christ.”

This understanding of Phil 2:11 has become a virtual icon of English translation, like the 23rd Psalm, the Lord’s Prayer, or the Apostles’ Creed. It has become iconic for its explicit identification of Jesus with YHWH. But is this actually what κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς means?

It is possible to translate Phil 2:11 in this way:

...and every tongue confess that
Lord Jesus Messiah
has become the glory of God the Father.

³⁵ Jerome, *Biblia Sacra Vulgata* (4th ed.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994).

³⁶ John Wycliffe, *The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments, with the Apocryphal Books, in the Earliest English Versions Made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and His Followers* (ed. Rev. Josiah Forshall and Sir Frederic Madden; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1850).

³⁷ William Tyndale, *The New Testament: The Text of the Worms Edition of 1526 in Original Spelling, Translated by William Tyndale* (ed. for the Tyndale Society by W. R. Cooper, with a Preface by David Daniell; London: British Library, 2000).

This translation is based in part on the assumption of an Aramaic *Vorlage* for the hymn. Joseph Fitzmyer, and others like Clarke, Levertoff, and Grelot, have argued in favor of such a *Vorlage*. The conspicuous absence of definite articles, copulae, and other Greek particles typical of narrative prose, as well as the absence of an identifiable Greek meter, all are good evidence that Phil 2:6–11 is translation Greek of what was originally an Aramaic hymn.

In light of the evidence, I am arguing that it is not necessary to translate κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός as if κύριος were the predicate nominative of an assumed copula. There is ample evidence in Paul for the use of κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός as a self-contained reference to Jesus. There are at least twelve instances of this in Paul's Letters.³⁸ Translating Phil 2:11 as if κύριος were the predicate nominative of an assumed copula would render this particular passage unique in comparison to all of Paul's uses of the phrase κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός elsewhere. So where does that leave us?

In Biblical Hebrew the grammatical construction יהיה ל־, in Biblical Aramaic the phrase is ל־היה, means “to become.” In the LXX the construction is ἐγένετο...εἰς + the Accusative, “to become something,” the “something” being in the Accusative case. In Phil 2:11, the poetic hymnic character of the text would allow for the elision of ἐγένετο, as the copula is regularly elided elsewhere (cf. 1 Cor 15:45), and just as the assumed copula is elided in the traditional interpretation of Phil 2:11. In Greek there is no “is” there.

The Greek, ἐγένετο...εἰς + Accusative, as a translation of the Biblical Hebrew ל־היה, can be seen in the LXX version of Gen 2:7:

καὶ ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν

And God fashioned the man from the dust of the ground and he breathed into his face the breath of life, and the man became a living being.

I include the Hebrew for comparison:

וַיִּצַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם עֹפֶר מִן־הָאָדָמָה וַיִּפַּח
בְּאָפִיו נְשֵׁמַת חַיִּים וַיְהִי הָאָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה

Paul's interpretation of Gen 2:7 at 1 Cor 15:45 is an expression of his Adam typology, which predates his use of the hymn in Phil 2:

οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται· ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδάμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν.

Thus also it is written: the first human, Adam, became a living soul, the last Adam (became) a life-giving spirit.

Notice how ἐγένετο is elided in the second half of this sentence. The point is that it is possible for ἐγένετο to be missing in the ἐγένετο...εἰς + Accusative construction in Paul's writings, which leads us to translate κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ

³⁸ Cf. Rom 7:23; 13:14; 1 Cor 1:3; 8:6; 2 Cor 1:2; 13:13; Gal 1:3; 1 Thess 1:1; there are four instances of this alone in Philippians: 1:2; 2:11; 3:20; 4:23.

πατρός as, “the Lord Jesus Christ has become the glory of God the Father.” This reading further leads us to recognize that the contrast between Adam and Christ exists also at the end of the hymn; the evidence suggests that the contrast runs from the beginning through the middle all the way to the end, maintaining the integrity of the hymn in its entirety.

Returning to what appears to be evidence for a soteriological debate in the Adam traditions of *GLAE* and Paul’s Letters, Paul further emphasizes that Christ is the image and glory of God in 2 Cor 4:4–6. Here Paul ties εἰκῶν and δόξα even more closely together with reference to Christ:

ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγασαί τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν εἰκῶν τοῦ θεοῦ... ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ὁ εἰπὼν· ἐκ σκότους φῶς λάμψει, ὃς ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ [Ἰησοῦ] Χριστοῦ.

...the God of this age has blinded the minds of the unbelievers so that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God might not shine forth [for them]... For it was the God who said, “Out of darkness light will shine,” who shines in our hearts with the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

Paul explicitly identified Christ as both the image and the glory of God.

According to *GLAE* Adam and Eve no longer wear the glory of God. They lost this glory because they sinned (*GLAE* 20:1–21:6). With this much Paul would agree: “all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God” (Rom 3:23). And yet, because he was made in the image of God, Adam is also referred to as the image of God according to *GLAE* (33:5; 35:2). Yet for Paul in Phil 2, it is no longer Adam who is the image of God; Adam actually lost the divine glory because of his disobedience. Christ, by his willing obedience and death on the cross, has demonstrated that *he* is the image and the glory of God. Consequently in v. 11 of Phil 2, κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς should be understood to mean, “the Lord Jesus Christ has become the glory of God the Father.”

This reading of Phil 2:6–11 in light of *GLAE* demonstrates three important points regarding Paul’s participation in the development of early christology in the middle of the first century C.E. First, it demonstrates Paul’s awareness of early christological formulations (dating between 29/30 and 60 C.E.) growing out of a first-century Jewish soteriological debate. Second, it demonstrates an interesting and complex intertextuality between first-century Adam traditions in Jewish texts and Paul’s letters, specifically *GLAE*, 1 Cor 15, Rom 1–5, and the *Carmen Christi* of Phil 2. It is an intentional assimilation of an Adam typology, a familiar feature of Second Temple period literature in the first century C.E., into Paul’s arguments. And third, this analysis also demonstrates that Paul and the early followers of Jesus considered their christology to be a supersession of a particular Adam typology contemporaneous with Paul. While the allusion to Isa 45 in Phil 2:10–11 may indeed associate Jesus with YHWH, this association is not made in the confession of v. 11. It makes more sense to read the confession of v. 11 in light of the Adam typology running all the way through from the beginning to the end of the hymn. What is confessed in 2:11 is the belief that Lord Jesus Messiah “has become the glory of God the father”

in the place of Adam who lost the divine glory. This demonstrates Paul's method of a thoroughly supersessive merging of what was already familiar Adam typology in the first century with his own ideas about κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.

Sometime between the death of Jesus in 29/30 C.E. and the composition of the Synoptic Gospels a soteriological debate occurred between at least two Jewish groups—those who articulated their soteriology in terms of “Adam” as the prototypical human being according to the traditions that came to be embedded in *GLAE* on the one hand, and early followers of Jesus who articulated their soteriology in terms of a supersessive Adam christology which had Jesus replacing Adam as both the image and “the glory of God the Father” according to Phil 2:6–11. The Adam group understood “image” of God in terms of a created humanity who enjoyed a special relationship with God on the basis of being created in God's image and having a repentant disposition toward God (*GLAE* 28:4). Even Jesus, they would have argued, was a part of this same created humanity, with the same special relationship with God, and was subject to the same participation in sin as all other human beings descended from Adam were. This is why we have from the Jesus group the stress on Jesus' obedience in the hymn of Phil 2, in contrast to Adam's disobedience in *GLAE*, a stress that is then developed into Paul's contrast between Adam's sin and Christ's obedience in Rom 5 and Paul's concept of Jesus' sinlessness in 2 Cor 5:21, a concept that appears again later in the Epistle to the Hebrews (4:15).

Evidence that strengthens this reconstruction of exalted Adam traditions participating in a soteriological debate current in the first century C.E. may be located in Philo. Philo appears to have written against exalted Adam traditions by arguing that Moses did not write of Adam “being the image of God,” but that he wrote of Adam as having been created “according to the image of God.” This suggests that exalted Adam traditions were already present in the late first century B.C.E. and the early first century C.E. While Philo's statement may not be a direct polemic against exalted Adam traditions, it comes in the context of Philo's argument that there is not a division between the two forms of reason, the archetypal reason “above us” and the copy “we possess”:

Having said, therefore, what was appropriate concerning these things, [Moses] continues: “the birds he did not separate” (Gen 15:10), calling birds—both the winged and the high flying by nature—the two reasons. One is the archetype above us, the other an imitation that exists according to us. Moses calls the one above us the image of God; the other one that is according to us [he calls] a mold of the image. “For God,” he says, “made the human being” not the image of God, but “according to the image” [καλεῖ δὲ Μωυσῆς τὸν μὲν ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς εἰκόνα θεοῦ, τὸν δὲ καθ' ἡμᾶς τῆς εἰκόνας ἐκμαγεῖλον. ἐποίησε γὰρ φησιν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον οὐχὶ εἰκόνα θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ κατ' εἰκόνα, Gen 1:27]. And so the mind in each of us, which indeed precisely and truly is the human being (ἄνθρωπος), is a third type from the Creator, and occupying the midway between the image and the mold of the image it serves as both the pattern of the human being and the tangible representation of God. (*Quis Rerum* 230–31)³⁹

³⁹ For the Greek text, cf. Colson and Whitaker, *Philo* (LCL; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1985), 4:396–98.

The entire argument of *GLAE*, with its focus on Adam's access to paradise after the fall, primarily rests on the concept of Adam "being" the image of God.

In 1 Cor 15:20–28 Paul presented the messiah figure in a subjected role to the divine figure. It is interesting that Paul introduced this argument with a reference to Adam. In relation to the divine figure, according to Paul, the messiah figure, the son himself, will be subjected to God after he delivers the kingdom to God the Father (1 Cor 15:28). Paul asserted this in the context of his argument on the resurrection. Paul began this argument by stating the primitive *kerygma* about the messiah figure: "For I delivered to you with priority what I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he was raised on the third day according to the scriptures." This basic assertion about the messiah figure in Paul's thought sets up his argument about the resurrection in 1 Cor 15. Paul follows this with his account of a number of resurrection appearances of the messiah figure, which in turn is followed by a detailed rhetorical argument regarding Paul's belief in the factuality of the messiah figure's resurrection. "For if the dead are not raised, neither has Christ been raised; and if Christ has not been raised, your faith is useless; you are still in your sins" (1 Cor 15:16–17). Paul follows this with his assertion about the messiah figure delivering the kingdom and submitting himself in subjection to the divine figure:

But now Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep. For since through a human being death [came], also through a human being is the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive. But each in his own order: the first fruits, Christ, then those who belong to Christ at his coming. Then is the end, when he gives back the kingdom to [his] God and Father, when he destroys all rule and all dominion and power. For it is necessary that he reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death. For all things he has subjected under his feet. And when it says, all things are subjected, it is clear that it is with the exception of the one who subjected all things to him. And when all things are subjected to him, then also the son himself will be subjected to the one who subjected all things to him, in order that God may be all things in all. (1 Cor 15:20–28)

The primary purpose of this passage is to support Paul's larger argument about the resurrection. However, within this supporting argument Paul has given us what appears to be a very clear statement about his view on the relationship between the divine figure and the messiah figure. This is the first reference of any kind to the figure Adam in any of Paul's letters. Paul's argument makes perfect sense without any reference to Adam; the reference to Adam seems unnecessary. However, the lesser argument within the larger argument on the resurrection clearly brought to Paul's mind the figure Adam. The reference to Adam in the context of Paul's lesser argument about the subjection of the messiah figure to the divine figure fits well within the context of Paul's awareness of a soteriological debate in which any statements about an exalted Adam, or in the case of *GLAE* an Adam restored to his original condition before he sinned, might be taken as a subordination of the messiah figure to Adam. In other words, in 1 Cor 15 Paul asserts that it is the divine figure,

and the divine figure alone, to whom the messiah figure is subjected, and not Adam. And, as I have already argued, the only role Paul allows to Adam is a negative one. This is also reflected here: “For as in Adam all die...”

Exalted Adam traditions in the context of soteriological debate is not just evidenced between *GLAE* and *LP*. In the Latin *Life of Adam and Eve (Vita Adae et Eve)*, a recension of the *Life of Adam and Eve* traditions that post-dates *GLAE*, the divine figure commands Satan to worship Adam because Adam is the image of God.⁴⁰ While the text actually serves as an aetiology for the fall of Satan, it also provides evidence of Jewish thought that was moving in the direction of developing traditions about an exalted Adam figure. Exalted Adam traditions also appear at Qumran. Crispin Fletcher-Louis has given a detailed analysis of human anthropology at Qumran in priestly liturgical contexts.⁴¹ Fletcher-Louis surveys the literature of the Second Temple period, persuasively arguing that within some Jewish circles the creator–created boundary was not as rigid as traditional scholarship has assumed. Human beings, created in the image of God, are set apart from the rest of God’s creation. This distinction is reflected in both biblical and extra-biblical liturgical ideology in the way the priesthood is described in various texts. The specific exaltation of Adam that appears in some texts (*GLAE*; *Testament of Abraham*) may very well be variations on the divine image and glory traditions Fletcher-Louis has described. In *GLAE* 39, for example, God announces to Adam after his death that he will be exalted and that he will be seated on the throne of the one who deceived him, Satan, who first made the choice to abandon his throne in rebellion against the divine figure. This further underscores the importance of repentance in *GLAE*. Satan rebelled, was removed from his throne in paradise, refused to repent, and remained separated from his throne. Adam also rebelled (with the involvement of Satan), and was removed from paradise. But unlike Satan, Adam goes to great lengths to demonstrate repentance, is restored to paradise, and is given Satan’s throne. Another text from roughly the same period as *GLAE* or maybe slightly later, the *Testament of Abraham*, contains a vision of Adam seated on a golden throne and presiding over the entrance of the dead through the gates of heaven and hell (*T. Abr.* 11). Following this scene is a vision of another figure on another throne: “And the marvelous man who sat on the throne, he himself judged and passed sentence on the souls” (καὶ ὁ μὲν ἀνὴρ ὁ θαυμασιος ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ θρονου, αὐτὸς ἔκρινεν καὶ ἀπεφῆνατο τὰς ψυχάς, *T. Abr.* 12:11). Abraham then asks the archangel who the man seated on the throne is:

Then the archistrategos said, “Do you see, all holy Abraham, the fearful man who is sitting on the throne? This is the son of Adam the protoplast, who is called Abel, whom Cain the evil one killed. And he sits here to judge all creation, examining the righteous and the sinners. Because God said, ‘I do not judge you, but every human being will be judged by a human being.’ On account of this he gave him judgment, to judge the world until his great and glorious parousia. And then, righteous Abraham,

⁴⁰ Cf. David Steenburg, “The Worship of Adam and Christ as the Image of God,” *JSNT* 39 (1990): 95–109.

⁴¹ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*.

there will be perfect judgment and pay back, eternal and unchangeable, which no one can discern. For every human being is born from the protoplast, and because of this they are judged first here by his son. And at the second parousia they will be judged by the twelve tribes of Israel, every breathing and living thing. And the third (time) they will be judged by the Lord God of all and then the remaining, the rest of that judgment, will be at hand, and fearful will be the sentence, and there is no one who releases. And finally through three judgment sittings the judgment of the world and the pay back will take place. And therefore upon one or two witnesses the matter is not established in the end. But every matter will be established by three witnesses.” (*T. Abr.* 13:1–8)⁴²

There are a number of elements in this text that could be described as a more developed concept of judgment, for example, a three-part execution of the judgment. Pertinent to the present discussion, however, is the development of the exalted Adam tradition which has Abel, “the son of Adam,” enthroned in heaven and executing the first judgment. This is the kind of exaltation of Adam, and here “the son of Adam,” that was antithetical to Paul’s concept of Adam in relation to the messiah figure.⁴³ As we have already noted, Paul only referred to Adam in a negative sense, as a figure who only introduced sin and death to humanity (Rom 5; 1 Cor 15), or as a figure whose disobedience is to be contrasted with the obedience of the messiah figure (Phil 2).

So, what does this mean for Paul’s silence with regard to the term “Son of Man”? If Paul knew the conceptual elements of the messianic traditions of BP and even drew upon those traditions to shape his own vision for the messiah figure in LP, why is the terminology “Son of Man” missing in LP? It is nowhere to be found in any of his letters. If Paul was aware of the Enochic Son of Man traditions about Jesus—and it is virtually impossible that he was not, given the extent of the correspondence between BP and LP in terms of the shared combination of conceptual elements of messianic traditions—then why did Paul avoid the terminology? Instead of the traditional claim that Paul’s letters were written in a Gentile context where Son of Man language would have made no sense to his readers, I would suggest an answer to this question based on the Jewish context of Paul’s Adam christology. Paul avoided using Son of Man terminology with reference to Jesus because of the first-century soteriological debate over how one achieved eternal life. This was a debate that included a number of different exalted Adam traditions, one of which argued that because Adam was the prototypical human who regained access to paradise, it was possible for any human being, created in the image of God as Adam was, to gain access to the mercy of God and paradise through repentance. And we should

⁴² For the Greek text, cf. Michael E. Stone, ed. and trans., *The Testament of Abraham: The Greek Recensions* (Texts and Translations 2; Pseudepigrapha Series 2; Missoula: SBL, 1972), 30–32. See the discussion of this text by Philip B. Munoa in *Four Powers in Heaven: The Interpretation of Daniel 7 in the Testament of Abraham* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998).

⁴³ It should not escape our notice that Enoch is referred to as “the son of Adam” in the genealogy at the beginning of BP (*1 En.* 37:1).

carefully note here that there are other Jewish texts from this period that make a similar argument about repentance, the *Psalms of Solomon* and the *Hodayot* from Qumran, for example. Paul, on the other hand, argued that this was not enough. For Paul it was necessary for Christ to replace Adam as the image and glory of God, and for an obedient Christ (the last Adam) to be crucified in order to satisfy God's justice. It was further necessary, according to Paul, for one to be "in Christ" (a prominent Pauline theme) in order to gain access to God's mercy through the forgiveness of sins. It was precisely because of this soteriological difference between Adam and Jesus that Paul chose to avoid using "Son of Man" or "Son of Adam" terminology. By not referring to Jesus as Son of Man or Son of Adam, Paul could then avoid subordinating Jesus to Adam, and thereby avoid the appearance of inconsistency in his argument.

CONCLUSIONS

7.0 Final Remarks

I began this examination of the messiah figure in Paul's thought with the simple statement that Paul was a Jew. And I qualified this with the question, What kind of Jew was he? Since Paul lived at a time when Jewish identity was defined in a context of significant religious diversity, the problem we face today in our attempts to understand Paul entails exploring the various streams of Jewish intellectual traditions in order to contextualize Paul's ideas. This study has demonstrated that at least one facet of Paul's thought, his christology, was heavily influenced by Enochic Son of Man traditions.

7.1 Conclusions

If we take on their own terms the various elements of the nature and the functions of the messiah figure held in common by the *Book of the Parables of Enoch* (BP) and the Letters of Paul (LP), then there are four elements of messianic nature that are unprecedented in Jewish literature: the messiah figure is (1) a heavenly being, (2) preexistent, (3) like an angel, and (4) associated with the divine name. There are four functions that are unprecedented in Jewish literature: the messiah figure (1) sits on the throne of judgment, (2) presides at the judgment, (3) raises the dead, (4) and is worshiped by humans. Every other element of nature and function of the messiah figure held in common by BP and LP have literary precedents. Taken separately, the preceded elements of messianic nature and functions give the appearance that BP is simply continuing previous traditions. It is the combination of elements that leads to the conclusion that an extraordinary development of messianic thought has occurred in BP. The fact that a human messiah figure, which in itself was

not unprecedented in the literature, is now also a preexistent heavenly being who from the throne of the divine figure presides over the eschatological judgment, causes the resurrection of the dead, and is worshiped by humans—this is a striking development of Second Temple period Jewish messianic thought. Such an unprecedented level of development in BP precludes any suggestion of coincidental or parallel development of the same combination of messianic conceptual elements in LP. It must be acknowledged, however, that we cannot say with any certainty that Paul actually knew the text of BP. There is no evidence of direct quotation, like the quote of BW in the Letter of Jude.¹

The evidence leads to the conclusion that Paul must have been familiar with the conceptual elements of the messianic traditions in BP. While Paul developed his concept of the messiah figure well beyond that of BP by adding the functions of crucifixion, resurrection, and forgiveness of sins, again the similarity of the combination of conceptual elements pertaining to both the nature and the functions of the messiah figure that are common to both BP and LP is too striking to dismiss as coincidental or as a parallel development.

It must also be acknowledged that there are terminological differences regarding the messiah figures in BP and LP. While both BP and LP refer to the messiah figure as “Messiah,” BP refers to the messiah figure as the Chosen One, the Son of Man, and the Righteous One. Paul did not use these epithets for the messiah figure. Paul referred to the messiah figure as *Kyrios* (“Lord”), *Christos* (“Messiah”), son of David, and son of God. Paul never referred to the messiah figure in LP as the Son of Man. Even though there are clear terminological differences regarding the messiah figures in BP and LP, the similarity of combination of conceptual elements is striking and the terminological difference in no way mitigates the conclusion that Paul used the extraordinary combination of conceptual elements of messianic traditions in BP to create his own vision of the messiah figure in LP.

7.2 Sociological Analysis: Making Sense of the Data

The problem remains, however, to describe the mechanism of transmission between BP and LP. How did Paul receive these Enochic Son of Man traditions? It seems entirely possible that Paul could have received the Son of Man traditions in the context of debate with an ideological opponent, a discussion with a friend or colleague, a sermon in a liturgical

¹ Jude 14–15 is a direct quote of BW (*1 En.* 1:9).

context, or the oral interpretation of a text in a scribal community. Here recent studies of orality and literacy in scribal communities of Second Temple Judaism may have some bearing on the question.²

The first possibility, debate with an ideological opponent, could have taken place in Paul's world. The Acts of the Apostles, for example, describes Paul as a willing participant in public debate in Athens (Acts 17:16–34).³ This, however, is not a strong possibility, simply for the fact that Paul's christology was *positively* influenced by the Enochic traditions. The other suggestions present more attractive possibilities for transmission between BP and LP. Paul very likely received the Son of Man traditions in the context of discussions with friends or colleagues, or by hearing a sermon in a liturgical setting, or by hearing the interpretation of a text in a scribal community. Martin Jaffee suggests that the scribal communities from this period were associated either with the intellectual activities of the priestly authorities of the Jerusalem temple, or with dissident sectarian groups opposed to the temple. Jaffee describes the temple as "the primary employer of various sorts of literary scribes."⁴ He also rightly points out that there were "dissident scribes" who were critical of the priestly establishment in Jerusalem and who developed a kind of "revisionist tradition" that questioned the legitimacy of the ruling priesthood. Jaffee's social reconstruction of scribal communities focuses on the second century B.C.E. His reconstruction, however, is also relevant to the first century B.C.E and the first century C.E. I would nuance Jaffee's description to include intellectual sectarian groups who would have restrained themselves from opposing the temple cult or from criticizing the priesthood, who compromised with the temple authorities in order to enjoy the political and socio-economic protections that the powerful temple institution could provide.⁵ I have already pointed out that there is an absence of such criticisms in BP. It is very likely that BP was associated with an apocalyptic community of this kind. We know that Paul himself was open to the kinds of ecstatic experiences that an apocalyptic community like that of BP would have embraced.⁶

² I rely on the work of Martin S. Jaffee for the discussion that follows; see his *Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism, 200 BCE–400 CE* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

³ See also 1 Cor 1:20, where Paul refers to "the debater of this age."

⁴ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁵ Josephus gives us a concrete example of such a sectarian social group at *Ant.* 18.18–19.

⁶ Cf., e.g., Paul's description of his own heavenly visions at 2 Cor 12:1–7. Cf. Johan Christiaan Beker, *Paul's Apocalyptic Gospel: The Coming Triumph of God*

Jaffee is even more specific about the kind of social activity that might have been associated with the oral transmission of a text in this period. The ability to read and write texts created a socially stratified culture. This created an intellectual elite stratum of literacy where an individual trained in scribal activities would lead a particular community in its reception of a text. Books “commonly functioned as ritual objects whose iconic significance transcended that of the information they preserved.”⁷ In other words, the oral transmission of textual traditions would have occurred in liturgical contexts via sermons,⁸ or in the context of exegetical exposition, such as in the Jerusalem temple, or in a synagogue, or in some scribal community. Jaffee also describes how the act of reading a book in the context of a gathered community established the book as a locus of power and authority through ceremonial ritual performance: “The book was a locus of power and authority far more than information... And its authority was manifested publicly in and through the human voice—often that of an officially appointed communal teacher—that sounded out the text’s words and expounded its mysteries.”⁹

Jaffee applies this analysis to his reading of texts produced by a specific dissident sectarian group from this period, the Dead Sea community. Referring to this community’s “oral-performative transmission of written texts,” Jaffee points out that for this community the authority of transmission rested not with connections “over vast stretches of time,” but with the demonstration of “contemporary moments of illumination” and “gifts of prophecy” displayed by its leaders.¹⁰ Jaffee then discusses the practice of oral transmission within the Dead Sea community, with one of the leaders “expounding the Torah” as prescribed in the Community Rule (1QS vi 6–8).

(Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982); and Beker, *The Triumph of God: The Essence of Paul’s Thought* (trans. Loren T. Stuckenbruck; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1990).

⁷ *Ibid.*, 15–16.

⁸ Functional illiteracy was the norm in this period. For the pragmatic legitimacy of this point we need only look as far as our own contemporary religious experience and what amounts to functional illiteracy and ignorance of biblical texts among those who attend religious services. Most religious people receive their knowledge of the Bible as it is read in community gatherings and interpreted in oral sermon deliveries.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 17–18.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 32. This would also appear to explain the many layers of (redacted) traditions that make up the final form of the text of BP as a literary production of a specific community shaped by ongoing ecstatic interpretive contributions. Cf. also the conclusion of CD, 4Q266 18 v 20.

BP must have been associated with a scribal community similar to this, where the authoritative transmission of the text was developed out of ongoing “moments of illumination” or ecstatic experiences.¹¹ The text of BP contains a single reference to an existing community, “the houses of his congregation,” at *1 En.* 46:8.¹² This is in all probability a reference to an actual social group that may be identified with the oral transmission and literary composition of the messianic traditions of BP. It is possible that Paul may have had contact with one or more of “the houses” of this scribal community. It is not possible to know this with certainty, but neither can it be ruled out.

It is just as likely, however, that Paul received Enochic Son of Man traditions through contact with communities of the early Jesus movement. The early Jewish followers of Jesus should be understood as having gathered themselves into a reform movement within Judaism, and not having begun a new religion known as Christianity. This internal Jewish reform movement would not become identifiable as “Christianity” until a “parting of the ways” occurred between this movement and the Pharisaic proto-Rabbinic movement after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. The early Jesus movement attracted individuals from a wide variety of backgrounds, which included priests and Pharisees according to the Acts of the Apostles. Acts 15 describes an internal debate within the Jesus movement that included a disagreement over Torah interpretation between Paul and a group of Pharisees. Acts 6:7 informs us that “a large group of the priests became obedient to the faith.” The priests who joined the early followers of Jesus would have brought with them the variety of scribal practices described by Jaffee. These “priests” who became a part of the early Jesus movement would have distinguished themselves as a group of individuals who were

¹¹ It is also interesting to note that the redactors of BP were sensitive to the tension between orality and literacy. At the beginning of BP Enoch is given to say, “it is profitable to speak these things first” (*1 En.* 37:3). Later, in one of the Noachic fragments, Noah describes how his great grandfather, Enoch, transmitted the secrets in the *Book of Parables*: “And after this, my great-grandfather gave me the explanation of all the secrets in a book, and the parables that were given to him, and gathered them for me in the words of the Book of Parables” (*1 En.* 68:1). This might suggest a later date for the Noachic material because of its affinity for the literary rather than the oral form of the traditions included in BP.

¹² There are three other references to communities in BP, but these are in contexts describing eschatological judgment or the appearance of an end-of-time community after the judgment; cf. “the congregation of the righteous” at *1 En.* 38:1, “the house of his congregation” at *1 En.* 53:6, and “the congregation of the chosen” at *1 En.* 62:8.

equipped with the kinds of tools that were necessary for transmitting traditions via events of oral performance and the production of written texts.¹³ Acts 6, however, does not give us enough information to discern whether these were priests coming from the temple authorities or priests coming from a sectarian group. Acts 5:17–18 suggests that the party of the Sadducees publicly resisted the Jesus movement. According to Acts 9:1–2, Paul himself, before his experience as Saul of Tarsus on the way to Damascus, was a Pharisee allied with the Sadducean community in active persecution of the early followers of Jesus. This would suggest that the “large group of the priests” mentioned in Acts 6:7 could have been dissident priests who were themselves opposed to the priestly establishment in control of the Jerusalem temple cult. Another possibility is that these priests who joined the early Jesus movement were not actually opposed to the priestly establishment (which would correspond to the position of BP). They were sectarians who, because of different halakhic interpretations of the Torah, were excluded from the temple sacrifices by the priestly establishment in control of the temple cult. Josephus alludes to this kind of group at *Ant.* 18.18–19.

Paul’s contact with Enochic Son of Man traditions also may have occurred outside of Jerusalem. The migration of the early Jesus movement from Jerusalem to communities throughout Judaea and Samaria is attested in an account that describes the early persecution of the followers of Jesus in which the pre-Damascus Saul of Tarsus participated (Acts 8:1–4). Acts 11:19 indicates that this migration of the Jesus movement at this time spread also to Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Syrian Antioch. Acts 8:5 refers to the oral transmission of the early *kerygma* among Samaritans. The account of Acts 9 indicates that the movement had spread to Damascus of Syria. This is where Paul first may have come into contact with the Enochic Son of Man traditions, in the early community of Jesus followers in Damascus immediately following his arrival there: “And he was with the disciples in Damascus for some days, and immediately he preached Jesus in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God” (Acts 9:19–20). The immediate context of this same narrative indicates that Paul interacted directly with Jews in Damascus who opposed this message: “But Saul increased all the more in power and he

¹³ Acts 2:42, for example, describes oral transmission of apostolic teaching within the early Jesus community. This also has implications for the development and transmission of early Gospel traditions that scholars refer to as “Q”. See the informative and helpful discussions by Richard A. Horsley and Jonathan A. Draper in *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity, 1999).

confounded the Jews who were living in Damascus demonstrating that he [Jesus] is the Messiah” (Acts 9:22). The author of Acts leaves out of his narrative what this demonstration by Paul actually entailed. The present analysis and conclusions strongly suggest that it would have included Enochic Son of Man traditions.¹⁴ Acts 9:28 indicates that Paul moved freely “in and out” among the Jerusalem apostles, where he also might have come into contact with the Son of Man traditions (cf. Gal 1:18–21). Paul also had contact with the early followers of Jesus in Syrian Antioch, where he and Barnabas spent a year teaching “a large group” of Christians (Acts 11:25–26).¹⁵ The evidence is clear that Paul had close contacts with the earliest followers of Jesus, even companions of Jesus who were direct eyewitnesses of Jesus’ life and first-generation students of his teachings, which would have included the Son of Man traditions that were later included in the written gospels.

This analysis indicates that the concept of the messiah in Paul’s thought and the concept of the messiah in the oral transmission of the earliest communities of the Jesus movement (which were later included in the written gospel accounts) grew out of the same soil.¹⁶ They were developed from the same traditions about the Son of Man that Jesus himself spoke and taught to his disciples. In other words, it is no longer possible to view Paul’s concept of the messiah figure in LP and the concept of the messiah figure in the canonical Gospels as distinct and irreconcilable conceptions. The old view that Paul’s messiah was shaped by a non-Jewish, Gentile context and that the messiah in the Gospels was shaped in a Jewish context is no longer tenable. The wedge must now be considered to have been permanently removed.

In the end it is the combination of conceptual elements of messianic ideology held in common by the *Book of the Parables of Enoch* and the Letters of Paul that leads to the firm conclusion that Paul was aware of the Enochic Son of Man traditions, and that he was in fact influenced by these traditions. We really cannot say with any certainty that Paul knew

¹⁴ The author of Acts was also familiar with these traditions; cf. Acts 7:54–56.

¹⁵ See David Suter’s discussion of revelatory traditions from this region that probably influenced the origins of the Enoch literature in “Why Galilee? Galilean Regionalism in the Interpretation of 1 Enoch 6–16,” *Henoch* 25 (2003): 167–212; see also George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee,” *JBL* 100 (1981): 575–600.

¹⁶ The recent analysis by Leslie W. Walck, building on the work of R. H. Charles, E. Sjöberg, H. E. Tödt, and J. Theisohn, demonstrates a development of the Son of Man traditions in the Gospel according to Matthew out of the Enochic Son of Man traditions in BP. See Walck’s *The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and in Matthew* (London: T&T Clark, 2011).

the text of the *Parables*, because there is no evidence of direct quotation. On the basis of comparative analysis, however, we can say that Paul was familiar with the conceptual elements of the Enochic messiah traditions, and that Paul developed his concept of the *Kyrios* out of these Enochic messiah traditions and out of the *kerygma* of the early Jesus movement.

Paul indeed was a Jew. Now we can say with a high degree of certainty from which stream of Jewish intellectual tradition Paul developed his concept of the Messiah. It was Enoch.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Primary Sources

- Black, Matthew. *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*. New Eng. ed., with Commentary and Textual Notes by M. Black in collaboration with J. C. VanderKam, with an Appendix on the Astronomical Chapters (78–82) by O. Neugebauer. SVTP 7. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- . *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch; a New English Translation with Commentary and Textual Notes*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995.
- Charles, R. H., ed. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1913.
- . *The Ascension of Isaiah*. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1900.
- Charlesworth, James H. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- . *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 2. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- Colson, F. H., G. H. Whitaker, J. W. Earp, and R. Marcus, eds. *Philo*. LCL. 13 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927–62.
- Danby, Herbert, ed. *The Mishnah*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Elliger, K., and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1984.
- Holmes, Michael W., ed. *The Greek New Testament*. SBL ed. Atlanta: SBL, 2010.
- Jacobson, Howard. *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- de Jonge, Marinus, ed. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. PVTG 1/2. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Knibb, Michael, ed. *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.
- Lake, Kirsopp, ed. *The Apostolic Fathers*. LCL. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1913.
- Martínez, Florentino García, ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Nestle, Erwin, and Kurt Aland, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E., and James VanderKam. *1 Enoch: A New Translation*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 2004.
- Parry, Donald W., and Emanuel Tov, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. 6 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935.

- Robinson, James M., ed. *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978.
- Thackery, H., R. Marcus, and L. Feldman, eds. *Josephus*. LCL. 10 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927–65.
- Uhlig, S., ed. *Das Äthiopische Henochbuch*. JSRZ 6. Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 1984.

2. Secondary Literature

- Abbot, Ezra. "On the Construction of Romans ix. 5." *Journal for the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* (1881): 87–154.
- Abegg, Martin. "The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?" *DSD* 2 (1995): 125–44.
- Adler, William. "A Dead End in the Enoch Trajectory: A Response to Andrei Orlov." Pages 137–42 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- . "Enoch in Early Christian Literature." *SBLSP* 17 (1978): 271–76.
- Albani, Matthias. "The 'One Like a Son of Man' (Dan 7:13) and the Royal Ideology." Pages 47–53 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and Qumran Origins*.
- Alexander, Philip S. "Predestination and Free Will in the Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 27–49 in Barclay and Gathercole, eds., *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*.
- Anderson, Gary A., and Michael E. Stone, eds. *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*. SBL Early Judaism and Its Literature Series 5. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Anderson, Gary A., Michael Stone, and Johannes Tromp, eds. *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays*. SVTP 15. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Arcari, Luca. "A Symbolic Transfiguration of a Historical Event: The Parthian Invasion in Josephus and the Parables of Enoch." Pages 478–86 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- Aschim, Anders. "Melchizedek and Jesus: 11QMelchizedek and the Epistle to the Hebrews." Pages 129–47 in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. Edited by James R. Davila and Gladys S. Lewis. JSJSup 63. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Aune, David E., ed. *Rereading Paul Together: Protestant and Catholic Perspectives on Justification*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006.
- Baillet, Maurice, ed. *Qumrân Grotte 4, III (4Q482–4Q520)*. DJD VII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.
- Bakker, Adolphine. "Christ an Angel? A Study of Early Christian Docetism." *ZNW* 32 (1933): 255–65.
- Barbour, Ian G. *Myths, Models and Paradigms: The Nature of Scientific and Religious Language*. London: SCM, 1974.
- Barclay, John M., and Simon J. Gathercole, eds. *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*. LNTS 335. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Barker, Margaret. *The Gate of Heaven*. London: SPCK, 1991.
- . *The Great Angel: A Study of Israel's Second God*. London: SPCK, 1992.
- . "Temple Imagery in Philo: An Indication of the Origin of the Logos?" Pages 70–102 in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays in Honor of Ernst Bammel*. JSNTSup 48. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991.

- Barthélemy, D., and Josef T. Milik, eds. *Qumran Cave I*. DJD I. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- Bassler, Jouette M. *Navigating Paul: An Introduction to Key Theological Concepts*. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 2006.
- Bauckham, Richard J. *God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . *Jesus and the God of Israel*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2008.
- . *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified; and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- . "The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus." Pages 43–69 in Newman, Davila, and Lewis, eds., *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*.
- . "The Worship of Jesus in Apocalyptic Christianity." *NTS* 27 (1980–81): 322–41.
- Bauer, Walter. *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Edited by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. 3d ed. Rev. Frederick W. Danker. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. *The Damascus Document (4Q266–273), Qumran Cave 4, XIII*. DJD XVIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Baur, Ferdinand Christian. *The Church History of the First Three Centuries*. London: Williams & Norgate, 1878.
- . *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche*. Tübingen: L. F. Fues, 1863.
- . *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, His Life and Work, His Epistles and Doctrine: A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity*. London: Williams & Norgate, 1876.
- . *Vorlesungen über Neutestamentliche Theologie*. Leipzig: L. F. Fues, 1864.
- Bauch, Kelley Coblentz. "Adamic Traditions in the Parables? A Query on 1 Enoch 69:6." Pages 352–60 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- Beker, Johan Christiaan. *Paul's Apocalyptic Gospel: The Coming Triumph of God*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
- . *The Triumph of God: The Essence of Paul's Thought*. Trans. Loren T. Stuckenbruck. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1990.
- Beyerle, Stefan. "'Der mit den Wolken des Himmels kommt,' Untersuchungen zu Traditionsgefüge 'Menschensohn.'" Pages 1–52 in *Gottessohn und Menschensohn. Exegetische Studien zuzwei Paradigmen biblischer Intertextualität*. Edited by Dieter Sänger. Biblisch-Theologische Studien 67. Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2004.
- . "'One Like a Son of Man': Innuendos of a Heavenly Individual." Pages 54–58 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and Qumran Origins*.
- Bird, Michael F. *The Saving Righteousness of God: Studies on Paul, Justification and the New Perspective*. Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 2007.
- Black, Matthew. "The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch: Their Date and Contribution to Christological Origins." Pages 145–68 in Charlesworth, ed., *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*.
- . "The Throne-Theophany Prophetic Commission and the 'Son of Man': A Study in Tradition History." Pages 57–73 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. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.
- . "Two Unusual Nomina Dei in the Second Vision of Enoch." Pages 1:53–59 in *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke*. Edited by William C. Weinrich. 2 vols. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1984.

- Blass, Friedrich, and Albert Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Trans. from the 9th–10th German. Edited by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- . ed. *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- . “Finding a Place for the Parables of Enoch within Second Temple Jewish Literature.” Pages 263–89 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- . “Inner-Jewish Debate on the Tension between Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism.” Pages 9–26 in Barclay and Gathercole, eds., *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*.
- . *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- . ed. *The Origins of Enochic Judaism: Proceedings of the First Enoch Seminar, University of Michigan, Sesto Fiorentino, Italy, June 19–23, 2001*. Henoch 24.1–2. Turin: Silvio Zamorani Editore, 2002.
- . *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History, from Ezekiel to Daniel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele, and John J. Collins, eds. *The Early Enoch Literature*. JSJSup 121. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Böttrich, Christfried. “Konturen des ‘Menschensohnes’ in äthHen 37–71.” Pages 53–90 in *Gottessohn und Menschensohn. Exegetische Studien zuzwei Paradigmen biblischer Intertextualität*. Edited by Dieter Sänger. Biblisch-Theologische Studien 67. Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2004.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*. Translated by John E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon, 1970. German original 1913.
- Bowker, J. “‘Merkabah’ Visions and the Visions of Paul.” *JSS* 16 (1971): 157–73.
- Box, G. H. “The Idea of Intermediation in Jewish Theology: A Note on Memra and Shekinah.” *JQR* 23 (1932–33): 103–19.
- Boyarín, Daniel. “The Gospel of the Memra: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John.” *HTR* 94, no. 3 (2001): 243–84.
- . “Two Powers in Heaven; Or, the Making of a Heresy.” Pages 331–70 in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*. Edited by Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Burkett, Delbert. “The Nontitular Son of Man: A History and Critique.” *NTS* 40 (1994): 504–21.
- . *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation*. SNTSMS 107. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Campbell, Douglas A. *The Quest for Paul’s Gospel: A Suggested Strategy*. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Campbell, William S. *Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity*. London: T&T Clark, 2008.
- Capes, David B. *Old Testament Yahweh Texts in Paul’s Christology*. WUNT 2/47. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck, 1992.

- Capes, David B., April D. DeConick, Helen K. Bond, and Troy A. Miller, eds. *Israel's God and Rebecca's Children: Christology and Community in Early Judaism and Christianity. Essays in Honor of Larry W. Hurtado and Alan F. Segal*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- Carson, D. A., Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark Seifrid, eds. *Justification and Variegated Nomism: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001.
- . *Justification and Variegated Nomism: The Paradoxes of Paul*, vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004.
- Cary, M., and H. H. Scullard. *A History of Rome: Down to the Reign of Constantine*. 3d ed. New York: St. Martin's, 1975.
- Casey, Maurice. *An Aramaic Approach to Q: Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*. SNTSMS 122. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- . "The Aramaic Background of Mark 9:11: A Response to J. K. Aitken." *JTS* 55 (2004): 92–102.
- . "Aramaic Idiom and Son of Man Sayings." *ExpT* 96 (1984–85): 233–36.
- . "Aramaic Idiom and the Son of Man Problem: A Response to Owen and Shepherd." *JSNT* 25 (2002): 3–32.
- . *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel*. SNTSMS 102. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- . "The Corporate Interpretation of 'one like a son of man' at the Time of Jesus." *NovT* 18 (1976): 167–80.
- . *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God: The Origins and Development of New Testament Christology*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1991.
- . "General, Generic and Indefinite: The Use of the Term 'Son of Man' in Aramaic Sources and in the Teaching of Jesus." *JSNT* 29 (1987): 21–56.
- . "Idiom and Translation: Some Aspects of the Son of Man Problem." *NTS* 41 (1995): 164–82.
- . "The Jackals and the Son of Man (Matt. 8:20/Luke 9:58)." *JSNT* 23 (1985): 3–22.
- . "Method in Our Madness, and Madness in Their Methods: Some Approaches to the Son of Man Problem in Recent Scholarship." *JSNT* 42 (1991): 17–43.
- . "Monotheism, Worship and Christological Development in the Pauline Churches." Pages 214–33 in Newman, Davila, and Lewis, eds., *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*.
- . *The Solution to the "Son of Man" Problem*. LNTS 343. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- . *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7*. London: SPCK, 1979.
- . "The Son of Man Problem." *ZNW* 67 (1976): 147–54.
- . "The Use of the Term (א)נש(א) בַר in the Aramaic Translations of the Hebrew Bible." *JSNT* 54 (1994): 87–118.
- . "The Use of the Term 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch." *JSJ* 7 (1976): 11–29.
- Charlesworth, James H. "Can We Discern the Composition Date of the Parables of Enoch?" Pages 450–68 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- . ed. *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Chester, Andrew. "The Christ of Paul." Pages 109–21 in *Redemption and Resistance: The Messianic Hopes of Jews and Christians in Antiquity*. Edited by Markus Bockmuehl and James Carleton Paget. London: T&T Clark, 2007.

- . “Jewish Messianic Expectations, Mediatorial Figures, and Pauline Christology.” Pages 17–89 in *Paulus und das antike Judentums*. Edited by M. Hengel and U. Heckel. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1991.
- . *Messiah and Exaltation: Jewish Messianic and Visionary Traditions and New Testament Christology*. WUNT 207. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Chialà, Sabino. “The Son of Man: The Evolution of an Expression.” Pages 153–78 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- Clarke, W. K. Lowther. *New Testament Problems—Essays—Reviews—Interpretations*. New York: Macmillan, 1929.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro, and John J. Collins. *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Collins, John J. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- . *Daniel with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- . “Enoch and the Son of Man: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig.” Pages 216–27 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- . “The Heavenly Representative: The ‘Son of Man’ in the Similitudes of Enoch.” Pages 111–33 in Collins and Nickelsburg, eds., *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism*.
- . *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
- . “Response: The Apocalyptic Worldview of Daniel.” Pages 59–66 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and Qumran Origins*.
- . *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
- . *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . “The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High in the Book of Daniel.” *JBL* 93 (1974): 50–66.
- . “The Son of Man in First Century Judaism.” *NTS* 38 (1992): 448–66.
- . “Stirring Up the Great Sea: The Religio-Historical Background of Daniel 7.” Pages 139–55 in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. Edited by A. S. van der Woude. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993.
- . “A Throne in the Heavens: Apotheosis in Pre-Christian Judaism.” Pages 43–58 in Collins and Fishbane, eds., *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*.
- Collins, John J., and Michael Fishbane, eds. *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*. New York: State University of New York, 1995.
- Collins, John J., and George W. Nickelsburg, eds. *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. SCS 12. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1980.
- Cope, Lamar. “First Corinthians 8–10: Continuity or Contradiction?” *ATR: Supplementary Series II. Christ and His Communities: Essays in Honor of Reginald H. Fuller* (March 1990): 114–23.
- Cullmann, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.
- Cummins, Stephen Anthony. *Paul and the Crucified Christ in Antioch: Maccabean Martyrdom and Galatians 1 and 2*. SNTSMS 114. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Das, A. Andrew. *Paul and the Jews*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2003.

- . *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2001.
- Davis, Leo Donald. *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325–787): Their History and Theology*. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1983.
- Davis, P. G. “Divine Agents, Mediators, and New Testament Christology.” *JTS* 45 (1994): 479–503.
- De Witt Burton, Ernest. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*. 3d ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1976 [repr. of the 3d ed., 1898].
- Delcor, M. “Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews.” *JSJ* 2 (1971): 115–35.
- Dewey, J., ed. *Semeia 65: Orality and Textuality in Early Christian Literature*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1995.
- Dey, Lala Kalyan Kumar. *The Intermediary World and Patterns of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews*. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1975.
- Doehorn, Jan. *Die Apokalypse des Mose: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. TSAJ 106. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Dobbin, Orlando T., ed. ΧΡΙΣΤΟΦΑΝΕΙΑ. *The Doctrine of the Manifestations of the Son of God under the Economy of the Old Testament*. By the Late Rev. George Balderston Kidd. London: Ward & Co., Paternoster Row, 1852.
- Dunn, James D. G., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- . *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. 2d ed. London: SCM, 1989.
- . *Did the First Christians Worship Jesus? The New Testament Evidence*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- . *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians*. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1990.
- . ed. *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, AD 70 to 135*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- . *The Justice of God: A Fresh Look at the Old Doctrine of Justification by Faith*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- . *The New Perspective on Paul, Revised Edition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- . ed. *Paul and the Mosaic Law*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- . *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- . *The Theology of Paul’s Letter to the Galatians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Dwight, Timothy. “On Romans ix. 5,” *Journal for the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* (1881): 22–55.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Eisenbaum, Pamela. *Paul Was Not a Christian: The Original Message of a Misunderstood Apostle*. New York: Harper, 2009.
- Eldridge, Michael D. *Dying Adam with His Multiethnic Family: Understanding the Greek Life of Adam and Eve*. SVTP 16. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Ellens, J. Harold. *The Son of Man in the Gospel of John*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2010.
- Ellis, E. Earle. “‘Wisdom’ and ‘Knowledge’ in 1 Corinthians.” Pages 45–62 in *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity: New Testament Essays*. WUNT. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck, 1978.

- Eriksson, Anders. *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof: Pauline Argumentation in 1 Corinthians*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1998.
- Eshel, Esti. "The Identification of the 'Speaker' of the Self-Glorification Hymn." Pages 619–35 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich. STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Eshel, Hanan. "An Allusion in the Parables of Enoch to the Acts of Matthias Antigonus in 40 B.C.E.?" Pages 487–91 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Aramaic Background of Philippians 2:6–11." *CBQ* 50 (1988): 470–83.
- . "New Testament Kyrios and Maranatha and Their Aramaic Background." Pages 218–35 in *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies*. New York: Crossroads, 1981.
- . "The New Testament Title 'Son of Man' Philologically Considered." Pages 143–60 in *A Wandering Aramaean: Collected Aramaic Essays*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.
- . *The One Who Is to Come*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin. "4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christology." *DSD* 3 (1996): 236–52.
- . *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah 42. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- . "Heavenly Ascent or Incarnational Presence? A Revisionist Reading of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*." Pages 367–99 in *SBL Seminar Papers 1998*. SBLSP 37. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- . "The High Priest as Divine Mediator in the Hebrew Bible: Daniel 7:13 as a Test Case." Pages 161–93 in *SBL Seminar Papers 1997*. SBLSP 36. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- . *Luke—Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*. WUNT 2/94. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1995.
- Fossum, Jarl E. *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology*. NTOA 30. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995.
- . *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism*. WUNT 36. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1985.
- . "The New *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*: The Quest for Jewish Christology." Pages 638–46 in *SBL Seminar Papers 1991*. SBLSP 30. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Gager, John G. *Reinventing Paul*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "A 'Groningen' Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History." *RevQ* 14 (1990): 521–41.
- . "Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis." *FO* 25 (1988): 62–136.
- García Martínez, Florentino, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, eds. *Qumran Cave 11*. DJD XXIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Julio Trebolle Barrera, eds. *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Gathercole, Simon J. *The Preexistent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

- . *Where is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1–5*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Gieschen, Charles A. *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 42. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . “The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch.” Pages 238–49 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- Granerod, Gard. *Abraham and Melchizedek: Scribal Activity of Second Temple Times in Genesis 14 and Psalm 110*. BZAW 406. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.
- Greenfield, Jonas C., and Michael E. Stone. “The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes.” *HTR* 70 (1977): 51–65.
- Grelot, P. “Deux notes critiques sur Philippiens 2,6–11.” *Biblica* 54 (1973): 169–86.
- Grether, O. *Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament*. BZAW 64. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1934.
- Hahne, Harry Alan. *Corruption and Redemption of Creation: Nature in Romans 8:19–22 and Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Hammerton-Kelly, R. G. *Pre-Existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man: A Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Hannah, Darrell D. “The Book of Noah, the Death of Herod the Great, and the Date of the Parables of Enoch.” Pages 469–77 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- . *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity*. WUNT 2/109. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- . “The Throne of His Glory: The Divine Throne and Heavenly Mediators in Revelation and the Similitudes of Enoch.” *ZNW* 94 (2003): 68–96.
- Hellerman, Joseph H. *Reconstructing Honor in Roman Philippi: Carmen Christi as Cursus Honorum*. SNTSMS 132; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Hengel, Martin. “‘Sit at My Right Hand!’ The Enthronement of Christ at the Right Hand of God and Psalm 110:1.” Pages 119–225 in *Studies in Early Christology*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1995.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. “Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple.” *SBLSP* 26 (1987): 210–17.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- . “Heavenly Ascent and the Relationship of the Apocalypses and the Hekhalot Literature.” *HUCA* 59 (1988): 73–100.
- . “Revelation and Rapture: The Transformation of the Visionary in the Ascent Apocalypses.” Pages 79–90 in *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium*. Edited by John J. Collins and James H. Charlesworth. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.
- . *Tours of Hell: An Apocalyptic Form of Jewish and Christian Literature*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983.
- Hindley, J. C. “Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch.” *NTS* 14 (1968): 551–65.
- Hofius, Otrfied. *Der Christushymnus Philipper 2,6–11: Untersuchungen zu Gestalt und Aussage eines urchristlichen Psalms*. WUNT 17. 2d ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck, 1991.

- . *Der Vorhang vor dem Thron Gottes: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Hebräer 6,19 f. und 10,10 f.* WUNT 14. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck, 1972.
- Hollander, H. W., and Marinus de Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary.* SVTP 8. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Horbury, William. *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ.* London: SCM, 1998.
- . *Messianism among Jews and Christians: Biblical and Historical Studies.* London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Horrell, David G. "Theological Principle of Christological Praxis? Pauline Ethics in 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1." *JSNT* 67 (1997): 95–96.
- Horsley, Richard A., and Jonathan A. Draper. *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q.* Harrisburg: Trinity, 1999.
- Horton, Fred L., Jr. *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews.* SNTSMS 30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *At the Origins of Christian Worship: The Context and Character of Earliest Christian Devotion.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- . *How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God? Historical Questions about Earliest Devotion to Jesus.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- . *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- . "New Testament Christology: A Critique of Bousset's Influence." *TS* 40 (1979): 306–17.
- . *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- . "What Do We Mean by 'First Century Jewish Monotheism'?" *SBLSP* 32 (1993): 348–68.
- Jaffee, Martin S. *Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism, 200 BCE–400 CE.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Jonge, Marinus de. *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature: The Case of the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve.* SVTP 18. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Jonge, Marinus de, and Johannes Tromp, eds. *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.
- Jonge, Marinus de, and A. S. van der Woude. *Christology in Context: The Earliest Christian Response to Jesus.* Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988.
- Käsemann, Ernst. "Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2, 5–11." *ZTK* 47 (1950): 313–60.
- Klijn, A. Frederik, ed. *Der lateinische Text der Apokalypse des Esra.* TUGAL 131. Berlin: Akademie, 1983.
- Knibb, Michael A. "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review." *NTS* 25 (1978–79): 344–59.
- . ed. *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions.* SVTP 22. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- . "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Scrolls." *DSD* 2 (1995): 177–80.
- . ed. *The Septuagint and Messianism.* Leuven: Peeters, 2006.
- . "The Structure and Composition of the Parables of Enoch." Pages 48–64 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man.*

- Knittel, Thomas. *Das griechische "Leben Adams und Evas"*. TSAJ 88. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Psalms 60–150: A Commentary*. Translated by Hilton C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989.
- . *Theology of the Psalms*. Translated by Keith Crim. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986.
- Kreitzer, L. Joseph. *Jesus and God in Paul's Eschatology*. JSNTSup 19. Sheffield: JSOT, 1987.
- Kuhn, Thomas. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962. 2d ed. 1979.
- Kvanvig, Helge S. *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*. WMANT 61. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1988.
- . "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch." Pages 179–215 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- . "Throne Visions and Monsters: The Encounter between Danielic and Enochic Traditions." *ZAW* 117 (2005): 249–72.
- Laurence, R. *The Book of Enoch the Prophet... Now First Translated from an Ethiopic Manuscript in the Bodleian Library*. Oxford: Parker, 1821.
- Lee, Aquila. *From Messiah to Preexistent Son: Jesus' Self-Consciousness and Early Christian Exegesis of Messianic Psalms*. WUNT 192. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Levison, John R. "Adam and Eve in Romans 1.8–25 and the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*." *NTS* 50 (2004): 519–34.
- . *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch*. JSPSup 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1988.
- . *Texts in Transition: The Greek Life of Adam and Eve*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 16. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.
- Liddell, H. G., R. Scott and H. S. Jones. *Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. *Der Brief an die Philipper*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1928. 14th ed., rev. W. Schmauch, 1974.
- . *Kyrios Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2,5–11*. Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse 1927–28 / 4. Heidelberg, 1928. 2d ed. 1961.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*. Vancouver: Regent, 2001.
- . ed. *Contours of Christology in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene A. Nida, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. Vol. 1, *Introduction and Domains*. 2d ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
- Lovejoy, Arthur O. *The Great Chain of Being: The Study of the History of an Idea*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936.
- . "The Historiography of Ideas." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 78 (1938): 529–43.
- . "Reflections on the History of Ideas." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 1 (1940): 3–23.
- Martin, Ralph P. *Carmen Christi: Philippians 2.5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

- . *A Hymn of Christ: Philippians 2:5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1997.
- McGrath, James P. *The Only True God: Early Christian Monotheism in Its Jewish Context*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2009.
- Mearns, Christopher L. “Dating the Similitudes of Enoch.” *NTS* 25 (1978–79): 360–69.
- Meeks, Wayne A. “And Rose Up to Play: Midrash and Paraenesis in 1 Corinthians 10:1–22.” *JSNT* 16 (1982): 64–78.
- Mettinger, T. N. D. *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*. ConBOT 18. Lund: Gleerup, 1982.
- Milik, J. T. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.
- . “Problèmes de la littérature hénochique à la lumière des fragments araméens de Qumrân.” *HTR* 64 (1971): 333–78.
- Moberly, R. W. L. “How Appropriate Is ‘Monotheism’ As a Category for Biblical Interpretation?” Pages 216–34 in Stuckenbruck and North, eds., *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*.
- Moo, Douglas J. “The Christology of the Early Pauline Letters.” Pages 169–92 in Longenecker, ed., *Contours of Christology in the New Testament*.
- Moore, George Foot. “Intermediaries in Jewish Theology: Memra, Shekinah, Metatron.” *HTR* 15 (1922): 41–85.
- Morris, Leon. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Moule, C. F. D. “Further Reflexions on Philippians 2:5–11.” Pages 264–76 in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce on His 60th Birthday*. Edited by W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1970.
- Müller, Morgens. *The Expression ‘Son of Man’ and the Development of Christology: A History of Interpretation*. London: Equinox, 2008.
- Munoa, Philip B. *Four Powers in Heaven: The Interpretation of Daniel 7 in the Testament of Abraham*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.
- Murmelstein, B. “Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre.” *WZKM* 35 (1928): 242–75; 36 (1929): 51–86.
- Murphy, Roland E. “The Personification of Wisdom.” Pages 222–33 in *Wisdom in Ancient Israel*. Edited by John Day, Robert P. Gordon, and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Newman, Barclay M., and Eugene A. Nida. *A Translator’s Handbook on Paul’s Letter to the Romans*. London: UBS, 1973.
- Newman, Carey C. *Paul’s Glory-Christology*. NovTSup 69. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Newman, Carey C., James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis, eds. *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. JSJSup 63. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Nickelsburg, George W. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- . *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins: Diversity, Continuity, and Transformation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
- . “Discerning the Structure(s) of the Enochic Book of Parables.” Pages 23–47 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- . “Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee.” *JBL* 100 (1981): 575–600.

- . *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*. 2d ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 2005.
- Nickelsburg, George W., and John J. Collins, eds. *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism*. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1980.
- Nickelsburg, George W., and James C. VanderKam. *1 Enoch: A New Translation Based on the Hermeneia Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.
- Oegema, Gerbern S. *The Anointed and His People: Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba*. JSPSup 27. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.
- Olson, Daniel C. "Enoch and the Son of Man in the Epilogue of the Parables." *JSP* 18 (1998): 27–38.
- Orlov, Andre A. *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*. JSJSup 114. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- . "Roles and Titles of the Seventh Antediluvian Hero in the Parables of Enoch: A Departure from the Traditional Pattern?" Pages 110–36 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- Oropeza, B. J. "Laying to Rest the Midrash: Paul's Message on Meat Sacrificed to Idols in Light of the Deuteronomistic Tradition." *Biblica* 79 (1998): 57–68.
- . *Paul and Apostasy: Eschatology, Perseverance, and Falling Away in the Corinthian Congregation*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck, 2000.
- Parry, Donald W., and Emanuel Tov, eds., with the assistance of Nehemiah Gordon and Derek Fry. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader Part 1: Texts Concerned with Religious Law*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader Part 2: Exegetical Texts*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader Part 5: Poetic and Liturgical Texts*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Piovanelli, Pierluigi. "'A Testimony for the Kings and the Mighty Who Possess the Earth': The Thirst for Justice and Peace in the Parables of Enoch." Pages 363–79 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- Qimron, Elisha, and John Strugnell. *Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah, Qumran Cave 4, V*. DJD X. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Robinson, James M. *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. San Francisco: Harper, 1978.
- Robinson, James M., Paul Hoffman, and John S. Kloppenborg, eds. *The Critical Edition of Q*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- Roetzel, Calvin. *Paul: The Man and the Myth*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1999.
- Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1982.
- Sacchi, Paolo. *The History of the Second Temple Period*. JSPSup 285. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.
- . *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*. JSPSup 20. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990.
- Sanday, William, and Arthur C. Headlam. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 5th ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1980.
- Sandelin, Karl-Gustav. "'Do not Be Idolaters!' (1 Cor 10:7)." Pages 257–73 in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts—Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*. Edited by David Hellholm and T. Fornberg. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995.
- Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977.

- Sanders, Jack T. *The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Background*. SNTSMS 15. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Sänger, Dieter, ed. *Gottessohn und Menschensohn. Exegetische Studien zuzwei Paradigmen biblischer Intertextualität*. Biblisch-Theologische Studien 67. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2004.
- Segal, Alan F. "Heavenly Ascent in Hellenistic Judaism, Early Christianity, and Their Environment." *ANRW* 2.23.2 (1980): 1333–94.
- . *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- . "The Risen Christ and the Angelic Mediator Figures in Light of Qumran." Pages 302–28 in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- . *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism*. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Sjörberg, E. *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochsbuch*. Skrifter Utgivna av kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet I Lund 41. Lund: Gleerup, 1946.
- Stanton, Graham. "Matthew's Christology and the Parting of the Ways." Pages 99–116 in Dunn, ed., *Jews and Christians*.
- Steenburg, David. "The Worship of Adam and Christ as the Image of God." *JSNT* 39 (1990): 95–109.
- Stone, Michael E. "Adam and Eve in the 'Life of Adam and Eve.'" Pages 7–32 in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergen. Harrisburg: Trinity, 1998.
- . "Enoch's Date in Limbo; or, Some Considerations on David Suter's Analysis of the Book of Parables." Pages 444–49 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- . *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- . *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- . ed. *The Testament of Abraham: The Greek Recensions*. Texts and Translations 2. Pseudepigrapha Series 2. Missoula: SBL, 1972.
- Stowers, Stanley. *A Rereading of Romans*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*. WUNT 2/70. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.
- . "The Parables of Enoch according to George Nickelsburg and Michael Knibb: A Summary and Discussion of Some Remaining Questions." Pages 65–71 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T., and Wendy E. S. North, eds. *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. JSNTSup 263. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. "The Understanding of Christ in the Pauline School: A Sketch." Pages 159–75 in Dunn, ed., *Jews and Christians*.
- Sullivan, Kevin P. *Wrestling with Angels*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Suter, David W. "Enoch in Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Book of Parables." Pages 415–43 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- . "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6–16." *HUCA* 50 (1979): 115–35.

- . *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch*. SBLDS 47. SBL: Scholars, 1979.
- . “Why Galilee? Galilean Regionalism in the Interpretation of 1 Enoch 6–16.” *Henoch 25* (2003): 167–212.
- Theisohn, Johannes. *Der auserwählte Richter: Untersuchungen zum traditionengeschichtlichen Ort der Menschensohngestalt der Bilderreden des Äthiopischen Henoch*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.
- Thompson, Michael B. *The New Perspective on Paul*. Cambridge: Grove, 2002.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. “Remarks on Transmission and Traditions in the Parables of Enoch: A Response to James VanderKam.” Pages 100–109 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- Tromp, Johannes. *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Edition*. PVTG 6. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Tyndale, William. *The New Testament: The Text of the Worms Edition of 1526 in Original Spelling, Translated by William Tyndale*. Edited for the Tyndale Society by W. R. Cooper, with a Preface by David Daniell. London: British Library, 2000.
- VanderKam, James C. “The Book of the Parables within the Enoch Tradition.” Pages 81–99 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- . “Daniel 7 in the Similitudes of Enoch (1 Enoch 37–71).” Pages 291–307 in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . *Enoch, A Man for All Generations*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.
- . *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. CBQMS 16. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association, 1984.
- . “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71.” Pages 169–91 in Charlesworth, ed., *The Messiah*.
- . “The Textual Base for the Ethiopic Translation of 1 Enoch.” Pages 247–62 in *Working with No Data: Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin*. Edited by David M. Golomb. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1987.
- VanderKam, James C., and William Adler, eds. *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*. CRINT 4. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- Vermes, Geza. “The Son of Man Debate Revisited (1960–2010).” Pages 236–55 in *Jesus in the Jewish World*. London: SCM, 2010.
- Waddell, James A. “Will the Real Judaism Please Stand Up? Ritual Self-Definition As Ideological Discourse from Qumran to Jerusalem.” *Henoch 26* (2004): 3–23.
- Walck, Leslie W. *The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and in Matthew*. Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 9. London: T&T Clark, 2011.
- . “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels.” Pages 299–337 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- Wedderburn, A. J. M. *The Reasons for Romans*. Edited by John Riches. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988.
- Weiser, Artur. *The Psalms: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962.
- Wise, Michael, Martin Abegg, Jr., and Edward Cook, ed. and trans. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. New York: HarperCollins, 1996.
- Witherington, Ben, III. “Jesus as the Alpha and Omega of New Testament Thought.” Pages 25–46 in Longenecker, ed., *Contours of Christology in the New Testament*.

- Wright, N. T. *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- . *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision*. London: SPCK, 2009.
- . *Paul in Fresh Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.
- . "The Structure of the Parables of Enoch: A Response to George Nickelsburg and Michael Knibb." Pages 72–78 in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*.
- . *What St. Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Wycliffe, John. *The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments, with the Apocryphal Books, in the Earliest English Versions Made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and His Followers*. Edited by Rev. Josiah Forshall and Sir Frederic Madden. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1850.
- Yeo, Khiok-Khng. *Rhetorical Interaction in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10: A Formal Analysis with Preliminary Suggestions for a Chinese, Cross-Cultural Hermeneutic*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Zimmerli, W. *Ezekiel*. Hermeneia. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

INDEXES

INDEX OF REFERENCES

HEBREW BIBLE	16:49	139	51:1–9	150
<i>Genesis</i>	19:1–10	150	51:3–11	150
1	20:7–11	136, 138,	66:4	40
1:1		139	72:11	100
1:9–10	21:5–6	139	82	157
1:26	25:1–18	139	82:1	157
1:27			104:24	129
2:7	<i>Deuteronomy</i>		109:1	165
2:17	5:5	137	109:2	122, 155
3	21:23	115	110	133, 154,
3:1–7				155, 162
3:5	<i>Judges</i>		110:1	108, 165
4:9–10	6:8	122	110:2	122, 154,
5:24	13:20	100		155
6–8			130	150, 151
13:14–17	<i>I Chronicles</i>			
15:1–6	29:20	100	<i>Proverbs</i>	
15:10			2	182
	<i>Job</i>		3:19	129
<i>Exodus</i>	1:20	100	8–9	131, 182
12:22	38:8–11	38	8	39
13:17–14:31	40:15–41:34	38	8:22–31	66
14			8:22–23	66
14:19–20	<i>Psalms</i>		8:22	64, 129,
14:20	2	83, 93		133
15:11	2:2	83, 93	8:24–26	66
16:1–17:7	7:8–9	157	8:25	129
17:6	7:9	157	9:1	66
	9:4	35		
20:18–19	11	93	<i>Ecclesiastes</i>	
32	11:4	93	7:20	65
40:34–38	11:6	93		
	11:7	93	<i>Isaiah</i>	
<i>Leviticus</i>	23	194	1:18	150
14:1–9	32	149	6	189
14:48–53	32:1–5	149	6:1–3	32
	32:1–2	152	6:3	30
<i>Numbers</i>	33:9	111	11:2	82
16:14	51	150	27:9	152

45	193, 196	6:1	75	<i>Hosea</i>	
45:22–25	193	7:1	75	1:1	44
49	83	8:2	134		
49:5–10	82	8:5–17	75	Joel	
52:7	157	11:2	75	1:1	44
53	70	11:15	75	2:32 LXX	168
56:1	113	12:1	44	3:5	168
58:6–9	113	13:1	44		
59:18–19	113			<i>Zechariah</i>	
60:1–3	113	<i>Daniel</i>		14:5	163
60:19–22	113	2:11	127		
61:2	156, 157	3	99, 100	DEAD SEA SCROLLS	
63:1–6	113	3:5	100	<i>IQ14</i>	
63:19–64:3	113	3:6	100	i–v 1	72
64:1–4	113	3:7	100	i–v 2	72
66:1	108	3:10	100		
66:15–16	113	3:11	100	<i>IQ15</i>	72
		3:15	100		
<i>Jeremiah</i>		3:28	100	<i>IQH</i>	
1:4	44	7–9	162	v 13–20	110
2:1	44	7–8	155	viii 17	110
7:25	122	7	14, 20, 61,		
51:14	158		77, 81,	<i>IQH^a</i>	
			83–85,	iv 9–15	151
<i>Ezekiel</i>			89–91,	ix 7–10	38
1–2	59		154, 155,		
1	14, 20, 61,		157, 182	<i>IQM</i>	
	80, 81,	7:1–10	89	xiv 4–19	95
	83–85, 91,	7:9–14	61		
	134, 181,	7:9–10	82, 155	<i>IQS</i>	
	182	7:9	61	iii 11	40
1:1	80	7:13–18	157	vi 6–8	205
1:3	44	7:13–14	77, 83, 89	viii 14	72
1:4	80, 81	7:13	61, 155	x 1–3	40
1:5–6	81	7:14	77, 155		
1:22	81	8	156, 160	<i>IQapGen</i>	
1:26–28	61, 81	8:11	156	ii 19–21	66
1:26	61, 82,	8:17	100		
	134	8:23–25	156	<i>IQpHab</i>	
1:28	61, 81	8:25	156	iv 17	72
2:1–8	75	9	157	vi 14	72
2:1	134	9:26	157		
3:1–11	75	10–12	155	<i>4Q161</i>	
3:5–6	122	10	134	2–4 6	72
3:12	81	10:5	134	2–4 9	72
3:23	81	10:9	134	8–10 12	72
4:1	75	10:18	155	8–10 13	72
5:1	75	10:21	155		

<i>4Q171</i>	72	<i>4Q491a</i>		<i>Tobit</i>	
		11 ii 11–18	158, 160	3:2	35
<i>4Q175</i>	72				
<i>4Q176</i>	72	<i>4Q491c</i>	160	<i>Wisdom of Solomon</i>	
3	110	1	159	1:6–7	129
		11–12	158	2:12–18	121
<i>4Q180</i>		<i>4Q503</i>	40	2:23	110
i 1	72			4:16–5:8	70
i 7–10	41	<i>4Q504</i>		6:22	133
		viii 1–8	38	7:21	133
<i>4Q183</i>	72			7:25–26	133
		<i>6Q12</i>		7:26	67, 129
<i>4Q186</i>	38	iii 4–5	72	8:5	129
				8:6	133
<i>4Q216</i>		<i>11Q5</i>	72	9:1–4	110
v–vii	110	xxvi 9–15	38	9:2	129
				9:4	133, 182
<i>4Q266</i>		<i>11Q13</i>	5, 14,	9:9	133
18 v 20	205		156–58,	9:10	133
			160, 176,	11:21–23	151
<i>4Q267</i>			182, 185	13:1–9	110
9 iv 4	72	5–6	156	13:10–19	106
9 v 4	72	9–10	156		
		10	157	<i>Sirach</i>	
<i>4Q318</i>	38	11	157	1:4	129, 131
		13	157	2:11	152
<i>4Q398</i>		18–20	157	18:1	110
14–17 ii		18	157	24:1–12	64, 132
31–32	109			24:8–9	131
		<i>11Q17</i>	40	24:23	64, 67,
<i>4Q400–407</i>	40				132
				28:2	152
<i>4Q409</i>	110	<i>Damascus Document</i>		39:5	152
		(CD)		45:3	133
<i>4Q413</i>	72	2.13	36	47:11	152
		xiv 19	153	50	27, 184
<i>4Q422</i>		APOCRYPHA		PSEUDEPIGRAPHA	
1 i 6–12	38	<i>1 Esdras</i>		<i>1 Enoch</i>	
		8:86	152	1:1–4	108
<i>4Q427</i>				1:2	33, 65, 67,
7 ii 22–23	110	<i>2 Esdras</i>			69
		3:3–5	38	1:3–4	51
<i>4Q462</i>	72	6:49–52	38	1:4	33
				1:6	93
<i>4Q491</i>	182	<i>3 Maccabees</i>		1:8	95
8–10 i	95	2:19	152	1:9	41, 51,
10 ii	158				203

5:1-3	38	34:4	32	39:11	32, 34
5:6-8	46, 95	37-69	53, 54	39:12-13	32, 40
5:8	46	37-44	63	39:12	29-32, 96, 99
7:1-8:2	93	37:1-70:2	55		
9:1-11	71	37:1-5	38, 86	39:13	50, 72, 99
9:4	33	37:1	49-51, 75, 200	39:14	51
9:11	34			40	31, 44
10:1	33	37:2	29, 30, 33	40:1-10	32
10:4-12	41	37:3	206	40:1-7	30
10:6	36	37:4	29, 30, 39, 51	40:1	31, 96
10:9	36			40:2	31, 96
10:15-22	36	37:5	39	40:3-4	40
10:20-22	36	38-44	69, 75	40:3	31, 32, 96, 99
10:21	40	38:1-6	95		
12-13	62	38:1	69, 70, 206	40:4	99
12:1-2	53			40:5	69, 96, 99
12:3	32	38:2	29, 46, 48, 69, 89	40:6	72, 98
12:4	65, 69			40:9	98
13-14	55	38:4	29, 43	40:10	30
13	55	38:6	29, 43	41:1-2	44
13:8	56	39	31, 33, 66, 67	41:2	30, 42, 45, 50, 72, 98
14	55, 89				
14:8-16:4	67	39:1-2	33	41:3-8	63
14:8-23	54, 108	39:1	75	41:3-4	36
14:8	56	39:2	33, 51	41:3	50
14:18-25	89	39:3-7	49, 60	41:5	36, 37
14:18-20	59	39:3	30, 32, 50, 51, 60, 69, 96	41:6	30, 36-38
14:19	59			41:7	30, 99
14:20	59			41:8	36, 72
14:21	59	39:4-5	30, 32, 60, 96	41:9	44, 45
14:24-16:4	33			42	64
14:24-25	56	39:5	31, 32	42:1-3	65, 67, 87
14:24	60	39:6-8	67, 74, 84, 96	42:1-2	39, 63
15:1	65, 69			42:2	75
15:2	50	39:6-7	30, 32, 60, 66, 69	42:3	39
16:1	41			43:1-4	63
19:1	41	39:6	30, 31, 50, 51, 69	43:4	30, 39, 72, 98
22:3	80				
22:4-11	41	39:7-10	96	44:1	63
24	31	39:7-9	29	45-57	70
25:3	31	39:7	31, 69, 72, 98, 99	45:1-51:5	83
25:4-5	31			45:1-6	83, 84
25:4	41	39:8	51, 60, 66, 67	45:1-3	90
25:7	31, 32			45:1-2	98
26:3	32	39:9-10	32	45:1	72, 168
27:1	32	39:9	31, 40, 72, 98, 99	45:2-3	42, 89
27:3-4	40			45:2	41, 72
32:3-6	65	39:10	32, 50, 99		

<i>1 Enoch</i> (cont.)	48	12, 42, 63,	51:1-5	84
45:3	69, 72, 83, 84, 90, 95		51:1	95
45:4	69, 95	48:1-7	51:2	95
45:5	42	48:1	51:3	30, 39, 83, 84, 86, 89,
45:6-46:1	71	48:2-7		90, 99
45:6	42		51:5	90, 95
46-47	71	48:2-4	52	93
46	26, 42, 61, 71, 74, 81, 91	48:2-3	52:1-53:7	161
46:1-8	61, 75, 93	48:2	52:1-2	50
46:1-6	81, 84		52:2	51, 93
46:1-2	42	48:3	52:4	48, 77, 93
46:1	51, 61, 67, 71	48:4-7	52:5	30, 39
46:2	61	48:4-5	52:6	50, 93
46:3	30, 42, 49, 62, 69, 71, 75, 86	48:5	52:7-8	93
46:4-8	91		52:9	69
46:4-6	45, 93		53	72
46:4-5	26, 74	48:6	53:1	50
46:4	26, 91		53:2	70
46:5	91, 92	48:7	53:3-5	72, 93
46:6-8	82		53:6	58, 69, 72, 206
46:6	72, 74, 98, 99, 168	48:8-10	53:7	70, 93
46:7-8	26, 42, 83	48:8-9	54:1	50
46:7	39, 40, 42, 72, 92, 98, 168	48:8	54:5-10	41
46:8	27, 70, 72, 92, 98, 206	48:10	54:5	30, 41
47	41, 70, 71, 82	49	54:6	30, 41, 93
47:1-4	71, 83, 84	49:1-4	54:7-55:2	35
47:1-2	82	49:1-2	54:7	30, 41
47:1	30, 40, 69, 70, 74	49:2-4	55:1	36, 42
47:2-3	82	49:2	55:2	72
47:2	30, 42, 70, 72, 98, 99	49:3	55:3	30, 41
47:3-4	71	49:4	55:4	45, 72, 89, 90, 94, 97
47:3	41, 42, 83, 89, 90, 93	50	56-57	23
47:4	30, 69-71	50:1-5	56	24, 26
		50:1-2	56:5-8	23
		50:1	56:5-6	24
		50:2-3	56:5	23, 26
			56:6	26
		50:2-3	56:7-8	23
			57	25
		50:2	57:1-2	24
		50:3	57:1	25
		50:4-5	57:2	25
		50:5	57:3	30, 40, 74, 99
		51	58:1-6	46

58:4	30, 37, 72	62	63, 67, 91,	63:4	40, 99
58:6	30		92	63:5-8	89
59	38	62:1-16	97	63:5-7	40
59:1-3	39	62:1-9	12, 84	63:5	99
59:1-2	38	62:1-8	75	63:7-8	42
59:1	30, 38, 50	62:1-3	89	63:7	40, 72, 99,
59:2	30	62:1-2	69, 88, 92,		168
60	42		94, 97	63:8	37
60:1-10	39	62:1	37	63:10	93
60:1	39	62:2-3	69	63:11	45, 75, 95
60:2-5	55	62:2	30, 88, 90,	63:12	30, 41
60:2	41, 42, 45,		93	64:2	93
	89, 90	62:3-8	88	65	42
60:3-4	50	62:3-6	63	65:6-8	93
60:3	42, 45	62:3	90, 94, 97	65:6	37, 43
60:5	42	62:4-5	94	65:9	30
60:6	30, 41, 42,	62:5	89, 90, 92,	65:11	30
	44, 45, 72,		97	66:2	30
	99	62:6	92, 97, 99	67-68	29, 43
60:7-10	34, 37, 38	62:7-8	63	67	43
60:8	30, 38, 50,	62:7	39, 62, 67,	67:1	29, 44
	146		92	67:2-3	44
60:10	51, 75, 86	62:8	206	67:3	37, 43, 72
60:11-23	39	62:9-12	88, 97,	67:4-69:1	43
60:22	38, 39		169	67:4-13	43
60:24-25	37, 39, 41	62:9-10	95	67:4-7	93
60:24	30, 34, 37,	62:9	8, 75, 95-	67:4-5	41
	38		97, 99	67:5	43
60:25	30, 34, 43	62:10-12	41	67:7	43
61	92	62:10	30, 90	67:8	30, 37, 43
61:3	72	62:11-12	42	68:1	206
61:5	30, 95	62:11	70	68:4	30, 37, 43
61:6-13	97	62:12	30, 42	69	73, 102
61:6-9	35	62:13-16	95	69:6-7	93
61:6	99	62:13-14	43, 89	69:6	75
61:8-9	45, 89	62:13	88, 89, 95,	69:8	75
61:8	30, 69, 89,		96	69:12	75
	90, 92, 94	62:14	30, 75	69:13-16	37
61:9	30, 35, 72,	62:15-16	43, 96	69:13	75
	99, 168	62:15	95	69:14	37, 58
61:10-13	35	62:16	30	69:16-25	37
61:10	37, 92, 97	63	42	69:17-25	37
61:11-12	72, 168	63:1-12	40	69:24	30, 72, 99
61:11	72, 98, 99	63:1-4	40	69:26-29	75
61:12	99	63:1-2	30	69:26	37, 58, 99
61:13	30, 35, 43,	63:1	40, 99	69:27	89, 91, 93
	72	63:2-3	98	69:29	30, 89, 91,
		63:2	40, 99		93

<i>1 Enoch</i> (cont.)		81:10	40	<i>Jubilees</i>	
70–71	50, 52–55	83:11–84:3	40	2	38
70	53	84:1–2	33	2:1–16	110
70:1–2	53–55, 57, 58	84:3	34, 133	4:22	41
70:1	30, 51, 55, 57, 58, 75	84:4	41	5:12–19	35
70:2	53	90:19–27	41	5:12	35
70:3–4	53–55	90:20–27	41		
70:3	53	90:20	42	<i>Greek Apocalypse of Ezra</i>	
71	54, 55, 66, 74, 75	91:7	41	4:36	163
71:1–17	53	92:4	41		
71:1–2	54	93:11	33	<i>Greek Life of Adam and Eve</i>	
71:1	50, 51	94:9	41	1:1	189
71:2	30	94:10–95:2	41	6:2	189
71:3–5	55	97:3–6	41	9:3	189
71:3–4	54	100:4	41	20:1–21:6	196
71:3	69	104:9	33	20:1–3	194
71:5–9	93	108:13	41	20:1	96, 193
71:5–8	54	<i>2 Baruch</i>		21:2	96
71:5	50, 51	29:8–30:1	122	21:6	96
71:6	50	39–40	161	27:1–2	189
71:7	41, 59, 91	<i>3 Enoch</i>		28:4	197
71:8	50	12–13	62	32	189
71:9–17	93	16	134	33:5	189, 196
71:9–12	51, 54	<i>4 Ezra</i>		35:2	189, 196
71:9–11	51	3:20	148	37–38	163
71:10	42, 51	3:21–22	147	39	199
71:11	87, 99, 134	7:116–20	147	42:6	189
71:12	42, 51, 99	<i>Apocalypse of Abraham</i>		<i>Letter of Aristeas</i>	
71:13–14	54	30	163	132	106
71:13	42, 50, 51	31:1–2	161	<i>Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah</i>	
71:14–17	74	31:1	163	8:11	59
71:14	42, 49–52, 55, 57, 58, 65, 67, 69, 75, 86, 87	<i>Apocalypse of Zephaniah</i>		8:14–15	51
71:15–17	55	9–12	163	9:6–9	51
71:15	41, 91	<i>Exagoge of Ezekiel the Tragedian</i>		<i>Psalms of Solomon</i>	
71:16	58, 65, 69	68–89	94, 98	2:18	116
71:17	72, 75	82–86	98	9:4–5	109
73:3	36	86–89	16	9:6–7	151
75:3	31, 37	<i>Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers</i>		15:12	41
76:4	38	11	151	17–18	185
81:1–3	31			17	20, 68, 161, 182
81:3	40			17:21–25	160
				17:21	122

17:32–39	161	<i>Legum allegoriae</i>	16:3	26	
17:36	142	1.43	129	16:16–18	139
18	20			17:6	134
18:5	122	<i>De opificio mundi</i>		22:1–13	95
18:11–12	110	134–39	147	23:35	70
		147	147	23:37	145
<i>Questions of Ezra,</i>		<i>Quaestiones in Genesin</i>		24:43–44	164
Recension B	163	2.62	21		
		4.97	129	<i>Mark</i>	
<i>Septuagint Odes</i>				2:1–12	185
14:28	187	<i>Quis rerum divinarum</i>		2:10	149, 185
		<i>heres sit</i>		16:19	108
<i>Sibylline Oracles</i>		55–57	190		
1:5–37	110	84	135	<i>Luke</i>	
3:629	106	106	110	1:46–55	95
		119	135	4:8	40
<i>Testament of Abraham</i>		127–29	135	7:25	125
1:3	29	133–60	110	12:39–40	164
8:25–26	148	169	106	13:34	145
11	199	203–4	138	14:16–24	95
12:10	163	205–6	137	22:69	108
12:11	199	230–31	197	24:25–27	185
13:1–8	199, 200				
		<i>De vita Mosis</i>		<i>John</i>	
<i>Testament of Benjamin</i>		1.158	21, 176	1:1–5	125
3:8	142			1:1–2	124
		FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS		1:1	21
<i>Testament of Job</i>		<i>Antiquities</i>		1:14	125
43:13	116	5.112	106		
		14.330–66	25	<i>Acts</i>	
<i>Testament of Judah</i>		14.330–32	25	2:33	108
24:1	142	17.171	43	2:42	207
		18.18–19	27, 204,	5:17–18	207
<i>Testament of Levi</i>			207	5:31	108
7:4–8:1	55			6	207
		<i>The Jewish War</i>		6:1–9:2	139
<i>Vitae Adae et Evae</i>		1.179	24	6:7	206, 207
13–14	8	1.180	24	7:54–56	208
		1.184	25	7:55–56	108
PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA		1.248–70	25	8:1–4	207
<i>De ebrietate</i>		1.248–49	25	8:5	207
30–31	129	1.270	25	9	207
		2.128	40	9:1–30	1
<i>De fuga et inventione</i>				9:1–2	207
177–201	82, 135	NEW TESTAMENT		9:14	9
177	110	<i>Matthew</i>		9:19–20	207
195	135	4:10	40	9:21	9
		5:12	145	9:22	208

<i>Acts</i> (cont.)		2:5	116	5:14	174
9:28	208	2:6	174	5:15–21	147
11:19–30	138	2:7	175	5:15–17	148
11:19	139, 207	2:8	175	5:18–21	148
11:25–26	208	2:11	116	6:4	114
13:1–3	138	2:14	175	6:10	175
14:2	144	2:16	116, 166	6:16	174, 175
14:5	144	2:23	174	6:17	174
14:19	144	2:29	174	6:21	174
15	206	3	109, 161	7	145
17:5	144	3:3–4	106	7:6	174
17:13	144	3:6	116	7:15	174
17:16–34	204	3:8	174	7:16	174
21:21	144	3:21–26	109, 114,	7:19	174
22:1–21	1		162	7:20	174
22:16	9	3:23	193, 194,	7:23	195
25:2–7	144		196	8	108
26:1–23	1	3:25	151, 153,	8:1–4	114, 145
			174	8:3	113, 119–
<i>Romans</i>		3:27–30	114		22, 125,
1–5	196	3:28	105		155, 174
1	192	3:29–30	105	8:5	175
1:1–4	120, 121,	3:30	174	8:11	114
	125	4	147	8:15	105, 174
1:1	105	4:6	174	8:24	174
1:2	174	4:7–8	152	8:25	174
1:3–4	119	4:7	174	8:28–30	108
1:3	119, 120	4:8	174	8:29	174
1:4	144	4:16	174	8:30	174
1:5	174	4:17	110, 111,	8:32	174
1:6	174		116, 174	8:33–34	108
1:7	105, 119	4:18	174	8:33	108, 175
1:9	174	4:20	116	8:34	108, 133,
1:15	175	4:21	174		144, 155,
1:16–17	109, 161	4:24	114, 174		174, 175
1:18–32	108	4:25	144, 145,	8:39	175
1:18	108, 110,		174	9:1–5	173
	116	5	128, 147,	9:4	174
1:20	107		191, 197,	9:5	10, 107,
1:23	107		200		170, 172–
1:24–25	110	5:1	119		77
1:25	105, 107,	5:2	174	9:6	175
	110, 116,	5:6–11	147	9:7	175
	174	5:6–9	166	9:15	174
1:27	174	5:9	147	9:18	174
2:1	174	5:10	119, 146	9:21	174
2:2–3	116	5:11	174	9:23	174
2:4	116	5:12–14	147	9:24	174
2:5–11	116	5:12	174	9:28	105, 116

10:8	174	1:3	105, 119,	6:14	114, 144
10:9–13	119, 167,		195	6:18	174
	168	1:7–8	119, 164,	6:19	174
10:9–10	9		166	6:20	116
10:9	114, 141,	1:7	164	6:24	174
	168	1:8	174	7:1	174
10:13	141, 174	1:9	119, 174	7:34	175
10:14	174	1:17–31	111	7:36	174
11	152	1:18–25	111	7:37	174
11:2	174	1:18	175	7:39	174
11:7	174	1:20	204	8	107
11:22	116	1:22–24	130, 153	8:4–6	106, 107,
11:25–27	152	1:23–24	129		111, 123,
11:32	148	1:23	144		124, 143,
11:33–36	6, 143,	1:24	130, 133,		165
	144		135, 153	8:4	105
11:36	116	1:30	129, 174	8:5–6	119
12:1	116	2	112	8:6	105, 119,
12:3	174	2:1–5	112		124, 125,
13:14	119, 195	2:2	144		129, 174,
14:2	174	2:6–7	112		195
14:5	174	2:7–10	112	8:11	144, 174
14:9	144	2:7	174	10–11	138
14:10–12	116	2:8	119, 144,	10:1–4	136–40
14:10	165		174	10:1–2	140
14:11	116	2:9	174	10:4	139
14:15	174	2:11	175	10:5–11	139
14:21	174	2:12	175	10:6–7	138
14:22	174	2:13	174	10:11	163, 174
15:6	105, 116,	2:16	174	10:13	174
	119	3:5	174	10:14	138
15:17	175	3:11	174	10:15	174
15:18	174	3:13	164	10:16	174
15:30	119	3:14	174	10:20	174
15:31	175	4:4–5	166	10:24	175
16:2	174	4:4	118	10:29	174
16:5	174	4:5	164, 174	10:31	116
16:6	174	4:6	174, 175	11:12	111
16:11	175	4:7	174	11:21	174
16:12	174	4:17	174, 175	11:23	174
16:17	174	5:1	174	11:24	174
16:20	119	5:5	164, 165	11:26	166
16:27	116, 174	5:7	145	11:27	174
		5:13	116	12:1–3	168
<i>1 Corinthians</i>		6:5	174	12:3	141, 168
1:1	105	6:11	119	12:6	175
1:2	9, 119,	6:13–14	116	12:8	174
	167, 168,	6:13	116	12:28	174
	175				

<i>1 Corinthians</i> (cont.)	1:13	174	11:12	174
13	174	1:14	11:14	189
13:11	175	1:17	11:15	174
14:25	116	1:18	11:17	174
14:37	174	1:19	11:21	174
15	128, 146,	1:20	11:28	175
	152, 153,	2:3	11:30	175
	191, 196,	2:4	11:31	107, 175,
	198, 200	2:8–9		176
15:1–5	153	2:10	12:1–7	204
15:1–4	162	3:4–4:6	12:1–4	51
15:1	174	3:6	12:4	174
15:2	174	4:4–6	12:6	174
15:3–4	144, 185	4:4	12:13	174
15:3	174		12:14	175
15:6	174	4:5–6	12:17	174
15:8	1, 113	4:6	13:3	174
15:9	174		13:4	144
15:10	174	4:14	13:10	174
15:12–28	162	4:15	13:13	195
15:15	114, 174	5:4	13:14	119
15:16–17	153, 198	5:5		
15:20–28	198	5:10	<i>Galatians</i>	
15:20–23	162		1:1	105, 114,
15:22	146	5:14–15		119, 175
15:23–28	155	5:16	1:3–4	146, 152
15:23	146, 163	5:17–19	1:3	105, 119,
15:24	162, 166	5:17		195
15:27–28	166	5:18–19	1:4	105, 114,
15:28	198	5:21		175
15:31	174		1:5	116, 174
15:36	174	7:14	1:7	174
15:37	174	8	1:8	142, 174
15:42–50	146	8:1	1:9	174
15:45	38, 195	8:4	1:11	175
15:47	123, 125	8:9	1:12	113
15:57	119		1:13	1
16:2	174	8:18	1:15–16	113
16:22	163, 166	8:19	1:15	175
		8:22	1:16	1, 119
<i>2 Corinthians</i>		9:2	1:18–21	208
1:1	175	9:13	1:20	105
1:2	105, 119,	10:1	1:23	174
	195	10:2	1:24	116
1:3	107	10:8	2	139
1:4	174, 175	10:13	2:1–10	139
1:6	174	10:18	2:2	174
1:9	175	11:3	2:3	175
1:10	174	11:4	2:4	174

2:8	115, 175	5:21	174	2:11	105, 133,
2:9	175	5:24	175		141, 187,
2:10	174	6:7	174		194–96
2:11–14	138, 139	6:8	175	2:13	115, 175
2:18	174	6:12	174	2:14–18	166
2:20–21	144, 146	6:14	119, 174	2:14–16	191
2:20	119, 174,	6:16	174	2:15	174
	175	6:18	119	2:16	164
3	105			2:19	175
3:1	112, 144	<i>Philippians</i>		2:20	174
3:2	117	1:1	175	2:21	175
3:3	117	1:2	105, 119,	2:23	175
3:4–5	117		195	3	162
3:5	117	1:6	164, 166,	3:3	116
3:10	174		191	3:5–6	1
3:13	115, 146,	1:10	164, 166	3:6	175
	175	1:11	116, 175,	3:7	174
3:15–20	120, 121,		191	3:8	174
	125	1:27	175	3:9	175
3:16	119, 120,	1:28	116, 174	3:10	162
	174	2	8, 125,	3:11	175
3:17	175		128, 129,	3:12	174
3:19–20	105		140, 186,	3:16	175
3:19	120		187, 191–	3:17–19	176
3:21	175		94, 196,	3:18	174
4	122		200	3:19	174–76
4:4–5	113, 120,	2:1–4	191	3:20–21	162, 166
	121, 125	2:4	175	3:20	119, 123,
4:4	113, 119,	2:5–11	40, 191		174, 191,
	121, 136,	2:5–9	121, 125		195
	155	2:5	174	3:21	174
4:5	175	2:6–11	129, 140,	4:3	174
4:6	105, 119		148, 149,	4:7	175
4:9	174		190–92,	4:8	174
4:13–14	141, 142		195–97	4:9	174
4:14	119, 142	2:6–8	124, 126,	4:10	174
4:19	174		128	4:11	174
4:21	175	2:6–7	125	4:20	116
4:23	175	2:6	125–27,	4:23	119, 195
4:24	174		174, 192		
4:26	174	2:7–8	127	<i>Colossians</i>	
4:29	175	2:7	124, 126,	1:15–17	124
5:1–15	117		127, 192	1:15	133
5:1	117	2:8	127, 144,	3:1–4	108
5:10	117, 174,		148, 192		
	175	2:9–11	119	<i>1 Thessalonians</i>	
5:14	175	2:9	175, 193	1:1	105, 119,
5:17	174	2:10–11	193, 196		195
5:19	174			1:3	105, 119

<i>1 Thessalonians</i> (cont.)	12	174	PATRISTIC SOURCES
1:8	175	13	174
1:9	106	25	119
1:10	114, 119, 123, 164, 166, 174	<i>Hebrews</i>	
2:13	174	1:1–3	124
2:14–15	144	1:3	108, 133, 135
2:14	175	4:15	142, 197
2:15	175	5:1–3	27
2:16	116	9:24	108
2:19	163	10:12	108
3:11	105	12:2	108
3:13	105, 119, 163	12:24	70
4:5	175	<i>James</i>	
4:8	117, 175	2:24	80
4:13–5:4	164, 165	<i>1 Peter</i>	
4:13	175	1:19	142
4:14	116, 144	3:18	152
4:15–18	163	3:21–22	108
4:15	163, 175	<i>1 John</i>	
4:16	163	2:2	152
4:17	175	3:5	152
5:2	164	4:10	152
5:9–10	115	<i>Jude</i>	
5:9	116, 119, 166	14–15	203
5:10	144	<i>Revelation</i>	
5:23–24	115	1:5	152
5:23	119, 163	4	108
5:24	174	RABBINIC LITERATURE	
5:28	119	<i>b. Hagigah</i>	
<i>1 Timothy</i>		14a	5
2:13–14	189	<i>b. Sanhedrin</i>	
<i>2 Timothy</i>		38b	5
2:22	9	<i>Mekhilta Bahodesh</i>	
<i>Philemon</i>		5	5
3	119		
5	174		
10	174		
11	175		

INDEX OF AUTHORS

- Abbot, E. 172, 173
Abegg, M., Jr. 159
Alexander, P. S. 39, 62, 65
Anderson, G. A. 187
Arcari, L. 22
Aune, D. E. 4
- Baillet, M. 158, 159
Bakker, A. 142
Barbour, I. G. 18
Barker, M. 142
Barrera, J. T. 27
Barthélemy, D. 151
Bassler, J. M. 4, 106
Bauckham, R. J. 6, 7, 21, 41
Bauer, W. 126
Baumgarten, J. M. 153
Baur, F. C. 3
Beker, J. C. 204, 205
Bird, M. F. 4
Black, M. 30, 50, 70, 89, 91, 93
Blass, F. 126
Boccaccini, G. 2, 17, 22, 27, 35, 38, 39, 64, 79, 86, 87, 131, 132
Bousset, W. 3, 119, 186
Boyarin, D. 28
- Capes, D. B. 7
Carson, D. A. 4
Cary, M. 23
Casey, M. 5, 15, 28, 30, 55, 76–80, 84, 173, 176, 192
Charles, R. H. 22
Charlesworth, J. H. 22
Chialà, S. 75
Clarke, W. K. L. 191
Collins, A. Y. 122
Collins, J. J. 52, 54–56, 58, 65, 67, 122, 130, 155, 156
Colson, F. H. 137, 197
Cook, E. 159
Cope, L. 136
- Das, A. A. 4
Davila, J. R. 28
Davis, L. D. 135
De Witt Burton, E. 125
Debrunner, A. 126
Dobbin, O. T. 137
Dochhorn, J. 187, 188
Draper, J. A. 207
Dunn, J. D. G. 4, 6, 7, 10, 106, 119, 124, 125, 129, 130, 134, 168, 173, 175, 192
Dwight, T. 172, 175
- Ehrman, B. D. 144
Eisenbaum, P. 2, 4
Eldridge, M. D. 187
Ellis, E. E. 136
Eriksson, A. 136
Eshel, E. 159
Eshel, H. 22
- Fitzmyer, J. A. 15, 127, 167, 183
Fletcher-Louis, C. 11, 16, 27, 94, 98, 199
Foerster, W. 110, 111
Fossum, J. E. 15, 73, 121, 192
- García Martínez, F. 27, 156
Gathercole, S. J. 4, 122, 191
Gieschen, C. A. 7, 16, 21, 62, 73, 133, 141, 142, 146
Greenfield, J. C. 22
Grelot, P. 191
Grether, O. 73
- Hahne, H. A. 37
Hammerton-Kelly, R. G. 124
Hannah, D. D. 22, 41, 43, 165
Headlam, A. C. 173, 175, 176
Hellerman, J. H. 190
Hengel, M. 41
Himmelfarb, M. 52–54, 59
Hindley, J. C. 22
Hoffman, P. 139
Horrell, D. G. 136

- Horsley, R. A. 207
Hurtado, L. W. 6, 8–14, 100, 119, 123, 124,
128, 129, 166–68, 172
- Jaffee, M. S. 204, 205
Jones, H. S. 126
Jonge, M. de 173, 187–90
- Käsemann, E. 191, 192
Klijn, F. A. 147
Kloppenborg, J. S. 139
Knibb, M. A. 22
Knittel, T. 187
Kraus, H.-J. 154
Kuhn, T. 17, 18
Kvanvig, H. S. 33, 39, 49, 52, 55–57, 59,
61, 65, 66, 72, 75, 89
- Laurence, R. 77
Levison, J. R. 187, 191, 192
Lewis, G. S. 28
Liddell, H. G. 126
Lohmeyer, E. 191
Longenecker, R. N. 172, 173
Louw, J. P. 127
Lovejoy, A. O. 17
- Martin, R. P. 190, 192
McGrath, J. P. 21, 107
Mearns, C. L. 23
Meeks, W. A. 136
Mettinger, T. N. D. 73
Milik, J. T. 22, 151
Moberly, R. W. L. 106, 107
Moo, D. J. 173
Morris, L. 173
Moule, C. F. D. 193
Munoa, P. B. 200
Murphy, R. E. 64
- Newman, B. M. 176
Newman, C. C. 28
Nickelsburg, G. W. E. 33, 34, 44, 46, 55,
59–61, 208
Nida, E. A. 127, 176
North, W. E. S. 104
- O'Brien, P. T. 4
Olson, D. C. 57
Orlov, A. A. 53, 62
Oropeza, B. J. 136
- Parry, D. W. 109, 151, 156, 158, 159
- Qimron, E. 109
- Robinson, J. M. 139
Roetzel, C. 173
Rowland, C. 41, 60, 90, 134
- Sanday, W. 173, 175, 176
Sandelin, K.-G. 136
Sanders, E. P. 3
Scott, R. 127
Scullard, H. H. 23
Segal, A. F. 2, 4, 6, 28
Seifrid, M. 4
Sjörberg, E. 70
Stanton, G. 124
Steenburg, D. 199
Stone, M. E. 22, 148, 187, 188, 200
Stowers, S. 4
Strugnell, J. 109
Stuckenbruck, L. T. 104
Stuhlmacher, P. 140
Sullivan, K. P. 21
Suter, D. W. 22, 43, 53, 208
- Theisohn, J. 45, 93
Thompson, M. B. 4
Tigchelaar, E. J. C. 156
Tov, E. 109, 151, 156, 158, 159
Tromp, J. 187–90
Tyndale, W. 194
- VanderKam, J. W. 33, 34, 44, 46, 48, 50,
51, 53, 55, 58, 61, 62, 69–72, 74, 75, 91,
93, 94
Vermes, G. 15
- Waddell, J. A. 8, 27, 36
Walck, L. W. 208
Wedderburn, A. J. M. 173
Weiser, A. 154
Whitaker, G. H. 137, 197
Wise, M. 159
Witherington, Ben, III 172
Woude, A. S. van der 156
Wright, N. T. 4, 6, 172
Wycliffe, J. 194
- Yeo, K.-K. 136