

THE MESSIAH

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

James A. Waddell



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

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 Antigonos, the son of Hyrcanus' now deceased brother and political rival Aristobulus.⁶⁴ Antigonos, the last of the Has-monean 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, Antigonos sent an emissary to Jerusalem to invite Hyrcanus to meet with him in Galilee. Hyrcanus and his advisor Phasael willingly accepted Antigonos' invitation to meet, against the vigorous objections of Herod. After their meeting, under the ruse of sending Hyrcanus and Phasael away with gifts, Antigonos intercepted them on their way back to Jerusalem and had them put in chains. Josephus describes how Antigonos "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 Antigonos 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, Antigonos literally "mutilated the ears with his teeth" (*War* 1.270): ...ὁ δὲ Ὑρκανοῦ μὲν προσπερόντος αὐτὸς τὰ ὠτα 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.