

Department of  
**New Testament Greek and Literature**

## **THE KINGDOM OF GOD IN THE JEWISH APOCRYPHAL LITERATURE: PT. 3**

BY GEORGE LADD, PH.D.

*(Continued from the April-June Number, 1952)*

### I ENOCH

Enoch is one of the most notable examples of the genus of Jewish literature called apocalyptic as well as one of the most important books for New Testament backgrounds. In it for the first time appears the concept of a *temporal* messianic kingdom, and in it is elaborated the Jewish doctrine of the Son of Man. Before we discuss the book itself, a brief characterization of apocalyptic literature will give background for the discussion.

The word "apocalypse" has a twofold meaning. In biblical literature it is used of divine disclosures made to individuals<sup>1</sup> or to men collectively,<sup>2</sup> of supernatural truths either present<sup>3</sup> or future.<sup>4</sup> It is used in the introduction to the one prophetic book of the New Testament<sup>5</sup> of the revelation or disclosure of the things which were shortly to come to pass, which God the Father gave to His Son who in turn, as the mediator of revelation, made it known to John.<sup>6</sup> The word here refers to the total contents of our book which God,

<sup>1</sup>Gal. 1:12, 2:2, II Cor. 12:1, I Cor. 14:6, 26.

<sup>2</sup>Rom. 16:25, Eph. 1:17, II Thess. 1:7.

<sup>3</sup>Rom. 16:25, II Cor. 12:1, Gal. 1:12.

<sup>4</sup>Rom. 2:5, 8:19, I Pet. 1:7.

<sup>5</sup>Revelation 1:1.

<sup>6</sup>Some take the phrase, *apokalypsis Iesou Christou*, to involve an objective genitive; but the second phrase, "which God gave him", i.e., to Christ, seems to require the subjective genitive. Christ is indeed the mediator of revelation. Cf. John 7:16, 14:10, 17:7,8.

through Christ, disclosed to John on Patmos and which John later wrote down. The word may be similarly applied to the disclosures made to Daniel although the word is not there used.

In modern biblical study, "apocalypse" has been infused with a broader technical meaning to describe the *literary* product of such divine disclosures, whether they are real or pretended. The word has been borrowed from the Revelation of John and applied to a series of Jewish writings which, in imitation of Daniel, are cast in the form of disclosures of future events. Epoch is the first of such books. The word itself is not found in any of these writings.

The adjective "apocalyptic" has been given a still larger meaning to include writings which are not strictly apocalypses, i.e., whose literary form is not that of visionary revelations, but whose content deals largely or in substantial part with the sort of eschatological expectations which are found in the apocalypses. In this sense the eschatology of Jesus is called apocalyptic, for although He does not speak in symbols nor experience visions, He does prophesy the end of the world by the dramatic Parousia of the Son of Man from heaven and the judgment of God upon the world; and these are considered to be among the essential ideas of apocalyptic literature.<sup>7</sup>

It is customary for modern criticism to distinguish between prophecy and apocalyptic and to consider apocalyptic as the successor of prophecy, arising out of the troubles of the Maccabean times. There is unquestionably a substantial measure of truth in this position, as we shall shortly see. However there is one all-important factor to be taken into consideration in the rise of the Jewish apocalypses which much modern criticism is unable fully to evaluate. This is the existence of the apocalyptic form in the genuine pro-

<sup>7</sup>Cf. for illustrations C. C. McCown, *The Search for the Real Jesus* (New York, 1940), pp. 243-53; H. J. Cadbury, *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus* (New York, 1937), pp. 73-75; H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (Second ed.; London, 1947), pp. 114-23; T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus* (Cambridge, 1935), pp. 155 ff.

phetic literature, especially in the book of Daniel.<sup>8</sup> In the historical as well as the prophetic literature, visions and

<sup>8</sup>Most of the study of Jewish apocalyptic literature has been done by scholars who place Daniel in the Maccabean times, and understand it not as a genuine prophecy but as the first representative of the formal apocalyptic literary efforts, like Enoch and the other non-canonical apocalypses. (For some of the standard studies, see H. T. Andrews, "Apocalyptic Literature", *A Commentary on the Bible* [A. S. Peake, ed.; New York and London, 1919], pp. 431-35; A. C. Zenos, "Apocalyptic Literature" *Hastings' Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, I, 79-94; R. H. Charles, "Apocalyptic Literature", *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, I, Columns 213-50; F. C. Porter, *The Messages of the Apocalyptic Writers* [New York, 1905]; H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* [Second ed.; London, 1947].) We are beyond a doubt greatly in the debt of such scholars for their work in this difficult field, and debts should be acknowledged wherever they exist. However, one of the most relevant questions in the historical interpretation of apocalyptic literature as a whole is that of the date of Daniel; for if the book was produced in Babylonian times as it claims, then the imitative factor in the later apocalypses is much greater than if Daniel is practically contemporary with the earliest parts of Enoch. There are unquestionably difficulties particularly in the linguistic area, which must be dealt with in establishing the date of Daniel. Still, the crucial problem is a theological one; for contrary to the insistence of many, theology cannot be isolated from historical study. The central issue in the Babylonian date of Daniel is that of "the reality of the supernatural and the divine origin of the revelations it contains" (R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* [New York, 1941], p. 175). The liberal critic maintains that "historical research can deal only with authenticated facts which are within the sphere of natural possibilities and must refrain from vouching for the truth of supernatural events. In a historical study of the Bible, convictions based on faith must be deemed irrelevant, as belonging to subjective rather than objective knowledge" (*Loc. cit.* H. H. Rowley objects to this view. Cf. *The Growth of the Old Testament* [London, 1950], pp. 158f.). However, such an attitude does not really "refrain from vouching for the truth of supernatural events; it, in fact, renders a decision against their truthfulness. If one concludes, because of the references to Antiochus Epiphanes, that Daniel was not written in Babylonian but in Maccabean times, then one has decided that its alleged prophecies are not true but are indeed history, masquerading as prophecy" (A. S. Peake, *A Commentary on the Bible*, p. 48). This position eliminates on grounds the possibility of the impartation by God to men of a supernatural revelation, or of God's entering into human history for the salvation of sinful men. The conservative critic (who needs be no less "critical" in the true sense of the word for that reason) is compelled by the totality of experience to admit the reality of the supernatural in divine revelation and to see in Daniel predictive prophecy, what he does not find in Enoch or in the other non-canonical apocalypses. For conservative criticism of Daniel see Robert Dick Wilson, *Studies in the Book of Daniel* (New York, First Series, 1917; Second Series, 1938); E. J. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, 1949). While Dr. Young does not exegete Daniel in a premillennial manner, his works are very helpful for these critical problems.

symbolic imagery are a frequent medium of divine revelation. Furthermore, one of the main themes of the prophetic literature is the main concern of the later apocalypses, viz., the Day of the Lord and the kingdom of God. Numerous apocalyptic sections are to be found embedded in the prophetic writings.<sup>9</sup> Thus the apocalypse of Daniel has its antecedents in the other prophetic literature. "The prophecies of Daniel are not distinguished even in their apocalyptic form from the whole body of prophecy in nature, but only in degree".<sup>10</sup> The existence of the canonical Daniel provided the prototype for the subsequent apocalypses. It may well be that the fulfillment of the detailed prophecy in Daniel of Antiochus Epiphanes provided the incitement in 168 B.C. to production of the earliest parts of the pseudepigraphical apocalypses, the books of Enoch,<sup>11</sup> by giving rise to the expectation that God was now at last about to intervene to inaugurate His kingdom.

It is not within the scope of the present studies to discuss the problems involved in the book of Daniel. We believe it to be a genuine revelation given by God to Daniel under genuine prophetic inspiration. The later apocalypses were imitative productions coming from a time when the voice of prophecy had long been stilled.<sup>12</sup> For many generations Israel, God's people, had been in subjection to a succession of world empires. The people over whom God alone should reign were subservient to the Gentiles. Centuries passed, and the kingdom of God predicted in Daniel and the prophets did not come. God seemed to be silent and to have removed

<sup>9</sup>Cf. such passages as Isaiah 24-27, Joel, Zechariah 12-14, Ezekiel 38-39, etc. Cf. T. H. Robinson in *A Companion to the Bible* (T. W. Manson, ed.; Edinburgh, 1945), pp. 307 f.; James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (New York, 1927), pp. 78 ff.

<sup>10</sup>C. F. Keil, *The Book of Daniel* (English Trans., Edinburgh, 1877; reprinted by Eerdmans, 1949), p. 27. Cf. further Robert Dick Wilson, "Apocalypses and the Date of Daniel", *Studies in the Book of Daniel*, (New York, 1938), pp. 101-16.

<sup>11</sup>For the reason for the detailed prophecy about Antiochus see Robert Dick Wilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 270-80.

<sup>12</sup>For recognition of the cessation of prophecy, see I Macc. 4:46, 14:41. For the later talmudic literature see George Foot Moore, *Judaism* (Cambridge, 1944), I, 421.

Himself from the historical experiences of His people. Finally, under the domination of the Grecian Ptolemies and then the Seleucids, there came the deadly inroads of Hellenism and of pagan customs and influences which threatened to turn the entire nation away from the Law and the worship of Jehovah.<sup>13</sup> A hellenizing party arose among the Jews which by obtaining the high priesthood was able to promote its policies with great success.<sup>14</sup> So far did these pagan influences advance that some scholars have felt that if the process had been allowed to pursue its natural course, the Jewish people would have been completely hellenized and would have lost their religious distinctives.<sup>15</sup> There intervened the violent persecution by Antiochus when with fire and sword he attempted to force Greek religion upon the Jews.

Through these long years of political bondage which witnessed the slow encroachment of pagan influences finally culminating in one of the fiercest persecutions God's people ever experienced, years during which evil in both subtle and violent form grew increasingly worse, God was silent. Again and again the question was raised, Where is God's kingdom which the prophets promised? Why does God not vindicate Himself? When shall the Day of Jehovah come? No prophet appeared to proclaim a fresh word from God in answer to these questions. No Isaiah, no Joel, no Zephaniah stood up among the people to announce, 'Thus saith the Lord.' God's voice was silent.

In their despair the devout began to search the Scriptures afresh for an answer. They turned to the specifically predictive portions of the prophets, especially those passages which described in great detail the coming of the Day of Jehovah and the inauguration of the kingdom of God. The

<sup>13</sup>Cf. I Macc. 1:11-15. Cf. also W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, *Hebrew Religion* (London, 1937), pp. 340-43; Edwyn Bevan, *Jerusalem under the High Priests* (London, 1904), pp. 31-80.

<sup>14</sup>Cf. II Macc. 4:7-17.

<sup>15</sup>Cf. E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* (3 and 4 Aufl.; Leipzig, 1901), I, 189; English Trans., *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* (New York, 1890), I, i, 197-98.

example of this predictive prophecy par excellence was Daniel. Brooding over the message of these Old Testament revelations, devout souls tried to reinterpret their experiences in the light of Old Testament prophecy. Witnessing the fulfillment of some of Daniel's prophecies in the person of Antiochus Epiphanes,<sup>16</sup> the messianic expectations of the devout were aroused. God was about to intervene! The kingdom was at hand! God's enemies were soon to be destroyed! And this not by the success of Hasmonean arms, but by the direct intervention of God. The immediate future would witness the destruction of the wicked and the salvation of God's people. The pious need only be patient, for the end was about to come. The message of the apocalyptic literature is addressed mainly to this expectation.

Out of this milieu of messianic expectation came the various parts of Enoch. Devout men, looking for the early intervention of God to establish His kingdom, wished to encourage their discouraged fellow Jews to steadfastness in view of the imminent end. How could they convey this message? The day of prophecy was over. Prophetic inspiration was no more. How could this conviction of an immediate deliverance be authoritatively imparted? The apocalyptic writings needed some authority by which they might authenticate themselves to the people. Thus arose the use of pseudonyms, the names of some of the ancient men of Israel long dead. Moses to whom God had given the Law and who was buried by the hand of God in an unmarked grave; Enoch who was translated to heaven; Ezra who led God's People back to the land from captivity; Baruch, faithful friend and amanuensis of Jeremiah who held an important place in Jewish legend;<sup>17</sup> these and other famous ancients lent their names to give weight to post-prophetic books of a prophetic character. Prophecy was dead; the canon was

<sup>16</sup>Cf. Daniel 8. The prophecy of the "Abomination of Desolation" of Daniel 9:27, 11:31, 12:11 was thought to be fulfilled by the profanation of the temple by Antiochus (cf. I Macc. 1:54 and Josephus, *Ant.* XII, v, 4).

<sup>17</sup>This is illustrated by the apocryphal book of Baruch. Cf. C. C. Torrey, *The Apocryphal Literature* (New Haven, 1945), pp. 59 ff.

closed. The one way a book could obtain substantial influence with the nation was to embody prophecies allegedly coming from one of the prophets or inspired writers.<sup>18</sup>

Into the mouth of the ancient patriarch or prophet, the author placed a prophecy of events which would ensue to the inauguration of the kingdom of God, what was thought to be near in the author's own time. This history, masquerading as prophecy, was portrayed in symbolic imagery in imitation of Daniel, but with this difference: whereas much of Daniel's symbolism is clear because it is interpreted in the book itself, the symbolism of the later apocalypses is usually fantastic and so obscure as to tax the interpreter's ability to find the intended application. In addition to such prophetic visions and dreams, the apocalyptic literature contains revelations of the secrets of heaven and sheol. In the hands of the apocalyptists, such visions became a set literary form and are often so wooden that they can hardly be thought to represent real visionary or ecstatic experiences.

A word is now pertinent as to the source of the books of Enoch and of the other Jewish apocalypses and the place which such books had in Jewish life. Do the views found in these books represent the beliefs of the Pharisees? Were Jesus and the disciples familiar with these expectations? Or were these books and their beliefs the product of isolated, unimportant groups and individuals who did not represent the normal life and thought of the first-century Jews? This

<sup>18</sup>This is the explanation for pseudonymity suggested by R. H. Charles (*A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life* [Second ed.; London, 1913], pp. 196-205) and usually followed. However, H. H. Rowley feels this to be inadequate and has suggested a different explanation which finds pseudonymity first attaching itself to the book of Daniel by accident (*The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, pp. 37 ff.). It is of great significance that neither the Revelation of John nor the book of Daniel are pseudonymous in the above sense, even for those who espouse the Maccabean date of Daniel. John, even according to liberal criticism, was a well-known personage in Asia and writes in his own name. Daniel, apart from the character in the canonical book, is a person of no significance in the Old Testament, whose name—and even this is contested—occurs only thrice (Ezekiel 14:14, 20, 28:5); a man so ignored in Jewish tradition that his very historicity is questioned by many critics. (Cf. Robert Dick Wilson, *Studies in the Book of Daniel* [New York, 1917], pp. 24-42). Such a pseudonym is certainly not of the same order as an Enoch, a Moses, or an Ezra.

question, which has great implications for New Testament study, has been vigorously and widely debated, and extreme differences of opinion are to be found among critical scholars. On the one hand, it is sometimes said that the period between 168 B.C. and 100 A.D. swarmed with eschatologists;<sup>19</sup> but on the other hand, it is maintained by students of the rabbinic tradition in Judaism that the apocalyptists played no more important role in the Jewish religious life as a whole than "the cabalistic combinations and chronological calculations of our own millenarians" play in the liberal Protestant tradition of contemporary America.<sup>20</sup> It must be frankly admitted that this problem cannot be solved with finality, because our sources are inadequate. We do not have evidence to prove that Jewry was swarming with apocalypses. On the other hand, the evidence which Moore cites to support his position, viz., the antipathy of the later rabbinic literature to the apocalyptic materials, is susceptible of adequate explanation on other grounds. R. H. Charles has shown that both apocalyptic and rabbinic Judaism stem from the same source of reverence for the Law.<sup>21</sup> It is safe to conclude that the apocalyptic ideas were quite widely known among the Jews, although they may have been particularly cherished and nurtured by individuals or groups whose interests led in this direction.

Much discussion has centered around the question of the circles from which the apocalypses arose. Some have held

<sup>19</sup>Cf. W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (Baltimore, 1946), p. 287. The assumption of the "Consistent Eschatology" of Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer is that Jesus' idea of the kingdom of God is practically identical with the sort of kingdom found in these apocalypses. "The thoroughgoing application of Jewish eschatology to the interpretation of the teaching and work of Jesus has created a new fact upon which to base the history of dogma. . . . The Gospel is at its starting-point exclusively Jewish-eschatological" (A. Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters* [English trans., London, 1912], p. ix).

<sup>20</sup>Cf. George Foot Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era* (Cambridge, 1944), I, 127.

<sup>21</sup>R. H. Charles, *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life* (Second ed.; London, 1913), pp. 193-96; *Religious Development Between the Old and the New Testaments* (London, 1914), pp. 33 ff. Charles' position that Christianity is the historical successor of apocalyptic Judaism as Rabbinic Judaism was the successor of legalistic Judaism merits a criticism which cannot here be given.



that the Essenes produced these books;<sup>22</sup> and although this view has not been very popular, it has recently received the able support of Professor Albright.<sup>23</sup> Jewish scholars and students of Rabbinics, taking as their point of departure the viewpoint of the later writings, insist that the apocalyptic writings could not have come from the rabbinical schools but must have arisen among the zealots.<sup>24</sup> The hostility of the later rabbinical schools to all of the "outside books" is well known.<sup>25</sup> It does not necessarily follow, however, that the Pharisees of New Testament times, nor especially the Chasidim (or Asideans)<sup>26</sup> of nearly two centuries earlier, maintained the same attitude. There is a great deal in our apocalyptic books which coincides with what we know about the Pharisees from other sources, particularly in the matter of reverence for the Law. Furthermore, it is difficult to believe that the outlook of such a sect would remain static for over a period of three centuries. Events of world-shaking importance (from the Jewish viewpoint) took place in the first century A.D., in the fall of the Jewish state and the rise of the Christian church. Such events must have exercised a strong influence upon Jewish life and outlook,<sup>27</sup> and the failure of the messianic revolt under Bar Cocheba in 133 A.D. must have brought disillusionment to the hopes expressed by the apocalyptic literature.<sup>28</sup>

We may conclude, therefore, that those who understand

<sup>22</sup>Cf. J. E. H. Thomson, "Apocalyptic Literature", I.S.B.E., I, 163-64; *Books Which Influenced Our Lord and His Apostles* (Edinburgh, 1891), pp. 76-109.

<sup>23</sup>W. F. Albright, *op. cit.*, pp. 287-90. Albright thinks that John the Baptist rose out of this milieu.

<sup>24</sup>Cf. R. Travers Herford, *Judaism in the New Testament Period* (London, 1928), pp. 11, 21, 111 and especially 126-27.

<sup>25</sup>Cf. G. H. Box, *The Ezra Apocalypse* (London, 1912), pp. lviii-lxi, 305-6 for a discussion of the relationship of apocalyptic to rabbinic Judaism.

<sup>26</sup>Cf. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity* (London, 1920), I, i, 87-89. Although Lake and Foakes Jackson are skeptical at this point, it is usually felt that the Chasidim were the predecessors of the Pharisees.

<sup>27</sup>Cf. V. H. Stanton, *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah* (Edinburgh, 1886), pp. 30 ff. for a forceful statement of this position.

<sup>28</sup>Cf. H. Wheeler Robinson in *A Companion to the Bible* (T. W. Manson, ed.; Edinburgh, 1939), pp. 307-8; F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, *op. cit.*, p. 361.

the apocalyptic literature to have arisen out of the circle of the devout Jews who were motivated by a strong love for the Law, and who expected the kingdom to be inaugurated by the miraculous intervention of God in fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies, rather than by the success of Hasmonean arms or by the revolts of the zealots, are sound in their judgment. The "righteous" of Enoch may well be the Chasidim of Maccabean times.<sup>29</sup>

The name of Enoch is associated with two apocalyptic books which concern us; but the two works have nothing in common except that they describe the experiences and journeys of Enoch after his translation to heaven. The two books are called I and II Enoch, or Ethiopic and Slavonic Enoch, because of the languages in which they have mainly been preserved. The later work, also called the Secrets of Enoch, will be treated toward the end of this series since it is one of the latest of the apocalypses.

Enoch is not a single book but a collection of books, some of which probably enjoyed an independent existence,<sup>30</sup> whose history cannot be recovered. One need only read the several parts of the apocalypse to be struck by the differences of subject matter. There seems to have been a cycle of tradition that clustered around the name of Enoch which assumed written form at various times and was compiled finally in the book as we have it; but when and by whom this compilation was made we cannot say. Critics have analyzed the book in many ways;<sup>31</sup> most recent criticism has followed Charles' division into five books as follows:<sup>32</sup>

I. The First Book. 1-36

A. Introduction. 1-5

B. The Fall of the Angels. 6-16

C. Enoch's Journeys through the Universe. 17-36

<sup>29</sup>Cf. F. M. Abel, *Les Livres des Maccabees* (Paris, 1949), p. 43.

<sup>30</sup>Otto Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament unter Einschluss der Apokryphen and Pseudepigraphen* (Tübingen, 1934), p. 674.

<sup>31</sup>Cf. R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford, 1912), pp. xxx-xlv for a brief survey of the most important critical inquiries.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. xlvi-lii. Cf. also R. H. Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times* (New York, 1949), pp. 76-77.

- II. The Second Book. The Parables or Similitudes. 37-71
- III. The Third Book. Astronomical Section. 72-82
- IV. The Fourth Book. Two Dream Visions. 83-90
  - A. The Vision of the Flood. 83-84
  - B. The Vision of the Seventy Shepherds. 85-90.
- V. The Fifth Book. 91-108
  - A. Introduction. 92:1-2, 91:1-11, 18-19<sup>33</sup>
  - B. The Apocalypse of Weeks. 93:1-14, 91:12-17
  - C. The Final Judgment. 94-104
  - D. Appendices. 105-108.

We shall describe the content of each book as we deal with the various concepts of the kingdom of God. The third book, which has to do with the courses of the heavenly of luminaries, has nothing of eschatological interest and so may be ignored for the present purpose.

Our composite book of Enoch was originally written in a Semitic tongue, but it is not clear whether it was Hebrew or Aramaic. The book in its original language has disappeared entirely from sight, though it has fortunately been preserved in part or in the whole, in other languages. Most of the Greek version has perished; only two substantial fragments have been preserved. One, discovered in 1886-1887 in a Christian tomb in upper Egypt at Akhmin and published in 1892, contains chapters 1:1-32:6 and may be found appended to the second section of Swete's Septuagint.<sup>34</sup> Chapters 97:7-107:3 have been edited and published from recently discovered Greek papyri by Campbell Bonner of the University of Michigan.<sup>35</sup> An imperfect Latin fragment of 106:1-18, discovered in the British Museum by M. R. James, points to a Latin version.

We are indebted to the Abyssinian Church for the preservation of Enoch in its entirety. In 1773 James Bruce, an

<sup>33</sup>The material seems to be in disarrangement here and the references, following Charles, indicate what appears to be the proper arrangement.

<sup>34</sup>H. B. Swete, ed.; *The Old Testament in Greek* (Second ed.; Cambridge, 1899), pp. 789-809.

<sup>35</sup>Campbell Bonner, ed.; *The Last Chapters of Enoch in Greek* (London, 1937).

English traveller, brought to Europe three manuscripts of Enoch in Ethiopic. The book was not made available to the English-speaking world until 1821, when Lawrence rendered Enoch into an English translation. The study of the Ethiopic text has passed through a long development; and it is to R. H. Charles, that we owe the definitive work of editing the majority of the 29 manuscripts known and of producing a critical text.<sup>36</sup> The standard English version has also been made by Charles and appears not only in his monumental edition of the *Pseudepigrapha*,<sup>37</sup> and in his commentary on Enoch,<sup>38</sup> but also in a convenient manual edition.<sup>39</sup>

It is very difficult to date the book of Enoch either in whole or in its parts. There are a few references to it in other Jewish apocryphal books. Charles lists a great many parallels from Jubilees, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Assumption of Moses, IV Ezra, and from various books of the New Testament, which he feels establish a broad dependence;<sup>40</sup> but we will be on firmer ground if we rely only on distinct references.

The book of Jubilees refers to Enoch's visions and heavenly journeys and to his astronomical and prophetic writings.<sup>41</sup> The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs which are written after the times of John Hyrcanus (135-104 B.C.)

<sup>36</sup>R. H. Charles, *The Ethiopic Versions of the Book of Enoch, Edited from Twenty Three Mss. Together with the Fragmentary Greek and Latin Versions* (Oxford, 1906).

<sup>37</sup>R. H. Charles, ed.; *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* (2 vols.; Oxford, 1913).

<sup>38</sup>*The Book of Enoch* (Oxford, 1912).

<sup>39</sup>R. H. Charles and W. O. E. Oesterley, edd.; *The Book of Enoch* (Translations of Early Documents). London, S.P.C.K., 1917; reissued in 1942.

<sup>40</sup>Cf. *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, II, 177-181.

<sup>41</sup>Cf. Jubilees 4:17-24, 10:17. Some scholars account for this obvious dependence on Enoch by positing an earlier lost book of Enoch, an ur-Enoch, from which our book is a later descendent. (Cf. W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* [Baltimore, 1946], p. 266, following Edward Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* [Stuttgart and Berlin., 1921], II, 46 f.) While as we have indicated the traditions incorporated in our Enoch may well involve a long history which we cannot recover, the supposition of an earlier work at this point is quite unnecessary. Cf. H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* [Second ed.; London, 1947], p. 88.

make nine direct references to Enoch, only three of which can be paralleled in our extant book.<sup>42</sup>

Two other definite chronological references appear. In the Similitudes 56:5, the angels bring divine judgment upon the Jews' enemies to the east, the Parthians and the Medes. Before 100 B.C., the great enemy of the Jews was Syria, and after the intrusion of Pompey in 64 it was Rome. During the intervening years the Parthians to the east were the most formidable pagan people, and the book at this point reflects the Jewish mind of that period.<sup>43</sup>

Again, in the second Dream Vision (which is found in chapters 85-90) the history of the world from Adam to the Messianic Kingdom is portrayed in symbols. The outline of history is recognizable and can be traced through the Exile, the Persian and Grecian periods to the Maccabean revolt against Antiochus Epiphanes, and perhaps to the events which immediately followed under the rule of the Has-moneans. This suggests a date for this section of the years following 168 B.C., but before the coming of Rome in 64 B.C. In the light of such data and in view of the internal evidence of the book as a whole relative to religious conditions within Jewish life, the books of Enoch are usually placed between the years 165 and 65 B.C., although it is always possible that the final compilation took place at a later date. However if Rome had entered into the fate of the Jewish hopes (as she did in 64 B.C.) before our book was compiled, it is difficult to feel that there would not occur some reflection of this fact.

One major objection has been raised to this date. In a

<sup>42</sup>Cf. *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, II, 179. The fact that there occur in the Testaments six references which we cannot find in our extant Enoch suggests not only were parts of our book known by 100 B.C., but that other traditions, probably in written form, associated with the name of Enoch (which are not preserved in our extant literature) were then known.

<sup>43</sup>Cf. R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, p. 109; E. Kautzsch, Hsgbr.; *Die Apokryphen and Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (Tübingen, 1900), II, 231.

number of earlier studies,<sup>44</sup> Enoch has been dated in Christian times because of the similarities of its messianic doctrine to Christian eschatological doctrine, especially in the Son of Man doctrine. Recent writers have at times maintained that the Son of Man passages are Christian interpolations and are not authentic. But while admitted similarities exist, there is one great difference which presents a decisive objection to the theory of Christian influence: there is no reference to the historical Jesus and to the incarnation.<sup>45</sup> The Enochian doctrine of the Son of Man can be adequately explained apart from any theory of Christian influence by understanding it to be an expansion of the reference to a heavenly Son of Man in Daniel 7:13.<sup>46</sup> The evidence points to a date in Hasmonean times, and not substantial objection militates against such a date.

Pasadena, California

<sup>44</sup>Cf. V. H. Stanton, *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah* (Edinburgh, 1886), pp. 62 ff.; James Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah* (London, 1877), pp. 49-73.

<sup>45</sup>Contrast the parallel situation in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs where there are admitted Christian interpolations: Simeon 6:7, Levi 16:3, Asher 7:3, Benjamin 3:8, 9:3-5, 10:7, 9.

<sup>46</sup>Glasson has recently questioned the pre-Christian date of the Similitudes and suggested a date in the middle of the first Christian century, but his reasoning is not forceful. Cf. T. Francis Glasson, *The Second Advent* (London, 1945), pp. 56-62.

*(To be continued)*

This material is cited with gracious permission from:

Dallas Theological Seminary  
3909 Swiss Ave.  
Dallas, TX 75204  
www.dts.edu

Please report any errors to Ted Hildebrandt at: [thildebrandt@gordon.edu](mailto:thildebrandt@gordon.edu)  
Thanks to Amy Gentile for help with proofing.