

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

Mr. Charles's Edition of the Book of Enoch.

BY THE REV. CANON T. K. CHEYNE, D.D., ROCHESTER.

THE attention of biblical scholars has for some time past been increasingly drawn to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, and not least to the Book of Enoch. This was due partly to general causes connected with the history of Old Testament criticism and theology, and partly to the publication by August Dillmann in 1851 of the first really scholarly edition of the Ethiopic version of Enoch, and in 1853 of the first satisfactory translation of the Ethiopic text with an admirable introduction and commentary. It was in fact (as Mr. Charles's bibliographical list sufficiently shows) the new light thrown upon Enoch by the linguistic, critical, and exegetical ability of that greatest of the pupils of Ewald which first enabled scholars to recognise and appreciate the real contents of that strange "book." A fresh impetus to the study of Enoch has quite lately been given by the discovery of a fragment of the Greek version of Enoch at Akhmim (near the east bank of the Nile, about 320 miles above Cairo), and by Mr. Charles's new critical edition, especially by the new readings communicated therein from Ethiopic manuscripts brought home from Abyssinia by our troops, and now stored up in our national museum. It is of Mr. Charles's edition that I have now to speak, with the reserve imposed upon me by the friendly personal relations to which he has referred. I leave it to others to give a general account of the book for popular purposes, and also to those who are competent for the task to give a full critical estimate of it from the points of view of Ethiopic scholarship, the higher criticism, and the history of religious ideas. My own purpose is merely to record some queries, suggestions, and observations which have occurred to me on making my first acquaintance with the book.

In spite of the great drawback of the loss of the original text, Mr. Charles thinks that tolerably definite results of "higher criticism" are attainable. A summary of his views is given in the general introduction, and a detailed justification in the special introduction to each part. One important result is the separation of chaps. i.-xxxvi. from lxxii.-c., which have generally been regarded as forming together the *Grundschrift* or foundation-

document. Mr. Charles supposes: (*a*) chaps. i.-xxxvi. to have been written at latest before 170 B.C.; (*b*) chaps. lxxii.-lxxviii., with lxxxii. and lxxix., to be an independent work of doubtful date; (*c*) chaps. lxxxiii.-xc. to have arisen between 166 and 161 B.C.; (*d*) chaps. xci.-civ. to have been written between 134 and 94 B.C. (or possibly 104 and 94); while (*e*) chaps. lxxx.-lxxxii. and chap. cv. are included by him among the numerous interpolations, mostly due to the editor of the "book." If the dates of (*a*) and (*c*) may be accepted, and Mr. Charles's argument seems to me careful and circumspect, we get a very interesting subject of inquiry, viz. the theological and literary relation between these two writings and the apocalypse of Daniel. Adopting Mr. Charles's date, the record called (*a*) confirms and justifies the impression derived from Dan. xii. 2, that in 164 (the date of Daniel) a doctrine of resurrection was by no means a novelty. I say "a doctrine of resurrection," because, as Mr. Charles points out, it is clear that the writer of (*a*) had assimilated "neither the thought of the immortality of the soul, nor the doctrine of the resurrection of the righteous to an eternal blessedness." His eschatological standpoint reminds us in fact strongly of Isa. lxxv. and lxxvi. But (*c*) becomes not a whit less interesting. Writing in 161 (we had better choose the latest possible year) the author naturally enough agrees with "Daniel" in his implied conception of the life of the righteous who have risen from their graves as eternal (see note on xc. 38).

There is not much to arrest attention in the interpolated passages, here called (*e*). In lxxxii. 9, however, as Dillmann has already pointed out, there is an interesting interpretation of Isa. lvii. i. The writer supposes the deaths of righteous men spoken of to be violent deaths, and to be caused by the divine judgments, the righteous suffering with the wicked owing to the solidarity of all members of the community. Among the arguments for the separate origin of chap. cv., Mr. Charles mentions that the phrase "children of earth," which in xci.-civ. is a synonym for the sinners or heathen, "has here a good ethical signification." A similar argument has been well offered by Duhm for the separate origin of Isa.

lvi. 2 (with its context, whether larger or smaller) as compared with li. 12, etc. In the same chapter we have the Lord's reference to the Messiah as "my Son." Mr. Charles sees no difficulty in this from the Messianic point of view of the writer. König, however (whose range of study is unusually wide), thinks that the phrase, "I and my Son will unite with thee for ever," goes beyond Jewish modes of expression (*Einleitung*, 1893, p. 497). My own judgment coincides with that of Mr. Charles and of his eminent predecessor Dillmann (whose note on En. cv. 2 should be consulted), and it is not unimportant to notice here that König goes astray (if I may be allowed to say so) on the much discussed question of the date of the Similitudes (chaps. xxxvii.-lxx. or lxxi.). This section, according to König, cannot be pre-Christian, cannot be the source of the title, "the Son of Man," applied to Himself by our Lord. In support of his view he refers to Hilgenfeld's article on this title in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1892, pp. 445 foll., which I regret not to have seen, but which is hardly likely to contain much that is new. Dillmann and Mr. Charles have, I should have thought, made any other view simply impossible, save that the Similitudes were written at any rate before 64 B.C.

The section called the Similitudes deserves to receive more attention from Christian theologians, both because of the nearness of its date to the time of Christ, and because of the parallelism between its conception of the Messiah (one of whose titles in the Similitudes is, of course, the Son of Man) and that found in the Gospels (including the Fourth). Mr. Charles gives us as much help as he could without entering into questions of Gospel criticism. I am myself surprised that he does not at any rate allude to such questions, except once (and then not very distinctly), with regard to Matt. xvi. 13, on which he mentions that the reading, "I, the Son of Man," is not in accordance with the earliest tradition (p. 316). In this connexion I may refer to Matt. xix. 28, though its parallel passage in Enoch does not occur in the Similitudes. It is natural to hold that the passage in Matthew is suggested by En. cviii. 12, but En. cviii. is obviously a later addition, and strongly Essenian in tone. Does not this favour the view that Matt. xix. 28 belongs to the accretions on our Lord's original prophecy of the Parousia? The point at

least requires consideration. Then, as to the Fourth Gospel, I do not notice that Mr. Charles refers to John viii. 58 as a saying of Christ, though one is bound to illustrate the passage by En. xlvi. 2; but he does refer to John v. 22, 27 for utterances of the Master. This appears to me slightly inconsistent with his critical attitude towards Enoch. I quite agree that John v. 22 is probably a reminiscence of En. lxix. 27. But I do not see that this at all confirms the authenticity of that saying. I find it difficult to believe that our Lord was so deeply influenced by Enoch as this reminiscence would imply. I am even inclined to doubt whether He adopted the title "the Son of Man" quite as often as an uncritical reader of the Synoptic Gospels would suppose. Matt. xvi. 13 can hardly be the only passage in which this title has been inserted by a later editor.

The preceding remarks do but touch the fringe of a great question, which is nothing less than this, How far is it possible or probable that admiring students of the Book of Enoch interfered with and, however unintentionally, marred the earliest traditional sayings of the Master. The question may come up again in this country later; a reserve which is perfectly intelligible has held back our best scholars from critical inquiries which are nevertheless inevitable, and, as some think, are desirable in order to a "return to Christ." The parallelism between many New Testament statements on the world of the dead and statements of the Book of Enoch is especially striking, and grave critical questionings are suggested thereby. No one, I hope, would be so foolish as to suppose that Enoch is a key that will fit all locks; indeed, Enoch, in its several parts, is but an expression of tendencies of various origin. Among the influences which possibly produced these tendencies, Mr. Charles more than once mentions Zoroastrian ones. His remarks, of course, imply a critical view of Zoroastrianism—he would not permit himself to quote Zoroastrian tenets which can be shown to be due to late Jewish influence. In this attitude, he is at one with the best contemporary German criticism; nor must we too quickly give way to the radical criticism of Darmesteter, any more than we give way (in the Old Testament field) to the radical criticism of another eminent Jewish scholar, directed like Darmesteter's against German criticism, Isidore Loeb. Mr. Charles is one of

those who, in the future, will probably contribute most to the settlement of these New Testament questions. He is well aware that though his book has suggested my queries, there is underlying them that "higher criticism" of the Gospels which, though as yet very incomplete, is yet none the less real and important because in our conservative land it has been so much ignored or depreciated.

I will not trouble my readers with the thoughts on the development of New Testament doctrine (e.g. on the Parable of Dives and Lazarus) which have occurred to me in examining Mr. Charles's book; Enoch will be found extremely suggestive, and may open up some fresh questions to English students. It may indeed be startling to find that these inquiries lead to results which to many will appear worthier ones than some which accord better with a conservative view of biblical inspiration. Students who strongly hold, on historical and psychological grounds, to the uniqueness of Jesus Christ's person will sometimes be greatly tried at being drawn (whether permanently or only for a time) to a critical view which may be uncongenial to older scholars. We must be tolerant to each other, remembering that the great churches of our land, if they are not to sink into mere sects, must be theologically comprehensive, and place a generous confidence in theological students.

That I may not be too eulogistic, I venture to add a few slight criticisms. The appendix on the title "the Son of Man" (taken together with the notes on En. xlvi. 1, 3) is helpful, both in its criticisms and in the positive view to which these criticisms lead (see p. 316). But the excessive space given to Mr. J. V. Bartlet's theory (see *Expositor*, December 1892, and compare EXPOSITORY TIMES, June 1893), leads me to remark that Mr. Carpenter's appendix on the title referred to (*The Synoptic Gospels*, ed. i. pp. 372-388) had perhaps a prior claim to be mentioned, especially as it has contributed an important element to Mr. Bartlet's theory. On page 62 I notice an incautious statement, made on the authority of Delitzsch, to the

effect that the words in Gen. vi. 1 "are to be taken as belonging to a very early myth of Persian origin." I had forgotten this assertion of Delitzsch, nor have I here any books available for criticising it, but I have no doubt that it is erroneous. On page 87 I find it stated that "these chapters (xviii., xix.) are entirely foreign to the rest of the section," and "are full of Greek elements"; on page 93, that chap. xxii. contains a view of Sheol which agrees, in one point at least, with Greek and Egyptian ideas. I do not, however, find any comprehensive theory respecting the amount of Greek influence on the writers of Enoch; this will doubtless come in the historical Treatise on Eschatology which we are led to expect. On page 99 a reference might have been made to the startling Septuagint addition (accepted recently by Klostermann) to the text of Isa. lxx. 22. The author of the addition (which is plainly unsuitable) presumably knew Enoch. On page 130 ("worms their bed") I would rather have now compared Isa. xiv. 11, Job xxi. 26. On page 265 or 291 Mr. Charles might have mentioned my theory that Ps. xlix. "is incidentally (as can be shown by the allusions of later writers) a protest against the old Hebrew notion of Sheol, on the ground that this notion conduces to the selfish tyranny of the rich, by which the psalmist and many other good Israelites are sufferers" (*The Origin of the Psalter*, pp. 381, 382; cf. pp. 412, 413).

I venture to conclude with a recommendation to the student of Mr. Charles's *Book of Enoch* to begin at Section xi. of the general introduction, "On the influence of Enoch on Jewish and Patristic Literature and on the New Testament, in Phraseology, Ideas, and Doctrines." I may mention that in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, for July 1893, he will find the introduction to a translation by Mr. Charles of the *Book of Jubilees* (on which see Dr. Drummond's *Jewish Messiah*) from a text based on two hitherto uncollated Ethiopic MSS. This, it is already evident, will represent a revised text greatly superior to that published by the great August Dillmann in 1859.