

RICHARD BAUCKHAM

The Jewish World
around the New Testament

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament*

233

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament

Herausgeber / Editor
Jörg Frey (München)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors
Friedrich Avemarie (Marburg)
Judith Gundry-Volf (New Haven, CT)
Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL)

233



Richard Bauckham

The Jewish World
around the New Testament

Collected Essays I

Mohr Siebeck

RICHARD BAUCKHAM, born 1946; 1973 PhD University of Cambridge, England; 1977–87 Lecturer in the History of Christian Thought, 1987–92 Reader in the History of Christian Thought, University of Manchester, England; 1992–2007 Professor of New Testament Studies, St Mary's College, St Andrews University, Scotland; now emeritus Professor, St Andrews University, and Senior Scholar, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-151522-4

ISBN 978-3-16-149614-1

ISSN 0512-1604 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© 2008 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by Martin Fischer in Tübingen, printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. The Martyrdom of Enoch and Elijah: Jewish or Christian? | 3 |
| 3. Enoch and Elijah in the Coptic Apocalypse of Elijah | 27 |
| 4. The Rise of Apocalyptic | 39 |
| 5. The Delay of the Parousia | 65 |
| 6. A Note on a Problem in the Greek Version of 1 Enoch 1. 9. | 89 |
| 7. The Son of Man: ‘A Man in my Position’ or ‘Someone’? | 93 |
| 8. The Apocalypses in the New Pseudepigrapha | 103 |
| 9. Pseudo-Apostolic Letters | 123 |
| 10. Kainam the Son of Arpachshad in Luke’s Genealogy | 151 |
| 11. The List of the Tribes of Israel in Revelation 7. | 161 |
| 12. The Parting of the Ways: What Happened and Why. | 175 |
| 13. The Messianic Interpretation of Isaiah 10:34 | 193 |
| 14. The Relevance of Extra-Canonical Jewish Texts to New Testament Study | 207 |
| 15. Josephus’ Account of the Temple in Contra Apionem 2.102–109 | 221 |
| 16. Life, Death, and the Afterlife in Second Temple Judaism | 245 |
| 17. What if Paul had Travelled East rather than West? | 257 |
| 18. Covenant, Law and Salvation in the Jewish Apocalypses | 269 |
| 19. The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts. | 325 |
| 20. Paul and Other Jews with Latin Names in the New Testament | 371 |
| 21. The Horarium of Adam and the Chronology of the Passion | 393 |
| 22. The Spirit of God in us Loathes Envy (James 4:5). | 421 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 23. Tobit as a Parable for the Exiles of Northern Israel. | 433 |
| 24. The Continuing Quest for the Provenance of Old Testament Pseudepigrapha | 461 |
| Particulars of First Publication | 485 |
| Index of Scriptures and Other Ancient Writings | 487 |
| Index of Ancient Persons | 532 |
| Index of Modern Authors | 538 |
| Index of Place Names | 546 |

1. Introduction

Most New Testament scholars would now agree that the New Testament writings belong wholly within the Jewish world of their time. However much some may be in serious conflict with other Jewish groups, these disagreements take place within the Jewish world. Even New Testament works authored by and/or addressed to non-Torah-observant Gentile Christians still move within the Jewish world of ideas. Their God is unequivocally the God of Israel and of the Jewish Scriptures that they treat as self-evidently their own. Jesus for them is the Messiah of Israel and the Messiah also for the nations only because he is the Messiah of Israel. This is not to deny the obvious influence of the non-Jewish Greco-Roman world in which the New Testament writings also belong, but that influence was felt right across the Jewish world in varying ways and to varying degrees. The most profound influence of Hellenistic thought in the Jewish world of the first century CE is to be found, not in the New Testament, but in Philo of Alexandria, such that it was Philo, more than any of the New Testament writers, who prepared the way for the kind of profound engagement with Hellenistic philosophy that later Christian scholars, such as Clement of Alexandria and Origen, pursued.

The essays collected in this volume were written over the course of thirty years of study of the New Testament and early Judaism, and their topics are quite diverse, but they all share that basic perspective on the historical place of the New Testament writings within late Second Temple Judaism. In an essay I wrote to introduce students and beginning scholars to the relevance of extra-canonical Jewish literature to the study of the New Testament (chapter 14 in this volume) I said: 'The NT student and scholar must use the Jewish literature in the first place to understand Judaism. Only someone who understands early Judaism for its own sake will be able to use Jewish texts appropriately and accurately in the interpretation of the NT.' Accordingly the present volume includes some essays that make no or only passing reference to the New Testament but are intended as contributions to the understanding of Second Temple Judaism and its literature: these include chapters 15 (on Josephus), 16 (on Jewish beliefs about death and afterlife), 18 (on the Jewish apocalypses), and 23 (on the book of Tobit). Most of the

essays in this volume relate some part or feature of the New Testament to the literature, religion or life of Jews in that period.

The main literary sources for late Second Temple Judaism are the Apocrypha, Old Testament pseudepigrapha, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the works of Josephus and Philo. Rabbinic literature, though of much later date, can be relevant when used with caution, and we should not forget that the New Testament itself is evidence of the Judaism of its period, not only in the sense that the early Christian movement from which it comes was itself Jewish, but also in the sense that it refers to other forms and aspects of the Judaism of its period. As well as the literary sources, there is also documentary and epigraphic material, both from Palestine and from the Diaspora. Among these sources, these essays make most use (besides the New Testament) of the Apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, which have long been my special interest, though many of the essays do also refer to and discuss other sources. Among the sources, the most problematic as evidence for late Second Temple Judaism are the rabbinic literature, because of its date, and the so-called Old Testament pseudepigrapha. I do not say 'the Pseudepigrapha' because, unlike the Apocrypha, these are not a defined body of literature with even approximately agreed boundaries, but an indefinite category. While some of these writings can be conclusively shown to be early Jewish writings, the fact that most of them are known only from manuscripts of Christian provenance means that, not only is their date often hard to determine, but also whether they are of Christian or Jewish origin may be more debatable than some scholars have assumed. It is interesting that this issue of the Jewish or Christian provenance, either of Old Testament pseudepigrapha themselves or of traditions they transmit, is common to both the first and the last of the essays in this collection, showing that this is an issue of which I have long been aware. In chapter 21 I provide new arguments for the Jewish provenance of a text generally thought to be most likely of Christian origin.

The essays appear in the chronological order of their original publication, except that chapter 3 belongs so obviously with chapter 2 that I thought it best to place it out of chronological order. There is not much in these essays on which I have significantly changed my mind. Chapter 4 covers a large topic on which much has been written since I wrote it, but the most important point that would be different if I were to write it now is that I would not use the term 'apocalyptic' to refer to a kind of eschatology or a set of ideas, but only in a literary sense with reference to the literary genre apocalypse. To chapters 2 and 20 I have added appendices updating my treatments with reference to subsequently published information and discussion, but it would have been impractical to do this in other cases.

Special thanks are due to Patrick Egan, who compiled the indices.

2. The Martyrdom of Enoch and Elijah: Jewish or Christian?*

From the standpoint of biblical theology “the establishment of the date of the apocalyptic tradition of the martyrdom of the returning of Elijah is of great importance” (J. Jeremias).¹ Almost all references to the martyrdom of the returning Elijah are to be found in early Christian literature and are references to the joint martyrdom of Elijah and Enoch at the hands of Antichrist:² the question of the origin of this Christian tradition of the martyrdom of Enoch and Elijah has, therefore, been regarded as a major line of inquiry in the search for a pre-Christian Jewish tradition of the martyrdom of Elijah. W. Bousset in 1895 sifted early Christian traditions about Antichrist to reconstruct a pre-Christian tradition which included the return of Enoch and Elijah to denounce Antichrist and to suffer martyrdom.³ But texts of some importance to the question have come to light only since Bousset wrote, including the relevant section of the Coptic Apocalypse of Elijah, on which Jeremias’s case for a pre-Christian tradition of Elijah’s martyrdom depends heavily. This article is an attempt to reexamine the origins of the Christian tradition of the martyrdom of Enoch and Elijah. To facilitate this a diagrammatic analysis of the relevant texts is included.

The table lists only motifs which occur in more than one of the texts. The texts (which include several that were unavailable to Bousset) are:

- (A) Rev 11:3–13.
- (B) Coptic *Apocalypse of Elijah* (in G. Steindorff, *Die Apokalypse des Elias* [TU 17/3 a; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1899]).
- (C) Ethiopic *Apocalypse of Peter*, chap. 2 (tr. in E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher (eds.), *New Testament Apocrypha* [ed. R. McL. Wilson; London: Lutterworth, 1965], 2. 669).
- (D) Tertullian, *De anima* 50.

* First publication: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95 (1976) 447–458.

¹ *TDNT* 2 (1964) 941.

² Jeremias (*TDNT* 2 [1964] 941 n. 106) cites one rabbinic reference to Elijah’s death. For the death of Elijah in Lactantius and Commodian, see n. 19 below.

³ *The Antichrist Legend* (London: Hutchinson, 1896 [German original, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895]) 203–11. – The term “Antichrist” is strictly anachronistic with reference to *Jewish* literature, but for convenience I have used it throughout this article with reference to both Jewish and Christian concepts of an eschatological adversary.

- (E) Hippolytus, *De Antichristo* 43, 46–47; In *Danielem*, 35, 50.
- (F) *Acts of Pilate* 25 (Greek text in L. F. K. Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha* [Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1876] 331; Latin text, *ibid.* 404–5).
- (G) Ephraem Syrus, *Sermo de fine extremo* (in T. J. Lamy [ed.], *Sancti Ephraem Syri hymni et sermones* 3 [Mechlin: Dessain, 1889] 207–10).
- (H) Ephraem “Graecus,” *Sermo in adventum Domini* (in J. S. Assemani [ed.], *Sancti Ephraem Syri opera omnia quae exstant* [Rome: Salvioni, 1746], 3. 141–42).
- (I) Ps.-Ephraem “Latinus,” *Sermo de fine mundi* (in C. P. Caspari, *Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten* [Christiania: Malling, 1890] 219).
- (J) Ps.-Hippolytus, *De consummatione mundi* 21 (in P. A. Lagarde [ed.], *Hippolyti Romani quae feruntur omnia graece* [Leipzig: Teubner, 1858] 104–5).
- (K) Ps.-Hippolytus, *De consummatione mundi* 29 (*ibid.*, 111).
- (L) Ps.-Methodius, *Revelationes* 14 (Greek text in A. Vassiliev, *Anecdota graeco-byzantina* [Moscow: Imperial University, 1893] 38; Latin text in E. Sackur, *Sibyllinische Texte und Forschungen* [Halle: Niemeyer, 1898], 95–96).
- (M) *Visio Danielis* (Greek) (in A. Vassiliev, *Anecdota*, 43).
- (N) Ps.-Methodius, *Révélations* 6 (Syriac) (tr. in F. Naum, *Révélations et légendes* [Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1917] 31).
- (O) Syriac (Clementine) *Apocalypse of Peter* (tr. in E. Bratke, “Handschriftliche Überlieferung und Bruchstücke der arabisch-aethiopischen Petrus-Apokalypse,” *ZWT* 36/1 [1893] 471–72).
- (P) Ethiopic (Clementine) *Apocalypse of Peter* (tr. in E. Bratke, “Handschriftliche Überlieferung,” 483).
- (Q) Latin *Tiburtine Sibyl* (in E. Sackur, *Sibyllinische Texte*, 186).
- (R) Greek *Tiburtine Sibyl* (in P. S. Alexander, *The Oracle of Baalbek* [Dumbarton Oaks Studies 10; Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library, 1967] 22).
- (S) *Apocalypse of Ps.-Shenoute* (in E. Amélineau, *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique française au Caire (1885–1886)* 4/1 [Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1888] 345).
- (T) Bohairic *History of Joseph* 31–32 (tr. in F. Robinson, *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels* [Texts and Studies 4/2; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1896] 146–47; Arabic in J. K. Thilo, *Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti* [Leipzig: Vogel, 1832] 58–61).
- (U) *Apocalypse of Ps.-John* 8 (in L. F. K. Tischendorf, *Apocalypses apocryphae* [Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1866] 77).
- (V) Syriac *Apocalypse of Ezra* (tr. in F. Baethgen, “Beschreibung der syrischen Handschrift ‘Sachau 131’ auf der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin,” *ZAW* 6 [1886] 209).
- (W) Adso, *Libellus de Antichristo* (in E. Sackur, *Sibyllinische Texte*, 111–12).
- (Y) Adso, *Libellus de Antichristo* (longer text) (in *PL* 90: 1186).

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | Y |
|-----------------------------------|---|------------------|---|---|---|------------------|---|---|----------------|------------------|---|---|---|---|----------------|---|---|---|---|----------------|---|---|---|---|
| Explicit quotation of Rev 11 | | | | x | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | x |
| Enoch and Elijah | | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x ⁴ | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | | x | x | x ⁵ | x | x | x | x |
| Elijah and Enoch | | x | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | |
| witnesses | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| prophets | x | | | | | | x | x | x | x | | | | | | | | | | x | | | x | x |
| descend | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | |
| fight Antichrist | | x | | | | | x | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | |
| preach repentance | x | | | | | x | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| plague enemies | x | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| expose Antichrist | | x | x | | | | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Antichrist enraged | | x | | | | | x | | | | x | x | x | x | x | | | | | x | | | | |
| figures them | x | x | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x |
| conquers them | x | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| kills them | x | x | | | | (x) ⁶ | x | x | x | (x) ⁷ | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| on the altar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x |
| bodies lie unburied | x | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | |
| 3½ days | x | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | x ⁸ | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 days | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x |
| 4 days | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| in the streets of Jerusalem | x | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | |
| the great city | x | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| everyone sees them | x | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| they rise | x | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x |
| are raised by Michael and Gabriel | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| renewed conflict with Antichrist | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ascend to heaven | x | (x) ⁹ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| in the sight of all | x | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| destroy Antichrist | | | | | | (x) ⁶ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x |

⁴ Ps.-Hippolytus 21 adds John.

⁵ *History of Joseph* (Arabic) adds “Schila” and Tabitha.

⁶ Tertullian: “They are reserved to die, so that they may extinguish Antichrist with their blood.”

⁷ There is a gap in the MS.

⁸ Tischendorf’s Latin text has 3½ days; his Greek text 3 days.

⁹ Is it not quite clear that the *Apocalypse of Elijah* intends to describe an ascension: “They will raise cries of joy towards heaven, they will shine, and all the people and the whole world will see them.”

The date and interrelationships of many of these texts have not been established and cannot be on the basis of examining only this one element of the eschatological traditions they share. But it is important to notice that none of the texts F–Y may be dated before the fourth century¹⁰ and many are much later. Undoubtedly, eschatological traditions in early and medieval Christianity were transmitted in relatively stable forms; the same apocalyptic texts were frequently updated and adapted to new circumstances, and late texts are therefore by no means worthless evidence of early tradition. But they must nevertheless be used with care in attempts to investigate the origins of traditions. Since it is rarely possible to prove that a tradition did *not* exist at an earlier date than the evidence attests, the temptations to project traditions further back than the evidence warrants must be painstakingly resisted.

Of the pre-fourth-century texts, there is, of course, no doubt of the date of Tertullian and Hippolytus. The *Apocalypse of Peter* dates from the early second century, but we shall see that the Ethiopic version's reference to Enoch and Elijah may not belong to the original apocalypse. The *Apocalypse of Elijah* is even more problematic. It has commonly been regarded as a third- or fourth-century Christian redaction of early Jewish material,¹¹ and most scholars have thought that its account of Enoch and Elijah is dependent on the account of the two witnesses in Revelation 11,¹² though perhaps also embodying independent Jewish tradition. Jeremias thought that a Jewish tradition of the martyrdom of Elijah could probably be discerned beneath the Christian redaction,¹³ but much more confident of the Jewish provenience of the work is J.-M. Rosenstiehl.¹⁴ He regards it as substantially an Essene work of the first century B. C., expanded in chap. 2 by another Jewish author of the third century A. D. Its account of the return of Enoch and Elijah he regards as wholly Jewish and pre-Christian, related to Revelation 11 only *via* a common source.

¹⁰ An earlier date for the *Acts of Pilate* has sometimes been advocated, but G. C. O'Ceallaigh ("Dating the Commentaries of Nicodemus," *HTR* 56 [1963] 21–58) has demonstrated a *terminus post quem* at 555 for the earliest part (Part I) of the work. The Descent into Hell (which includes chap. 25) is later.

¹¹ E. Schürer, review of Steindorff's edition, *TLZ* 24 (1899) 7–8; W. Bousset, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Eschatologie," *ZKG* 20 (1899) 103–12; H. Weinel, "Die spätere christliche Apokalypstik," *EYXAPIETHPION: Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments* (Gunkel Festschrift; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923), 2. 164–66.

¹² E. g., D. Haugg, *Die Zwei Zeugen: Eine exegetische Studie über Apok 11, 1–13* (NTAbh 17/1; Münster: Aschendorf, 1936) 94; M. Black, "Servant of the Lord and Son of Man," *SJT* 6 (1953) 10 n. 1; W. Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition* (SNTSMS 7; London/New York: Cambridge University, 1968) 14 n. 1.

¹³ *TDNT* 2 (1964) 939–41.

¹⁴ *L'Apocalypse d'Elie* (Paris: Geuthner, 1972).

Rosenstiehl's arguments do not carry complete conviction.¹⁵ A final conclusion as to the date of the *Apocalypse of Elijah* can only be reached after a fuller study of the traditions it contains, and since the present inquiry is part of such study the question of date must be regarded as still open. Initially, however, we may notice from the table that the *Apocalypse of Elijah*'s account of Enoch and Elijah obviously has close affinities not only with Revelation 11 but also with the Christian tradition of the fourth century onwards. These affinities provide the obvious indications of date, and we shall require strong evidence for dating as early as the first century B.C. a tradition which is otherwise attested for the fourth century and later but not before. It should also be noticed that the undoubtedly strongly Jewish character of the *Apocalypse of Elijah* need not mean that it always preserves *pre-Christian* Jewish tradition. Some of its striking points of contact with Jewish apocalyptic are not with extant pre-Christian apocalyptic but with the so-called Neo-Hebraic apocalyptic of the Christian era.¹⁶ It is probable that a two-way traffic in apocalyptic traditions between Judaism and Christianity continued long after the first century,¹⁷ and not beyond possibility that a Jewish tradition of the martyrdom of Enoch and Elijah could have resulted from the influence of Christian traditions based on Revelation 11.

J. Munck, in a survey of many of the texts included in the table, argued, against Bousset and Jeremias, that there was no Christian tradition of the return of Enoch and Elijah independent of Revelation 11 and therefore no evidence of a pre-Christian tradition of their martyrdom. Revelation 11, subjected to a mistaken exegesis by such writers as Hippolytus and Ps.-Hippolytus, gave rise to the whole Christian tradition of the return of Enoch and Elijah.¹⁸ In his major contention that the *martyrdom* of Enoch and Elijah is a tradition deriving from exegesis of Revelation 11, we shall see that Munck was probably correct. But it is less likely that *all* aspects of the tradition derive from Revelation 11.

An expectation of the return of Enoch and Elijah is attested in pre-Christian Judaism, though much more rarely than the expectation of Elijah alone. 4 Ezra 6:26 expects the appearance of those who had not died (cf. 7:28; 13:52), but doubtless means not only Enoch and Elijah, for Jewish writers of this period exalted others (Moses, Baruch, Ezra) to the privilege of escaping death. But 1 *Enoch* 90:31 does seem to refer to the return of

¹⁵ See some critical comments in a review by P.M. Parvis, *JTS* 24 (1973) 588–89.

¹⁶ This is especially true of the description of Antichrist: see J.-M. Rosenstiehl, "Le portrait de l'Antichrist," *Pseudépigraphe de l'Ancien Testament et manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1967), 1. 45–60.

¹⁷ Cf. M. Bittenwieser, *Outline of the Neo-Hebraic Apocalyptic Literature* (Cincinnati: Jennings and Pye, 1901) 1.

¹⁸ *Petrus und Paulus in der Offenbarung Johannis* (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde og Bagger, 1950) 81–118.

Enoch and Elijah specifically, probably at a period when only these two were thought to have escaped death. The survival of this tradition in Christianity and its lack of attestation in Judaism ought perhaps to be associated with the popularity of the Enoch literature in some early Christian circles and its corresponding lapse from favor in Judaism. Certainly early Christian writers tended to regard Enoch and Elijah as the only two who had escaped death (Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 5.5.1; cf. 4 Ezra 1:39; *Apocalypse of Paul* 20).

If early Christian writers took over from Judaism the expectation that Enoch and Elijah would return to earth before the Judgment, it is not so clear that they took over specific functions that the two were to perform. In *1 Enoch* 90:31 they appear to have no function. Among Christian writers Hippolytus at least seems to have used no extra-scriptural traditions except the mere expectation of Enoch and Elijah's return. His accounts are closely dependent on Revelation 11 and he does little more than identify the two witnesses as Enoch and Elijah: his explanation that they are to be martyred "because they will not give glory to Antichrist" (*De Antichristo* 47) is surely an intelligent deduction from the text rather than a sign of the influence of independent tradition. But it is noteworthy that he apparently found it unnecessary to argue for his identification of the witnesses: he cites Mal 4:5–6 for the return of Elijah but seems to regard as unquestionable the identification of the second witness as Enoch. Arguably, once one witness had been identified as Elijah, Enoch's claim to be the other was obvious, for these were the two men who had not died. But it is more probable that an existing tradition of the return of Enoch with Elijah influenced Hippolytus' exegesis. Lactantius and Commodian show attempts to interpret Revelation 11 in the light of an alternative tradition of the return of Elijah alone,¹⁹ and patristic authors who gave close attention to the text of Revelation 11 were quite capable, like modern scholars, of finding that the characteristics of the two witnesses in 11:5–6 recall Elijah and Moses and Jeremiah but not Enoch.²⁰ The identification with Elijah *and Enoch* was not obvious from the text, and its prevalence in the early church must probably be explained by reference to an independent tradition of the return of Enoch and Elijah in the light of which Revelation 11 was interpreted.

The tradition in most of the texts other than Hippolytus goes further than naming Enoch and Elijah in its divergence from Revelation 11. At least from the time of Ephraem Syrus, the tradition seems to assume an independent

¹⁹ Lactantius (*Inst.* 7,17) and Commodian (*Carmen de duobus populis* 833–64) are both patently dependent on Rev 11:3–13, but Lactantius speaks only of one figure, Elijah, and Commodian speaks first of Elijah alone (833, 839, 850) and then of *prophetae* (856–62). The tradition of the return of Elijah alone also appears in Justin, *Dial.* 49; *Sib. Or.* 2:187; Tertullian, *De resurrectione* 22; *De anima* 25.

²⁰ Hilarius, *In Matt.* 20:10 (PL 9.1032); Victorinus, *In Apoc.* 11:5 (PL 5.334).

life of its own, so that the story as told in most of the texts bears little resemblance to the story of the two witnesses, and only in a few cases (J, W) does it appear that the writer himself made any reference to the text of Revelation 11. In terms of the motifs listed in the table, there are two accounts (C, N) which have no point of contact at all with Revelation 11, and one (H) which coincides only in describing the two as prophets. All the others agree with Revelation 11 at least in recounting the martyrdom, but six of these (D, L, M, T, U, V) coincide with Revelation 11 only at this point, and three (G, P, R) only at this point and at the resurrection. It is true that most of the accounts are much briefer than Rev 11:3–13; but this only highlights the significance in the tradition of recurrent motifs which are not found at all in Revelation 11. The idea that the purpose of Enoch and Elijah's mission is to expose Antichrist's deceits is found in sixteen of the texts (B, C, G, H, I, J, K, L, N, O, P, S, T, U, W, Y), while the motifs of Antichrist's rage against Enoch and Elijah occur in seven texts (B, G, L, M, O, R, S). Other features clearly not derived from Revelation 11 are found occasionally: Enoch and Elijah come to fight Antichrist (B, F, N, R), they are put to death on the altar (U, V), they are raised by Michael and Gabriel (G, P), their conflict with Antichrist continues after their resurrection (B, S), and they finally destroy Antichrist (B, N, S). The tradition is by no means uniform, and the omission of some motifs is doubtless often determined by the nature of the context or a desire for brevity; but most of the texts given in the table recount the return of Enoch and Elijah in the context of a sequential prophecy of the events of the last days and may, therefore, be expected to convey what was regarded as the main point of the tradition. Only a few of the texts (D, F, T) are in the nature of more incidental allusions. Therefore the degree of divergence from Revelation 11 and the recurrent prominence of motifs not derived from Revelation 11 is striking.

The point of most consistent divergence is the purpose of the mission of Enoch and Elijah. The two witnesses in Rev 11:3–13 are preachers of repentance; they are not represented as preaching against Antichrist specifically; they encounter Antichrist only when their witness is completed. In the Enoch and Elijah tradition, almost without exception,²¹ the two prophets are sent against Antichrist, after his reign has begun. This may mean that they are the instruments of his destruction (B, D, N, S), but it most commonly means that they expose him as an imposter. They denounce him either to his face or to the people or both, and this is what provokes his rage and their

²¹ The exceptions are Hippolytus, who follows Revelation 11 closely; the Latin *Tiburtime Sibyl* (Q), where the mission of Enoch and Elijah is "to announce the Lord's coming"; and the Syriac *Apocalypse of Ezra* (V), which has no reference to the purpose of their coming. Adso – and thence the whole Western medieval tradition – gives them the additional role of converting the Jews to Christianity.

martyrdom. The fact that some accounts (B, G, H, K, O) give details of the verbal exchange between Antichrist and the two prophets illustrates the prominence of this theme in the tradition. Sometimes the people at large are convinced by this exposure of the false Messiah (L), sometimes the faithful are encouraged or reclaimed (I, W, Y), sometimes “few believe” (H).

It is clear, therefore, that Bousset was correct in drawing attention to the characteristics of the Enoch and Elijah tradition which distinguish it from Revelation 11. But his conclusion, that such texts as K, L, U, V represent substantially a pre-Christian Jewish tradition uninfluenced by Revelation 11, was too hasty.²² According to Bousset the pre-Christian tradition was that Enoch and Elijah would return to denounce Antichrist and would be slain by him. The motif of resurrection after three days he regarded as originating in Revelation 11 and appearing only in texts influenced by Revelation 11.²³ In fact, it is very doubtful whether the resurrection can be regarded as a secondary addition to a tradition which already included the martyrdom. It seems, on the contrary, that the resurrection has dropped out of the tradition in those texts which conclude the story with martyrdom, just as the ascension has been omitted by almost all the texts which include the resurrection. There are some texts evidently dependent on Revelation 11 which omit both resurrection and ascension (E, J, W), and in many cases the motive for such an omission is clear. In most of the texts the account of the last days has been compressed so that the general resurrection follows swiftly upon the martyrdom of Enoch and Elijah, and their individual resurrection becomes redundant.²⁴ In other cases, (D, T) the allusion to the tradition is in order to make a particular point which depends on the martyrdom, not the resurrection.²⁵ If there was a pre-Christian tradition, it must either have included both martyrdom and resurrection or have included neither.

Those who, like Rosenstiehl, regard the account in the *Apocalypse of Elijah* as Jewish will argue that there was a Jewish tradition of both martyrdom and resurrection. It is much more probable that both features entered the tradition from Revelation 11. Apart from the debatable case of the *Apocalypse of Elijah* and the brief reference of Tertullian, the martyrdom is attested before the fourth century only in Hippolytus, who quite clearly derived it from Revelation 11. Thus two centuries before the texts from which Bousset constructed a pre-Christian tradition, Christians were iden-

²² *Antichrist Legend*, 208–9.

²³ *Ibid.*, 209–10.

²⁴ It is interesting to note that in *Acts of Pilate* 25 the resurrection and ascension of Enoch and Elijah are related in the language of 1 Thes 4:17, thereby assimilating them to the general resurrection and rapture of the saints.

²⁵ Munck has argued at length that there was never a tradition of martyrdom without resurrection (*Petrus und Paulus*, 100–109).

tifying Enoch and Elijah with the two witnesses of Revelation 11. It would be surprising if the later tradition showed no influence from Revelation 11, and such influence is surely responsible for the near unanimity of the texts in expecting the martyrdom of Enoch and Elijah.

A more profitable approach to the question of pre-Christian tradition is to examine those three texts (C, H, N) which are remarkable for *not* mentioning the martyrdom.²⁶ These texts are the most dissimilar from Revelation 11 and the most likely to reflect entirely independent tradition. One of them, chap. 2 of the Ethiopic version of the *Apocalypse of Peter*, would be the earliest Christian reference to the return of Enoch and Elijah, if it could be shown to be part of the original early second-century apocalypse. But the Ethiopic text of chap. 2 is suspect. A general comparison of the Ethiopic of the *Apocalypse of Peter* with the Greek fragments and the patristic citations suggests that, while “on the whole the Ethiopic presents the original contents of the Apocalypse”,²⁷ in detail it is scarcely a reliable witness to the original text. Moreover, the text of chap. 2 shows some degree of confusion. One part represents the “house of Israel” as following the false messiahs; another represents them as suffering martyrdom at the hands of the deceiver. The transition from the several false messiahs to the one Antichrist is oddly abrupt; and in favor of the originality of the former motif rather than the latter may be cited chap. 1 of the Ethiopic and vv. 1–2 of the Akhimimic text, which must represent at least a summary of this part of the apocalypse. In this case the *Apocalypse of Peter* belongs with 2 Peter and the synoptic apocalypse in knowing of false prophets and messianic pretenders of the last days, rather than of the single Antichrist of 2 Thessalonians. The parable of the fig-tree and its explanation would then have been introduced around an original prophecy of false messiahs who would lead the people astray. The introduction of Enoch and Elijah at the end of chap. 2 seems almost an afterthought, unnecessary to the interpretation of the parable and perhaps intended to clear up the difficulty of the preceding text: it is the preaching of Enoch and Elijah which will enlighten the Jews as to the true nature of Antichrist and so make them martyrs.

²⁶ Not only do all the other texts in the table refer to the martyrdom, but also other texts which were not sufficiently important to be included: Philippus Solitarius, *Dioptra* 3.10; John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa* 4.20; Honorius of Autun, *Elucidarium* 3.9. The only other example that I know of referring to the return of Enoch and Elijah without the mention of their martyrdom is in the Arabic (Clementine) *Apocalypse of Peter* (A. Mingana, *Woodbrooke Studies* [Cambridge: Heffer, 1931], 3. 359). But the martyrdom may be included in the section Mingana omits (p. 360), as it evidently is in the version described by Bousset (*Antichrist Legend*, 74).

²⁷ C. Maurer in E. Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha* (ed. R. McL. Wilson; London: Lutterworth, 1965), 2. 665.

This is a conjectural explanation of the text, but it illustrates the difficulty of using it as evidence that the tradition of Enoch's and Elijah's return to denounce Antichrist was already known in the early second century. On the other hand, the singular absence of reference to the martyrdom may indicate an early (though not necessarily second-century) tradition. It might be understood contextually, if the point of the reference to Enoch and Elijah is to explain how the Jews are to recognize Antichrist as an imposter. But even so the context of reference to martyrdom was one in which other writers would not be able to resist adding that Enoch and Elijah too would seal their witness in blood. The point is well illustrated by comparing this text with a parallel one in the later Ethiopic (Clementine) *Apocalypse of Peter* (P), which is certainly dependent on it:

(C)

... he will kill with the sword and there shall be many martyrs. Then shall the boughs of the fig-tree, that is the house of Israel, sprout, and there shall be many martyrs by his hand: they shall be killed and become martyrs. Enoch and Elijah will be sent to instruct them that this is the deceiver who must come into the world and do signs and wonders in order to deceive. And therefore shall they that are slain by his hand be martyrs and shall be reckoned among the good and righteous martyrs who have pleased God in their life.

(P)

... they will be beheaded and become martyrs. In that day will be fulfilled what is said in the Gospel: when the branches of the fig-tree are full of sap, know that the time of the harvest is at hand. Shoots of the fig-tree are those righteous men called, who become martyrs at his hand, and the angels will bring them to the joy, and no hair of their head will be lost. Then Enoch and Elijah will descend. They will preach and put to shame that tyrannical enemy of righteousness and son of lies. Then they will be beheaded, and Michael and Gabriel will raise them up and bring them into the garden of joy, and no drop of his (*sic*) blood will fall on the ground...

In the second text the preaching of Enoch and Elijah against Antichrist is retained, but no longer serves to make martyrs of anyone but Enoch and Elijah themselves. The parallelism of language between the account of the martyrs and the account of Enoch and Elijah shows the extent to which they are here portrayed as examples of martyrdom, the very last of all the martyrs. This was the dominant trend of the tradition.

The *Apocalypse of Peter* may thus be evidence that the tradition of the return of Enoch and Elijah to denounce Antichrist first existed independently of the tradition of the martyrdom. The same early tradition may also survive in Ephraem Graecus (H), where the martyrdom is not mentioned. The process of assimilation to Revelation 11 can be seen rather clearly in Ps.-Hippolytus: in chap. 21 (J) the motif of exposing Antichrist has been introduced into an

account drawn from Hippolytus and dependent on Revelation 11; in chap. 29 (K) the motif of martyrdom has been added to an account of the mission of Enoch and Elijah very similar to that in Ephraem Graecus.²⁸

The Syriac version of Ps.-Methodius (N) seems to represent another form of the tradition which did not include the martyrdom, a form in which Enoch and Elijah come to destroy Antichrist. It is a quite distinctive account:

... when he comes to Jerusalem, Enoch and Elijah will leave the land of life; they will rise up against him, they will withstand him and he will curse them. When he sees them, he will melt like salt in the presence of water, and he will be the first to be punished, before all men, together with the demons who entered into him...

The only close parallel to this account is at the end of the *Apocalypse of Elijah*, where Enoch and Elijah descend a second time from heaven, and “pursue the Son of Iniquity and kill him, without his being able to speak. In that day he will be destroyed before them like ice destroyed by the fire...” The destruction of Antichrist by Enoch and Elijah then reappears in the *Apocalypse of Ps.-Shenoute* (S), which is dependent on the *Apocalypse of Elijah*. Perhaps also to be connected with this tradition is Tertullian’s statement that “they are reserved to die, so that they may extinguish Antichrist with their blood” (*morituri reservantur, ut Antichristum sanguine suo extinguant*). This is a reinterpretation of the destruction of Antichrist in terms of the martyrological idea that the death of the martyr rebounds in judgment on the persecutor and thereby secures his destruction. It is possibly a reinterpretation independent of Revelation 11 but more probably Tertullian, like Hippolytus, identified Enoch and Elijah with the two witnesses and understood their death in the light of Rev 12:11, 15:2 as a conquest of Antichrist.

This motif of the destruction of Antichrist by Enoch and Elijah is likely to be of Jewish origin, as is also the alternative tradition of his destruction by the archangel Michael, which found its way from Judaism into the Christian tradition:²⁹ the elimination of the last great enemy of the people of God was a messianic function in both Jewish and Christian apocalyptic.³⁰ A Christian author is unlikely to have originated a tradition in which Enoch and Elijah are permitted in this way to usurp the role of Christ.³¹ But the messianic

²⁸ For the relationship of Ps.-Hippolytus to Ephraem Graecus, see W. Bousset, *Antichrist Legend*, 41–42.

²⁹ See W. Bousset, *Antichrist Legend*, 227–31; M. Bittenwieser, *Outlines*, 43; *Jewish Encyclopedia*, 8. 536–7.

³⁰ Jewish: *2 Apoc. Bar.* 40:1–2; M. Bittenwieser, *Outlines*, 31, 35, 38. Christian: *2 Thes* 2:8; *Rev* 19:11–21; W. Bousset, *Antichrist Legend*, 224–25.

³¹ This is undoubtedly why it appears rarely in the Christian sources. Ps.-Shenoute (S), which is dependent on the *Apocalypse of Elijah*, retains the motif, but the Greek *Ti-*

expectations of first-century Judaism were more varied and could easily have accommodated a tradition in which Enoch and Elijah were a pair of messianic figures appearing at the end to combat and destroy Antichrist. Such a tradition has not survived in extant Jewish texts, but a messianic role for Elijah is attested,³² while Enoch in the *Similitudes of Enoch* assumes the messianic functions of the Son of Man.

We may now attempt a classification of the traditions:

- Ia. The return of Enoch and Elijah (purpose unspecified): *1 Enoch* 90:31.
- Ib. The return of Enoch and Elijah as the two witnesses of Revelation 11: Hippolytus (E).
- Ia. The return of Enoch and Elijah to destroy Antichrist: Syriac Ps.-Methodius (N).
- Iib. The return of Enoch and Elijah to destroy Antichrist by suffering martyrdom: Tertullian (D).
- IIIa. The return of Enoch and Elijah to expose Antichrist: Apocalypse of Peter (C), Ephraem Graecus (H)
- IIIb. The return of Enoch and Elijah to expose Antichrist and suffer martyrdom: Ps.-Hippolytus 29 (K) etc.

Ia and probably Iia are pre-Christian Jewish traditions. IIIa may also be a Jewish tradition, though we cannot be sure. The martyrdom appears only in the secondary development of each, probably in each case under the influence of Revelation 11. Certainly there is no *evidence* that this development had already taken place in Judaism. The majority of the texts belong to IIIb, with greater or less assimilation to Revelation 11.

The tendency of many of the texts is to emphasize the martyrological aspects of the tradition, not only by taking over the martyrdom motif itself from Revelation 11 but also by incorporating additional martyrological features such as Antichrist's rage (B, G, L, M, O, R, S)³³ and the sacrificial understanding of martyrdom attested by death on the altar (U, V).³⁴ The tendency to represent Enoch and Elijah primarily as exemplary martyrs of the last days is illustrated by the Ethiopic (Clementine) *Apocalypse of Peter* (P), quoted above, and is also to be seen in the account in the *Apocalypse of Elijah*, where Enoch and Elijah appear among a sequence of martyrs

bertine Sibyl (R), which is also dependent on the *Apocalypse of Elijah*, replaces it with the intervention of Christ himself, who raises Enoch and Elijah and then fights and destroys Antichrist.

³² *TDNT* 2 (1964) 931; Str-B, 4. 782–84; J. A. T. Robinson, "Elijah, John and Jesus: An Essay in Detection," *NTS* 4 (1957–58) 263–81, esp. pp. 268–70.

³³ The rage of the persecutor is a stock feature of martyrdom stories: Dan 3:13, 19; 11:30; Bel 8; 2 Macc 7:39; 4 Macc 8:2; 9:10; Acts 7:54; H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972) 22, 26, 54, 66, 190.

³⁴ The same understanding is found in the *Apocalypse of Elijah*, when Antichrist throws the blood of the martyr Tabitha on the temple and when the Sixty Righteous Men are burned on the altar.

comprising Tabitha, Enoch, and Elijah, and the Sixty Righteous Men, and where the martyrological aspect of the tradition is strongly emphasized by the details of the narrative, including those which it shares with Revelation 11.

A narrative of idealized martyrs of the end-time can be paralleled from pre-Christian Jewish apocalyptic: the incident of “Taxo” and his seven sons in chap. 9 of the *Assumption of Moses*. But it was a Christian innovation to cast Enoch and Elijah in this role. Seen in the light of the rest of the evidence for the Enoch and Elijah tradition, the *Apocalypse of Elijah* has the characteristics of a relatively late version, taking up varied elements of eschatological tradition and elaborating them into an extended narrative of the reign of Antichrist. By means of incorporating two distinct forms of the tradition of Enoch and Elijah (IIIb and IIa), the *Apocalypse of Elijah* was able to relate two distinct comings of Enoch and Elijah: first to denounce Antichrist and suffer martyrdom and then a second time at the end to destroy him. Possibly the second belonged to an original Jewish *Apocalypse of Elijah*, but the first may be credibly attributed to the third- or fourth-century Christian redaction which was responsible for the present form of the work.³⁵

To conclude: the Christian tradition of the return of Enoch and Elijah provides no evidence of a pre-Christian Jewish tradition of their martyrdom. The martyrdom is a Christian innovation deriving via Rev 11:3–13 from the Christian innovation of the martyrdom of the Messiah.

Additional Note A: More texts

Since completing the article that is reprinted here as the above chapter, I have come across a variety of other Christian³⁶ apocalyptic works that contain the tradition of the martyrdom of Enoch and Elijah. They are all relatively late texts and they do not suggest that any modifications of my argument in the article are needed, but they are listed here and tabulated in the same way as the my original set of texts in order to supplement the evidence:

- (A¹) Arabic *Sibyl* A (E. Y. Ebied and M. J. L. Young, ‘An Unrecorded Arabic Version of a Sibylline Prophecy,’ *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 43 [1977] 279–307).
- (B¹) Arabic *Sibyl* B (E. Y. Ebied and M. J. L. Young, ‘A Newly-Discovered Version of the Arabic Sibylline Prophecy,’ *Oriens Christiana* 60 [1976] 83–94).

³⁵ I have discussed the account of Enoch and Elijah in the Apocalypse of Elijah more fully in “Enoch and Elijah in the Coptic Apocalypse of Elijah” (chapter 3 below).

³⁶ The Falasha *Apocalypse of Ezra*, like other Falasha literature, is a de-christianized version of an originally Christian text.

- (C¹) Greek *Apocalypse of Daniel* (*Diegesis Danielis*) 14:1–15/14:1–12 (Klaus Berger, *Die griechische Daniel-Diegesis* [SPB 27; Leiden: Brill, 1976] 18, 144–148; G. T. Zervos, ‘Apocalypse of Daniel [Ninth Century A. D.]: A New Translation and Introduction,’ in James Charlesworth [ed.], *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1 [London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983] 755–770).³⁷
- (D¹) *Apocalypse of Leo of Constantinople* 21 (Riccardo Maisano, *L’Apocalisse Apocriфа di Leone di Constantinopoli* [Nobiltà dello Spirito NS 3; Naples: Morano, 1975] 98–99).
- (E¹) *Oracles of Leo the Wise* 5.36–39 (E. Legrand, *Les Oracles de Léon le Sage, La Bataille de Varna, La Prise de Constantinople: Poèmes en grecs vulgaires* [Collection de Monuments pour servir à l’étude de la langue néo-hellénique, NS 5; Paris: Maissonneuve/Athens: Coromilas, 1875] 49).
- (F¹) *Andreas Salos Apocalypse*, 286–289 short text (L. Rydén, ‘The Andreas Salos Apocalypse: Greek Text, Translation, and Commentary,’ *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 28 [1974] 197–261, here 212–213, 223–224).
- (G¹) *Andreas Salos Apocalypse*, 286–289 long text (Rydén, ‘The Andreas Salos Apocalypse,’ 212, 223–224 n.).
- (H¹) *Two Sorrows of the Kingdom of Heaven* 8 (Máire Herbert and Martin McNamara, *Irish Biblical Apocrypha* [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989] 21).
- (I¹) Karshuni *Testament of our Lord Jesus* 6 (J. Ziadé, ‘Un testament de N.S. concernant les invasions des Mongols,’ *ROC* 21 [1918–19] 261–273, 433–444, here 443; Juan Pedro Monferrer Sala, *Apócrifos Árabes Cristianos* [Madrid: Trotta, 2003] 240–241).
- (J¹) Coptic *Vision of Daniel* 80–81 (Otto Meinardus, ‘A Commentary on the XIVth Vision of Daniel: According to the Coptic Version,’ *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 32 [1966] 394–449, here 447).³⁸
- (K¹) *Falasha Apocalypse of Ezra* (J. Halévy, *Tēʿezāza Sanbat [Commandements du Sabbat] accompagnés de six autres écrits pseudo-épigraphiques admis par les Falachas ou Juifs d’Abyssinie* [BEHE.H 137; Paris, 1902] 195).

This list is still far from exhaustive. Like other apocalyptic traditions this one made its way far and wide in a variety of Christian traditions. For some further examples, see J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976) 119–123; Berger, *Die griechische Daniel-Diegesis*, table facing page 148; Richard Kenneth Emerson, *Antichrist in the Middle Ages* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981) 95–101, 136–140; David Dumville, ‘Biblical Apocrypha and the Early Irish: A Preliminary Investigation,’ *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 73C (1973) 299–338, here 308–311.

³⁷ On this apocalypse, see Lorenzo DiTommaso, *The Book of Daniel and the Apocryphal Daniel Literature* (SVTP 20; Leiden: Brill, 2005) 130–141, 356–359.

³⁸ On this apocalypse, see DiTommaso, *The Book of Daniel*, 179–184, 456–458.

| | A ¹ | B ¹ | C ¹ | D ¹ | E ¹ | F ¹ | G ¹ | H ¹ | I ¹ | J ¹ | K ¹ |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Explicit quotation of Rev 11 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Enoch and Elijah | (x) ⁴¹ | x | (x) ⁴² | x | x ³⁹ | | x ⁴⁰ | | x | x | (x) ⁴³ |
| Elijah and Enoch | | | | | | x ⁴⁴ | | x | | | |
| witnesses | | | | | | | | | | | |
| prophets | | | | (x) ⁴⁵ | | | | | | | x |
| descend | | | | | | | | | | | |
| fight Antichrist | | | | | | | | x | | | |
| preach repentance | | | | | | | | | | | |
| plague enemies | | | | | | | x | | | | |
| expose Antichrist | x | x | x | x | | x | x | | x | | x |
| Antichrist enraged | x | | | | | | | | | | |
| fight them | | | | x | | | | | | | |
| conquers them | | | | | | | | | | | |
| kills them | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| on the altar | x | x | x | | | | | | x | | |
| bodies lie unburied | | | | x | | | x | | | | |
| 3 ½ days | | (2½) | | x | | | x | | | x | |
| 3 days | | | | | | | | | | | x |
| 4 days | | | | | | | | | | | |
| in the streets of Jerusalem | | | | x | | | x | | | x | |
| the great city | | | | | | | | | | x | |
| everyone sees them | | | | | | | x | | | | |
| they rise | | x | | x | | | x | | | x | x |
| are raised by Michael and Gabriel | | | | | | | | | | | |
| renewed conflict with Antichrist | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ascend to heaven | | | | x | | | x | | | | |
| in the sight of all | | | | | | | | | | | |
| destroy Antichrist | | | | | | | | | | | |

³⁹ With John the evangelist.

⁴⁰ With John the evangelist.

⁴¹ Two unnamed men.

⁴² Two unnamed men from heaven (Enoch and Elijah) and one unnamed man from earth (John the evangelist).

⁴³ Two unnamed men.

⁴⁴ With John the evangelist.

⁴⁵ Here they are called 'preachers (κηρυκεις) of the truth'.

*Additional Note B:
A pre-Christian Jewish tradition
of the return of Enoch and Elijah?*

In the first paragraph of the chapter I said that Wilhelm Bousset ‘in 1895 sifted early Christian traditions about Antichrist to reconstruct a pre-Christian Jewish tradition which included the return of Enoch and Elijah to denounce Antichrist and to suffer martyrdom.’ This statement was mistaken.⁴⁶ Bousset’s purpose in the whole book was to reconstruct a tradition about Antichrist that early Christians inherited from Jewish sources.⁴⁷ I must have assumed that he considered ‘the return of Enoch and Elijah to denounce Antichrist and to suffer martyrdom,’ which he treats at some length in the course of working through the whole reconstructed narrative,⁴⁸ to be part of this pre-Christian Jewish tradition. In fact, however, at this point he draws some distinctions between the original Jewish tradition and the form in which it appears in early Christian literature. He states that the ‘original Jewish expectation, as is still to be seen in the Gospels,⁴⁹ was for the return of Elias alone (Malachi iv.1).’⁵⁰ He notes that this expectation of Elijah alone is found also in the second book of the Sibylline Oracles (2.187), in Justin (*Dial.* 49, where it is attributed to the Jew Trypho), in Lactantius and Commodian,⁵¹ and in the later Jewish apocalyptic literature. After showing the way in which the existing tradition about Enoch and Elijah was adapted by the author of Revelation 11, he concludes:

Still, with all this, one point remains unexplained – the origin of the idea of the two witnesses. There can scarcely be a doubt that it cannot have emanated from a Jewish source. Here the return of Elias is expected, while the expectation of the two witnesses would seem to have never been more generally diffused, as is shown by the later Jewish tradition.⁵²

Bousset’s view seems to be that in Jewish tradition Elijah alone was expected, but that in a Christian version of the tradition, pre-dating Revelation, Enoch

⁴⁶ This was pointed out to me in a personal letter from Barry Blackburn, dated 23 May 1979.

⁴⁷ For recent critical assessments of Bousset’s overall thesis about the Antichrist tradition, see Gregory C. Jenks, *The Origins and Early Development of the Antichrist Myth* (BZNW 59; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1991) 5–13; G.W. Lorein, *The Antichrist Theme in the Intertestamental Period* (JSPSup 44; London/New York: T. & T. Clark International [Continuum], 2003) 1–7, 237.

⁴⁸ Wilhelm Bousset, *The Antichrist Tradition*, tr. A. H. Keane (London: Hutchinson, 1896) 203–11.

⁴⁹ Mark 9:11–13.

⁵⁰ Bousset, *The Antichrist Tradition*, 207.

⁵¹ See n. 19 above.

⁵² Bousset, *The Antichrist Tradition*, 210.

was added. In addition, he states clearly that the author of Revelation was ‘personally responsible for the incident about the resurrection of the witnesses after the third day,’ since this is clearly a Christian contribution⁵³ (but why should it not have been already part of the Christian tradition that added Enoch to Elijah?). What is wholly unclear is whether Bousset thinks that the role of denouncing Antichrist and consequent martyrdom at his hands were already attributed to Elijah in Jewish tradition or belonged to that Christian redaction of the tradition that added the second figure, Enoch.

If Bousset’s view were the latter, then he was in essential agreement with my own argument in the chapter above. However, he was mistaken in supposing that the idea of the eschatological return of Enoch and Elijah together had no non-Christian Jewish source. It is true that it is not to be found in rabbinic literature or in the medieval Jewish apocalypses that have parallels to many of the other traditions about Antichrist in the Christian apocalypses. Its absence from rabbinic literature may be due to the lack of a scriptural basis for expecting the return of Enoch, by contrast with the explicit prophecy relating to Elijah (Mal 4:1). The medieval Jewish apocalypses, on the other hand, reflect non-scriptural traditions abundantly. The absence of Enoch from them is perhaps to be attributed to the controversial nature of the figure of Enoch in Jewish tradition from the second century CE onwards. In any case, there is a pre-Christian Jewish reference to the return of Enoch and Elijah in a text Bousset neglected: 1 Enoch 90:31.⁵⁴

This text deserves a little more attention than I gave it in the chapter above. It belongs to the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch 85–90, which dates from the Maccabean period. In a work attributed to Enoch and in view of Enoch’s assumption to heaven without dying (Gen 5:24; 1 Enoch 87:2–4), it is not very surprising to find this expansion of the already existing belief that Elijah would return at the end (Mal 4:1; Sir 48:10). 1 Enoch 90:31 reads:

After that, those three who were clothed in white and who had taken hold of me [Enoch] by my hand, who had previously brought me up (with the hand of that ram also taking hold of me), set me down among those sheep before the judgment took place.⁵⁵

The three are the angels who had taken Enoch up to heaven at the end of his earthly life (87:2–4). The ram is Elijah, whose assumption to paradise

⁵³ Bousset, *The Antichrist Tradition*, 210.

⁵⁴ There is a useful table of the sources used by Bousset and their contributions to his reconstructed Antichrist tradition in Jenks, *The Origins*, 8–9, while Jenks, *The Origins*, 10, lists Jewish works of the Second Temple period not used by Bousset, including 1 Enoch.

⁵⁵ Translation from George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004) 134.

has also been described earlier in the Animal Apocalypse (89:52), which makes it clear that Elijah joined Enoch in paradise. No other assumption to paradise has been mentioned in this Apocalypse's grand review of biblical history. This makes very improbable the alternative suggestion: that the ram of 90:31 is Judas Maccabeus (depicted as a ram in 90:9–10).⁵⁶ Most scholars have agreed that the ram must be Elijah.⁵⁷

The last phrase of 1 Enoch 90:31 ('before the judgment took place') is problematic. The judgment has already been recounted (90:20–27) and has been followed by an account of the New Jerusalem (90:28–30). No further judgment follows. It may be that the text is 'completely corrupt'.⁵⁸ If not, then according to Nickelsburg 'either the verse has been (accidentally?) transposed from its chronologically correct location between vv 19 and 20, or that "before the judgment took place" is a scribal gloss that ties Enoch's and Elijah's return to earth to the tradition of their participation in the judgment.'⁵⁹ It would seem easiest to suppose that, whatever the origin of the last phrase in the present Ethiopic text, the verse did not originally place the coming of Enoch and Elijah before the judgment. In that case, the significance of their return is not difficult to decide. They return in order to participate in the new age along with the rest of God's faithful people. What is clear is that they do not oppose an Antichrist figure or die at his hands. Those features of the later tradition are absent from this earliest reference to the return of Enoch and Elijah.

Additional Note C:

A non-Christian Jewish tradition of the return and martyrdom of Enoch and Elijah?

In a brief response or addendum to my article,⁶⁰ Alexander Zeron pointed out the relevance of a passage I had not cited: Pseudo-Philo, *Biblical Antiq-*

⁵⁶ J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976) 45.

⁵⁷ Matthew Black, 'The "Two Witnesses" of Rev. 11:3f. in Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Tradition,' in Ernst Bammel, C. Kingsley Barrett and W. D. Davies (ed.), *Donum Gentilicium: New Testament Studies in Honour of David Daube* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) 227–237, here 228 and n. 1; idem, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985) 279; Patrick A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (SBL Early Judaism and Its Literature 04; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1993) 377–378; George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001) 405.

⁵⁸ Tiller, *A Commentary*, 379.

⁵⁹ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 405.

⁶⁰ Alexander Zeron, 'The Martyrdom of Phineas-Elijah,' *JBL* 98 (1979) 99–100.

uities 48:1. This passage, probably from the late first century, is the earliest evidence of a tradition, later found in the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum to the Pentateuch (Exod 4:13; 6:18; 40:10; Deut 30:4; cf. Num 25:12) and occasionally in rabbinic literature (*Pirqe R. El.* 29), that identified Elijah with the high priest Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron.⁶¹ We need not discuss the exegetical origins of the tradition here. What is important for our present purposes is that the version of the tradition in Pseudo-Philo refers to the death of the returning Elijah:

And in that time Phinehas laid himself down to die, and the Lord said to him, ‘Behold you have passed the 120 years that have been established for every man. And now rise up and go from here and dwell in Danaben on the mountain and dwell there many years. And I will command my eagle, and he will nourish you there, and you will not come down to mankind until the time arrives and you be tested at that time; and you will shut up the heaven then, and by your mouth it will be opened up. And afterward you will be lifted up into the place where those who were before you were lifted up, and you will be there until I remember the world. Then I will make you all come, and you [plural] will taste what is death (*Bib Ant.* 48:1).⁶²

Here Phinehas is commanded to hide on a mountain, where God nourishes him, until the time – many centuries later – when he is to re-appear in the world as the prophet Elijah, unequivocally identified by the information that he will both conjure up a drought and put an end to it. Elijah’s ascension is then predicted: ‘you will be lifted up into the place where those who were before you (*priores tui*) were lifted up.’ Presumably this is paradise, and there Elijah and the others remain until, at the end time, God brings them back to the earth. Only then will Phinehas-Elijah and the others die. This reference to the death of Phinehas-Elijah in the eschatological future seems to be unique among the texts that identify Phinehas and Elijah.

Who are the ones who had been lifted up to paradise before Phinehas-Elijah? Certainly they include Enoch, whose translation to heaven Pseudo-Philo has noted in its place, following Genesis 5:24 (*Lib. Ant.* 1:16). Perhaps Pseudo-Philo’s statement that Enoch ‘was not found’ (*non inveniebatur*), where Genesis has ‘was not,’ is intended to assimilate Enoch’s ascension to

⁶¹ Martin Hengel, *The Zealots*, tr. David Smith (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989) chap. IVB; Robert Hayward, ‘Phinehas—the Same is Elijah,’ *JJS* 29 (1978) 22–34; Richard Bauckham, ‘Messianism According to the Gospel of John,’ in John Lierman (ed.), *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John* (WUNT 2/219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006) 34–68, here 36–37.

⁶² Translation from D.J. Harrington, ‘Pseudo-Philo,’ in James Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1 (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983) 297–377, here 362. For the argument that Phinehas is here identified with Elijah, see Frederick J. Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) 184–185; Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo’s Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, vol. 2 (AGAJU 31; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 1060.

that of Elijah (cf. 2 Kgs 2:17).⁶³ Pseudo-Philo nowhere indicates that any other of his characters belong in the same category. According to 2 Baruch (13:3), Baruch does, and according to 4 Ezra (14:9), Ezra does, but these lived long after Elijah's ascension.⁶⁴ Later rabbinic literature supplies other names of 'those who entered paradise alive': Eliezer the servant of Abraham, Serah the daughter of Asher (Gen 46:17), Bithiah the daughter of Pharaoh (1 Chron 4:17, identified with the Egyptian princess who rescued Moses), Jabez (1 Chron 4:9–10), Hiram king of Tyre, Ebed-melech the Ethiopian (Jer 38:7–13; 39:15–18), Jonadab the Rechabite and his descendants (Jer 35), the servant of Rabbi Judah the Prince, Rabbi Joshua ben Levi, and the Messiah.⁶⁵ Of these, Eliezer, Serah, Bithiah, and perhaps Jabez, lived before the time of Phinehas, while Hiram lived before the time of Elijah's ascension. We have no evidence that precisely these persons were already, in the late first century CE, when Pseudo-Philo wrote, thought not to have died, but, in some cases at least, this idea about them was based in ingenious exegesis of the kind that certainly was employed in Pseudo-Philo's time and often presupposed by Pseudo-Philo's text. Some of these persons, therefore, may be those, besides Enoch, who had already been translated to paradise before Phinehas-Elijah was.

Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* has much in common, especially in its eschatological themes and language, with the two apocalypses of roughly the same date: 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch.⁶⁶ The notion of a group of people who had not died and whom God would bring to earth at the end-time is found in 4 Ezra (6:26; 7:28; 13:52; 14:9), which provides the closest parallel to the *Biblical Antiquities* in this respect. The group are defined as 'those who were taken up, who from their birth have not tasted death' (6:26). The following passage is especially illuminating for our purposes:

For my son the Messiah shall be revealed with those who are with him, and those who remain shall rejoice four hundred years. After those years my son the Messiah shall die, and all who draw human breath. Then the world shall be turned back to primeval silence for seven days, as it was at the first beginnings, so that no one shall

⁶³ Zeron, 'The Martyrdom,' 100.

⁶⁴ 2 Macc 15:13–16 is sometimes cited as evidence of a belief that Jeremiah had ascended without dying. This is not at all certain, but in any case, for our purposes, is not relevant, since Jeremiah lived after the ascension of Elijah.

⁶⁵ Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, vol. 5 (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1925) 95–96. The Messiah is included in the list of nine (including Enoch and Elijah) in Derek Ereš Zuta 1, because he was thought to have lived at some point in Israel's history and to have then been taken up to heaven, whence God will bring him to earth in the last days. This tradition is probably also presupposed in 4 Ezra 7:28.

⁶⁶ M. R. James, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo* (London: SPCK, 1917) 46–58; Harrington, 'Pseudo-Philo,' 302.

be left. After seven days the world that is not yet awake shall be roused, and that which is corruptible shall perish (4 Ezra 7:28–31 NRSV).

In this passage those who are with the Messiah apparently share in the messianic kingdom, at the end of which both the Messiah and all living humans die. The latter must include those who had been taken up without dying and who return to earth with the Messiah at the beginning of the messianic kingdom. The idea seems to be that everything in this world must revert to nothing before it can be recreated in the world to come. No mortal being, not even the Messiah himself, can enter the new creation without dying and rising again. The issue seems to be the same as that with which Paul deals in 1 Corinthians 15:50–52, though the solution is rather different.⁶⁷

It is not easy to parallel at all precisely these expectations of the death of the Messiah and the reversion of all creation to chaos (though cf. 2 Bar 44:9), but it is notable how closely the end of this passage and the following verses (4 Ezra 7:31–35) are paralleled by *Biblical Antiquities* 3:10, including the idea of another, everlasting world to come. In view of the close parallels at these and other points between the eschatological expectations of 4 Ezra and Pseudo-Philo, it is reasonable to find in 4 Ezra 7:28–31 an explanation of the expected death of the returning Elijah in *Biblical Antiquities* 48:1. Phinehas-Elijah will finally taste death because every human must; it is the only way into the new creation. But he will die, not be killed. Thus, while Zeron was right to find in *Biblical Antiquities* 48:1 an expectation that both Enoch and Elijah (along with others who ascended without dying) will eventually die, he was mistaken to call this death ‘martyrdom.’⁶⁸ This expectation has little in common with the expectation found in the Christian apocalypses that Enoch and Elijah will come to denounce Antichrist and will be put to death by him. Both the manner of their death and the rationale for it are quite different.

Two studies that relate quite closely to the chapter above were published, coincidentally, around the same time. The first was the major work by Klaus Berger: *Die Auferstehung des Propheten und die Erhöhung des Menschensohn: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Deutung des Geschickes Jesu in frühchristlichen Texten* (SUNT 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976). The second was a journal article: Johannes M. Nützel, ‘Zum Schicksal der eschatologischen Propheten,’ *BZ* 20 (1976) 59–94.

⁶⁷ Rabbinic literature often denies that either Enoch or Elijah escaped death. This may be due to a comparable sense that human nature as it exists in this world is mortal and there can be no exceptions to the universality of death. Denying that Enoch and Elijah ascended without dying deals with this concern in one way, affirming that they will die following their future return does so in another.

⁶⁸ Zeron, ‘The Martyrdom,’ 100.