

INTERCESSION AND THE DENIAL OF PEACE IN 1 ENOCH 12–16

by

JONATHAN PAIGE SISSON

Kreuzbleiche 7, 9000 St. Gallen, Switzerland

It is well-known that the throne-vision in 1 Enoch 14–16 is introduced in connection with Enoch's role as intercessor. The vision itself combines the motif of ascent with that of a prophetic call: Enoch is brought before the heavenly throne and entrusted with a divine commission (15:2). The immediate occasion for Enoch's ascent and commission is a request on the part of the fallen watchers of heaven that he intercedes with the deity on their behalf (13:4). Preceding the request of the watchers, and in fact precipitating it, is the sentence of judgment upon them and their bastard children which Enoch announces before their assembly (13:3). Enoch's attempt at intercession on behalf of the watchers fails. Instead of "forgiveness and length [of days]" (13:6), he reaffirms the original judgment against them: "You shall have no peace" (16:4; cf. 12:5,6; 13:1).

Although the notion of intercession is closely connected with Enoch's prophetic commission, until recently little attention had been paid to the narrative framework in which the throne-vision was handed down. Among those studies having pursued this line of research, important insights have been gained with regard to the myth of angelic rebellion in 1 Enoch 6–16.¹ Of particular interest is the apparent adaptation of the rebellion myth in connection with a polemic against the priesthood in Jerusalem (Suter, 1979b; Nickelsburg, 1981). Indeed, there is reason to believe that Enoch's prophetic commission in chaps. 12–16 is part of an older on-going controversy concerning the legitimacy of the normative cult. It is the intention of this paper to show that both Enoch's role as intercessor and especially the denial of peace to the fallen watchers are traditional elements associated with that polemic. In this regard, it is important to note at the outset that the interpretation of the phrase *ʿên-šālôm* 'no peace' presented here runs counter to prevailing scholarly

1. In this regard, see Hanson, 1977, and Nickelsburg, 1977. An attempt to apply the insights of these two studies towards an understanding of the structure and development of 1 Enoch 6–19 as a whole has been undertaken by Newsom, 1980.

opinion which has suggested that the denial of peace in these chapters is the inversion of an epistolary formula.²

The investigation itself will proceed in two stages. First of all, we will examine the background of the controversy, focusing on two passages in Ezekiel and Third Isaiah in which the denial of peace in the form of an oracle of $\text{ʔ}en\text{-}šālôm$ has been transmitted as part of a polemic against the cultic prophets and the $rēšāʿîm$ 'wicked' respectively. Secondly, we will investigate the reception of this polemical material in 1 Enoch 12–16 by drawing attention to the evidence of intercessory activity associated with Enoch's prophetic commission and to the significance of the denial of peace for the priesthood in Jerusalem.

I

In an earlier article on Jeremiah and the Jerusalem conception of peace, I argued that one of the main areas of contention between Jeremiah and his prophetic opponents centered on the use of the term $šālôm$ in a salvation oracle, the *Sitz im Leben* of which was a liturgy of intercession (Sisson, 1986). Jeremiah opposed the efforts of the cultic prophets to restore the welfare of the community in Jerusalem by speaking $šālôm$ oracles.³ His own efforts at intercession on behalf of the community resulted in a negative oracle of $\text{ʔ}en\text{-}šālôm$ which entailed not only a negation, but also a reversal of the motifs associated with the Jerusalem conception of peace.⁴

The significance of these conclusions for our present investigation is twofold. On the one hand, they confirm the existence of a controversy in pre-exilic Jerusalem concerning the legitimacy of the intercessory activity of the cultic prophets and of their oracles of $šālôm$. On the other hand, they identify Jeremiah's own oracle of $\text{ʔ}en\text{-}šālôm$ as a formal denouncement of that activity. In the following pages, we will examine the further development of that controversy in the literature of the exilic and early post-exilic period, limiting our discussion to those few passages which contain a negative formulation of the $šālôm$ oracle.

2. So Milik, 1976, p. 34: "... as a professional scribe, Enoch addresses ʿAšaʿel in an epistolary style, but with a grim inversion of the usual formula: instead of 'peace to you', he begins 'there will be no peace to you'." See also Newsom (1980, p. 318) who subscribes to Milik's interpretation. To my knowledge, there is no evidence in the vast corpus of early Jewish and Christian epistolary literature which would support such an interpretation of the formula.

3. An example of such an oracle has been handed down in Jer 4:10 (= 23:17): *šalom yihyeh lakem* 'it will be well with you'. Other examples of the oracular usage of $šālôm$ may be found in Jer 6:14 (= 8:11); 14:13; 14:19 (= 8:15); 15:5; 28:9; 29:7; 38:4.

4. See the references to $\text{ʔ}en\text{-}šālôm$ in Jer 6:14 (= 8:11); 12:12; 30:5.

The denial of peace in Ezek 13:10

In Ezek 13:10-16, the activity of the false prophets in speaking *šālôm* oracles is denounced, comparing their efforts at intercession to the practice of whitewashing a mud-brick wall. The passage is part of a larger polemic against the prophets (13:1-23) which has been handed down in the form of a series of judgment sayings.⁵

Our interest in the passage is limited to the condemnation of prophetic activity in 13:10a: "Because, yea, because they have misled my people, saying 'Peace,' when there is no peace (*šālôm wē'ên-šālôm*)." ⁶ The reference to an abbreviated formulation of a *salom* oracle and its negation in this verse recalls the polemical formulation in Jer 6:14(= 8:11): "'Peace, peace,' when there is no peace (*šālôm šālôm wē'ên-šālôm*)." In Ezek 13:10, the *šālôm* oracle of the false prophets is cited as evidence to the effect that their activity in mediating such oracles has deceived the community.⁷ The accusation of deception is used to disqualify the intercessory activity of the prophets and, in the present context, to substantiate the announcement of judgment in 13:13. Although Jeremiah apparently cited the *šālôm* oracles of his prophetic opponents in connection with a liturgy of intercession of his own on behalf of the community,⁸ there is no indication that the reference to the oracle in 13:10 derived from a similar context. This is true, although we know that on occasion Ezekiel did intercede on behalf of the community.⁹

Whatever the original context of the formulation of Ezek 13:10, it is clear from its inclusion in the collection of judgment sayings in 13:1-23 that both the reference to the intercessory activity of the prophets in speaking *šālôm* oracles and a denunciation of that activity (*'ên-šālôm*) have become elements of a standard polemic against the cultic community in Jerusalem.¹⁰

5. Although the collection in its present form is evidently the work of a redactor, it does contain genuine material. The vv. 10-16 constitute a separate unit within this complex, of which vv. 10 and 13-14 are original. See Zimmerli, 1969, pp. 286-87.

6. The translation of this and all further biblical passages is from the RSV.

7. A similar set of circumstances lies behind the quotation of the *šālôm* oracle in Jer 4:10. See Sisson, 1986, pp. 435-36.

8. An example of such a liturgy has been preserved in Jer 14:2-15:4. See Sisson, 1986, pp. 434-35.

9. Cf. Ezek 9:8 and 11:13. For additional evidence of possible intercessory evidence on the part of the false prophets in seeking *šālôm* oracles, see Ezek 7:25 and 13:16 (cf. 22:28).

10. In this regard, we note that the quotation of the *šālôm* oracle in Jer 4:10 has also been handed down in Jer 23:17 as part of a series of judgment sayings against the prophets. Zimmerli (1969, p. 288) has suggested that the collection of sayings in Jer 23:9-32, which in its present form is a product of the deuteronomic redaction, has influenced

Peace and the denial of peace in Isa 57:18b–21

Another example of the juxtaposition of salvation and judgment sayings containing the word *šālôm* is found in Isa 57:18b–21. It is generally recognized that vv. 18b–19 are part of a larger salvation oracle comprising vv. 14–19, while the judgment saying in vv. 20–21 is a redactional addition.¹¹

Of particular interest for our present purposes is the formulation of the *šālôm* oracle in v. 19a: “Peace, peace, to the far and to the near (*šālôm šālôm lārāhōq wēlaqqārōb*).” The repetition of the term *šālôm*, usually ascribed to stylistic dependence upon Second Isaiah, reminds us of the abbreviated formulation of the oracle in Jer 6:14(= 8:11). The similarity between the two texts becomes more apparent when we consider that the prophecy of *šālôm* in v. 19a is combined with a promise of healing (*rp*³) in v. 18b,¹² just as the oracle of the prophets in Jer 6:14(= 8:11) is mentioned in connection with their vain efforts to heal (*rp*³) the wound of the community in Jerusalem (6:14a[= 8:11a]). The comparison with the oracle cited by Jeremiah leads us to conclude that in Isa 57:18b–19 we have an example of a *šālôm* oracle such as was spoken by the cultic prophets in pre-exilic Jerusalem. The presence of such an oracle in Third Isaiah is not surprising, as it corresponds to descriptions elsewhere in that writing of the restoration of Zion-Jerusalem in terms which reflect the cultic traditions associated with that city.¹³ The difference, of course, is that, unlike the earlier traditions, from the perspective of Third Isaiah the restoration of Jerusalem is a future event still to take place.

Turning now to the redactional addition in vv. 20–21, we note that in v. 21 there is a negative formulation of the *šālôm* oracle: “There is no peace . . . for the wicked (*ʔēn-šālôm . . . lārēšāʕim*).” What is remarkable about the addition of the oracle of *ʔēn-šālôm* in v. 21 is that a constellation of salvation and judgment oracles emerges in Isa 57:18b–21 which resembles the configuration of oracles in Jer 6:14(= 8:11) and Ezek 13:10. In this regard, it is important to point out that the oracle of *ʔēn-šālôm* is no longer being used by the redactor of Third Isaiah, as it

the form and content of Ezek 13:1–23. However that may be, we do note that there is no mention of the denial of peace in Jer 23:17.

11. The judgment saying in Isa 57:21 has also been transmitted in 48:22. With regard to the form and redaction of Isa 57:14–21, see Westermann, 1986, pp. 260–63.

12. The repetition of the reference to healing (*ūrēpāʔīw* ‘and I will heal him’) in Isa 57:19b is apparently a redactional addition. See Westermann, 1986, p. 263.

13. See the discussion of Isa 60–62 in Hanson, 1979, pp. 46–77.

was by Jeremiah (and Ezekiel), to announce a negation or indeed a reversal of the motifs associated with the *šālôm* of the community in Jerusalem. At no time is the restoration of the community itself being called into question. While the promise of peace in v. 19 remains the unshakable foundation of that community, the oracle in v. 21 has the effect of isolating a specific group within it, the *rěšā'im*, who are held responsible for the delay in the fulfillment of the promise. It has been suggested, moreover, that the redactional addition in vv. 20-21 reflects the struggle between visionary and hierocratic elements within the community, and that the polemic against the *rěšā'im* is, in fact, directed against the representatives of the normative cult (Hanson, 1979, pp. 71-75 and 78-79). In this case, the denial of peace would have the additional nuance of condemning the cultic practices of the members of that group. Their exclusion from cultic worship would restore the community to a state of wholeness and, in turn, ensure a renewal of peace in Jerusalem. It is here that we see a parallel to earlier usage of the oracle as a polemic against the cultic prophets.

The analysis of Ezek 13:10 and Isa 57:18b-21 has shown that the promise of peace in the form of a *šālôm* oracle was the focal point of a controversy concerning the legitimacy of the normative cult in the exilic and early post-exilic period. The controversy itself centered on the intercessory activity of the prophets and, at a later point, of the *rěšā'im*, a group associated with the normative cult. In the course of this controversy, the oracle of *ʔên-šālôm* became an established polemical expression, both denouncing the activity of the normative cult and denying its representatives a part in the restoration of the community in Jerusalem.

II

In turning now to the question of Enoch's role as intercessor, we note that, in fact, two separate commissioning scenes have been recorded in 1 Enoch 12-16. As these two scenes differ considerably in form and content, it will be necessary to discuss them at length separately.

In the first commissioning scene (12:3-13:3), Enoch is summoned by an angel or angels¹⁴ in response to a prayer he is addressing to "the Lord of majesty and the King of the ages" (12:3).¹⁵ Although the content of the prayer has not been handed down at this point, there is reason to believe that it contained a plea for help on behalf of beleaguered

14. Milik (1976, p. 192) argues that the Aramaic text reads the singular *mlk* 'angel' at this point, and not the plural as in G and E.

15. The quotations of the text of 1 Enoch are cited from the translation in Black, 1985.

humankind.¹⁶ Enoch is addressed as “scribe of righteousness” (12:4a) by the angel(s) and is then sent to announce judgment on the three (groups of) sinners familiar from the rebellion myth in chaps. 6–11: the watchers of heaven (12:4–5), who have abandoned their station in heaven and defiled themselves with women (cf. 6:1–7:1; 9:7–8; 10:11–14); their bastard children, the giants (12:6), who have wrought violence on the earth (cf. 7:2–6; 9:1,9–10; 10:9–10); and ^śAśa^ʔel (13:1–2), the angelic chieftain, who has taught forbidden knowledge to humans (cf. 8:1–2; 9:6; 10:4b–6).¹⁷ In all three instances, the sentence of judgment is a negative oracle of *šālôm*: “You shall have no peace” (13:1).¹⁸ While this is certainly the original formulation of the oracle, we find that in the other two cases it has been slightly elaborated, so in 12:5: “You shall have no peace or forgiveness,” and in 12:6: “They shall have neither mercy nor peace.”¹⁹ The nature of these additions suggest that they have to do with the situation of intercession. In 12:6, the fruitless efforts at intercession are mentioned which the watchers undertake on behalf of their children, and in 13:2, the denial of peace is followed by the statement: “Nor shall forbearance, petition, nor mercy be yours.”²⁰ The scene concludes as Enoch delivers his solemn message before the assembly of the watchers who respond with “fear and trembling” (13:3), an indication that the judgment itself was perceived in the form of a theophany.²¹

The analysis of the first commissioning scene raises several important issues in connection with Enoch’s role as intercessor. First of all, there is

16. See the discussion of the angelic prayer of intercession in 9:4–11 below.

17. Cf. Nickelsburg, 1981, 575. The repetition of Enoch’s message to ^śAśa^ʔel in 13:1–2 and to the assembled watchers in 13:3 has long given rise to speculation about a possible corruption of the text. Most notable in this regard is the proposal by Charles (1912, p. 27) that a section of the text containing a request for intercession on behalf of ^śAśa^ʔel has been lost. More recently, Newsom (1980, p. 317) has argued that the introduction of the teaching motif associated with ^śAśa^ʔel at this point is an intrusion in the narrative which originally was only concerned with the transgressions of Šemihazah and his horde.

18. *G ouk estai hymin eirēnē*. Cf. 4QEn^a 1,2,14 *lt slm lkn* ‘you shall have no peace’ and 4QEn Giants^a 13 [*dy lʔ*] *ʔyty lkh s[lm]* [‘pea]ce will [not] be to you’. See Milik, 1976, pp. 146–47 and 317.

19. *G ouk estai autois eis eleon kai eirēnēn*. On the unusual form of the oracle here, see Black, 1985, p. 143. In addition to 12:5,6; 13:1; 16:4, a negative formulation of the *šālôm* oracle is also found in 1 Enoch 5:4, 5 (*G ouk estai hymin eleos kai eirēnē*; E omits *kai eirēnē*); 94:6 (E only); it occurs in G^b in 98:16; 99:13; 102:3; 103:8 in the form *ouk estin hymin chairein* (cf. Isa 48:22 and 57:21 LXX *ouk estin chairein asebesin*).

20. So E. G reads *kai anochē kai erōtēsis soi ouk estai*. On the textual problems in 13:2, see Uhlig, 1984, p. 534.

21. The same formulation (“fear and trembling”) is employed in 1 Enoch 1:5 to describe the response of the fallen watchers to the appearance of the deity upon Sinai. With regard to the nature of the theophany in the opening chapter of 1 Enoch, see VanderKam, 1973.

the question of the subject matter and possible *Sitz im Leben* of Enoch's prayer in 12:3. A second point in question concerns the denial of peace to the watchers and its function as a polemic against the priesthood.

The Enochic prayer of intercession (1 Enoch 9:4–11; 84:2–6)

Enoch's prayer in 12:3, which occasions his call, has a precedent in the prayer of intercession in 9:4–11 spoken by the archangels on behalf of the souls of those who have been murdered by the giants. This prayer, which has evidently been interpolated by the author of the Šemihazah narrative into its present context,²² has a three-part structure typical of intercessory prayer.²³ It begins with a lengthy doxology (9:4–5), addressing the deity as lord, god, and king and extolling him as the creator and all-powerful authority from whose sight nothing is hidden. A statement of motive (9:6–10) follows, citing the transgressions of the fallen angels and the sufferings of humankind, to which a plea for help (9:11) on behalf of the latter in the form of a lament has been added.²⁴ Significantly, the prayer of the archangels is followed by a commissioning scene in chapt. 10 in which each of the angels is addressed by the deity and sent to announce judgment upon the watchers and their children, while at the same time promising salvation to Noah and his descendants. Of interest in this regard is the promise to Noah that "from him a plant shall be planted and established for all generations for ever" (10:3).²⁵

The relationship between the prayer and the commission of the angels in chaps. 9–10 leads us to believe that the commission of Enoch in 12:3–4 is the response to a prayer of intercession on his part on behalf of humankind. Additional evidence of what seems to have been a standard prayer of intercession in Enochic circles is provided by a passage in the first dream-vision of Enoch (83:3–84:6). In 84:2–6, a prayer ascribed to Enoch has been handed down which resembles the prayer of the archangels in 9:4–11 in both form and content.²⁶ It exhibits the same three-part structure, commencing with a long doxology (84:2–3) in which the

22. See the discussion of 1 Enoch 9:4–11 in Nickelsburg, 1977, p. 387.

23. On the form of intercessory prayer, see Eissfeldt, 1976, pp. 17–18.

24. As Nickelsburg (1977, p. 387, n. 16) points out, there is a unique tension in the prayer between the assertion of divine knowledge and power in the doxology and the complaint that the deity has nevertheless failed to act in judgment against the watchers.

25. See also the reference to the "plant of righteousness" in 10:16. On the significance of this phrase as an eschatological image in 1 Enoch 10, see Hartmann, 1976–77, p. 94.

26. With regard to the probable dependency of 1 Enoch 84: 2–6 upon 9:4–11, see Camponovo, 1984, p. 248. Milik (1976, pp. 316–17) has published two fragments of the Book of Giants (4QEnGiants^a 9–10) which he suggests belong to a prayer of Enoch similar to the prayers in 1 Enoch 9 and 84.

deity is addressed as lord, king, and god and praised as the all-powerful creator and ruler who knows and sees all things. While the doxology shows evidence of elaboration with the addition of the sophia figure (84:3c), the statement of motive (84:4) is considerably shorter than in the angelic prayer, mentioning the sins of the watchers and the tribulations of humankind in a single verse. The prayer concludes with a petition (84:5–6) that the wicked be eliminated from the earth and that Enoch and his offspring be established as a “seed-bearing plant” (84:6) forever. In its present context, the prayer is spoken by Enoch in response to a dream-vision, the content of which was a theophany of judgment (83:3b–4,7c). Awakening from his dream, Enoch recounts the vision to his grandfather Malalel, and it is he who encourages Enoch to formulate the prayer of intercession. Enoch, in turn, instructs his son Methuselah concerning the vision and the prayer, thus ensuring the continuity of intercessory activity among his descendants.

The correspondence between the prayers in 9:4–11 and 84:2–6 confirms our thesis that a prayer of intercession of more or less set form and content was handed down as part of the Enochic tradition. It is clear from the context of the prayer in the first dream-vision that the tradents of the prayer (and the vision) regarded themselves as the “remnant” (83:8) on whose behalf Enoch was instructed to intercede. The line of tradition Malalel—Enoch—Methuselah is a further indication that the prayer was transmitted in Enochic circles over generations.²⁷

The evidence of its transmission in a fixed line of tradition over generations raises the question of the possible *Sitz im Leben* of the prayer. Although the question cannot be resolved with any great degree of certainty, there is reason to believe that it was transmitted in a liturgical setting or at least reflects the practice of intercessory prayer in such a context. In this regard, we may draw attention to the fact that it has been handed down in yet another recension in 63:2–10 as part of a larger liturgy of intercession.²⁸ An intriguing parallel with more far-reaching implications, however, is suggested by the role of intercession in what apparently was a ceremony of covenant renewal celebrated at

27. Rau (1974, 455–85) has argued that both the dream-vision in 1 Enoch 83–84 and the animal apocalypse in 85–90 belonged to the teachings of an Enochic school of wisdom, a so-called “house of Enoch,” whose adherents claimed authority as the “descendants” of Enoch. Characteristic for the transmission of tradition from “father” to “son” in this school was a period of apprenticeship during which the pupil “slept” with the teacher. It was during sleep with the teacher that the pupil learned to “see” and to receive teachings in the form of a vision.

28. See the discussion of 1 Enoch 63:2–10 below.

Qumran.²⁹ References to intercession in two of the main sources of that ceremony (Jub 1; IQS 1:16-2:18) indicate that intercessory prayer was instrumental in mediating the blessings and curses of the covenant.³⁰ Although it would be premature to propose any such setting for the Enochic prayer of intercession, we do note that Hartmann (1979) drew in part upon the same evidence in support of his thesis that the *Sitz im Leben* of 1 Enoch 1-5 was a cultic celebration with covenant associations. Once again there seems to be evidence of intercessory activity in mediating both the promise of peace and mercy to the righteous (5:6,7) and the denial of peace to the wicked (5:4,5).³¹

The inference of the above observations for the commission of Enoch in 12:3-4 is that the reference to the introductory formula of address

29. The constituent elements of that ceremony included a recitation of the deity's salvific deeds, a confession of sins, and a series of blessings and curses. See M. Weise, 1961, pp. 109-12.

30. With regard to the evidence of a celebration of covenant renewal in the book of Jubilees and the Manual of Discipline, see A. Jaubert, 1963, pp. 100-115 and M. Weise, 1961, pp. 61-112, respectively. In Jub 1, the notion of covenant renewal is a recurrent theme throughout the chapter. Of interest in this regard is the intercession of Moses on behalf of the community in 1:19-21 which is followed by a reference to the confession of sins on their part in v. 22. It is clear from the context (cf. the blessings and curses in vv. 10-17) that the renewal of the covenant is contingent upon a public expression of remorse. The reference to the Mosaic prayer of intercession leads us to conclude that intercessory prayer was itself part of that ritual, the purpose of which was to ensure the continuity of blessing (cf. the statement of trust in vv. 23-25). The description of a similar ceremony celebrated during the festival of weeks is found in IQS 1:16-2:18. The blessings and curses spoken by the priests and levites on that occasion (cf. 2:2-9) are based upon a paraphrase of the priestly blessing (Num 6:24-26) which was interpreted from an eschatological perspective. In particular, we note that the levitic curse in 2:9 was formulated as a negative oracle of *šālôm*: *wlw² yhyh lkh šlwm bpy kwl ʾwhzy ʾbwt* 'and may there be no peace for thee at the mouth of any intercessors' (Wernberg-Møller, 1957, p. 23). Although there is some doubt about the meaning of the phrase *ʾwhzy ʾbwt*, Wernberg-Møller (1957, pp. 53-54, n. 26) has argued convincingly that a reference to angelic intercessors (counterparts of the punishing angels in 2:6) is intended. The underlying notion is that the response to a plea of intercession on behalf of the wicked will be negative: They will receive no mercy and there will be no forgiveness of sins (cf. 2:8). The effect of the curse within the context of covenant renewal was to deny the "men of Belial's lot" all further benefit of intercessory prayer, whereas the "men of God's lot" were granted "eternal peace" (2:4).

31. Hartmann (1979, pp. 24-39) argued that a benediction-malediction rite similar to that in IQS 1:16-2:18 lay behind the combination of blessings and curses in 1 Enoch 5:4-9. In this regard, he suggested further that a paraphrase of the priestly blessing also influenced the formulation of the promise and denial of peace in these verses. While there is some merit to this view, the presence of the *ʾên-šālôm* formula in 5:4,5 and the reference to the forgiveness of sins in connection with the salvation saying in 5:6 G indicate that the paraphrase itself was elaborated in connection with intercessory prayer.

“lord and king” in 12:3 is, in fact, an allusion to the Enochic prayer of intercession (cf. also 1 Enoch 25:7 and 27:3,5). It is unclear why the prayer was not quoted here more fully, although it may have to do with the rather awkward transition from the narrative in chaps. 6–11 at this point and with the fact that a version of the prayer had already been interpolated into that narrative.

The denial of peace as a polemic against the priesthood

A further point in question pertains to the denial of peace to the watchers. A number of recent studies have identified the fallen watchers of heaven with the priesthood in Jerusalem (Suter, 1979b; Nickelsburg, 1981). According to this view, the central concern of the myth of angelic rebellion in the recension of its oldest strand, the Šemiḥazah narrative, is the corruption of the angels themselves. By abandoning their abode in heaven and taking human wives, they have transgressed against the cosmic order. The theme of the defilement of the watchers seems to reflect an underlying halachic concern with the purity of the priesthood. The accusation that the angels have polluted themselves by lusting after women and lying with them is evidently a reference to illegitimate sexual relations or marriages on the part of the priesthood, perhaps even to their defilement through contact with menstrual blood (cf. 15:2) (see Dimant, 1978, p. 325; Suter, 1979, p. 130). Similarly, the designation of their children, the giants, as “bastards” (10:9) identifies them as the offspring of an adulterous union (see Dimant, 1978, p. 325; Suter, 1979b, pp. 122–23). Later strands of the myth, such as the teaching motif associated with Šemiḥazah and ʿAšaʿel, indicate that the accusations of sorcery and idolatry were also brought against the priesthood (see Dimant, 1978, pp. 327–29).

The identification of the fallen watchers with the priesthood in Jerusalem fits in well with our own interpretation of the formal usage of the *šālôm* oracle. The formulation of the judgment sayings in 12:5,6 and 13:1 as a negative oracle of *šālôm* is evidence of the deliberate usage of terminology associated with the age-old polemic against the Jerusalem cultic community. Within the context of the rebellion myth the polemic has taken on an additional nuance. The defilement of the priesthood had grave consequences for the natural, social, and political life of the community. The violent oppression of humankind by the giants which, as Nickelsburg (1977, p. 391) has suggested, may reflect the turmoil in Palestine during the Diodochan wars of succession is the most immediate such consequence. It is the perception that this state of distress has come

upon the community because of the corruption of the cult which occasions the angelic and Enochic prayer of intercession. The denial of peace thus has the effect of abrogating the authority of the normative cult. In its stead, a new authority and a new cult, a new “plant,” so to speak, will be established which will realize the long awaited promise of peace. In this respect, we note an affinity between the visionary perspective in Third Isaiah and that in 1 Enoch 12–16.

The second commissioning scene (1 Enoch 13:8–16:4)

The question of authority is a crucial one in connection with the polemic against the priesthood in Jerusalem. While Enoch’s role as intercessor on behalf of humankind is the focus of the first commissioning scene, it is the second commissioning scene in 13:8–16:4 which is the source of Enoch’s own claim of authority as a prophet of judgment (cf. 14:3). At the heart of the second commissioning scene is, of course, the throne-vision (14:8–16:4). As mentioned above, the vision itself combines the element of ascent (14:8–25) with that of a prophetic commission (15:1–16:4). Our interest in the present context is limited to Enoch’s commission as a prophet of judgment and to the circumstances surrounding his intercession on behalf of the fallen angels.

The narrative framework in which the commissioning scene has been handed down focuses on a plea by the watchers that Enoch intercede with the deity on their behalf. The details of that request and Enoch’s attempt to fulfil it are described in 13:4–7.

The penance of the watchers

Significant in this regard is the “shame” of the watchers (13:5) as well as their request for “forgiveness and length [of days]” (13:6).³² The formulation of the latter is an indication that their petition actually included two separate requests: a plea of pardon for themselves (“forgiveness”) and one on behalf of their children (“length [of days]”). Both requests correspond to formulations in the earlier sentence of judgment spoken by Enoch and the archangels upon the watchers (cf. 12:5; 13:4) and the giants (cf. 10:10), respectively. That the fallen angels pray on

32. With regard to the rendering of G *makrotēs* / E *nuḥat* as ‘length [of days]’, see Charles, 1912, p. 30. Black (1985, p. 144) translates ‘forgiveness and restoration’ at this point by proposing a Heb./Aram. original *ʾrwkh*? “lit. ‘healing’ but always used figuratively.” If nothing else, his reconstruction fails to account for G, as *makrotēs* hardly derives from *ʾrwkh*?

behalf of the giants reflects not only their former status as angelic intercessors, but also the favor which the giants enjoy as their “beloved ones” (10:12; 12:6; 14:6), an apparent designation of election.³³

The shame of the watchers, on the other hand, is a reference to their remorse which takes the form of a penitential ritual in which they are seated as a group and pray with their faces covered (13:9). Although the content of their prayer has not been handed down, we may assume that it contained a confession of sins and a plea for forgiveness. This form, which is typical for songs of lament, is a common element in prayers of intercession. An example of such a prayer attributed to the “mighty kings who possess the earth” is found in the aforementioned liturgy in 1 Enoch 63:2–10. In addition to a doxology similar to that in the angelic and Enochic prayers of intercession (cf. 9:4–5; 84:2–3), the liturgy also includes a song of collective lament, the two main elements of which are a plea for forgiveness (63:5–6) and a confession of sins (63:7). The prayer in 63:2–10 represents a later development of the tradition associated with the imprisonment and punishment of the fallen watchers which at some time became interwoven with midrashic material about the fate of the kings and mighty of the earth.³⁴ Moreover, it is not the only evidence of repentance on the part of the watchers in the Enochic writings.³⁵ There is no indication, however, that their petition for forgiveness ever received a favorable response.

Enoch's commission as a prophet of judgment

In conclusion, a few words are necessary concerning the form of Enoch's commission as a prophet of judgment. Enoch's presence in the heavenly throne-room occasions an elaboration of the formula of address in 15:1: Enoch is addressed as both a “righteous man” and “scribe of righteousness”, a reference to the fact that he is charged with both

33. With regard to *agapētos* as a term of divine favor, see Quell and Stauffer, 1933, pp. 48–49. As Wallis (1973, pp. 127–28) points out, *ḥb* was also used at Qumran to designate the election of the community.

34. With regard to the conflux of tradition in 1 Enoch 62–63, see Suter, 1979a, pp. 26, 54–55, 117–20.

35. Cf. 2 Enoch 18:1–9. Charles (1912, p. 6) drew attention to this passage in an attempt to explain the gloss in 1 Enoch 1:5 G “and the watchers shall believe.” In his opinion, the reference to the belief of the watchers and to their “singing” (1:5b) was introduced by the scribe of G who was aware of the tradition about the repentance of the watchers. In this regard, it is of interest to note that a tradition of repentance on the part of the watchers has also survived in an early medieval midrash, contrasting the penitential efforts of Šemiḥazah who suspends himself upside down between heaven and earth with the unrepentant attitude of ʿAšaʿel who continues to commit sin (see Milik, 1976, pp. 321–31).

witnessing and recording the following proceedings.³⁶ Enoch is then sent to announce to the watchers that their petition has been rejected (15:2) and that the response to their plea is *ʔēn-šālôm* (16:4). The motive for the rejection of the watchers' request is formulated in 15:3-7, restating in more detail the reasons already cited in 12:4, namely their abandonment of heaven and their defilement by taking wives for themselves. A discourse on the spirits of the giants follows in 15:8-16:1. This passage serves as a response to the plea of the watchers on their behalf, explaining that, although the violent end of the giants has been ordained (16:1; cf. 10:9-10; 12:5), their spirits will continue to plague humankind until the consummation of the age on the day of judgment. In 16:2, there is a renewal of Enoch's commission to announce judgment upon the watchers who are accused of having taught heavenly secrets to women.³⁷

As a whole, the form of Enoch's commission in 15:1-16:4 resembles that of a *riḥ*-patterened denouncement speech which Enoch is called upon to witness. Typically, the denouncement speech is accompanied by a description of the scene of judgment and is formulated as an address by the plaintiff in the second person to the defendant.³⁸ Several characteristic elements of that speech are evident in the account of Enoch's commission: a reproach of the defendant based on the (ensuing) accusation (15:2), an accusation in question form addressed to the defendant (15:3), a refutation of the possible argument of the defendant (15:4-7 and 15:8-16:1), and a sentence of judgment (16:4). It is clear that the watchers are the defendants in the present context, while the deity takes on the role of the plaintiff. Enoch's part in the lawsuit derives from both his advocatory role on behalf of the watchers and his duties as a scribe. He not only pleads the case of the accused before the divine council, but also records the testimony and delivers the word of judgment.

The use of the *riḥ*-pattern in formulating the second commissioning scene is significant for our understanding of Enoch's role as a prophet of judgment. As we have seen, it is Enoch's attempt at intercession on behalf of the watchers which results in his admission into the heavenly throne-room. It is there that he received his charge to announce judgment upon the fallen angels. The formulation of that commission in the pattern of a denouncement speech which he is called upon to witness and record suggests that Enoch has, in fact, replaced the fallen watchers

36. On Enoch's role as a witness before the divine council, see Betz, 1963, pp. 56-57.

37. The introduction of the teaching motif at this point is abrupt and may well stem from the hand of a redactor. See Newsom, 1980, pp. 319-20.

38. With regard to the form of the denouncement speech, see Huffmon, 1959, pp. 285-86.

of heaven in the divine council. It is Enoch, and no longer the watchers, who has access to the heavenly throne-room and is able to mediate prayers of intercession on behalf of humankind. The incongruity of this reversal of roles is noted in the reproach of the watchers in 15:2.³⁹ At the same time, their exclusion from the divine council is confirmed by the denial of peace in 16:4. The effect of the oracle of *ʔēn-šālôm* within the context of the polemic against the cultic community in Jerusalem is clearly an abrogation of any further claim of the priesthood to act as intercessors for the remnant of Israel.

Summary and conclusions

In the course of this paper, I have argued that the denial of peace to the watchers in 1 Enoch 12–16 has its roots in connection with an older on-going polemic against the cultic community in Jerusalem. In this respect, the oracle of *ʔēn-šālôm* was used by both Jeremiah and Ezekiel to denounce the intercessory activity of their prophetic opponents in mediating salvation oracles. The evidence of its usage in Third Isaiah, on the other hand, indicates that the oracle was no longer used to question the promise of *šālôm* to the community as a whole, but rather to deny a segment of the community, the *rěššāʿīm*, participation in that (future) welfare. The denial of peace to the *rěššāʿīm* reflects the visionary perspective of Third Isaiah which made the representatives of the normative cult responsible for the delay in the restoration of the Jerusalem community.

It is this tradition, associating the denial of peace with a polemic against the priesthood in Jerusalem, which re-emerges in 1 Enoch 12–16. In the context of two different commissioning scenes, Enoch is called to announce judgment upon the fallen watchers and their children, the giants. In the first scene (12:3–13:3), Enoch is summoned in response to a prayer of intercession which he spoke on behalf of beleaguered humankind. The second scene (13:8–16:4) describes Enoch's attempt at intercession on behalf of the watchers. The negative response to their petition is related in the form of a *riḥ*-patterned denouncement speech. The denial of peace in connection with this speech testifies to the exclusion of the fallen angels from the divine council. In their stead, Enoch in his role as intercessor is brought before the heavenly throne where he is entrusted with cosmological and eschatological secrets.⁴⁰

39. Suter (1979b, p. 134) is surely mistaken when he reads 1 Enoch 15:2 as a rebuke of Enoch for interceding on behalf of angels.

40. As Newsom (1980, p. 322) points out, Enoch's cosmic journey in 1 Enoch 17–19 juxtaposes his knowledge of the heavenly mysteries with the secrets known by the watchers. Whereas the watchers know worthless mysteries (cf. 16:3), Enoch is shown the true secrets.

The interpretation of the two commissioning scenes within the context of the polemic against the Jerusalem priesthood has important implications for our understanding of the visionary perspective in 1 Enoch 12-16. While denying the legitimacy of the temple cult, they attest to the authority of the figure of Enoch and his "descendants" as the recipients and tradents of celestial knowledge in the form of a throne-vision. Unlike the polemic in Third Isaiah, however, the denial of peace in these chapters precludes a restoration of the community in Jerusalem during the current age which is dominated by the evil spirits of the giants. The hope for renewal which does remain is relegated to the eschaton. While the throne-vision is the source of the claim to divine favor in Enochic circles in their struggle against the priesthood, it is their knowledge and practice of intercessory prayer which will sustain them until the end of the age.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Betz, O. 1963. *Das Paraklet*. Leiden.
- Black, M. 1985. *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*. Leiden.
- Camponovo, O. 1984. *Königtum, Königsherrschaft und Reich Gottes in den Frühjüdischen Schriften*. Fribourg/Göttingen.
- Charles, R. H. 1912. *The Book of Enoch*. Oxford.
- Dimant, D. 1978. "1 Enoch 6-11: A Methodological Perspective." *Society of Biblical Literature 1978 Seminar Papers* 1, pp. 323-339. Ed. P. J. Achtemeier. Missoula, MT.
- Eissfeldt, O. 1976. *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. New York.
- Hanson, P. D. 1977. "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6-11." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96: 195-233.
- _____. 1979. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia.
- Hartman, L. 1976-77. "'Comfort of the Scriptures'—An Early Jewish Interpretation of Noah's Salvation, 1 Enoch 10:16-11:2." *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 41-42: 87-96.
- _____. 1979. *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1-5*. Lund.
- Jaubert, A. 1963. *La Notion d'Alliance dans le Judaïsme*. Paris.
- Milik, J. T. 1976. *The Books of Enoch*. Oxford.
- Newsom, C. A. 1980. "The Development of 1 Enoch 6-19: Cosmology and Judgment." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 42: 310-329.
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E. 1977. "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6-11." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96: 383-405.

- _____. 1981. "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100: 575-600.
- Quell, G. and E. Stauffer. 1933. "Agapaō, agapē, agapētos." *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* 1, pp. 20-55. Ed. G. Kittel. Stuttgart.
- Rau, E. 1974. *Kosmologie, Eschatologie und die Lehrautorität Henochs*. Hamburg.
- Sisson, J. P. 1986. "Jeremiah and the Jerusalem Conception of Peace." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105: 429-42.
- Suter, D. W. 1979a. *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch*. Missoula, MT.
- _____. 1979b. "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6-16." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 50, pp. 115-35. Cincinnati.
- Uhlig, S. 1984. *Das Aethiopische Henochbuch*. Gütersloh.
- Vanderkam, J. C. 1973. "The Theophany of 1 Enoch 1:3b-7,9" *Vetus Testamentum* 23: 129-50.
- Wallis, G. 1973. "ḥb." *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* 1, 105-128. Eds. G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Stuttgart.
- Weise, M. 1961. *Kultzeiten und kultischer Bundesschluss in der "Ordensregal" vom Toten Meer*. Leiden.
- Wernberg-Møller, P. 1957. *The Manual of Discipline*. Leiden.
- Westermann, C. 1986. *Das Buch Jesaja. Kapitel 40-46*. Göttingen.
- Zimmerli, W. 1969. *Ezekiel I*. Neukirchen-Vluyn.