

Concepts of Righteousness in 1 Enoch 1-36 and Romans 1-3: A Comparative Analysis

Eliezer Gonzalez
Queensland, Australia

1. Introduction

The recent debate within Protestantism over justification, spearheaded by N.T. Wright, has highlighted some of the core issues of the New Perspective on Paul. Paul would have known of the popular Jewish apocalypses, and indeed, many scholars identify them as a source of Paul's eschatological thinking. The concept of "righteousness" is prominent in many of these apocalypses. Given the renewed interest in the apocalyptic background to Paul's thought-world it is relevant to examine some of the issues in the current debate in this context.

What similarities are there between Paul's understanding of "righteousness" and the understanding reflected in the Jewish apocalypses? More importantly, in what ways does Paul, in his epistles, significantly depart from the understanding of righteousness that was held by popular Judaism of his day? To attempt to glean some perspectives on these questions, this paper will compare and contrast the concepts of righteousness in 1 Enoch 1-36 (*Book of Watchers*) and Romans 1-3.

2. Background to the Debate

The current and ongoing debate within Protestantism over the issue of justification should be of keen interest to Seventh-day Adventists, given their historic focus on righteousness by faith. Indeed, the current polemic

GONZALEZ: CONCEPTS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

touches on issues of contention within Adventism in recent decades. However, Adventists appear to have been largely watching from the sidelines.

The current debate within Protestantism over the issue of justification¹ is spearheaded by N. T. Wright, who argues that the verb, δικάιόω, “to justify,” “does not denote an action which transforms someone so much as a declaration which grants them a status. It is the *status* of the person which is transformed by the action of ‘justification,’ not the *character*.”² In fact, he argues that Paul used the verb δικάιόω “precisely and exactly”³ in this sense, unlike those who since Augustine have tried to use it to refer to “the whole range of ‘becoming a Christian’ from first to last.”⁴ In parallel to this, Wright argues that God does not impute moral righteousness from somewhere else.⁵

Wright argues that “God’s righteousness” in second-temple Judaism and in Paul’s writings means “faithfulness to the covenant.”⁶ Wright holds to Sanders’ concept of covenantal nomism;⁷ in other words, that “Judaism. . . was therefore not a religion of ‘legalistic works-righteousness’ such as generations of scholars, preachers. . . have imagined.”⁸ “Getting into” the

¹ At the core of the current debate are issues that are similar to the issues at the heart of the important debate between Bultmann and Käsemann over the meaning of the expression “the righteousness of God” (*dikaïosyne theou*). For an overview of the debate see M. C. De Boer, “Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology,” in *The Continuum History of Apocalypticism*. (Ed. B. McGinn, J. J. Collins, and S. J. Stein; New York: Continuum, 2003), 166-194. More specifically, see R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (vol. 1; New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1951); and E. Käsemann, “The ‘Righteousness of God’ in Paul,” in *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), 168-182.

² N. T. Wright, *Justification: God’s Plan and God’s Vision* (Downer’s Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 2009), 91.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid., MA (*ECJS*)

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ See E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.)

⁸ Wright, *Justification*, 73-74; See also N. T. Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 18-19.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

covenant is by God's mercy, and "staying in" is by obedience.⁹ In terms of the role of the law, the idea is that, "now that you're in the covenant, here is the law to keep."¹⁰

Wright maintains that, "the key question facing Judaism as a whole was not about individual salvation, but about God's purposes for Israel and the world."¹¹ Within this scheme, he argues that righteousness in Romans 1:17 refers to God's own righteousness.¹² Furthermore, within the argument of Romans, Wright maintains that, "it makes no sense whatever to say that the judge imputes, imparts, bequeaths, conveys or otherwise transfers his righteousness."¹³ Therefore, "[j]ustification is not how someone becomes a Christian. It is the declaration that they have become a Christian."¹⁴

This has proven to be a confronting challenge to traditional Protestant understandings of righteousness and justification. At the forefront of recent responses to Wright has been John Piper,¹⁵ who mounts a strong defense of the traditional Protestant position.¹⁶ Wright, in turn, has responded that Piper "fails to grapple with the larger context of Romans 3 and 4."¹⁷

A significant entrant into the broader debate has been Douglas Campbell, with his monograph, *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic*

⁹ D. A. Carson, "Introduction," in *Justification and Variegated Nomism. The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (Vol.1; Ed. D.A. Carson, P. T. O'Brien, and M. A. Seifrid; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001), 2.

¹⁰ Wright, *Justification*, 72.

¹¹ Wright, *Justification*, 75-76.

¹² Wright, *Justification*, 180. Here, with specific reference to Rom 1:17, Wright states that righteousness refers to God's own covenant faithfulness.

¹³ Wright, *Justification*, 19.

¹⁴ Wright, *Justification*, 125.

¹⁵ John Piper, *The Future of Justification: A Response to N. T. Wright* (Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2007.)

¹⁶ Piper, *Future of Justification*, 19-23, in particular defends a number of ideas contra his understanding of Wright's position; namely that, justification is how you become a Christian, that justification is the gospel, that we are justified by believing in justification; that the imputation of God's righteousness does make sense, that first-century Judaism did have self-righteousness and boastful legalism, and that God's righteousness is not the same as His covenant faithfulness.

¹⁷ Wright, *Justification*, 67.

GONZALEZ: CONCEPTS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

*Rereading of Justification in Paul.*¹⁸ In this work, Campbell argues passionately against the traditional Protestant understanding of justification by faith, which he calls, “justification theory,”¹⁹ maintaining that it is not at the heart of Paul’s theology, but that the heart is rather the “apocalyptic in breaking of the Christ event and the subsequent union of believers with Christ in His death and resurrection.”²⁰ In doing so, Campbell aligns himself significantly with Wright.²¹ Campbell therefore defines salvation as “[t]he saving transformation through participation in Christ in the Spirit,”²² and he analogously states that, “Christians are saved through their participation [in] the cross.”²³ The traditional Protestant understanding of righteousness is therefore under attack from a number of different quarters.

Francis Watson makes the valid critique of Campbell’s work that, “at no point is the alternative, participatory-apocalyptic position presented as anything other than the antagonist of Justification.”²⁴ Is the apocalyptic position on “righteousness” as monolithic, on the one hand, as Campbell makes “justification theory” out to be on the other? Bauckham’s work certainly indicates that it is not.²⁵ Therefore, may we grant that Paul’s position may be thoroughly apocalyptic, and yet not be entirely analogous with significant streams of apocalyptic thought in the first century? This present paper, in spite of its limited scope, suggests that we most certainly can.

Ultimately the issues of this debate turn on the broader and fundamental views of the New Perspective, as originally proposed by Sanders, regarding covenantal nomism. Some form of covenantal nomism

¹⁸ Douglas Campbell, *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.)

¹⁹ Campbell, *Deliverance of God*, 9ff.

²⁰ Campbell, *Deliverance of God*, 722, 748, 882; in this he follows the tradition of Schweitzer and Wrede.

²¹ E.g. Campbell, *Deliverance of God*, 695.

²² Campbell, *Deliverance of God*, 83.

²³ Campbell, *Deliverance of God*, 89.

²⁴ Francis Watson, Review of Campbell, “Deliverance.” *Early Christianity* 1 (2010): 175-189, 180.

²⁵ Richard Bauckham, “Apocalypses,” in *Justification and Variegated Nomism. The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (Vol. 1; Ed. D. A. Carson, P. T. O’Brien, and M. A. Seifrid. Tübingen: J. C .B. Mohr, 2001), 135-188.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

is seen by many scholars today as the underlying framework within which Second Temple Judaism should be understood. However, the basis on which Sanders' work has been critiqued²⁶ is summarized by Wright himself when he states that, "Sanders has offered a massive but, to many, deeply unconvincing reading of the 'pattern of religion' in second-temple Judaism: unconvincing because it is too uniform, unconvincing also because it is insufficiently theological."²⁷

The most thorough evaluation of covenantal nomism in recent years has been the two multi-authored volumes edited by Don Carson. My reading of the papers in this volume is that in essence they argue that what is needed is a careful and nuanced reading of the texts dealing with Second Temple Judaism. In his introduction²⁸ Carson observes that,

the literature of Second Temple Judaism reflects patterns of belief and religion too diverse to subsume under one label. The results are messy. But if they are allowed to stand, they may in turn prepare us for a more flexible approach to Paul. It is not that the new perspective has not taught us anything helpful or enduring. Rather, the straitjacket imposed on the apostle Paul by appealing to a highly unified vision of what the first-century "pattern of religion" was really like will begin to find itself unbuckled.²⁹

Regardless, reviewing the essays in Don Carson's work, Wright justifiably comments that, "[t]he essays in large part support Sanders' overall case more than (we may suppose) the editors had hoped when they commissioned them, and even Don Carson in his conclusion. has to admit that Sanders has a point even if he has overplayed it."³⁰

²⁶ Westerholm observes, "[t]hat there is little consensus on the 'new perspective' is apparent enough." (S. Westerholm, "The 'New Perspective' at Twenty-Five," in *Justification and Variegated Nomism. The Paradoxes of Paul* (Vol.2; Ed. D. A. Carson, P. T. O'Brien, and M. A. Seifrid; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2004), 37.

²⁷ Wright, *Justification*, 73.

²⁸ Carson's introduction reflects a summary of this work.

²⁹ Carson, *Introduction*, 5.

³⁰ Wright, *Justification*, 74.

3. The Jewish Apocalyptic Context

This paper will compare the concepts of “righteousness” found in the *Book of Watchers*,³¹ a core Jewish apocalyptic text that was popular in the first century, with that found in Romans 1-3, a core section of the Pauline writings. Based on this analysis, some tentative implications will be suggested for the idea of righteousness in the Pauline texts and in contemporary first-century Jewish texts. Obviously, this analysis cannot hope to engage with the full spectrum and depth of the current debate. However, it is intended that the findings may at least be suggestive and illustrative of the issues involved.

What we know of the book of *1 Enoch* is that it is not a single, unitary work, but it is rather “a major collection of apocalyptic writings.”³² It is well recognized that since quite early times, there were a number of small and originally independent books³³ that circulated in Judaism, and that were attributed to Enoch. The discovery of significant parts of this corpus among the Qumran texts,³⁴ has added determinative weight to the arguments for the antiquity of this work.³⁵

³¹ The *Book of Watchers* is found in *1 Enoch* chs 1-36.

³² J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd ed. (The Biblical Resources Series; Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998), 266.

³³ F. G. Martinez, “Contribution of the Aramaic Enoch Fragments to Our Understanding of the Books of Enoch,” in *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992,) 46. See also G. W. E. Nickelsburg, “The Bible Rewritten and Expanded,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (Ed. M. Stone; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 90.

³⁴ J. C. VanderKam, “1 Enoch, Enochic Motifs, and Enoch in Early Christian Literature,” in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*. *Compendia Rerum Iudicarum ad Novum Testamentum*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996,) 33-34.

³⁵ Aramaic fragments from eleven manuscripts of parts of the book of *1 Enoch* have been found at Qumran, which comprises parts of all of the sections of the book except *The Similitudes or Parables of Enoch* (1 Enoch 37-71). See M. E. Stone, “Apocalyptic Literature,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (Ed. M. Stone; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 397. Previously, *1 Enoch* was only known in an Ethiopic translation, discovered in Ethiopia in 1769, and a number of Greek manuscripts that subsequently surfaced. David Syme Russell, *Divine Disclosure: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic* (London: SCM Press, 1992), 38.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

There are a number of important, and indeed fascinating reasons why *1 Enoch*, of which the *Book of Watchers* forms a part, may be profitably compared and contrasted with the Pauline texts in terms of its understanding of “righteousness.” The first reason is that the availability of several Enochic texts, and certainly *1 Enoch*, was contemporary with the ministries of Jesus, Paul, and the development of the early church.³⁶ As far as *1 Enoch* is concerned, and in particular contrast, for example, with sections of the Rabbinic writings, no argument therefore needs to be made for its contemporaneity, in terms of usage, with the writings of Paul.³⁷

The second reason for the relevance of *1 Enoch* in this context was its influence generally on the thought-world of the New Testament, and specifically, on several New Testament writers. We have the well-known direct quotation from *1 Enoch* 1:9 in Jude 14. In Luke’s account of the transfiguration, the voice from heaven calls Jesus “My Elect One,” which is the title used for the Son of Man throughout *1 Enoch* 37-51.³⁸ Accordingly, Isaac notes not only that *1 Enoch* was well known to many Jews, but that, “Enochic concepts are found in various New Testament books, including the Gospels and Revelation.”³⁹

³⁶ Martinez, *Aramaic Enoch*, 71-72, notes regarding the 3rd century dating for this work, that “[t]he dating of the work in the 3rd century B.C. is of decisive importance for the study of apocalyptic. . . it also implies that the text of the ideological elements reflected in the work must be placed in a period prior to the hellenisation of Palestine.” VanderKam dates the *Book of Watchers* to the third century BC. (*Enochic Motifs*, 33. See also Martinez, *Aramaic Enoch*, 46,71-72; and C. Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1982), 266.

³⁷ The writings of Philo, as well as the *Wisdom of Solomon*, represent a more Hellenistic Judaism, which was contemporary with Paul. However, the impact of Philo’s works on first century Judaism is unknown, and the relative importance of the various sources of Paul’s thought-world still continues to be a much-debated question. This paper uses as a background some aspects of Paul’s clear affinity with Jewish apocalyptic literature, without denying of course, that other influences were also important to Paul.

³⁸ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου; See for example, *1 Enoch* 45:3,4; 49:2; 53:6; 55:4; 61:8-10. Charles notes that the Messianic designation of the “Elect One” seems to have its origin in Isaiah 42:1; cv. Luke 9:35. (R. H. Charles, tr., *The Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch* (Originally published 1912; Pomeroy: Health Research Books, 1964), 78.

³⁹ E. Isaac, “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (“Introduction”; Vol.1; Ed. J. H. Charles; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 8. See also R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament: in English with introductions and critical explanatory notes to the several books* (Vol.2; Edited in conjunction with many scholars by

GONZALEZ: CONCEPTS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

More broadly, the Enochic literature appears to have been highly influential in early Judaism.⁴⁰ An important question that must be borne in mind is precisely how sectarian *I Enoch* was. Certainly, at Qumran, it would appear that *I Enoch*, “enjoyed a status no less hallowed and authoritative than that of the Bible in the circles to which the authors belonged; they were clearly held to be divinely inspired or revealed by angels.”⁴¹ The question must also be asked, to what extent were the “sectarian” views of the Qumran community reflected in Judaeen Judaism more broadly?

In this vein, there can hardly be any doubt about the immense popularity of Jewish apocalyptic writings within Judaism in the Second Temple period.⁴² There is strong evidence to suggest that extant Jewish apocalyptic texts are merely a fraction of what must have existed.⁴³ Although there appear to have been many sectarian groups within Second Temple Judaism, Russell notes that, “the composition of apocalyptic literature was not confined to any of these.” Furthermore, and regardless of the distribution of the texts, the ideas of Jewish apocalyptic exercised a wide influence upon Second Temple Judaism.⁴⁴

R. H. Charles; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 180.

⁴⁰ See David Syme Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic: 200 BC -AD 100* (London: SCM Press, 1964), 37.

⁴¹ R. Eilior, *The Three Temples: On the Emergence of Jewish Mysticism* (Tr. D. Louvish; Oxford: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2004), 20.

⁴² However, Vajda observes that, “rabbinical Judaism, which became the normative Jewish tradition after the Roman conquest of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Second Temple (70 C.E.)—retained almost nothing [of the apocalyptic writings].” (G. Vajda, “Jewish Mysticism,” in *Understanding Jewish Mysticism: A Source Reader--The Merkabah Tradition and the Zoharic Tradition* (Ed. D.R. Blumenthal; New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1978), 6. See also Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 271.

⁴³ Russell, *Method and Message*, 28-29 notes that, “towards the close of the inter-testamental period, the writer of II Esdras can refer to no fewer than seventy secret books (presumably apocalyptic writings, to be delivered to the wise among the people (cf. 14.13, 26, 46), which were in circulation in his day and which he mentions in the same breath as the canonical Scriptures themselves (cf. 14.45-46).”

⁴⁴ Russell, *Divine Disclosure*, 35. See Russell, *Method and Message*, 28. Also Russell, *Divine Disclosure*, 33; and Margaret Barker, *The Older Testament: The Survival of Themes from the Ancient Royal Cult in Sectarian Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1987), 12.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Within early Christianity, we know that *1 Enoch* enjoyed a privileged position of authority.⁴⁵ Although it was ultimately deemed non-canonical by the church as a whole, it was certainly considered canonical by the Ethiopian church, through whom the text principally survived.⁴⁶ Indeed, *1 Enoch* was certainly influential⁴⁷ and “accepted as inspired and canonical in many Jewish and Christian circles”⁴⁸ in the early centuries of Christianity. It is evident that, “the writings of seven authors from the first three centuries of Christian history. . . show familiarity with Enochic books and accord them authoritative standing (all use words such as scripture or prophet/prophesy in connection with them).”⁴⁹

As a work of early Judaism, Isaac considers that *1 Enoch* helps us to discern the “complexities of both intertestamental Jewish thought and early Christian theology.”⁵⁰ In a historical sense, it straddles the Old and New Testament, since it depends on the Old Testament as much as “it is

⁴⁵ See J. Danielou, *The Origins of Latin Christianity* (Vol. 3 of A History of Early Christian Doctrine Before the Council of Nicaea (Tr. D. Smith and J. A. Baker; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977), 162; and Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 264.

⁴⁶ See Barker, *Older Testament*, 8-9.

⁴⁷ VanderKam, *Enochic Motifs*, 60,100, traces the central Enochic myth of the angels who married the daughters of men, and concludes that “[t]he booklets that comprise *1 Enoch*, especially the *Book of Watchers*, were apparently more popular among Christian readers than among their Jewish contemporaries, or at least the surviving literature suggests as much.”

⁴⁸ On the popularity of Jewish apocalyptic within earliest Christianity, see C. W. Griggs, *Earliest Egyptian Christianity: From its Origins to 451 C.E.* (2nd ed. Vol. 2 of Coptic Studies; Leiden: Brill, 1991), 7. See also W. Adler, “Introduction,” in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (Compendia Rerum Iudicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996), 1; and Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 33.

⁴⁹ VanderKam, *Enochic Motifs*, 59-60, citing Jude, Barnabas, Athenagoras, Irenaeus, Clement, Tertullian, and Origen. See also B. A. Pearson, “Enoch in Egypt,” in *Gnosticism and Christianity in Roman and Coptic Egypt, Studies in Antiquity and Christianity* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 134; *Epistle of Barnabas*, 4.3, in W. H. Holmes, tr. and ed., *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (3d ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 387. Regarding Tertullian’s views of *1 Enoch* as canonical, and the Western Church more broadly, see Tertullian, *On the Apparel of Women*, III.3, tr. S. Thelwall, in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Church Fathers Down to A.D. 325* (Vol.4; Ed. A. Roberts and J. Donaldson; American Reprint of the Edinburgh Edition; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), 14-26. See also Danielou, *Latin Christianity*, 162, 167; Isaac, “Introduction,” 8; Vanderkam, *Enochic Motifs*, 34. Adler, “Introduction,” 9, 24-25.

⁵⁰ Isaac, “Introduction,” 9.

GONZALEZ: CONCEPTS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

influential upon the New Testament and later extracanonical literature.”⁵¹ Barker tantalizingly observes that, “our failure to find a real place for the Enochic tradition in our picture of Christian origins is a good example of blinkered scholarship. The Old Testament is not the only ancient authority that New Testament writers recognize or cite, despite what we have been told.”⁵²

The important background issue for this paper is not whether Paul quotes or alludes to *1 Enoch* at all, but rather, as has been long recognized, that Paul displays a clear affinity with Jewish apocalyptic literature at many levels of his writings. Jewish apocalyptic thought was a key element in Paul’s mental milieu, and many of its aspects are reflected in his work.⁵³ Paul is not writing apocalypses, nevertheless, contemporary scholarship recognizes that, “Paul stands firmly within the Jewish apocalyptic-mystical tradition. His understanding of the end of time and the resurrection is terms firmly apocalyptic. He describes his own spiritual experiences in terms appropriate to a Jewish apocalyptic-mystagogue of the first century.”⁵⁴

Key passages that particularly highlight Paul’s apocalyptic heritage are 1 Cor 15,⁵⁵ 1 Thess,⁵⁶ and 2 Cor 12.⁵⁷ In 1 Cor 15, both Paul’s notions of

⁵¹ Ibid.. See esp. p.10.

⁵² Barker, *Older Testament*, 8, contra J. A. Sanders, *Torah and Canon* (2nd ed.; Originally published in 1972; Philadelphia: Cascade Books, 2005), xiv.

⁵³ De Boer, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 182, comments that, “[a]s a former Pharisee, Paul’s deep familiarity with the perspectives and assumptions of forensic Jewish apocalyptic eschatology is thus readily explicable.”

⁵⁴ A. F. Segal, “Paul’s Thinking About Resurrection in its Jewish Context.” *New Testament Studies* 44 (1998): 400. See also De Boer, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 182.

⁵⁵ On this, see Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 265. Indeed, as Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 265, notes, Paul considers himself to be a “steward of the mysteries” (1 Cor 4:1), which are not merely eschatological, but rather embrace the complete plan of God which was previously hidden but which has not been revealed by the Spirit (1 Cor 2:6-8). See also S. M. Lewis, “The Apocalyptic Nature of 1 Cor 15,” in *So That God May Be All In All: the Apocalyptic Message of 1 Corinthians 15*, 12-34 (Roma: Ed. Pontificia Univ. Gregoriana, 1998,) 142.

⁵⁶ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 266, points to 1 Thessalonians as particularly exemplifying this apocalyptic expectation.

⁵⁷ In 1 Cor 12, Paul feels the need to distance himself from the revelation through the quasi-pseudonymity of the phrase οἶδα ἄνθρωπον (“I know a man.” - v.2), which reflects the literary style of Jewish apocalyptic. See also Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 385.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

eschatology and anthropological vocabulary⁵⁸ are distinctly aligned with those of Jewish apocalyptic thought. The key point is not that Paul's thought is dependent on *1 Enoch*, let alone the broader Jewish apocalyptic texts, but rather that Paul was writing within an apocalyptic Jewish milieu,⁵⁹ and within this milieu, *1 Enoch* appears to have been a particularly authoritative text.⁶⁰ As such, a comparison between the concepts of righteousness in *1 Enoch*⁶¹ and the Pauline texts would appear to be a fruitful endeavor.

Roetzel notes that δικαιοσύνη is "a fundamental term for Jewish apocalyptic"⁶² In this regard, Watson's comment is salient, "Schweitzer's evaluation of the doctrine of righteousness by faith creates a sharp disjunction between the scriptural and the apocalyptic strands of Paul's Jewish heritage. And yet the disjunction is untenable. A Hellenizing Paul

⁵⁸ See Segal, *Resurrection*, 417.

⁵⁹ As Adler, "Introduction," 2, observes, "there is a broad consensus that primitive Christianity took root on the same soil that produced the Jewish apocalyptic literature."

⁶⁰ De Boer, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 180, notes that Schweitzer argued in the early part of the twentieth century that Paul, like Jesus, "stood closer to the world of thought represented by the Book of Enoch" than to that of "the Apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra." On this, see Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (Tr. William Montgomery; Originally published in London: Adam & Charles Black, 1931; This edition published in Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1998), 57. This was of course also the view of Käsemann, in polemical opposition to Bultmann.

⁶¹ Of course, this is not to say that *1 Enoch* is representative of the emphasis of all Jewish apocalyptic in terms of "righteousness." The Jewish apocalyptic texts indeed present a broad range of ideas. *1 Enoch* is simply a text which we know was being circulated contemporarily with Paul, and whose ideas were highly influential.

⁶² C. J. Roetzel, *Judgment in the Community: A Study of The Relationship Between Eschatology and Ecclesiology in Paul* (Dissertation at Duke University; Leiden: Brill, 1972), 32, continues to explain his view that, "[w]hile the term. . . (*diatheke*) does not frequently appear in the apocalyptic literature it does occupy a more prominent place in apocalyptic than in rabbinic literature." Viviano comments that, "[t]he technical term *dikaioσύνη theou* occurs only once in the Old Testament; otherwise it occurs exclusively in late Jewish apocalyptic writings, e.g., in the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Dan 6:10 etc.) and in *Qumran* (1 QS XI:12)." (B. T. Viviano, "The Righteousness of God in Paul: A Grammatical Note," in *Trinity-Kingdom-Church: Essays in Biblical Theology* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquoos 48; Freiburg: Schweiz Univ., 2001), 248.

GONZALEZ: CONCEPTS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

could perhaps be detached from his Jewish scriptural heritage, but not a Jewish one.”⁶³

However, we must proceed with care. Even if we grant influence and importance to Jewish apocalyptic literature, Collins notes that the early Enochic literature “cannot be regarded as normative for all apocalypses.”⁶⁴ Additionally, Körtner reminds us that Jewish apocalyptic thought during the post-exilic period does not constitute thinking,

that remained unchanged through the various centuries, or any essentially unified system of ideas. In fact, the apocalyptic thinking of Judaism during the postexilic period remained constantly in flux and generated extremely disjunctive notions of judgment, the end time, and the salvific messianic age, and allowed such notions to exist beside one another.⁶⁵

However, one concept that is common to all types of Jewish apocalyptic is that of dualism. Importantly, this dualism manifests itself eschatologically,⁶⁶ however, dualism in Jewish thought also presupposes an understanding of an ethnic dualism, “which finds its dividing point in the line between Jew and Greek, circumcised and uncircumcised.”⁶⁷ Closely related to this is “ethical dualism,” which posits a distinction between two

⁶³ Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 40.

⁶⁴ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 11.

⁶⁵ U. H. J. Körtner, *The End of the World: A Theological Interpretation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 131.

⁶⁶ Körtner, *End of the World*, 131, observes that, “[c]ommon to all types of Jewish apocalyptic is the notion that a catastrophic event will bring about a one-time, decisive turn from disaster and affliction to salvation. The thinking of Jewish apocalyptic is thus fundamentally dualistic at the outset. Cautiously formulated, the dualism of Jewish apocalyptic consists in the irreconcilable antithesis between a present condition of disaster and affliction on the one hand, and a future condition of salvation on the other. It frequently appears as the juxtaposition of two world periods of the aeons. The idea does interject itself that the future aeon constitutes a world completely different from the present world and history.”

⁶⁷ R. W. Ciampa, *The Presence and Function of Scripture in Galatians 1 and 2* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament / 2, 102; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 136, with reference to circumcision in Gal 2:1-10.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

classes of human beings, such as the “righteous” versus the “wicked,” the “godly” versus the “impious,” or the “holy” versus the “impure.”⁶⁸

With regard to this, Gammie tellingly notes that the extent to which ethical dualism predominates in Jewish apocalyptic and sapiential thought has been overlooked in recent scholarship. Within Jewish thought, the dividing line in terms of ethical dualism was a matter for considerable discussion. It was not a fixed boundary, and Ciampa⁶⁹ notes that there was a latent understanding that the existing categories were unsatisfactory, and needed revision. Gammie⁷⁰ observes that, “whereas the older traditions tend to see the contrast between two opposing groups without or within Israel, some of the later traditions are inclined to identify the sons of Israel with the ‘righteous’ and non-Israelites as the ‘ungodly’ (Wisdom of Solomon, Jubilees, War Scroll.)”

This latter group of traditions found in the apocalyptic and sapiential literature would appear to be the ones which were more prominent and contemporaneous with Paul’s epistles.⁷¹ It is therefore appropriate, that at least to some extent, the analysis undertaken for this paper presupposes a dualistic paradigm.

Of course, Sanders is aware of *I Enoch*. Sanders in fact classes *I Enoch* in particular as being a document that is “defective” in terms of the pattern that he seeks to demonstrate in the Jewish texts.⁷² However, *I Enoch* can hardly be classed as defective in terms of representing at least an influential stream of popular Jewish thought in the first century. Since one of Sanders’ great contributions has been, as Westerholm emphasizes, to remind us of “the need to portray the Judaism of Paul’s day in its own terms, and from other sources other than Paul’s writings,”⁷³ it is relevant indeed to have another look at the *Book of Watchers*.

⁶⁸ J. G. Gammie, “Spatial and Ethical Dualism within Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic Literature.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93.3 (1974): 357.

⁶⁹ Ciampa, *Scripture*, 136.

⁷⁰ Gammie, *Dualism*, 384.

⁷¹ Indeed, Ciampa, *Scripture*, 137, comments that, “[t]his implied rejection of the Jew-Gentile distinction as the proper dividing line for ethical dualism also goes to the heart of Paul’s polemic in this letter.”

⁷² Sanders, quoted in Carson, *Introduction*, 2-3.

⁷³ Westerholm, *New Perspective*, 37.

GONZALEZ: CONCEPTS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

In Bauckham's review of the Jewish apocalyptic literature in terms of covenantal nomism, he notes that, "Sanders's work depends on an earlier stage of scholarly study of *1 Enoch*. . . unaffected by the Qumran evidence." However, he concludes that this is not decisive for his assessment of the ideological stance of the major Enochic writings.⁷⁴ This may be true for Sanders' assessment of the ideological stance of the texts; however, the Qumran material is significant in terms of allowing a re-evaluation, not only of the dating, but also of the influence of the Enochic material in Second Temple Judaism.

Having reviewed the Jewish apocalyptic texts overall, Bauckham concludes that, "[b]roadly, our findings coincide with Sanders's." However, there are some differences. The texts tend to presuppose a rather narrower definition of the righteous or the true Israel compared with the broader definition that Sanders finds in the Rabbinic texts.⁷⁵ More generally, Bauckham comments that it is not quite clear, "that Sanders does justice to these texts by claiming that they exhibit much the same pattern of religion as he finds in the Rabbis."⁷⁶

In the analysis below, I will necessarily have to look at the words and the themes in the selected passages texts. Appendices 1 and 2 show the words and specific texts selected for comparison. I note that Wright has stated that, "[v]erbal statistics, and accidental occurrences of themes, are in any case a dangerous guide in 'incidental' writings like Paul's."⁷⁷ The point being made by Wright must be appreciated; however it must also be balanced against one of his frequent expressions, which is that "the text is the text." Accordingly, we must venture into the text, bearing in mind the broader contextual constraints.

4. Analysis

For the purpose of this analysis, every occurrence of words belonging to the "righteousness" word group was considered in the *Book of Watchers*⁷⁸ and in Romans 1-3. Each reference was classified on the basis

⁷⁴ Bauckham, *Apocalypses*, 148.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 148, citing Sanders, *Palestinian Judaism*, 361.

⁷⁷ Wright, *Justification*, 96.

⁷⁸ I.e. *1 Enoch* 1-36.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

of whether it appeared to refer to either end of the polarity explicit in the analytical criteria.

The criteria selected for analysis are:

1. Is Righteousness Referring to God's Righteousness or Human Righteousness?
2. Is Righteousness Presented as Moral Standing or as God's Saving Activity?
3. Is Righteousness Presented as Covenant Faithfulness?
4. Is Righteousness Associated With God's Grace, Mercy, and Forgiveness?⁷⁹

Some caveats are however required with regard to the methodology and outcomes of this analysis. Firstly, the different purposes of the two passages selected for comparison must be borne in mind. The *Book of Watchers* and Romans 1-3 have both been selected because they both deal centrally with notions of righteousness and unrighteousness, with notions of the commencement and progress of unrighteousness in the world, and fundamentally, with the question of theodicy. However, in spite of these similarities, the respective authors of these passages ultimately have different agendas and different contexts.⁸⁰ This comparative analysis is not

⁷⁹ Following a discussion of *4 Ezra* 8:31-36, Piper comments that, "[i]t is fairly obvious from these texts as well as many in the Old Testament that the righteousness of God in Jewish literature does not always mean strict retributive justice: it embraces mercy. This view of righteousness as *iustitia salutifera* has come to be seen as the peculiarly Jewish-biblical view and thus functions for many scholars as an assumption in dealing with Pauline texts. More than a few scholars, however, have seen the hermeneutical pitfalls of such a use of the history of a concept. Käsemann and Stuhlmacher especially have come in for methodological criticism on this point. In reaction to the Käsemann-Stuhlmacher interpretation of God's righteousness, Hans Conzelmann and Günther Klein have both stressed. . . [that] [d]ecisive is not the history of a concept but the pauline context." (John Piper, "The Demonstration of the Righteousness of God in Romans 3:25-26," in *The Pauline Writings* (Ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig E. Evans; New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 190, quoting G. Klein, "Gottes Gerechtigkeit als Thema der neuesten paulus Forschung," in *Rekonstruktion und Interpretation* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser verlag, 1969), 230.

⁸⁰ It is significant to note here that Campbell, *Deliverance of God*, 528, marginalizes Rom 1-4 as not being indicative of the heart of Paul's thought, whereas he considers that chs. 5ff, with their focus on participation with Christ, are. In Campbell's view Rom 1-3 are

GONZALEZ: CONCEPTS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

an attempt to force one or the other to say what they do not mean to say; rather, the intent is simply to consider the semantic fields in which they respectively used the “righteousness” word group.

Secondly, it should be noted that the two texts are not of equal size. Therefore it is not helpful to directly compare the frequencies with which words are used. Rather, the respective proportions of usage within each text is of more value as an indicator of the author’s focus.

Thirdly, a pragmatic approach has been used in how the instances of words from the “righteousness” word group have been clustered. In other words, in a given verse or passage, if relevant words are used more than once in the same sense, they have been counted only as one instance in most cases.

Finally, it must be said that although some attempt has been made for some rigor in this methodology, it is recognized that the methodology, the analysis, and the conclusions are of course debatable. Regardless, it has seemed preferable to at least adopt a methodology of some sort rather than just making blanket statements about how these words “appear” to be used in the relevant texts.

1. The Book of Watchers (1 Enoch 1-36)

1a) Criterion 1 – God’s Righteousness or Human Righteousness?

Of the 18 references to righteousness, 3 referred to righteousness as pertaining to God, and 15 referred to righteousness pertaining to humans.⁸¹

1b) Criterion 2 – Righteousness as Moral Standing or as God’s Saving Activity?

merely a polemical response to an alternative gospel of conservative Jewish Christians in Rome; essentially a *reductio ad absurdio*. This seems to me to be highly unlikely and certainly most difficult to prove. However, even if this were granted, the selection of Rom 1-3 for a consideration of Paul’s use of the “righteousness” group of words would still remain appropriate and relevant.

⁸¹ One of these references, in *The Book of the Watchers* 10:16-18, although predominantly referring to human righteousness, may also possibly be a reference to God’s righteousness.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Of the 18 references to righteousness, 17 clearly referred to righteousness in terms of moral standing. This was most often in the form of a reference to “the righteous” as a group. In only one of these references did it appear that righteousness was work of God, with reference to God making righteousness appear in the eschaton.⁸² The adjective “righteous” is therefore most often used simply as a designation of a group in this text, e.g. “the righteous elect.” In this use, the concept of “righteous,” certainly appears to be much more static, and merely descriptive.

1c) Criterion 3 – Righteousness as Covenant Faithfulness?

In only one of the 18 references is it conceivable that there is an allusion to God’s covenant faithfulness⁸³ although it is striking that there are no explicit references to the covenant at all in this text.

1d) Criterion 4 – Righteousness Associated With God’s Grace, Mercy, and Forgiveness?

Of the 18 references to righteousness, there is only one in which righteousness is explicitly associated with God’s grace, mercy and forgiveness.⁸⁴

2. Romans 1-3

2a) Criterion 1 – God’s Righteousness or Human Righteousness?

There are 16 references to righteousness in Rom 1-3. Of these, 8 clearly refer to the righteousness of God, and 2 refer to righteousness as a “shared” or “parallel” concept for both God and humanity.⁸⁵

⁸² *The Book of the Watchers* 10:16-18.

⁸³ *Ibid.*

⁸⁴ *The Book of the Watchers* 27:3,4. This is a reference to God imparting mercy to the righteous in the judgment. Chapter 10:16-18, dealing with the restoration of righteousness in the eschaton, may also perhaps be seen to be associated with God’s grace, mercy, and forgiveness; although these are not mentioned in the text.

⁸⁵ The two references where righteousness appears to be a parallel or shared concept between God and humanity are found in Rom 1:16-17 and Rom 3:5.

2b) Criterion 2 – Righteousness as Moral Standing or as God’s Saving Activity?

Of the 16 references to righteousness, 11 refer to righteousness as moral standing, and 4 refer to righteousness as God’s Saving Activity. In the remaining reference, righteousness is mentioned in connection with both. (Rom 1:16-17.)

2c) Criterion 3 – Righteousness as Covenant Faithfulness?

Of the 16 references to righteousness, 3 occurrences are in connection with God’s covenant faithfulness.⁸⁶

2d) Criterion 4 – Righteousness Associated With God’s Grace, Mercy, and Forgiveness?

Of the 16 references to righteousness, 6 are explicitly associated with the grace, mercy, or forgiveness of God.

5. Findings

Criterion 1 – God’s Righteousness or Human Righteousness?

The focus in the *Book of Watchers* is, to a highly significant extent, on righteousness as an attribute of humans. Romans 1-3, however, presents righteousness as pertaining to both God and man.

Criterion 2 – Righteousness as Moral Standing or as God’s Saving Activity?

The *Book of Watchers* almost exclusively refers to righteousness in terms of moral standing. Righteousness is essentially presented as a static

⁸⁶ These references are Rom 3:21, 22; Rom 3:22-23; and Rom 3:28, 30. The immediate context of vv. 28, 30 is explicitly covenantal. Note also that Rom 1:16-17 refers to the covenant by allusion.

quality and is most commonly used as an adjective; there is no question of becoming righteous, or of “transferral” of righteousness in any way. Bauckham notes that “the language of election. . . is closely associated with the language of righteousness” in this work,⁸⁷ and that “it is simply assumed that the elect are those who are loyal and obedient to God. This is generally true of the rest of the Enochic literature also.”⁸⁸

Romans 1-3 predominantly refers to righteousness as moral standing, although a significant number of references also refer to righteousness in terms of God’s saving activity.⁸⁹ The prominent adjectival use of “righteous” as a simple descriptor for a group in the *Book of Watchers* is almost completely absent from Rom 1-3.

Criterion 3 – Righteousness as Covenant Faithfulness?

The concept of righteousness is not presented in the *Book of Watchers* in connection with God’s covenant faithfulness.⁹⁰ There are in fact no explicit references to the covenant at all in this text. In Romans 1-3, several references to righteousness are clearly made in connection with God’s covenant faithfulness.

Criterion 4 – Righteousness Associated With God’s Grace, Mercy, and Forgiveness?

In the *Book of Watchers*, righteousness is, with only one exception, not associated with the grace, mercy or forgiveness of God. In this regard, Bauckham comments that, “[i]n chs. 1-5 there is no exhortation to the wicked to repent or to the righteous to continue in obedience. There is

⁸⁷ Bauckham, *Apocalypses*, 145.

⁸⁸ Bauckham, *Apocalypses*, 144.

⁸⁹ Moo’s view is that, “Paul’s righteousness language appears to be concentrated solely on the relationship of God to people.” (D. Moo, “Excursus: ‘Righteousness Language in Paul,’” in *The Epistle to the Romans (The New International Commentary on the New Testament)*; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 89.

⁹⁰ It should however be noted that Bauckham considers that Hartman has argued convincingly that chs. 1-5 of *1 Enoch* evoke God’s covenant with Israel as their “referential background.” (Bauckham, *Apocalypses*, 142, citing Lars Hartmann, *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1-5* (Lund: LiberLäromedel/Gleerup, 1979.)

GONZALEZ: CONCEPTS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

simply the announcement of judgment on the apostates and mercy and peace for the righteous. Presumably, there is no possibility of forgiveness for the wicked.”⁹¹

By contrast, in Romans 1-3, a significant number of the references to righteousness are explicitly associated with the grace, mercy, or forgiveness of God.

6. Conclusions

In terms of the New Perspective generally, and bearing in mind the limitations of this brief exercise, it would appear that the *Book of Watchers* does not explicitly display the characteristics of Second Temple Judaism that the proponents of the New Perspective prefer to emphasize. Given the dating and influence of *1 Enoch*, this should at least give us cause to consider again the breadth of diversity of first-century Judaism.

As far as the recent debate on righteousness is concerned, this analysis suggests that Paul’s usage of words from the “righteousness” group in Romans 1-3 is different to that in the *Book of Watchers*, and perhaps even significantly so. The *Book of Watchers* presents righteousness as primarily a descriptive human attribute, while Romans 1-3 has much more emphasis on righteousness as a quality that pertains to both God and man. The concept of righteousness as moral standing is apparent in both texts, although in Rom 1-3, the idea of righteousness as God’s saving activity comes more to the fore. The idea of righteousness as covenant faithfulness is not overtly present in the *Book of Watchers*; it comes to the fore much more in Rom 1-3. Finally, the association of righteousness with grace, mercy, and forgiveness is not made in the *Book of Watchers*, although it is clear in Rom 1-3. This analysis strongly suggests that in Rom 1-3, Paul’s use of the concept of righteousness is considerably more organic, multifaceted, and generally, more complex, than the contemporary use of the term in the *Book of Watchers*.

While, on the one hand “we are bound to read the New Testament in its own first-century context”⁹² it is also true that on the other hand, “[t]he

⁹¹ Bauckham, *Apocalypses*, 142.

⁹² Wright, *Justification*, 46.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

evidence in Paul should be assessed on the basis of his own usage.”⁹³ It is in the balancing of these two requirements that the crux of these issues lies. While Paul uses first century words and concepts, he is at the same time employing them to create something that is new. Furthermore, just as it would be wrong to assume the existence of a monolithic Judaism in the first century, it may well be similarly an error to try to circumscribe Paul’s use of particular concepts to a single dimension or focus, whether this be philosophically, or confessionally determined.

What this comparison between the *Book of Watchers* and Rom 1-3 suggests is that there were streams of thought within Second Temple Judaism, and influential streams at that, which can be conceived of as having understood righteousness with a focus that appears to be different to that of Paul. These streams of thought do not necessarily reflect the views of the New Perspective well. However, these streams of thought were only that: some streams among many.

Second Temple Judaism appears to have been far more complex than many have previously considered. If this is the case, then perhaps we can acknowledge the existence, and indeed the value, of the emphases that N. T. Wright offers, while at the same time also appreciating that the value of some of the traditional Protestant perspectives on righteousness and justification. In the final analysis, this study also fundamentally suggests that even when all the contextual considerations have been taken into account, to understand “righteousness” in Paul, we must start with Paul. To adapt a line from N. T. Wright: “the Word is the Word.”

Eliezer Gonzalez has a Masters degree in Early Christian and Jewish Studies from Macquarie University, and a Master of Arts in Theology from Avondale College. He is currently completing a PhD in early Christian history. Eliezer lives on the Gold Coast in Australia with his wife Ana and their two children. research@eliezergonzalez.org

⁹³ H. Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament* (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), 218.