5

Watchers Traditions in the Catholic Epistles

Eric F. Mason

Watchers traditions are present in three books among the Catholic Epistles: 1 Peter, Jude, and 2 Peter. Most scholars agree that 2 Peter is dependent on Jude and that there is no direct authorial relationship between 1 and 2 Peter. Each of these texts exhibits some level of independent use of Watchers traditions, and this provides insight into the influence of these traditions on early Christian thought. The ways in which the letters make use of the Watchers traditions, especially allusions to the punishment of the Watchers, suggest that Christian audiences were well acquainted with the larger narrative frame associated with the angels.

Author and Audience

Though some scholars defend the tradition of Petrine authorship of 1 Peter shortly before the apostle's martyrdom in the mid-60s, the mainstream consensus is that the epistle is the product of a Petrine school or a pseudepigraphic author, writing from Rome to Christians in Asia Minor in the latter decades of the first century CE.[1] Scholarly agreement that 2 Peter

1. Commentators defending Petrine authorship include Ernest Gordon Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, 2nd ed. (New York: St. Martin's, 1947); Wayne A. Grudem, *The First Epistle of Peter: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988); and Karen H. Jobes, *1 Peter*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005). Those assuming pseudonymity include Leonhard Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993); Ralph P. Martin, in *The Theology of the Letters of James, Peter, and Jude*, NTT, ed. Andrew Chester and Ralph P. Martin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Pheme Perkins, *First and Second Peter, James, and Jude*, Interpretation (Louisville: John Knox, 1995); Paul J. Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996); John H. Elliott, *I Peter: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB (New York: Doubleday,

is pseudepigraphic—and by extension not directly related to 1 Peter—is even stronger. J.N.D. Kelly could write already in 1969 that "scarcely anyone nowadays doubts that 2 Peter is pseudonymous," and this view is finding increasing acceptance even in conservative circles.[2] Though earlier generations of scholars debated how best to explain the literary relationship between 2 Peter and Jude (whether Jude was excerpted from 2 Peter, 2 Peter used Jude as a source, both relied on common traditions, or both had the same author), virtually all scholars today recognize the dependence of 2 Peter on Jude. Proposals for dating the book extend as late as 125 CE.[3]

In contrast, most recent commentators on Jude are inclined to consider its authenticity, and those who ultimately decide otherwise often do so cautiously. Richard Bauckham, who argued for pseudonymity for 2 Peter, defends the traditional view that Jude is the product of mid-first century CE Palestinian Jewish Christianity, even by the "brother" of Jesus himself, while others question whether Jude would have had the requisite rhetorical and linguistic skills to produce this epistle. Alternately, Udo Schnelle argues that the author's concept of tradition, distinction between orthodoxy and heresy, and discussion of the rise of false teachers as a sign of the last days demand a date in the late first century CE; thus the letter, in his estimation, would be pseudonymous.[4]

2000); and Reinhard Feldmeier, *The First Letter of Peter: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008). Both J.N.D. Kelly (*The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, BNTC [London: A&C Black, 1969]), and J. Ramsey Michaels (*1 Peter*, WBC [Waco, TX: Word, 1988]) admit difficulties with the assumption of Petrine authorship but opt for theories that find strong Petrine influence on a letter written after the apostle's death. Peter H. Davids (*The First Epistle of Peter*, NICNT [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990]) opts for Silvanus as author, writing on behalf of Peter.

2. Kelly, *Epistles,* 235; see the similar comment of Jerome Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 128. Richard J. Bauckham's rejection of Petrine authorship (*Jude, 2 Peter*, WBC [Waco, TX: Word, 1983]) has been influential among evangelical scholars; see also Scot McKnight, "2 Peter," in *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn and J.W. Rogerson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003). Others, though, defend Petrine authorship (Gene L. Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, BECNT [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008]) or argue for a core of authentic Petrine tradition (Ben Witherington III, *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1–2 Peter* [Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2008]).

3. See Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, 120–22, for discussion of the four options. On dating, see John H. Elliott, "Peter, Second Epistle of," *ABD* 5:282–87, esp. 287. Elliott (284) also notes the extent of use of Jude in 2 Peter—nineteen of Jude's 25 verses have some sort of parallel in 2 Peter, and 111 words of the 460-word vocabulary of Jude appear in 2 Peter.

4. See Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 13–16, and "Jude, Epistle of," *ABD* 3:1098–1103, esp. 1101–02; similarly Martin, *Letters*; Duane F. Watson, "Jude," *NIB* vol. 12; and Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, 9 ("albeit likely with some scribal assistance"). Compare also Udo Schnelle, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998) 417–18; and the similar argument of Perkins, *First*

Synopsis

Watchers Traditions in Jude

This short letter includes one explicit quotation of *1 En.* 1:9 (in Jude 14–15) along with several possible allusions to portions of the *Book of the Watchers* (*1 Enoch* 1–36).[5] Among the allusions, three are most significant. The statement in Jude 8 that the false teachers "defile the flesh" (σάρκα … μιαίνουσιν) likely alludes to the frequent comments in the *Book of the Watchers* that the fallen angels "defile themselves" (μιαίνεσθαι) with women.[6] Also, the language of Jude 13 seems indebted to *1 En.* 18:15–16; 21:5–6 as the author of the letter concludes a series of negative examples from nature with mention of "wandering stars"; Jude's wandering stars are reminiscent of the stars that did not rise at the appointed time and were subsequently punished in the Enochic text.[7]

Most important for the present discussion, however, is Jude 6: "And the angels who did not keep their own position, but left their proper dwelling, he has kept in eternal chains in deepest darkness for the judgment of the great day." Mention of these disobedient angels appears as the second of three examples of God's judgment on unfaithfulness in Jude 5–7, between unbelievers in the Exodus period and Sodom and Gomorrah. In Jude 8, the author recalls elements of these three examples, but not in a way that one-to-one correlations may be discerned. Appeals to these particular stories—especially associating the chastisement of the Watchers with that of Sodom—are common in Second Temple period literature; here they function not as condemnation of personal conduct of the recipients, but as types for contemporary antitypes they encounter.[8] The tie between the Watchers and Sodom examples is evident from Jude 7—in both, there is a desire for σαρκὸς ἑτέρας ("strange flesh") that involves sexual transgression of the natural order dividing heavenly and

and Second Peter, 142–43). Neyrey leans toward pseudonymity but concludes that "there is scant data for taking a firm position as to date, place, and author" (*2 Peter, Jude,* 31).

5. Some of the following discussion of Jude and 2 Peter also appears in my chapter titled "Biblical and Nonbiblical Traditions in Jude and 2 Peter: Sources, Usage, and the Question of Canon," forthcoming in 2014, Eric F. Mason and Troy W. Martin, eds., *Reading 1-2 Peter and Jude: A Resource for Students,* Resources for Biblical Study (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).

6. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 56, who cites *1 En.* 7:1; 9:8; 10:11; 12:4; 15:3, 4.

7. Bauckham finds the most substantive ties between the broader context of Jude 13 and *1 En.* 80 (*Jude, 2 Peter*, 89–91).

8. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 46–47, who notes that the examples are linked closely by ὡς . . . ὁμοιον in Jude 7.

earthly figures.[9] Clearly the author of Jude has the Watchers in mind, with the (admittedly restrained) descriptions of their misdeeds and corresponding punishment in v. 6. That the author is appealing to the Enochic account of the Watchers (as opposed to versions of the story preserved in other texts), however, is very likely because Enochic traditions also appear elsewhere in Jude.

The aforementioned quotation in Jude 14–15 concerns judgment of the ungodly. It is adapted from theophoric introductory comments in *1 Enoch* that in turn draw heavily from Jer. 25:30–31; Isa. 66:15–16; and especially Deut. 33:1–3.[10] While numerous correspondences between the wording of the quotation in Jude and the Greek of this Enochic passage preserved in Codex Panopolitanus confirm that this is a quotation, several divergences may also imply knowledge of the Enoch text both in Greek translation and in the original Aramaic.[11]

Two interrelated issues concerning use of this passage in Jude demand brief attention—the identity of the figure bringing judgment and the timing of this event. God is the active figure in *1 En.* 1:9, "coming" (ἔρχεται) with "his myriads and his holy ones" (following Codex Panopolitanus) at some future time, whereas in Jude 14 "the Lord came" (ἦλθεν κύριος) to bring judgment. Most interpreters assert that the author of Jude has recast this quotation as a prophecy of Jesus' parousia, so for example Bauckham understands κύριος in Jude 14 as Jesus and the aorist verb as a prophetic perfect.[12] Likewise, George Nickelsburg notes that in *1 En.* 52:5–9, the coming of the Anointed and Chosen One is described in light of the language of *1 En.* 1:3–7.[13]

Despite the popularity of this approach, one should consider the possibility that Jude 14–15 denotes God's judgment in the past. The language admittedly

9. Ibid., 54.

10. George W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1–36, 81–108*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 143–44, 148–49.

11. See the chart of parallel texts and discussion of variants in Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 94–96. Codex Panopolitanus, also called the Akhmim Manuscript, was discovered in a grave at a Coptic cemetery at Akhmim (Panopolis) and dates to the fifth or sixth century CE. Its contents include partial versions of the *Gospel of Peter*, the *Apocalypse of Peter*, and the text of *1 En.* 19:3—21:9, followed immediately by the complete text of *1 En.* 1:1—32:6a. See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 12.

12. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 93, 96–97; virtually the same position is defended in Kelly, *Epistles*, 276; Perkins, *First and Second Peter*, 153; and Watson, *NIB* 12:494. Both the NRSV and NIV render the passage as "the Lord is coming"; cf. NAB "the Lord has come." Jesus is elsewhere called κύριος in Jude 4, 17, 21, 25; and the term is used for God in Jude 9. Jude 5 is plagued with textual variants, several involving κύριος; the context of judgment on the unfaithful of Israel's wilderness generation would imply that God is the intended referent, though some scribes explicitly sought to evoke Jesus here.

13. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 149.

may be read as that of final judgment (though the Deut. 33:1–3 language to which this passage is strongly indebted describes a theophany at Sinai, not an eschatological event), but the author next turns in Jude 17–23 to remind the audience that the apostles *also* foretold of events of the last days, both of the presence of the ungodly and the return of Jesus. The pattern has been to compare the wicked of the past with those of the recipients' generation; since the biblical chronology in Genesis placed Enoch prior to any of the negative examples in Jude 5–7, Enoch's prophecy of judgment by the κύριος God in Jude 14–16 might be read as the precedent guaranteeing the validity of the apostolic foresight in Jude 17–23, thus affirming that the κύριος Jesus Christ will also bring judgment on a later generation of scoffers. Ultimately, one's decision hinges on the identity of "these" in v. 14, whether they are the contemporary opponents of the author (as most interpreters assume) or the ancient prototypes of evil.

Watchers Traditions in 2 Peter

Because the author of 2 Peter is dependent on Jude as a source for his epistle, two issues demand attention: how does the author of 2 Peter deal with Watchers materials present already in Jude, and does the author of 2 Peter independently value and utilize Watchers traditions?

Regarding the first question, it was noted above that four passages in Jude have significant Enochic influence. Though most of the contents of Jude appear in some form in 2 Peter, the quotation of *1 En.* 1:9 in Jude 14–15 was not retained, nor were the comments about "wandering stars" (Jude 13) and defilement of the flesh (Jude 8, assuming that 2 Pet. 2:13–14 instead reflects Jude 12). Whereas nothing stands in their place in 2 Peter, elsewhere materials from Jude are retained but "domesticated" in 2 Peter, as happens with Jude 9. This is not an Enochic passage and thus was not addressed above, yet it relies on pseudepigraphical traditions (likely the *Assumption of Moses* or *Testament of Moses*) about the death of Moses. Jude's explicit discussion of the verbal restraint of the archangel Michael in his dispute with the devil for Moses' body is replaced with considerably more vague language in 2 Pet. 2:11.

Jude's fourth major Enochic passage is the example of God's judgment of the Watchers in v. 6. This material is retained in 2 Peter but is used differently. Now it heads a series of three examples of God's actions in the past, but it is followed by accounts of the flood and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (stressing God's judgment of the wicked, but with no "strange flesh" mentioned for the latter). It is also paired with reminders of God's mercy toward Moses and Lot (providing examples of God's deliverance of the righteous). A few common

terms remain from Jude 6 (especially various forms of the verb τηρέω, here underlined), but 2 Peter seems paraphrastic:

> **Jude 6—**And the angels [ἀγγέλους] who did not keep [μὴ τηρήσαντας] their own position, but left their proper dwelling, he has kept [τετήρηκεν] in eternal chains in deepest darkness [δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον] for the judgment [εἰς κρίσιν] of the great Day
>
> **2 Pet 2:4—**For if God did not spare the angels [ἀγγέλων] when they sinned, but cast them into hell and committed them to chains of deepest darkness [σειραῖς ζόφου] to be kept [τηρουμένους] until the judgment [εἰς κρίσιν][14]

This comparison of language leads to the second question raised above, whether the author of 2 Peter independently utilized Watchers traditions. It should be noted that the blunting of Enochic traditions from Jude does not indicate that the author of 2 Peter considered such things vulgar. Rather, the author retains discussion of the imprisoned Watchers from Jude 6 and likely reflects other non-canonical traditions in 2 Pet. 3:4-13.[15] One should also note that the author of 2 Peter changes the description of the imprisonment of the sinful angels, going beyond what he finds in Jude. Use of the term ταρταρόω (NRSV "cast into hell") in 2 Pet. 2:4 is reminiscent of the story of the confinement of the Titans to Tartarus by Zeus, the Olympian gods, and the "Hundred-handers" in Hesiod's *Theogony* (617-819).[16] Though one might argue that the author of 2 Peter has connected the Watchers story with the Greek mythological

14. Some manuscripts read σειροῖς or σιροῖς ("pits" or "caves") in 2 Pet. 2:4 rather than σειραῖς. Bauckham argues that if the former were original, it could imply independent knowledge of the description of the dungeon of the Watchers in *1 Enoch*. See Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 249; and Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, 268.

15. See the discussion of literary relationships between 2 Peter and texts of the Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 139–40. Bauckham's explanation for 2 Peter's omission of most of the non-canonical materials in Jude is that they (other than the ubiquitous story of the imprisoned Watchers) were unfamiliar to the author, who presumed the same would be true for his audience. Bauckham notes that *1 Enoch* was very popular in Greek translation among Christian writers of the second century CE, but the author of 2 Peter presumably could not read these texts in Aramaic as did the author of Jude. Bauckham asserts, however, that both the authors of 2 Peter and *1 Clement* utilized traditions from the *Book of Eldad and Modad*. Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch 1*, 14) argues that at least the *Book of the Watchers* must have been in Greek translation by the late first century because of the quotation of *1 En.* 1:9 in Jude 14-15 (but see comments above) and use of the book by the author of Revelation.

tradition in the course of his paraphrase, Tartarus language appears elsewhere in the Greek translation of *1 Enoch* and in other Second Temple period Jewish literature (including the Septuagint).[17]

Watchers Traditions in 1 Peter

Most scholars agree that Watchers traditions are present in 1 Peter 3. Indeed, Nickelsburg finds 1 Peter steeped in this and other Enochic parallels:

> The author of 1 Peter works from an apocalyptic worldview similar to that of 1 Enoch . . . The eschaton and the final judgment are imminent, and the reader can take comfort in the knowledge that, in spite of present tribulation, heaven holds a reward, as yet unseen, for the righteous (1:3-12). In addition, the author, alluding to the tradition about the watchers, attributes to Jesus a journey to the underworld that parallels Enoch's interaction with the rebel watchers (3:19-20), and compares baptism to the purifying effects of the flood (cf. 10:21). With its criticism of braiding hair, decoration of gold, and wearing fine clothing, 1 Pet 3:3 may also reflect the story of the watchers.[18]

Elliott is significantly more restrained—he observes that no quotations of books of the Pseudepigrapha appear in 1 Peter, and he limits possible links almost exclusively to 1 Pet. 3:19-20.[19]

This key passage appears in the context of the household code and its related exhortations, including calls to endure undeserved suffering. Christ earlier was presented as a model of such suffering in connection with the admonitions to slaves in the household code, and this topic is resumed in 3:18-22:

16. See especially Birger A. Pearson, "A Reminiscence of Classical Myth at 2 Peter 2:4," *GRBS* 10 (1969): 71–80. Bauckham is sympathetic and notes precedents in Hellenistic Jewish texts (*Jude, 2 Peter*, 249). See also the survey of possible influences of the Titans story elsewhere in Second Temple Jewish literature in Brook W.R. Pearson, "Resurrection and the Judgment of the Titans: ἡ γῆ τῶν ἀσεβῶν in lxx Isaiah 26.19," in *Resurrection*, JSNTSup 186, ed. S.E. Porter, M.A. Hayes, and D. Tombs (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 33–51, esp. 41–47.

17. See the list in Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, 250–51.

18. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 86. See also his chart of relationships between 1 Peter and *1 Enoch* 108 (560).

19. Elliott, *I Peter*, 18, though he briefly mentions 1 Pet. 1:12 as a second possible passage with Enochic influence. Neither Achtemeier nor Michaels devotes significant attention to possible ties.

> 18 For Christ also suffered for sins once for all, the righteous for the unrighteous, in order to bring you to God. He was put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit, 19 in which also he went and made a proclamation to the spirits in prison, 20 who in former times did not obey, when God waited patiently in the days of Noah, during the building of the ark, in which a few, that is, eight persons, were saved through water. 21 And baptism, which this prefigured, now saves you—not as a removal of dirt from the body, but as an appeal to God for a good conscience, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ, 22 who has gone into heaven and is at the right hand of God, with angels, authorities, and powers made subject to him.

Much has been written about this passage, which has significant theological implications for understanding the approach to suffering encouraged by the author and his teachings on baptism; as such it poses numerous challenges to interpreters in terms of style, coherence, and context.[20] Specific issues of debate include how to understand σάρχ ("flesh'") and πνεύμα ("spirit") in v. 18 (and, related to the latter, the interpretation of ἐν ᾧ ["in which"] in v. 19); the identity of the preacher (Jesus, Jesus through Noah or Enoch, or Enoch on the basis of textual emendation?) in v. 19; the purpose of the proclamation in v. 19; the identity of the "spirits" of v. 19; and the nature and location of the "prison" in v. 19. Also, the hymnic nature of vv. 18-19 is frequently discussed, as is the possible relationship of the "spirits" of 3:19 and the "dead" of 1 Pet. 4:6. These issues are covered extensively in the major commentaries and in important monographs, so the details and history of interpretation need not be addressed here.[21] It will suffice to note the position that is now standard among most interpreters, especially since the original publication of William J. Dalton's book *Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits* in 1965.

Though earlier generations of scholars tended to be unaware of the Watchers traditions in *1 Enoch*, few today deny their use by the author of 1 Peter.[22] Watchers—not humans—are normally understood as the imprisoned spirits of 3:19 to whom Jesus makes proclamation, which accords with the

20. Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 240.

21. Bo Reicke, *The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism: A Study of 1 Pet. III. 19 and Its Context*, ASNU 13 (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1946); William Joseph Dalton, *Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits: A Study of 1 Peter 3:18—4:6*, 2nd ed., AnBib 23 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1989); and more recently Chad T. Pierce, *Spirits and the Proclamation of Christ: 1 Peter 3:18—22 in Light of Sin and Punishment Traditions in Early Jewish and Christian Literature*, WUNT 2/305 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).

standard use of the plural term πνεύματα in the NT to refer to malevolent spiritual beings rather than humans.[23] The content of the preaching typically is understood as confirmation of God's victory over evil through the resurrection of Jesus, not an evangelistic appeal; the latter would make sense only if humans (rather than angels) were the imprisoned spirits.[24] Dalton notes that unlike the modern practice of incarceration as punishment, in the ancient world imprisonment was a *preliminary* stage: "the period of detention, no matter how painful or miserable, was only an interval leading to judgment."[25] This too fits well the account of the binding of the Watchers in *1 Enoch* in anticipation of their later judgment.

The text in 1 Peter 3 is not explicit about the location of these spirits, but contemporary scholarship largely rejects earlier notions—in part influenced by creedal formulations—that Jesus went down to the abode of the dead to preach in the period between his crucifixion and resurrection. According to 1 Peter, Jesus "went" (πορευθεὶς) in v. 19 to make the proclamation and "went

22. The first scholar to appeal to the Watchers tradition was Friedrich Spitta, *Christi Predigt an die Geister (1 Petr. 3, 19ff.): Ein Beitrag zur neutestamentlichen Theologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1890). Modern dissenters include Wayne Grudem, "Christ Preaching Through Noah: 1 Peter 3:19-20 in the Light of Dominant Themes in Jewish Literature," *TJ* 7 n.s. (1986): 3–31; Goppelt, *Commentary,* 255–60; and Feldmeier, *First Letter*, 202–06. Jobes (*1 Peter*, 24–47) assumes that Watchers traditions lie behind the passage yet still questions whether Gentile readers in the mid-first century CE (assuming authentic Petrine authorship) would know *1 Enoch*. She nevertheless concludes that the Watchers traditions were so widespread as to make it likely that the recipients of the epistle would understand this passage, and she follows Paul Trebilco (*Jewish Communities in Asia Minor*, SNTSMS 69 [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991]) in arguing that Noah and flood traditions were well known in Asia Minor among both Gentiles and Jews. Michaels agrees that the Watchers tradition from *1 Enoch* is utilized by the author of 1 Peter, but he understands the "spirits" as the offspring of the fallen angels and human women (not the disobedient angels themselves), and they are understood to be "in security" or "in refuge" rather than imprisoned (*1 Peter,* 205–12, esp. 209).

23. Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 255. See also his brief survey (254–56) of various proposals for understanding the imprisoned spirits as humans (whether all the dead, only those who died before the birth of Jesus, wicked contemporaries of Noah, only the righteous, etc.). Michaels (*1 Peter*, 207) identifies Heb. 12:23 as the only NT use of "spirits" for humans ("spirits of just people made perfect"). Goppelt (*Commentary*, 258) suggests also Luke 24:37, 39; he understands the spirits in 1 Pet. 3:19 as human, commenting that "I Peter, like Hebrews and Luke, tries always to present biblical concepts in Greek terms, and πνεῦμα is an ancient Greek synonym for ψυχή."

24. Davids (*First Epistle,* 140) notes that in the NT, κηρύσσω "normally refers to the proclamation of the kingdom of God or the gospel . . . but it does on a few occasions retain its secular meaning of 'proclaim' or 'announce.'" He also observes that the verb εὐαγγελίζω and noun εὐαγγέλιον otherwise are used in 1 Peter for proclamation of the gospel (1:12; 1:25; 4:6; 4:17).

25. Dalton, *Christ's Proclamation*, 159. See also Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 261.

to heaven" (πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανὸν) in v. 22. This correlation is important for Achtemeier, who finds here graphic language implying Jesus' ascent to the right hand of God after his resurrection.[26] Dalton argues similarly, noting that πορεύομαι is never used in the NT to discuss a descent of Jesus to the abode of the dead, nor does any passage address activities of Jesus between his death and resurrection.[27] Others note that καταβαίνω would be more appropriate language to describe a descent.[28]

One must consider, however, whether the author of 1 Peter intends to address the spatial location of the prison. Whereas the Watchers traditions in *1 Enoch* locate the prison on, at the end of, or under the earth, Kelly notes that *2 Enoch* locates the prison in the second heaven; this allows Kelly to reconcile the location of the prison with the ascension motif he discerns in use of πορεύομαι.[29] Achtemeier, however, is more concerned to explain *how* Jesus preaches rather than *where*—Jesus does so "made alive by the Spirit" (v. 18, parallel to the statement that he had been "put to death by flesh").[30] As for the spatial location of the prison, there is no uniform tradition in Second Temple Jewish texts or the NT, thus "such ambiguity prevents us . . . from coming to any firm conclusion about the prison's location."[31]

Influence

As discussed above, the authors of Jude and 1 Peter clearly know Watchers traditions consistent with those in *1 Enoch*. Scholarly assessments vary concerning the overall nature of the influence of *1 Enoch* on 1 Peter, though most agree that 1 Pet. 3:19 is best interpreted as reflecting the Watchers tradition. On the other hand, the text of Jude is thoroughly imbued with the Watchers tradition and numerous other elements paralleled in *1 Enoch*. The author of 2 Peter inherits and adapts the Watchers tradition from Jude but may

26. Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 260–61.

27. Dalton, *Christ's Proclamation*, 162.

28. Davids, *First Epistle*, 140n37, following Kelly, *Epistles*, 155–56.

29. Kelly, *Epistles*, 155–56. Elliott (*I Peter*, 654–55) also implies that the author of 1 Peter assumes the prison is located in a level of heaven.

30. Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 248–53, 260; see also his translation of the passage on 239. Achtemeier argues here for a reference to the Holy Spirit, as does Michaels (*1 Peter*, 205). The thrust of Elliott's interpretation is similar, but he finds an affirmation of God's activity rather than explicit mention of the Holy Spirit (*I Peter*, 646). Davids is more cautious, preferring instead (following Selwyn and Kelly) to understand here only a reference to Jesus' post-resurrection activity. See Davids, *First Epistle*, 138.

31. Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 256.

also demonstrate independent knowledge of the legend in a form influenced by Greek mythology.

The nature of the use of the Watchers traditions in all three of these NT books is consistent in that an explanation of the Watchers is never the focus. Rather, the authors can mention the Watchers in passing without elaboration in order to illustrate more central themes in the respective passages. This pattern is significant, as it demonstrates indirectly that familiarity with Watchers traditions may be assumed among many early Christians, something also evidenced in other essays in this volume.

Conclusion and Recommendations for Future Research

Major thrusts of New Testament scholarship in the twentieth century included an awareness of the impossibility of neatly distinguishing between Jewish and Hellenistic thought and influences, along with a renewed appreciation for the Jewish roots of early Christianity. As such, scholars increasingly recognized the importance of non-canonical texts like the Dead Sea Scrolls and those classified as Pseudepigrapha for understanding Second Temple Judaism and hence also early Christianity. The presence of the Watchers traditions in 1 Peter, Jude, and 2 Peter illustrates very well the importance of these developments. Likewise, this use of the Watchers tradition in the NT also points to an issue already emerging as a key focus for twenty-first century scholarship—the question of how, when, and even whether one may speak of neatly-defined lines between "canonical" and "non-canonical" texts in Second Temple Judaism and earliest Christianity. Clearly any resolution to this issue which would seek (or that would attain) a scholarly consensus will have to pay significant attention to use of Enochic and other "non-canonical" texts in these three Catholic Epistles.

Brief Bibliography

Achtemeier, Paul J. *1 Peter*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.

Bauckham, Richard J. *Jude, 2 Peter*. Word Biblical Commentary. Waco, TX: Word, 1983.

Dalton, William Joseph. *Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits: A Study of 1 Peter 3:18—4:6.* 2nd ed. AnBib 23. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1989.

Elliott, John H. *I Peter: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

Nickelsburg, George W.E. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1–36, 81–108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.