Since the publication of J. C. HINDLEY’s article1) and the publication of J. T. MILIK’s works on the fragments of Enochic literature from Qumran Cave 42) attention needs to be riveted on the apparently isolated historical reference in 1 En. 56 to the activities of the Parthians and Medes, but it needs to be treated with a much greater care for history.

Fragments of eleven manuscripts representing parts of the Book of Enoch have been found in Cave 4, but not a single fragment represents the Similitudes of Enoch3). This fact is enough for MILIK to say that Sim. En. did not exist in the pre-Christian era4). Hence the pre-Christian date for Sim. En. is hazardous to maintain, but a post-Christian date very problematic to place. MILIK too relies upon the historical allusion to the Parthians and Medes to date the book as a Greek Christian composition around the year AD 270 or shortly afterwards5). HINDLEY relates ch. 56 to Trajan’s Parthian campaign AD 113-7.

HINDLEY and MILIK take contrasting views on the origin of Sim. En. HINDLEY proposes that it is the work of a Jew who wrote for polemical purposes against the Christian view of Jesus the Son of Man, and that the identification of Enoch with the Son of Man was deliberately made over against the Christian view. MILIK thinks that it is a Christian Greek work drawing its inspiration from the

---

3) We will refer to the Similitudes of Enoch as Sim. En.
4) J. T. MILIK, Books, op. cit., p. 91. The book and the article present the same thoughts and work.
5) MILIK, Books, op. cit., p. 96.
New Testament, especially the Gospels, and written to take the place of the Book of Giants in his supposed Enoch pentateuch. Before turning our attention to Parthian history we will briefly look at the theories of Milik and Hindley.

Milik's theory of an Enoch pentateuch and his Christian era date for Sim. En. has been criticized by J. C. Greenfield and M. E. Stone. As they say, there is no evidence for an Enochic pentateuch among the fragments at Qumran and this weakens the argument for the date of the Similitudes). Greenfield and Stone were replying to Milik's article which preceded the publication of his book but which submits the same arguments. Only one scroll possibly contained the four books which with a separate scroll for the Astronomical section made up the Pentateuch. Greenfield and Stone argue that the Book of Giants had a separate literary history and that collections varying in their content of Enochic books existed in first century Palestine.

Exclusion from the library at Qumran is no argument for non-existence at the time of the settlement there. There were other sects and writers around. The identification of Enoch with the Son of Man is hardly credible as the product of a Christian writer. B. Lindars says that it is improbable that a Christian author should compose the book with this identification at its climax. The identification of Enoch with the salvific figure of a chief angel is very problematic for Milik's theory. It is part and parcel of developing Jewish Merkabah Mysticism which involved an angel under the name of Yahoel (c. AD 70-100) and Metatron. Milik gives late dates for works of this nature, but already in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan for Gen. 5: 24 it says that Enoch received the name of Metatron.

---

7) Greenfield and Stone, op. cit., p. 53.
8) Milik, Books, op. cit., p. 58. This is 4QEnC which was copied in the second half of the first century BC. Milik proposes that this scroll contained the Book of Giants as well, but submits no evidence for this (p. 57). Other scrolls contained one or two of the parts of 1 Enoch.
9) Greenfield and Stone, op. cit., p. 53
10) Greenfield and Stone, op. cit., p. 63
11) B. Lindars, 'Re-enter the Apocalyptic Son of Man,' in NTS 22 (1975-6), pp. 52-72; p. 58.