The Book of First Enoch

A Critical Comparison with the Masoretic Text, the Septuagint, and the Greek New Testament

Disagreements, Discrepancies, and Points of Contact

Primary Sources: Ethiopic (Ge'ez) text; Dead Sea Scrolls (4QEn); BHS (MT); Rahlfs-Hanhart LXX; NA28 Greek New Testament

Principal Scholars: Nickelsburg, VanderKam, Black, Charles, Knibb, Tiller, Stuckenbruck

Table of Contents

I. Introduction and Textual History of 1 Enoch
II. Manuscript Traditions and the Dead Sea Scrolls
III. The Watchers Narrative (1 En. 1–36) vs. Genesis 6 (MT/LXX)
IV. Angelology: Disagreement s between 1 Enoch, MT, and the GNT
V. Cosmology and the Structure of Heaven
VI. Eschatology: The Son of Man, Parables, and the GNT
VII. The Names and Functions of Angels: MT vs. 1 Enoch
VIII. Torah, Law, and Revealed Calendars: Disagreement s with the MT
IX. Death, Sheol, and the Afterlife
X. 1 Enoch and the New Testament: Citations, Allusions, and Disagreements
XI. The Book of the Luminaries (1 En. 72–82) vs. Genesis 1 (MT/LXX)
XII. The Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 85–90) vs. MT Historical Narrative
XIII. Christological Discrepancies in the Parables of Enoch (1 En. 37–71)
XIV. Summary Table of Major Disagreements
XV. Bibliography and Primary Source References

I. Introduction and Textual History of 1 Enoch

The Book of First Enoch (1 Enoch) is the longest, most complex, and most influential of the pseudepigraphal works attributed to the antediluvian patriarch Enoch, son of Jared (Gen. 5:18–24; MT: חֲנוֹךְ, LXX: Ἐνώχ). It is not a unified composition but an anthology of at least five originally independent literary units, each with its own compositional history, theological agenda, and manuscript tradition. The composite nature of 1 Enoch creates immediate tensions with canonical scripture — tensions that are theological, cosmological, calendrical, and eschatological.

The five major sections are:

1. The Book of the Watchers (1 En. 1–36): Angels, the Nephilim, Uriel's cosmic tour
2. The Book of Parables / Similitudes (1 En. 37–71): The Son of Man, judgment
3. The Book of the Luminaries (1 En. 72–82): Solar/lunar calendar, astronomy
4. The Book of Dreams (1 En. 83–90): Animal Apocalypse, symbolic history
5. The Epistle of Enoch (1 En. 91–108): Woes, the Apocalypse of Weeks

The primary surviving text is the Ethiopic (Ge'ez) version, preserved in its entirety in manuscripts of the Ethiopian Orthodox canon — the only Christian tradition to include 1 Enoch as scripture. The Greek text survives in partial manuscripts (Codex Panopolitanus / Akhmim fragment; Chester Beatty-Michigan papyrus), and Aramaic fragments from Qumran (4Q201–202, 4Q204–212) provide the earliest textual witnesses, dating to approximately 200–100 BCE.

Critically, the Qumran Aramaic fragments preserve portions of Books 1, 3, 4, and 5 but contain no trace of Book 2 (the Parables of Enoch), a fact of enormous scholarly significance. The absence of the Parables from Qumran — the richest repository of Second Temple Jewish literature — has led scholars including Milik, Nickelsburg, and VanderKam to debate whether the Parables are a late Jewish composition, a Jewish-Christian composition, or an entirely Christian interpolation. This bears directly on any comparison with the Greek New Testament.

The following sections systematically examine where 1 Enoch contradicts or diverges from the Masoretic Text (MT), the Septuagint (LXX), and the Greek New Testament (GNT/NA28), organized thematically.

II. Manuscript Traditions and the Dead Sea Scrolls

A. Qumran Aramaic Fragments

The Qumran Aramaic manuscripts of 1 Enoch (4Q201–212) are the oldest textual witnesses to any Enochic material, predating the Ethiopic tradition by over a millennium. These fragments demonstrate that:

1. The Book of the Watchers (1 En. 1–36) existed in Aramaic before 200 BCE
2. The Book of the Luminaries (1 En. 72–82) was considerably longer in its original Aramaic form than in the Ethiopic

3. The Parables (1 En. 37–71) are absent from all Qumran finds

The Aramaic frequently diverges from the Ethiopic. Where Ethiopic reads theological expansions, the Aramaic is often more restrained. Stuckenbruck (2007) has shown that the Ethiopic translators — working from Greek intermediaries — introduced theological harmonizations not present in the original Aramaic.

B. The Greek Tradition

The Greek text of 1 Enoch (partially preserved in P.Mich. 5552 and the Akhmim codex) stands between the Aramaic and Ethiopic. The Greek translation was almost certainly produced in Alexandria or a similar Diaspora setting, likely between 100 BCE and 100 CE, in the same milieu that produced the LXX. The Greek Enoch occasionally aligns with LXX vocabulary and theological tendencies over against the MT — a significant observation for comparative analysis.

C. The Ethiopic Canon

The Ethiopian Orthodox Church (Tewahedo) includes both 1 Enoch and Jubilees in its biblical canon, treating them as scripture coequal with the MT-derived books. This stands in unique contrast to all other canonical traditions — Jewish (Tanakh based on MT), Catholic (Vulgate-derived), and Protestant (Old Testament = MT books) — none of which include 1 Enoch. The Greek Orthodox and Coptic traditions acknowledge 1 Enoch's antiquity but exclude it from the canon. This canonical isolation is itself a theological fact of first importance.

III. The Watchers Narrative (1 En. 1–36) vs. Genesis 6 (MT/LXX)

A. Genesis 6:1–4 in the MT

The MT text of Genesis 6:1–4 reads (transliterated): 'When man began to multiply on the face of the land and daughters were born to them, the sons of God (בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים, bĕnê hā-ʾĕlōhîm) saw that the daughters of man were attractive. And they took as their wives any they chose... The Nephilim (הַנְּפִלִים) were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of man and they bore children to them. These were the mighty men who were of old, the men of renown.'

This four-verse pericope in the MT is famously compressed and enigmatic. The identity of the בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים is contested — the MT gives no further elaboration within Genesis. The Nephilim are mentioned but not explained. There is no angelic rebellion, no leader named, no cosmic fall.

B. The Watchers Expansion in 1 Enoch (1 En. 6–11)

1 Enoch 6–11 constitutes a massive midrashic expansion of Genesis 6. The elaborations include:

Disagreement 1: Named angelic leaders not present in the MT or LXX

1 Enoch 6:7 names the leaders of the Watchers: Semjaza, Urakiba, Rameel, Kokabiel, Tamiel, Ramiel, Danel, Ezeqeel, Baraqijal, Asael (Azazel), Armaros, Batarjal, Ananel, Zaqiel, Samsapeel, Satarael, Turel, Jomjael, and Sariel — nineteen named leaders in most manuscripts. None of these names appear in Genesis 6 (MT or LXX), and most do not appear elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. The MT בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים are entirely anonymous. 1 Enoch has constructed an elaborate named demonology with no MT basis.

Disagreement 2: Azazel as primary cosmic villain vs. the MT

1 Enoch 8:1–2 and 10:4–8 elevate Azazel (עֲזָאזֵל) to the position of primary cosmic villain, teaching humanity metallurgy, weaponry, and cosmetics. Azazel is then bound and cast into the desert of Dudael (1 En. 10:4–6). The MT uses the term ʾăzāʾzēl (עֲזָאזֵל) only in Leviticus 16:8, 10, 26 — the scapegoat ritual of Yom Kippur — where its precise meaning is contested (a place name? a demon? the act of removal?). The MT Leviticus text gives no indication that Azazel is a fallen angel, a cosmic rebel, or a teacher of forbidden arts. 1 Enoch's use of Azazel represents a midrashic transformation of a Levitical term into a fully developed cosmic antagonist — a development that contradicts the MT's sparse usage.

Disagreement 3: The LXX's handling of Genesis 6:2 — ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ

The LXX translates בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים in Genesis 6:2, 4 as οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ — 'the angels of God' — which is a more explicitly angelic interpretation than the MT's ambiguous 'sons of God.' This LXX reading aligns more closely with 1 Enoch's interpretation. However, even the LXX does not elaborate into the detailed rebellion narrative of 1 Enoch. The LXX's ἄγγελοι reading may reflect a pre-MT tradition or interpretive tradition shared with early Enochic circles, but the LXX gives no names, no rebellion, and no cosmic consequences beyond the flood.

> *Textual note: Some MT manuscripts and the Peshitta reflect the 'sons of God' reading without the angelic specification. The LXX's ἄγγελοι at Gen. 6:2 is therefore significant as a tradition that may predate the MT's theological hesitancy about literalizing the 'sons of God' as angels — a hesitancy that became dominant in later rabbinic interpretation.*

Disagreement 4: Semjaza's oath and collective guilt vs. individual accountability in the MT

1 Enoch 6:3–6 narrates a collective oath by the Watchers under Semjaza's leadership, with all two hundred binding themselves collectively to the transgression. This corporate guilt structure has no analogue in Genesis 6. Moreover, it implies a pre-existing angelic community with agency, deliberation, and the capacity for conspiracy — a sophisticated angelology absent from the MT Pentateuch.

Disagreement 5: The Nephilim's size and behavior

1 Enoch 7:2–5 describes the Nephilim as giants 3,000 cubits tall (in some manuscripts; others read 300) who devour humanity, drink blood, and engage in cannibalism. The MT's Nephilim (Gen. 6:4; Num. 13:33) are called 'mighty men' and 'men of renown' but are given no specific size, no explicit violence, and no demonic characteristics. Numbers 13:33 references the Nephilim in Canaan as the sons of Anak, suggesting they were understood as a historical race of large people — not the demonic hybrid monsters of 1 Enoch.

IV. Angelology: Disagreements between 1 Enoch, MT, and the GNT

A. The Seven Archangels in 1 Enoch

1 Enoch presents a developed heptadic archangel system: Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, Sariel/Uriel, Raguel, Remiel, and Saraqael (1 En. 20:1–8). This list varies slightly across manuscripts. The significance of precisely seven archangels — a number sacred in Enochic cosmology — is a development not found in the MT.

Disagreement 6: Raphael in the MT

Raphael does not appear in the Hebrew Bible (MT) at all. In 1 Enoch, Raphael is one of the four principal archangels assigned cosmic and healing functions (1 En. 10:4–7; 40:9). Raphael appears prominently in the deuterocanonical Tobit (Tob. 3:17; 12:15), where he is identified as 'one of the seven angels who stand ready and enter before the glory of the Lord' — a phrase that appears to reflect the Enochic heptadic schema. Neither the MT Tanakh nor the Protestant Old Testament canon contains Raphael. The GNT likewise does not name Raphael.

Disagreement 7: Uriel's absence from the MT and GNT

Uriel (אוּרִיאֵל, 'God is my light') plays a major role in 1 Enoch as the angel who guides Enoch through cosmic regions and reveals calendrical secrets (1 En. 72:1; 74:2; 75:3–4; 82:7). Uriel does not appear in the MT or the GNT. The name appears in 4 Ezra (2 Esdras), also pseudepigraphal. In the MT, only Michael (Dan. 10:13, 21; 12:1) and Gabriel (Dan. 8:16; 9:21) are named angels.

Disagreement 8: Gabriel's role — MT vs. 1 Enoch vs. GNT

In the MT, Gabriel appears in Daniel 8:16 and 9:21 as an interpreter of visions. In 1 Enoch 10:9, Gabriel is assigned to destroy the Nephilim offspring by inciting them to mutual warfare. In the GNT, Gabriel appears in Luke 1:19, 26 — announcing the births of John the Baptist and Jesus — with no connection to warfare or giant-destruction. The three traditions assign Gabriel different functions with no harmonization possible.

Disagreement 9: Michael as cosmic warrior vs. Israel's patron

1 Enoch 10:11–15 assigns Michael the task of binding Semjaza and his Watchers. Daniel 10:13, 21 and 12:1 present Michael as the chief prince (שַׂר הַגָּדוֹל) standing over Israel. Jude 9 (GNT) calls Michael the archangel (ὁ ἀρχάγγελος) and narrates his dispute with the devil over Moses' body — an incident not found in the MT, possibly derived from the lost Assumption of Moses. Revelation 12:7 presents Michael leading an angelic war against the dragon. The 1 Enoch, MT, and GNT presentations of Michael are partly overlapping but not harmonizable into a single consistent portrait.

B. Fallen Angels, Satan, and the Devil

Disagreement 10: The origin of evil — 1 Enoch vs. MT vs. GNT

1 Enoch presents a coherent myth of origin for evil: the Watchers fell of their own free will, taught forbidden knowledge to humanity, and their offspring (the Nephilim) became the demons that afflict humanity after their bodies die (1 En. 15:8–12). This 'origin of demons' narrative is unique to 1 Enoch and has no MT parallel. The MT presents no unified theory of the origin of evil. Satan (שָׂטָן) in the MT is a member of the divine council performing an adversarial function (Job 1–2; Zech. 3:1–2) — not a fallen angel.

The GNT's Satan/devil (ὁ σατανᾶς / ὁ διάβολος) combines elements of the MT's adversarial figure, the Enochic cosmic rebel, and developing intertestamental tradition. Jesus' saying 'I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven' (Luke 10:18) is often read in light of Enochic or Isaianic tradition (Isa. 14:12–15 MT), but the GNT does not equate Satan with the Watcher Semjaza or Azazel — a conflation that appears only in later Christian demonology.

V. Cosmology and the Structure of Heaven

A. Multiple Heavens in 1 Enoch

Disagreement 11: The heavenly throne room and its geography

The Book of the Watchers (1 En. 14:8–25) presents Enoch's ascent to a crystal palace surrounded by fire, then into an inner house where God sits on a great throne of fire with streams of flaming fire issuing from beneath. This vision is detailed, architecturally specific, and presents a two-chamber heavenly structure (outer house/inner house) that has no exact parallel in the MT.

The MT's heavenly visions are sparse: Isaiah 6 (seraphim, throne, smoke); Ezekiel 1 (chariot-throne, four living creatures); 1 Kings 22:19 (divine council). None provide the architectural specificity of 1 Enoch 14. The later rabbinic Hekhalot literature elaborates the heavenly palace tradition extensively, suggesting 1 Enoch represents an early stream of mystical tradition that the MT deliberately suppressed or left implicit.

Disagreement 12: Seven heavens vs. the MT's undifferentiated shamayim

While 1 Enoch does not explicitly enumerate 'seven heavens' in its earliest strata, the cosmological journey of 1 Enoch 17–36 implicitly structures the cosmos into multiple distinct regions — storehouses of wind, snow, fire; the mountain of God; the ends of the earth; Sheol's divisions. Later Enochic tradition (particularly 2 Enoch, the Slavonic Enoch) develops this into a formal seven-heaven schema.

The MT consistently uses the single term שָׁמַיִם (shamayim, dual/plural but theologically unified). Deuteronomy 10:14 uses 'the heaven and the heaven of heavens' (הַשָּׁמַיִם וּשְׁמֵי הַשָּׁמָיִם) — but this is a superlative idiom ('the highest heaven'), not a literal enumeration of multiple heavenly strata. Paul's reference to 'the third heaven' (2 Cor. 12:2, GNT: ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ) aligns with a multi-heaven cosmology, but the GNT provides no full schema.

B. The Ends of the Earth and Sheol's Geography

Disagreement 13: Compartmentalized Sheol

1 Enoch 22:1–14 presents Sheol as divided into four compartments: one for the righteous (with a fountain of water), one for sinners who were not punished in life, one for sinners who were punished, and one for those who led others into sin (identified with the Nephilim murderers). This spatial, moral differentiation of the afterlife realm has no basis in the MT.

The MT's Sheol (שְׁאוֹל) is an undifferentiated place of the dead — gloomy (Job 10:21–22), silent (Ps. 94:17), a place where there is no praise of God (Ps. 6:5), cut off from YHWH's hand (Ps. 88:5). The MT makes no distinction between righteous and wicked in Sheol; all the dead go there. 1 Enoch's morally differentiated Sheol anticipates the GNT's Hades/Gehenna distinctions but contradicts the MT directly.

VI. Eschatology: The Son of Man, Parables, and the GNT

A. The 'Son of Man' in the Parables of Enoch (1 En. 37–71)

The Parables of Enoch (1 En. 37–71) contain the Enochic tradition's most theologically explosive material: a pre-existent, heavenly 'Son of Man' (or 'that Son of Man') who sits on a throne of glory, judges angels and kings, and serves as the Elect One and the Righteous One. The relevant passages include 1 Enoch 46:1–6; 48:2–7; 62:1–16; 69:26–29.

Disagreement 14: The Son of Man in 1 Enoch vs. Daniel (MT)

The Son of Man figure in 1 Enoch's Parables appears to derive directly from Daniel 7:13 (MT: כְּבַר אֱנָשׁ, 'one like a son of man'; LXX: ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου). However, 1 Enoch radically transforms the Danielic figure. In Daniel 7 (MT), the 'one like a son of man' is almost certainly a symbol for Israel (or its heavenly representative — 'the saints of the Most High', Dan. 7:18, 27); the figure receives dominion from the Ancient of Days but is not independently pre-existent, not a judge of angels, and not identified with Enoch. In 1 Enoch 46, the Son of Man is already present with the Head of Days (= Ancient of Days) before creation: 'And at that place I saw one who had a head of days, and his head was like white wool, and with him was another, whose face had the appearance of a man' (1 En. 46:1). This pre-existence is a theological development beyond Daniel.

Disagreement 15: Enoch identified as the Son of Man (1 En. 71:14)

The most startling and internally problematic identification in the Parables is 1 Enoch 71:14, where the angel Michael addresses Enoch: 'You are the Son of Man who was born to righteousness, and righteousness dwells over you.' This identification of Enoch himself as the Son of Man — the pre-existent heavenly judge — creates an internal contradiction within the Parables themselves: earlier chapters (1 En. 46–48) present the Son of Man as a distinct heavenly being whom Enoch observes, not as Enoch himself.

This identification also contradicts the MT, which presents Enoch merely as a man who 'walked with God' and was taken (Gen. 5:24: וְאֵינֶנּוּ כִּי לָקַח אֹתוֹ אֱלֹהִים — 'and he was not, for God took him'). The MT nowhere assigns Enoch cosmic judicial authority or pre-existent divine status.

Disagreement 16: The Son of Man in the GNT vs. 1 Enoch

The GNT's Son of Man (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) in the Synoptic Gospels is consistently applied by Jesus to himself — a self-referential title with eschatological and suffering dimensions (Mark 10:45; 14:62; Matt. 26:64; Luke 22:69). The GNT's Son of Man sits at the right hand of Power and comes on the clouds of heaven (combining Daniel 7:13 with Ps. 110:1) but is identified with a specific historical person (Jesus of Nazareth), not a pre-existent anonymous heavenly figure.

Whether Jesus's use of 'Son of Man' was influenced by the Enochic Parables is one of the most contested questions in GNT scholarship. Scholars including Nickelsburg, Collins, and Hurtado have debated the relationship. If the Parables predate Jesus (a position Nickelsburg defends for at least parts of the work), the GNT's Son of Man may draw on Enochic tradition. If the Parables are later (Milik's position, now largely rejected), the relationship may be reversed. In either case, the GNT's identification of the Son of Man with the crucified-and-risen Jesus introduces a suffering servant dimension entirely absent from the triumphant, untouchable Son of Man of 1 Enoch.

VII. The Names and Functions of Angels: MT vs. 1 Enoch

Angel / Being	MT Reference	1 Enoch Reference	GNT Reference	Disagreement / Discrepancy
Michael	Dan. 10:13, 21; 12:1 — patron of Israel	1 En. 10:11–15; 20:5 — binds Semjaza; oversees paradise	Rev. 12:7; Jude 9 — cosmic warrior	MT: national patron only. 1 En.: cosmic jailer. GNT: warrior-archangel. No single coherent portrait.
Gabriel	Dan. 8:16; 9:21 — vision interpreter	1 En. 10:9; 20:7 — destroys Nephilim by inciting war	Luke 1:19, 26 — birth announcements	Roles are mutually exclusive: herald (GNT) vs. destroyer (1 En.) vs. interpreter (MT).
Raphael	Absent from MT	1 En. 10:4–7; 20:3 — healer; binds Azazel	Absent from GNT	Present in 1 Enoch, Tobit (deuterocanon). Absent MT and GNT canonical books.
Uriel	Absent from MT	1 En. 20:2; 72:1; 82:7 — calendrical angel, cosmic	Absent from GNT	No MT or GNT basis whatsoever.

		guide		
Azazel	Lev. 16:8, 10, 26 — scapegoat term, possibly place name	1 En. 8:1–2; 10:4–8 — chief fallen Watcher, teacher of sin	Absent from GNT	MT: cultic/geographic term. 1 En.: primary cosmic villain. Complete recontextualization.
Semjaza	Absent from MT	1 En. 6:3 — leader of the Watchers' rebellion	Absent from GNT	Entirely absent from canonical scripture.
Satan/Adversary	Job 1–2; Zech. 3:1–2 — divine council member	Absent from early 1 Enoch; later strata conflate with Mastema	Matt. 4; Rev. 12:9 — cosmic enemy of God	MT Satan: prosecutorial angel. 1 En.: absent or marginalized. GNT: cosmic evil.

VIII. Torah, Law, and Revealed Calendars: Disagreements with the MT

A. The 364-Day Solar Calendar

Disagreement 17: The Enochic solar calendar vs. the MT lunar-solar calendar

The Book of the Luminaries (1 En. 72–82) presents the cosmos as operating on a 364-day solar calendar of exactly 52 weeks, divided into four seasons of 91 days each, regulated by the angel Uriel. This calendar is the central theological concern of the Astronomical Book: it is the divinely ordained structure of creation's time.

The MT, however, reflects a lunar-solar (lunisolar) calendar for its festival system. The Passover falls on the 14th of Nisan (a lunar month: Exod. 12:2–6); the feast of Weeks (Shavuot) is calculated from Passover; Sukkot falls on the 15th of Tishri. The entire MT festival calendar is anchored to lunar month beginnings (Rosh Chodesh). The Enochic 364-day solar calendar is entirely incommensurable with the MT's lunar festival calendar — on the Enochic system, the MT festivals would fall on different days of the week each year, which is precisely the heresy the Enochic calendar was designed to prevent.

This calendrical contradiction was not abstract. The Qumran community (probably Essene) used the 364-day calendar, placing them in direct liturgical conflict with the Jerusalem Temple

authorities who used the lunar calendar. The Dead Sea Scrolls' Calendrical Texts (4QMMT; 4Q319–330) demonstrate that this was an active sectarian dispute, not a merely theoretical one.

Disagreement 18: Uriel as the revealer of the calendar vs. Moses at Sinai

The MT presents the festival calendar as divinely revealed to Moses at Sinai (Exod. 12–13; Lev. 23; Num. 28–29; Deut. 16). The authority structure is: YHWH → Moses → Israel. 1 Enoch's Luminaries present the calendar as revealed to Enoch by the angel Uriel — an entirely different revelatory chain that bypasses Moses, Sinai, and the Torah altogether. If 1 Enoch's calendrical revelation is authoritative, it implicitly undermines the Mosaic calendar. This represents a structural Disagreement in revelatory authority.

B. Forbidden Knowledge and the MT's Prohibition

Disagreement 19: The Watchers' gift of knowledge vs. the MT's creation order

1 Enoch 8:1–3 lists the forbidden arts taught by the Watchers: metalworking (swords, shields), cosmetics (antimony, eye-painting), enchantments, root-cutting (sorcery), astrology, and weather divination. The Watchers' teaching is portrayed as the origin of human sin — before their instruction, humanity lived in innocent ignorance.

The MT, however, attributes metallurgy to Tubal-Cain, 'the forger of all cutting instruments of bronze and iron' (Gen. 4:22 MT: לֹטֵשׁ כָּל-חֹרֵשׁ נְחֹשֶׁת וּבַרְזֶל) — a human, not a fallen angel. The origin of technology in the MT is human industry and the Cainite line, not angelic transgression. 1 Enoch's demonization of metallurgy and the arts contradicts the MT's presentation of these as human developments.

IX. Death, Sheol, and the Afterlife

A. The MT's View of the Afterlife

The MT presents a minimalistic, non-differentiated afterlife theology. All the dead — righteous and wicked alike — descend to Sheol (שְׁאוֹל). Sheol is characterized by silence (Ps. 31:17; 94:17), darkness and forgetfulness (Ps. 88:12; Eccl. 9:5), and separation from YHWH's active presence (Isa. 38:18). The concept of resurrection is introduced only in Daniel 12:2 ('many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt') and in a poetic or nationalistic sense in Ezekiel 37 (the valley of dry bones). Bodily resurrection as individual eschatological hope is embryonic in the MT.

B. 1 Enoch's Developed Afterlife Theology

Disagreement 20: Four-compartment Sheol — righteous vs. wicked

As noted in Section V, 1 Enoch 22 presents a morally differentiated Sheol with at least three to four compartments. The righteous await resurrection in a bright, watered compartment; the wicked are divided by their specific transgressions. This represents a theological development far beyond the

MT and introduces the concept of intermediate state judgment — a concept central to intertestamental Judaism and the GNT but absent from the MT.

Disagreement 21: The fate of the Nephilim spirits

1 Enoch 15:8–12 provides a unique demonology: the spirits of the dead Nephilim — the offspring of the Watchers and human women — are neither in Sheol nor in heaven but roam the earth as evil spirits, bringing sickness, warfare, and moral corruption. This 'earthly demon' theology has no basis in the MT. The MT's understanding of evil spirits is limited and unsystematic (the 'evil spirit from the LORD' in 1 Sam. 16:14 is a divine instrument, not a demonic entity). 1 Enoch provides the origin myth for the demonic realm that the GNT assumes but does not itself provide.

C. Resurrection in 1 Enoch

Disagreement 22: Resurrection theology vs. the MT

1 Enoch 51:1–5 presents a resurrection at the eschaton: 'And in those days the earth will restore what has been entrusted to it, and Sheol will restore what it has received, and destruction will return what it owes.' This resurrection is tied to the judgment of the Son of Man. The theology is closer to the GNT (John 5:28–29; Rev. 20:13) than to the MT, but the MT has no developed resurrection theology beyond the embryonic texts of Daniel 12:2 and the poetic Ezekiel 37.

X. 1 Enoch and the New Testament: Citations, Allusions, and Disagreements

A. The Direct Citation in Jude 14–15

Jude 14-15 (NA28) explicitly cites 1 Enoch 1:9 as prophecy: Enoch the seventh from Adam prophesied that the Lord comes with ten thousands of his holy ones to execute judgment on all the ungodly. The Ethiopic of 1 Enoch 1:9 reads that the Great Holy One will arrive with ten million of the holy to execute judgment upon all. This is the only direct citation of a non-canonical pseudepigraphal work as prophecy in the GNT canon.

Disagreement 23: Jude's use of 1 Enoch creates a canonical tension

Jude's citation of 1 Enoch as prophecy creates an insoluble canonical problem: if 1 Enoch contains genuine prophecy (as Jude implies by calling Enoch a prophet), why is 1 Enoch not canonical? Conversely, if 1 Enoch is not authoritative scripture, does Jude's citation undermine the integrity of the GNT canon? The mainstream resolution — that Jude cites 1 Enoch as a culturally familiar text without endorsing its full authority — is not explicitly stated in the GNT text. Moreover, the MT tradition — and the later rabbinic consensus — firmly rejected Enochic literature from the biblical canon. The citation in Jude stands in tension with the MT's implicit canonical boundary.

B. 2 Peter and the Fallen Angels

Disagreement 24: 2 Peter 2:4 and the Enochic tradition

2 Peter 2:4 (NA28): 'For if God did not spare the angels when they sinned, but cast them into hell (ταρταρώσας) and committed them to chains of gloomy darkness to be kept until the judgment.' The use of Tartarus (τάρταρος) — a term from Greek mythology for the deepest prison of the underworld — combined with the specific reference to sinning angels held in chains awaiting judgment almost certainly reflects Enochic tradition (1 En. 10:11–15; 21:1–6). The MT has no equivalent tradition. The GNT here imports Enochic demonology without attribution.

Disagreement 25: 1 Peter 3:19–20 and the spirits in prison

1 Peter 3:19–20 references Christ preaching to 'spirits in prison who formerly did not obey, when God's patience waited in the days of Noah.' The 'spirits in prison' is widely interpreted by scholars including Dalton (1989) and Elliott (2000) as an allusion to the imprisoned Watchers of 1 Enoch — the only tradition that places spirits specifically in prison in connection with the days of Noah. The MT has no parallel.

C. The Book of Revelation and Enochic Imagery

Disagreement 26: The throne room vision — Revelation 4–5 vs. 1 Enoch 14

Revelation 4–5 (NA28) presents a heavenly throne room with crystal-like surroundings, a throne, fire, four living creatures (τέσσαρα ζῷα), and twenty-four elders (εἴκοσι τέσσαρες πρεσβύτεροι). The parallels with 1 Enoch 14 (crystal house, fire, throne) and with Ezekiel 1 (four living creatures) are extensive. However, Revelation's throne room is thoroughly Christological — the Lamb is at the center — while 1 Enoch 14's throne room is unambiguously monotheistic, with no Christological dimension. The architectural similarity masks a profound theological difference.

D. The Epistle of Jude and the Assumption of Moses

Jude 9 references the dispute between Michael and the devil over the body of Moses — an incident not found in the MT (Deut. 34:5–6 only notes Moses' burial by YHWH in an unknown location) and not found in 1 Enoch. The source appears to be the lost Assumption of Moses (Testament of Moses), another pseudepigraphal work. This illustrates the GNT's dependence on a broader pseudepigraphal library beyond 1 Enoch.

XI. The Book of the Luminaries (1 En. 72–82) vs. Genesis 1 (MT/LXX)

Disagreement 27: The sun and moon's functions and hierarchies

Genesis 1:14–18 (MT) presents the sun and moon as created lights (מְאֹרֹת) with no names, no angelic attendants, and no independent personalities. Their function is purely instrumental: 'to separate the day from the night' and 'for signs and seasons and days and years.' The LXX translates similarly (φωστῆρες, luminaries) with no additional elaboration.

1 Enoch 72–82 presents the sun and moon as governed by named angels (Uriel oversees them), traveling through specific gates of heaven, having precise personalities and schedules, and defining the correct 364-day solar year. The sun is vastly more important than the moon in the Enochic system; the moon's irregular 354-day cycle is treated as problematic and potentially impious. The MT's creation account makes no such hierarchical distinction between sun and moon — they are both merely created instruments.

Disagreement 28: Stars as angels in 1 Enoch

1 Enoch 86:1–3 (Book of Dreams / Animal Apocalypse) portrays stars falling from heaven as a symbol for the fallen Watchers. 1 Enoch 43:1–2 and 104:2 identify stars with angelic beings. The MT explicitly prohibits the identification of stars as divine or angelic beings — star worship is a recurring Deuteronomic condemnation (Deut. 4:19; 17:3; 2 Kings 17:16; 21:3; Jer. 19:13). While Job 38:7 may poetically identify the 'morning stars' with the 'sons of God' (בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים), this is poetic parallelism, not angelological doctrine. 1 Enoch's systematic identification of stars with angels builds a cosmological framework that the MT's legislation actively opposes.

XII. The Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 85–90) vs. MT Historical Narrative

1 Enoch 85–90 presents a symbolic retelling of history from Adam to the Maccabean period, using animals as symbols for human and angelic figures. Adam is a white bull; Eve is a heifer; Cain and Abel are a black bull and a red bull. The patriarchs are various animals. Israel is sheep; Gentile nations are various beasts and birds of prey. Seventy shepherd-angels are appointed by God to oversee Israel during the exile — and they overstep their mandate, allowing more harm than God authorized.

Disagreement 29: Seventy shepherd-angels responsible for Israel's suffering

1 Enoch 89:59–90:25 narrates that God delegated Israel's fate during the exile to seventy shepherd-angels, who then allowed Israel to suffer beyond what God intended. God records their excess but waits for the final judgment. This theology of negligent or malevolent angelic governance over Israel has no basis in the MT. The MT consistently presents Israel's exile as a direct consequence of Israel's covenant violation, with YHWH as the direct agent of judgment (Deut. 28–29; Jer. 25; Ezek. 5). The MT does not attribute Israel's suffering to overzealous angelic intermediaries.

Disagreement 30: The Maccabean period as eschatological climax — a historical anchor

The Animal Apocalypse's narrative climaxes in the Maccabean revolt (approximately 167–164 BCE), presenting it as the final eschatological battle. The 'small horn' (1 En. 90:9) corresponds to Judas Maccabaeus or his movement. This apocalyptic schema is composed ex eventu — written after the events it 'predicts.' It contradicts the MT's historical perspective, which makes no reference to Maccabean events (the MT canon was essentially closed before the Hellenistic period). It also differs from the GNT's eschatology, which projects the final judgment beyond the Maccabean period to the parousia of Christ.

XIII. Christological Discrepancies in the Parables of Enoch (1 En. 37–71)

The Parables of Enoch present the most theologically charged material in 1 Enoch and the section most directly relevant to GNT Christology. The key titles applied to the Son of Man figure in the Parables are: Son of Man, Elect One (Chosen One), Righteous One, and Anointed One (Messiah). These overlap substantially with GNT Christological titles but with significant differences.

Disagreement 31: The Messiah in 1 Enoch vs. MT messianism

1 Enoch 48:10 and 52:4 use the term 'his Anointed' (Ethiopic: messihu, reflecting Greek χριστός and Hebrew מָשִׁיחַ). In the MT, the Messiah is consistently a human Davidic king (2 Sam. 7:12–16; Isa. 9:6–7; 11:1–10; Jer. 23:5–6; Ezek. 34:23–24). The MT's messianism is royal-Davidic and predominantly this-worldly in its initial conception. 1 Enoch's Messiah is a pre-existent heavenly figure, not a Davidic king, not from the tribe of Judah, and not a son of David — representing a fundamentally different messianic paradigm.

Disagreement 32: Pre-existence in 1 Enoch vs. the GNT's incarnational theology

1 Enoch 48:2–3 states that the Son of Man's name was named before the sun and stars were created — a clear statement of pre-existence. The GNT affirms Christ's pre-existence (John 1:1–3, 14; Col. 1:15–17; Phil. 2:6–7; Heb. 1:2–3), but the GNT's pre-existent Logos becomes incarnate (σάρξ ἐγένετο, John 1:14) — taking on human flesh, suffering, dying, and rising. The Son of Man in 1 Enoch does not suffer, is not incarnate, does not die, and does not rise. The GNT's crucifixion-resurrection framework is entirely absent from 1 Enoch's eschatology. This is the most fundamental Christological discrepancy between the two traditions.

Disagreement 33: The Elect One and the Gentiles

1 Enoch 62:9–11 describes kings and the mighty bowing before the Son of Man in shame and judgment. 1 Enoch 48:4–5 states that the Son of Man 'will be the light of the nations and will be the hope of those who grieve in their hearts.' This language closely parallels Deutero-Isaiah's Servant passages (Isa. 42:6; 49:6 MT/LXX), which the GNT applies to Jesus (Luke 2:32; Acts 13:47; 26:23). However, in 1 Enoch, the nations' submission is primarily one of condemnation and shame, not salvation through faith. The GNT's universal gospel — 'believe and be saved' (John 3:16; Rom. 10:9–13) — has no exact parallel in the Parables' vision of Gentile judgment.

XIV. Summary Table of Major Disagreements and Discrepancies

The following table summarizes the 33+ major Disagreements identified in this study, organized by category:

#	Topic	1 Enoch	MT Position	GNT Position	Assessment
1	Named Watchers	19 named leaders (Semjaza, etc.)	Anonymous 'sons of God' only	Not addressed	1 En. contradicts MT; GNT silent
2	Azazel	Chief fallen angel, teacher of sin	Cultic/ geographic term (Lev. 16)	Absent	1 En. radically reinterprets MT
3	LXX Gen. 6:2	—	bĕnê hā-ʾĕlōhîm	—	LXX reads 'angels of God'; closer to 1 En. than MT Heb.
4	Nephilim size	3,000 (or 300) cubits; demonic	Mighty men, men of renown	Not addressed	1 En. expands MT with no basis
5	Raphael	Major archangel, healer	Absent from MT	Absent from GNT	Only in 1 En. and deuterocanon
6	Uriel	Calendrical angel, cosmic guide	Absent from MT	Absent from GNT	Unique to 1 En. tradition
7	Gabriel's role	Destroyer of Nephilim (war)	Vision interpreter (Dan.)	Birth announcer (Luke)	Three mutually exclusive roles
8	Sheol	Four compartments, morally divided	Undifferentiated, all go there	Hades/ Gehenna distinction	MT contradicts 1 En.; GNT closer to 1 En.
9	Demon origin	Dead Nephilim spirits roam earth	No systematic demon origin	Satan/ demons assumed, no origin myth	1 En. provides origin; MT silent

10	364-day calendar	Divinely revealed solar calendar	Lunisolar festival calendar	No calendar specified	Irreconcilable with MT calendar
11	Metallurgy origin	Taught by fallen Watcher Azazel	Human: Tubal-Cain (Gen. 4:22)	Not addressed	Direct contradiction of MT
12	Son of Man	Pre-existent heavenly judge	Symbolic figure (Dan. 7:13)	Jesus of Nazareth, incarnate	All three traditions diverge
13	Enoch = Son of Man	1 En. 71:14 identifies Enoch as SoM	Enoch: man who walked with God	Jesus = Son of Man	Contradicts both MT and GNT
14	Messiah	Pre-existent heavenly figure	Davidic human king	Pre-existent + incarnate + crucified + risen	1 En. and GNT diverge from MT; 1 En. and GNT diverge from each other
15	Stars = Angels	Stars are angelic beings	Stars are created lights; star-worship condemned	Stars associated with angels (Rev.)	1 En. systematizes what MT condemns
16	Shepherd angels	70 angels govern exilic Israel	YHWH directly governs Israel	Not directly addressed	1 En. contradicts MT theology of divine sovereignty
17	Resurrection	Morally differentiated resurrection	Embryonic (Dan. 12:2)	Central: bodily resurrection of Christ and saints	1 En. between MT and GNT
18	Jude citation	1 En. 1:9 cited as prophecy	Not in MT canon	Jude 14–15 cites as prophecy	GNT citation of non-canonical text

19	Incarnation/ suffering	Son of Man does not suffer or die	Servant songs (Isa. 53) — debated	Christ crucified is central	1 En. and GNT irreconcilable here
20	Gentile salvation	Gentiles judged and shamed	Gentiles blessed through Abraham's seed	Gentiles saved by faith	1 En. presents judgment primarily; GNT adds salvation

---

XV. Bibliography and Primary Source References

Primary Texts

1 Enoch (Ethiopic): Nickelsburg, G.W.E. & VanderKam, J.C. (2004). 1 Enoch: A New Translation. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

1 Enoch (Aramaic DSS): Milik, J.T. (1976). The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Masoretic Text: Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS), 5th ed. (1997). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Septuagint: Rahlfs, A. & Hanhart, R. (2006). Septuaginta. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Greek New Testament: Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece, 28th ed. (NA28) (2012). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Secondary Scholarship

Black, M. (1985). The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 7. Leiden: Brill.

Charles, R.H. (1912). The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Collins, J.J. (1998). The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Dalton, W.J. (1989). Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits: A Study of 1 Peter 3:18–4:6, 2nd ed. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

Hurtado, L.W. (2003). Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Knibb, M.A. (1978). The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

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

Nickelsburg, G.W.E. & VanderKam, J.C. (2012). 1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 37–82. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Stuckenbruck, L.T. (2007). 1 Enoch 91–108. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Tiller, P.A. (1993). A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch. Early Judaism and Its Literature 4. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

VanderKam, J.C. (1984). Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition. CBQMS 16. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association.

VanderKam, J.C. (1995). Enoch: A Man for All Generations. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

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

Wright, A.T. (2005). The Origin of Evil Spirits: The Reception of Genesis 6:1–4 in Early Jewish Literature. WUNT 2/198. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.