Before I begin, I would like to thank our honored guest, Professor Nickelsburg, for the opportunity we have had to learn from him at this conference. I am grateful for his unparalleled work on 1 Enoch, and his broader contributions to our understanding of the role of the pseudepigrapha in Jewish and early Christian traditions. In this presentation, I will suggest how the LDS book of Enoch may be understood as the culminating story of an overall temple text in the book of Moses, “ritually understood and transmitted” as part of temple liturgy within the LDS tradition.
Figure 2. Old Testament Manuscript 1, page 12. Dictated 1 December 1830, in handwriting of Emma Smith. Changes to the ages of the Patriarchs are in the handwriting of Oliver Cowdery and were inserted no earlier than summer 1831. The page includes Genesis 5:14-21; Moses 6:19-34.

The Joseph Smith Translation as a Preparation for Temple Revelations
The LDS account of Enoch has been called the “most remarkable religious document published in the nineteenth century.” It was produced early in Joseph Smith’s ministry — in fact in the same year as the publication of the Book of Mormon — as part of a divine commission to “retranslate” the Bible. Writing the account of Enoch occupied a part of the Prophet’s attention for a month from 30 November to 31 December 1830. Later, the first eight chapters of the Joseph Smith Translation of Genesis, which included two chapters on Enoch, were separately canonized as the book of Moses.

Though the Joseph Smith Translation was not published in its entirety during Joseph Smith’s lifetime, his revelations make clear the urgency of the task of translation itself. Why was this so?
A careful study of the history of Joseph Smith’s effort provides clues that may provide a partial answer to this question. His focus is made apparent by an examination of the overall translation results and schedule. For example, by mid-1833, three years after the process of translation started, an initial manuscript of the JST had been completed. At left we see that Genesis 1-24 constitutes 1% of the Bible by page count. At right, we see the proportions of known durations of periods when each part of the translation was completed, with the first 24 chapters of Genesis occupying nearly a quarter of the total translation time for the entire Bible. Though we cannot know how much of Joseph Smith’s daily schedule the translation occupied during each of its phases, it is obvious that Genesis 1-24, the first 1% of the Bible, must have received a significantly more generous share of the Prophet’s time and attention than did the remaining 99%. Looking at it from the perspective of the number of revised verses rather than translation time, the same picture holds. As a proportion of page count, changes in Genesis occur four times more frequently than in the New Testament, and twenty-one times more frequently than in the rest of the Old Testament. The changes in Genesis are not only more numerous, but also more significant in the degree of doctrinal and historical expansion.
What important things could Joseph Smith have learned from translating Genesis 1-24? To begin with, the story of Enoch and his righteous city would have had pressing relevance to the mission of the Church, as the Prophet worked to help the Saints understand the law of consecration and to establish Zion in Missouri. Thus, it is no coincidence that the first part of this account was published in 1832. In addition, the early JST Genesis chapters also relate the accounts of other patriarchs whose stories directly relate to LDS doctrines about the priesthood and the temple, especially Adam, Noah, Melchizedek, and Abraham. In consideration of this fact, and other evidence from revelations and teachings of this period, I have come to believe that the most significant impact of the translation process may have been the early tutoring in temple-related doctrines received by Joseph Smith as he revised and expanded Genesis 1-24, in conjunction with his later translation of relevant passages in the New Testament and, for example, Old Testament references to prophets such as Moses and Elijah.
A corollary, in making this argument, is that a detailed understanding of the covenants and sequences of blessings associated with current forms of LDS temple worship may have been revealed to Joseph Smith more than a decade before he began to teach them in plainness to the Saints in Nauvoo, contradicting the view of those who consider the temple ordinances a late invention.
The Book of Moses as a Temple Text

Within a Mormon temple ritual called the “endowment” a narrative relating to selected events of primeval history provides the context for the presentation of divine laws and the making of covenants. Because the book of Moses, in which the greatest portion of Joseph Smith’s revelations on Enoch are to be found, is the most detailed account of primeval history found in the LDS canon, we should not be surprised to find that it contains a similar pattern where sacred history is interleaved with covenant-making themes. Arguing that these covenant-making themes helped dictate both the structure and the content of the material selected for inclusion in the book of Moses, Mark Johnson observed:

Throughout the text [of the book of Moses], the author stops the historic portions of the story and weaves into the narrative framework ritual acts such as sacrifice ...; ordinances such as baptism, washings, and the gift of the Holy Ghost; and oaths and covenants, such as obedience to marital obligations and oaths of property consecration .... [If we assume that material similar to Moses 1-8 might have served as a temple text, it would be expected that as] this history was recited, acts, ordinances and ceremonies would have been performed during this reading. For instance, during the story of Enoch and his city of Zion, members of the attending congregation would be put under oath to be a chosen, covenant people and to keep all things in common, with all their property belonging to the Lord.
A precedent for the idea of structuring key scriptural accounts to be consistent with a pattern of covenant-making can be found in Jack Welch’s analysis of the Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon at the Temple, where he argued that:  

The commandments ... are not only the same as the main commandments always issued at the temple, but they appear largely in the same order: obedience and sacrifice, evil speaking of the brethren, chastity and a higher understanding of marriage and divorce, ... and alms to the poor and consecration of one’s life to the worship and service of God.
In a similar vein, the eminent Bible scholar David Noel Freedman argues for an opposite pattern of covenant-breaking in the “Primary History” of the Old Testament. He argued that the biblical record was deliberately structured to reveal a sequence where each of the commandments were broken one by one:17

... a pattern of defiance of the Covenant with God that inexorably leads to the downfall of the nation of Israel ... Book by book ... the violation of the first nine [of the Ten Commandments] are charted one by one ...
This table illustrates the progressive separation of the “two ways” due to analogous sequences of covenant-keeping and covenant-breaking highlighted in the book of Moses. Specifics about these sequences are discussed in greater detail elsewhere.¹⁸

An interesting aspect of looking at the history of Adam through Enoch as a temple text is that — like the great sermons of Jesus Christ and the biblical text of the “Primary History” — the series of covenant-related themes unfolds in what appears to be a definite order of progression. For example, the sister laws of obedience and sacrifice are highlighted in the story of Adam and Eve after they leave the Garden of Eden, and Moses 5:58 tells us of how through Adam’s effort “the Gospel began to be preached from the beginning.”¹⁹ Immediately following in Moses 6, the law of chastity is highlighted in the contrast between the orderly family lines of the righteous and the confusion engendered by those who married outside the covenant. Most remarkable of all, I think, is the way that both the ultimate consequences of covenant-keeping as well as those of covenant-breaking are fully illustrated at the conclusion of the account: in the final two chapters of the book of Moses, Enoch and his people are taken up to walk in the presence of God²⁰ while the wicked are destroyed in the great Flood.²¹ In the remainder of this paper, we will take up temple themes from these last two chapters of the book of Moses in greater detail — focusing on the exaltation of Enoch and his people.
The Exaltation of Enoch and His People

In a seminal article relating to the story of Noah, the Genesis scholar Ronald Hendel makes the case that one of the most prominent themes in the first eleven chapters of the Bible is “a series of... transgressions of boundaries” that had been set up in the beginning to separate mankind from the dwelling place of Divinity. Likewise, Robert Oden highlighted the “human aspirations to divine status” as an underlying theme in all these stories, and the fact that such status “is ultimately denied them.”

This general thesis is useful as far as it goes. In the stories of the transgressions of Adam and Eve, of Cain, of Lamech, of the “sons of God” who married the “daughters of men,” and of the builders of the Tower of Babel, we cannot fail to observe the common thread of a God who places strict boundaries between the human and the divine. Surprisingly, however, a significant and opposite theme has been largely neglected by exegetes: namely, the fact that within some of these same chapters God is also portrayed as having sought to erase the divine-human boundary for a righteous few, drawing them into His very presence. The prime examples of this motif are, of course, Enoch and Noah, of whom it was explicitly said that they “walked with God.”
Indeed, transcending his status in the pseudepigraphal literature as a king and priest, Noah is portrayed in the Bible as a type of God Himself.\textsuperscript{26} Consider for example, the microcosmic Ark that Noah forms and fills with living creatures and food in imitation of the Creator God\textsuperscript{27} and his role as captain of the Ark as it moved “upon the face of the waters”\textsuperscript{28} — assuming the role of God in the original creation of the earth. Recall also Noah’s planting of an Eden-like garden after the emergence of dry land, his later locus “in the midst of”\textsuperscript{29} the most sacred place in that garden, and his pronouncement of a curse upon Canaan, the “serpent” who was responsible for the transgression of its sacred boundary. Noah’s high standing in the eyes of God can be compared with that of Enoch, who was the only other mortal in scripture specifically said to have “walked with God”\textsuperscript{30} — meaning, some claim, that these two patriarchs attained “eternal life” while still in mortality.\textsuperscript{31} Indeed, Enoch and Noah, whose names are mentioned together three times in the story of the Flood,\textsuperscript{32} are the only two included in the genealogical list of the patriarchs whose deaths are not mentioned.\textsuperscript{33} Both “found life amid the curse of death,”\textsuperscript{34} both were rescued from death by the hand of God,\textsuperscript{35} and each in his turn was a rescuer to others.\textsuperscript{36} Depictions of Noah in early Christian catacombs like the one here show him rising out of the Ark in a pose of resurrection, prefiguring the emergence of Jesus Christ from His tomb.
Figure 13. Moses and the Burning Bush, Byzantine Mosaic

**Enoch’s Prophetic Commission**

Before Enoch could begin his ministry he had to be “endued from with power from on high.” Joseph Smith’s account of Enoch’s prophetic commission begins as follows:

26 And it came to pass that Enoch journeyed in the land, among the people; and as he journeyed, the Spirit of God descended out of heaven, and abode upon him.

27 And he heard a voice from heaven, saying: Enoch, my son, prophesy unto this people...

Curiously, the closest biblical parallel to the wording of these opening verses is not to be found in the call of any Old Testament prophet but rather in John the Evangelist’s description of events following Jesus’ baptism where, like Enoch, he saw “the Spirit descending from heaven” and that it “abode on him” (i.e., Jesus). Two additional parallels with Jesus’ baptism follow: first in the specific mention of a “voice from heaven,” then in the proclamation of divine sonship by the Father. The connection between Enoch’s divine encounter and the baptism of Jesus becomes intelligible when one regards the latter event as an “ascent experience” consistent with the idea of baptism as a figurative death and resurrection.

In his masterful commentary on the book of Ezekiel, Walther Zimmerli distinguishes between two types of prophetic call in the Bible — the ‘narrative’ type, which includes a dialogue with God or other divine interlocutor; and the ‘throne theophany’ type, which introduces the prophetic commission with a vision of the heavenly throne of God. Following Norman Habel, Stephen Ricks distinguishes six characteristic features of the narrative call pattern:

1. the divine confrontation
2. the introductory word
3. the commission
4. the objection
5. the reassurance
6. the sign
Drawing on Professor Ricks’ discussion in which he shows how the six features apply in the account of the commissioning of Enoch, we will highlight selected details of this pattern. Following the “divine confrontation” and the “introductory word,” Enoch’s “objection” reads as follows, with some obvious similarities — and differences — with the calls of Moses and Jeremiah:

31 And when Enoch had heard these words, he bowed himself to the earth, before the Lord, and spake before the Lord, saying: Why is it that I have found favor in thy sight, and am but a lad, and all the people hate me; for I am slow of speech; wherefore am I thy servant?

LDS readers have often puzzled over Enoch’s self-description as a “lad” — though he was sixty-five at the time. This is the only instance of the term “lad” in the teachings and revelations of Joseph Smith. The use of this term by Joseph Smith is of special interest considering the prominence of “lad” as a title for Enoch in the pseudopigraphal books of 2 Enoch and 3 Enoch. Gary A. Anderson of Notre Dame writes the following about a reference in 2 Enoch:

It is worth noting that of all the names given Enoch, the title “lad” is singled out as being particularly apt and fitting by the heavenly host. Evidently the [other] seventy names were of a more general order of knowledge than the specific title “lad” ...
Besides fascinating resonances with Enoch’s title of lad or youth (Hebrew na’ar) in the Enoch literature, David Larsen and I are intrigued with a possible allusion to Enoch in a prophecy said to be “of old”\textsuperscript{50} that is applied to David in Psalm 89:19. In the translation of Eaton, we read:\textsuperscript{51}

I have set a youth [emending ‘ezer to na’ar] above the warrior; I have raised [or exalted] a young man [baḥur] over the people.

The youth who is set above the warrior (Hebrew gibbor) recalls Enoch’s victory over the gibborim in the Book of the Giants and in the book of Moses, as recapitulated David’s youthful triumph over the giant Goliath). Of course the motif of the exaltation of the anointed one is relevant to the stories of Enoch’s heavenly ascent in the book of Moses and in the pseudepigrapha, as well as David’s exaltation in the royal psalms, e.g., “the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.”\textsuperscript{52}
When Enoch is told: “Open thy mouth, and it shall be filled,” the obvious parallel is with Moses, who was also told that the Lord would “be with” his mouth and teach him what to say.\textsuperscript{53} However, an equally good parallel is found again in the Enoch literature. In 2 Enoch 39:5, Enoch avers: \textsuperscript{54} “... it is not from my own lips that I am reporting to you today, but from the lips of the Lord I have been sent to you.”

After the opening of Enoch’s mouth, his eyes are washed and “opened,” actions with unmistakable temple connotations:

35 And the Lord spake unto Enoch, and said unto him: Anoint thine eyes with clay, and wash them, and thou shalt see.\textsuperscript{55} And he did so.

36 And he beheld the spirits that God had created; and he beheld also things which were not visible to the natural eye; and from thenceforth came the saying abroad in the land: A seer hath the Lord raised up unto his people.

We do not have time today to explore the many interesting resemblances between the description of Enoch’s mission to the gibborim and the fragmentary Book of the Giants, found at Qumran in 1948. These resemblances range from general themes in the story line (secret works, murders, visions, earthly and heavenly books of remembrance that evoke fear and trembling, moral corruption, hope held out for repentance, and the eventual defeat of Enoch’s adversaries in battle, ending with their utter destruction and imprisonment) to specific occurrences of rare expressions in corresponding contexts (the reference to the “wild man,” the name and parallel role of Mahijah/Mahujah, and the “roar of the wild beasts”). Note that these parallels with the Book of the Giants are not drawn at will from a large corpus of Enoch manuscripts but rather are concentrated in a scant three pages of Qumran fragments. It would be thought remarkable if any nineteenth-century document were to exhibit a similar density of close resemblances with this small collection of ancient fragments, but to find such similarities in appropriate contexts relating in each case to the story of Enoch is astonishing.
Within the book of Moses, the stories of rescue and exaltation in the accounts of Noah and Enoch share a common motif of water. On the one hand, Noah's waters are the waters of destruction, the floods of an all-consuming deluge that cleanses the earth in a prelude to a new creation. On the other hand, Enoch's waters are the waters of sorrow, the bitter tears that precede the terrible annihilating storm. Indeed, in the vision of Enoch found in Joseph Smith's revelations, there is not one but three distinct parties that weep for the wickedness of mankind: God, the heavens, and Enoch himself. In addition, a fourth party, the earth, mourns—though does not specifically weep—for her children. Daniel Peterson cites non-LDS biblical scholar J. J. M. Roberts who identifies three similar voices within the laments of the book of Jeremiah: the feminine voice of the mother of the people (corresponding in the book of Moses to the voice of the earth, the “mother of men”), the voice of the people (corresponding to Enoch), and the voice of God Himself.

With respect to the weeping of God, the relevant passage in the book of Moses begins as follows:

28 And it came to pass that the God of heaven looked upon the residue of the people, and he wept ...

29 And Enoch said unto the Lord: How is it that thou canst weep, seeing thou art holy, and from all eternity to all eternity? ....

32 The Lord said unto Enoch: Behold these thy brethren; they are the workmanship of mine own hands, and I gave unto them their knowledge, in the day I created them; and in the Garden of Eden, gave I unto man his agency;

33 And unto thy brethren have I ... given commandment, that they should love one another, and that they should choose me, their Father; but behold, they are without affection, and they hate their own blood;

Because of its eloquent rebuke of the idea of divine impassibility — the notion that God does not suffer pain or distress — this passage that speaks of the voice of the weeping God has received the greatest share of attention in LDS scholarship compared to the other voices of weeping in the book of Moses chapters on Enoch. Recently, a book relating to the topic has been written by Terryl and Fiona Givens. They eloquently summarize the significance of this passage as follows:

It is not [the] wickedness [of humankind], but their “misery,” not their disobedience, but their “suffering,” that elicits the God of Heaven’s tears. Not until Gethsemane and Golgotha does the scriptural record reveal so unflinchingly the costly investment of God’s love in His people, the price at which He placed His heart upon them ... In the vision of Enoch, we find ourselves drawn to a God who prevents all the pain He can, assumes all the suffering He can, and weeps over the misery He can neither prevent nor assume.
In both the book of Moses and the pseudepigraphal book of *1 Enoch*, we also find Enoch weeping in response to visions of mankind’s wickedness. However, whereas in *1 Enoch*, the prophet weeps alone, the book of Moses invites us to reflect on the sympathetic *union* of Enoch and God in their sorrows. The weeping of Enoch is not merely significant in its own right but also because, according to Terryl and Fiona Givens, it is an illustration “of what the actual process of acquiring the divine nature requires ... Enoch is raised to a perspective from which he sees the world through God’s eyes.” In Moses 7:41 we read:67

> And it came to pass that the Lord spake unto Enoch, and told Enoch all the doings of the children of men; wherefore Enoch knew, and looked upon their wickedness, and their misery, and wept and stretched forth his arms, and his heart swelled wide as eternity; and his bowels yearned; and all eternity shook ...
The idea of raising the prophet to a level approaching godhood through shared sorrow with the divine is explored at length by theologian Terence Fretheim. Fretheim argues that the prophet’s “sympathy with the divine pathos” was not the result of merely contemplating the divine but instead a result of the prophet’s elevation to become a member of the divine council. He writes:

> [T]he fact that the prophets are said to be a part of this council indicates something of the intimate relationship they had with God. The prophet was somehow drawn up into the very presence of God; even more, the prophet was in some sense admitted into the history of God. The prophet becomes a party to the divine story; the heart and mind of God pass over into that of the prophet to such an extent that the prophet becomes a veritable embodiment of God.

Not surprising then, in the aftermath of Enoch’s soul-stretching emulation of “divine pathos” in the book of Moses, is that the weeping prophet is given a right to the divine throne. Says Joseph Smith’s Enoch to God:

> ... thou hast … given unto me a right to thy throne …

The book of Moses motif of granting access to the divine throne is nowhere more at home than in the pseudepigraphal Enoch literature. For example, in 3 Enoch, Enoch declares:

> ... the Holy One, blessed be He, made for me a throne like the throne of glory ... and sat me down upon it.
Summarizing other ancient literature relevant to this passage, Charles Mopsik concludes that the exaltation of Enoch is not meant to be seen as a singular event. Rather he writes that the “enthronement of Enoch is a prelude to the transfiguration of the righteous — and at their head the Messiah — in the world to come, a transfiguration that is the restoration of the figure of the perfect Man.” Following this ideological trajectory to its full extent, Mormons see the perfect Man (with a capital “M”), into whose form the Messiah and Enoch and all the righteous are transfigured, as God the Father, of whom Adam, the first mortal man, is a type. Fittingly, as part of Joseph Smith’s account of Enoch’s vision, God proclaims His primary identity to be that of an “Endless and Eternal” Man, declaring: “Man of Holiness is my name.”

Given the identity of God the Father as the “Man of Holiness,” the title “Son of Man,” which is a notable feature of the Book of Parables in 1 Enoch and also appears in marked density throughout the book of Moses vision of Enoch is perfectly intelligible within LDS theology. So are the related titles of “Chosen One,” “Anointed One” and “Righteous One” that appear prominently both in 1 Enoch and the LDS Enoch story. After considering the sometimes contentious debate among scholars about the single or multiple referent(s) of these titles and their relationship to other texts, Nickelsburg and VanderKam conclude that the author of 1 Enoch (like the author of the book of Moses) “saw the... traditional figures as having a single referent and applied the various designations and characteristics as seemed appropriate to him.”
As Mopsik observed, however, the story does not end here. Recall his conclusion that the “enthronement of Enoch is a prelude to the transfiguration of the righteous ... in the world to come.” Indeed, in one of Joseph Smith’s revelations, this idea is made explicit in the concept that these righteous will be ordained “after the order of Melchizedek, which was after the order of Enoch, which was after the order of the Only Begotten Son. Wherefore, as it is written, they are gods, even the sons of God.” In another of Joseph Smith’s revelations we are told that all of God’s earthly children are called, in essence, “Sons of Man.”

Making explicit the role of the Son of Man as the forerunner for the Sons of Man, the resurrected Jesus Christ varies this statement slightly in the Book of Mormon: “Therefore I would that ye should be perfect even as I, or your Father who is in heaven is perfect.”
In his insightful discussion of the Greek word *teleios*, translated “perfect” in Matthew, Jack Welch writes:88

"In commanding the people to “be perfect even as I, or your Father who is in heaven is perfect,” it seems that Jesus had several things in mind besides “perfection” as we usually think of it. Whatever He meant, it involved the idea of becoming like God (“even as I or your Father who is in heaven”), which occurs by seeing God90 and knowing God.91 These ultimate realities can be represented [ceremonially] in this world,92 for as Joseph Smith taught, it is through [the] ordinances [of the temple] that we are “instructed more perfectly.”93

This last statement brings us to the subject of Enoch and the temple. Hugh Nibley cites Caquot as saying that Enoch is:94

... “in the center of a study of matters dealing with initiation in the literature of Israel.”95 Enoch is the great initiate who becomes the great initiator96 ... The Hebrew book of Enoch bore the title of *Hekhalot*, referring to the various chambers or stages of initiation in the temple.97 Enoch, having reached the final stage, becomes the Metatron to initiate and guide others. “I will not say but what Enoch had Temples and officiated therein,” said Brigham Young, “but we have no account of it.”98 Today we do have such accounts.
In line with the theme of Enoch as a forerunner in the “transfiguration of the righteous” is the book of Moses idea that Enoch succeeded in bringing a whole people to be sufficiently “pure in heart” to fully live the law of consecration. In Zion, the “City of Holiness,” the people “were of one heart and one mind, and dwelt in righteousness; and there was no poor among them.” We are told that not only Enoch but also “all his people walked with God” and that they were eventually taken into heaven with him. This topic will be treated by David Larsen in his presentation.

In LDS temples, the promise of being “received... into [God’s] own bosom” like Enoch and his people is extended to all those who prepare themselves to receive it, through the sanctifying power of Christ. One of Joseph Smith’s revelations identifies Zion with “the pure in heart” — and, as Jesus said in the Sermon on the Mount, the reward of the pure in heart is that they shall “see God.” “Therefore,” the Lord told Joseph Smith, “sanctify yourselves that your minds become single to God, and the days will come that you shall see him; for he will unveil his face unto you, and it shall be in his own time, and in his own way, and according to his own will. Remember the great and last promise which I have made unto you.”

Conclusion
In a recent discussion of Mormon theology, non-LDS scholar Stephen Webb concludes that Joseph Smith “knew more about theology and philosophy than it was reasonable for anyone in his position to know, as if he were dipping into the deep, collective unconsciousness of Christianity with a very long pen.” More significantly, the Prophet recovered a story of Enoch that manifests a deep understanding of what it means to become a “partaker of the divine nature” and in that process to become a partner with God Himself in the salvation and exaltation of His children, being raised to a perspective from which we see the world through God’s eyes. The Enoch chapters in the book of Moses teach us that those who wish to follow the path of Enoch, which is the same path that was laid out by the great Redeemer, must take upon themselves its sufferings with its glory. “One is... obliged,” writes Eugene Seaich, to become not only “‘one flesh’ with Christ, but [also] one life, one sacrifice, thus participating actively in the eternal act of love which began in the heavens.”
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of walking “with” God is found in a description of those who have been declared worthy of exaltation (Revelation 3:4): “they shall walk with me in white: for they are worthy.” In addition, Abraham is commanded by the Lord to “walk before me” in Genesis 17:1, and Isaac speaks of “The Lord, before whom I walk” in Genesis 24:40. It may well be that a distinction is being made between walking “with” God and walking “before” God (**check the Hebrew). See also Genesis 3:8; 48:15; Leviticus 26:12; Deuteronomy 23:14; 1 Samuel 2:30; 1 Kings 11:38; 2 Chronicles 7:17; Psalm 56:13; 89:15; 116:9; Micah 6:8; 1 Nephi 16:3; Mosiah 2:27; 4:26; 18:29; Alma 1:1; 45:24; 53:21; 63:2; Helaman 15:5; Ether 6:17, 30; D&C 5:21; 11:12; 18:31; 20:69; 21:4; 46:7; 68:28; 90:24; Moses 5:26.

About possible reasons for the overlap and confusion between the characters of Noah, Enoch, and other patriarchs in the ancient literature, see H. W. Nibley, Enoch, pp. 22-55. Note that the figures of Enoch (see, e.g., J. C. Reeves, Heralds, pp. 185) and Noah (see, e.g., A. A. Orlov, Enoch-Metatron, pp. 306-320) were sometimes deprecated in the later rabbinical literature.

26 See, e.g., B. Embry, Naked Narrative, p. 426 n. 22.
28 Genesis 7:18.
29 Although KJV Genesis 9:21 translates the relevant phrase as “within” his tent, the Hebrew mirrors the description of the Tree of Life “in the midst of” the Garden of Eden (Genesis 2:9).
30 Regarding the application of this phrase to Enoch and his people, see Moses 6:39, 7:69. Regarding Noah and his sons, see Moses 8:27. In addition, Abraham is commanded by the Lord to “walk before me” in Genesis 17:1, and Isaac speaks of “The Lord, before whom I walk” in Genesis 24:40.
33 J. H. Sailhamer, Genesis, p. 71. In the case of Noah, however, his death is later noted in Genesis 9:29.
34 Ibid., p. 74.
35 Ibid., p. 75.
36 Enoch in establishing a city so righteous that it could be received into God’s “own bosom” (Moses 7:69), and Noah in making an ark that saved all living creatures and a remnant of mankind from the Flood.
38 Moses 6:26-27.
40 Matthew 3:27.
43 Romans 6:4-6.
44 W. Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, pp. 97-100.
45 S. D. Ricks, Narrative Call, p. 97. See S. N. Bunta, In Heaven for an interpretation of Ezekiel 1 as a heavenly ascent.
distinct and irreconcilable conceptions.

The old view that Paul's messiah was shaped by a non-Jewish, Him himself spoke and taught to his disciples. In other words, it is no longer possible to view Paul's concept of the messiah in the oral transmission of the earliest communities of the Jesus movement (which were later included in the written gospel accounts) grew out of the same soil [as that of the Enochic Son of Man traditions]. They were developed from the same traditions about the Son of Man that Jesus Himself spoke and taught to his disciples. In other words, it is no longer possible to view Paul’s concept of the messiah figure in the written gospel accounts as distinct and irreconcilable conceptions. The old view that Paul’s messiah was shaped by a non-Jewish,
Gentile context and that the messiah in the Gospels was shaped in a Jewish context is no longer tenable. The wedge must now be considered to have been permanently removed” (ibid., p. 208).

In addition, Waddell develops his reasons for the fact that Paul only used “Son of Man” concepts and not “Son of Man” terminology in ibid., pp. 186-201. Instead of the traditional argument that Son of Man language would have made no sense to Paul’s Gentile followers, he concludes that Paul avoided this language because of a first-century soteriological debate about how one achieved eternal life.

For a summary of the uses of the term “son of man” in the ancient literature, see S. Chialà, Son of Man. For a broad discussion of the use of the term “Son of Man” in the Gospels and in Daniel, see J. Ashton, Understanding, pp. 240-276. For additional arguments specifically relating the “Son of Man” title to the Enoch and New Testament literatures, see the work of Margaret Barker (e.g., M. Barker, Lost, pp. 91-104; M. Barker, Temple Themes, pp. 46-47, 154-165, 188-189, 195-197; M. Barker, Temple Mysticism, pp. 100-106, 134-143).

73 J. F. McConkie, Symbolism, p. 147. See Moses 5:24, 32; John 17:12. P. B. Munoa, Four Powers, p. 102 cites rabbinical sources giving support to the idea that Adam and God were not only identical in appearance, but:

- could be thought to share the same name, even Adam …

Lacocque, when discussing how Gnostic speculations about “Man” were anchored in the “older Israelite mentality,” quotes Corpus Hermeticum 10:25 to illustrate how God could be understood as a man:

Man on earth is a mortal god; God in the heavens is an immortal man.

Though the analysis of Borsch has been justly criticized, his wide survey of sources relating to the idea of the “first man” is still useful (F. H. Borsch, Son of Man, pp. 55-88). Fletcher-Louis discusses the concept of “angelomorphism” in Second Temple Judaism, as expressed in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Enoch literature, and other pseudepigrapha. Describing the destiny of the righteous of the community at Qumran, one text announces: “For these are those selected by God for an everlasting covenant and to them shall belong the glory of Adam” (Rule of the Community 4:22-23 in F. G. Martinez, DSS Translated, p. 7). Fletcher-Louis equates this “glory of Adam” to the glory of God (C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, Glory, p. 479, see also pp. 17-19). Cf. W. Blake, Natural Religion, p. 41; G. B. Hinckley, Don’t Drop, p. 46; L. Snow, Teachings 1984, 15 June 1901, p. 1; J. A. Waddell, Comparative Study, pp. 186-201. See also the comprehensive study of the anthropomorphic conception of God in old rabbinic thought by Marmorstein (A. Marmorstein, Doctrine, Vol. 3), Kugel’s more recent study (J. L. Kugel, God of Old), E. L. Cherbonnier, Anthropomorphism, E. J. Hamori, Embodied God, and J. M. Bradshaw, God’s Image 1, Commentary 1:12-c, p. 53, 2:26-c, p. 113.

For additional LDS statements about how God came to be God, see J. Smith, Jr., Teachings, 7 April 1844, pp. 345-346; B. Young, BY 5 January 1860, p. 102; B. Young, 12 June 1860-b, p. 81 G. Q. Cannon, 6 January 1884, p. 26; B. R. McConkie, New Witness, p. 64; J. E. Talmage, 6 April 1915, p. 123; B. Young, 17 June 1866, p. 249.

74 Moses 7:35.
75 Moses 7:35.
76 P. Alexander, 3 Enoch, 10:1-2, pp. 263-264.
77 Moses 7:24, 47, 54, 56, 59, 65.
79 Le., Messiah. See Moses 7:63.
80 Moses 6:57; 7:45, 47, 67.
81 G. W. E. Nickelsburg et al., 1 Enoch 2, p. 119, emphasis added. The entire discussion is found on pp. 113-123. For additional discussion of the "Son of Man" title from an LDS perspective, see S. K. Brown, Man and Son of Man.
In the view of Fletcher-Louis, much of the controversy can be attributed to false dichotomies that have been posited in various descriptions of the identity of the Son of Man (C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, Revelation of the Sacral, p. 257):

For the interpretation of Daniel 7 commentators are divided into broadly three different camps: (1) those who think the "one like a son of man" is an angel, (2) those who think that he is an individual human, the (royal) messiah, and (3) those who think he is merely a symbol representing the people of God; Israel. The debate ranges widely yet positions tend to be entrenched.

A solution to the problem entails the removal of the boundaries which force a separation between the various alternatives. In the first place it is not necessary, as commentators on all sides assume, to separate out heavenly/divine and earthly/human alternatives. There is a well-established tradition, some of the evidence for which we have examined in the preceding part of this study, that a human being or community can be angelic/divine and so the data pointing to an Israel or earthy messiah is entirely compatible with that pointing to an angel, if we have an angelomorphic human in view.

Secondly, whilst there is in fact within Daniel very little evidence for an interest in a Davidic messianism there is much to suggest that a priestly figure is in view in 7:13 (cf. 9:26 where Onias III is an "anointed on"). Israel’s high priest was widely, if not universally, believed to possess a divine or angelic identity. Of course, he also represented or embodied the people of God. This is vividly expressed in his bearing of the names of the twelve tribes of Israel upon his breastplate. He therefore fulfills the requirements for all three interpretations: he is angelic, he represents the people of God and yet he is a concrete individual figure.

82 In the view of Fletcher-Louis, much of the controversy can be attributed to false dichotomies that have been posited in various descriptions of the identity of the Son of Man (C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, Revelation of the Sacral, p. 257):

For the interpretation of Daniel 7 commentators are divided into broadly three different camps: (1) those who think the "one like a son of man" is an angel, (2) those who think that he is an individual human, the (royal) messiah, and (3) those who think he is merely a symbol representing the people of God; Israel. The debate ranges widely yet positions tend to be entrenched.

A solution to the problem entails the removal of the boundaries which force a separation between the various alternatives. In the first place it is not necessary, as commentators on all sides assume, to separate out heavenly/divine and earthly/human alternatives. There is a well-established tradition, some of the evidence for which we have examined in the preceding part of this study, that a human being or community can be angelic/divine and so the data pointing to an Israel or earthy messiah is entirely compatible with that pointing to an angel, if we have an angelomorphic human in view. Secondly, whilst there is in fact within Daniel very little evidence for an interest in a Davidic messianism there is much to suggest that a priestly figure is in view in 7:13 (cf. 9:26 where Onias III is an "anointed on"). Israel’s high priest was widely, if not universally, believed to possess a divine or angelic identity. Of course, he also represented or embodied the people of God. This is vividly expressed in his bearing of the names of the twelve tribes of Israel upon his breastplate. He therefore fulfills the requirement for all three interpretations: he is angelic, he represents the people of God and yet he is a concrete individual figure.

83 M. Barker, Angels, p. 43.
84 C. Mopsik, Hénoch, p. 214.
87 3 Nephi 12:48.
89 3 Nephi 12:48.
90 See 1 John 3:2.
91 See John 17:3.
92 For discussions of ceremonial representations of the process of becoming a Son of God in Mesopotamian and Jewish settings, see J. M. Bradshaw, Ezekiel Mural; J. M. Bradshaw et al., Investiture Panel. Fletcher-Louis similarly describes an angelomorphic form of worship in the Dead Sea Scrolls community in C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, Reflections; C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, Glory. For analogues in the LDS tradition, see J. M. Bradshaw, Temple Themes in the Oath.
93 J. Smith, Jr., Documentary History, 14 November 1835, 2:312. More to the point, the Prophet urged his followers to “go on to perfection, and search deeper and deeper into the mysteries of Godliness” (J. Smith, Jr., Teachings, 16 June 1844, p. 364). In this context, see also his frequent citations (and emendations) of Hebrews 5:1 (J. Smith, Jr., Documentary History, 18 June 1840, 4:136; J. Smith, Jr., Teachings, 1 September 1835, p. 82, 15 October 1843, p. 328, 10 March 1844, p. 338, 8 April 1844, p. 360).
95 A. Caquot, Pour une Étude, p. 121. Translation by Nibley.
96 Ibid., p. 121.
97 P. Alexander, 3 Enoch; C. Mopsik, Hénoch.
Our sincere thanks to David Calabro for checking and updating Hugh Nibley’s translation of this passage.

104 D. J. Larsen, Enoch and the City of Zion.

105 Moses 7:69.

106 D. H. Oaks, To Become.


Christ’s love is so deep that He took upon Himself the sins and afflictions of all mankind. Only in that way could He both pay for our sins and empathize with us enough to truly succor us — that is, run to us — with so much empathy that we can have complete confidence that He fully understands our sorrows. So, to love as Christ loves probably means that we will taste some form of suffering ourselves, because the love and the affliction are but two sides of the same coin. Only by experiencing both sides to some degree can we begin to understand and love other people with a depth that even begins to approach Christ’s love.

114 J. E. Seaich, Ancient Texts 1995, p. 550. Regarding the “eternal act of love which began in the heavens,” see Revelation 13:8: “the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.” Gross notes that “to imitate the ‘passion’ of a hero-savior in order to ensure salvation” is the heart of the mysteries (J. Gross, Divinization, p. 87). Cf. P. E. S. Thompson’s observation that the story of God’s choosing of Abraham — and later of Israel — “was to demonstrate that it was not an election to privilege ... but to responsibility for all mankind” (cited in A. LaCocque, Trial, p. 19). Commenting on Romans 8:17, LDS scholar James Faulconer observes: “Paul puts only one condition on the heirship of those who will be adopted into the household of God: We must suffer with Christ ... He is not saying that just as Christ could not escape suffering, we too cannot escape. Rather, he says that we suffer the same thing as Christ if we are heirs with him: inheriting the same thing requires suffering the same thing” (J. E. Faulconer, Life of Holiness, p. 405). For additional LDS perspectives on this idea, see J. M. Bradshaw, Temple Themes in the Oath, pp. 78, 180 n. 389.