commentators to think that here, *eunoukhos* does denote a castrated man. Yet this interpretation is not certain, and competent commentators question whether it refers to a "eunuch" in the strict sense.[1]

Conclusion

Was Potiphar a eunuch? We cannot say for certain whether he was or not, for we have no absolute proof. The pieces of evidence we have cited, however, and their respective weight, lead us tentatively to suggest that he was not. In any case, the translator should not lay all the emphasis on the purely formal and physiological aspect by translating *saris* as "eunuch". On the contrary, it is preferable to respect the sociological dimension of the word by choosing a functional title which underlines the importance of Potiphar's role.

THOMAS B. SLATER

MORE ON REVELATION 1.13 AND 14.14[2]

The author teaches in the Department of Religion of The University of Georgia, USA.

In an earlier article, I argued that "one like **a** son of man" was a preferable translation of *homoion huion anthrōpou* in Rev 1.13 and 14.14, rather than the NRSV'S "one like **the** son of man."[3] The present article offers additional evidence which confirms and strengthens my original argument.

In the first study, I noted that Lietzmann correctly understood that Dan 7.13, Rev 1.13 and 14.14 differ from the synoptics in two ways. First, both books employ comparisons; and, secondly, neither uses the definite article. Following Lietzmann, I concluded that *homoion huion anthrōpou* was not a messianic title in Daniel or Revelation, but a description by means of comparison. I supported my thesis by identifying similar "descriptive comparisons" in *1 Enoch* 46.1 (one "whose face had the appearance of a human being"[4]) and *4 Ezra/2 Esdras* 13.1 ("something like a figure of a man"[5]). The *Similitudes of Enoch*, *4 Ezra* and Revelation are all dated by scholarly consensus in the second half of the first Christian century[6]. Additionally, all three independently give messianic interpretations of Dan 7.13. Finally, both Dan 8.17 and *1 Enoch* 60.10 use the generic expression "son of man" as a means of direct address to the seer of the visions (cf Ezek 1.26-28; 2.1; 17.2).

Against my thesis, one might argue that the *Similitudes of Enoch* consistently employ "that Son of man" as a messianic title, and also refer in a titular sense to the seer Enoch as "the Son of Man" (71.14). However, all the Enochic "that Son of Man" passages refer back to the descriptive comparison in 46.1. *1 Enoch* 46.3

1 See E. Hänchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 7th ed., Göttingen 1977, 300: "one does not necessarily have to think of castration"; similarly John B. Polhill, *Acts* (New American Commentary), Nashville, Tennessee 1992, 223: "Whether he was an actual physical eunuch is not certain."

2 This study is dedicated to Ms Ruth E. Young, Main Library, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

3 T.B. Slater, "*homoion huion anthrōpou* in Rev 1.13 and 14.14", TBT 44 (1993) 349-350.

4 M.A. Knibb's translation in *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, ed. H.F.D. Sparks (Oxford: Clarendon 1984). *1 Enoch* is a composite of many different Enochic traditions. Chs 37-71 are also known as the *Similitudes of Enoch*; this paper will refer to those chapters in this manner.

5 B.M. Metzger's translation in J.H. Charlesworth, ed., *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols, Garden City, New York: Doubleday 1983.

6 See, e.g., J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, New York: Crossroad 1989, 155-186.

makes this abundantly clear. An interpreting angel tells the seer, "This is the Son of Man who has righteousness, and with whom righteousness dwells." "This" refers back to the one "whose face had the appearance of a man" in v 1. Thus the expression "that Son of Man" does not function as a title in the *Similitudes* but as a means of reference. As a minor correction to my earlier work, I should point out that *1 Enoch* 70-71 is not part of the original message of the *Similitudes* but a comment on that message.

Additional research confirms my original thesis. First, Ezekiel may be the source of Daniel's descriptive comparisons. Ezekiel uses them in 1.26-28; 8.2-4; 9.2-11 and 40.3-4. Secondly, Ezekiel, Daniel and the *Similitudes* use "son of man," in contrast to descriptive comparisons, as a means of direct address to the seer. Finally, Ezekiel, Daniel, the *Similitudes*, *4 Ezra* and Revelation all portray "Babylon" as the great oppressor of the people of God, the last four using Ezekiel's historical context as a theological metaphor for their own contexts. These similarities indicate a common tradition in second temple Judaism of presenting heavenly beings in human-likeness. The *Similitudes of Enoch*, *4 Ezra* and Revelation are independently reading Dan 7.13, as evidenced by their use of descriptive comparisons in three different ways, yet each with a messianic interpretation.

As noted above, *1 Enoch* 70-71 is an appendix to the original *Similitudes*. This is important to note, because 71.14 has been written in such a manner that the image of the human-like messiah approaching the Head of Days provides an inclusio for the Son of Man section, clearly echoing 46.3[1]. It reads, "You are the Son of Man who was born to righteousness and righteousness remains over you, and the righteousness of the Head of Days will not leave you." Alternatively, E. Isaacs translates 71.14, "You, son of man, who are born in righteousness and upon whom righteousness has dwelt, the righteousness of the Antecedent of Time will not forsake you"[2]. If Isaacs' translation is preferable, the appendix to the *Similitudes* also uses "son of man" as a form of direct address to the seer, as do Ezekiel (e.g. 1.26-28), Daniel (8.17) and the *Similitudes* themselves (60.10). The *Similitudes* did not originally identify Enoch as the Son of Man, but this identification probably reflects a Jewish response to the Christian kerygma (cf *1 Enoch* 62.7).

An examination of two other works roughly contemporaneous with the *Similitudes*, *4 Ezra* and Revelation, further confirms my original thesis concerning descriptive comparisons. The first is the *Apocalypse of Abraham (ApAb)*. Most scholars date it circa 100 CE. As with *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, it laments the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE. I concur with this date. The pertinent passage is in *ApAb* 10. In this chapter, Abraham has a vision and becomes faint (vv 1-2; cf Rev 1.17a). God sends an angel to strengthen Abraham (v 3) and the writer describes the angel in 4: "The angel he sent to me in the likeness of a man came, and he took me by my right hand and stood me on my feet." While not describing the messiah, this passage is consistent with those examined earlier that employed descriptive comparisons to depict heavenly beings. Although many parts of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* have been reworked by a Christian editor, 10.4 does not

1 This added appendix with its inclusio suggests that these two chapters were added before the entire *Enoch* corpus came together.

2 See Charlesworth, ed., *OTP*, vol 1.

show any signs of such redaction. I concur fully with Rowland's statement that *ApAb* 10.4 is based on Ezekiel and Daniel[1].

Our second example is the *Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah*. This contains three separate works: the *Martyrdom of Isaiah* (1.1–3.13; 4.19–5.16); the *Testament of Hezekiah* (3.14–4.18), and the *Vision of Isaiah* (chs. 6-11). While the *Martyrdom* is a Jewish midrash dated by most scholars no later than 100 CE, the *Testament* is a Christian apocalypse dated in the late 1st or early 2nd century CE. I concur with both dates. The *Vision* is a 2nd century CE Christian work with some relation to Gnosticism. It will not be examined in the present study. *Mart* 3.13, a passage from the Jewish midrash, states that Christ takes "the form into which he would be transformed, (namely) the form of a man"[2]. 4.2, a passage in the Christian apocalypse, follows suit. It describes Beliar/Satan in this manner: "He (Beliar) will descend from his firmament in the form of a man."

These passages have a direct bearing on a proper understanding of the descriptive comparisons in Rev 1.13 and 14.14. First, representing Jewish and Christian perspectives, both these passages explain that heavenly beings merely assume human form when they descend to earth. Secondly, and more importantly, the reader learns that the acquisition of human-likeness is not limited to good heavenly beings such as the messiah or archangels, but extends also to evil ones such as Satan. While the second passage has a later interpolation which identifies Beliar with Nero, it is clear that the original tradition simply said that Beliar took human form and did not specify any particular human being. Both *Mart* 3.13 and 4.2 reflect earlier Jewish traditions describing heavenly beings anthropomorphically. Finally, confirming my thesis concerning the role and function of descriptive comparisons, these passages state explicitly that heavenly beings take human form when they descend to earth, something which the descriptive comparisons in Ezekiel, Daniel, the *Similitudes of Enoch*, *4 Ezra* and Revelation only suggest; that is, the passages from the *Martyrdom* help us to interpret the role and function of descriptive comparisons in the other works.

How does all this relate to my original thesis concerning *homoion huion anthrōpou* in Rev 1.13 and 14.14? First, it confirms that this Greek phrase is essentially a comparison and not a Christological title, and that the better translation would be "like **a** son of man" (REB, RSV, NIV, cf GNB) in contrast to "like **the** son of man" (NRSV). Secondly, this study has shown a distinctively different employment of descriptive comparisons, on the one hand, and means of direct address to a seer, on the other. Thirdly, it should be noted that all these texts except the *Martyrdom of Isaiah* are apocalyptic to some degree, suggesting but not confirming an apocalyptic character for the figure identified as "a son of man". Fourthly, all but Ezekiel and Daniel can be dated between 50 and 150 CE. Thus, these works, individually and collectively, reflect speculation about heavenly beings current in second temple Judaism and early Christianity. Finally, both the non-titular and non-generic use of descriptive comparisons for heavenly beings in literature prior to Revelation (Ezekiel, Daniel, the *Similitudes of Enoch*), contemporaneous with Revelation (*4 Ezra*, the *Apocalypse of Abraham*), and after Revelation (the *Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah*) substantiate their role and

1 C. Rowland, "The Vision of the Risen Christ in Rev 1.13ff: The Debt of an Early Christian Christology to an Aspect of Jewish Angelology," *JTS*, 31 (1980) 1-11.

2 Quotation from Knibb's translation in Charlesworth, ed., *OTP*, vol 2.

function in Revelation itself as a means of describing heavenly beings by comparison with human beings.

REVIEWS

Gold, Victor R.; Hoyt, Thomas L. Jr.; Ringe, Sharon H.; Thistlethwaite, Susan B.; Throckmorton, Burton H. Jr.; Withers, Barbara (eds.): **The New Testament and Psalms: An Inclusive Version.** New York: Oxford University Press 1995. $14.95. ISBN 0 19 528418 6.

The publicity attending the publication of this book has been unusual, both in amount and kind. It has been announced and discussed in the United States on National Public Radio, on CNN, and in an hour-long discussion on "Talk of the Nation," a call-in program on NPR (September 12). On this show the host, Ray Suarez, exhibited considerable knowledge of the subject, and the respondent, Susan Brooks Thistlethwaite, one of the editors of this version, had some interesting things to say about it. Her main contention was that it succeeds in bringing out the inclusivity that is implicit, if not expressed, in the Bible. This may explain why one champion of this version (not Ms Thistlethwaite) called it "better than the original." Perhaps when the whole Bible is published it will be called "The Better News Bible."

Ms Thistlethwaite, Professor of Theology and Culture at Chicago Theological Seminary, made one statement hardly calculated to change the minds of those who don't like this version: "This translation is for people who have chosen to remain Christian but do not want to check their brains at the door." She told the listeners that the KJV added hundreds of "male pronouns" to the Bible that are not in the Greek, and which this version has eliminated. Actually, all those redundant masculine pronouns were eliminated by NRSV (and by RSV before it), on which this version is based. She used the occasion to take a gratuitous swipe at the TEV, saying that "Good News for Modern Man, which is a highly interpretive biblical translation, often chooses the word to translate that is the most hierarchical, the most patriarchal," the exact opposite of what this version does. Her most revealing statement came in response to a caller who observed that Jesus did not say "Father/Mother," but did say "Abba." To which Ms Thistlethwaite replied that the editors found it easier to make such changes in narrative passages, on the assumption that their version is more likely to represent what was actually meant. So they felt free to go behind the text and "translate" what might have been said, or at least meant, by that person at that place and time.

Even The New Yorker took notice of this version. In the October 2, 1995, issue, Anthony Lane, under the heading "Scripture Rescripted" and the subtitle, "In a new version, the Bible goes P.C.," has some very critical things to say. The following is one example:

> I guess that, over the years, those intoning the Lord's Prayer could learn to junk "kingdom" (with what the editors call its "blatantly androcentric and patriarchal character") and speak instead of "dominion." But will they ever come round to "Father-Mother"? In my view, the *moment critique* for this unwieldy phrase comes in the second chapter of Luke, when Jesus goes missing and is found by his worried parents—his mortal father and mother—in the temple: "Jesus said to them, 'Why were you searching for