

BIBLICAL FIGURES

OUTSIDE THE BIBLE

Edited by
Michael E. Stone
and
Theodore A. Bergren

TRINITY PRESS INTERNATIONAL
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

571
B53
1998

Copyright © 1998 by Trinity Press International

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the written permission of the publisher.

Trinity Press International, P.O. Box 1321, Harrisburg, PA 17105
Trinity Press International is a division of the Morehouse Group

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Biblical figures outside the Bible / edited by Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 1-56338-247-4 (alk. paper)

1. Bible. O.T. – Biography. 2. Christian literature, Early – History and criticism. 3. Rabbinical literature – History and criticism. 4. Apocryphal books (Old Testament) – Criticism, interpretation, etc. I. Stone, Michael E., 1938- . II. Bergren, Theodore A.

BS571.B53 1998

220.9'2 – dc21

98-39935

Printed in the United States of America

98 99 00 01 02 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

F-210

Early Christian Writings

- The Book of the Cave of Treasures*. Trans. E. A. Wallis Budge. London: Religious Tract Society, 1927.
- Cyril of Alexandria. *In sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrini in d. Joannis evangelium*. Ed. P. E. Pusey. 3 vols. Oxford, 1892. Reprint, Brussels: Impression Anastaltique Culture et Civilisation, 1965.
- Didyme L'Aveugle. *Sur la Genèse*. Ed. and trans. P. Nautin. 2 vols. SC 233, 244. Paris: Cerf, 1976-78.
- Ephraem Syrus. *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen de Nativitate (Epiphania)*. Ed. E. Beck. 2 vols. CSCO 186-87. Louvain: Peeters, 1959.
- . *Sancti Ephraem Syri in Genesim et in Exodum commentarii*. Ed. R.-M. Tonneau. 2 vols. CSCO 152-53. Louvain: Peeters, 1957.
- Eusebius Pamphili. *Evangelicae praeparationis*. Ed. and trans. E. H. Gifford. Four volumes in five. Oxford: E Typographeo Academico, 1903.
- . *Die praeparatio evangelica*. Ed. K. Mras. 2 vols. GCS 43. Berlin: Akademie, 1954-56.
- Vetus Testamentum Syriace: Iuxta simplicem syrorum versionem*. The Peshitta Institute, Leiden. Pt. 1, fascicle 1. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Notice: This material may be protected
by the copyright law (Title 17 USC).

FOUR

FROM SON OF ADAM TO SECOND GOD

Transformations of the Biblical Enoch

PHILIP S. ALEXANDER

Enoch is a most unlikely biblical hero. Though the Bible itself devotes only six verses to his life, largely in the form of a prosaic genealogy,¹ certain Jewish intellectuals in the Second Temple period came to regard him as a major figure of sacred history. They attributed to him an important body of revealed doctrine and elevated him to a position which equaled, and indeed rivaled, that of Moses, the lawgiver of Israel. They started a tradition which continued evolving with surprising vitality down to the Middle Ages and which constantly challenged the dominant Mosaic paradigm of Judaism. They created a figure who, transcending Judaism, was assimilated into Christianity, Gnosticism, and Islam, and became one of the universal religious teachers of late antiquity. Despite his obscure origins Enoch enjoyed one of the most illustrious careers in myth and legend of all the biblical patriarchs.

The earliest and fullest evidence of intense interest in Enoch is to be found in the so-called *First Book of Enoch*. This is now available in more or less its entirety only in a classical Ethiopic (Ge'ez) version probably made in the sixth century C.E. The Ethiopic was translated from a Greek text, partially extant in manuscript fragments and patristic quotations, composed in the first century C.E. The Greek in turn was derived from an Ara-

1. Gen 5:18-19, 21-24.

maic original, remnants of which, along with related materials not attested in the Greek and Ethiopic forms, have been discovered among the Dead Sea Scrolls. The original Aramaic *1 Enoch* probably dates from the first century B.C.E., but is manifestly a composite work — a loose collection of originally independent Enochic texts imperfectly patched together, some of which may be as early as the fourth century B.C.E.²

1 Enoch depicts Enoch as a great sage, the possessor of special knowledge — secrets not available on earth which came to him by divine revelation, sometimes in visions and dreams, sometimes through ascents to heaven where he was able to consult the heavenly tablets and records, sometimes in journeys through the cosmos in the company of angelic guides.

Enoch's wisdom covers a number of distinct subjects. He knew the mysteries of God's heavenly dwelling and of the throne of God itself. *1 Enoch* 14:8–25 gives an impressively detailed description of God's celestial palace.³ *1 Enoch* is also full of angelological lore. Enoch frequents the company of the angels, talks with them and knows their names, many of which are transparently related to their roles. They belong to different orders (Watchers, Holy Ones, Cherubim, and "Presences" — the four archangels, Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, and Phanuel, who minister directly before the Throne of God),⁴ and they seem to be marshaled into hierarchies. They perform various tasks, and in short are the agents through whom God rules the world. Central to the angelology of *1 Enoch* is the myth of the fallen Watchers — a band of angels that descended from heaven, had sexual intercourse with human women, and sired through them a race of Giants who oppressed mankind. These fallen angels corrupted mankind by revealing to them forbidden knowledge and by teaching them dark arts.⁵

2. Texts: Ethiopic: Knibb, *Book of Enoch*; Greek: Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*; Aramaic fragments from Qumran: Milik, *Books of Enoch*. Translations and notes: Charles, *Book of Enoch*; Isaac, *OTP* 1.5–89; Black, *Book of Enoch*. For general surveys of the Enochic traditions see especially VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*; Berger, "Enoch," 14.473–545; and Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 4–135.

3. A second detailed account of God's palace and throne occurs at *1 Enoch* 71:5–10.

4. *1 Enoch* 40:2–10.

5. See esp. *1 Enoch* 6–16.

Enoch's wisdom also extended to the workings of the cosmos. Time and again Enoch claims that his angelic mentors disclosed to him the mysteries of the natural world. They took him on a tour of the habitable earth and showed him its wonders. They revealed to him how the sun, moon, and stars function and determine the times and the seasons. While the cosmographical descriptions are impressionistic and full of fabulous elements, the account of the motions of the heavenly bodies is detailed and precise. The Ethiopic version appears to be severely abridged. The Qumran fragments point to the existence of a longer text which circulated as an independent treatise, though still under the name of Enoch. Behind this astronomical treatise may lie a polemical purpose, namely to promote a solar calendar of 364 days as according to the will of God and the natural order of the universe.

Finally, Enoch's wisdom embraces the future. Enoch is shown by the angels the history of the world from his own day down to the end of time and the creation of a new heaven and a new earth. Though visions of the future are scattered throughout *1 Enoch*, they are most comprehensively and systematically encoded in the cryptic *Apocalypse of Weeks* (93:3–10; 91:11–17) and the *Zoomorphic History of the World* (chaps. 85–90). This vision of the future is dominated by the theme of divine judgment: God will in the end punish the wicked and vindicate the righteous. The motif of imminent divine judgment is all-pervasive in *1 Enoch* and unifies its very diverse elements. The note of the ultimate triumph of the righteous and the destruction of the wicked, struck in the opening chapter, forms the key signature of the entire composition. *1 Enoch* casts Enoch in the role of a classic prophet: in God's name, as the recipient of divine revelation, he utters woes against the wicked, warns them of the coming day of the Lord, and comforts the righteous remnant with assurances of their final vindication and deliverance.

All this wisdom Enoch was supposed to have committed to writing. *1 Enoch* speaks throughout in the first person in Enoch's own voice. In terms of its content *1 Enoch* is an apocalypse — a revelation of secrets and mysteries — but this revelation has been cast, following a well-known literary pattern of ancient wisdom, as Enoch's moral last will and testament to his son Methuselah

where
Zachary
1965

(81:5). Enoch instructs his son at the angels' express command. His teaching is meant for future generations. Chapters 92–105, which go under the title of the *Epistle of Enoch*, are addressed not only to "all my children," but also "to later generations, to all dwellers on earth who observe uprightness and peace" (92:1). Noah played a key role in the transmission of Enoch's teaching: *1 Enoch* 65:1 states that he consulted Enoch about the future judgment, and in 68:1 the archangel Michael explains to him "all the things that are secret" in the book of his great-grandfather Enoch. *1 Enoch* claims the status of inspired scripture: it is based on divine revelation and was transcribed directly from the heavenly tablets. Modern source criticism of *1 Enoch* has demonstrated that it draws on a number of originally independent Enochic texts. By the first century B.C.E. at least five substantial works attributed to Enoch were in circulation. It may have been originally by virtue of all this supposed literary activity that Enoch was accorded the title of "skilled scribe."⁶

The Enoch who emerges from the pages of *1 Enoch* at first sight bears little resemblance to his biblical namesake. On closer inspection, however, numerous links begin to appear. The authors of *1 Enoch* clearly knew Genesis 5–6, apparently in the form in which we now have it: they quote from it more or less verbatim at a number of points. Almost everything said about Enoch in the Bible is enigmatic and can be interpreted in a number of highly suggestive ways. It seems to allude to a much fuller body of Enochic legends. Since Gen 5:18–25 belongs to a strand of the Pentateuch which may not have been finally redacted until post-exilic times,⁷ and since there is a stratum of *1 Enoch*, the *Book of the Heavenly Luminaries* (chaps. 72–82), probably going back to the Persian period (fourth century B.C.E.), it is tempting to suppose that *1 Enoch* drew not only on Genesis 5 but on the sources that stand behind Genesis 5. The theory is attractive, but detailed analysis rather rules it out. The relationship of *1 Enoch* to the biblical text seems to be predominantly exegetical. There is no need to postulate that the authors of *1 Enoch* had before them

6. *1 Enoch* 92:1.

7. In terms of the classic Documentary Hypothesis it belongs to the so-called P source.

any other account of the antediluvian sage than that contained in Genesis. They treated that account as authoritative scripture and applied to it procedures well attested in early Jewish Bible exegesis. By exploiting its ambiguities and its narrative lacunae they were able to attach to scripture ideas which were not found there, to confer validity on those ideas, and to incorporate them into the traditions of Israel.⁸

Gen 5:18–25 runs as follows:

And Jared lived a hundred and sixty-two years and begat Enoch: and Jared lived after he begat Enoch eight hundred years, and begat sons and daughters: and all the days of Jared were nine hundred and sixty and two years and he died. And Enoch lived sixty and five years and begat Methuselah. And Enoch walked with God after he begat Methuselah three hundred years, and begat sons and daughters: and all the days of Enoch were three hundred and sixty-five years: and Enoch walked with God: and he was not; for God took him. And Methuselah lived a hundred and eighty and seven years, and begat Lamech.

A number of phrases here immediately catch the attention. Enoch "walked with God" (ויחולך תוך אֵלֵהִים; vv. 22, 24). At first this suggests the idea of close communion with God — a life of outstanding piety and devotion. It should come as no surprise, therefore, to find Enoch depicted in *1 Enoch* as an outstandingly righteous man. This view could be reinforced by the fact that he belonged to the godly line of Seth. He is a foil to Lamech, his counterpart in the ungodly line of Cain. Lamech, a morally dubious character, is explicitly associated in the Bible with violence (Gen 4:23–24). Enoch is the seventh in line from Adam, and this, following an almost universal folk numerology, points to him as an "elect one," chosen by God for a special destiny. Contextual considerations can be brought into play. Enoch's piety would have set him apart from his generation. He lived in the period just before the flood, when wickedness and corruption were rampant on the earth. This suggests for him a prophetic role — standing against the spirit of the age, rebuking his contemporaries, and warning them of impending divine judgment.

8. This is not to deny that there are sources behind the biblical text (for a brief discussion see Hess, "Enoch," 2.508), but significantly, insofar as we can reconstruct those sources, they do not show any striking correlation with the distinctive traditions of *1 Enoch*.

1 *Enoch*, as stated earlier, gives a distinctive explanation for the wickedness of the antediluvian generations: they were corrupted by fallen angels. This idea is derived from Gen 6:1, where the "sons of God" are taken as angels — 1 *Enoch*, as we noted, calls them "Watchers" — who were seduced by the beauty of human women, descended to the earth, and had sexual intercourse with them. These Watchers imparted knowledge to men which corrupted them. They taught them metalworking. Here 1 *Enoch* once again converges with the biblical narrative, which associates metalworking first with Tubal-Cain, the son of Lamech, Enoch's contemporary.⁹ 1 *Enoch*, following a widespread mythological idea classically expressed by the myth of Prometheus, cannot envisage such an enormous technological advance occurring without extraterrestrial help. The art of metallurgy was used for baleful ends — to make weapons of war: hence, doubtless, the "violence" which characterized the period before the flood.¹⁰ 1 *Enoch* relates this "violence" also to the behavior of the monstrous offspring of the angels and the women — a race of giants which oppressed mankind.¹¹ The Bible itself is rather vague as to when the "sons of God" descended to the earth. 1 *Enoch* dates the event to the lifetime of Enoch's father Jared, an obvious piece of exegesis which sees in his name an allusion to the descent (ירידה) of the angels. This ploy allows the stories of Enoch and of the Watchers to be intertwined. All these elements, then, in 1 *Enoch* can be derived directly from the biblical text.

But the phrase "and Enoch walked with God" has further possibilities and can be interpreted in another less obvious way: אלהים may be taken in the sense of "gods," i.e., angels. Enoch then becomes someone who had a special relationship with the angels. This opens up the possibility that he ascended to heaven and learned secrets from the angels, or acted as an intermedi-

9. Gen 4:22. See further Sawyer, "Cain and Hephaestus," 155–66. This antitechnological attitude is very revealing for the mentality of the group that stands behind 1 *Enoch*. It is not Luddite, since the Enochic literature is redolent not of the crafts and labor but of the academic cloister. It reflects a deep intellectual conservatism that is frightened by technological change. Interestingly — but consistently — it seems to be coupled with an ingrained puritanism and a negative view of women. 1 *Enoch* was probably edited at a time of considerable social upheaval.

10. Gen 6:11–13.

11. 1 *Enoch* 15:8–16:3.

ary or intercessor between earth and heaven. Enoch's journey through the cosmos, so graphically described in 1 *Enoch*, may be an expansion of this element of the biblical narrative: Enoch went through the length and breadth of the cosmos¹² in the company of angels who revealed to him the mysteries of creation.

Equally suggestive is the statement "and he was not, for God took him." In Enoch's case the Bible pointedly avoids saying that he died: rather he was "taken" by God. This could be interpreted as meaning that he was removed from earth, or from human society, in some unusual way. Thus he becomes the first person in the biblical history to escape death. This understanding of the text is reinforced by the parallelism with Elijah, who was also "taken" by God, translated physically to heaven in a fiery chariot (2 Kgs 2:11). When the text is read in this way a host of narrative lacunae clamor to be filled. Why did God remove Enoch? Enoch's life span of 365 years is notably shorter than those of the other figures in the Sethite genealogy. This might point to abrupt, premature removal. But why? To where was Enoch taken — to heaven, to paradise, or to some other place? If he was removed without dying, then presumably he is still alive in this other place. What is he doing there, and what function does his preservation play in the divine scheme of things? How was he removed — in a chariot like Elijah, or in a whirlwind, or by some other means? Was physical translation involved and if so was his physical body transformed, or was his removal nothing more than a trance or dream ascent to heaven? Was the translation permanent? Did he, or will he in the future, return to earth to fulfill some God-given mission? The words "and he was not" are wonderfully vivid and evocative: they conjure up the picture of Enoch mysteriously vanishing and leaving his contemporaries baffled as to where he has gone.

So then it is possible to derive the salient features of Enoch in 1 *Enoch* from the present text of Genesis. But it is unlikely that the potential of the biblical narrative would have been so richly realized without some strong external stimuli. These impressive developments can only have taken place because Enoch "spoke"

12. Note the force of the *hitpa'el*.

to a group of people and served their agenda. 1 *Enoch*, in fact, fuses two quite distinct images of Enoch which served different purposes and may have had different origins. In the first image Enoch plays the role of a prophet who preaches righteousness and warns of divine judgment. In the second image he is a great sage who brings back to earth heavenly wisdom, notably a knowledge of astronomy and of the workings of the true calendar.

Enoch the preacher of righteousness seems to have been created in late Second Temple times by Jewish circles marked by a strongly eschatological worldview. They believed that they were living at the end of history and that catastrophic divine judgment was imminent. Their mentality was deeply sectarian: they were a righteous and persecuted minority standing out against an ungodly generation. They sensed a close parallelism between their own times and the period before the flood, when a similarly evil world order had been brought to an end by divine judgment, with only a righteous remnant being spared. For these circles Enoch, and to a lesser degree Noah, served as icons. Enoch had walked with God and rebuked the impiety of his contemporaries, warning them of impending disaster. He had left words of consolation which assured the righteous that the good would be rewarded and the wicked punished, and that they would with the help of God and his angels triumph over their enemies. Enoch's judgment of the fallen Watchers was an earnest that those in their own days who continued to follow the Watchers' corrupt ways would meet a similar fate. Indeed, Enoch himself, who had been physically removed from the world without seeing death, would return at the end of history to take part in the great final judgment.

Enoch the sage played a rather different role. His function was to authenticate a body of scientific doctrine relating to the heavenly bodies, the winds, and the structure of the world. It is probably no accident that this doctrine is concentrated in what is generally regarded as the oldest stratum of 1 *Enoch*, the *Book of the Heavenly Luminaries* (chaps. 72–82), which may date to the fourth century B.C.E. Broadly speaking this is a wisdom text, though the wisdom circles in which it originated may have had a large priestly component, since the priests were probably responsible for the calendar in ancient Israel, and the doctrine had

obvious calendric implications. In Judah of the fourth century B.C.E. this was alien wisdom. Where it came from is unclear: Babylonia is the most likely source, though its astronomical ideas are primitive and would have fallen short of the best in contemporary Babylonian science. One thing is reasonably certain: it is unlikely that anything resembling the *Book of the Heavenly Luminaries* had been seen before in Israel. Wisdom circles had, indeed, shown a keen interest in the marvels of nature, but that interest was expressed largely in poetry: nature was seen as evidence of God's glory and majesty, and there was a feeling, powerfully articulated in God's speech at the end of Job,¹³ that its ways were inscrutable to the human intellect. In 1 *Enoch* the emphasis has dramatically shifted: it is now considered proper to give a scientific description of the workings of nature, even of those most mysterious and inaccessible natural phenomena — the heavenly bodies. The sense of wonder is still there (as is the response of praise to God), but instead of stifling rational inquiry it spurred it on: the scientific description is a disclosure of the mind and purposes of God.

These wisdom circles chose Enoch as the "patron saint" of the new science, and he served their purposes well. Tradition clearly represented him as a righteous man, and seemed to hint that he had ascended to heaven and conversed with the angels. They could claim that it was in heaven that he learned the teaching and brought it back from there to earth. Perhaps they saw in his life span an allusion to the length of the solar year, which forms a core element of the doctrine. It was also an advantage that Enoch belonged to the early period of biblical history, before the flood, since antiquity conveyed prestige and authority. These were not newfangled ideas, but coeval with the dawn of time. And in attributing the new astronomy to Enoch they were, as we noted earlier, subscribing to the widespread notion that all great advances in human knowledge were the result of the disclosure of heavenly wisdom, imparted to the human race by culture-bringers — human figures who ascended to heaven, or

¹³ See Job 28 and 38–42. Job may have been composed in the late sixth or early fifth century B.C.E., no more than two hundred years before the *Book of the Heavenly Luminaries*.

quasi-divine figures who descended to earth. By attaching these ideas to Enoch the wisdom circles were able to validate them and to domesticate them within the traditions of Israel.

The image of Enoch as a sage belongs to the earliest recoverable strata of *1 Enoch*. Whether it predates the image of Enoch as a prophet is hard to say. It is equally uncertain whether the image of Enoch the prophet emerged in exactly the same circles as created the image of Enoch the sage. There are grounds for thinking that it did not, and that the image of Enoch the prophet was overlaid upon the image of Enoch the sage. This probably occurred, as we shall see presently, later than the appearance of the *Book of Jubilees* in ca. 150 B.C.E. There is a curious tension between the two images in our present *Book of Enoch*. In the *Book of the Watchers* (*1 Enoch* 1–36), the Watchers function, just as much as Enoch, as culture-bringers. There is no attempt to deny that the arts they brought involve heavenly wisdom, and yet that knowledge is viewed in a negative light: it should not have been disclosed and the result of its disclosure was to corrupt mankind and bring the flood. This reveals a deep uneasiness toward cultural innovation and change, which sits awkwardly with the espousal of Enoch the sage. Nowhere is it adequately explained why Enoch's wisdom was good and the Watchers' wisdom was bad. Enoch the prophet was probably the creation of a rather different circle, which took over and adapted the figure of Enoch the sage, reshaping in the process some of the traditions relating to the latter. We cannot be sure. One thing, however, is certain: in *1 Enoch*, as we now have it, the two images have been tightly intertwined into a single, richly composite figure.

In the Second Temple period an extensive literature circulated purporting to have been written by Enoch the great sage who lived before the flood. This literature claimed for itself high authority: it supposedly embodied revelations received directly from God and his angels, and had relevance for all time. That some took this claim very seriously is well illustrated by the *Book of Jubilees*, a retelling of Genesis which dates to around 150 B.C.E.¹⁴

14. Like *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* has survived intact only in Ethiopic. Edition: VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees*. Commentary: Charles, *Book of Jubilees*.

The author of *Jubilees* evidently knew much of the material now contained in *1 Enoch* and he summarizes it very fairly.¹⁵ He refers explicitly to a Book of the Signs of the Heavens (4:17), which may be the *Book of the Heavenly Luminaries* (*1 Enoch* 72–82), and to a testimony which Enoch left for future generations (4:18–19), perhaps an allusion to the *Epistle of Enoch* (*1 Enoch* 92–105) or some other hortatory part of *1 Enoch*. But there are intriguing differences in detail between *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch*. These may be explained in a number of ways. The author of *Jubilees* may have utilized the traditions in a different, probably earlier, form than that in which we now find them in *1 Enoch*,¹⁶ or he may have had access to texts which are no longer extant. It is also possible that differences have arisen through exegesis. The author of *Jubilees* may have treated the Enochic literature as scripture, to be read and interpreted with the same care and attention as any other sacred text. As we have seen, *1 Enoch* bears a closer, more exegetical relationship to Genesis than might at first sight be supposed. Broadly speaking, exegesis is the dynamic which drives the tradition forward, but it is not always exegesis directly of Genesis. It may be exegesis of other forms of the tradition which have, in effect, acquired the status of scripture. The result of this secondary exegesis is ultimately to carry the tradition further and further away from the Genesis narrative.

The following are some of the more noteworthy differences between *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch*:

1. *Jub.* 4:15 implies that the Watchers' descent to the earth was initially for good reasons — “in order to teach the sons of men and to perform judgment and uprightness upon the earth.” Only later did they begin “to mingle with the daughters of men so that they might be polluted” (4:22). According to this account the Watchers were originally beneficent bringers of culture, just

15. See especially *Jub.* 4:15–26.

16. It should be borne in mind that only two sections of *1 Enoch* can be dated with any certainty earlier than 150 B.C.E., the probable date of *Jubilees*, namely, the *Book of the Heavenly Luminaries* (*1 Enoch* 72–82) and the *Book of the Watchers* (*1 Enoch* 1–36), and even they may have been reworked later. This is certainly true for the *Book of the Heavenly Luminaries*. The relationship between *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch* is complex. However, *Jubilees* only makes sense if it is summarizing an extensive body of authoritative Enochic tradition, much of which is accurately reflected in our current *1 Enoch*.

like Enoch himself. In stark contrast, *1 Enoch*, as we have already seen, regards the Watchers as wicked from the start: their descent to earth was a fall from grace and the knowledge which they brought was in itself corrupting. It is almost certain that this represents a later reworking of the story. It reflects a more conservative and reactionary attitude toward cultural change, and may be a concomitant of the process of overlaying the image of Enoch the sage with that of Enoch the prophet.

2. *Jub.* 4:17 states that Enoch was "the first who learned writing." This seems to imply that he *invented* writing, or introduced it to mankind as part of the wisdom which he brought down to earth. This is nowhere explicitly asserted in *1 Enoch*. It is true that one of Enoch's titles in *1 Enoch* is "scribe,"¹⁷ but this can be interpreted in a number of ways. "Scribe" may simply be a synonym for "sage" or "scholar," or it may be descriptive of Enoch's role as the recorder of humans' deeds, or as the author of a revealed text or texts. *Jubilees* may be exegesis of the term "scribe." It would have been tempting, given Enoch's very early date in the biblical history and the frequent references to him in the tradition as writing, to conclude that he invented writing. Early mythmakers and historians saw the invention of writing as one of the great advances of civilization, and they speculated on when and by whom it was introduced.

3. The fixed solar calendar described in *1 Enoch* was almost certainly an innovation when it was promulgated in the fourth century B.C.E., and it diverged from the lunisolar calendar current in Judaism at that time. Yet *1 Enoch*'s account of the calendar is remarkably cool and scientific, and nowhere are its radical implications for religious observance explicitly drawn out. *Jubilees*, in contrast, is much more polemical in tone: the solar calendar was revealed to Enoch "so that the sons of man might know the [appointed] times of the years according to their order, with respect to each of their months" (4:17). In other words, Enoch's calendar is the true calendar which should be followed in observing festivals. Instead of the academic calm of *1 Enoch* we find in *Jubilees* the crusading spirit of religious reform. The divisive nature

17. See n. 6 above.

of *Jubilees*' claim can hardly be overestimated. The adoption of the Enochic calendar may have been one of the most important factors in defining the Qumran community as a sect within Israel and in setting it in radical opposition to the Jerusalem authorities and to the majority of Jews.

4. The author of *Jubilees* provides certain family details not found in *1 Enoch*. Thus we learn that Enoch's wife was Edni (or Edna) the daughter of Dan'el (4:20), and that his mother was Baraka the daughter of Rasuyal (4:15). *Jubilees* is here probably reflecting a lost source. There were circles in Second Temple Judaism interested in such genealogical minutiae. Their speculations feature prominently in Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*, which adds a plethora of names to the biblical genealogies, including five sons and three daughters of Enoch who were unknown to the author of Genesis.¹⁸ The origins of these names are usually completely obscure. Some of those associated with Enoch in *Jubilees* are, however, reasonably transparent: Edna seems to echo Eden = paradise, to which Enoch was translated; and the etymology of Dan'el ("God has judged") is clearly appropriate in the context of Enoch's role in divine judgment.

5. *Jubilees* states emphatically that when Enoch was removed from the earth he was taken to the Garden of Eden, where he records the deeds of men. These records will be used by God in passing sentence in the great assize at the end of human history.¹⁹ All this is implicit in *1 Enoch*, though it is nowhere expressed with such simplicity and force. *Jubilees*, however, adds a few touches of its own. First, it claims that because of Enoch "none of the waters of the flood came upon the whole land of Eden" (4:24). Evidently in the geography of *Jubilees*, as in the geography of *1 Enoch*, Eden is located on the same landmass as the habitable earth. The flood was a judgment on sinners, so it is logical that it should not have affected Eden where righteous Enoch dwelled. There is a hint here of an important theological idea, namely that the merit of the righteous can save the world, just as surely as the sins of the ungodly can destroy it. Second, *Jubilees* assigns to

18. Pseudo-Philo, *Bib. Ant.* 1:15–17.

19. *Jub.* 4:23–24; 10:17.

Enoch another role besides that of recording scribe. He officiates as a priest, burning incense at evening in a sanctuary on Mount Qater in the East of the world (4:25). This priestly role for Enoch is absent in *1 Enoch*, but was taken up strongly in later tradition.

6. Finally, Enoch is cited twice in *Jubilees* as an authority on religious law — once regarding aspects of sacrificial procedure (21:10), and once regarding firstfruits (7:38–39). This is totally unexpected, since, if we exclude the calendar, Enoch is nowhere represented in *1 Enoch* as a revealer of *halakhah*. Both sacrifices and firstfruits are covered in the Mosaic legislation. To invoke a pre-Sinai figure as authoritative in such matters is potentially significant, since it could suggest a diminution of the importance of the Sinai revelation and of its mediator Moses. We shall return to this point later.

Enochic literature appears to have been widely disseminated in late Second Temple Judaism and, as a result, Enoch was regarded as a figure of authority by very different sects and parties. The numerous fragments of Enochic literature preserved among the Dead Sea Scrolls testify to the esteem in which it was held at Qumran. It is a moot point whether or not it was regarded as scripture, but it was accorded sufficient status for the community to feel obliged to follow the solar calendar which it advocated.

Some Enochic traditions reached the Samaritans. This emerges from the fragments of Pseudo-Eupolemus preserved by Eusebius in his *Præparatio Evangelica* 9.17.1–9 and 9.19.2. From internal evidence the author of these fragments was a Samaritan who lived in the mid-second century B.C.E.²⁰ He claims that Abraham taught the Egyptian priests at Heliopolis “astrology and the other sciences . . . saying that the Babylonians had obtained this knowledge. However, he attributed the discovery of them to Enoch. Enoch first discovered astrology, not the Egyptians.” He goes on to assert that “the Greeks say that Atlas discovered astrology. However, Atlas is the same as Enoch.” He concludes: “The son of Enoch was Methuselah. He learned everything through the angels of God, and so knowledge came to us.”

20. Text, translation, commentary: Holladay, “Pseudo-Eupolemus (Anonymous),” 157–87. For other references to Enoch in Samaritan sources see *Memar Markah* 2:10 and 4:9, and the *Samaritan Targum* to Gen 5:24.

The standing of Enoch and Enochic literature seems to have been high also in early Christianity. Jude 14–15 regards Enoch, “the seventh from Adam,” as a prophet and quotes *1 Enoch* 1:9. This quotation is all the more significant because the New Testament writers normally cite directly only the books of the standard synagogue canon. 2 Pet 2:4 may echo *1 Enoch* 10:4–6, and Christ’s descent and proclamation to the imprisoned spirits in 2 Pet 3:19–20 has often been compared with Enoch’s visit and proclamation to the fallen Watchers in the underworld in *1 Enoch* 12–13. Enoch figures in the great catalog of the exemplars of faith in Hebrews 11: “By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and he was not found because God translated him: for before his translation he had witness borne to him that he had been well-pleasing to God” (Heb 11:5). There are grounds for believing that Enoch the prophet and sage was revered across the whole religious spectrum of Second Temple Judaism: he belonged to catholic Israel in much the same way as did Moses and David.

The continuing vitality of the Enochic tradition at the end of the Second Temple period is well illustrated by the so-called *Second Book of Enoch*. This enigmatic work survives now only in Slavonic in a bewildering variety of recensions and versions which attest its popularity in the Russian Orthodox church. Its tradition history has never been properly clarified and may be beyond recovery. Nor has any consensus been reached as to when and where it was written. However, there is evidence to suggest that behind the extant texts, which have been worked over by Christian scribes, stands a Jewish work composed in Greek in Alexandria in the first century of the current era.²¹

2 Enoch repeats many of the themes and motifs of *1 Enoch*, but it also has distinctive features which give it a character all its own. The story line is clear and strong, and fills out imaginatively the skeletal biblical narrative. Enoch, speaking in the first person, tells how in his 365th year he was taken up to heaven by two angels (identified in 33:6 as Samoila and Raguila). These angelic guardians escort him upward through six heavens, explaining the

21. Slavonic text: Vaillant, *Livre des Secrets d'Hénoch*. Translation and commentary: Andersen, “2 Enoch,” OTP 1.92–221.

sights to be seen in each. At the edge of the seventh heaven they leave him, and Gabriel, or, according to an alternative tradition, Michael, carries him up and sets him before the face of the Lord. The Lord bids the archangel Vrevoil to bring out the books from the heavenly storehouses and to read them to Enoch, who, armed with a "pen for speed-writing," fills at the angel's dictation 366 books. The Lord then instructs Enoch to return to earth and tell his sons "all that I have told you and everything that you have seen, from the lowest heavens up to my throne... and give them the books in your handwriting" (33:6, 8). He descends again to his house, summons his sons, and for thirty days disburdens himself of all the heavenly wisdom which he has received. At the end of this period he announces his final departure. He addresses parting admonitions to a crowd who gather to pay their last respects, and "when Enoch had spoken to his people the Lord sent the gloom onto the earth, and it became dark and covered the men who were standing and talking with Enoch. And the angels hurried and grasped Enoch and carried him up to highest heaven, where the Lord received him and made him stand in front of his face for eternity" (67:1-3).

The Enoch of *2 Enoch* is broadly the same as the Enoch of the earlier writings: again he is depicted as a great sage to whom the mysterious workings of nature were revealed on a heavenly journey; as a prophet who admonishes his contemporaries to walk in righteousness and warns them of judgment if they do not; and as a heavenly scribe who records humans' deeds pending the last judgment (though the theme of judgment is less prominent in *2 Enoch* than in *1 Enoch*). On one point, however, *2 Enoch* marks a radical new departure: it claims unequivocally that Enoch ascended *bodily* and that this ascent resulted in his physical transformation into an angel. The assertion that a human could bodily enter the upper world was profoundly problematic within the worldview of early Judaism. How could the human body endure such a journey? On what would it live? How was it conceivable that Enoch could perform the exalted role of heavenly scribe while still encumbered by the gross limitations of flesh and blood? The problem was more than practical: it was deeply theological. Heaven was the realm of God and God's angels;

earth belonged to humankind. It was not easy to admit that the boundary between these two worlds could be crossed, since this implied some form of ontological transformation which blurred the distinction between human and divine: descent from heaven involved "incarnation," ascent from earth "deification."

The care with which the authors of *1 Enoch* skirt around these problems shows how sensitive it was to them. Enoch's ascent to heaven, *1 Enoch* seems to say, was in a dream during sleep. The implication is that his body remained on earth and only his "soul" ascended to heaven. And when he finally departed from the world he was taken, not to heaven, but to paradise, which is located on the eastern rim of the habitable earth and consequently enjoys the same physical environment as the rest of the world. Enoch's cosmic journeys, borne bodily along by a whirlwind, take him to many strange places, but all appear to be strictly within the confines of the habitable earth. At only one point in the complex traditions of *1 Enoch* do we get a hint of the possible transformation of Enoch into an angelic being. This is in 71:14 where Enoch is apparently identified with the heavenly Son of Man. The Son of Man is the chief protagonist of the so-called *Parables of Enoch* (*1 Enoch* 37-71). He is a transcendent, angelic being who functions as the celestial champion of the righteous on earth and the judge of their wicked enemies. As Daniel 7 shows, he originated outside the Enochic tradition, and he is depicted in the *Parables* as quite distinct from Enoch (Enoch is *shown* the Son of Man). Only at the end, in an unexpected twist, is it asserted that Enoch *is* the Son of Man, and that what he has been observing is his own history: "And that angel came to me and greeted me with his voice, and said to me, 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."²² The fusion of the two figures is not without its logic, given Enoch's role as the representative of the righteous and as an agent of divine judgment. The date of the *Parables of Enoch* has been much debated, but there is now a consensus that it represents some of the latest material in our cur-

22. *1 Enoch* 71:14.

rent text of *1 Enoch*. It may even be post-Christian. Chapter 71, where Enoch is identified as the Son of Man, is almost certainly a late addition to the *Parables*. It is, therefore, possibly later in date than the original version of *2 Enoch*. It may even have emerged from the same circles that produced that work.

2 Enoch asserts with a boldness and clarity nowhere matched in *1 Enoch* that Enoch ascended *bodily* to heaven and was transformed into an angel. It is true that the story of his ascent begins when he is asleep, but it is expressly stated that his guardian angels woke him up, and that he rose and went out from his house, closing the door behind him. Such an ascent cannot be achieved without a physical transformation, so when he reaches God's presence, God tells Michael, "Go, and extract Enoch from his earthly clothing. And anoint him with my delightful oil, and put him into the clothes of my glory. And so Michael did, just as the Lord had said to him. And the appearance of that oil is greater than the greatest light, and its ointment is like sweet dew, and its fragrance myrrh, and it is like the rays of the glittering sun." Transformed Enoch, looking at himself, observes that he has "become like one of the Lord's glorious ones and there was no observable difference" (*2 Enoch* 22:8–10). Since Enoch has become an angel, his reverse journey back to earth now becomes a problem. How could mortals endure the advent of such a glorious one? This problem is addressed in *2 Enoch* 37, where Enoch's face is said to have been "chilled," because otherwise no human being would have been able to look at it. Back on earth, Methusalam offers to prepare Enoch a meal, but Enoch replies: "Since the time the Lord anointed me with the ointment of his glory, food has not come into me, and earthly pleasure my soul does not remember; nor do I desire anything earthly" (*2 Enoch* 56:2). And when Enoch finally returns to heaven it is to stand forever before the Lord as one of the angels of the presence (*2 Enoch* 67:2).

The theme of the physical transformation of Enoch was to open the way to astonishingly daring speculations about his heavenly role. Some of our earliest evidence for this speculation is to be found in the *Third Book of Enoch*, a late Hebrew apocalypse (probably in its present form dating to the sixth/seventh

century C.E.) which has been transmitted as part of the corpus of early Jewish mystical writings known as the *Heikhalot* literature.²³ *3 Enoch* tells how Rabbi Ishmael ascended to heaven and met the archangel Metatron, who revealed to him a range of secrets, about the angelic hierarchies and their liturgy, about the workings of the cosmos, and about the future redemption, rather similar to those we find in *1* and *2 Enoch*. However, the real focus of interest in *3 Enoch* is the figure of Metatron himself. He belongs to the very highest order of archangels, the Princes of the Presence (*שרי הפנים*), who alone are allowed to see God's face. He is the prince of the world; the heavenly high priest who officiates in the celestial sanctuary, the tabernacle of Metatron; the prince of Torah who mediated the Torah to Moses on Sinai; Israel's representative and advocate in the celestial law court; the angel in whom in a special way God has put God's Name.²⁴ The insignia of Metatron's high office — his throne, crown, and robe — are described in detail, and they match the insignia of God.²⁵ In short, Metatron is God's vice-regent: God has placed him over all the other angels, committed to him the governance of the world, and designated him "the Lesser YHWH" [*יהוה הקטן*].²⁶ "I made honor, majesty, and glory his garment," says God, "beauty, pride, and strength, his outer robe, and a kingly crown, five hundred times five hundred parasangs, his diadem. I bestowed on him some of my majesty, some of my magnificence, some of the splendor of my glory, which is on the throne of glory, and I called him by my name, 'The Lesser YHWH, Prince of the Divine Presence, knower of secrets.' Every secret I have revealed to him in love, every mystery I have made known to him in uprightness. I have fixed his throne at the door of my palace, on the outside, so that

23. Hebrew text: Odeberg, *3 Enoch*; Schäfer, *Synopse*. Translations and commentaries: Alexander, OTP 1.223–315; Mopsik, *Livre hébreu*; Schäfer and Hermann, *Übersetzung*. The references follow the edition of Odeberg. In his introduction Schäfer gives a table correlating this system with that employed in the *Synopse*.

24. For Enoch as prince of the world see *3 Enoch* 48C:9–10; as heavenly high priest, *3 Enoch* 15B; as prince of Torah, *3 Enoch* 48C:12; 48D:6–10; as Israel's representative in the heavenly law court, see Alexander, OTP 1.243; as the angel in whom God has put God's Name, *3 Enoch* 3:2; 12:5; 48D:1.

25. *3 Enoch* 10 and 12.

26. *3 Enoch* 12:5.

he might sit and execute judgment over all my household in the height."²⁷

It comes as something of a shock to learn that this exalted being, second only to God in the cosmic hierarchy, is none other than the patriarch Enoch, the son of Jared, who, having been taken up to heaven as a witness to God's justice in bringing the flood,²⁸ was transformed into an angel. Like *2 Enoch*, *3 Enoch* clearly envisages *bodily* ascent and so postulates the physical metamorphosis of Enoch: "When the Holy One, blessed be He, took me to serve the throne of glory, the wheels of the chariot and all the needs of the Shekhinah, at once my flesh turned to flame, my sinews to blazing fire, my bones to juniper coals, my eyelashes to lightning flashes, my eyeballs to fiery torches, the hairs of my head to hot flames, all my limbs to wings of burning fire, and the substance of my body to blazing fire."²⁹ So Enoch becomes, like the other angels, physically composed of fire. Another part of his transformation involved the enlargement of his body until it equaled the dimensions of the world: "I was enlarged and increased in size until I matched the world in its length and breadth. He made to grow on me seventy-two wings, thirty-six on one side and thirty-six on the other, and each single wing covered an entire world. He fixed in me 365,000 eyes and each eye was like the Great Light. There was no sort of splendor, brilliance, brightness, or beauty in the luminaries of the world that he failed to fix in me."³⁰ We shall return later to the possible significance of this bizarre tradition.

Metatron and Enoch, like Enoch and the heavenly Son of Man, were originally distinct figures. The similarities of their roles led to convergence and finally to identification. The result of the identification of Metatron and Enoch is clear: Enoch, a man with an earthly existence and genealogy, has been deified. Moreover there is a hint in *3 Enoch* that this process of deification will be replicated in the case of other men. *3 Enoch* presents a significant

27. *3 Enoch* 48C:7-8. This is part of the Alphabet of Aqiva traditions appended to the main text of *3 Enoch*.

28. *3 Enoch* 4 and 48C. *3 Enoch* makes considerable play of the idea that Enoch was taken up as a witness.

29. *3 Enoch* 15.

30. *3 Enoch* 9.

parallelism between the ascension of Ishmael and the ascension of Enoch. It seems to imply that Enoch's transformation prefigures that of every adept: he is the "forerunner" who has charted the way that others can follow.³¹

We have traced the figure of Enoch through Jewish literature from Second Temple times down to the early Middle Ages. Let us pause for a moment and take stock. The analysis so far suggests two important general observations. First, we seem to be faced with a genuine, ongoing *tradition*. The persistence of certain motifs is astonishing. For example, Enoch in *Jubilees* in the second century B.C.E. is a high priest. Almost a thousand years later he retains that role in the Heikhalot texts, though in a rather different setting. The figure, indeed, changes and evolves, but in a coherent way, so that the later phases of development can be seen as growing out of the earlier. Already in *1 Enoch* Enoch has a heavenly role. This looms larger and larger in the tradition and becomes ever more exalted. And yet the figure of Enoch in *3 Enoch* retains a recognizable family resemblance to his predecessor in the Second Temple period. Though we are clearly dealing with some form of intertextuality, direct literary dependence seems to be ruled out, since there is no evidence that the author of *2 Enoch* had *1 Enoch* in front of him, still less that *3 Enoch* knew *1* or *2 Enoch* directly. Such continuity is hard to explain other than in terms of apocalyptic circles that speculated about Enoch and passed on Enochic lore through the ages from one to the other. These circles may be shadowy and ill-defined, but their existence seems to be a necessary postulate of the literary remains.

The second general observation is that a powerful subtext can

31. There has been endless speculation on the origin of the name Metatron, but it is possible that it means something like "the forerunner." One very plausible etymology derives it from the Latin *metator*, which occurs in Greek as a loanword under the form *mitator*. The *metator* was the officer in the Roman army who went ahead of the column on the march to mark out the campsite where the troops would bivouac for the night. Hence, figuratively, "forerunner." There can be little doubt that the Latin *metator* was known to the rabbis and that as a loanword they spelled it *metatron/mitatron*. The appellation may first have been given to the angel of the Lord who led the Israelites through the wilderness: that angel acted like a Roman army *metator*, guiding the Israelites on their way. The name could then have been extended to express the idea that Enoch was a *metator* for the other adepts, showing them how they could escape from the wilderness of this world into the promised land of heaven. See further, Alexander, *OTP* 1.228.

be detected in the Enochic tradition, implying a contrast between Enoch and Moses. Moses, the lawgiver of Israel, was the founder of the Jewish polity. The circles which looked to Enoch as their patron were, at least to some extent, challenging Moses's primacy. We noted earlier the polemical potential of the fact that Enoch lived long before Moses and the Sinai revelation. It has been plausibly argued that late in the Second Temple period the Enochic writings were canonized into five books — a Pentateuch to rival the Five Books of Moses.³² We found Enoch cited occasionally as a legal authority who pronounced on halakhic matters explicitly covered in the Torah of Moses. Nor should we miss the subversive potential of the claim in 3 *Enoch* that it was Enoch-Metatron who, as prince of Torah, dispensed the Law to Moses on Sinai. This clarifies the relationship between Enoch and Moses in no uncertain terms. Moreover, if the adepts have direct access to the prince of Torah who instructed Moses, they are surely on a similar footing to Moses, and have less need to depend on him.

This implicit challenge to the primacy of Moses was recognized and countered in two main ways. First an attempt was made to cut off the Enochic development from its exegetical roots: Enoch, it was argued, was not such a righteous man, nor did he ascend to heaven, nor was he translated so that he did not see death. We find elements of this counterattack already in Philo's *De Abrahamo*, where Enoch is seen as an example of repentance, and a contrast is drawn between him as a "penitent" (μεταθεμενός) who devoted the earlier part of his life to vice but the latter to virtue, and the "perfect man" (τέλειος) who was virtuous from the first.³³ Philo's attitude is all the more significant when it is recalled that 2 *Enoch* was probably written in Alexandria in the first century C.E., and that Philo attributes to Moses many of the exalted characteristics of Enoch.³⁴ It is, however, in rabbinic literature — not surprisingly — that the exegetical counterattack to the exaltation of Enoch is most obvious. There is generally a marked silence about Enoch in rabbinic aggadah. Such observa-

32. Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 54–55 and *passim*.

33. *Abr.* 47. Philo takes a rather different, more favorable line in the *Quaest. in Gen.* 1.86.

34. See further below.

tions as exist are pointedly negative. The *locus classicus* is *Genesis Rabbah* 25:1:³⁵

"And Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him" (Gen 5:24). Rabbi Hama the son of Rabbi Hosha'ya said: ["And he was not" means] that he was not inscribed in the scroll of the righteous but in the scroll of the wicked. Rabbi Aivu said: Enoch was a hypocrite acting sometimes as a righteous, sometimes as a wicked man. Therefore the Holy One, blessed be he, said: "While he is righteous I will remove him." Rabbi Aivu also said: He judged him on New Year, when he judges all the inhabitants of world. Heretics asked Rabbi Abbahu: "We do not find that death is mentioned in the case of Enoch?" "How so?" he inquired. They said: "'Taking' is mentioned here and also in connection with Elijah: 'Do you know that today the Lord is taking your master away from you?'" (2 Kgs 2:5). "If you stress the word 'taking,'" he answered, "then 'taking' is mentioned here, while in Ezekiel it is said, 'Behold, I take away from you the desire of your eyes [with a plague]'" (Ezek 24:16). Rabbi Tanhuma observed: "He answered them well." A matron asked Rabbi Jose: "We do not find death stated of Enoch." Said he to her: "If it had said, 'And Enoch walked with God,' and no more, I would agree with you. Since, however, it says, 'And he was not, for God took him,' it means that he was no more in the world, 'for God took him [in death].'"

A second line of counterattack was to build up the figure of Moses and to attribute to him the same transcendent qualities as Enoch. Thus some claimed that Moses had ascended into heaven, had received heavenly wisdom, now played a cosmic role as a heavenly being, and had been, in some sense, "deified." Elements of this process of exalting Moses may be found as early as the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian (second century B.C.E.). Philo, as we have already hinted, accords to Moses divine status, which clearly parallels that assigned elsewhere to Enoch, while at the same time he rather denigrates Enoch.³⁶ 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 59:5–12 is an instructive case: there God shows to Moses "the measures

35. Note also *Targum Onqelos*'s translation of Gen 5:24: "And Enoch walked in the fear of the Lord; and he was not for the Lord caused him to die" (the variant "for the Lord did not cause him to die" is almost certainly secondary). Contrast this with *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*: "And Enoch served before the Lord in uprightness, and, behold, he was not with the dwellers on earth, for he was withdrawn and went up to the firmament by the word before the Lord, and his name was called Metatron the great scribe." William Tyndale's understanding of Gen 5:24, "Enos walked with God and was no more seen: that is, he lived godly and died," reflects classic rabbinic interpretation (it is notably close to *Targum Onqelos* and to Rashi), but where he got it is hard to say: see Hammond, *English Bible*, 35–36.

36. For a useful and careful survey of the evidence see Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 51–70.

of fire, the depths of the abyss, the weight of the winds" and so forth, cosmological doctrines closely associated in earlier tradition with Enoch. A similar transference of Enochic roles to Ezra — as Moses redivivus — is implied in 4 Ezra 14:50.

Chronology suggests that the Enochic traditions have the primacy. It is the supporters of Moses who are trying to steal Enoch's clothes. That the transference went the other way, from Moses to Enoch, is much less likely. However we view it, we should recognize that there is a hidden agenda here: the same system can hardly accommodate two such figures. Moses and Enoch are being set up in some sense as rivals, as representing competing paradigms of Judaism. The circles that looked primarily to *Moshe rabbenu* had a different outlook from those that looked primarily to *Hanokh rabbenu*. Historically speaking, the Mosaic paradigm predominated (it was the one embraced by the Pharisaic-rabbinic tradition), but the Enochic paradigm showed remarkable vitality and fed a number of sectarian movements within Judaism — notably the Dead Sea sect and early Christianity. It was also an important source of inspiration for later Gnostic systems, Manichaeism, and the medieval kabbala.

3 *Enoch* can be taken as a turning point in the history of the Enochic traditions; it marks the close of a development which began in the third century B.C.E., and the beginning of new departures which gave a new lease of life to the biblical patriarch. Within Judaism three strands can be distinguished in the Enoch traditions after 3 *Enoch*. First, we have the direct continuation of the 3 *Enoch* line of Enoch as an exalted, heavenly being. Second there was the reaffirmation of the denigrating rabbinic tradition, classically expressed in *Genesis Rabbah*. Third, we find a mediating position in which Enoch is regarded in a positive light as a righteous person and a folk hero, who is invoked in contexts of moral exhortation as a model of piety. It may be claimed that he had ascended to heaven, but little or no attention is paid to his heavenly existence.

Enoch's continuing cosmic and celestial life is bound up with the figure of Metatron. Metatron was of great interest to both the medieval Hasidei Ashkenaz and the kabbalists of Spain. He is identified sometimes as a high archangel distinct from God,

and sometimes as a manifestation of God or as an entity or potency within the godhead (in the kabbala often as the Sefirah *Malkhut*).³⁷ It is unclear to what extent we should regard the history of Metatron in the Middle Ages as automatically part of the history of Enoch. As we noted earlier Metatron was originally an independent figure, so it cannot be assumed that his identification with Enoch is everywhere presupposed. However, the link with Enoch was widely known and is mentioned on many occasions. The *Zohar* illustrates some of these developments. Its author clearly knew a version of the fall of the Watchers (called by him 'Uzza and 'Aza'el), whom he identifies with the *Nefilim* of Gen 6:4. He was also aware of the tradition of Enoch's entry into paradise.³⁸

When [Enoch] was born he found himself near the Garden. The light [i.e., the supernal radiance] began to shine within him. He was beautified with the beauty of holiness and the sparkling light rested upon him. He entered the Garden of Eden and found the Tree of Life there, the boughs and the fruit of the tree.

Elsewhere the "supernal radiance" is identified with the heavenly soul of Adam which had quitted him when he sinned but had returned to be reincarnated in Enoch.³⁹

Behind these passages is a concept of Metatron as a divine entity first incarnate in Adam and then reincarnate in Enoch. Enoch, having perfected himself, in contrast to Adam who sinned and fell, reascends to his heavenly home and takes his rightful place in the heights of the universe, above the highest angels. And there is a clear implication that what Enoch has done others may do as well. The heavenly *gnosis* through which Enoch perfected himself in the Garden of Eden is still available to the adepts and can be used by them to perfect themselves and to ascend like him. What is involved is little short of the deification of man. Enoch thus becomes a redeemer figure — a second Adam through whom humanity is restored.⁴⁰ There were hints of these ideas earlier in the tradition. 3 *Enoch*, as we noted, spoke of Enoch's physical

37. See Abrams, "Boundaries of Divine Ontology," 291–321.

38. *Zohar Hadash, Terumah* 42d. The translation is based on Tishby, *Wisdom of the Zohar*, 2.627. See further *Zohar* I, 37b, 55b.

39. Cf. *Zohar Hadash* to Song of Songs, 69a–b.

40. Tishby's eloquent exposition of the idea deserves to be quoted in full:

transformation as involving an increase in the size of his body until it matched the dimensions of the world. In certain rabbinic traditions, primordial Adam's body, like that of the Gnostic *protanthropos*, corresponded to the world in size, but was diminished to the present limited dimensions of the human body as a result of the fall. 3 *Enoch* may be expressing in mythological language the idea that Enoch reversed the fall of Adam. Moreover, we noted that in 3 *Enoch* Enoch-Metatron was in some sense represented as a "forerunner," blazing a trail that could ultimately be followed by every adept. But these ideas are put nowhere with the clarity and force with which we find them expressed in the kabbala.⁴¹

The classic rabbinic view of Enoch as found in *Genesis Rabbah* is repeated in the Middle Ages, particularly by biblical commentators. The *Yalqut Shim'oni* simply reproduces *Genesis Rabbah* as its comment on Gen 4:25. Rashi takes a softer line, reflecting specifically the view of Rabbi Aivu, that Enoch was removed by God while righteous to prevent him from falling back into sin.

An interesting representative of the mediating position is the eleventh-century paraphrase of Genesis known as *Sefer ha-Yashar*. This takes the view that Enoch was a righteous man who was translated to heaven, but it draws a veil over his heavenly life.

The Enoch-Metatron legend, especially when supplemented by kabbalistic ideas, expresses in a very striking way the awesome nature of man at the peak of perfection. The kabbalistic doctrine of man, based on earlier Jewish ideas, teaches that he is the crown of Creation and the most choice of all God's creatures, higher even than the angels in his real essence. The soul, which is alone the essence of man according to the Zohar, is extracted from the pure radiance of the divine emanation. It is a divine spark that has been inserted into the physical body. The soul descends and assumes a physical form only in order to acquire a special perfection in the terrestrial world (the world of "making"). At root, therefore, in his eternal, spiritual essence, man is very near indeed to the divine realm, and his folly and contamination by sin are no more than manifestations of corruption and degeneration occasioned by his temporal, physical existence. The unique man, Enoch, who was able to achieve the ideal, supernal perfection that was indeed destined for the whole of mankind, but taken from them because of Adam's sin, purified himself of the material defects inherent in corporeal existence, and ascended to the highest levels of the angelic hierarchy. Enoch-Metatron symbolizes the culmination of the ascent for which man is destined to strive, and in this refined image perfect man is superior to the angels. (*Wisdom of the Zohar* 2.630-31)

41. The idea that the body of primordial Adam matched the world in size is found in *Gen. Rab.* 8.1; *b. Hag.* 12a; and, possibly, in *Pesiq. Rab. Kah.* 1.1. For a discussion see Idel, "Enoch Is Metatron," 151-70. On Enoch-Metatron as the "forerunner," see n. 31 above.

As far as *Sefer ha-Yashar* is concerned his disappearance from the earth is the end of the story. *Sefer ha-Yashar* is full of embellishments not found elsewhere. Enoch is represented as a philosopher-king who ruled over the whole world and taught mankind morality and "the ways of the Lord." There is no hint of the antediluvian violence and disorder that is stressed elsewhere in the tradition.⁴²

Enoch is a Jewish figure, and the Jewish sources, so full, clear, and coherent, form the key tradition in his evolution. But we should not forget that he had a life outside of Judaism as well. The picture would be incomplete without some concluding remarks — however brief — on developments in Christianity, in the Hermetic and Gnostic traditions, and in Islam.

Direct quotations and allusions show, as we have already noted, that at least some New Testament writers knew the Enochic literature. These references doubtless helped to commend the Enochic writings to the early Christians. Two of our major surviving Enochic texts, 1 and 2 *Enoch*, though Jewish in origin, were preserved for posterity not within the synagogue but within the church. Interest in Enoch was widespread in the Christian world, but it seems to have been particularly strong in two areas — Egypt and the Balkans. 1 *Enoch*, though of Palestinian origin, circulated in Egypt, from where it may have passed southward to Ethiopia. It was translated into Ge'ez and was highly regarded by the Ethiopian church.⁴³ From the Balkans 2 *Enoch*, which originated in Egypt, seems to have been carried northeastward into Russia, where it was studied, copied, and reworked again and again by Russian Orthodox scholars.

42. Hebrew text: Goldschmidt, *Sefer hajaschar*, 8-14; Eisenstein, *Ozar Midrashim*, 1.182-83 (under the title "The Life of Enoch"). *Sefer ha-Yashar* was probably written in southern Spain at the end of the eleventh century. Its picture of Enoch as a philosopher-king may be influenced by Islamic sources. Herr, *Encljud* 16.1517, shrewdly observes that the structure of *Sefer ha-Yashar* is reminiscent of Pseudo-Philo's *Book of Biblical Antiquities*. It should be noted that the opening sections of Petrus Alphonsi's *Disciplina Clericalis* were translated into Hebrew and circulated under the title of *Sefer Hanokh*. Editions: Pichard, *Livre d'Hénoch*; Amzalak, *Da Amizade*. Apart from the opening sentence, "Enoch the philosopher, who is called Idris in Arabic, said to his son, 'Let the fear of God be your business, and profit shall come to you without pain,'" the text has nothing to do with the patriarch Enoch.

43. On the complex question of the canonic status of Enoch in Ethiopia, see Beckwith, *Old Testament Canon*, 478-505. It is uncertain whether 1 *Enoch* came to Ethiopia from Egypt or from Syria.

The influence of the Jewish Enochic traditions on Christian thought, though potentially great, is not easy to document. Whether or not the appellation "Son of Man" in the Gospels was ever intended to link Jesus with the heavenly figure of Daniel 7 and 1 *Enoch* 37–71 is a fiercely debated question. A case can certainly be made that the Gospel of Matthew's account of the Last Judgment (Matt 25:31–46) owes something to the judgment scene in 1 *Enoch* 62–63, with Jesus being implicitly identified as the heavenly "Son of Man." There can be no denying that Enoch and Christ are remarkably similar in Jewish and Christian sources. The ascent and celestial role of Enoch in 2 and 3 *Enoch* can easily be paralleled in christological texts. If we add Enoch's functions as a redeemer, as a second Adam, as a "forerunner," and as an earthly incarnation of the preexistent divine being Metatron, then the convergence is too exact to be accidental. The parallelism has, of course, been noticed by scholars in the twentieth century,⁴⁴ but they were by no means the first to do so. Earlier it had also struck Christian missionaries and apologists and Christian kabbalists, who exploited it for polemical purposes to argue that Judaism in fact knew of divine redeemers similar to Christ, and that the Jews could not, therefore, simply dismiss the orthodox Christian doctrine of Christ as a heretical aberration patently at odds with Jewish monotheism.⁴⁵ There may even be in the synagogue liturgy a concealed allusion to Jesus as Metatron.⁴⁶ What is not clear, however, is whether the figure of Enoch in early Judaism influenced the *origins* of Christology. Did the Jewish Enoch provide the first Christians with a serviceable model for interpreting the person and work of Christ? Or did the influence operate in the other direction: was Enoch-Metatron based on, and was he, perhaps, a polemical reaction to, the Christian claims about Christ? Both positions may, in principle, be correct: we should probably see here an intense dialectic between the two traditions.⁴⁷

44. E.g., Bietenhard, *Himmlische Welt*; Murtonen, "Figure of Metatron," 409–11.

45. Abrams, "Boundaries of Divine Ontology," 317–21, draws particular attention to the early-eighteenth-century writers Johannan Kemper and Caspar Calvor.

46. See Liebes, "Angels of the Shofar," 171–96.

47. Enoch provided a paradigm, but at the same time he also posed a threat, since by definition he possessed many of the powers and functions of Christ. He was, therefore, a

One development seems to be characteristically Christian. There was a widespread Christian belief that Enoch and Elijah would return at the end of history to challenge the Antichrist. They would be killed by him but would be raised from the dead and ascend to heaven. This tradition is rooted in the reference to the two unnamed witnesses in Rev 11:3–13.⁴⁸ Thus Enoch was assigned a secure place in Christian apocalyptic literature, and by far the commonest representations of him in Christian art show him as one of the two eschatological witnesses.⁴⁹ Jewish sources, of course, also saw a similarity between Enoch and Elijah (both were "taken" up to heaven by God), but apart from the hints in 1 *Enoch* of Enoch's role in the last judgment, the motif of a future return of Enoch at the end of history is not prominent in Jewish apocalyptic.⁵⁰

Enoch was also adopted by the Hermetic tradition. There are obvious similarities between Hermes-Thoth — the inventor of writing, the revealer of secrets, the guide of souls after death⁵¹ — and the Enoch of postbiblical Judaism, so obvious, indeed, that it is surprising more was not made of them. It has long been accepted that the early Hermetic writers drew on Jewish sources, and some have plausibly argued that they knew specifically the Enochic literature (there are possible echoes of 1 *Enoch*'s account

potential rival to Christ, just as he was to Moses in Jewish tradition. The early Christians were aware of the problem: the story of the transfiguration (Mark 9:2–8 and parallels) is an attempt to assert Christ's priority over two such potential rivals who had also ascended to heaven and been transfigured and glorified. Those two rivals are Moses and Elijah, but they could equally have been Moses and Enoch.

48. Further: Bauckham, "Martyrdom of Enoch," 447–58.

49. Emerson, *Antichrist*, 139–41. For earlier references to the two witnesses, see the classic study by Bousset, *Antichrist Legend*, 203–5.

50. For example, he plays no part in the late Hebrew apocalypse known as *Sefer Zerubabel*, though one should note that in the scenario of the end-time presented in this work, Armilos (Antichrist) is opposed by two messianic figures, one of whom is martyred by him, and his body left ignominiously outside the gates of Jerusalem for forty-one days. It should also be noted that the vision is revealed by Metatron, though he is identified with the archangel Michael, not with Enoch. See Lévi, "L'apocalypse de Zorobabel," 129–60.

51. The tradition that Metatron teaches Torah to the souls of unborn infants suggests that he performs some of the functions of a psychopomp: see 3 *Enoch* 48C:12, "Moreover, Metatron sits for three hours every day in the heavens above, and assembles all the souls of the dead that have died in their mothers' wombs, and the babes that have died at their mothers' breasts, and of the schoolchildren that have died while studying the five books of the Torah. He brings them beneath the throne of glory, and sits them around him in classes, in companies, and in groups, and teaches them Torah, and wisdom, and haggadah, and tradition, and he completes for them their study of the scroll of the Law."

of the fall of the angels in the Asclepius),⁵² but it is uncertain whether they identified Hermes with Enoch in the way in which they identified Hermes with Thoth. However, the Sabians of Harran in northern Mesopotamia in the early Middle Ages explicitly made the connection. They went on to equate Hermes with Idris in the Qur'an, thereby, incidentally, identifying Enoch and Idris.⁵³ There was also some interest in Enoch among the scholars who rediscovered the Hermetic corpus in Renaissance and post-Renaissance Europe, though once again the possibilities were not exploited as much as they might have been to legitimate Hermetic doctrine.⁵⁴

Enoch played a role in various forms of Gnosticism. Enochic literature was known to the Gnostics in Egypt: *2 Enoch*, as we have already noted, was composed in Egypt, and *1 Enoch* circulated there. Two fragmentary Enoch apocrypha (otherwise unattested) have survived in Coptic, and in the Egyptian Gnostic work, the *Pistis Sophia*, Jesus tells his disciples of the mysteries contained in the two Books of Jeu which Enoch wrote in paradise.⁵⁵ Manichaeism also embraced the figure of Enoch. Mani in his youth seems to have read Jewish apocalyptic litera-

52. Nag Hammadi Codex 6.73.5-6; Latin Asclepius 25. See Philonenko, "Allusion de l'Asclépius," 2.161-63. Cf. also the myth of the fall of the souls in *Stobaei Hermetica* 23 (Kore Kosmou). Comparison has also been made, though less convincingly, between the apocalyptic schema of *Corpus Hermeticum* I (the *Poimandres*) and that of *2 Enoch*.

53. The texts are conveniently assembled in the monumental study by Chwolson, *Ssabier und der Ssabismus*, 2.398, 409, 417, 419, 425, 439, 502, 511, 534, 608, 621, with the discussion in 1.637-38 and 787-89. See further below on Enoch in Islamic tradition. On the Sabians: Green, *City of the Moon God*, esp. p. 170; Gündüz, *Knowledge of Life*; Massignon, "Littérature hermétique," 1.384-400, esp. p. 385. The identification of Enoch with Hermes probably came first, when Christianity was the dominant religion of the region. The identification of Enoch with Idris would have been made after the Islamic conquest. Hermes and Enoch appear to be already equated in the incantation bowls from pre-Islamic Babylonia: see Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 338. Milik rightly insists that the magical bowls attest the circulation of Enochic literature in Babylonia in the Sasanian period.

54. Both Ludovico Lazarelli and Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa identified Hermes as a grandson of Enoch. John Dee invoked the precedent of Enoch, from whom he may have claimed to have received revelations through his medium Edward Kelley. The best introduction to Hermeticism at the time of the Renaissance is still Yates, *Giordano Bruno*. For John Dee, see French, *John Dee*, esp. p. 110. Although *1* and *2 Enoch* were not known in the West at this time, the failure to exploit the figure of Enoch cannot be totally explained by a lack of knowledge of Jewish texts. The Christian kabbalists certainly knew some kabbalistic traditions about Enoch. Moreover, a great deal could have been gleaned from the available patristic and apocryphal sources, as may be seen from Drusius, *Henoch*, and Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigraphicus*.

55. See further Pearson, "Pierpont Morgan Fragments," 227-84, esp. p. 228.

ture. The Cologne Mani Codex mentions apocalypses of Adam, Seth, Enosh, Shem, and Enoch, and Enoch was revered by the Manichaeans as one of the great prophets of history, along with Seth, Enosh, Shem, the Buddha, Zoroaster, and Paul. The canonical Manichaean *Book of Giants* has been shown to be based on an Enochic text, fragments of which have been preserved in Aramaic among the Dead Sea Scrolls and in a Hebrew epitome in the medieval *Midrash of Shemhazai and 'Aza'el*.⁵⁶ *2 Enoch* influenced Bogomil-Cathar mythology in the Balkans, and was given by the Bogomils a thoroughly Gnostic reinterpretation.⁵⁷

It is not hard to see why Enoch caught the Gnostics' attention. His postbiblical Jewish profile has features which would have interested them greatly. His role as "lesser YHWH" and as "prince of the world" could have suggested analogies with the Demiurge. Moreover, as a revealer of heavenly *gnosis* and as a "forerunner" who has escaped from the material world and returned to the celestial regions from which he had come, he can be seen as a redeemer who has charted the way for others to follow. But it would be an oversimplification always to assume that it was the Gnostics who borrowed from Jewish sources. Within Judaism Enoch-Metatron was a central figure both in the Heikhalot mysticism of late antiquity and in the kabbala of the Middle Ages. Both these systems are arguably *Jewish* forms of Gnosticism.⁵⁸ It is possible, therefore, that Enoch was, at least in part, shaped within Judaism under the influence of Gnostic ideas. The problem is similar to that of the relationship between Christ and Enoch-Metatron: rather than supposing one-way traffic in either direction, we should probably postulate a multisided interchange of ideas between traditions in continuous dialectic and conflict.

Finally, we note that the enigmatic figure of Idris mentioned

56. See Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 298-339; further, Lieu, *Manichaeism*, 33.

57. Unpublished paper by Stoyanov on "The Enochic Traditions in the *Secret Supper*." See further his study *Hidden Tradition*, esp. p. 212.

58. The classification of Heikhalot mysticism as "Gnosticism" is controversial. It was strongly argued by Scholem in *Jewish Gnosticism*. I and others have raised objections: see my essay, "Comparing Merkavah Mysticism," 1-18. However, since writing that article I have modified my stance. I would now hold that if one takes a broad view there is considerable merit in seeing Heikhalot mysticism as a form of Jewish Gnosticism. See further Dan, *Gershom Scholem*, 41-43. The Gnostic character of the medieval kabbala seems hardly in doubt.

twice in the Qur'an⁵⁹ was commonly identified by Muslim scholars with the biblical Enoch, and that this identification opened the way for importing into Islam a substantial body of postbiblical Jewish legend about the character and exploits of the antediluvian patriarch. The Qur'anic references, though brief, are suggestive. In both Idris is said to have been a righteous man; and in one he is called a prophet whom "we raised . . . to a high place." There are no grounds for believing that the identification of Idris as Enoch is correct. It is more likely that the name Idris is derived from the biblical Ezra, via its Greek spelling Esdras. The identification of Enoch with Idris may have been taken over by Muslim scholars from the Sabians of Harran. We have already noted that the Harranians linked Hermes Trismegistus both with Enoch in the Bible and with Idris in the Qur'an. They probably did so in order to locate their prophet and teacher within both Christian and Islamic tradition and thereby to try to give their heterodoxy legitimacy in the eyes of the two great world religions of their day. The inevitable outcome was to equate Enoch and Idris.

However the identification was first made, it enabled Muslim scholars to draw on Jewish sources about Enoch in order to throw light on a dark corner of the Qur'an. Much of the Islamic material on Enoch-Idris is recognizably Jewish. Enoch-Idris is said to have lived between the times of Adam and Noah. He was a culture-bringer who was credited with numerous discoveries, including the invention of writing. He left behind books containing revelations about various arts and sciences. He entered paradise alive, where the Prophet met him during his ascent to heaven. And he also made a journey through hell. However, the Muslim traditions are much less concerned than the Jewish texts with Enoch's exalted, heavenly life, and they do not see him as fulfilling a cosmic function. He is a prophet and nothing more. To have accorded him greater status or honor would doubtless have been problematic, and brought him into conflict with the figure

59. Sura 19:57-58; 21:85, with the commentaries of Beidawi and Tabari *ad loca*. For Muslim accounts of Enoch see Tabari, *History*, ed. Leiden, I, 166-79 (trans. Rosenthal, *History of al-Tabari*, 1.336-48); and Mas'udi, *Meadows of Gold*, ed. Meynard-Courteille, I, 73. The articles on "Idris" in *EI*¹ (A. J. Wensinck) and *EI*² (G. Vajda) provide a useful introduction to the Islamic material.

of Muhammad, thus replicating within Islam the rivalry within Judaism between Enoch and Moses.

Bibliography

General Treatments

Though they are by no means complete, the three most comprehensive surveys of the Enochic tradition are:

Berger, K. "Enoch." *RAC* 14.473-545. Good for its coverage of the patristic evidence.

Milik, J. T. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976. Publishes the important Qumran fragments and sets them in the context of a wide-ranging history of the Enochic traditions.

VanderKam, J. C. *Enoch: A Man for all Generations*. Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996.

Bible and Near Eastern Background

Hess, R. S. "Enoch." *ABD* 2.508. A useful, short survey.

Kvanvig, H. S. *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*. WMANT 61. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.

Lambert, W. G. "Enmeduranki and Related Matters." *JCS* 21 (1967) 126-38.

Early Jewish Apocalyptic and Qumran

Andersen, F. I. "2 Enoch." *OTP* 1.92-221. An accessible introduction, translation, and commentary to the Slavonic Enoch.

Black, M. *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*. SVTP 7. Leiden: Brill, 1985. Translation of the Ethiopic Enoch, with detailed commentary.

Charles, R. H. *The Book of Enoch*. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1912. The notes remain valuable because of Charles's vast knowledge of the cognate texts.

Grelot, P. "La légende d'Enoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification." *RSR* 46 (1958) 5-26, 181-210.

Jansen, H. L. *Die Henochgestalt: Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Skrifter utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, II, Historisk-Filosofisk Klasse, 1939.1. Oslo: I Kommissjon Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1939.

Mach, M. *Entwicklungstudien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 34. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1992.

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

The most comprehensive study of the impact of the Enochic traditions on Second Temple apocalyptic.

Later Jewish Tradition and the Kabbala

- Abrams, D. "The Boundaries of Divine Ontology: The Inclusion and Exclusion of Metatron from the Godhead." *HTR* 87 (1994) 291–321. A wide-ranging survey of the development of Metatron-Enoch as a divine figure.
- Alexander, P. S. "The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch." *JJS* 28 (1977) 156–80. Discusses the evolution of the figure of Metatron.
- . "3 Enoch." *OTP* 1.223–315. Contains introduction, translation, and a brief commentary.
- Ginzberg, L. *The Legends of the Jews*. 7 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909–38. See index under "Enoch." Important for its analysis of the rabbinic traditions.
- Idel, M. "Enoch Is Metatron." In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on the History of Jewish Mysticism: Early Jewish Mysticism*. Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought 6.1–2. Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1987. Pp. 151–70. In Hebrew. A French translation may be found in Mopsik, *Le livre hébreu d'Hénoch*, 381–406. Speculative but important.
- ✓ Mopsik, C. *Le livre hébreu d'Hénoch*. Paris: Verdier, 1989. A very full commentary on 3 Enoch, though it tends to overinterpret the text.
- Murtonen, A. "The Figure of Metatron." *VT* 3 (1953) 409–11. A pioneering discussion of possible christological influences on the development of the figure of Enoch-Metatron.
- Odeberg, H., ed. and trans. *3 Enoch; or the Hebrew Book of Enoch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928. Reprinted with prolegomenon by J. C. Greenfield, New York: Ktav, 1973. The introduction still contains the fullest listing of references to Metatron in later Jewish literature.
- Schäfer, P., and K. Hermann. *Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literatur I*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1995. An important new German translation of 3 Enoch.
- Scholem, G. "Metatron." *EncJud* 11.1443–46. A masterly survey of the Metatron traditions in Merkavah mysticism and the kabbala.
- Tishby, I. *The Wisdom of the Zohar*. 3 vols. Littman Library of Jewish Civilization. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989. 2.625–32, 643–45. A clear and authoritative analysis of the Enoch-Metatron traditions in the Zohar.

Christian

- Barker, M. *The Lost Prophet: The Book of Enoch and Its Influence on Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1988. Full of interesting ideas, but at times too daring and undisciplined in its speculation.
- Davis, P. G. "Divine Agents, Mediators, and New Testament Christology." *JTS* 45 (1994) 480–503.
- . "The Mythic Enoch: New Light on New Testament Christology." *SR* 13 (1984) 335–41.

- Hurtado, L. W. *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988. Especially pp. 51–56. A good summary of the possible influence of the Enoch traditions on New Testament Christology.
- Lindars, B. "Enoch and Christology." *ExpTim* 92 (1980–81) 295–99. Sets out the issues very clearly.
- Murray-Jones, C. "Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition." *JJS* 43 (1992) 1–31. A profound discussion of the theme of transformation during ascent to heaven.
- Rowland, C. C. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1982. Studies the Enoch traditions throughout, and sets them within the framework of early apocalypticism.

Gnosticism and Hermeticism

- Chwolson, D. *Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus*. 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1856. Dated, but still contains an indispensable collection of traditions relating to the Sabian identification of Enoch with Idris and with Hermes Trismegistus.
- Copenhaver, B. P. *Hermetica: The Greek Corpus Hermeticum and the Latin Asclepius in a New English Translation, with Notes and Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992. Introduction, esp. p. xlvii on the Sabian identification of Hermes with Enoch.
- Fossum, J. E. *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism*. WUNT 36. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1985. A detailed study of how Jewish ideas of angelic figures such as Enoch-Metatron may have been taken up into Gnosticism.
- Pearson, B. A. "The Pierpont Morgan Fragments of a Coptic Enoch Apocryphon." In *Studies in the Testament of Abraham*. Ed. G. W. E. Nickelsburg. SBLSCS 6. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976. Pp. 227–84.
- Philonenko, M. "Une allusion de l'Asclépius au livre d'Hénoch." In *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults*. Ed. J. Neusner. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1975. 2.161–63.

Islam

- Alexander, P. S. "Enoch-Idris in early Islamic Tradition." In *Studies in Muslim-Jewish Relations*. Vol. 3. Harwood Academic Publishers/Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies. Forthcoming. Argues that Idris in the Qur'an was not originally meant to be Enoch; the identification was invented by the Sabians.
- Schwarzbaum, H. *Biblical and Extra-biblical Legends in Islamic Folk-Literature*. Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte des Orients 30. Waldorf-Hessen: Orientalkunde Dr. H. Vorndran, 1982. Throughout and esp. pp. 8, 13, 53, 119–20, 127–28, 146–47. Takes a folklore approach to the material.

Speyer, H. *Die biblischen Erzählungen im Qoran*. 2d ed. Hildesheim: Olms, 1961. A fundamental study of the use of Jewish traditions in Islam, though it does not deal specifically with Enoch-Idris.

Two important surveys by masters of both Jewish and Islamic tradition are:

Vajda, G. "Idris." *EI*. New ed. Leiden: Brill, 1971. 3.1030–31.

Wensinck, A. J. "Idris." *EI*. 1st ed. Leiden: Brill, 1927. 3.449–50.

FIVE

NOAH IN EARLY JEWISH LITERATURE

DEVORAH DIMANT

The story of the flood and its righteous survivor has ancient roots, which go back as far as Sumerian and Babylonian legends.¹ The author of Genesis undoubtedly knew these stories and drew on them,² as may have the prophet Ezekiel, who mentions Noah with Daniel and Job as three exemplary models of righteousness (Ezek 14:14, 20).³

In its biblical garb the story of the flood and its righteous hero has a special place in the primeval history of mankind. The prominence of Noah's career is well reflected by the amount of space devoted to it: five out of the eleven chapters in Genesis dealing with primordial history concern Noah.⁴ Tenth of the first ten generations, Noah completes Adam's genealogy, and thus stands in a chiastic relationship to Adam at the head of the list. He is the direct descendant of the Sethian line and, as such, an heir to the image of God (Gen 5:1). Noah is analogous to Adam in other respects as well. Both were founders of new races: Adam fathered mankind, Noah the postdiluvian race. But Noah was privileged in a way that Adam was not. For he was righteous and blameless amid generations of wickedness (Gen 6:8–9), thus righteous

1. Cf. Heidel, *Gilgamesh Epic*; Lambert and Millard, *Atra-hasis*.

2. Cf. Heidel, *Gilgamesh Epic*; Kikawada, "Noah."

3. Cf. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* 1, 314. In Isa 54:9 the flood is labeled as "the waters of Noah."

4. A similar prominence is observed in *Jubilees*, which devotes five chapters to Noah, and in the Qumran Aramaic midrash the *Genesis Apocryphon*, which devotes more than twelve columns to him (1QapGen 1–12).