

Andrei A. Orlov

From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism:
Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha

Publisher

Andrei A. Orlov, born 1960; currently an assistant professor of Christian Origins at Marquette University, Milwaukee, USA

ISBN 0-00-00000-0
ISSN 0000-0000

© 2005 Andrei Orlov.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the author's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

Printed in Russia

Preface

This book contains a number of essays that were previously published in journals generally not available to many readers. I am thankful to the editors of these journals for permission to reuse the material.

The articles appear almost always without change from their published form. Alterations have been made in the original publications only where there were printing errors or clear errors of fact. The format of the original publications has also been retained.

I am grateful to Father Gregory (Basil Lourié) for his continuous support and encouragement during my work on this project.

Milwaukee
Epiphany, 2005

Andrei Orlov

Location of the Original Publications

- “Titles of Enoch-Metatron in 2 *Enoch*,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18 (1998) 71–86.
- “Secrets of Creation in 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*,” *Henoch* 22.1 (2000) 45–62.
- “Ex 33 on God’s Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition,” *Society of Biblical Studies Seminar Papers* 39 (2000) 130–47.
- “Melchizedek Legend of 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 31 (2000) 23–38.
- “‘Noah’s Younger Brother’: Anti-Noachic Polemics in 2 *Enoch*,” *Henoch* 22.2 (2000) 259–73.
- “The Origin of the Name ‘Metatron’ and the Text of 2 (*Slavonic Apocalypse of*) *Enoch*,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 21 (2000) 19–26.
- “Overshadowed by Enoch’s Greatness: ‘Two Tablets’ Traditions from the *Book of Giants to Palaea Historica*,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 32 (2001) 137–158.
- “‘Many Lamps Are Lightened from the One’: Paradigms of the Transformational Vision in the Macarian Homilies,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 55 (2001) 281–298.
- “Vested with Adam’s Glory: Moses as the Luminous Counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Macarian Homilies,” in: “Mémorial Annie Jaubert (1912–1980)” *Xristianskij Vostok* 4.10 (forthcoming).
- “The Flooded Arboretums: The Garden Traditions in the Slavonic Version of 3 *Baruch* and in the *Book of Giants*,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 65 (2003) 184–201.
- “On the Polemical Nature of 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*: A Reply to C. Böttrich,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 34 (2003) 274–303.
- “Celestial Choir-Master: The Liturgical Role of Enoch-Metatron in 2 *Enoch* and the Merkabah Tradition,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 14.1 (2004) 3–24.
- “The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob*,” in: *Of Scribes and Sages* (2 vols.; ed. C.A. Evans; T&T Clark, 2004) 2.59–76.

“Noah’s Younger Brother Revisited: Anti-Noachic Polemics and the Date of 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*,” *Henoah* (2004).

“‘Without Measure and Without Analogy’: The Tradition of the Divine Body in 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*,” (unpublished).

Table of Contents

Preface.....	iii
Location of the Original Publications.....	iv
Introduction.....	1
<i>The Enoch Tradition</i>	
Titles of Enoch-Metatron in <i>2 Enoch</i>	7
The Origin of the Name “Metatron” and the Text of <i>2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch</i>	21
Secrets of Creation in <i>2 (Slavonic) Enoch</i>	29
Overshadowed by Enoch’s Greatness: “Two Tablets” Traditions from the <i>Book of Giants</i> to <i>Palaea Historica</i>	49
Celestial Choir-Master: The Liturgical Role of Enoch-Metatron in <i>2 Enoch</i> and the Merkabah Tradition.....	69
“Without Measure and Without Analogy”: The Tradition of the Divine Body in <i>2 (Slavonic) Enoch</i>	93
<i>The Adam Tradition</i>	
On the Polemical Nature of <i>2 (Slavonic) Enoch</i> : A Reply to C. Böttrich....	119
“Many Lamps Are Lightened from the One”: Paradigms of the Transformational Vision in the Macarian Homilies.....	147
Vested with Adam’s Glory: Moses as the Luminous Counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Macarian Homilies.....	165
The Flooded Arboretums: The Garden Traditions in the Slavonic Version of <i>3 Baruch</i> and in the <i>Book of Giants</i>	181

The Noah Tradition

“Noah’s Younger Brother”: Anti-Noachic Polemics in *2 Enoch* 203

Noah’s Younger Brother Revisited: Anti-Noachic Polemics and
the Date of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*..... 219

The Moses Tradition

Ex 33 on God’s Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition 237

The Jacob Tradition

The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the
Slavonic Ladder of Jacob..... 255

The Melchizedek Tradition

Melchizedek Legend of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch* 279

Introduction

One of the distinguished students of early Jewish mystical traditions, Gershom Scholem, in his numerous publications, underlined the importance of the Second Temple pseudepigrapha in the history of early Jewish mysticism.¹ Scholem considered rabbinic and Hekhalot mystical testimonies as the consequent stages of the long-lasting history of the Merkabah tradition, the roots of which can be traced to pre-rabbinic apocalyptic circles. He stressed that the influence of the pseudepigraphic writings “on the subsequent development of Jewish mysticism cannot be overlooked” since they “undoubtedly contain elements of Jewish mystical religion.”²

The significant evidence that has never been systematically explored in the recent discussions about the origin of early Jewish mysticism is the testimony of several Jewish pseudepigraphic materials which have survived solely in their Slavonic translations. These texts include *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*, the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, the *Ladder of Jacob*, and some other documents where the traces of early Jewish mystical developments can be detected.³ This group of Jewish pseudepigrapha with an enigmatic history of

¹ G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1941); idem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, [1960] 1965); idem, *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1969); idem, *Kabbalah* (New York: Dorset Press, 1987); idem, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990).

² Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 40.

³ On Jewish mystical traditions in these texts, see P. Alexander, “3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch,” *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.247–248; idem, “From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch,” *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M. E. Stone and T. A. Bergen; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998) esp. 102–111; C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (WUNT 2/50; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992) 109–114; idem, “Beobachtungen zum Midrash vom ‘Leben Henochs,’” *Mitteilungen und Beiträge der Forschungsstelle Judentum an der Theologischen Fakultät Leipzig* 10 (1996) 44–83; A. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (SVC 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996); M. Himmelfarb, “Revelation and Rapture: The Transformation of the Visionary in the Ascent Apocalypses,” *Mysteries and Revelations; Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium* (eds. J. J. Collins and J. H. Charlesworth; JSPSup., 9; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991) 79–90; L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955) esp. 5.161–64; I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU 14; Leiden: Brill, 1980) 50–51; J. Fossum, *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,

transmission, that does not leave any traces of these writings in Greek or other languages, except in Slavonic, seems to share a highly developed mystical imagery that make them stand out in the corpus of the early pseudepigraphic texts. These writings have never been studied as a group for their possible connections with early Jewish mysticism. Although Hugo Odeberg, Gershom Scholem, Ithamar Gruenwald, and other students of early Jewish mystical traditions referred occasionally to these texts in their research, pointing to certain provocative allusions that seem to connect these pseudepigrapha with the imagery and conceptual world of the later Merkabah and Hekhalot materials, critics of Scholem's approach often ignored this important evidence. Even in the previous research of Odeberg, Scholem, and Gruenwald, despite their formal recognition of the importance of these pseudepigraphic texts for the history of early Jewish mysticism, the presence of Jewish mystical traditions in the Slavonic pseudepigrapha was never systematically explored. This situation has most likely arisen, in my judgment, because those scholars who have been seriously engaged in the study of early Jewish mysticism have historically lacked motivation to work with the Slavonic translations of the early Jewish texts. A primary obstacle was, of course, the Slavonic language, which itself was categorized by most scholars as "esoteric."

It appears that one of the important tasks in clarifying the origins of early Jewish mysticism lies in the systematic investigation of such writings as *2 Enoch*, the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, and the *Ladder of Jacob* and in understanding their role in shaping the imagery and the concepts of the subsequent Jewish mystical developments.

It should be noted that *2 Enoch*, the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, and the *Ladder of Jacob* represent a unique group of texts that share the theophanic and mediatorial language which, in my view, is as different from mainstream of early apocalyptic and pseudepigraphic writings as from later Hekhalot materials. One can see in this group of materials a witness to the lost *practical* and *literary* development which could well represent an

1985); idem, "Colossians 1,15–18a in the Light of Jewish Mysticism and Gnosticism," *NTS* 35 (1989) 183–201; idem, *The Image of the Invisible God. Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (NTOA 30; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995); M. Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220–240; J. Kugel, "The Ladder of Jacob," *HTR* 88 (1995) 209–27; H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973) esp. 52–63; W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box, *A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinic and Mediaeval Judaism* (New York: Macmillan, 1920) esp. 236; M. Philonenko, "La cosmogonie du 'Livre des secrets d'Hénoch,'" *Religions en Egypte: Hellénistique et romaine* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969) 109–16; Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*; idem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*; idem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition*; idem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in the Kabbalah* (New York: Schocken, 1991).

important transitional stage in early Jewish mystical testimonies, serving as a kind of bridge from the matrix of early Jewish apocalypticism, as it was manifested in the early Enochic literature, to the matrix of early Jewish mysticism as it became manifest in rabbinic Merkabah and Hekhalot materials. The articles gathered in this volume intend to illustrate this transitional character of the Slavonic pseudepigraphic evidence by exploring theophanic and angelological imagery found in *2 Enoch*, the *Ladder of Jacob*, Slavonic version of *3 Baruch* and other pseudepigraphical texts preserved in Slavonic language. It appears that the theophanic and angelological developments found in these documents occupy an intermediary stage between Second Temple apocalypticism and Hekhalot mysticism, thus manifesting its own, one might say, “proto-Hekhalot” mystical mold. Thus, for example, the Slavonic Enoch, similar to some of the Hekhalot writings, already operates with the concept of Metatron and his later titles, such as the Youth, which are absent from early Enochic writings but prominent in such Hekhalot macroforms as *Sefer Hekhalot* and *Hekhalot Rabbati*.

Another important feature of the pseudepigraphical documents investigated in this volume is their polemical thrust that facilitated the aforementioned transition from Jewish apocalypticism to early Jewish mysticism. Slavonic pseudepigraphical texts reveal to their readers an intricate web of the mediatorial debates in course of which the several traditions about exalted patriarchs and prophets prominent in the Second Temple Judaism, including Adam, Moses, Jacob, Melchisedek, Noah underwent polemical appropriation when their exalted features are transferred to the rival exalted heroes. These polemical tendencies seem to reflect the familiar atmosphere of the mediatorial debates widespread in the Second Temple period which offered contending accounts for the primacy and supremacy of their exalted heroes. The polemics found in the Slavonic pseudepigraphons are part of these debates and represent a response of the Enochic, Adamic, Jacobite, and Mosaic traditions to the challenges of its rivals.

This collection of studies in the Slavonic pseudepigrapha can be seen as only an initial preliminary step in the larger task of appropriating of the Slavonic pseudepigraphic evidence for understanding the origins of early Jewish mysticism. Detailed explorations of such important texts as *2 Enoch*, the *Apocalypse of Abraham* and the *Ladder of Jacob* are now necessitated. Future research on these Slavonic materials will help to resolve the mystery of this enigmatic collection of pseudepigraphic materials, which might have preserved traces of one of the earliest molds of Jewish mysticism. Such investigation could assist in further clarifying the origin and nature of this important religious movement.

The Enoch Tradition

Titles of Enoch-Metatron in 2 Enoch¹

Whoever is dealing with the Account of Creation and the Account of the Chariot must inevitably fail. It is therefore written, "Let this heap of ruins be under your hand" (Isa. 3.6). This refers to things that a person can not understand, unless he fails in them.

(The *Book of Bahir*, 150)

In his introduction to the English translation of 2 *Enoch* F.I. Andersen states that "all attempts² to locate the intellectual background of the book have

¹ Part of this paper was read at the Annual Meeting of SBL/AAR, New Orleans, 23-26 November 1996.

² On different approaches to 2 *Enoch*, cf. I.D. Amusin, *Teksty Kumrana* (Pamjatniki pis'mennosti vostoka, 33/I; Moscow: Nauka, 1971); F.I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP*, 1.91-221; Ch. Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos: Eine untersuchung zum slavische Henochbuch* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995); *idem*, *Das Slavische Henochbuch* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995); *idem*, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult; Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (WUNT, R.2, 50; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992); R.H. Charles, "The Date and Place of Writings of the Slavonic Enoch," *JTS* 22 (1921) 161-63 (163); J.H. Charlesworth, "In the Crucible: The Pseudepigrapha as Biblical Interpretation," in J.H. Charlesworth and C.A. Evans (eds.), *Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993) 20-43; J.H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament: Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins* (SNTSMS, 54; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); *idem*, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research with a Supplement* (SBLSCS, 7; Chico, CA: Scholar Press, 1981); J. Collins, "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism," in D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (Tübingen: J.C.B Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1983); L. Cry, "Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mystérieux en II Henoch," *RB* 49 (1940) 195-203; J. Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (Chicago: Henry Regency Company, 1964); U. Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (BZNW, 44; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1978); J. Fossum, "Colossians 1.15-19a in the fight of Jewish Mysticism and Gnosticism," *NTS* 35 (1989) 183-201; K. Lake, "The date of the Slavonic Enoch," *HTR* 16 (1923) 397-98; N.A. Meschchersky, "Sledy pamyatnikov Kumrana v staroslavjanskoj i drevnerusskoj literature (K izucheniu slavyanskij versij knigi Enocha)," *Trudy otdela drevnerusskoj literatury* 19 (1963) 130-47; N.A. Meschchersky, "K istorii teksta slavyanskoj knigi Enocha (Sledy pamyatnikov Kumrana v vizantijskoj i staroslavjanskoj literature)," *Vizantijskij vremennik* 24 (1964) 91-108; N.A. Meschchersky, "K voprosu ob istochnikan slavyanskoj knigi Enoha," *Kratkie soobshcheniya Instituta narodov Azii* 86 (1965) 72-78; J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); G.W.E. Nickelsburg, "The Books of Enoch in Recent Research," *RSR* 7 (1981) 210-17; H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: Ktav, 1973); M. Philonenko, "La cosmogonie du 'Livre des secrets d'Hénoch'," in *Religions en Egypte: Hellénistique et*

failed.”³ Among these endeavors were several efforts to establish the connection between *2 Enoch* and *Ma’aseh Merkabah*.⁴ One of the essential contributors to this approach Hugo Odeberg⁵ points out that the similarities in descriptions of Celestial titles for Enoch in *2* and *3 Enoch* may be the important evidence of a possible connection between *2 Enoch* and texts of

Romaine (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969); S. Pines, “Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch,” in R.J. Zwi Werblowsky (ed.), *Types of Redemption* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1970); J. Reeves, “Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library,” in J.C. Reeves (ed.), *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (Atlanta, CA: Scholars Press, 1994) 173-203; A. Rubinstein, “Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch,” *JJS* 15 (1962) 1-21; G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1954); *idem*, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (New York: Schocken Books, 1991); *idem*, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987); M. Scopello, “The Apocalypse of Zostrianos (Nag Hammadi VIII.1) and the Book of the Secrets of Enoch,” *Vigillae Christianae* 34 (1980) 367-85; M.E. Stone, *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984) 2.406-408; A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d’Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: L’institut d’études slaves, 1952; repr. Paris, 1976); J. VanderKam, *Enoch, a Man for All Generations* (Columbia: South Carolina, 1995).

³ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 95.

⁴ On the Merkabah tradition, see the following sources: P. Alexander, “The Historical Settings of the Hebrew Book of Enoch,” *JJS* 28 (1977) 156-80; D. Blumenthal, *Understanding Jewish Mysticism, a Source Reader: The Merkabah Tradition and the Zoharic Tradition*, I (2 vols.; New York: Ktav, 1978); I. Chernus, *Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1982); M. Cohen, *The Shi’ur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1983); J. Greenfield, “Prolegomenon,” in Oderberg, *3 Enoch*, pp. xi-xlvii; I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU, 14; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980); I. Gruenwald and M. Smith, *The Hekhaloth Literature in English* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983); D. Halperin, *The Faces of Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel’s Vision* (TSAJ, 16; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988); *idem*, *the Merkavah in Rabbinic Literature* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1980); M. Idel, “Enoch is Metatron,” *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220-40; L. Jacobs, *Jewish Mystical Testimonies* (New York: Schocken Books, 1977); N. Janowitz, *The Poetics of Ascent: Theories of Language in a Rabbinic Ascent Text* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989); M. Morgan, *Sepher ha-Razim: The Book of Mysteries* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983); C. Morray-Jones, “Hekhaloth Literature and Talmudic tradition: Alexander’s Three Test Cases,” *JJS* 22 (1991) 1-39; C. Newsom, *Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS, 27; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1985); P. Schäfer with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhaloth-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1981); P. Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992); P. Schäfer et al., *Übersetzung der Hekhaloth-Literatur* (4 vols.; TSAJ, 17, 22, 29, 46; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987-95); G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965); *Idem*, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1954); N. Séd, “Les traditions secrètes et les disciples de Rabban Yohannan ben Zakkai,” *RHR* 184 (1973) 49-66; M. Swartz, *Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism: An Analysis of Ma’aseh Merkavah* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1992).

⁵ Odeberg, *3 Enoch*.

the Merkabah tradition. The purpose of this article is to call attention to some details of these descriptions which might shed new light on the relationship between early Enochic⁶ and Merkabah traditions.

The Prince of the Presence

The substantial part of 2 *Enoch's* narrative is dedicated to Enoch's ascent into the celestial realm and to his heavenly metamorphosis near the Throne of Glory. In these lengthy and elaborated descriptions of Enoch's transformation into a celestial being, on a level with the archangels, one may find the origin of another image of Enoch which was developed later in Merkabah mysticism, that is, the image of the angel Metatron, The Prince of Presence.

Odeberg may well be the first scholar to have discovered the characteristics of "the Prince of the Presence" in the long recension of 2 *Enoch*. He successfully demonstrated in his synopsis of parallel passages from 2 and 3 *Enoch*, that the phrase "stand before my face forever"⁷ does not serve merely as normal Hebraism "to be in the presence," but establishes the angelic status of Enoch as Metatron, the Prince of the Presence, שֵׁר הַפְּנִיִּים.⁸

⁶ On the figure of Enoch and Enochic traditions see: M. Black, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes* (SVTP, 7; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985); Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*; *idem*, *The Pseudepigrapha*; J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1984) 33-67; P. Grelot, "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: son origine et signification," *RSR* 46 (1958) 5-26, 181-210; H.L. Jansen, *Die Henochgestalt; Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse, I; Oslo: Dybwad, 1939); H. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988); Milik, *the Books of Enoch*; Odeberg, *3 Enoch*; M. Stone, *Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha with Special Reference to American Tradition* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991); M. Stone, "The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century BCE," *CBQ* 40 (1978) 479-92; J. VanderKam, "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources," *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 1 (1978) 229-51; J. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984); J. VanderKam, *Enoch, a Man for All Generations*. On Merkabah features of Enochic traditions, cf. P. Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP*, 1.247-48; Greenfield, "Prolegomenon," xvi-xxi; Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 32-51.

⁷ "stani pred litsem moim vo věki." Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d' Henoch*, 24.

⁸ Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 1.55.

The title itself is developed mainly in chs. 21-22,⁹ which are dedicated to the description of the Throne of Glory. In these chapters, one finds many promises that Enoch will “stand in front of the face of the Lord forever.”¹⁰

In terms of the theological background of the problem, the title seems connected with the image of Metatron in the Merkabah tradition,¹¹ which was “crystallized in the classical Hekhalot literature.”¹² According to the legend of the Hekhalot tradition, Enoch “was raised to the rank of first of the angels and שר הַפְּנִיִּים (literally, “prince of the divine face,” or “divine presence”).”¹³ *3 Enoch*, as well as other texts of the tradition, have a well-developed theology connected with this title.

The Knower of Secrets

The Merkabah tradition emphasizes the role of Metatron as the “Knower of Secrets,” יודע רזים.¹⁴ According to *3 Enoch* he is “wise in the secrets and Master of the mysteries.”¹⁵ He is the one who received these secrets from the angels and from the Lord (the Holy One). He serves also as “the Revealer of Secrets,” the one who is responsible for the transmission of the highest secrets to the Princes under him, as well as to mankind. In ch. 38 of *3 Enoch*, Metatron told to R. Ishmael that he was the person who revealed secrets to Moses, in spite of the protests of heavenly hosts:

...when I revealed this secret to Moses, then all the host in every heaven on high raged against me and said to me: Why do you reveal this secret to a son of man...the secret by which were created heaven and earth... and the Torah and Wisdom and Knowledge and Thought and the Gnosis of things above and the fear of heaven. Why do you reveal this to flesh and blood?¹⁶

According to this theological material, Enoch (Metatron) is responsible for transmitting the secrets of the Written Torah as well as the Oral Tradition. “And Metatron brought them out from his house of treasuries and committed

⁹ Here and later I have used Andersen’s new English translation, and follow his division in chapters.

¹⁰ Cf. 21.3; 21.5; 22.6; 22.7.

¹¹ Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 67.

¹² About different stages in Hekhaloth tradition, cf. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 98-123, 67.

¹³ Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 67.

¹⁴ The origin of the role in Enochic traditions can be traced to *1 Enoch* 72.1; 74.2 and 80.1. See also 41.1, “And after this I saw all secrets of heaven.” M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) 2.128.

¹⁵ Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.30.

¹⁶ Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.177-78.

them to Moses, and Moses to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the prophets and the prophets to the men of Great Synagogue...”¹⁷

In late Merkabah, Metatron (Enoch) is the guide and the revealer of secrets to all who are initiated into the account of chariots.¹⁸ Hekhaloth literature (*3 Enoch, Shi'ur Qomah*) describes these functions of Metatron. He guides and reveals secrets to R. Ishmael and to R. Akiba. Sometimes the Merkabah narrative extends his role to the titles of the Prince of Wisdom and the Prince of Understanding.¹⁹

It is apparent that in *2 Enoch* one may see some kind of preparation of Enoch for his role as Metatron, “the Knower of Secrets.” The preparation entails several stages. First, the archangel Vereveil inducts Enoch into these secrets. He instructs Enoch in “all the deeds of the Lord, the earth and the sea, and all the elements and the courses...and the Hebrew language, every kind of language of the new song of the armed troops and everything that it is appropriate to learn” (23.1-2). Second, the Lord himself continues to instruct him in the secrets, which he had not even explained to the Angels (24.3). Finally, the Lord promised Enoch the role of “Knower of Secrets.” The important detail here is that the promise of the role is closely connected with other titles of Metatron such as “The Prince of Presence,” “The Heavenly Scribe,” and “The Witness of the Judgment.” In the text the Lord promised:

...and you will be in front of my face from now and forever.²⁰ And you will be seeing my secrets²¹ and you will be scribe for my servants²² since you will be writing down everything that has happened on earth and that exists on earth and in the heavens, and you will be for me a witness of the judgment²³ of the great age (36.3).

This substantial passage graphically depicts the interrelation of the future roles of Enoch (Metatron) in the narrative of *2 Enoch*. In spite of the fact that the text does not elaborate the real embodiments of these roles and titles, but only promises and initiations in these roles, it leaves the impression that *2 Enoch* is part of larger tradition and that its author has

¹⁷ Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.178.

¹⁸ Metatron himself was some sort of Merkabah’s mystic par-excellence and a good example for *Yorde Merkabah*. As Alexander notes, it is not hard to see why he attracted mystics. “He was a human being who had been elevated over all the angels, and was living proof that man could overcome angelic opposition and approach God. He was a powerful ‘friend at court’,” Alexander, “3 Enoch,” 244.

¹⁹ Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.30.

²⁰ “The Prince of Presence.”

²¹ “The Knower of Secrets.”

²² “The Heavenly Scribe.”

²³ “The Witness of Divine Judgment.”

prior knowledge of the future development of these titles and the deeds behind them.

It is intriguing that the narrative of *2 Enoch* does not show the promised powerful deeds of Enoch-Metatron in different offices of the heavenly realm, for example, those of The Knower, The Scribe, The Witness and The Prince of Presence even in early “primitive” Merkabah or apocalyptic form. It looks as if the author of the text deliberately avoids these details. He knows that it is not time for revealing these faces. Enoch must return to the earth, and only after that trip he will fully assume his heavenly offices. In 67.2, which serves as the conclusion to Enoch’s story, there is a statement about the theme: “and the Lord received him and made him stand in front of his face for eternity.”²⁴

In this regard, the narratives of *2 Enoch* and *3 Enoch* seem to be written from different temporal perspectives. The setting of Enoch’s story in *2 Enoch* is the antediluvian period. Melchizedek’s narrative of the book distinctively stresses this point. This explains why in *2 Enoch* “there is no place for Abraham, Moses, and the rest.”²⁵

The Heavenly Scribe

Odeberg notices that Enoch’s initiation into the Secrets (and his title- the Knower of Secrets) is closely connected with his scribal activities²⁶ and with his other title- “the Scribe”²⁷ (סופר) or “the Heavenly Scribe.”²⁸ The steps in the development of this theme in *2 Enoch* are apparent. Enoch’s scribal functions have several aspects:

1. He was initiated into the scribal activities by the Lord himself. “And the Lord said to Vereveil, “Bring out the books from the storehouses, and

²⁴ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 195.

²⁵ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 196.

²⁶ In early Enochic traditions these two functions are also unified. The motif of initiation into the secrets as the beginning of scribal activities occupies a substantial role in the Astronomical Book of *1 Enoch*, the oldest Enochic material. In *1 Enoch* 74.2 Enoch writes the instructions of the angel Uriel regarding the secrets of heavenly bodies and their movements. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.173. Qumran Enochic fragments (4QEnGiants 14; 4QEn 92.1) picture Enoch as “the scribe of distinction” ספר פרשא Cf. Milik, *The Book of Enoch*, 261-62 and 305. In the book of *Jubilees* Enoch is attested as “the first who learned writings and knowledge and wisdom... And who wrote in the book the signs of the heaven.” O.S. Wintermute, “Jubilees,” *OTP*, 2.62.

²⁷ The origin of the title in Enochic traditions can be traced to the *Book of the Watchers* of *1 Enoch* 12.4, 15.1, where Enoch is named as “a scribe of righteousness.” Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.92 and 100. According to Black the possible biblical parallel to Enoch’s role as the Scribe could be the passage from Ezek. 9, which pictures man clad in white linen with an ink-horn by his side. Black, *The Book of Enoch*, 143.

²⁸ Odebert, *3 Enoch*, 1.56.

give a pen to Enoch²⁹ and read him the books.” And Vereveil...gave me the pen³⁰ from his hand” (22.11).³¹

2. He writes down the mysteries which were explained to him by angels. In 23.4 angel Vereveil commands him: “Write everything that I have explained to you.”³²

3. The results of his scribal activity were a certain number of books. “I wrote accurately. And I expounded 300 and 60 books” (23.6).³³

4. The Lord instructed Enoch to deliver these books in his handwriting to his sons³⁴ (33.8), and to distribute the books in his handwriting to his children, and they to their children, and they to their children, for they will read them from generation to generation (33.8-10).

5. The Lord appointed the guardian angels for Enoch’s writings:

For I will give you an intercessor, Enoch, my archistratig, Michael, on account of your handwritings and the handwritings of your fathers-Adam and Seth. They will not be destroyed until the final age. For I have commanded my angels Arioch and Mariokh, whom I have appointed on the earth to guard them and to command the things of time to preserve the handwritings of your fathers so that they might not perish in the impending flood which I will create in your generation (33.10-12).³⁵

The motif of guardian angels of the books is very specific for the esoterism³⁶ of Merkabah tradition. This motif can be found in *3 Enoch* as well as in late texts of the tradition.

6. Finally the Lord gave the promise to Enoch about his future role as the Heavenly Scribe when he will return to heaven after the instructions of his sons, “...and you will be the scribe³⁷ for my servants, since you will be writing down everything that has happened on earth and that exists on earth and in the heavens, and you will be for me a witness of the judgment of the great age” (36.3).³⁸

²⁹ “vdai že trost’ Enochovi.” Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d’Enoch*, 26.

³⁰ “vdast mi trost.” Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d’Enoch*, 26.

³¹ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 141.

³² Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 141.

³³ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 141.

³⁴ In *1 Enoch* 81.6 the angel Uriel commands to Enoch “teach your children, and write (these things) down for them, and testify to all your children.” Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.187.

³⁵ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 157.

³⁶ Alexander notes that “ classic rabbinical literature makes it clear that there was an esoteric doctrine in Talmudic Judaism. It was concerned with two subjects-the Account of Creation (*Ma’aseh Bereschit*) and the Account of the Chariot (*Ma’aseh Merkabah*). All study and discussion of these topics in public was banned.” Alexander, “3 Enoch,” 229-30.

³⁷ “knižnik.” Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d’Enoch*, 36.

³⁸ It is an important moment for understanding of the presence of Merkabah tradition in the text of *2 Enoch*: the functions of Enoch as the Scribe will be connected with his role as the witness of the Divine Judgment: “Metatron sits and judges the heavenly household” or “Metatron, the angel of the Presence, stands at the door of the Palace of God and he sits

To conclude this section I shall examine an interesting detail that is very important as a characteristic of a hypothetical provenance, but which has remained unnoticed by scholars. In 23.4, when Enoch was already in the highest realms, Vereveil gave him permission to sit down.³⁹ “You sit down; write everything...” And Enoch said, “And I sat down⁴⁰ for a second period of 30 days and 30 nights, and I wrote accurately” (23.6).⁴¹ It is important to notice that Vereveil’s suggestion that Enoch be seated occurs after Enoch has been “brought in front of the face of the Lord” (22.6), and after he has been invited by the Lord “to stand in front of his face forever” (22.6-7). According to Rabbinic tradition, “there is no sitting in heaven.”⁴² An allegorical description, which can be found in *3 Enoch*, depicts God as the one who places Metatron on a throne at the door of the seventh Hall.⁴³ In his commentary on this section of *3 Enoch*, Odeberg states that “assigning a seat or a throne to any angel-prince or to any one beside the Holy One, might endanger the recognition of the absolute sovereignty and unity of the Godhead.”⁴⁴ Furthermore, he reasoned that according to Rabbinic tradition the privilege of “sitting” was accorded to Metatron by virtue of his character as “scribe,” for he was granted permission as a scribe “to sit and write down the merits of Israel.”⁴⁵ This fact, that Enoch was seated in the text of *2 Enoch* is one more powerful example that further strengthens the hypothesis regarding the connection of the text of *2 Enoch* with the *Merkabah* tradition.

The Youth

Previous research has shown that the descriptions of celestial titles in *2 Enoch* occupy some sort of intermediate position between early Enochic traditions and Metatron tradition. Therefore, some later titles of Metatron, which are absent in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* and Qumran materials are presented in the narrative of *2 Enoch*. A good illustration of this situation could be the observation of another celestial title of Enoch (Metatron) which can be

and judges all the heavenly hosts before his Master. And god pronounces judgment and he executes it.” Odebert, *3 Enoch*, 2.171.

³⁹ “ syadi.” Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d’ Henoch*, 26.

⁴⁰ “ sydoch.” Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d’ Henoch*, 26.

⁴¹ Andersen, “ *2 Enoch*” p. 141.

⁴² *b. Chag.* 15a.

⁴³ *3 En.* 10.

⁴⁴ Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.27

⁴⁵ Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.27

found in 2 Enoch, namely-*Na'ar*, נַעַר which can be translated as “The Youth” or “The Lad.”⁴⁶

According to Jewish mystical lore, this title could be considered as “proof” of the theological assumption that Metatron is the translated Enoch ben Yared. The tradition derives this title from the exegesis of Prov. 22.6 (חַנוּךְ לְנֶעֶר), which was interpreted as “Enoch was made into the Na’ar, i.e. Metatron.”⁴⁷

The title “Youth” in Merkabah has several possible theological meanings. According to one of them, the name may be explained by the fact that Metatron grows old, and is then constantly rejuvenated.⁴⁸ Another possible explanation is that he is young in comparison with other angel-princes who existed from the beginning.⁴⁹ It is notable, that the several important occurrences of the title “Youth” in the text of 2 Enoch come from the mouths of angels. In ch. 9 of the short recension an angelic being, who is accompanying Enoch on his way through the heavenly realm, addresses Enoch as “Youth”: “This place has been prepared, Youth (*yunoshe*), for the righteous...”⁵⁰ Later in ch. 10 we can hear the same address again: “This place, Youth (*yunoshe*), has been prepared for those who practice godless uncleanness on the earth...”⁵¹ These occurrences could be considered by someone simply as reminders for Enoch about his novice status in the heavenly realm. This, however, is not the case with the Merkabah tradition, where “*Na'ar*” also designates special relationships between the Holy One and Metatron. In 3 Enoch when R. Ishmael asks Metatron “What is your name?” Metatron answers, “I have seventy names, corresponding to the seventy tongues of the world... but my King calls me “Youth” (*Na'ar*).”⁵² Interestingly enough, we can see the beginning of this tradition in the test of 2 Enoch. In ch. 24 of the short recension⁵³ we read: “And the Lord called me (Enoch) and he placed me to himself closer than Gabriel. And the Lord spoke to me “Whatever you see, Youth (*yunoshe*) things standing still and moving about were brought to perfection by me. And not even to my angels

⁴⁶ According to Tishby it is the most popular title of Metatron. “Metatron is known by many names and titles, but his regular designation, found even in the earlier literature, is, na’ar-“boy”, or “lad” . I, Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar: Anthology of Texts* (3 vols.; London: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1994) 2.628.

⁴⁷ Odebert, 3 Enoch, 1.119.

⁴⁸ Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, 2.628: “ it is the mystery of the boy who reaches old age and then reverts to his youth as at the beginning.”

⁴⁹ Odebert, 3 Enoch, 1.80.

⁵⁰ Barsov’s manuscript [B], ch. V in M.I. Sokolov, “ Slavyanskaya kniga Enokha pravednogo: Teksty, latinsky perevod I izsledovanie,” *Chteniya v obshchestve istorii i drevnostei Rossiiskikh* 4 (1910) 85.

⁵¹ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 119.

⁵² Odeberg, 3 Enoch, 2.6-7.

⁵³ On Merkabah stratum of the shorter recension cf. A. Orlov, “Merkabah Stratum” of the Short Recension of 2 Enoch (Brown Library, Abilene, 1995).

have I explained my secrets... as I am making them known to you today.”⁵⁴ As we can see in the passage the title “Youth” stresses the unique role of Enoch-Metatron among other archangels-princes, despite his young angelic age. In spite of the abundance of the information about “*Na’ar*” in Merkabah literature the title itself, in many respects remains a mysterious theological puzzle. Perhaps the most mysterious thing connected with this title is the fact that prominent scholars of Jewish mystical literature like Scholem and Odeberg do not find the important title in the narrative of *2 Enoch*. One possible explanation may be that Vaillant did not pay enough attention to the variants of the reading of the term “Youth” in his edition, considering this reading as a “corruption,”⁵⁵ and consequently dedicated just a few sentences to this fact. According to Vaillant this “corruption” occurred because the Slavonic word *Enoshe*, the vocative form of “Enoch,” is very similar to “Youth,” *yunoshe*.⁵⁶ This probably explains why those scholars who based their research on Vaillant’s text also missed this vital point. Only the new collation of manuscripts for Andersen’s translation again drew attention to this variant. Andersen gives a short concluding note on the term “Youth” that “It cannot be a coincidence that this title is identical with that of Enoch (=Metatron) in *3 Enoch*.”⁵⁷

The Governor of the World

The Merkabah tradition stresses the role of Metatron as “governing power over the nations, kingdoms and rulers on earth.”⁵⁸ Chapter 30 of *3 Enoch* pictures Metatron as the Prince of the World שר העולם, the leader of seventy-two princes of the kingdom of world, who speaks (pleads) in favor of the world before the Holy One.⁵⁹ Odeberg notes that “the Prince of the World in *3 Enoch* combines the function of the rulers of the nations: they

⁵⁴ Barsov’s manuscript [B], ch. XI in M.I. Sokolov, “Slavyanskaya kniga Enokha pravednogo: Teksty, latinsky perevod I izsledovaniye,” *COIDR* 4 (1910) 90-91.

⁵⁵ Andersen criticizes Vaillant’s position. He stresses that “the similarity to the vocative *enoše* might explain the variant as purely scribal slip. But it is surprising that it is only in address, never in description, that the term is used. The variant *jenokhu* is rare. There is no phonetic reason why the first vowel should change to ju; *junokhu* is never found.” Andersen, “*2 Enoch*,” 118-19.

⁵⁶ Cf. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d’ Henoch*, 8.

⁵⁷ Andersen, “*2 Enoch*,” p. 119. Sreznevsky’s dictionary equates the Slavonic word *yunoshe* with Greek νεανίσκος. Cf. I. Sreznevsky, *Slovar’ drevnerusskogo Yazyka* (3 vols.; Moscow: Kniga, 1989) 2.1627-28.

⁵⁸ Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 1.81.

⁵⁹ Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.105. In chapter 48 of *3 Enoch* the Holy One says that he “committed unto him (Metatron) 70 angels corresponding to the nations (of the world) and gave into his charge all the household above and below ... and arranged for him all the works of Creation.” Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 2.166.

plead each one the cause of his nation, the Prince of the World pleads the cause of all nations together, of the world in its entirety.”⁶⁰

Both ch. 43 of the short recension of 2 Enoch and a similar passage of the text of 2 Enoch in a Slavonic collection “The Just Balance”⁶¹ reveal Enoch in his new celestial role. The texts outline Enoch’s instructions to his children during his brief return to the earth I which he mentions his new role as the Governor of the earth:

Blessed is he who understands all works of the Lord, (and glorifies Him): and, because of His work, knows the Creator. And behold my children, I am the Governor⁶² of the earth, I wrote (them) down. And the whole year I combined and the hours of the day.⁶³ And the hours I measured: and I wrote down every seed on earth. And I compared every measure and the just balance I measured. And I wrote (them) down, just as the Lord commanded...the doings of each person will put down, and no one will hide, because the Lord is the one who pays, and He will be the avenger on the great judgment day.⁶⁴

The interesting parallel here to 3 Enoch is the fact that the role of Enoch (Metatron) as the Governor (Prince) of the World is closely connected in both texts with the theme of Divine Judgment⁶⁵ and with Metatron’s role in that process as the Witness of the Judgment. As we recall in 3 Enoch these two themes – governing of the world and pleading for the world – stayed together: Metatron is the Prince of the World “who pleads in the favor of the world.” The narrative of 2 Enoch has a similar pattern – the title of

⁶⁰ Odeberg, 3 Enoch, 2.105.

⁶¹ “The Just Balance” (*Merilo Pravednoe*) is the Slavonic collection of ethical writings in which the existence of 2 Enoch first was made public. Cf. M.N. Tihomirov, *Merilo Pravednoe po rukopisi XIV veka* (Moscow: AN SSSR, 1961).

⁶² Majority of manuscripts use Slavonic words *krumstvuemaya* or *kormstvuemaya*. I. Sreznevsky in his dictionary relates these Slavonic terms to the Greek word *χρῆστης* or the Latin *gubernatio*. Cf. I.I. Sreznevsky, *Stovar’ drevnerusskogo yazyka*, I (II), p. 1410. The manuscripts of “*Merilo Pravednoe*” [MPr] use the word *pravlemaya*. Cf. Tihomirov, *Merilo Pravednoe po rukopisi XIV veka*, 71. Andersen translates the term as “manager” – “I am the manager of the arrangements on earth...” Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 217.

⁶³ Cf. Similar functions of Enoch in the book of *Jubilees* where he “appointed times of the years according to their order, with respect to each of their months... And their weeks according to jubilees he recounted; and the days of the years he made known. And the months he set in order, and the sabbaths of the years he recounted,” Wintermute, “*Jubilees*,” 62-63.

⁶⁴ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 217-19.

⁶⁵ The rudimentary traces of this tradition can be found in other documents of early Enochic literature: in 1 Enoch, *Aramaic Levi*, and in the book of *Jubilees*, where Enoch is pictured as the one “who saw what was and what will happen among the children of men in their generations until the day of judgment. He saw and knew everything and wrote his testimony and deposited the testimony upon the earth against all the children of men and their generation...And he wrote everything, and bore witness to the Watchers...And Enoch bore witness against all of them...And behold, he is there writing condemnation and judgement of the world, and all of the evils of the children of men.” Wintermute, “*Jubilees*,” 62.

Governor in this context means “the Mediator of Divine Judgment”⁶⁶ - Enoch pleads before the Lord for the world while reminding the world about the Divine Judgment.

Another interesting point about this material is the fact that the passage which is dedicated to the description of Enoch’s role as “Governor of the World” is incorporated into a part of the book that is directly connected with other descriptions of the titles of Enoch. My previous observations about the celestial titles of the Enoch showed that these descriptions are situated in chs. 21-38 (according to Andersen’s division). These early chapters unfold Enoch’s transformation from a human being into an angel in the highest celestial realms near the Throne of Glory.

In chs. 39-67, Enoch gives some instructions to his children during his brief visit to the earth. The text makes clear that during this visit Enoch is already an angelic being. In ch. 56 of *2 Enoch* he says to his son: “Listen, my child! Since the time when the Lord anointed me with the ointment of my glory, it has been horrible for me, and food is not agreeable to me, and I have no desire for earthly food.”⁶⁷ This portrayal of Enoch as angelic being in this section of the book is very important, because it allows us to see traces of another tradition in the text of *2 Enoch*. It is possible that in this part of the book we have some remnants of developed Metatron tradition. Chapters 39-67 differ slightly from chs. 21-38 in the ways the picture Enoch’s role in the celestial realm.

First, later chapters (43-44) give an important description of Enoch as Governor (Prince) of the world, a role which in late Merkabah literature usually is connected with Metatron tradition.

Second, an important aspect of the passage of chs. 43-44 is the Slavonic term *prometaya*,⁶⁸ which follows Enoch’s title, “the Governor of the World.”⁶⁹ This Slavonic term is found solely in the text of *2 Enoch*. There is no other Slavonic text where the word *prometaya* is documented. Phonetically close to the term “Metatron” *prometaya* could represent a very early, rudimentary form of the name which later was transformed into the term “metatron.”⁷⁰ It is noteworthy that we can not find the term in the early chapters connected with the descriptions of other celestial titles.

Third, at the beginning of this textual block (ch. 40) we have the following words of Enoch: “Now therefore, my children, I know everything;

⁶⁶ See *Jub.* 4.24 “...he (Enoch) was put there for a sign and so that he might relate all of the deeds of the generations until the day of judgment.” Wintermute, “Jubilees,” 63.

⁶⁷ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 183.

⁶⁸ Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d’ Hénoch*, 44.

⁶⁹ “And behold my children, I am the Governor of the earth, [prometaya], I wrote them down ...”

⁷⁰ I investigated the relationships between the words *prometaya* and Metatron in my article “The Origin of the Name ‘Metatron’ and the Text of 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch” *JSP* (forthcoming).

some from the lips of the Lord, other my eyes have seen from the beginning to the end, and from the end to the recommencement.”⁷¹ This statement does not fit with previous descriptions of Enoch’s initiations which were restricted by fixed temporal boundaries (angel Vereveil instructions for 30 days and 30 nights, and so on). Later, in ch. 50, Enoch says that the already “put into writing the achievements of every person, and no one can escape.”⁷² As we recall in his deeds as the Governor of the earth he already “arranged the whole year” (43.1) and he “has distinguished every seed on the earth, and every measure and every righteous scale”(43.1). This unlimited horizon of functions and deeds of Enoch is not consistent with the previous narrative of chs. 21- 38. It is apparent that we have two different traditions which sometimes demonstrate the lack of linkage and reconciliation.

Finally, we must keep in mind the fact which radically differentiates 2 *Enoch*’s story from other stories of early Enochic documents (like 1 *Enoch*, Jubilees or Qumran fragments). The important theological watershed of Enochic and Metatron traditions in the book is the allegorical description of the extraction of Enoch from his “earthly clothing” and the placement of him into the “clothes of Glory.”⁷³ In 2 *Enoch* 22, after the archangel Michael extracted Enoch from his clothes and anointed him with the delightful oil which was “greater than the greatest light,”⁷⁴ Enoch becomes like “one of the glorious ones, and there was no observable difference.”⁷⁵ This symbolic event of angelic⁷⁶ transmutation⁷⁷ apparently represents in

⁷¹ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 165.

⁷² Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 177.

⁷³ A possible parallel to this theme could be 1 *Enoch* 71 where Enoch “was born to righteousness.” The text describes the situation when Enoch went through some sort of “transformation” when his whole body was “melted” and his spirit was transformed. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.166-67. However radical difference of this transformation from the similar event in 2 *Enoch* is the fact that transformed Enoch in 1 *Enoch* does not belong to the archangelic rank of “glorious ones” to which Metatron belongs. The text is silent about any text of angelic transmutation.

⁷⁴ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 139.

⁷⁵ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 139.

⁷⁶ J.H. Charlesworth rightly observes on this episode that “it is conceivable that here Enoch – although he is not explicitly called “an angel” – has attained the rank of an angel or been transformed into angel. The possibility looms large since in 2 Enoch 21.3 Gabriel is identified as one of the Lord’s glorious ones.” James H. Charlesworth, “The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel,” in: J.J. Collins and G.W.E. Nickelsburg (eds.), *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980) 135-51 (147). Cf. Also Scopello, “The Apocalypse of Zostrianos,” 377.

⁷⁷ In Merkabah tradition we can find many parallels to this story. 3 *Enoch* has the similar description of the clothing Metatron in a garment of Glory. “He made me a garment of glory on which were fixed all kinds of lights and He clad me in it.” Odeberg, 3 *Enoch*, 2.32.

many ways an important turning point in which the Enochic tradition has moved into a new era of its development – the Metatron tradition.⁷⁸

Conclusion

As I have already mentioned, the most impressive alignments between 2 *Enoch* and Merkabah tradition are dependent upon developing the themes connected with the Celestial Titles of Enoch (Metatron). They give new evidence that the Metatron tradition has deep connections with early Enochic literature.⁷⁹

As we know, the process of the hidden theological transformation, when one name (“Enoch”) suddenly becomes transformed into another name (“Metatron”), does not demonstrate the continuity of the textual tradition. On the contrary, a gap exists between the early Enochic literature (*I Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Qumran Enoch*, *2 Enoch*) and the Metatron literature (*Shi’ur Qomah*, *3 Enoch*). Because of the two distinct names, it appears that the two traditions are not linked. Something seems to be missing between these two great theological streams. An important scholarly task involves finding “bridge” which may fill this theological gap between the prerabbinic Enoch and the rabbinic Metatron. One of the links may be found in the indissoluble continuity of the titles of this main character, which are common to both traditions. The titles, like the developed images of the Heavenly roles of Enoch (Metatron), help us to see the transparent theological development which lies beneath the hidden meanings of these enigmatic names.

⁷⁸ P. Alexander notes that the transformation of Enoch in *2 Enoch* 22 provides the closest approximation, outside Merkabah literature, to Enoch transformation into Metatron in *3 Enoch* 3-15. Alexander, “*3 Enoch*,” 248.

⁷⁹ For a discussion of the date of *2 Enoch* in the first century CE before the destruction of the Second Temple, cf. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism*, 17; and Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 50.

The Origin of the Name “Metatron” and the Text of 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch¹

The history of scholarship on *2 Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch* (hereafter *2 En.*) has produced no real consensus concerning the possible provenience of this apocalypse.² Rather, there are numerous scholarly positions.³ These

¹ This study has benefited considerably from the comments and kindnesses of the following scholars who read the MS and preliminary materials at various stages: Professors Christfried Böttrich, James Charlesworth, John Collins, April De Connick, Ian Fair, Everett Ferguson, Daniel Matt, André Resner, E.P. Sanders, Alan Segal, Carolyn Thompson, James Thompson, James VanderKam, Ben Zion Wacholder.

² F.I. Andersen in his English translation of *2 Enoch* notes that ‘there must be something very peculiar about a work when one scholar concludes that it was written by a hellenized Jew in Alexandria in the first century BCE while another argues that it was written by Christian monk in Byzantium in the ninth century CE’. See F.I. Andersen, ‘2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch’, in *OTP*, I, p. 95.

³ See Andersen, ‘2 Enoch’; F. Borsch, *The Son of Man in Myth and History* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967); C. Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995); C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1992); C. Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (London: Oxford University Press, 1914); R.H. Charles, ‘The Date and Place of Writings of the Slavonic Enoch’, *JTS* 22 (1921), p. 163; J.H. Charlesworth, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research* (Missoula, MT: Scholar’s Press, 1976); J. Collins, ‘The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism’, in D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck, 1983); L. Cry, ‘Quelques noms d’êtres mystérieux en II Henoch’, *RB* 49 (1940), pp. 195-203; J. Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1964); J. Fossum, ‘Colossians 1.15-18a in the Light of Jewish Mysticism and Gnosticism’, *NTS* 35 (1989), pp. 183-201; K. Lake, ‘The Date of the Slavonic Enoch’, *HTR* 16 (1923), pp. 397-98; M. McNamara, *Intertestamental Literature* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1983); N.A. Meschchersky, ‘Sledy pamyatnikov Kumrana v staroslavjanskoj i drevnerusskoj literature (Kizuchenu slavyanskijh versij knigi Enoha), Trudy otdela drevnerusskoj literatury 19 (1963), pp. 130-47; N.A. Meschchersky, ‘K istoriitcksta slavyanskoj knigi Enoha (Sledy pamyatnikov Kumrana v vizantijskoj i staroslavjanskoj literature)’, *Vizantijskij vremennik* 24 (1964), pp. 91-108; N.A. Meschchersky, ‘K voprosu ob istochnikah slavyanskoj knigi Enoha’, *Kratkie soobshcheniya Instituta narodov Azii* 86 (1965), pp. 72-8 (in Russian); J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); G.W.E. Nickelsburg, ‘The Books of Enoch in Recent Research’, *RSR* 7 (1981), pp. 210-17; H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: Ktav, 1973); M. Philonenko, ‘La cosmogonie du “Livre des secrets D’Hénoch,” ’ in *Religions en Egypte: Hellénistique et Romaine* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969); S. Pines, ‘Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch’, in R.J. Zwi Werblowsky (ed.), *Types of Redemption*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1970); H.H. Rowley (ed.), *A Companion to the Bible* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963) A. Rubinstein, ‘Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch’, *JJS* 15 (1962), pp. 1-21; G. Scholem, *Major Trends in*

conclusions are most likely the consequences of the different backgrounds and perspectives which scholars have brought to their study of *2 Enoch*.

One of the important insights of research on *2 Enoch* is the view that the text has deep connections with so-called Merkabah mysticism.⁴ Among the leading pioneers of this approach stand Gershom Scholem and Hugo

Jewish Mysticism (New York: Schocken Books, 1954); G. Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987); M.E. Stone, *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), II, pp. 406-408; A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: L'Institut d'Etudes Slaves, 1952; repr. Paris, 1976); H. Wicks, *The Doctrine of God in the Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature* (New York: Ktav, 1971)

⁴ The term 'Merkabah' is closely connected with the term which designates the mystical interpretation ('Ma'ase Merkabah'—'The Account of the Chariot' or 'The Works of the Divine Chariot') of the first chapter of Ezekiel. Earliest traces of the Merkabah tradition are situated in apocalyptic and Qumran literature. However, as Gruenwald notes, the main corpus of the Merkabah literature was composed in Israel in the period 200-700 CE. Some references to this tradition can be found also in the literature of German Hasidim (twelfth to thirteenth centuries CE) and medieval Cabalistic writings (*the Zohar*).

The term 'Hekhaloth' ('Divine Palaces') designates the corpus of literature that first gives a full-scale presentation of Merkabah mysticism (the beginning of the tradition is connected with the circle of Rabbi Yohanan ben Zakkai and his pupils). According to Gruenwald the main subjects dealt with in the Hekhaloth literature are heavenly ascensions and the revelation of cosmological secrets. I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980). The term 'Merkabah' (the Chariot) can be used also in its technical Kabbalistic meaning as the link between the physical and the divine worlds or as one of the upper worlds. On the Merkabah and the Hekhaloth traditions, see the following sources: D. Blumenthal, *Understanding Jewish Mysticism, a Source Reader: The Merkabah Tradition and the Zoharic Tradition* (New York: Ktav, 1978); I. Chernus, *Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1982); M. Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1983); I. Gruenwald and M. Smith, *The Hekhaloth Literature in English* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983); D. Halperin, *The Faces of Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988); D. Halperin, *The Merkavah in Rabbinic Literature* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1980); M. Idel, 'Enoch is Metatron', *Immanuel* 24-25 (1990), pp. 220-40; L. Jacobs, *Jewish Mystical Testimonies* (New York: Schocken Books, 1977); N. Janowitz, *The Poetics of Ascent: Theories of Language in a Rabbinic Ascent Text* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989); M. Morgan, *Sepher ha-Razim: The Book of Mysteries* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983); P. Schäfer (ed.), *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981); P. Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992); G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965); G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1954); M. Swartz, *Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism; An Analysis of Ma'aseh Merkavah* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992).

Odeberg.⁵ Odeberg may well be the first scholar who pointed out that the descriptions of celestial titles for Enoch in *2 Enoch* are the most important evidences of possible connections between it and texts of the Merkabah tradition.

In these descriptions of celestial titles, one may find the origins of another image of Enoch, quite distinct from early Enoch literature, which was later developed in Merkabah mysticism—the image of the angel Metatron, ‘The Prince of the Presence’. The Slavonic text provides rudimentary descriptions of several traditional Merkabah titles of Metatron-Enoch, (e.g., ‘the Lad’, ‘the Scribe’, ‘the Prince of the World’, ‘the Prince of Presence’).⁶ Keeping these manifestations of Merkabah symbolism in mind, this article will focus upon only one of these titles of Enoch, namely, ‘The Prince, or the Governor, of the World’. The article will also explore some Slavonic terminology related to this title which may yield insight into the origin of the name ‘Metatron’.

The Merkabah tradition stresses the role of Metatron as the ‘governing power over the nations, kingdoms and rulers on earth’.⁷ *Sefer Heikhaloth* pictures Metatron as the Prince of the World, the leader of 72 princes of the kingdom of the world, who speaks (pleads) in favor of the world before the Holy One. Chapter 43⁸ of the short recension of *2 Enoch* and a similar passage of the text of *2 Enoch* in the Slavonic collection ‘The Just Balance’⁹ reveal Enoch in his new celestial role. Both texts outline Enoch’s instructions to his children, during his brief return to the earth, in which he mentions his new role as the Governor or the Guide of the earth:

Blessed is he who understands all works of the Lord (and glorifies Him): and, because of His work, knows the Creator. And behold my children, I am the Governor¹⁰ of the earth, *prometaya*, I wrote (them) down. And the whole year I combined and the hours of the day. And the hours I measured: and I wrote down

⁵ H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: Ktav, 1973); G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1954); *idem*, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987).

⁶ See A. Orlov, “‘Merkabah Stratum’ of the Short Recension of 2 Enoch” (Brown Library, Abilene Christian University, Abilene, 1995).

⁷ Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, p. 81.

⁸ Here and later I have used Andersen’s English translation and follow his division in chapters (Andersen, ‘2 Enoch’, pp. 102-221).

⁹ ‘The Just Balance’ (*Merilo Pravednoe*) is the Slavonic collection of ethical writings in which the existence of *2 Enoch* was made public. See M.N. Tichomirov, *Merilo Pravednoe po rukopisi XIV veka* (Moscow: AN SSSR, 1961).

¹⁰ Andersen translates the titles as ‘manager’—‘I am the manager of the arrangements on earth’ (Anderson, ‘2 Enoch’, p. 217). Sreznevsky in his dictionary relates *kurmichistive* to the Greek word κυβερνήσις or the Latin—*gubernatio*. (I. Sreznevsky, *Slovar’ drevnerusskogo yazyka* (Moscow: Kniga, 1989), I[II], p. 1410). Cf. Christfried Böttrich, *Das Slavische Henochbuch* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995), p.958.

every seed on earth. And I compared every measure and the just balance I measured.¹¹

An important aspect of both passages is the Slavonic term *prometaya*, which follows Enoch's title, 'The Governor of the World'.¹² This term was deliberately left in its original Slavonic form in order to preserve its authentic phonetic image. *Prometaya* represents an etymological enigma for experts in Slavonic, since it is found solely in the text of *2 Enoch*. It should be stressed again that there is no other Slavonic text where the word *prometaya* is documented.

Prominent Russian linguist I. Sreznevsky, in his Slavonic dictionary, which is still considered by experts as a most reliable tool of Slavonic etymology, was unable to provide a definition for *prometaya*.¹³ He simply added a question mark with the meaning for the word.¹⁴ The variety of readings for this term in the manuscripts of *2 Enoch*¹⁵ shows similar 'linguistic embarrassment' among Slavic scribes who most likely had some difficulties discerning the meaning of this ambiguous term. The readings of other manuscripts include *promitaya*, *prometaemaa*, *pometaya*, *pametaa*.

One possible explanation for the singular occurrence of *prometaya* is that the word may actually be a Greek term that was left untranslated in the original text for some unknown reason. In fact, *2 Enoch* contains a number of transliterated Hebrew and Greek words preserved in their original phonetic form (e.g., *Grigori*, *Ophanim*, *Raqia Araboth*). When I started to investigate the term *prometaya* more closely, what drew my attention was the root *meta*, which necessitated further examination of the relationship between the words *prometaya* and *metatron*.

Contemporary scholarship does not furnish a consensus concerning the origin of the name 'Metatron'. In scholarly literature, there are several independent hypotheses about the provenance of the term. I want to draw our attention to one possible interpretation, which could be connected with some materials in *2 Enoch*. According to this interpretation, the name 'Metatron' may be derived from the Greek word μέτρον (measure, rule). Adolf Jellinek may well be the first scholar who suggested μέτρον as an

¹¹ Andersen, '2 Enoch', pp. 217-219.

¹² Andersen translates the title as 'The manager of the arrangements on earth'. Andersen, '2 Enoch', p. 217.

¹³ On the other hand, Vaillant in his edition states that *prometaya* could be identified as a rare verb corresponding to the Greek βασιανίζων. The linguistic source of this suggestion remains unknown. Andersen criticizes this translation, pointing out that the meaning is not quite suitable and does not correspond to earlier materials. See Andersen, '2 Enoch', p. 217.

¹⁴ *promitati*, *promitaya*—? I. Sreznevsky, *Slovar' drevnerusskogo yazyka* (Moscow: Kniga, 1989), II(II), p. 1544.

¹⁵ Andersen stresses that the variations show 'theological embarrassment' among the Slavic scribes ('2 Enoch', p.217).

alternative explanation of Metatron, on the assumption that Metatron was identical with Horos.¹⁶ Gedaliahu Stroumsa in his article, 'Forms of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ', gives some convincing new reasons for the acceptance of this etymology, on the basis that Metatron not only carried God's name, but also measured Him; he was His *shiur qomah* (the measurement of the Divine Body).¹⁷ In light of this observation, Stroumsa stresses that 'renewed attention should be given to μέτρον and/or *metator* as a possible etymology of Metatron'.¹⁸

Matthew Black, in his short article dedicated to the origin of the name Metatron, expounds upon an additional etymological facet of this interpretation of the name. He traces the origin of the name to a previously unnoticed piece of evidence which can be found in Philo's¹⁹ *Quaest. in Gen.*, where, among other titles of the Logos, Black finds the term *praemetitor*.²⁰ He further suggests that *praemetitor* could be traced to the Greek term μετρητής,²¹ the Greek equivalent of the Latin *metator*, 'measurer', applied to the Logos.²²

The term *praemetitor* in its hypothetical meaning as a 'measurer' is an important piece of evidence because it is almost phonetically identical with the Slavonic term *prometaya*.

Additionally, the term *prometaya* is incorporated into the passage which describes Enoch as the Measurer of the Lord. In ch. 43 of *2 Enoch*, immediately after the use of this term, Enoch makes the following statement:

I have arranged the whole year. And from the year I calculated the months, and from the months I calculated the days, and from the day I calculated the hours. I have measured²³ and noted the hours. And I have distinguished every seed on the earth, and every measure²⁴ and every righteous scale. I have measured²⁵ and recorded them.²⁶

¹⁶ Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, p. 134.

¹⁷ G.G. Stroumsa, 'Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ', *HTR* 76 (1983), p.287.

¹⁸ Stroumsa, 'Form(s) of God', p.287.

¹⁹ The idea that the Metatron figure originally came into Judaism from Philo's Logos speculations was popular thought in German scholarship of the last century. Cf. M. Friedländer, *Der vorchristliche Jüdische Gnostizismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1898); M. Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Sprach-und Sagenkunde* (Berlin: S. Calvary, 1901); M. Sachs, *Beiträge zur Sprach-und Alterthums-forschung* (Berlin, 1852); N. Weinstein, *Zur Genesis der Agada* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901).

²⁰ M. Black, 'The Origin of the Name Metatron', *VT* 1 (1951), p. 218.

²¹ Black, 'The Origin of the Name Metatron', p. 218.

²² Black, 'The Origin of the Name Metatron', p. 218.

²³ *Izmerikh*. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch*, p. 46.

²⁴ *Meru*. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch*, p. 46.

²⁵ *Izmerikh*. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch*, p. 46.

²⁶ Andersen, '2 Enoch', p. 171.

A similar passage in the previously mentioned collection, ‘The Just Balance’ also emphasizes the functions of Enoch as the measurer:

And the whole year I combined, and the hours of the day. And the hours I measured: and I wrote down every seed on earth. And I compared every measure and the just balance I measured. And I wrote (them) down, just as the Lord commanded. And in everything I discovered differences.²⁷

These two passages echo the passage from Philo’s *Quaest. in Gen.* which discusses the Divine Logos as the ‘just measure’:

And ‘Gomorrah’, ‘measure’ true and just²⁸ is the Divine Logos, by which have been measured and are measured all things that are on earth—principles, numbers and proportions in harmony and consonance being included, through which the form and measures of existing things are seen.²⁹

The text of 2 *Enoch* uses the identical term ‘just measure’ (*mera pravedna*), immediately after the passage dedicated to the function of Enoch as a measurer.

In addition to Stroumsa’s suggestion about possible connections between ‘the measurer’ and ‘the measurement of divine body’, it is noteworthy that there is another hypothetical link between the functions of Enoch-Metatron as ‘the measurer’ and his ‘measurement’ of human sin for final judgement in the text of 2 *Enoch*. Following Enoch’s introduction as ‘the measure’, the text mentioned the ‘measurement’ of each person for final judgment:

...in the great judgement day every measure and weight in the market will be exposed, and each one will recognize his own measure, and in it he will receive his reward...Before humankind existed, a place of judgment, ahead of time, was prepared for them, and scales and weights by means of which a person will be tested.³⁰

A second possible interpretation of the term *prometaya* can be traced to Enoch’s title, ‘Governor of the World’, after which the Slavonic term *prometaya* occurs. It can be assumed that *prometaya* in this situation is a Greek word, which somehow is connected with this title. Possible hypothetical Greek prototypes of *prometaya* could be προμήθεια (προμηθεύς, προμηθέομαι), in the sense of protection, care, or providence, which could be directly related to the preceding title of Enoch, Governor, Guide of the earth—‘I am the Governor of the earth, *prometaya*, I have written them down’.

In conclusion, it is important to note that *prometaya* could represent a very early, rudimentary form of the title that later was transformed into the term ‘metatron’. In relation to this, Gershom Scholem, in his analysis of the

²⁷ Andersen, ‘2 Enoch’, p. 217.

²⁸ See Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d’Hénoch*, p. 46.

²⁹ Philo, *Quaest. in Gen.*

³⁰ Andersen, ‘2 Enoch’, p. 219.

term 'metatron', shows that the reduplication of the letter *tet* (טט) and the ending *ron* represent a typical pattern that runs through all Merkabah texts. In his opinion, 'both the ending and the repetition of the consonant are observable, for instance, in names like Zoharariel and Adiriron'.³¹ Further, he stresses that it must also be borne in mind that *on* and *ron* may have been fixed and typical constituents of secret names rather than meaningful syllables.³²

Thus, keeping in mind the possible date of 2 *Enoch* in the first century of the common era³³ before the destruction of the Second Temple, *prometaya* could be one of the earliest traces connecting the names Enoch and Metatron.

³¹ Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, p.69

³² Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, pp. 69-70.

³³ On the hypothetical date of 2 *Enoch* see: Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1965), p.17; Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, p.50.

Secrets of Creation in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch

Enoch was found blameless, and he walked with the Lord and he was taken away a sign of לְעוֹלָם for generations
(Cairo Geniza Ms. B Sirach 44:16)

... the learned savant who guards the secrets of the great gods.
(Tablet from Nineveh, 19)

I. The Secrets

The notion of "secrets" occupies a distinct place in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*. The importance of this terminology is highlighted by its prominent position in the title of the book. While various manuscripts of *2 Enoch* are known under different titles, most of them¹ include the word "secrets."² In some of these titles the term is connected with Enoch's books - "The Secret Books of Enoch."³ In other titles "secrets" are linked either to God ("The Book[s] [called] the Secrets of God, a revelation to Enoch")⁴ or to Enoch himself ("The Book of the Secrets of Enoch").⁵ This consistency in the use of the term "secrets," in spite of its varied attribution to different subjects, may

¹ Several MSS do not include the word "secrets" in their titles. Among them - *J* ("The word of Enoch..."), *B* ("The life of righteous Enoch..."), *MPr* ("From the book of righteous Enoch"), *P*² ("The book of Enoch the son of Ared"). Cf. M.I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *COIDR* 4 (1910) 2.47; 2.83; 2.106 and 1.145.

² **ТАИНЫ**. Cf. A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Enoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut D'Etudes Slaves, 1952) 2.

³ Cf. MSS *A*: "From the secret book(s) about the taking away of Enoch the just," *Tr*: "Which are called the secret books of Enoch," *U*: "From the secret books about the taking away of Enoch the just," and *Rum*: "From the secret books of Enoch." Cf. F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.103; Sokolov, 1.161; 1.111; and 1.153.

⁴ MSS *V*, *N* "And these are the books (called) the secrets of God, a revelation to Enoch." Sokolov, 1.83. Cf. also *B*² "This is the book of the secrets of God, a revelation to Enoch." Sokolov, 1.133.

⁵ Cf. *P* "The book (about) the secrets of Enoch, the son of Ared," and *R* "The books of the holy secrets of Enoch..." Cf. A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Enoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut D'Etudes Slaves, 1952) 1 and Sokolov, 1.1.

indicate that the authors and/or the transmitters of the text viewed the motif of "secrets" as a central theme of the apocalypse. The purpose of this article is to call attention to some details of this theme in *2 Enoch*.

The Story

Despite the prominent role the word "secrets" seems to play in the titles of the book, it occurs, quite unexpectedly, only three times in the main body of *2 Enoch*, twice in chapter 24 and once in chapter 36. It is not, however, coincidental that the term is found in this section of the book. Chapters 24-36 of *2 Enoch* can be viewed as the climax of angelic and divine revelations to Enoch during his celestial tour. From these chapters we learn that Enoch, previously described to have been "placed" into the clothes of glory and instructed by the archangel Vereveil, was called by the Lord. The book tells that the Lord decided to reveal to Enoch the secrets of His creation, which he never explained even to his angels. Further the term "secrets" is applied only to this account of God's creation, conveyed to Enoch by the Lord himself, "face to face."⁶ The content of these revelations includes the following details:

1. Prior to the Creation the Lord decided to establish the foundation of all created things;
2. He commanded one of the invisible "things" to come out of the very lowest darkness and become visible;
3. By Lord's command a primordial "great aeon," bearing the name Adoil, descended and, disintegrating himself, revealed all creation which the Lord "had thought up to create;"⁷
4. The Lord created a throne for himself. He then ordered to the light to become the foundation for the highest things;
5. The Lord called out the second aeon, bearing the name Arukhas, who became the foundation of the lowest things;
6. From the waters the Lord "hardened big stones," establishing the solid structure above the waters;
7. The Lord fashioned the heavens and the sun;
8. From fire the Lord created the armies of "the bodiless ones;"
9. The Lord created vegetation, fish, reptiles birds and animals;
10. The Lord created man.

While the general structure of the account of creation appears to be similar in the shorter and the longer recension, the latter offers a lengthy account dedicated to Adam's creation and his transgression.

⁶ Andersen, 140.

⁷ Andersen, 144.

Let it be also noted that the notion of "secrets" sets symbolic boundaries for the story of creation; it begins and closes the account of creation. In chapter 24 the Lord tells Enoch that he wants to instruct him in His secrets. In some manuscripts of the longer recension, chapter 24 even has a specific heading, "About the great secrets of God, which God revealed and related to Enoch; and he spoke with him face to face."⁸ In chapter 36, which serves as a conclusion of the Lord's instruction, the Lord promises Enoch the role of the expert in His secrets--"Because a place has been prepared for you, and you will be in front of my face from now and forever. And you will be seeing my secrets⁹...."¹⁰

Expert in Secrets

The tradition about Enoch as an expert in God's secrets does not begin in 2 *Enoch*. Already in the earliest Enochic booklets of 1 (*Ethiopic*) *Enoch*, the knowledge and the revelation of secrets become major functions of the elevated Enoch.¹¹ Later Enochic traditions also emphasize the role of Enoch as the "Knower of Secrets" (יִדְעֵי סֵדֵרִים). According to 3 *Enoch*, Enoch-Metatron is able to behold "deep secrets and wonderful mysteries."¹² In this Merkabah text Metatron is also responsible for transmitting the highest secrets to the Princes under him, as well as to humankind. H. Kvanvig observes that "in Jewish tradition Enoch is primarily portrayed as a primeval sage, the ultimate revealer of divine secrets."¹³

⁸ Andersen, 140.

⁹ ТАИНЫ МОЯ. Vaillant, 36.

¹⁰ Andersen, 161

¹¹ The origin of the role in Enochic traditions can be traced to 1 *Enoch* 72:1; 74:2; and 80:1. In 1 *Enoch* 41:1 Enoch is attested as the one who "saw all secrets of heaven..." M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) 2.128.

¹² 3 *Enoch* 11:2. Here and later I have used Philip Alexander's English translation of 3 *Enoch*, and follow his division in chapters. Cf. P. Alexander "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.264.

¹³ H.S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988) 27.

Two recent important studies¹⁴ in Enochic traditions trace the origin of the image of Enoch as a primeval sage preoccupied with divine secrets to some heroes of the Mesopotamian lore. According to these studies, one of these possible prototypes can be an intriguing character of the "Sumerian" Kings list--Enmeduranki, king of Sippar. In three copies of the List he occupies the seventh place, which in Genesis' genealogy belongs to Enoch. In other Mesopotamian sources Enmeduranki appears in many roles and situations remarkably similar to Enoch's story. One of these roles is that of the knower and the guardian of the secrets of gods.¹⁵

The tablet from Nineveh, possibly dated before 1100 B.C.E., is a primary witness to the parallels between the stories of Enoch and Enmeduranki.¹⁶ The text, reconstructed by W.G. Lambert,¹⁷ describes Enmeduranki's initiation into the divine secrets and attests him as "the learned savant, who guards the secrets of the great gods." In this text¹⁸ Enmeduranki also

¹⁴ J. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 16; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984); H.S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988). On Mesopotamian origins of Enoch's figure cf. also: H. Zimmern, "Urkönige und Uroffenbarung" in E. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (2 vols.; Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1902-3) 2.530-43; H. L. Jansen, *Die Henochgestalt: Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1; Oslo: Dybwad, 1939); P. Grelot, "La Légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: son origine et signification" *RSR* 46 (1958) 5-26, 181-210.

¹⁵ P. Grelot, "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification", *RSR* 46 (1958) 182 and 186. Enmeduranki was also regarded as the founder of the *ba2ru3* guild, the elite group of diviners, the experts in omens. Cf. J. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 16; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984) 42.

¹⁶ Kvanvig, 190.

¹⁷ W.G. Lambert, "Enmeduranki and Related Matters," *JCS* 21 (1967) 126-38.

¹⁸ The text reads as follows:

3. Shamash in Ebabbara [appointed]
1. Enmeduranki [king of Sippar],
2. the beloved of Anu, Enlil [and Ea].
4. Shamash and Adad [brought him in] to their assembly,
5. Shamash and Adad [honored him],
6. Shamash and Adad [set him] on a large throne of gold,
7. They showed him how to observe oil on water, a mystery of Anu, [Enlil and Ea],
8. They gave him the tablet of the gods, the liver, a secret of heaven and [underworld],
9. They put in his hand the cedar[-rod], beloved of the great gods.
10. Then he, in accordance with their [word(?)] brought
11. the men of Nippur, Sippar and Babylon into his presence,
12. and he honoured them. He set them on thrones before [him],
13. he showed them how to observe oil on water, a mystery of Anu, Enlil and Ea,
14. He gave them the tablet of the gods, the liver, a secret of heaven and underworld,
15. He put in their hand the cedar[-rod], beloved of the great gods.

functions as a mediator between the deities and the people of Nippur, Sippar and Babylon. He instructs them in the secrets, which he received from the deities.

Kvanvig observes that the tablet emphasizes the esoteric character of the divine wisdom revealed to Enmeduranki, reinforced by such terms as *nisirtu* (mystery) and *piristu* (secret).¹⁹

Another important detail in the passage is the juxtaposition of the terms "secrets" and "mysteries" with the phrases "heaven and underworld" and "heaven and earth." Kvanvig points out that both phrases have a "cosmological" meaning.²⁰ Intended to describe the totality of creation--"the whole world," this terminology can also be related to cosmogonic and creational concepts.

Secrets in Enochic traditions

Just as the role of Enoch as the Knower of secrets does not begin in 2 *Enoch*, so the information about the heavenly secrets is also not peculiar only to this apocalypse. We encounter this theme in other Biblical and the Pseudepigraphical texts,²¹ including the early Enochic booklets of 1 *Ethiopic Enoch*.

16. {The tablet of the gods, the liver, a mystery of heaven and underworld;

17. how to observe oil on water, a secret of Anu, Enlil and Ea;

18. "that with commentary," When Anu, Enlil; and how to make mathematical calculations.}

19. The learned savant, who guards the secrets of the great gods,

20. will bind his son whom he loves with an oath

21. before Shamash and Adad by tablet and stylus and

22. will instruct him. When a diviner,

23. an expert in oil, of abiding descent, offspring of Enmeduranki, king of Sippar,

24. who set up the pure bowl and held the cedar[-rod],

25. a benediction priest of the king, a long-haired priest of Shamash

26. as fashioned by Ninhursagga,

27. begotten by a *nisakku*-priest of pure descent:

28. if he is without blemish in body and limbs

29. he may approach the presence of Shamash and Adad where liver inspection and oracle (take place)." W.G. Lambert, "Enmeduranki and Related Matters," 132.

¹⁹ Kvanvig, 188.

²⁰ Kvanvig, 188.

²¹ On the notion of "secrets" in the Old Testament and the Pseudepigrapha cf. Markus N.A. Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (WUNT, 2. Reihe, 136; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1990). Qumran texts also use extensively the notions of "secret" (סֵּתֵר) and "special knowledge" (דְּעֵתָה) and apply them to varied things, including the Torah and the halachic precepts. Cf. Markus N.A. Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*, 53-6; W.D. Davies, "'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 1.1:25-30" in Davies,

I Enoch applies the term "secrets" to various things Enoch acquires during his celestial tour. In 41:1-3 Enoch tells about his experience:

...I saw all the secrets of heaven, and how the kingdom is divided, and how the deeds of men are weighed in the balance. There I saw the dwelling of the chosen and the resting-places of the holy; and my eyes saw there all the sinners who deny the name of the Lord of Spirits being driven from there, and they dragged them off, and they were not able to remain because of the punishment which went out from the Lord of Spirits. And there my eyes saw the secrets of the flashes of lightning and the thunder, and the secrets of the winds, how they are distributed in order to blow over the earth, and the secrets of the clouds and of the dew....²²

The passage shows that in *I Enoch* the secrets include not only astronomical, cosmological, and calendar information, but also eschatological details which Enoch acquired either himself or through angelic mediators.²³ The unity between the cosmological and the eschatological, between the secrets of "heaven" and the secrets of "earth," is prominent in *I Enoch* 52:2, where Enoch attests that he "saw the secrets of heaven, everything that will occur on earth: a mountain of iron, and a mountain of copper, and a mountain of silver, and a mountain of gold, and a mountain of soft metal, and a mountain of lead... all these things which serve the authority of the Messiah."²⁴ M. Bockmuehl notes that cosmological and eschatological secrets occur repeatedly in tandem and show the intimate link between the cosmological mysteries of heaven and the eschatological questions pursued by the visionaries.²⁵

The tendency to include the knowledge about future eschatological events in the notion of "secrets" can be found both in the Pseudepigrapha and in the Bible. M. Bockmuehl observes that the term סֵפֶת in Daniel always relates in some way to a disclosure of the future.²⁶ The labeling of disclosures of the future as "secrets" becomes a prominent motif in the later "Enochic" text, *Sefer Hekhaloth*. In *3 Enoch* 11:2-3 Enoch-Metatron tells R. Ishmael that from the time of his elevation he has acquired an ability to see

Christian Origins and Judaism (London, 1962) 119-144; B. Reicke, "Da^cat and Gnosis in Intertestamental Literature," *Neotestamentica et Semitica. Studies in Honor of Matthew Black* (eds. E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox; Edinburg: Clark, 1969) 245-55; H. Ringgren, "Qumran and Gnosticism," *Le Origini dello Gnosticismo* (ed. U. Bianchi; Leiden: Brill, 1967) 379-88.

²² Knibb, 2.128-9.

²³ For the complete discussion about "revealed things" in apocalyptic literature see M. Stone's pioneering research in M. Stone "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature," *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God* (eds. F.M. Cross, W.E. Lemke, and P.D. Miller, Jr.; New York: Doubleday, 1967) 414-52.

²⁴ Knibb, 2.136.

²⁵ Markus N.A. Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (WUNT, 2. Reihe, 136; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1990) 35.

²⁶ Markus N.A. Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (WUNT, 2. Reihe, 136; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1990) 36.

deep secrets and wonderful mysteries.²⁷ According to the text, before a man thinks in secret, Metatron is able to see his thought; before a man acts, he can see his act. Metatron concludes that "there is nothing in heaven above or deep within the earth concealed from me."²⁸ It is clear that the passage understands "secrets" to be foresights of human deeds and thoughts.

3 Enoch also demonstrates some other affinities with *1 Enoch* in its usage of the notion "secrets." First, it applies the word "secrets" to various revealed "things"--"all mysteries of wisdom, all the depths of the perfect Torah, and the thoughts of human hearts."²⁹ Second, in similarity with *1 Enoch*, it includes eschatological and historical details into the category of the "secrets". Third, the angels in *3 Enoch* are aware of God's secrets: "YHWH the God of Israel is my witness that when I revealed this secret to Moses, all the armies of the height, in every heaven, were angry with me..."³⁰ Fourth, Gruenwald's research emphasizes the close proximity between apocalyptic and Merkabah mysticism in the concept of "secret oath/name" which plays a significant role in the cosmology of *1 Enoch* and *3 Enoch*.³¹

In contrast to these apocalyptic and Merkabah Enochic texts, *2 Enoch* offers a different understanding of "secrets." At least four points of difference need to be noted. First, *2 Enoch* does not apply the notion of "secrets" to many types of revelation. This term, occurs very rarely in the book and is reserved only for the particular cosmogonic³² revelation of the Lord. Second, the term is never applied to an earthly affair, not even in reference to historical and eschatological information. Third, the "secret name" does not play any significant role in *2 Enoch's* cosmogony. Fourth, the angels in *2 Enoch* do not know about God's cosmogonic "secrets."

Moreover, it seems that in *2 Enoch* the realm of the secrets, even "topologically," transcends the angelic world. The shorter recension tells that before the cosmogonic revelation took place, the Lord had "placed" Enoch to the left of Himself, closer than Gabriel.³³ Further, the Lord

²⁷ להסתכל ברזי עמוקה ובסוד מופלאה. Cf. P. Schäfer with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhaloth-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981) 9.

²⁸ Alexander, 1.264.

²⁹ *3 Enoch* 11:1. Cf. Alexander, 1.264.

³⁰ Alexander, 1.315.

³¹ I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1980) 10-11.

³² On cosmogony in *2 Enoch* cf.: S. Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," in *Types of Redemption* (ed. R.J. Zwi Werblowsky; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1970) 72-87; M. Philonenko, "La cosmogonie du 'Livre des secrets d'Hénoch,'" *Religions en Egypte: Hellénistique et Romaine* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969) 109-16; G. Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (New York: Schocken, 1991) 98-101; *idem*, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987).

³³ Andersen, 143.

confirms the transcendence of the knowledge about creation over the angelic world when He informs Enoch that even to his angels He has explained neither his secrets nor his "endless and inconceivable creation which He conceived."³⁴

The "secrecy" of the Lord's revelation is underscored further by several additional factors.

First, immediately following the cosmogonic instructions, the Lord informed Enoch that he appointed an intercessor, the archangel Michael, and guardian angels, Arioch and Marioch,³⁵ for Enoch's writings which should not perish in the impending flood:

For I will give you an intercessor, Enoch, my archistratig, Michael, on account of your handwritings and the handwritings of your fathers - Adam and Seth. They will not be destroyed until the final age. For I have commanded my angels Arioch and Marioch, whom I have appointed on the earth to guard them and to command the things of time to preserve the handwritings of your fathers so that they might not perish in the impending flood which I will create in your generation (33:10-12).³⁶

The motif of the guardian angels of the books is peculiar to the esoteric tradition conveyed to Enoch. It might indicate that we deal here with the famous "secret" books by which antediluvian wisdom reached postdeluvian generations. This motif of antediluvian "secret" writings has a number of parallels in Mesopotamian lore.³⁷

Second, the esoteric details of the Lord's cosmogonic revelations do not appear in chapters 39-66, dedicated to Enoch's instructions to his children. In these chapters Enoch shares the information about his heavenly tour and his extraordinary experiences near the Throne of Glory. He conveys to his children an esoteric knowledge which includes meteorological, cosmological and eschatological information. In this section of the book Enoch even offers a lengthy description of the Lord's limbs "without measure and analogy"³⁸ which, some scholars believe, belongs to another highly esoteric trend of Jewish mysticism.³⁹ The full account of God's cosmogonic revelations, however, does not appear in these instructions of Enoch. Even though the text makes several allusions to the creation story, telling that "the Lord was the one who laid the foundations upon the

³⁴ Andersen, 143.

³⁵ On the origin of the names Arioch and Marioch see J. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord*, 321-8; L. Cry, "Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mystérieux en II Henoch," *RB* 49 (1940) 199-200.

³⁶ Andersen, 157.

³⁷ Cf. P. Grelot, "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification", *RSR* 46 (1958) 9-13.

³⁸ Andersen, 163.

³⁹ G. Scholem argues that the terminology of this section in *2 Enoch* shows apparent similarities to קוּמָה שִׁעוּר tradition. Cf. G. Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (New York: Schocken, 1991) 29.

unknown things and... spread out the heavens above the visible and the invisible things,"⁴⁰ Enoch never discloses to his children the full story about Adoil and Aruchas.

II. Secrets of Creation in Merkabah Tradition

Despite the differences in the treatment of "secrets" in *2 Enoch* and *3 Enoch* that have been mentioned earlier, the approach to the mysteries of creation found in *3 Enoch* demonstrates close affinities with the *Slavonic Enoch*.

The theme of the secrets of creation plays an important role in *3 Enoch*; it is surrounded by several details found in *2 Enoch*. The similarities include the following points:

1. One of these parallels is Enoch's initiation into the secrets of Creation. The important detail in both texts is that some preparatory instructions before the account of creation were given through angels. In the case of *3 Enoch*, the instructions were given through the angels known as the "Prince of Wisdom" (שֵׁר הַחִכְמָה) and the "Prince of Understanding" (שֵׁר הַבִּינָה); in the case of *2 Enoch* they came through the angel Vereveil (ВЕРЕВЕИЛ). In both books these angelic mediators do not reveal "secrets" but offer instead some preparatory knowledge. In *2 Enoch* Vereveil instructs Enoch in different "things"--"all things of heaven and earth and sea and all the elements and the movements and their courses... and the Hebrew language, every kind of language of the new song of the armed troops and everything that it is appropriate to learn" (23:1-2).⁴¹ In *3 Enoch* the Prince of Wisdom and the Prince of Understanding teach Enoch-Metatron "wisdom"--"the wisdom of those above and those below, the wisdom of this world and the world to come."⁴²

2. Both texts also mention that immediately after these preparatory angelic instructions, the Lord (the Holy One) reveals "the secrets of creation" to Enoch (Metatron). From *3 Enoch* 11:2 we learn that all the secrets of creation (בְּרֵאשִׁית סִתְרֵי)⁴³ now stand revealed before Enoch-Metatron as they stand revealed before the Creator. In *2 Enoch* 24:2-4 the Lord instructs Enoch in the secrets of his "endless and inconceivable creation," the mysteries which he never explained even to his angels:

⁴⁰ Andersen, 174.

⁴¹ Andersen, 140.

⁴² Alexander, 264.

⁴³ MS M40. Cf. P. Schäfer with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius., *Synopse zur Hekhaloth-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981) 8. MS V228 instead of "the secrets of creation" uses - "the orders of creation" (סִדְרֵי בְרֵאשִׁית). Cf. P. Schäfer with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius., *Synopse zur Hekhaloth-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981) 9.

Whatever you see, Enoch, things standing still and moving about and which were brought to perfection by me, I myself will explain it to you... And not even to my angels have I explained my secrets, nor related to them their composition, nor my endless and inconceivable creation which I conceived, as I am making them known to you today.⁴⁴

3. As was mentioned earlier, the notion of "secrets" in *3 Enoch* includes various types of revelations. Even though the book applies the term "secrets" to several things, including the Torah, it also seems to use the notion of "the special secret" in reference to certain details of the Account of Creation. According to the book, this special secret plays an important role in "God's creation of everything." We learn about the secret from *3 Enoch* 48D, where Metatron tells to R. Ishmael that he was the person who revealed the special secret to Moses, in spite of the protests of the heavenly hosts:

YHWH the God of Israel is my witness that when I revealed this secret to Moses, all the armies of the height, in every heaven, were angry with me. They said to me, "Why are you revealing this secret to humankind, born of woman, blemished, unclean, defiled by blood and impure flux, men who excrete putrid drops--that secret by which heaven and earth were created, the sea and the dry land, mountains and hills, rivers and springs, Gehinnom, fire and hail, the garden of Eden and the tree of life? By it Adam was formed, the cattle and the beasts of the field, the birds of heaven and the fish of the sea, Behemoth and Leviathan, the unclean creatures and reptiles, the creeping things of the sea and the reptiles of the deserts, Torah, wisdom, knowledge, thought, the understanding of things above, and the fear of heaven. Why are you revealing it to flesh and blood?"⁴⁵

P. Alexander observes that in this passage "the secret" could be either (1) the Torah, or (2) the secret names of God. He further suggests that "the identification of the secret with the Torah appears to be excluded by the fact that Torah is one of the things created by the secret."⁴⁶ This situation in which the notion of "secret" transcends the realm of the Torah and refers instead to God's creation appears to have close affinities to the position of *2 Enoch*, where the Torah is not listed among God's mysteries.

III. Secrets of Creation in Zoharic Tradition

The cosmogonic account in *2 Enoch* demonstrates close similarities not only with the Merkabah tradition but also with much later developments of Jewish mysticism. The following analysis is an attempt to trace some affinities between the account of creation in *2 Enoch* and in some medieval texts of Jewish mysticism.

⁴⁴ Andersen, 143.

⁴⁵ Alexander, 315.

⁴⁶ Alexander, 315.

Stones

In one of his books⁴⁷ G. Scholem points to an interesting detail of the creation narrative in *2 Enoch*. The story involves the enigmatic stones the Lord placed in the waters during the process of creation. In chapters 28-29, when the Lord instructed Enoch about the secrets of the Account of Creation, He said:

Then from the waters I hardened⁴⁸ big stones,⁴⁹ and the clouds of the depths⁵⁰ I commanded to dry themselves. And I did not name what fell to the lowest places.⁵¹ Gathering the ocean into one place, I bound it with a yoke. I gave to the sea an eternal boundary, which will not be broken through by the waters. The solid structure⁵² I fixed and established it above the waters (28:2-4).⁵³

The theme of the "big stones" plays an important role in the creation narrative of *2 Enoch*. G. Scholem draws attention to the relationship between these enigmatic stones and the cosmogonic tradition of "an esoteric baraita⁵⁴ in which the word בְּהוּ in וַתְּהוּ וַבְּהוּ of Genesis 1:2 was interpreted as 'muddy stones, sunk in the abyss'."⁵⁵ Scholem's remark⁵⁶ invites a further exploration into the role of the enigmatic stones in Aggadic traditions. *Hag.* 11b prohibits the exposition of מַעֲשֵׂה בְרֵאשִׁית in the public. Cosmogonic doctrines, however, were important during all stages of

⁴⁷ G. Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 73.

⁴⁸ The verb **ОУТВЕРДИТИ** could be also rendered as "to place." Sreznevskij's dictionary lists this translation among possible meanings of the Slavonic word. See I. Sreznevskij, *Slovar' drevnerusskogoazyka* (3 vols.; Moscow: Kniga, 1989) III(II), 1306.

⁴⁹ **КАМЕНИЕ ВЕЛИКО**. Vaillant, 30.

⁵⁰ **БЕЗДНЫМЪ**. Vaillant, 30. Another choice for translation can be "abyss." Kurz and Sreznevskij equate the Slavonic term with the Greek ἄβυσσος. Cf. J. Kurz, ed., *Slovník Jazyka Staroslovenského [Lexicon Linguae Palaeo-Slovenicae]* (4 vols.; Prague: Akademia, 1966-) 1.76; Sreznevskij, *Slovar'*, I(I), 55.

⁵¹ **БЕЗДНЫ**. Again the same term, which can be translated as "abyss."

⁵² **ТВЕРДЬ** Vaillant, 30. This Slavonic word can be also translated as "a foundation." The previous verb **ОСНОВАХ** ("established") favors such a translation.

⁵³ Andersen, 147.

⁵⁴ *Hag.* 12a.

⁵⁵ Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 74. He points also to "the muddy stones from which darkness flows" in the Targum on Job 28:8. Another interesting early parallel could be "stones of bohu" in Isa 34:11.

⁵⁶ Gershom Scholem was a unique exception in his field, as he persistently tried to investigate the relationships between *2 Enoch* and the Jewish mystical traditions. Even though his observations on possible parallels between *2 Enoch* and Jewish texts are not systematic, they are very perceptive and can provide many insights for students of *2 Enoch*.

Jewish mysticism,⁵⁷ and occupied a prominent role in such books as *Sefer Yetsirah* and *Sefer Bahir*.⁵⁸ Isaiah Tishby observes that the understanding of the causes and processes of the formation of the world became one of the central themes in late Jewish mysticism.⁵⁹

In late Jewish mysticism, especially in the *Zohar*, the theme of the big stones placed by the Creator in the waters (in the abyss) occupied an important place. In spite of the late date of the *Zohar*, these materials have preserved important early traditions relevant to the subject of our research. Moreover, this medieval compendium of Jewish mystical knowledge mentions a book under the title "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch"⁶⁰ which is identical with the titles given to *2 Enoch* in some manuscripts.⁶¹

Similarities between *2 Enoch* and the *Zohar* are not confined only to the title of the *Slavonic Enoch*. Several scholars, including G.H. Box and H. Odeberg, have noted striking parallels between both texts, especially in the materials of the longer recension. G. H. Box points to the connection between *2 Enoch* and the *Zohar* and observes that "the *Slavonic Enoch* ... is remarkably illuminating in its realistic presentment of some of the Kabbalistic ideas--e.g. as to the process of creation, the constitution of the heavens, and so on."⁶² H. Odeberg, who was Box's student at the University of London, holds a similar view.⁶³ In spite of some apparent deficiencies in his edition⁶⁴ of *3 Enoch* his work contains important insights into possible relationships between the *Slavonic Enoch* and late Jewish mysticism. Odeberg, who used Forbes' separate translations of the shorter and longer recensions of *2 Enoch*, makes a number of provocative comments on the nature of the Jewish mystical traditions incorporated in these texts. In his opinion, the longer recension sometimes contains concepts that belong to a

⁵⁷ Cf. G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1954).

⁵⁸ For the discussion of the parallels between the cosmogonies of these two texts and *2 Enoch* cf. G. Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 73-5; *idem*, *On Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (N.Y.: Schocken, 1991) 98-100.

⁵⁹ I. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar: Anthology of Texts* (3 vols.; London: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1994) 2.549.

⁶⁰ ספר הזוהר, רבספרא דריון דחנוך. 2.180b. Cf. R. Margaliot, ed., ספר הזוהר (3 vols.; Jerusalem, 1940) 2.360.

⁶¹ Cf. Р книга ѿ тайнахъ енѳовихъ ("The book about the secrets of Enoch") and Р книги святихъ тайнъ енѳовъ ("The books of the holy secrets of Enoch"). Cf. A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Enoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut D'Etudes Slaves, 1952) 1; Sokolov, 1.1.

⁶² W.O.E. Oesterley and G.H. Box, *A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinical and Mediaeval Judaism* (New York: Macmillan, 1920) 236.

⁶³ Cf. H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973) 1.22.

⁶⁴ Cf. J. Greenfield, "Prolegomenon," in H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973) xi-xlvii.

later (post-Hekhaloth) development of Jewish mysticism. In this respect, he found a number of striking similarities with Zoharic tradition. It should be noted that Odeberg's position was partially conditioned by his favoring of the shorter recension as more ancient and original.⁶⁵ He viewed the longer recension as a later expansion of the shorter one. In the light of the recent studies of F. Andersen, J. Charlesworth,⁶⁶ A. de Santos Otero,⁶⁷ and C. Böttrich,⁶⁸ who argue for the originality of the longer recension, Odeberg's hypothesis is losing its persuasive power. In this context, an investigation of the possible parallels between the story of creation in *2 Enoch* and the Account of Creation in the *Zohar* can contribute not only to our understanding of the hypothetical provenance of the longer recension but to the provenance of the text in general. It also can clarify the formative value of the account of creation in *2 Enoch* for subsequent rabbinic developments. The importance of such inquiry constitutes one of the reasons for the inclusion of some materials from the *Book of Zohar* in our research.

Zohar I, 231a reads:

The world did not come into being until God took a certain stone, which is called the "foundation stone,"⁶⁹ and cast it into the abyss⁷⁰ so that it held fast there, and from it the world was planted. This is the central point of the universe, and on this point stands the holy of holies. This is the stone referred to in the verses, "Who laid the corner-stone thereof" (Job XXXVIII, 6), "the stone of testing, the precious corner-stone" (Is. XXVIII, 16), and "the stone that the builders despise became the head of the corner" (Ps. CXVIII, 22). This stone is compounded of fire, water, and air, and rests on the abyss. Sometimes water flows from it and fills the deep. This stone is set as a sign in the centre of the world.⁷¹

⁶⁵ Although, "original" might be an inappropriate word here. P. Sacchi rightly observes that "the original is an abstract concept; no one possesses the author's manuscript. Even the original of the *Book of the Secrets of Enoch* is only the most ancient form of the text available, and therefore the closest to the Original (with a capital 'O')." Cf. P. Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History* (JSPSS, 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990) 237.

⁶⁶ Cf. J.H. Charlesworth, "The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch (Seminar Report)," *NTS* 25 (1979) 315-23; J.H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament. Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins* (SNTSMS, 54; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985) 102-06.

⁶⁷ A. de Santos Otero, "Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo)," *Apocrifos del AT* (ed. A. Dies Macho; Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1984) 4.147-202.

⁶⁸ C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (WUNT, R.2, 50; Tübingen: Mohr, 1992); C. Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995); C. Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1995).

⁶⁹ אבן שתייה. R. Margaliot, ed., *ספר הזוהר* (3 vols.; Jerusalem, 1940) 1.461.

⁷⁰ תהוומא. R. Margaliot, ed., *ספר הזוהר* (3 vols.; Jerusalem, 1940) 1.461.

⁷¹ H. Sperling and M. Simon (trs.), *The Zohar* (5 vols.; London and New York: Soncino, 1933) 2.399.

Zohar II, 222a continues the theme of the foundation stone:

When the Holy One, blessed be He, was about to create the world, He detached one precious stone⁷² from underneath His Throne of Glory and plunged it into the Abyss, one end of it remaining fastened therein whilst the other end stood out above; and this other and superior head constituted the nucleus of the world, the point out of which the world started, spreading itself to right and left and into all directions, and by which it is sustained. That nucleus, that stone, is called *shethyiah* (foundation), as it was the starting-point of the world. The name *shethyiah*, furthermore, is a compound of *shath* (founded) and *Yah* (God), signifying that the Holy One, blessed be He, made it the foundation and starting-point of the world and all that is therein.⁷³

We will now examine some important details in these two narratives. The text of *2 Enoch* uses the term **БЕЗДНА**⁷⁴ (literally, "abyss") which also occupied a prominent place in the narrative of the *Zohar*. In the *Zohar*, the Holy One cast a stone into the abyss. *2 Enoch* does not mention that the stone fell into the abyss but does utilize the phrase, "I did not name what fell to the abyss" (28:3), with the implication that this act of the Lord had already taken place.

Another important motif in relation to the stones in both texts has to do with the theme of "establishing the foundation." *2 Enoch* tells that the stones (stone) are related to the foundation which the Lord has established above the waters.⁷⁵ This labeling of stones as "foundation" is very typical for the *Zoharic* narrative, where the stone is referred to many times as **שְׁתִּיָּה** ("foundation") or **שְׁתִּיָּה לְבֵנִי** ("foundation stone"). The concept of the "Foundation Stone" occupies a prominent place in several cosmological stories.⁷⁶ E. Burrows' research points to the Mesopotamian provenance of the concept of the "Foundation Stone," which symbolises in these traditions the bond between heaven and earth.⁷⁷ Burrows traces the geographical origins of this cosmogonic pattern to "the sanctuaries at Nippur, at Larsa, and probably at Sippar."⁷⁸ The possible connection with Sippar is especially

⁷² **אֲבִנֵי יְקִירִים**. R. Margaliot, ed., **סֵפֶר הַזֹּהָר** (3 vols.; Jerusalem, 1940) 2.443.

⁷³ H. Sperling and M. Simon (trs.), *The Zohar* (5 vols.; London and New York: Soncino, 1933) 4.258-9.

⁷⁴ **МГЛАМ ЖЕ БЕЗДНЫМЪ** - the clouds of the abyss, or the darkness of the abyss; **ОУПАДЪКЪ БЕЗДНЫ** - what fell to the abyss.

⁷⁵ **Твердь водружих и основах врѣху вод** (literally - "I erected a firm foundation and established it above the waters").

⁷⁶ On the concept of the Foundation Stone cf.: L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955) 5.15; E. Burrows, "Some Cosmological Patterns in Babylonian Religion", *The Labyrinth* (ed. S.H. Hooke; London, 1935) 45-59.; J. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord* (WUNT, 36; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1985) 250ff.

⁷⁷ E. Burrows, "Some Cosmological Patterns in Babylonian Religion", 45-52.

⁷⁸ E. Burrows, "Some Cosmological Patterns in Babylonian Religion", 46-7.

important for the Enochic text, if we keep in mind the possible Mesopotamian origin of Enoch's figure, based on the antediluvian king Enmeduranki of Sippar.

Finally, the difference in the number of stones in both texts must also be explained. The *Zohar* tells about one foundation stone, *2 Enoch* speaks about stones.⁷⁹ But later in the narrative of *2 Enoch*, the term switches from the plural to the singular, and refers only to one stone: "From the stone⁸⁰ I cut off a great fire...(29:3)."⁸¹

Adoil and Arukhas: Etymology of the Names

During His instructions in the secrets of creation, the Lord told Enoch that in the beginning of creation He had thought to create a visible creation from the invisible. This process occupies an important place in the narrative of *2 Enoch* and demonstrates a complicated imagery of this stage of creation. To assist our inquiry, the following passage must be quoted:

The Lord told Enoch: And I thought up the idea of establishing a foundation, to create a visible creation. And I commanded the lowest things: "Let one of the invisible things come out visibly!" And Adoil⁸² descended, extremely large. And I looked at him, and, behold, in his belly he had a great age.⁸³ And I said to him, "Disintegrate yourself, Adoil, and let what is disintegrated from you become visible." And he disintegrated himself, and there came out from him the great age. And thus it carried all the creation which I had wished to create. And I saw how good it was. And I placed for myself a throne, and I sat down on it. To the light I spoke: "You go up higher and be solidified and become the foundation for the highest things." And there is nothing higher than the light, except nothing itself. And I spoke, I straightened myself upward from my throne. And I called out a second time into the lowest things, and I said, "Let one of the invisible things come out solid and visible." There came out Arukhas⁸⁴, solid and heavy and very black. And I saw how suitable he was. And I said to him, "Come down low and become solid! And become the foundation of the lowest things!" And there is nothing lower than the darkness, except nothing itself (24-25-26).⁸⁵

The passage deals with two enigmatic names, Adoil and Arukhas. Much attention has been devoted to the etymology of these words which might

⁷⁹ КАМЕНИЕ. Vaillant, 30.

⁸⁰ КАМЕНИЕ. Vaillant, 32.

⁸¹ Andersen, 149.

⁸² АДОИЛЪ.

⁸³ ВЪКА БЕЛИКАГО. Vaillant, 30. It can be also translated as "a great aeon."

⁸⁴ АРУХАЗЪ.

⁸⁵ Andersen, 145.

indicate that many scholars consider these names as important cues for clarifying the origins of the text.

R.H. Charles asserts that Adoïl might be derived from Hebrew, **יְד אֱל**, translated as "The hand of God."⁸⁶ M. Philonenko supports this etymology pointing to some Egyptian parallels in which "les premières créatures naissent du liquide séminal que le démiurge solitaire avait fait jaillir au moyen de sa main."⁸⁷

L. Cry suggests reading Adoïl as **אֱוֹר אֱל**, "the light of God". In his opinion, some letters in the Hebrew word **אֱוֹר**, "light," were transformed. *Resh* was changed into *daleth*. *Waw* was transposed. As a result of these transformations, it sounds like Adoïl.⁸⁸

A. Vaillant suggests that the name might be derived from a Hebrew word **עֶד** with a suffix, "his eternity, his aeon."⁸⁹ G. Scholem criticizes this rendering and shows that in Hebrew the word **עֶד** has the peculiar characteristic of being unable to carry a pronominal suffix.⁹⁰ According to Scholem's own interpretation Adoïl derives from Sadoqil.⁹¹

J. Milik considers the name Adoïl as "a Greek and Semitic hybrid: Hades + El."⁹² G. Quispel derives it from *Adonai-el*, where the first element is the circumlocution for the Tetragrammaton.⁹³

Another proper name in the narrative, Arukhaz, also poses several problems for interpretation. R.H. Charles believes that Arukhaz may have originated from the Hebrew word **רְקִיעַ** ("firmament").⁹⁴

A. Vaillant supports the view that the term "Arukhas" is connected with the image of foundation (Greek, *στερέωμα*; Hebrew, **רְקִיעַ**). In his opinion it was composed from the Hebrew words **עֲרוֹךְ** "arranged" and **עָז** "hard."⁹⁵

⁸⁶ *APOT*, 2.445.

⁸⁷ M. Philonenko, "La cosmogonie du 'livre des secrets d'Hénoch'" *Religions en Égypte. Hellénistique et Romaine* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969) 114.

⁸⁸ See L. Cry, "Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mystérieux en II Henoch," *RB* 49 (1940) 201.

⁸⁹ Vaillant, xi.

⁹⁰ Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, 73.

⁹¹ G. Scholem, "Die Lehre vom 'Gerechten' in der jüdischen Mystik" *Eranos-Jahrbuch* 27 (1958) 252.

⁹² J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976) 113.

⁹³ Cf. J. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord*, 288.

⁹⁴ *APOT*, 2.445.

⁹⁵ Vaillant, xi-xii.

J. Milik traced "Arukhas" to the Hebrew feminine term אַרוּכָה ("geographical basin"), transcribed with the masculine flexional ending as Aruchaz.⁹⁶

F. Andersen, while thinking that the name could probably be derived from the Greek word ἄρχή, points out that the ending -as, which is not Slavonic, is doubtful.⁹⁷ He opts for another translation that connects the name with a Hebrew word עָרֹךְ ("extended").⁹⁸

However, some materials found in the *Zohar* might lead us to quite different interpretations of the names "Adoil" and "Arukhas." In the *Zohar* I, 17b one may find some provocative material from the Account of Creation that describes the same stage in the story of creation which began, just as the passage of 2 *Enoch*, with the idea of establishing a "foundation:"

Let there be a firmament: i.e. let there be a gradual extension. Thereupon *El* (God), the "right cluster," *El Gadol* (Great God),⁹⁹ spread forth from the midst of the waters to complete this name *El* and to combine with this extension, and so *El* was extended into *Elohim* (=El+H, Y, M). These H, Y, M, extended and became reversed so as to form lower waters, Y, M, H. This extension which took place on the second day is the upper waters. The *hé, yod, mim*, form *hayat* (the sea), which the upper waters. The reversal of these letters, *yamah* (seaward), is the lower waters. When they were firmly established, all became one whole, and this name was extended to a number of places. The upper waters are male and the lower waters female. At first they were commingled,¹⁰⁰ but afterwards they were differentiated into upper and lower waters. This is the meaning of "*Elohim* upper waters," and this is the meaning of "*Adonai* lower waters;" and this is the meaning of upper *Hé* and lower *Hé*.¹⁰¹

First, the applicable correlation between this narrative and the passage of 2 *Enoch* lies in the similarities between the name "Adail" which is spelled in the majority of Slavonic manuscripts as "Adoil"¹⁰² and אֵל גְּדוּל - *El gadol*

⁹⁶ Milik, 113.

⁹⁷ Andersen, 144-145.

⁹⁸ Andersen, 145.

⁹⁹ אֵל גְּדוּל. R. Margaliot, ed., סֵפֶר הַזֹּהַר (3 vols.; Jerusalem, 1940) 1.34.

¹⁰⁰ Literally: "there were waters within waters" (הָיוּ מַיִם בְּמַיִם). R. Margaliot, ed., *rhzh rps* (3 vols.; Jerusalem, 1940) 1.34.

¹⁰¹ H. Sperling and M. Simon (trs.), *The Zohar* (5 vols.; London and New York: Soncino, 1933) 1.75.

¹⁰² In the majority of MSS this name has a form Adoil (Адоилъ) with "o" in the middle of the word:

J - Adoil. Andersen, 144.

R - Adoil. Sokolov, 1.25;

P- Adoilju. Sokolov, 1.25;

U - Adoil'. Sokolov, 1.117;

N - Idoil. Vaillant, 28.

B - Adoil'; Idoil'. Sokolov, 1.91;

B² - Adoil. Sokolov, 1.137;

Chr - Adoil'. Sokolov, 1.150.

(or *Gadol-el*, "the great one"). Let it be noted that the Slavonic text, after it introduces the name "Adoil," defines it as "the great one": **АДОИЛЪ ПРЕВЕЛИКЪ СЪЛЛО**¹⁰³ "Adoil, the great one,"¹⁰⁴ which, in Hebrew, is identical with his name.¹⁰⁵

Second, the title *El Gadol* in the *Zohar* is identified with the upper waters. A similar correspondence can be found in *2 Enoch* where Adoil is matched with the upper foundation.

The same symmetrical pattern also shows in the case of Arukhaz: Arukhaz, the lower foundation in *2 Enoch*, and the "other extension," the lower waters in the *Zohar*. Both texts use the term "lower" in reference to Arukhaz. This term can serve as a clue to resolving the etymological mystery of this enigmatic name. The word "Arukhaz" in *2 Enoch* might be related to the Aramaic **ארעײ**, translated as "lower."¹⁰⁶ Noteworthy, that *Frg.Tg.* on Gen 1:6 uses this term in the expression "the lower waters" (**מֵי אַרְעָא**).¹⁰⁷

Conclusion

It would be helpful now to offer some concluding remarks about the Account of Creation in *2 Enoch*. These inferences will be concerned mainly with the form and the content of the examined textual material.

1. *2 Enoch* appears to contain a systematic tendency of treating the story of creation as the most esoteric knowledge. Even though *2 Enoch* deals with various meteorological, astronomical, and cosmological revelations, it specifically emphasizes the "secrecy" of the account of creation. *2 Enoch*, unlike other early apocalyptic materials (such as the Book of Daniel and *1 Enoch*), does not include the variety of "revealed things" in the notion of "secrets."

2. *2 Enoch's* emphasis on the "secrecy" of the creation story demonstrates an intriguing parallel to the later rabbinic approach to **מעשה בראשית** as an esoteric knowledge. *2 Enoch*, therefore, can be seen as an important step in the shaping of the later Rabbinic understanding of

¹⁰³ Vaillant, 29-30.

¹⁰⁴ Andersen translated it as "extremely large."

¹⁰⁵ The title *El gadol*, "the great God," can be connected with the term "Great Aeon," which came out from the belly of "Great One,"- *Adoil*. Compare also *Zohar's* narrative: "At first there were waters within waters."

¹⁰⁶ M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic* (Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1990) 77.

¹⁰⁷ M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic* (Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1990) 77.

"secret things," which eventually led to the esoterism of the Account of Creation.

3. The Account of Creation in *2 Enoch* includes the cosmogonic motifs of God's creation of the primordial order. These descriptions show a number of parallels with late Jewish mysticism, namely the Zoharic tradition. It supports the Box-Odeberg hypothesis, that the creation narrative of the longer recension shows a presentiment of some of the Zoharic ideas about the process of creation. At this stage of our research, it is difficult to determine whether these blocks of the Account of Creation are interpolations during the later stages of transmission or whether they belong to the original layer of the text.

4. The story of Creation appears to be more developed in the manuscripts of the longer recension. To illustrate this fact, we could point to the important description of the creation of Adam¹⁰⁸ in chapters 30-32, which are absent in the manuscripts of the shorter recension. It supports Andersen's position that "the claims of the longer recension need special attention in the sections dealing with creation, chapters 24-33."¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 51.

¹⁰⁹ Andersen, 94.

Overshadowed by Enoch's Greatness: "Two Tablets" Traditions from the *Book of Giants* to *Palaea Historica*

Introduction

In *Jewish Antiquities* Josephus unveils a certain tradition according to which the descendants of Seth

...discovered the science of the heavenly bodies and their orderly array. Moreover, to prevent their discoveries from being lost to mankind and perishing before they become known – Adam having predicted a destruction of the universe, at one time by a violent fire and at another by a mighty deluge of water – they erected two pillars, one of brick and the other of stone, and inscribed these discoveries on both; so that, if the pillar of brick disappeared in the deluge, that of stone would remain to teach men what was graven thereon and to inform them that they had also erected one of brick.¹

In previous studies, several scholars have noted that although Josephus refers to Seth and his progeny, some features of the "two stelae" story allude to peculiar roles and situations which Jewish lore traditionally associates with the seventh antediluvian patriarch Enoch. One of these features includes the fact that Josephus credited Seth's descendants with the discovery of "the science of the heavenly bodies and their orderly array." Scholars have noted that this role from ancient time was traditionally ascribed to Enoch,² who in various Enochic traditions is portrayed as an expert in cosmological, astronomical and calendrical secrets.

Another important detail in Josephus' account is that the "two stelae" passage appears in *Jewish Antiquities* immediately before the story about the Giants. In 1:73 Josephus tells that "for many angels of God now consorted with women and beget sons who were overbearing and disdainful of every virtue, such confidence had they in their strength; in fact the deeds that tradition ascribes to them resemble the audacious exploits told by the

¹ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* (LCL; tr. H.S.J. Thackeray; Cambridge: Harvard University Press/London: Heinemann, 1967) 4.33.

² J. VanderKam observes that in the passage about the discovery of astronomical learnings, Josephus "attributes the achievement not to Enoch but, instead, to the descendants of Seth." J. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1995) 153. H.S.J. Thackeray also notes the "Enochic role" in Josephus' passage. See: Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* (LCL; tr. H.S.J. Thackeray; Cambridge: Harvard University Press/London: Heinemann, 1967) 4.32.

Greeks of the giants.”³ J. Vanderkam remarks that the author of *Jewish Antiquities* does not connect this “Enochic-sounding” tale with the seventh patriarch; “rather, he makes Noah preach to them – unsuccessfully.”⁴ He further suggests that “it is not impossible that Josephus took his information from a source such as *I Enoch* 6-11, which mentions Noah but not Enoch.”⁵ It appears that the suggestions of scholars about the connection between the “two stelae” narrative and some Enochic materials are valid and deserve further investigation.

Besides Josephus’ writings,⁶ the two tablets/stelae tradition⁷ appears in many other sources, including the Armenian *History of the Forefathers* and the Armenian *Abel*, the Latin *Life of Adam and Eve*, various Christian Chronographers, a fragment from Greek *Palaea Historica*, and some other materials.⁸ Even a brief review of these documents shows that the “two stelae” narrative contains traces of Enochic traditions. The purpose of this article is to investigate these associations between the “two stelae” tradition and Enochic tradition.

³ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* (LCL; tr. H.S.J. Thackeray; Cambridge: Harvard University Press/London: Heinemann, 1967) 4.35.

⁴ J. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 153.

⁵ J. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 153.

⁶ Another important early source about the antediluvian stelae is *Jub.* 8:1-3. On the tablets’ tradition in the *Book of Jubilees* see: F. García Martínez, “The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees,” in: *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (eds. M. Albani et al.; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997) 243-60. On the antediluvian writings see also: R. Eppel, “Les tables de la loi et les tables célestes” *RHPPhR* 17 (1937) 401-12; P. Grelot, “La légende d’Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification” *RSR* 46 (1958) 9-13; M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974) 1.242-43; H. L. Jansen, *Die Henochgestalt: Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1; Oslo: Dybwad, 1939) 28ff; S.M. Paul, “Heavenly Tablets and the Book of Life” *JANES* 5 (1973) 345-52; W. Speyer, *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970) 110-24.

⁷ On the “two stelae” traditions see: W. Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 26; Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1989); D. Flusser, “Palaea Historica – An Unknown Source of Biblical Legends,” *Studies in Aggadah and Folk-Literature* (eds. J. Heinemann and D. Noy; Scripta Hierosolymitana, 22; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1971) 51-2; S.D. Fraade, *Enosh and His Generation* (SBLMS, 30; Atlanta: Scholars, 1984) 19, 25-6; L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955) 1.120-22, 5.148-50; A.F.J. Klijn, *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1977) 24-5, 121-23; S. Rappaport, *Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus* (Frankfurt a. M.: Kauffmann, 1930) 6-9, 87-90; M. E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 151, 198; M.E. Stone, “Selections from ‘On the Creation of the World’ by Yovhannes Tulkuranci,” *Literature on Adam and Eve* (eds. G. Anderson et al.; SVTP, 15; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 210.

⁸ The Biblical concept of the two tablets, found in Ex 31-34, transcends the boundaries of the current research.

I. "Shadows" of the Enochic Roles

Josephus' account of the two stelae specifically credited the architects of the antediluvian pillars (in Josephus' case, the Sethites⁹) with the discovery of the science of astronomy. It was noted earlier that this reference alludes to the seventh antediluvian patriarch, who, according to the *Astronomical Book*, first received such knowledge from the archangel Uriel during his celestial tour. A closer look at Josephus' passage and other textual evidence associated with the "two stelae" traditions shows that the discovery of astronomy is not the only Enochic achievement that appears to be borrowed in the variety of these stories. It seems that the employment of different Enochic roles is not a rare feature of these traditions. This section of the research will seek therefore to uncover the hidden "shadows" of the Enochic roles that were implicitly preserved in the various "two stelae" narratives.

Foreknowledge of the Destruction of the World

An account of the Byzantine chronographer John Malalas is one of the many witnesses to the two stelae traditions in medieval Christian chronicles. In the two tablets' story, in his *Chronography* 1:5, he seems to depend entirely on Josephus' evidence.¹⁰ However, his retelling helps to see some new angles in the familiar story. In his narration of Josephus' account, Malalas points to the foreknowledge of the future destruction of the world as an important characteristic of the authors of the antediluvian stelae.¹¹ He stresses that "Seth's descendants were god-fearing men and, having foreknowledge of the destruction, or change, that was then to affect

⁹ On the figure of Seth and Sethian traditions see: T. Gluck, *The Arabic Legend of Seth, the Father of Mankind* (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1968); A. Klijn, *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1977); R. Kraft, "Philo on Seth: Was Philo Aware of Traditions Which Exalted Seth and His Progeny?" *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* (ed. B. Layton; Supplements to Numen, XLI; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 457-8; G. MacRae, "Seth in Gnostic Texts and Traditions," in *SBLSP* 11 (1977) 24-43; B. Pearson, "The Figure of Seth in Gnostic Literature," *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* (ed. B. Layton; Supplements to Numen, XLI; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 472-504; E.C. Quinn, *The Quest of Seth for the Oil of Life* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1962); M. Stone, "Report on Seth traditions in the Armenian Adam Books," *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* (ed. B. Layton; Supplements to Numen, XLI; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 459-71.

¹⁰ E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys & R. Scott, *The Chronicle of John Malalas* (Byzantina Australiensia, 4; Melbourne: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1986).

¹¹ Another Christian chronographer, George the Monk, also notices this feature: "...For the descendants of Seth had been warned in advance from on high about the coming destruction of mankind, and made two stelae, one of stone, the other of brick; and they wrote on them all the celestial knowledge set forth their father Seth, ... as Josephus says." Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, 215. For the Greek text see: *Georgii Monachi Chronicon* (2 vols.; ed. C. de Boor; Leipzig: Teubner, 1904) 1.10.

mankind, made two tablets, the one of stone and the other of clay.”¹² Again, this motif of the foreknowledge of the future destruction of the earth returns us to some situations and roles associated with Enoch.

In Enochic traditions only a few prediluvian persons received revelation about the upcoming destruction of the world. Among them Enoch and Noah can be found. Although Noah is informed about the future destruction of the world, the specific function of writing down this revelation is usually assigned to Enoch, who in the *Book of Watchers*,¹³ *Jubilees*,¹⁴ and in the *Book of Giants*,¹⁵ is often portrayed as the one who writes and delivers the warnings about the future destruction to the Watchers/Giants and to humans. An important detail in these Enochic traditions relevant to the “two stelae” story (which entertains the idea about dual destruction of the world by water and fire), is the fact that, in contrast to Noah who is informed about the Flood, Enoch, due to the specifics of his mediating affairs, also knows about the upcoming destruction of the Watchers/Giants by fire.

Art of Writing

Josephus’ passage pictures the descendants of Seth as the ones who inscribe astronomical discoveries on the pillars. It seems that the various “two stelae” stories seek to emphasize the scribal expertise of the Sethites by attributing to them even the invention of writing.

Although Josephus’ fragment does not say directly that the descendants of Seth invented writing, other “two stelae” accounts often do so. Thus, the Armenian *Abel* depicts Enosh as the one who invented the letters.¹⁶ The anonymous chronicler included in the CSHB edition of John Malalas¹⁷ and

¹² E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys & R. Scott, *The Chronicle of John Malalas* (Byzantina Australiensia, 4; Melbourne: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1986) 4.

¹³ See *1 Enoch* 12-14.

¹⁴ See *Jub.* 4:23.

¹⁵ See *4Q203* 8: “scri[be...] [...] Copy of the seco[n]d tablet of [the] le[tter...] by the hand of Enoch, the distinguished scribe [...] and holy (one), to Shemihazah and to all [his] com[panions...] You should know th[at] no[t...] and your deeds and those of your wives [...] they [and the]ir sons and the wives o[f their sons...] for [yo]ur prostitution in the [l]and. It will happen [t]o yo[u...] and lodges a complaint against you and against the deeds of your sons [...] the corruption with which you have corrupted it. [...] until the coming of Raphael. Behold, destruction [...] and which are in the deserts and whi[ch] are in the seas. And tear loose [the] totality [of...] upon you for evil. Now, then, unfasten your chains which ti[e (you)...] and pray. [...]” F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997) 1.411.

¹⁶ “However, we found that Enosh, son of Seth, made the letter(s) and called the planets by name. And he prophesied that this world would pass away twice, by water and by fire. And he made two stelae, of bronze and of clay, and he wrote upon them the names of the parts of creation which Adam had called. He said, ‘If it passes away by water, then the bronze (will) remain, and if by fire, then the fired clay.’” M. E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP 14; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 151.

¹⁷ *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia* (ed. L. Dindorf; CSHB; Bonn: Weber, 1831) 5.

the Latin *Life of Adam and Eve* also point to the Sethites' invention of the art of writing by referring to Seth as to the one "who devised the caps of letters."¹⁸

Upon observing these references to the scribal activities of the various authors of the antediluvian stelae, one can easily recognize certain similarities to Enoch's figure. As was noted earlier, he, similar to the Sethites, was also involved in producing of the antediluvian writings dedicated to the astronomical secrets.

The excursus about the unique scribal functions of the seventh antediluvian patriarch in the Enochic traditions can begin with the passage found in *2 Enoch* 22. It provides a striking picture of Enoch's initiation into the scribal activities which takes place near the Throne of Glory. During this initiation the Lord himself commands the archangel Vereveil to give a pen to Enoch so that he can write the mysteries explained to him by the angels. This tradition about the scribal functions of the patriarch is already documented in the earliest Enochic literature.¹⁹ The *Book of Giants* fragments label Enoch as the distinguished scribe.²⁰ In *Jub.* 4:17, he is attested as the one who "learned (the art of) writing, instruction, and wisdom and who wrote down in a book the signs of the sky..."²¹ In the Merkabah tradition, Enoch/Metatron is also depicted as a scribe who has a seat (later, a throne) in the heavenly realm.²² The theme of Enoch/Metatron's scribal functions became a prominent motif in the later Rabbinic tradition, where according to *b. Hag.* 15a, the privilege of "sitting"

¹⁸ *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*. (2nd rev.ed.; eds. G. Anderson and M. Stone; Early Judaism and Its Literature, 17; Atlanta: Scholars, 1999) 96E.

¹⁹ In *1 Enoch* 74:2, Enoch writes the instructions of the angel Uriel regarding the secrets of heavenly bodies and their movements. M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) 2.173. Adler draws the reader's attention to an interesting passage from M. Glycas which refers to Uriel's instruction to Seth in a manner similar to Uriel's revelation of the calendrical and astronomical secrets to Enoch in the *Astronomical Book of 1 Enoch*. "It is said that the angel stationed among the stars, that is the divine Uriel, descended to Seth and then to Enoch and taught them the distinctions between hours, months, seasons, and years." Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, 105. For the Greek text see: *Michaelis Glycae Annales* (ed. I. Bekker; CSHB; Bonn; Weber, 1836) 228.

²⁰ 4Q203 8: "...Copy of the seco[n]d tablet of [the] le[tter...] by the hand of Enoch, the distinguished scribe..." F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997) 1.411.

²¹ J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (2 vols.; CSCO 510-11, Scriptorum Aethiopicorum 87-88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989) 2.25-6.

²² This tradition can be seen already in *2 Enoch* 23:4-6, which depicts the angel Vereveil commanding Enoch to sit down: "'You sit down; write everything....' And Enoch said, 'And I sat down for a second period of 30 days and 30 nights, and I wrote accurately.'" F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.141.

beside God was accorded solely to Metatron by virtue of his character as a "scribe"; for he was granted permission as a scribe to sit and write down the merits of Israel.

Dissemination and Preservation of the Celestial Knowledge

Josephus' passage makes clear that the purpose of building the stelae was to preserve the astronomical knowledge for the postdiluvian generations. He writes that the Sethites wanted to build the pillars in order "to prevent their discoveries from being lost to mankind and perishing before they became known."²³ A similar motif can be found in Enochic traditions where Enoch's writings often serve for the same purpose of the preservation of knowledge in light of the impending flood. In *2 Enoch* 33 the Lord tells Enoch that the main function of his writings is the dissemination of knowledge and its preservation from the impending catastrophe:

And give them the books in your handwriting, and they will read them and they will acknowledge me as the Creator of everything... And let them distribute the books in your handwritings, children to children and family to family and kinfolk to kinfolk.... So I have commanded my angels, Ariukh and Pariukh, whom I have appointed to the earth as their guardians, and I commanded the seasons, so they might preserve them [books] so they might not perish in the future flood which I shall create in your generation.²⁴

Despite the apparent "esoteric" character of the knowledge conveyed by the angels and the Lord to the seventh antediluvian patriarch, the dissemination of this information remains one of the major functions of Enoch-Metatron in various Enochic traditions. They depict him as the one who shares astronomical, meteorological, calendrical, and eschatological knowledge with his sons and others during his short visit to the earth. He also delivers knowledge about future destruction to the Watchers/Giants. In the Merkabah tradition, Enoch-Metatron is also responsible for transmitting the highest secrets to the Princes under him, as well as to humankind. H. Kvanvig observes that "in Jewish tradition Enoch is primarily portrayed as a primeval sage,²⁵ the ultimate revealer of divine secrets."²⁶

Expertise in Astronomical and Calendar Science

²³ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, 4.33.

²⁴ F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.156.

²⁵ On Enoch's role as the knower of the secrets see: Andrei A. Orlov, "Secrets of Creation in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch" *Henoch* (forthcoming).

²⁶ H.S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988) 27.

Josephus credited the authors of the antediluvian stelae with the discovery of astronomical and apparently calendrical knowledge, since his passage contains the reference to the science of the heavenly bodies and "their orderly array."²⁷ Another "two stelae" text, drawn from Michael Glycas, also refers to the Sethites discovery of the calendar. It reads that "the divine Uriel, descended to Seth and then to Enoch and taught them the distinction between hours, months, seasons and years..."²⁸ The "two stelae" traditions also claimed that the Sethites gave astronomical bodies their names. For example, the Armenian account of two stelae found in *Abel* explicitly supports this tradition by referring to Enosh, son of Seth, as the one who "called the planets by name."²⁹ This tradition, with a reference to Josephus, is repeated in the Chronicle of John Malalas.³⁰ The account about the naming of the planets also appears in the anonymous chronicler included in the CSHB edition of John Malalas.³¹ In this text Seth is the one who called the planets by name. The account even refers to the specific Greek names, which Seth gave to the planets.

The depictions of the Sethites' achievements in astronomical science echoes traditional Enochic roles. Already in the early Enochic booklets of *1 Enoch*, Enoch is portrayed as the one who learned the knowledge about the movements of the celestial bodies from archangel Uriel. In the *Astronomical Book* the knowledge and revelation of cosmological and astronomical secrets become major functions of the elevated Enoch. The origin of these roles in Enochic traditions can be traced to *1 Enoch* 72:1, 74:2, and 80:1. In *1 Enoch* 41:1 Enoch is depicted as the one who "saw all secrets of heaven..."³² *Jub.* 4:17 also attests to this peculiar role of the seventh patriarch. A large portion of *2 Enoch* is dedicated to Enoch's initiation into the treasures of meteorological, calendrical and astronomical lore during his celestial tour. Later Merkabah developments also emphasize the role of Enoch as the "Knower of Secrets." According to *3 Enoch* 11:2, Enoch-Metatron is able to behold "deep secrets and wonderful mysteries."³³

²⁷ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, 4.33.

²⁸ Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, 105; *Michaelis Glycae Annales* (ed. I. Bekker; CSHB; Bonn; Weber, 1836) 228.

²⁹ M. E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 151.

³⁰ "...the names which Seth, the son of Adam, and his children had given the stars, as the most learned Josephus has written in the second book of his *Archeology*." E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys & R. Scott, *The Chronicle of John Malalas* (Byzantina Australiensia, 4; Melbourne: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1986) 4.

³¹ *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia* (ed. L. Dindorf; CSHB; Bonn: Weber, 1831) 5-6.

³² M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) 2.128.

³³ P. Alexander "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.264.

Several scholars have noted the possible Enochic prototype behind the Sethites' role as the experts in astronomical and calendrical science. M. Stone, remarking on the passage from *Abel*, observes that "the tradition connecting Seth with the invention of the names of the stars is unusual. It may be related to the more prevalent tradition attributing the invention of both writings and astronomy to Enoch."³⁴

In the distant past, R.H. Charles also noted that in the Byzantine chronicles many discoveries attributed to Seth reflect a transfer of "Enoch's greatness to Seth."³⁵ In reference to Charles' comments, W. Adler observes that the tradition attested in the "two stelae" narrative of Josephus and widespread in the Byzantine chronicles "became the basis for the attribution to Seth of numerous revelations and discoveries, many of them precisely parallel to those imputed to Enoch."³⁶

Preaching to the Giants

It was observed earlier that in Josephus' account the "two stelae" story is attached to the Watchers/Giants narrative. The author of *Jewish Antiquities* portrays Noah's unsuccessful preaching to the Giants. J. Vanderkam notes that "it is not impossible that Josephus took his information from a source such as *1 Enoch* 6-11, which mentions Noah but not Enoch, although in those chapters Noah does not try to improve the overbearing giants."³⁷ Indeed, despite the fact that some traditions point to a possible close relationship between Noah and the Giants in view of his miraculous birth,³⁸ his "experience" in dealing with the Giants in Enochic traditions cannot be even compared with Enoch's record. In various Enochic materials, Enoch is pictured as the special envoy of the Lord to the Watchers/Giants with a special, long-lasting mission to this rebellious group, both on earth and in other realms. The *Book of Watchers* depicts him as the intercessor to the fallen angels. According to *Jub.* 4:22, Enoch "...testified to the Watchers who had sinned with the daughters of men... Enoch testified against all of them."³⁹ In the *Book of Giants* Enoch delivers the written "sermon," reprimanding the Watchers/Giants' sinful behavior and warning them about the upcoming punishment.⁴⁰ *2 Enoch* 18 portrays

³⁴ M. E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 151.

³⁵ *APOT* 2.18.

³⁶ Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, 105.

³⁷ Vanderkam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generation*, 153.

³⁸ J. Reeves, "Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?" *JBL* 12 (1993) 110-15

³⁹ Vanderkam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.27-28.

⁴⁰ See *4Q203* 8.

Enoch's "preaching" to the Watchers during his celestial tour, encouraging them to start the liturgy before the face of the Lord.⁴¹

An examination of the surviving evidences to the "two stelae" story shows that some of them attest to a tradition different from that attested in Josephus. Instead of Noah's preaching to the Giants, they portray Enosh's preaching to the sons of God. Two references about the preaching to the sons of God in the "two stelae" traditions are especially important. Both of them have been preserved in the Armenian language and include the Armenian *History of the Forefathers* and *Abel*.

The Armenian *History of the Forefathers* 40-44 deals with the two stelae story. In 45 the narrative continues with the description of Enosh's preaching:

40 Sixth, because he [Enosh] set up two pillars against the sons of Cain, these are hope and good works, which they did not have.

41 Seventh, that he made writings and wrote on stela(e) of baked brick and bronze, and he prophesied that the earth will pass through water and fire on account of the sins of humans. And he cast the baked brick into the water and the bronze into the fire, in order to test (them), if the fire was to come first, the bronze would melt, and if the water was to come first, the brick would be destroyed. And by this means he learned that the water was destined to come, and then fire. And these are a work of hope.

42 And the writings on the two stelae told the names of all things, for he knew that by lispers, stutters and stammerers the language was destined to be corrupted.

43 And they confused and changed the names of the objects that had come into being, which Adam had named and fixed. On this account he wrote (them) on the two stelae and left them, so that if the water came first and destroyed the pillar of baked brick, the bronze writing and names of things would remain, so that after the flood and the passing of times it might come to use.

44 Likewise, also if the fiery flood⁴² and the bronze (i.e., stele) melted and ruined the writing, the earthen one might remain more baked. And this is a true action of hope.

45 Eighth, that Enosh preached to his sons to take on a celibate and immaculate way of life, for the sake of the just recompense of God. Two hundred persons, having learned this from him, remembered the life of paradise and established a covenant for themselves to live purely. And they were called "sons of God" on

⁴¹ Andersen, 1.130-33.

⁴² *b. Sanh.* 108b refers to a flood of water and a flood of fire. See Klijn, 122.

account of hope and of being busy with heavenly desire. For the glory of Christ, our hope.⁴³

The Armenian *Abel* also portrays Enosh as the author of the stelae. However, in contrast to the previous text, it connects the tradition about the sons of God with Enoch and his prediluvian writings that survived the Flood:

4.3 However, we found that Enosh, son of Seth, made the letter(s) and called the planets by name.

4.4 And he prophesied that this world would pass away twice, by water and by fire. And he made two stelae, of bronze and of clay, and he wrote upon them the names of the parts of creation which Adam had called. He said, "If it passes away by water, then the bronze (will) remain, and if by fire, then the fired clay."

4.5 And they were called true sons of God because God loved them, before they fornicated.

4.6 By this writing the vision of Enoch was preserved, he who was transferred to immortality. And after the Flood, Arpachshad made Chaldean writing from it, and from the others (were made).⁴⁴

Several details in these two Armenian accounts about the preaching to the sons of God are important for establishing possible connections with Enochic traditions:

1. Both texts use the terminology of "sons of God";
2. *History of the Forefathers* applies this term to the audience of Enosh's preaching;
3. *History of the Forefathers* also specifies the number of the sons of God as two hundred persons;
4. *Abel* 4.5 describes the sons of God as those whom God loved before they fornicated;
5. *History of the Forefathers* 45 refers to the possible angelic status of the sons of God, describing them as those who "remembered the life of paradise" and "being busy with the heavenly desire."⁴⁵

An important characteristic in both texts is the reference to the "sons of God." Who are these sons of God? In the Bible the term can be traced to the Giants story in Gen 6. Scholars, however, note that in later Christian

⁴³ M.E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 198-200.

⁴⁴ M. E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 151-2.

⁴⁵ M. Stone observes that the Sethites are often called angels in some Greek patristic and Byzantine sources. Cf. M. E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 150.

accounts the term “the sons of God” was often used in reference to the Sethites.⁴⁶ They also note the peculiar tendency to equate the Watchers and the Sethites in various accounts of the “two stelae” tradition.⁴⁷ It is quite possible that the authors of the two Armenian accounts understand the sons of God to be the Sethites. It is also evident that the prototype of the story was connected with the Watchers' story and Enoch's preaching to them. Several details in the texts point to this connection. First, *History of the Forefathers* 45 defines the number of “the sons of God” as two hundred. In Enochic traditions this numeral appears often in reference to the number of the Watchers who descended on Mount Hermon.⁴⁸ Another important feature in the Armenian accounts is the description of the sons of God as those whom God loves before they fornicated. It may allude to the exalted status of the Watchers and their leaders before their descent on Mount Hermon.

The important aspect of the preaching story found in *History of the Forefathers* 45 involves the question why instead of Noah or Enoch this text depicts Enosh as the one who preaches to the sons of God. It is possible that Enoch's name here was misplaced with that of Enosh. M. Stone observes that Enosh and Enoch are often confused in the Armenian tradition.⁴⁹ It is noteworthy that the story about the sons of God found in *Abel* uses Enoch instead of Enosh. It might refer to the Enochic background of the Armenian accounts. The “two stelae” tradition from the Latin *Life of Adam and Eve* further supports our contention. Chapter 53 of the *Life* also has the passage about Enoch's “preaching” immediately after the “two stelae” account.⁵⁰

⁴⁶ M.E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 150. Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, 113-116. For a Christian interpretation of the “sons of God” see Fraade, *Enosh and His Generation*, 47-107.

⁴⁷ Cf. Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, 92.

⁴⁸ Cf. *1 Enoch* 6:6: “And they were in all two hundred, and they came down on Ardis which is the summit of Mount Hermon.” M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978) 2.68.

⁴⁹ M. E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* (SVTP, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 151.

⁵⁰ “On these stones was found what Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied before the flood about the coming of Christ: “Behold the Lord will come in his sanctuary (in his holy soldiers, in his soldiers, in his holy clouds?) to render judgment on all and to accuse the impious of all their works by which they have spoken concerning him - sinners, impious murmurers, and the irreligious who have lived according to their feelings of desire, and whose mouths have spoken pridefully.” *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*. (2nd rev. ed.; eds. G. Anderson and M. Stone; Early Judaism and Its Literature, 17; Atlanta: Scholars, 1999) 96E. For the Latin text of *Vita*, see also: W. Meyer, “Vita Adae et Evae” *Abhandlungen der königlichen Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosph.-philologische Klasse* (Munich, 1878) 14.3: 185-250; J.H. Mozley, “The Vitae Adae” *JTS* 30 (1929) 121-49.

II. Enochic Authorship of the Tablets

Palaea's Account

In *Palaea Historica*,⁵¹ the Byzantine medieval compendium, the following passage, referring to Enoch's authorship of the two tablets can be found:

Concerning Enoch. Enoch was born and became a good and devout man, who fulfilled God's will and was not influenced by the counsels of the giants. For there were giants (on earth) at that time. And Enoch was translated (to heaven) by God's command, and no one saw [how] his removal [happened].

Concerning Noah. In the days when the giants were around and did not want to glorify God, a man was born whose name was Noah, who was devout and feared God, and like Enoch he was not influenced by the giants' counsels....

...When the giants heard that the righteous Noah was building an ark for the Flood, they laughed at him. But Enoch, who was still around, was also telling the giants that the earth would either be destroyed by fire or by water. And the righteous Enoch was doing nothing else but sitting and writing on marble (tablets) and on bricks the mighty works of God which had happened from the beginning. For he used to say: "If the earth is destroyed by fire, the bricks will be preserved to be a reminder [for those who come after] of the mighty works of God which have happened from the beginning; and if the earth is destroyed by water, the marble tablets will be preserved." And Enoch used to warn the giants about many things, but they remained stubborn and impenitent, nor did they want to glorify the Creator, but instead each [of them] walked in his own will of the flesh...⁵²

A glance at the *Palaea* fragment shows that it is completely different from the previous "two stelae" accounts based on Josephus' story. The main distinction is that Enoch, who in the Sethites' accounts occupied a peripheral role, stays now in the center of his own authentic narrative. The fact that the preaching to the Giants preceded the writing of the stelae emphasizes that the focus of the story was changed and the proper order of the events was restored.

This leads to important corrections. Unlike the Sethites in Josephus' account, Enoch does not try to preserve only one facet of the prediluvian

⁵¹ On *Palaea Historica* see: D. Flusser, "Palaea Historica – An Unknown Source of Biblical Legends" *Studies in Aggadah and Folk-Literature* (eds. J. Heinemann and D. Noy; Scripta Hierosolymitana, 22; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1971) 48-79; M.N. Speranskij, *Is istorii russko-slavjanskih literaturnyh svjazei* (Moscow: 1960) 104-47; Émile Turdeanu, *Apocryphes Slaves et Roumains de L'Ancien Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1981) 392-403; V. Tvorogov, "Paleja Istoricheskaja" in: *Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti Drevnei Rusi (Vtoraja polovina XIV-XVI v.)* (2 vols.; ed. D.S. Lihachev; Leningrad: Nauka, 1989) 2.160-61; On various manuscripts of *Palaea Historica* cf. A.Vassiliev, *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina* (Moscow, 1893) L-LI.

⁵² A.Vassiliev, *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina* (Moscow, 1893) 196-98.

knowledge, astronomical or calendar, but attempts to save the whole totality of the celestial knowledge, as it was commanded to him by the Lord in some Enochic accounts. Just as in *2 Enoch*, he writes about everything that happened before him.

In contrast to the Sethites' account, the *Palaea* does not mention the name of Adam. In the Sethites' "two stelae" stories, Adam serves as the mediator of the divine revelation, through whom the Sethites receive the knowledge about the future destruction of the earth. The *Palaea* does not refer to the Adamic tradition, since Enoch and Noah, unlike the Sethites, have direct revelation from God about the upcoming destruction.

These differences indicate that the author of the passage in *Palaea Historica* seems to draw on traditions different from those represented in Josephus. It is also evident that the stories in *Palaea* and Josephus⁵³ rely on the common source in which Noah's figure was exalted.⁵⁴ In the Josephus account, however, the Noachic tradition⁵⁵ appears to be overwritten by the

⁵³ One will recall that the Josephus account has Noah, rather than Enoch, preach to the Giants.

⁵⁴ In *Palaea* the story of Noah looms large. The two tablets story is situated in the middle of a large Noachic account which occupies three chapters in *Palaea Historica*. Unfortunately, in our presentation of the *Palaea* fragment, we were unable to reproduce this lengthy Noachic narrative. For the full text of the Noachic account see A. Vassiliev, *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina* (Moscow, 1893) 196-200.

⁵⁵ On Noachic traditions see: M. Bernstein, "Noah and the Flood at Qumran," *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (eds. D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 199-231; D. Dimant, "Noah in Early Jewish Literature," *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (eds. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998) 123-50; F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 24-44; F. García Martínez, "Interpretation of the Flood in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Interpretations of the Flood* (eds. F. García Martínez and G.P. Luttikhuisen; TBN 1; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 86-108; H. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic. The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man* (WMANT 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988) 242-54; J. Lewis, *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1968); A. Orlov, "'Noah's Younger Brother': The Anti-Noachic Polemics in *2 Enoch*" *Henoch* 22 (2000) (forthcoming); J. Reeves, "Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?" *JBL* 12 (1993) 110-15; J.M. Scott, "Geographic Aspects of Noachic Materials in the Scrolls of Qumran," *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (eds. S.E. Porter and C.E. Evans; JSPS 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 368-81; R.C. Steiner, "The Heading of the Book of the Words of Noah on a Fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon: New Light on a 'Lost' Work," *DSD* 2 (1995) 66-71; M. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M. E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 133-49; M. Stone, "Noah, Books of," *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem: Keter, 1971) 12.1198; J. VanderKam, "The Righteousness of Noah," *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (eds. J. J. Collins and G.W.E. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS 12; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980) 13-32; J. VanderKam, "The Birth of Noah," *Intertestamental Essays in Honor of Józef Tadeusz Milik* (ed. Z.J. Kapera; Qumranica Mogilanensia 6; Krakow: The Enigma

Adamic tradition.⁵⁶ In the Pseudepigrapha and the Qumran writings, the Adamic and Priestly-Noah tradition often compete with and suppress each other.⁵⁷ The “two stelae” story from *Jewish Antiquities* might contain the traces of such polemics.

Water and Fire

Among the several two stelae/tablets stories we have examined, the passage from *Palaea Historica* baffles the reader more than the others. It portrays Enoch unceasingly writing on the tablets made from marble and brick. The depiction takes place in the midst of the Noachic narrative where the theme of the Flood comes to the fore. The reference to the tablets for the fire destruction therefore appears puzzling since the assurance of the approaching Flood makes them completely unnecessary. Why does Enoch need the tablets made from the two types of material if it is already certain that the earth will perish inevitably in the imminent Flood?

The answer to these questions can possibly be found by reference to the *Book of Giants*, where the theme of the Enochic tablets also looms large. Although the temporal locus of this narrative appears to be placed before the approaching Flood, it seems to entertain the idea of the dual destruction of the world, by water and by fire.

One of the Qumran Aramaic fragments of the *Book of Giants* (4Q530) depicts a dream in which a giant sees the destruction of a certain “garden” by water and fire.⁵⁸ Most scholars take this symbolic dream to signify the upcoming destruction of the world by water and fire. J. Reeves observes that “the Qumran passage reflects an eschatological conception⁵⁹ well attested in the Hellenistic era of a dual cosmic destruction, one of which

Press, 1992) 213-31; Cana Werman, “Qumran and the Book of Noah” *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M. E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 171-81.

⁵⁶ The influence of the Adamic tradition(s) can be found in the majority of the two stelae stories which are based on the Josephus account.

⁵⁷ See M. Stone, “The Axis of History at Qumran,” *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M.E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 133-49.

⁵⁸ 4Q530: “...Then two of them dreamed dreams, and the sleep of their eyes and come to [...] their dreams. And he said in the assembly of [his frien]ds, the Nephilin, [...in] my dream; I have seen in this night [...] gardeners and they were watering [...] numerous roo[ts] issued from their trunk [...] I watched until tongues of fire from [...] all the water and the fire burned in all [...] Here is the end of the dream.” F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997) 2.1063.

⁵⁹ Some scholars point to a possible Mesopotamian background in this imagery of the dual destruction of the world. Cf. Klijn, *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature*, 24, 123; J. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmology: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College, 14; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992) 145.

employs water (*mabbul shel mayim*) and the other fire (*mabbul shel 'esh*).⁶⁰

In their analysis of the dream about the destruction of the garden, scholars have tried to establish a connection between the material from 4Q530 and the late Rabbinic text known as the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*.⁶¹ This rabbinic account was allegedly a part of the no longer extant *Midrash Abkir*.⁶² Some scholars point to striking similarities between *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* and the dream from 4Q530.⁶³ Similarly to 4Q530, the midrash also portrays the giant's dream about the destruction of the garden in a way that symbolizes the destruction of the world.⁶⁴

The *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* has survived in several manuscripts,⁶⁵ including the composition known as the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel*. It is noteworthy that in the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* is situated between two almost identical stories connected with the "two stelae" tradition. In M. Gaster's edition⁶⁶ of the *Chronicles*, the *Midrash Shemhazai and Azael* occupies chapter 25. In chapter 24, the following story can be found:

...Jubal discovered the science of music, whence arose all the tunes for the above two instruments. This art is very great. And it came to pass, when he heard of the judgments which Adam prophesied concerning the two trials to come upon his descendants by the flood, the destruction and fire, he wrote down the science of music upon two pillars, one of white marble, and the other of brick, so that it one would melt and crumble away on account of the water, the other would be saved. 24:6-9.⁶⁷

⁶⁰ Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaeon Cosmology*, 88.

⁶¹ Milik, *The Books of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976) 321-330; Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaeon Cosmology*, 86-7; Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (TSAJ, 63; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997) 114-15.

⁶² On *Midrash Abkir* see: H.L. Strack and G. Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (Edinburg: T&T Clark, 1991) 341; A. Marmorstein, "Midrash Abkir" *Debir* 1 (1923) 113-44.

⁶³ For a detailed discussion of the similarities see: Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaeon Cosmology*, 86-7. For the criticism of Reeves' position see: L. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (TSAJ, 63; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997) 115.

⁶⁴ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 328.

⁶⁵ Cf. J.D. Eisenstein, *Otzar midrashim* (2 vols.; New York: J.D. Eisenstein, 1915) 2.549-50; A. Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrash* (Jerusalem, 1938) 4.127-28; Ch. Albeck, *Midrash Bereshit Rabbati* (Jerusalem, 1940) 29-31; R. Martini, *Pugio Fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos* (Leipzig, 1687) 937-39.

⁶⁶ *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel* (tr. M. Gaster; Oriental Translation Fund, 4; London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1899).

⁶⁷ *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel* (tr. M. Gaster; Oriental Translation Fund, 4; London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1899) 51.

In chapter 26 of Gaster's edition, right after the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*, the story about the two pillars is repeated again⁶⁸ in a slightly different form.⁶⁹ The second time, it is placed before the account about Enoch and the Flood.⁷⁰

An important detail in Jubal's fragments is that they do not connect the "two stelae" narrative with the Sethites, the constant feature of the stories based on the Josephus account.⁷¹ Jubal represents the Cainites. Both texts from the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* do not seem to object to this line of descent. Jubal, as well as the Sethites, knows about Adam's prophecy. The reference to Adam in Jubal's story might indicate that the main theological concern of the writers/editors of the "two stelae" accounts was not the prominent role of the Sethites, but rather Adam's prophecy about the upcoming destruction of the earth. Here again the traces of the Adamic tradition(s) are clearly observable.

It was mentioned earlier that the *Book of Giants* entertains the idea of the dual destruction of the world, by water and fire. Although the Bible and the Pseudepigrapha commonly refer to the Flood they rarely use the image of the earth's destruction by fire. It also appears that the Enochic Watchers/Giants account is one of the few places in intertestamental Jewish literature where the necessity of such fire annihilation finds a consistent theological explanation. In spite of the fragmentary nature of the extant materials, they nevertheless are able to demonstrate the complexity of the theme in the *Book of Giants*.

It should be noted that the allusions to the future judgment by fire are not confined only to the Aramaic portions found at Qumran. The fragments of the *Book of Giants* which have survived in other languages give additional details of this theme in the book.⁷² They include several Manichaean

⁶⁸ M. Gaster in his commentary on both passages about the two tablets' tradition noted that "...in chapter 26 our compiler seems to have intercalated from the middle of paragraph 15 on to the end of 20 a tradition that occurs once before in chapter 24, paragraph 6-9, and which is missing in the Latin. It is not at all improbable that this portion belongs to the old original." *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, lxxv.

⁶⁹ "...Jubal heard the prophesy of Adam concerning two judgments about to come upon the world by means of the flood, the dispersion and fire, that he wrote down the science of music upon two pillars, one of fine white marble and the other of brick, so that in the event of the one melting and being destroyed by the waters, the other would be saved. 26:15-20." *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, 56.

⁷⁰ "...and Enoch - who was the author of many writings - walked with God, and was no more, for God had taken him away and placed him in the Garden of Eden, where he will remain until Elijah shall appear and restore the hearts of the fathers to the children. And the Flood took place." *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, 57.

⁷¹ Another distinctive feature in Jubal's story is that it refers to white marble as one of the materials used for the stelae. As far as I know, the only other text that refers to this component in the "two stelae" stories is Enoch's account from *Palaea Historica*.

⁷² Additional evidence that the motif of fire destruction played an important role in the *Book of Giants* is a passage from George Syncellus, which some scholars believe might be

fragments in Middle-Persian, Partian, and Coptic which address the motif the annihilation of the world by fire.⁷³

Tablets

We mentioned earlier that there are some indications that the theme of the Enochic tablets play quite a prominent role in the *Book of Giants*. Unfortunately, the fragmentary character of the extant materials does not allow us to draw a coherent picture of the "tablets" tradition in this enigmatic text. It is important, however, to emphasize several features of this theme relevant to the subject of our investigation:

1. It is clear that the story of the tablets represents a major theme in the original *Book of Giants*. In a relatively small amount of the extant Qumran materials of the *Book of Giants*, the *contextual* reference to the tablet(s)

related to the textual tradition of the *Book of Giants*. See: Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 318-20; Adler, *Time Immemorial*, 179. Syncellus' fragment describes the fire destruction of Mount Hermon, the prominent topos where the Watchers' descent once took place. The text preserved in Syncellus reads: "...and again, concerning the mountain, on which they swore and bound themselves by oath, the one to the other, not to withdraw from it for all eternity: There will be descend on it neither cold, nor snow, nor frost, nor dew, unless they descend on it in malediction, until the day of the Great Judgment. At that time it will be burned and brought low, it will be consumed and melted down, like wax by fire. Thus it will be burned as a result of all its works..." Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 318. For the critical edition of the text see: Georgius Syncellus, *Ecloga Chronographica* (ed. A.A. Mosshammer; Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana; Leipzig: Teubner, 1984) 26-7. The story of fire destruction of Mount Hermon in Syncellus echoes *I Enoch* 10:13-16, where God tells Michael that He has prepared the destruction by fire for the Watchers.

⁷³ The first group of fragments is connected with the final fire punishment of "sinners" (in Henning's opinion, "sinners" represent the Watchers and the Giants) under the eyes of the Righteous. Henning believes that this group of texts belonged to the Kawân. F - "(Col. D) ...sinners...is visible, where out of this fire your soul will be prepared (for the transfer) to eternal ruin (?). And as for you, sinful misbegotten sons of the Wrathful Self, cofounders of the true words of that Holy One, disturbers of the action of Good Deed, aggressors upon Piety,...-ers of the Living..., who their...

(Col. E)... and on brilliant wings they shall fly and soar further outside and above that Fire, and shall gaze into its depth and height. And those Righteous that will stand around it, outside and above, they themselves shall have power over that Great Fire, and over everything in it...blaze...souls that...

(Col.F)...they are purer and stronger [than the] Great Fire of Ruin that sets the worlds ablaze. They shall stand around it, outside and above, and splendor shall shine over them. Further outside and above it they shall fly (?) after those souls that may try to escape from the Fire. And that..." W.B. Henning, "The Book of the Giants" *BSOAS* 11 (1943-46) 68. Several other Manichaean fragments allude to the motif of the fire annihilation of the world. They include a Parthian fragment about the Great Fire and a Coptic fragment from Manichaean Psalm book where the name of Enoch is mentioned: N - "And the story about the Great Fire: like unto (the way in which) the Fire, with powerful wrath, swallows this world and enjoys it...;" Q - "The Righteous who were burnt in the fire, they endured. This multitude that were wiped out, four thousand ... Enoch also, the Sage, the transgressors being..." W.B. Henning, "The Book of the Giants" *BSOAS* 11 (1943-46) 72.

occurs six times in three fragments: 2Q26;⁷⁴ 4Q203 7BII,⁷⁵ and 4Q203 8.⁷⁶ The tablets are also mentioned in the Sundermann fragment of the Manichaean *Book of Giants*⁷⁷ and in the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*.⁷⁸

2. Several fragments of the *Book of Giants* refer to two tablets. The two tablets are addressed in 4Q203 7 BII and 4Q203 8. This number of tablets also occurs in the Middle Persian fragment of the *Book of Giants* published by W. Sundermann.⁷⁹

3. The extant materials ascribe the authorship of the tablets to Enoch. 4Q203 8 refers to a “copy of the seco[n]d tablet of [the] le[tter...] by the hand of Enoch, the distinguished scribe...”⁸⁰ Enoch is described as the distinguished scribe. He is also portrayed as the one who copied the tablets, since the reference to a “copy of the seco[n]d tablet” in 4Q203 8:3-4 occurs in conjunction with his name.

4. The reference to Enoch’s copying of the tablet is quite intriguing, since “copying” plays a decisive role in various two tablets/stelae materials mentioned in our research earlier, which are construed around the idea of the duplication of the tablets in various materials.

5. In conclusion to this section, it should be noted that the *Book of Giants*’ materials seem to contain traces of a more developed and multifaceted tradition about the tablets than the later “two tablets” accounts. In the *Book of Giants* copying is only one of the several roles Enoch has in relation to the tablets. In this text the theme of tablets seems closely connected with other traditional roles of the elevated Enoch such as those of Mediator⁸¹ and the Witness of the Divine Judgment.⁸² These Enochic roles

⁷⁴ 2Q26 “[...]and] they washed the tablet to er[ase...] [...] and the water rose above the [tab]let [...] [...] and they lifted the tablet from the water, the tablet which [...] [...]... [...] to them all [...].” F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997) 1.221.

⁷⁵ 4Q203 7BII: “[...] [...] to you, Maha[wai...] the two tablets [...] and the second has not been read up till now [...].” F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997) 1.411.

⁷⁶ 4Q203 8: “...Copy of the seco[n]d tablet of [the] le[tter...] by the hand of Enoch, the distinguished scribe [...] and holy (one), to Shemihazah and to all [his] com[panions...] ...” F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997) 1.411.

⁷⁷ W. Sundermann, “Ein weiteres Fragment aus Manis Gigantenbuch” *Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata* (Acta Iranica, 23; Leiden: Brill, 1984) 491-505.

⁷⁸ “One saw a great stone spread over the earth like a table, the whole of which was written over with lines (of writing). And an angel (was seen by him) descending from the firmament with a knife in his hand and he was erasing and obliterating all the lines, save one line with four words upon it.” Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 328.

⁷⁹ W. Sundermann, “Ein weiteres Fragment aus Manis Gigantenbuch” *Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata* (Acta Iranica, 23; Leiden: Brill, 1984) 495-6.

⁸⁰ F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997) 1.411.

⁸¹ The “mediating” function of Enoch remains prominent during the whole history of the Enochic traditions. It has been shown previously that in *1 Enoch* and *2 Enoch*, the

are reflected in the peculiar functions of the tablets in the *Book of Giants*. The tablets serve as a record of accusations against the Watchers/Giants, representing the written account of their sins.⁸³ The tablets are also a mediating tool in the dialogue between God and Watchers/Giants via the representatives of the both parties - Enoch and Mahaway.⁸⁴ These peculiar functions are only slightly hinted at later tablet traditions.⁸⁵ The later "two tablets" traditions seem primarily preoccupied with the idea of copying, where the tablets are portrayed as the specific means for the preservation of knowledge in the impending catastrophe. They therefore appear to represent only one facet of the complicated story of the Enochic tablets.

Conclusion

1. The first part of our research deals with the "two stelae" stories based on the Josephus account. Our analysis of these accounts shows that they contain traces of the Enochic traditions. It appears that these "two stelae" stories interact with Enochic traditions by way of attributing various Enochic roles to the alleged "authors" of the antediluvian stelae. These "authors" are usually portrayed as the Sethites. The attribution involves substantial rewriting of the original Enochic motifs and themes. The analysis also shows that the interaction of "two stelae" stories with Enochic traditions seems to involve some details of the Watchers/Giants' story.

2. The passage found in *Jewish Antiquities* and the stories which are based on this account demonstrate the influence of the Adamic tradition(s). In these accounts Adam's prophecy about the upcoming destruction of the earth serves as the reason for the making of the antediluvian stelae.

3. It is also possible that despite the decisive formative influence Josephus' account had on the subsequent "two stelae" stories, it itself represents the Adamic revision of the original two stelae/tablets account based on Noachic/Enochic traditions. Noah's preaching to the Giants in Josephus' account, the host of Enochic roles, and remnants of the Watchers/Giants

seventh antediluvian patriarch "transmits" celestial knowledge to various human and angelic agents. In the Merkabah tradition, Metatron/Enoch is also responsible for transmitting the highest secrets to the Princes under him and to humankind.

⁸² On Enoch's roles see A. Orlov, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in 2 *Enoch*" *JSP* 18 (1998) 71-86.

⁸³ Cf. 4Q203 8:6-15 and possibly 2Q26. Apparently the last one pictures an attempt to erase (wash out) this record of inequities: 2Q26 "[...and] they washed the tablet to er[ase...] and the water rose above the [tab]let [...] and they lifted the tablet from the water, the tablet which [...] to them all [...]" F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997) 1.221.

⁸⁴ F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 110.

⁸⁵ *Palaea Historica* alludes to the fact that Enoch starts writing tablets only after the Giants rejected his call to repentance.

story in various “two stelae” narratives may point to the Noachic/Enochic prototype.

4. It is possible that the Noachic/Enochic prototext was dedicated neither to the Sethites nor the Cananites who followed Adam’s instructions, but rather to Enoch and Noah.

5. The tradition preserved in *Palaea Historica* might directly derive from this Noachic/Enochic original, which has not undergone Adamic revisions.

6. It is possible that some “two stelae” accounts might be connected with, or maybe even derived from, traditions similar to the *Book of Giants*. The circulating of materials related to the *Book of Giants* traditions in medieval Christian milieux does not seem impossible. W. Adler observes that some passages found in Syncellus “imply the existence of some work circulating in the name of the Giants.”⁸⁶ He also demonstrates that such references sometimes occur in connection with the two stelae/tablets traditions.⁸⁷

7. In an attempt to find possible antecedents for the two tablets story in the known Noachic/Enochic materials the tablet tradition(s) preserved in the *Book of Giants* fragments were explored.

8. While our comparative analysis of the “two stelae” traditions with materials from the *Book of Giants* revealed some suggestive similarities, it is evident that the extremely fragmentary character of the extant materials from the *Book of Giants* cannot give us definite evidence about the presence of the two stelae/tablets tradition in the original document.

⁸⁶ Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, 91, n.68.

⁸⁷ Cf. Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, 91, n. 68 and 181-82.

Celestial Choir-Master: The Liturgical Role of Enoch-Metatron in 2 *Enoch* and Merkabah Tradition

Introduction

In one of his recent publications,¹ Philip Alexander traces the development of Enoch's image through the Jewish literature of the Second Temple period up to the early Middle Ages. His study points to "a genuine, ongoing tradition" that shows the astonishing persistence of certain motifs. As an example, Alexander explicates the evolution of Enoch's priestly role which was prominent in the Second Temple materials and underwent in the later Merkabah sources further development in Metatron's sacerdotal duties. He observes that "Enoch in *Jubilees* in the second century BCE is a high priest. Almost a thousand years later he retains this role in the Heikhalot texts, though in a rather different setting."² Noting the long-lasting association of Enoch-Metatron³ with the sacerdotal office, P. Alexander draws attention to

¹ P. Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergen; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998) 102-104; H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973) 52-63.

² Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God," 107.

³ On Metatron's figure, see: D. Abrams, "The Boundaries of Divine Ontology: the Inclusion and Exclusion of Metatron in the Godhead" *HTR* 87 (1994) 291-321; P.S. Alexander, "The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch" *JJS* 28-29 (1977-1978) 156-180; idem, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.223-315; H. Bietenhard, *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1951) 143-160; M. Black, "The Origin of the Name Metatron" *VT* 1 (1951) 217-219; M.S. Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1983) 124ff; J. Dan, "The Seventy Names of Metatron," in: J. Dan, *Jewish Mysticism. Late Antiquity* (2 vols.; Northvale: Jason Aronson, 1998) 1.229-34; idem, *The Ancient Jewish Mysticism* (Tel-Aviv: MOD Books, 1993) 108-124; J.R. Davila, "Of Methodology, Monotheism and Metatron," *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism. Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus* (eds. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis; SJSJ, 63; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 3-18; idem, "Melchizedek, the 'Youth,' and Jesus," in: *The Dead Sea scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and early Christianity. Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001* (ed. J.R. Davila; STDJ, 46; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 248-74; W. Fauth, "Tatrosjah-totrosjah und Metatron in der jüdischen Merkabah-Mystik" *JSJ* 22 (1991) 40-87; C. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT 2.94; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1997) 156; D.

the priestly role of this exalted figure attested in 3 *Enoch* 15B where Enoch-Metatron is put in charge of the heavenly tabernacle. The passage from *Sefer Hekhalot* reads:

Metatron is the Prince over all princes, and stands before him who is exalted above all gods. He goes beneath the throne of glory, where he has a great heavenly tabernacle of light, and brings out the deafening fire, and puts it in the ears of the

Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988) 420ff; M. Hengel, *Studies in Early Christology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995) 191-194; I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (Leiden-Köln: E. J. Brill, 1980) 195-206; M. Himmelfarb, "A Report on Enoch in Rabbinic Literature," *SBLSP* (1978) 259-69; C. Kaplan, "The Angel of Peace, Uriel – Metatron" *Anglican Theological Review* 13 (1931) 306-313; M. Idel, "Enoch is Metatron" *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220-240; idem, *The Mystical Experience of Abraham Abulafia* (tr. J. Chipman; Albany: SUNY, 1988) 117-19; idem, "Metatron – Comments on the Development of Jewish Myth," in: *Myth in Jewish Thought* (ed. H. Pediah; Ber Sheva: Ber Sheva University Press, forthcoming); S. Lieberman, *Sheki'in* (Jerusalem, 1939) 11-16; idem, "Metatron, the Meaning of his Name and his Functions," Appendix to: Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 235-241; M. Mach, *Entwicklungsstudien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1992) esp. 394-396 (bibliography on Metatron); R. Margaliot, *Mal'akei 'Elyon* (Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1964) 73-108; J. Milik, *The Books of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976) 125-35; G.F. Moore, "Intermediaries in Jewish Theology: Memra, Shekinah, Metatron," *HTR* 15 (1922) 41-85; C. Mopsik, *Le Livre hébreu d'Hénoch ou Livre des palais* (Paris: Verdier, 1989); C.R.A. Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition" *JJS* 43 (1992) 1-31, esp. 7-11; A. Murtonen, "The Figure of Metatron" *VT* 3 (1953) 409-411; H. Odeberg, "Föreställningarna om Metatron i äldre judisk mystic," *Kyrkohistorisk Årsskrift* 27 (1927) 1-20; idem, *3 Enoch, or the Book of Enoch*, 79-146; idem, "Enoch," *TDNT* 2.556-560; A. Orlov, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in 2 *Enoch*" *JSP* 18 (1998) 71-86; idem, "The Origin of the Name 'Metatron' and the Text of 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse) of Enoch" *JSP* 21 (2000) 19-26; P. Schäfer, *Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1992) 29-32; G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (Jerusalem: Schocken Publishing House, 1941) 43-55; idem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkavah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, [1960] 1965) 43-55; idem, "Metatron," *EJ* (Jerusalem: Keter, 1971) 11.1443-1446; idem, *Kabbalah* (New York: Dorset Press, 1987) 377-381; idem, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990) 214-15; A. F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (SJLA 25; Leiden: Brill, 1977) 60-73; G.G. Stroumsa, "Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ" *HTR* 76 (1983) 269-288; I. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar* (3 vols.; London: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1989) 2.626-632; G. Vajda, "Pour le Dossier de Metatron," in: *Studies in Jewish Religious and Intellectual History Presented to A. Altmann* (eds. S. Stein and R. Loewe; University of Alabama Press, 1979) 345-354; E.E. Urbach, *The Sages, Their Concepts and Beliefs* (2 vols.; tr. I. Abrahams; Jerusalem, 1975) 1.138-139; 2.743-744; E. Wolfson, *Through a Speculum that Shines: Vision and Imagination in Medieval Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994) 113, 334; idem, "Metatron and Shi'ur Qomah in the Writings of Haside Ashkenaz," in: *Mysticism, Magic and Kabbalah in Ashkenazi Judaism* (eds. Karl E. Groezinger and J. Dan, Berlin - New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1995) 60-92.

holy creatures, so that they should not hear the sound of the utterance that issues from the mouth of the Almighty.⁴

This passage portrays the translated patriarch as a heavenly priest in the celestial tabernacle located beneath God's *Kavod*. Along with the reference to Metatron's role as the sacerdotal servant, the text also alludes to another, more enigmatic tradition in which this angel is depicted as the one who inserts "the deafening fire" into the ears of the *hayyot* so the holy creatures will not be harmed by the voice of the Almighty. This reference might allude to another distinctive role of the exalted angel, to his office of the celestial choir-master, i.e., one who directs the angelic liturgy taking place before the Throne of Glory. The tradition attested in *3 Enoch* 15B, however, does not explicate this role of Metatron, most likely because of the fragmentary nature of this passage which is considered by scholars as a late addition to *Sefer Hekhalot*.⁵ A similar description in *Synopse* §390⁶ appears to have preserved better the original tradition about Metatron's unique liturgical role. The text relates:

One *hayyah* rises above the seraphim and descends upon the tabernacle of the youth (משכן הנער) whose name is Metatron, and says in a great voice, a voice of sheer silence: "The Throne of Glory is shining." Suddenly the angels fall silent. The watchers and the holy ones become quiet. They are silent, and are pushed into the river of fire. The *hayyot* put their faces on the ground, and this youth whose name is Metatron brings the fire of deafness and puts it into their ears so that they could not hear the sound of God's speech or the ineffable name. The youth whose name is Metatron then invokes, in seven voices (מזכיר באות שעה בשבעה קולות) (שהנער ששמו מטטרון), his living, pure, honored, awesome, holy, noble, strong, beloved, mighty, powerful name.⁷

Here again the themes of Metatron's priesthood in the heavenly tabernacle and his duty of bringing the fire of deafness to the *hayyot* are conflated.

⁴ P. Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 303.

⁵ The literary integrity of *Sefer Hekhalot* is a complicated issue. The form of the work in the major manuscripts demonstrates "clear signs of editing." Scholars observe that "3 *Enoch* has arisen through the combination of many separate traditions: it tends to break down into smaller 'self-contained' units which probably existed prior to their incorporation into the present work... It is not the total product of a single author at particular point in time, but the deposits of a 'school tradition' which incorporates elements from widely different periods." Alexander, "3 Enoch," 223. Alexander also observes that "an inspection of the textual tradition shows that chapters 3-15/16, which describe the elevation of Enoch, circulated as an independent tract...and it is intrinsically probable that these chapters formed the core round which the longer recensions grew." Alexander, "The Historical Settings of the Hebrew Book of Enoch," 156-7. The detailed discussion of the literary character of *3 Enoch* and its possible transmission history transcends the boundaries of current investigation.

⁶ MS New York JTS 8128.

⁷ Peter Schäfer, with M. Schlüter and H. G. von Mutius., *Synopse zur Hekhaloth-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981) 164.

This passage also indicates that Metatron is not only the one who protects and prepares the heavenly hosts for their praise to the Deity,⁸ but also the choir-master who himself conducts the liturgical ceremony by invoking the divine name. The passage underlines the extraordinary scope of Metatron's own vocal abilities that allow him to invoke the Deity's name in seven voices. Yet the portrayal of this celestial choir-master intentionally "deafening" the members of his own choir might appear puzzling. A close examination of Hekhalot liturgical theology may however help clarify the paradoxical imagery. Peter Schäfer points out that in the Hekhalot writings "the heavenly praise is directed solely toward God" since "for all others who hear it—men as well as angels—it can be destructive."⁹ As an example, Schäfer refers to a passage from *Hekhalot Rabbati* which offers a chain of warnings about the grave dangers encountered by those who dare to hear the angelic praise.¹⁰ James Davila's recent study also confirms the importance of the motif of the dangerous encounters in the course of the heavenly worship in Hekhalot liturgical settings.¹¹

This motif may constitute one of the main reasons for Metatron's preventive ritual of putting the deafening fire into the ears of the holy creatures.¹² It is also helpful to realize that Youth-Metatron's role of safeguarding the angelic hosts stems directly from his duties as the liturgical servant and the director of angelic hosts.

It should be stressed that while Enoch-Metatron's liturgical office plays a prominent role in the Merkabah lore, this tradition appears to be absent in early Enochic texts, including *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Genesis Apocryphon* and the *Book of Giants*. Despite this apparent absence, this paper will argue that the roots of Enoch-Metatron's liturgical imagery can be traced to the Second Temple Enochic lore, namely to *2 Enoch*, the Jewish apocalypse, apparently written in the first century CE. Some traditions found in this text

⁸ Another Hekhalot passage attested in *Synopse* §385 also elaborates the liturgical role of the exalted angel: "...when the youth enters below the throne of glory, God embraces him with a shining face. All the angels gather and address God as "the great, mighty, awesome God," and they praise God three times a day by means of the youth (יד הנער) (ומשבחים הקב"ה שלשה פעמים יום על)...." Schäfer, *et al.*, *Synopse*, 162-3.

⁹ Schäfer, *Hidden and Manifest God*, 25.

¹⁰ *Synopse* 104 reads: "...The voice of the first one: one who hears [this] voice, will immediately go mad and tumble down. The voice of the second one: everyone who hears it, immediately goes astray and does not return. The voice of the third one: one who hears [this] voice is struck by cramps and he dies immediately...." Schäfer, *Hidden and Manifest God*, 25.

¹¹ On this motif of the dangerous encounters with the divine in the Hekhalot literature, see: James R. Davila, *Descenders to the Chariot: The People Behind the Hekhalot Literature* (SJSJ, 70; Leiden: Brill, 2001) 136-139.

¹² It appears that the angelic hosts must be protected not for the whole course of the celestial liturgy but only during the invocation of the divine name. Cf. M.S. Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Texts and Recensions* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1985) 162-163.

appear to serve as the initial background for the developments of the future liturgical role of Enoch-Metatron as the celestial choir-master. This study will focus on investigating these developments.

Priestly Role of the Seventh Antediluvian Patriarch in Early Enochic Traditions

Before our research proceeds to a detailed analysis of the liturgical role of the translated patriarch in *2 Enoch* and the Merkabah tradition, a brief introduction to the priestly and liturgical function of the seventh antediluvian hero in the pseudepigraphical materials is needed.

In early Enochic booklets the seventh antediluvian patriarch is closely associated with the celestial sanctuary located, as in the later Merkabah lore, in the immediate proximity to the Divine Throne. Enoch's affiliations with the heavenly Temple in the *Book of the Watchers*, the *Book of Dreams* and the *Book of Jubilees* can be seen as the gradual evolution from the implicit references to his heavenly priesthood in the earliest Enochic materials to a more overt recognition and description of his sacerdotal function in the later ones. While later Enochic traditions attested in the *Book of Jubilees* unambiguously point to Enoch's priestly role by referring to his incense sacrifice in the celestial sanctuary, the earlier associations of the patriarch with the heavenly Temple hinted at in the *Book of the Watchers* took the form of rather enigmatic depictions. A certain amount of exegetical work is, therefore, required to discern the proper meaning of these initial associations of the patriarch with the celestial sanctuary.

Martha Himmelfarb's research helps to clarify Enoch's possible connections with the celestial sanctuary in the *Book of the Watchers*, the account of which appears to fashion the ascension of the seventh antediluvian patriarch to the Throne of Glory as a visitation of the heavenly Temple.¹³ *1 Enoch* 14:9-18 reads:

¹³ M. Himmelfarb, "The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of the Watchers, and the Wisdom of ben Sira," in *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces: Essays in the Geographics of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (Eds. Jamie Scott and Paul Simpson-Housley; New York: Greenwood Press, 1991) 63-78; idem, "Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple," in: *Society of Biblical Literature 1987 Seminar Papers* (SBLSP 26; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987) 210-217. Himmelfarb's research draws on the previous publications of J. Maier and G.W.E. Nickelsburg. Cf. J. Maier, "Das Gefährdungsmotiv bei der Himmelsreise in der jüdischen Apokalyptik und 'Gnosis'" *Kairos* 5(1) 1963 18-40, esp. 23; idem, *Vom Kultus zur Gnosis*, 127-8; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee" *JBL* 100 (1981) 575-600, esp. 576-82. Cf. also H. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988) 101-102; Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, 81.

And I proceeded until I came near to a wall (*teqm*) which was built of hailstones, and a tongue of fire surrounded it, and it began to make me afraid. And I went into the tongue of fire and came near to a large house (*bēt 'ābijy*) which was built of hailstones, and the wall of that house (was) like a mosaic (made) of hailstones, and its floor (was) show. Its roof (was) like the path of the stars and flashes of lightning, and among them (were) fiery Cherubim, and their heaven (was like) water. And (there was) a fire burning around its wall, and its door was ablaze with fire. And I went into that house, and (it was) hot as fire and cold as snow, and there was neither pleasure nor life in it. Fear covered me and trembling, I fell on my face. And I saw in the vision, and behold, another house (*kel'e bēt*), which was larger than the former, and all its doors (were) open before me, and (it was) built of a tongue of fire. And in everything it so excelled in glory and splendor and size that I am unable to describe you its glory and its size. And its floor (was) fire, and above (were) lightning and the path of the stars, and its roof also (was) a burning fire. And I looked and I saw in it a high throne, and its appearance (was) like ice and its surrounds like the shining sun and the sound of Cherubim.¹⁴

Commenting on this passage, Himmelfarb draws attention to the description of the celestial edifices which Enoch encounters in his approach to the Throne. She notes that the Ethiopic text reports that, in order to reach God's Throne, the patriarch passes through three celestial constructions: a wall, an outer house, and an inner house. The Greek version of this narrative mentions a house instead of a wall. Himmelfarb observes that "more clearly in the Greek, but also in the Ethiopic this arrangement echoes the structure of the earthly temple with its vestibule (*'ulam*), sanctuary (*hekhal*), and holy of holies (*dvir*)."¹⁵ God's throne is located in the innermost chamber of this heavenly structure and is represented by a throne of cherubim. It can be seen as a heavenly counterpart to the cherubim found in the Holy of Holies in the Jerusalem temple.¹⁶ In drawing parallels between the descriptions of

¹⁴ M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978) 1.50-52; 2.98-99.

¹⁵ Himmelfarb, "Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple," 210.

¹⁶ One comment must be made about the early traditions and sources that may lie behind the descriptions of the upper sanctuary in *I Enoch* 14. Scholars observe that the idea of heaven as a temple was not invented by the author of the *Book of the Watchers* since the concept of the heavenly temple as a heavenly counterpart of the earthly sanctuary was widespread in the ancient Near East and appears in a number of biblical sources. Cf. Himmelfarb, "The Temple and the Garden of Eden," 68. Students of Jewish priestly traditions previously noted that the existence of such a conception of the heavenly sanctuary appears to become increasingly important in the times of religious crises when the earthly sanctuaries were either destroyed or "defiled" by "improper" rituals or priestly successions. For an extensive discussion of this subject, see: *Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Temples und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (eds. B. Ego, et al.; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1999); R. Elior, "From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines: Prayer and Sacred Song in the Hekhalot Literature and Its Relation to Temple Traditions" *JSQ* 4 (1997) 217-67; idem, "The Priestly Nature of the Mystical Heritage in Heykalot Literature," in: *Expérience et écriture mystiques dans les religions du livre: Actes d'un colloque international tenu par le Centre*

the heavenly Temple in the *Book of the Watchers* and the features of the earthly sanctuary, Himmelfarb observes that the “fiery cherubim” which Enoch sees on the ceiling of the first house (Ethiopic) or middle house (Greek) of the heavenly structure represent, not the cherubim of the divine throne, but images that recall the figures on the hangings on the wall of the terrestrial tabernacle mentioned in Ex 26:1, 31; 36:8, 35 or possibly the figures which, according to 1 Kings 6:29, 2 Chr 3:7 and Ezek 41:15-26, were engraved on the walls of the earthly temple.¹⁷

Several words must be said about the servants of the heavenly sanctuary depicted in *1 Enoch* 14. Himmelfarb observes that the priests of the heavenly temple in the *Book of the Watchers* appear to be represented by angels, since the author of the text depicts them as the ones “standing before God’s throne in the heavenly temple.”¹⁸ She also points to the possibility that in the *Book of the Watchers* the patriarch himself in the course of his ascent becomes a priest¹⁹ similarly to the angels.²⁰ In this perspective, the angelic status of the patriarch and his priestly role²¹ are viewed as mutually

d'études juives Université de Paris IV-Sorbonne 1994 (eds. R. B. Fenton and R. Goetschel; EJM 22; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 41-54.

¹⁷ Himmelfarb, "Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple," 211.

¹⁸ Himmelfarb, "Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple," 211. David Halperin also supports this position. In his view, “the angels, barred from the inner house, are the priests of Enoch’s heavenly Temple. The high priest must be Enoch himself, who appears in the celestial Holy of Holies to procure forgiveness for holy beings.” Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, 82.

¹⁹ David Halperin’s studies also stress the “apocalyptic” priestly function of Enoch in the *Book of the Watchers*. He observes that “Daniel and Enoch share an image, perhaps drawn from the hymnic tradition of merkabah exegesis (think of the Angelic liturgy), of God surrounded by multitudes of angels. But, in the Holy of Holies, God sits alone....The angels, barred from the inner house, are the priests of Enoch’s heavenly Temple. The high priest must be Enoch himself, who appears in the celestial Holy of Holies to procure forgiveness for holy beings.” Halperin, *Faces of the Chariot*, 81-2.

²⁰ Himmelfarb, “Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple,” 213.

²¹ George Nickelsburg’s earlier study on the temple symbolism in *1 Enoch* 14 provides some important additional details relevant to our ongoing discussion. Nickelsburg argues that Enoch’s “active” involvement in the vision of the Lord’s throne, when he passes through the chambers of the celestial sanctuary, might indicate that the author(s) of the *Book of the Watchers* perceived him as a servant associated with the activities in these chambers. Nickelsburg points to the fact that Enoch’s vision of the Throne in the *Book of the Watchers* is “qualitatively different from that described in the biblical throne visions” by way of the new “active” role of its visionary. This new, active participation of Enoch in the vision puts *1 Enoch* 14 closer to later Merkabah accounts which are different from biblical visions. Nickelsburg stresses that in the biblical throne visions, the seer is passive or, at best, his participation is reactionary. In contrast, in the Merkabah accounts, Enoch appears to be actively involved in his vision. In Nickelsburg’s view, the verbal forms of the narrative (“I drew near the wall,” “I went into that house”) serve as further indications of the active “participation” of the seer in the visionary “reality” of the heavenly Throne/Temple. On the other hand, biblical visions are not completely forgotten by Enochic authors and provide an important exegetical framework for *1 Enoch* 14.

interconnected. Himmelfarb stresses that “the author of the *Book of the Watchers* claims angelic status for Enoch through his service in the heavenly temple” since “the ascent shows him passing through the outer court of the temple and the sanctuary to the door of the holy of holies, where God addresses him with his own mouth.”²² It is important for our investigation to note, that despite that Enoch appears to be envisioned as an angel by the authors of the text, nothing is said about his leading role in the angelic liturgy.

The traditions about the seventh patriarch’s heavenly priesthood are not confined solely to the materials found in the *Book of the Watchers*, since they are attested in other *I Enoch*’s materials, including the *Animal Apocalypse*.

It is noteworthy that, whereas in the *Book of the Watchers* Enoch’s associations with the heavenly temple are clothed with rather ambiguous imagery, his depictions in the *Animal Apocalypse* do not leave any serious doubts that some of the early Enochic traditions understood Enoch to be intimately connected with the heavenly sanctuary.

Chapter 87 of *I Enoch* portrays the patriarch taken by three angels from the earth and raised to a high tower, where he is expected to remain until he will see the judgment prepared for the Watchers and their earthly families. *I Enoch* 87:3-4 reads:

And those three who came out last took hold of me by my hand, and raised me from the generations of the earth, and lifted me on to a high place, and showed me a tower (*māxefada*) high above the earth, and all the hills were lower. And one said to me: “Remain here until you have seen everything which is coming upon these elephants and camels and asses, and upon the stars, and upon all the bulls.”²³

James VanderKam notes a significant detail in this description, namely, Enoch’s association with a tower. He observes that this term²⁴ is reserved

Comparing the Enochic vision with the Ezekelian account of the temple, Nickelsburg suggests that the Enochic narrative also represents a vision of the temple, but, in this case, the heavenly one. He argues that “the similarities to Ezek 40-48, together with other evidence, indicate that Enoch is describing his ascent to the heavenly temple and his progress through its *temenos* to the door of the holy of holies, where the chariot throne of God is set.” G.W.E. Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee” *JBL* 100 (1981) 575-600, esp. 579-81.

²² Himmelfarb, “Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple,” 212.

²³ Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 1.294; 2.198.

²⁴ Cf. *I Enoch* 89:50 “And that house became large and broad, and for those sheep a high tower was built on that house for the Lord of the sheep; and that house was low, but the tower was raised up and high; and the Lord of the sheep stood on that tower, and they spread a full table before him.” Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 208 ; *I Enoch* 89:73 “And they began again to build, as before, and they raised up that tower, and it was called the high tower; and they began again to place a table before the tower, but all the bread on it (was) unclean and was not pure.” Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.211.

in the *Animal Apocalypse* for a temple.²⁵ The association of the patriarch with the tower is long-lasting, and apparently he must have spent there a considerable amount of time, since the text does not say anything about Enoch's return to the earth again until the time of judgment, so the patriarch is depicted as present in the heavenly sanctuary for most of the *Animal Apocalypse*.²⁶

Although the traditions about Enoch's associations with the heavenly Temple in the *Book of the Watchers* and in the *Animal Apocalypse* do not refer explicitly to his performance of the priestly duties, the account attested in the *Book of Jubilees* explicitly makes this reference.

Jub 4:23 depicts Enoch to be taken from human society and placed to Eden²⁷ "for (his) greatness and honor."²⁸ *Jubilees* then defines the Garden as a sanctuary²⁹ and Enoch as one who is offering an incense sacrifice on the mountain of *incense*:

He burned the evening incense³⁰ of the sanctuary which is acceptable before the Lord on the mountain of incense.³¹

James VanderKam suggests that here Enoch is depicted as one who "performs the rites of a priest in the temple."³² He further observes that

²⁵ J. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1995) 117.

²⁶ VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 117.

²⁷ For Enoch's place in the heavenly Paradise, see: *Testament of Benjamin* 10:6; *Apocalypse of Paul* 20; *Clementine Recognitions* 1:52; *Acts of Pilate* 25; and the *Ascension of Isaiah* 9:6. Cf. C. Rowland, "Enoch," in: *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (eds. K. van der Toorn, et al; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 302.

²⁸ J. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (2 vols.; CSCO 510-11, Scriptorum Aethiopicum 87-88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989) 2.28.

²⁹ VanderKam argues that there are other indications that in the *Book of Jubilees* Eden was understood as a sanctuary. As an example, he points to Jub 3:9-14 which "derives the law from Lev 11 regarding when women who has given birth may enter the sanctuary from the two times when Adam and Eve, respectively, went into the garden." VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generation*, 117.

³⁰One must note the peculiar details surrounding the depiction of Enoch's priestly duties in early Enochic lore. While the *Book of the Watchers* does not refer to any liturgical or sacrificial rituals of the patriarch, *Jubilees* depicts the patriarch offering incense to God. The absence of references to any animal sacrificial or liturgical practice in Enoch's sacerdotal duties might indicate that his office may have been understood by early Enochic traditions to be of the "divinatory angle," i.e., as the office of oracle-priest, practiced also by the Mesopotamian diviners who, similarly to Enoch's preoccupation with incense, widely used the ritual of libanomancy, or "smoke divination," a "practice of throwing cedar shavings onto a censer in order to observe the patterns and direction of the smoke." M.S. Moore, *The Balaam Traditions: Their Character and Development* (SBLDS, 113; Atlanta: Scholars, 1990) 43.

³¹ VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.28.

³² VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 117.

Enoch's priestly duties represent a new element³³ in "Enoch's expanding portfolio."³⁴

The purpose of the aforementioned analysis was to demonstrate that, despite that the early Enochic materials found in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* emphasize the patriarch's association with the heavenly sanctuary, they do not contain any references to his role in directing the celestial liturgy. Unlike the later Merkabah materials where the priestly duties of Enoch-Metatron are often juxtaposed with his liturgical activities, early Enochic lore does not link two these sacerdotal functions. Moreover it appears that in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* Enoch does not play any leading role in the celestial liturgy. Thus for example in the *Book of the Similitudes* (*1 Enoch* 39), where the celestial liturgy plays an important part, the patriarch does not play any significant role. Moreover the text stresses that Enoch is unable to sustain the frightening "Presence" of the Deity. In *1 Enoch* 39:14 the patriarch laments that during celestial liturgy his "face was transformed" until he was not able to see.³⁵ This lament makes clear that Enoch's capacities can in no way be compared with Metatron-Youth's potentialities which are able not only to sustain the terrifying "Presence" of the Deity but also to protect others, including the angelic hosts during the celestial liturgy.

These conceptual developments indicate that in the early Enochic materials the leading role of the translated patriarch in the sacerdotal settings remains solely priestly, but not liturgical. Unlike the later Merkabah materials where the theme of the celestial sanctuary (the tabernacle of the Youth) is often conflated with Metatron's role as the celestial choir-master, the early Enochic materials associated with *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* show only one side of the story. Our research must now proceed to the testimonies about Metatron's priestly and liturgical activities in the Hekhalot and *Shi'ur Qomah* materials.

³³ Scholars point to the possible polemical nature of the patriarch's priestly role. Gabriele Boccaccini observes that "Enochians completely ignore the Mosaic torah and the Jerusalem Temple, that is, the two tenets of the order of the universe." In his opinion, "the attribution to Enoch of priestly characteristics suggests the existence of a pure prediluvian, and pre-fall, priesthood and disrupts the foundation of the Zadokite priesthood, which claimed its origin in Aaron at the time of the exodus, in an age that, for the Enochians, was already corrupted after the angelic sin and the flood." G. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 74.

³⁴ VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 117.

³⁵ Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2.127.

Tabernacle of the Youth: Priestly and Liturgical Roles of Enoch-Metatron in Merkabah Tradition

It has been already mentioned that, in contrast to the early Enochic booklets which do not provide any hints to Enoch's leading role in the heavenly liturgy, in the Merkabah tradition the priestly role of Enoch-Metatron is closely intertwined with his pivotal place in the course of the angelic worship. Since both of these sacerdotal functions are closely interconnected, before we proceed to a detailed analysis of the liturgical imagery associated with this exalted angel we must explore Metatron's priestly duties, which in many respects echo and develop further the earlier Enochic traditions about the sacerdotal duties of the seventh antediluvian hero.

Heavenly High Priest

While the early Enochic materials depict the seventh antediluvian patriarch as a newcomer who just arrives to his new appointment in the heavenly sanctuary, the Merkabah materials portray Metatron as an established celestial citizen who is firmly placed in his sacerdotal office and even possesses his own heavenly sanctuary that now bears his name. Thus in the passage found in *Merkabah Shelemah* the heavenly tabernacle is called the tabernacle of Metatron (משכן מטטרון). In the tradition preserved in *Numbers Rabbah* 12:12 the heavenly sanctuary again is associated with one of Metatron's designations and is named the tabernacle of the Youth (משכן הנער).³⁶

R. Simon expounded: When the Holy One, blessed be He, told Israel to set up the Tabernacle He intimated to the ministering angels that they also should make a Tabernacle, and the one below was erected the other was erected on high. The latter was *the tabernacle of the youth* (משכן הנער) whose name was Metatron, and therein he offers up the souls of the righteous to atone for Israel in the days of their exile.³⁷

This close association between the exalted angel and the upper sanctuary becomes quite widespread in the Hekhalot lore where the celestial temple is often called the tabernacle of the Youth.³⁸

A significant detail of the rabbinic and Hekhalot descriptions of the tabernacle of the Youth is that this structure is "placed" in the immediate proximity to the Throne, more precisely right beneath the seat of Glory.³⁹

³⁶ It should be noted that the expression "the tabernacle of the Youth" occurs also in the *Shi'ur Qomah* materials. For a detailed analysis of the Metatron imagery in this tradition, see Cohen, *Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism*, 124ff.

³⁷ *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1961) 5.482-3.

³⁸ Cf. *Sefer Haqqomah* 155-164; *Siddur Rabbah* 37-46.

³⁹ *3 Enoch* 8:1 "R. Ishmael said: Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, said to me: Before the Holy One, blessed be he, set me to serve the throne of glory..." Alexander, "3

As mentioned in the introduction, 3 *Enoch* 15B locates Enoch-Metatron's "great heavenly tabernacle of light" beneath the throne of Glory.⁴⁰ This tradition appears to be not confined solely to the description attested in 3 *Enoch* since several Hekhalot passages depict Youth (who often is identified there with Metatron)⁴¹ as the one who "emerges" from beneath the Throne.⁴² The proximity of the tabernacle to *Kavod* recalls the early Enochic materials, more specifically 1 *Enoch* 14, where the patriarch's visitation of the celestial sanctuary is described as his approach to God's Throne. Both Enochic and Hekhalot traditions seem to allude here to Enoch-Metatron's role as the celestial high priest since he approaches the realm where the "ordinary" angelic or human creatures are not allowed to enter, namely the realm of the immediate presence of the Deity, the place of the Holy of Holies, which is situated behind the veil, represented by heavenly (פֶּרֶגְוֹד)⁴³ or terrestrial (פֶּרֶכֶת) "curtains." Metatron's service behind the heavenly Curtain parallels the unique function of the earthly high priest who alone was allowed to enter behind the veil of the terrestrial sanctuary.⁴⁴ It has been mentioned that the possible background of this unique role of Metatron can be traced to the Enochic materials, more specifically to 1 *Enoch* 14 where the patriarch alone appears in the celestial Holy of Holies while the other angels are barred from the inner house.⁴⁵ This depiction also correlates

Enoch," 262. Metatron's prominent role might also be reflected in the fragment found on one magic bowl where he called

אִסְרָא רַבָּא דְכוֹרְסִיָּה, "the great prince of the throne." C. Gordon, "Aramaic Magical Bowls in the Istanbul and Baghdad Museums" *Archiv Orientalni* 6 (1934) 328.

⁴⁰ Alexander, "3 *Enoch*," 303.

⁴¹ On the title "youth" in the Hekhalot literature, see: Davila, "Melchizedek, the 'Youth,' and Jesus," 254ff and Halperin, *Faces of the Chariot*, 491-4.

⁴² Cf. for example, *Synopse* §385: "when the youth enters beneath the throne of glory (נִכְנַס הַנְּעָר לְתַחַת כִּסֵּא הַכְּבוֹד)." Schäfer, *et al.*, *Synopse*, 162. Another text preserved in the *Cairo Genizah* also depicts the "youth" as emerging from his "sacerdotal" place in the immediate Presence of the Deity: "...Now, see the youth, who is going forth to meet you from behind the throne of glory. Do not bow down to him, because his crown is like the crown of his King..." P. Schäfer, *Geniza-Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 6; Tübingen: Mohr, 1984) 2b:13-14.

⁴³ On the imagery of the Celestial Curtain, see also: *b. Yom 77a*; *b. Ber 18b*; 3 *Enoch* 45:1.

⁴⁴ On the celestial curtain *Pargod* as the heavenly counterpart of the *paroket*, the veil of the Jerusalem Temple, see: D. Halperin, *The Merkabah in Rabbinic Literature* (AOS, 62; New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1980) 169, note 99; C.R.A. Moray-Jones, *A Transparent Illusion. The Dangerous Vision of Water in Hekhalot Mysticism* (Leiden: Brill, 2002) 164ff.

⁴⁵ D. Halperin argues that in 1 *Enoch* "the angels, barred from the inner house, are the priests of Enoch's heavenly Temple. The high priest must be Enoch himself, who appears in the celestial Holy of Holies to procure forgiveness for holy beings... We cannot miss the implication that the human Enoch is superior even to those angels who are still in good standing." Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, 82.

with the Hekhalot evidence according to which only Youth, i.e. Metatron, similarly to the earthly High Priest, is allowed to serve before as well as behind the heavenly veil. The inscription on one Mandaean bowl describes Metatron as the attendant “who serves before the Curtain.”⁴⁶ Philip Alexander observes that this definition “may be linked to the Hekhalot tradition about Metatron as the heavenly High Priest ... and certainly alludes to his status as ‘Prince of the Divine Presence.’”⁴⁷ It is true that Metatron’s role as the Prince of the Divine Presence or the Prince of the Face (*sar happanim*) cannot be separated from his priestly and liturgical duties since both the tabernacle of this exalted angel and the divine liturgy that he is conducting are situated in the immediate proximity to God’s presence, also known as His Face. In respect to our investigation of the liturgical imagery, it is worth noting that by virtue of being God’s *sar happanim* Youth-Metatron can unconditionally approach the Presence of the Deity without harm for himself, a unique privilege denied to the rest of the created order. He is also allowed to go behind the Curtain and behold the Face of God,⁴⁸ as well as to hear the voice of the Deity. This is why he is able to protect the *hayyot* against the harmful effects of the Divine Presence in the course of the angelic liturgy. Such imagery points to the fact that Metatron’s bold approach to the Divine Presence is predetermined, not only by his special role as the celestial High Priest, but also by his privileges in the office of the Prince of the Divine Presence.

It should be noted, that in contrast to the early Enochic traditions which hesitate to name explicitly the exalted patriarch as the High Priest, the Merkabah materials directly apply this designation to Metatron. Rachel Elijor observes that Metatron appears in *Genizah* documents as a High Priest who offers sacrifices on the heavenly altar.⁴⁹ She draws attention to the important testimony attested in one *Cairo Genizah* text which labels Metatron as the High Priest and the chief of the priests. The text reads:

I adjure you [Metatron], more beloved and dear than all heavenly beings, [Faithful servant] of the God of Israel, the High Priest (כהן גדול), chief of [the priest]s (ראש [הכהנים]), you who poss[ess seven]ty names; and whose name[is like your Master’s] ... Great Prince, who is appointed over the great princes, who is the head of all the camps.⁵⁰

⁴⁶ W.S. McCullough, *Jewish and Mandaean Incantation Texts in the Royal Ontario Museum* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967) D 5-6.

⁴⁷ Alexander, “The Historical Settings of the Hebrew Book of Enoch,” 166.

⁴⁸ The passage found in *Synopse* §385 relates: “... when the youth enters beneath the throne of glory, *God embraces him with a shining face...*”

⁴⁹ Elijor, “From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines,” 228.

⁵⁰ L.H. Schiffman and M.D. Swartz, *Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation Texts from the Cairo Genizah* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992) 145-7, 151. On Metatron as the High Priest, see: Schiffman *et al.*, *Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation Texts from the*

It is also noteworthy that Metatron's role as the heavenly High Priest appears to be supported in the Hekhalot materials by the motif of the peculiar sacerdotal duties of the terrestrial protagonist of the Hekhalot literature, Rabbi Ishmael b. Elisha, to whom Metatron serves as an *angelus interpres*. In view of Enoch-Metatron sacerdotal affiliations, it is not coincidental that Rabbi Ishmael is the tanna who is attested in *b. Ber* 7a as a high priest.⁵¹ R. Elijor observes that in *Hekhalot Rabbati* this rabbinic authority is portrayed in terms similar to those used in the Talmud, i.e., as a priest burning an offering on the altar.⁵² Other Hekhalot materials, including *3 Enoch*,⁵³ also often refer to R. Ishmael's priestly origins. The priestly features of this visionary might not only reflect the heavenly priesthood of Metatron⁵⁴ but also allude to the former priestly duties of the patriarch Enoch known from *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, since some scholars note that "*3 Enoch* presents a significant parallelism between the ascension of Ishmael and the ascension of Enoch."⁵⁵

Celestial Choir-Master

Unlike the early Enochic booklets that unveil only the patriarch's leading role in the priestly settings, the Merkabah materials emphasize another important dimension of his activities in the divine worship, i.e., the liturgical aspect of his celestial duties. The passages from *3 Enoch* 15B and *Synopse* §390 that began our investigation show that one of the features of Metatron's service in the heavenly realm involves his leadership over the angelic hosts delivering heavenly praise to the Deity. Metatron is portrayed there not just as a servant in the celestial tabernacle or the heavenly high priest, but also as the leader of the heavenly liturgy. The evidences that

Cairo Genizah 25-28; 145-47; 156-157; esp. 145; Elijor, "From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines," 299, f. 30. Ya'qub al-Qirqisani alludes to the evidence from the Talmud about the priestly function of Metatron. See L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Tr. H. Szold; Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1998) 6.74; L. Nemoy, "Al-Qirqisani's Account of the Jewish Sects and Christianity" *HUCA* 7 (1930) 317-97.

⁵¹ Cf. also *b. Ket* 105b; *b. Hull* 49a.

⁵² Elijor, "From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines," 225.

⁵³ Cf., for example, *3 Enoch* 2:3: "Metatron replied, 'He [R. Ishmael] is of the tribe of Levi, which presents the offering to his name. He is of the family of Aaron, whom the Holy One, blessed be he, chose to minister in his presence and on whose head he himself placed the priestly crown on Sinai.'" Alexander, "3 Enoch," 257.

⁵⁴ N. Deutsch observes that in *3 Enoch* "likewise, as the heavenly high priest, Metatron serves as the mythological prototype of Merkabah mystics such as Rabbi Ishmael. Metatron's role as a high priest highlights the functional parallel between the angelic vice regent and the human mystic (both are priests), whereas his transformation from a human being into an angel reflects an ontological process which may be repeated by mystics via their own enthronement and angelification." N. Deutsch, *Guardians of the Gate: Angelic Vice Regency in Late Antiquity* (BSJS, 22; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 34.

⁵⁵ Alexander, "From Son of Adam," 106-7.

unfold Metatron's liturgical role are not confined solely to the Hekhalot corpus, but can also be detected in another prominent literary stream associated with early Jewish mysticism which is represented by the *Shi'ur Qomah* materials. The passages found in the *Shi'ur Qomah* texts attest to a familiar tradition in which Metatron is posited as a liturgical servant. Thus, *Sefer Haggomah* 155-164 reads:

And (the) angels who are with him come and encircle the Throne of Glory. They are on one side and the (celestial) creatures are on the other side, and the Shekhinah is on the Throne of Glory in the center. And one creature goes up over the seraphim and descends on the tabernacle of the lad whose name is Metatron and says in a great voice, a thin voice of silence, "The Throne of Glory is glistening!" Immediately, the angels fall silent and the *'irin* and the *qadushin* are still. They hurry and hasten into the river of fire. And the celestial creatures turn their faces towards the earth, and this lad whose name is Metatron, brings the fire of deafness and puts (it) in the ears of the celestial creatures so that they do not hear the sound of the speech of the Holy One, blessed be He, and the explicit name that the lad, whose name is Metatron, utters at that time in seven voices, in seventy voices, in living, pure, honored, holy, awesome, worthy, brave, strong, and holy name.⁵⁶

A similar tradition can be found in *Siddur Rabbah* 37-46, another text associated with *Shi'ur Qomah* tradition, where the angelic Youth however is not identified with the angel Metatron:

The angels who are with him come and encircle the (Throne of) Glory; they are on one side and the celestial creatures are on the other side, and the Shekhinah is in the center. And one creature ascends above the Throne of Glory and touches the seraphim and descends on the Tabernacle of the Lad and declares in a great voice, (which is also) a voice of silence, "The throne alone shall I exalt over him." The *ofanim* become silent (and) the seraphim are still. The platoons of *'irin* and *qadushin* are shoved into the River of Fire and the celestial creatures turn their faces downward, and the lad brings the fire silently and puts it in their ears so that they do not hear the spoken voice; he remains (thereupon) alone. And the lad calls Him, "the great, mighty and awesome, noble, strong, powerful, pure and holy, and the strong and precious and worthy, shining and innocent, beloved and wondrous and exalted and supernal and resplendent God."⁵⁷

In reference to these materials M. Cohen notes that in the *Shi'ur Qomah* tradition Metatron's service in the heavenly tabernacle appears to be "entirely liturgical" and "is more the heavenly choir-master and beadle than the celestial high priest."⁵⁸

⁵⁶ M. Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Texts and Recensions* (TSAJ, 9; Tübingen: Mohr, 1985)162-4.

⁵⁷ Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Texts and Recensions*, 162-4. On the relation of this passage to the Youth tradition see: Davila, "Melchizedek, the 'Youth,' and Jesus," 248-74.

⁵⁸ Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism*, 134.

It is evident that the tradition preserved in *Sefer Haqqomah* cannot be separated from the microforms found in *Synopse* §390 and *3 Enoch* 15B since all these narratives are unified by a similar structure and terminology. All of them also emphasize the Youth's leading role in the course of the celestial service. It is also significant that Metatron's role as the one who is responsible for the protection and encouragement of the servants delivering praise to the Deity is not confined only to the aforementioned passages, but finds support in the broader context of the Hekhalot and *Sh'ur Qomah* materials.⁵⁹

Thus, in the Hekhalot corpus Metatron's duties as the choir-master or the celestial liturgical director appear to be applied, not only to his leadership over angelic hosts, but also over humans, specifically the visionaries who are lucky enough to overcome the angelic opposition and be admitted into the heavenly realm. In *3 Enoch* 1:9-10 Enoch-Metatron is depicted as the one who "prepares" one of such visionaries, Rabbi Ishmael, for singing praise to the Holy One:

At once Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, came and revive me and raise me to my feet, but still I had no strength enough to sing a hymn before the glorious throne of the glorious King...⁶⁰

It is possible that these descriptions of Enoch-Metatron as the one who encourages angels and humans to perform heavenly praise in the front of God's Presence might have their roots in early Second Temple materials. Our investigation must now turn to analyzing of some of these early developments that might constitute the early background of the Merkabah liturgical imagery.

The Beginnings: Liturgical Role of Enoch in Slavonic Apocalypse

One of the texts which might contain early traces of Enoch-Metatron's liturgical imagery is *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*, the Jewish apocalypse, apparently written in the first century CE. In contrast to other early Enochic materials, such as *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, which emphasize only one side of the patriarch's heavenly service through the reference to Enoch's priestly activities, the Slavonic text appears to encompass both sacerdotal dimensions, priestly as well as liturgical. Allusions to the priestly office of

⁵⁹ This tradition is not forgotten in the later Jewish mystical developments. Thus, Daniel Abrams notes that in *Sefer ha-Hashek* "Metatron commands the angels to praise the King of the Glory, and he is among them." Abrams, "The Boundaries of Divine Ontology," 304.

⁶⁰ Alexander, "3 Enoch," 256. Peter Schäfer suggests that Ishmael's example stresses the connection between heavenly and earthly liturgies. Cf. Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God*, 132.

the seventh antediluvian hero in the Slavonic text demonstrate marked difference in comparison with the testimonies found in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*. Thus, unlike the aforementioned Enochic tracts, *2 Enoch* does not associate the translated patriarch with any celestial structure that might remotely resemble the descriptions found in *1 Enoch* 14 and 87. On the other hand, the Slavonic text contains a number of other indirect testimonies that demonstrate that the authors of this apocalypse were cognizant of the patriarch's priestly role. Thus, scholars previously observed that Enoch's anointing with shining oil and his clothing into the luminous garments during his angelic metamorphosis in *2 Enoch* 22 appears to resemble the priestly vesture.⁶¹ Another possible sacerdotal association comes from *2 Enoch* 67-69 where the descendents of the seventh antediluvian patriarch, including his son Methuselah, are depicted as the builders of the altar which is erected on the place where Enoch was taken up to heaven. The choice of the location for the terrestrial sanctuary might allude to the peculiar role of the patriarch in relation to the heavenly counterpart of this earthly structure. The Slavonic text also appears to refer to the sacerdotal office of Enoch by portraying the patriarch as the one who in *2 Enoch* 59 delivers the sacrificial instructions to his children. All these testimonies show that *2 Enoch's* authors were familiar with the traditions about the priestly affiliations of the seventh antediluvian hero attested also in the early Enochic booklets. However, in contrast to these early materials that mention only Enoch's priestly role, the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse also appear to have knowledge about another prominent office of the translated patriarch--his liturgical activities and his role as the one who encourages and directs the celestial hosts in their daily praise of the Creator.

Entertaining this possibility of the Enochic origins of Metatron's role as the leader of the divine worship, we must direct our attention to the passage found in *2 Enoch* 18 where the patriarch is depicted as the one who encourages the celestial Watchers to conduct liturgy before the face of God. The longer recension of *2 Enoch* 18:8-9 relates:

And I [Enoch] said, "Why are you waiting for your brothers? And why don't you perform the liturgy⁶² before the face of the Lord? Start up your liturgy,⁶³ and

⁶¹ M. Himmelfarb observes that "the combination of clothing and anointing suggests that the process by which Enoch becomes an angel is a heavenly version of priestly investiture." M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) 40.

⁶² Slav. *Sluzhite*. M.I Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *Chtenija v Obshchestve Istorii i Drevnostej Rossijskih* 4 (1910) 16.

⁶³ Slav. *Sluzhbi vasche*. M.I Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij

perform the liturgy before the face of the Lord, so that you do not enrage your Lord to the limit.” And they responded to my recommendation, and they stood in four regiments in this heaven. And behold, while I was standing with those men, 4 trumpets trumpeted in unison with a great sound, and the Watchers burst into singing in unison. And their voice rose in front of the face of the Lord, piteously and touchingly.⁶⁴

One can notice that the imagery of this account represents a vague sketch that only distantly alludes to the future prominent liturgical role of Enoch-Metatron. Yet here, for the first time in the Enochic tradition, the seventh antediluvian patriarch dares to assemble and direct the angelic creatures for their routine job of delivering praise to the Deity. The choice of the angelic group, of course, is not coincidental since in various Enochic materials the patriarch is often described as a special envoy to the Watchers, the fallen angels, as well as their faithful celestial brothers.

It is significant that, despite that in *2 Enoch* 18 the patriarch gives his advise to the angels situated in the fifth heaven, he repeatedly advises them to start liturgy “before the Face of the Lord,” i.e., in front of the divine *Kavod*, the exact location where Youth-Metatron will later conduct the heavenly worship of the angelic hosts in the *Shi'ur Qomah* and Hekhalot accounts.

The shorter recension of the Slavonic text⁶⁵ adds several significant details among which Enoch’s advice to the Watchers to “perform the liturgy in the name of fire”⁶⁶ can be found. This peculiar terminology involving the symbolism of fire appears to allude to the concepts found in the aforementioned Hekhalot liturgical accounts where the imagery of fire, in the form of the references to the *deafening fire* and angels “bathing” in the fire, plays an important role. The shorter recension also stresses the importance of Enoch’s leading role, specifically underscoring that the angels needed “the earnestness” of his recommendation.⁶⁷

The reference of *2 Enoch* 18 to the later Youth-Metatron office as the heavenly choir-master does not appear to be happenstance, since the

perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *COIDR* 4 (1910) 16.

⁶⁴ F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 132.

⁶⁵ The shorter recension of *2 Enoch* 18:8-9 reads: “‘And why don’t you perform the liturgy before the face of the Lord? Start up the former liturgy. Perform the liturgy in the name of fire (*vo imja ogne*), lest you annoy the Lord your God (so that) he throws you down from this place.’ And they heeded the earnestness of my recommendation, and they stood in four regiments in heaven. And behold, while I was standing, they sounded with 4 trumpets in unison, and the Grigori began to perform the liturgy as with one voice. And their voices rose up in the Lord’s presence.” Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 133.

⁶⁶ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 133.

⁶⁷ Andersen, “2 Enoch,” 133.

Slavonic apocalypse alludes to some additional features that recall the later Merkabah liturgical developments. Our research will concentrate on two of such characteristics that enhance Enoch's connection with his newly acquired liturgical office. Both of them are linked to Enoch-Metatron's designations, namely his titles as Youth and the Servant of the Divine Presence which appear here for the first time in the Enochic tradition. These titles seem to have direct connection to the liturgical imagery found in the Hekhalot and *Shi'ur Qomah* materials where the offices of the Youth and *sar happanim* help unfold Metatron's liturgical activities. Our study must now proceed to the investigation of these two titles in *2 Enoch's* materials.

The Servant of God's Face

It has been already observed that Metatron's sacerdotal and liturgical duties cannot be separated from his office as the *sar happanim*, the one who can approach God's Presence without limit and hesitation. It is not surprising that in *2 Enoch*, which attests to the origins of Enoch-Metatron's liturgical imagery, one can also find for the first time in the Enochic tradition an explicit reference to the patriarch's role as the Servant of the Divine Presence.⁶⁸

Hugo Odeberg may well be the first scholar to have discovered the characteristics of "the Prince of the Presence" in the long recension of *2 Enoch*. He successfully demonstrated in his synopsis of the parallel passages from *2* and *3 Enoch* that the phrase "stand before my face forever"⁶⁹ found in the Slavonic apocalypse does not serve there merely as a typical Hebraism "to be in the presence," but establishes the angelic status of Enoch as Metatron, the Prince of the Presence, **שַׁר הַפְּנִיִּים**.⁷⁰ In *2 Enoch* therefore the patriarch is depicted not as one of the visionaries who has only temporary access to the Divine Presence but as an angelic servant permanently installed in the office of the *sar happanim*. The title itself is developed primarily in chapters 21-22 which are devoted to the description of the Throne of Glory. In these chapters, one can find several promises

⁶⁸ Although the imagery of angels of the presence was widespread in the pseudepigraphical writings and specifically in the early Enochic pseudepigrapha there, it was never explicitly identified with the seventh antediluvian patriarch. *1 Enoch* 40:9, however, mentions the four "Faces" or "Presences" of Ezek 1:6 identifying them with the four principal angels: Michael, Phanuel, Raphael, and Gabriel.

⁶⁹ Slav. *stoati prěd licem moim' v'' věky*. M.I Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *COIDR* 4 (1910) 22.

⁷⁰ Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 1.55.

coming from the mouth of archangel Gabriel and the Deity himself that the translated patriarch will now stand in front God's face forever.⁷¹

In terms of the theological background of the problem, the title seems to be connected with the image of Metatron in the Merkabah tradition,⁷² which was crystallized in the classical Hekhalot literature.⁷³ According to the legend of the Hekhalot tradition, Enoch "was raised to the rank of first of the angels and שר הפנים (literally, "Prince of the Divine Face," or "Divine Presence")."⁷⁴ *3 Enoch*, as well as other texts of Hekhalot tradition, have a well-developed theology connected with this title.

⁷¹ Cf. *2 Enoch* 21:3: "And the Lord send one of his glorious ones, the archangel Gabriel. And he said to me 'Be brave, Enoch! Don't be frightened! Stand up, and come with me and stand in front of the face of the Lord forever.'"

2 Enoch 22:6: "And the Lord said to his servants, sounding them out: 'Let Enoch join in and stand in front of my face forever!'"

2 Enoch 36:3: "Because a place has been prepared for you, and you will be in front of my face from now and forever." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 136, 138, 161.

⁷² Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 67.

⁷³ On the debates about the various stages in the development of the Merkabah tradition, see: Alexander, "The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch," 173-80; David J. Halperin, *The Merkabah in Rabbinic Literature*; idem, "A New Edition of the Hekhalot Literature" *JAOS* 104.3 (1984) 543-552; idem, *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988) 359-63; Martha Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, 106-14; idem, "The Experience of the Visionary and the Genre in the Ascension of Isaiah 6-11 and the Apocalypse of Paul" *Semeia* 36 (1986) 97-111; idem, "The Practice of Ascent in the Ancient Mediterranean World," in: *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys* (ed. J.J. Collins and M. Fishbane; Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1995) 123-37, esp. 126-28; Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 98-123, 67; Johann Maier, *Vom Kultus zur Gnosis: Studien zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte der "Judischen Gnosis."* *Bundeslade, Gottesthron und Märkabah* (Kairos, 1; Salzburg: Müller, 1964) 128-146; Peter Schäfer, "Prolegomena zu einer kritischen Edition und analyse der Merkava Rabba" *FJB* 5 (1977) 65-99; idem, "Die Beschwoerung des sar ha-panim, Kritische Edition und Übersetzung" *FJB* 6 (1978) 107-45; idem, "Aufbau und redaktionelle Identität der Hekhalot Zutarti" *JJS* 33 (1982) 569-82; "Tradition and Redaction in Hekhalot Literature" *JSJ* 14 (1983) 172-81; idem, "Engel und Menschen in der Hekhalot-Literatur," in: P. Schäfer, *Hekhalot-Studien* (TSAJ 19; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988) 250-76, esp. 258, 264-65; idem, "The Aim and Purpose of Early Jewish Mysticism. Gershom Scholem Reconsidered," in: *Hekhalot-Studien*, 277-95; idem, *The Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1992) 150-55; Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 43-44; Michael D. Swartz, *Scholastic Magic: Ritual and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996) 29; 153-57; 170-72; 210-12; Ephraim E. Urbach, "The Traditions about Merkavah Mysticism in the Tannaitic Period," in: *Studies in Mysticism and Religion Presented to Gershom G. Scholem on His Seventieth Birthday by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends* (ed. E.E. Urbach et al; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1967) 1-28 [in Hebrew].

⁷⁴ Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 67.

Youth

It has been already shown that in the descriptions related to Metatron's sacerdotal and liturgical duties he often appears under the title "Youth." Such persistence of the Hekhalot writers who repeatedly connect this designation with Metatron's priestly and liturgical service may be explained by one of the possible meanings of the Hebrew term for the Youth נער that also can be translated as "servant." It should be stressed that the sobriquet "youth" is never applied to designate the seventh patriarch in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Genesis Apocryphon*, and the *Book of Giants*. Yet, it is significant that in some manuscripts of the Slavonic Enoch for the first time in the Enochic tradition the seventh antediluvian patriarch becomes associated with this prominent Metatron's title.⁷⁵ Despite that this designation occurs only in several Slavonic manuscripts, the author of the recent English translation, Francis Andersen, considered this reading as the original.⁷⁶ He was also the first scholar to propose that Enoch's designation as "Youth" in *2 Enoch* recalls the identical title of Metatron attested in *3 Enoch* and other Hekhalot writings.⁷⁷ In his commentary to the English translation of *2 Enoch* in OTP, Andersen wrote:

The remarkable reading *yunoše* [youth], clearly legible in A, supports the evidence of V, which has this variant four times (not here), and of other MSS, that there was a tradition in which Enoch was addressed in this way. The similarity to the vocative *enoše* [Enoch] might explain the variant as purely scribal slip. But it is surprising that it is only in address, never in description, that the term is used. The variant *jenokhu* is rare. There is no phonetic reason why the first vowel should change to *ju*; *junokhu* is never found. But it cannot be a coincidence that this title is identical with that of Enoch (=Metatron) in *3 Enoch*.⁷⁸

The employment of the designation "Youth" in the Slavonic apocalypse cannot be separated from its future usage in the later Merkabah materials, since the context of the usage of the sobriquet is very similar in both traditions. Thus, according to the Merkabah tradition, God likes to address Enoch-Metatron as "Youth." In *3 Enoch* 3, when R. Ishmael asks Metatron, "What is your name?" Metatron answers, "I have seventy names, corresponding to the seventy nations of the world ... however, my King calls me "Youth".⁷⁹ The designation of the translated patriarch as "Youth" seems to signify here a special relationship between the Deity and Metatron. One can see the beginning of this tradition already in *2 Enoch* where in chapter 24 of the shorter recension the following tradition can be found:

⁷⁵ Slav. *yunoše*.

⁷⁶ Professor Francis Andersen reassured me in a private communication about the originality of this reading, referring to it as "powerful evidence."

⁷⁷ See, for example, §§ 384; 385; 390; 396. in: Schäfer, *Synopse*, 162-3, 164-5, 166-7.

⁷⁸ Andersen, "2 Enoch," 118-9.

⁷⁹ Alexander, "3 Enoch," 1.257.

And the Lord called me (Enoch) and he placed me to himself closer than Gabriel. And I did obeisance to the Lord. And the Lord spoke to me "Whatever you see, Youth, things standing still and moving about were brought to perfection by me and not even to angels have I explained my secrets...as I am making them known to you today..."⁸⁰

It is significant that the title "Youth" here is tied to the motif of Enoch's superiority over angels and his leading role in the celestial community which will play later a prominent role in the Merkabah liturgical accounts. It is possible that the title "Youth" also signifies here Enoch's role as a very special servant of the Deity who has immediate access to God's Presence which is even closer than that of the archangels. In this context it is not surprising that in the longer recension of *2 Enoch* 24:1-2 the patriarch is depicted as the one who has seat left⁸¹ to the Lord, "closer than Gabriel," i.e. next to God.

Finally, we must note that several important readings of "Youth" in the materials associated with the Slavonic Enoch can be found in the Vienna Codex.⁸² In this manuscript Enoch is addressed by the Lord as "Youth"⁸³ in the context of angelic veneration. The passage from *2 Enoch* 22 of the Vienna Codex reads:

And the Lord with his own mouth called me [Enoch] and said: Be brave, Youth!⁸⁴ Do not be frightened! Stand up in front of my face forever. And Michael, the Lord's *archistratig*, brought me in the front of the Lord's face. And the Lord tempted his servants and said to them: "Let Enoch come up and stand in the front of my face forever." And the glorious ones bowed down and said: "Let him come up!"⁸⁵

This veneration of the Youth by the heavenly hosts in the context of God's speech recalls the liturgical accounts found in *Synopse* §390 and *Sefer Haqqomah* where the angelic hosts prostrate themselves before the Youth in the presence of the Deity allowing the exalted angel to insert the fire of

⁸⁰ M.I Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *COIDR* 4 (1910) 90-91.

⁸⁰ Andersen, „2 Enoch,“ 119.

⁸¹ The assigning of the left side to the vice-regent might be seen as puzzling. Martin Hengel, however, rightly observes that this situation can be explained as the "correction" of the Christian scribe(s) who "reserved this place for Christ." M. Hengel, *Studies in Early Christology* (Edinburg: T&T Clark, 1995)193. Hengel points to a similar situation in the *Ascension of Isaiah* where the angel of the holy spirit is placed at the left hand of God.

⁸² I want to express my deep gratitude to Professor Francis Andersen who generously shared with me the microfilms and photographs of MSS V, R, and J.

⁸³ Unfortunately, Friedrich Repp's research on the Vienna Codex failed to discern the proper meaning of "Youth" in this important manuscript. See: F. Repp, "Textkritische Untersuchungen zum Henoch-Apokryph des co. slav. 125 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek" *Wiener slavistische Jahrbuch* 10 (1963) 65.

⁸⁴ Slav. *junoše*.

⁸⁵ MS. V (VL 125) [Nr. 3], fol. 317.

deafness into their ears. It is not coincidental that scholars previously pointed to the liturgical coloring of this scene from *2 Enoch* 22 where the patriarch changes his earthly garments for the luminous attire which now closely resembles the priestly vesture.⁸⁶

Conclusion

The liturgical tradition found in *2 Enoch* can be viewed as a bridge that connects the early traditions about the sacerdotal duties of the patriarch found in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* with the later Hekhalot and *Shi'ur Qomah* lore where references to the translated hero's priestly role are juxtaposed with his liturgical performances. Scholars have previously noted that Enoch's figure portrayed in the various sections of *2 Enoch* appears to be more complex than in the early Enochic tractates of *1 Enoch*.⁸⁷ For the first time, the Enochic tradition seeks to depict Enoch, not simply as a human taken to heaven and transformed into an angel, but as a celestial being exalted above the angelic world.⁸⁸ In this attempt, one may find the origins of another image of Enoch, very different from the early Enochic literature, which was developed much later in Merkabah mysticism—the concept of the supreme angel Metatron, the "Prince of the Presence."⁸⁹ The attestation of the seventh antediluvian patriarch as the celestial liturgical director in *2 Enoch* gives additional weight to this hypothesis about the transitional

⁸⁶ Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, 40.

⁸⁷ Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," 102-104; Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, 52-63.

⁸⁸ One can argue that the beginning of this process can be seen already in the *Book of the Similitudes* where Enoch seems to be identified with the Son of Man. It is possible that the *Similitudes*, written close to the time of *2 Enoch*, also reflects this process of transition to the new image of Enoch. In contrast to *2 Enoch*, the *Similitudes*, however, does not elaborate this process to the same degree as the Slavonic apocalypse does. Enoch's transformation into the Son of Man in the *Similitudes* 71 is rather instantaneous and ambiguous. In contrast, in *2 Enoch* this process of Enoch's transition to a new super-angelic identity is described in detail through the expositions of Enoch's celestial titles which unfold the patriarch's new roles in numerous celestial offices. On Enoch's transformation in the *Similitudes*, see, Davila, "Of Methodology, Monotheism and Metatron," 9-15; Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*, 151; M. Knibb, "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls", *DSD* 2 (1995) 177-80; D.W. Suter, *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch* (SBLDS, 47; Missoula: Scholars, 1979) 14-23; J. VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37-71," *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity. The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (eds. J.H. Charlesworth, et al.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 182-3.

⁸⁹ P. Alexander observes that "the transformation of Enoch in *2 Enoch* 22 provides the closest approximation, outside Merkabah literature, to Enoch's transformation in *3 Enoch* 3-13." Alexander, "3 Enoch," 248.

nature of the Slavonic account which guides the old pseudepigraphical traditions into the new mystical dimension. In this respect the tradition found in *2 Enoch* 18 might represent an important step towards defining and shaping Enoch-Metatron's liturgical office in its transition to his new role as the celestial choir-master.⁹⁰ It is also significant that the beginning of Enoch's liturgical functions in *2 Enoch* is conflated there with the development of his new titles-offices as the Youth and the Servant of the Divine Presence which will later play a prominent role in the Merkabah passages pertaining to Metatron's liturgical actions.

⁹⁰ It is intriguing that a similar or maybe even competing development can be detected in the early lore about Yahoel. Thus, the *Apocalypse of Abraham* 10:9 depicts Yahoel as the one who is responsible for teaching "those who carry the song through the medium of man's night of the seventh hour." R. Rubinkiewicz, "Apocalypse of Abraham," *OTP*, 1.694. In chapter 12 of the same text Abraham addresses to Yahoel as "Singer of the Eternal One."

“Without Measure and Without Analogy”: The Tradition of the Divine Body in 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*

Introduction

In one of his books¹ Gershom Scholem remarks on the origins of the terminology associated with the *Shi^cur Qomah* materials.² These materials depict visionaries, Rabbi Ishmael and Rabbi Akiba, receiving from the supreme angel Metatron revelations of the 'measurement of the body' (in Hebrew, *Shi^cur Qomah*), an anthropomorphic description of the Deity together with the mystical names of its gigantic limbs.³ Although the majority of evidence of the *Shi^cur Qomah* tradition survived in late Jewish writings, Scholem argues⁴ that the beginning of *Shi^cur Qomah* speculations can be dated not later than the second century CE. Scholem appeals to a passage in 2 *Enoch*, a Jewish apocalypse apparently written in the first century CE, which in his opinion represents the earliest witness to the *Shi^cur Qomah* terminology. The passage is situated in 2 *Enoch* 39 where the antediluvian patriarch Enoch tells his children about the vision of the Lord, whom he encountered during his celestial tour. Enoch describes the appearance of the Lord as a terrifying extent analogous to the human form:

And now, my children it is not from my lips that I am reporting to you today, but from the lips of the Lord who has sent me to you. As for you, you hear my words, out of my lips, a human being created equal to yourselves; but I have heard the words from the fiery lips of the Lord. For the lips of the Lord are a furnace of fire, and his words are the fiery flames which come out. You, my children, you see my face, a human being created just like yourselves; I am one who has seen the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot by a fire, emitting sparks. For you gaze into (my) eyes, a human being created just like yourselves; but I have gazed into the eyes of the Lord, like the rays of the shining sun and terrifying the eyes of a human being. You, (my) children, you see my right hand beckoning you, a human being

¹ G. Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in the Kabbalah* (New York, 1991), p. 29.

² For texts and translations of the *Shi^cur Qomah* materials, see: P. Schäfer, with M. Schlüter and H. G. von Mutius., *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen, 1981); M. Cohen, *The Shi^cur Qomah: Texts and Recensions* (TSAJ, 9; Tübingen, 1985); P. Schäfer et al., *Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ, 17, 22, 29, 46; Tübingen, 1987-95).

³ G. Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton, 1990), p. 20.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

created identical to yourselves; but I have seen the right hand of the Lord, beckoning me, who fills heaven. You see the extent of my body, the same as your own; but I have seen the extent of the Lord,⁵ without measure and without analogy, who has no end....' (2 *Enoch* 39:3-6).⁶

In his commentary on the text, Scholem draws the reader's attention to the expression 'the extent of my body.' He notes that earlier Abraham Kahana, in his Hebrew translation of 2 *Enoch*,⁷ rendered this expression as *shi^cur qomati*.⁸ Scholem further suggests that despite the late date of the known Rabbinic *Shi^cur Qomah* materials, the *Shi^cur Qomah* terminology might be already evident in the account drawn from 2 *Enoch* 39 where Enoch describes God's gigantic limbs.

Scholem's suggestions are valuable⁹ and deserve serious attention, since several additional features in the aforementioned account of 2 *Enoch* account also seem to suggest the imagery found in the *Shi^cur Qomah* tradition. In the Slavonic apocalypse, Enoch describes to his children the gigantic hand of the Lord which fills the heaven. This description recalls the imagery of the *Shi^cur Qomah* accounts in which Enoch-Metatron transmits to Rabbi Ishmael and Rabbi Akiba knowledge about the gigantic limbs of the Deity which *fill the heaven*. A series of analogies between Enoch's body and Lord's body in 2 *Enoch* 39:3-6 appear also pertinent because the later Merkabah accounts often portray Enoch-Metatron as possessing the gigantic body himself. Moreover, some of these accounts seem to depict Metatron as the *measure* of the Divine Body.

Scholem's comments about the significance of 2 *Enoch* 39 for the history of early Jewish mysticism are important.¹⁰ His analysis, however, is

⁵ Slav. *Ob'jatie Gospodne*. M. I. Sokolov, 'Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij', *COIDR* 4 (1910), vol. 1, p. 94; vol. 2, p. 38. Unless noted otherwise, this and the subsequent Slavonic citations are drawn from Sokolov's edition.

⁶ F. Andersen, '2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch', *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York, 1985 [1983]), vol. 1, p. 163.

⁷ A. Kahana, 'Sefer Hanok B', in: *Ha-Sefarim ha-Hitsonim le-Torah* (Jerusalem, 1936f), pp. 102-41.

⁸ Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in the Kabbalah*, p. 29.

⁹ Ithamar Gruenwald supports Scholem's position, suggesting that the expression found in 2 *Enoch* 39 may represent the first reference to the *Shi^cur Qomah* of God. Cf. I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkabah Mysticism* (AGJU, 14; Leiden, 1980), p. 213. For criticism of Scholem's position, see: M. S. Cohen, *The Shi^cur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (New York, 1983), p. 80.

¹⁰ On Jewish mystical traditions in 2 *Enoch*, see: P. Alexander, '3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch', *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York, 1985 [1983]), vol. 1, pp. 247-248; idem, 'From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch', *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergen; Harrisburg, 1998), pp. 102-111; C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit*,

incomplete since it focuses only on the *Shi'ur Qomah* passage found in chapter 39. It does not explore the broader context of the passage, especially its relation to other descriptions of Enoch in the Slavonic apocalypse that seem to recall the depictions of Metatron in the *Shi'ur Qomah* materials. Moreover, it appears that the traditions about the divine body are not limited in this text to the figure of Enoch and include another important character of the text, namely, the patriarch Adam. The portrayal of the prelapsarian Adam found in the longer recension of *2 Enoch* reveals fascinating similarities to the later *Shi'ur Qomah* descriptions. Keeping in mind these important features of the Slavonic apocalypse, this article will investigate the roles of Adam and Enoch in the broader context of the *Shi'ur Qomah* account found in *2 Enoch*.

Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch (WUNT, R.2, 50; Tübingen, 1992), pp. 109-114; idem, 'Beobachtungen zum Midrash vom 'Leben Henochs'', *Mitteilungen und Beiträge der Forschungsstelle Judentum an der Theologischen Fakultät Leipzig* 10 (1996), pp. 44-83; A. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (SVC, 33; Leiden, 1996); M. Himmelfarb, 'Revelation and Rapture: The Transformation of the Visionary in the Ascent Apocalypses', *Mysteries and Revelations; Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium* (eds. J.J. Collins and J.H. Charlesworth; JSPSS 9; Sheffield, 1991), pp. 79-90; L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia, 1955), vol. 5, pp. 161-64; I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU, 14; Leiden, 1980), pp. 50-51; J. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord., Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism* (WUNT, 36; Tübingen, 1985); idem, 'Colossians 1,15-18a in the Light of Jewish Mysticism and Gnosticism', *NTS* 35 (1989), pp. 183-201; idem, *The Image of the Invisible God. Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus, 30; Freiburg, Göttingen, 1995); M. Idel, 'Enoch is Metatron', *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990), pp. 220-240; H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York, 1973), pp. 52-63; W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box, *A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinic and Mediaeval Judaism* (New York, 1920), p. 236; A. A. Orlov, 'Titles of Enoch-Metatron in 2 Enoch', *JSP* 18 (1998), pp. 71-86; idem, 'Secrets of Creation in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch', *Henoch* 22.1 (2000), pp. 45-62; idem, 'Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition', *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 39 (Atlanta, 2000), pp. 130-47; idem, 'Melchizedek Legend of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch', *JSJ* 31 (2000), pp. 23-38; idem, 'The Origin of the Name 'Metatron' and the Text of 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch', *JSP* 21 (2000), pp. 19-26; A. Orlov and A. Golitzin, 'Many Lamps Are Lightened from the One': Paradigms of the Transformational Vision in the Macarian Homilies', *Vig. Chr.* 55 (2001), pp. 281-298; M. Philonenko, 'La cosmogonie du 'Livre des secrets d'Hénoch'', *Religions en Egypte: Hellénistique et Romaine* (Paris, 1969), pp. 109-16; G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York, 1946), idem, *Origins of the Kabbalah*, idem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkavah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York, 1965).

Adamic Tradition of *2 Enoch*

Before proceeding to an investigation of the traditions about the divine body found in the Slavonic apocalypse, a short excursus into the Adamic narrative of *2 Enoch* is necessary. This narrative appears partly to be responsible for creating the polemical context in which the divine body traditions in the text are introduced and discussed.

Adam's story occupies a significant place in *2 Slavonic Enoch*. Accounts of the protoplast's creation and his fall can be found in all three major sections of the book.¹¹ The text depicts Adam as a glorious angelic being, predestined by God to be the ruler of the earth, but falling short of God's expectations. Although a large part of the Adamic materials belongs to the longer recension, a number of important passages related to this tradition are also attested in the shorter recension. The presence of Adamic materials in both recensions and the significance of the Adamic narrative for the whole theological framework of the Slavonic apocalypse lead the interpreter to conclude that they are not later interpolations, but belong to the original layer of the text.

It should be noted that such an extensive presence of Adamic materials in the early Enochic text is quite unusual. For instance, in the Enochic books, included in *1 (Ethiopic) Enoch*, Adamic traditions are not accentuated and are limited to a few insignificant remarks.¹² Moreover, Adam's image in *1 Enoch* is quite different from the one attested in the Slavonic Apocalypse. *1 Enoch's* materials do not provide any information about the elevated status of the protoplast.

The modest role which Adam plays in the early Enochic books can be explained by the fact that Enochic and Adamic traditions often contend with each other in offering different explanations of the origin of evil¹³ in the world.¹⁴ From the point of view of this rivalry between Adamic and Enochic traditions, it might appear that the concentrated presence of Adamic materials in *2 Enoch* represents alien accretions interpolated into the original narrative much later during its long transmission in the Christian environment. A closer examination of the text, however, reveals that the presence of the Adamic tradition in the Slavonic apocalypse is neither

¹¹ *2 Enoch* 30:8-32:2; 33:10; 41:1; 42:5; 44:1; 58:1-3; 71:28.

¹² See, *1 Enoch* 32:6; 37:1; 60:8; 69:9-11; 85:3; 90:37-38.

¹³ The Enochic tradition bases its understanding of the origin of evil on the Watchers story where the fallen angels corrupt human beings by passing on to them various celestial secrets. In contrast, the Adamic tradition traces the source of evil to Satan's disobedience and the transgression of Adam and Eve in Eden.

¹⁴ M. Stone, 'The Axis of History at Qumran', *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M. E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden, 1999), pp. 133-49; J. C. Reeves, *Exploring Early Jewish Mythologies of Evil* (forthcoming).

secondary nor coincidental but has a profound conceptual value for the overall theology of the pseudepigraphon. It appears that the purpose of the extensive presence of Adamic materials in *2 Enoch* can be explained through the assessment of Enoch's image in the text.

Scholars have previously noted that Enoch's figure, portrayed in the various sections of *2 Enoch*, is more developed than in the early Enochic tractates of *1 Enoch*. For the first time, the Enochic tradition tries to portray the patriarch, not simply as a human taken to heaven and transformed into an angel, but as a celestial being exalted above the angelic world. In this attempt, one may find the origin of another image of Enoch (very different from the early Enochic literature) which was developed much later in Merkabah mysticism—the concept of the supreme angel Metatron, 'the Prince of the Presence.'¹⁵ It is therefore possible that the traditions about the exalted status of Adam were introduced in *2 Enoch*, for the first time in the Enochic tradition, in order to enhance the new profile of the seventh antediluvian patriarch.¹⁶

The elevated prelapsarian condition of the protoplast as the archetype of exalted humanity appears to serve in the Slavonic apocalypse as a model for constructing the new super-angelic identity of Enoch.¹⁷ In *2 Enoch* the

¹⁵ Philip Alexander observes that 'the transformation of Enoch in *2 Enoch* 22 provides the closest approximation, outside Merkabah literature, to Enoch's transformation in *3 Enoch* 3-13.' P. Alexander, '3 Enoch', p. 248

¹⁶ In 1987 Moshe Idel published an article in which he explored the role of the Adamic traditions in shaping the image of Enoch as the supreme angel Metatron. Although Idel's research deals mainly with later rabbinic materials, it demonstrates that already in some pseudepigraphic accounts Enoch appears to be portrayed as a luminous counterpart of Adam who regained Adam's glory, which was lost during the protoplast's transgression. Idel suggests that Enoch's luminous metamorphosis attested in *2 Enoch* 22 might also belong to the same tradition which views Enoch as the one who regained Adam's lost status and luminosity. He observes that to the best of his knowledge 'Enoch is the only living person for whom we learn that luminous garments, reminiscent of Adam's lost garments of light, were made.' M. Idel, 'Enoch is Metatron,' *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990), pp. 220-240. Alexander, in his recent research, adds new insight to Idel's argument about the formative value of the Adamic traditions for the image of the elevated Enoch. Alexander points to a number of rabbinic passages in which the 'supernatural radiance' of Adam's heavenly soul, which departed from him when he sinned, then returned to be incarnated in Enoch. He further observes that 'behind these passages is a concept of Metatron as a divine entity first incarnate in Adam and then incarnate in Enoch. Enoch, having perfected himself, in contrast to Adam, who sinned and fell, re-ascends to his heavenly home and takes his rightful place in the heights of the universe, above the highest angels... Enoch thus becomes a redeemer figure--a second Adam through whom humanity is restored.' Alexander, 'From Son of Adam to a Second God', p. 111.

¹⁷ Christfried Böttrich, in his recent book *Adam als Mikrokosmos* (Berlin, 1995), attempted to investigate the Adamic traditions about the protoplast's creation out of the seven components and the correspondence of his name with the four corners of the world found in *2 Enoch* 30. Unfortunately, Böttrich's research completely ignored the polemical nature of the Adamic narrative in *2 Enoch* and its formative value for the elevated image of Enoch in this text. As a consequence Böttrich failed to uncover the function of the

seventh antediluvian patriarch acquired a host of roles and qualities which the Adamic narrative of the Slavonic apocalypse associates with the protoplast. One of these transferences includes the tradition of Adam's cosmic body that seems to play a formative role in creating such new identities of Enoch as the *measure* and the *measurer* of the divine body in the Slavonic apocalypse.

The Corporeality of the Protoplast

The later Jewish materials associated with the Merkabah tradition often depict Enoch-Metatron as the one who possesses a corporeal structure of cosmic dimensions. One of such testimonies can be found, for example, in *3 Enoch* 9,¹⁸ which describes the transformation of the patriarch Enoch into the supreme angel Metatron. According to this text, during this celestial metamorphosis Enoch-Metatron 'was enlarged and increased in size till [he] matched the world in length and breadth.'¹⁹ The materials associated with the *Shi'ur Qomah* tradition²⁰ also describe Enoch-Metatron in similar terms, telling that 'the stature of this youth fills the world'²¹ (קומתו מלא העולם) (והנער הזה).²²

Despite the prominent role that the traditions about the cosmic body of Enoch-Metatron occupy in the later Merkabah accounts, the early Enochic materials of the Second Temple period are silent about the great dimensions of the body of the elevated patriarch. Enochic traditions attested in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Genesis Apocryphon* and the *Book of Giants* do not provide any hints about Enoch's gigantic body. In contrast to this silence about Enoch's corporeality, several early Jewish sources attest to the lore about the enormous body of another Biblical character, the patriarch Adam, which the

Adamic tradition in the larger theological framework of the Slavonic apocalypse and to discern the proper meaning in the polemical context of the divine body traditions in *2 Enoch*.

¹⁸ See also: *3 Enoch* 48C:5-6: 'I increased his stature (קומתו) by seventy thousand parasangs, above every height, among those who are tall of stature (בכל רומי הקומה). I magnified his throne from the majesty of my throne. I increased his honor from the glory of my honor. I turned his flesh to fiery torches and all the bones of his body (גופו) to coals of light. I made the appearance of his eyes like the appearance of lightning, and the light of his eyes like "light unfailing." I caused his face to shine like the brilliant light of the sun.' Alexander, "3 Enoch", p. 312; Schäfer et al., *Synopse*, pp. 36-37.

¹⁹ Alexander, '3 Enoch', p. 263.

²⁰ Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Texts and Recensions*, p. 159. Cf. also Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism*, p. 162.

²¹ His body is 30,000,000 parasangs, and they call him, 'Lad.' Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Texts and Recensions*, pp. 40-41.

²² Schäfer et al, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, p. 162.

protoplast possessed before his transgression in Eden. Thus, Philo in *QG* 1.32 unveils a tradition according to which '[the first humans] ...were provided with a very great body and the magnitude of a giant....'²³ A similar testimony can be found in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, a Jewish text written around the first century CE. The *Apocalypse of Abraham* 23:4-6 relates the description of the terrifying corporalities of the protoplasts:

And I looked at the picture, and my eyes ran to the side of the garden of Eden. And I saw there a man very great in height and terrible in breath, incomparable in aspect, entwined with a woman was also equal to the man in aspect and size. And they were standing under the tree of Eden....²⁴

Moreover, in some pseudepigraphical accounts the body of the protoplast is portrayed, not simply as gigantic, but even as comparable with the dimensions of the divine corporeality. Thus, in several pseudepigraphical materials the depictions of Adam's stature are often linked to the imagery of the enthroned divine anthropomorphic extent known from the priestly and Ezekelian sources as God's *Kavod*. One such association might be hinted in *2 Enoch* 30; here the *Kavod* imagery seems to have been applied to Adam's prelapsarian condition. In this text the protoplast is labeled as 'the second angel' to whom the Lord assigned four special stars. Jarl Fossum suggests²⁵ that, in view of the imagery attested in another Enochic texts where stars often designate angels, the allotment to Adam of the 'four special stars' might allude to the fact that Adam, like God, also has his own 'Princes of the Presence' - the four angels whose function is to serve near the Throne of Glory. This angelic imagery signals that *2 Enoch's* authors might understand Adam as an enthroned entity resembling the Lord's glorious anthropomorphic extent, his *Kavod*.²⁶

The *Testament of Abraham* 11:4 (Recension A) also attests to a similar tradition when it offers a depiction of 'the first-formed Adam' seated on the throne at the entrance to paradise at the end of time: 'And outside the two gates of that place, they saw a man seated on the golden throne. And the appearance of that man was terrifying, like the Master's.'²⁷ Here again

²³ Philo, *Questions and Answers on Genesis* (tr. R. Marcus; Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1949), vol. 1, p. 19.

²⁴ R. Rubinkewicz, 'Apocalypse of Abraham', *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York, 1985 [1983]), vol. 1, p. 700.

²⁵ J. Fossum, 'The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis', *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (eds. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger and P. Schäfer; Tübingen, 1996), vol. 1, p. 535, n. 39.

²⁶ Further support for the suggestion that in *2 Enoch* Adam is enthroned is offered in that the text says that the Lord created open heaven in order that Adam might look upon the angels singing the triumphal song. This detail again recalls the traditional *Kavod's* imagery where the angelic hosts sing the triumphal song before the enthroned King.

²⁷ E. P. Sanders, 'Testament of Abraham', *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York, 1985 [1983]), vol. 1, p. 888.

Adam is depicted as a resemblance of the Lord's *Kavod*, the divine form manifested on the Seat of Glory.²⁸

It is intriguing that in Georgian, Armenian and Latin versions of the primary Adam books,²⁹ the protoplast is depicted as a being venerated by angelic hosts.³⁰ The tradition about the angelic veneration of the protoplast might also point to associations with the *Kavod* tradition in which one of the essential functions of angelic hosts in the celestial realm is veneration of the enthroned divine Glory.

The heterodox movements in early Christianity that are closely associated with Sethian and Adamic traditions also contain several important testimonies about Adam's body pertaining to the subject of our investigation.³¹ Some of these accounts recall the imagery found in the later Merkabah accounts. Thus, the *Apocryphon of John* relates a tradition according to which the seven powers were responsible for the creation of the seven souls of Adam.³² The text relates that the seven powers provided for the angels the seven substances of the soul in order to create the proportions of the limbs of Adam.³³ In the *Apocryphon* each of the limbs of the first man corresponds to the name of the angel responsible for its creation.³⁴ The detailed attention to the limbs of the first man and their naming according to angelic connotations seem to recall the later *Shi'ur Qomah* materials with their tendency to name the various parts of the cosmic body and for providing the detailed depictions of its limbs.³⁵

All these early testimonies demonstrate that long before the traditions about the gigantic physique of Enoch-Metatron took their distinctive mold in the Merkabah tradition, a similar imagery was already applied in the Jewish pseudepigrapha and the Christian apocrypha to Adam's prelapsarian corporeality. As already mentioned, earlier scholars proposed that the

²⁸ On the traditions of Adam's enthronement, see: P. B. Munoa III, *Four Powers in Heaven. The Interpretation of Daniel 7 in the Testament of Abraham* (JSPSS, 28; Sheffield, 1998), pp. 87-90.

²⁹ Cf. Georgian, Armenian, and Latin versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve* 13:2-14:2.

³⁰ Michael Stone recently demonstrated that one of the earliest instances of this tradition can be found in *2 Enoch* 22 where Enoch transformed after the glory of God into a glorious angelic being venerated by angels. Stone points to the original Adamic mytheme behind this Enochic imagery. M.E. Stone, 'The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve*', *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Andersen, M. Stone, J. Tromp; SVTP, 15; Leiden, 2000), p. 47.

³¹ Cf. for example: Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 1.30.6 'Ialdabaoth exclaimed, 'Come, let us make man after our image.' The six powers, on hearing this, ... jointly formed a man of immense size, both in regard to breadth and length.'

³² *The Apocryphon of John: Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II, 1; III, 1; and VI, 1 with BG 8502, 2* (eds. M. Waldstein and F. Wisse; NMS, 33; Leiden, 1995), pp. 88-91.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 95-111.

³⁵ Cf. G. G. Stroumsa, 'Polymorphie divine et transformations d'un mythologème: l'Apocryphon de Jean et ses sources', *Vig. Chr.* 35 (1988), pp. 412-434.

Adamic imagery played a formative role in the shaping of the Metatron tradition. It is also possible that the concept of the cosmic body of the protoplast played a formative role in constructing the later Metatron's office as the measurer of the divine body. The beginning of this significant development might be detected already in *2 Enoch*. In order to support this hypothesis, our investigation will proceed in the following manner. First, we will explore in detail the tradition of Adam's body in the Slavonic apocalypse. Then, we will focus on the theme of Enoch's corporeality in the text. Finally, we will try to establish the relationship between both traditions in their connections with the motif of the Lord's *Shi'ur Qomah* found in chapter 39.

From the Four Corners of the World

According to *2 Enoch* 30:12, the prelapsarian Adam was a very special celestial being. The Slavonic apocalypse defines him as a second angel who was great (Slav. *velik*) and glorious. The Slavonic terminology used for the term 'great' (*velik*) appears to be related to the physical dimensions of the protoplast. *2 Enoch* 30:10 provides additional proof that the greatness might designate Adam's proportions. In this passage the Lord tells that 'even at his [Adam's] greatest he is small, and again at his smallest he is great.'³⁶ The conjunction of the term 'great' with the term 'small' further supports the hypothesis that the epithet 'greatness' in the text is applied to the dimensions of the first human.

Besides these general references to the 'greatness' of Adam, the text also provides other hints about the dimensions of the patriarch's body. It appears that the most important evidences about the unusual frame of the protoplast in the Slavonic apocalypse are conveyed via the traditions about the creation and the naming of the protoplast.

In *2 Enoch* 30:13 the Lord tells Enoch that he created Adam out of the seven components and assigned to Adam a name from the four 'components:' from East - (A), from West - (D), from North - (A), and from South - (M).³⁷ The correspondence of the anagram of Adam's name with the four corners of the earth might indicate that the dimensions of his body are considered identical with the size of the earth. The Slavonic text, however, does not make this connection explicitly. Moreover, the question remains if this passage about the anagram is really linked to the traditions about Adam's body. The analysis of the early evidences of the anagram's motif shows that this theme was often connected with the theme of Adam's bodily

³⁶ Andersen, '2 Enoch', p. 152.

³⁷ The letters of this anagram correspond to Gk. ἀνατολή, δύσις, ἄρκτος, and μεσημβρία.

form. In order to illustrate this point, a short excursus in the history of this tradition is needed.

One of the early Jewish texts where a similar³⁸ tradition about the anagram can be found is the third book of *Sibylline Oracles*, a composition apparently written in Egypt around 160-50 BCE.³⁹ It is intriguing that already in the *Sibylline Oracles* 3:24-27⁴⁰ the anagram is linked to the motif of Adam's bodily form: 'Indeed it is God himself who fashioned Adam, of four letters, the first-formed man, fulfilling by his name east and west and south and north. He himself fixed the shape of the form of men (αὐτὸς δ' ἔστηπιξε τύπον μορφῆς μερόπων τε).'⁴¹ The term 'shape of the form' (τύπον μορφῆς) here seems to be related to the body of the protoplast. The conflation of the anagram of Adam's name with the shape of his form is significant for our investigation.⁴²

Another Egyptian source,⁴³ a passage found in the writings of the Hermetic author, the alchemist Zosimos of Panopolis who lived in Alexandria in the late third or early fourth century CE,⁴⁴ also connects the tradition about the anagram of Adam's name with his body:⁴⁵ '... they have also spoken of him [Adam] symbolically, *according to his body*, through the four elements ... for his 'alpha' element indicates the east, the air, while his

³⁸ The *Sibylline Oracles* have a slightly different sequence of the 'corners': east-west-south-north.

³⁹ J. J. Collins, 'Sibylline Oracles', *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York, 1985 [1983]), vol. 1, pp. 355-6.

⁴⁰ John Collins observes that *Sibylline Oracles* 3:1-45 'finds its closest parallels in the Jewish Orphic fragments, which probably date to the second century B.C., and also in Philo.' Collins, 'Sibylline Oracles', p. 360.

⁴¹ Collins, 'Sibylline Oracles', p. 362; *Sibyllinische Weissagungen* (ed. A.-M. Kurfess; Berlin, 1951), p. 72.

⁴² *Vita Adae et Evae* 27:1 also connects Adam's name with 'the memory of the divine majesty.' This expression might serve to designate Adam's glorious form, which represents 'memory' or likeness of the divine form: '...My Lord, Almighty and merciful God, holy and faithful, do not let the name of the memory of your majesty be destroyed (*ne deleatur nomen memoria tuae maiestatis*).' *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve. Second Revised Edition* (eds. G. A. Anderson and M. E. Stone; Early Judaism and Its Literature, 17; Atlanta, 1999), pp. 32-32E.

⁴³ It is significant that the *Sibylline Oracles* and the Zosimos passage are both connected with the Egyptian environment, a place of possible provenance of 2 *Enoch*. One should also note that the aforementioned research of C. Böttrich also refers to the passages from the *Sibylline Oracles* and Zosimos. Böttrich, however, did not recognize them as a chain of references to the body of the protoplast. Cf. Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos*, pp. 23-27.

⁴⁴ A. J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, Vol. I. L'Astrologie et les sciences occultes* (Paris, 1983), p. 239.

⁴⁵ Cf. B. A. Pearson, 'Enoch in Egypt', in: *For A Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity* (eds. R.A. Argall, B. A. Bow, and R.A. Werline; Harrisburg, 2000), p. 222

'delta' element indicates the west, and the 'mu' element [indicates] midday⁴⁶

It should be noted that the *Sibylline Oracles* 3 and the Zosimos passage, the two early attestations which link the anagram of Adam's name with his body, are both associated with the Egyptian milieu. A passage from Philo mentioned in our previous investigation indicates that by the first century CE the lore about the gigantic physique of the first humans appeared to be widespread in the Alexandrian environment. *2 Enoch*, which also contains a host of traditions pertaining to the protoplast's body, might have been also composed at the same time and place, namely, in the Alexandrian Diaspora of the first century CE.

The tradition in which the anagram of Adam's name was associated with his body was not lost in the melting pot of the Alexandrian environment but was carefully transmitted by later Jewish traditions. The same tendency to link the name of Adam derived from the Greek designations of the four corners of the world with his body is observable in the rabbinic materials. The difference between the early accounts found in the *Sibylline Oracles* and Zosimos of Panopolis and these rabbinic materials is that the latter explicitly identify the anagram, not simply with Adam's body, but with his cosmic body, which according to the rabbinic accounts was created 'from one end of the universe to the other.' This tradition is attested in a great variety of the rabbinic sources.

For example, the passage from *Gen R.* 8:1 reads:

R. Tanhuma in the name of R. Banayah and R. Berekiah in the name of R. Leazar said: He created him [Adam] as a lifeless mass extending from one end of the world to the other; thus it is written, Thine eyes did not see mine unformed substance (Ps. CXXXIX, 16). R. Joshua b. R. Nehemiah and R. Judah b. R. Simon in R. Leazar's name said: He created him filling the whole world. How do we know [that he stretched] from *east to west*? Because it is said, 'Thou hast formed me behind and before.' From *north to south*? Because it says, Since the day that God created man upon the earth, and from the one end of heaven unto the other (Deut. IV, 32). and how do we know that he filled the empty spaces of the world/ From the verse, 'And laid Thy hand upon me' (as you read, Withdraw Thy hand from me (Job XIII, 21)).⁴⁷

This passage indicates that the speculations about the cosmic body of the protoplast in the rabbinic literature were juxtaposed with the tradition about the correspondence of Adam's name with the four corners of the earth. It is remarkable that the passage from *Gen. R.* 8:1 has exactly the same 'sequence' of the corners as *2 Enoch*, namely 'from east (A) to west (D)' and from 'north (A) to south (M),' which precisely corresponds to the sequence of the letters of Adam's name. The presence of the anagram in the midrashic

⁴⁶ For the Greek text, see: M. P. E. Berthelot/Ch.-Ém. Ruelle, *Collection des Anciens Alchimistes Grecs* (2 vols.; Paris, 1888), vol. 2, p. 231.

⁴⁷ *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; trs. H. Freedman and M. Simon; London, 1939), vol. 1, pp. 54-55.

text points to its ancient Hellenistic origin since the anagram does not carry any meaning in Hebrew, but only in Greek. This tradition about the correspondence of Adam's cosmic body with the four corners of the world and the four letters of his name was widespread in rabbinic literature and was repeated multiple times in *Gen. R.* 21:3, *Gen. R.* 24:2, *Lev. R.* 14:1, and *Lev. R.* 18:2. It is significant that all these passages have the same order of the corners of the world: from east to west and from north to south. A similar tradition can be also found in the *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* and the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* where the motif of Adam's gigantic body created from the four corners of the world is conflated with the story of the veneration of the protoplast by the creatures who mistakenly perceived him as a deity.⁴⁸

Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer 11 reads:

He [God] began to collect the dust of the first man from the four corners of the world... He [Adam] stood on his feet and was adorned with the Divine Image. His height was from east to west, as it is said, 'Thou hast beset me behind and before.' 'Behind' refers to the west, 'before' refers to the east. All the creatures saw him and became afraid of him, thinking that he was their Creator, and they came to prostrate themselves before him.⁴⁹

In the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* 6-12, the same tradition is repeated in a virtually identical form:

...God then called Gabriel, and said unto him: 'Go and bring Me dust from the four corners of the earth, and I will create man out of it'.... He [Adam] stood upon his feet, and was in the likeness of God; his height extended from the east to the west, as it is said, 'Behind and in front Thou hast formed me.' Behind, that is the west, and in front, that is the east. All creatures saw him and were afraid of him; they thought he was their creator, and prostrated themselves before him.⁵⁰

The testimonies from *Midrash Rabbah*, *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* and the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* demonstrate that in the Jewish materials the anagram tradition was consistently interpreted as a reference to the cosmic body of the protoplast, created from one end of the universe to the other. In light of this tendency, it is possible that the tradition about the anagram found in *2 Enoch* 30 also represents a reference to the cosmic body of the protoplast. This suggestion is made more plausible when one considers that the anagram tradition in *2 Enoch* 30:13 follows immediately after the definition of the protoplast as a great celestial creature.⁵¹

⁴⁸ The importance of this motif for *2 Enoch's* traditions will be discussed later.

⁴⁹ *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* (tr. G. Friedlander; New York, 1965), pp. 76-79.

⁵⁰ *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel* (tr. M. Gaster; Oriental Translation Fund, 4; London, 1899), pp. 14-17.

⁵¹ Another tradition found in chapter 30 about the creation of Adam from the seven components might also serve as an allusion to the cosmic body of the protoplast. The description found in *2 Enoch* 30:8 relates that Adam's flesh was created from earth; his blood from dew and from sun; his eyes from the bottomless sea; his bones from stone; his

The Measure of the Divine Body

As has been already mentioned in the introduction, *2 Enoch* 39 depicts the Lord's body as a huge extent 'without measure and without analogy.' While the text unambiguously states that the Lord's extent transcends any analogy, the account of Enoch's vision of the Lord seems in itself to represent a set of analogies in which the descriptions of the patriarch's face and the parts of his body are compared with the descriptions of the divine face and the parts of the Lord's body.

Several details in this narrative are important for establishing the connection between *2 Enoch's* account and the later Jewish traditions about the divine body.

1. It is significant that, through the analogical descriptions introduced in chapter 39 for the first time in the Enochic tradition, a significant bond was established between the immense body of the Lord and Enoch's body; this bond will later play a prominent role in Merkabah mysticism. In *2 Enoch*, as with later Merkabah developments, the proximity between the two bodies appears also to be reinforced by additional metaphors. These metaphors are intended to demonstrate the closeness between the corporeality of the Deity and the Enoch-Metatron corporeality.⁵² From the Merkabah materials one can learn that 'the hand of God rests on the head of the youth, named Metatron.'⁵³ In *2 Enoch* 39:5 the patriarch uses a similar metaphor when he tells his children that he has seen the right hand of the Lord helping (beckoning)⁵⁴ him.⁵⁵

reason from the mobility of angels and from clouds; his veins and hair from grass of the earth; his spirit from the Lord's spirit and from wind. It is possible that by such postulations the text intends to stress that the primordial Adam was the creature of macrocosmic dimensions since Adam's creation from the seven elements refers to Adam as a microcosm, e.g. the anthropomorphic representation of the world. The motif of creation from the seven elements might also be linked to the traditions associated with *Shi'ur Qomah* mysticism. The previously mentioned passage from the *Apocryphon of John*, where the *seven* powers create the seven 'souls' of Adam might shed additional light on *2 Enoch's* account of Adam's creation from the *seven* elements.

⁵² Ithamar Gruenwald observes that 'it is hard to say whether any method lies behind these measures, but we assume that originally the measures aimed at conveying the notion of ideal proportions. These proportions were shared by God and man alike.' Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkabah Mysticism*, p. 214.

⁵³ *Synopse* § 384.

⁵⁴ The same imagery can be found in Ezekiel the Tragedian's *Exagoge* 72: 'Upon it sat a man of noble mien, be-crowned, and with a scepter in one hand while with the other he did beckon me....' R. G. Robertson, 'Ezekiel the Tragedian', *OTP*, 1.812.

⁵⁵ Cf. also *2 Enoch* 24:2 (the shorter recension). 'And the Lord called me; and he placed me to the left of himself closer than Gabriel.' Andersen, '2 Enoch', p. 143.

2. In the Merkabah materials the divine corporeality is labeled as the Measure of the Body⁵⁶ (שִׁיעוּר קוֹמָה). The same terminology is often applied to Enoch-Metatron's body. According to one of the Merkabah texts, 'the stature (קוֹמָתוֹ) of this youth fills the world.'⁵⁷ The link between the body of the patriarch and the divine body in the Slavonic apocalypse is also emphasized by identical terminology. It, therefore, comes as no surprise that in *2 Enoch* the *Shi'ur Qomah* terminology is applied, not only to the body of the Lord (the stature⁵⁸ of the Lord), but also to the body of the patriarch (stature of my [Enoch's] body).

3. In *2 Enoch* 39, Enoch's body seems to serve as the measure and the analogy through which the patriarch conveys to his children the immeasurability of the Lord's stature. In *2 Enoch* 39:6 the term *without measure*⁵⁹ (Slav. *bezmerno*) is used immediately after the expression 'the stature⁶⁰ of the Lord.'⁶¹ This conflation of the concepts of 'stature' and 'measure' further strengthens G. Scholem's hypothesis that *2 Enoch* 39 might attest to the precise *Shi'ur Qomah* terminology, since the term שִׁיעוּר can be translated as a measure.⁶²

4. It is also important that the message about the impossibility of measuring⁶³ the Lord's body comes from the mouth of Enoch, depicted in

⁵⁶ G. Scholem observes that the term *qomah* was often translated as 'height' ('Measurement of the Height'), used in the Biblical sense. He stresses that such translation does not apply to the Merkabah materials where *qomah*, like in the Aramaic incantation texts, signifies 'body'. Cf. G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, p. 364.

⁵⁷ Schäfer et al., *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, p. 162.

⁵⁸ Slav. *Ob'jatie*. Sokolov, vol. 1, pp. 38, 94.

⁵⁹ Some *Shi'ur Qomah* descriptions also stress the idea of the immeasurability of the Divine Face: '...The image of His face and the image of His cheeks is as the dimensions of the spirit and as the creation of the soul, such that no one can recognize it, as it is stated (in Scripture): 'His body is *tarshish*.' His splendor is luminous and glows from within the darkness, and (from within) the cloud and fog that surround Him and although they surround Him, all the princes of the Presence (supplicate) before Him as (obediently as water flows when it is poured from) a water-pitcher, because of the vision of His comeliness and beauty. There is no measurement (מִדָּה) in our hands; the names (alone) are revealed.' Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah: Texts and Recensions*, p. 47.

⁶⁰ Slav. *Ob'jatie*. literally can be translated as 'embrace.' This noun is related to the Slavonic verb - to embrace somebody, to fold somebody in one's hands. Francis Andersen translates the term as 'scope' (the longer recension) and 'extent' (the shorter recension).

⁶¹ *2 Enoch* 39:6 '...I have seen the stature of the Lord, without measure and without analogy...'

⁶² Markus Jastrow translates the term as 'proportion', 'standart', 'definite quantity', 'size', or 'limit'. M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (2 vols.; New York, 1967), vol. 2, p. 1565.

⁶³ The stress on the immeasurability of God in *2 Enoch* does not contradict the theology of the *Shi'ur Qomah* tradition. Peter Schäfer observes that 'the *Shi'ur Qomah* tradition does not intend to state that God can be 'calculated,' that he is, so to speak, a superman of enormous yet exactly measurable and conceivable dimensions ... the completely absurd calculations is to demonstrate that God cannot be conceived of in human categories: he, 'as

various sections of *2 Enoch* as a measurer responsible for measuring various earthly and celestial phenomena.⁶⁴ It demonstrates a remarkable parallel to the later role of Metatron as the one who conveys to visionaries the measure/the stature of the Body. In the *Shi'ur Qomah* section of the *Merkabah Rabbah*, the following tradition is attested: 'I said to him, to the Prince of Torah,⁶⁵ teach me the measure of our Creator, and he said to me the measure of our Creator, and he said to me the measure of the body (שיעור קומה).' (*Synopse* §688).⁶⁶ In later Jewish mysticism Enoch-Metatron himself is described as the measure⁶⁷ of the divine body.

In the conclusion of this section, it should be stressed that our analysis of the description of the Lord's corporeality in chapter 39 indicates that several features of this account manifest remarkable similarities to the concepts and imagery of the divine body found in the later Hekhalot and Merkabah writings. The development detectable in the Slavonic apocalypse, however, seems to represent a very early form of this tradition, which contains a vague sketch of what will take its definitive form in Jewish mysticism much later.

Bodily Ascent

It has been previously mentioned that Enoch's image in *2 Enoch* appears to be quite different from his portrait in the early Enochic circle. Among the new features that constitute this new enhanced profile of the seventh antedeluvian patriarch, a significant concept can be found that seems related to our ongoing discussion about the cosmic body traditions in the Slavonic apocalypse. This important concept appears in the first chapter of *2 Enoch*, which describes the beginning of Enoch's celestial ascent.

In *2 Enoch* 1:3 the reader finds the patriarch sleeping on his bed. According to the text Enoch sees a strange dream in which two huge angelic beings, with faces like the shining sun, approach the patriarch's bed and call

it were,' is like a human being and yet hidden.' P. Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God. Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism* (tr. A. Pomerance; Albany, 1992), pp. 149-50.

⁶⁴ See, for example, *2 Enoch* 40:2-12: 'I know everything, and everything I have written down in books, the heavens and their boundaries and their contents. And all the armies and their movements I have measured. And I have recorded the stars and the multitude of multitudes innumerable... The solar circle I have measured, and its rays I have measured... The lunar circle I have measured, and its movements... I measured all the earth, and its mountains and hills and fields and woods and stones and rivers, and everything that exist....' Andersen, '2 Enoch', pp. 164-166.

⁶⁵ = Metatron.

⁶⁶ Schäfer et al, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, p. 252.

⁶⁷ G. G. Stroumsa, 'Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ', *HTR* 76 (1983), pp. 269-88.

him by his name. The text says that after the patriarch was awakened by the angels, he went out from his house closing the door behind him as the angels had ordered. Philip Alexander draws the reader's attention to an important detail in this description; he observes that *2 Enoch* 'attests with a boldness and clarity nowhere matched in *1 Enoch* that Enoch ascended bodily to heaven....'⁶⁸ He also notes that this emphasis on the bodily ascent in the awakened condition represents a departure from the early Enochic materials attested in *1 (Ethiopic) Enoch*, where the patriarch's ascension to heaven seems to be depicted as in a dream during sleep.⁶⁹ Alexander further observes that this unequivocal claim that a human could bodily enter the upper realm was profoundly problematic within the worldview of early Judaism.⁷⁰

It is intriguing that later Merkabah Enochic accounts, as with *2 Enoch's* account, insist on the bodily ascension of the patriarch. Alexander observes that, *3 Enoch* 'clearly envisages bodily ascent and so postulates the physical metamorphosis of Enoch' during which Enoch 'becomes, like other angels, physically composed of fire.'⁷¹ Alexander also points to another consequence of this metamorphosis, namely, the enlargement of Metatron's body until it equaled the dimensions of the world.⁷²

This connection between the bodily ascent of the visionary and the transformation of his body in *2 Enoch* and the *Sefer Hekhalot* is not coincidental, since in the Slavonic apocalypse, for the first time in the Enochic tradition as we saw earlier, the body of the patriarch becomes a locus of intense theological deliberation. As has been already demonstrated in the *Shi'ur Qomah* passage from *2 Enoch* 39, the patriarch's body was explicitly compared with the divine body and linked with it by identical technical terminology. The insistence on the bodily ascent of the patriarch in *2 Enoch* seems also to constitute an important step in the forming of this new perspective on Enoch's physique, the development that reached its formative stage in the later Merkabah speculations about the Metatron's body matching the size of the world.

Adam and Enoch: "Two Powers" in Heaven

⁶⁸ Alexander, 'From Son of Adam to Second God', p. 104.

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 103.

⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 102. It should be noted that despite that *1 Enoch's* materials do not attest to the bodily ascent of the visionary the transition to this concept occurred in early Judaism not later than the first century CE. Besides *2 Enoch's* evidence, which can be dated to the first century CE, before the destruction of the Second Temple, the Pauline passage attested in 2 Cor 12 also demonstrates familiarity with the concept of the bodily ascent. I am indebted to Alan Segal for this clarification.

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 106.

⁷² Ibid., p. 106.

Previous studies proposed that the traditions about the cosmic body of Metatron in the later Jewish mysticism might have been originated as a result of the polemics with the traditions about the cosmic body of the protoplast. Thus, P. Alexander, in his comment on the motif of Enoch-Metatron enlargement in *3 Enoch* 9, refers to certain rabbinic traditions⁷³ about 'the primordial Adam's body, like that of the Gnostic protoanthropos, [which] corresponded to the world in size, but was diminished to the present limited dimensions of the human body as a result of the fall.'⁷⁴ He further suggests that *3 Enoch's* account about the gigantic body of Enoch-Metatron 'maybe expressing in mythological language the idea that Enoch reversed the fall of Adam.'⁷⁵

Moshe Idel's research also reveals that 'Jewish mystical literature indicates ... a certain similarity between the enlarged states of Adam and Enoch.'⁷⁶ He notes that 'the end of the gigantic Adam is well-known: he was severely reduced in his human dimensions. Enoch, on the other hand, merited undergoing the reverse process' described in *3 Enoch* as the patriarch's elevation and elongation as the measure of the length and breath of the world.⁷⁷

Idel notes that in some Rabbinic materials the conception of the elevated Enoch, depicted as the supreme angel Metatron, contains remnants of the Adamic traditions.⁷⁸ In these materials Enoch is conceived as the one who regained the cosmic status and the extraordinary qualities that the primordial Adam had lost after his transgression in the Garden of Eden, namely, his luminosity and size.⁷⁹

Moreover, in some Rabbinic accounts Metatron is often directly described as a counterpart of Adam predestined to substitute for the fallen patriarch even before his actual transgression.⁸⁰ Idel points⁸¹ to the development of this theme in *3 Enoch*. The *Sefer Hekhalot* 48C reads:

⁷³ In *Gen. R.* 8.1, *b. Hag.* 12a, and possibly, in *Pesiq. Rab Kah.* 1.1.

⁷⁴ Alexander, 'From Son of Adam to a Second God', pp. 111-12.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 112.

⁷⁶ Idel, 'Enoch is Metatron', p. 225.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 225.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 220.

⁷⁹ Cf. *b. Sanh.* 38b: 'Rab Judah said in Rab's name: The first man reached from one end of the world to the other... R. Elezar said: The first man reached from earth to heaven... but when he sinned, the Holy One, blessed be He, laid His hand upon him and diminished him...' *The Babylonian Talmud (Hebrew-English Edition) Sanhedrin* (trs. J. Shachter and H. Freedman; London, 1994), p. 38b.

⁸⁰ Isaiah Tishby observes that in both the *Raya Mehemna* and the *Tikkunei ha-Zohar*, Metatron is portrayed as the lord of the lower chariot, a human figure seated upon the throne; and in this role he is called 'the lesser Adam.' Tishby notes that according to the *Tikkunei ha-Zohar* '...Metatron was created first and foremost among all the hosts of heaven below, and he is the lesser Adam, which the Holy One, blessed be He, made in the celestial image.' I. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, (3 vols.; London, 1994), vol. 2, pp. 628-629. In some Zoharic materials Metatron's name(s), similar to Adam's name, are also

The Holy One, blessed be he, said: I made him strong, I took him, I appointed him, namely Metatron my servant, who is unique among all denizens of the heights. 'I made him strong' in the generation of the first man....'I took him' --Enoch the son of Jared, from their midst, and brought him up.... 'I appointed him' --over all the storehouses and treasures which I have in every heaven....⁸²

According to this passage God elected Metatron already in the generation of the first man. Metatron was thus viewed as a preexistent divine being,⁸³ first incarnated in Adam and then in Enoch, who re-ascended to the protoplast's heavenly home and took his rightful place in the heights of the universe.⁸⁴ Our research will later demonstrate that in *2 Enoch* the account of Enoch's elevation, similarly to this Metatron tradition, is juxtaposed with the story of the elevated prelapsarian Adam. Idel also observes that in Jewish mystical literature another significant parallelism in the depictions of the corporalities of Adam and Enoch can be detected. He points out that in both cases 'their immense size caused an error of faith, namely other creatures were induced to believe that two powers governed the universe, not God alone.'⁸⁵

Several rabbinic and Hekhalot sources, including *b. Hag. 15a.*, *Sefer Hekhalot 16*, and *Merkavah Rabbah (Synopsis §672)* attest to a tradition according to which the terrifying vision of Metatron, seated on a great throne at the door of the seventh palace, caused Aher to believe that Metatron represents the second power in heaven.

In *3 Enoch 16:1-5* Enoch-Metatron tells to Rabbi Ishmael the following story:

At first I sat upon a great throne at the door of the seventh palace, and I judged all the denizens of the heights on the authority of the Holy One, blessed be he.... I sat in the heavenly court. The princes of kingdoms stood beside me, to my right and to my left, by authority of the Holy One, blessed be he. But when Aher came to behold the vision of the chariot and set eyes upon me, he was afraid and trembled before

juxtaposed with the tradition about the four corners of the world: 'This is Metatron, which is higher [than the creatures] by a distance of five hundred years. Metatron, Mitatron, Zevul, Eved, Zevoel - here are five [names], and *his names multiply in four directions to the four corners of the world* according to the missions of his Master.' Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, vol. 2, p. 643.

⁸¹ Idel, 'Enoch is Metatron', p. 226.

⁸² Alexander, '3 Enoch', p. 311.

⁸³ Scholem argued that in the Metatron lore one can find two possible concepts of this angel. The first one considers him as an angelic counterpart of the seventh antedeluvian patriarch translated to heaven before the Flood and transfigured into an immortal angelic being. He argued that there was also another trend in which Metatron was not connected with Enoch or any other human prototype but was understood as a pre-existent angel. See G. Scholem, *Kabbalah* (New York, 1987), pp. 378-380.

⁸⁴ It is noteworthy that the motif of Enoch as the redeemer and the restorer of prelapsarian humanity can be traced to *2 Enoch 64:4-5* where the patriarch is portrayed as the one who carried away the sin of humankind. Andersen, '2 Enoch', p. 190.

⁸⁵ Idel, 'Enoch is Metatron', p. 225.

me. His soul was alarmed to the point of leaving him, because of his fear, dread, and terror of me, when he saw me seated⁸⁶ upon a throne like king, with ministering angels standing beside me as servants and all the princes of kingdoms crowned with crowns surrounding me.⁸⁷

Despite the prominent role that Enoch-Metatron plays in the 'two powers' controversy, the initial background of this tradition about the erroneous veneration of the exalted humanity appears to originate, not in the Enochic, but in the Adamic⁸⁸ tradition.

Jarl Fossum's research demonstrates that the motif of the misplaced adoration of Adam by the angels appears in several forms in the rabbinic literature.⁸⁹ Thus, from *Gen. R.* 8:10 one can learn that when God created man in his own image 'the ministering angels mistook him [for a divine being] and wished to exclaim 'Holy' before Him... What did the Holy One, blessed be He, do? He caused sleep to fall upon him, and so all knew that he was [only a mortal] man.'⁹⁰ In *the Alphabet of R. Akiba* the angels' erroneous behavior is explained through the reference to Adam's gigantic body.⁹¹

⁸⁶ The rabbinic tradition states that there is no sitting in heaven, where according to *b. Hag. 15a*, the privilege of 'seating' beside God was accorded solely to Metatron by virtue of his character as a 'scribe'; for he was granted permission as a scribe to sit and write down the merits of Israel. It is important that the motif of the 'seating' of Enoch-Metatron in heaven is first documented in *2 Enoch 23:4* where the archangel Vereveil allows the patriarch to sit down and 'write everything.'

⁸⁷ Alexander, '3 Enoch', p. 268.

⁸⁸ For Adam's connection with the two powers' traditions, see Segal's pioneering research: A. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven. Early Rabbinic Reports About Christianity and Gnosticism* (SJLA, 25; Leiden, 1977), pp. 108-115.

⁸⁹ Jarl Fossum differentiates three major forms of this tradition: '(1) The angels mistake Adam for God and want to exclaim 'Holy' before him, whereupon God lets sleep fall upon Adam so it becomes clear that the latter is human; (2) all creatures mistake Adam for their creator and wish to bow before him, but Adam teaches them to render all honor to God as their true creator; (3) the angels mistake Adam for God and wish to exclaim 'Holy' before him, whereupon God reduces Adam's size.' J. Fossum, 'The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis', in: *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (eds. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger and P. Schäfer; Tübingen, 1996), vol. 1, pp. 529-30. An important similarity can be detected between these Adamic traditions and the Metatron accounts. In *b. Hag. 15a* God punished Metatron with sixty fiery lashes. Alan Segal observes that 'just as Metatron needed correction for the false impression he gave Aher, so Adam needs correction for the false impression given the angels.' Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, p. 112. Indeed, in the Adamic accounts of two powers the protoplast is disciplined in various ways, including the reduction of his stature.

⁹⁰ *Midrash Rabbah*, vol. 1, p. 61.

⁹¹ It should be noted that the traditions about the gigantic body of Adam were widespread in the rabbinic literature. See: A. Altmann, 'The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends', *JQR* 35 (1945), pp. 371-391; B. Barc, 'La taille cosmique d'Adam dans la littérature juive rabbinique des trois premiers siècles après J.-C.', *RSR* 49 (1975), pp. 173-85; J. Fossum, 'The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis', *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (2 vols; eds. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger and P. Schäfer; Tübingen, 1996),

This teaches that initially Adam was created from the earth to the firmament. When the ministering angels saw him, they were shocked and excited by him. At that time they all stood before the Holy One, blessed be He, and said to Him; 'Master of the Universe! There are two powers in the world, one in heaven and one on earth.' What did the Holy One, blessed be He, do then? He placed His hand on him, and decreased him,⁹² setting him at one thousand cubits.⁹³

It is clear that these Adamic accounts do not originate in the rabbinic literature under the influence of Metatron's story but in early pseudepigraphical writings. Scholars observe⁹⁴ that these accounts have their roots in the prominent story already found in the primary Adam books⁹⁵ and other early materials,⁹⁶ according to which God himself ordered the angels to venerate Adam, and all the angels except Satan bowed before the first human.

The prototype of the story of the misplaced veneration of Enoch-Metatron also can be traced to this early Adamic lore. It is possible that the transition from the Adamic two powers template to the Enoch-Metatron two powers template occurred not in the Rabbinic period but much earlier, that is, already inside the Second Temple Judaism. M. Stone has demonstrated that in *2 Enoch* 22 the Adamic tradition of the protoplast's veneration by the angels was skillfully transferred to the seventh antediluvian patriarch.⁹⁷ It is

vol. 1, pp. 529-39; S. Niditch, 'The Cosmic Adam: Man as Mediator in Rabbinic Literature', *JJS* 34 (1983), pp. 137-146; P. Schäfer, *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorstellung* (Berlin; New York, 1975); Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven. Early Rabbinic Reports About Christianity and Gnosticism*, pp. 108-115.

⁹² *Pesiq. Rab Kah.* 1:1 reflects the same tradition: 'Said R. Aibu, 'At that moment the first man's stature was cut down and diminished to one hundred cubits.'" *Pesiqta de Rab Kahana* (tr. J. Neusner; 2 vols.; Atlanta, 1987), vol. 1, p. 1.

⁹³ Idel, 'Enoch is Metatron', p. 226.

⁹⁴ Altmann, 'The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends', p. 382; Fossum, 'The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis', p. 530-31.

⁹⁵ The account of Adam's elevation and his veneration by angels is also found in Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve* 13-15. These versions depict God's creation of Adam in his image. The first man was then brought before God's face by the archangel Michael to bow down to God. God commanded all the angels to bow down to Adam. All the angels agreed to venerate the protoplast, except Satan (and his angels) who refused to bow down before Adam, because the first human was 'younger' ('posterior') to Satan.

⁹⁶ The Slavonic version of *3 Baruch* 4; *Gospel of Bartholomew* 4, *Coptic Enthronement of Michael*, *Cave of Treasures* 2:10-24, and *Qur'an* 2:31-39; 7:11-18; 15:31-48; 17:61-65; 18:50; 20:116-123; 38:71-85.

⁹⁷ M. Stone's article investigates an important motif preserved in chapters 21-22 of the Slavonic apocalypse. He observes that the story found in *2 Enoch* 21-22 recalls the account of Adam's elevation and his veneration by angels found in Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve*. Stone notes that, besides the motifs of Adam's elevation and his veneration by angels, the author of *2 Enoch* appears to be also aware of the motif of angelic disobedience and refusal to venerate the first human. M. Stone draws the reader's attention to the phrase 'sounding them out', found in *2 Enoch*

not coincidental that the transference of the 'two powers' tradition from Adam to Enoch was made for the first time in the Slavonic Apocalypse where the protoplast and the seventh antediluvian patriarch were interconnected via the conception of the cosmic body.

Two Bodies Created According to the Likeness of the Third One

Our previous analysis has shown that in the various Jewish texts the traditions about Adam's and Enoch's corporalities often appear to be linked and share similar imagery. Our investigation has also demonstrated that this connection can be detected already in *2 Enoch*. A critical question, however, still remains: how can these traditions about the corporealities of the two patriarchs be related to the *Shi'ur Qomah* account of the Divine Face found in chapter 39.

It appears that the depiction of the divine anthropomorphic extent, labeled in *2 Enoch* as the Lord's Face, serves as an important locus that unifies the Adamic tradition of the cosmic body of the protoplast and the Enochic tradition about the glorious angelic body of the translated patriarch. Our research must now turn to the analysis of the accounts of the Divine Face which unifies both traditions.

It should be noted that *2 Enoch* contains two descriptions involving the motif of the Divine Face. The first one occurs in *2 Enoch* 22, a chapter which depicts Enoch's encounter with the Lord in the celestial realm. The second account appears in chapter 39 where the patriarch reports his initial theophanic experience to his sons during his short visit to earth, adding some new details. Although both descriptions demonstrate a number of terminological affinities, the second account explicitly connects the Divine Face with the Lord's anthropomorphic 'extent.' It is also significant that in both theophanic descriptions the stature of the Lord, His 'Face,' is associated with light and fire. In biblical theophanies smoke and fire often serve as a divine envelope that protects mortals from the sight of the Divine Form. Radiant luminosity emitted by the Deity fulfills the same function, indicating the danger of the direct vision of the divine form. Luminosity also represents the screen which protects the Deity from the necessity of revealing Its true form. Scholars note that in some theophanic traditions God's form remains hidden behind His light.⁹⁸ The hidden *Kavod* is revealed

22:6, which another translator of the Slavonic text rendered as 'making a trial of them.' Stone notes that the expressions 'sounding them out' or 'making a trial of them' imply here that it is the angels' obedience that is being tested. Cf. M. E. Stone, 'The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve*', *JTS* 44 (1993), pp. 143-156.

⁹⁸ April DeConick's pioneering research shows that in Enochic traditions God's form remains hidden behind his light. Cf. DeConick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas*, pp. 104-5.

through this light, which serves as a luminous screen, 'the face' of this anthropomorphic extend. *2 Enoch's* theophanies, which use the metaphors of light and fire, may well be connected with such traditions where the Divine 'Form' is hidden behind the incandescent 'face,' which covers and protects the sovereignty of the Lord.⁹⁹

In *2 Enoch* 39:3-6 the 'face' is closely associated with the divine 'extend' and seems to be understood, not simply as a part of the Lord's body, but as a radiant *façade* of His whole anthropomorphic 'stature.' This identification between the Lord's face and the Lord's form is reinforced by an additional parallel in which Enoch's face is identified with Enoch's form. The association between the Divine Face and the Divine Form in *2 Enoch* 39:3-6 closely resembles the biblical tradition from Ex 33:18-23, where the divine *panim* is mentioned in connection with the glorious Divine form, God's *Kavod*.

The motif of the Divine Face has paramount significance for our investigation since it serves as a symbol decisively linking Enoch's newly acquired luminous angelic body with the glorious body of the protoplast.¹⁰⁰ Enoch's luminous metamorphosis takes place in the front of the Lord's glorious 'extent,' labeled in *2 Enoch* as the Lord's 'Face.' From *2 Enoch* 22 one can learn that the vision of the divine 'Face' had drastic consequences for Enoch's appearance. His body endures radical changes as it becomes covered with the divine light. This encounter transforms Enoch into a glorious angelic being. The text says that after this procedure Enoch had become like one of the glorious ones, and there was no observable difference.¹⁰¹ This phrase describes Enoch's transition to his new celestial identity as 'one of the glorious ones.' During this transition in the front of the Lord's face Enoch's own 'face' has been radically altered and the patriarch has now acquired a new glorious 'visage'

⁹⁹ The imagery of the divine Face plays an important role in Merkabah mysticism. In the *Hekhalot Rabbati* the following descriptions can be found: '... the holy living creatures ... put on garments of fire and wrap themselves in a covering of flame, and cover their faces with a lighting bolt, and the Holy One, blessed be He, unveils His face.' *Synopse* §184. 'The honored King is enthroned and He rises up the living creatures... They embrace Him and they kiss Him and they unveil their faces. They unveil themselves and the King of Glory covers His face, and the Arabot firmament used to burst like a sieve before the face of the King.' *Synopse* §189.

¹⁰⁰ C. Böttrich, in his research on the Adamic motifs in *2 Enoch* was not able to discern the significance of the Divine Face account for Adamic polemics in the Slavonic apocalypse and rejected the descriptions of the Lord's Face in *2 Enoch* 22 and 39 as later interpolations. See: Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch*, pp. 112-113. This rejection had, in my judgment, drastic consequences for Böttrich's research and his ability to discern the theology of the text in general and the meaning of the Adamic traditions in *2 Enoch* in particular, since the tradition of the Divine Face represents a nexus through which several significant polemical trajectories of the text are interwoven.

¹⁰¹ Andersen, '2 Enoch', p. 139.

which reflects the luminosity¹⁰² of the Lord's *Panim*.¹⁰³ The account of the Lord's Face in *2 Enoch* 39 also stresses the proximity between the Face and the patriarch's body. It is expressed through a series of analogical comparisons that demonstrates that Enoch's new transformed stature is fashioned in the *likeness* of the Lord's 'Face.'

This creation in the likeness of the Lord's Face represents an important link that connects this new angelic body of Enoch with the body of the glorious Adam. It has been demonstrated that the Face in *2 Enoch* 22 represented the cause and the prototype after which the new celestial identity of Enoch was 'created.' The new creation fashioned after the Face signifies here the return to the prelapsarian condition of Adam, who according to the Slavonic apocalypse was also 'modeled' during his creation after the Face of God. In *2 Enoch* 44:1 one can learn that the protoplast was created in the likeness of God's Face. The text says that 'the Lord with his own two hands created mankind; in a facsimile of *his own face*, both small and great, the Lord created [them].'¹⁰⁴ It is intriguing that *2 Enoch* departs here from the canonical reading attested in Gen 1:26-27, where Adam was created, not after the face of God, but after His image (*tselem*). In view of this departure, the author of the recent English translation of the Slavonic apocalypse, Francis Andersen, observes that *2 Enoch's* 'idea is remarkable from any point of view.... This is not the original meaning of *tselem*.... The text uses *podobie lica* [in the likeness of the face], not *obrazu* or *videnije*, the usual terms for 'image'.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰² *2 Enoch's* narrative gives evidence that Enoch's face acquired the same qualities of luminosity as the Face of the Lord. In *2 Enoch* 37, the Lord calls one of his angels to chill the face of Enoch before his return to earth. The angel, who 'appeared frozen', then chilled Enoch's face with his icy hands. Immediately after this procedure, the Lord tells Enoch that if his face had not been chilled in such a way, no human being would be able to look at his face. This chilling procedure indicates that Enoch's metamorphosis near the Face involves the transformation of the visionary's face into the fiery, perilous entity which now resembles the Lord's Face. We can find a detailed description of this process in another 'Enochic' text, the *Sefer Hekhalot*, which describes the transformation of Enoch-Metatron, the Prince of the Divine Presence, into a fiery creature. Cf. *3 Enoch* 15:1 'R. Ishmael said: The angel Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, the glory of highest heaven, said to me: When the Holy One, blessed be he, took me to serve the throne of glory, the wheels of the chariot and all needs of the Shekinah, 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.' Alexander, '3 Enoch', p. 267.

¹⁰³ It is noteworthy that after this procedure Enoch's 'face' itself, similar to the Lord's face, acquired the ability to glorify other subjects. Thus in *2 Enoch* 64:3-5 the following tradition can be found: '...and the elders of the people and all the community came and prostrated themselves and kissed Enoch... O our father Enoch, bless your sons and all the people, so that we may be glorified in front of your face today.' Andersen, '2 Enoch', p. 190.

¹⁰⁴ Andersen, '2 Enoch', p. 170.

¹⁰⁵ Andersen, '2 Enoch', p. 171, note b.

The previous analysis, however, demonstrates that this reading does not arise in the Slavonic environment but belongs to the original argument of *2 Enoch*, where the creation of the luminous protoplast after the Face of the Lord corresponds to a similar angelic 'creation' of the seventh antediluvian patriarch. There is almost no doubt that, in view of the information about Adam's glorious angelic nature attested in *2 Enoch* 30:11, the author of the Slavonic apocalypse tries to connect the theme of Adam's creation with the motif of the glorious Face of the Lord.

This connection also reveals that the bodies of the two characters of the Slavonic apocalypse, the prelapsarian corporeality of the protoplast and the body of his luminous counterpart, the patriarch Enoch, are both fashioned in the likeness of the third body, namely, the Extent of the Lord, also known as the luminous 'Face.' It is not coincidental that in *2 Enoch* the interconnection of all three corporealities, the glorious body of the protoplast, the glorious body of the elevated Enoch, and the luminous divine body, is made via the account of the Divine Face where, according to Gershom Scholem, the precise *Shi'ur Qomah* terminology might have already been made evident.

The Adam Tradition

On Polemical Nature of 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*: A Reply to C. Böttrich

In one of the recent issues of this journal¹ Christfried Böttrich offered his criticism² of my article³ dedicated to the polemical developments in the shorter recension of the Melchizedek legend of 2 *Enoch*.

In his critical response C. Böttrich denied the possibility of any polemics not only in the Melchizedek story but also in the whole text of the Slavonic apocalypse. He stated that "polemics are not heard elsewhere in the narration; the picture of a still unified archaic mankind has no place for them."⁴

Böttrich's strong negative reaction to the possibility of polemics in the Slavonic apocalypse must be understood in the context of his own scholarship. If such polemical developments do indeed exist, they pose a serious problem to Böttrich's research on 2 *Enoch*; this research has been for many years conducted without any recognition or consideration of such polemics. The existence of these polemical developments would reveal, therefore, the apparent flaw of his methodological approach, which has been unable to grasp the polemical character of the text. Moreover, if the investigation were to proceed with the proper methodology, one which takes into consideration the polemical nature of 2 *Enoch*, a large number of

¹ C. Böttrich, "The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) *Enoch*: A Reaction to A. Orlov" *JSJ* 32.4 (2001) 445-70.

² All Böttrich's criticism rests on his single erroneous assumption that 2 *Enoch* 71:32-33, which I used in my argument, represent an interpolation. This is simply incorrect. There is nothing Christian in these two verses. They are presented in both recensions in all major MSS of 2 *Enoch*. A simple comparison of two recensions provides an additional proof that it is not an interpolation. In the shorter recension an interpolation in 71:34-36 is absent. If 71:32-33 also belong to this interpolation it is difficult to explain why these verses are still preserved in the shorter recension. It should be noted that previous translators A. Vaillant and F. Andersen did not consider 2 *Enoch* 71:31-32 as an interpolation. Cf. A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut d'Etudes Slaves, 1952) 80-82; F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) *Enoch*", *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.208 note p. It is unfortunate, that Böttrich did not read my other article on the same subject (A. Orlov, "'Noah's Younger Brother': Anti-Noachic Polemics in 2 *Enoch*" *Henoch* 22.2 (2000) 259-73) where I further develop my argument about the polemical nature of the Melchizedek story of 2 *Enoch* on the materials of the longer recension. In this article I demonstrated the important role that 2 *Enoch* 71:31-32 play in the anti-Noachic polemics of the Slavonic apocalypse.

³ A. Orlov, "Melchizedek Legend of 2 (Slavonic) *Enoch*" *JSJ* 31 (2000) 23-38.

⁴ C. Böttrich, "The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) *Enoch*: A Reaction to A. Orlov" *JJS* 32.4 (2001) 465.

Böttrich's conclusions on the theology, the history of the transmission, and the role of Jewish mystical traditions in the text would be dismissed as erroneous.

My reply to Christfried Böttrich, however, should not proceed solely as an exposition of the errors of his previous research, but should rather take a form of a further demonstration of the polemical nature of the Slavonic apocalypse. This paper, therefore, will seek to investigate the Adamic polemics in *2 Enoch*, one of the most important polemical developments taking place in the Slavonic apocalypse; this polemical development, unfortunately, completely escaped Böttrich's attention.⁵ By this investigation I will try to demonstrate to Christfried Böttrich that the polemics permeate the whole text and that without their consideration any research on *2 Enoch* ends inevitably in a blind alley.

The Function of the Adamic Tradition in *2 Enoch*

Adam's story occupies a prominent place in *2 Slavonic (Apocalypse of Enoch)*. The traditions pertaining to the first human can be found in all the sections of the book.⁶ In these materials Adam is depicted as a glorious angelic being, predestined by God to be the ruler of the earth, but falling short of God's expectations. Although a major bulk of Adamic materials belongs to the longer recension, which includes, for example, the lengthy Adamic narrative in chapters 30-32, the Adamic tradition is not confined solely to this recension. A number of important Adamic passages are also attested in the shorter recension. The extensive presence of Adamic materials in both recensions and their significance for the theology of the Slavonic apocalypse indicates that they are not later interpolations but are part of the original layer of the text.

It should be noted that such an extensive presence of Adamic materials in the intertestamental Enochic text is quite unusual. In the early Enochic circle, included in the composition known as *1 (Ethiopic) Enoch*, Adam does not figure prominently. His presence in these materials is marginal and limited to a few insignificant remarks. Besides these few short references to the first humans,⁷ the early Enochic booklets are silent about the traditions associated with the protoplast. Moreover, Adam's image in *1 Enoch* is quite different from the one attested in the Slavonic Apocalypse. *1 Enoch's*

⁵ It is remarkable that Böttrich's book dedicated to the Adamic tradition in *2 Enoch* [C. Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos* (Berlin: Peter Lang, 1995)] does not have even one word on the polemical nature of the Adamic narrative in the Slavonic apocalypse. The question of the influence of the Adamic tradition on the image of Enoch is also completely ignored.

⁶ *2 Enoch* 30:8-32:2; 33:10; 41:1; 42:5; 44:1; 58:1-3; 71:28.

⁷ See, *1 Enoch* 32:6; 37:1; 60:8; 69:9-11; 85:3; 90:37-38.

materials do not give any specific details about the elevated status of the protoplast. For example, the *Animal Apocalypse* 85:3 depicts Adam as a white bull. Although, white is a positive symbol in the imagery of *An. Ap.*,⁸ scholars note that, in general, this allegory does not indicate goodness or elevation, but rather lineage.⁹ Thus, in *An. Ap.* all the sheep are white, even the blinded ones. White color, therefore, does not serve as a sign of the elevated or angelic status of the protoplast. Sethites, for instance, are also depicted as white bulls. If the authors or editors of *An. Ap.* want to stress the angelic status of a character, they usually depict it in transformation from an animal into a human. Thus, in Ethiopic and Aramaic versions of *An. Ap.* 89:36, Moses is portrayed as the one who was transformed from a sheep into a man during his encounter with God on Mount Sinai. Moses' "humanization" points to his transition to the angelic status. The same process can be found in the Ethiopic version of *An. Ap.* 89:9 where Noah's angelic metamorphosis is symbolically depicted as a transformation from a white bovid into a man.¹⁰ Such "humanization," however, has never been applied to Adam in *An. Ap.*

The modest role which Adam plays in the early Enochic circle can be explained by several factors. Scholars previously observed that Enochic and Adamic traditions often offer contending explanations of the origin of evil in the world.¹¹ The Enochic tradition bases its understanding of the origin of evil on the Watchers story where the fallen angels corrupt human beings by passing on to them various celestial secrets. In contrast, the Adamic tradition traces the source of evil to Satan's disobedience and the transgression of Adam and Eve in Eden.

From the point of view of this long-lasting contention between Adamic and Enochic traditions, it might appear that the sudden occurrence of the large bulk of Adamic materials in *2 Enoch* represents alien accretions skillfully interpolated into the original narrative during its long transmission in the Greek and Slavonic milieux.

A closer examination of the text, however, shows that the presence of the Adamic tradition in the Slavonic apocalypse is not secondary or coincidental but has a profound conceptual value for the whole theological framework of the Slavonic apocalypse. It appears that the purpose of the extensive presence of Adamic materials in *2 Enoch* can be explained through the assessment of Enoch's image in the text.

⁸ P. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1993) 226.

⁹ Tiller, 226.

¹⁰ The "humanization" of Noah is not attested in the Aramaic. See, Tiller, 267.

¹¹ M. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M. E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 133-49.

Scholars have previously noted that Enoch's figure, portrayed in the various sections of *2 Enoch*, is more complex than in the early Enochic tractates of *1 Enoch*.¹² For the first time, the Enochic tradition seeks to depict Enoch, not simply as a human taken to heaven and transformed into an angel, but as a celestial being exalted above the angelic world.¹³ In this attempt, one may find the origins of another image of Enoch, very different from the early Enochic literature, which was developed much later in Merkabah mysticism—the concept of the supreme angel Metatron, "the Prince of the Presence."¹⁴ It is, therefore, possible that this new profile of the elevated Enoch in the Slavonic apocalypse can serve as an important clue to unriddling the mysteries of the extensive Adamic presence in *2 Enoch*.

In 1987 Moshe Idel published an article¹⁵ in which he explored the role of the Adamic traditions in shaping the image of Enoch as the supreme angel Metatron. Although Idel's research dealt mainly with later rabbinic materials, it demonstrated that already in some pseudepigraphic accounts

¹² P. Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," in: *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergen; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998) 102-104; H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973) 52-63.

¹³ One can argue that the beginning of this process can be seen already in the *Book of the Similitudes* where Enoch seems to be identified with the Son of Man. It is possible that the *Similitudes*, written close to the time of *2 Enoch*, also reflects this process of transition to the new image of Enoch. In contrast to *2 Enoch*, the *Similitudes*, however, does not elaborate this process to the same degree as the Slavonic apocalypse does. Enoch's transformation into the Son of Man in the *Similitudes* 71 is rather instantaneous and ambiguous. In contrast, in *2 Enoch* this process of Enoch's transition to new super-angelic identity is described in detail through the expositions of Enoch's celestial titles which unfold the patriarch's new roles in numerous celestial offices. On Enoch's transformation in the *Similitudes* see, J. R. Davila, "Of Methodology, Monotheism and Metatron," in: *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism. Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus* (eds. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis; SJSJ, 63; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 9-15; C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT, Reihe 2:94; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997) 151; M. Knibb, "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls", *DSD* 2 (1995) 177-80; D.W. Suter, *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch* (SBLDS, 47; Missoula: Scholars, 1979) 14-23; J. VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37-71", in: *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity. The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (eds. J.H. Charlesworth, et al.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 182-3.

¹⁴ P. Alexander observes that "the transformation of Enoch in *2 Enoch* 22 provides the closest approximation, outside Merkabah literature, to Enoch's transformation in *3 Enoch* 3-13." P. Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.248.

¹⁵ M. Idel, "Enoch is Metatron" *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220-240. The original Hebrew version of this article appeared in, *Early Jewish Mysticism* (ed. J. Dan; Jerusalem, 1987).

Enoch appears to be portrayed as a luminous counterpart of Adam who regained Adam's glory lost during the protoplast's transgression.¹⁶

Idel further suggested that Enoch's luminous metamorphosis attested in 2 *Enoch* 22 might also belong to the same tradition which views Enoch as the one who regained Adam's lost status and luminosity. He observed that to the best of his knowledge, "Enoch is the only¹⁷ living person for whom ... luminous garments, reminiscent of Adam's lost garments of light, were made."¹⁸

Phillip Alexander, in his recent research, provides new insight into Idel's argument about the formative value of the Adamic tradition for the image of the elevated Enoch. Alexander points to a number of rabbinic passages in which the "supernatural radiance" of Adam's heavenly soul, which departed from him when he sinned, later returned to be reincarnated in Enoch.¹⁹ He further observes that

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, re-ascends to his heavenly home and takes his rightful place in the heights of the universe, above the highest angels... Enoch thus becomes a redeemer figure--a second Adam through whom humanity is restored.²⁰

It appears that the suggestions of scholars about the connection between Enoch and Adam are valid and deserve further investigation. It seems that the traces of the concept of Enoch as a second Adam can be detected already in 2 *Enoch* where Enoch assumes the glorious status of the protoplast.

It is also significant that in the Slavonic apocalypse the luminosity is not the only quality that Enoch inherited from Adam. In this text, Enoch

¹⁶ Idel points to one of such accounts, the Armenian text known as "The Words of Adam and Seth" where the following tradition can be found: "But he [Adam], not having observed the commandments, and having been stripped of the divine light, and having been thrown outside the Garden, became an equal of the dumb beast. And Enoch considered these things, and for forty days and for forty nights he did not eat at all. And after this he planned a luscious garden, and he planted in it fruit bearers. and he was in the garden for five hundred and forty-two years, and after that, in body, he was taken up to heaven, and was found worthy of the divine glory and light." Michael E. Stone, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to the Patriarchs and Prophets* (Jerusalem, 1982) 12-13.

¹⁷ It should be noted that rabbinic and Samaritan literature often depict Moses as a luminous counterpart of Adam who acquired a luminous garment during his encounter with the Lord on Mount Sinai.

¹⁸ M. Idel, "Enoch is Metatron" *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 224.

¹⁹ P. Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," in: *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergen; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998) 111.

²⁰ P. Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," in: *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergen; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998) 111.

acquired a whole host of roles and qualities which the Adamic narrative of the Slavonic apocalypse associates with the protoplast. In the course of these polemical appropriations, the elevated angelic status of the prelapsarian Adam, his luminosity, his wisdom, and his special roles as the king of the earth and the steward of all earthly creatures are transferred to the new occupant of the celestial realm, the patriarch Enoch, who, near the Lord's throne, is transformed into one of the glorious ones initiated into the highest mysteries by the Lord, becomes the "manager of the arrangements on the earth," and writes down "everything that nourished" on it.

Our further analysis will demonstrate that the traditions about the prelapsarian conditions of Adam provide an initial background for the polemical appropriations. The features of Adam's story, his roles and offices, become used in *2 Enoch* as the building blocks²¹ for creating the new, celestial identity of the elevated Enoch.

This investigation must now turn to the text of the Slavonic Enoch in order to explore in detail these polemical developments.

King of the Earth

2 Enoch 30:12 describes Adam as the king of the earth.²² This honorable title in *2 Enoch*, like in the Genesis account, represents not merely an impressive metaphor but endows specific duties unfolding Adam's royal status. Most of these activities have biblical roots.²³ From *2 Enoch* 58:3, we learn that the Lord appointed Adam over

...everything [as king], and he subjected everything to him in subservience under his hand, both the dumb and the deaf, to be commanded and for submission and for

²¹ It should be noted that the Adamic tradition is not the only "building material" used in *2 Enoch* in order to create the new, celestial image of Enoch. There is also strong presence of the traditions about the elevated Moses which help to enhance Enoch's new identity in various theophanic settings throughout the text. On the Mosaic traditions in *2 Enoch* see, A. Orlov, "Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition", *Seminar Papers 39, Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting 2000* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000) 130-147; idem, "The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic Ladder of Jacob" in: *Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 9* (ed. C.A. Evans; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) (forthcoming).

²² Slav. (tsar' zemli) ЦАРЬ ЗЕМЛИ. M.I Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *COIDR* 4 (1910) 1.30.

²³ On the connections between the Genesis account and the Adamic story of *2 Enoch*, see, J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, "The Creation of Man and Woman in Early Jewish Literature," in: *The Creation of Man and Woman: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions* (ed. G.P. Luttikhuisen; Brill: Leiden, 2000) 34-62.

every servitude. So also to every human being. The Lord created mankind to be the lord of all his possessions.²⁴

This description of Adam's duties corresponds to the account found in Gen 1:26-30 where God gives Adam dominion over "everything that has the breath of life."

Like in Gen 2:19-20, one of the important functions of the new appointed king is the registration of all the "possessions," i.e., all the living creatures of the earth given to his stewardship through the act of their naming. 2 *Enoch* 58 tells that

...the Lord came down onto the earth [on account of Adam]. and he inspected all his creatures which he himself had created in the beginning of the thousand ages and then after all those he had created Adam. And the Lord summoned all the animals of the earth and all reptiles of the earth and all the birds that fly in the air, and he brought them all before the face of our father Adam, so that he might pronounce names for all the quadrupeds; and [Adam] named everything that lives on the earth.²⁵

Giving names here, just as in the Genesis account, also designates Adam's dominion over "everything that lives on the earth." This dominion, however, like in the Biblical account, is supervised by the Lord. The whole picture indicates that the author of 2 *Enoch* understands Adam's "kingship" as the managing of God's property.²⁶ It is significant that the Slavonic apocalypse defines Adams' role as "the lord of all God's possessions."²⁷

In the Slavonic apocalypse, however, the governing role of Adam as the lord of all God's possessions becomes challenged by the account of Enoch's kingship and his role as "the manager of the arrangements on the earth."

²⁴ Andersen, 1.184.

²⁵ Andersen, 1.185.

²⁶ Cf. Philo, *Opif.* 88 "So the Creator made man after all things, as a sort of driver and pilot, to drive and steer the things on earth, and charged him with the care of animals and plants, like a governor subordinate to the chief and great King." *Philo* (trs. F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker; 11 vols.; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1949) 1.73. See, also, J.R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (JSPSS, 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988) 66-68.

²⁷ Adam's designation as the second angel in 2 *Enoch* 30:11 also seems to point to the protoplast's role as the viceroy of God. Cf. Philo, *Opif.* 148 "... and the first man was wise with a wisdom learned from and taught by Wisdom's own lips, for he was made by divine hands; he was, moreover, a king, and it befits a ruler to bestow titles on his several subordinates. And we may guess that the sovereignty with which that first man was invested was a most lofty one, seeing that God had fashioned him with the utmost care and deemed him worthy of the second place, making him His own viceroy and the lord of all others." *Philo* (trs. F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker; 11 vols.; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1949) 1.117. It is also important that in 2 *Enoch* the realm of Adam's dominion is designated as *another world*: "And the devil understood how I wished to create another world, so that everything could be subjected to Adam on the earth, to rule and reign over it." 2 *Enoch* 31:3. Andersen, 1.154.

This new role of Enoch vividly recalls the former royal status of the protoplast.

The first hint about Enoch's role as the governing power on earth comes from chapter 39 where Enoch relates to his children the details of his encounter with the divine anthropomorphic extent, labeled in the text as the Lord's Face. Enoch's description provides a series of analogies in which the earthly Enoch compares his face and parts of his body with the attributes of the Lord's Face and body. At the end of his description, Enoch delivers the following conclusion:

Frightening and dangerous it is to stand before the face of the earthly king, terrifying and very dangerous it is, because the will of the king is death and the will of the king is life. How much more terrifying [and dangerous] it is stand before the face of the King of earthly kings and of the heavenly armies...Who can endure that endless misery?²⁸

In the light of the overall logic of the patriarch's speech, in which the "attributes" of the Lord have been compared with Enoch's "attributes" it becomes clear that the earthly king of the story is Enoch himself. This interpretation is "confirmed" by the manuscripts of the shorter recension which directly identify Enoch as the earthly king:

And now my children, listen to the discourses of *an earthly king*. It is dangerous and perilous to stand before the face of the earthly king,²⁹ terrifying [and very perilous] it is...³⁰

The designation of Enoch as the royal/governing power on earth does not confined solely to the passage found in chapter 39. *2 Enoch* 46:1-2 (the longer recension) also recounts the tradition about Enoch as the earthly king. There again Enoch refers to his royal status indirectly in third person.³¹

The significant feature of Enoch's designation as the earthly king in the Slavonic apocalypse is that this text understands Enoch, not as one of the earthly kings, but as *the* king of the earth, who, in a manner similar to the protoplast supervises all arrangements on the earth. This exclusive role is hinted at *2 Enoch* 64 which depicts the patriarch's address to the *princes of the people*, as they prostrate themselves before him. This role is also intimated in chapter 43 of the shorter recension and a similar passage from *2*

²⁸ *2 Enoch* 39:8 (the longer recension). Andersen, 1.164.

²⁹ Slav.(tsar' zemnoi) ЦАРЬ ЗЕМНОГО. M.I Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *COIDR* 4 (1910) 1.38; 1.94.

³⁰ *2 Enoch* 39:8. Andersen, 1.165.

³¹ "Listen, my people, and give heed to the utterance of my lips! If to an earthly king someone should bring some kinds of gifts, if he is thinking treachery in his heart, and the king perceives it, will he not be angry with him?" Andersen, 1.172.

Enoch found in the Slavonic collection, "the Just Balance," where Enoch is described as the manager of the earth:

...and behold my children, I am the manager of the arrangements on earth,³² I wrote (them) down. and the whole year I combined and the hours of the day. And the hours I measured: and I wrote down every seed on earth. And I compared every measure and the just balance I measured. And I wrote (them) down, just as the Lord commanded ...³³

It should be noted that the definition of Enoch as the king is a unique motif³⁴ in early Enochic materials. In *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, and the *Book of Giants*, the patriarch is often described as an intercessor, a visionary, a scribe, an expert in secrets, but never as a king.³⁵ It, therefore, becomes apparent that the royal/governing functions of Enoch are construed in the Slavonic apocalypse in the context of its polemical response to the Adamic tradition; it serves as a counterpart to the royal status of the protoplast. It is not therefore coincidental that in this situation some duties of Adam in his

³² The title can also be translated as the Governor of the earth. Some manuscripts use Slavonic words (kormstvuemaa) *КОРМСТВУЕМАА* or (krymstvuemaja) *КРЪМСТВУЕМАЈА*. These Slavonic terms are related to the Greek word *χυβέρνησις* or the Latin *gubernatio*. Cf. I.I. Sreznevskij, *Slovar' drevnerusskogo jazyka* (3 vols.; Moscow: Kniga, 1989) I (II) 1410. The manuscripts of "Merilo Pravednoe" use the word (pravlemaja) *ПРАВЛЕМАЈА*. Cf. Tihomirov, *Merilo Pravednoe po rukopisi XIV veka* (Moscow: AN SSSR) 71. F. Andersen translates the term as "manager" - "I am the manager of the arrangements on earth..." Andersen, 1.217.

³³ Andersen, 1.217.

³⁴ I am indebted to Professor James Vanderkam for this clarification.

³⁵ Although Enoch's role as the governing power on earth is unknown in the early Enochic materials, it does not mean that such designation of Enoch in the Slavonic apocalypse is a foreign interpolation invented by the Greek or Slavic scribes. It appears that the depiction of Enoch as the governing power on earth represents an important step in shaping the new image of Enoch as the supreme angel elevated above the angelic world. The role of Enoch as the king/manager of earth in *2 Enoch* is, therefore, directly connected with the later Metatron title, the "Prince of the world," found in the Merkabah literature and on the incantation bowls from Babylonia. Cf. Alexander, *3 Enoch*, 1.229, 1.243; C.H. Gordon, "Aramaic and Mandaic Magical Bowls" *ArOr* 9 (1937) 94-95. The Merkabah tradition stresses the role of Enoch-Metatron as the governing power over the nations, kingdoms, and rulers on earth. Chapter 30 of *3 Enoch* alludes to the role of Metatron as the Prince of the world, the leader of seventy-two princes of kingdoms in the world who speaks (pleads) in favor of the world before the Holy One... every day at the hour when the book is opened in which every deed in the world is recorded. The depiction of Metatron as the "Prince of the world" in *3 Enoch* reveals several similarities to the royal status of Enoch in the Slavonic apocalypse. One of them is that in *2 Enoch* 64:1 the patriarch delivers his address "to his sons and to the princes of the people." The reference to the princes of the people is intriguing since in *3 Enoch* 30 Metatron is described as the leader of seventy-two princes of the kingdoms of the world. The second important similarity is that in both texts the role of Enoch/Metatron as the governing power on earth is tied to his duties as the witness of the divine judgment. Both accounts, therefore, contain references to Enoch's writings representing the record of all the deeds of every person.

office of the king of the earth become also transferred to the new occupant of this office, the seventh antediluvian patriarch. In chapters 39 and 43, Enoch's introductions as the king and the manager of the earth follow with lengthy accounts of Enoch's activities involving measuring everything on earth. Right after Enoch is defined as the earthly king in *2 Enoch* 39, the patriarch tells his children:

...And everything that is nourished on the earth I have investigated and written down, and every seed, sown and not sown, which grows from earth, and all the garden plants, and all the grasses, and all the flowers, and their delightful fragrances and their names...

I measured all the earth, and its mountains and hills and fields and woods and stones and rivers, and everything that exist...³⁶

It appears that the functions of Enoch in his role as the king/manager of the earth, include similarly to the role of Adam, the duty registering the created order. Like Adam who "named" everything that lives on the earth Enoch in his turn writes down "every seed on the earth."³⁷

It is important that Enoch's "stewardship" over the created order, akin to Adam's duties, also includes the obligation to protect and care for the animals. In *2 Enoch* 58-59, the protoplast's responsibilities pertaining to the animals are transferred to the seventh antediluvian patriarch and his descendants.

It is noteworthy that both accounts, the story of Adam's naming of animals and Enoch's instructions to his children about the protection of animals, are located in the same chapter of the Slavonic apocalypse. *2 Enoch* 58 depicts the Lord summoning all creatures of the earth and bringing them before Adam that the first human might name them. This story then continues with Enoch's instructions to his children about the special care for animals whose souls will testify against human beings at the great judgment if they treat them unjustly. This account, which substitutes one steward of God's earthly creatures for another, fits perfectly into the pattern of the Adamic polemics found in the Slavonic apocalypse.

In *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult*, C. Böttrich drew attention to the patriarch's designation as the earthly king.³⁸ Unfortunately, he failed to recognize the polemical meaning of this royal title in the original argument of the Slavonic apocalypse and dismissed it as a later interpolation. Böttrich's attempt to illuminate the origins of Enoch's royal imagery through

³⁶ Andersen, 1.164-166. In chapter 43, the same picture can be observed. Enoch's measuring activities follow his definition as the governor/manager of the earth.

³⁷ It should be noted that this role of Enoch as the measurer of *the earthly things* is unknown in the early Enochic booklets of *1 Enoch* where Enoch's functions as the heavenly scribe are limited to the meteorological, calendrical and astronomical matters.

³⁸ C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (WUNT, R.2, 50; Tübingen: Mohr, 1992) 113-14.

the reference to the late rabbinic text *Hayye Hanokh* from *Sefer haYashar* is problematic.³⁹ In the light of our hypothesis about the Adamic provenance of Enoch's royal title in the Slavonic apocalypse, the need for such dubious associations loses its necessity.

Angelic Veneration

In 1993 Michael Stone published an article⁴⁰ the value of which for understanding Adamic polemics in *2 Enoch* is very difficult to overestimate. This illuminating study reveals that the argument with the Adamic tradition in the Slavonic apocalypse includes, not only the internal debates based on *2 Enoch's* depictions of the protoplast, but also the intertextual polemics with the Adamic traditions attested in the primary Adam books.⁴¹ The fact that these Adamic traditions are already re-written in the Slavonic apocalypse, as the deeds and functions of the protoplast are transferred to Enoch without any reference to their original "proprietor," serves as strong evidence to the scope of the polemical intentions of *2 Enoch's* authors.

M. Stone's article investigates an important motif preserved in chapters 21-22 of the Slavonic apocalypse. The story depicts angels bringing Enoch to the edge of the seventh heaven. By the Lord's command, archangel Gabriel invites the patriarch to stand in front of the Lord forever. Enoch agrees and archangel Gabriel carries him to the "Face" of the Lord where the patriarch does obeisance to God. God then personally repeats the invitation to Enoch to stand before him forever. After this invitation, archangel Michael brings the patriarch to *the front* of the face of the Lord. The Lord then tells his angels, sounding them out: "Let Enoch join in and stand in front of my face forever!" In response to this address, the Lord's glorious ones do obeisance to Enoch saying, "Let Enoch yield in accordance with your word, O Lord!"⁴² After that the patriarch, extracted by archangel Michael from his earthy garments and anointed with shining oil, becomes like one of the glorious ones.⁴³

³⁹C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (WUNT, R.2, 50; Tübingen: Mohr, 1992) 113. Cf. also, C. Böttrich, "Beobachtungen zum Midrash vom 'Leben Henochs'," *Mitteilungen und Beiträge der Forschungsstelle Judentum an der Theologischen Fakultät Leipzig* 10 (1996) 44-83.

⁴⁰M.E. Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve*" *JTS* 44 (1993) 143-156.

⁴¹This does not mean that *2 Enoch* is literally dependent on the primary Adam books in their final form, but rather indicates that the traditions which stand behind these books have ancient origins since, by the first century CE, these traditions were already appropriated inside the Enochic text.

⁴²Andersen, 1.138.

⁴³Andersen, 1.138.

M. Stone observes that the story found in *2 Enoch* 21-22 recalls the account of Adam's elevation and his veneration by angels found in Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve*.⁴⁴ These versions depict God's creation of Adam in his image. Archangel Michael brought and had the first human bow down before God's face. God then commanded all the angels to bow down to Adam. All the angels agreed to venerate the protoplast except Satan (and his angels) who refused to bow down before Adam, because the first human was "younger"("posterior") to Satan.

M. Stone notes that, besides the motifs of Adam's elevation and his veneration by angels, the author of *2 Enoch* appears to be also aware of the motif of angelic disobedience and refusal to venerate the first human. M. Stone draws the reader's attention to the phrase "sounding them out," found in *2 Enoch* 22:6, which another translator of the Slavonic text rendered as "making a trial of them."⁴⁵ M. Stone rightly notes that the expressions "sounding them out" or "making a trial of them" imply here that it is the angels' obedience that is being tested.⁴⁶

Comparing the similarities between Adamic and Enochic accounts, M. Stone observes that the order of events in *2 Enoch* exactly duplicates the order found in the primary Adam books since both sources know three chief events:⁴⁷

I. *LAE*: Adam is created and situated in heaven.

2 Enoch: Enoch is brought to heaven.

II. *LAE*: Archangel Michael brings Adam before God's face. Adam does obeisance to God.

2 Enoch: Archangel Michael brings Enoch before the Lord's Face. Enoch does obeisance to the Lord.

III. *LAE*: God commands the angels to bow down. All the angels do obeisance. Satan and his angels disobey.

⁴⁴ The Adamic story of the angelic veneration of Adam and Satan's disobedience is attested in many Jewish, Christian and Muslim materials. Cf. Slavonic version of *3 Baruch* 4; *Gos. Bart.* 4, Coptic *Enthronement of Michael*, *Cave of Treasures* 2:10-24; *Koran* 2:31-39; 7:11-18; 15:31-48; 17:61-65; 18:50; 20:116-123; 38:71-85.

⁴⁵ W.R. Morfill and R.H. Charles, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1896) 28.

⁴⁶ M.E. Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve*" in: *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Andersen, M. Stone, J. Tromp; SVTP, 15; Brill: Leiden, 2000) 47.

⁴⁷ M.E. Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the *Books of Adam and Eve*" in: *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Andersen, M. Stone, J. Tromp; SVTP, 15; Brill: Leiden, 2000) 48.

2 *Enoch*: "The rebellion in the Adam events is assumed. God tests whether this time the angels will obey. The angels are said to bow down and accept God's command."⁴⁸

M. Stone concludes that the author of 2 *Enoch* 21-22 was cognizant of the traditions resembling⁴⁹ those found in Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve*.⁵⁰ He also stresses that these traditions did not enter 2 *Enoch* from the Slavonic *Life of Adam and Eve*, because this form of tradition does not occur in the Slavonic recension of the primary Adam book.⁵¹

It appears that the Adamic tradition from chapter 22 is not an interpolation, but belongs to the original core of the Slavonic apocalypse. Two significant features found in 2 *Enoch* seem to indicate that the tradition of angelic veneration is interwoven into the original fabric of the text. The first is evidenced in 2 *Enoch* 7. 2 *Enoch* 7:3 depicts Enoch carried by angels to the second heaven. There the patriarch sees the condemned angels kept as prisoners awaiting the "measureless judgment." Enoch's angelic guides explain to him that the prisoners are "those who turned away from the Lord, who did not obey the Lord's commandments, but of their own will plotted together and turned away with their prince and with those who are under restraint in the fifth heaven."⁵² The story further continues with angelic veneration: the condemned angels bow down to Enoch asking for his intercession: "Man of God, pray for us to the Lord!"⁵³

It is possible that this passage about the group of the condemned angels is an allusion to the motif of angelic veneration found in 2 *Enoch* 22 and in the primary Adam books.

Three details of the story from 2 *Enoch* 7 seem to support this interpretation:

- a. In 2 *Enoch* 7, similarly to the Adamic accounts, the sin of the imprisoned angels is *disobedience* to the Lord's commandments.
- b. The subject of the rebellion is a *group of angels* with "*their prince*." It recalls the information found in the Adamic accounts where not only Satan, but also other angels under him, refuse to venerate Adam. The longer

⁴⁸ Stone, *The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the Books of Adam and Eve*, 48.

⁴⁹ Stone's argument was later supported and developed by G. Anderson. G. Anderson observes that "one cannot imagine that the tradition in the Enoch materials was created independently from the tradition found in the *Vita*." G. Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan" in: *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Andersen, M. Stone, J. Tromp; SVTP, 15; Brill: Leiden, 2000) 101.

⁵⁰ Stone, *The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the Books of Adam and Eve*, 48.

⁵¹ Stone, *The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the Books of Adam and Eve*, 48.

⁵² Andersen, 1.114.

⁵³ Andersen, 1.114.

recension of *2 Enoch* 18:3 directly identifies the prisoners of the second heaven as the angels of Satanail.⁵⁴

c. The imprisoned angels *bow down* before man (Enoch). An additional important detail here is that the patriarch is addressed by the fallen angels as a "man" - "a man of God."

This event of angelic bowing before Enoch in the second heaven might represent an allusion that anticipates later angelic obeisance the patriarch received in chapter 22 of the Slavonic apocalypse.

The second evidence demonstrating that the theme of angelic bowing from chapter 22 is deeply imbedded in the original theological framework of the Enochic writing is its connection with the Enochic title "Youth" or "Lad" found in some Slavonic MSS of *2 Enoch*.

Youth

We have already seen that the authors of *2 Enoch* are responsible for creating the new roles and titles of Enoch which are absent in the early Enochic treatises of *1 Ethiopic Enoch* but can be found in the later Merkabah mysticism. One of such titles is "Youth" which becomes one of the favorite designations of Metatron in the Merkabah literature.

Before proceeding to the analysis of the title "Youth" in the Slavonic text and its connection with the Adamic tradition, a short excursus into the later Rabbinic materials is necessary.

Recently G. Anderson successfully demonstrated that the Adamic story of angelic veneration and opposition to humanity played a prominent role in rabbinic literature.⁵⁵ In his article Anderson draws attention to the account found in *3 Enoch* 4 where the Adamic motif of angelic veneration, in a manner similar to *2 Enoch* 22, was applied to Enoch-Metatron.

3 Enoch 4:1-10 depicts Rabbi Ishmael questioning his celestial guide Metatron about his name "Youth." The passage reads:

⁵⁴ *2 Enoch* 18: 3 "And those men answered me, 'These are the Grigori, who turned aside from the Lord, 200 myriads, together with their prince Satanail. And similar to them are those who went down as prisoners in their train, who are in the second heaven, imprisoned in great darkness.'" Andersen, 1.130. It is noteworthy that in *2 Enoch* the Enochic story of the Watchers' rebellion and the Adamic story of Satan's refusal to venerate humanity appear to be closely connected. They demonstrate an intriguing parallel to the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* 2, *3 Enoch* 5:9-1 and *Zohar* III.207b-208a where the leaders of the Watchers are depicted as the forces opposing the creation and elevation of humanity.

⁵⁵ G. Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan" in: *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Andersen, M. Stone, J. Tromp; SVTP, 15; Brill: Leiden, 2000) 83-110.

R. Ishmael said: I said to Metatron: "... you are greater than all the princes, more exalted than all the angels, more beloved than all the ministers ... why, then, do they call you 'Youth' in the heavenly heights?" He answered: "Because I am Enoch, the son of Jared ... the Holy One, blessed be he, appointed me in the height as a prince and a ruler among the ministering angels. Then three of ministering angels, 'Uzzah, 'Azzah, and 'Aza'el, came and laid charges against me in the heavenly height. They said before the Holy One, blessed be He, " Lord of the Universe, did not the primeval ones give you good advice when they said, Do not create man!⁵⁶ ... And once they all arose and went to meet me and prostrated themselves before me, saying "Happy are you, and happy your parents, because your Creator has favored you. *Because I am young in their company and mere youth among them in days and months and years* (שָׁאֲנוּ קָטָן בְּתוֹכֶם וְנֶעַר בִּינֵיהֶם בַּיָּמִים וּבַחֲדָשִׁים וּבַשָּׁנִים) (ומתוך)⁵⁷ --therefore they call me 'Youth' (נער)."⁵⁸

Commenting on this passage, G. Anderson suggests that if "we remove those layers of the tradition that are clearly secondary ... we are left with a story that is almost identical to the analog we have traced in the Adam and Eve literature and II Enoch."⁵⁹ He further notes that the acclamation of Enoch as "Youth" in *Sefer Hekhalot* is intriguing since the reason *3 Enoch* supplies for this title is deceptively simple and straitforward: "Because I am young in their company and mere youth among them in days and months and years--therefore they call me 'Youth.'" G. Anderson proposes that the title might have Adamic origins since the explanation for the epithet "youth" recalls the reason for the angelic refusal to worship Adam in the *Vita* on the basis of his inferiority to them by way of his age.⁶⁰

G. Anderson's hypothesis that the origin of the title "Youth" is connected with the appropriation of the Adamic tradition is crucial to the current investigation.

It is interesting that in some manuscripts of the Slavonic Enoch the seventh antediluvian patriarch is also often addressed as "youth."⁶¹ Despite that this designation occurs only in several Slavonic manuscripts, the author of the recent English translation F. Andersen considered this reading as the

⁵⁶ For the similar tradition see: the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* 2, and *Zohar* III.207b-208a.

⁵⁷ Peter Schäfer, with M. Schlüter and H. G. von Mutius., *Synopse zur Hekhaloth-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981) 7.

⁵⁸ P. Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.258-59.

⁵⁹ G. Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan" in: *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Andersen, M. Stone, J. Tromp; SVTP, 15; Brill: Leiden, 2000) 107.

⁶⁰ G. Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan" in: *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Andersen, M. Stone, J. Tromp; SVTP, 15; Brill: Leiden, 2000) 108.

⁶¹ Slav. (junoshe) ЮНОШЕ.

original.⁶² He was also the first scholar to propose that Enoch's designation as "Youth" in *2 Enoch* recalls the identical title of Metatron attested in *3 Enoch* and other Hekhaloth writings. In his commentary to the English translation of *2 Enoch* in OTP, Andersen wrote:

The remarkable reading *yunose* [youth], clearly legible in A, supports the evidence of V, which has this variant four times (not here), and of other MSS, that there was a tradition in which Enoch was addressed in this way. The similarity to the vocative *enose* [Enoch] might explain the variant as purely scribal slip. But it is surprising that it is only in address, never in description, that the term is used. The variant *jenokhu* is rare. There is no phonetic reason why the first vowel should change to *ju*; *junokhu* is never found. But it cannot be a coincidence that this title is identical with that of Enoch (=Metatron) in *3 Enoch*.⁶³

It is notable that several important occurrences of the title "Youth" in *2 Enoch* come from the mouth of angels. Thus in chapter 9 of the shorter recension, an angelic being accompanying Enoch on his way through the heavenly realm addresses him as "youth:" "This place has been prepared, Youth, for the righteous..."⁶⁴ Later in chapter 10, one can hear the same address again: "this place, Youth, has been prepared for those who practice godless uncleanness on the earth..."⁶⁵ These angelic addresses are consistent with the Adamic and Merkabah accounts in which angelic beings point to Enoch's young age.

According to the Merkabah tradition, God also likes to address Enoch-Metatron as "Youth." In *3 Enoch* 3, when R. Ishmael asks Metatron "What is your name?", Metatron answers, "I have seventy names, corresponding to the seventy nations of the world...however, my King calls me 'Youth'."⁶⁶ The designation of Enoch as "Youth" seems to signify here the special relationship between the Holy One and Metatron. One can see the beginning of this tradition already in *2 Enoch* where in chapter 24 of the shorter recension the following tradition can be found:

And the Lord called me (Enoch) and he placed me to himself closer than Gabriel. And I did obeisance to the Lord. And the Lord spoke to me "Whatever you see, Youth, things standing still and moving about were brought to perfection by me. and not even to angels have I explained my secrets...as I am making them known to you today..."⁶⁷

⁶² F. Andersen reassured me in a private communication about the originality of this reading, referring to it as "the powerful evidence."

⁶³ Andersen, 1.118-9.

⁶⁴ M.I. Sokolov, "Slavjanskaja kniga Enoha pravednogo: Teksty, latinskij perevod and issledovanie," *Chtenija v obshestve istorii i drevnostej Rossijskih* 4 (1910) 85.

⁶⁵ Andersen, 1.119.

⁶⁶ Alexander, *3 Enoch*, 1.257.

⁶⁷ M.I. Sokolov, "Slavjanskaja kniga Enoha pravednogo: Teksty, latinskij perevod and issledovanie," *Chtenija v obshestve istorii i drevnostej Rossijskih* 4 (1910) 90-91.

⁶⁷ Andersen, 1.119.

It is significant that the title "youth" here is tied to the motif of human superiority over angels, which plays a prominent role in the primary Adam books where God orders his angels to bow down before humanity.

Finally, we must note that several important readings of "youth" in the materials associated with the Slavonic Enoch can be found in the Vienna Codex.⁶⁸ In this manuscript Enoch is addressed by the Lord as "youth"⁶⁹ in context of angelic veneration:

And the Lord with his own mouth called me [Enoch] and said: Be brave, Youth!⁷⁰
Do not be frightened! Stand up in front of my face forever. And Michael, the Lord's archistratig, brought me in the front of the Lord's face. And the Lord tempted his servants and said to them: "Let's Enoch come up and stand in the front of my face forever." And the glorious ones bowed down and said: "Let's him come up!"⁷¹

In conclusion, it should be noted that the current analysis revealed that several important readings pertaining to the Adamic polemics can be found in the manuscripts of the shorter recension. It does not mean, however, that these evidences are secondary and not original. The rehabilitation of the longer recension, as well as the reaffirmation of its value in recent scholarship, should not lead to the automatic rejection of everything in the shorter recension as unauthentic and secondary. The mere subscription to one of the recensions deceptively simplifies the problem of the original. The task is more complicated and necessarily involves a careful investigation of the theological intentions of the authors and editors of the text. Almost three decades ago F. Andersen warned the students of *2 Enoch* against making simplistic and hasty conclusions. He noted that "all of the materials calls for reassessment...In the present state of our knowledge, the genuineness of any disputed passage is difficult to judge."⁷² His prudent advise still remains valuable in our time.

The Hunger Motif

The previous analysis demonstrated that the author(s) of the Slavonic apocalypse were cognizant of the motifs and themes similar to those found in the primary Adam books. One of the prominent Adamic motifs absent in

⁶⁸ I want to express my deep appreciation to Prof. Francis Andersen who generously shared with me the microfilms and photographs of MSS V, R, and J.

⁶⁹ Unfortunately, Friedrich Repp's research on the Vienna Codex failed to discern the proper meaning of "youth" in this important manuscript. See, F. Repp, "Textkritische Untersuchungen zum Henoch-Apokryph des co. slav. 125 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek" *Wiener slavistische Jahrbuch* 10 (1963) 65.

⁷⁰ Slav. (junoshe) юноше.

⁷¹ Ms. V (VL 125) [Nr. 3], fol. 317.

⁷² Andersen, 1.93-94.

the Biblical account but presented in the later extrabiblical traditions is the theme of Adam and Eve's hunger after their eviction from Eden to earth.⁷³

The primary Adam books begin their stories with depicting the expulsion of the first humans from the Garden. The narrative continues with describing the hunger the first humans experienced as they found themselves on earth. It seems that the cause of their hunger was not the absence of food on earth, but the dining habits of the first humans, who used to the celestial nourishment during their stay in Paradise. It is, therefore, significant that the Armenian, Georgian, and Latin versions of the primary Adam books emphasize the difference between the two foods: the angelic food which Adam and Eve ate in the paradise and the food that lies before them on the earth.⁷⁴

In *2 Enoch* the story of the first humans' hunger takes a new polemical form. The second part of *2 Enoch* depicts the patriarch who, just like Adam and Eve, was transported from heaven to earth. This time, however, the transition is pleasant: Enoch is not punitively expelled from heaven, like Adam, but sent by God on a short trip to instruct his children. From *2 Enoch* 56:2 we learn that during Enoch's instructions, Methuselah asks his father a blessing, so that he may prepare some food for him to eat. The patriarch answers his son in the following manner:

Listen, child! Since the time when 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 the longer recension).

In the shorter recension of *2 Enoch*, the patriarch's rejection of food is even more decisive:

Listen my child! Since the time when the Lord anointed me with ointment of my glory, it has been horrible for me, and food is not agreeable to me, and I have no desire for *earthly* food.⁷⁵

The important detail that connects this Enochic account to the account found in the Armenian, Georgian, and Latin primary Adam books is their emphasis on the fact that it is the *earthly* food that is unsuitable for those who just came from the celestial realm. The account found in these versions of the primary Adam books also stresses this fact. They inform that Adam and Eve "did not find food like the food by which they had been nourished in the Garden." Eve's discourse found in 4:2 again emphasizes this

⁷³ On the hunger motif in the primary Adam books, see: G. Anderson, "The Penitence Narrative in the Life of Adam and Eve," in: *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Andersen, M. Stone, J. Tromp; SVTP, 15; Brill: Leiden, 2000) 6ff.

⁷⁴ "They arose and went about upon the earth, and they did not find food like the food by which they had been nourished in [the Garden]." *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve. Second Revised Edition* (eds. G.A. Anderson and M.E. Stone; Early Judaism and Its Literature, 17; Atlanta: Scholars, 1999) 3E.

⁷⁵ Andersen, 1.183.

difference between earthly and celestial food, referring to earthly food as nourishment for the beasts.⁷⁶

These similarities suggests that the tradition found in *2 Enoch* 56:2 might represent a part of the polemics with the Adamic traditions in the Slavonic apocalypse. Here Enoch is depicted as superior to Adam and Eve, who must accept the earthly food as the sign of the Fall and their permanent transition to the lower realm.

It should be also noted that it is unlikely that this tradition entered *2 Enoch* from the Slavonic *Life of Adam and Eve*, since the Slavonic *Vita* does not attest to the traditions about earthly and celestial food.

The Motif of the Divine Face

Our previous investigation of the motif of angelic veneration showed that one of the concentrated elaborations of Adamic polemics in *2 Enoch* is found in chapter 22, which depicts the climax of Enoch's celestial trip and his luminous metamorphosis near the Throne of Glory. The patriarch's transition to the new, celestial identity found in this part of the text is therefore convenient for appropriating the Adamic tradition about the luminous condition of the protoplast.

The motif of the divine Face is important to linking Enoch's glorious condition with the former luminosity of Adam. Enoch's luminous metamorphosis takes its place in front of the Lord's glorious "extent," labeled in *2 Enoch* 22 and 39 as the Lord's "Face."⁷⁷ From *2 Enoch* 22 we learn that the vision of the divine "Face" had dramatic consequences for Enoch's appearance. His body endured radical changes as it became covered with the divine light. This encounter transformed Enoch into a glorious angelic being. The text says that after this procedure Enoch became *like one of the glorious ones*, and *there was no observable difference*.⁷⁸ This phrase describes Enoch's transition to his new celestial identity as "one of the glorious ones." During this transition in front of the Lord's face, Enoch's own "face" became radically altered and the

⁷⁶ *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 5E.

⁷⁷ "I saw the view of the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot in a fire and brought out, and it emits sparks and is incandescent. Thus even I saw the face of the Lord. But the face of the Lord is not to be talked about, it is so very marvelous and supremely awesome and supremely frightening. And who am I to give an account of the incomprehensible being of the Lord, and of his face, so extremely strange and indescribable? And how many are his commands, and his multiple voice, and the Lord's throne, supremely great and not made by hands, and the choir stalls all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, and their never-silent singing. Who can give an account of his beautiful appearance, never changing and indescribable, and his great glory? And I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord" (*2 Enoch* 22:1-4, the longer recension). Andersen, 1.136.

⁷⁸ Andersen, 1.139.

patriarch acquired a new glorious "visage" which reflected the luminosity⁷⁹ of the Lord's *Panim*.⁸⁰ The important link that connects this new condition of Enoch with the condition of the glorious Adam is the theme of the new creation after the Lord's Face. It has been shown that the Face in *2 Enoch* 22 represented the cause and the prototype after which the new celestial identity of Enoch was *formed*. The new creation after the Face signifies here the return to the prelapsarian condition of Adam, who also was "modeled" after the Face of God. Support for this view can be found in *2 Enoch* 44:1 where one learns that the protoplast was also *created after the Face of God*. The text says that "the Lord with his own two hands created mankind; in a facsimile of *his own face*, both small and great, the Lord created [them]." It is intriguing that *2 Enoch* departs here from the canonical reading attested in Gen 1:26-27 where Adam was created, not after the face of God, but after His image (*tselem*). F. Andersen observes that *2 Enoch's* "idea is remarkable from any point of view. This is not the original meaning of *tselem*... . The text uses *podobie lica* [in the likeness of the face], not *obrazu* or *videnije*, the usual terms for "image."⁸¹

It is clear, however, that this reading did not arise in the Slavonic environment, but belonged to the original argument of *2 Enoch* where the creation of the luminous protoplast after the Face of the Lord corresponds to a similar angelic "creation" of the seventh antediluvian patriarch. There is almost no doubt that, in the view of the information about Adam's glorious angelic nature attested in *2 Enoch* 30:11, the author of the Slavonic apocalypse tries to connect the theme of Adam's creation with the motif of the glorious Face of the Lord.

⁷⁹ *2 Enoch's* narrative gives evidence that Enoch's face acquired the same qualities of luminosity as the Face of the Lord. In *2 Enoch* 37, the Lord calls one of his angels to chill the face of Enoch before his return to earth. The angel, who "appeared frozen," then chilled Enoch's face with his icy hands. Immediately after this procedure, the Lord tells Enoch that if his face had not been chilled in such a way, no human being would be able to look at his face. This chilling procedure indicates that Enoch's metamorphosis near the Face involves the transformation of the visionary's face into the fiery, perilous entity which now resembles the Lord's Face. We can find a detailed description of this process in another "Enochic" text, *Sefer Hekhaloth*, which describes the transformation of Enoch-Metatron, the Prince of the Divine Presence, into a fiery creature. Cf. *3 Enoch* 15:1 "R. Ishmael said: The angel Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, the glory of highest heaven, said to me: When the Holy One, blessed be he, took me to serve the throne of glory, the wheels of the chariot and all needs of the Shekinah, 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." *3 Enoch* 15:1. Alexander, *3 Enoch*, 1.267.

⁸⁰ It is noteworthy that after this procedure Enoch's "face," just as the Lord's face acquired the ability to glorify other subjects. Thus in *2 Enoch* 64:3-5 the following tradition can be found: "...and the elders of the people and all the community came and *prostrated themselves* and kissed Enoch... O our father Enoch, bless your sons and all the people, so that we may be glorified in front of your face today." Andersen, 190.

⁸¹ Andersen, 1.171, note b.

Unfortunately, Böttrich did not recognize the pivotal role of the imagery of the divine Face in the original argument of the Slavonic apocalypse and rejected the descriptions of the Lord's Face in *2 Enoch* 22 and 39 as later interpolations.⁸² This dismissal had, in my judgment, dramatic consequences for Böttrich's research and its ability to discern the theology of the text in general and the meaning of the Adamic traditions in *2 Enoch* in particular. The tradition of the Divine Face represents a nexus through which several significant polemical trajectories of the text are interwoven together. One of these trajectories is the connection between the traditions of Adam's cosmic body in *2 Enoch* 30:8-11 and the *Shi'ur Qomah* tradition presented in *2 Enoch* 39, which depicts Enoch as the measurer of the divine body.⁸³ This important connection completely escaped Böttrich's attention and undermined the credibility of his later research on the cosmic body of Adam.⁸⁴

Oil from the Tree of Life

Another Adamic motif in the story of Enoch's transformation is the luminous oil, which causes the patriarch's glorious metamorphosis. *2 Enoch* 22:9 portrays the archangel Michael extracting Enoch from his clothes and anointing him with delightful oil. The text tells that the oil's appearance was "greater than the greatest light and its ointment is like sweet dew, and the fragrance [like] myrrh; and it is like rays of the glittering sun."⁸⁵ The anointing with the oil causes the patriarch's transformation from the garments of skin to the luminous garment of an immortal angelic being, one of the glorious ones.

It appears that that the oil used in Enoch's anointing comes from the Tree of Life, which in *2 Enoch* 8:3-4 is depicted with a similar symbolism. *2 Enoch* 8:3-4 tells that "... the tree [of life] is indescribable for pleasantness and fine fragrance, and more beautiful than any (other) created thing that exists. And from every direction it has an appearance which is gold-looking

⁸² See: C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (WUNT, R.2, 50; Tübingen: Mohr, 1992) 112-113.

⁸³ G. Scholem was first to propose that the expression "the extend of the Lord" found in *2 Enoch* 39 might reflect the exact terminology found in the *Shi'ur Qomah* materials. Cf. Scholem's lecture "The Age of *Shi'ur Qomah* Speculation and a Passage in Origen" in: G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1965); idem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in the Kabbalah* (New York, Schocken, 1991) 29.

⁸⁴ C. Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos* (Berlin: Peter Lang, 1995).

⁸⁵ Andersen, 1.138.

and crimson, and *with the form of fire*."⁸⁶ The shorter recension also refers to a second, olive tree near the first one "flowing with oil continually."⁸⁷

It should be noted that Enoch oil anointing is a unique motif in the Enochic tradition. Enoch's approach to the throne in the *Book of Watchers* and his transformation into the Son of Man in the *Book of the Similitudes* do not involve anointing with or any usage of oil. Later "Enochic" traditions are also silent about oil. For example, the account of Metatron's transformation in *3 Enoch* does not mention any anointing with oil.

Yet while unknown in the Enochic literature, the motif of anointing with the oil from the Tree of Life looms large in the Adamic tradition. Chapter 35(9) of the primary Adam books contains the story of Adam's sickness. The patriarch finds himself in great distress and pain. Trying to find a cure, Adam sends Eve and Seth to paradise so they can bring the oil of the Tree of Life that will relieve his illness. Their mission, however, is unsuccessful. The archangel Michael refuses to give the oil to Eve and Seth, telling them that the oil will be used "when the years of the end are filled completed" for those who "be worthy of entering the Garden."⁸⁸

There are several corresponding characteristics that can be detected in the Adamic and Enochic accounts:

1. The purpose of the anointing is similar in both traditions. Its function is the "resurrection of Adam's body"⁸⁹ e.g., the reversal of the earthly fallen condition into the incorruptible luminous state of the protoplast. It is not coincidental that in *2 Enoch* 22 oil anointing transforms Enoch into a luminous angelic being. As has been already noted, it recalls the description of the protoplast in *2 Enoch* 30:11 as a glorious angelic being.

2. The subject of the anointing is also identical. In *2 Enoch* and in the primary Adam books, the oil is used (or will be used) for transforming the righteous ones in their transition to the angelic state in the celestial realm. In the primary Adam books, the oil is prepared for those who "be worthy of entering the Garden."⁹⁰ Stone observes that *2 Enoch* also "knows an anointing with the heavenly perfumed oil that brings about a transformation of the righteous."⁹¹

The same situation is also attested in *3 Baruch*, where the reward of the righteous is oil. H. Gaylord notes that this theme in *3 Baruch* has a connection with the Adamic tradition. He observes that "by his disobedience

⁸⁶ Andersen, 1.114.

⁸⁷ Andersen, 1.117.

⁸⁸ *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 45E (Armenian version).

⁸⁹ *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 45E (Armenian version).

⁹⁰ 43(13): "The Lord said, 'I will admit them into the Garden and I will anoint them with that unction.'" *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 45E (Georgian version).

⁹¹ M. Stone, "The Angelic Prediction in the Primary Adam Books," In: *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Andersen, M. Stone, J. Tromp; SVTP, 15; Brill: Leiden, 2000) 127.

Adam lost 'the glory of God' (4:16[G]), which may have been comparable to that of angels (cf. 13:4[S]). The reward of the righteous is oil, possibly the sign of the glory of God, which the angel-guide promises to show Baruch several times in this text (6:12; 7:2; 11:2; 16:3[S]). It is hardly accidental that there are traditions that Adam sought to receive the 'oil of mercy' at the point of death, and that Enoch was transformed by the 'oil of his glory'...⁹²

3. It is important that in *2 Enoch* and in the primary Adam books a person in charge of oil is the archangel Michael.⁹³ In *2 Enoch* 22 he anoints Enoch with shining oil causing his luminous metamorphosis. In *3 Baruch* 15:1 Michael brings oil to the righteous.⁹⁴ In the primary Adam books he also seems to be in charge of oil since it is he who declines giving Seth the oil for healing Adam.

4. It is intriguing that *2 Enoch* and the primary Adam accounts refer to the *flowing* of the oil. Thus, the Georgian *LAE* 36(9):4 relates that "...And (God) will send his angel to the Garden where the Tree of Life is, from which the oil flows out, so that he may give you a little of that oil."⁹⁵ *2 Enoch* 8:5 seems attest to the same tradition: "and another tree is near it, an olive, flowing with oil continually." M. Stone notes that "it is striking that *2 Enoch* highlights the flowing of the oil, just like the Adam books."⁹⁶

These similarities show that the motif of the oil from the Tree of Life in *2 Enoch* might have Adamic provenance. It is unlikely that this tradition is a later interpolation. Attested in both recensions, it plays a pivotal role in the scene of Enoch's luminous metamorphosis.

"The One Who Carried Away the Sin of Humankind"

It has been mentioned earlier that in later Jewish mysticism Metatron was viewed as a divine being first incarnated in Adam and then in Enoch, who re-ascended to the protoplast's heavenly home and took his rightful place in the heights of the universe. P. Alexander observes that "Enoch thus becomes

⁹² H.E. Gaylord, "3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.658.

⁹³ Cf. M. Stone, "The Angelic Prediction in the Primary Adam Books," In: *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Andersen, M. Stone, J. Tromp; SVTP, 15; Brill: Leiden, 2000) 126.

⁹⁴ E.C. Quinn, *The Quest of Seth for the Oil of Life* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962) 59.

⁹⁵ *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 40E.

⁹⁶ M. Stone, "The Angelic Prediction in the Primary Adam Books," In: *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays* (eds. G. Andersen, M. Stone, J. Tromp; SVTP, 15; Brill: Leiden, 2000) 126.

a redeemer figure--a second Adam through whom humanity is restored."⁹⁷ It appears that this theological motif of Enoch's redeeming role is already developed in *2 Enoch*.

In chapter 64 of the longer recension of the Slavonic apocalypse, the "astounding encomium" can be found which, in the view of one of *2 Enoch's* translators, "could hardly please a Christian or a Jew."⁹⁸ The chapter depicts a prostration of "the elders of the people" and "all the community" before Enoch at the place of his second departure to heaven. The people who came to bow down before the patriarch delivered to Enoch the following address:

O our father,⁹⁹ Enoch! May you be blessed by the Lord, the eternal king! And now, bless your [sons], and all the people, so that we may be glorified in front of your face today. For you will be glorified in front of the face [of the Lord for eternity], because you are the one whom the Lord *chose in preference to all the people upon the earth*; and he appointed you to be the one who makes a written record of all his creation, visible and invisible, and *the one who carried away the sin of mankind* (*2 Enoch* 64:4-5).¹⁰⁰

An important detail in this address is Enoch's designation as "the one who *carried away* the sin of [hu]mankind." This depiction of the patriarch as a redeemer is intriguing. But what kind of sin was Enoch able to carry away?

Böttrich argues that the description of Enoch as the one who carried away the sins of the humankind reflects not the reality but only the expectation of the "elders of the people." He stresses that *2 Enoch* strictly rejects the idea of intercession before God,¹⁰¹ pointing to the passage in chapter 53, where the patriarch warns his children that he will not be able to help them on the day of judgment, since no one can help relieve another person's sin.¹⁰²

Unfortunately, Böttrich's observations, based on an erroneous methodology, miss the gist of the argument in chapter 64. Unaware of Adamic polemics in the text, he fails to notice a crucial to interpretation detail: in *2 Enoch* 64 the "elders of the earth" define Enoch, not as the one

⁹⁷ P. Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," in: *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergen; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998) 111.

⁹⁸ Andersen, 1.190.

⁹⁹ The designation of Enoch as "our father" here and in *2 Enoch* 69:2, 69:5, 70:3 might have a polemical flavor. In *2 Enoch* 58:1 Adam is also designated as "our father." In *WisSol* 10:1 the title "the Father of the World" is applied to the protoplast. See, P.B. Munoa III, *Four Powers in Heaven. The Interpretation of Daniel 7 in the Testament of Abraham* (JSPSS, 28; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) 104-5.

¹⁰⁰ Andersen, 1.190.

¹⁰¹ C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (WUNT, R.2, 50; Tübingen: Mohr, 1992) 194-95. C. Böttrich, "The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reaction to A. Orlov" *JJS* 32.4 (2001) 457.

¹⁰² *2 Enoch* 53:1-4. See also 7:4-5, 62:2.

who *will carry* away the sin of humankind, but as the one who already *carried* away this sin.¹⁰³ The emphasis on the already accomplished redemptive act provides an important clue to understanding the kind of sin Enoch was able to erase. The focus here is not on the individual *sins* of Enoch's descendents, but on the primeval *sin of humankind*.¹⁰⁴ Therefore, it becomes apparent that the redeeming functions of the patriarch are not related to his possible intercession for the sins of his children, the fallen angels or the "elders of the earth," like Böttrich suggested. Rather they pertain to the sin of the protoplast which the patriarch was able to "carry away" by his righteousness, ascension, and transformation. Accordingly, Enoch has already accomplished his role as the "redeemer" of humanity through his luminous metamorphosis near the throne of glory.¹⁰⁵ Humanity has been redeemed in him, and this redemption gives hope to other righteous ones, who will later attain the paradisaal condition. The significant detail that confirms Enoch's unique redeeming role is that, unlike in chapter 53 where he opposes the idea of intercession, in *2 Enoch* 64-65 he does not object to the idea that he is able to carry away the sin of humankind.

Enoch's response to the people's address, which occupies the following chapter 65, provides additional support for interpreting the sin Enoch was able to carry away as related to the transgression of the protoplast. It is not coincidental that the patriarch starts his response with paraphrasing the account of Adam's creation, telling that the Lord "constituted man in his own form, in accordance with a similarity."¹⁰⁶ He further relates that the Lord gave the protoplast "eyes to see, and ears to hear, and heart to think, and reason to argue."¹⁰⁷ Some elements of this part of the paraphrase allude to the details of the protoplast's marvelous creation found in *2 Enoch* 30:9, namely to some of his properties (seeing, hearing, reasoning) given to Adam at his creation.

Enoch concludes his reply to the people with the theme of the restoration of humanity to its prelapsarian "paradisaal" condition, further indicating that the whole account revolves around the patriarch's role in the removal of Adam's sin. It is logical, therefore, that this message of hope comes from the patriarch's mouth whose humanity has already been restored to the paradisaal

¹⁰³ Slav. **ОТМИТЕЛЕЪ** (otimitel'/otyjatel') - literally "the one who has taken away." M.I Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *COIDR* 4 (1910) 1.59; 1.101.

¹⁰⁴ Another important hint that Enoch was able to take away the sin of the protoplast is that the MSS of the longer recension speak, not about many sins, but about only one sin, "the *sin* of [*hu*]mankind." In contrast, the reading of the shorter recension, which uses a plural form - "our sins," is clearly secondary.

¹⁰⁵ The important hint to this unique role is Enoch's definition in *2 Enoch* 64 as "the one whom the Lord chose in preference to all the people of the earth."

¹⁰⁶ Andersen, 1.190.

¹⁰⁷ Andersen, 1.190.

condition. In *2 Enoch* 65:8-10 Enoch tells the people that at the end all the righteous who escaped from the Lord's great judgment "will be collected together into the great age ... and they will have a great light, a great indestructible light, and paradise, great and incorruptible. For everything corruptible will pass away, and the incorruptible will come into being, and will be the shelter of the eternal residence."¹⁰⁸

Conclusion

The limited scope of this paper did not allow to explore all the facets of the Adamic polemics in *2 Enoch*.¹⁰⁹ However, some conclusions can be drawn at this stage of the research.

1. The foregoing survey testifies to the existence of Adamic polemics in *2 Enoch*. These polemical developments contain, not only the "internal" debates based on *2 Enoch's* depictions of the protoplast, but also the intertextual polemics with the "external" Adamic traditions attested in the primary Adam books.

2. The analysis shows that Adamic polemics involves a rewriting of "original" Adamic motifs and themes when the details of Adam's "story" are transferred to a new "hero," the seventh antediluvian patriarch Enoch.

3. The analysis demonstrates that, similar to the early booklets of *1 Enoch* the attitude of the author(s) of *2 Enoch* to Adam's figure and the traditions associated with his name, reminds highly polemical. Yet, in comparison with *1 Enoch*, the Slavonic Enoch demonstrates a paradigm shift in polemical strategy. Now the competitive tradition is not silenced but is rather exposed and openly appropriated for polemics. This switch might be connected with the challenge which the intense development of the traditions about the exalted patriarchs and prophets posed to the "classical" profile of Enoch found in early Enochic booklets. Adamic, Mosaic, and Noachic polemics found in *2 Enoch* might represent the reaction of the Enochic tradition to these new conceptual developments. It should be noted that the traditions about the elevated Adam appeared to be widespread in the Alexandrian environment of the first century CE, the place and time of the possible composition of *2 Enoch*.

4. The investigation of Adamic polemics helped to prove that a number of important passages associated with the early Jewish mysticism, like the

¹⁰⁸ Andersen, 1.192.

¹⁰⁹ One of these unexplored subjects includes the connection between the tradition of Adam's cosmic body in *2 Enoch* 30 and the role of Enoch as the measurer of the divine body in *2 Enoch* 39. Unfortunately, this lengthy investigation cannot be included in this paper and will be published separately.

motif of the Divine Face in chapters 22 and 39, the future prominent role of Enoch-Metatron as the governing power on the earth, and his title "Youth," belong to the primary text, since they play a decisive role in the original argument of the Slavonic apocalypse. In the light of this role Böttrich's hypothesis that these themes represent later interpolations must now be dismissed as erroneous.

5. The analysis of the polemical developments in the text also reveals that the theological intentions of its authors were not to find a peaceful consensus with the non-Jewish environment in the Diaspora situation, like Böttrich proposed, but to resolve the internal problems of the Enochic tradition facing the challenges of its competitors.

“Many Lamps are Lightened from the One”: Paradigms of the Transformational Vision in the Macarian Homilies

Among mystical testimonies circulating in the Eastern Christian tradition, two portentous descriptions of transformational visions can be found.

The first account is drawn from *2 Enoch*, a Jewish apocalypse, apparently written in the first century CE and preserved in the Eastern Christian environment in its Slavonic translation. In this text the prediluvian patriarch Enoch describes his luminous metamorphosis near the Throne of Glory:¹

And Michael, the Lord's greatest archangel, lifted me up and brought me in front of the face of the Lord ... And Michael extracted me from my clothes. He anointed me with the delightful oil; and the appearance of that oil is greater than the greatest light, its ointment is like sweet dew, and its fragrance like myrrh; and its shining is like the sun. And I gazed at all of myself, and I had become like one of the glorious ones, and there was no observable difference.¹

The second account is written a thousand years later and comes from *Philokalia*, a collection of Eastern Christian writings compiled by Nicodemus Hagioretes, in which Pseudo-Symeon conveys preparatory instructions for acquiring the vision of the Taboric light:

Then sit down in a quiet cell, in corner by yourself, and do what I tell you. Close the door, and withdraw your intellect from everything worthless and transient. Rest your beard on your chest, and focus your physical gaze, together with the whole of your intellect, upon the centre of your belly or your navel. Restrain the drawing-in of breath through your nostrils, so as not to breathe easily, and search inside yourself with your intellect so as to find the place of the heart, where all the powers of the soul reside. To start with you will find there darkness and an impenetrable density. Later, when you persist and practice this task day and night, you will find, as though miraculously, an unceasing joy. For as soon as the intellect attains the place of the heart, at once it sees things of which it previously knew nothing. It sees the open space within the heart and it beholds itself entirely luminous and full of discrimination.²

It is apparent that these two descriptions belong to very different symbolic worlds. In the first one, an adept, on his celestial trip, finds himself before the glorious appearance of the Lord, accompanied by the angels who extract

¹ *2 Enoch* 22:6-10. F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 139.

²Pseudo-Simeon, "The Three Methods of Prayer," in: *The Philokalia* (5 vols.; tr. G.E.H. Palmer, P. Sherrard, and K. Ware; London: Faber and Faber, 1995) 4.72-3.

the visitor from his earthly garments and anoint him with delightful oil. In the second one, he is led through darkness and "an impenetrable density" on the inner journey to the depth of his heart. The majesty of the celestial environment strikingly confronts the monotonous quietness of the inner contemplation. Still, something similar is recognizable in these two accounts. In both descriptions the visionaries eventually come to the same result--they behold themselves luminescent. Both accounts also stress the totality of this metamorphosis - mystical adepts of these visions become "entirely" luminous. It is, however, observable that in the two accounts the source of the divine light is different. In the first account, it comes from outside, namely from the glorious appearance of the Lord, depicted symbolically as the angelic anointing with shining oil. The shining oil, the "covering" substance of the transformation, serves as an additional detail which stresses the outer nature of the visionary's luminous metamorphosis.

The important feature of the second account which differentiates it from the first is the "inner" nature of the luminous metamorphosis--the illumination comes from inside, from the darkness of the soul, proceeding from the open space within the heart of the visionary.

Separated by a millennium, these two accounts serve as significant marks of the long-lasting theological journey from the outer transformational vision to its inner counterpart. On this journey the towering figure of the Syrian father, known to us as Pseudo-Macarius, remains prominent. The purpose of this article is to explore some of his concepts which in our opinion play a formative role in the transition from outer to inner in the transformational visions of Eastern Christian tradition.

The Background: Transformational Vision of the *Kabod*

In order to clarify the differences between the two transformational visions mentioned earlier, we must return now to the initial theological contexts which lie behind these two accounts.

The origin of the *Kabod* paradigm, which is formative for the vision in the Slavonic apocalypse, can be traced to Old Testament materials where one can find various polemics for and against the anthropomorphic understanding of God.³ Weinfeld observes that the imagery of the enthroned

³ On the issue of Old Testament's anthropomorphism see: J. Barr, "Theophany and Anthropomorphism in the Old Testament," *VT Suppl.* 7 (1960) 31-8; J. Hempel, "Die Grenzen des Anthropomorphismus Jahwes im Alten Testament," *ZAW* 57 (1939) 75-85; F. Michaeli, *Dieu à l'image de l'homme: Étude de la notion anthropomorphique de Dieu dans l'Ancient Testament* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux, 1950); W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961) 1.210-20; M.C.A. Korpel, *A Rift in the Clouds. Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine* (Münster: UGARIT-Verlag, 1990) 87-590; T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the*

divine glory known to us as the Lord's *Kabod* was "crystallized" in the Priestly and Ezekielian traditions.⁴

Theological developments of the Priestly tradition demonstrate that the anthropomorphism of the Priestly source is intimately connected with the place of Divine habitation.⁵ In this tradition, "in which the Divinity is personalized and depicted in the most tangible corporeal similitudes," God, who possesses a human form, has a need for a house or tabernacle.⁶

Weinfeld rightly observes that this anthropomorphic position was not entirely an invention of the Priestly source⁷ but derived from early sacral conceptions.⁸ In these traditions the Deity was sitting in his house ensconced between the two cherubim, and at his feet rests the ark,⁹ his footstool.¹⁰

This motif of the enthroned Deity becomes a central image in the book of Ezekiel, whose *Kabod*¹¹ theology is similar¹² to the Priestly doctrine.¹³

Shem and Kabod Theologies (Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series, 18; Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1982); M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972) 191-209. On late Jewish anthropomorphism see: M. Fishbane, "The 'Measures' of God's Glory in the Ancient Midrash," in I. Gruenwald *et al.* (eds.), *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity. Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992) 53-74; Arthur Marmorstein, *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God: Essays in Anthropomorphism* (New York: KTAV, 1937).

⁴ M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972) 191.

⁵ T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series, 18; Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1982) 24.

⁶ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 191.

⁷ For the roots of the theology of the priestly tabernacle see: T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 81-3.

⁸ Weinfeld shows that "the notion of God sitting enthroned upon the cherubim was prevalent in ancient Israel (1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; Ps 80:2; 2 Kgs 19:15)." Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 192.

⁹ Mettinger stresses that "the most important aspect of the Ark in Solomon's Temple was that it served as the footstool of God." T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 87.

¹⁰ M. Haran, "The Ark and the Cherubim," *IEJ* 9 (1959) 30-8.

¹¹ The term *Kabod* (Heb. *kbwd*) occurs 199 times in the OT (24 occurrences in the Pentateuch, 7 in the Deuteronomistic history, 18 in the Chronicler's history, 38 in Isaiah, 19 in Ezekiel, occasionally in Jeremiah and the Minor Prophets, 51 occurrences in the Psalms and 16 in Proverbs). The term *kbwd* can be translated as "substance," "body," "mass," "power," "might," "honor," "glory," "splendor." In its meaning as "glory" *Kabod* usually refers to God, his sanctuary, his city, or sacred paraphernalia. The Priestly tradition uses the term in connection with God's appearances in the tabernacle. P and Ezekiel describe *Kabod* as a blazing fire surrounded by radiance and a great cloud. M. Weinfeld, "*kabod*" *TDOT*, 7.22-38.

¹² It is also noteworthy that Ezekiel and the materials of the Priestly tradition, such as Gen 5:1, share similar terminology, namely the term *dmwt*. The term *dmwt* appears 12 times in the Book of Ezekiel where it becomes a favorite terminology for the description

Mettinger observes that "in Ezekiel, the *Kabod*-conception proved to represent an earlier phase than that discovered in the P-materials."¹⁴ He further stresses that the iconography of Ezekiel is closely connected with the idea of God's royal presence in his sanctuary.¹⁵ This connection of the *Kevod YHWH* with the enthroned God can scarcely be divorced from its previously established usage in early royal contexts.¹⁶

Weinfeld notes that Ezekiel's persistent tendency to describe God's *Kabod* as a brilliant and radiant fire encased in a cloud is also a distinct characteristic of the Priestly writings.¹⁷ He argues that in the Priestly and Ezekielian writings the fire and cloud are inseparable elements of the apparition of God's Glory, where the cloud is the divine envelope which screens the Deity from mortal view.¹⁸ In later Jewish and Christian traditions the radiant luminosity emitted by various celestial beings fulfills the same function, protecting against the direct vision of their true forms. In the Hebrew Bible, as well as in later apocalyptic traditions, God's "form" remains hidden behind His light. The hidden *Kabod* is revealed through its light.¹⁹ This situation explains the wide use of the *Kabod* paradigm in the visions of light phenomena.

Kabod theology leads to the special type of transformational visions that can be found in various biblical and apocalyptic materials.²⁰ In the climactic points of these accounts, their visionaries normally "see" the extend of the divine glory, often portrayed as enthroned anthropomorphic figure. As a

of various divine and angelic "appearances." It occupies a prominent place in Biblical anthropomorphic debates. Both terms *kbwd* and *dmwt* are intimately connected through the notion of "hiddenness" of the Divine form/glory. Later Jewish *Shiur Qomah* traditions stress the aspect of the hiddenness of *dmwt*: "His *dmwt* is hidden from everyone, but no one's *dmwt* is hidden from Him." M.S. Cohen, *The Shiur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1983) 113. For a fuller discussion see A. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 102-4.

¹³ On the connections between P and Ezekiel see B. Stein, *Der Begriff "Kebod Jahweh"* (Emsdetten; Lechte, 1939) 299. See also T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 107-11.

¹⁴ T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 116-17.

¹⁵ T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 117.

¹⁶ T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*, 117.

¹⁷ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 201.

¹⁸ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 202.

¹⁹ De Conick, *Seek to See Him*, 104-5. De Conick's research investigates the relationships between God's form and God's light, showing their complexity. She argues that in some traditions God's form remains hidden behind His light. The hidden *Kabod* is revealed through its light. "The visionary can only gain access to a vision of the deity through the deity's light." De Conick, *Seek to See Him*, 104-5.

²⁰ G. Quispel, "Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis," *VC* 34 (1980) 1-13.

consequence of this encounter, the visionary experiences a dramatic external metamorphosis which often affects his face, limbs, and garments, making them luminescent. A classic example of such a transformational vision is the account of Moses' shining countenance in Ex 34 after his encounter with the Lord's *Kabod* on Mount Sinai. It is noteworthy that in the apocalyptic and Merkabah traditions the vision of the Lord's Glory ("the King in His beauty") increasingly become the main teleological point of the heavenly ascents.

Enoch's transformation in the Slavonic apocalypse also belongs to the *Kabod* paradigm. Enoch's luminous metamorphosis took place in the front of the Lord's glorious "extent," labeled in *2 Enoch* as the Lord's "Face."²¹ From this Enochic account we learn that the vision of the Divine "Face" had dramatic consequences for Enoch's appearance. His body endures radical changes as it becomes covered with the divine light. A significant detail in this description is that Enoch is not transformed into light but covered, "clothed," with the light of God's Glory. The use of delightful oil as a covering substance emphasizes this "covering nature" of the luminous metamorphosis.

In Enoch's radiant metamorphosis before the Divine face, an important detail can be found which links Enoch's transformation with that of Moses' account in Exodus. In *2 Enoch* 37 we learn about the unusual procedure performed on Enoch's face in the final stage of his encounter with the Lord. The text informs that the Lord called one of his senior angels to chill the face of Enoch. The text says that the angel appeared frigid; he was as white as snow, and his hands were as cold as ice. The text further depicts the angel chilling Enoch's face, who could not endure the terror of the Lord, "just as it is not possible to endure the fire of a stove and the heat of the sun..."²² Right after this "chilling procedure," the Lord informs Enoch that if his face had not been chilled here, no human being would have been able to look at his face.²³ This reference to the radiance of Enoch's face after his encounter with the Lord is an apparent parallel to the incandescent face of Moses after the Sinai experience in Ex 34.

²¹ "I saw the view of the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot in a fire and brought out, and it emits sparks and is incandescent. Thus even I saw the face of the Lord. But the face of the Lord is not to be talked about, it is so very marvelous and supremely awesome and supremely frightening. And who am I to give an account of the incomprehensible being of the Lord, and of his face, so extremely strange and indescribable? And how many are his commands, and his multiple voice, and the Lord's throne, supremely great and not made by hands, and the choir stalls all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, and their never-silent singing. Who can give an account of his beautiful appearance, never changing and indescribable, and his great glory? And I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord" (*2 Enoch* 22:1-4, the longer recension). Andersen, 136.

²² Andersen, 160.

²³ Andersen, 160.

In spite of the dominant role of the *Kabod* pattern in biblical and apocalyptic theophanic accounts, it becomes increasingly challenged in the postbiblical rabbinic²⁴ and patristic environments which offered new understandings of the transformational vision. In these new developments, one can see a growing emphasis on the interiorization of the visionary experience.²⁵ Among the new notions employed for the purposes of such a paradigm shift was the prominent biblical concept of the image of God after which Adam was created.

²⁴ It becomes especially notable in Hekhaloth mysticism, where the teleology of the mystical journeys came to be expressed in terms of descent into the Merkabah. On Merkabah and Hekhaloth mysticism see: P. Alexander, "The Historical Settings of the Hebrew Book of Enoch," *JJS* 28 (1977) 156-80; D. Blumenthal, *Understanding Jewish Mysticism, a Source Reader: The Merkabah tradition and the Zoharic tradition* (New York: KTAV, 1978); I. Chernus, *Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1982); M. Cohen, *The Shiur Qomah: Liturgy and Theurgy in Pre-Kabbalistic Jewish Mysticism* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1983); J. Greenfield, "Prolegomenon," in: H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973) xi-xlvii; I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU, 14; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980); Gruenwald, I. and M. Smith, *The Hekhaloth Literature in English* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983); D. Halperin, *The Faces of Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (TSAJ, 16; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988); D. Halperin, *The Merkavah in Rabbinic Literature* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1980); M. Idel, "Enoch is Metatron," *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990) 220-40; L. Jacobs, *Jewish Mystical Testimonies* (New York: Schocken Books, 1977); N. Janowitz, *The Poetics of Ascent: Theories of Language in a Rabbinic Ascent Text* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989); M. Morgan, *Sepher ha-Razim: The Book of Mysteries* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983); C. Morray-Jones, "Hekhaloth Literature and Talmudic Tradition; Alexander's Three Test Cases," *JJS* 22 (1991) 1-39; C. Newsom, *Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS, 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985); A. Orlov, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in 2 Enoch," *JSP* 18 (1998) 71-86; P. Schäfer with M. Schlüter and H.G. von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhaloth-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981); P. Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992); P. Schäfer et al., *Übersetzung der Hekhaloth-Literatur* (4 vols.; TSAJ, 17, 22, 29, 46; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr/Siebeck, 1987-95); G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic tradition* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965); G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1954); N. Séd, "Les traditions secrètes et les disciples de Rabban Yohannan ben Zakkai," *RHR* 184 (1973) 49-66; M. Swartz, *Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism: An Analysis of Maaseh Merkavah* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992).

²⁵ On the issue of the interiorization of transformational visions see: A. Golitzin, "Liturgy and Mysticism: The Experience of God in Eastern Orthodox Christianity," *Pro Ecclesia* 2 (1999) 159-86; Ieromonah Alexander (Golitzin), "Forma lui Dumnezeu si Vederea Slavei. Reflectii Asupra Contraversei Antropomorfitie Din Anul 399 D. Hr.," in: Ieromonah Alexander (Golitzin), *Mistagogia. Experienta lui Dumnezeu în Ortodoxie* (Sibiu: Deisis, 1998) 184-267; N. Séd, "La shekinta et ses amis araméens," *Cahiers d'Orientalisme* XX (1988) 133-42.

In the Likeness of God's Image

Gilles Quispel in his book *Makarius, Das Thomasevangelium und das Lied von der Perle*²⁶ draws the reader's attention to an interesting tradition preserved in Homily II.12²⁷ of Pseudo-Macarius. From the homily we learn that "Adam, when he transgressed the commandment, lost two things. First, he lost the pure possession of his nature, so lovely, created according to the image and likeness of God (κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ). Second, he lost the very image itself (αὐτὴν εἰκόνα) in which was laid up for him, according to God's promise, the full heavenly inheritance"(II.12.1).²⁸ Further, another important passage in the homily informs the reader that Adam and Eve before the Fall were clothed (ἐνδεδυμένοι) with God's glory in place of clothing (περιβολαίου) (II.12.8).²⁹ The text reveals a certain continuity between Adam's "very image itself" and his glorious clothing. An important detail in the narrative is that the homilist makes a distinction between Adam's nature, created according to the image and likeness of God³⁰ and Adam's "very image (εἰκόνα) itself," speaking about them as of two separate entities which were lost during the Fall. This subtle theological distinction shows the author's familiarity with the Jewish aggadic traditions about *tselem* of Adam--the luminous image of God's glory according to which Adam was created.³¹

²⁶ G. Quispel, *Makarius, Das Thomasevangelium und das Lied von der Perle* (SNT, 15; Leiden: Brill, 1967) 57-8.

²⁷ There are four Byzantine medieval collections of Macarian Homilies. Three of them appeared in critical editions. Collection I was published in *Makarios/Simeon: Reden und Briefe. Die Sammlung I des Vaticanus Graecus 694 (B)* (2 vols.; ed. H. Bertold, GCS; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1973). Collection II appeared in: H. Dörries, E. Klostermann, and M. Kroeger *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios* (PTS, 4; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1964). Collection III appeared in *Neue Homilien des Makarios/Simeon aus Typus III* (eds. E. Klostermann and H. Berthold; TU, 72; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961) and *Pseudo-Macaire. Oeuvres spirituelles. Vol. I: Homelies propres a la Collection III* (ed. V. Desprez; SC, 275; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1980). In our references to the Macarian homilies the first uppercase Roman numeral will designate the Collection, following arabic numerals will designate the specific homily and its subsections.

²⁸ Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter* (tr. G.A. Maloney, S.J.; New York: Paulist Press, 1992) 97. H. Dörries *et al. Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios* (PTS, 4; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1964) 107-8.

²⁹ Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 100.

³⁰ It is important that Genesis 1:26 stresses that Adam's *s5lm* was created after God's own *s5lm*, being some sort of luminous "imitation" of the glorious *s5lm* of God. Some scholars even argue that "in this way, the likeness that Adam and God shared is not physicality - in the normal sense of having a body - but luminescence." David Aaron, "Shedding Light on God's Body," 303.

³¹ For discussions about the luminous garment/image/body of Adam see: David H. Aaron, "Shedding Light on God's Body in Rabbinic Midrashim: Reflections on the Theory of a Luminous Adam," *HTR* 90 (1997) 299-314; S. Brock, "Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition," *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den*

The term "image" (Gk. εἰκών) can be found in a number of significant New Testament passages. The most important of them for the purposes of the current investigation is the Pauline description of Christ as the "image of the invisible God" in Col 1:15, which has often been compared to the account of the creation of Adam and seen as part of Paul's Adam Christology.³² This theological connection between Adam's creation after the image of God and Christ as the image of God has opened several possibilities for using ancient aggadic traditions about the luminous *tselem* of Adam in new Christian theophanic contexts. In Pauline writings we can also see peculiar terminological parallels in which the notion of image (εἰκών) becomes closely associated with such important theophanic concepts, prominent in traditional *Kabod* theology, as glory³³ (δόξα)³⁴ and form (μορφή).³⁵

östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter (Eichstätter Beiträge, 4; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1982) 11-40; A.D. De Conick and J. Fossum, "Stripped before God: A New Interpretation of Logion 37 in the Gospel of Thomas," *VC* 45 (1991) 141; L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955) 5.97; Alon Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," *HTR* 87 (1994) 171-95; B. Murmelstein, "Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 35 (1928) 255; W. Staerk, *Die Erlösererwartung in den östlichen Religionen* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1938) 11.

³² J. Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus, 30; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995) 15. Cf. also: A. Schlatter, *Die Theologie der Apostel* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1922) 299; M. Black, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam," *SJT* 7 (1954) 174-9; R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966) 97-9.

³³ See for example 2 Cor 4:4: "...the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God..."

³⁴ H.A.W. Meyer, J. Weiss and J. Behm understand Paul's concept of *morfhv* as the divine Glory (δόξα), believing that "in Pauline sense, Christ was from the beginning no other than *kbwd*, δόξα of God himself, the glory and radiation of his being, which appears almost as an independent hypostasis of God and yet is connected intimately with God." See R.P. Martin, *Carmen Christi. Philippians 2.5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 104-5. One of the major exponents of the hypothesis, J. Behm, in Kittel's *TDNT*, argues that the statement in Phillipians 2:6 about the form of God corresponds closely with the statement in John 17:5 about the glory which "I had with Thee before the world was." *TDNT*, 4.751.

³⁵ Biblical scholars argue that *μορφή* and *εἰκών* are used as interchangeable terms in the LXX and in Paul. For example, an investigation of the Old Testament's connection between terms *tselem* and *dmwt* in the light of their translation in the LXX as *μορφή* lead scholars to believe that "*μορφή* in Phillipians 2:6 is immediately related to the concept *εἰκών*, since the Semitic root word *tselem* can correspond to either of the two Greek words." R.P. Martin, *Carmen Christi. Philippians 2.5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 108. For the discussion of the body/image of Christ in Pauline thought see Jarl Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus, 30; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995).

Other important theological developments in Gnostic³⁶ and rabbinic circles lead to a gradual "interiorization" of the *tselem* imagery. In postbiblical Jewish accounts, *tselem* is often identified with the luminous "clothing" of the human heart. Scholem's research shows that in Jewish mysticism *tselem* was also understood as a sort of "garment" of the soul, which "floats" over it. He observes that "this garment also becomes the soul's heavenly attire when it returns to Paradise after death."³⁷ This Jewish idea of the "inner" luminous *tselem* might well be already known in Christian circles, particularly in the Syriac environment.

It is also possible that Ephraem, Macarius, and some other Syrian Christian writers might have acquired the notion of the luminous human *tselem* through their familiarity with the Targums, the Aramaic renderings of the Hebrew Bible, which attest to traditions about the original luminosity of Adam and Eve.³⁸

It is noticeable that in the Macarian homilies and other Eastern Christian writings the notion of luminous *tselem* became gradually employed for the purposes of the internalized beatific vision. *Tselem* became utilized as a sort of theological counterpart to the classic concept of the divine *Kabod* which traditionally played a prominent role in Biblical and apocalyptic visions. Sometimes both imageries were used interchangeably.

In the patristic environment the concept of the image of God gradually became a "safer" way to convey visionary experiences of the light phenomena, especially after the anthropomorphic controversy of 399 CE,³⁹ when antianthropomorphic polemics⁴⁰ made it increasingly difficult to

³⁶ J. Fossum observes that in some Gnostic circles "'the shining,' 'image,' or 'likeness' of God, after which the body of the earthly man was fashioned appears as a separate entity, even some form of hypostasis." Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 16.

³⁷ Gershom Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (New York: Schocken Books, 1976) 264.

³⁸ Cf. S. Brock, "Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition," *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter* (Eichstätter Beiträge, 4; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1982) 11-40.

³⁹ On the anthropomorphic controversy see: Elizabeth A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992); Graham Gould, "The Image of God and the Anthropomorphic Controversy in Fourth Century Monasticism," in Robert J. Daly (ed.), *Origeniana Quinta* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, CV; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992) 549-57.

⁴⁰ On antianthropomorphic polemics see: Elizabeth A. Clark, "New Perspectives on the Origenist Controversy: Human Embodiment and Ascetic Strategies," *Church History* 59 (1990) 145-62; Lawrence Hennessey, "A Philosophical Issue of Origen's Eschatology: The Three Senses of Incorporeality," in Robert J. Daly (ed.), *Origeniana Quinta* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, CV; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992) 373-80; John A. McGuckin, "The Changing Forms of Jesus," in Lothar Lies (ed.), *Origeniana Quarta* (Innsbrucker Theologische Studien, Bd. 19; Innsbruck; Wien: Tyrola-Verlag, 1987) 215-222; David L. Paulsen, "Early Christian Belief in a Corporeal Deity: Origen and Augustine as Reluctant Witnesses," *HTR* 83:2 (1990) 105-16; Gedaliahu

employ the traditional "anthropomorphic" language of beatific visions, including the classical *Kabod* imagery.⁴¹ By the fourth century in patristic trinitarian debates about the divine light the *Kabod* terminology was almost completely substituted by the symbolism of the divine image.

A thousand years later, in Hesychast transformational visions of the Taboric light, the concept of the image of God still continued to play a crucial theological role. It is especially noticeable in Gregory Palamas' theology of the divine image which shows amazing parallels to the concepts and imagery of Macarius. Among them is an open employment of the Adamic *Gestalt*. Palamas, following Macarius, draws heavily on ancient traditions about the luminous *tselem* of Adam. In *One Hundred and Fifty Texts*, he argues that "Adam, before the fall, also participated in this divine illumination and resplendence, and because he was truly clothed in a

Stroumsa, "The Incorporeality of God: Context and Implications of Origen's Position," *Religion* (1983) 345-58.

⁴¹ Similar antropomorphic developments are also noticeable in postbiblical Jewish mysticism, with its gradual elaboration of the *tselem* concept. In Jewish tradition *s5lm* played an important role in anthropomorphic developments. It was understood not simply as an abstract likeness but had a strong "corporeal meaning." See Alon Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," *HTR* 87 (1994) 174. See also: Gershom Scholem, *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead* (New York: Schocken Books, 1976) 251-73. Gottstein's research deals with a number of rabbinic texts that reveal this "corporeal" understanding of *tselem*. He argues that in some instances it is interchangeable with other Hebrew terms for the designation of "body," like the term *dmwt*. Speaking about these corporeal meanings of *tselem* Gottstein notes that "... Adam's *tselem* is his luminous body. In other sources, such as the story of Hillel washing his body [*Lev.R.* 34.3], the *tselem* referred to the physical body. *Tselem* can be thus refer to various levels, or aspects, all of which bear a resemblance to the physical body. I would propose that these various levels, or various bodies, reflect one another. The physical body is a reflection of the body of light. This reflection may translate itself down to the details of circumcision. The kind of graded devolutionary process that we encountered above may be a model for two ways of talking about *tselem*. The *tselem* in its original form may be lost, but the dimmer reflection of this form is extant in the physical body, which may still be spoken of as *tselem*." Alon Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," 188. Rabbinic literature gives a number of references to traditions about the luminosity of the original *tselem* of Adam. One of them can be found in *Lev. R.* 20.2. in which "Resh Lakish, in the name of R. Simeon the son of Menasya, said: The apple of Adam's heel outshone the globe of the sun; how much more so the brightness of his face! Nor need you wonder. In the ordinary way if a person makes salvers, one for himself and one for his household, whose will he make more beautiful? Not his own? Similarly, Adam was created for the service of the Holy One, blessed be He, and the globe of the sun for the service of mankind." H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1939) 4. 252. Another important passage which can be found in *Gen. R.* 20.12 tells us that the scroll of Rabbi Meir reads "garments of light" instead of "garments of skin," stressing thus that Adam has not lost completely his luminous quality even after the Fall: "In R. Meir's Torah it was found written, 'Garments of light (or)': this refers to Adam's garments, which were like a torch [shedding radiance], broad at the bottom and narrow at the top." H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1939) 1. 171.

garment of glory he was not naked, nor was he unseemly by reason of his nakedness."⁴² The Syrian background of Palamas' speculation about Adam is evident.⁴³ Recognizing the tragic consequences which Adam's fall had for the condition of the human *tselem*,⁴⁴ he reaffirms its irrevocable value for the inner transformational vision: "Leaving aside other matters for the present, I shall simply say that perfection of the divine likeness is accomplished by means of the divine illumination that issues from God."⁴⁵

The theme of regaining this lost luminous image of God, "the dimmer reflection," which is still mysteriously extant in the human physical body (sometimes in the form of a luminous "clothing" of the heart) and can be eventually "restored," had a number of interesting theological ramifications in the Hesychast tradition.⁴⁶ The Hesychast idea of the light-like (φωτοειδές) sensitive nature of man⁴⁷ shows clear similarities with this early Syrian understanding of the luminous *tselem* as a reflection of God's Glory.

Internalization of the Kabod

It was mentioned earlier that in some biblical accounts the figure of Moses is often connected with *Kabod* theology.⁴⁸ This tendency is traceable both in the Old Testament Exodus stories and in New Testament accounts of Christ's Transfiguration where Moses serves as a significant "theophanic" reminder. In postbiblical Jewish and Christian writings the Moses *Gestalt*, however, gradually became utilized for the purposes of internalized visions. It cannot be a coincidence that in these new theological "developments," the Moses account was also linked with the *tselem* imagery.

⁴² *The Philokalia*, 4.377.

⁴³ An aggadic tradition, which survived in the Syriac environment, explains why Adam and Eve discovered their nakedness only after the Fall. According to the tradition, it happened because after their transgression they lost their original radiance--the "garments of light" which prevented them from seeing their naked "physical" bodies. Luminosity thus served for the prelapsarian humankind as a sort of screen which concealed their original form. Gregory Palamas clearly employs this tradition.

⁴⁴ "Even though we still bear God's image to a greater degree than the angels, yet as regards the likeness of God we fall far short of them." *Philokalia*, 4.376.

⁴⁵ *Philokalia*, 4.376.

⁴⁶ Cf. John S. Romanides, "Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 6 (1960-61) 186-205 and *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 9 (1963-64) 225-70.

⁴⁷ See John S. Romanides, "Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 9 (1963-64) 235.

⁴⁸ On Moses' connection with *Kabod* theology see: A. Orlov, "Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition," *Society of Biblical Literature 2000 Seminar Papers* (SBLSP, 39; Atlanta: Scholars, 2000) 130-47.

These tendencies are noticeable in the Macarian Homilies where Moses is often portrayed as Adam's luminous counterpart. Following the already mentioned Adamic narrative of Homily II.12, which tells us how Adam lost his luminous status and "obeyed his darker side," Macarius gives us Moses' example who "had a glory shining on his countenance." The homily refers to Moses' Sinai experience, expanding this tradition and adding some new significant details:

Indeed, the Word of God was his food and he had a glory shining on his countenance. All this, which happened to him, was a figure of something else. For that glory now shines splendidly from within the hearts of Christians. At the resurrection their bodies, as they rise, will be covered (σκεπάζεται) with another vesture, one that is divine, and they will be nourished with a heavenly food (II.12.14).⁴⁹

It is noticeable that the passage serves as a bridge between the symbolic worlds of the *Kabod* and *tselem*. Macarius openly "internalizes" the Moses account, stressing that Moses' glory now "shines splendidly from within the hearts of Christians." On the other hand, some features of the *Kabod*'s paradigm are still noticeable: the homilist understands Moses' luminosity as a covering with God's glory.⁵⁰ The author's further discussion in II.12.15 about the clothing of Christians and wrapping them in "divine and glorious garments" gives additional strength to this motif of Moses, covered with the luminous garments of God's glory.

The tendencies for internalizing the *Kabod* paradigm through implications of the concept of God's image found in Macarian Homilies demonstrate amazing similarities to some Jewish developments. The late Rabbinic midrashim attest to such traditions.⁵¹ The origin of such

⁴⁹ Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 102. H. Dörries et al. *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 114.

⁵⁰ The motif of covering with the Glory is also prominent in another Macarian passage which depicts Moses' shining countenance: "For blessed Moses provided us with a certain type through the glory of the Spirit which covered his countenance upon which no one could look with steadfast gaze (II.15.10)." Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 74.

⁵¹ In Rabbinic literature the traditions about Moses as a luminous counterpart of Adam also can be found. Gottstein stresses that "the luminescent quality of the *tselem* is the basis for comparison between Moses and Adam in several rabbinical materials." Alon Goshen Gottstein, "The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature," 182. *Deut. R.* 11.3 attests to such traditions: "Adam said to Moses: 'I am greater than you because I have been created in the image of God.' Whence this? For it is said, 'and God created man in his own image' (Gen. 1,27). Moses replied to him: 'I am far superior to you, for the honor which was given to you has been taken away from you, as it is said: but man (Adam) abideth not in honor, (Ps. XLIX, 13) but as for me, the radiant countenance which God gave me still remains with me.' Whence? For it is said: 'his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated' (Deut. 34,7)." H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1939) 7. 173. Gottstein also gives another midrashic passage from *Midrash Tadshe* 4 in which Moses is again Adam's luminous counterpart: "In the likeness

theological innovations can be found in its rudimentary form already in some Jewish apocalypses, notably in *2 Enoch* from which we learn that the Lord created Adam after His face. F. Andersen stresses the theological uniqueness of such creational imagery. He, however, does not clarify what the creation after the Lord's face means in the broader textual context of the Slavonic apocalypse. The Lord's face plays an important role in *2 Enoch's* theophanic descriptions being identified with the Lord's glorious form--His *Kabod*. In chapter 22 of *2 Enoch* the Lord's face emits light and fire and serves as the source of Enoch's luminous metamorphosis. In this context, the creation of Adam after the Lord's Face demonstrates a remarkable effort toward merging the *Kabod* and *tselem* paradigms of the transformational vision.

The previous investigation shows the important role of Adam/Moses connection in the evolution from outer to inner in *Kabod* imagery. It is clear, however, that in the Macarian writings the internalizing of the *Kabod* paradigm is not confined solely to the reevaluation of Moses' *Gestalt*. The effort is much more radical. In fact, it is so revolutionary, that it strikes even distinguished students of the mystical traditions. One of them, Gershom Scholem, points to the amazing Macarian tendency for mystical "reinterpretation" of the Merkabah vision of Ezekiel in which the human soul become itself the throne of glory.⁵² In Homily II.1.1-2 Macarius writes:

When Ezekiel the prophet beheld the divinely glorious vision, he described it in human terms but in a way full of mysteries that completely surpass the powers of the human mind... And all of this which the prophet saw in ecstasy or in a trance was indeed true and certain, but it was only signifying and foreshadowing something no less hidden, something divine and mysterious, "a mystery hidden for generations" (Col 1:26) but that "has been revealed only in our time, the end of the ages," (1 Pt 1:20) when Christ appeared. For the prophet was viewing the mystery of the human soul that would receive its Lord and would become his throne of glory. For the soul that is deemed to be judged worthy to participate in the light of the Holy Spirit by becoming his throne and habitation, and is covered with the beauty of ineffable glory of the Spirit, becomes all light, all face, all eye.⁵³

Scholem, observing such a radical rethinking of classic *Kabod* imagery, further asks the legitimate question: "was there not a temptation to regard man himself as the representative of divinity, his soul as the throne of glory?"⁵⁴ Interestingly enough, this query directs us to the very heart of the Macarian theological enterprise in which the *Kabod* internalization become

of the creation of the world the Holy One blessed be he performed miracles for Israel when they came out of Egypt... In the beginning: 'and God created man in his image,' and in the desert: 'and Moshe knew not that the skin of his face shone.'" Cf. Adolph Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrash* (6 vols.; Jerusalem: Wahrman, 1967) 3. 168.

⁵² G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1961) 79.

⁵³ Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 37.

⁵⁴ G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1961) 79.

possible only as a consequence of the unique interrelationships between human and divine in the event of Christ's transfiguration.

Crystallization of the New Paradigm: The Macarian Account of the Lord's Transfiguration

The previous analysis shows that in the Macarian homilies Moses' shining countenance and the luminosity of Adam's prelapsarian *tselem* serve as metaphors for major paradigms of the transformational vision.

In the Macarian writings, one can also encounter a third paradigm of luminous transformation which is radically different from the previous two traditions. In a peculiar Macarian understanding of Christ's transfiguration⁵⁵ on Mt. Tabor, the duality of inner and outer in *visio Dei* is attempted through in a new metaphor of the transformational vision--Christ's "Body⁵⁶ of Light."⁵⁷

⁵⁵ The original Synoptic accounts of Christ's transfiguration seem influenced by the Kabod paradigm in its classical Exodus' form. Several details of the account serve as important reminders: the vision took place on a mountain, the presence of Moses, a bright cloud that enveloped the visionaries, a voice which came out of the cloud, and the shining face of Christ. On Moses typology in the Synoptic accounts of the Transfiguration see: J.A. McGuckin, *The Transfiguration of Christ in Scripture and Tradition* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity, 9; Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1986) 1-19; J. Markus, *The Way of the Lord* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992) 80-93; M.E. Thrall, "Elijah and Moses in Mark's Account of the Transfiguration," *NTS* 16 (1969-70) 305-17.

⁵⁶ The verb from the Synoptic account implies that Jesus' body was changed. Cf. J. Behm, *TDNT*, 4.755-7.

⁵⁷ Another important testimony to the Lord's Body of Light is *Pseudo-Clementine Homily* 17.7 which pictures the brilliant radiance of Christ's body in connection with Christ's image: "For He has shape, and He has every limb primarily and solely for beauty's sake, and not for use. For He has not eyes that He may see with them; for He sees on every side, since He is incomparably more brilliant in His body than the visual spirit which is in us, and He is more splendid than everything, so that in comparison with Him the light of the sun may be reckoned as darkness. Nor has He ears that He may hear; for He hears, perceives, moves, energizes, acts on every side. But He has the most beautiful shape on account of man, that the pure in heart may be able to see Him, that they may rejoice because they suffered. For He molded man in His own shape as in the grandest seal, in order that he may be the ruler and lord of all, and that all may be subject to him. Wherefore, judging that He is the universe, and that man is His image (for He is Himself invisible, but His image man is visible), the man who wishes to worship Him honours His visible image, which is man." A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* (10 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950-51) 8. 319-20. It is important that here Christ's luminosity is placed into the account of Adam's creation after God's image. The phrase "He is incomparably more brilliant in his body than the visual spirit which is in us" deserves particular attention since it can refer to the correspondence between the Lord's luminous "body" and the Adamic *tselem*.

Macarius makes an important theological statement when he observes that in His Transfiguration Christ was not just covered by the Glory but "was transfigured into (μετεμορφώθη εἰς) divine glory and into infinite light (εἰς τὸ φῶς τὸ ἄπειρον)" (II.15.38).⁵⁸

In II.15.38 the homilist elaborates this ingenious understanding of Christ's transfiguration in which the internal and external aspects of transformational mystical experience are absolutely resolved:

For as the body of the Lord was glorified when he climbed the mount and was transfigured into the divine glory and into infinite light, so also the bodies of the saints are glorified and shine like lightning.⁵⁹ Just as the interior glory of Christ covered his body and shone completely, in the same way also in the saints the interior power of Christ in them in the day will be poured out exteriorly upon their bodies...(II.15.38).⁶⁰

The language of the passage further reinforces the totality of this transformational vision--Christ's internal glory serves as the teleological source of his complete, luminous metamorphosis.

In the articulation of the newness of Christ's condition, Macarius thus offers a completely new paradigm of the beatific vision--the bodies of visionaries are now not simply covered externally with the divine light but are "lightened"⁶¹ in the way as many lamps are lightened from the one:

Similarly, as many lamps are lighted from the one, same fire, so also it is necessary that the bodies of the saints, which are members of Christ, become the same which Christ himself is. (II.15.38).⁶²

In this new concept of the transformational vision, Macarius, however, sets a significant distinction between Christ's Transfiguration and human luminous transformation. In contrast to the Lord's metamorphosis, the bodies of mortals cannot be completely "transfigured into the divine glory" but rather simply become "glorified."

The hypostatic quality of Christ's luminous form is what differentiates Him from transformed Christians who are only predestined to participate in the light of His Glory and "have put on the raiment of ineffable light."⁶³

⁵⁸ Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 122-3. H. Dörries et al. *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 149-50.

⁵⁹ Origen in *Princ.* 2.3.7 remarks that the best and purest spirits must have some kind of body, being changed according to their degree of merit into an ethereal condition, and interprets "change" in 1 Cor 15:52 as "shining with light."

⁶⁰ Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 122-3. H. Dörries et al. *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 149-50.

⁶¹ It is noteworthy that the homilist applies the imagery of "covering" not only to the physical bodies of these Christians but also to their souls which according to him will be "covered with the beauty of the ineffable glory of the light of Christ." Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 37.

⁶² Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 122-3. H. Dörries et al. *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 149-50.

⁶³ Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 44.

This articulation of the distinction between Christ's hypostasis and His light will play later an important role in Palamas' dialectics of God's essence and the divine energies.

Conclusion

It is time to return to the passage from the *Philokalia* which began this investigation. In comparison with the "traditional" cases of transformational visions, this account might look quite ambiguous. It demonstrates the absence of significant details of such visions in which the luminous metamorphosis of a visionary becomes possible as the consequence of the beatific vision of the glorious "form" of the Deity. The teleological necessity of such a divine form, in its external or internal manifestations, seems to presuppose the very possibility of any luminous metamorphosis. On the contrary, in the *Philokalia* account a visionary does not see any luminous form, but "the open space within the heart," which, however, makes him entirely luminous.

The answer to this strange situation can be found in the Macarian understanding of Christ's transfiguration on Mount Tabor which plays a paradigmatic role in later Hesychastic visions of the divine light. Macarius' position implies that Christ in the Tabor story represents both aspects of the transformational vision. First, He is the Glory after which a visionary is transformed. Second, He is also the visionary himself, whose face and garments⁶⁴ are transformed. In the Macarian writings Christ's interior glory is poured out upon his external body, making it luminous.

For as the body of the Lord was glorified when he climbed the mount and was transfigured into the divine glory and into infinite light, so also the bodies of the saints are glorified and shine like lightning. Just as the interior glory of Christ covered his body and shone completely, in the same way also in the saints the interior power of Christ in them in the day will be poured out exteriorly upon their bodies...(II.15.38).⁶⁵

In the light of the Macarian account of Christ's transfiguration, the requirement for the divine glorious form as the transforming source of the visionary experience becomes substituted by the notion of the divine energies. It becomes possible since the locus of the visionary's perspective now is not external to the divine luminous form, but is rather immanent

⁶⁴ The luminous face and the transformed garments of Christ in the Synoptic accounts of the Transfiguration may stress the role of Christ as a visionary of His own glory. It parallels the shining face of Moses after his visionary experience on Mount Sinai and to the transformation of visionaries' garments in Jewish and Christian apocalypses.

⁶⁵ Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 122-3. H. Dörries et al. *Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, 149-50.

within it. In this situation the dichotomy between the subject of the beautiful vision and the object of the beautiful vision can be easily overcome.

A Hesychast in his transformational vision intends to resemble Christ in the Transfiguration. He focuses his physical and intellectual gaze not on the outside but on the inside, upon his heart, "where all the powers of the soul reside," waiting patiently that the interior power of Christ will lighten him as a lamp, so he can "become the same which Christ himself is." Divine glory here, just as in the *Kabod* tradition, is still confined within the anthropomorphic form, but there is a substantial difference--this human form is now the visionary himself, who imitates Christ's transfiguration, whose inner glory pours out exteriorly upon the body.

Vested with Adam's Glory: Moses as the Luminous Counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Macarian Homilies

Two Luminaries

In the group of the Dead Sea Scrolls fragments known under the title the *Words of the Luminaries* (4Q504),¹ the following passage about the glory of Adam in the Garden of Eden can be found:

...[... Adam,] our [fat]her, you fashioned in the image of [your] glory ([äë] āāë úā āá äúøöé [...] [...] the breath of life] you [b]lew into his nostril, and intelligence and knowledge [...] [...] in the gard]en of Eden, which you had planted. You made [him] govern [...] [...] and so that he would walk in a glorious land... [...] [...] he kept. And you imposed on him not to tu[rn away...] [...] he is flesh, and to dust [...] ...²

Later in 4Q504, this tradition about Adam's former glory follows with a reference to the luminosity bestowed on another human body--the glorious face of Moses at his encounter with the Lord at Sinai:

¹ On the *Words of Luminaries*, see: M. Baillet, Un recueil liturgique de Qumrân, grotte 4; 'Les Paroles des Luminaires' // *Revue biblique* 67 (1961) 195-250; IDEM, Remarques sur l'édition des Paroles des Luminaires // *RevQ* 5 (1964) 23-42; IDEM, Qumran Grotte 4 III (4Q482-520) (DJD, 7; Oxford, 1982); E. Glickler Chazon, "Words of the Luminaries" (4QDibHam): A Liturgical Document from Qumran and Its Implications (Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1991); IDEM, 4QDibHam: Liturgy or Literature? // *RevQ* 15 (1991-2) 447-55; IDEM, 'Dibre Hammêorot'; Prayer for the Sixth Day (4Q504 1-2 v-vi) // *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine: A Critical Anthology* (eds. M. Kiley *et al.*; London, 1997) 23-27; C.A. Evans, Aspect of Exile and Restoration in the Proclamation of Jesus and the Gospels // *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish and Christian Concepts* (ed. J.M. Scott; Leiden, 1997) (JSJSup., 56) 308-09; D. Falk, Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls (Leiden, 1988) (STDJ, 27) 59-94; F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden-New York-Köln, 1997) 2.1008-1019; K.G. Kuhn, Nachträge zur Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten // *RevQ* 4 (1963) 163-234; B. Nitzan, Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry (Leiden, 1994) (STDJ, 12); D.T. Olson, Words of the Lights (4Q504-4Q506) // *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translation. Vol. 4A: Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers* (eds. J.H. Charlesworth and H.W.L. Rietz; Tübingen/Louisville, KY, 1997) 107-53; É. Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la Vie Future* (2 vols.; Paris, 1993) 2.563-568.

² F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln, 1997) 2.1008-1009.

...[...Re]member, please, that all of us are your people. You have lifted us wonderfully [upon the wings of] eagles and you have brought us to you. And like the eagle which watches its nest, circles [over its chicks,] stretches its wings, takes one and carries it upon [its pinions] [...] we remain aloof and one does not count us among the nations. And [...] [...] You are in our midst, in the column of fire and in the cloud [...] [...] your [hol]y [...] walks in front of us, *and your glory is in [our] midst* (אֲנִי עִמָּךְ וְכָבוֹדְךָ בְּתוֹכָנוּ) [...] [...] *the face of Moses* (פְּנֵי מֹשֶׁה), [your] serv[ant]...³

Two details are intriguing in these descriptions. First, the author of 4Q504 appears to be familiar with the lore about the glorious garments of Adam, the tradition according to which first humans had luminous attires in Eden before their transgression.

Second, the author seems to draw parallels between the glory of Adam and the glory of Moses' face.⁴ The luminous face of the prophet might represent in this text an alternative to the lost luminosity of Adam and serve as a new symbol of God's glory once again manifested in the human body. It appears, therefore, that in 4Q504, traditions about Adam's glory and Moses' glory are creatively juxtaposed with each other. Unfortunately, the fragmentary character of the Qumran document does not allow to grasp the full scope and intentions of the author(s) of 4Q504 in making such juxtaposition. To understand this juxtaposition better, research must proceed to other sources where the association between the glory of Adam and Moses was made more explicit. One of such sources includes the Macarian Homilies, where the author vividly accentuates this association. However, before our research proceeds to a detailed analysis of the Adam/Moses

³ F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2.1008-1009.

⁴ On Moses traditions, see: R. Bloch, *Die Gestalt des Moses in der rabbinischen Tradition // Moses in Schrift und Überlieferung* (Düsseldorf, 1963) 95-171; G.W. Coats, *Moses: Heroic Man, Man of God* (Sheffield, 1988) (JSOTSup., 57); *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys* (eds. J.J. Collins, M. Fishbane; Albany, 1995); C. N. T. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (Tübingen, 1997); J. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism* (Tübingen, 1985) 90-94; IDEM, *The Image of the Invisible God* (Göttingen, 1995) (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus, 30); S.J. Hafemann, *Moses in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Survey // Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 7 (1990) 79-104; P.W. van der Horst, *Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist // Journal of Jewish Studies* 34 (1983) 21-29; H. Jacobsen, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel* (Cambridge, 1983); W.A. Meeks, *Moses as God and King // Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (ed. Jacob Neusner; Leiden, 1968); IDEM, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (Leiden, 1967); A. Orlov, *Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition // Seminar Papers* 39, Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting 2000 (Atlanta, 2000) 130-147; A. Schalit, *Untersuchungen zur Assumptio Mosis* (Leiden, 1989); J.P. Schultz, *Angelic Opposition to the Ascension of Moses and the Revelation of the Law // Jewish Quarterly Review* 61 (1970-71) 282-307; J. Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary* (Leiden, 1993).

connection in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Macarian homilies, a short introduction to the Jewish, Samaritan, and Christian materials about the glorious garments of Adam and the glorious face of Moses is needed.

The Background: The Garments of Light

The Biblical passages found in Gen 1:26-27 and Gen 3:21 represent two pivotal starting points for the subsequent Jewish and Christian reflections on the glorious garments of Adam and Eve. Gen 1:26 describes the creation of human being(s) after the likeness (úã ā) of the image (í ì ö) of God. It is noteworthy that Gen 1:26-27 refers to the í ì ö (*tselem*) of Adam, the luminous image of God's glory according to which Adam was created.⁵ The particular interest in Gen 1:26 is that Adam's *tselem* was created after God's own *tselem* (ã ì öá) (literally "in our *tselem*"), being a luminous "imitation" of the glorious *tselem* of God. Some scholars argue that the likeness that Adam and God shared was not physicality--in the usual sense of having a body--but rather luminescence.⁶

The Targums, the Aramaic renderings of the Hebrew Bible, also attest to the prelapsarian luminosity of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. The Biblical background for such traditions includes the passage from Gen 3:21, where "the Lord God made for Adam and his wife garments of skin and clothed them." The Targumic traditions, both Palestinian⁷ and Babylonian,⁸

⁵ For discussions about the luminous garment/image/body of Adam, see: David H. Aaron, *Shedding Light on God's Body in Rabbinic Midrashim: Reflections on the Theory of a Luminous Adam* // *Harvard Theological Review* 90 (1997) 299-314; S. Brock, *Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition* // *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter* (Regensburg, 1982) (Eichstätter Beiträge 4) 11-40; A.D. De Conick and J. Fossum, *Stripped before God: A New Interpretation of Logion 37 in the Gospel of Thomas* // *VC* 45 (1991) 141; A. D. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (Leiden, 1996) (SVC, 33); L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.: Philadelphia, 1955) 5.97; Alon Goshen Gottstein, *The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature* // *Harvard Theological Review* 87 (1994) 171-95; B. Murelstein, *Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre* // *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 35 (1928) 255; W. Staerk, *Die Erlösererwartung in den östlichen Religionen* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1938) 11.

⁶ David Aaron, *Shedding Light on God's Body*, 303.

⁷ In Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Gen 3:21 the following tradition can be found: "And the Lord God made garments of glory for Adam and for his wife from the skin which the serpent had cast off (to be worn) on the skin of their (garments of) fingernails of which they had been stripped, and he clothed them." Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis (tr. M. Maher, M.S.C.; Collegeville, 1992) (The Aramaic Bible, 1B) 29. Targum Neofiti on Gen 3:21 unveils the similar tradition: "And the Lord God made for Adam and for his wife *garments of glory* (ø÷ãã ā ìûãì), for the skin of their flesh, and he clothed them." Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis (tr. M. McNamara, M.S.C.; Collegeville, 1992) (The Aramaic

read, instead of "garments of skin," "garments of glory." This Targumic interpretation is reinforced by Rabbinic sources. One of them can be found in *Genesis Rabbah* 20:12, which tells that the scroll of Rabbi Meir reads "garments of light" (ⲟⲩⲁⲩ ⲓⲁⲩⲓⲉ) instead of "garments of skin" (ⲟⲩⲁⲩ ⲓⲁⲩⲓⲉ): "In R. Meir's Torah it was found written, 'Garments of light: this refers to Adam's garments, which were like a torch [shedding radiance], broad at the bottom and narrow at the top.'"⁹

It is usually understood that Gen 3:21 refers to God's clothing Adam and Eve's nakedness *after the Fall*. S. Brock, however, argues that sufficient evidence exist to suggest that there also was another way of understanding the time reference of Gen 3:21. According to this alternative understanding the verbs are to be taken as pluperfects, referring to the status of Adam and Eve at their creation *before the Fall*.¹⁰

It is noteworthy that in the later Jewish and Samaritan sources, the story about Adam's luminous garments is often mentioned in conjunction with Moses' story. In these materials, Moses is often depicted as a luminous counterpart of Adam.

Jarl Fossum and April De Conick successfully demonstrated the importance of the Samaritan materials for understanding the connection between the "glories" of Adam and Moses. The Samaritan texts insist that when Moses ascended to Mount Sinai, he received the image of God which Adam cast off in the Garden of Eden.¹¹ According to *Memar Marqa*, Moses was endowed with the identical glorious body as Adam.¹² *Memar Marqa* 5.4

Bible: 1A) 62-63; A. Díez Macho, *Neophiti 1: Targum Palestinense MS de la Biblioteca Vaticana* (Madrid-Barcelona, 1968) 1.19. The Fragmentary Targum on Gen 3:21 also uses the imagery of the glorious garments: "And He made: And the memra of the Lord God created for Adam and his wife *precious garments* (ⲟⲩⲁⲩ ⲓⲁⲩⲓⲉ) [for] the skin of their flesh, and He clothed them." M.I. Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch according to Their Extant Sources* (2 vols.; Rome, 1980) (AB, 76) I.46; II.7.

⁸Targum Onqelos on Gen 3:21 reads: "And the Lord God made for Adam and his wife *garments of honor for the skin of their flesh* (ⲓⲁⲩⲓⲉ ⲟⲩⲁⲩ ⲓⲁⲩⲓⲉ), and He clothed them." *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis* (tr. B. Grossfeld; Wilmington, 1988) (*The Aramaic Bible*, 6) 46; *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts* (ed. A. Sperber; Leiden, 1959) I.5.

⁹ Cf. H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London, 1939) 1. 171.

¹⁰ S. Brock, *Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition*, 14.

¹¹J. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism* (Tübingen, 1985) 93; A. D. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas*, 159.

¹² Fossum, *The Name of God*, 94.

tells that: "He [Moses] was vested with the form which Adam cast off in the Garden of Eden; and his face shone up to the day of his death."¹³

The Adam/Moses connection also looms large in the Rabbinic sources. Alon Goshen Gottstein stresses that "the luminescent quality of the image (*tselem*) is the basis for comparison between Moses and Adam in several rabbinical materials."¹⁴

Deuteronomy Rabbah 11.3 offers important witness to the Adam/Moses connection. It includes the following passage in which two "luminaries" argue whose glory is the greatest:

Adam said to Moses: "I am greater than you because I have been created in the image of God." Whence this? For it is said, "and God created man in his own image" (Gen. 1,27). Moses replied to him: "I am far superior to you, for the honor which was given to you has been taken away from you, as it is said: but man (Adam) abideth not in honor, (Ps. XLIX, 13) but as for me, the radiant countenance which God gave me still remains with me." Whence? For it is said: "his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated" (Deut. 34,7).¹⁵

Goshen Gottstein draws attention to another significant midrashic passage from *Midrash Tadshe* 4, in which Moses poses Adam's luminous counterpart. The tradition tells that

...in the likeness of the creation of the world the Holy One blessed be he performed miracles for Israel when they came out of Egypt... In the beginning: "and God created man in his image," and in the desert: "and Moshe knew not that the skin of his face shone."¹⁶

It is also remarkable that later Rabbinic materials often speak of the *luminosity of Adam's face*,¹⁷ the feature that might point to the influence of the Adam-Moses connection. Thus, as an example, in *Leviticus Rabbah* 20.2, the following passage can be found:

Resh Lakish, in the name of R. Simeon the son of Menasya, said: The apple of Adam's heel outshone the globe of the sun; how much more so the *brightness of his face*! Nor need you wonder. In the ordinary way if a person makes salvers, one for himself and one for his household, whose will he make more beautiful? Not his own? Similarly, Adam was created for the service of the Holy One, blessed be He, and the globe of the sun for the service of mankind.¹⁸

¹³ J. Macdonald, *Memar Marqah. The Teaching of Marqah* (Berlin, 1963) (BZAW, 83) 209.

¹⁴ Alon Goshen Gottstein, *The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature*, 182.

¹⁵ H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London, 1939) 7.173.

¹⁶ Cf. Adolph Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrash* (6 vols.; Jerusalem, 1967) 3. 168.

¹⁷ According to Jewish sources, the image of God was reflected especially in the radiance of Adam's face. See: Fossum, *The Name of God*, 94; J. Jervell, *Imago Dei* (Göttingen, 1960) (FRLANT, 76) 45.

¹⁸ H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London, 1939) 4.252.

Genesis Rabbah 11 also focuses, not on Adam's luminous garments, but rather on his glorious face:

Adam's glory did not abide the night with him. What is the proof? But Adam passeth not the night in glory (Ps. XLIX, 13). The Rabbis maintain: His glory abode with him, but at the termination of the Sabbath He deprived him of his splendor and expelled him from the Garden of Eden, as it is written, Thou changest *his countenance*, and sendest him away (Job XIV, 20).¹⁹

Despite the importance of these late Rabbinic passages linking the luminosity of Adam's body and Moses' face, the chronological boundaries of these evidences are difficult to establish. Rabbinic attestations to the Adam/Moses connection are also very succinct and sometimes lack any systematic development.

Much more extensive expositions of the traditions about Moses as the heavenly counterpart of Adam can be found in the writings of the fourth century Christian author, the Syrian father, known to us as Pseudo-Macarius.

Adam and Moses in the Macarian Homilies

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of Adam/Moses "glory" typologies for the theological enterprise of the Macarian Homilies.²⁰ The symbolism of the divine light seems to stay at the center of the theological world of the Syrian father.²¹ Adam's luminosity in the Garden and Christ's luminosity at Mount Tabor serve for Pseudo-Macarius as important landmarks of the eschatological *Urzeit* and *Endzeit*. In dealing with these stories of the fall and the restoration of the divine light in human nature,

¹⁹ H. Freedman and M. Simon (tr.), *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London, 1939) 1.81.

²⁰ This feature of the Macarian Homilies serves as additional proof of the close relationship between Pseudo-Macarius and the various Syriac developments in which the theme of Adam's garments plays an important theological role. S. Brock notes the extensive usage of the "clothing" metaphors in the Syriac tradition. He shows that this imagery is closely connected with Adam Christology: "...the first Adam loses the robe of glory at the Fall; the second Adam puts on the body of the first Adam in order to restore the robe of glory..." S. Brock, *Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition*, 16.

²¹ The traditions about the glorious garments of Adam and Eve were widespread in the Syriac sources. [For a detailed discussion of this subject, see: A. D. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas*, 157-172; S. Brock, *Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition*, 11-38]. It is possible that the early Syrian authors gained access to such traditions through their familiarity with the Targums, the Aramaic renderings of the Hebrew Bible. The Macarian Homilies, which were connected with the Syrian milieu, demonstrate that their author was exposed to a great variety of the Jewish and Christian traditions about the luminous garments of the first humans.

Macarian writings also employ another important traditional symbol of the manifestation of the divine glory in humans--Moses' luminous face. In his employment of the Adam/Moses connection, the author of the Macarian Homilies reveals profound knowledge of the Jewish and Christian esoteric traditions about the glorious manifestations of Adam and Moses.

The story of Adam serves for the homilist as the starting point of his theology of the divine light. Thus, from the homily II.12²² the reader learns that "Adam, when he transgressed the commandment, lost two things. First, he lost the pure possession of his nature, so lovely, created according to the image and likeness of God (κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ). Second, he lost the very image itself (αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα) in which was laid up for him, according to God's promise, the full heavenly inheritance"(II.12.1).²³ Further, another important passage in the same homily informs the reader that Adam and Eve before the Fall were clothed (ἐνδεδυμένοι) with God's glory in place of clothing (II.12.8).²⁴ The homily shows a certain continuity between Adam's "very image itself" and his glorious clothing. An important detail in the narrative is that the homilist makes a distinction between Adam's nature, created after the image and likeness of God, and Adam's "very image itself;" he speaks of them as of two separate entities which were lost during the Fall. This subtle theological distinction shows the author's familiarity with the Jewish aggadic traditions about the *tselem* of Adam--the luminous image of God's glory according to which the first human being was created. The Macarian association of Adam's garments and his creation after the luminous image of God points us again to the Qumran passage from 4Q504, where Adam is depicted as the one who was "fashioned" in the image of God's glory. It should be noted that besides this reference to "image," both texts entertain several other parallels that reveal similarities between the Adamic story in the Macarian Homilies and the Adamic traditions at Qumran.

²² There are four Byzantine medieval collections of Macarian Homilies. Three of them appeared in critical editions. Collection I was published in Makarios/Simeon: Reden und Briefe. Die Sammlung I des Vaticanus Graecus 694 (B) (2 vols.; ed. H. Berthold, Berlin, 1973). Collection II appeared in H. Dörries, E. Klostermann, and M. Kroeger, Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios (Berlin, 1964) (PTS, 4). Collection III appeared in Neue Homilien des Makarios/Simeon aus Typus III (eds. E. Klostermann and H. Berthold; Berlin, 1961) (TU, 72) and Pseudo-Macaire. Oeuvres spirituelles. Vol. I: Homelies propres a la Collection III (ed. V. Desprez; Paris, 1980) (SC, 275). In references to the Macarian homilies, the first uppercase Roman numeral will designate a Collection, and the following Arabic numerals will designate a specific homily and its subsections.

²³ Pseudo-Macarius, The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter (tr. G.A. Maloney, S.J.; New York, 1992) 97. H. Dörries *et al.*, Die 50 Geistlichen Homilien des Makarios (Berlin, 1964) (PTS, 4) 107-8.

²⁴ Pseudo-Macarius, The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter, 100.

First, the Qumran Adamic account in 4Q504 8 is distinctive in that it connects Adam's glorious state²⁵ with his ability to exercise dominion²⁶ over the rest of creation. 4Q504 8 reads:

... [... Adam,] our [fat]her, you fashioned in the image of [your] glory ... You made [him] govern [...] [...] and so that he would walk in a glorious land...²⁷

Macarian writings also employ the same juxtaposition by linking Adam's glory with his capacity to exercise power over the created order by giving names to various things.²⁸ The Homily II.12.6 tells that:

...As long as the Word of God was with him, he [Adam] possessed everything. For the Word himself was his inheritance, his covering, and a glory that was his defense (Is 4:5). He was his teaching. For he taught him how to give names to all things: "Give this name of heaven, that the sun; this the moon; that earth; this a bird; that a beast; that a tree." As he was instructed, so he named them.²⁹

A second important detail that connects the Adamic tradition at Qumran with Macarian writings is that the luminous image (*tselem*) of Adam in the Macarian Homilies is termed as "the full heavenly inheritance."³⁰ In II.12.1, it is also associated with a very valuable estate:

...he lost the very image itself in which was laid up for him, according to God's promise, the full heavenly inheritance (*κληρονομία*). Take the example of a coin bearing the image of the king. If it were mixed with a false alloy and lost its gold content, the image also would lose its value. Such, indeed, happened to Adam. A very great richness and inheritance was prepared for him. It was as though there were a large estate and it possessed many sources of income. It had a fruitful vineyard; there were fertile fields, flocks, gold and silver. Such was the vessel of Adam before his disobedience like a very valuable estate.³¹

The terminology found in this Macarian passage seems allude to the Qumran Adamic materials, which also refer to Adam's "inheritance." Thus, the Qumran Peshar on Psalms (4Q171) contains a reference to the inheritance of Adam (í ã à ù ì ç ð) which the Israelites will have in the future:

²⁵ Cf. 2 Enoch 30:11-12 (the longer recension): "And on the earth I assigned him to be a second angel, honored and great and glorious. And I assigned him to be a king, to reign on the earth, and to have my wisdom." F. Andersen, 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch // The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York, 1985 [1983]) 1.152.

²⁶ E. Glickler Chazon, The Creation and Fall of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls // The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation. A Collection of Essays (eds. J. Frishman and L. Van Rompay; Lovain, 1997) (Traditio Exegetica Graeca, 5) 15.

²⁷ F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln, 1997) 2.1009.

²⁸ Cf. also Gen 1:26.

²⁹ Pseudo-Macarius, The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter, 99.

³⁰ Pseudo-Macarius, The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter, 97.

³¹ Pseudo-Macarius, The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter, 97.

...those who have returned from the wilderness, who will live for a thousand generations, in salva[tio]n; for them there is all the inheritance of Adam (í ā à ú ì ç ð), and for their descendants for ever...³²

In previous studies, scholars³³ noted that this passage from 4Q171 seems to refer to an eschatological period characterized in part by a reversal of the Adamic curse and the restoration of the glory³⁴ of Adam.³⁵

It is important to note that the Macarian passage links the *inheritance* with the large estate which includes a *vineyard*. The reference to the vineyard is intriguing since in 4Q171 the term, the "inheritance" of Adam, is closely associated with the Temple³⁶ and the Temple mountain.³⁷

The foregoing analysis shows that the theme of Adam's heavenly garments plays an important role in the theological universe of the Macarian Homilies. The homilist, however, does not follow blindly these ancient traditions, but, incorporates them into the fabric of the Christian story. The Adamic narrative, therefore, represents an essential part of the Macarian "glory" Christology, where the lost luminous garment of the First Adam has to be restored by the glory of the Second Adam, Christ. The Second Adam thus must put on the body of the first Adam in order to restore the lost clothes of the divine light, which now has to be acquired by the believers at their resurrection.

However, in Macarian writings this "glory" Christology is not simply confined to the Adam-Christ dichotomy but includes a third important element, namely, the story of Moses, whose glorious face serves as the *prototype* for the future glory of Christ at the Transfiguration.³⁸ The radiance of the patriarch's face remains in the Macarian Homilies to be the mediator between the former glory of Adam lost in the Paradise and the

³² 4Q171 3:1-2. F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.345.

³³ M.O. Wise, *4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam // RevQ 15* (1991-92) 128.

³⁴ Cf. *CD* 3:20 "Those who remain steadfast in it will acquire eternal life, and all the glory of Adam (í ā à ā ā ä è ì è ä) is for them." F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.555.

³⁵ M. Wise observes that this description in 4Q171 "jibes completely with the concept of í ā à ā ā ä è in *CD*." M.O. Wise, *4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam // RevQ 15* (1991-92) 128.

³⁶ On the identification of Eden with the Sanctuary, see: G.J. Brooke, *Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community // Gemeinde ohne Tempel/Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (Tübingen, 1999) 285-299

³⁷ 4Q171 3:11 "...they will inherit the high mountain of Isra[el and] delight [in his] holy [mou]ntain." F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.345.

³⁸ Here again Macarius draws on the established Christian tradition which can be traced to Pauline writings (esp. 2 Cor 3), where the glory of Moses and the glory of Christ are interconnected.

future glory of Christ, which will eventually be manifested in the resurrected bodies of the saints. Thus, in the Homily II.5.10-11, Macarius tells about the Moses glorious face as the prototype of the future glory:

...For the blessed Moses provided us with a *certain type* (τὸν τύπον) through the glory of the Spirit which covered his countenance upon which no one could look with steadfast gaze. This type anticipates how in the resurrection of the just the body of the saints will be glorified with a glory which even now the souls of the saintly and faithful people are deemed worthy to possess within, in the indwelling of the inner man...³⁹

In his presentation of the shining appearance of Moses, the homilist, however, makes a clear distinction between the glory of Moses at Sinai and the glory of Christ at the Transfiguration. Moses' glory is only a "prototype" of God's "true" glory. Macarius' understanding of Moses' glory as the *prototype* (τύπος) or the *figure* of the "true glory" is observable, for example, in the Homily II.47.1:

...The glory of Moses which he received on his countenance was a *figure of the true glory* (τύπος ἦν τῆς ἀληθινῆς δόξης). Just as the Jews were unable "to look steadfastly upon the face of Moses" (2 Cor 3:7), so now Christians receive that glory of light in their souls, and the darkness, not bearing the splendor of the light, is blinded and is put to fight.⁴⁰

Another feature of Moses' glorification is that Moses' luminous face was only "covered" with God's glory in the same way as the luminous garments covered the body of the first humans. According to Macarius, Moses' luminosity was not able to penetrate human nature and remove the inner garments of darkness bestowed by the devil on the human heart.⁴¹ In II.32.4, the Syrian father affirms that:

³⁹ Pseudo-Macarius, The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter, 74; Dörries, 62. The Homily II.5.11 repeats the same idea again: "In a double way, therefore, the blessed Moses shows us what glory true Christians will receive in the resurrection: namely, the glory of light and the spiritual delights of Spirit which even now they are deemed worthy to possess interiorly." Pseudo-Macarius, The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter, 74.

⁴⁰ Homily II.47.1. Pseudo-Macarius, The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter, 232; Dörries, 304.

⁴¹ The Macarian motif of the garments of darkness bestowed by Satan on the first humans brings us to the connection between the Macarian Homilies and the Targumic traditions. It has been mentioned previously that the Syrian authors might have acquired their knowledge of the Jewish aggadic traditions about the luminosity of the garments of Adam and Eve via their familiarity with the Targumic texts. Some features of Adam's story found in the Macarian Homilies point in this direction. For example, the Homily II.1.7 tells that when "... Adam violated the command of God and obeyed the deceitful serpent he sold himself to the devil and that evil one put on Adam's soul as his garment - that most beautiful creature that God had fashioned according to his own image..." [Pseudo-Macarius, The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter, 41]. This motif of Adam being clothed with the evil one as his garment seems to allude to the Targumic

...Moses, having been clothed in the flesh, was unable to enter into the heart and take away the sordid garments of darkness.⁴²

For Macarius, only the glory of Christ is able to remove the attire of darkness and "heal" the human heart. It is, therefore, observable that for the Syrian father the glory of Moses shows a greater typological affinity to the glory of Adam⁴³ than to the glory of Christ.

A decisive feature of the Macarian Homilies is that the homilist often emphasizes the connection between the luminosity of Adam's heavenly attire lost in the Paradise and the luminosity of Moses' face acquired on Mount Sinai. In the Macarian Homilies, the motif of Moses' glorious face seems to serve as a sign of the partial restoration of the former glory of Adam,⁴⁴ the glorious garment of light in which Adam and Eve were clothed in the Garden of Eden before their transgression. Moses' glorious face is, therefore, viewed by the homilist as the counterpart of the glorious garment of Adam. The conflation of the two "glories," lost and acquired, is observable, for instance, in the Homily II.12. After the already mentioned

tradition which attests to the fact that God made garments for Adam and Eve from the skin which the serpent had cast off. The Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Gen 3:21 tells that: "And the Lord God made garments of glory for Adam and for his wife from the skin which the serpent had cast off (to be worn) on the skin of their (garments of) fingernails of which they had been stripped, and he clothed them." [Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis (tr. M. Maher, M.S.C.; Colledgeville, 1992) (The Aramaic Bible, 1B) 29]. It seems, however, that the author of the Macarian Homilies substantially edits this Targumic tradition. In the Macarian Homilies, the garments of the devil become the attire of darkness in contrast to the Palestinian Targum, where they are depicted as the garments of light. On the garments of darkness, cf. also the Homily II.30.7: "In that day when Adam fell, God came walking in the garden. He wept, so to speak, seeing Adam and he said: 'After such good things, what evils you have chosen! After such glory, what shame you now bear! What darkness are you now! What ugly form you are! What corruption! From such light, what darkness has covered you!' When Adam fell and was dead in the eyes of God, the Creator wept over him. The angels, all the powers, the heavens, the earth and all creatures bewailed his death and fall. For they saw him, who had been given to them as their king, now become a servant of an opposing and evil power. Therefore, darkness became the garment of his soul, a bitter and evil darkness, for he was made a subject of the prince of darkness." Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 192-93.

⁴²Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 198.

⁴³ Cf. the Homily I.2.3.14: "I think that the glorified face of Moses was a type (τύπος) and teaching of the first Adam, formed by the hands of God, which death saw and was wounded by it, not being able to look on it, and fearing that its kingdom would be dissolved and destroyed--which, with the Lord, did in fact occur." Alexander Golitzin, *The Macarian Homilies from Collection I*, 3 (forthcoming); Makarios/Simeon: *Reden und Briefe. Die Sammlung I des Vaticanus Graecus 694 (B) (2 vols.; ed. H. Berthold, Berlin, 1973) 1.9*. I am thankful to Father Alexander Golitzin for letting me use here his forthcoming English translation of the Macarian Homilies from Collection I.

⁴⁴ Cf. the Homily I.2.3.14 "Now, I think that when the enemy saw the original glory of Adam on the face of Moses, he was wounded because [he understood that] his kingdom was going to be taken away." Alexander Golitzin, *The Macarian Homilies from Collection I*, 3 (forthcoming).

Adamic narrative of Homily II.12, which tells how Adam lost his luminous status and "obeyed his darker side," Macarius sets before the reader the example of Moses as the one who "had a glory shining on his countenance."⁴⁵

The Healing Motif

The employment of Adam/Moses connection in the Qumran materials does not seem to be confined solely to 4Q504. There is another important document which appears to entertain a similar connection. In the Qumran fragment 4Q374, also known as the *Discourse on the Exodus/Conquest Tradition*,⁴⁶ the portentous clause can be found which connects Moses' shining countenance⁴⁷ at the Sinai encounter⁴⁸ with the motif of healing. The passage unveils the following tradition: "[But] he (Moses) had pity with [...] and when he let his face shine for them *for healing* (à ôôî ì), they strengthened [their] hearts again...."⁴⁹

In this passage, as in 4Q504, God's glory is described to be manifested through Moses' shining face. It appears that the passage is related to the ongoing discussion about the luminosity of Moses and Adam. Here again, as in the case of 4Q504, the evidence found in the Macarian Homilies helps to clarify the possible connection.

⁴⁵ "...Indeed, the Word of God was his food and he had a glory shining on his countenance. All this, which happened to him, was a figure of something else. For that glory now shines splendidly from within the hearts of Christians. At the resurrection their bodies, as they rise, will be covered (σχεπέζετα) with another vesture, one that is divine, and they will be nourished with a heavenly food." (II.12.14).

Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 102; Dörries, 114.

⁴⁶ On 4Q374, see: C. Fletcher-Louis, 4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christianity // *Dead Sea Discoveries* 3 (1996) 236-252; C.A. Newsom, 4Q374: A Discourse on the Exodus/Conquest Tradition // *The Dead Sea Scroll: Forty Years of Research* (eds. D. Dimant, and U. Rappaport; Leiden, 1992) (STDJ, 10) 40-52. On Moses pseudepigrapha in the DSS, see: J. Strugnell, *Moses-Pseudepigrapha at Qumran: 4Q375, 4Q376, and Similar Works* // *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L.H. Schiffman, Sheffield, 1990) (JSPSS, 8) 221-256.

⁴⁷ On the luminosity of the Moses face, see: M. Haran, *The Shining of Moses's Face: A Case Study in Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Iconography* [Ex 34:29-35; Ps 69:32; Hab 3:4] // *In the Shelter of Elyon* (JSOP, 31; Sheffield, 1984) 159-73; W. Propp, *The Skin of Moses' Face - Transfigured or Disfigured?* // *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1987) 375-386.

⁴⁸ Crispin Fletcher-Louis rightly observes that there is ample evidence that the passage from 4Q374 was concerned with the revelation at Sinai. Cf. C. Fletcher-Louis, 4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christianity, 238.

⁴⁹ F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2.740-741.

The Homily II.20 describes Christ as the true physician of human nature who can heal the human soul and adorn it with the *garments* of his grace. It is evident that the theme of healing is interwoven in the homily with the motif of the luminous garments. In unfolding this theme, the homilist, first, retells the Gospel story about the woman who was *cured* of the blood flow by touching of the *garment* of the Lord, and connects the motif of healing with the theme of the garments:

...and again just as the woman afflicted with an issue of blood believed truly and touched the hem of the garment of the Lord and immediately received a healing and the flow of the unclean fountain of blood dried up...⁵⁰

Following the story of the healed woman, Macarius proceeds to the examples of Adam and Moses. It is not a coincidence that in this homily, as in 4Q504, Moses' name is mentioned in connection with the theme of healing. From the homily II.20.6, we learn that "indeed, Moses came, but he was unable to bring a perfect healing (ἀλλ' οὐκ ἠδυνήθη ἴασιν παντελῆ δοῦναι)."⁵¹ The conflation of Moses' figure with the healing motif in the Macarian Homilies is intriguing since it might indicate that the author of the Homilies draws on the traditions similar to those that can be found in 4Q374.⁵²

The affinities between the healing motif found in the Macarian Homilies and in 4Q374 include another important feature. Both texts interpret *healing* to be the *healing of the human heart*. The Qumran material speaks that after the healing through Moses' shining countenance the *hearts* of the Israelites were "strengthened" again.⁵³

The Homily II.20.7 also links the motif of healing with the theme of the curing (or cleansing) of the human heart. It tells that "man could be healed only by the help of this medicine and thus could attain life by a cleansing of his heart by the Holy Spirit."⁵⁴

⁵⁰Pseudo-Macarius, The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter, 151.

⁵¹ Pseudo-Macarius, The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter, 151. Dörries, 190.

⁵² Cf. also the Homily I.2.12.7-9: "...the devil, by means of a tree and serpent, used jealousy and trickery to deceive Adam and Eve, and arranged [for them] to be thrown out of Paradise, and brought them down from their purity and glory to bitter passions and death, and subsequently, having received from them the whole human race [to be] under his power, cased [it] to stray into every sin and defiling passion... by his inexpressible wisdom, God, making provisions for humanity, send forth Moses the healer to redeem the People through the wood of his staff...therefore half of piety was set aright through Moses, and half of the passions *healed* (ἰάθη) ..." Alexander Golitzin, The Macarian Homilies from Collection I, 9 (forthcoming); Makarios/Simeon: Reden und Briefe. Die Sammlung I des Vaticanus Graecus 694 (B) (2 vols.; ed. H. Berthold, Berlin, 1973) 1.24.

⁵³ F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition, 2.741.

⁵⁴ Pseudo-Macarius, The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter, 152.

It seems that in both excerpts (4Q374 and Macarian), the luminosity of Moses' face plays an important role. Although the Macarian passage does not directly refer to the shining face of Moses, the context of the passage, which deals with the garments of the Lord, indicates that in the Macarian Homilies the motif of "healing" is understood as the restoration of the former Adamic glory, the glorious garments with which the first humans were clothed in Eden before their transgression. The author of the Homilies seems to view Moses' shining face as an important step in the process of the recovery of the former divine glory once manifested in humans during their life in Paradise. According to the homilist, the glory would be restored in humanity only later, in the event of the incarnation of Christ, which brings "perfect healing" to the wretched human nature. In this context, Moses' shining face appears to be an important, even if not a "final," step in the process of healing of human nature.⁵⁵

An additional detail that connects Moses with Adam is that the homilist understands Adam's deprivation of the luminosity as the *wound* which requires healing.⁵⁶ In II.20.1 and 20. 4-5, Macarius links the loss of the external luminous attire by Adam with the internal wound. The homilist tells that the human being who...

...is naked and *lacks the divine and heavenly garment*...is covered with the great shame of evil affections... since ... the enemy, when Adam fell, used such cunning and diligence that he wounded and *darkened the interior man*... man was, therefore, so wounded that no one else could cure him...⁵⁷

Despite the extensive "usage" of the Moses typology in the Macarian discussion of the Adamic "wound," the whole purpose of this employment

⁵⁵ It is noteworthy that Macarius again follows here the established tradition which connects the glory of Moses and the glory of Christ. The beginning of such a tradition can be found in 2 Cor 3:7-4:6. See: J.A. Fitzmyer, S.J., *Glory Reflected on the Face of Christ* (2 Cor 3:7-4:6) and a Palestinian Jewish Motif // *JTS* 42 (1981) 630-644; A. Orlov and A. Golitzin, *Many Lamps are Lightened from the One: Paradigms of the Transformation Vision in the Macarian Homilies // Vigiliae Christianae* 55 (2002) forthcoming. The Synoptic accounts of Christ's transfiguration seem to be also influenced by the Moses typology. Several details in the accounts serve as important reminders of Mosaic tradition(s): the vision took place on a mountain, the presence of Moses, a bright cloud that enveloped the visionaries, a voice which came out of the cloud, and the shining face of Christ. On Moses typology in the Synoptic accounts of the Transfiguration, see: J.A. McGuckin, *The Transfiguration of Christ in Scripture and Tradition* (Lewiston, 1986) (*Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity*, 9) 1-19; J. Markus, *The Way of the Lord* (Louisville, 1992) 80-93; M.E. Thrall, *Elijah and Moses in Mark's Account of the Transfiguration* // *NTS* 16 (1969-70) 305-17.

⁵⁶ It should be noted that despite the fact that the motif of Adam's luminous clothing is widespread in Aramaic and Syriac milieu, the conflation of this theme with the imagery of healing seem unique. See S. Brock, *Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition*, 11-40.

⁵⁷ Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 151.

remains Christological. Here again Macarius uses Mosaic traditions as the mediative tool for his glory Christology.

The Homily II.20 recounts that Moses' "healing" was incomplete in comparison with the healing of Christ, since it was "external" and unable to heal the inner wound inflicted by Satan at the Fall. In II.32.4, Macarius sums up the Mosaic argument by telling that:

...Moses, having been clothed in the flesh, was unable to enter into the heart and take away the sordid garments of darkness.⁵⁸

Although Macarius tries to diminish the significance of Moses' shining face in the process of healing the human heart, he still seems to draw heavily on the Jewish traditions similar to *4Q374*, where Moses is depicted as the healer of the darkened human nature.⁵⁹

Conclusion

It should be noted in conclusion that the examination of the Adam-Moses connection in the Macarian Homilies and in the Qumran fragments might be mutually beneficial for a better understanding of both textual corpora.

First, the evidences to Adamic and Mosaic accounts found in the Macarian writings can extend the possible scope of the traditions which were preserved in the Dead Sea Scrolls materials in a very fragmentary form. In the light of the Macarian evidence, which provided an additional context for such traditions, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the passage from *4Q374* might speak about the healing power of Moses' glorious face as healing the "wound" of Adam in the weak human nature. Therefore, in *4Q374*, as well as in *4Q504*, one might encounter a very early tradition depicting Moses as the glorious counterpart of Adam, the theme that later became a famous leitmotif in numerous Jewish and Christian materials. Despite that the Qumran passage about the healing in *4Q374* lacks any reference to Adam or to his glorious garments, its close affinities with the later Macarian evidence, where such connections are explicitly made, seem to clarify the proper meaning of the Qumran reference.

Second, it is also evident that both *4Q504* and *4Q374* can provide further insights for the background of the Adamic and Mosaic traditions in the Macarian Homilies. Despite their fragmentary character, these Qumran evidences about Adam and Moses help one see that the Macarian employment of the Mosaic traditions has in fact a strong polemical nature. The Syrian father seems to try to diminish the significance of Moses'

⁵⁸Pseudo-Macarius, *The Fifty Spiritual Homilies and the Great Letter*, 198.

⁵⁹The Macarian Homilies, therefore, can be seen as the set of the intense polemics with the Jewish developments.

"glorification" in the process of "healing" human nature, depicting it as the *external* covering unable to heal the inner wound caused by the Adamic transgression. However, the testimony to the Mosaic tradition found in *4Q374* demonstrates that the emphasis on the internal character of the healing was already made at Qumran, where Moses' luminosity was depicted to be potent to heal the human heart.

The Flooded Arboretums: The Garden Traditions in the Slavonic Version of *3 Baruch* and the *Book of Giants*¹

Introduction

3 (Apocalypse of) Baruch depicts a celestial tour during which an angelic guide leads a visionary through five heavens revealing to him the wonders of the upper realm. Scholars have previously noted that some details of this heavenly journey resonate with the visionary accounts found in Enochic materials.² Despite the similarities, the author of *3 Baruch* seems to avoid making direct references to the motifs and themes associated with Enochic tradition. One of the scholars, therefore, noted that “it is remarkable that *3 Baruch*, which throughout chapters 2-5 is preoccupied with the stories of Gen 2-11, makes no reference to the Watchers.”³ He further suggests that the author of this apocalypse “is perhaps engaged in a polemical rejection of the Enoch traditions, so that as well as substituting Baruch for Enoch he also substitutes the human builders for the angelic Watchers. Instead of deriving evil on earth from the fall of the Watchers, he emphasizes its origin in the Garden of Eden.”⁴ In response to this observation, another scholar agrees that various textual features of *3 Baruch* reveal a polemic against the Enochic literature.⁵ These observations are intriguing and deserve further investigation. Even a brief look at the apocalypse shows that despite a conspicuous coloring of the Adamic interpretation of the origin of evil, the details of *3 Baruch's* Garden descriptions expose the motifs and themes

¹ I am indebted to professor Francis Andersen for his insight and encouragement in undertaking this study. My research was inspired by his illuminating remarks on the connection between *3 Baruch* and the Enochic traditions.

² F.I. Andersen, “The Sun in the Book of the Secrets of Enoch,” *Xristianskij Vostok* 2001 (forthcoming); R. Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead. Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (SNT, 93; Brill: Leiden, Boston, Köln, 1998); H.E. Gaylord, “3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch,” *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.653-79; M.I. Sokolov, “Feniks v apokrifah ob Enohe i Varuhe,” in: *Novyj sbornik statej po slavyanovedeniju, sostavlennyj i izdannyyj uchenikami V. I. Lamanskago* (St. Peterburg, 1905) 395-405.

³ R. Bauckham, “Early Jewish Visions of Hell” *JTS* 41 (1990) 72.

⁴ R. Bauckham, “Early Jewish Visions of Hell” *JTS* 41 (1990) 72.

⁵ M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) 93.

linked to another prominent story in which the source of evil is traced to the Watchers/Giants myth.

This article will investigate the Paradise account found in chapter four of *3 Baruch* and its possible connection with Enochic and Noachic traditions.

The Paradise Traditions of the Slavonic Version of *3 Baruch*

3 *Baruch* became first known in its Slavonic version.⁶ Only later have the Greek manuscripts of the book been uncovered.⁷ Despite the availability of the Greek evidence scholars noted that in some parts of the pseudepigraphon the Slavonic text seems to preserve better the original material. H. Gaylord's newly assembled Slavonic sources show several

⁶ For publications of the Slavonic MSS of 3 *Baruch*, see: E. Hercigonja, "Videnie Varuhovo' u Petrisovu Zborniku iz 1468 godine," in: *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 7 (1964) 63-93; H.E. Gaylord, "Slavjanskij tekst tret'ej knigi Varuha" (The Slavonic Text of the Third Book of Baruch) *Polata knigopisanija* 7 (1983) 49-56; J. Ivanov, *Bogomilski knigi i legendi* (Sofija, 1925); P.A. Lavrov, "Otkrovenie Varuha," *Sbornik otdelenija russkago jazyka i slovesnosti (SORJaS)* 67/3 (1899) 149-51; S. Novakovic, "Otkrivene Varuhovo" *Starine* 18 (1886) 203-9; M.I. Sokolov, "Apokrificheskoe otkrovenie Varuha" *Drevnosti, Trudy slavjanskoi komissii imp. Moskovskago arheologicheskogo obshchestva* 4 (1907) 201-58; N. Tihonravov, "Otkrovenie Varuha," in: "Apokrificheskie Teksty," *Sbornik otd. russk. jaz. i slov (SORJaS)* 58 (1894) 48-54. For translations of the Slavonic version of 3 *Baruch*, see: G.N. Bonwetsch, "Das slavisch erhaltene Baruchbuch" *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen: philologische-historische Klasse* (1896) 91-101; W. Hage, *Die griechische Baruch-Apokalypse. JSHRZ* 5.1 (Gütersloh, 1974) 15-44; H. Gaylord, "3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.653-55; A.G. Kuz'min and A.Ju. Karpov, *Zlatostruj. Drevnjaja Rus'. X-XIII vv.* (M., 1990) 276-82; W.R. Morfill, "The Apocalypse of Baruch translated from the Slavonic," *Apocrypha Anecdota II* (Texts 5/1; ed. J.A. Robinson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897) 95-102. For research on the Slavonic version of 3 *Baruch*, see: H.E. Gaylord, "How Sataniel Lost His '-el'," *JJS* 33 (1982) 303-9; H.E. Gaylord, "Redactional Elements behind the Petrisov Zbornik of III Baruch" *SLOVO* 37 (1987) 91-115; H.E. Gaylord, *The Slavonic Version of III Baruch* (Diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1983); W. Lüdtke, "Beiträge zu slavischen Apocryphen: 2. Apokalypse des Baruch" *ZAW* 31 (1911) 218-31; A.Ju. Karpov, "O kalendare slavjanskoj knigi 'Otkrovenie Varuha,'" *Palestinskij sbornik* 32 (1993) 81-83; P.A. Lavrov, "Zametka ob apokrifah v rukopisi Publichnoj Biblioteki Grech. 70," *Juzhnoslovenski Filolog* 2 (1921) 61-64; B. Philonenko-Sayar, "La version slave de l'Apocalypse de Baruch," in: *La littérature intertestamentaire* (ed. A Caquot; Paris, 1985) 89-97; M.I. Sokolov, "Feniks v apokrifah ob Enohe i Varuhe," in: *Novyj sbornik statej po slavyanovedeniju, sostavlennyj i izdannyy uchenikami V. I. Lamanskago* (St. Peterburg, 1905) 395-405; M.I. Sokolov, "O fenikse po apokrif. knigam Enoha i Baruha," in *Drevnosti, Trudy Slav. Komissii Imp. Mosk. Arheol. Obshchestva* 4/1 (1907); R. Stichel, "Die Verführung der Stammeltern durch Satanael nach der Kurzfassung der slavischen Baruch-Apokalypse," in: *Kulturelle Traditionen in Bulgarien* (eds. R. Lauer and P. Schreiner; Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, 177; Göttingen, 1989) 116-28; E. Turdeanu, "Apocryphes bogomiles et apocryphes pseudo-bogomiles" *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 69 (1950) 22-52; 176-218. (For 3Bar, see especially 177-81); E. Turdeanu, "L'Apocalypse de Baruch en slave" *Revue des études slaves* 48 (1969) 23-48; E. Turdeanu, "Les apocryphes slaves et roumains: Leur apport à la connaissance des apocryphes grecs," *Studi bizantini e neoellenici* 8 (1953) 47-52. (For 3Bar, see especially, 50-52); B.M. Zagrebin, "O prishozhdenii i sud'be nekotoryh slavjanskih palimpsestov Sinaja," in: *Iz istorii rukopisnyh i staropechatnyh sobranij Otdela rukopisej i redkih knig GPB (Issledovanija, obzory, publikacii). Sbornik nauchnyh trudov* (Leningrad, 1979) 61-80.

⁷ J.-C. Picard, *Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece* (PVTG, 2; Leiden: Brill, 1967).

areas where Slavonic appears to be closer to the original.⁸ One of such areas concerns the fourth chapter of the text. H. Gaylord observes that the overall structure and content of chapter four in Slavonic seems closer to the original⁹ than the extant Greek version, which in this part “has suffered the most at the hands of Christian scribes.”¹⁰ Chapter four of the Slavonic version contains several important details that are missing in the Greek version, including the story of the angels planting the garden.

In the light of these scholarly observations, our investigation of chapter four will deal primarily with the Slavonic version of the fourth chapter, which will be in some instances compared with and supplemented by the Greek version.

In chapter four of *3 Bar*, the reader finds Baruch in the middle of his heavenly journey. The angelic guide continues to show him celestial wonders. In the beginning of chapter four, Baruch sees a serpent on a stone mountain who “eats earth like grass.” Then, in *3 Bar* 4:6, Baruch asks his *angelus interpretes* to show him the tree which deceived Adam. In response to this request, Baruch hears the story about the planting and destruction of the heavenly garden. In the Slavonic version, the story has the following form:

And the angel said to me “When God made the garden and commanded Michael to gather *two hundred* thousand¹¹ and three angels so that they could plant the garden, Michael planted the olive and Gabriel, the apple; Uriel,¹² the nut; Raphael, the melon; and Sataniel,¹³ the vine. For at first his name in former times was Sataniel, and similarly all the angels planted the various trees.”¹⁴ And again I Baruch said to

⁸ Gaylord, “3 Baruch,” *OTP*, 1.655.

⁹ In his recent illuminating research D. Harlow supports this position. He observes that “in some instances the Slavonic likely does possess an equal or better claim to priority than does the Greek, as is the case in chapters 4-5.” D. Harlow, *The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch) in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity* (SVTP, 12; Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1996) 40. See also his comment on the page 150: “certainly the Slavonic presents a more coherent form of material in chapters 4-5...”

¹⁰ Gaylord, “3 Baruch,” *OTP*, 1.657.

¹¹ Some MSS read “two thousand.” See Gaylord, “Slavjanskij Tekst,” 52.

¹² Slav. **УРИЛЬ**. H.E. Gaylord, “Slavjanskij tekst tret'ej knigi Varuha” (The Slavonic Text of the Third Book of Baruch) *Polata knigopisanija* 7 (1983) 52; **САРАСАНИЛЬ**. J. Ivanov, *Bogomilski knigi i legendi* (Sofija, 1925) 196. Variants of this angel's name in the Slavonic MSS of *3 Baruch* show that the author/the editor knew the Enochic variations involving names Uriel/Phanuel/Sariel.

¹³ Slav. **САТАНИАНЬ/СОТОНАНЬ**. Gaylord, “Slavjanskij tekst,” 52; N. Tihonravov, “Otkrovenie Varuha,” 48-54. Both Greek manuscripts read Σαμουηλ. Picard, *Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece*, 85.

¹⁴ After this verse several Slavonic MSS of the Russian group contain the following tradition: “And he said to Michael, Sound the trumpet for the angels to assemble and bow down to the work of my hands which I made. And the angel Michael sounded the trumpet, and all the angels assembled, and all bowed down to Adam order by order. But Sataniel did not bow down and said, To mud and dirt I will never bow down. And he said, I will

the angel, "Lord, show me the tree through which the serpent deceived Eve and Adam." And the angel said to me, "Listen, Baruch. In the first place, the tree was the vine, but secondly, the tree (is) sinful desire which Sataniel spread over Eve and Adam, and because of this God has cursed the vine because Sataniel had planted it, and by that he deceived the protoplast Adam and Eve." And I Baruch said to the angel, "Lord, if God has cursed the vine and its seed, then how can it be of use now?" And the angel said to me, "Rightly you ask me. When God made the Flood upon the earth, he drowned every firstling, and he destroyed 104 thousand giants, and the water rose above the highest mountains 20 cubits above the mountains, and the water entered into the garden, (*and destroyed all flower*),¹⁵ bringing out one shoot from the vine as God withdrew the waters. And there was dry land, and Noah went out from the ark and found the vine lying on the ground, and did not recognize it having only heard about it and its form. He thought to himself, saying, "This is truly the vine which Sataniel planted in the middle of the garden, by which he deceived Eve and Adam; because of this God cursed it and its seed. So if I plant it, then will God not be angry with me?" And he knelt down on (his) knees and fasted 40 days. Praying and crying, he said, "Lord, if I plant this, what will happened?" And the Lord send the angel Sarasael; he declared to him, "Rise, Noah, and plant the vine, and alter its name, and change it for the better." (3 Bar 4:7-15).¹⁶

establish my throne above the clouds and I will be like the highest. Because of that, God cast him and his angels from his face just as the prophet said, These withdrew from his face, all who hate God and the glory of God. And God commanded an angel to guard Paradise. And they ascended in order to bow down to God. Then having gone, Sataniel found the serpent and he made himself into a worm. And he said to the serpent, Open (your mouth), consume me into your belly. And he went through the fence into Paradise, wanting to deceive Eve. But because of that one I was cast out from the glory of God. And the serpent ate him and went into Paradise and found Eve and said, What did God command you to eat from the food of Paradise? And Eve said, from every tree of Paradise we eat; from this tree God commanded us not to eat. And having heard Sataniel said to her, God begrudged the way you live lest you be immortal; take and eat and you will see and give it to Adam. And both ate and the eyes of both were opened and they saw that they were naked." H. Gaylord, "How Sataniel lost his '-el'," 305. For the Slavonic text, see: N. Tihonravov, "Otkrovenie Varuha," 50.

¹⁵ Slav. и възатъ въсь цвѣтъ. Gaylord, "Slavjanskij tekst," 52. This expression can be also translated as "and took all was blooming." This sentence about the destruction of all vegetation in the Garden is not included in Gaylord's English translation of the Slavonic version published in the first volume of *OTP*. The reading, however, can be found in his publication of the Slavonic text of 3 Baruch in: Gaylord, H.E., "Slavjanskij tekst tret'ej knigi Varuha" (The Slavonic Text of the Third Book of Baruch) *Polata knigopisanija* 7 (1983) 52. Cf. also: N. Tihonravov, "Otkrovenie Varuha," 51.

¹⁶ H. Gaylord, "3 Baruch," 1.666. Here and later on I used Gaylord's English translation of the Slavonic version of 3 Baruch and follow his division of chapters and verses. The Slavonic citations of 3 Baruch are drawn from the following publications of the Slavonic MSS: E. Hercigonja, "'Videnie Varuhovo' u Petrisovu Zborniku iz 1468 godine," in: *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 7 (1964) 63-93; H.E. Gaylord, "Slavjanskij tekst tret'ej knigi Varuha" (The Slavonic Text of the Third Book of Baruch) *Polata knigopisanija* 7 (1983) 49-56; J. Ivanov, *Bogomilski knigi i legendi* (Sofija, 1925); P.A. Lavrov, "Otkrovenie Varuha," *Sbornik otdelenija russkago jazyka i slovesnosti (SorJaS)* 67/3 (1899) 149-51; S. Novakovic, "Otkrivene Varuhovo" *Starine* 18 (1886) 203-9; M.I. Sokolov, "Apokrificheskoe otkrovenie Varuha" *Drevnosti, Trudy slavjanskoj komissii imp.*

The depiction conveys to the reader several rare traditions about the Garden. Two of them are especially important for this investigation. They include the themes of the angels planting the Garden and the flooding of this garden by the waters of the Deluge. Scholars previously observed that both of these traditions are uniquely preserved only in this pseudepigraphon. There are, however, some early materials that seem to allude to the same rare “garden” traditions about the angels planting the garden and its flooding by waters of the Deluge. One of these materials includes the fragments of the *Book of Giants*.

The Garden Traditions in the Book of Giants

The composition known as the *Book of Giants* is available to contemporary scholarship only in a very fragmentary form preserved through Jewish and Manichean sources. These sources include the Aramaic fragments of the *Book of Giants* found at Qumran,¹⁷ the fragments of the Manichean *Book of Giants*,¹⁸ and the later Jewish text known as the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*.¹⁹

In these materials associated with the *Book of Giants*, we find the themes of the planting and the destroying of a garden. The Aramaic fragment of the *Book of Giants* from Qumran (4Q530) and the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* depict a dream in which the giant Hahyah, the son of the watcher Shemihazah, sees a certain garden planted and then destroyed.

Moskovskago arheologicheskogo obshchestva 4 (1907) 201-58; N. Tihonravov, "Otkrovenie Varuha," in: "Apokrificheskie Teksty," *Sbornik otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti (SORJaS)* 58 (1894) 48-54.

¹⁷ K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984); K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994); F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ, 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992); J. Milik, *The Book of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments from Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); É. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4 (XXII). Textes Araméens. Première Partie. 4Q529-546* (DJD, 31; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001); J. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmology: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College, 14; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992); L. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (TSAJ, 63; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997).

¹⁸ W.B. Henning, "The Book of the Giants" *BSOAS* 11 (1943-46) 52-74; P.O. Skjærvø, "Iranian Epic and the Manichean Book of Giants. Irano-Manichaica III," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* XLVIII (1-2) (1995) 187-223; W. Sundermann, "Ein weiteres Fragment aus Manis Gigantenbuch" *Hommages et opera minora 9: Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata* (Acta Iranica, 23/Second Series 9; Leiden: Brill, 1984) 491-505.

¹⁹ In this research I will use the Hebrew texts and the English translation of the *Midrash* published in Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 321-328.

4Q530:3-12 reads:

... Then two of them dreamed dreams, and the sleep of their eyes and come to [...] their dreams. And he said in the assembly of [his frien]ds, the Nephilin, [...in] my dream; I have seen in this night [...] gardeners and they were watering [...] numerous roo[ts] issued from their trunk [...] I watched until tongues of fire from [...] all the water and the fire burned in all [...] Here is the end of the dream.²⁰

The fragment seems to depict certain gardeners planting or sustaining a garden by watering its numerous “roots.” It also portrays the destruction of the same garden by water and fire. The description of both events is very fragmentary and many features of the story appear to be missing in 4Q530. Both motifs seem better preserved in the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*, another material associated with the *Book of Giants*, which provides additional important details. It directly refers to the *planting* of the garden by using the Hebrew verb נָטַע:

... One night the sons of Shemhazai, Hiwwa and Hiyya,²¹ saw (visions) in dream, and both of them saw dreams. One saw the great stone spread over the earth...The other (son) saw a garden, *planted* (נָטַע)²² whole with (many) kinds of trees and (many) kinds of precious stones. And an angel (was seen by him) descending from the firmament with an axe in his hand, and he was cutting down all the trees, so that there remained only one tree containing three branches. When they awoke from their sleep they arose in confusion, and, going to their father, they related to him the dreams. He said to them: “The Holy One is about to bring a flood upon the world, and to destroy it, so that there will remain but one man and his three sons.”²³

Besides 4Q530 and the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*, the Hahyah/Hiyya dream is also mentioned in the Middle Persian Kawân fragment *j* of the Manichean *Book of Giants* published by W.B. Henning. The evidence, however, is very terse containing only one line:

Nariman²⁴₂₅ saw a gar[den full of] trees in rows. Two hundred ... came out, the trees ...

Henning suggests that this fragment should be interpreted in the light of another Middle Persian fragment *D* (M 625c) which links the Watchers with the trees:

... outside ... and ... left ... read the dream we have seen. Thereupon Enoch thus ... and the trees that come out, those are the Egregoroi, and the giants that came out of the women. And over ... pulled out ... over ...²⁶

²⁰ F. García Martínez and E. J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997) 2.1063.

²¹ = Hahyah.

²² Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 325.

²³ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 328.

²⁴ = Hahyah.

²⁵ W.B. Henning, “The Book of the Giants” *BSOAS* 11 (1943-46) 57 and 60.

Several important details in the above mentioned descriptions from Jewish and Manichaean sources should be clarified.

The first detail concerns the subjects planting the garden. *4Q530* refers to the gardeners watering numerous roots issued from their trunk. Who are these gardeners? J. Milik was first to identify the “gardeners” as *angelic* beings. He argued that the gardeners are “guardian angels” or “bailiffs of the world-garden” and are matched by the shepherds in the *Book of Dreams* in *1 Enoch* 89:59 and 90:1.²⁷ L. Stuckenbruck agrees that the “gardeners” might be angelic beings but notes that there is reason to question whether the “gardeners” are meant to represent “good” angelic beings.²⁸ He suggests that in light of *4Q530* 8 the ultimate outcome of the “gardeners” work seems to be the production of “great shoots” from the root source, which, in Stuckenbruck’s opinion, signifies “the birth of the giants from the women.”²⁹ He further argues that “watering” activity is a metaphor for impregnation and the “gardeners” in fact represent fallen angelic beings, the Watchers.³⁰ J. Reeves’ earlier research proposes that the “gardeners” might represent the Watchers prior to their apostasy.³¹ He notes that the image of the gardeners “watering” the garden may allude to the initial educational mission of the Watchers, who according to *Jub.* 4:15, were originally sent by God on earth to instruct humans in moral conduct.³²

The second detail of the description concerns the imagery of the trees. It seems that the trees symbolize not the vegetation, but the inhabitants of the garden: angelic, human or composite creatures. Arboreal metaphors are often used in Enochic tradition to describe the Watchers and the Giants.³³

Another important detail in the aforementioned descriptions concerns the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* associating the destruction of the garden with the Flood and Noah’s escape from it. *4Q530:10* also seems to allude to the Flood, since Hahyah’s dream mentions the destruction of the garden by fire and *water*. A short Qumran fragment *6Q8* also serves as important evidence for the connection of Hahyah’s dream with Noah’s escape. F. García Martínez observes³⁴ that the reference to Noah and his sons in the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* has its equivalent in *6Q8* 2, which speaks

²⁶ W.B. Henning, “The Book of the Giants” *BSOAS* 11 (1943-46) 66.

²⁷ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 304.

²⁸ Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran*, 114.

²⁹ Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran*, 114.

³⁰ Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran*, 114.

³¹ Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 95.

³² Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 96.

³³ Cf. *CD* 2:17-19

³⁴ F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 101. See also Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 87 and 95; Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 309.

of three shoots preserved from the flood³⁵ so as to signify the escape of Noah and his three sons.

J. Reeves³⁶ offers the following reconstruction of the dream based on the two fragments:³⁷

Hahyah beholds in his vision a grove of trees carefully attended by gardeners. This tranquil scene is interrupted by the sudden appearance (or transformation?) of two hundred figures within this garden. The result of this invasion was the production of 'great' shoots sprouting up from the roots of the trees. While Hahyah viewed this scene, emissaries from Heaven arrived and ravaged the garden with water and fire, leaving only one tree bearing three branches as the sole survivor of the destruction.³⁸

When this description from the *Book of Giants* is compared to the story found in the Slavonic version of *3 Baruch* 4, it shows that both accounts seem to have three similar events that follow each other in the same sequence: the plantation of the garden, the destruction of the garden, and the escape of one tree from the destruction. These intriguing similarities call for a more thorough investigation of the parallels between the garden traditions found in the *3 Baruch* 4 and the *Book of Giants*.

The Angelic Planting of the Garden: *3 Bar* 4:7-8

Scholars have previously noted that the motif of angels planting the garden is uniquely preserved only in the Slavonic version of *3 Baruch*.³⁹ In the text the tale about the planting comes from the mouth of Baruch's angelic guide. From him the visionary learns that God commanded Michael to gather two hundred thousand and three angels in order to plant the garden. The story

³⁵ 6Q8 ii : "its three roots [...and] while I was [watching] came [...] all this orchard, and [...]" F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997) 2.1149.

³⁶ Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 95-96; Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran*, 114-15.

³⁷ It should be noted that any arrangement of the fragments can be considered only as tentative. On this issue, see: L.T. Stuckenbruck, "The Sequencing of Fragments Belonging to the Qumran *Book of Giants*: An Inquiry into the Structure and Purpose of an Early Jewish Composition" *JSP* 16 (1997) 10.

³⁸ Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 95.

³⁹ The Greek version contains only a very short reference to Samael's plantation of the tree: "It is the vine which the angel Samael planted (ἐφύτευσεν) by which the Lord God became angered, and he cursed him and his planting (τὴν φυτεῖαν αὐτοῦ)." Gaylord, "3 Baruch," 667; Picard, *Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece*, 85.

further tells that Michael, Gabriel, Uriel, Raphael and Sataniel planted five trees. Other angels also planted "various trees."

Several features in the plantation story found in *3 Bar* 4:7-8 seem to resonate with the account of garden planting found in the *Book of Giants*. These details include the following significant points:

1. *3 Bar* 4:7 mentions *two hundred* thousand and three angels planting the garden;
2. The *fallen angel Sataniel* also takes part in the plantation of the "trees;"
3. According to the story, Sataniel plants the *bad tree* - the tree of deception;
4. The tree is described as a *sinful desire* which the fallen angel had for humans;
5. *3 Bar* 4:7 mentions the planting of *five types* of trees in the garden;

These five points should now be investigated in detail.

1. The first important feature of *3 Bar* 4 that recalls the *Book of Giants* materials is the number of angelic hosts involved in the planting of the garden. *3 Bar* 4:7 tells that God commanded Michael⁴⁰ to gather two hundred thousand and three angels in order to plant the Garden. The numeral two hundred thousand and three,⁴¹ reserved here for the number of angelic hosts is pertinent to our investigation. It clues the reader into seeing the angelic "gardeners" described in *3 Bar* 4:7 as somehow related to the fallen Watchers, who in the *Book of Giants* "planted" gigantic "trees" on the earth through their iniquities. In early Enochic accounts, the numeral "two hundred" often refers to the number of the Watchers descending on Mount

⁴⁰ The commissioning of Michael for the mission of gathering two hundred thousand angels might allude to Michael's role in the *Book of Watchers* (*1 Enoch* 10:11-15) where he is responsible for the affairs connected with Shemihazah and the Watchers.

⁴¹ Several words must be said about the three angels mentioned in *3 Bar* 4:7 in conjunction with the two hundred thousand angels. It might be a reference to a tradition in which the three principal angels (Raphael, Uriel, Gabriel) were called by the fourth principal angel, Michael, to fulfill God's command to plant the garden. Another explanation of the angelic triad in *3 Bar* 4:7 is that it can represent the leaders of the Watchers group. It is noteworthy that the later Enochic accounts often speak about, not two, but about *three* leaders of the fallen Watchers. Cf. *3 Enoch* 4:5-6 "... And the Holy One, blessed be he, appointed me (Enoch) in the height as a prince and a ruler among the ministering angels. Then three of ministering angels, 'Uzzah, 'Azzah, and 'Aza'el, came and laid charges against me in the heavenly height..." P. Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.258. See also *3 Enoch* 5:9 "...it was only because taught them sorceries that they brought them down and employed them, for otherwise they would not have been able to bring them down..." Alexander, *3 Enoch*, 1.260. Annette Yoshiko Reed argues in her recent article that the tradition about 'Uzzah, 'Azzah, and 'Aza'el is "reflecting direct knowledge of the account of the fall of the angels in *1 Enoch* 6-11." A.Y. Reed, "From Asael and Semihazah to Uzzah, Azzah, and Azael: *3 Enoch* 5 (§§7-8) and Jewish Reception-History of *1 Enoch*," *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 8 (2001) 110.

Hermon.⁴² Some later Enochic accounts, however, sometimes tend to exaggerate the number of the fallen Watchers depicting them as *two hundred thousand* or *two hundred myriads*. An example of such tendency can be found in the longer recension *2 Enoch* 18:3, where the angelic guides give Enoch the following information about the Watchers: “These are the *Gregori* (Watchers), who turned aside from the Lord, *200 myriads*, together with their prince Satanail.”⁴³ It is noteworthy that in *3 Bar* 4, similar to *2 Enoch* 18, the tradition about the two hundred myriads of angelic beings is creatively conflated with the name of Satanail.⁴⁴

2. The second detail of *3 Baruch*'s story that seems to allude to the *Book of Giants* account is that in *3 Baruch* an angelic creature planting the Garden is fallen. In *3 Bar* 4:7-8 Satanail, along with the four principal angels (Michael, Gabriel, Uriel and Raphael), participates in planting the Garden. The description of Satanail as the Gardener is puzzling. The pseudepigraphical texts usually follow the biblical account⁴⁵ that claims that the Garden was planted by God.⁴⁶ This motif of the fallen "planter" might, therefore, parallel the *Book of Giants* where the fallen angels are also depicted as gardeners.

3. In *3 Baruch* and the *Book of Giants*, the “planting of trees/tree” is part of the angelic plot to corrupt the human race. In the *Book of Giants*, the “gardeners” represented by fallen angelic beings “plant” bad “trees”—the wicked offspring which, through their enormous appetites, brought many disasters to the antediluvian generation. In *3 Bar* 4, the “gardener,” the fallen angel Satanail, also plants a tree designed to cause the fall and degradation of the human race. In *3 Baruch*'s story, the vine tree eventually becomes the tool through which Adam and Eve were deceived and corrupted.

⁴² Cf. *1 Enoch* 6:6: “And they were in all two hundred, and they came down on Ardis which is the summit of Mount Hermon.” M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978) 2.68.

⁴³ F. Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.130.

⁴⁴ The possibility that the author of *3 Baruch* was cognizant of the Watchers myth is also supported by the information found in other parts of the book. R. Bauckham offers important insight which proves that the author of *3 Bar* indeed knew about the Watchers story. Bauckham suggests that two groups of condemned angels in chapters 2 and 3 of *3 Bar* are paralleled to two group of Watchers in the second and fifth heaven from chapters 7 and 18 of *2 Enoch*. See: R. Bauckham, “Early Jewish Visions of Hell” *JTS* 41/2 (1990) 372.

⁴⁵ I am indebted to Prof. Michael Stone for this clarification.

⁴⁶ See: Gen 2:8 “Now the Lord God had planted a garden in the east, in Eden.”; *4Q504* 8:4-6 “... [... Adam,] our [fat]her, you fashioned in the image of [your] glory [...] [... the breath of life] you [b]lew into his nostril, and intelligence and knowledge [...] [...] in the gard]en of Eden, which you had planted...” F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997) 2.1009.

4. 3 *Baruch's* account is also distinctive in that it connects the tree planted by Sataniel with the “sinful desire” spread by this fallen angel over the first humans. In *3 Bar* 4:8, the *angelus interpretis* tells Baruch that “in the first place, the tree was the vine, but secondly, the tree (is) sinful desire⁴⁷ which Sataniel spread over Adam and Eve...”⁴⁸ This reference to the “sinful desire” of the fallen angel over humans is intriguing since it alludes to the terminology found in Enochic tradition. Thus *1 Enoch* 6 says that the Watchers had *sinful desire* for human creatures.⁴⁹ The *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* also uses the term “evil desire” or “evil inclination” (Heb. יצר הרע) in reference to the relationships between the descended Watchers and the “daughters of man”:

...Forthwith the Holy One allowed the *evil inclination* (יצר הרע) to rule over them, as soon as they descended. When they beheld the daughters of man that they were beautiful, they began to corrupt themselves with them, as it is said, “When the sons of God saw the daughters of man,” they could not restrain their inclination...⁵⁰

It is important to note that in the story from the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* the evil desire of the Watchers over humans seems to come as consequence of the Watchers’ disrespect for humanity in general and the first human creature in particular.⁵¹ In view of this detail, it is intriguing that some Russian manuscripts of *3 Baruch* contain the passage about Sataniel’s

⁴⁷ Slav. похоть греховная. S. Novakovic, "Otkrivene Varuhovo" *Starine* 18 (1886) 206.

⁴⁸ Gaylord, “3 Baruch,” 1.666.

⁴⁹ “And it came to pass, when the son of men had increased, that in those days there were born to them fair and beautiful daughters. And the angels, the sons of heaven, saw them and desired them...” *1 Enoch* 6:1-2a. Knibb, 2.67.

⁵⁰ Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 327.

⁵¹ ... When the generation of Enosh arose and practiced idolatry and when the generation of the flood arose and corrupted their actions, the Holy One - Blessed be He - was grieved that He had created man, as it is said, “And God repented that he created man, and He grieved at heart.” Forthwith arose two angels, whose names were Shemhazai and Azael, and said before Him: “O Lord of the universe, did we not say unto Thee when Thou didst create Thy world, ‘Do not create man?’” The Holy One - Blessed be He - said to them; “Then what shall become of the world?” They said before Him: “We will suffice (Thee) instead of it.” He said: “It is revealed and (well) known to me that if peradventure you had lived in that (earthly) world, the evil inclination would have ruled you just as much as it rules over the sons of man, but you would be more stubborn than they.” They said before Him: “Give us Thy sanction and let us descend {and dwell} among the creatures and then Thou shall see how we shall sanctify Thy name.” He said to them: “Descend and dwell ye among them.” Forthwith the Holy One allowed the evil inclination to rule over them, as soon as they descended. When they beheld the daughters of man that they were beautiful, they began to corrupt themselves with them, as it is said, “When the sons of God saw the daughters of man,” they could not restrain their inclination...” *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* 1-4. Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 327.

refusal⁵² to venerate Adam,⁵³ which recalls the account found in *Midrash* 1-4.⁵⁴ H. Gaylord, however, does not include this account in his English translation of the Slavonic version of *3 Baruch* in the *OTP*, considering it to be a later interpolation.

5. Finally, the last point under investigation concerns the number of the trees planted in the garden. *3 Bar* 4:7 refers to five kinds trees. The text says that the olive tree was planted by Michael, the apple by Gabriel, the nut by Uriel, the melon by Raphael, and the vine by Sataniel. Although the number of the principal angels seems unusual, the reference to the “five trees” excites interest in light of a passage found among the fragments of the Manichean *Book of Giants* published by W.B. Henning. This fragment, similar to *3 Bar* 4:7, also operated with the notion of the “five trees”:

... evil-intentioned ... from where ... he came. The Misguided fail to recognize the five elements, [the five kinds of] trees, the five (kinds of) animals (frg. h).⁵⁵

Concluding this section, it is important to mention that in both Enochic and Adamic accounts, the flooded garden is depicted as a place where the drama of the primeval evil unfolds. Scholars previously observed that Enochic and Adamic traditions often compete with each other offering different explanations of the origin of evil in the world.⁵⁶ The Enochic tradition bases its understanding of the origin of evil on the Watchers story, in which the descended Watchers corrupt human beings by passing on to them various celestial secrets. In contrast the Adamic story traces the source of evil to the fall of Adam and Eve in Eden. Despite apparent differences in these two accounts, they share many common details which reveal persistent, strenuous polemics between both stories. The polemical materials found in *3 Baruch* 4 put both accounts even closer to each other, thus helping one to

⁵² On Satan's refusal to venerate Adam, see: M. Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the Books of Adam and Eve" *JTS* 44 (1993) 145-48; G. Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan" *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 6 (1997) 105-134.

⁵³ "...And he said to Michael, Sound the trumpet for the angels to assemble and bow down to the work of my hands which I made. And the angel Michael sounded the trumpet, and all the angels assembled, and all bowed down to Adam order by order. But Sataniel did not bow down and said, To mud and dirt I will never bow down. And he said, I will establish my throne above the clouds and I will be like the highest. Because of that, God cast him and his angels from his face just as the prophet said, These withdrew from his face, all who hate God and the glory of God. And God commanded an angel to guard Paradise...." H. Gaylord, "How Sataniel lost his '-el'," 305.

⁵⁴ "... Forthwith arose two angels, whose names were Shemhazai and Azael, and said before Him: 'O Lord of the universe, did we not say unto Thee when Thou didst create Thy world, Do not create man?'..." Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 327

⁵⁵ W.B. Henning, "The Book of the Giants" *BSOAS* 11 (1943-46) 63.

⁵⁶ M. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M. E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 133-49.

recognize the similarities of two interpretations in which the flooded garden becomes the arena of the primordial heavenly rebellion involving angelic beings of the highest status.

The Flood in the Garden: 3 Bar 4:10-11

In 3 Bar 4:8, the angel tells the visionary about the evil role the vine tree played in Sataniel's deception of Adam and Eve. According to the story, God, as a result of this deception, cursed the vine and its seed. Upon hearing this story, Baruch asked the angel why, despite God's curse, the vine can still exist. The angel told Baruch about the flood in the heavenly garden.

The story recounts that God first made the Flood upon the earth which led to the drowning of "every fistling," including 104 thousand giants. Then the water rose above the highest mountains and flooded the heavenly garden. As God withdrew the water, "all flower" was destroyed except for one shoot from the vine. When the land appeared from the water, Noah went out from his ark and discovered the vine lying on the ground.

Several points of this Flood story found in 3 Bar 4:7-8 seem to resemble the Flood account found in the *Book of Giants*. These similarities involve the following details:

1. In 3 Bar 4:10 and in the *Book of Giants*, the flooding of the garden is paralleled to the flood on the earth;
2. In both traditions the destruction of all vegetation (in 3 Baruch - "all flower"⁵⁷) in the garden "mirrors" the destruction of all flesh and the Giants on earth;
3. In both traditions the surviving "plant" from the flooded garden is paralleled to the escape of Noah from the Flood.

These three points should now be investigated in detail.

1. Later Rabbinic materials sometimes operate with the notion of two gardens: the celestial garden of Eden and the terrestrial garden. 3 Enoch 5:5-6 reports that before the generation of Enosh had sinned God's *Shekinah* freely traveled from one garden to the other:

When the Holy One, blessed be he, went out and in from the garden to Eden, and from Eden to the garden, from the garden to heaven, and from heaven to the garden of Eden, all gazed at the bright image of Shekinah and were unharmed - until the coming⁵⁸ of the generation of Enosh, who was the chief of all the idolaters in the world.

The garden story found in 3 Bar 4 might represent one of the early prototypes of such traditions about the two gardens, since in this apocalypse

⁵⁷ Slav. **ВЪСЬ ЦВѢТЪ**. Gaylord, "Slavjansij Tekst," 52.

⁵⁸ Alexander, 3 Enoch, 260.

the garden becomes the locus of both celestial and terrestrial events at the same time. It also appears that in the flood story found in *3 Bar* 4:10-11 the events taking place in heaven and on earth are depicted as if they were to mirror each other: the destruction of “all flesh,” including the giants on earth “mirrors” the destruction of “all flower” in the heavenly garden. Both accounts also mention survivors, the patriarch Noah from the flooded earth and one plant from the flooded heavenly garden.

This parallelism is similar to the materials in the *Book of Giants* where the dream(s) about the destroyed “vegetation” of the garden and the singly preserved shoot symbolized the drowned Giants and Noah’s miraculous escape.

2. We mentioned above that in the Enochic traditions the fallen angels and their offspring are often depicted through arboreal imagery. *CD* 2:17-19 refers to the Giants as tall cedars.⁵⁹ The *Book of Giants* materials support this tendency. In the Manichean fragments of this composition, the Watchers are unambiguously associated with the trees.⁶⁰ The *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael* also seems to symbolize the Watchers/Giants group as the vegetation of the garden. This correspondence, however, is made not directly, but through parallelism. In the *Midrash*, Shemhazai’s statement about the flood on earth follows immediately after Hiyya’s dream about the destruction of the trees. The two events seem to “mirror” each other in such a way that the first depicts symbolically the second.

3 Bar 4:10 follows the same pattern portraying the destruction of “all flesh” and the Giants on earth and the destruction of “all flower” in the heavenly garden as two “mirroring” processes taking place in the celestial and terrestrial realms. It seems that the similarities between *3 Bar* 4 and the *Book of Giants* descriptions are not coincidental. An additional significant detail that supports the view that *3 Baruch’s* parallelism is modelled after materials in the *Book of Giants* is that the description of “all flesh” in *3 Bar* 4:10 includes a direct reference to the drowned giants.⁶¹

⁵⁹ “...For having walked in the stubbornness of their hearts the Watchers of the heaven fell; on account of it they were caught, for they did not heed the precepts of God. And their sons, whose height was like that of cedars and whose bodies were like mountains, fell.” F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997) 1.555.

⁶⁰ “... outside ... and ... left ... read the dream we have seen. Thereupon Enoch thus ... and the trees that come out, those are the Egregoroi, and the giants that came out of the women. And over ... pulled out ... over ... W.B. Henning, “The Book of the Giants” *BSOAS* 11 (1943-46) 66.

⁶¹ It is possible that *3 Bar* 4:3 also attests to the Giants traditions. The text says that Baruch’s angelic guide showed him a serpent who “drinks one cubit of water from the sea every day, and it eats earth like grass.” This description might allude to the appetites of the giants who were notorious for consuming everything alive on the surface of the earth. The *Book of Watchers* and the *Book of Giants* attest to the enormous appetites of the Giants.

3. The next point under investigation is the identification of Noah with the "escaped plant." In the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*, the giant Hiyya beholds in his dream one tree with three branches that survived the destruction of the garden. The text tells that:

... an angel (was seen by him) descending from the firmament with an axe in his hand, and he was cutting down all trees, so that there remained only one tree containing three branches.⁶²

A verse later, the story switches to Noah⁶³ and his three sons:⁶⁴

He (Shemhazai) said to them (Hiwwa and Hiyya): "The Holy One is about to bring a flood upon the world, and to destroy it, so that there will remain but one man and his three sons."⁶⁵

Thus the following parallel structure is observable in the *Midrash* 10b-11a: the reference to Noah and his three sons enduring the Flood follows immediately after the symbolic depiction of the tree with three branches surviving the destruction. Although the *Midrash* does not directly identify the tree with Noah, it makes the identification obvious by correlating these two descriptions.

Exactly the same correlation is observable in *3 Bar* 4:10b-11, where the reference to Noah and his escape follows immediately after the statement about the preserved shoot:

...and the water entered into the garden and destroyed every flower, bringing out one shoot from the vine as God withdrew the waters. And there was dry land, and Noah went out from the ark.⁶⁶

It is important, however, that the escaped "tree," which in the *Book of Giants* was associated with the righteous remnant, becomes associated in *3 Baruch's* story with the evil deception. This difference might point to the polemical character of *3 Baruch's* appropriation of Enochic imagery.

The Noachic Narrative: *3 Bar* 4:11-15

Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael tells that "...each of them eats daily a thousand camels, a thousand horses, a thousand oxen, and all kinds (of animals)." Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 328.

⁶² Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 328.

⁶³ The associations of Noah with the plant abound. Cf. *1 Enoch* 10:16 - "Destroy all wrong from the face of the earth...And let the plant of righteousness and truth appear..." Knibb, 2.90. For the survey of the evidences, see Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 99-100.

⁶⁴ Scholars believe that *6Q8:2* contains a reference to the same story.

⁶⁵ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 328.

⁶⁶ Gaylord, "3 Baruch," 1.666.

3 Bar 4:11-15 deals with Noah's story.⁶⁷ It depicts the patriarch after his debarkation seeing the vine shoot lying on the ground. Noah hesitates to plant the vine knowing the fatal role this plant had in deceiving Adam and Eve. Puzzled, Noah decides to ask the Lord in prayer if he can plant the vine. The Lord sends Noah the angel Sarasael who delivers to the patriarch the following command: "Rise, Noah, and plant the vine, and alter its name and change it for the better."⁶⁸ Sarasael's address to Noah is important for establishing the connection between 3 Bar 4 and the broader Enochic/Noahic traditions. It reveals that the author of 3 Baruch was familiar not only with the details of Noah's escape from the Flood found in the extant materials of the *Book of Giants*, but with the peculiar details of Noah's story found in the *Book of Watchers* and in the traditions associated with the *Book of Noah*.

⁶⁷ On Noachic traditions see: M. Bernstein, "Noah and the Flood at Qumran," *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (eds. D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 199-231; D. Dimant, "Noah in Early Jewish Literature," *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (eds. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998) 123-50; F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 24-44; F. García Martínez, "Interpretation of the Flood in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Interpretations of the Flood* (eds. F. García Martínez and G.P. Luttikhuisen; TBN 1; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 86-108; H. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic. The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man* (WMANT 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988) 242-54; J. Lewis, *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1968); A. Orlov, "'Noah's Younger Brother': The Anti-Noachic Polemics in 2 Enoch" *Henoch* 22.2 (2000) 259-73; A. Orlov, "Overshadowed by Enoch's Greatness: 'Two Tablets' Traditions from the Book of Giants to Palaea Historica" *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 32 (2001) 137-158; J. Reeves, "Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?" *JBL* 12 (1993) 110-15; J.M. Scott, "Geographic Aspects of Noachic Materials in the Scrolls of Qumran," *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (eds. S.E. Porter and C.E. Evans; JSPS 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 368-81; R.C. Steiner, "The Heading of the Book of the Words of Noah on a Fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon: New Light on a 'Lost' Work," *DSD* 2 (1995) 66-71; M. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M. E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 133-49; M. Stone, "Noah, Books of," *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem: Keter, 1971) 12.1198; J. VanderKam, "The Righteousness of Noah," *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (eds. J. J. Collins and G.W.E. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS 12; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980) 13-32; J. VanderKam, "The Birth of Noah," *Intertestamental Essays in Honor of Józef Tadeusz Milik* (ed. Z.J. Kapera; Qumranica Mogilanensia 6; Krakow: The Enigma Press, 1992) 213-31; Cana Werman, "Qumran and the Book of Noah" *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M. E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 171-81.

⁶⁸ Gaylord, "3 Baruch," 1.668.

The Greek and Ethiopic evidences of *1 Enoch* 10:1-3 attest that God commissioned Sariel to inform Noah about the approaching Flood.⁶⁹ This story might possibly parallel Sarasael's⁷⁰ revelation to Noah in *3 Bar* 4:15. The only problem preventing direct associations between two texts here is the fact that Sariel's revelation in *1 Enoch* 10:1-3 does not contain any information about the plant. Scholars, however, believe that the "original" reading of *1 Enoch* 10:3 might have survived in its entirety not in the Ethiopic text of *1 Enoch* but in the text preserved by Syncellus⁷¹ which corresponds closely to the Aramaic evidence.⁷² In the passage found in Syncellus, God commissioned Sariel to tell Noah not only about his escape from the Flood but also about a *plant*:

And now instruct the righteous one what to do, and the son of Lamech, that he may save his life and escape for all time; and from him a plant shall be planted and established for all generations for ever.⁷³

Although "a plant" in this revelation can be taken as a symbolic reference to the restored humanity⁷⁴ or Noah himself, who is described in *1 Enoch* 10:16 as the "plant of righteousness and truth," some texts associated with Enochic traditions reveal that besides "planting" justice and righteousness Noah was also involved in the literal planting of the vine. Thus, *Jub.* 7:1, for example, says that "during the seventh week, in its first year, in this jubilee Noah planted a vine at the mountain (whose name was Lubar, one of the mountains of Ararat) on which the ark had come to rest. It produced fruit in the fourth year."⁷⁵ Here, just as in *3 Bar* 4:13-15, the planting of the vine is associated with Noah's debarkation.

⁶⁹ "And then the Most High, the Great and Holy One, spoke and sent Arsyalalyur to the son of Lamech, and said to him: Say to him in my name 'Hide yourself,' and reveal to him the end which is coming, for the whole earth will be destroyed, and a deluge is about to come on all the earth, and what is in it will be destroyed. And now teach him that he may escape, and (that) his offspring may survive for the whole earth." *1 Enoch* 10:1-3. Knibb, 2.87.

⁷⁰ Sarasail represents here the corruption of Sariel, the angelic name of the archangel Uriel also known in various traditions under the name of Phanuel. On the Uriel/Sariel/Phanuel connection, see: A. Orlov, "The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic Ladder of Jacob," in: *Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity* 9 (ed. C.A. Evans; Sheffield, 2001) (forthcoming).

⁷¹ M. Black observes that "the longer text of Sync. seems closer to an original." M. Black, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (SVTP, 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985) 133. .

⁷² Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 161-62.

⁷³ Black, *The Book of Enoch*, 30.

⁷⁴ P.A. Tiller, "The 'Eternal Planting' in the Dead Sea Scrolls" *DSD* 4.3 (1997) 317. See also: S. Fujita, "The Metaphor of Plant in Jewish Literature of the Intertestamental Period," *JSJ* 7 (1976) 30-45.

⁷⁵ J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (2 vols.; CSCO 510-11, Scriptores Aethiopicus 87-88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989) 2.43.

It should be stressed that Noah's story as found in 3 Bar 4:11-16 gives additional evidence to the hypothesis about the existence of the materials associated with the *Book of Noah*. F. García Martínez' pioneering research⁷⁶ demonstrates that the materials of the *Book of Noah* are closely associated with the Enochic/Noachic traditions found in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, the Qumran materials, and Syncellus.⁷⁷ The materials found in 3 Bar 4 might provide additional support for this hypothesis. It seems that in 3 Bar 4 several traditions associated with the *Book of Noah* appear to be intimately interconnected, thus pointing to their possible common origin in the *Book of Noah*.

As an example of such interconnection one can point to another important piece of evidence which also seems to be associated with the materials of the *Book of Noah*. Besides the already mentioned similarities with the fragments of the *Book of Noah* preserved in *1 Enoch* 10 and 6Q8, 3 Bar 4 also seems to contain a reference to another important motif associated with the *Book of Noah*. In 3 Bar 4:15-17, Sarasaël tells Noah about the dangers of the vine. The angel tells him that the plant still retains its evil. This revelation about *the plant and the evil it possesses* recalls another passage possibly associated with the *Book of Noah*, namely, the tradition about the angelic revelation to Noah recorded in *Jub.* 10:1-14 which says that Noah was taught by angels about *the plants and evil spirits*.⁷⁸

Conclusion

⁷⁶ F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 1-44.

⁷⁷ Even though the book of Noah is not listed in the ancient catalogues of the apocryphal books, the writings attributed to Noah are mentioned in such early materials as the *Book of Jubilees* (*Jub.* 10:13 and *Jub.* 21:10), the *Genesis Apocryphon* from Qumran, and the Greek fragment of the Levi document from Mount Athos. In addition to the titles of the lost Book of Noah, several fragmentary materials associated with the early Noachic traditions have survived. Most researchers agree that some parts of the lost book of Noah "have been incorporated into *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* and that some manuscripts of Qumran preserve some traces of it." F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 26.

⁷⁸ *Jub.* 10:11b-14 "... All of the evil ones who were savage we tied up in the place of judgement, while we left a tenth of them to exercise power on the earth before the satan. We told Noah all the medicines for their diseases with their deceptions so that he could cure (them) by means of the earth's plants. Noah wrote down in a book everything (just) as we had taught him regarding all the kinds of medicine, and the evil spirits were precluded from pursuing Noah's children. He gave all the books that he had written to his oldest son Shem because he loved him much more than all his sons." VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.60.

1. The foregoing analysis has demonstrated a number of intriguing parallels between the garden theme found in *3 Bar 4* and similar traditions associated with the materials of the *Book of Giants*.⁷⁹ In both accounts, the gardens are depicted as the place of the primordial heavenly rebellion involving angelic being(s). Although *3 Bar 4* is written from the Adamic perspective,⁸⁰ this account demonstrates several details that are absent in "traditional" Adamic accounts but can be found in the Enochic tradition. This suggests that the author of *3 Bar* might be involved in anti-Enochic polemics borrowing and rewriting Enochic motifs and themes from the Adamic perspective. Therefore, the story of the plantation and the destruction of the garden in *3 Baruch* seems to represent the locus of intense debates involving substantial rewriting of the "original" Enochic/Noahic motifs and themes. The details of the Enochic Watchers/Giants story appear to be rearranged⁸¹ and transferred to new characters of the Adamic story, including Samael/Sataniel and the serpent.⁸²

2. The author of *3 Baruch* seems to be engaged in anti-Enochic polemics not only with the traditions associated with the *Book of Giants* but also with the Enochic motifs and themes found in the *Book of Watchers*, the *Book of Jubilees*, and Syncellus. It appears that even the theme of the flooding of the heavenly garden represents an anti-Enochic motif. *Jub. 4* depicts Enoch as the one who was translated to the garden of Eden. *Jub. 4:23* further tells that because of Enoch "the flood water did not come on any of the land of Eden because he was placed there as a sign and to testify against all people in order to tell all the deeds of history until the day of judgment."⁸³

3. A substantial part of *3 Bar 4* is occupied by the Noahic account. The research demonstrates that the Noahic tradition found in *3 Bar 4* is closely

⁷⁹ The analysis demonstrates that, among the Jewish and Manichean materials associated with the *Book of Giants*, the *Midrash Shemhazai and Azael* shows the closest proximity to the garden traditions found in *3 Bar 4*.

⁸⁰ *3 Baruch 4* appears to be one of the texts where the Adamic tradition plays a prominent role. Scholars have previously noted that Adamic and Enochic/Noahic traditions often compete with each other offering different interpretations of the origins of evil in the world and the agents responsible for the transgression. In the course of the long-lasting polemics about these matters, Adamic and Enochic traditions often allude to the motifs and themes of each other. For a detailed discussion of this subject, see: M. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M. E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 133-49.

⁸¹ D. Harlow noted that the author of *3 Bar 4* "put the Watcher's myth on its head." Harlow, *The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch*, 59.

⁸² The depiction of the serpent in *3 Bar* seems to allude to the enormous appetites of the Giants.

Cf. *3 Bar 4:3* "And he showed me a plain, and there was a serpent on a stone mountain. And it drinks one cubit of water from the sea every day, and it eats earth like grass." Gaylord, *3 Baruch*, 1.666.

⁸³ VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.28.

connected with the fragments of the *Book of Noah* found in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, the DSS fragments and Syncellus. It appears, however, that the Noachic materials found in *3 Bar 4* also seem to have undergone the “Adamic” revisions. H. Gaylord observes that “a strong typological relation is set up between Adam and Noah, who discovers a piece of the vine through which Adam and Eve sinned washed out of the garden by the receding floodwaters.”⁸⁴

⁸⁴ Gaylord, “3 Baruch,” 1.659.

The Noah Tradition

“Noah’s Younger Brother”: The Anti-Noachic Polemics in *2 Enoch*¹

In recent years there has been a growing number of publications devoted to Noachic traditions.² Even though the book of Noah is not listed in the ancient catalogues of the apocryphal books,³ the writings attributed to Noah are mentioned in such early materials as the *Book of Jubilees* (*Jub.* 10:13⁴ and *Jub.* 21:10⁵), the *Genesis Apocryphon* from Qumran,⁶ and the Greek fragment of the Levi document from Mount Athos.⁷

¹ I am indebted to Professor Michael Stone for his useful comments and criticism of this work. All errors that remain are, of course, my responsibility alone.

² On Noachic traditions see: M. Bernstein, "Noah and the Flood at Qumran," *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (eds. D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 199-231; D. Dimant, "Noah in Early Jewish Literature," *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (eds. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998) 123-50; F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 24-44; F. García Martínez, "Interpretation of the Flood in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Interpretations of the Flood* (eds. F. García Martínez and G.P. Luttikhuisen; TBN 1; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 86-108; H. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic. The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man* (WMANT 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988) 242-54; J. Lewis, *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1968); J. Reeves, "Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?" *JBL* 12 (1993) 110-15; J.M. Scott, "Geographic Aspects of Noachic Materials in the Scrolls of Qumran," *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (eds. S.E. Porter and C.E. Evans; JSPS 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 368-81; R.C. Steiner, "The Heading of the Book of the Words of Noah on a Fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon: New Light on a 'Lost' Work," *DSD* 2 (1995) 66-71; M. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M. E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 133-49; M. Stone, "Noah, Books of," *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem: Keter, 1971) 12.1198; J. VanderKam, "The Righteousness of Noah," *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (eds. J. J. Collins and G.W.E. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS 12; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980) 13-32; J. VanderKam, "The Birth of Noah," *Intertestamental Essays in Honor of Józef Tadeusz Milik* (ed. Z.J. Kapera; Qumranica Mogilanensia 6; Krakow: The Enigma Press, 1992) 213-31; Cana Werman, "Qumran and the Book of Noah" *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M. E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 171-81.

³ F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 24.

⁴ "Noah wrote down in a book everything (just) as we had taught him regarding all the kinds of medicine..." J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (2 vols.; CSCO 510-11, *Scriptores Aethiopici* 87-88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989) 2.60.

⁵ "...because this is the way I found (it) written in the book of my ancestors, in the words of Enoch and the words of Noah." J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.123.

In addition to the titles of the lost Noah's book, several fragmentary materials associated with the early Noachic traditions have survived. Most researchers agree that some parts of the lost book of Noah "have been incorporated into *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* and that some manuscripts of Qumran⁸ preserve some traces of it."⁹

A large bulk of the survived Noachic fragments is associated with Enochic materials. This association points to an apparent unity behind the "Enoch-Noah's axis." In some Pseudepigrapha texts, "the words of Noah" often follow closely "the words of Enoch." From the earliest Enochic materials we can see this interdependence between Noachic and Enochic traditions. H. Kvanvig points out that in Noachic traditions Noah and Enoch often appear in the same roles.¹⁰

In some Enochic writings, however, this long-lasting unity of Enoch and Noah appears to be broken for some reasons. They ignore the "Enoch-Noah axis" and show fierce theological polemics against Noah and the traditions associated with his name. One of the Pseudepigrapha texts which attests to such uncommon criticisms against Noah is *2 Enoch*.¹¹ The purpose of this article is to investigate these anti-Noachic tendencies in the Slavonic text of *2 Enoch*. In our further analysis we will examine certain features of Noah's story which come under attack in these polemics.

⁶ "The Book of the Words of Noah" col. 5, line 29. Cf. R.C. Steiner, "The Heading of the Book of the Words of Noah on a Fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon: New Light on a 'Lost' Work," *DSD* 2 (1995) 66-71.

⁷ "For thus my father Abraham commanded me for thus he found in the writing of the book of Noah concerning the blood" §57. J.C. Greenfield and M. Stone, "The Aramaic and Greek Fragments of a Levi Document," in *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* (ed. H.W. Hollander and M. de Jonge; SVTP 5; Leiden: Brill, 1985) 465. Among other important late allusions to Noah's writings, the *Chronography* of Syncellus and the *Book of Asaph the Physician* should be mentioned. See F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 25 and 38.

⁸ According to F. García Martínez, the following Qumran materials are related to the Book of Noah: 1QapGen 1-17, 1Q19; 1Q20; 4Q534 (4QMess Ar), and 6Q8. Cf. F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 43-4.

⁹ F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 26.

¹⁰ H. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic. The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man* (WMANT 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988) 117. On Enoch's roles cf. A. Orlov, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch*" *JSP* 18 (1998) 71-86.

¹¹ M. Stone notes that "an extensive development of Noachic traditions is to be observed in *2 Enoch* 71-72 which rewrites the story of Noah's birth, transferring the special traditions to Melkisedek." M. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," 139.

Noah's Sacrifices

Gen 8:20 pictures Noah's animal sacrifice after his debarkation. It may be the first account of an animal sacrifice on the altar found in the Bible. Although Abel's animal offerings are mentioned in Gen 4:4, these sacrifices did not establish any significant sacrificial pattern for future generations.¹² Until Noah, the Bible does not attest to any ongoing tradition of animal sacrifices. When *Jub.* mentions the offerings of Adam and Enoch, it refers to them as incense sacrifices.¹³

Noah thus can be regarded as the originator of the official ongoing tradition of animal sacrifices. He is also the first person to have received from the Lord the commandment about the blood. As M. Stone observes, Noah's connection to the sacrificial cult and to instructions concerning the blood was not accidental.¹⁴

In *2 Enoch*, however, the role of Noah as a pioneer of animal sacrificial practice is challenged by a different story. We learn in this text that immediately after Enoch's instructions to his sons during his short visit to the earth and his ascension to the highest heaven, the firstborn son of Enoch, Methuselah, and his brothers, the sons of Enoch, constructed an altar at Achuzan,¹⁵ the place¹⁶ where Enoch had been taken up. In *2 Enoch*, chapter 69 the Lord appeared to Methuselah in a night vision and appointed him the priest before the people. Verses 11-16 of this chapter describe the first animal sacrifice of Methuselah on the altar. The text says that the people brought sheep, oxen, and birds (all of which have been inspected) for Methuselah to sacrifice them before the face of the Lord.¹⁷ Further, the text gives an elaborate description of the sacrificial ritual during which Methuselah slaughters with a knife, "in the required manner," sheep and

¹² Cf. M. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," 138.

¹³ "On that day, as he was leaving the Garden of Eden, he burned incense as a pleasing fragrance--frankincense, galbanum, stacte, and aromatic spices..." *Jub.* 3:27; "He burned the evening incense of the sanctuary which is acceptable before the Lord on the mountain of incense." *Jub.* 4:25. J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.20 and 2.28.

¹⁴ Michael E. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," 138.

¹⁵ Slav. *Achuzan*. Unless noted otherwise, this and the subsequent Slavonic citations are drawn from Vaillant's edition. Cf. A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Henoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut D'Etudes Slaves, 1952).

¹⁶ The text of *2 Enoch* defines this place as the center of the world, "the place Achuzan, i.e. in the center of the world, where Adam was created." Vaillant, 116. Compare with Ezek 48:20-21 where the Hebrew word "special property of God" applies to Jerusalem and the Temple. Cf. J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976) 114; C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult*, (WUNT R.2, 50; Tübingen: Mohr, 1992) 195.

¹⁷ F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.199. Here and later on I use Andersen's English translation and follow his division of chapters.

oxen placed at the head of the altar.¹⁸ All these sheep and oxen, of course, are tied according to the sectarian instructions given by Enoch earlier in the book. It is apparent that Methuselah's role in the animal sacrificial practice conflicts with the canonical role of Noah as the originator of animal sacrificial tradition.

The text¹⁹ poses a more intensive challenge to Noah's unique place in the sacrificial tradition by indicating that before his death Methuselah passes his priestly/sacrificial duties to the younger brother of Noah--the previously unknown Nir. Chapter 70 of *2 Enoch* recounts the last days of Methuselah on earth before his death. The Lord appeared to Methuselah in a night vision and commanded him to pass his priesthood duties on to the second son of Lamech, Methuselah's grandson Nir. The text does not explain why the Lord wanted to pass the priesthood to Nir instead of Noah (Lamech's²⁰ firstborn son),²¹ even though Noah is also mentioned in the dream. The text only tells about the response of the people to that request: "Let it be so for us, and let the word of the Lord be just as he said to you." Further, the book tells that Methuselah invested Nir with the vestments of priesthood before the face of all the people and "made him stand at the head of the altar."²² He also taught him "everything that he would have to do among the people."²³

The text offers a detailed description of Nir's sacrifice during which he commanded people to bring sheep, bulls, turtledoves, and pigeons. People brought them and tied them up at the head of the altar. Then Nir took the sacrificial knife and slaughtered them in the front of the face of the Lord.²⁴ The important detail here is that immediately following the sacrifice the text offers the formula in which the Lord is proclaimed to be the God of Nir. This title apparently stresses the patriarchal authority of Nir: "and all people made merry in front of the face of the Lord, and on that day they glorified the Lord, the God of heaven and earth, (the God) of Nir"²⁵ 70:21-22.²⁶

¹⁸ Andersen, 198-9.

¹⁹ It should be stressed that both the longer and the shorter recensions of *2 Enoch* include all significant points of the anti-Noachic polemics. There is no substantial difference between the recensions in the representation of these materials. During my analysis I have used illustrations from both recensions in equal proportions.

²⁰ Lamech died before Methuselah. According to Gen 5:26-31, after Lamech was born, Methuselah lived 782 years... Lamech lived a total of 777 years.

²¹ This priestly succession from Methuselah to Nir is an apparent violation of all the norms of traditional succession. Cf. the traditional view in *Jub.* 7:38-39: "For this is how Enoch, your father's father, commanded his son Methuselah; then Methuselah his son Lamech; and Lamech commanded me everything that his fathers had commanded him. Now I am commanding you, my children, as Enoch commanded his son in the first jubilee." J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.49-50.

²² Andersen, 197-203.

²³ Andersen, 202-03.

²⁴ Andersen, 202.

²⁵ Slav. *Gospoda Boga nebesi i zemlja Nirova*. Vaillant, 74.

²⁶ Andersen, 202.

Noah as an Originator of Sacrificial Instruction

The teaching about sacrifices comes from ancient times and is connected with Noah both in *Jub.* 21 and in the Levi document (Mount Athos) §57.²⁷ *Jub.* 21:10 refers to the sacrificial traditions written "in the words of Enoch and in the words of Noah."²⁸ The first part of this statement about Enoch as the originator of sacrificial instruction fully agrees with *2 Enoch's* story. The text offers a lengthy account of Enoch's sacrificial prescriptions to his sons during his short visit to the earth. These instructions have a form of sacrificial halakhot. The halakhic character of these commands is reinforced by the specific Slavonic vocabulary which employs the term *zakon'* ("law") in reference to these sacrificial regulations. The text stresses that "he who puts to death any animal without binding it, it is an evil law,²⁹ he acts lawlessly³⁰ with his own soul." Clearly, the passage speaks not about secular legal prescriptions, but about the halakhic precepts. The Slavonic word *zakon'* commonly used to denote a binding custom or a rule of conduct in the community, in some instances, carries forward a much more restricted, technical meaning: it sometimes refers to the Mosaic Law and serves as an alternate designation for "halakha."³¹

Enoch's sacrificial precepts occupy an important place in the narrative of *2 Enoch*. Some of these sacrificial rules, however, have an apparent sectarian flavor. In chapter 59, Enoch offers Methuselah, as well as his brothers--Regim, Ariim, Akhazukhan, Kharimion--and the elders of all the people, some instructions in animal sacrifices. These halakhot include the following guidelines:

1. Enoch commands his sons to use clean beasts in their sacrifices. According to his prescriptions, "he who brings a sacrifice of clean beasts, it is healing, he heals his soul. And he who brings a sacrifice of clean birds, it is healing, he heals his soul."³²

2. Enoch teaches his sons that they should not touch an ox because of the "outflow."³³

²⁷ Michael E. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," 138.

²⁸ J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.123.

²⁹ Slav. *zlozakonie*. Vaillant, 58.

³⁰ Slav. *bezzakonit'*. Vaillant, 58.

³¹ Cf. P.I. Avanesov, ed., *Slovar' drevnerusskogo jazyka XI-XIV vv.* (10 vols.; Moscow: Russkij jazyk, 1988-) 3.317-9; R.M. Cejtlin, ed., *Staroslovjanskij slovar' po rukopisjam X-XI vekov* (Moscow: Russkij jazyk, 1994) 228; J. Kurz, ed., *Lexicon Linguae Palaeo-Slovenica* (4 vols.; Prague: Akademia, 1966-) 1.643-4; I.I. Sresnevskij, *Slovar' drevnerusskogo jazyka* (3 vols.; Moscow: Kniga, 1989) I(II), 921-2.

³² Andersen, 185.

³³ The terminology of this prescription is unclear. For a detailed discussion of the passage cf. Andersen, 184-5.

3. Enoch's prescriptions address the issue of the atoning sacrifices. He suggests that "a person bring one of the clean animals to make a sacrifice on account of sin, so that he may have healing for his soul."³⁴ Although the blood is not mentioned in these sacrificial prescriptions of Enoch, the text uses extensively the term "an animal soul." Enoch commands his sons to be cautious in dealing with animal souls, because those souls will accuse man in the day of judgment.³⁵

4. Enoch also teaches his sons to bind sacrificial animals by four legs:

...he who brings a sacrifice of clean beasts, it is healing, he heals his soul. And he who brings a sacrifice of clean birds, it is healing, he heals his soul. And everything which you have for food, bind it by four legs³⁶; there is healing, he heals his soul. He who puts to death any animal without binding it, it is an evil custom; he acts lawlessly with his own soul.³⁷

S. Pines draws attention to this unique practice of tying together four legs during animal sacrifices. On the basis of a passage in the Mishna (*Tamid*, 31b) which states that each of the forelegs of the sacrificial animal was tied to the corresponding hind leg, Pines notes that the tying together of all four legs was contrary to the tradition.³⁸ Pines gives one of the two explanations found in the Gemara of the Babli that this disapproval sought to prevent the imitation the customs of the heretics, *minim*³⁹ (the authors of Mishnaic sacrificial prescriptions considered the practice of tying together all four legs to have strong sectarian overtones). In his final conclusion, Pines suggests that "it may have been an accepted rite of a sect, which repudiated the sacrificial customs prevailing in Jerusalem. It might be conjectured that this sect might have been the Essenes, whose sacrificial usage differed according to the one reading of the passage of Josephus⁴⁰ from those practiced at the Temple."⁴¹

As we can see, *2 Enoch* depicts Enoch as the originator of the sacrificial instruction. Although some of these instructions are not necessarily canonical, the role of Enoch in the sacrificial tradition fully agrees with *Jub.* 21:10a. On the other hand, *2 Enoch* is completely silent about Noah's role in these sacrificial instructions. He is referred to neither as the originator of these instructions nor as their practitioner. While the text speaks several times about the future role of Noah as a "procreator" of the postdiluvian

³⁴ Andersen, 184.

³⁵ Andersen, 185.

³⁶ Slav. *svjazhete e po chetyre nogi*. Vaillant, 58.

³⁷ Andersen, p. 185

³⁸ S. Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," in *Types of Redemption* (ed. R.J. Zwi Werblowsky; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1970) 74-75.

³⁹ Pines, 75.

⁴⁰ *Ant.* XVIII, 18.

⁴¹ Pines, 75.

race,⁴² it is silent about his place in the priestly/sacrificial tradition. We might expect that Noah, then, will have an opportunity to do his part after the Flood, but the text, leaves out any significant role for Noah in the postdiluvian priestly/sacrificial tradition. The duty of the priestly successor is given to Nir's "son" - Melchisedek, who "will be the head of the priests"⁴³ in the postdiluvian generation. Noah's role is less prominent. According to the *Slavonic Enoch*, he "will be preserved in that generation for procreation."⁴⁴

Noah and Divine Revelations

In the Bible and the Pseudepigrapha, Noah is portrayed as a recipient of divine revelations, given to him both before and after the Flood. In Gen 6:13-21 and Gen 7:1-5, God speaks to Noah about the Deluge and the construction of the ark. The evidence for the direct communication between God and Noah is further supported by *1 Enoch* 67, *Jub.* 5, and the *Genesis Apocryphon* 6-7. According to the Pseudepigrapha, Noah also enjoys various angelic revelations. In *1 Enoch* 10:1-3, an angel Asuryal warns Noah about the upcoming destruction of the earth. *Jub.* 10:1-14 records an angelic revelation to Noah about evil spirits and healing herbs which he wrote in a book and gave to Shem, his oldest son.⁴⁵ Scholars also believe that in *1 Enoch* 60 it is Noah who was described as a visionary.⁴⁶

These traditions depict Noah as the chosen vessel of divine revelation who alone found favor in the sight of the Lord⁴⁷ in the antediluvian turmoil.

These details and emphases on the direct communication between the Lord and Noah are challenged by the information about Noah found in *2 Enoch*. As has been shown earlier, in the *Slavonic Enoch* Noah keeps a low profile. Although Noah is the firstborn of Lamech, he is portrayed as a family man, a helper to his prominent younger brother Nir, who assists him during the troubles with Sothonim and Melchisedek. While Nir is a priest

⁴² "Then I will preserve Noah, the firstborn son of your son Lamech. And I will make another world rise up from his seed, and his seed will exist throughout the ages" 70:10. Andersen, 203. "For I know indeed that this race will end in confusion, and everyone will perish, except that Noah, my brother, will be preserved in that generation for procreation" 71:37. Andersen, 209.

⁴³ Andersen, 211.

⁴⁴ Andersen, 209.

⁴⁵ J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.60.

⁴⁶ Kvanvig argues that "in *1 Enoch* 60, 1-10.24c-25 Noah is described as a visionary (as in 4QMess Ar) and in a vision he is warned about the coming catastrophe. This description of the flood hero as a visionary had its parallel in both Atra-Hasis and Berossos' version of the Flood story when the flood hero is warned in a dream." Kvanvig, 242.

⁴⁷ Cf. Gen 6:8 and *Jub.* 5:5 - "He was pleased with Noah alone." J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.33.

surrounded by the crowds of people, Noah is a timid relative whose activities are confined to the circle of his family. After Melchisedek's situation was settled, Noah quietly "went away to his own place." Andersen, 206-7.

In contrast to this modest role of Noah, Methuselah and Nir are pictured as priests of the Lord who have dreams/visions in which the Lord gives them important instructions about priestly successions and future events. It sharply contrasts with the absence of any indication of the direct revelations of the Lord to Noah.⁴⁸ We therefore learn about the Flood and Noah's role in it from Methuselah⁴⁹ and Nir's dreams.

In *2 Enoch* chapter 70 the Lord appears to Methuselah in a night vision. The Lord tells him that the earth will perish but Noah, the firstborn son of his son Lamech, will be preserved in order that "another world rise up from his seed."⁵⁰ The account of the Lord's revelation to Methuselah about the Flood and Noah in *2 Enoch* 70:4-10 might belong to the "original" Noachic tradition. It shows some similarities to the account of Enoch's revelation to Methuselah in *1 Enoch* 106:15-19. The affinities, however, should not be exaggerated.

A symmetrical parallel to Methuselah's dream in *2 Enoch* 70:4-10 is Nir's night vision in 71:27-30. In this short dream, which also describes in almost identical terms⁵¹ the future destruction of the earth, one important detail is missing. Noah is absent from this revelation,⁵² and his place is now

⁴⁸ *2 Enoch* 73, which attests to such a revelation, is a later interpolation represented only by the manuscript *R* and partly (only one line) by *Rum*. Cf. M.I Sokolov, 'Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij', *COIDR* 4 (1910) I, 80 and 155. Our analysis of antiNoachic polemics strengthens the hypothesis that *2 Enoch* 73 is a later addition, foreign to the original body of the text. For the discussion about chapter 73 cf. Vaillant, xxii; Andersen, 212.

⁴⁹ The motif of these divine/angelic revelations to Methuselah parallels *1 Enoch* 106, 1QapGen 2:19 and to the text of Pseudo-Eupolemus where "Methuselah ... learned all things through the help of the angels of God, and thus we gained our knowledge." Carl Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors* (Chico, Calif.: Scholar Press, 1983) I.175.

⁵⁰ Andersen, 203.

⁵¹ For example, see in the manuscript *R*: *2 Enoch* 70:8 - "everything that stands will perish" and *2 Enoch* 71:27 - "everything that stands on the earth will perish." M.I Sokolov, 'Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij', *COIDR* 4 (1910)

1.69 and 1.75.

⁵² It is clear that Noah's name was purged from the original Noachic account which lies behind Nir's vision. The additional supporting detail here is that right after Nir's vision, when he arose from the sleep, he repeats the vision in his own words. In this repetition Nir mentions both Melchisedek and Noah as survivors of the Flood. It is apparent that we have here two different traditions which sometimes do not reconcile with each other. Cf. "And

occupied by Melchisedek, who according to the Lord will not perish during the Flood but will be the head of the priests in the future.⁵³ This revision which substitutes one survivor of the Flood for another fits perfectly in the pattern of antiNoachic polemics of the *Slavonic Enoch*. The important role of Noah as the "bridge" between the antediluvian and postdiluvian worlds is openly challenged.

Noah as a Bridge over the Flood

M. Stone stresses that "the sudden clustering of works around Noah indicates that he was seen as a pivotal figure in the history of humanity, as both an end and a beginning."⁵⁴ He also points out that the Pseudepigrapha from Qumran, which ascribe the priestly teaching to Noah, stress Noah's role as the "bridge" between the ante- and postdiluvian worlds.⁵⁵

In the Pseudepigrapha Noah carries the priestly tradition through the Flood. *Jub.* pictures Noah and his sons as priests. Targumic and Rabbinic traditions also attest to the priestly functions of Noah's family. The canonical emphasis on the role of Noah in the sacrificial practice has been mentioned earlier.

In *2 Enoch*, however, this function of Noah as a vessel of the priestly tradition over the Flood⁵⁶ is seriously undermined by Melchisedek--the child predestined to survive the Flood in order to become the priest to all priests in the postdiluvian generation. This story is repeated in the text several times during the Lord's revelations to Nir and to archangel Gabriel.⁵⁷

Melchisedek will be the head of the priests in another generation. For I know indeed that this race will end in confusion and everyone will perish, except that Noah, my brother, will be preserved in that generation for procreation" 71:33-7. Andersen, 209.

⁵³ Andersen, 208.

⁵⁴ Michael E. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," 141.

⁵⁵ Michael E. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," 143.

⁵⁶ Another challenge to Noah's role as a carrier of antediluvian traditions over the Flood is the theme of Enoch's books. From *2 Enoch* 33:8-12 we learn that the Lord commanded his angels Ariokh and Mariokh to guard Enoch's books, so "they might not perish in the impending flood." Andersen, 157. This motif of the "secret" books by which antediluvian wisdom reached postdiluvian generations plays a prominent role in the Mesopotamian flood stories. Cf. P. Grelot, "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification", *RSR* 46 (1958) 9-13.

⁵⁷ This story is supported by the lengthy priestly genealogy which also includes Enoch, Methuselah, and Nir. Noah, of course, is not presented in this list. Cf. "Therefore honor him (Melchisedek) together with your servants and great priests, with Sit, and Enos, and Rusi, and Amilam, and Prasadam, and Maleleil, and Serokh, and Arusan, and Aleem, and Enoch, and Methusalam, and me, your servant Nir. And behold, Melchisedek will be the head of the 13 priests who existed before" 71:32-33. Andersen, 208.

In chapter 71 the Lord appeared to Nir in a night vision. He tells Nir that the child Melchisedek will be placed by the archangel in the paradise of Eden where he can survive the destruction of the earth in order to become the priest to all priests after the Flood.⁵⁸ Further, in chapter 72 the Lord commands his archangel Gabriel to take Melchisedek and place him in the paradise for preservation, so that he becomes "the head of the priests" in the postdiluvian generation.⁵⁹

In the midst of the antiNoachic polemic, Noah himself recognizes the future priesthood of Melchisedek and surrenders his own and his descendents' priestly right to this child. From 71:20-21 we learn that when Noah saw the child Melchisedek with the badge of priesthood on his chest, he said to Nir: "Behold, God is renewing the continuation of the blood of the priesthood after us."⁶⁰

The Birth of Noah

It has been shown that in the course of anti-Noachic polemics, the elements of Noah's story are transformed and his traditional roles are given to other characters. It is therefore no surprise to see that some details of Noah's birth in *2 Enoch* are transferred to a new hero--the future postdiluvian priest, Melchisedek.

The birth of Noah occupies an important place in the Noachic traditions. In *1 Enoch* 106-107 and in the *Genesis Apocryphon* 2-5, Noah is portrayed as a wonder-child. *1 Enoch* pictures him with a glorious face and eyes like the rays of the sun. He was born fully developed; and as he was taken away from the hand of the midwife, he spoke to the Lord. These extraordinary qualities of the wonder-child lead his father Lamech to suspect that Noah's birth was angelic in origin.

In the context of antiNoachic polemics of *2 Enoch*, this prominent part of Noah's biography finds its new niche. Here again we have the polemical rewriting of the Noachic narrative when the peculiar details of Noah's story are transferred to an another character, namely, to Melchisedek.

Scholars noted previously that Melchisedek's birth in *Slavonic Enoch* recalls some parallels with the birth of Noah in *1 Enoch* and in the *Genesis Apocryphon*.⁶¹ The Melchisedek narrative occupies the last chapters of 2

⁵⁸ Andersen, 208-9.

⁵⁹ Andersen, 211.

⁶⁰ Andersen, 207.

⁶¹ Cf. M. Delcor, "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews." *JSJ* 2 (1971) 129; *idem*, "La naissance merveilleuse de Melchisédeq d'après l'Hénoch slave" *Kecharitomene. Mélanges René Laurentin* (ed. C. Augustin *et al.*; Paris: Desclée, 1990) 217-229; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981) 185; A. de Santos Otero, "Libro de los

Enoch. The content of the story is connected with the family of Nir. Sothonim, the wife of Nir, gave birth to a miraculous child "in her old age," right "on the day of her death." She conceived the child, "being sterile" and "without having slept with her husband." The book tells that Nir the priest had not slept with her from the day that the Lord had appointed him before the face of the people. Therefore, Sothonim hid herself during all the days of her pregnancy. On the day she was to give birth, Nir remembered his wife and called her to himself in the temple. She came to him, and he saw that she was pregnant. Nir, filled with shame, wanted to cast her from him, but she died at his feet. Melchisedek was born from Sothonim's corpse. When Nir and Noah came in to bury Sothonim, they saw the child sitting beside the corpse with "his clothing on him." According to the story, they were terrified because the child was fully developed physically. The child spoke with his lips and he blessed the Lord. The unusual child was marked by the sign of priesthood. The story describes how "the badge of priesthood" was on his chest, glorious in appearance. Nir and Noah dressed the child in the garments of priesthood and fed him the holy bread. They decided to hide him, fearing that the people would have him put to death. Finally, the Lord commanded His archangel Gabriel to take the child and place him in "the paradise Eden," so that he might become the high priest after the Flood. The final passages of the short recension describe the ascent of Melchisedek on the wings of Gabriel to the paradise Eden.

The details of Noah's birth correspond at several points with the Melchisedek story:

1. Both Noah and Melchisedek belonged to the circle of Enoch's family.
2. Both characters are attested as "survivors" of the Flood.
3. Both characters have an important mission in the postdiluvian era.
4. Both characters are pictured as glorious wonder children.
5. Immediately after their birth, both characters spoke to the Lord.

1 *Enoch* 106:3 - "And when he (Noah) arose from the hands of the midwife, he opened his mouth and spoke to the Lord with righteousness."

2 *Enoch* 71:19 - "he (Melchisedek) spoke with his lips, and he blessed the Lord."⁶²

6. Both characters were suspected of the divine/angelic lineage.

M. Delcor affirms that Lamech's phrase in the beginning of the *Genesis Apocryphon*, "Behold, then I thought in my heart that the conception was the work of the Watchers and the pregnancy of the Holy Ones..." can be

secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo)," *Apocrifos del Antiguo Testamento* (ed. A. Dies Macho; Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1984) 4.199; R. Stichel, *Die Namen Noes, seines Bruders und seiner Frau. Ein Beitrag zum Nachleben jüdischer Überlieferungen in der außerkanonischen und gnostischen Literatur und in Denkmälern der Kunst* (AAWG.PH 3. Folge 112; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979) 42-54.

⁶² Andersen, 207.

compared with the words of Noah in *2 Enoch* uttered at the time of the examination of Melchisedek: "This is of the Lord, my brother."⁶³

7. Their fathers were suspicious of the conception of their sons and the faithfulness of their wives.⁶⁴

In the *Genesis Apocryphon*, Lamech is worried and "frightened" about the birth of Noah, his son. Lamech suspects that his wife Bathenosh was unfaithful to him and that "the conception was (the work) of the Watchers and the pregnancy of the Holy Ones, and it belonged to the Nephil[in]."⁶⁵ The motif of Lamech's suspicion about the unfaithfulness of Bathenosh found in the *Genesis Apocryphon* seems to correspond to Nir's worry about the unfaithfulness of Sothonim: "And Nir saw her, and he became very ashamed about her. And he said to her, 'what is this that you have done, O wife? And why have you disgraced me in the front of the face of all people? And now, depart from me, go where you conceived the disgrace of your womb.'"⁶⁶

8. Their mothers were ashamed and tried to defend themselves against the accusation of their husbands.

In the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the wife of Lamech responds to the angry questions of her husband by reminding him of their intimacies: "Oh my brother and lord! remember my sexual pleasure... [...] in the heat of intercourse, and the gasping of my breath in my breast."⁶⁷ She swears that the seed was indeed of Lamech: "I swear to you by the Great Holy One, by the King of the hea[vens...]...[...] that this seed comes from you, [...] and not from any foreigner nor from any of the watchers or sons of heav[en]."⁶⁸ In *2 Enoch* Sothonim does not explain the circumstances of the conception. She answers Nir: "O my lord! Behold, it is the time of my old age, and there was not in me any (ardor of) youth and I do not know how the indecency of my womb has been conceived."⁶⁹

9. Their fathers were eventually comforted by the special revelation about the prominent future role of their sons in the postdiluvian era.

⁶³ Delcor, 129.

⁶⁴ George Nickelsburg observes that the miraculous circumstances attending Melchisedek's conception and birth are reminiscent of the Noah story in *1 Enoch*, although the suspicion of Nir is more closely paralleled in the version of the Noah story in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. George W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981) 188.

⁶⁵ F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997) 1.29.

⁶⁶ Andersen, 205.

⁶⁷ F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997) 1.29

⁶⁸ F. García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997) 1.29-31.

⁶⁹ Andersen, 205.

It is noteworthy that this information is given in both cases in the context of the revelation about the destruction of the earth by the Flood.

1 Enoch 106:16-18 - "And this son who has been born unto you shall be left upon the earth, and his three sons shall be saved when they who are upon the earth are dead."

2 Enoch 71:29-30 - "And this child will not perish along with those who are perishing in this generation, as I have revealed it, so that Melchisedek will be ...the head of the priests of the future."⁷⁰

One cannot fail to note a host of interesting overlaps between the birth of Noah in the Pseudepigrapha and the birth of Melchisedek in *2 Enoch*. It is not difficult to notice that the author of *2 Enoch* wants to diminish the extraordinariness of Noah's person and transfer these qualities to Melchisedek. The text therefore can be seen as a set of improvisations on the original Noachic themes.

Noah's Son

Shem b. Noah plays a prominent role in Noachic traditions.⁷¹ According to *Jubilees*, Shem is Noah's choice in the transmission of his teaching. From *Jub.* 10:13-14 we learn that "Noah wrote down in a book everything ... and he gave all the books that he had written to his oldest son Shem because he loved him much more than all his sons."⁷² Because of his unique role in the Noachic tradition, Shem b. Noah is also one of the targets of the anti-Noachic polemics of *2 Enoch*. This debate takes its place in the last chapters of the book which are connected with the Melchisedek legend.

The previous exposition shows that the Melchisedek story is closely connected with Nir's family. Even though Nir is not the biological father of Melchisedek, he later adopts him as his son. In *2 Enoch* chapter 71 Nir says to the Lord: "For I have no descendants, so let this child take the place of my descendants and become as my own son, and you will count him in the number of your servants." Andersen, 209.

In this instance of Nir's "adoption" of Melchisedek we have again an anti-Noachic motif.

In Targumic and rabbinic literature Melchisedek is often attested as the oldest son of Noah - Shem. The identification of Melchisedek and Shem can be found in *Tg. Ps.-J.*, *Frg. Tg.*, *Tg. Neof.*, *Gen. Rab.* 43.1; 44.7, *'Abot R. Nat.* 2, *Pirque R. El.* 7; 27, and *b. Ned.* 32b.

⁷⁰ Andersen, 208.

⁷¹ On Shem traditions in *2 Enoch* see: Andrei A. Orlov, "Melchisedek Legend of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*," *JSJ* (forthcoming).

⁷² J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2.60.

The basic message of the passages from the Targums and rabbinic literature is the building up of the priestly antecedents of Melchisedek (Shem) in the context of the transmission of this priestly line to Abraham.⁷³ In these texts Shem b. Noah (Melchisedek) represents an important link in the passing of the Noachic priestly/sacrificial tradition to Abraham. This prominent motif of the succession of the Noachic priestly/sacrificial tradition by the tradition of Abraham and his descendants, including Isaac and Levi, can be found already in *Jub.* 21 and in the Levi document from Athos.

In contrast, the text of the *Slavonic Enoch* attempts to build an alternative to the traditional Targumic/rabbinic line of interpretation, which serves as a parallel to the official Noah-Shem line. Previously unknown Nir, the young brother of Noah, plays an important theological role in this shift. The substitution of Noah's "fatherhood" to Nir's "fatherhood" is one more facet of the complicated anti-Noachic polemics in the text of *2 Enoch*.

Conclusion

The goal of our research was to show the existence of antiNoachic polemics in *2 Enoch*. To understand the reasons of the suppression of the Noachic traditions in the text would require another lengthy investigation. However, some conclusions can be made at this stage of the research.

1. The foregoing survey testifies to the existence of antiNoachic polemics in *2 Enoch*. The analysis shows that these polemics seem to be based on the "original" Noachic materials which demonstrate some distant parallels with the fragments of the *Book of Noah* found in *1 Enoch*, *Jub.*, and the *Genesis Apocryphon*.⁷⁴

⁷³ Cf. for example *b. Ned.* 32b: "R. Zechariah said on R. Ishmael's authority: The Holy One, blessed be He, intended to bring forth the priesthood from Shem, as it is written, 'And he [Melchizedek] was the priest of the most high God' (Gen 14:18). But because he gave precedence in his blessing to Abraham over God, He brought it forth from Abraham; as it is written, 'And he blessed him and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth, and blessed be the most high God' (Gen 14:19). Said Abraham to him, 'Is the blessing of a servant to be given precedence over that of his master?' Straightway it [the priesthood] was given to Abraham, as it is written (Ps 110:1), 'The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool;' which is followed by, 'The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek' (Ps 110:4), meaning, 'because of the word of Melchizedek.' Hence it is written, And he was a priest of the most High God, [implying that] he was a priest, but not his seed." *The Babylonian Talmud. Seder Nedarim* (London: Soncino Press, 1936) 98-9.

⁷⁴ It is possible that some traces of the polemics with Noachic tradition can be found already in early Enochic documents, including booklets of *1 Enoch*, where Enoch often "substitutes" Noah in Noachic narratives. Such tensions between Enoch and Noah can be

2. The antiNoachic debates involve a substantial rewriting of the "original" Noachic motifs and themes. The details of the Noah "biography" are rearranged and transferred to other characters, including Methuselah, Nir and Melchisedek.

3. It appears that the main target of the antiNoachic polemics is the Noah-Abraham priestly connection. It explains why Melchisedek (who in Targumic/rabbinic traditions represents the important link in the passing of the Noachic priestly/sacrificial tradition to Abraham) becomes the center of the fierce antiNoachic debates in *2 Enoch*. The fact that Abraham and his progeny are completely absent in *2 Enoch* further supports the hypothesis. In this Slavonic apocalypse the Lord is named as "God of your father Enoch"⁷⁵--the familiar title which in the Bible is connected with Abraham and his descendants.

4. The antiNoachic polemics could be also triggered by the prominence of the Adamic tradition in the *Slavonic Enoch*,⁷⁶ where "the high priesthood is traced back ultimately to Adam."⁷⁷ In the Pseudepigrapha and the Qumran writings, the Adamic and Priestly-Noah traditions often compete with and suppress each other. In the Adamic tradition, the source of evil is traced to the fall of Adam and Eve in Eden. In contrast to that, the Noachic tradition bases its understanding of the origin of the evil on the Watchers story. In this story descended Watchers corrupt human beings by passing to them various celestial secrets. By those mysteries the humans multiply evil deeds upon the earth.⁷⁸ This Noachic motif seems to be challenged in *2 Enoch*, where the Lord keeps His utmost secrets from the angels.⁷⁹

5. It is evident that *2 Enoch* contains a systematic tendency to diminish or refocus the priestly significance of the Noachic tradition. These antiNoachic revisions take place in the midst of the sectarian debates about the sacrificial practice and the priestly succession.⁸⁰

rooted in certain Mesopotamian "prototypes" common for both characters. Cf. P. Grelot, "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification", *RSR* 46 (1958) 189-91.

⁷⁵ Cf. *2 Enoch* 69:2, 69:5, and 70:3 - "I am the Lord, the God of your father Enoch" Slav. *Bog' otca tvoego Enoha*. Vaillant, 68.

⁷⁶ On the Adamic traditions in the Slavonic pseudepigrapha and in *2 Enoch* see: Émile Turdeanu, *Apocryphes Slaves et Roumains de L'Ancien Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1981) 405-35; C. Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1995).

⁷⁷ Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," 148.

⁷⁸ *1 Enoch* 16:3.

⁷⁹ Cf. Andersen, 143.

⁸⁰ As A. Rubinstein notes, "it is hard to escape the impression that the purpose of the account is to build up the priestly antecedents of Melchizedek." A. Rubinstein, "Observations on the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*," *JJS* 15 (1962) 5. P. Sacchi adds that the Melchizedek story gives "the impression of a work that develops an Enochic priestly tradition in the midst of the problems of first-century Jewish thought, with particular reference to the relation between the function of Enoch and those of Melchizedek." P.

Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History* (JSPSS 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996) 234-5.

Noah's Younger Brother Revisited: Anti-Noachic Polemics and the Date of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch

Several years ago, in an article published in this journal, I argued that 2 *Enoch* contains systematic polemics against the priestly Noahic tradition.¹ My study tried to demonstrate that in the course of these polemics the exalted features of Noah's story, such as his miraculous birth, his leading roles as the originator of animal sacrificial practice and a bridge over the Flood become transferred to other characters of the Slavonic apocalypse including Methuselah, Nir, who defined in the story as "Noah's younger brother," and his miraculously born child Melchisedek.² The analysis

¹ A. Orlov, "Noah's Younger Brother': Anti-Noachic Polemics in 2 Enoch," *Henoch* 22.2 (2000) 259-73.

² Noachic polemics take place in the last chapters of the Slavonic apocalypse (chs 68-72). In this section of the pseudepigraphon we learn that, immediately after Enoch's instructions to his sons during his short visit to the earth and his ascension to the highest heaven, the firstborn son of Enoch, Methuselah, and his brothers, the sons of Enoch, constructed an altar at Achuzan, the place where Enoch had been taken up. In 2 *Enoch* 69 the Lord appeared to Methuselah in a night vision and appointed him the priest before the people. Verses 11-16 of this chapter describe the first animal sacrifice of Methuselah on the altar. The text gives an elaborate description of the sacrificial ritual during which Methuselah slaughters with a knife, "in the required manner," sheep and oxen placed at the head of the altar. All these sheep and oxen are tied according to the sectarian instructions given by Enoch earlier in the book. Chapter 70 of 2 *Enoch* recounts the last days of Methuselah on earth before his death. The Lord appeared to Methuselah in a night vision and commanded him to pass his priesthood duties on to the second son of Lamech, the previously unknown Nir. The text does not explain why the Lord wanted to pass the priesthood to Nir instead of Noah (Lamech's firstborn son), even though Noah is also mentioned in the dream. Further, the book tells that Methuselah invested Nir with the vestments of priesthood before the face of all the people and "made him stand at the head of the altar." The account of the sacerdotal practices of Enoch's relatives then continues with the Melchisedek story. The content of the story is connected with Nir's family. Sothonim, Nir's wife, gave birth to a child "in her old age," right "on the day of her death." She conceived the child, "being sterile" and "without having slept with her husband." The book told that Nir the priest had not slept with her from the day that the Lord had appointed him in front of the face of the people. Therefore, Sothonim hid herself during all the days of her pregnancy. Finally, when she was at the day of birth, Nir remembered his wife and called her to himself in the temple. She came to him and he saw that she was pregnant. Nir, filled with shame, wanted to cast her from him, but she died at his feet. Melchisedek was born from Sothonim's corpse. When Nir and Noah came in to bury Sothonim, they saw the child sitting beside the corpse with "his clothing on him." According to the story, they were terrified because the child was fully developed physically. The child spoke with his lips and he blessed the Lord. According to the story, the newborn child was marked with the sacerdotal sign, the glorious "badge of priesthood" on his chest. Nir and Noah dressed the child in the garments of priesthood and they fed

showed that the transferences of Noah's features and achievements to other characters were intended to diminish the extraordinary role traditionally assigned to the hero of the Flood in the crucial juncture of the primeval history.

While demonstrating the existence of the Noachic polemics my previous study did not fully explained the purpose of these polemics. Why Noah who traditionally is viewed as the main ally of the seven antediluvian hero in early Enochic booklets suddenly become devalued by the Enochic tradition? In this current investigation I will try to advance an argument that the polemics with the exalted figure of the hero of the Flood found in *2 Enoch* might represent the response of the Enochic tradition to the challenges posed to the classic profile of the seventh antediluvian hero by the Second Temple mediatorial traditions about the exalted patriarchs and prophets.

A further, and more important, goal of this study will be clarification of the possible date of *2 Enoch* which represent a crucial problem for the students of the Slavonic apocalypse who often lament the absence of a single unambiguous textual evidence that can place the pseudepigraphon in the chronological boundaries of the Second Temple Judaism. Scholars have rightly observed that "although many commentators take for granted a date as early as the first century CE for *2 Enoch*, the fact remains that it survives only in Medieval manuscripts in Slavonic and that exegesis of it needs to commence at that point and proceed backwards to a putative (and highly debatable) first-century Jewish original only on the basis of rigorous argument."³

It is possible that the anti-Noachic developments found in the Slavonic apocalypse can finally provide the decisive proof for the early date of this text. The investigation will explore whether Noachic polemical developments, which focus the issues of sacrificial practices and priestly successions, can be firmly dated not later than 70 CE since they reflect a distinctive sacerdotal situation peculiar to the time when the Temple was still standing. This study will try to demonstrate that the Noachic polemics in *2 Enoch* belong to the same stream of early Enochic testimonies to the priestly-Noah tradition as those reflected in the *Genesis Apocryphon* and the *Epistle of Enoch*, written before the destruction of the Second Jerusalem Temple.

him the holy bread. They decided to hide him, fearing that the people would have him put to death. Finally, the Lord commanded His archangel Gabriel to take the child and place him in "the paradise Eden" so that he might become the high priest after the Flood. The final passages of the story describe the ascent of Melchisedek on the wings of Gabriel to the paradise Eden.

³ Davila, "Melchisedek, the 'Youth,' and Jesus," in: *The Dead Sea scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and early Christianity. Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001* (ed. J. R. Davila; STDJ, 46; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 261, n. 20.

Purpose of the Polemics

My study published in *Henoch*⁴ demonstrated that *2 Enoch* shows a systematic tendency to diminish or refocus the priestly significance of the figure of Noah. These revisions take place in the midst of the debates about sacrificial practice and priestly succession. But what is the role of this denigration of the hero of the Flood and the traditions associated with his name in the larger framework of the mediatorial polemical interactions found in the Slavonic apocalypse?

I have argued elsewhere that the anti-Noachic developments is not the only polemical trend found in the Slavonic apocalypse.⁵ In fact *2 Enoch* reveals an intricate web of the mediatorial debates in course of which the several traditions about exalted patriarchs and prophets prominent in the Second Temple Judaism, including Adam and Moses, underwent polemical appropriation when their exalted features are transferred to the seventh antediluvian hero. These polemical tendencies seem to reflect the familiar atmosphere of the mediatorial debates widespread in the Second Temple period which offered contending accounts for the primacy and supremacy of their exalted heroes. The polemics found in *2 Enoch* is part of these debates and represent a response of the Enochic tradition to the challenges of its rivals.

It has been mentioned that *2 Enoch* contains polemics with Adamic and Mosaic traditions. These polemical moves are consistent with the ambiguous attitude towards Adam and Moses already discernable in the earliest Enochic materials where these two exalted characters traditionally understood as the major mediatorial rivals of the seventh antediluvian patriarch.⁶ But why do the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse attempt to diminish the significance of Noah, who was traditionally considered as a main ally of the seventh antediluvian patriarch and, consequently, occupied a prominent place among the main heroes of the Enochic lore starting from the earliest Enochic booklets?

⁴ A. Orlov, "Noah's Younger Brother': Anti-Noachic Polemics in *2 Enoch*," *Henoch* 22.2 (2000) 259-73.

⁵ A. Orlov, "On the Polemical Nature of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*: A Reply to C. Böttrich," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 34 (2003) 274-303; idem, "'Without Measure and Without Analogy': *Sh'iuur Qomah* Traditions in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*," *Journal of Jewish Studies* (2005) (forthcoming).

⁶ See: J. VanderKam, "The Interpretation of Genesis in *1 Enoch*," in: *The Bible at Qumran* (eds. P. W. Flint and T. H. Kim; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 142; P. Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformation of the Biblical Enoch," *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergen; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998) 100; idem, "Enoch and the Beginnings of Jewish Interest in Natural Science," in: *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (eds. C. Hempel et al., BETL, CLIX; Leuven: Peeters, 2002) 234; Orlov, "On the Polemical Nature of *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*: A Reply to C. Böttrich," 276-7.

The important feature of the removal of Noah's priestly and sacrificial roles in *2 Enoch* is that, although the significance of the hero of the flood is almost completely sacerdotally denigrated, it does not affect or destroy the value or meaning of the alternative priestly tradition which he was faithfully representing for such a long time. The legacy of this priestly-sacrificial office is still strictly maintained within the Enochic family since Noah's priestly garments are not lost or destroyed but instead are skillfully transferred to other kinsmen of the Enochic clan, including its traditional member Methuselah⁷ and two other, newly-acquired relatives, Nir⁸ and Melchisedek.⁹

This shows that the impetus for the denigration of Noah, this important character of the Enochic-Noachic axis, does not come from opponents to the Enochic tradition, but rather originates within this lore. It represents a domestic conflict that attempts to downgrade and devalue the former paladin who has become so notable that his exalted status in the context of mediatorial interactions now poses an imminent threat to the main hero of the Enochic tradition. It is noteworthy that in the course of the aforementioned polemical transferences, the priestly profile of Enoch and the sacerdotal status of some members of his immediate family become much stronger. His son Methuselah, the first-born and heir of his father's teaching, has now acquired the roles of high priest and pioneer of animal sacrificial practice by constructing an altar on the high place associated with the Jerusalem Temple.¹⁰ Further, it should not be forgotten that the priest Nir is also a member of Enoch's family, so the future priest Melchisedek, who despite the fact of his bizarre fatherless birth, is nevertheless safely brought into the circle of Enoch's family through his adoption by Nir.¹¹ The priestly succession from Enoch and Methuselah to Shem-Melchisedek, an important carrier of sacrificial precepts, thus occurs without the help of Noah. Moreover this enigmatic heir of Enoch's priestly tradition is then able to survive the Deluge not in the ark of the hero of the Flood, but through translation, like Enoch, to heaven.

Enoch also seems to have benefited from Noah's removal from priestly and sacrificial duties since this has made him the only remaining authority in sacrificial instruction, an office that he shared previously with Noah.¹² This fact

⁷ Orlov, "'Noah's Younger Brother': Anti-Noachic Polemics in *2 Enoch*," 209.

⁸ Orlov, "'Noah's Younger Brother': Anti-Noachic Polemics in *2 Enoch*," 210.

⁹ Orlov, "'Noah's Younger Brother': Anti-Noachic Polemics in *2 Enoch*," 216ff.

¹⁰ *2 Enoch* 68-69. F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.196-199.

¹¹ In *2 Enoch* 71 Nir says to the Lord: "For I have no descendants, so let this child take the place of my descendants and become as my own son, and you will count him in the number of your servants." Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 209.

¹² Orlov, "'Noah's Younger Brother': Anti-Noachic Polemics in *2 Enoch*," 210-12.

might have encouraged him to openly deliver a series of sacrificial halakhot to his children that he never did previously in the Enochic materials.¹³

It is also significant that, although the priestly profile of Noah is removed in the text and his elevated qualities are transferred to other characters, he still remains a faithful member of the Enochic clan. Although he ceases to be an extraordinary figure and peacefully surrenders his prominent offices to his relatives, he still manages to perfectly fit in the family surroundings by virtue of his newly-acquired role of an average person and a family helper in the new plot offered by *2 Enoch's* authors.¹⁴ This depiction of Noah as an ordinary person provides an important key for understanding the main objective of Noachic polemics in the Slavonic apocalypse as an argument against the exalted profile of the hero of the Flood posing as a mediatorial rival of Enoch.

The changing attitude toward Noah as a potential threat to Enoch's exalted role, might already be detected in the late Second Temple Enochic developments. A tradition preserved in the Ethiopic text of the *Animal Apocalypse*¹⁵ portrays Noah with imagery identical to that used in the portrayal of Moses in the Aramaic and Ethiopic versions of the text, that is, as an animal transformed into a human; in the zoomorphic code of the book this metamorphosis signifies the transformation into an angelomorphic creature. The Aramaic fragments of *1 Enoch* do not attest to the tradition of Noah's elevation, which suggests that this tradition was a later Second Temple development.¹⁶ It might indicate that in the later Second Temple Enochic lore, about the time when *2 Enoch* was written, Noah was understood as an angelomorphic creature similar to Moses, thus posing a potential threat to the elevated profile of the seventh antediluvian hero.

Debates about the Date

The foregoing analysis of Noachic polemics in the Slavonic apocalypse points to the complex process of interaction between the various mediatorial streams competing for the primacy of their heroes. Yet these conceptual engagements allow us not only to gain a clearer view of the enhancement of Enoch's elevated profile but also to determine a possible date for the text.

Students of Jewish pseudepigrapha have previously raised concerns about the date of the Slavonic apocalypse, pointing to the fact that the text

¹³ *2 Enoch* 59. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 184-87.

¹⁴ In *2 Enoch* 71, Noah is depicted as a timid relative whose activities are confined to the circle of his family. After Melchisedek's situation was settled, Noah quietly "went away to his own place." Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 206-7.

¹⁵ *1 Enoch* 89:9.

¹⁶ P. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1993) 267.

does not seem to supply definitive evidence for placing it within precise chronological boundaries.

It should be noted that the scholarly attitude towards the Slavonic apocalypse as evidence of Second Temple Jewish developments remains somewhat ambiguous in view of the uncertainty of the text's date. Although students of the apocalypse working closely with the text insist on the early date of the Jewish pseudepigraphon, a broader scholarly community has been somehow reluctant to fully embrace *2 Enoch* as a Second Temple Jewish text.¹⁷ In scholarly debates about the Second Temple pseudepigrapha, one can often find references to Francis Andersen's remark that "in every respect *2 Enoch* remains an enigma. So long as the date and location remain unknown, no use can be made of it for historical purposes."¹⁸

The uncritical use of this brief statement about *2 Enoch* as an enigma "in every respect" unfortunately tends to oversimplify the scholarly situation and diminish the value of the long and complex history of efforts to clarify the provenance and date the text.¹⁹ The following brief excursus into the

¹⁷ The early date of the pseudepigraphon was supported by, among others, the following investigations: R. H. Charles and W. R. Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896); M. I. Sokolov, 'Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij', *COIDR* 4 (1910) 165; G. N. Bonwetsch, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (AGWG.PH Neue Folge Bd.1 Nr.3; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1896); N. Schmidt, "The Two Recensions of Slavonic Enoch," *JAOS* 41 (1921) 307-312; G. Scholem, *Ursprung und Anfänge der Kabbala* (Berlin, 1962) 62-64; M. Philonenko, "La cosmogonie du 'Livre des secrets d'Hénoch,'" in: *Religions en Egypte: Hellénistique et romaine* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969) 109-116; S. Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," in: *Types of Redemption* (eds. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky and C. Jouco Bleeker; SHR, 18; Leiden: Brill, 1970) 72-87; J. C. Greenfield, "Prolegomenon", in: H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973) XVIII-XX; U. Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (BZNW, 44; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978) 38-41; J. H. Charlesworth, "The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch (Seminar Report)," *NTS* 25 (1979) 315-23; J. J. Collins, "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism," in: *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1983) 533; F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," in: *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.91-221; M. E. Stone, *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (CRINT, 2.2; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984) 406; A. de Santos Otero, "Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo)," in: *Apocryfos del AT* (ed. A. Diez Macho; Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1984) 4.147-202; C. Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995) 812-13. P. Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (JSPSS, 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).

¹⁸ Andersen, "2 Enoch," 97.

¹⁹ After all it should not be forgotten that in the same study Francis Andersen explicitly assigns the book to the late first century CE. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 91.

history of arguments against the early date of the text demonstrates the extreme rarity of critical attempts and their very limited power of persuasion.

1. In 1896, in his introduction to the English translation of *2 Enoch*, R.H. Charles assigned "with reasonable certainty" the composition of the text to the period between 1-50 CE,²⁰ before the destruction of the Temple; this view, however, did not remain unchallenged.²¹ In 1918 the British astronomer A.S.D. Maunder launched an attack against the early dating of the pseudepigraphon, arguing that the Slavonic Enoch does not represent an early Jewish text written in the first century CE, but instead is "a specimen of Bogomil propaganda," composed in the Slavonic language in "the 'Middle Bulgarian' period – i.e., between the 12th and 15th centuries."²² In the attempt to justify her claim, Maunder appealed to the theological content of the book, specifically to its alleged Bogomil features, such as the dualism of good and evil powers. She found that such dualistic ideas were consistent with the sectarian teaching that "God had two sons, Satanail and Michael."²³ Maunder's study was not limited solely to the analysis of the theological features of the text but also included a summary of the astronomical and calendarical observations which attempted to prove a late date for the text. Her argument against the early dating of the pseudepigraphon was later supported by J. K. Fotheringham, who offered a less radical hypothesis that the date of *2 Enoch* must be no earlier than the middle of the seventh century CE.²⁴

Scholars have noted that Maunder's argumentation tends to underestimate the theological and literary complexities of the Slavonic Enoch. The remark was made that, after reading Maunder's article, one can be "astonished at the weakness of this argument and at the irrelevant matters adduced in support

²⁰ In his introduction to the Forbes' translation of *2 Enoch* in *APOT*, Charles broadened the range of the dating of the apocalypse, postulating that "*2 Enoch* in its present form was written probably between 30 B.C. and AD 70. It was written after 30 B.C., for it makes use of *Sirach*, *1 Enoch*, and the *Book of Wisdom*..., and before A.D. 70; for the temple is still standing." R. H. Charles and N. Forbes, "The Book of the Secret of Enoch," *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; ed. R. H. Charles; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913) 2. 429. This opinion about the early date of *2 Enoch* was also supported by Charles' contemporaries, the Russian philologist Matvej Sokolov and German theologian Nathaniel Bonwetsch. Sokolov, *Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo*; Bonwetsch, *Das slavische Henochbuch*; idem, *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs*.

²¹ R. H. Charles and W. R. Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896) xxvi.

²² A. S. D. Maunder, "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *The Observatory* 41 (1918) 309-16, esp. 316.

²³ Maunder, "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Book of Enoch," 315.

²⁴ J. K. Fotheringham, "The Date and the Place of Writing of the Slavonic Enoch," *JTS* 20 (1919) 252.

of it."²⁵ Charles responded to the criticism of Maunder and Forthingam in his article published in 1921 in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, in which he pointed out, among other things, that "the Slavonic Enoch, which ascribes the entire creation to God and quotes the Law as divine, could not have emanated from the Bogomils."²⁶

2. Another attempt to question the scholarly consensus about the early date of *2 Enoch* was made by Josef Milik in his introduction to the edition of the Qumran fragments of the Enochic books published in 1976.²⁷ In the introductory section devoted to the Slavonic Enoch, Milik proposed that the apocalypse was composed between the ninth and tenth centuries CE by a Byzantine Christian monk who knew the Enochic Pentateuch "in the form with which we are familiar through the Ethiopic version."²⁸ In order to support his hypothesis of a late date Milik draws attention to several lexical features of the text. One of them is the Slavonic word **ЗМОУРЕНИЕМЪ** (*zmurenienem'*)²⁹ found in *2 Enoch* 22:11 which Milik has traced to the Greek term **συρματόγραφος**,³⁰ a derivative of the verb **συρματιογραφεῖν**, translated as "to write in minuscule, hence quickly."³¹ He argues that this verb appears to be a neologism which is not attested in any Greek text before the beginning of the ninth century. In addition in his analysis of the lexical features of the apocalypse, Milik directed attention to the angelic names of Arioch and Marioch found in *2 Enoch* 33, arguing that they represent the equivalents of the Harut and Marut of the Muslim legends attested in the second sura of the Qur'an.³²

John Collins, among others, has offered criticism of Milik's lexical arguments, noting that even if the Slavonic text uses the Greek word **συρματόγραφος**, "a single word in the translation is not an adequate basis

²⁵ A. Rubinstein, "Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *JJS* 15 (1962) 1-21, esp.3.

²⁶ R. H. Charles, "The Date and Place of Writings of the Slavonic Enoch," *JTS* 22 (1921) 162-3. See also K. Lake, "The Date of the Slavonic Enoch," *HTR* 16 (1923) 397-398.

²⁷ J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).

²⁸ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 109.

²⁹ Sokolov, *Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo*, 1.23, footnote 13.

³⁰ Milik's hypothesis is implausible. Most scholars trace the word **ЗМОУРЕНИЕМЪ** (*zmurenienem'*) to the Slavonic **ЗМОУРЪНА** (*zmur'na*) which corresponds to **μύρρα**, *myrrha*. J. Kurz, ed., *Slovník Jazyka Staroslovenskeho (Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenicae)* (4 vols.; Prague: Akademia, 1966) 1.677-8. Andersen's translation renders the relevant part of *2 Enoch* 22:11 as follows: "And Vereveil hurried and brought me the books mottled with myrrh." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 141.

³¹ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 111.

³² Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 110.

for dating the whole work."³³ He has also pointed out that "the alleged correspondence of the angels Arioch and Marioch to Harut and Marut of Muslim legend is indecisive since the origin of these figures has not been established."³⁴

Milik's arguments were not confined only to the lexical features of the apocalypse. He also argued that the priestly succession from Methuselah to Noah's nephew Melchisedek described in the third part of *2 Enoch* reflects "the transmission of monastic vocations from uncle to nephew, the very widespread custom in the Greek Church during the Byzantine and medieval periods."³⁵ This feature in his opinion also points to the late Byzantine date of the pseudepigraphon. Unfortunately Milik was unaware of the polemical nature of the priestly successions detailed in the Slavonic Enoch and did not understand the actual role of Nir and Melchisedek in the polemical exposition of the story.

It should be noted that Milik's insistence on the Byzantine Christian provenance of the Slavonic apocalypse was partially inspired by the earlier research of the French Slavist André Vaillant who argued for the Christian authorship of the text.³⁶ Vaillant's position too generated substantial critical response since the vast majority of readers of *2 Enoch* had been arguing for the Jewish provenance of the original core of the text.³⁷

The foregoing analysis of the arguments against the early dating of the pseudepigraphon demonstrates how scanty and unsubstantiated they were in the sea of the overwhelming positive consensus. It also shows that none of these hypotheses has been able to stand up to criticism and to form a rationale that would constitute a viable counterpart to the scholarly opinion supporting the early date. Still, one should recognize that, while the adoption of an early date for the text itself does not face great challenges, placing the text within the precise boundaries of Second Temple Judaism is a much more difficult task.

In proceeding to this task one must first understand what features of the text point to the early date of the text in the chronological framework of

³³ J. J. Collins, "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism," in: *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1983) 533, n. 7.

³⁴ Collins, "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism," 533, note 7.

³⁵ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 114.

³⁶ A. Vaillant, *Le Livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Textes publiés par l'Institut d'études slaves, 4; Paris: L'Institut d'études slaves, 1976 [1952]).

³⁷ Some of the supporters of the idea of the Jewish authorship of the text include the following scholars: Amusin, Andersen, Bonwetsch, Böttrich, Bousset, Charles, Charlesworth, Collins, De Conick, Delcor, Denis, Eissfeldt, Ginzberg, Gieschen, Greenfield, Gruenwald, Fletcher-Louis, Fossum, Harnak, Himmelfarb, Kahana, Kamlah, Mach, Meshcherskij, Odeberg, Pines, Philonenko, Riessler, Sacchi, Segal, Sokolov, de Santos Otero, Schmidt, Scholem, Schürer, Stichel, Stone, and Székeley.

Second Temple Judaism. It is noteworthy that the vast majority of scholarly efforts have been in this respect directed towards finding possible hints that might somehow indicate that the Temple was still standing when the original text was composed.³⁸ Thus, scholars have previously noted that the text does not seem to hint that the catastrophe of the destruction of the Temple has already occurred at the time of its composition. Critical readers of the pseudepigraphon would have some difficulties finding any explicit expression of feelings of sadness or mourning about the loss of the sanctuary.

The affirmations of the value of the animal sacrificial practices and Enoch's halakhic instructions also appear to be fashioned not in the "preservationist," mishnaic-like mode of expression, but rather as if they reflected sacrificial practices that still existed when the author was writing his book.³⁹ There is also an intensive and consistent effort on the part of the author to legitimize the central place of worship, which through the reference to the place *Akhuzan* (a cryptic name for the temple mountain in Jerusalem), is transparently connected in *2 Enoch* with the Jerusalem Temple.⁴⁰ Scholars have also previously noted that there are some indications in the text of the ongoing practice of pilgrimage to the central place of worship; these indications could be expected in a text written in the Alexandrian Diaspora.⁴¹ Thus, in his instructions to the children, Enoch repeatedly encourages them to bring the gifts before the face of God for the remission of sins, a practice which appears to recall well-known sacrificial customs widespread in the Second Temple period.⁴² Moreover, the Slavonic apocalypse also contains a direct command to visit the Temple three times a day, advice that would be difficult to fulfill if the sanctuary has already been destroyed.⁴³

One can see that the crucial arguments for the early dating of the text are all linked to the themes of the Sanctuary and its ongoing practices and customs. These discussions are not new; even Charles employed the references to the Temple practices found in the Slavonic apocalypse as main proofs for his hypothesis of the early date of the apocalypse. Since Charles' pioneering research these arguments have been routinely reiterated by scholars.

³⁸ U. Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (BZNW, 44; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978) 40-41; Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*, 812-13.

³⁹ *2 Enoch* 59.

⁴⁰ In Ezek 48:20-21 the Hebrew word *קדש* "special property of God" is applied to Jerusalem and the Temple. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 114.

⁴¹ Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*, 813.

⁴² *2 Enoch* 61:1-5; *2 Enoch* 62:1-2.

⁴³ *2 Enoch* 51:4: "In the morning of the day and in the middle of the day and in the evening of the day it is good to go to the Lord's temple on account of the glory of your creator." Andersen, "2 Enoch," 178.

Recently, however, Christfried Böttrich attempted to broaden the familiar range of argumentation by bringing to scholarly attention a description of the joyful celebration which in his opinion may fix the date of the apocalypse within the boundaries of the Second Temple period. In his introduction to his German translation of *2 Enoch* published in 1995, Böttrich draws attention to a tradition found in Chapter 69 of the Slavonic apocalypse which deals with the joyful festival marking Methuselah's priestly appointment and his animal sacrifices.⁴⁴ According to Böttrich's calculations, this cult-establishing event falls on the 17th of Tammuz, which in his opinion is identified in *2 Enoch* as the day of the summer solstice.⁴⁵ Böttrich links this solar event with the imagery found in *2 Enoch* 69, where Methuselah's face becomes radiant in front of the altar "like the sun at midday rising up." He then reminds us that, since the second century CE, the 17th of Tammuz was observed as a day of mourning and fasting because it was regarded as the day when Titus conquered Jerusalem.⁴⁶ Böttrich suggests that the description of the joyful festival in *2 Enoch* 69, which does not show any signs of sadness or mourning, indicates that the account and consequently the whole book were written before the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE.⁴⁷

Böttrich's observations are of interest, but his understanding of Chapter 69 and especially of the motif of the radiant face of Methuselah, pivotal for his argument, is problematic in the light of the polemical developments detected in the Slavonic apocalypse. Böttrich is unaware of the Noachic polemics witnessed to by the Slavonic apocalypse and does not notice that the description of Methuselah as the originator of the animal sacrificial cult in *2 Enoch* 69 represents the polemical counterpart to Noah's role, who is portrayed in the Bible and the pseudepigrapha as the pioneer of animal sacrificial practice.⁴⁸ Methuselah, who has never been previously attested in Second Temple materials as the originator of sacrificial cult, thus openly supplants Noah, whose prominent role and elevated status the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse want to diminish. It has already been mentioned that in the course of the Noachic polemics, many exalted features of the hero of the Flood have been transferred to other characters of the book. One of these transferences includes the motif of the luminous face of Noah, the feature which the hero of the flood acquired at his birth.

⁴⁴ Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*, 813. See also: C. Böttrich, "The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reaction to A. Orlov," *JSJ* 32.4 (2001) 451.

⁴⁵ There are many discrepancies and contradictions in the calendarical data presented in the text.

⁴⁶ *y. Ta^can. 68c and b. Ta^can. 26b.*

⁴⁷ Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*, 813.

⁴⁸ M. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Chazon and M. E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 138.

As one might recall, the early Enochic materials portray Noah as a wonder child. *1 Enoch* 106,⁴⁹ the *Genesis Apocryphon*,⁵⁰ and possibly 1Q19⁵¹ depict him with a glorious face and eyes "like the rays of the sun." *1 Enoch* 106:2 relates that when the new-born Noah opened his eyes, the whole house lit up. The child then opened his mouth and blessed the Lord of heaven. Scholars have previously noted⁵² that the scene of the glorious visage of the young hero of the Flood delivering blessings upon his rising up from the hands of the midwife has a sacerdotal significance and parallels the glorious appearance and actions of the high priest.⁵³ It manifests the portentous beginning of the priestly-Noah tradition.⁵⁴ The priestly features of Noah's natal account are important for discerning the proper meaning of the symbolism of Methuselah's luminous visage in *2 Enoch* 69.

In his analysis of the account, Böttrich recognizes that the description of Methuselah's radiant face alludes to the picture of the high priest Simon attested in Sirach 50:1-24. Still, Böttrich is unable to discern the Noachic meaning of this allusion. Meanwhile Fletcher-Louis clearly sees this Noachic link, demonstrating that Methuselah's radiant face in *2 Enoch* 69 is linked not only to Sirach 50:5-11 but also to *1 Enoch* 106:2⁵⁵ and 1Q19.⁵⁶ Sirach's

⁴⁹ *1 Enoch* 106:5 "... his eyes (are) like the rays of the sun, and his face glorious...." M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) 2.244-5.

⁵⁰ 1QapGen 5:12-13 "...his face has been lifted to me and his eyes shine like [the] s[un...] (of) this boy is flame and he..." F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997) 1.31.

⁵¹ A similar tradition is reflected in 1Q19. 1Q19 3: "...were aston[ished ...] [... (not like the children of men) the fir]st-born is born, but the glorious ones [...] [...] his father, and when Lamech saw [...] [...] the chambers of the house like the beams of the sun [...] to frighten the [...]." 1Q19 13: "[...] because the glory of your face [...] for the glory of God in [...] [...] he will] be exalted in the splendor of the glory and the beauty [...] he will be honored in the midst of [...]." García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.27.

⁵² C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ, 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002) 33ff.

⁵³ Crispin Fletcher-Louis notes parallels between this scene and the description of the ideal high priest from Sirach 50. He argues that "in Sirach 50 the liturgical procession through Simon's various ministrations climaxes with Aaron's blessings of the people (50:20, cf. Numbers 6) and a call for all the readers of Sirach's work 'to bless the God of all who everywhere works greater wonders, who fosters our growth from birth and deals with us according to his mercy' (50:22). So, too, in *1 Enoch* 106:3 the infant Noah rises from the hands of the midwife and, already able to speak as an adult, 'he opened his mouth and blessed the Lord.'" Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 47.

⁵⁴ Fletcher-Louis argues that "the staging for [Noah's] birth and the behavior of the child have strongly priestly resonances." Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 46.

⁵⁵ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 50.

⁵⁶ He notes that the statement "I shall glorify you in front of the face of all the people, and you will be glorified all the days of your life" (*2 Enoch* 69:5) and the references to God "raising up" a priest for himself in 69:2,4 "is intriguingly reminiscent of 1Q19 13 lines 2-3." Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 50.

description of the high priest Simon serves here as an intermediate link that elucidates the connection between Noah and Methuselah. All three characters are sharing the identical priestly imagery. Fletcher-Louis notes strong parallelism between Simon's description and the priestly features of the story of Noah. He observes that

this description of Simon the high priest comes at the climax of a lengthy hymn in praise of Israel's heroes which had begun some six chapters earlier with (Enoch and) Noah (44:16-17), characters whose identity and purpose in salvation-history the high priest gathers up in his cultic office. Obviously, at the literal level Noah's birth in *1 Enoch* 106:2 takes place in the *private* house of his parents. However, I suggest the reader is meant to hear a deeper symbolic reference in that house to *the* house (cf. Sirach 50:1), the Temple, which Simon the high priest illuminates and glorifies. Just as Simon appears from behind the veil which marks the transition from heaven to earth and brings a numinous radiance to the realm of creation at worship, so Noah breaks forth from his mother's waters to illuminate the house of his birth.⁵⁷

It has been mentioned that Böttrich points to the possible connection of the radiance of Methuselah's face to solar symbolism. Nevertheless, he fails to discern the proper meaning of such a connection, unable to recognize the Noachic background of the imagery. It is not coincidental that in the Noachic accounts the facial features of the hero of the Flood are linked to solar imagery. Fletcher-Louis notes the prominence of the solar symbolism in the description of Noah's countenance; his eyes are compared with "the rays of the sun." He suggests that "the solar imagery might ultimately derive from the Mesopotamian primeval history where the antediluvian hero is closely identified with the sun."⁵⁸ Yet, in the Second Temple period such solar imagery has taken on distinctively priestly associations.⁵⁹

In the light of the aforementioned traditions, it is clear that Methuselah, who in *2 Enoch* 69 inherits Noah's priestly office is also assuming there the features of his appearance as a high priest, one of which is the radiant visage associated with solar symbolism. The radiant face of Methuselah in *2 Enoch* 69 thus represents a significant element of the polemics against the priestly Noachic tradition and its main character, whose facial features were often compared to the radiance of the sun.

Noachic Polemics and the Date of the Text

The analysis of the Noachic background of the priestly and sacrificial practices in *2 Enoch* leads us to the important question about the role of Noachic polemical developments in discerning the early date of the

⁵⁷ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 47.

⁵⁸ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 46.

⁵⁹ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 46.

apocalypse. It is possible that the Noachic priestly polemics reflected in *2 Enoch* represent the most important and reliable testimony that the text was composed when the Second Temple was still standing.

The central evidence here is the priestly features of the miraculous birth of the hero. It has been already demonstrated that the main concern of the story of the wondrous birth was sacerdotal; the story is permeated with imagery portraying the newborn as the high priest *par excellence*. It also has been shown that the anti-Noachic priestly tradition reflected in *2 Enoch* is not separate from the Enochic-Noachic axis but belongs to the same set of conceptual developments reflected in such Second Temple Enochic and Noachic materials as *1 Enoch* 106, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, and 1Q19.⁶⁰ The traditions prevalent in these accounts were reworked by the Enochic author(s) of the Slavonic apocalypse in response to the new challenging circumstances of the mediatorial polemics. The priestly features of *2 Enoch's* account of the wondrous birth might thus point to the fact that this narrative and, as a consequence, the whole macroform to which it belongs was written in the Second Temple period. It should be emphasized again that the distinct chronological marker here is not the story of the wonder child itself, which was often imitated in later Jewish materials, but the priestly features of the story that are missing in these later improvisations.

The analysis of the later pseudepigraphic and rabbinic imitations of the account of Noah's birth shows that the priestly dimension of the story never transcended the boundaries of the Enochic-Noachic lore, nor did it cross the chronological boundary of 70 CE since it remained relevant only within the sacerdotal context of the Second Temple Enochic-Noachic materials. Although some later Jewish authors were familiar with the account of Noah's birth, this story never again became the subject of priestly polemics once the dust of the destroyed Temple settled.

Several examples can illustrate this situation. In search of the later variants of the story of the wonder child Fletcher-Louis draws attention to the account of Cain's birth in the primary Adam books.⁶¹ Thus, the Latin *Life of Adam and Eve* 21:3 relates that Eve "brought forth a son who shone brilliantly (*lucidus*). At once the infant stood up and ran out and brought some grass with his own hands and gave it to his mother. His name was called Cain."⁶² Fletcher-Louis points out that this narrative of the wonder

⁶⁰ Fletcher-Louis suggests that the authors of *Jubilees* probably also knew the story of Noah's birth, since the text mentions his mother Bitenosh. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 35, n. 9.

⁶¹ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 51-52.

⁶² G. A. Anderson and M. E. Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve. Second Revised Edition* (SBLEJL, 17; Atlanta: Scholars, 1999), 24-24E. See also Armenian and Georgian versions of LAE: "Then, when she bore the child, the color of his body was like the color of stars. At the hour when the child fell into the hands of the midwife, he leaped up and, with his hands, plucked up the grass of the earth..." (Armenian). "Eve arose as the

child recalls the story of Noah. Yet he notes that "all the features which in the birth of Noah signal the child's priestly identity—solar imagery, birth in a house and child's blessing of God are markedly absent in the Adamic story."⁶³ Such absence of the significant features can be an indication that the final form of the text was composed outside the chronological boundaries of Second Temple Judaism and therefore, unlike *2 Enoch*, displays no interest in the sacerdotal dimension of the story. Although the authors of the Latin *LAE* might have been familiar with the narrative of Noah's birth, the priestly concerns associated with the story were no longer relevant for them.

The same situation of the absence of the sacerdotal concern is observable also in the rabbinic stories of Moses' birth reflected in *b. Sotah* 12a,⁶⁴ *Exod. R.* 1:20,⁶⁵ *Deut. R.* 11:10,⁶⁶ *PRE* 48,⁶⁷ and the *Zohar* II.11b,⁶⁸ whose authors were possibly cognizant of the Noachic natal account.

Reflecting on this evidence Fletcher-Louis notices that, although the authors of the rabbinic accounts of Moses' birth appear to be familiar with Noah's narrative, these materials do not show any interest in the sacerdotal dimension of the original story. Buried in the ashes of the destroyed Sanctuary, the alternative portrayal of the Noachic priestly tradition was neither offensive nor challenging for the heirs of the Pharisaic tradition.

angel had instructed her: she gave birth to an infant and his color was like that of the stars. He fell into the hands of the midwife and (at once) he began to pluck up the grass...." (Georgian). *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*, 24E.

⁶³ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 52.

⁶⁴ "He was born circumcised; and the Sages declare, At the time when Moses was born, the whole house was filled with light – as it is written here, 'And she saw him that he was good' (Ex 2:2), and elsewhere it is written, 'And God saw the light that it was good' (Gen 1:4)." *Sotah* 12a.

⁶⁵ "...she saw that the Shechinah was with him; that is, the 'it' refers to the Shechinah which was with the child." *Midrash Rabbah* (trs. H. Freedman and M. Simon; 10 vols.; London: Soncino, 1961) 3.29-30.

⁶⁶ "Moses replied: 'I am the son of Amram, and came out from my mother's womb without prepuce, and had no need to be circumcised; and on the very day on which I was born I found myself able to speak and was able to walk and to converse with my father and mother ... when I was three months old I prophesied and declared that I was destined to receive the law from the midst of flames of fire.'" *Midrash Rabbah*, 7.185.

⁶⁷ "Rabbi Nathaniel said: the parents of Moses saw the child, for his form was like that of an angel of God. They circumcised him on the eight day and they called his name Jekuthiel." *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* (tr. G. Friedlander; 2nd ed.; New York: Hermon Press, 1965) 378.

⁶⁸ "She saw the light of the Shekinah playing around him: for when he was born this light filled the whole house, the word 'good' here having the same reference as in the verse 'and God saw the light that it was good' (Gen 1:4)." *The Zohar* (trs. H. Sperling and M. Simon; 5 vols.; London and New York: Soncino, 1933) 3.35. See also Samaritan *Molad Mosheh*: "She became pregnant with Moses and was great with child, and the light was present." *Samaritan Documents Relating to Their History, Religion and Life* (tr. J. Bowman; Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1977) 287.

Fletcher-Louis observes that, although Moses, like Noah, is able to speak from his birth and the house of his birth becomes flooded with light, "the differences of the specifically priestly form of that older tradition can be clearly seen."⁶⁹ He points out that while Moses is able to speak as soon as he is born, he does not bless God, as do Noah and Melchisedek.⁷⁰ The same paradigm shift is detected in the light symbolism. While in the rabbinic stories the whole house becomes flooded with light, the Mosaic birth texts do not specifically say that Moses is himself the source of light.⁷¹ These differences indicate that, unlike in *2 Enoch*, where the priestly concerns of the editors come to the fore, in the rabbinic accounts they have completely evaporated.⁷² Fletcher-Louis notices that "the fact that in the Mosaic stories the child is circumcised at birth indicates his role as an idealized representative of every Israelite: where Noah bears the marks of the priesthood, Moses carries the principal identity marker of every member of Israel, irrespective of any distinction between laity and priesthood."⁷³

The marked absence of sacerdotal concerns in the later imitations of the story may explain why, although the rabbinic authors knew of the priestly affiliations of the hero of the Flood, the story of his priestly birth never appeared in the debates about the priestly successions. This fact convincingly demonstrates that the Noachic priestly tradition reflected in *2 Enoch* can be firmly placed inside the chronological boundaries of the Second Temple period, which allows us to safely assume a date of the Melchisedek story and the entire apocalypse before 70 CE.

⁶⁹ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 52.

⁷⁰ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 52.

⁷¹ Fletcher-Louis reminds that "the illumination of the house through Noah's eyes and the comparison of the light to that of the sun are specifically priestly features of Noah's birth." Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 52-53.

⁷² Although the priestly affiliation of the hero of the Flood was well known to the rabbinic authors, as the story of Shem-Melchisedek has already demonstrated.

⁷³ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 53.

The Moses Tradition

Ex 33 on God's Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition

Ex 33:18-23 depicts Moses who asks the Lord to show him His glory. Instead the Lord agrees to proclaim his name before Moses, telling him that it is impossible for a human being to see God's face.

In recent scholarship this prominent motif of Moses' story has become a stumbling block for students of the Hebrew Bible. Currently most biblical scholars agree upon apparent difficulties in the literary-critical analysis of this section of Exodus. M. Noth comments that "a literary-critical analysis of Ex 33 is probably impossible."¹ B. Childs confirms that there are several fundamental exegetical problems with Ex 33:18-23. "The most difficult one is to determine the role of this passage in its larger context."²

The internal logic of the passage about the Divine face is also problematic. The whole narrative about God's פנים in Ex 33 is quite perplexing. Ex 33:11 informs a reader that God would speak to Moses face to face (פנים אל-פנים) as a man speaks with his friend. A few verses later, in 33:14-15, God promises Moses that His face will go with him (פני ילכו). In the context of these promises and early testimonies about "face-to-face" relationships, it comes as a surprise that in 33:20 the Lord suddenly rejects Moses' request to see His face (לא תוכל לראת את-פני).

It is clear that the anthropomorphic tradition about the divine face in Ex 33 has a fragmentary character.³ It may well contain polemics between the anthropomorphic position of J source and the Deuteronomic theology of the divine name: instead of seeing of God's face the Lord offers Moses to hear His name.⁴ M. Noth observes that Ex 33 can be seen as "a conglomeration of secondary accretions."⁵

¹ M. Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972) 31, n. 114.

² B.S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus. A Critical, Theological Commentary* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974) 595.

³ A.F. Campbell and M.A. O'Brien placed Ex 33 within the nonsource texts. Cf. A.F. Campbell and M.A. O'Brien, *Sources of the Pentateuch: Texts, Introductions, Annotations* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993) 263.

⁴ The Old Testament materials reveal complicated polemics for and against anthropomorphic understanding of God. Scholars agree that the anthropomorphic imagery of the Hebrew Bible was "crystallized" in the tradition, known to us as the Priestly source. Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972) 191. Theological developments of the Priestly tradition demonstrate that the anthropomorphism of the Priestly source is intimately connected with the place of Divine habitation. In this tradition, "in which the Divinity is personalized and depicted in the most

The apparent difficulties one faces in clarifying the concept of the divine face within the context of the known sources of the Pentateuch call for an investigation of the broader biblical and extrabiblical traditions where this motif could be possibly preserved in its extended form. Implicitly linked to the "original" Exodus motif, these later "interpretations" might provide some additional insights which may help us better understand the fragmentary tradition preserved in chapter 33. This article will focus on one of the possible echoes of Ex 33--the theophanic tradition of the divine countenance preserved in the corpus of the Enochic writings.

The Face of the Lord

The *Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch*, a Jewish text, apparently written in the first century CE,⁶ contains two striking theophanic descriptions involving

tangible corporeal similitudes," God, who possesses a human form, has a need for a house or tabernacle. (Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 191). Weinfeld rightly observes that this anthropomorphic position was not entirely an invention of the Priestly source, but derives from early sacral conceptions found in the early sources. In these traditions the Deity was sitting in his house ensconced between the two cherubim, and at his feet rests the ark, his footstool. In spite of the active promulgation of anthropomorphic concepts in some Old Testament materials, like J, P and Ezekielian sources, the Hebrew Bible also contains polemics against God's corporeality. Scholars note the sharp opposition of the book of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic school to the anthropomorphism of the Priestly source and early anthropomorphic traditions. In their opinion, Deuteronomistic school "first initiated the polemic against the anthropomorphic and corporeal conceptions of the Deity and that it was afterwards taken up by the prophets Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah." (Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 198). In contrast to the anthropomorphic imagery of J and P, the Deuteronomistic school promulgates anticorporeal theology of "divine name" with its conception of sanctuary (tabernacle) as the place where only God's name dwells. On Deuteronomistic antianthropomorphism cf.: T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series, 18; Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1982); Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 191-209.

⁵ M. Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972) 31, n. 114.

⁶ On 2 *Enoch* see: I. D. Amusin, *Kumranskaja Obshchina* (Moscow: Nauka, 1983); F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1. 91-221; G. N. Bonwetsch, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (AGWG, 1; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1896); G. N. Bonwetsch, *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs: Das sogenannte slavische Henochbuch* (TU, 44; Leipzig, 1922); C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (WUNT, R.2, 50; Tübingen: Mohr, 1992); C. Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995); C. Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995); R. H. Charles, and W. R. Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896); J. H. Charlesworth, "The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at

the motif of the divine face. The first one occurs in *2 Enoch* 22⁷ which portrays Enoch's encounter with the Lord in the celestial realm. Enoch recounts:

I saw the view of the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot in a fire and brought out, and it emits sparks and is incandescent. Thus even I saw the face of the Lord. But the face of the Lord is not to be talked about, it is so very marvelous and supremely awesome and supremely frightening. And who am I to give an account of the incomprehensible being of the Lord, and of his face, so extremely strange and indescribable? And how many are his commands, and his multiple voice, and the Lord's throne, supremely great and not made by hands, and the choir stalls all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, and their never-silent singing. Who can give an account of his beautiful appearance, never changing and

Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch (Seminar Report)," *NTS* 25 (1979) 315-23; J. H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament. Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins* (SNTSMS, 54; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); J. Collins, "The Genre of Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism," *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1983); L. Cry, "Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mystérieux en II Hénoch," *RB* 49 (1940) 195-203; U. Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (BZNW, 44; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1978); A. S. D. Maunder, "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *The Observatory* 41 (1918) 309-316; N. Meshcherskij, "Sledy pamjatnikov Kumrana v staroslavjanskij i drevnerusskij literature (K izucheniju slavjanskih versij knigi Enoha)," *Trudy otdela drevnerusskij literatury* 19 (1963) 130-47; N. Meshcherskij, "K voprosu ob istochnikah slavjanskij knigi Enoha," *Kratkie soobshchenija Instituta narodov Azii* 86 (1965) 72-8; J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973); A. Orlov, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch*," *JSP* 18 (1998) 71-86; S. Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *Types of Redemption* (ed. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970) 72-87; A. Rubinstein, "Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *JJS* 15 (1962) 1-21; P. Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (JSPSS, 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); A. De Santos Otero, "Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo)," *Apócrifos del AT IV* (ed. A. Díez Macho; Madrid, 1984) 147-202; G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic tradition* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965); M. I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskij literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *Chtenija v Obshchestve Istorii i Drevnostej Rossijskij (COIDR)* 4 (1910); M. Stone, *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (2 vols; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984) 2, 406-8; A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut d'Etudes Slaves, 1952; repr. Paris, 1976); J. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1995).

⁷ In this paper I have used Andersen's English translation of *2 Enoch* and follow his division in chapters. Cf. F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1.102-221.

indescribable, and his great glory? And I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord (*2 Enoch* 22:1-4, the longer recension).⁸

In chapter 39 Enoch reports this theophanic experience to his sons during his short visit to the earth, adding some new details. Although both portrayals demonstrate a number of terminological affinities, the second account explicitly connects the divine face with the Lord's anthropomorphic "extend." The following account is drawn from the shorter recension of *2 Enoch*:

And now, my children it is not from my lips that I am reporting to you today, but from the lips of the Lord who has sent me to you. As for you, you hear my words, out of my lips, a human being created equal to yourselves; but I have heard the words from the fiery lips of the Lord. For the lips of the Lord are a furnace of fire, and his words are the fiery flames which come out. You, my children, you see my face, a human being created just like yourselves; I am one who has seen the face of the Lord,⁹ like iron made burning hot by a fire, emitting sparks. For you gaze into my eyes, a human being created just like yourselves; but I have gazed into the eyes of the Lord, like the rays of the shining sun¹⁰ and terrifying the eyes of a human being. You, my children, you see my right hand beckoning you, a human being created identical to yourselves; but I have seen the right hand of the Lord, beckoning me, who fills heaven. You see the extend of my body, the same as your own; but I have seen the extend of the Lord,¹¹ without measure and without analogy, who has no end... To stand before the King, who will be able to endure the infinite terror or of the great burning (*2 Enoch* 39:3-8).¹²

⁸ Andersen, 136. The shorter recension of the Slavonic text gives a less elaborated description of the Lord's appearance: "I saw the Lord. His face was strong and very glorious and terrible. Who (is) to give an account of the dimensions of the being of the face of the Lord, strong and very terrible? Or his many-eyed ones and many-voiced ones, and the supremely great throne of the Lord, not made by hands, or those who are in attendance all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, or how unvarying and indescribable and never-silent and glorious is his service. and I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord." Cf. Andersen, 137. Andersen observes that the absence of the comparison with hot iron in MSS of shorter recension shows the embarrassment of scribes over this attempt to describe the Lord's appearance. Andersen, 137.

⁹ *lice Gospodne*. Cf. A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Enoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut D'Etudes Slaves, 1952) 38. Unless noted otherwise, this and the subsequent Slavonic citations are drawn from Vaillant's edition.

¹⁰ The important detail of this description is solar symbolism, which plays an important role in *2 Enoch*. The text often uses solar metaphors in various descriptions of angelic beings; e.g., in chapter 1 where Enoch meets two angels with "faces like the shining sun." Later, during his heavenly journey, Enoch sees "a group of seven angels, brilliant and very glorious with faces more radiant than the radiance of the sun." The images of fire and light are often involved in these solar descriptions of angelic hosts. The text pictures "... glorious and shining and many-eyed stations of the Lord's servants... and of the ranks of powerful fireborn heavenly armies." Andersen rightly observes that "fire and light are fundamental elements in the physics of *2 Enoch*." Andersen, 104.

¹¹ *©b;œtie Gospodne*. Vaillant, 38.

¹² MSS of the longer recension do not demonstrate substantial differences with this description.

In both theophanic descriptions the notion of the Lord's "face" plays a crucial role. It is not a coincidence that in both of them the "face" is associated with light and fire. In biblical theophanies smoke and fire often serve as a divine envelope that protects mortals from the sight of the divine form. Radiant luminosity emitted by the Deity fulfills the same function, signaling the danger of the direct vision of the divine form. Luminosity also represents the screen which protects the Deity from the necessity of revealing its true form. Scholars note that in some theophanic traditions God's form remains hidden behind His light.¹³ The hidden *dwbk* is revealed through this light, which serves as the luminous screen, "the face" of this anthropomorphic extend. *2 Enoch's* theophanies which use the metaphors of light and fire may well be connected with such traditions where the divine "extend" is hidden behind the incandescent "face," which covers and protects the sovereignty of the Lord.

In *2 Enoch* 39:3-6 the "face" is closely associated with the divine "extend" and seems to be understood not simply as a part of the Lord's body (His face) but as a radiant *façade* of His anthropomorphic "form."¹⁴ This identification between the Lord's face and the Lord's "form" is reinforced by an additional parallel pair in which Enoch's face is identified with Enoch's "form":

You, my children, you see my face, a human being created just like yourselves; but I am one who has seen the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot by a fire, emitting sparks... And you see the form of my body, the same as your own: but I have seen the form (extend) of the Lord, without measure and without analogy, who has no end (*2 Enoch* 39:3-6).

The association between the divine face and divine form in *2 Enoch* 39:3-6 alludes to the biblical tradition from Ex 33:18-23 where the divine *panim* is mentioned in connection with his glorious divine form - God's *kabod*.¹⁵

Then Moses said, "Now show me your glory (*°dbk*)." And the Lord said, "I will cause all my goodness to pass in front of you, and I will proclaim my name, the

¹³ April De Conick's pioneering research shows that in Enochic traditions God's form remains hidden behind his light. A. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 104-5.

¹⁴ G. Scholem's research on the presence of the *Šiur Qomah* traditions in *2 Enoch* 39 helps to clarify the "anthropomorphic" character of the Lord's "extend" in *2 Enoch*. Cf. his lecture "The Age of *Šiur Qomah* Speculation and a Passage in Origen" in G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1965).

¹⁵ The term *dwbk* can be translated as "substance," "body," "mass," "power," "might," "honor," "glory," "splendor." In its meaning as "glory" *dwbk* usually refers to God, his sanctuary, his city, or sacred paraphernalia. The Priestly tradition uses the term in connection with God's appearances in the tabernacle. P and Ezekiel describe *dwbk* as a blazing fire surrounded by radiance and a great cloud. M. Weinfeld, " *dwbk*" *TDOT*, 7. 22-38.

Lord, in your presence... but," he said, "you cannot see my face (ynp), for no one may see me and live."

It is clear that in the biblical passage the impossibility of seeing the Lord's face is understood not simply as the impossibility of seeing the particular part of the Lord but rather as the impossibility of seeing the complete range of His glorious "body." The logic of the whole passage, which employs such terms as God's "face" and God's "back," suggests that the term *panim* refers to the "forefront" of the divine extend. The imagery of the divine face found in Psalms¹⁶ also favors this motif of the identity between the Lord's face and His anthropomorphic "form." For example, in Ps 17:15 the Lord's face is closely associated with His form or likeness (hnmt):

As for me, I shall behold your face (פניי)¹⁷ in righteousness; when I awake, I shall be satisfied with beholding your form (תמונתי).¹⁸

It is evident that all three accounts, Ex 33:18-23, Ps 17:15 and 2 *Enoch* 39:3-6, represent a single tradition in which the divine face serves as the *terminus technicus* for the designation of the Lord's anthropomorphic extend.

Apparently, all these accounts deal with the specific anthropomorphic manifestation known as God's *Kabod*.¹⁹ The possibility of such identification is already hinted in Ex 33 where Moses who asks the Lord to show him His *kabod* receives the answer that it is impossible for him to see the Lord's "face." The correlation of the divine face with "likeness" (תמונה) in Ps 17:15 can be also an allusion to *kabod*, which in Ez 1:28 is described as "the likeness of the glory of the Lord (דמות כבוד יהוה)."

There is another early Mosaic account which correlates the Sinai encounter with *Kabod*. This important tradition, found in the fragments of

¹⁶ On the Face of God in Psalms see: S. Balentine, *The Hidden God: The Hiding Face of God in the Old Testament* (Oxford; Oxford University Press, 1983) 49-65; W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (2 vols; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967) 2.35-9; M. Fishbane, "Form and Reformulation of the Biblical Priestly Blessing," *JAOS* 103 (1983) 115-21; J. Reindl, *Das Angesicht Gottes im Sprachgebrauch des Alten Testaments* (ETS 25; Leipzig: St. Benno, 1970) 236-7; M. Smith, "'Seeing God' in the Psalms: The Background to the Beatific Vision in the Hebrew Bible," *CBQ* 50 (1988) 171-83.

¹⁷ Note also that poetic rhyme פניי תמונתי further reinforces the correspondence between the face and the form of God in this passage.

¹⁸ Although the passage uses a different terminology, namely, the term hnmt, the identification still has a strong anthropomorphic flavor. The term hnmt, which can be translated as form, likeness, semblance, or representation,

¹⁹ Contra W. Eichrodt who insists that the *panim* had no connection with the *kabod* at any rate. He argues that the two concepts derive from different roots, and were never combined with one another. Cf. W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 2.38.

the drama "Exodus" written by Ezekiel the Dramatist, depicts Moses' experience at Sinai as the vision of God's anthropomorphic *kabod*.²⁰

I dreamt there was on the summit of mount Sinai a certain great throne (θρόνον μέγαν) extending up to heaven's cleft, on which there sat a certain noble man wearing a crown and holding a great scepter in his left hand.²¹

W. Meeks observes that this passage may be safely taken as a witness to traditions of the second century BCE, since it was quoted by Alexander Polyhistor who lived around 80-40 BCE.²² It means that by the second century BCE Moses' association with *kabod*, hinted in Ex 33, was already surrounded by an elaborate imagery, in which the Throne of Glory played a crucial role.

2 *Enoch* 22 further strengthens this theophanic pattern in which the encounter with the Divine Face is understood as the vision of God's throne. The text gives a number of evidences which prove that the anthropomorphic "extend," identified with the divine face, indeed represents His *kabod*. The theophany of the divine countenance in the Slavonic apocalypse is surrounded by a peculiar *kabod* imagery, which plays a prominent role in the Ezekelian account. The following parallels are noteworthy:

1. The theophany of the divine face took place in the highest of the heaven.²³ The highest of the heaven is a traditional place of God's Throne, the abode of His Glory. A later account found in 3 *Enoch* tells that "In Arabot there are 660 thousands of myriads of glorious angels, hewn out of flaming fire, standing opposite the throne of glory. The glorious King covers his face, otherwise the heaven of Arabot would burst open in the middle, because of the glorious brilliance..."²⁴

2. The theophanic description in 2 *Enoch* 22 refers to "His many-eyed ones,"²⁵ alluding to האופנים, the Wheels, the special class of the Angels of the Throne who in Ezekiel 1:18 are described as the angelic beings "full of eyes (מלאה עינים)."

3. A reference to the "many-voiced ones" probably alludes to choirs of angelic hosts surrounding the Throne.

²⁰ Pieter W. van der Horst observes that Ezekiel the Dramatist's vision of God in human shape seated on the throne is based on the first chapter of the biblical Ezekiel. Cf. P.W. van der Horst, "Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist," *JJS* 34 (1983) 24.

²¹ C.R. Holladay, *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors* (4 vols.; Texts and Translations, 30; Pseudepigrapha Series, 12; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) 2.363.

²² W. Meeks, *The Prophet-King. Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (SNT, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967) 149. Cf. also C.R. Holladay, *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2.308-12.

²³ Andersen, 136-37.

²⁴ Alexander, 305.

²⁵ Andersen, 137.

4. Finally, in *2 Enoch* 22 there is a direct reference to the throne of the Lord, which occupies a central place in the theophanic description, and is pictured as "supremely great and not made by hands."²⁶ The Throne of Glory is surrounded by the armies of the angelic hosts, cherubim and the seraphim, with "their never-silent singing."²⁷

Moses' Face

Previous research shows that the correlation between God's face and his luminous form (his glorious *Kabod*) was already implicitly articulated in Ex 33. The Enochic theophany found in *2 Enoch* further strengthens this connection, giving a theophanic description of the Lord's face as his terrifying "extend" which emits light and fire.

The important detail of these two accounts is the "danger motif"--the warnings about the peril of seeing the Deity. Both of them contain specific references to the harmful effect this theophanic experience has on the mortals, who dare to behold the Divine face. In Ex 33:20 the Lord warns Moses about the danger of seeing His face: "You cannot see my face, for no one may see me and live." The motif of peril is further reinforced by the Lord's instructions in 33:22 where he commands Moses to hide himself into a cleft in the rock and promises to protect the prophet with His hands.

The "danger motif" also looms large in *2 Enoch*. In *2 Enoch* 39, immediately after his description of the theophany of the face, Enoch gives warning to his children about the danger of this theophanic experience:

Frightening and dangerous it is to stand before the face of an earthly king, terrifying and very dangerous it is, because the will of the king is death and the will of the king is life. How much more terrifying [and dangerous] it is to stand before the face of the King of earthly kings and of the heavenly armies, [the regulator of the living and of the dead]. Who can endure that endless misery? (*2 Enoch* 39:8).²⁸

The "danger motif" in Ex 33 and in *2 Enoch* implicitly suggests that both of these accounts support the idea that the human being actually can see the face of God. M. Weinfeld argues that the warning about the danger of seeing the Deity usually affirms the possibility of such an experience. In his observations about antianthropomorphic tendencies of Deuteronomy, Deutero-Isaiah and Jeremiah, he points to the fact that these texts demonstrate a lack of usual warnings about the danger of seeing the Deity found in pre-Deuteronomic books. He concludes that it happened because

²⁶ Andersen, 137.

²⁷ Andersen, 137.

²⁸ Andersen, 164.

the Deuteronomic school cannot conceive of the possibility of seeing the Deity.²⁹

The possibility of theophany hinted in *2 Enoch* and Ex 33 might suggest that Exodus' account implicitly asserts that Moses could see the divine form.³⁰ The distinctive details in the depiction of Moses' face in Ex 34 may further support this conclusion. But before we explore this motif, let us again return to the narrative of *2 Enoch*.

From this Enochic account we learn that the vision of the Divine face had dramatic consequences for Enoch's appearance. His body endures radical changes as it becomes covered with the divine light. The important detail here is that the luminous transformation of Enoch takes place in front of radiant "face" of the Lord. In 22:6 Enoch reports that he was lifted up and brought before the Lord's face by archangel Michael. The Lord decides to appoint Enoch as *רֹאשׁ הַפְּנִיּוֹת*, the Prince of the Divine Presence: "Let Enoch come up and stand in front of my face forever."³¹ Further, the Lord commanded the archangel Michael to extract Enoch from earthly clothing, anoint him with the delightful oil, and put him into the clothes of the Lord's glory (22:8-9).³² The text describes the actions of Michael, who anoints Enoch with the delightful oil and clothes him. The symbolism of light permeates the whole scene; the oil emanates the rays of the glittering sun "greater than the greatest light."³³ At the end of this procedure, Enoch "had become like one of the glorious ones,"³⁴ and there was no observable difference."³⁵

In Enoch's radiant metamorphosis before the Divine face an important detail can be found which links Enoch's transformation with Moses' account in Exodus. In *2 Enoch* 37 we learn about the unusual procedure performed on Enoch's face on the final stage of his encounter with the Lord. The text informs that the Lord called one of his senior angels to chill the face of Enoch. The text says that the angel appeared frigid; he was as white as snow, and his hands were as cold as ice. The text further depicts the angel chilling Enoch's face, who could not endure the terror of the Lord, "just as it

²⁹ M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 207.

³⁰ Another "Mosaic" account attributed to J, openly articulates this possibility: "With him (Moses) I speak mouth to mouth (פה אל-פה), clearly and not in riddles; he sees the form (וְהַמָּנֶה) of the Lord (Num 12:8)."

³¹ Andersen, 139.

³² Andersen, 139.

³³ Andersen, 138. Jarl Fossum provides a number of allusions to the theme of "shining oil" in *2 Enoch*. cf. J. Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on early Christology* (NTOA, 30; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1995) 84.

³⁴ Andersen observes that "this motif (Enoch's transformation into the glorious angel) seems to have been influenced by the legend of Moses, whose shining face was a reflection of God's magnificent glory." Andersen, 139.

³⁵ Andersen, 139.

is not possible to endure the fire of a stove and the heat of the sun..."³⁶ Right after this "chilling procedure," the Lord informs Enoch that if his face had not been chilled here, no human being would be able to look at his face.³⁷ This reference to the radiance of Enoch's face after his encounter with the Lord is an apparent parallel to the incandescent face of Moses³⁸ after the Sinai experience in Ex 34.

References to the shining countenance of a visionary found in *2 Enoch* return us again to the Exodus story. Ex 34:29-35 portrays Moses³⁹ after his encounter with the Lord. The passage says that "when Moses came down from Mount Sinai ... he was not aware that his face was radiant, because he had spoken with the Lord." The strange logic of the last sentence, which points to ambiguous connection between the speech of the Lord as a cause of Moses' glowing face can be explained by the Enochic theophanic account where "the lips of the Lord are a furnace of fire, and his words are the fiery flames which come out."⁴⁰

These parallels between the later Enochic text and the biblical Mosaic account are not inappropriate. As will be demonstrated later, the connection between the Enochic and Mosaic accounts has quite ancient roots. One of the evidences of the early link between Enoch and Moses includes the already mentioned drama of Ezekiel the Dramatist, which was apparently written during the second century BCE.⁴¹

W. Meeks⁴² and P. W. van der Horst⁴³ observe that Moses' depiction in the drama of Ezekiel the Dramatist bears some similarities to Enoch's figure in the Enochic traditions. They note a number of remarkable allusions in the drama to the Enochic motifs and themes. These allusions include the following points:

1. Moses's account is depicted as his dream vision in a fashion similar to Enoch's dreams in *1 Enoch* and *2 Enoch*.

³⁶ Andersen, 160.

³⁷ Andersen, 160.

³⁸ About possible Mesopotamian provenance of this motif cf.: M. Haran, "The Shining of Moses's Face: A Case Study in Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Iconography [Ex 34:29-35; Ps 69:32; Hab 3:4]," *In the Shelter of Elyon* (JSOP, 31; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984) 159-73; W. Propp, "The Skin of Moses' Face - Transfigured or Disfigured?" *CBQ* 49 (1987) 375-386.

³⁹ On Moses' traditions see: R. Bloch, "Die Gestalt des Moses in der rabbinischen Tradition," in *Moses in Schrift und Überlieferung* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963) 95-171; G.W. Coats, *Moses: Heroic Man, Man of God* (JSOTSup, 57; Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 1988); S. Hafemann, "Moses in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Survey," *JSP* 7 (1990) 79-104; W.A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (NovTSup, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967); R. Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History* (New York: Seabury, 1980).

⁴⁰ Andersen, 163.

⁴¹ C.R. Holladay, *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2.312.

⁴² Meeks, 147.

⁴³ P.W. van der Horst, 21-29.

2. In the text Moses is "elevated" by God, who gives him the throne, the royal diadem,⁴⁴ and the scepter.

3. God appointed Moses as an eschatological judge of humankind able to see "things present, past and future"⁴⁵--the traditional role of Enoch found already in early Enochic booklets.

4. Moses is an "expert" in "a variety of things," including cosmological and astronomical information:

I beheld the entire circled earth
Both beneath the earth and above the heaven,
And a host of stars fell on its knees before me;
I numbered them all, They passed before me like a squadron of soldiers.⁴⁶

This preoccupation with various meteorological, astronomical and eschatological "secrets" are typical duties of the elevated Enoch which are here transferred to Moses apparently for the first time.⁴⁷

5. Finally, the motif of assigning the seat/throne is a peculiar feature of Enochic literature where Enoch/Metatron is depicted as a scribe⁴⁸ who has a seat (later a throne) in the heavenly realm.⁴⁹ *2 Enoch* 23:4 pictures the angel Vereveil who commands Enoch to sit down.⁵⁰ "You sit down; write everything...." And Enoch said, "And I sat down for a second period of 30

⁴⁴ The crowning of Enoch-Metatron became a prominent leitmotif in later Enochic tradition, especially, in *3 Enoch*. W. Meeks observes that the enthronement of Enoch-Metatron in *3 Enoch* "betrays interesting similarities to Moses' traditions." Meeks, 207. See also van der Horst who observes that "like Moses, Enoch is assigned a cosmic and divine function that involves the wearing of regalia." P.W. van der Horst, 25.

⁴⁵ C.R. Holladay, *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2.367.

⁴⁶ C.R. Holladay, *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 2.365.

⁴⁷ R.H. Charles argued that this transition of Enoch's function to Moses first was made in *2 Apoc. Bar.*, where God shows Moses "the measures of the fire, also the depths of the abyss, and the weight of the winds, and the number of the drops of rain." *APOT*, 2.514.

⁴⁸ In *1 Enoch* 74:2 Enoch writes the instructions of the angel Uriel regarding the secrets of heavenly bodies and their movements. M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) 2.173. Qumran Enochic fragments (4QEnGiants 14; 4QEn 92:1) picture Enoch as "the scribe of distinction" ספר פרסא. Cf. J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976) 261-62 and 305. In the Book of Jubilees Enoch is attested as "the first of mankind... who learned (the art of) writing, instruction, and wisdom and who wrote down in a book the signs of the sky..." J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (2 vols.; CSCO 510-11, Scriptorum Aethiopicorum 87-88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989) 2.25-6.

⁴⁹ P.W. van der Horst also stresses unique features of Moses' enthronement in Ezekiel the Dramatist, which depart from Enochic and Merkabah imagery. He observes that "In Moses' vision, there is only one throne, God's. And Moses is requested to be seated on it, not at God's side but all alone. God leaves his throne. This scene is unique in early Jewish literature and certainly implies a deification of Moses." van der Horst, 25.

⁵⁰ Sjadi. Vaillant, 26.

days and 30 nights, and I wrote accurately" (23:6).⁵¹ The theme of Enoch/Metatron's seat became a prominent motif in Rabbinic tradition, where according to *b. Hag.* 15a, the privilege of "sitting" beside God was accorded solely to Metatron by virtue of his character as a "scribe": for he was granted permission as a scribe to sit and write down the merits of Israel.

The tacit links between Enoch and Moses found in the early Enochic theophanic tradition later become openly articulated in Rabbinic literature. In this later enunciation, as in the initial encounters, the familiar theophanic motif from the Exodus story again plays a crucial role. From *3 Enoch* we learn that it is Enoch-Metatron, whose face once was transformed into fire,⁵² who is now the one⁵³ who tells Moses about his shining visage: "At once Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, said to Moses, 'Son of Amram, fear not! for already God favors you. Ask what you will with confidence and boldness, for light shines from the skin of your face from one end of the world to the other.'"⁵⁴

Conclusion

The foregoing research has examined some extrabiblical materials related to the divine face's motif found in Ex 33. The investigation has shown that the evolution of this motif in later traditions is dependent on Enoch-Moses *gestalt*, which plays a prominent role in Enochic theophanies of the divine face. This research, however, would not be complete without mentioning another important source which is also related to the traditions about the patriarch Enoch and the prophet Moses. This source is the priestly editor of the Pentateuch.

Much attention has been devoted to the peculiar interest of the priestly editor in anthropomorphic descriptions of the Deity.⁵⁵ M. Weinfeld and T.

⁵¹ Andersen, 141.

⁵² *3 Enoch* 15:1 depicts this radiant metamorphosis of Enoch-Metatron: "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 Schekinah, 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." Alexander, 267.

⁵³ Scholars observes that in Merkabah tradition Metatron is explicitly identified with the Face of God. Cf.: A. De Conick, "Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A Case for First-Century Christology in the Second Century," *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism* (eds. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis; JSJ 63; Brill: Leiden, 1999) 329; D.J. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot* (TSAJ 16; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988) 424-425.

⁵⁴ *3 Enoch* 15B:5. Cf. Alexander, 304.

⁵⁵ On the issue of Old Testament's anthropomorphism see: J. Barr, "Theophany and Anthropomorphism in the Old Testament," *VT Suppl.* 7 (1960), 31-8; J. Hempel, "Die

Mettinger show that the Priestly source played a crucial role in promoting biblical theophanic traditions. In these traditions Moses' figure has occupied an important place.⁵⁶

The Priestly source also was the locus where the enigmatic figure of Enoch for the first time appeared in its esoteric complexity,⁵⁷ indicating that the priestly author was cognizant of the broader Enochic developments. Some scholars believe that perhaps it is "to some such developed Enoch tradition the author of Genesis is making reference when he emits his cryptic statements about Enoch in Genesis 5:22-24."⁵⁸

Students of the Enochic tradition are now aware that the priestly editor was familiar with the peculiar Mesopotamian traditions⁵⁹ which constituted a conceptual framework for Enoch's figure.⁶⁰

Grenzen des Anthropomorphismus Jahwes im Alten Testament," *ZAW* 57 (1939), 75-85; F. Michaeli, *Dieu à l'image de l'homme: Étude de la notion anthropomorphique de Dieu dans l'Ancient Testament* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux, 1950); E. Jacob, *Théologie de l'Ancient Testament* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux, 1955), 30ff.; M.C.A. Korpel, *A Rift in the Clouds. Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine* (Münster: UGARIT-Verlag, 1990), 87-590; T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series, 18; Lund: Wallin & Dalholm, 1982); J. Oelsner, *Benennung und Funktion der Körperteile im hebräischen Alten Testament* (Leipzig, 1960).

⁵⁶ T.N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*; Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 191-209.

⁵⁷ The traditions about Enoch are different in J and P. For the discussion of the differences cf. J. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 16; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984) 23-51; H.S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988) 40-53.

⁵⁸ M. Stone, "Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origin" *JSJ* 19 (1988) 162.

⁵⁹ On the Mesopotamian traditions behind the Enoch's figure cf.: H. Zimmern, "Urkönige und Uroffenbarung" in Eberhard Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (2 vols., Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1902-03) 2.530-43; H. L. Jansen, *Die Henochgestalt: Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1; Oslo: Dybwad, 1939); P. Grelot, "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: origine et signification", *RSR* 46 (1958) 5-26, 181-210; J. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*; H.S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*.

⁶⁰ Important witnesses to these traditions include the various versions of the so-called Sumerian antediluvian King List, the materials which dated from 1500 B.C.E. to 165 B.C.E. The List demonstrates a number of similarities with the genealogy of Genesis 5. One of its interesting details is that Mesopotamian kings, as well as patriarchs from Genesis' account, had extraordinary long reigns, ranging from 3,600 to 72,000 years. A second important parallel is that two versions of the List give ten kings, the last of whom is designated as the hero of the flood. It demonstrates a close resemblance to the role of Noah who occupies the tenth place in the list of Genesis 5. J. Vanderkam notes that "in the literature on Genesis 5 there is a well established tradition which holds that P modeled his pre-flood genealogy on a Mesopotamian list of antediluvian kings, the so-called Sumerian

In these Mesopotamian traditions a prototype of Enoch, Enmeduranki, is portrayed as a "translated" figure, the one "who sat in the presence (*ma-*

King List." Vanderkam, 26. An important character in the Sumerian King list is Enmeduranki (Enmeduranna), the king of Sippar, the city of the sun-god Shamash. In three copies of the List he occupies the seventh place, which in Genesis' genealogy belongs to Enoch. Moreover, in other Mesopotamian sources Enmeduranki appears in many roles and situations which demonstrate remarkable similarities with Enoch's story. J. Vanderkam's research shows that the priestly author was aware of these broader Mesopotamian traditions which served as a prototype for Enoch's figure, whose symbolical age of 365 years reflects the link between the patriarch and the solar cult of Shamash. Vanderkam concludes that "the biblical image of Enoch is based on the Mesopotamian picture of Enmeduranki." Vanderkam, 50.

har)⁶¹ of Shamash and Adad, the divine adjudicators."⁶² This reference to Enmeduranki's access to the glorious presence/face of the solar deity⁶³ indicates that the later role of Enoch as *Sar ha-Panim*, the Prince of the Divine Presence or the Prince of the Face,⁶⁴ was already present in its

⁶¹ In another text about Enmeduranki the same motif of the divine presence can be found: "...he may approach the presence (ma-h9ar) of Shamash and Adad..." W.G. Lambert, "Enmeduranki and Related Matters", *JCS* 21 (1967) 132.

⁶² W.G. Lambert, 128 and 130.

⁶³ On Mesopotamian solar symbolism and its influence on biblical concepts, including the concept of the divine *panim* cf. A. Caquot, "La Divinite Solaire Ougaritique," *Syria* 36 (1959) 90-101; B. Janowski, *Rettungsgewissheit und Epiphanie des Heils* (Bd. 1; Neukirchen, 1989) 105ff.; B. Lang, *Gott als "Licht" in Israel und Mesopotamien: Eine Studie zu Jes. 60:1-3.19* (Klosterneuburg, 1989); W. Smelik, "On Mystical Transformation of the Righteous into Light in Judaism," *JSJ* 26 (1995) 122-44; M. Smith, *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the other Deities in Ancient Israel* (San Francisco, 1990); M. Smith, "The Near Eastern Background of Solar Language for Yahweh," *JBL* 109/1 (1990) 29-39; H. P. Stähli, *Solare Elemente im Jahweglauben des Alten Testaments* (OBO 66; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985).

⁶⁴ Some scholars argue that the biblical concept of the divine face also has Mesopotamian roots. M. Fishbane and M. Smith show that the language of the Lord's shining face was part of Israel's inheritance from ancient Near Eastern culture. Cf. M. Fishbane, "Form and Reformulation of the Biblical Priestly Blessing," *JAOS* 103 (1983) 115-21; M. Smith, "'Seeing God' in the Psalms: The Background to the Beatific Vision in the Hebrew Bible," *CBQ* 50 (1988) 171-83. Fishbane stresses that "the various and

rudimentary form in the Mesopotamian traditions known to the priestly editor.

In the light of these observations the idea that Ex 33 could actually contain the original Enochic motif is not inappropriate. The implicit link between the Enochic account of the divine Presence and the Mosaic account of the divine *panim* may well reflect the conceptual world of the priestly editor, who often "has expressed his acquaintance with a fairly broad range of Mesopotamian traditions in remarkably few words."⁶⁵

abundant use of such imagery in ancient Near Eastern literature, particularly from Mesopotamia where it recurs in a wide range of genres, suggests that ancient Israel absorbed such imagery as part and parcel of its rich patrimony." M. Fishbane, 116.

⁶⁵ Vanderkam, 50.

The Jacob Tradition

The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob*

Introduction

The book of Genesis portrays Jacob as someone who not only saw God but also wrestled with Him. Jacob's visionary experiences begin in Gen. 28 where he sees in a dream the ladder on which the angels of God are ascending and descending. Above the ladder Jacob beholds the Lord. The distinct feature of the Bethel account is the paucity of theophanic imagery. Despite the fact that the vision is linked with the celestial realm ("ladder's top reaching to heaven"), which is labeled in the story as "the awesome place", "the house of God", and "the gate of heaven", the narrative does not offer any descriptions of God's celestial court or His appearance. Instead we have the audible revelation of God, His lengthy address to Jacob with promises and blessings.

God appears again to Jacob in Gen. 32. While the narrative stresses the importance of the vision of God (the account claims that Jacob "saw God face to face" and even called the place of wrestling Peniel/Penuel - "The Face of God"), it focuses its description on Jacob's *wrestling* with God rather than his *seeing* of God.

The reference to the motif of God's Face (which plays an important role in a number of Biblical theophanic accounts)¹ and to Jacob's seeing of God "face to face" could however indicate that the authors or editors of Jacob's account might be cognizant of the broader anthropomorphic theophanic debates in which the motif of God's Face² played an important role. In

¹ See for example Exod. 33:18-23; Ps. 17:15.

² On the Face of God see: S. Balentine, *The Hidden God: The Hiding Face of God in the Old Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), pp. 49-65; A. De Conick, "Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A Case for First Century Christology in the Second Century", *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism* (eds. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis; JSJ, 63; Brill: Leiden, 1999), pp. 325-330; W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (2 vols; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967), II, pp. 35-9; M. Fishbane, "Form and Reformulation of the Biblical Priestly Blessing", *JAOS* 103 (1983), pp. 115-21; S. Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the Naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism* (TSAJ, 36; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1993), pp. 105-109; J. Reindl, *Das Angesicht Gottes im Sprachgebrauch des Alten Testaments* (ETS 25; Leipzig: St. Benno, 1970), pp. 236-7; M. Smith, "Seeing

order to clarify these theophanic developments which can shed further light on the background of Jacob's Biblical story, the current research must turn to other materials associated with Jacob's traditions where his visionary accounts have a more elaborated form. Such materials include the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob*,³ a Jewish pseudepigraphon, which has survived in its Slavonic translation.

The Slavonic Account of Jacob's Vision

The materials known under the title, the *Ladder of Jacob*, have been preserved solely in Slavonic as a part of the so-called *Tolkovaja Paleja*⁴ (the Explanatory Palaia) where the editors of its various versions reworked⁵ and

God' in the Psalms: The Background to the Beatific Vision in the Hebrew Bible", *CBQ* 50 (1988), pp. 171-83.

³ On the *Ladder of Jacob* see: *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (ed. H.F.D. Sparks; Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), pp. 453-63; N. Bonwetsch, "Die Apokryphe 'Leiter Jakobs'", *Göttinger Nachrichten, philol.-histor. Klasse* (1900), pp. 76-87; E. Bratke, *Das sogenannte Religionsgespräch am Hof der Sasaniden*. TU N.F. 4.3a (1899), pp. 101-6; I. Franko, *Apokrifi i legendi z ukrains'kih rukopisiv* (5 vols.; L'vov, 1896-1910), I, pp. 108-120; A. I. Jacimirskij, *Bibliograficheskij obzor apokrifov v juznoslavjanskoj i ruskoj pis'mennosti (spiski pamjatnikov): Vol. 1: Apokrifi vethozavetnye* (Petrograd, 1921), pp. 38-9; M.R. James, "Ladder of Jacob", in *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament* (TED; London, New York, 1920), pp. 96-103; J. Kugel, "The Ladder of Jacob", *HTR* 88 (1995), pp. 209-27; G. Kushelev-Bezborodko, *Pamjatniki starinnoj ruskoj literatury* (St. Petersburg, 1865), III, pp. 27-32; *Paleja tolkovaja po spisku sdelannomu v g. Kolomne v 1406 g., Trud uchenikov N.S. Tihonravova* (Moscow, 1892), pp. 153-166; I.Ja. Porfir'ev, "Apokrificheskie skazanija o vethozavetnyh lichah i sobytijah po rukopisjam soloveckoj biblioteki" *Sbornik otd. r. jaz. i slov.* 17.1 (St. Petersburg, 1877), pp. 138-49; M.A. Salmina, "Lestvica Iakova", in: *Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti Drevnei Rusi (XI - pervaja polovina XIV v.)* (ed. D.S. Lihachev; Leningrad: Nauka, 1987), pp. 230-31; D. Svjatskij, *Lestnica Iakova ili son najavu* (St. Petersburg: M. Stasjulevich, 1911), pp. 31-32; N.S. Tihonravov, *Pamjatniki otrechennoj ruskoj literatury* (St. Petersburg, 1863), I, pp. 91-95; *Tolkovaja paleja 1477 goda, Obshchestvo ljubitelej drevnerusskoj pis'mennosti*, vol. 93 (St. Petersburg, 1892), pp. 100a-107b; N.M. Vtoryh, *Drevnosti. Trudy Slavjanskoj komissii Moskovskoj arheologicheskogo obshchestva* 2 (1902), propokol 1.

⁴ On *Tolkovaja Paleja* see: V.P. Adrianova, *K literaturnoi istorii Tolkovoj Palei* (Kiev, 1910); V.M. Istrin, "Redakzii Tolkovoj Palei", *IORJaS* 10/4 (1905), pp. 150-51; *Paleja tolkovaja po spisku sdelannomu v g. Kolomne v 1406 g., Trud uchenikov N.S. Tihonravova* (Moscow, 1892); I.Ja. Porfir'ev, "Apokrificheskie skazanija o vethozavetnyh lichah i sobytijah po rukopisjam soloveckoj biblioteki", *Sbornik otd. r. jaz. i slov.* 17.1 (St. Petersburg, 1877), pp. 11-12; *Tolkovaja paleja 1477 goda, Obshchestvo ljubitelej drevnerusskoj pis'mennosti*, vol. 93 (St. Petersburg, 1892); O.V. Tvorogov, "Paleja Tolkovaja", in: *Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti Drevnei Rusi (XI - pervaja polovina XIV v.)* (ed. D.S. Lihachev; Leningrad: Nauka, 1987), pp. 285-88; V.M. Uspenskij, *Tolkovaja Paleja* (Kazan', 1876).

⁵ H. Lunt observes that the seventh chapter of the *Ladder* is a later Christian addition juxtaposed to the story by a Slavic (possibly, Russian) editor of *Palaia*. H.G. Lunt,

rearranged them. Despite its long life inside the compendium of heterogeneous materials and its long history of transmission in Greek and Slavonic milieu, the pseudepigraphon seems to have preserved several early traditions that can be safely placed within the Jewish environment of the first century CE. Scholars propose that the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob* is most likely derived from its Greek variant, which in turn appears to have been translated from Hebrew or Aramaic.⁶ The content of the work is connected with Jacob's dream about the ladder and the interpretation of the vision. In Horace Lund's translation, the text is divided into seven chapters.⁷ The first chapter depicts Jacob's dream in which he sees the ladder and receives God's audible revelation about the promised land and blessings upon his descendants. In the second chapter, a reader encounters Jacob's lengthy prayer to God in which he uncovers additional details of his dream and asks God to help him interpret the dream. In chapter three, God sends to Jacob the angel Sariel as an interpreter. In chapter four, Sariel informs Jacob that his name has been changed to Israel. Perceptive readers may thus notice that despite the title of pseudepigraphon, its text is not only confined to the ladder account but also accommodates features of Jacob's other visions, namely, the substitution of his name during the wrestling account. The last three chapters of the *Ladder* recount Sariel's eschatological interpretations of Jacob's dream in which he reveals to the visionary the details of future human history.

"Ladder of Jacob", *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), II, pp. 404-5.

⁶ Kugel, p. 209.

⁷ In this paper I have used H. Lunt's English translation of *LadJac* and follow his division of chapters and verses. See H.G. Lunt, "Ladder of Jacob", *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), II, pp. 401-11. The Slavonic citations are drawn from the following publications of the MSS:

Recension A:

MS S (Sinodal'naja Palaia. Sin. 210) published in: *Tolkovaja paleja 1477 goda, Obshchestvo ljubitelej drevnerusskoj pis'mennosti*, vol. 93 (St. Petersburg, 1892), pp. 100a-107b;

MS R (Rumjancevskaja Palaia. Rum. 455) published in: G. Kushelev-Bezborodko, *Pamjatniki starinnoj russkoj literatury* (St. Petersburg, 1865), II, pp. 27-32;

MS F (Krehivskaja Palaia) published in: I. Franko, *Apokrifi i legendi z ukrains'kih rukopisiv* (5 vols.; L'vov, 1896-1910), I, pp. 108-120;

Recension B:

MS K (Kolomenskaja Palaia. Tr.-Serg. 38) published in: N.S. Tihonravov, *Pamjatniki otrenchennoj russkoj literatury* (St. Petersburg, 1863), I, pp. 91-95 and in: *Paleja tolkovaja po spisku sdellanomu v g. Kolomne v 1406 g., Trud uchenikov N.S. Tihonravova* (Moscow, 1892), pp. 153-166;

MS P (Soloveckaja Palaia. Sol. 653) published in: I.Ja. Porfir'ev, "Apokrificheskie skazaniya o vethozavetnyh licah i sobytijah po rukopisjam soloveckoj biblioteki", *Sbornik ot d. jaz. i slov.* 17.1 (St. Petersburg, 1877), pp. 138-49.

The Face as God's *Kavod*

The imagery of the divine/angelic faces plays a prominent role in the first chapter of *LadJac*. The text describes Jacob's dream in which he sees a twelve step ladder, fixed on the earth, whose top reaches to heaven with the angels ascending and descending on it. This familiar Biblical motif then is elaborated further and adds some new features.⁸ The story relates that on the ladder Jacob sees twenty two human faces with their chests, two of them on each step of the ladder. On the top of the ladder, he also beholds another human face "carved out of fire"⁹ with its shoulders and arms. In comparison with the previous "faces", this fiery "higher" face looks "exceedingly terrifying". The text portrays God standing above this "highest" face and calling Jacob by his name. The depiction leaves the impression that God's voice¹⁰ is hidden behind this fiery terrifying "face" as a distinct divine manifestation, behind which God conveys to Jacob His audible revelation about the promised land and the blessings upon Jacob's descendants.

This description of the celestial "Face" as the fiery anthropomorphic extent,¹¹ which serves as the embodiment of the Deity leads us to another Slavonic text in which the theme of the fiery Face looms large. This text is 2

⁸ *LadJac* 1:3-10 reads: "And behold, a ladder was fixed on the earth, whose top reaches to heaven. And the top of the ladder was the face as of a man, carved out of fire. There were twelve steps leading to the top of the ladder, and on each step to the top there were two human faces, on the right and on the left, twenty-four faces (or busts) including their chests. And the face in the middle was higher than all that I saw, the one of fire, including the shoulders and arms, exceedingly terrifying, more than those twenty-four faces. And while I was still looking at it, behold, angels of God ascended and descended on it. And God was standing above its highest face, and he called to me from there, saying, 'Jacob, Jacob!' And I said, 'Here I am, Lord!' And he said to me, 'The land on which you are sleeping, to you will I give it, and to your seed after you. And I will multiply your seed...'"" H.G. Lunt, "Ladder of Jacob", *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), II, pp. 407.

⁹ H.G. Lunt, "Ladder of Jacob", *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), II, pp. 406.

¹⁰ James Charlesworth notes that in *LadJac*, as "in some of other pseudepigrapha, the voice has ceased to be something heard and has become a hypostatic creature". See Charlesworth's comment in: H.G. Lunt, "Ladder of Jacob", *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), II, pp. 406.

¹¹ I use the term "extent" since *LadJac* specifically mentions shoulders and arms in its description of the Face.

(Slavonic) *Enoch*,¹² a Jewish apocalypse, the hypothetical date of which (c. first century CE) is in close proximity to the date of *LadJac*.¹³

¹² In this paper I have used F. Andersen's English translation of *2 Enoch* and follow his division of chapters. Cf. F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch", *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), I, pp. 102-221.

¹³ On the date and the provenance of *2 Enoch* see: I. D. Amusin, *Kumranskaja Obshchina* (Moscow: Nauka, 1983); F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch", *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), I, pp. 91-221; G. N. Bonwetsch, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (AGWG, 1; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1896); G. N. Bonwetsch, *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs: Das sogenannte slavische Henochbuch* (TU, 44; Leipzig, 1922); C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (WUNT, R.2, 50; Tübingen: Mohr, 1992); C. Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995); C. Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995); R. H. Charles, and W. R. Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896); J. H. Charlesworth, "The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch (Seminar Report)", *NTS* 25 (1979), pp. 315-23; J. H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament. Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins* (SNTSMS, 54; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); J. Collins, "The Genre of Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism", *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1983); L. Cry, "Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mystérieux en II Hénoch", *RB* 49 (1940), pp. 195-203; U. Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (BZNW, 44; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1978); A. S. D. Maunder, "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Book of Enoch", *The Observatory* 41 (1918), pp. 309-316; N. Meshcherskij, "Sledy pamjatnikov Kumrana v staroslavjanskoj i drevnerusskoj literature (K izucheniju slavjanskih versij knigi Enoha)", *Trudy otdela drevnerusskoj literatury* 19 (1963), pp. 130-47; N. Meshcherskij, "K voprosu ob istochnikah slavjanskoj knigi Enoha", *Kratkie soobshchenija Instituta narodov Azii* 86 (1965), pp. 72-8; J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973); A. Orlov, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch*", *JSP* 18 (1998), pp. 71-86; A. Orlov, "Melchizedek Legend of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch", *JSJ* 31 (2000), pp. 23-38; A. Orlov, "The Origin of the Name 'Metatron' and the Text of 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch", *JSP* 21 (2000), pp. 19-26; A. Orlov, "Secrets of Creation in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch", *Henoch* 22 (2000), pp. 45-62; S. Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch", *Types of Redemption* (ed. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970), pp. 72-87; A. Rubinstein, "Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch", *JJS* 15 (1962), pp. 1-21; P. Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (JSPSS, 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); A. De Santos Otero, "Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo)", *Apócrifos del AT IV* (ed. A. Díez Macho; Madrid, 1984), pp. 147-202; G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic tradition* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965); M. I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij", *Chtenija v Obshchestve Istorii i Drevnostej Rossijskikh (COIDR)* 4 (1910); M. Stone, *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (2 vols; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), II, pp. 406-8; A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut d'Etudes Slaves, 1952; repr. Paris, 1976); J.

2 *Enoch* 22¹⁴ contains a theophanic depiction of the Face of the Lord, which emits light and fire. The important detail that connects this passage with *LadJac* is that the Face in 2 *Enoch* is similarly defined as “fiery”¹⁵ and “terrifying”.¹⁶ Another parallel is that in both 2 *Enoch* and *LadJac* the Face is understood as the luminous representation of the Deity, behind which He can convey His audible revelation to visionaries.¹⁷

It is noteworthy that the incandescent Face in 2 *Enoch*, as well as in *LadJac*, is depicted not as a part of an angelic or divine “body” but rather as the fiery “forefront” of the whole anthropomorphic extent.¹⁸

It has been previously noted¹⁹ that this fiery extent, labeled in some Biblical and intertestamental texts as the “Face”, is related to the glorious celestial entity known in theophanic traditions as God’s *Kavod*.²⁰ In these

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

¹⁴ 2 *Enoch* 22:1-4 (the longer recension): “I saw the view of the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot in a fire and brought out, and it emits sparks and is incandescent. Thus even I saw the face of the Lord. But the face of the Lord is not to be talked about, it is so very marvelous and supremely awesome and supremely frightening. And who am I to give an account of the incomprehensible being of the Lord, and of his face, so extremely strange and indescribable? And how many are his commands, and his multiple voice, and the Lord’s throne, supremely great and not made by hands, and the choir stalls all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, and their never-silent singing. Who can give an account of his beautiful appearance, never changing and indescribable, and his great glory? And I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord”. F. Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch”, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), I, pp. 136.

¹⁵ F. Andersen in his commentary on 2 *Enoch* 22 notes the similarities between the fiery face in 2 *Enoch* and the face of fire in *LadJac*. Cf. Andersen, p. 137, n. 22d.

¹⁶ Both Slavonic pseudepigraphons in their description of the Face share the similar Slavonic terminology, words like face (*lice*); fiery (*ognena, iz ognja*); terrifying (*strashno*). Cf. I. Franko, *Apokrifi i legendi z ukrains'kih rukopisiv* (5 vols.; L'vov, 1896-1910), I, p. 109; G. Kushelev-Bezborodko, *Pamjatniki starinnoj russkoj literatury* (St. Petersburg, 1865), III, p. 27; I.Ja. Porfir'ev, “Apokrificheskie skazanija o vethozavetnyh lichah i sobytijah po rukopisjam soloveckoj biblioteki”, *Sbornik otd. r. jaz. i slov.* 17.1 (St. Petersburg, 1877), p. 138; N.S. Tihonravov, *Pamjatniki otrechennoj russkoj literatury* (St. Petersburg, 1863), I, p. 91; *Tolkovaja paleja 1477 goda, Obshchestvo ljubitelej drevnerusskoj pis'mennosti*, vol. 93 (St. Petersburg, 1892), p. 100b; A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut d'Etudes Slaves, 1952; repr. Paris, 1976), pp. 24 and 38.

¹⁷ See A. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (SVC, 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996), pp. 104-5.

¹⁸ It is notable that although *LadJac* uses the Slavonic term *lice* (face) in its depiction of the “Face”, the text mentions that the face Jacob sees has also shoulders and arms.

¹⁹ A. Orlov, “Ex 33 on God’s Face: A Lesson from the Enochic Tradition”, *Society of Biblical Literature 2000 Seminar Papers* (SBLSP, 39; Atlanta: Scholars, 2000), pp. 130-47.

²⁰ The early traces of this tendency to identify *Kavod* with the Face within Enochic tradition can be seen already in the *Book of Watchers* 14 where the enthroned Glory is labeled the *Face*. Cf. 1 *Enoch* 14:21: “And no angel could enter, and at the appearance of the face (*gašš*) of him who is honored and praised no (creature of) flesh could look”. M.

traditions, the Face often serves to designate the radiant *façade* of the Divine *Kabod*.²¹ This tendency to equate the Face with the *Kavod* can be found already in some Biblical accounts, including Exod. 33:18-23, where in response to Moses' plea to God to show him His *Glory*, God answers that it is impossible for a human being to see God's *face*.²²

The second chapter of the *Ladder of Jacob*, in which the visionary asks God to interpret the dream, provides several additional important details about the dream that explicitly identify the fiery Face with God's *Kavod*.

In the second chapter of the Slavonic text, Jacob offers a prayer in which he discloses further details of his vision of the Face. *LadJac* 2:7-19 reads:

Lord God of Adam your creature and Lord God of Abraham and Isaac my fathers and of all who have walked before you in justice! You who sit firmly on the cherubim and the fiery throne of glory ... and the many-eyed (ones) just I saw in my dream, holding the four-faced cherubim, bearing also the many-eyed seraphim, carrying the whole world under your arm, yet not being borne by anyone; you who have made the skies firm for the glory of your name, stretching out on two heavenly clouds the heaven which gleams under you, that beneath it you may cause the sun to course and conceal it during the night so that it might not seem a god; (you) who made on them a way for the moon and the stars; and you make the moon wax and wane, and destine the stars to pass on so that they too might not seem gods. Before the face of your glory the six-winged seraphim are afraid, and they cover their feet and faces with their wings, while flying with their other (wings), and they sing unceasingly a hymn: ... whom I now in sanctifying a new (song) ... Twelve-topped, twelve-faced, many-named, fiery one! Lightning-eyed holy one! Holy, Holy, Holy, Yao, Yaova, Yaoil, Yao, Kados, Chavod, Savaoth...²³

Several details are important in this description. Jacob's prayer reveals that his dream about the Face might represent the vision of the Throne of God's Glory. A number of points need to be noted to support this conclusion:

a. The prayer refers to "his many-eyed ones",²⁴ alluding to **האופנים**, the Wheels, the special class of the Angels of the Throne who are described in Ezek. 1:18 as the angelic beings "full of eyes"

Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), II, p. 99.

²¹ It is noteworthy, that already in the classic Ezekilean description of God's Glory in Ezek. 1:27, *Kavod* is described similarly to the description of the Face in *LadJac*, namely as the fiery *bust*: "I saw that from what appeared to be his *waist up* he looked like glowing metal, as it full of fire, and that from there down he looked like fire; and brilliant light surrounded him".

²² See Exod. 33:18-23: "Then Moses said, 'Now show me your glory (כבודך).' And the Lord said, 'I will cause all my goodness to pass in front of you, and I will proclaim my name, the Lord, in your presence... but,' he said, 'you cannot see my face (פני), for no one may see me and live.'"

²³ H.G. Lunt, "Ladder of Jacob", *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), II, p. 408.

²⁴ Andersen, p. 137.

- b. The text describes the Deity as seated on the fiery Throne of Glory.
- c. The vision contains references to the angelic liturgy and the *Trisagion*.
- d. The text refers to the fear of the angelic hosts, who stand in the front of the terrifying fiery “Face” and try to protect themselves with their wings (“before the face of your glory the six-winged seraphim are afraid, and they cover their feet and faces with their wings”). The motif of protection against the harmful brilliance of God’s throne is typical to theophanic descriptions of *Kavod* from the earliest accounts found in Isa. 6:1-4 to the latest accounts found in *3 Enoch*, which relates that “...in ‘Arabot there are 660 thousands of myriads of glorious angels, hewn out of flaming fire, standing opposite the throne of glory. The glorious King covers his face, otherwise the heaven of ‘Arabot would burst open in the middle, because of the glorious brilliance”.²⁵
- e. The passage also contains a specific terminology associated with the Throne imagery. It has been mentioned earlier that the Slavonic text of the *Ladder* is possibly based on the Semitic original. *LadJac* 2: 18 contains a non-Slavonic word *Chavod*²⁶ which the translator (H. Lunt) defines as the transliterated Hebrew term *Kavod*.²⁷
- f. Finally, the passage explicitly identifies the fiery Face with God’s glory. *LadJac* 2:15 says that “before the face of your glory the six-winged seraphim are afraid...”. Thus the fiery face in *LadJac* 1:6 is not just any face but the Face of God.

The apparent similarities between two Slavonic accounts indicate that *LadJac*, as well as *2 Enoch*, seem to represent a single tradition in which the fiery Face is associated with *Kavod*.

Additional evidence to support the view that the fiery Face on the ladder in *LadJac* represents God’s *Kavod* can be found in the targumic accounts of Jacob’s story. *Targ. Ps.-J.* and *Targ. Onq.* give numerous references to the Glory of the Lord in their description of Jacob’s vision of the ladder.

Targ. Ps.-J. to Gen. 28:13-17 reads:

...And, behold, the Glory of the Lord (יְקָרָא דְּהוּא) stood beside him and said to him, “I am the Lord, the God of your father Abraham and the God of Isaac. The land on which you are lying I will give to you and to your children ... And Jacob awoke from his sleep and said, “In truth the Glory of the Shekinah (שְׁכִינָתָא) of the Lord dwells in this place, and I did not know it”. He was afraid and said, “How awesome and glorious is this place! This is not a profane place, but a sanctuary to

²⁵ Alexander, p. 305.

²⁶ MS S - *Chavod*; MS R - *Chavod*; MS F - *Chsavod*. See: *Tolkovaja paleja 1477 goda, Obshchestvo ljubitelej drevnerusskoj pis'mennosti*, vol. 93 (St. Petersburg, 1892), p. 101b; G. Kushelev-Bezborodko, *Pamjatniki starinnoj russkoj literatury* (St. Petersburg, 1865), III, p. 28; I. Franko, *Apokrifi i legendi z ukrains'kih rukopisiv* (5 vols.; L'vov, 1896-1910), I, p. 110.

²⁷ See Lunt, p. 408, n. 2.i.

the name of the Lord; and this is (a place) suitable for prayer, corresponding to the gate of heaven, founded beneath the Throne of Glory (כּוֹרְסֵי יְקֻרָא).²⁸

*Targ. Onq.*²⁹ to Gen. 28:13-16 also reflects the same tradition, which depicts Jacob's encounter as the vision of the Divine Glory. In both targumic accounts, the Glory of the Lord seems topologically located in the place which in *LadJac* is occupied by the Face.

The Face as Jacob's Heavenly Counterpart

Scholars have previously noted that in *LadJac* the fiery Face not only embodies God's Glory but also seems to represent the heavenly counterpart of Jacob.³⁰ They observe that the bust of fire, labeled in *LadJac* as the Face, can be associated with the heavenly "image" of Jacob engraved on the Throne of Glory.³¹ The traditions about the heavenly "image" of Jacob are present in several targumic³² texts,³³ including *Targ. Ps.-J.*, *Targ. Neof.*,³⁴ and *Frag. Targ.*³⁵

²⁸ *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (tr. M. Maher, M.S.C.; The Aramaic Bible, 1B; Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992), pp. 99-100; *Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum* (ed. A. Díez Macho; Matriti: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1977), pp. 195-97.

²⁹ "...and here, The Glory of the Lord (יְקֻרָא דֵי) was standing over him, and He said, 'I am the Lord, the God of your Father Abraham and the God of Isaac: the one on which you sleep I will give to you and to your offspring ...' The Jacob awoke from his sleep and said, 'Truly the Glory of the Lord (יְקֻרָא דֵי) dwells in this place, and I did not know it.'" *The Targum Onkelos to Genesis* (tr. B. Grossfeld; The Aramaic Bible, 6; Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988), p. 104; *Targum Onkelos to Genesis. A Critical Analysis Together with an English translation of the Text* (eds. M. Aberbach and B. Grossfeld; Ktav, 1982), p. 171.

³⁰ Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, pp. 135-51, esp. p. 143.

³¹ "... [in the *Ladder of Jacob*] in the fiery bust of the terrifying man we are probably correct to see the heavenly 'image' of Jacob". Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, p. 143, n.30.

³² The same tradition can be found in Rabbinic texts. *Gen. R.* 68:12 reads: "...thus it says, Israel in whom I will be glorified (Isa. xlix, 3); it is thou, [said the angels,] whose features are engraved on high; they ascended on high and saw his features and they descended below and found him sleeping". *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1961), II, p. 626. On Jacob's image on the Throne of Glory see also: *Gen. R.* 78:3; 82:2; *Num. R.* 4:1; *b. Hul.* 91b; *Pirqe R. El.* 35.

³³ On the traditions about Jacob's image engraved on the Throne see: E.R. Wolfson, *Along the Path: Studies in Kabbalistic Myth, Symbolism, and Hermeneutics* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), pp. 1-62; pp. 111-186.

³⁴ "And he dreamed, and behold, a ladder was fixed on the earth and its head reached to the height of the heavens; and behold, the angels that had accompanied him from the house of his father ascended to bear good tidings to the angels on high, saying: 'Come and see the pious man whose image is engraved in the throne of Glory, whom you desired to see.' And behold, the angels from before the Lord ascended and descended and observed him".

In *Targ. Ps.-J.* to Gen 28:12 the following description can be found:

He [Jacob] had a dream, and behold, a ladder was fixed in the earth with its top reaching toward the heavens ... and on that day they (angels) ascended to the heavens on high, and said, Come and see Jacob the pious, whose image is fixed (engraved) in the Throne of Glory (דא'יקונין דיליה קביעא בכורסי 'קרא), and whom you have desired to see".³⁶

A distinctive feature of this description is that the heavenly counterpart of Jacob, his "image", is engraved on a very special celestial entity, on the *Throne of Glory*. Engraving on the Throne might indicate an association with the *Kavod* since the Throne is the central part of the *Kavod* imagery – the seat of the anthropomorphic Glory of the Lord. The image engraved on the Throne might be an allusion to the face,³⁷ the fiery face, since it is engraved on the fiery glorious Throne of the Glory.

Besides the tradition of "engraving" on the Throne, some Jewish materials point to an even more radical identification of Jacob's image with *Kavod*. Jarl Fossum's research³⁸ demonstrates that in some traditions about Jacob's image, his "image" or "likeness" is depicted not simply as *engraved* on the heavenly throne, but as *seated* upon the throne of glory.³⁹ J. Fossum argues that this second tradition is original. Christopher Rowland proposed that Jacob's image is "identical with the form of God on the throne of glory (Ezek. 1.26f.)".⁴⁰ J. Fossum offers additional support for this idea by pointing out that the Hebrew forms of the Greek loan word εἰκῶν, used in

Targum Neofiti I: Genesis (tr. M. McNamara, M.S.C.; The Aramaic Bible: 1A; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992), p. 140.

³⁵ "... And he dreamt that there was a ladder set on the ground, whose top reached towards the heavens; and behold the angels that had accompanied him from his father's house ascended to announce to the angels of the heights: 'Come and see the pious man, whose image is fixed to the throne of glory...'" M.L. Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch According to Their Extant Sources* (2 vols.; AB, 76; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980), I, p. 57 and II, p. 20.

³⁶ *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (tr. M. Maher, M.S.C.; The Aramaic Bible, 1B; Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992), pp. 99-100; *Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum* (ed. A. Díez Macho; Matriti: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1977), p. 195.

³⁷ *Hekhalot Rabbati* (*Synopse* §164) attests to the tradition of Jacob's *face* engraved on the throne of glory: פניו יעקב אביהם שהיא חקוקה לי על כסא כבודי. Peter Schäfer, with M. Schlüter and H. G. von Mutius., *Synopse zur Hekhaloth-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981), p. 72.

³⁸ Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, pp. 140-41.

³⁹ J. Fossum notes that this tradition is already observable in some versions of the Fragmentary Targum which do not contain the verb "engraved" or "fixed". Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, 141. He also points to a certain baraita (*b. Hul.* 91b) that seems to attest to the same tradition. Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, pp. 139-40.

⁴⁰ C. Rowland, "John 1.51, Jewish Apocalyptic and Targumic Tradition", *NTS* 30 (1984), p. 504.

the Targums and *Gen. R.* 68:12, are synonymous with **צלם** and **דמות**.⁴¹ He further suggests that “**אִיקוֹנִי**” or **דִּיּוֹקְנָא** can thus be seen to denote a bodily form, even that of God, that is the Divine Glory”.⁴²

The hypothesis about the identification of Jacob’s image and the Divine Glory returns us again to the imagery of God’s *Kavod* with which, as has been shown earlier, the Face in *LadJac* and *2 Enoch* is closely associated.

Enochic materials may also correlate the Face of God (His *Kavod*) with the heavenly counterpart of the visionary. In *2 Enoch*, the Face of the Lord seems to play an important role in the description of Enoch’s heavenly counterpart. *2 Enoch* 39:3-6 depicts the patriarch who, during his short trip to the earth, retells to his children his earlier encounter with the Face. Enoch relates:

You, my children, you see my face, a human being created just like yourselves; I am one who has seen the face of the Lord, like iron made burning hot by a fire, emitting sparks. For you gaze into my eyes, a human being created just like yourselves; but I have gazed into the eyes of the Lord, like the rays of the shining sun and terrifying the eyes of a human being. You, my children, you see my right hand beckoning you, a human being created identical to yourselves; but I have seen the right hand of the Lord, beckoning me, who fills heaven. You see the extend of my body, the same as your own; but I have seen the extend of the Lord, without measure and without analogy, who has no end.⁴³

Enoch’s description provides a series of analogies in which the earthly Enoch compares his face and parts of his body with the attributes of the Lord’s Face and body. For this investigation, however, another juxtaposition is most pertinent. It is a contrast between the two identities of the visionary: the earthly Enoch (“a human being created just like yourselves”) and his heavenly counterpart (“the one who has seen the Face of God”). It appears that Enoch tries to describe himself in two different modes of existence: as a human being who now stands before his children with a human face and body *and* as the one who has seen God’s Face in the celestial realm. These descriptions of two conditions (earthly and celestial) occur repeatedly in tandem. It is possible that the purpose of Enoch’s instruction to his children is not to stress the difference between his human body and the Lord’s body, but to emphasize the distinction between *this* Enoch, a human being “created just like yourselves”, and the *other* angelic Enoch who has been standing before the Lord’s face. Enoch’s previous transformation into the glorious one and his initiation into *Sar ha-Panim* in *2 Enoch* 22:7 support this suggestion. It is unlikely that Enoch somehow “completely” abandoned his supra-angelic status and his unique place before the Face of the Lord granted to him in the previous chapters. An

⁴¹ Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, p. 142.

⁴² Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, p. 142.

⁴³ Andersen, p. 163.

account of Enoch's permanent installation can be found in chapter 36 where the Lord tells Enoch, before his short visit to the earth, that a place has been prepared for him and that he will be in the front of Lord's face "from *now* and forever".⁴⁴ Finally, in chapter 43,⁴⁵ Enoch introduces himself to his children as the Governor⁴⁶ of the World.⁴⁷ This title gives additional proof to the fact that the permanent installation of Enoch-Metatron in the heavenly offices, including the office of the Prince of the World (שר העולם), has already taken place. The importance of this account for the idea of the heavenly counterpart in *2 Enoch* is apparent because it points to the simultaneous existence of Enoch's angelic double installed in heaven and its human counterpart, whom God sends periodically on missionary errands. Targumic and Rabbinic Jacob accounts also attest to this view of the heavenly counterpart when they depict angels beholding Jacob as one who at one and the same time is installed in heaven and is sleeping on earth.⁴⁸

The idea about the heavenly counterpart of the visionary found in *2 Enoch* is also present in another early Enochic account. One of the booklets of *1 (Ethiopic) Enoch* attests a similar tradition. Scholars have previously observed⁴⁹ that the *Similitudes* seem to entertain the idea of the heavenly twin of a visionary when it identifies Enoch with the Son of Man.⁵⁰ For a

⁴⁴ *2 Enoch* 36:3. Andersen, p. 161.

⁴⁵ A similar testimony can also be found in the passage of *2 Enoch* preserved in the Slavonic collection of ethical writings, "The Just Balance" (*Merilo Pravednoe*), in which the existence of *2 Enoch* was first made public. Cf. M.N. Tihomirov, *Merilo Pravednoe po rukopisi XIV veka* (Moscow: AN SSSR, 1961).

⁴⁶ F. Andersen translates the title as "the manager of the arrangements on earth". Cf. Andersen, p. 217.

⁴⁷ On this title of Enoch and its connection with the office of the Prince of the World see: A. Orlov, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch*", *JSP* 18 (1998), pp. 82-85.

⁴⁸ *Targ. Neof.* to Gen 28:12: "...and behold, the angels from before the Lord ascended and descended and observed him [Jacob]". *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis* (tr. M. McNamara, M.S.C.; The Aramaic Bible: 1A; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992), p. 140; *Gen. R.* 68:12: "...they ascended on high and saw his features and they descended below and found him sleeping". *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1961), II, p. 626.

⁴⁹ See J. VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in *1 Enoch* 37-71", in: *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity. The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (eds. J.H. Charlesworth, et al.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), pp. 182-3; M. Knibb, "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls", *DSD* 2 (1995), pp. 177-80; Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, pp. 144-5; C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT, Reihe 2:94; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997), p. 151.

⁵⁰ It is important to note that in the *Similitudes*, the Son of Man is depicted as seated on the throne of glory. See *1 Enoch* 62:5, *1 Enoch* 69:29. J. Fossum observes that "in the 'Similitudes' the 'Elect One' or 'Son of Man' who identified as the patriarch Enoch, is enthroned upon the 'throne of glory.' If 'glory' does not qualify the throne but its occupant, Enoch is actually identified with the Glory of God". Fossum further concludes that "...the 'Similitudes of Enoch' present an early parallel to the targumic description of

long time, students of the Enochic traditions were puzzled by the fact that the Son of Man, who in the previous chapters of the *Similitudes* has been distinguished from Enoch, becomes suddenly identified in *1 Enoch* 71 with the patriarch. James Vanderkam suggests that this puzzle can be explained by the Jewish notion, attested in several ancient Jewish texts, that a creature of flesh and blood could have a heavenly double or counterpart.⁵¹ To provide an example, J. Vanderkam points to Jacob's traditions in which the patriarch's "features are engraved on high".⁵² He stresses that this theme of the visionary's ignorance of his higher angelic identity is observable, for example, in *PrJos*.

It is noteworthy that in the *Similitudes*, similarly in *2 Enoch* and *LadJac*,⁵³ the theme of the heavenly counterpart seems to conflate with the imagery of God's *Kavod*. *1 Enoch* 71:5 reports that Enoch is brought by Michael to the fiery structure, surrounded by the rivers of living fire, which he describes as "a something built of crystal stones, and in the middle of those stones tongues of living fire".⁵⁴

There is no doubt that the fiery "structure" in the *Similitudes* represents the Throne of Glory, which, in another booklet of *1 Enoch*, is also described as the crystal structure issuing streams of fire.⁵⁵ An explicit reference to the Throne of Glory in *1 Enoch* 71:8,⁵⁶ immediately after the description of the fiery "crystal" structure, makes this clear.

Jacob being seated upon the 'throne of glory.'" Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God*, p. 145.

⁵¹ J. VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37-71", in: *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity. The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (eds. J.H. Charlesworth, et al.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), pp. 182-3.

⁵² J. VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37-71", in: *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity. The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (eds. J.H. Charlesworth, et al.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), pp. 182-3.

⁵³ A notable detail in the description is that during his ascension Enoch, in a manner similar to Jacob's vision of the ladder, sees the angelic "movements" and the angelic "faces". In *1 Enoch* 71:1 he reports about "...the sons of the holy angels treading upon flames of fire, and their garments (were) white, and their clothing, and the light of their face (was) like snow". M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), II, p. 165.

⁵⁴ M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), II, p. 166.

⁵⁵ In the *Book of Watchers* 14:18-19 the Throne of Glory is also described as a crystal structure surrounded of the rivers of fire. The reference to "crystal" structure also recalls the depiction of the Throne in Ezek. 1:26, where it is described as a throne of sapphire (ספיר).

⁵⁶ *1 Enoch* 71:7: "And round about (were) the Seraphim, and the Cherubim, and the Ophanim; these are they who do not sleep, but keep watch over the throne of his glory" M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), II, p. 166.

Similarities between *1 Enoch* 71 and *2 Enoch* 22 in the depictions of *Kavod* and Enoch's transformation near the Throne of Glory are also apparent.

a. In both accounts (*1 Enoch* 71:3-5 and *2 Enoch* 22:6), Enoch is brought to the Throne by archangel Michael.

b. Angelology of the Throne in *1 Enoch*, similarly to *2 Enoch* and *LadJac*,⁵⁷ include three classes of angelic beings: ophanim, cherubim and seraphim.

c. Both Enochic accounts speak about the transformation of the visionary. Enoch's metamorphosis in *1 Enoch* 71 recalls the description of the luminous transformation of Enoch into a glorious heavenly being from *2 Enoch* 22:8-9.

d. In both cases, the transformation takes place in front of the fiery "structure", a possible source of both transformations.

e. Studies in the past have noted that in both accounts the transformation of the visionary takes place in the context of the angelic liturgy (*2 Enoch* 21:1-22:10; *1 Enoch* 71:11-12).⁵⁸ The same feature is also observable in *LadJac* 2:15-18.

f. In both accounts Enoch falls on his face before the Throne.⁵⁹

g. The manner in which Enoch is greeted near the Throne of Glory in *1 Enoch* 71:14-17 evokes the scene from *2 Enoch* 22:5-6, where the Lord personally greets Enoch. In both accounts we have an address in which the visionary is informed about his "eternal" status.⁶⁰

⁵⁷ The *Ladder* also refers to three classes of angels, ophanim (many-eyed ones), cherubim and seraphim, right after the remark about the Throne: "...the fiery throne of glory ... and the many-eyed (ones) just I saw in my dream, holding the four-faced cherubim, bearing also the many-eyed seraphim...". Lunt, p. 408.

⁵⁸ C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT, Reihe 2:94; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1997), p. 154.

⁵⁹ *1 Enoch* 71:11 "And I fell upon my face". Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, II, p.166. *2 Enoch* 21:2 "I fell on my face". Andersen, p. 135.

⁶⁰ *1 Enoch* 71:14-15: "You are the Son of Man who was born to righteousness, and righteousness remains over you...and so you will have it for ever and for ever and ever". Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, II, pp. 166-7. *2 Enoch* 22:5-6: "Be brave, Enoch! Don't be frightened! Stand up, and stand in front of my face forever". Andersen, pp. 138-39.

These features of both Enochic accounts, entertaining the idea of the heavenly twin, point to the importance of the vision of the Kavod in the process of acquiring knowledge about the heavenly counterparts of the visionaries. It is not coincidental that in Jacob's tradition, which also attests the idea of the heavenly counterpart, the vision of God's glory also becomes an important theophanic motif. It is clearly recognizable in the targumic Jacob's accounts and the Ladder of Jacob, where reports about Jacob's angelic counterpart are creatively conflated with theophanic traditions about the vision of God's Kavod.

Uriel-Sariel-Phanuel

Another prominent trait that links Jacob's account in *LadJac* with both above mentioned Enochic accounts (*1 Enoch* 71 and *2 Enoch* 22) is the reference to the angel Sariel, also known in various traditions under the names of Phanuel and Uriel.⁶¹

In *2 Enoch* 22-23, Uriel⁶² plays an important role during Enoch's initiations near the Throne of Glory.⁶³ He instructs Enoch about various subjects of esoteric knowledge in order to prepare him for various celestial offices, including the office of the Heavenly Scribe.

1 Enoch 71 also refers to the same angel and names him Phanuel. In the *Similitudes*, he occupies an important place among the four principal angels, namely, the place usually assigned to Uriel. In fact, the angelic name

⁶¹ J. Smith observes that in five instances in *1 Enoch* (40:9; 54:6; 71:8,9,13), confined to the *Similitudes*, Phanuel replaces Uriel in a catalog of the four archangels. He also points out that while Sariel is a relatively unknown angelic figure, his name seems to be quite frequently conflated with Uriel, as in *1 Enoch* 9:1. Cf. J.Z. Smith, "Prayer of Joseph", *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), II, pp. 708-9. For the discussion about Uriel-Sariel-Phanuel, see: J. Greenfield, "Prolegomenon", in H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: Ktav, 1973), pp. xxxiv-xxxv; Lunt, *The Ladder of Jacob*, p. 405, n. 10; J. Milik, *The Books of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), pp. 170-74; S. Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the Naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism* (TSAJ, 36; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1993), pp. 105-109; J.Z. Smith, "The Prayer of Joseph", in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (ed. J. Neusner; Sup Numen, 14; Leiden: Brill, 1968), pp. 270 and 227; G. Vermes, "The Archangel Sariel: A Targumic Parallel to the Dead Sea Scrolls", in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults* (SJLA, 12:3; Leiden: Brill, 1975), pp. 159-166; G. Vermes, "The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies", *JJS* 26 (1975), p. 13.

⁶² Slav. *Vereveil*. Vaillant, 26.

⁶³ The beginning of this tradition can be found in the *Book of Heavenly Luminaries* (*1 Enoch* 74:2), where Enoch writes the instructions of the angel Uriel regarding the secrets of heavenly bodies and their movements. M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), II, p. 173.

Phanuel might be a title which stresses the celestial status of Uriel/Sariel⁶⁴ as one of the servants of the Divine *Panim*.⁶⁵

The title “Phanuel” is reminiscent of the terminology found in various Jacob’s accounts. In Gen. 32:31, Jacob names the place (הַמְקוֹם) of his wrestling with God as Peniel (פְּנֵי־אֵל) - the Face of God.⁶⁶ Scholars believe that the angelic name *Phanuel* and the place *Peniel* are etymologically connected.⁶⁷

Although *LadJac*’s narrative does not directly refer to the angel named Phanuel, it uses another of his names, Sariel, in reference to the angelic being, who interprets Jacob’s dream and announces to him his new angelic status, depicted symbolically in the changing of the patriarch’s name to Israel. *LadJac* 2 portrays Jacob asking God in prayer for help in interpreting the dream. Chapter 3 of the *Ladder* relates that, God responds to Jacob’s prayer by commanding: “Sariel, leader of those who comfort, you who in charge of dreams, go and make Jacob understand the meaning of the dream”. The text further depicts the angelophany of Sariel who comes to the patriarch to inform him about his new angelic name and status.

⁶⁴ G. Vermes observes that at Qumran, “Sariel becomes one of the four chief angels, replacing Uriel, the traditional fourth archangel in the Greek Enoch and midrashic literature ... He also appears in an Aramaic fragment of 4Q Enoch 9:1”. G. Vermes, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies”, *JJS* 26 (1975), p. 13.

⁶⁵ *Hekhalot Rabbati* (*Synopse* §108) refers to the angel Suria/Suriel as the Prince of the Face: סוּרִיא/סוּרִיאל שֶׁר הַפְּנִים. Cf. Peter Schäfer, with M. Schlüter and H. G. von Mutius., *Synopse zur Hekhaloth-Literatur* (TSAJ, 2; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981), p. 52. On the identification of Sariel with the Prince of the Presence see: Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, pp. 99ff; J.Z. Smith, “Prayer of Joseph”, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), II, p. 709.

⁶⁶ The connection between the terms God’s Face (פְּנֵי־אֵל) and the Place (הַמְקוֹם) in Gen. 32:31 is important. In later theophanic contexts the term הַמְקוֹם is closely associated with the *Kavod* imagery. This tradition can be found, for example, in *3 Enoch* 45:1; 47:1; 48D:8. *3 Enoch* also uses an expression “the Curtain (*pargod*) of the Place” in reference to the celestial veil, which shields the angelic hosts from the harmful luminescence of the *Kavod*.

⁶⁷ G. Vermes suggests that the angelic name Phanuel “is depended on the Peniel/Penuel of Genesis 32”. Cf.: G. Vermes, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies”, *JJS* 26 (1975), p. 13. J. Smith supports Vermes’ position. In his opinion, “it is most likely that the name Phanuel is to be derived from the place name Peniel/Penuel (the face of God) in Genesis 32:30, and therefore may be related to the title ‘a man seeing God.’” J.Z. Smith, “Prayer of Joseph”, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), II, p. 709. See also S. Olyan, who argues that “the angel Penuel was either derived from texts such Exod. 13:14-15 and Deut. 4:37, where the divine presence is given figurative treatment, or it emerged from the exegesis of Gen. 32:25-33”. S. Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the Naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism* (TSAJ, 36; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1993), pp. 108-109

This reference to Sariel/Uriel as the angel who instructs/wrestles with Jacob and announces to him his new angelic name is documented in several other sources, including *Targ.Neof.* and *PrJos.* In *PrJos.*, Jacob attests that “Uriel, the angel of God, came forth and said that ‘I [Jacob-Israel] had descended to earth and I had tabernacled among men and that I had been called by the name of Jacob.’ He envied me and fought with me and wrestled with me...”⁶⁸

In targumic and rabbinic accounts, Sariel/Uriel is also depicted as the angel who wrestled with Jacob and announced him his new angelic name.

Targ.Neof. to Gen. 32:25-31 reads:

And Jacob was left alone; and the angel Sariel (שריאל) wrestled with him in the appearance of a man and he embraced him until the time the dawn arose. When he saw that he could not prevail against him, he touched the hollow of his thigh and the hollow of Jacob’s thigh became benumbed in his wrestling with him. And he said: “Let me go because the rise of the dawn has arrived, and because the time of the angels on high to praise has arrived, and I am a chief of those who praise” (ואנא ריש למשבחיא). And he said: “I will not let you go unless you bless me”. And he said to him: “What is your name?” And he said: “Jacob”. And he said: “Your name shall no longer be called Jacob but Israel, because you have claimed superiority with angels from before the Lord and with men and you have prevailed against them. And Jacob asked and said: “Tell me your name I pray”; and he said: “Why, now, do you ask my name?” And he blessed him there. And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel (פניאל) because: “I have seen *angels from before the Lord face to face* and my life has been spared”.⁶⁹

Scholars have previously noted that “in the circles represented by the Similitudes of Enoch, Qumran and Neofiti variety of the Palestinian Targum, the angelic adversary of Jacob was recognized as one of the four celestial princes and called alternatively Sariel or Phanuel”.⁷⁰ It appears that *LadJac* also belongs to the same circles. In *Targ. Neof.* and *Frag. Targ.*⁷¹ to Gen 32:27, Sariel is defined as “the chief of those who give praise” (ריש למשבחיא). The *Ladder of Jacob* seems to allude to this title. In

⁶⁸ J.Z. Smith, “Prayer of Joseph”, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), pp. 713.

⁶⁹ *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis* (tr. M. McNamara, M.S.C.; The Aramaic Bible: 1A; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992) 158; A. Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1, Targum Palestinense Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana* (Textos y Estudios, 7; Madrid/Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968), I, pp. 217-219.

⁷⁰ G. Vermes, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies”, *JJS* 26 (1975), p. 13; J.Z. Smith, “Prayer of Joseph”, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), II, p. 709.

⁷¹ M.L. Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch According to Their Extant Sources* (2 vols.; AB, 76; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980), I, p. 59; and II, p. 22.

LadJac 3:2 Sariel is described as “*stareishino uslazhdaemych*”⁷² which can be translated as “the chief of those who give joy”.⁷³

It is of interest to note that in *LadJac*, Sariel/Phanuel imagery seems to be influenced by the Enochic tradition even more extensively than in the Targums; in the *Ladder*, the motif of wrestling is completely absent and is substituted by the depiction of Sariel as the interpreter of dreams. It seems that Sariel/Uriel in *LadJac* assumes the traditional “Enochic” functions of *angelus interpres*.⁷⁴

Princes of the Face

In the *Ladder of Jacob* and the *Prayer of Joseph*, Jacob’s identification with his heavenly counterpart, the angel Israel, involves the initiatory encounter with the angel Sariel/Uriel, who in other texts is also known as Phanuel, the angel of the Divine Presence or the Face. The same state of events is observable in Enochic materials where Uriel serves as a principal heavenly guide to another prominent visionary who has also acquired knowledge about his own heavenly counterpart, namely, Enoch/Metatron. In both traditions, Uriel/Sariel/Phanuel appears as the guide who assists the visionaries in acquiring or identifying with their new celestial identities.

The process of establishing twinship with the heavenly counterpart might be reflected in the initiatory procedure of becoming a *Sar ha-Panim*, one of the angelic⁷⁵ Princes of the Divine Face or Presence, the prominent celestial office, which is often described in detail in various apocalyptic and Merkabah accounts. The installation of a visionary as *Sar ha-Panim* seems to correlate with the procedure of identifying a visionary with his heavenly counterpart.⁷⁶

⁷² MSS S, R, F. Cf: *Tolkovaja paleja 1477 goda, Obshchestvo ljubitelej drevnerusskoj pis'mennosti*, vol. 93 (St. Petersburg, 1892), p. 101b; G. Kushelev-Bezborodko, *Pamjatniki starinnoj russkoj literatury* (St. Petersburg, 1865), III, p. 28; I. Franko, *Apokrifi i legendi z ukrains'kih rukopisiv* (5 vols.; L'vov, 1896-1910), I, p. 110.

⁷³ Slav. “*uslazhdaemych*” can be literally translated as “sweetened”. Cf. *Staroslovjanskij slovar' po rukopisjam X-XI vekov* (ed. R.M. Cejtin; Moscow: Russkij jazyk, 1994), p. 477; I.I. Sresnevskij, *Slovar' drevnerusskogo jazyka* (3 vols.; Moscow: Kniga, 1989), III, p. 1266.

⁷⁴ On Uriel as an *angelus interpres* see: C.A. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (AGAJU, 42; Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1998), p. 60.

⁷⁵ For a complete discussion about angels as the heavenly counterparts of humans, see: A. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (SVC, 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996), pp. 148-57.

⁷⁶ The reference to the angels of the Presence as the heavenly counterparts of humans is not confined solely to the Jewish pseudepigrapha. April De Conick’s research refers to several important Christian passages in which angels of the Presence/the Face serve as heavenly counterparts of humans. See A. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (SVC, 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996), pp. 153-54. One of

In *1 Enoch* 71, Enoch is transformed and identified with the Son of Man in front of God's Throne. In *2 Enoch* 22:6-10, Enoch's initiation into one of the Princes of Presence⁷⁷ also takes place in front of the fiery Face of the Lord. This encounter transforms Enoch into a glorious being. It is important to note that after this procedure Enoch observes that he had *become like one of the glorious ones*, and *there was no observable difference*.⁷⁸ The last phrase describes Enoch's transition to his new identity as "one of the glorious ones". This identity might refer to his angelic counterpart. It also indicates that Enoch's earthly appearance/face has been radically altered and that the visionary has now acquired a new "face" which "mirrors" or "doubles" the Face of the Lord.⁷⁹ The motif of engraving the image of the visionary on the Throne might also serve as a metaphor for the similarity between the visionary's face and the Face. There is no doubt that one of the features which unifies both "faces" is their luminosity.

2 Enoch's narrative gives evidence that Enoch's face acquired the same qualities of luminosity as the Face of the Lord. In *2 Enoch* 37, the Lord calls one of his angels to chill the face of Enoch before his return to earth. The angel, who "appeared frigid", then chilled Enoch's face with his icy hands. Immediately after this procedure, the Lord tells Enoch that if his face had not been chilled in such way, no human being would be able to look at his face. This chilling procedure indicates that Enoch's metamorphosis near the Face into the *Sar ha-Panim* involves the transformation of the visionary's face into the fiery, perilous entity which now resembles *Kavod*. We can find a detailed description of this process in another "Enochic" text, *Sefer Hekhalot*, which describes the transformation of Enoch-Metatron, the Prince of the Divine Presence, into the fiery creature:

R. Ishmael said: The angel Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, the glory of highest heaven, said to me: When the Holy One, blessed be he, took me to serve the throne of glory, the wheels of the chariot and all needs of the Shekinah, at once my flesh turned to flame, my sinews to blazing fire, my bones to juniper coals, my eyelashes to lightning

such traditions is reflected in the Gospel of Matthew 18:10: "See that you do not despise one of these little ones; for I tell you that in heaven their angels always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven".

⁷⁷ On Enoch's role as the Prince of Presence in *2 Enoch*, see: A. Orlov, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in *2 Enoch*", *JSP* 18 (1998), pp. 74-75.

⁷⁸ Andersen, 139.

⁷⁹ A visionary, therefore, becomes a reflection or even a "representation" of the Face/*Kavod*, a sort of its vice-regent. Christopher Morray-Jones observes that "there is evidence, then, of the early existence of a tradition concerning the ascent to heaven of an exceptionally righteous man who beholds the vision of the divine *Kabod* upon Merkabah, is transformed into an angelic being and enthroned as celestial vice-regent, thereby becoming identified with the Name-bearing angel who either is or is closely associated with the *Kabod* itself and functions as a second, intermediary power in heaven". C.R.A. Morray-Jones, "Transformation Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition", *JJS* 43 (1992), pp. 10-11.

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.⁸⁰

It is possible that the reference to the heavenly counterpart of Jacob in the form of his image (engraved) on the Throne of Glory also implies that Jacob is one of the servants of the Divine Face. This possibility is already hinted at in the Biblical account where Jacob is attested as one who saw God face to face.⁸¹ Moreover, in some of Jacob's traditions, he is directly described (in a manner similar to Enoch-Metatron) as the Prince of the Divine Face. We learn about this title from the *Prayer of Joseph* 8,⁸² where Jacob-Israel himself unveils his status as the *Sar*⁸³ *ha-Panim*,⁸⁴ proclaiming that he is "the first minister before the Face of God".

It is also not coincidental that the initiation of Jacob into an angelic being involves another servant of the Face, the angel Sariel whose last name, Phanuel,⁸⁵ reflects his close proximity to the Face of God. As has been mentioned previously, this initiatory pattern is already observable in the Enochic tradition, where Sariel/Uriel/Phanuel (along with another angel of the Presence, Michael⁸⁶) actively participates in the initiation of the another prominent servant of the Divine Face, Enoch-Metatron.

However, Jacob's identification with a *Sar ha-Panim* seems to be missing one detail that constitutes a distinct feature of the descriptions of visionaries initiated in this office, that is luminous metamorphosis of an adept's face and body. *LadJac* and *PrJos*, as well as the Biblical account of Jacob's vision, are silent about any transformation of Jacob's body and his

⁸⁰ 3 *Enoch* 15:1. Alexander, p. 267.

⁸¹ Gen. 32:30 "...it is because I saw God face to face (פָּנִים אֶל-פָּנִים)".

⁸² The tradition about Jacob as the *Prince* of Presence seems to be also reflected in *Targ. Onq.* to Gen. 32:29: "Whereupon, he said, 'No longer shall your name be called Jacob, but rather Israel; for you are a *prince* before the Lord and among men; therefore have you prevailed.'" *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis* (tr. B. Grossfeld; The Aramaic Bible, 6; Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988), p. 116.

⁸³ G. Vermes notices that *Targ. Neof.* explains the etymology of Israel from שָׂרָר (to rule, to act as a prince). G. Vermes, "The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies" *JJS* 26 (1975), p. 13.

⁸⁴ C.A. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (AGAJU, 42; Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1998), pp. 141-2.

⁸⁵ The fact that Sariel/Uriel/Phanuel is known under several names might indicate that this angel also serves as a heavenly counterpart in the manner similar to other servants of the Face such as Jacob/Israel, Enoch/Metatron, and possibly Melchizedek/Michael. On the identification of Michael with Melchizedek see: J.R. Davila, "Melchizedek, Michael, and War in Heaven", *SBLSP* 35 (1996), pp. 259-72; D.D. Hannah, *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity* (WUNT, Reihe 2:109; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1999), pp. 70-74.

⁸⁶ S. Olyan refers to Rashi's passage which identifies "the 'angel of his presence' of Isa. 63:9 with Michael, the Prince of Presence". S. Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the Naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism* (TSAJ, 36; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1993), p. 108.

face. This tradition, however, can be found in another prominent account connected with the Jacob story.⁸⁷ In this important material, the eyes of Jacob, similar to the eyes of the transformed Metatron, are emitting flashes of lighting.

Conclusion

Finally, it is necessary to address the question why some theophanic traditions depict angelic beings as both the servants of the Face and the Face itself. Later Merkabah accounts categorize Metatron as the Face of God.⁸⁸ The reference to Uriel/Sariel, who is also known as Phanuel (“the Face of God”), can serve as another example. This ambiguity in the theophanic tradition is also apparent in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob*, where the fiery Face can be taken as either God’s *Kavod* or an enthroned vice-regent associated with the Face (i.e. the enthroned Jacob-Israel). The difficulty in discerning between these two luminous entities can be illustrated through a reference to a late “Enochic” passage,⁸⁹ describing the enthronement of Metatron at the door of the seventh palace. From this account we learn that when one infamous visionary encountered the enthroned Metatron, he took it as something equal to the Chariot. Then, according to the story, the visionary opened his mouth and uttered: “There are indeed two powers⁹⁰ in heaven!”⁹¹

Besides other things, this account might serve as:

⁸⁷ The beginning of the second half of *Joseph and Aseneth* gives a description of Joseph and Aseneth visiting Jacob. *Joseph and Aseneth* 22:7-8 says that when Aseneth saw Jacob, she “was amazed at his beauty... his eyes (were) flashing and darting (flashes of) lighting, and his sinews and his shoulders and his arms were like (those) of an angel, and his thighs and his calves and his feet like (those) of a giant. And Jacob was like a man who had wrestled with God. And Aseneth saw him and was amazed, and prostrated herself before him face down to the ground”. C. Burchard, “Joseph and Aseneth”, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]), II, p. 238

⁸⁸ For the identification of Metatron with the Face, see: A. De Conick, “Heavenly Temple Traditions and Valentinian Worship: A Case for First Century Christology in the Second Century”, *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism* (eds. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis; JSJ, 63; Brill: Leiden, 1999), p. 329; D.J. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot* (TSAJ, 16; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1988), pp. 424-425. C. Morray-Jones notes that in the Merkabah texts Metatron “in some sense embodies, the *Kabod*”. Cf. C.R.A. Morray-Jones, “Transformation Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition”, *JJS* 43 (1992), p. 9.

⁸⁹ 3 *Enoch* 16.

⁹⁰ On “two powers in heaven”, see Alan Segal’s pioneering research in A. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (SJLA, 25; Leiden: Brill, 1977).

⁹¹ Alexander, p. 268.

1. an additional evidence that some heavenly counterparts are indeed “mirrors” of the Face;
2. an important lesson about the evasive nature of the celestial “faces”;
and
3. a warning about the possible perils for those who try to explain what these “faces” might really represent.

The Melchizedek Tradition

Melchizedek Legend of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch

Contemporary scholarship does not furnish a consensus concerning the possible provenance of 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*.¹ In the context of ambiguity

¹ On different approaches to 2 *Enoch* see: I. D. Amusin, *Kumranskaja Obshchina* (Moscow: Nauka, 1983); F. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985 [1983]) 1. 91-221; G. N. Bonwetsch, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (AGWG, 1; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1896); G. N. Bonwetsch, *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs: Das sogenannte slavische Henochbuch* (TU, 44; Leipzig, 1922); C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch* (WUNT, R.2, 50; Tübingen: Mohr, 1992); C. Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995); C. Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995); R. H. Charles, and W. R. Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896); J. H. Charlesworth, "The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch (Seminar Report)," *NTS* 25 (1979) 315-23; J. H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament. Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins* (SNTSMS, 54; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); J. Collins, "The Genre of Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism," *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1983); L. Cry, "Quelques noms d'anges ou d'êtres mystérieux en II Hénoch," *RB* 49 (1940) 195-203; U. Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (BZNW, 44; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1978); A. S. D. Maunder, "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *The Observatory* 41 (1918) 309-316; N. Meshcherskij, "Sledy pamjatnikov Kumrana v staroslavjanskoj i drevnerusskoj literature (K izucheniju slavjanskih versij knigi Enoha)," *Trudy otdela drevnerusskoj literatury* 19 (1963) 130-47; N. Meshcherskij, "K voprosu ob istochnikah slavjanskoj knigi Enoha," *Kratkie soobshchenija Instituta narodov Azii* 86 (1965) 72-8; J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (New York: KTAV, 1973); A. Orlov, "The Origin of the Name 'Metatron' and the Text of 2 (*Slavonic Apocalypse of*) *Enoch*," *JSP* (forthcoming); A. Orlov, "Titles of Enoch-Metatron in 2 *Enoch*," *JSP* 18 (1998) 73-89; S. Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *Types of Redemption* (ed. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970) 72-87; A. Rubinstein, "Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *JJS* 15 (1962) 1-21; P. Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (JSPSS, 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); A. De Santos Otero, "Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo)," *Apócrifos del AT IV* (ed. A. Diez Macho; Madrid, 1984) 147-202; G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic tradition* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965); M. I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *Chtenija v Obshchestve Istorii i Drevnostej Rossijskih (COIDR)* 4 (1910); M. Stone, *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (2 vols; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984) 2, 406-8; A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction*

and uncertainty of cultural and theological origins of *2 Enoch*, even distant voices of certain theological themes in the text become very important. One of these important theological reminiscences of *2 Enoch* is the theme of Melchizedek - the legendary priest of God Most High.²

Before giving an exposition of the content of the story it is worth mentioning that for a long time the legend was considered to be an interpolation in the text of *2 Enoch*. Charles, Morfill, and Bonwetsch³

française (Paris: Institut d'Etudes Slaves, 1952; repr. Paris, 1976); J. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1995).

² On Melchizedek's traditions and Melchizedek in *2 Enoch* see: I. Amusin, "Novyj eshatologicheskij tekst iz Kumrana (11QMelchizedek)," *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 3 (1967) 45-62; I. Amusin, *Teksty Kumrana* (Pamjatniki pis'mennosti vostoka, 33/1; Moscow: Nauka, 1971); V. Aptowitz, "Malkizedek. Zu den Sagen der Agada," *Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 70 (1926) 93-113; A. Caquot, "La pérennité du sacerdoce," *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme* (Paris: E. De Boccard, 1978) 109-16; De Jonge, M. and Van der Woude, A. S., "11QMelchizedek and the New Testament," *NTS* 12 (1965-6) 301-26; M. Delcor, "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JSJ* 2 (1971) 115-35; F. du Toit Laubscher, "God's Angel of Truth and Melchizedek. A note on 11 Q Melh 13b," *JSJ* (1972) 46-51; J. Fitzmyer, "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11," *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (SBL SBS, 5; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974) 245-67; J. Gammie, "Loci of the Melchizedek Tradition of Gen. 14:18-20," *JBL* 90 (1971) 385-96; F. García Martínez, "4Q Amram B 1:14; ?Melkiresa o Melki-sedeq?" *RevQ* 12 (1985) 111-14; C. Gianotto, *Melchizedek e la sua tipologia: Tradizioni giudiche, cristiane e gnostiche* (sec II a.C.-sec. III d.C) (SrivB, 12; Paideia, 1984); I. Gruenwald, "The Messianic Image of Melchizedek," *Mahanayim* 124 (1970) 88-98 (in Hebrew); F. Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition; A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (SNTSMS, 30; Cambridge/London/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University, 1976); P. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchires7a*; (CBQMS, 10; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981); O. Michel, "Melchizedek," *TDNT* 4 (1967) 568-71; B. Pearson, "The Figure of Melchizedek in the First Tractate of the Unpublished Coptic-Gnostic Codex IX from Nag Hammadi," *Proceedings of the XIIth International Congress of the International Association for the History of Religion* (Supplements to Numen, 31; Leiden: Brill, 1975) 200-8; B. Pearson, *Gnosticism, Judaism and Egyptian Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990); J. Petuchowski, "The Controversial Figure of Melchizedek," *HUCA* 28 (1957) 127-36; H. Rowley, "Melchizedek and Zadok (Gen 14 and Ps 110)," *Festschrift für Alfred Bertholet zum 80. Geburtstag* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1950) 461-72; M. Simon, "Melchisédech dans la polémique entre juifs et chrétiens et dans la légende," *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* (1937) 58-93; R. Smith, "Abram and Melchizedek (Gen. 14, 18-20)," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* LXXXVII (1965), 129-53; H. Stork, *Die sogenannten Melchizedekianer mit Untersuchungen ihrer Quellen auf Gedankengehalt und dogmengeschichtliche Entwicklung* (Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur, 8/2; Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1928); G. Vajda, "Melchisédec dans la mythologie ismaélienne," *Journal Asiatique* 234 (1943-1945) 173-83; G. Wuttke, *Melchisedech der Priesterkönig von Salem: Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Exegese* (BZNW, 5; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1927).

³ Cf. R. H. Charles and W. R. Morfill., *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896); G. N. Bonwetsch, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (AGWG, 1; Berlin, 1896).

thought that the theme of Melchizedek was sort of an appendix and did not belong to the main body of the text. For this reason, the legend was not investigated for a long time. Even Fred Horton in his fundamental work dedicated to the Melchizedek tradition ignores the material of *2 Enoch* on the basis that it is found only in one recension.⁴ On the contrary to these opinions, A. Vaillant successfully demonstrates that Melchizedek's legend is an integral part of *2 Enoch*. Andersen supports this position. His new collation of manuscripts shows that the Melchizedek tradition is found in both recensions, in six manuscripts which represent four text families. His final conclusion is that "there is no evidence that the second part ever existed separately."⁵

Exposition

The Melchizedek narrative occupies the last chapters of the book. The content of the story is connected with the family of Nir,⁶ the priest, who is

⁴ Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition*, 81.

⁵ Andersen, 92.

⁶ *Nir*. There were a number of attempts to interpret this enigmatic name. One of them was Vaillant's hypothesis that Slavonic "Nir" equals Semitic נִר, and can be taken in its etymological sense as "light." He supports his opinion by referring to Ethiopic Enoch, since Nir, the brother of Noah, is in *2 Enoch* a "dedoublement" of Noah, who was described as the wonder child in *1 Enoch* 106. Vaillant, xii. Vaillant's argument probably refers to the "light-like appearance" of Noah in Ethiopic Enoch: "His eyes are like the rays of the sun, and his face glorious" (106:5). The hypothesis has many weak points. Rubinstein shows the difficulty of this explanation, because the "dedoublement" of Noah in *Slavonic Enoch* is related to the description of Melchizedek, not Nir (see our discussion about Noah-Melchizedek's birth). Rubinstein also stresses that there is nothing miraculous about Nir in *2 Enoch* and he (Nir) can be described as a "sacerdotal drudge." Rubinstein, *Observations*, 17-18. Rubinstein notes a remote possibility that the name of Nir was chosen with an eye to the figurative use of the term נִר in the Old Testament for the description of "dominion" of David's descendants. He further suggests that "it is not impossible that an oral exegesis of the Melchizedek legend in *Slavonic Enoch* somehow connected Melchizedek and Nir with Davidic descent, though the fact that Nir is only said to have adopted Melchizedek is an obvious difficulty." Rubinstein, *Observations*, 18. Finally, J. Milik argues that Nir "certainly means 'luminary,' because the author of *2 Enoch* doubtless drew on the name of the wife of Noah, Νωρία, meaning 'Fire of God.'" Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 115. In my opinion, one more possible explanation of the name Nir can be suggested. This interpretation can be connected with the meaning of Nir as "clearing, breaking ground or earth." M. Jastrow in his dictionary defines *ryn* as "to break ground," "to clear." Cf. M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York: Judaica Press, 1985) 909. According to Jastrow it can mean "new broken land" in some instances. In *2 Enoch* the destiny of Nir is connected with "clearing of the Earth." The Lord told him that He planned "to send down a great destruction on the earth." Nir is the last priest before the great destruction of the Flood. At the very end of *2 Enoch*, Nir says: "For I know indeed that this race will end in confusion, and everyone will perish, except that Noah, my

pictured in the book as "second son of Lamekh"⁷ and the brother of Noah. Sothonim⁸ the wife of Nir, gave birth to a child "in her old age,"⁹ right "on the day of her death."¹⁰ She conceived the child, "being sterile" and "without having slept with her husband."¹¹ The book told that Nir the priest had not slept with her from the day that the Lord had appointed him in front of the face of the people. Therefore, Sothonim hid herself during all the days of her pregnancy.¹² Finally, when she was at the day of birth, Nir remembered his wife and called her to himself in the temple. She came to him and he saw that she was pregnant. Nir, filled with shame, wanted to cast her from him, but she died at his feet. Melchizedek¹³ was born from Sothonim's corpse. When Nir and Noah came in to bury Sothonim they saw the child sitting beside the corpse with "his clothing on him." According to the story they were terrified because the child was fully developed physically. The child spoke with his lips and he blessed the Lord.

It is of great significance that the newborn child was marked by the sign of priesthood. The story describes how "the badge of priesthood"¹⁴ was on his chest, and it was glorious in appearance. Nir and Noah dressed the child in the garments of priesthood and they fed him the holy bread. They decided to hide him, fearing that the people would have him put to death. Finally, the Lord commanded His archangel Gabriel¹⁵ to take the child and

brother, will be preserved in that generation for procreation." Nir is indeed the man who beheld the future "clearing, breaking down" of the earth, therefore it is possible that his name reflects this coming situation.

⁷ *Nira syna Lamehova vtorago*. Vaillant, 72.

⁸ *Sofonim, Sofonima*. Rubinstein tries to connect this proper name with the facts of Sothonim's biography. He draws attention to the details of the story: Sothonim who had been described earlier as old and on the point of death, falls dead at Nir's feet and while Nir is away, having gone to inform Noah of Sothonim's death, the infant Melchizedek emerges from her body. Rubinstein believes that it is highly probable that the author of 2 *Enoch* had in mind the story of Benjamin's birth in Gen 35:18. Rachel travailed, and had a difficult labor and as her soul was departing ... she called his name Ben-oni..., i.e. the son of my sorrow. Rubinstein further suggests that the name Sothonim may well mean "the end of afflictions," "the end of sorrows" - in Hebrew, מַןְוָאֵשׁ - symbolic of Sothonim's release from the feelings of shame and sorrow during her pregnancy and her dispute with Nir. Cf. Rubinstein, *Observations*, 18.

⁹ *vo vremja starosti*. Vaillant, 74.

¹⁰ *v den' smerti*. Vaillant, 74.

¹¹ Certain parallels with the birth of Jesus were discussed by scholars. Andersen concludes that "it is certainly not an imitation of the account of Jesus' birth found in Matthew and Luke... No Christian could have developed such a blasphemy." Andersen, 97.

¹² Professor Ben Zion Wacholder in his kind letter to me suggested an interesting interpretation of the name Sothonim. He mentioned that the phonetic pattern of the name could be traced to the Hebrew word צַפְנִים, hidden or mysteries. The hypothesis is supported by the fact that Sothonim hid herself from Nir during days of her pregnancy.

¹³ *Melhisedek*.

¹⁴ *Pechat' svjatitel'stva*. Vaillant, 78.

¹⁵ In the longer recension - Michael,

place him¹⁶ in "the paradise Eden" so that he might become the high priest after the Flood. Final passages of the short recension describe the ascent of Melchizedek on the wings of Gabriel to the paradise Eden.

Shem Traditions

The Melchizedek narrative in the book is connected with the name of Noah, the legendary pre-deluge patriarch. We can not only find Noah in the book but also his grandfather, Methuselah¹⁷ and his father, Lamech. The midrashim of these descendants of Enoch occupy chapters 68-73 of the text. Right after Enoch's ascension to the highest heaven, the firstborn son of Enoch, Methuselah, and his brothers, "the sons of Enoch," constructed an altar at Achuzan¹⁸ the place where Enoch had been taken up (ch. 68). It is important to stress that the term *Achuzan* here is a specific name for the hill of the Temple in Jerusalem. In chapter 69 the Lord appeared to Methuselah in a night vision and appointed him as the priest before the people. Verses 11-16 of this chapter describe the first animal sacrifice of Methuselah on the altar. Chapter 70 reveals the last days of Methuselah on the earth before his death. The Lord again appeared to Methuselah in a night vision and commanded him to pass his priesthood duties on to the second son of his son Lamech - Nir. The text does not explain why the Lord wanted to pass the priesthood to Nir, instead of Noah - Lamech's firstborn son. The text just mentions that the people answered on that request, "Let it be so for us, and let the word of the Lord be just as he said to you." Further the book tells that Methuselah invested Nir with the vestments of priesthood in front of the face of all the people and "made him stand at the head of altar."¹⁹

As shown, *2 Enoch* presents Melchizedek as a continuation of the priestly line from Methuselah, son of Enoch, directly to the second son of Lamech, Nir (brother of Noah), and on to Melchizedek. *2 Enoch* therefore considers Melchizedek as the grandson of Lamech. This understanding of Melchizedek as the continuation of the priestly line of descendants of Enoch has interesting parallels in rabbinic literature.

In the Babylonian Talmud the following passage is found:

¹⁶ The preservation of Melchizedek as protection against the unrighteousness of the world reveals an interesting parallel to the Qumranic term פֶּרֶדֶס קִטְטָא - "paradise of righteousness."

¹⁷ *Mefusalom, Mefousal.*

¹⁸ *Achouzan.* The text of *2 Enoch* defines this place as the center of the world, "the place Achuzan, i.e. in the center of the world, where Adam was created." Vaillant, 116. Compare with Ezek 48:20-1 where the Hebrew word *hʒja* "special property of God" applies to Jerusalem and the Temple. Cf. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 114; Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult*, 195.

¹⁹ Andersen, 197-203.

R. Zechariah said on R. Ishmael's authority: The Holy One, blessed be He, intended to bring forth the priesthood from Shem, as it is written, 'And he [Melchizedek] was the priest of the most high God' (Gen 14:18). But because he gave precedence in his blessing to Abraham over God, He brought it forth from Abraham; as it is written, 'And he blessed him and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth, and blessed be the most high God' (Gen 14:19). Said Abraham to him, 'Is the blessing of a servant to be given precedence over that of his master?' Straightway it [the priesthood] was given to Abraham, as it is written (Ps 110:1), 'The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool;' which is followed by, 'The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek' (Ps 110:4), meaning, 'because of the word of Melchizedek.' Hence it is written, And he was a priest of the most High God, [implying that] he was a priest, but not his seed (*Ned.* 32b).²⁰

This identification of Melchizedek with Shem, son of Noah, descendant of Methuselah and Lamech by Rabbi Ishmael ben Elisha was very popular in rabbinic literature.²¹ We can find the origins of the tradition from a very early time; identifying Melchizedek as Shem can be found in the Targums,²² Aramaic renderings of the Hebrew Bible. *Tg. Neof.* on Gen 14:18 shows the

²⁰ *The Babylonian Talmud. Seder Nedarim* (London: Soncino Press, 1936) 98-9.

²¹ Two other rabbinic evidences that attest Melchizedek as Shem include *Pirke R. El.* and *Gen. Rab.* *Pirke R. El.* has two references to Melchizedek-Shem. The first reference occurs in the passage dedicated to the handling of the tradition of intercalation among the Patriarchs. The text says that "Noah handed on the tradition to Shem, and he was initiated in the principle of intercalation; he intercalated the years and he was called a priest, as it is said, "And Melchizedek king of Salem ... was a priest of God Most High" (Gen 14:18). Was Shem the Son of Noah a priest? But because he was the first-born, and because he ministered to his God by day and by night, therefore was he called a priest." *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*. Translated by Gerald Friedlander (New York: Hermon Press, 1965) 53. The second reference to Melchizedek-Shem in *Pirke R. El.* occurs in the chapter 28 where we can find the following passage: "Rabbi Joshua said: Abraham was the first to begin to give a tithe. He took all the tithe of the kings and all the tithe of the wealth of Lot, the son of his brother, and gave (it) to Shem, the Son of Noah, as it is said, 'And he gave him a tenth of all.'" *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*. Translated by Gerald Friedlander (New York: Hermon Press, 1965) 195.

Gen. Rab. gives a very interesting interpretation to the fear of Abram after his meeting with Melchizedek. It says: "Fear not, Abram. Whom did he fear? Rabbi Berekiah said: He feared Shem (whose descendants, viz. Chedorlaomer and his sons, Abraham had slain), as it is written, 'The isles saw, and feared' (Isa 41:5): just as islands stand out in the sea, so were Abraham and Shem outstanding in the world. And feared: Each one feared the other. The former (Abraham) feared the latter, thinking, Perhaps he nurses resentment against me for slaying his sons. And the latter (Shem) feared the former, thinking, Perhaps he nurses resentment against me for begetting wicked offspring." *Midrash Rabbah* (10 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1961) 1,365. This passage shows that not only was Melchizedek Shem, but the four kings of the Elamite opposition were sons of Shem.

²² Only the *Tg. Onq.* does not mention Shem in connection with Melchizedek. The interesting fact here is that *Tg. Onq.* is the only targum which also shows a negative attitude toward Enoch: "and Enoch walked in reverence of the Lord, then he was no more, for the Lord has caused him to die (Gen. 5,24)." B. Grossfeld (tr.), *The Targum Onkelos to Genesis* (Aramaic Bible, 6; Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1988) 52.

exegetical development of this identification: "And Melchisedech, king of Jerusalem - he is Shem the Great - brought out bread and wine, for he was the priest who ministered in the high priesthood before the most High God."²³ The *Tg. Ps.-J.* holds the similar exegetical position when it reads: "... the righteous king - that is Shem, the son of Noah - king of Jerusalem, went out to meet Abram, and brought him bread and wine; at that time he was ministering before God Most High."²⁴ Biblical chronology proves the possibility of the meeting of Shem (Melchizedek) and Abraham after the defeat of the kings (Gen 14:17). According to Gen 11:10-26, Shem lived 500 years after the birth of his first son Arphaxad. There were 290 years between the birth of Arphaxad and the birth of Abram. When Abram was born, Shem lived for another 210 years. According to Gen 25:7 Abraham lived 175 years. Therefore Shem in fact outlived Abraham by 35 years.

Another important point in identification of Shem and Melchizedek is the fact that the blessing of Shem in Gen 9:26 has distinct parallels with the blessing which Melchizedek gives to Abraham. Fred Horton proves that both blessings have some similarities from "a formcritical standpoint."²⁵

It is interesting to note several important similarities between Targumic and rabbinic material and Melchizedek's portion of *2 Enoch*.

a. *2 Enoch* as well as Targumic and rabbinic sources tried to put the genealogy of Melchizedek into the Semitic context of Enoch's descendants. They endeavoured to give this abstract and ahistorical character of Genesis a certain historical location and place him in the context of the pre-Deluge generation.

b. Both traditions are interested in the descriptions of the priestly functions of Enoch's family.²⁶ *2 Enoch* has a lengthy account of Methuselah and Nir with elaborated descriptions of their priestly and sacrificial duties and practices. As Rubinstein notes, "it is hard to escape the impression that the purpose of the account is to build up the priestly antecedents of Melchizedek."²⁷ The main point of the passage from *Ned.* as well as from *Gen. Rab.* and *Pirke R. El.* is the building up of the priestly antecedents of Melchizedek (Shem) in the context of the transmission of this priestly line to Abraham.

²³ M. McNamara (tr.), *Targum Neofiti I: Genesis* (Aramaic Bible, 1A; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1992) 92.

²⁴ M. Maher (tr.), *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (Aramaic Bible, 1B; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1992) 58.

²⁵ Horton, 117.

²⁶ Sacchi notes that the Melchizedek story in *2 Enoch* gives "the impression of a work that develops an Enochic priestly tradition in the midst of the problems of first-century Jewish thought, with particular reference to the relation between the function of Enoch and those of Melchizedek." Cf. P. Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*, 234-5.

²⁷ Rubinstein, 5.

c. Both traditions are also interested in taking away the priestly line from Enoch's historical descendants. *Ned.* 32b stressed about Shem-Melchizedek, "he was priest; but not his seed." Melchizedek's final translation to heaven at the end of *2 Enoch* also shows discontinuation of the historical priestly line of Enoch's relatives. In the text, the Lord says: "Melchizedek will be my priest to all priests,²⁸ and I will sanctify him and I will change him into a great people who will sanctify me....Melchizedek will be the head of the priests in another generation."²⁹

d. Another important point, which can be found in observations of the rabbinic and *2 Enoch* sources, is that the text of the *Slavonic Enoch* attempts to build an alternative to the traditional rabbinic line from Methuselah's priestly vocation, which can be some type of parallel to the official Noah-Shem line. The important theological role in this shift is played by previously unknown Nir, the young brother of Noah.³⁰

We can see some sort of theological polemic by the author of *2 Enoch* with traditional Judaic (Targumic, rabbinic) positions. It shows that the traditional Judaic settings of the Oral Torah about Melchizedek as Shem were very important and authoritative for the audience of *2 Enoch* even in the situation of their rejection.

Noahitic Traditions

Our previous analysis of Shem traditions in the Melchizedek story reveals also some references to the Noahitic tradition.³¹ A substitution of the line Noah-Shem to the line Nir-Melchizedek shows that one of the main targets of author's polemic in *2 Enoch* is in fact a Noah figure. It is not a coincidence that this sort of polemic takes place in the Enochic narrative. From earliest Enochic materials we can see the interdependence of Noahitic

²⁸ Andersen notices that this detail is one more piece of evidence against Christian authorship of *2 Enoch*. He says that "the fantastic details about this priest conflict with Christian belief in Jesus as God's sole legitimate priest in heaven." Andersen, 96.

²⁹ Andersen, 209.

³⁰ This substitution of Nir for Noah could be also viewed as a polemic with Noahitic tradition. See our analysis of Noahitic tradition.

³¹ On Noahitic traditions see: L. Bailey, *Noah: the Person and the Story in History and Tradition* (Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina, 1989); F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (STDJ, 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 24-44; J. Lewis, *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1968); J. Reeves, "Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?" *JBL* 12 (1993) 110-15; J. VanderKam, "The Righteousness of Noah," *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (eds. J. J. Collins and G. W. E. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS, 12; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980); J. VanderKam, "The Birth of Noah," *Intertestamental Essays in Honor of Josef Tadeusz Milik* (ed. Z. J. Kapera; Qumranica Mogilanensia, 6; Krakow: The Enigma Press, 1992) 213-31.

and Enochic traditions. Kvanvig shows that in Noahitic traditions Noah and Enoch often appear in the same roles.³² The *Slavonic Enoch* in many ways is a continuation of this tendency.

According to some scholars, Melchizedek's story in *Slavonic Enoch* recalls some parallels with the birth of Noah³³ in the *Genesis Apocryphon* of Qumran.³⁴ In the Qumran text, Lamech is worried about the birth of Noah, his son. Lamech suspects that his wife Bathenosh was unfaithful to him and that "the conception was (the work) of the Watchers and the pregnancy of the Holy Ones, and it belonged to the Nephil[in]."³⁵ The story of the relationships between Lamech and Bathenosh found in the *Apocryphon* is very similar to the story of the relationships between Nir and Sophonim. However, there are some essential differences between the texts. In the Qumran text the wife of Lamech, in response to his angry questions, tries to remind him of their intimacies - "Oh my brother and lord! remember my sexual pleasure... [...] in the heat of intercourse, and the gasping of my breath in my breast."³⁶ She swears that the seed was indeed of Lamech: "I swear to you by the Great Holy One, by the King of the hea[vens...]...[...] that this seed comes from you, [...] and not from any foreigner nor from any of the watchers or sons of heav[en]."³⁷

On the other hand, in 2 *Enoch* Sothonim did not explain the circumstances of the conception. She answered Nir: "O my lord! Behold, it is the time of my old age, and there was not in me any (ardor of) youth and I

³² H. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic. The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988) 117.

³³ Another similar motif in the Noahitic traditions is the story of Noah's birth in *I Enoch* 106, who appears also as a marvellous child. The story in *I Enoch* 106-7 says: "And after (some) days my son Methuselah took for his son Lamech a wife, and she became pregnant by him and bore a son. And his body was white like snow and red like the flower of a rose, and the hair of his head (was) white like wool...and his eyes (were) beautiful; and when he opened his eyes, he made the whole house bright like the sun so that the whole house was exceptionally bright. And when he was taken from the hand of the midwife, he opened his mouth and spoke to the Lord of Righteousness. And his father Lamech was afraid of him and fled and went to his father Methuselah. And he said to him: 'I have begotten a strange son; he is not like a man, but is like the children of the angels of heaven, of a different type, and not like us. And his eyes (are) like the rays of the sun, and his face glorious. And it seems to me that he is not sprung from me, but from angels.'" M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (2 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) 2,244-45.

³⁴ M. Delcor, "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews." *JSJ* 2 (1971) 129; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981) 185.

³⁵ F. García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden; New York; Köln: Brill, 1997) 1,29.

³⁶ F. García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1,29.

³⁷ F. García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1,29-31.

do not know how the indecency of my womb has been conceived."³⁸ However, some scholars draw attention to the fact that both texts have similar features in this situation. Delcor affirms that the phrase of Lamech in the beginning of *the Apocryphon*, "Behold, then I thought in my heart that the conception was the work of the Watchers and the pregnancy, of the Holy Ones..." can be compared with the words of Noah in *2 Enoch* spoken at the time of the examination of Melchizedek: "This is of the Lord, my brother."³⁹ An important supporting detail here is the fact that the description of Enoch and his descendants in *Genesis Apocryphon* shows a number of interesting similarities with *2 Enoch's* story.

Chapters 39-66 of *2 Enoch* describe the instruction which Enoch gave to his sons and the elders of the people during his thirty day visit to the earth. The text makes clear that during this visit Enoch is already an angelic being. In chapter 56 of *2 Enoch* he says to his son: "Listen, my child! Since the time when the Lord anointed me with the ointment of my glory, it has been horrible for me, and food is not agreeable to me, and I have no desire for earthly food."⁴⁰

Chapter 67 of *2 Enoch* describes the final departure of Enoch to heaven. The information about the transformed Enoch can be found also in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. The text says that when Methuselah knew about Lamech's suspicions he decided to ask advice from Enoch. The *Genesis Apocryphon* continues that "he (Methuselah) left for the higher level, to Parvaim, and there he met Enoch, [his father...]."⁴¹ This reference to the "higher level" can be considered as a hint for the elevated status of the translated Enoch. *Apocryphon* further tells that "He (Methuselah) said to Enoch, his father: O my father and lord, to whom I have co[me...] [...] I say to you: Do not be annoyed with me because I came here to [...] you [...] fear (?) before you [...]."⁴² Methuselah's fear before Enoch is an additional supporting detail that he in fact met not a man, but a heavenly being.

Another feature of *2 Enoch* which shows some possible connection between this text and the sectarian Judaism is the issue of animal sacrifices. The description of animal sacrifices occupies a very important place in the narrative of *2 Enoch*. In chapter 59, Enoch instructed Methuselah, his brothers - Regim, Ariim, Akhazukhan, Kharimion - and the elders of all the people how to perform animal sacrifices: "...he who brings a sacrifice of clean beasts, it is healing, he heals his soul. And he who brings a sacrifice of clean birds, it is healing, he heals his soul. And everything which you

³⁸ Andersen, 205.

³⁹ Delcor, 129.

⁴⁰ Andersen, 183.

⁴¹ F. García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1,31.

⁴² F. García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1,31.

have for food, bind it by four legs⁴³; there is healing, he heals his soul. He who puts to death any animal without binding it, it is an evil custom; he acts lawlessly with his own soul."⁴⁴ Further the book tells that right after the appointment of Methuselah to the position of the priest he came up to the Lord's altar "with all the people in procession behind him and he stood in front of the altar with all the people...around the altar...and ...the elders of the people,... taking sheep and oxen...tied (their) four legs together, and placed (them) at the head of the altar."⁴⁵ S. Pines draws attention to this unique practice of tying together four legs during animal sacrifices. He refers to a passages in the Mishna and in the Talmud (*b. Tamid*, 31b) which, according to the most probable interpretation, state that each of the forelegs of the sacrificial animal was tied to the corresponding hind leg and declares that the tying together of all the four legs was contrary to the tradition.⁴⁶ Pines gives one of the two explanations found in the Gemara of the Babli that this expression of disapproval was due to the fact that the customs of the heretics, *minim*, should not be imitated.⁴⁷ The practice of tying together all four legs had very strong sectarian meaning for the authors of Mishnaic sacrificial prescriptions. In his final conclusion, Pines suggests that "it may have been an accepted rite of a sect, which repudiated the sacrificial customs prevailing in Jerusalem. It might be conjectured that this sect might have been the Essenes, whose sacrificial usage differed according to the one reading of the passage of Josephus⁴⁸ from those practiced at the Temple."⁴⁹

Sethian Traditions

Schlomo Pines' reference to sacrificial practices of "*minim*," heretics, which were usually represented in Jewish orthodox mindset as Jewish Gnostics,⁵⁰ necessitated further examination of the relationship between the Melchizedek story of *2 Enoch* and some Gnostic traditions. One of the tractates of the Nag Hammadi corpus, Melchizedek (further *Melch.*) deserves special attention because it contains materials that echo certain

⁴³ *svazhete e po chetyre nogi*. Vaillant, 58.

⁴⁴ Andersen, 185.

⁴⁵ Andersen, 199.

⁴⁶ Pines, 74-75.

⁴⁷ Pines, 75.

⁴⁸ *Ant*, XVIII, 18.

⁴⁹ Pines, 75.

⁵⁰ G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1991), 359.

motifs in *2 Enoch's* story.⁵¹ The text has a form of revelations given by heavenly intermediaries to Melchizedek who communicates the revelations to a privileged few, "the congregation (ἐκκλησία) of [the] [children] of Seth (5:19-20)."⁵² According to scholars,⁵³ *Melch.* has important similar features with traditions associated with Sethian gnosticism. It is possible that the author of the tractate reworked some earlier Judaic Melchizedek's traditions into gnostic Christian settings.⁵⁴ In spite of the fragmentary character of the tractate, there are a number of important details which can be connected with Melchizedek's story in *2 Enoch*. Two features of the Gnostic text are especially valuable. First, the author's use of the phrase "the children of Seth" (5:20), and second, his usage of the phrase "the [race] (γένος) of the High priest (ἀρχιερεύς) (6:17)."⁵⁵ These details seem to have certain parallels with Melchizedek's narrative of *2 Enoch*, which contains materials about priestly functions of Seth. In chapter 72 of the shorter recension of *2 Enoch*, the following statement comes from the lips of the Lord: "... and Melchizedek will be the head of the priests in another generation as was Seth in this generation."⁵⁶ The author's familiarity with the traditions which exalted Seth however become evident much earlier in chapter 33:10 where the Lord promises to give Enoch an intercessor archangel Michael and guardian angels Ariokh and Mariokh on account of his handwritings and the handwritings of his fathers -- Adam and Seth.⁵⁷ Mentioning all three traditions together shows that Sethian tradition has in the eyes of *2 Enoch's* author equal value to the tradition of Adam and Enoch.

⁵¹ The issue of possible connections between the Nag Hammadi texts and the Enochic tradition can be clarified by reference to some patristic materials. As we know, the place of discovery of the Nag Hammadi library was close to the former site of the Pachomian monastery at Chenoboskion. The following condemnation of the "apocryphal books" was made by patriarch Athanasius and recorded in the Pachomian *Lives*: "Who has made the simple folk believe that these books belong to Enoch even though no scriptures existed before Moses?" Cit. in D. Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism* (Oxford, 1995) 330.

⁵² Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X* (NHS, 15; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 51.

⁵³ Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, 36.

⁵⁴ Pearson stresses the fact that Jewish apocalyptic elements are prominent in *Melch.* He argues that "it might be suggested that *Melch.* is a Jewish-Christian product containing an originally pre-Christian Melchizedek speculation overlaid with Christian christological re-interpretation." Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, 34.

⁵⁵ Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, 53.

⁵⁶ "i Melkisedek boude glava iereem v rode tom yako z7e bo mi Sif v rode sem." Cf. Manuscripts [B] and [Rum] in: M.I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *Chtenija v Obshchestve Istorii i Drevnostej Rossijskih (COIDR)* 4 (1910) 106 and 155.

⁵⁷ Andersen, 157.

Melch. also gives an interesting list which includes Adam, Enoch and Melchizedek.⁵⁸ Birger Pearson suggests that "the list of biblical figures mentioned in this passage, culminating with Melchizedek, may be intended as a list of those heroes of the past who functioned as priests."⁵⁹

Another important testimony to Sethian tradition is found in chapter 71 where the author of *2 Enoch* depicts a priestly line which begins with Seth: "Therefore honor him (Melchizedek) together with your servants and great priests, with Seth, and with Enoch, and Maleleil, and Aamilam, and Phrasidam, and with Maleleil, and with Rusif and with Enoch and with your servant Nir..."⁶⁰

Through observing these testimonies to Sethian tradition there are obvious similarities between *Melch.* and *2 Enoch*. Both stories emphasize priestly functions of Seth in their connections with priestly functions of Melchizedek. It is noteworthy that this emphasis on priestly role of Seth is a rare motif in Sethian traditions. In the variety of Sethian traditions, Seth is often pictured as an astrologer, a scribe, or the head of a generation, but he is rarely viewed as a priest.⁶¹

⁵⁸ "...of Adam [Abel], Enoch, [Noah] you, Melchizedek, [the Priest] of God [Most High] (12:7-11)." Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, 63.

⁵⁹ Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, 25. Pearson supports his hypothesis by referring to the list of priests in the Hellenistic-Jewish synagogue prayer quoted in *Const. Ap.* VIII.5.3, which includes Abel, Seth, Enos, Enoch, Noah, and Melchizedek.

⁶⁰ Manuscript [B]. Cf. M.I. Sokolov, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *COIDR* 4 (1910) 106.

⁶¹ On the figure of Seth and Sethian traditions cf. A. Klijn, *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1977); R. Kraft, "Philo on Seth: Was Philo Aware of Traditions Which Exalted Seth and His Progeny?" *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* (ed. B. Layton; Supplements to Numen, XLI; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 457-8; G. MacRae, "Seth in Gnostic Texts and Traditions," in *SBLSP* 11 (1977) 24-43; B. Pearson, "The Figure of Seth in Gnostic Literature," *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* (ed. B. Layton; Supplements to Numen, XLI; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 472-504; M. Stone, "Report on Seth traditions in the Armenian Adam Books," *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism* (ed. B. Layton; Supplements to Numen, XLI; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 459-71.

From the other side despite these parallels,⁶² there is a fundamental divergence between *Melch.* and *2 Enoch*. The purpose of the author of *Melch.* is apparent -- to place Melchizedek in the context of Sethian priestly authority. In observations on the tractate, B. Pearson stresses that because of the reference to the "children of Seth" (5:20), and the parallel reference to the "race of the high priest" (i.e. *Melch.*, 6:17), it is possible that in *Melch.*, the priest-savior Melchizedek is regarded as an earthly incarnation of the heavenly Seth.⁶³ On the contrary, in *2 Enoch*, however, there is an established attempt to challenge the Sethian priestly line and replace it with a new postdiluvian priestly authority of Melchizedek.

Conclusion

The fragmentary character of our observations about the Melchizedek legend does not allow the complete picture of possible cultural, historical, or theological provenance of Melchizedek's story in *2 Enoch* to be considered. However, some conclusions can be made at this stage of the research. These conclusions focus on the problem of the hypothetical community behind the Melchizedek narrative.

First, the Melchizedek portion demonstrates the interest in the issues of priestly practice, succession and authority, which occupies an important part in the eschatology of *2 Enoch*;

Second, the material reflects complicated polemics with various traditions of the priestly practice and the priestly succession inside Judaism;

⁶² Several additional parallels between *2 Enoch* and *Melch.*, which were noticed by Pearson should also be mentioned. According to Pearson's hypothesis in both texts Melchizedek appears in several historical manifestations. Pearson rightly observes that in *Slavonic Enoch* Melchizedek "has three different manifestations: miraculously born before the Flood, serving in the post-diluvian age as a great priest, and functioning as a priest in the end-time, i.e. in messianic capacity." Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, 30. Pearson also notes that in *Melch.* Melchizedek appears in several roles: "as ancient priest and recipient of heavenly revelations of the eschatological future, and as eschatological savior-priest identified with Jesus Christ." Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, 20.

According to Pearson, another parallel between *2 Enoch* and *Melch.* is that both texts belong to the genre "apocalypse." Pearson notes that *Melch.* "satisfies the generic requirements of an apocalypse: it is pseudonymous, attributed to a biblical hero of the past, and contains purported prophecies of future events given by an angelic informant, as well as secrets pertaining to the heavenly world, presumably in a visionary experience." Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, 20.

⁶³ B. Pearson, "The Figure of Seth in Gnostic Literature," *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, 498.

Third, the story of Melchizedek, this *sacerdos in aeternum*, is used in 2 *Enoch* as well as in many other traditions as the theological tool of legitimization of alternative priestly authority (line);

Fourth, it is possible that in the text we can see a specific attitude toward the priestly authority (hierocracy) connected with the Temple in Jerusalem.⁶⁴ The important supporting detail here is naming the place of sacrificial duties of Enoch's descendants as Achuzan.⁶⁵ This may also be the main reason for the replacement of official priestly line Noah-Shem to the line Nir-Melchizedek, as a legitimate background for the new sectarian priestly authority;

Fifth, the Melchizedek material of 2 *Enoch* was probably composed in a community which respected the authority of the Jewish lore (the opinion about Enoch's ancestors as predecessors of Melchizedek). This community might have had certain liturgical and theological differences (sectarian biases) from the mainstream of Second Temple Judaism;

Sixth, apparently, the community of 2 *Enoch* repudiated the sacrificial customs prevailing in traditional Judaism (Jerusalem) (the tying together of all the four legs of the animals during the sacrifices);

Seventh, liturgical (priesthood's line) and exegetical (Noah, Melchizedek) features of the Melchizedek portion of 2 *Enoch* have certain similarities to the ideology of the Qumran community (an alternative priestly line, exegesis of Noah, and Melchizedek's story). It is evident, however, that the ideological and theological settings of the document cannot be explained solely by referring to the Qumran materials because of an absence of major Judaic symbols and themes which occupied a central place in the ideology of the Qumranites.

⁶⁴ The question of the relationship between 2 *Enoch* and the temple in Leontopolis remains open. A possible Alexandrian provenance of *Slavonic Enoch* could give additional support to this hypothesis. Cf. Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum*, 40-41; Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) 42-5. On the relationship between Leontopolis, Jerusalem and Qumran see: J. Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (Missoula: University of Montana, 1974) 48-55; R. Hayward, "The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis: A Reconsideration," *JJS* 33 (1982) 429-43; S. Steckoll, "Qumran Sect in Relation to the Temple of Leontopolis," *RevQ* 6 (1967) 55-69.

⁶⁵ It is interesting to note that the text specifies the place of the future priestly vocation of Melchizedek - "He, Melchizedek will be a priest and a king on the place Achuzan, i.e. the center of the world, where Adam was created." Vaillant, 116.