

briefly mentioned. I have tried to pay consistent attention to the problems of textual criticism, translation, and allegorical representation. I have selected a few issues for fuller treatment in the introduction, but even there much remains to be investigated. The reader is referred to the commentaries of Dillmann and Charles which together have laid the foundation for all Enochic studies. For a detailed discussion of the Aramaic fragments as well as a stimulating discussion of a broad range of issues, one should make use of J. T. Milik's *The Books of Enoch*. For his constant attention to possible Aramaic equivalences, Black's *The Book of Enoch* should be consulted. For a full treatment of the *An. Apoc.*, one would have to employ all of the works mentioned here, as well as all those mentioned in the notes, and no doubt others that I have overlooked.

As an exegetical commentary, the focus of the present work is the definition of the particular textual, exegetical, and historical problems encountered in the text. I have presented the extant texts in Aramaic, Greek, and Ethiopic. I have added seven MSS to the published base of the Ethiopic text and have offered emendations wherever the readings of the MSS seemed wrong. I have also attempted to explain the allegory, both when the author maintains it in his use of signs and when he strays from his intended allegorical path. I have attempted to identify the sources used by the author and the historical events and persons referred to. Wherever possible I have analyzed pseudo-Enoch's special views on the history he reports and how those views may have reflected his own situation. In doing so, I have attempted to explicate at least something of the author's own ideology.

The introduction to the commentary deals with the broader issues raised in the commentary. Chapters 2 and 3 discuss interpretive matters. Chapter 2 deals with the understanding of history and eschatology implied in the narrative. Chapter 3 deals with the allegory, its use, the meaning of particular signs within the allegory, and the implications of the allegory for an understanding of the text as a whole. Chapters 4-6 deal with historical issues, specifically, the date of composition, the relation of the *An. Apoc.* to the rest of the Enochic corpus, and the place of the text in the political and intellectual history of Judaism. Finally, chapter 7 deals with matters of textual criticism.

## 2. HISTORY AND ESCHATOLOGY IN THE ANIMAL APOCALYPSE

### A. The Structure of History

#### 1. The Structure of the Three Ages

In the *An. Apoc.*, time on earth is divided into three ages: the remote past, the present, and the ideal future. Each age begins with a single patriarch represented by a white bull: the first begins with Adam, the second with Noah, and the third with an unknown eschatological patriarch.<sup>1</sup> The first age begins when "a bull came forth from the earth; and that bull was white" (85.3). This bull took a female calf who bore at first two calves: a black one and a red one. After the death of the red one, she bore a white bull. This quite obviously refers to the creation of Adam and Eve, the birth of Cain and Abel, the murder of Abel, and the birth of Seth.

During the course of the first age, stars (the Watchers) fell from the sky. The first star (Asael) corrupted the cattle so that they "changed their pens and their pasture and their calves, and they began to butt one another" (86.2).<sup>2</sup> Subsequent stars (Semihazah and his subordinates) mated with the cattle (humans), who bore elephants, camels, and asses (three classes of giants: Gibborim, Nephilim, and

<sup>1</sup> I am indebted to George Nickelsburg whose comments (prepublication draft of his forthcoming *Hermeneia* commentary, introductory notes) helped me to see the importance of the three beginnings as an organizing principle of the *An. Apoc.* See also Dimant, "History According to the Vision of the Animals," 23, for a similar division.

<sup>2</sup> The Ethiopic text reads either "to mourn with/for one another" or "to live (with) one another." I provisionally accept Black's suggestion of a corruption in Aramaic of נגע ("strike") or נגח ("butt") for גע ("low," of cattle) (*The Book of Enoch*, 259).

Elioud). These bastard offspring acted violently and started a cycle of violence among the cattle.

The first age ends with the advent of seven white men (archangels) from heaven. Three accompanied Enoch to heaven; three imprisoned the stars and turned the elephants, camels, and asses against each other; and one announced a mystery to one of the white bulls (Noah), who then built a boat by which he and three other bulls (Shem, Ham, and Japheth) survived a flood which destroyed all of the other cattle and all of the elephants, camels, and asses. This refers to the judgment of the Watchers and the Deluge.<sup>3</sup>

The second age begins with the four bulls who survived the flood. The first (Noah) departed (died?). Of the remaining three, one was white, one was red like blood, and one was black. From these were born various kinds of predatory animals whose first act was to bite one another.<sup>4</sup> Before the bulls died out, the white ones produced wild asses (Ishmael and Ishmaelites/Midianites), wild boars (Esau and Edomites), and sheep (Jacob and Israel).

This whole age is characterized by the violence perpetrated upon the sheep by the various predatory animals. After the sheep had proved unfaithful to their owner by abandoning the house (Jerusalem) and tower (temple) that he had given them, shepherds (angels) were appointed to care for the sheep and kill some of them. These shepherds proved to be unfaithful as well and permitted the wild animals to destroy many more sheep than their commission allowed. Thus, in this age the history of Israel is interpreted as the history of constant victimization and occasional deliverance.

Near the end of the second age a pitched battle between the sheep led by a horned ram (Judas Maccabeus) on one side and the animals on the other results in the intervention of the owner of the sheep to give victory to the sheep. There follows a judgment scene in which the owner of the sheep condemns all the stars and shepherds to be burned in a great abyss. Then the blind (wicked) sheep are condemned to a separate but equal abyss. A time of peace and goodness follows in which the animals are reconciled with the sheep

<sup>3</sup> The account is exactly parallel to the account in the *Book of the Watchers*, 1 Enoch 10.

<sup>4</sup> The wild boars, hyraxes, and swine are probably secondary accretions to the list of 89.10. The birth of the predatory animals corresponds to the table of nations in Genesis 10. See below chapter 3, "The Allegory," pp. 29–30.

and subordinated to them, and everyone is good and has returned to the house (Jerusalem).

The beginning of the third age is mentioned in 90.37–38. It begins with the birth of a white bull. This bull obtains universal dominion, and then all of the animals become white bulls like it. It then is transformed into some other animal,<sup>5</sup> with great black horns. The dream closes with the statement, "and the owner of the sheep rejoiced over them and over all the cattle."<sup>6</sup>

This white bull has no traditional referent, but it is clear that in the narrative it functions as the patriarch of the future, ideal age. It is exactly like the patriarchs of the first two ages in that it is the white bull from whom all other animals come forth.<sup>7</sup> The third age is different from the first two in that in the third age there are only white cattle. There are no black ones to perpetrate violence and no red ones to be victimized.

## 2. The Character of the Three Ages

The three ages are characterized by the use of different sets of animals in each age. The first is the age of the bulls, an age in which all people were of one race and there were no nations. During this age the white bulls (Sethites) were singled out for divine approval. This prenatal race extends from Adam to Isaac.

During the second age, humans are represented by multiple animals; it is an age in which there are many nations in conflict. During this age the sheep (Israel) are singled out as both the objects of God's care and as the victims of the violence of gentile nations. This multinational condition of the human race begins immediately

<sup>5</sup> The Ethiopic text is corrupt at this point so that it is not certain whether it is the first white bull or one of the other ones that is transformed; nor is it certain what the animal is transformed into. The Ethiopic reads "The first one became in their midst a thing and that thing was a wild animal." The second clause is an interpolation. The Ethiopic *nagar* ("word, thing") is probably corrupt. See the note on 90.38 for the proposed emendations, which include "lamb" and "wild ox." The point of this final transformation is not entirely clear either unless it is to maintain this figure's superiority to the rest of the race.

<sup>6</sup> Note that God is still referred to as the owner of the sheep even though all of the sheep are now cattle.

<sup>7</sup> In fact, the first two patriarchs were the ones from whom all others were born, and the third patriarch is only the model for the transformation of all the animals into white bulls. But that is merely a formal difference that has been forced on the author by the constraints of his understanding of reality.

after the Deluge and lasts until some indeterminate future time following the final judgment.

The third age is again an age of white bulls, when there is again only one race and one nation. In this age all bulls receive divine approval. This division of human history into periods of prenatality, multinationality, and neo-prenationality corresponds to three ages marked by the three beginnings except that the bulls of the first age survive long enough into the second age to give rise to all of the nations, including Israel, the last of all.

### B. The Nature of History

The author views human history as the account of progressive deterioration, with evil and violence (both human and demonic) progressively increasing. History is divided into two ages, the second of which actually includes part of the eschaton. The first age begins with the murder of Abel, proceeds to violence and fornication under the influence of fallen angels, and culminates in the devouring of human flesh by giants. The age ends with a catastrophic judgment which ushers in a new age. The second age likewise begins with violent conflict between nations, worsens (from the point of view of Israel) as Israel becomes the object of international violence, and culminates when, as the result of Israel's sin, angels, appointed to shepherd Israel, join the nations in destroying Israel. The second age also ends with a catastrophic judgment which sets the stage for a new, ideal, third age.

The first age is that of the remote, mythical past and consists exclusively of the account of Adam and Eve and their children and the fall and judgment of the Watchers (including the Deluge). The second encompasses the author's own present and corresponds to reality as he experiences it. The author uses the mythical events of the first age to interpret the negative conditions of life in the second. Whatever characterized the first age also characterizes the second and serves as the model by which the second age can be understood. Violence, departure from the right way with the consequent evils, and demonically induced evil are all understood in the light of the descent and judgment of the Watchers.<sup>8</sup> The second age is even worse than

<sup>8</sup> It is significant that the version of the legend of the Watchers in the *An. Apoc.* is quite different from that in its more-or-less immediate predecessor, the *Book of the Watchers*. In the *An. Apoc.* humans begin to sin at the instigation of

the first in that the white cattle (Sethites) have degenerated into white sheep (Israel).<sup>9</sup>

### C. The Nature of the Eschaton

The author also uses the mythical events and characteristics of the first age to propose a new, ideal, third age.<sup>10</sup> The eschaton takes place in two stages. The first represents a restoration to the ideal conditions of the second age. All nations are gathered to Jerusalem in peace and goodness, subject to Israel, and God is in their midst. The second stage of the eschaton marks the beginning of the third age. It represents a restoration to the ideal form of the first age. Nations disappear and all humanity is restored to the conditions and status of the first man and woman.

#### 1. The Second Adam

The final scene in the vision is the birth of a white bull who receives obeisance from all the beasts and birds (but not the sheep). In time all the animals are transformed and become white cattle. Finally, the first white bull is transformed into some other animal with great black horns on his head.<sup>11</sup> According to J. T. Milik,

---

Asael before Semihazah and his angels even descend. It is probable that in the *An. Apoc.* Semihazah and his angels descend only because of the increased beauty of women who make use of the jewelry and cosmetics that they learned from Asael. Thus the *An. Apoc.* stresses human responsibility for the evil conditions of life. This theme is picked up in the second age when the seventy shepherds themselves do very little to the sheep but only allow or encourage the predatory animals to prey on them.

<sup>9</sup> This corresponds, no doubt, in part to the decrease in life expectancy: Abraham and Isaac each lived over one hundred and seventy years but Jacob only lived one hundred forty-seven years and complained to Pharaoh seventeen years before his death, "Few and evil have been the days of the years of my life, and they have not attained to the days of the years of the life of my fathers in the days of their sojourning" (Gen 47:9). But more significantly, the change from bull to sheep represents the beginning of the nation Israel and the end of human existence apart from nationality. It was Jacob who was called Israel (Gen 32:28), and consequently it is he who is first represented as a sheep.

<sup>10</sup> In another context, Gedaliahu A. G. Stroumsa (*Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology* [NHS 24; Leiden: Brill, 1984] 2) says, "In opposition to primitive, or even to early Greek mythology, the Gnostic myth arose in a mental world where metaphysical problems had already been addressed in non-mythological ways, and it arose precisely as a rejection of these ways." The same could be said of Enoch, at least at the stage of the *An. Apoc.*

<sup>11</sup> See note 5 above for the textual corruption at this point.

The 'white bull' of 90:37 is obviously the new Adam (Adam 'white bull', 85:3), but more glorious than the first, for 'his horns are large'. Just as the descendants of Adam were 'white bulls' (85:8-10), so the contemporaries of the second Adam will become 'all white bulls' (90:38).<sup>12</sup>

Actually the eschatological white bull is the third Adam, the patriarch of the third age.

The account of this third age is very brief and tells only of its origin, but a few comments are possible. The third age is instituted only after the definitive statement of the ideal stage reached at the close of the second age. All nations have been united in Jerusalem (90.33); conflict and violence have ceased (90.34); all have become righteous without exception (90.35); and Jerusalem has become "large and spacious and very full" (90.36). Only one imperfection remains: humanity is still divided into separate nations, and the people of God remain in the degenerated form represented by sheep instead of cattle. The birth of the white bull initiates the removal of this final imperfection.

The theological implications of this situation are quite surprising. The existence of the separate nations, one of which is Israel, is apparently seen as one of the negative effects of human history that the ideal future will undo. It is difficult to be sure of the extent to which the *An. Apoc.* is being truly universalist. We are not told the implications of this transformation of all the nations into a single, Adamic race. Already at the beginning of the eschaton there was no more temple worship but only pure living before God. Does this final restoration to Edenic conditions mean the repeal of the law of Moses which was binding on Israel? Or does the fact that this transformation occurs only within the context of the righteous assembly of all nations in Jerusalem imply that the law is still in force? At any rate although the final restoration is viewed first of all in nationalistic terms, its climax is pictured in universalist terms.

<sup>12</sup> Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 45.

### 3. THE ALLEGORY

#### A. The *Animal Apocalypse* as an Allegory

The *An. Apoc.* is set in the form of a dream that presents the history of the world in a schematized format that is usually called, "symbolic."<sup>1</sup> Since a symbol may be used in many different ways, however, it is important to evaluate the nature of the "symbols" and their use. It has been correctly observed that the *An. Apoc.* is an allegory,<sup>2</sup> that is, an extended narrative in which each detail of the story represents something outside of the story. According to its traditional formulation, allegory "says one thing and means another."

There are two complementary sides to allegory.<sup>3</sup> The first is allegory as a compositional strategy by which elements of a fictitious narrative have correspondences to a reality that is the real subject of the text. The second is allegory as an interpretive strategy by which any narrative can be read as a fiction that really intends to

<sup>1</sup> E.g., Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 255; Martin, *Le livre d'Hénoch*, 197-98; Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (1912), 186; Black, *The Book of Enoch*, 19; Dimant, "History According to the Vision of the Animals," 23, 26 (who also speaks of "metaphor"); John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1987) 56; James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984) 164; and Ida Fröhlich, "The Symbolical Language of the Animal Apocalypse of Enoch (1 Enoch 85-90)," *RevQ* 14 (1989) 629-36.

<sup>2</sup> Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, xxxv; George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981) 91; and prepublication draft of his forthcoming *Hermeneia* commentary, introductory notes; and Stephen Breck Reid, *Enoch and Daniel: A Form Critical and Sociological Study of Historical Apocalypses* (BIBAL Monograph Series 2; Berkeley: BIBAL, 1989) 60, 62.

<sup>3</sup> For a discussion of "The Allegorical Problem," see Jon Whitman, *Allegory: The Dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval Technique* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987) 3-8.

communicate truth.<sup>4</sup> The *An. Apoc.* involves primarily the first side of allegory; the author has used allegory as a compositional strategy to develop a story about cattle and sheep which is really not about cattle and sheep at all. It also involves the second side of allegory since it is also itself an interpretation of prior texts (OT historical narratives from Genesis to Kings and the Enochic *Book of the Watchers*). As an interpreter, the author of the *An. Apoc.* has made use of allegory to understand the biblical history as a paradigm for his own situation and the ideal future state. It is therefore the task of the modern reader of the *An. Apoc.* to attempt to allegorize, along with pseudo-Enoch, both the OT and Enochic texts that he utilized and his own narrative about the animals.

Thus there are two levels of story: the surface story about cattle, the sheep and their keepers, and the predatory animals; and the real story, the referent of the surface story, which is the history of humanity as seen in the "true" light of divine and angelic activity. What is said on the surface level is clearly a fiction but can be understood to be true on the referential level. Although the allegory is not very subtle, it at least formally functions as a sort of riddle; only the wise who can make the proper inferences will be able to understand the true meaning of history.

It can be shown that all known (and published) readers of the *An. Apoc.* have in fact read it allegorically. The first certain reference to the *An. Apoc.* is in the *Epistle of Barnabas*. *Barn.* 16.5 reads,

Again, it was made manifest that the city and the temple and the people of Israel were to be delivered up. For the Scripture says, "And it shall come to pass in the last days that the Lord shall deliver the sheep of his pasture, and the sheep-fold, and their tower to destruction."

The citation is not precise, but it is clear that pseudo-Barnabas interprets the sheep and the tower as Israel and the temple. The sheepfold which he understands to be the city (of Jerusalem) is probably to be equated with the house of the *An. Apoc.*

The Ethiopians have also read it allegorically. Marginal notes in MSS bt and bw demonstrate that individual objects and animals were

<sup>4</sup> It is not essential to allegorical interpretation that the narrative to be interpreted be understood as a fiction. The "deeper" meaning can be understood to supplement rather than replace the literal meaning of a text as in Philo and some Christian exegetes.

taken to refer to specific historical objects and people. A fifteenth century Ethiopic composition, *Maṣḥafa Sellāsē* (*The Book of the Trinity*), cites 1 *Enoch* 89.20–30 and explains, "but the hyenas, of whom Enoch speaks, are the Egyptians."<sup>5</sup>

The Greek tradition appears to have read it in the same way. An excerpt of 89.43–49a exists in a Greek tachygraphic (shorthand) manuscript, taken from a collection of (Enochic?) texts with commentary. At the end of the citation, the text reads,

For David, having made war with the Canaanites and Amalek and the sons of Ammon in the days of his kingship, prevailed over them. "Against the foxes" (means) the sons of Ammon; "the boars" being (the sons of) of Amalek; and next "the dogs" being the Foreigners whom it is also customary in the Scripture to call Philistines. In this vision it has been recorded in this way from Adam until the consummation.<sup>6</sup>

Thus in this text the *An. Apoc.* is understood as nothing more than an allegorical record of history. Finally, all modern, western scholars read the *An. Apoc.* in the same way. This uniformity of reading does not in itself prove that it is the correct way to read the *An. Apoc.* but it does prove that the allegorical reading is not idiosyncratic.

Stephen Breck Reid has attempted to define the genre of the *An. Apoc.* more precisely. He calls the *An. Apoc.* "a theriomorphic historical allegory" and compares it to Ezek 17:1–21; and Dan 7:2–8; 8:3–12.<sup>7</sup> Reid, however, fails to discuss the implications of his "genre" definition for the interpretation of the individual signs or of the text as a whole.

An implication (and verification) of the use of allegory is that the author frequently speaks of the characters of the allegory in ways that are appropriate only to the external referent of the sign, especially when he is referring to heavenly beings. For example, in 89.61 the text refers to "another." In the context of the allegory it should mean "another shepherd," but as the story proceeds it becomes clear that

<sup>5</sup> Kurt Wendt, ed., *Das Maṣḥafa Milād (Liber Nativitatis) und Maṣḥafa Sellāsē (Liber Trinitatis) Des Kaisers Zar'a Yā'qob*, (CSCO 235; Scriptorum Aethiopicorum 43; Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1963) 81–82. See the note on 89.10 for the meaning of the word *ze'b* ("hyena") which is usually translated "wolf."

<sup>6</sup> Michael Gitlbauer, *Die Uebersetzung Griechischer Tachygraphie im Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1809*, 95 (my translation of the Greek text).

<sup>7</sup> Reid, *Enoch and Daniel*, 60–61. Reid limits this definition strictly to 85.3b–89.50 but concedes that "on the basis of the predominance of the theriomorphic, historical allegory, the entire unit [the *An. Apoc.*] should be classified as a historical allegory" (p. 62).

this "other" is not a shepherd but a sort of auditor. The word "another" is apparently used because the referent of this other is an angel, as are the referents of the shepherds. Probably the worst violation of the symbolism is the statement in 87.2 that four beings like white men came down from *heaven*. These inconsistencies are grounded in the self-destructive nature of allegory. According to Whitman,

The basis for the technique is obliquity—the separation between what a text says, the 'fiction,' and what it means, the 'truth.' This very obliquity, however, relies upon an assumed correspondence between the fiction and the truth. The apparent meaning, after all, only diverges from the actual one insofar as they are compared with each other. In these two conflicting demands—the divergence between the apparent and actual meanings, and yet the correspondence between them—it is possible to see both the birth and the death of allegorical writing. The more allegory exploits the divergence between corresponding levels of meaning, the less tenable the correspondence becomes. Alternatively, the more it closes ranks and emphasizes the correspondence, the less oblique, and thus the less allegorical, the divergence becomes.<sup>8</sup>

Apparently, the two levels of meaning were sufficiently close that pseudo-Enoch was able to assert things about the fiction that were appropriate only to the real meaning.

There are at least three levels of symbolism in the *An. Apoc.* Accordingly I will use three different words: allegory, sign, and symbol. By allegory I mean the literary convention by which a narrative about one set of things can refer to another set of things that is entirely external to the narrative itself. By sign I mean the individual characters, events, and things of the narrative each of which points to an external referent. I use the more general term symbol of any of the more evocative representations that seem to be more culturally loaded, rather than simple ad hoc signs whose representations work only within the allegory.

If one looks to the *An. Apoc.* for the kind of rich symbolism displayed in some of the other apocalypses, the result will be a little disappointing.<sup>9</sup> There are beasts and birds, but each beast has only

<sup>8</sup> Whitman, *Allegory*, 2.

<sup>9</sup> Perhaps the reason for this is that allegory, in order to succeed at all, must provide the reader with a systematic, predictable set of what would normally be called metaphorical correspondences. The element of surprise that is usually a part of good metaphor destroys the possibility of allegory, which requires the

one head with at most two horns and each bird has one head and two wings. There is a great flood and the splitting of a "pool of water," but no monsters live in the water or come forth from it, nor are there living waters flowing from the new house at the end of history. There are stars that fall from heaven, but they do not destroy vast tracts of land or turn rivers to blood. Yet one is not entirely disappointed. The allegorical narrative itself sometimes has symbolic significance. The recurrence of black, red, and white cattle after the flood is ominous, precisely because of the color scheme. The recurrence of only white cattle in the ideal future is positive, again precisely because of the color scheme. The use of "house" as a sign for two or three different historical places tells the reader that Jerusalem should be understood as legally equivalent to the desert camp.

Other signs in the *An. Apoc.* function symbolically as well as allegorically. The house without the tower, which in the restoration becomes home to all the animals, may be a mother image.<sup>10</sup> The pastoral animals, cattle and sheep, call forth images of divine care for the readers. Levitical cleanness and uncleanness are positive and negative markers. Predatory animals represent the human capacity for violence. There are lofty towers and rocks that symbolically reach toward heaven. There are magical swords, fiery abysses, giants, and flights through the sky. Nevertheless all of these are inherited symbols and myths. The author of the *An. Apoc.* seems not to have been able to develop their symbolic value. As D. Flusser has said, "The allegory is mostly external and clumsy, but this is why its content can be easily revealed."<sup>11</sup>

Carol Newsom has argued for a more sympathetic reading. According to her,

reader to make relatively predictable associations between the narrative fiction and the reality to which it points.

<sup>10</sup> According to Northrop Frye (*The Great Code: The Bible and Literature* [New York/London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982] 156), "Urban imagery is naturally focused on Jerusalem, and cities are apt to be symbolically female, as the word 'metropolis' (mother city) reminds us. In sexual imagery the relation of male to female is expressed in two ways, depending on whether the two bodies or only the sexual organs themselves are taken as the basis. In one the male is above and the female below; in the other the male is at the center and the female surrounds him. . . . Th[is] relation is illustrated by the temple of the (usually male) god in the midst of the bridal city."

<sup>11</sup> D. Flusser, "Seventy Shepherds, Vision of," *EncJud* 14 (1972) 1199.

Caught in the mesh of transparent allegory are genuine symbols whose surplus of meaning imparts added significance to the allegorical ciphers and makes the narrative a witness to certain esoteric traditions of the Enoch circle.<sup>12</sup>

Her single example from the *An. Apoc.* is the symbol of the open eyes, which functions as a cipher for obedience to God, but, by means of allusion to various traditions of the vision of God, the symbol also "connects the righteous community with an esoteric wisdom tradition and treats them as sharing in some way the special qualities of their founder, Enoch."<sup>13</sup> The symbolic implication is possible, though uncertain. In any case it lacks the complex expressiveness of more symbolic works. Philip Wheelwright distinguishes between steno-language, which is stipulative (referential) and univocal, and expressive language, which is characterized by plurisignation, "soft focus" (openness to new meanings), paralogical dimensionality (emotive association), and paradox.<sup>14</sup> These two kinds of language are not mutually exclusive, but represent opposite extremes; all language falls somewhere in between. The allegorical language of the *An. Apoc.* is not strictly steno-language, but it does seem to lean in that direction. The occasional examples of symbolic expressiveness are relatively inartistic borrowings from the traditions in pseudo-Enoch's background.<sup>15</sup>

Although it is probably impossible to discover why, whether consciously or unconsciously, the author chose to use an allegorical vision, some suggestions are in order. Carol Newsom has rightly suggested that

probably the use of allegory here is due to the influence of the vision genre, for allegory may be traced back through the visions of Zechariah and Ezekiel to the use of the graphic cipher in the vision reports of Jeremiah and Amos.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Carol A. Newsom, "Enoch 83-90: The Historical Résumé as Biblical Exegesis" (Unpublished seminar paper, Harvard University, 1975) 30.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 31.

<sup>14</sup> Philip Wheelwright, *The Burning Fountain: A Study in the Language of Symbolism* (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1982) 73-101.

<sup>15</sup> Although I have been critical of pseudo-Enoch's artistry, it is not my intent to imply a criticism of allegory as a strategy of composition. I do not hold allegory to be a lower or worse form of symbolism, only a distinct form.

<sup>16</sup> Newsom, "Enoch 83-90," 10.

The prominence of allegorical visions in the literature has doubtless provided pseudo-Enoch with the model for his composition. It has often been suggested that inasmuch as apocalypses often represent anti-establishment propaganda, they use obscure language to prevent being found out by the authorities. In a general discussion of allegory, not limited to apocalyptic texts, Angus Fletcher states,

Considered also as a nonmetaphysical semantic device, whether leading to apocalypse or not, allegory likewise appears to express conflict between rival authorities, as in times of political oppression we may get "Aesop-language" to avoid censorship of dissident thought. At the heart of any allegory will be found this conflict of authorities.<sup>17</sup>

It would be difficult to verify, especially in the case of the *An. Apoc.* that its author hoped to avoid censorship, especially since the allegory is so transparent. What is perhaps more likely is that allegory serves admirably in any propaganda war since its basic function is to subvert normal language that has been traditionally pressed into service for the dominant party. Agents, objects, and ideals can be caricatured in new ways that may be more natural to the narrative fiction than to the reality that it represents. To quote Fletcher again, "Allegories are far less often the dull systems that they are reputed to be than they are symbolic power struggles."<sup>18</sup>

Whether or not these suggestions as to the possible reasons for the author's choice to use allegory are convincing, it is possible to investigate the consequences of the choice for the meaning of the text. The allegory is the author's own creation, and it has accomplished its task of revealing the inner or metaphysical meaning of the history that it represents. As Northrop Frye says in another context, "Man creates what he calls history as a screen to conceal the workings of the apocalypse from himself."<sup>19</sup> The *An. Apoc.* removes the screen to show history as it really is, a great playing field where God, angels, and demons compete for possession of and control over the humans that pass in and out of it. By means of the allegory, the author has been able to level this playing field so that he can imaginatively present the whole hierarchy of God, angels and demons, and humans as acting on the same playing field. The allegory bridges the cosmic

<sup>17</sup> Angus Fletcher, *Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode* (1964; reprinted Ithaca: Cornell Paperbacks, 1970) 22.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 23.

<sup>19</sup> Frye, *The Great Code*, 136.

dualism between heaven and earth, and the angels are seen as being as much a part of the life of Israel as a shepherd is a part of the life of a sheep.

## B. The Identity of the Wild Animals

### 1. The Introductory List of 89.10

And they began to beget wild beasts and birds and there came from them species of every sort: lions, tigers, hyenas,<sup>20</sup> dogs, hyenas, wild boars, foxes, hyraxes, swine, falcons, eagles, kites, foqans-birds, and ravens; and there was born in their midst a white bull.

Immediately after the flood (89.10), the bulls (Shem, Ham, and Japheth) begin to beget all kinds of predatory animals and birds. Of these, all except the hyraxes, swine, falcons, and foqans-birds are mentioned later in the account. There seem to be three principles of inclusion in this list. The most important is probably that those animals that were useful for the subsequent allegory were included in the list. The only two animals that appear in the subsequent narrative but are not listed here are the wild asses, which really should not be in this list anyway (see below, p. 29) and the vultures which are probably interpolated in every case that they appear in the later history (see below, pp. 31–32). The second principle of inclusion seems to be that only Levitically unclean animals are included. All of the listed animals are either explicitly mentioned as unclean in Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14, or they are unclean because of general rules of uncleanness laid out in those chapters.<sup>21</sup> It is possible to understand this second principle of inclusion in terms of the contrast between domesticated and wild animals. Dimant emphasizes the meaning of this contrast for the understanding of the text.

As in the first period, these symbols concern themselves only with domesticated animals, but because at this time only part of humanity,

<sup>20</sup> See the note on 89.10 for the meaning of this word. It is usually translated "wolf" on the basis of its cognates in other Semitic languages, but in Ethiopic it means "hyena." The Aramaic fragments show that the original word was דב ("bear"; see note on 89.13). To avoid confusion with the other mention of hyenas, I will refer to these animals as bears in the discussion.

<sup>21</sup> Note, however, that the grounds for inclusion or exclusion from the list in the *An. Apoc.* are not necessarily related to the grounds for inclusion or exclusion

that is Israel, is made up of domesticated animals, these symbols refer only to Israel. They are taken from a world of symbols of sheep and cattle. The staying of the sheep in their barn or in the house of the master of the sheep describes the state of faith between the flock and its master. When the sheep leave his house and get lost in various ways, this describes sin and error.<sup>22</sup>

The special significance of the fact that the sheep are domesticated animals is that in contrast to the wild animals, "they gain protection and food in exchange for receiving the yoke of their master and obedience to him."<sup>23</sup> Since the contrast between clean and unclean and that between domestic and wild both apply to the animals listed, it seems likely that both interact in the production of meaning. The fact that the sheep are clean expresses their acceptance by God; their domestication expresses the terms of their particular relationship to God. The third principle of inclusion in the list is really an explanation of the first. Most of the animals in this list, and all of those that are later mentioned in the allegory are either predators or scavengers; that is, they are the sort of animals that might prey upon live sheep or eat dead sheep.<sup>24</sup>

### 2. The Text of 89.10

There are a number of irregularities in this list which must be resolved before one can address the identity of the individual animals. It is appropriate that the wild asses are not listed here, even though they are mentioned later as one of the wild animals with which the sheep have to deal, because they represent Ishmael and do not come into existence until vs 11. For the same reason the wild boars, though (wrongly) mentioned here, do not belong in this list because they represent Esau and are not born until vs 12. They may have been added to this list by a scribe who recognized their importance in the subsequent narrative and wanted to include them in this introductory

from the lists of Leviticus and Deuteronomy. Pseudo-Enoch may use the biblical texts, but he does not necessarily understand them in any historical sense.

<sup>22</sup> Dimant, "History According to the Vision of the Animals," 24 (כמו בתקופה הראשונה, אמורים סמלים אלו רק בהיות המבויתות. אך מכיון שבפרק זמן זה רק חלקה של האנושות היינו ישראל, מורכב מחיות מבויתות. מתייחסים הסמלים הללו לגביו בלבד. הם לקוחים מתוך עולם הדימויים של צאן ומקנה שהיית (הכבשים בדיר בבית או של אדון ה צאן מצי).

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 26 (הן זוכות להגנה ולמזון תמורת קבלת עולו של אדונין וציות לו).

<sup>24</sup> See below, p. 30, for the possibility that some of the animals that do not appear in the rest of the *An. Apoc.* and are neither predatory nor scavengers may have been interpolated into this list.



list. Inconsistently, the foxes are included in this list. They probably represent Moab and Ammon, both descended from Lot and neither included in the table of nations of Genesis 10. They should therefore have been excluded from this list. Either the author was inattentive or a copyist has added them.

The swine should be excised from this list; the Ethiopic word *hanzar* ("swine") is a rare word that is apparently indistinguishable in meaning from *harāwiyā* ("swine, boar"; *harāwiyā gadām/haql* is used to represent a wild boar) which is consistently used to translate both ὕς ("wild or domesticated hog," male or female) and χοῖρος ("pig"). But here where the Greek apparently had both ὕς and χοῖρος,<sup>25</sup> the Ethiopic translator made use of *hanzar* to translate the latter. But since in Greek ὕς and χοῖρος are scarcely distinguishable and since Aramaic does not seem to have a word for domesticated pig as distinct from wild boar,<sup>26</sup> it seems unlikely that the original text would have mentioned swine more than once. The word χοῖρος would have been added in a Greek text, following χοιρογρύλλιος as a sort of dittography.

One nonpredatory animal remains, the hyrax (also known as rock rabbit, rock badger, or coney [KJV]; *geheyāt*, χοιρογρύλλιος, גֶּחֱיָאֵת). The hyrax is a small hoofed animal, famous in the Bible for living in the rocks (Ps 104:18, Prov 30:26). Far from preying on sheep, it eats vegetation only. The only justification for its inclusion in this list seems to be that, like the birds that follow, it is prominently included in the lists of unclean animals of Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14. Since none of the other beasts in the list (except for the textually suspect swine) are mentioned in Leviticus 11 or Deuteronomy 14, it is likely that this animal was added by a scribe who mistook the significance of the list for a simple list of unclean animals modeled after Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14.

If the swine and hyraxes were originally part of the list of animals in 89.10, then their function in the *An. Apoc.* would be primarily to

<sup>25</sup> One might have expected that *harāwiyā haql* should translate κάπρος ("boar," especially "wild boar") but G<sup>vat</sup> shows that the Greek word was in fact ὕς, at least in 89.42–49.

<sup>26</sup> The Aramaic word for both swine and boar is חזיר (4QEn<sup>d</sup> 2 iii 28 [89.43]). Carl Brockelmann (*Lexicon Syriacum* [2d ed.; Halis Saxonum: Max Niemeyer, 1928]) has two listings for wild boar, *dizā* and *warzā* (both Persian loan words), but what is needed is a word for domesticated pig that can be differentiated from the wild boar that represents Esau.

stress the unclean nature of the animals listed. Both are listed in Lev 11:4–7 and Deut 14:7, 8 along with camels and hares as unclean mammals. They have no function in the *An. Apoc.* apart from their presence in this list of otherwise predators and scavengers. Their presence in this list reminds the reader that as all of the animals listed are unclean, whether or not they are harmful to sheep, so no gentile nation is acceptable to God, whether or not it is harmful to Israel.

There are two types of birds in the list that do not occur elsewhere in the *An. Apoc.*: the falcons (*sisit*: according to Dillmann, either a wild or a predatory bird) and the foqans-birds (*foqāns* or *foqāsa*: according to Dillmann, a foreign word, perhaps originally the same as φοῖνιξ [Phoenix] but in 1 Enoch 89.10 the name of a predatory bird).<sup>27</sup> It is impossible to say what would have occasioned their inclusion in the list, either by the original author or a later scribe or editor. Since copyists are often prone to add to lists such as this, it is possible that one or both of these birds were not original to the *An. Apoc.*

The final problem is that of the second bird in the list, the eagles (ʿansert, α), or vultures (ʿawest, β), or vultures and eagles (bn<sup>c</sup>). Both birds reappear in 90.2, where "all the birds of heaven come—eagles and vultures and kites and ravens. And the eagles were leading all the birds."<sup>28</sup> The eagles are mentioned without the vultures or ravens in 90.4 as coconsumers of mutton along with dogs and kites. In 90.11 the eagles and vultures and ravens and kites continued attacking the sheep.<sup>29</sup> In 90.13, "the shepherds and the eagles and those vultures and kites came and cried to the ravens that they should break the horn of that ram."<sup>30</sup> In 90.16, "All the eagles and vultures and ravens and kites assembled. . . that they might break the horn of that ram."<sup>31</sup> Since the reading of bn<sup>c</sup> for 89.10, "eagles and vultures," is an obvious

<sup>27</sup> August Dillmann, *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae cum indice Latino* (1865; reprinted New York: Frederick Ungar, 1955) 394, 1371. Isaac ("1 Enoch," 65) mentions the fact that the Ethiopic word *foqes* may also refer to a small monkey (possibly a colobus monkey), and that the term *hobāy* may mean either "kite" or "baboon," but monkeys and baboons are clearly out of place here in the list of birds. Moreover, it is unlikely that an Aramaic writer of Judea would have thought that monkeys or baboons were a major threat to sheep.

<sup>28</sup> α<g q aa bv> read ". . . eagles and vultures and eagles and kites and ravens. . ."

<sup>29</sup> MS u omits vultures and kites; g omits kites.

<sup>30</sup> MS aa bv omit "and eagles"; u omits "and those vultures."

<sup>31</sup> MS u omits "eagles."

conflation and since the vultures have no independent role in the rest of the vision, it is probable that the reading of  $\alpha$ , "eagles," is the correct reading.<sup>32</sup> Since the vultures would then be the only animal (except for wild asses, see above) mentioned in the subsequent narrative but missing from 89.10, it is probable that they are a secondary intrusion into the text wherever they appear in chapter 90. The fact that no distinction between eagle and vulture is usually made in Aramaic (נשר, like Ethiopic *nsr*, which I have here translated as "eagle," includes both eagle and vulture) makes it unlikely that both birds would have appeared in the same list. The fact that there are textual variants in every case where the eagles appear, either with or without the vultures, shows that these two Ethiopic words with similar spellings and similar meanings could either supplant or attract each other.<sup>33</sup>

### 3. The Identification of the Animals

The identity of some of the animals is quite clear. The wild asses represent Ishmael (89.11; cf. Gen 16:12 where Ishmael "shall be a wild ass of a man") and his descendents, including the Midianites (89.13 = Gen 37:28 and 89.16 = Exod 2:15). The wild boars represent Esau (89.12) and his descendants, both Edom (Gen 36:15–19) and Amalek (Gen 36:15–16). The bears (hyenas in Ethiopic) represent Egypt (89.13–27 = the slavery in Egypt and the Exodus).<sup>34</sup> The dogs represent Philistia (cf. 89.47 where it is the dogs who kill the ram that represents Saul).

The identity of the other animals is less obvious but can be discovered. As shown in table 1, during the time of the Judges up until Saul's kingship, Israel's chief enemies were the Philistines, the Amalekites, and the Ammonites. According to 89.42 (Ethiopic), during this period "the dogs and the foxes and the wild boars began to devour those sheep." Since the dogs and wild boars have been already identified as Philistia and Edom, the foxes must represent

<sup>32</sup> The corrector of bn almost always agrees with the majority of the  $\beta$  MSS. The corrector of bn added 'awest ("vultures") from his  $\beta$  exemplar and for one reason or another failed to omit 'ansert ("eagles").

<sup>33</sup> See the note on 90.11 for an alternate explanation for the interpolation of "vultures" into the text of chapter 90 by the same Aramaic redactor who added 90.13–15.

<sup>34</sup> Note that 4QEn<sup>a</sup> 4 ii 17 and iii 14 read רביע ("bears") where Ethiopic has 'az'ebt ("hyenas"). See the notes on 89.10 and 89.13.

Ammon. Since Moab, along with Ammon, was a descendant of Lot (Gen 19:37–38) it is likely that Moab should be included with Ammon among the foxes. Note that the Moabites were enemies of David and of Judah during the period of the divided kingdoms and that the foxes are mentioned in the *An. Apoc.* both as enemies of David (89.49) and of Judah during the divided kingdom (89.55). See tables 1 and 2.

TABLE 1  
ISRAEL'S CHIEF OPPONENTS FROM  
THE JUDGES TO THE EXILE

Biblical Reference	Period	Israel's enemies
Judges 3	Judges	Philistia, Amalek, Ammon, Moab
Judges 10–11	Judges	Philistia, Ammon
Judges 14–16	Judges	Philistia
1 Samuel 4,7	Samuel	Philistia
1 Samuel 11	Saul	Ammon
1 Samuel 13–14	Saul	Philistia
1 Sam 14:47	Saul	Amalek, Ammon, Moab, Aram, Edom
1 Samuel 17	Saul	Philistia
1 Samuel 18–19	David's flight	Philistia
1 Samuel 23	David's flight	Philistia
1 Samuel 28–29	David's flight	Philistia
1 Samuel 31	Saul's death	Philistia
2 Samuel 5	David	Philistia
2 Samuel 8	David	Moab, Aram, Edom
2 Sam 8:12	David	Philistia, Amalek, Ammon, Moab, Aram, Edom
2 Samuel 10–12	David	Ammon, Aram
2 Samuel 21, 23	David	Philistia
1 Kings 11	Solomon	Moab, Aram
1 Kings 14	Divided Kingdom	Egypt against Judah
1 Kings 15, 16	Divided Kingdom	Philistia, Aram against Israel
1 Kings 20, 22	Divided Kingdom	Aram against Israel and Judah
2 Kings 3	Divided Kingdom	Moab against Israel and Judah

TABLE 1—Continued.

Biblical Reference	Period	Israel's enemies
2 Kings 6–7	Divided Kingdom	Aram against Israel and Judah
2 Kings 8	Divided Kingdom	Aram against Israel
2 Kings 8	Divided Kingdom	Edom against Judah
2 Kings 10, 12	Divided Kingdom	Aram against Israel and Judah
2 Kings 13	Divided Kingdom	Moab and Aram against Israel
2 Kings 14	Divided Kingdom	Edom against Judah
2 Kings 15	Divided Kingdom	Assyria against Israel
2 Kings 16	Divided Kingdom	Aram, Edom, Assyria against Judah
2 Kings 17–19	Divided Kingdom	Assyria against Israel and Judah
2 Kings 23	Divided Kingdom	Egypt against Judah
2 Kings 24	Destruction of Jerusalem	Ammon, Moab, Aram, Babylon against Judah
2 Kings 25	Destruction of Jerusalem	Babylon against Judah

NOTE: The Canaanites of the Book of Judges are excluded since they seem to have no role in the *An. Apoc.* This is probably due to the fact that the whole period of the Judges is summed up in 89.41a, "And sometimes their eyes were opened and sometimes they were darkened. . . ."

This leaves the lions, tigers, and hyenas to be identified and Aram, Assyria, and Babylon as important enemies of Israel that have not yet been associated with one of the animals. Although the three animals are undifferentiated in 89.55, the lions are singled out in 89.56 as the ones into whose hands the sheep are delivered when the owner of the sheep abandons their house and tower. They also lead in the destruction of the house and tower in 89.65–66. Therefore the lions must represent Babylon. The lions have often been thought to represent the Assyrians because 89.56 is understood to represent the exile of the Northern Kingdom by Assyria (2 Kings 17). But the author of the *An. Apoc.* seems to have adopted the same attitude toward the Northern Kingdom as did the Chronicler and the author of the *Testament of Moses* (which makes no mention of the Northern Kingdom from the time of Jeroboam until the predicted restoration of the whole house of Israel, *T. Mos.* 2.3–3.4). Once they have

abandoned the temple in Jerusalem, their subsequent history is of no interest. Thus the exile of the Northern Kingdom is not mentioned, and Assyria is one of the lesser enemies of the sheep.

TABLE 2  
ISRAEL'S OPPONENTS ACCORDING TO THE ANIMAL  
APOCALYPSE FROM THE JUDGES TO THE EXILE

	Period	Animals representing Israel's enemies	Biblical Reference
89.42	Judges to Samuel	Dogs, foxes, boars	Judges—1 Samuel 8
89.43	Saul	Dogs, foxes, boars	1 Samuel 9–15
89.46	David's flight	Dogs	1 Samuel 18–30
89.47	Saul's death	Dogs	1 Samuel 31
89.49	David	Dogs, foxes, boars	2 Samuel
89.55	Divided kingdom	Lions, tigers, bears, hyenas, foxes	1 Kings 12–2 Kings 24
89.56	?	Lions and all animals	?
89.65	?	Lions	?
89.66	Destruction of Jerusalem	Lions, tigers, boars	2 Kings 24

This leaves the tigers and hyenas, which by a process of elimination, must be assumed to represent Aram and Assyria. That Assyria is not prominent in the *An. Apoc.* is understandable since it only fruitlessly threatened Judah in 2 Kings 18–19 and required tribute money in 2 Kings 16 and 18. The low profile of Aram in the *An. Apoc.* is strange. Aram was a major enemy of Israel during the reigns of David and Solomon (2 Samuel 8; 10; 11), but these wars are omitted from the *An. Apoc.* They were also important enemies throughout the period of the divided kingdom but are represented only as one of a long list of enemies in 89.55 and possibly also as one of the nations that aided in the destruction of Jerusalem (89.66).<sup>35</sup> The reasons for

<sup>35</sup> According to 89.66 the tigers and boars helped the lions to destroy the house and tower. If the tigers represent Aram, and not Assyria, then Aram would be blamed for its part in the destruction of Jerusalem. Note, however, that

this repression of Aram's role as one of Israel's traditional enemies can only be guessed at. Possibly the militant band, represented by the horned lambs (90.6, 9) and to which the author of the *An. Apoc.* undoubtedly belonged, was allied with some native Syrians in their struggle against Antiochus Epiphanes. They would have wanted to avoid offending their allies who, as native Syrians, would have been distinguished from Antiochus and his Greek friends.

The identity of the birds is less complex if one can assume that the vultures can be ignored as an Ethiopic intrusion into the text and that the eagles, kites, and ravens should refer to the various Greek dynasties that threatened Judah. The eagles as the leaders of the birds (90.2) are probably the Macedonians.<sup>36</sup> They were accompanied in 90.4 by the kites who probably represent the Ptolemies.<sup>37</sup> In 90.8–13 the ravens are singled out as the opponents of the horned sheep and as the leaders of the other birds. They represent the Seleucids, the final great enemy of Judah at the time of the writing of this text.

### C. The Temple and Associated Images

The *An. Apoc.* idealizes the desert camp both in its treatment of the tabernacle and the First and Second Temples, and in its treatment of the history of Israel. This idealization is primarily an expression of the hope that in the ideal future God will again be near to his people. In the *An. Apoc.* the sign of the house allegorically represents both the desert camp and Jerusalem. The house further symbolizes the place that God has granted to Israel to dwell in so that the ideal house is one in which Israel and God live together in peace and goodness. I shall consider the various houses in the *An. Apoc.* neither in their chronological nor in their narrative order, but in the order of greatest clarity.

---

there are no other traditions of Aram's participation in the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. See the note on 89.66. It is possible that the tigers are also interpolated into the text and that Aram is not represented at all.

<sup>36</sup> But cf. Nickelsburg (prepublication draft of his forthcoming Hermeneia commentary, notes on 90.2–5) who, at the suggestion of Jonathan Goldstein, identifies the eagles as "the Ptolemies, whose coins regularly display an eagle on their reverse side."

<sup>37</sup> Thus, the reign of the Ptolemies over Judah is viewed very negatively, and the wars between the Ptolemies and Seleucids over Palestine are ignored.

### 1. The First Temple and Jerusalem

And that house became large and spacious (. . .), and a tall and large tower was built on that house for the owner of the sheep. And that house was lower, but the tower was raised up and became tall, and the owner of the sheep stood upon that tower, and a full table was set before him. 1 *Enoch* 89.50

This verse describes the institution of the temple and the sacrificial cult in Jerusalem by Solomon. Beginning with this verse Jerusalem is represented by a house in which the sheep (Israel) dwell, and the temple is represented by a tower on which the owner of the sheep (God) stands.<sup>38</sup> This temple plays an important role in the *An. Apoc.* from the time of Solomon until its destruction by Babylon (89.66–67). It is mentioned once again when it is inadequately rebuilt by two (or three) sheep in 89.73 but is never mentioned again. On the other hand, the house plays an important role from the time of its first appearance until the end.

The importance of the temple in the *An. Apoc.* can be seen in the initial description of the temple. It is of great significance that the tower was tall. In 89.50 the word "tall" is used of the tower twice, it is once called "lofty," and it is contrasted with the low house. There is another tall tower in the *An. Apoc.* In 87.3, just before the deluge, Enoch was raised by three white men to a high place from which he could see a tall tower that rose high above the earth and was taller than any hill. This is a reference to Enoch's translation to paradise near the mountain of God upon which the heavenly temple sits.<sup>39</sup>

Height is not one of the signs of the allegory that has a specific external referent. It is a necessary attribute of any mountain or tower to be relatively high and all mountains and towers in the *An. Apoc.* are accordingly high. Nevertheless, it may have some meaning for the *An. Apoc.* The new house brought by the owner of the sheep after the judgment is also lofty, but that may be because it stands on an elevated mountain. Nickelsburg relates the height of the towers

---

<sup>38</sup> That the house represents Jerusalem and the tower represents the temple is recognized by all commentators. For a demonstration of this identification see Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 262–63, and Dimant, "Jerusalem and the Temple," 178–79.

<sup>39</sup> See excursus 4, "The high tower (87.3)." For an Enochic map of the world, see Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 15–18.

and the height of the new house to the function of worship.<sup>40</sup> While there are no explicit clues in the *An. Apoc.* that point to this conclusion, it is nevertheless natural to expect height to indicate proximity to heaven in some sense. In the *An. Apoc.* everything that is called high does in fact have something to do with either the presence or worship of God. The height of the tower, then, seems to be only appropriate for a place where God will receive worship. In keeping with this, according to 89.50, "the owner of the sheep stood upon that tower, and a full table was set before him."

The contrast between the high tower and the low house is partially intended to emphasize the glory of the temple and the presence of God in it. But in doing so it also serves to hint at a change in the relationship between God and Israel. Just as the temple mount lies on a hill, higher than and separate from the rest of the city, so God now dwells in a place higher than and separate from his people. Either this implies a more remote relationship (previously the owner had come down to the sheep but now he is removing himself, at least a little, from the sheep) or a closer relationship (he had not had a permanent residence among the sheep until now).

## 2. The Second Temple

And after that I saw as the shepherds were tending for twelve hours. And behold, two of those sheep returned and came and entered and began building everything that had fallen of that house. And the wild boars prevented them so that they could not. And they began to build again as at first and they raised up that tower, and it was called the tall tower. And they began again to place a table before the tower, but all the bread that was upon it was polluted, and it was not pure. (1 *Enoch* 89.72–73)

These verses depict the return from exile and the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the temple by Zerubbabel and Joshua.<sup>41</sup> The whole

<sup>40</sup> Nickelsburg, prepublication draft of his forthcoming *Hermeneia* commentary, notes on 90.28–36. Dimant remarks ("Jerusalem and the Temple," 179–80), "An early idea is reflected here [89.50] that the temple stands on top of a high mountain and rises and thus comes to express its height and closeness to God" (משתקף כאן רעיון קדום שמקדש עומד בראש הר רם ונישא ובכך באה לידי ביטוי מעלתו וקרבתו אל האל). She goes on to cite biblical and other parallels from the ancient Near East.

<sup>41</sup> According to MS bn\*, it was two sheep that returned and rebuilt the house and tower. All other MSS read "three." The number two was already conjectured by Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 270. See the note on 89.72.

period from the exile to the restoration is depicted as a time when the sheep have been abandoned by their owner into the care of derelict shepherds. The description of this tower deliberately contrasts it with the first tower, the temple of Solomon. As Dimant argues, the second tower was *not* said to have been "for the owner of the sheep," it was only a *so-called* tall tower, the owner of the sheep did *not* stand upon it, and the table offered there was "polluted and not pure."<sup>42</sup> Reese extends this comparison to a comparison of the general character of the time of Solomon and the Persian period:

Then the table in the house of the lord was in order; this time it is not (vs 73); then the sheep were sighted, this time they are blind (vs 74); then the people grew and multiplied, this time they are persecuted and destroyed (vs 74f.).<sup>43</sup>

Thus, the situation for the sheep was even worse after the Exile than it was before the Exile began. *Then* the sheep were blinded and straying and had abandoned the owner's house (89.54). *Now* they are still blinded, still have no worthwhile dwelling place, and what is worse, they are now under the power of shepherds who are also blind.

The specific reasons for this negative evaluation of the temple and cult are not given.<sup>44</sup> Commentators from Dillmann on have assumed that the issue was primarily the problem of intermarriage with foreigners (cf. Ezra 9),<sup>45</sup> but this is not at all certain. According to Volkmar, the objection was that the cult was established and maintained under a covenant with the Gentiles.<sup>46</sup> The violations that the author had in mind may have been similar to the reasons found in the Damascus Rule. In CD v 6–8 the temple is said to be profaned by those who "lie with a woman who sees her bloody discharge" and

<sup>42</sup> Dimant, "Jerusalem and the Temple," 180. That the second tower was "called" lofty does not necessarily mean that the author disagrees with that judgment, but the implication is not difficult to arrive at.

<sup>43</sup> Reese, "Die Geschichte Israels," 46 ("Damals war der Tisch im Hause des Herrn in Ordnung, diesmal ist er es nicht [V.73]; damals waren die Schafe sehend, diesmal sind sie blind [V.74]; damals wuchs und mehrte sich das Volk, diesmal wird es verfolgt und vernichtet [V.74f]").

<sup>44</sup> See Jonathan A. Goldstein (*I Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 41; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976] 42), who thinks that the author of the *An. Apoc.* approves of the temple itself and finds fault only with the priest and offerings.

<sup>45</sup> Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 270.

<sup>46</sup> Volkmar, *Die Geschichts-Vision des Buches Henoch*, 12.

by marriage between niece and paternal uncle. CD vi 11–21 implies more broadly that the profanation of the temple was the result of the failure to "act according to the exact interpretation of the Law." Thus, for CD, it was a matter of observing precise distinctions between clean and unclean as interpreted by the members of its community. The author of the *An. Apoc.* may have objected to the cult on similar grounds of divergent interpretations of specific purity and marriage regulations. It may also have involved such calendrical disputes as are evidenced in *Jubilees*, Book 3 of 1 *Enoch* (the *Astronomical Book*), the *Damascus Rule*, and other Qumran texts. 4QMMT may be instructive in this regard. In the context of an explanation of the sect's separation from the rest of Judaism, the document polemically discusses issues of calendar, lawful mixtures, ritual purity (especially concerning the temple and sacrificial cult), and marriage.<sup>47</sup> These parallels serve only to provide a range of possibilities. It is not clear whether any or all of these issues were relevant for the author of the *An. Apoc.*, who seems not to be especially interested in legal interpretation. In any case these would have been only the legal objections and would probably be intertwined with social and political opposition as well. Since the group of sighted lambs with which the author identifies seem to have arisen early in the second century BCE and probably already rejected the Second Temple, this rejection of the Second Temple probably predated the defilement of the temple by the agents of Antiochus IV, so that it would not have been directly related to issues of Hellenization.

### 3. The Tabernacle and Desert Camp

And I saw in this vision until that sheep (was changed and) became a man and built a house for the owner of the sheep, and he caused all the sheep to stand in that house. (1 *Enoch* 89.36)

This verse follows the account of the Exodus and the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai. The sheep that became a man refers to Moses and probably represents his transformation to some kind of

<sup>47</sup> See Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, "An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran," *The Israel Museum Journal* 4 (1985) 9–10; and another, more detailed article of the same name in *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, April 1984* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities in Cooperation with the American Schools of Oriental Research, 1985) 401–7.

angelic status. The Aramaic fragment, 4QEn<sup>c</sup> 4, unfortunately breaks off after about one third of the first letter of the word corresponding to "house" in the Ethiopic version. Enough is visible, however, to verify that in all probability the letter is a ה.<sup>48</sup> Milik restores מן[שכן] ("tabernacle"), but that would seem to violate the allegory quite badly and does not explain why the Ethiopic reads bēt ("house").<sup>49</sup> I propose מן[דר] ("dwelling," "compartment").<sup>50</sup> This proposal corrects one of the sources of confusion for the *An. Apoc.* One of the traditional, Jewish names for the temple in Jerusalem is "house" (Hebrew, Aramaic = בית), but beginning in 89.50 the word "house" is used to represent, not the temple, but the city of Jerusalem. The false assumption that in the *An. Apoc.* בית was used to represent Jerusalem instead of the temple has caused commentators to assume an inconsistency on the part of the author; namely, that the city is represented by a word which normally refers to the temple.

The commentators, from Dillmann on, unanimously identify the house of 89.36 with the tabernacle.<sup>51</sup> I, on the other hand, propose to interpret this house as signifying the camp. The interpretation that the house represents the tabernacle is based on the biblical text, which the *An. Apoc.* normally follows quite closely. (1) According to Exod 25:8; 29:45, the tabernacle is to be a place where the Lord will dwell in the midst of Israel; from that point of view it would make a great deal of sense in the allegory to call the place where the owner of the sheep

<sup>48</sup> According to Milik, "The trace of the last letter in this line would make a Mem מן[שכן] more likely than an Beth ב[יא] [sic]" (*The Books of Enoch*, 206). Only the right portion of the letter is visible, but just enough of the bottom stroke can be seen to verify that it curves downward. Occasionally in this MS the bottom strokes of ב, מ, כ, and פ curve downward, but in this case it is quite pronounced. I therefore agree with Milik that מן is clearly the most likely reading.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 205.

<sup>50</sup> Gustaf H. Dalman, *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch* (3d ed.; 1938; reprinted Hildesheim: Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967) 225; and, spelled מדר, Marcus Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (2 vols.; 1886–1890; reprinted New York: Judaica Press, 1982) 2: 733. There is another possibility, that I mention only because it could completely invalidate all speculation about the relationship between the desert camp and Jerusalem: מן[שר] ("camp"; Dalman, *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch*, 258; cf. 1QApGen xxi.1) would fit the present context well but would not translate well into Greek either as οἶκος ("house") or its cognates, or apartment ("apartment, quarters"). In order to account for the Ethiopic text, one might have to suppose that it had been harmonized with the text of 89.50, where the original Aramaic text was not משר but בית ("house").

<sup>51</sup> Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 261. This is also the interpretation of the Ethiopic tradition. MSS bt and bw both have debtarā ("tabernacle") in the margin.

is to live a "house." (2) Exodus refers to Moses building the tabernacle but says nothing of building the camp. This discrepancy can be accounted for by the author's greater interest in the camp than in the tabernacle and the fact that the tabernacle might, by synecdoche, have suggested the whole camp. (3) The presence of the house in the pleasant land in 89.40 might have suggested a reference to Josh 18:1, "Then the whole congregation of the people of Israel assembled at Shiloh, and set up the tent of meeting there." On the other hand it could also refer to the camp, which was also at Shiloh according to Josh 18:9, "then they came to Joshua in the camp at Shiloh." Thus although, on the basis of a comparison with Exodus and Joshua, one might have expected the house to represent the tabernacle, it is not at all impossible for it to represent the camp.

As always, the internal use of the sign within the allegory must decide its meaning. The allegory provides two major clues as to the correct interpretation of the house. The first is that it is not the owner of the sheep who inhabits the house but the sheep. The commentators have had great difficulty in explaining what the sheep are all doing in the sheep owner's house. There are significant indications in the *An. Apoc.* that the house, wherever it appears, represents not a building that is the focus of cultic activity, but a place for Israel to dwell.<sup>52</sup> If one compares the function of this house in 89.36, 40 with the functions of both the tower and the houses in what follows, one sees that the house of 89.36 is functionally equivalent to the house which represents Jerusalem and not to the tower with which it has no parallels. This is consistent with an interpretation of the house as a sign for the desert camp.

Most commentators have argued that the presence of the sheep in the house represents the tabernacle as the center of Israelite worship.<sup>53</sup> However in the *An. Apoc.* worship is represented, not by dwelling in the house or tower, but by the more salient sign of a full table spread out before the owner of the sheep. Dimant asserts that in the desert period both God and Israel dwell in the house.<sup>54</sup> The text does not

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Dimant ("Jerusalem and the Temple," 178) who states that, "The distinction between the house and the tower is established by their functions: the house is essentially a dwelling place for the sheep; in contrast the tower is reserved for the owner of the sheep" (בתפוקדיהם: הבית בין המגדל מקיימת גם) לעומתו שמור המגדל לארון הצאן (בתפוקדיהם: הבית הוא בעיקרו משכן לצאן).

<sup>53</sup> See, for example, Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (1912), 193.

<sup>54</sup> Dimant, "Jerusalem and the Temple," 187.

say this, but it may possibly be assumed from the fact that the owner was with the sheep before the construction of the house and was not said to have left. Nevertheless, it is not at all clear that this living together implies anything about tabernacle service.

The second clue is that the house later comes to represent the city of Jerusalem, which implies some symbolic continuity between the two houses. An altogether new sign, the tower, is introduced to represent the temple. In keeping with the symbolic discontinuity between the first house and the later tower, none of the language that identifies the tower as a cultic place is used of this house; there is no table, it is not lofty, and the owner of the sheep does not stand on or in it. Thus the house stands in symbolic and functional continuity with Jerusalem but not with the temple. It seems that the author of the *An. Apoc.* understands the house of 89.36 as the place where Israel dwells and not the focus of cultic activity. The tabernacle, if present at all, is only to be thought of as the center of the camp and therefore part of the house.

Dimant has explained the symbolic continuity between the two houses on the basis of the indirect relation between the tabernacle and the city of Jerusalem in Jewish Halakah.<sup>55</sup> She has shown that there is a close, legal relation between the tabernacle and the temple and between the desert camp and Jerusalem. Her argument is that the Pentateuch deals with laws for the purity of the tabernacle and the camp but gives no comparable set of laws for the temple and Jerusalem. Therefore laws about the camp were applied to Jerusalem and the laws about the tabernacle were applied to the temple. The *Temple Scroll* makes two specific moves in this regard. (1) Prohibitions concerning the Camp of Israel in the desert are applied to Jerusalem.<sup>56</sup> (2) The holiness of the temple is extended to all of Jerusalem. Dimant concludes,

If Jerusalem is likened to the Camp of Israel in the desert and it is completely like the temple, let us suppose that it is correct to say also

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., 184-85.

<sup>56</sup> Note also that 4QMMT specifically states that "Jerusalem is the holy camp" (כי ירושלים היא מחנה הקדש) (discussion by Yigael Yadin, *Biblical Archaeology* 1975, 429, in response to Qimron and Strugnell, "An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran," 400-407).

the opposite: the Camp of Israel in the desert was completely like the temple, or like the tabernacle.<sup>57</sup>

This clearly explains the grounds for the identification of Jerusalem with the desert camp that is implied in the identity of signs. It may also explain why no separate sign was required for the tabernacle within the camp. Just as the holiness of the temple was understood to extend to all of Jerusalem, so the holiness of the tabernacle was understood to extend to the whole camp so that the camp was understood as an extension of the tabernacle.

The *An. Apoc.* sees the overlap between temple and city and between tabernacle and camp from a different perspective than the *Temple Scroll*. In the *Temple Scroll* the extension has the effect of emphasizing the temple. In the *An. Apoc.* the camp is emphasized, to the practical exclusion of the tabernacle as the center of worship and sacrifice.<sup>58</sup> While the city and camp share in the holiness of the temple and tabernacle, both documents retain a clear distinction between the two. When 89.50 states that "that house became large and spacious and { . . . } a tall and large tower was built on that house for the owner of the sheep," it is clear that whatever the house was before, it has now become much bigger and that an entirely different thing, the tower, has been superimposed upon it. In other words, the author of the *An. Apoc.* has not only identified the first house with Jerusalem but he has also distinguished it from the temple. Thus there is continuity between the two houses but not between the house and the tower. Although the *Temple Scroll* extends the purity of the temple to the city of the sanctuary and describes a temple that is as big as the historical Jerusalem, it still maintains a strict distinction between the city and the temple. According to 11QTemple xlv 9-11, "You shall make a one-hundred-cubits-wide ditch around the sanctuary which shall divide the holy sanctuary from the city so that no one can rush in to my sanctuary and defile it."

The only solution that accounts for all of the details in the text is that what Moses built in 89.36 was not merely the tabernacle but also the whole camp.<sup>59</sup> The tabernacle, if present at all, is only to be

<sup>57</sup> Dimant, "Jerusalem and the Temple," 185. אם ירושלים נדמית למחנה (185). הרי יהיה נכון לומר גם את ההיפך: מחנה ישראל במדבר והיא כולה כמקדש. הרי יהיה נכון לומר גם את ההיפך: מחנה (ישראל) במדבר היה כולו כמקדש, או כמחנה.

<sup>58</sup> This is not the case, however, with the later city and temple.

<sup>59</sup> Nickelsburg (prepublication draft of his forthcoming Hermeneia commentary, notes on 89.36-38), for example, argues that the house represents first the

thought of as the center of the camp. There is never any clear statement in the *An. Apoc.* that the owner of the sheep ever dwells in any of the houses, until the eschatological house of 90.28-34. But even in the case of the new house, the primary inhabitants are sheep. The reason for choosing "house" (בֵּית) as a sign now becomes clear. It represents the place that God has provided for Israel to dwell.

In the *An. Apoc.* signs generally make some sense for the allegory within the constraints of the primary signs of cattle and sheep. The sheep already had sheepfolds to live in (89.34-35) before this house was built. After the construction of the house, there is no more mention of sheepfolds, presumably because the sheep no longer live in a fold but in a house. The significance of the house that Moses built for them seems to be that the desert camp was qualitatively different from whatever encampment they had lived in before. In other words the house that Moses built and in which he caused the sheep to stand is the place of Israelite life within the guidelines of Mosaic legislation. For this reason the sign "house" is used both for the camp and for Jerusalem. It may also be that the author has a greater interest in the practical matters of Levitical purity or other legislation than in forms of tabernacle service.

A more complete understanding of the lack of attention given to the tabernacle lies in the ideological relationship between the desert camp and the new Jerusalem.

#### 4 The New Jerusalem

And I saw until the owner of the sheep brought a house, new and larger and loftier than the former, and he erected (it) in the place of the former one which had been rolled up. And all of its pillars were new and its beams were new and the ornaments were new and larger than (those of) the former old one which he had taken out. And all the sheep were in the midst of it. (1 *Enoch* 90.29)

In the first stage of the eschaton, immediately following the judgment of the stars, shepherds, and blinded sheep, the old house will be removed, and the owner of the sheep will bring a new house and put it in the place of the old one. Presumably the former tower will also be removed with the old house. All of the surviving sheep and other animals will be gathered together in this new house and it

tabernacle, but that it also alludes "to the whole Israelite camp, which was placed around the tabernacle."



will be very full. This represents both a geographic restoration of Israel to Jerusalem and a new, ideal stage within the age of the sheep. The nations are still distinct but, they gather in Jerusalem and are subject to Israel.

This new house is different from the old one in several respects. It is larger and loftier; it is built by the owner of the sheep; all the sheep are in it; all of the other animals come to it in subjection to the sheep; and it has no tower.<sup>60</sup> Most of these innovations in architecture and occupancy are to be expected of the eschatological Jerusalem. Its size and the coming of the Gentiles are prophetic commonplaces.<sup>61</sup> For example, according to Isa 2:2, "It shall come to pass in the latter days that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established as the highest of the mountains, and shall be raised above the hills; and all the nations shall flow to it." Possibly this height is intended to mean that Jerusalem will become the mountain of God. According to Zech 8:3, "Thus says the Lord: I will return to Zion, and will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem, and Jerusalem shall be called the faithful city, and the mountain of the Lord of hosts, the holy mountain." However, as Dimant points out, although the idea that God himself would build the future temple is not unknown in contemporary Judaism, the idea that he would build the new city seems to have appeared first in the *An. Apoc.*<sup>62</sup>

What is even more interesting is that there is no temple in the New Jerusalem. Not all commentators have agreed that the new Jerusalem lacks a temple. According to Dillmann it is self-evident that if the house is renewed, then also is the tower.<sup>63</sup> However, pseudo-Enoch has given consistent and clear attention to the temple and it seems inconceivable that it is here merely assumed. According to Nickelsburg, "It [the house] is both greater and higher than the old

<sup>60</sup> As von Hofmann (*Der Schriftbeweis*, 1. 423) had already noted, the author speaks only of a new city and not of a new temple.

<sup>61</sup> See also 5Q15 (A Description of the New Jerusalem) on the expanded size of the New Jerusalem. The document is discussed by Jacob Licht in "An Ideal Town Plan from Qumran—The Description of the New Jerusalem," *IEJ* 29 (1979) 45–59.

<sup>62</sup> Dimant, "Jerusalem and the Temple," 190–91. For the idea the God himself would build the new temple see *Jub.* 1.27, 29; 11QTemple xxix 9–10; and 4QFlor i 1–4.

<sup>63</sup> Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 284. See also Black (*The Book of Enoch*, 278) who says, "No explicit mention is made here of the Temple (the 'tower' of 89.50) but it is no doubt included."

house (v 29) and is, thus, both city and temple (cf. 89:50, the house is broad and large and the tower is high)."<sup>64</sup>

Nickelsburg's comment is imprecise. Height seems to imply nearness to God, if not the presence of God. However, the house does *not* take on the function of the tower, except inasmuch as the owner is present in the new house as he had been in the old tower. The tower simply disappears and its cultic function is not replaced. The significant point is that the separation implied in the contrast between the low house and the lofty tower has been resolved. The owner of the sheep now dwells together with the sheep. Although the new house may function to a certain extent as the tower had, this is limited to the presence of the owner of the sheep among the sheep. There is no full table to represent the cultic service. The ideal temple of the *Temple Scroll* has increased in size to encompass the whole city of Jerusalem so that one could say that the city has almost become the temple. But this is not the impression that one receives from the *An. Apoc.*

### 5. Ideological Implications

There are two surprising features in the treatment of the tabernacle and temple in the *An. Apoc.*<sup>65</sup> First, during the period of the tabernacle in the desert, the author is interested in the camp to the practical exclusion of the tabernacle. Second, the New Jerusalem contains no temple and does not even contain the implements of the cult. Both of these features point to an idealization of the desert camp in the ideology of pseudo-Enoch.

The closest parallel to this is Rev 21:22, "And I saw no temple in the city [New Jerusalem] for its temple is the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb." According to Jer 3:16, in the context of a discussion of the future, ideal Jerusalem, there will be no ark of the covenant and no one will even remember it. This may be relevant as an indication of an eschatological restoration to Jerusalem but with a new or modified cultic and/or legal system. Neither of these parallels, however, is contemporary with the composition of the *An. Apoc.*, and they are of little help in understanding the thought of the *An. Apoc.*

<sup>64</sup> Nickelsburg, prepublication draft of his forthcoming Hermeneia commentary, notes on 90.28–36.

<sup>65</sup> The negative evaluation of the Second Temple can be paralleled in a number of texts, e.g., *T. Mos.* 4.8; 5.3–4; *T. Levi* 14.7–16.5; and *Jub.* 23.21.

Closer in time are the Qumran documents. 4QFlor (= 4Q174), though it speaks of a *מקדש אדם* ("human temple") does not help. Whether the phrase should be understood to mean a human temple, or "a man-made sanctuary,"<sup>66</sup> or "a Sanctuary amongst men,"<sup>67</sup> it does not exclude the existence of a future, material temple as the *An. Apoc.* seems to. Nor does 5Q15, a description of the New Jerusalem, help. Although the extant fragments are exclusively concerned with a description of the plan of the city, it explicitly mentions the temple.

This idealization of the desert camp is paralleled in the *Temple Scroll*, in which the construction of the gates of the outer courtyard (col. 44) is modeled after the arrangement of the camps of the tribes of Israel around the camp of Levi, which in turn surrounded the tabernacle (Num 1:52–2:34). The two documents, however, work out the idealization of the desert camp in quite different ways. The *Temple Scroll* works this out both in terms of an idealized temple and in terms of the city that shares in the purity of that temple. The *An. Apoc.*, on the other hand, represents the ideal of the desert camp exclusively in terms of an idealized city.

Because of its uniqueness, the ideology of the *An. Apoc.* must be sought first from the *An. Apoc.* itself. The reason for the lack of an eschatological temple seems to be that for the author of the *An. Apoc.*, the ideal situation to be restored is represented not by the Solomonic temple, but by the camp of Israel in the desert.<sup>68</sup> The function of the New Jerusalem is identical to that of the camp. Just as Moses caused all the sheep to stand in the first house, the desert camp, so now all the sheep are in the midst of the new house (90.29). As the presence of the sheep in Moses' house represented their living in accordance with Levitical purity legislation, so now the return of the sheep (with all the other animals) to the new house is related to the fact that they have all become good (90.33). In fact from 90.29 to 90.36 statements about the presence of the sheep in the house and statements about the goodness of the sheep are repeated, one after the other, three times.

<sup>66</sup> J. M. Allegro, "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological *Midrašim*," *JBL* 77 (1958) 352.

<sup>67</sup> Yigael Yadin, "A Midrash on 2 Sam. vii and Ps. i–ii (4Q Florilegium)," *IEJ* 9 (1959) 96.

<sup>68</sup> Dimant ("Jerusalem and the Temple," 187–91) has approximately the same analysis but emphasizes the continuity of both the desert camp and the New Jerusalem with the temple a little more than I do.

In terms of the allegory, the house represents the desert camp and Jerusalem, but it seems to have a further symbolic significance. In 89.36 it serves as home to all the sheep. When the sheep move from the desert to a "pleasant land" they bring the house with them. The real significance of the house is seen in the fact that the whole period of the divided kingdoms is seen in terms of the abandonment of the house (and the tower), first by the sheep, then by the owner of the sheep. In the aftermath of the destruction of the house, pseudo-Enoch says rather pessimistically (and enigmatically) that he could not see whether the sheep were still entering the house (89.67). The faulty reconstruction of the tower in 89.73 is accompanied by a failure to finish the rebuilding of the house in 89.72. Finally, the new house represents a reversal of everything that has preceded. Therefore the house (= Jerusalem) seems to symbolize the covenant relationship between God and Israel. Obedience is represented by the sheep dwelling in the house; disobedience is represented by the abandonment of the house or the absence of the house.<sup>69</sup>

If one follows the internal logic of the *An. Apoc.*, it may be that for pseudo-Enoch, the temple, while holy and proper, marks an inferior stage in the relationship of God with Israel. The *An. Apoc.* presents all of history as a gradual and progressive deterioration of the human race, especially in terms of evil and violence, but also in terms of Israel's relation to God. The owner of the sheep is not introduced into the story until the Exodus when he came to the sheep from his lofty abode and accompanied the sheep across a pool of water and into a wilderness where he pastured them (89.16–35). The owner temporarily drops out of the story until the construction of the tower on the newly expanded house. Then the owner stands on the tower. Doubtless, this represents the presence of God with Israel and the proper functioning of the cult, but this presence may be less immediate than that with Israel during the Exodus and desert wanderings. The next step in the relationship is when the owner abandons sheep, house, and tower, and hands the sheep over to Jewish shepherds. In keeping with the general character of the ideal future as a restoration of all good things, all of this is reversed in the new house, which is the abode of both sheep and owner. The only uncertain aspect of this decline and reversal is whether the owner

<sup>69</sup> So Dimant, "History According to the Vision of the Animals," 24; and idem, "Jerusalem and the Temple," 181–82.

dwells with the sheep in the first house in the desert. Thus, although the first temple is clearly a positive sign in the *An. Apoc.*, it may well not represent the ideal that was realized in the desert camp and will again be realized in the New Jerusalem.

Socially the idealization of the desert camp may have arisen from the problems caused by maintaining loyalty to the law of Moses in a time when no proper temple existed. From the point of view of the circles in which the *An. Apoc.* was written, this situation may have existed from the destruction of the First Temple, since it dates the impurity of the Second Temple to its beginnings. Alternately, if the attribution of impurity to the Second Temple is anachronistic, then the disaffection with the Second Temple could have begun any time during the postexilic period. It does not seem to be related to the specific problems of Hellenization.

This may also have implications for understanding the social setting of the *An. Apoc.* The idealization of the desert camp may have proved especially appealing to those who had been forced to flee to the Judean desert by the persecutions under Antiochus. 1 Macc 2:27–38 tells of two groups that fled to the wilderness: Mattathias and his sons, and those who were slaughtered on the Sabbath with their families because of their refusal to fight on the Sabbath. Those who later settled at Qumran seem to have had a similar ideology concerning the idealization of the desert camp, which inspired them to establish a desert camp where they could live in purity and holiness together with the holy angels while the rest of Israel was pursuing a course of apostasy. Although it may not be possible to identify any of these groups with each other or with the circles from which the *An. Apoc.* emanated, they are examples of the kind of groups that would have existed at the time that the *An. Apoc.* was composed.

Ideologically, the idealization of the desert camp may have arisen from a vision of an ideal future state in the presence of God. The community already possessed a fixed tradition of a past ideal in the desert camp which could be interpreted in such a way as to provide the paradigm for the ideal future as it was envisioned. Exegetically the utopian vision of the future and the tradition of a long past ideal age may have interacted to result in an understanding of the desert camp almost exclusively in terms of the immediate presence of God as a consequence of divine intervention and the defeat of Israel's enemies. Likewise the tradition of the Exodus and the desert camp

may have influenced the vision of the future as a life in Jerusalem in imitation of the life in the desert camp as a consequence of a final intervention of God and a final defeat of Israel's enemies.

#### D. The Seventy Shepherds

##### 1. The Identity of the Shepherds

In 1912 Charles called this "the most vexed question in Enoch."<sup>70</sup> Due in part to his own exposition, in which he followed Schürer,<sup>71</sup> who followed von Hofmann,<sup>72</sup> the place of the shepherds in the allegory and thought of the book has been satisfactorily identified. All subsequent exposition has been and must be based on this identification. I summarize Charles's argument here because of its importance. The seventy shepherds represent seventy angels whom God commissioned to shepherd Israel.

Though God rightly forsook Israel and committed it to the care of angels, though, further, Israel was rightly punished for its sins, yet the author . . . believed that they were punished with undue severity, indeed twofold more grievously than they deserved (Is. 40<sup>2</sup>). How was this to be accounted for? . . . It was owing to the faithlessness with which the angels discharged their trust.<sup>73</sup>

Charles lists seven arguments for this position, three of which are absolutely conclusive.<sup>74</sup> First, they are apparently human shepherds,

Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (1912), 200.

Schürer, *Lehrbuch*, 531–32; and idem, *A History of the Jewish People*, 3. 63–64.

von Hofmann (*Der Schriftbeweis*, 1. 422), who scarcely seems to notice that he has correctly identified the shepherds as the "angelic rulers of the peoples of the world" ("engelischen Machthaber der Völkerwelt"), so interested is he in identifying the lamb with the great horn (90.9) with Jesus and the editor of this book as a Christian.

Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (1912), 200. It should be noted that the excessive destruction wrought by these angels indicates that more is at stake here than simply the problem of God's inaccessibility. If it were merely a question of God's remoteness, one would have expected the angels to be more cooperative with Israel.

See also Martin (*Le livre d'Hénoch*, 217–18) for a similar list of six arguments. Martin stresses that "The seventy shepherds are charged with ruling Israel successively, each for one period, and not at the same time. This is the only interpretation, it seems to us, that permits the resolution of all the difficulties and the explication of vss 64; 90.1, 5; etc." ("les soixante-dix pasteurs sont chargés de gouverner Israël successivement, chacun pour une période, et non simultanément. C'est la seule interprétation, nous semble-t-il, qui permette de résoudre toutes les difficultés, et d'expliquer les versets 64; xc, 1, 5, etc.") (p. 217).

and the other humans in this document seem to represent angels (or God). Second, in the final judgment they are associated with the fallen angels or Watchers (90.24–25). Not only are they judged with the stars, but they are cast into the same abyss with them. There is a different fiery abyss for the sheep. Third, the heavenly scribe, introduced in 89.61, is called "another" so that he is identified with the shepherds.<sup>75</sup> In 90.14, 17, 22 this scribe is said to be one of the seven white men. If this angelic auditor can be identified both with the shepherds and with the seven white men, then the shepherds, like the white men and like the stars, must represent angels.

The *An. Apoc.* is not the only text of the period that expresses the idea that there is a group of wicked angels by whom Israel is ruled. 4Q390, quoted by Milik, expresses a similar notion. According to Milik,

The author of this text [4Q390], like the author of the Testament of Levi in Aramaic, is primarily interested in the destinies of the Aaronic priesthood. The repeated transgressions of the Sons of Aaron deliver them up automatically into the power of the wicked angels: ומשלו ומשלו בהם 2 i 7; ומשלו בהם ביד מלאכי המשתמדות 390 i 11; בהמה מלאכי המשתמדות 2 i 4.<sup>76</sup>

Although the shepherds are not identical with the stars,<sup>77</sup> they share certain common features both in their identity and in their role in human history. Both groups are disobedient angels and both wreak havoc on the earth.<sup>78</sup> This is one of the primary means in the

<sup>75</sup> It is not entirely clear who this "other" is, but that he is called "another" indicates that he is at least "of the same nature as the shepherds" (Martin, *Le livre d'Hénoch*, 217, "de la même nature que les pasteurs").

<sup>76</sup> Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 255. The Aramaic texts may be translated as follows: "and the angels of Mastemoth will rule over them"; "... in the power of the angels of Mastemoth and they shall rule over them"; and "the rule of Belial shall be over them." The significance of this text for the *An. Apoc.* was kindly pointed out to be by Devorah Dimant, whose commentary is to be published in the forthcoming *Proceedings of the Madrid Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

<sup>77</sup> That this is so is clear from 90.21–25 where the stars and shepherds are judged separately and from the fact that from the time of the flood to the final judgment Semihazah and his angels have been locked away in a deep abyss, contrary to Milik who supposes that "in the guise of the seventy shepherds" we meet Shemihazah and his companions again (*The Books of Enoch*, 252).

<sup>78</sup> If one could assume that the *An. Apoc.* shares *Jubilees'* understanding of the commission of the Watchers, then the parallel would be even closer. In *Jubilees*, the Watchers were originally commissioned by God to "teach the sons of man, and perform judgment and uprightness upon the earth" (*Jub.* 4.15). But it is not

narrative of the *An. Apoc.* by which we are meant to understand the troubles and dangers of this life from the perspective of the ancient, mythical past.<sup>79</sup> Just as the tremendous evil and violence that led up to the Deluge was at least in part caused by demonic forces, so the troubles that beset exilic (and postexilic) Israel are caused in part by demonic forces.

It has been frequently suggested that in the seventy shepherds, the author combined the notion that God had assigned an angel to each of the seventy nations with the division of the time of exile into seventy periods.<sup>80</sup> In this, Charles's hesitance is absolutely correct:

There may be some distant connexion between the seventy angels here and the seventy guardian angels of the Gentile nations."<sup>81</sup> Although the connection with the seventy-period length of the exile seems assured, the only thing that could confirm the connection with the angelic patrons of nations is the number seventy. But that number in the *An. Apoc.* is to be accounted for on the basis of a widespread tradition of periodization (including Jeremiah's prophecy of seventy years of exile [*Jer* 25:11–12]) and not on the basis of the number of heathen nations. Furthermore, none of the texts usually adduced to demonstrate the idea of seventy guardian angels of seventy nations mentions the number seventy.<sup>82</sup> The number comes rather from various methods of counting the nations listed in Genesis 10.

seen in 1 *Enoch* 86.1 whether it was the intent of the first star, Asael, to teach forbidden or licit topics.

<sup>79</sup> See above chapter 2, "History and Eschatology in the *Animal Apocalypse*," pp. 18–19.

<sup>80</sup> See, for example, Black, *The Book of Enoch*, 270–71; VanderKam, *Enoch*, 165–66; and Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Antiquity during the Early Hellenistic Period* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974) 1. 160.

<sup>81</sup> According to the version of Deut 32:8 found in the LXX, 4QDt<sup>9</sup> (Patrick W. Lehman, "A Fragment of the 'Song of Moses' [Deut. 32] from Qumran," *BASOR* 146 [1954] 12–15) and other early versions (Symmachus and Vetus Latina), God divided the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the sons/angels of God. Here these peoples are clearly distinguished from Israel who has no guardian except God. Thus there are apparently as many peoples as angels to watch them. See also Sir 17:17; *Jub.* 15.31; Dan 10:13, 20. See also Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* 1. 187, 2. 126 n. 527.

<sup>82</sup> Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (1912), 200.

<sup>83</sup> The only such reference that I know of is the Hebrew *T. Naph.* 8.3–6, a relatively late text.

Nevertheless, the part played by these shepherd angels in the life and history of Israel corresponds in some ways to the role of the angelic patrons of nations. According to *Jub.* 15:31-32,

And he sanctified them [Israel] and gathered them from all of the sons of man because (there are) many nations and many people, and they all belong to him, but over all of them he caused spirits to rule so that they might lead them astray from following him. But over Israel he did not cause any angel or spirit to rule because he alone is their ruler and he will protect them and he will seek for them at the hand of his angels and at the hand of his spirits and at the hand of all of his authorities so that he might guard them and bless them and they might be his and he might be theirs henceforth and forever.

The "shepherds" of the *An. Apoc.* are like the angelic patrons of nations in *Jubilees* only in that both groups are malevolent, sent to cause some kind of harm to their subjects.<sup>83</sup>

It seems, then, that the shepherds of the *An. Apoc.* are not the seventy patrons of the seventy nations, but seventy angelic patrons of Israel, each appointed for a particular period of time, both to care for and to punish Israel. Thus the *An. Apoc.* introduces a new idea into the already traditional notion of the angelic patrons of the nations. It disagrees both with the Book of Daniel, for which Israel's patron is Michael, and the other texts for which Israel has no angelic patron but only God as their ruler and protector. According to the *An. Apoc.*, Israel was God's portion and God was Israel's ruler until the time of Jehoiakim. Then God turned Israel over to a series of seventy malevolent angels who were to shepherd and punish Israel on God's behalf.

## 2. The Number Seventy

There are three levels of periodization in the *An. Apoc.*: (1) The three ages beginning respectively with Adam, Noah, and the eschatological white bull; (2) the division of the second age into (a) the time of the sheep under their owner, (b) the time of the sheep under the shepherds, and (c) the eschatological time of the sheep again

<sup>83</sup> See Nickelsburg (prepublication draft of his forthcoming Hermeneia commentary, notes on 89:61-64), who also notes that "Their [the shepherds'] negligent or malevolent character, however, is more in keeping with the demonic identity of the angels who oversee the nations according to *Jub.* 15:31, while the angelic scribe here has characteristics more in keeping with Michael, the patron of Israel."

under their owner; and (3) the division of the time of the sheep under the shepherds (the exile) into four periods, consisting respectively of twelve, twenty-three, twenty-three, and twelve parts.

1. The primordial age of the bulls (Adam to flood)
2. The present age of the sheep (Noah to the eschaton)
  - a. The sheep under their owner
  - b. The sheep under the shepherds
    - i. The Babylonian period (12 shepherds)
    - ii. The Persian period (23 shepherds)
    - iii. The Ptolemaic period (23 shepherds)
    - iv. The Seleucid period (12 shepherds)
  - c. The eschatological period of the restored sheep
3. The ideal future age of the white bulls (restoration to Adamic stature)

It is normally assumed that the division of the exile into seventy periods reflects an interpretation of Jeremiah's prophecy of seventy years of exile which is paralleled by Daniel's seventy weeks of years (*Dan.* 9:24-27).<sup>84</sup> Milik, however, finds indications of another source for this scheme of seventy periods. According to Milik, there is a discernable development of a literary tradition of the division of (sacred) history into seventy ages.<sup>85</sup> The beginning of this development was a "Book of Periods" written "probably in the Persian period" which

presented the sacred history divided into seventy ages corresponding approximately to seventy generations, from Adam to Noah ten generation-weeks, from Noah to Abraham ten weeks, etc., up to the advent of the eschatological era.<sup>86</sup>

To prove the existence of such a book, Milik points to two citations of it. The first is *1 Enoch* 10:12, where Michael is told to "bind them [the Watchers] fast for seventy generations in the valleys of the earth until the great day of their judgement." This is certainly not a clear citation

<sup>84</sup> See Michael A. Knibb ("The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period," *HeyJ* 17 [1976] 253-72) for the propriety of naming the whole period following the Exile up to the expected eschaton.

<sup>85</sup> Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 248-59.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, 252. Milik further suggests that this Book of the Periods is "Probably preserved partly in Aramaic on papyrus fragments of a 4Q manuscript (to be published in an article by me)" (p. 252 n. 1).

of another text but may indicate the knowledge of a tradition of seventy generations from Noah to the judgment day. The second is the *Pesher on the Periods* (4Q180) and the closely related 4Q181 which, according to Milik, is another copy of the same work.<sup>87</sup> The text of 4Q180 begins, פֶּשֶׁר עַל הַקְצִים אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה אֵל (Pesher concerning the periods that God made). Milik translates, "Commentary on (the book of) periods created by God," and comments,

This text is a commentary on a very early work which enjoyed an authority among the Essenes equal to that of the prophetic books, the Psalter, etc., for which *pesharim* were composed to make them better understood by readers and listeners. I have not much doubt that it is precisely to this 'Book of Periods' that the passage in En. 10:12 refers.<sup>88</sup>

As in the case of 1 Enoch 10.12, the claimed citation is by no means obvious. Dimant points out that the formula used in 4Q180 is not identical to the other ones used at Qumran and does not introduce any known type of Pesher. She concludes,

Thus, we cannot simply classify the work as a Pesher according to the known categories, even if a Pesher-formula occurs. We may have here a different type of Pesher which expounds subject-matters other than biblical texts.<sup>89</sup>

Nor is it clear that 4Q180 has anything to do with a division of history into seventy periods. Milik's claim that it does is based on the text of 4Q181, which mentions seventy weeks in connection with the birth of giants, and his assertion that the two MSS are copies of the same work. As Dimant shows, the relatively small amount of identical text and the large number of supposed scribal variants really makes the identity of 4Q180 and 4Q181 questionable, though still possible.<sup>90</sup>

The value of 4Q180 and 4Q181 for the present study is not that they demonstrate an ancient and "canonical" text which divides all of

<sup>87</sup> John M. Allegro, with the collaboration of Arnold A. Anderson, *Qumrân Cave 4, I* (4Q158 4Q186) (DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968) 77–80; John Strugnell, "Notes en marge du volume V des «Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan»," *RQ* 7 (1970) 252–55; J. T. Milik, "Milki-šedeq et Milki-reša' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens," *JSS* 23 (1972) 109–26; and Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 248–53.

<sup>88</sup> Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 251–52.

<sup>89</sup> Devorah Dimant, "The 'Pesher on the Periods' (4Q180) and 4Q181," *Israel Oriental Studies* 9 (1979) 92.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, 89–90.

history into seventy ages and which may then be assumed to provide for the *An. Apoc.* the basis of the division of the exile into seventy periods ruled by seventy angels. Rather they demonstrate the possibility of speaking of "seventy weeks" without reference to the prophecy of Jeremiah. Other examples of such periodization involving either the number seventy or jubilees are: (1) *Testament of Levi* 16–17; (2) Dan 9:24–27; (3) the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (1 Enoch 93.1–10; 91.11–17; seven weeks of history plus three weeks of the eschaton); (4) 4Q385–390, a document attributed to Ezekiel which contains a series of weeks and jubilees (originally thought to be a single document, but now identified by Dimant as consisting of a pseudo-Ezekiel and a pseudo-Moses text); (5) 4QpDan<sup>a</sup>; and (6) 11QM<sup>elch</sup>.<sup>91</sup> Jubilees also presupposes the division of history into weeks of years and jubilees, but there does not seem to be any systematic periodization. Of these texts only 1 Enoch 10.12 and possibly the *Testament of Levi* can be dated substantially earlier than the *An. Apoc.* It is evident nevertheless that there was in the second century BCE a substantial body of literature that spoke of periods of history in terms of weeks of years and/or jubilees.

Accordingly, the traditions that the author of the *An. Apoc.* drew upon in devising the scheme of the seventy angelic shepherds are more complex than has been previously supposed.<sup>92</sup> At least seven traditions are presupposed, each with various kinds of influence. (1) The prophecy of Jeremiah (25:11) determines the temporal scope of the period of the seventy shepherds. It begins with the exile and ends with the restoration, which for the author of the *An. Apoc.* had not yet authentically occurred.<sup>93</sup> (2) Traditions connecting the fallen

<sup>91</sup> For 4Q385–390, see John Strugnell and Devorah Dimant, "4Q Second Ezekiel," *RevQ* 13 (1988) 45–58; and idem, "The Merkabah Vision in Second Ezekiel (4Q385–4Q390)," *RevQ* 14 (1989) 331–48; and Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 254–55. On 4QpDan (which contains the phrase "seventy years"), see J. T. Milik, "Prière de Nabonde," *RB* 63 (1956) 411–15. On 11QM<sup>elch</sup>, see A. S. Van der Woude, "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen apokalyptischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI," *OTS* 14 (1965) 354–73; and Dimant, "Milki-šedeq et Milki-reša'," 96–144.

<sup>92</sup> See the note on 90.1 for a demonstration of the fact that the seventy angels correspond to seventy periods.

<sup>93</sup> According to Devorah Dimant ("Jerusalem and the Temple," 180) the calculation of the seventy years that is reflected in 2 Chr 36:21–22 and Ezra 1:1 is that they started in the fourth year of Jehoiaquim, the year of the pronouncement of the prophecy (Jer 25:1), and ended in the first year of Cyrus. The *An. Apoc.* seems to begin the period at about the same time.

Watchers with seventy generations or weeks of evil after which there will be a judgment and restoration have provided the bridge between a prophecy of seventy years and a system of periodization of a much longer period.<sup>94</sup> (3) Traditions of angelic patrons of nations have provided the conceptual material from which Israel's subjection to evil (or at best incompetent) angels was derived. The fact of gentile rule over Israel may have partially motivated the notion that as on earth Israel is being ruled by foreign kings, so in heaven Israel is being ruled by angels who in the past have not been associated with God's rule of Israel. (4) Traditions concerning the excessiveness of the divine punishments of Israel (Isa 40:2; Psalm 79) provided the problem that is to be solved by the notion of the seventy shepherds. By attributing the excessive punishments to delinquent angels, the *An. Apoc.* protects God's reputation while acknowledging the demonic character of Israel's present experience.<sup>95</sup> (5) The myth of the fallen Watchers has provided the model according to which the excessive evils and violence of the present can be attributed to the activity of malevolent angels, though not the same group of angels involved in the fall of the Watchers. (6) The *An. Apoc.* is in accordance with the notion that those who destroyed Jerusalem were acting as God's servants and will in turn be punished for their actions (Jer 27:6-7; 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 5.3; Hab 2:6-8). The *An. Apoc.* modifies this notion in that it is primarily the angelic agents of God who will be judged for their behavior towards Israel (1 *Enoch* 90.15-19). (7) The traditional Mesopotamian metaphor of the shepherd has provided the fundamental allegorical scheme of the whole *An. Apoc.*

The question of the antecedents for the symbolism of the *An. Apoc.* has usually focused on various biblical texts that may have

<sup>94</sup> Dan 9:2, 24-27 seems to have followed the same strategy. It is possible, if not likely, that both Daniel and the *An. Apoc.* were preceded by some prior combination of Jeremiah's prophecy with schemes of seventy periods, since it is otherwise unlikely that the two documents have any literary relationship. According to Klaus Koch ("Sabbatstruktur der Geschichte," ZAW 95 [1983] 420) the *Apocalypse of Weeks* also has a scheme of four hundred and ninety years for the time of the Exile, but in dependence, not on Jeremiah, but on "chronological speculations about the world-epochs and Israel's place in them" ("chronologische Spekulationen um die Weltepochen und den Ort Israels in ihnen").

<sup>95</sup> For a similar scenario in which the excessive disasters that befell Jerusalem during the seventy years' Exile are attributed to agencies other than God, see Zech 1:12-15.

provided the basic symbolism of sheep and shepherds.<sup>96</sup> Recently, however, in a study of Daniel 7 and 8, Paul Porter has applied the "interaction theory of metaphor" of Max Black to the *An. Apoc.* He has demonstrated that the root metaphor of the *An. Apoc.* (which serves for him as the model for the interpretation of Daniel 7 and 8) is the metaphor of the shepherd. This metaphor is applied in various ways to the relationships between God and Israel, angels and humans, military leaders and their armies, kings or judges and their subjects, and predators (as antishepherds) and oppressed.<sup>97</sup> For the question of sources, it is of interest that the basic metaphor and all of its applications can be found in other Mesopotamian texts.<sup>98</sup> It seems, therefore, that the allegorical scheme of the *An. Apoc.* was not derived primarily from any single model, but was a development of a popular metaphor with parallels in dozens of biblical text.

The parallels adduced thus far would lead one to expect that the period of the seventy shepherds should last exactly four hundred and ninety years. With allowances for imprecise chronology, this would yield the following dates: the Babylonian period would run ca. 588-515 BCE (eighty-three years); the Persian period would run ca. 515-332 (one hundred eighty-four years); the Ptolemaic period would run ca. 332-200 (one hundred thirty-two years); and the Seleucid period would last run ca. 200-160? (forty years?). Although one can imagine that the discrepancies for the second and third periods are due to bad chronology, the fourth period is far too short. Nickelsburg attempts to solve the problem by suggesting that the activity of the shepherds begins during the reign of Manasseh (687-642 BCE) and that the significant events associated with each period occur at the middle of their respective periods rather than at the beginning.<sup>99</sup> Thus the

\* See Nickelsburg (prepublication draft of his forthcoming Hermeneia commentary, "Excursus: The Biblical Sources of the Idea of the Negligent Shepherds") for an argument that the symbolism of the seventy shepherds is dependent especially on Ezekiel 34 and Zechariah 11. For an attempt to derive most of the imagery of the seventy shepherds from Jeremiah 25, see Newsom, "Enoch 83-90," 24-27; and VanderKam, *Enoch*, 165-67. Because of the widespread use of the imagery it is difficult to decide on any of the suggested passages as the primary source or inspiration. See also Jer 12:10; 23:1-4; Zech 1:12 and several of the Psalms that speak of God as Shepherd of Israel.

<sup>96</sup> Paul A. Porter, *Metaphors and Monsters*, 41.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, 69-120.

<sup>98</sup> Nickelsburg, prepublication draft of his forthcoming Hermeneia commentary, "Excursus on 'The Chronology of the Vision: Seventy Shepherds Ruling for Seventy Weeks of Years.'"

fourth period begins around the middle of the third century BCE and the lambs begin to open their eyes during the Ptolemaic period. This leaves sufficient time for eighty-four years to elapse before the end of history. Dan Olson has speculated that the last twelve periods lasted only three and one half years each (cf. Dan 12:7) lasting a total of forty-two years.<sup>100</sup> Two possible motivations come to mind: (1) it could account for the increased viciousness of the last twelve shepherds (90.17—their killing was compressed into half the time); or (2) God may have mercifully shortened the respective reigns of the last twelve shepherds in order to guarantee the survival of at least some of the sheep (cf. Matt 24:22; Mark 13:20). Both of these suggestions are highly speculative and neither can be demonstrated. Either the length of the tenure of each of the seventy angels is indefinite or the author's chronology is unknown.

## 4. THE DATE OF COMPOSITION

### A. General Considerations

The *terminus ad quem* for the composition of the *An. Apoc.* is the earliest surviving fragment, 4QEn<sup>f</sup> which Milik has dated to "the early Hasmonean period, 150–125 B.C."<sup>1</sup> However, Frank Moore Cross, Jr. has privately indicated that the fragment cannot be dated earlier than 100 BCE, and Beyer has dated it to the end of the second century BCE.<sup>2</sup> Although the fragment is very small, its identification is certain as is shown by the clear presence of the words "their folds" and "stars" in the same context, and the possibility of fitting all the rest of the letters and traces into the context of 86.1–3. Since this fragment is presumably not a part of the autograph, the date of composition must have preceded 100 BCE at the latest.<sup>3</sup>

The *terminus post quem* is more difficult to establish. The *An. Apoc.* makes use of the story of the fall and judgment of the Watchers as found in 1 Enoch 6–11, though in a slightly different form.<sup>4</sup> Since the *Book of the Watchers*, or at least the section containing chapters 6–11, was probably written in the third century,<sup>5</sup> the *An. Apoc.* must have been written no earlier than the third century.

<sup>1</sup> Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 244.

<sup>2</sup> Klaus Beyer, *Die aramäische Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984) 228.

<sup>3</sup> Although paleography does not provide a precise date, one must also allow for at least a few years between the composition of the work and the copying of it in 4QEn<sup>f</sup>. Thus, 100 BCE may serve as a convenient *terminus ad quem*.

<sup>4</sup> See below chapter 5, "The Place of the *Animal Apocalypse* in the Enochic Corpus," pp. 83–96, for a discussion of the use of the *Book of the Watchers* in the *An. Apoc.*

<sup>5</sup> For the dating of the *Book of the Watchers*, see VanderKam, *Enoch*, 111–14. According to Milik (*The Books of Enoch*, 140–41), paleographically one of the MSS of the *Book of the Watchers* can be dated to the first half of the second century BCE and there are indications that it may have been copied from a third century MS. The composition of chapters 6–11, the part used by the author of the *An. Apoc.*,