

# Dictionary Early Judaism

*Edited by*

John J. Collins *and* Daniel C. Harlow

WILLIAM B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING COMPANY  
GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN / CAMBRIDGE, U.K.

1 *Enoch* 46:3; 49), the Servant Songs (Isa. 49:1-7; 52:13-53:12; cf. 1 *Enoch* 48; 62-63), the passage in Proverbs concerning the preexistent figure of wisdom (Prov. 8:23-26; cf. 1 *Enoch* 48:2-3), and a whole range of other prophetic passages referring to future judgment and salvation. The Chosen One/Son of Man is presented as a preexistent, exalted heavenly being and as such may be compared with the messianic figures who appear in other documents of the period, notably the messiah in 2 Esdras [*Ezra*] 11-13, Melchizedek in 11QMelchizedek (11Q13), and the son of God figure in 4QAramaic Apocalypse (4Q246).

It comes as something of a surprise that, whereas throughout 1 *Enoch* 38-69 Enoch is clearly distinguished from the Son of Man — whom he sees and describes — in 1 *Enoch* 70-71 Enoch is himself identified as the Son of Man (see 71:14). However, it is likely that chaps. 70-71 were added at a secondary stage to the *Book of Parables* and represent a reinterpretation of the Son of Man tradition.

### Cosmic Phenomena

The account of what Enoch sees in the course of his heavenly journey includes descriptions both of the divine throne room and of cosmic phenomena (e.g., 41:3-8; 43:1-4; 59:1-3), and the presence of the latter seems at first sight somewhat strange. Similar descriptions do form part of the account of Enoch's journey around the cosmos in the *Book of the Watchers* (see 17:1-18:5; 33-36), and the function of material of this kind may in part be to present Enoch as one who had knowledge of everything, as one who really had visited the heavenly regions.

### Date and Provenance

It is difficult to date the *Parables* precisely because the few historical allusions that have been proposed (e.g., the supposed allusion in 56:5-8 to the Parthian intervention in Jerusalem in 40 B.C.E.) provide very uncertain evidence. But it is likely that "the kings and the mighty" represent the Roman authorities, and a good case has been made for the view that the *Parables* date from around the turn of the era. As an alternative view, it has been suggested, by the present writer, that the *Parables* date from around the end of the first century C.E. and were intended as a response to the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. It is in any case likely that the *Parables* come from Jerusalem or the surrounding area.

### Language and Transmission

The *Parables* have survived only in Classical Ethiopic (Ge'ez). It is very likely that they were composed in Aramaic (or, conceivably, in Hebrew) and subsequently translated into Greek, exactly as in the case of the other sections of 1 *Enoch*, but no trace of either the Aramaic original or the Greek translation of the *Parables* has been found. It is, however, clear that the Ethiopic translation of the *Parables*, like that of 1 *Enoch* as a whole, was made from a Greek text. We have no knowledge of the circumstances in which the *Parables* were translated into Greek, but it is a reasonable assumption that

it was at the Greek stage that the *Parables* were incorporated as the second item in the corpus of Enochic writings to form the fivefold *Book of Enoch* now known from the Ethiopic version, and that this whole process was completed by the early decades of the second century at the latest. In contrast, there are good grounds for thinking that the Greek text of 1 *Enoch* was translated into Ge'ez in the fifth or sixth century as part of the translation of the Scriptures into Ethiopic. It should, however, be pointed out that the oldest surviving manuscripts of the Ethiopic version of 1 *Enoch* date from no earlier than the fifteenth century.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- G. BOCCACCINI, ED. 2007, *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. • J. J. COLLINS 1998, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 2d ed., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 177-93. • M. A. KNIBB 1978, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press. • M. A. KNIBB 1985, "The Parables of Enoch," in *Outside the Old Testament*, ed. M. de Jonge, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 43-55. • M. A. KNIBB 1995, "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls," *DSD* 2: 165-84. • M. A. KNIBB 2007A, "The Structure and Composition of the Book of Parables," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, ed. G. Boccaccini, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 48-64. • M. A. KNIBB 2007B, "The Book of Enoch or Books of Enoch? The Textual Evidence for 1 Enoch," in *The Early Enoch Literature*, ed. G. Boccaccini and J. J. Collins, Leiden: Brill, 21-40. • G. W. E. NICKELSBURG 2005, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*, 2d ed., Minneapolis: Fortress, 248-56. • G. W. E. NICKELSBURG 2006, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity*, rev. ed., Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 94-111, 284-88. • J. C. VANDERKAM 1992, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37-71," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis: Fortress, 169-91.

MICHAEL A. KNIBB

## Enoch, Slavonic Apocalypse of (2 Enoch)

2 *Enoch* is an early Jewish pseudepigraphon preserved principally in the Slavonic language but also in a few recently discovered Coptic fragments. The central theme of the text is the ascent of the seventh antediluvian patriarch Enoch through the heavens, his luminous metamorphosis near the throne of glory, and his initiation into the heavenly mysteries.

### Contents

The book, which combines the features of an apocalypse and a testament, can be divided into three parts. The first part (chaps. 1-38) describes Enoch's heavenly journey, which culminates in his encounter with the Deity, who reveals to the seer the secrets of creation. After the encounter Enoch returns to earth to instruct his children in the celestial knowledge he received from

God and the angels. The second part (chaps. 39–67) begins with Enoch's testamentary admonitions to his sons during his short visit to earth and ends with the second ascension of the patriarch. The third part of the book (chaps. 68–73) describes the priestly functions of Enoch's family, the miraculous birth of Melchizedek, and the flood.

### Slavonic Manuscripts and Recensions

*2 Enoch* has survived in more than twenty Slavonic manuscripts and fragments dated from the fourteenth to eighteenth centuries C.E. These Slavonic materials did not circulate independently but were included in collections that often rearranged, abbreviated, or expanded them. Typically, Jewish pseudepigraphical texts were transmitted in Slavic milieu as part of larger historiographical, ethical, and liturgical codices and compendia, in which ideologically marginal and mainstream materials were mixed with each other. Only a small number of the manuscripts, namely, A (0:1–72:10), U (0:1–72:10), B (0:1–72:10), and R (0:1–73:9), give a full account of the story leading up to the flood. Manuscript J (0:1–71:4) goes to chap. 71. Manuscripts P (0:1–68:7), N (0:1–67:3), V (1:1–67:3), and B<sup>2</sup> (1:1–67:3) contain only the first two parts of the book and end with Enoch's second ascension. Manuscript L (0:1–33:8) goes to chap. 33. The rest of the manuscripts give only fragments of the different parts of the book: P<sup>2</sup> (28:1–32:2), Tr (67:1; 70–72), Syn (71; 72), Rum (71:1–73:1), G (65:1–4; 65:6–8), Chr (fragments from chaps. 11–58), Chr<sup>2</sup> (11:1–15:3), K (71:1–72:10), and I (70:22–72:9). A large group of the manuscripts (MPr, TSS 253, TSS 489, TSS 682) are copies of the compilation of rearranged materials from chaps. 40–65 of *2 Enoch* from a judicial codex known as *The Just Balance* (*Merilo Pravednoe*).

Scholarly consensus holds that *2 Enoch* exists in longer and shorter recensions, although some scholars have proposed the existence of three or even four recensions (Andersen 1983). The longer and shorter recensions of *2 Enoch* differ not only in length but also in the character of the text, and both of them preserve original material. Manuscripts R, J, and P represent the longer recension. Manuscripts U, A, B, V, N, B<sup>2</sup>, and L represent the manuscripts of the shorter recension. Manuscripts P<sup>2</sup>, Tr, Syn, Rum, MPr, TSS 253, TSS 489, TSS 682, G, Chr, Chr<sup>2</sup>, I, and K represent fragments of the longer or shorter recensions. Although several stemmas of the relationships between the manuscripts have been proposed, they must be regarded as provisional until critical editions of the major manuscripts become available (Andersen 1983).

### Recently Discovered Coptic Fragments

During his work preparing Coptic manuscripts for publication, Joost Hagen, a doctoral student at Leiden University, recently came across transcriptions and photographs of some Coptic fragments of *2 Enoch*. The forgotten fragments derive from a find made in 1972 during excavations by the British Egypt Exploration Society at Qasr Ibrim, one of the capital cities of Nubia during its Christian phase, which extended from the

fifth to fifteenth centuries. Since at this writing (April 2009) Hagen is the only scholar to have examined the materials, any statements about them must be very tentative for now.

According to Hagen, there are four fragments, which are evidently remnants of four consecutive leaves of a parchment codex. The fourth fragment is rather small and not yet placed with certainty; no photograph of it is yet available, only the transcription of its text made by one of the excavators. For the other three fragments, both this transcription and two sets of photographs are available. The present location of the fragments themselves is unknown, but they may be in one of the museums or storage facilities of the Egyptian Antiquities Organization.

Hagen reports that the Coptic fragments contain chaps. 36–42 of *2 Enoch*. He takes them to represent a text of the short recension, since they lack chap. 38 and some other parts of the long recension, and since the material in chap. 39 precedes that in chap. 37. The text also contains the material at the end of chap. 36 that is present only in the oldest Slavonic manuscript of the work, U (15th century), and in the closely related manuscript A (16th century).

In Hagen's opinion the Coptic manuscript of *2 Enoch* likely belonged to a church library before the year 1172, or even before 956, two important dates in the history of Qasr Ibrim. Hagen's initial paleographic study has led him to suggest a tentative date for the fragments in the eighth, ninth, or perhaps tenth century. A date in this range would mean that the Coptic fragments are a century or more older than the translation of *2 Enoch* into Slavonic (11th to 12th century), and several hundred years older than the earliest Slavonic witness (14th century).

### Original Language

Most scholars believe that the Slavonic version was translated from Greek, since the text has material that makes sense only in the Greek language. For example, in chap. 30 there is a tradition that derives Adam's name from the Greek designations of the four corners of the earth. Semitisms in the text, such as *Ophanim* and *Raqia Arabot*, point to the possibility of a Semitic *Vorlage* behind the Greek version. Nevertheless, some scholars warn that the Semitisms might be "due to the cultivation of a biblical style in the Greek original" (Andersen 1983). The possibility of direct translation from Hebrew into Slavonic has also been suggested (Mescherskij 1965). Yet this suggestion has met strong criticism from experts who "find it thoroughly unlikely that translations from Hebrew into any sort of written Slavic were made in any region of Slavdom before the middle of the fifteenth century" (Lunt and Taube 1988). The possibility that *2 Enoch* was composed in Greek and that it originated in Egypt may be strengthened by the reported discovery of Coptic fragments of the work, since most early Coptic texts were translated from a Greek original.

### Date

The date of *2 Enoch* can be deduced solely from internal evidence. Most arguments for an early dating have been based on the work's portrait of the Jerusalem Temple and its ongoing practices and customs. In this respect, scholars have attempted to find hints that might indicate that the Temple was still standing when the original text was composed. These discussions are not new, since already in his first systematic exploration of the text published in 1896, R. H. Charles used references to Temple practices to argue for an early date for the apocalypse, which he placed in the first century before the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 C.E. (Charles and Morfill 1896). Charles and scholars after him also noted that *2 Enoch* gives no indication that the destruction of the Temple had already occurred by the time of the book's composition; nowhere does the text express feelings of sadness or mourning about the loss of the Holy Place.

Affirmations of the value of animal sacrifice and Enoch's halakic instructions found in chap. 59 appear to be fashioned not in a preservationist, mishnaic mode but rather as if they reflected sacrificial practices that still existed when the author was writing. There is also an intensive and consistent effort on the part of the author to legitimize the central place of worship, which in reference to the place Ahuzan — a cryptic name for the Temple Mount in Jerusalem — is explicitly connected with the Jerusalem Temple. Scholars have also noted indications of the ongoing practice of pilgrimage to the central place of worship. These indications could be expected in a text written in the Diaspora. Thus in his instructions to his children, Enoch repeatedly encourages them to bring gifts before the face of God for the remission of sins, a practice which appears to recall well-known sacrificial customs widespread in the Second Temple period (Böttrich 1992). Further, the Slavonic apocalypse contains a direct command to visit the Temple three times a day, an injunction that would be difficult to fulfill if the sanctuary had been already destroyed.

### Jewish or Christian Authorship

Although several hypotheses about Christian authorship of the book have been put forward, none of them has withstood scholarly scrutiny. Besides the early hypothesis of a Bogomil provenance (Maunder 1918), the most consistent effort to establish the Christian provenance of the work was offered by the French Slavist André Vaillant (Vaillant 1952). His position was later supported by J. T. Milik, who argued that the apocalypse was written by a Byzantine monk in the ninth century C.E. (Milik 1976). Both Vaillant's and Milik's positions have been widely rejected. The vast majority of scholars maintain a Jewish provenance for the original work.

### Geographical Provenance

Since the pioneering work of R. H. Charles, an Alexandrian provenance for *2 Enoch* has dominated scholarly discussion. Charles proposed that the apocalypse was written by a Hellenized Jew in Alexandria. The text ap-

pears to attest to some themes that were distinctive of the Alexandrian environment. One such cluster of motifs deals with traditions concerning Adam. Thus in *2 Enoch* 30:13 the Lord tells Enoch that he created Adam out of the seven "components" and assigned to Adam a name from four of the components: from East — (A), from West — (D), from North — (A), and from South — (M). Earlier testimony to this anagram of Adam's name can be found in the third book of the *Sibylline Oracles*, a composition probably written in Egypt around 160-50 B.C.E. Another reference comes in the writings of the Hermetic author Zosimos of Panopolis, who lived in Alexandria in the late third or early fourth century C.E. (Böttrich 1995). Other Adamic motifs found in *2 Enoch*, such as the tradition about Adam's role as governor of the earth, also seem to point to Alexandria since they exhibit similarities with traditions found in Philo (*De Opificio Mundi* 88; 148).

The description of phoenixes and chalydras, mythical creatures that Enoch encounters during his celestial tour, might also point to Egypt. Charles noted this imagery, and Van den Broek's study of phoenix traditions confirms Charles's hypothesis that *2 Enoch* reflects the Egyptian syncretism of Roman times (Van den Broek 1972).

### Theology

The theological universe of *2 Enoch* is deeply rooted in the Enochic tradition of Jewish apocalypticism in the Second Temple period. Yet the text attempts to reshape these traditions by adding a new mystical dimension. The figure of Enoch portrayed in the various sections of *2 Enoch* appears to be more elaborate than that in the early Second Temple tractates of *1 Enoch*. For the first time, *2 Enoch* seeks to depict Enoch not simply as a human taken to heaven and transformed into an angel, but as a celestial being exalted above the angelic world (Orlov 2005). In this attempt, one may find the origins of another, very different image of Enoch that was developed much later in rabbinic Merkavah and Hekhalot mysticism: the image of the supreme angel Metatron, "the Prince of the Presence." The titles of the patriarch found in the Slavonic apocalypse are different from those attested in the early Enoch literature. They bear a close resemblance to the titles given Metatron in some Hekhalot sources (Odeberg 1928). These developments demonstrate that *2 Enoch* represents a bridge between the early Enoch traditions and the later mystical rabbinic and Hekhalot ones.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- F. ANDERSEN 1983, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," in *OTP* 91-221. • C. BÖTTRICH 1992, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik. Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch*, Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck. • C. BÖTTRICH 1995, *Adam als Mikrokosmos: Eine Untersuchung zum Slavischen Henochbuch*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. • R. H. CHARLES AND W. R. MORFILL 1896, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, Oxford: Clarendon Press. • H. G. LUNT AND M. TAUBE 1988, "Early East Slavic Translations from Hebrew," *Russian Linguistics* 12: 147-87. • A. S. D. MAUNDER 1918, "The Date and Place of Writing of

the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*," *The Observatory* 41: 309-16. • N. MESHCHERSKIJ 1965, "K voprosu ob istochnikh slavjanskoj knigi Enoha," *Kratkie soobshchenija Instituta narodov Azii* 86: 72-78. • J. T. MILIK 1976, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4*, Oxford: Clarendon. • H. ODEBERG 1928, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. • A. ORLOV 2005, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck. • M. SOKOLOV 1910, "Materialy i zametki po starinnoj slavjanskoj literature. Vypusk tretij, VII. Slavjanskaja Kniga Enoha Pravednogo. Teksty, latinskij perevod i izsledovanie. Posmertnyj trud avtora prigotovil k izdaniju M. Speranskij," *Chtenija v Obshchestve Istorii i Drevnostej Rossijskikh* 4: 1-167. • A. VAILLANT 1952, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: Texte slave et traduction française*, Paris: l'Institut d'études slaves. • R. VAN DEN BROEK 1972, *The Myth of the Phoenix according to Classical and Early Christian Traditions*, Leiden: Brill.

ANDREI A. ORLOV

## Enosh

In the Bible, Enosh (Hebr. *ʿēnōš*) is the son of Seth and the grandson of Adam. Apart from his presence in genealogical lists detailing the progression of the descendants of Seth (Gen. 5:6-11; 1 Chron. 1:1), the only narrative elaboration devoted to him is the syntactically difficult redactional comment in Gen. 4:26: "And to Seth also was born a son, and he named him Enosh. Then was begun invocation with the Name YHWH." The proper noun *ʿēnōš* signifies "humankind," a designation that mirrors the meaning of the name of his grandfather Adam. It is likely, given the rich history of speculative thought surrounding the figure of Seth, that some circles interpreted the posited father-son relationship of Seth and Enosh as emphasizing Seth's status as the (true) ancestor of humankind, a status that Adam forfeited when he transgressed the command of God.

Great ambiguity surrounds the figure of Enosh on account of the multiple ways of understanding the latter half of Gen. 4:26 ("then was begun invocation with the Name YHWH"). Christian and so-called Gnostic groups tend to give the clause a positive valence, the former seeing Enosh as one who cultivated and established the proper liturgical service of the one god, and the latter (where attested) tending to view Enosh as a righteous successor to Seth who perpetuated his father's legacy of righteousness and guarded and transmitted his forebears' writings and teachings. It is in fact as a conduit, rather than producer, of written works that Enosh achieves what fleeting fame he enjoys among such groups; it is largely thanks to him that the written testimonia associated with Adam and Seth were preserved. Few writings are ascribed to his hand, and even those are arguably due to scholastic conflation or confusion with more renowned figures; thus the reference to two inscribed stelae erected by Enosh in the Armenian historian Moses Khorenats'i is likely based on Josephus' (*Ant.* 1.69-71) description of a similar action performed by the collective descendants of Seth. Similarly, when the thirteenth-century Syriac *Book of the Bee*

avers that Enosh "was the first to author books on the courses of the stars and zodiacal signs," it is likely that Enosh has been confused here with the more illustrious figures of Enoch or Seth, both of whom are famous in parabiblical sources for their astronomical discoveries. The so-called *Prayer of Enosh* (4Q369) allegedly recovered among the Dead Sea Scrolls has been conclusively shown to be a chimera (Kugel 1998).

It is within Mandeism, a Mesopotamian "Gnostic" movement, that Enosh attains true individuality as an author and revelatory messenger. Living on earth in his material identity as son of Seth, he fortuitously escapes drowning in a flood brought on by demonic adversaries by being transported to heaven by an emissary of the principal Mandaean deity. There he is installed as a heavenly entity known as the "great Anōsh." Portions of the Mandaean scriptures are attributed to him; for example, the eleventh book of the *Right Ginza* is introduced as "the mystery and book of the great Anōsh, son of the great Shitil (i.e., Seth), son of the great Adam." He also functions in certain narrative sources as a divine emissary warning humans of imminent catastrophes.

In contrast to the ways in which the character of Enosh developed in Christian writings and works traditionally labeled Gnostic, classical Jewish tradition normally ascribes a negative connotation to the phraseology of Gen. 4:26b by reading it as an etiology for false religion: "then was begun the naming [of material objects] with the Name YHWH." In other words, Enosh and/or his generation marked the first appearance in the world of idolatry (*b. Šabbat* 118b; *Tg. Ps.-J. Gen.* 4:26). Representative of this thread is the brief haggadic tale found in the medieval *Midrash Bereshit Rabbati* (ed. Albeck, p. 41):

What did the people of his (Enosh's) generation do? They arose and piled together all the silver, gold, pearls, and precious stones that were in the world and made a large pedestal. They then erected an idol on it, and they worshipped it and made offerings to it. They also directed harsh words toward Heaven, as Scripture says: "Then they said to God, 'Leave us alone!'" (*Job* 21:14).

Due to the depravity associated with Enosh and his generation, his name is sometimes parsed as *anūsh* ("weak, diseased"), and a number of rabbinic sources speak of a mini-deluge that engulfed "one-third of the world" in his time (e.g., *Sifre Deuteronomy* §43). Here one might compare the similar linkage of a flood with Enosh in the Mandaean tradition, as mentioned above. It seems possible that these specific traditions about the appearance of corruption on earth in the third generation (Adam-Seth-Enosh) are the remnants of a primitive narrative cycle about the early history of humanity which lacked the motifs of angelic sin, disobedience in the Garden, and primal murder that characterize some or all of the other extant stories.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

S. D. FRAADE 1984, *Enosh and His Generation: Pre-Israelite Hero and History in Postbiblical Interpretation*, Chico, Calif.: