

THE BIOGRAPHY OF ENOCH AND THE BOOKS OF ENOCH

by

DEVORAH DIMANT

Haifa

Among the many issues raised by J. T. Milik in his edition of the Qumrân Aramaic fragments of 1 Enoch, *The Books of Enoch* (Oxford, 1976—cited below as *Books*), there is also the question of the significance and form of the Enochic collection. The problem is not new. It has long been established by scholars such as A. Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch* (Leipzig, 1853), and R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford, 1912), that the collection preserved in the Ethiopic version consists of five separate works: 1. *The Book of the Watchers* (*BW*): chapters i-xxxvi; 2. *The Book of Parables* (*BP*): chapters xxxvii-lxxi; 3. *The Astronomical Book* (*AB*): chapters lxxii-lxxxii; 4. *The Book of Dreams* (*BD*): chapters lxxxiii-xc; 5. *The Epistle of Enoch* (*EE*): chapters xci-cv and an appendix on the birth of Noah: chapters cvi-cvii.

In establishing distinct literary units, these scholars unwittingly raised a question, namely, why these units were put together and arranged as they were in the Ethiopic collection. But apart from pointing out the obvious—namely, that the link between these works is the common pseudepigraphic authorship of Enoch—little has been said on this subject in the various scholarly discussions to date. Moreover, from the classical commentaries one gets the impression that the Enochic writings were selected at random and arbitrarily arranged. The result of the neglect of this important issue is keenly felt in the work of J. T. Milik, the editor of the Qumrân material. Realizing the need to explain the Enochic collection as such, he based himself on the defective previous studies. Consequently his explanations lack substance and are unconvincing.

Yet by his treatment Milik has reintroduced the idea of the Enochic Pentateuch into the scholarly discussion. It seems, then, timely to examine afresh the literary nature of the Enochic collection in order to answer the question whether 1 Enoch is a mere random collection of writings or a unified literary corpus.

I. Qumrân and the Enochic collection

One of the few attempts to understand the significance of the Enochic works as a corpus, was made some fifty years ago by G. H. Dix, "The Enochic Pentateuch", *JThS* 27 (1925), pp. 29-42. Noting the numerical similarity of the five Enochic works and those of the Pentateuch, and alleging other similarities of content between them and the books of the Pentateuch, he argued that the Enochic collection was modelled on the five books of the Torah. But his arguments failed to convince and had little influence on subsequent scholarly studies. Milik, however, in his recent publication of the Qumrân fragments, has taken up this idea. Accepting the basic proposition that the Ethiopic collection is indeed modelled on the Pentateuch, he proceeds to claim that a Pentateuch-like Enochic corpus actually existed and was in circulation at Qumrân as early as 100 B.C.E. and was probably compiled by "an erudite scribe of the Qumrân scriptorium".¹ Milik follows the alleged traces of such a corpus, from Qumrân, through the Greek translations, to its final form in the Ethiopic version. Most of Milik's arguments do not concern the actual nature of the corpus as such, but rather the history of its successive stages. These arguments have already been criticized by others² and being irrelevant to the literary questions they will not be discussed here. As for the arguments strictly concerning the literary character of the collection, Milik confines himself to the evidence of the Aramaic fragments alone. Therefore I will restrict myself to this aspect of his discussion, which has a bearing on the question of the Enochic corpus.

One of the most interesting facts to emerge from the Qumrân data is that the findings corroborate the result of earlier literary criticism in that they attest separate case histories of the various Enochic works. Only four out of the five units were found at Qumrân: The *BW*, *AB*, *BD* and the *EE* with the appendix on

¹ *Books*, p. 184. Milik discusses the idea on pp. 4, 22, 54-5, 57-8, 76-7, 109-10, 183-5, 227, 310.

² Cf. the comments in my dissertation "The Fallen Angels" in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic Books related to them (Hebrew) (Hebrew University, 1974), pp. 17-21; J. C. Greenfield and M. Stone, "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes", *HTR* 70 (1977), pp. 51-65; M. A. Knibb, "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review", *NTS* 25 (1979), pp. 345-59.

Noah.³ *BP* was not found at Qumrân.⁴ Each of the four works appears to have been set down in a different manner, as we may gather from the surviving fragments: *AB* is available only in separate manuscripts. *BW* exists partly in separate manuscripts and partly together with *BD*. *BD* is only found in manuscripts also containing *BW*, while *EE* is found both separately—in the fragments 4QEn⁸⁵—and in one of the manuscripts containing also *BW* and *BD*—4QEn^c.

The picture that emerges from these facts is a complex one, since each work is differently situated. In such a state of affairs, one would have expected Milik to offer a balanced and cautious judgement of the evidence. Yet in his evaluation of the evidence Milik chooses to rely mainly on one manuscript, 4QEn^c, a manuscript which present the exception rather than the rule. For 4QEn^c is of a singular character, containing, as it does, three Enochic works, *BW*, *BD* and *EE* with the appendix. Milik concluded that this manuscript bears witness to an Enochic corpus, namely, a collection assembled according to a certain literary principle. Furthermore, in his opinion 4QEn^c included a fourth composition, namely, the Book of Giants (*BG*). This work tells about Enoch and the Giants—the offsprings of the Watchers, the Fallen Angels—and was previously known only from Manichaean sources.⁶ Milik has identified several copies of an Aramaic version of this work at Qumrân⁷ and expresses the view that one copy, 4QEnGiants^a, originally formed part of 4QEn^c.⁸ Milik claims that the *BG* was

³ Omitting chapter cviii. Cf. *Books*, p. 183. This chapter is also absent from the Chester Beatty papyrus, which contains a Greek translation of chapters xcvi-cvii. Cf. C. Bonner and H. C. Youtie, *The Last Chapters of Enoch in Greek, Studies and Documents* 8 (London, 1937).

⁴ Milik bases himself on this omission to argue that the *BP* is a late mid-third century work of Christian origin. Cf. *Books*, pp. 78, 94-6. Both the date and origin are unacceptable on internal grounds. Cf. the criticism levelled by Greenfield, Stone and Knibb (n. 2).

⁵ Cf. the synoptic table of the fragments in *Books*, p. 6.

⁶ Cf. W. B. Henning, "The Book of Giants", *BSOAS* 11 (1943), pp. 52-74.

⁷ Cf. *Books*, pp. 298-339; idem, "Turfan et Qumran, Livre de Géants juif et manichéen", *Tradition und Glaube, Festgabe K. G. Kuhn* (Göttingen, 1971), pp. 117-27.

⁸ Cf. *Books*, pp. 178, 310. The quality of the photographs in Milik's edition makes it difficult to verify this claim. On literary grounds it seems to me unlikely that *BG* was included in an Enochic corpus such as the Ethiopic one. Though *BG* obviously draws upon the Enochic legends, it does not seem to have been written as a pseudepigraphic work ascribed to Enoch. All the fragments published to date are written as a third person narrative.

substituted in the corpus for the missing *BP*. Thus, according to Milik, 4QEn^c formed a tetralogy of Enochic writings, which together with the *AB* constituted the Enochic Pentateuch at Qumrân. This Pentateuch, Milik claims, was copied in Qumrân in two separate parts: the first one consisted of four works: *BW*, *AB*, *BD* and *EE* with the appendix. They were all copied on single manuscripts and in Milik's opinion fragments 4QEn^c and 4QEn^{c9} represent this type of manuscripts. The second part of the Enochic collection consisted of the *AB* alone. According to Milik it was copied separately owing to the unusual length of the work (*Books*, pp. 58, 183, 273). Thus, although the actual manuscripts attest that 1 Enoch was copied in distinctive ways, Milik tries to present them as a unified entity. Yet we must distinguish between the material data offered by the manuscripts themselves and the literary theories adduced to explain them. As for the data themselves, the manuscripts attest at best a tendency to group together some of the Enochic works, a tendency manifested in manuscripts 4QEn^{c,d,e}. But a still larger number of manuscripts contained only one work, 4QEn^{a,b,f,g} and 4QEnastr^{a-d}. Even the case of 4QEn^c should not be overstated, for because of its unique nature we are not able to judge whether it reflects a general practice or is simply an isolated case. Even if we accepted Milik's judgement of the manuscripts, we should still have to settle the question whether the grouping of the manuscripts is necessarily indicative of a literary purpose. It may be due merely to a practical consideration. This is not to say that the existence of a literary principle is to be ruled out; but this should not be assumed merely from the form of the manuscripts, particularly when they are as fragmentary and poorly preserved as the Enochic fragments. In fact, it is not even possible to tell whether in the more complete manuscripts, i.e., 4QEn^{c,d,e}, the works were originally in a sequence identical with that of the Ethiopic collection, as Milik assumes as matter of course. The only fragment containing a sequence of sections is 4QEn^c 5 i, in which the appendix on Noah immediately follows the end of the *EE*.¹⁰ Thus, the bad

⁹ Cf. *Books*, pp. 227, 236-7. Milik identifies fragments 2 and 3 of this manuscript as probably belonging to *BG*. But they seem to me too small for any definite identification. My examination of the actual fragments of this manuscript confirmed my impression. I wish to express here my thanks to Dr Magen Broshi of the Israel Museum, Jerusalem, who helped to locate these fragments, and also placed them at my disposal.

¹⁰ Chapters civ-cvii. Cf. *Books*, p. 207.

state of preservation prevents us from making a judgement whether copying some works on the same manuscript has a literary significance.

It is even more difficult to decide how many works were actually included in the alleged collection of Qumrân. The only conclusion which we may safely make is that one of the manuscripts contained three works, and some had two. Less certain is Milik's assertion that 4QEn^c contained a fourth work. His contention that the *AB* also belonged to the collection is not substantiated by the evidence, for the *AB* exists only in separate manuscripts. Milik's explanation, that this separation is due to the length of the *AB* is doubtful, for we now know that scrolls as long as 9 metres, the assumed length of the Temple Scroll,¹¹ were in circulation at Qumrân.

Even if Milik had proved his point about the existence of an Enochic collection at Qumrân, he would still have to convince the reader that such a collection was modelled on the Pentateuch. Milik adduces two arguments in support of this claim: first, that the Enochic collection at Qumrân contained five books; secondly, that *EE* with the appendix on Noah is, like Deuteronomy, presented as a testament.¹² As regards the first argument, Milik has not proved that a collection consisting of five books actually existed at Qumrân. Moreover, the mere inclusion of five works in a collection is not sufficient to prove its Pentateuch-like character. As regards the second argument, it is true that *EE* exhibits certain similarities to Deuteronomy, but these, I suggest, are limited to the basic pattern, which is common to most pseudepigraphic testaments, and imitates Gen. xlix as well as Deut. xxix-xxxiii. The function of the *EE* as a testament will be discussed below.

The difficulty in providing a solution to the problems raised by the Qumrân findings is due to the fact that the most basic question concerning 1 Enoch is still unanswered: is it a mere amalgamation of similar works or was it assembled and arranged according to a definite plan? This question must be confined to the only real

¹¹ Cf. Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (Jerusalem, 1977) I, p. 9, (Hebrew).

¹² *Books*, pp. 54-5, 183-4. Milik thinks that both the author of *EE* and the compiler of the collection sought to imitate Deuteronomy. A similar view was advanced by Dix (n. 4), p. 31. For a criticism of Milik's view cf. Greenfield and Stone (n. 6), p. 65. For other important criticism of Milik's views the reader is also referred to another article by the same authors, "The Books of Enoch and the Traditions of Enoch", *Numer* 26 (1979), pp. 89-103

Enochic collection which we possess, namely, the Ethiopic one. And it can be answered only through a literary analysis, for it concerns a literary aim. This article attempts to show that the Ethiopic Enoch does indeed constitute a unified corpus carefully constructed around a definite theme, namely, the biography of Enoch. To demonstrate this, a close scrutiny of Enoch's life history is required.

II. *The Biography of Enoch—Jubilees*

The two main sources for Enoch's biography are: the Book of Jubilees (= Jub.) iv 16-25 and 1 Enoch. Because of its particular significance, the Jub. passage will be quoted in full. Jub. iv 16-25:¹³

- 16 And in the eleventh jubilee Jered took to himself a wife and her name was Baraka, the daughter of Rasuyal, a daughter of his father's brother, in the fourth week of this jubilee. And she bare him a son in the fifth week in the fourth year of the jubilee and he called his name Enoch. /
- 17 Now he was the first¹⁴ of men who were born on earth who learnt writing and knowledge and wisdom, and who wrote down in a book the signs of heaven according to the order of their months, so that men might know the seasons of the /
- 18 years according to their orders each month. He was the first to write a testimony and he testified about the sons of men among the families of the earth. And the weeks of the jubilees he told and the days of the years he made known and the months he ar-

¹³ The following is R. H. Charles's translation from *The Book of Jubilees* (Oxford, 1902), with some revisions I have introduced on the basis of a re-examination of the Ethiopic text and manuscripts. I hope to publish at a later date a fuller discussion of the quoted passage, its text and meaning. For other translations the reader may consult A. Dillmann in *Jahrbücher der Biblischen Wissenschaft* 2 (1849), pp. 240-1; E. Littmann in *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* II (Tübingen, 1900), p. 47. A French translation by F. Martin was published by P. Grelot, "Hénoch et ses Écritures", *RB* 82 (1975), pp. 431-2. The passage was recently discussed from a different point of view by J. C. VanderKam, "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and other Second-Century Sources", *SBL 1978 Seminar Papers* I (Missoula 1978), pp. 229-51.

¹⁴ A tiny Hebrew fragment from Qumrân corresponding to vv. 16-17 was identified by Milik "A propos de 11QJub", *Bib* 54 (1973), pp. 77-8. Cf. also J. C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (Missoula, 1977), pp. 25-7. For a fragment of the Syriac version cf. E. Tisserant, "Fragments Syriaques du Livre des Jubilés", *RB* 30 (1921), p. 77.

- ranged and the sabbaths of the years he told as we made (them) known to him. /
- 19 And what was and what will be he saw in a dream-vision, as it will happen to the children of men in their generations until the Day of Judgement. All he saw and understood, and he wrote his testimony and he placed it for testimony on earth about all the sons of men /
- 20 and about their generations. And on the twelfth jubilee, on the seventh week thereof, he took to himself a wife and her name was Edni, the daughter of Danel, the daughter of his father's brother. And in the sixth year in this week she bare him a son and he called his name Methuselah. /
- 21 Now he was with the angels of God six jubilees of years and they showed him everything which is on earth and in the heavens, the rule of the sun; and he /
- 22 wrote down everything. And he testified against the Watchers who sinned with the daughters of men; for they began to copulate so as to be defiled with the daughters of /
- 23 men. And Enoch testified against them all. And he was taken from among the sons of men and we conducted him into the Garden of Eden for majesty and honour, and lo, he is there writing down the adjudication and judgement of the world and all the wickedness of the sons of /
- 24 men. And on account of it: (God) brought the waters of the Flood upon all the Land of Eden. For he was set there for sign so that he would testify upon all the sons of men, in order that he would recount all the deeds of the generations until the Day of /
- 25 Judgement. And he burnt evening incense of the sanctuary, which is pleasing before God, on the Mountain of Spices.

In the above description Enoch's career falls into three distinct parts: *a.* Enoch's activities before his marriage and the birth of Methuselah. According to Jub.'s chronology this covers a period of 65 years from 522 to 587. *b.* Enoch's sojourn with the angels for a period of six jubilees. *c.* The final taking of the patriarch from among men into Paradise and his activities there. This tripartite division is clearly based on the biblical account in Gen. v 21-24: "And Enoch lived sixty and five years, and begat Methuselah. And Enoch walked with God after he begat Methuselah three hundred

years, and he begat sons and daughters: And all the days of Enoch were three hundred sixty and five years. And Enoch walked with God: and he was not; for God took him".¹⁵ The biblical text also clearly divides Enoch's life into periods: the first one lasted 65 years¹⁶ and coincides with the first part of Enoch's career in Jub. It terminates, in the Bible as in Jub., with Enoch's marriage and begetting of children. The second period covers Enoch's remaining years, the three hundred years during which Enoch is said to have walked with God. This tallies with the second part of Jub., from which we deduce that Jub. equated six jubilees with 300 years, calculating a jubilee as consisting of 50 years each ($6 \times 50 = 300$).¹⁷ Thus Jub. gives 365 as the total number of Enoch's years, a number confirmed by all the textual witnesses of the Pentateuch.¹⁸ Jub.'s story follows the biblical account in other respects too. Thus, the episode about the voyage with the angels is quite obviously an interpretation of the enigmatic Hebrew expression *wayyithallēk hānōk ʾet-hāʾēlōhīm*, "and Enoch walked with God". Apparently, the verb was taken literally to mean "go about" (cf. Job ii 2), while the Hebrew plural form for "God" was understood to refer to angels.¹⁹ In the same way the disappearance of Enoch is based on an interpretation of the word *wʾēnennū* "and he was not". All our most ancient sources explain this as an allusion to Enoch's ascension to Paradise, a celestial or terrestrial one²⁰ (cf. below). In this respect Jub. merely echoes an ancient exegesis of the biblical text, and this is probably true too of the entire episode.

¹⁵ The translation is that of the Authorized Version.

¹⁶ This is according to the chronology of the MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch. The LXX has a different tradition—165 years.

¹⁷ Cf. also Milik, *Books*, p. 12. This is an interesting illustration of Jub.'s compiling method. Usually Jub. reckons one jubilee as 49 years, but in the present episode it departs from this practice, probably because it leans on its source and has to maintain the combination $65 + 300$. This shows that Jub. borrows from various sources, often without reconciling the contradictions.

¹⁸ Thus the MT, LXX and the Samaritan.

¹⁹ The use of *ʾēlōhīm* in the sense of "angels" has its background in the Bible itself. Cf. e.g. Gen. xxxii 3; Judg. xiii 22; Ps. xcvi 7.

²⁰ Cf. 1 Enoch xiv 8-23, lxx 1-2, lxxi 1, lxxx 6, cvi 7; Ben-Sira xlv 16. Compare also the LXX, the *Vetus Latina* and the Aramaic Targums of Genesis ad loc. Cf. A. Schmitt, "Die Angaben über Henoch Gen 5, 21-24 in der LXX", *Wort, Lied und Gottespruch*, Fs. J. Ziegler (Würzburg 1972), pp. 161-9; D. Lührmann, "Henoch und die Metanoia", *ZNW* 66 (1975), pp. 103-16. For the Mesopotamian origins of the ascension cf. R. Borger, "Die Beschwörungsserie *Bil Mēseri* und Die Himmelfahrt Henochs", *JNES* 33 (1974), pp. 183-96.

An additional detail specifies that the angels themselves took Enoch to Paradise (cf. Jub. iv 23). This may be derived from the biblical account *w^oʔenennū kī-lāqah ʔōtō ʔēlohīm*, “and he was not, for God took him”.

This last detail and the events surrounding Enoch’s departure for Paradise are particularly elaborated in two additional sources, which supplement the Jub. account. One is a tiny Hebrew fragment from Qumrân, 4Q227, partly published by Milik (cf. *Books*, p. 12), and the other is a passage from *AB*. Of particular interest is the fragment from Qumrân, as it is very similar to Jub. but not identical with it.

It reads as follows:

(... E)noch after we have taught him
 () () six jubilees of years
 (E)arth amidst men and he testified about all
 () and also about the Watchers and he wrote everything
 (the) sky and the paths of its hosts and (the mon)ths
 (s)o that the (Just) will not go astray...²¹

This fragment seems to be situated at the end of the patriarch’s travels with the angels. It agrees with Jub. on the duration of the period in question—six jubilees.

Also, the teachings of Enoch coincide with some of the activities mentioned in Jub. They concern astronomic and calendrical knowledge, as well as a testimony to the Watchers. In addition, the angels are introduced in the first person, as relating the events. This feature is also shared by Jub.²² But unlike Jub., Enoch’s teachings are situated in the fragment at the end of his stay with the angels, and not before or during this time as in Jub. This difference is explained by a third passage from *AB* lxxi 5-6 which tells how, having ended his journey through the universe with the angels, Enoch is brought back home by them. He is instructed to stay another year among men in order to teach and testify to his sons before his final return to Paradise. The situation closely resembles the one depicted in 4Q227. We assume, then, that the same circumstances are allud-

²¹ This translation is my own. Milik has translated only a few lines to which he adds some comments. He does not provide a photograph.

²² Cf. e.g. Jub. iii 15, iv 23, v 23, x 10-13, 23. The similarity of this fragment to Jub. in content and style is so close that it should perhaps be identified as belonging to Jub., but in a slightly different text.

ed to in both works. Thus the teachings mentioned in 4Q227 may form part of Enoch’s final testimony and transmission of the knowledge he had acquired throughout his terrestrial life, while Jub. gives a general review of Enoch’s acts in the order in which they occurred. Therefore, Jub. and 4Q227 are not necessarily contradictory and may still reflect the same aggadic tradition.²³

What clearly emerges from the above analysis is that Jub. closely follows the Genesis story—with certain amplifications—both in its general framework and in specific details. The only real additions are those referring to Enoch’s studies, his writing them down and transmitting them. Of this there is no mention in Genesis.

The conclusion we derive from the foregoing analysis is that Jub. must be drawing first and foremost on an exegetical tradition of the biblical narrative. Consequently, similarities between Jub. and the scattered biographical details in the Enochic writings should be seen as independent witnesses of a single exegetical tradition, and not as an indication of the literary dependence of Jub. on 1 Enoch, as supposed by several scholars.²⁴ This is especially true of those episodes which have clearly been added to the biblical text, such as Enoch’s sojourn with the angels and his disappearance. In order to prove literary dependence one must produce evidence of similarities of style and phraseology, as well as ideas. This cannot be said to be the case with Jub. in relationship to 1 Enoch. Consequently, it may be assumed that all the materials relating to Enoch’s life history, including the amplifications and the additions, go back to an ancient aggadic tradition independently attested by Jub. and 1 Enoch. This assumption accords with the character of the early Jewish pseudepigraphic literature, which employs current legends in the construction of the pseudepigraphic framework. Only by assuming the existence of a rich and elaborated body of Enochic legends can we explain the numerous pseudepigrapha ascribed to Enoch as early as the third century B.C.E. Significantly, the principal features of the Enoch figure in the Enochic body of writings are his wisdom, teachings, writing down and transmitting of knowledge. This may

²³ In my opinion this assumption accords most satisfactorily with the facts. There is no need, nor is it convincing, to claim as Milik does that 4Q227 summarizes the *AB*.

²⁴ Cf. e.g. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees* (Oxford, 1902), pp. lxxviii-lxxix, 36-7, and more recently Milik, *Books*, pp. 12, 24-5, Grelot (n. 13), pp. 483-8, and VanderKam (n. 13).

be explained by the prominence of these same features in the Enochic legends current at that time and perhaps, too, in the older Mesopotamian sources relating to the seventh antediluvian sage.

III. *The Biography of Enoch—1 Enoch*

a. *The Book of the Watchers*—This is a composite piece. It consists of five independent units.²⁵ Chapters i-v relate Enoch's vision on the Day of Judgement and his admonition to the Wicked; chapter vi-xi tell the story of the Fallen Angels, their sin with the women and their punishment; chapters xii-xvi tell about Enoch's intercession on behalf of the Fallen Angels, namely, the Watchers; chapters xvii-xxxvi contain two distinct pieces, xvii-xix and xx-xxxvi, which probably depend on each other. Both describe Enoch's travels through the universe accompanied by various angels, each showing his domain. Scholars have suggested various explanations for the fragmentary character of *BW*,²⁶ ascribing this to the work of editors. Some thought that i-v were intended as an introduction to the entire Enochic collection.²⁷ But these suggestions have so far failed to provide a satisfactory explanation of *BW*'s present structure. My own suggestion is to examine it in the light of Enoch's life, as we know it from Jub. This approach sheds an unexpected light on *BW* and the arrangement of its content: the three sections, i-v, xii-xvi and xvii-xxxvi deal with various activities of Enoch during his lifetime, which appear to be arranged in the sequence indicated by Jub.: first comes the vision of the Day of Judgement, which in Jub. falls within the first period; next come his intercession on

²⁵ This was shown, for example, by G. Beer, *Das Buch Henoch, Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments II* (Tübingen, 1900), pp. 221-2; Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, (Oxford 1912), pp. xlvi-xlviii, 1-3. For a recent edition of the Ethiopic text and a new English translation, see M. A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (Oxford, 1978).

²⁶ Cf., for example, the division proposed by F. Martin, *Le Livre d'Hénoch* (Paris, 1906), pp. lxiii-lxxxviii.

²⁷ Cf. e.g. Beer, p. 221; Charles, p. 2. Recently, L. Hartman has pointed out that in the light of the Qumrân evidence this view is no longer tenable. For we now possess two manuscripts, 4QEn^{a,b}, which contain passages from i-v and the rest of the *BW*, and are earlier than the supposed date of *BD*. Cf. idem, *Asking for Meaning* (Lund, 1979), pp. 138-45. Yet his own suggestion that i-v serves only as an introduction to *BW* is not convincing. In support of this claim he produces a list of themes common to i-v and vi-xxxvi, which proves, in his opinion, that i-v stands as an introduction. But most of these themes are common also to the entire Enochic corpus, as well as to many other apocalyptic books.

behalf of the Watchers and his travels with the angels, both of which fall within the second period of Jub. In fact, at the beginning of the Watchers episode it is explicitly stated that the events that follow occurred after Enoch had disappeared from among men, because of his sojourn with the angels (cf. 1 Enoch xii 1). Significantly all the sections dealing with Enoch employ a similar literary device: they are presented as accounts related in the first person by the patriarch himself. This is, of course, the typical style of the pseudepigraphic writings. But it is not employed in chapters vi-xi. These chapters are markedly different in style and intention: they do not mention Enoch at all and they are written in a typical third person narrative style. This difference should, I believe, be explained by the different origin of the section in question. Unlike the other sections it is not pseudepigraphic and resembles, in its style and methods, such works as the Genesis Apocryphon, Jub. and the Biblical Antiquities. I suggest, therefore, that these chapters were taken from an ancient midrash on Gen. vi 1-4.²⁸ They were introduced by the editor of the *BW* before the incident of the Watchers in order to provide the necessary background.

To conclude, *BW* may be said to cover events from the first and the second periods of Enoch's life, and was therefore properly placed at the head of the Enochic corpus.

b. *The Astronomical Book*—This work consists of Enoch's account of what he saw in the company of the angels while travelling in various secret places of the earth. The most elaborate description is that of the luminaries and the stars, shown to him by the angel Uriel, though other parts of the universe are also mentioned. The work is written as a personal account which Enoch (lxxii 1) addresses to his son Methuselah (lxxvi 14, lxxix 1). But besides information on what Enoch has learnt, the work also contains, at the end, a biographical section. Chapters lxxxi-lxxxii depict the end of Enoch's journeys, his blessing, his return home, the instruction of his children, his testimony and his admonition. In the context of the biographical theme of 1 Enoch, *AB* takes up the story from Enoch's travels to his final acts before the final disappearance. Thus the proper place for *AB* in the collection would have been after *BW*, which it continues.

²⁸ This view is taken also P.S. Alexander, "The Targumim and Early Exegesis of the 'Sons of God' in Genesis 6", *JJS* 23 (1972), p. 60.

c. *The Book of Dreams*—This work relates two nightly visions revealed to Enoch: one about the coming Flood, the other about the history of the world. In the pseudepigraphic framework of the work the first vision is said to have occurred at the time when Enoch was learning to write, the second, before he took a wife. This information accords with the account in Jub., according to which Enoch saw the visions about the future history of the world in the first period of his life. At the same time, this book, like *AB*, is addressed to Methuselah (lxxxiii 1, lxxxv 1-2). In a certain way both works can be said to have a testamentary character in that they contain wisdom and lessons of past experience transmitted from father to son. In Enoch's case the actual transmission took place at the end of his terrestrial years. Therefore, even though *BD* deals with events that took place in the first period of Enoch's life, namely, preceding the acts related in *AB*, it may still be considered as belonging to the final period of the handing down of wisdom. This would explain why *BD* is placed after *AB*: *AB* gives the actual circumstances of the final departure, while both *AB* and *BD* record some of the teachings transmitted on this occasion. The *EE* brings the sequence to a conclusion by giving the actual testament of Enoch.

d. *The Epistle of Enoch*—This work employs a typical testament form, at least in the opening section: Enoch summons his children, reveals the future to them and delivers his final exhortation. This is the pattern of the classical testaments of the Bible, namely, Gen. xlix and Deut. xxix-xxxiii,²⁹ which is also to be found in other pseudepigraphic testaments.³⁰ For our purpose, it suffices to recognize *EE* as the final testament of Enoch.³¹ As such it is properly placed at the end of the Enochic collection.

²⁹ Compare e.g. xci 1-2 to Gen. xlix 1-2; xci 3-9 to Deut. xxxi 12-21, xxxii 1.

³⁰ I intend to devote a more detailed study to this genre. For the time being cf. K. Baltzer, *The Covenant Formulary*, E. tr. (Oxford 1971), pp. 137-66, *Das Bundesformular* (Neukirchen, 1960), pp. 142-67; A. B. Kolenkow, "The Genre Testament and Forecasts of the Future in the Hellenistic Jewish Milieu", *JSL* 6 (1973), pp. 57-71.

³¹ The Chester Beatty papyrus (cf. n. 3) ends chapter cvii with the formula "the Epistle of Enoch". The Epistle form may be suggested also by xcii 1, c 6. But most of the other indications point to the testament form, and this is especially apparent in chapters xci-xciii which open the work. Therefore it seems to me that the testament form better describes the structure of *EE*. For the inner structure of this work cf. G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Apocalyptic Message of 1 Enoch 92-105", *CBQ* 39 (1977), pp. 309-28.

e. *The Appendix on Noah*—This section depicts the miraculous birth of Noah, the perplexity of his father Lamech, and the voyage of the grandfather Methuselah to the ends of the earth to ask his father Enoch for advice. Enoch does it by explaining the future role of Noah in the coming Flood. This section, I believe, refers to an incident which occurred well after Enoch's terrestrial life was over. There are several indications of this: first of all, according to the MT and LXX chronology, Noah was born after the disappearance of Enoch.³² Secondly, Enoch was staying at the time in the company of the angels (cvi 7). Thirdly, the event takes place at the far end of the earth and this accords with the idea expressed in *BW* which locates Paradise at the far end of the earth.³³ In the light of this interpretation, the appendix on Noah appears as an appropriate conclusion to the testament of Enoch, and indeed to the complete corpus,³⁴ which reviews Enoch's life and achievements. The appendix records events occurring during the ultimate and eternal stage of Enoch's existence, in Paradise, writing down human history. It is his knowledge of future events that enabled him to advise Methuselah.

If the above analysis is correct, the basic Enochic collection, comprising *BW*, *AB*, *BD*, *EE* and the Appendix, was assembled in such a way as to give a synopsis of Enoch's deeds and teachings in the sequence in which they occurred: firstly the vision of the Day of Judgement and the exhortation to the Wicked, then the period spent with the angels (which includes Enoch's intercession on behalf of the Watchers and his journey through the universe) his return to earth to make his preparations for the final departure, the transmission of his knowledge to Methuselah, and his final testimony and exhortation to his children. The corpus concludes

³² According to MT he was born 69 years after Enoch was taken to Paradise. The LXX gives the figure as 55 years. In contrast to these two witnesses, the Samaritan Pentateuch and Jub. place Noah's birth 180 years before the taking of Enoch.

³³ xxxii 3, partly preserved in 4QEa I xxvi 21 which reads *prds qstl* []. The Greek equivalent is *παράδεισος τῆς δικαιοσύνης*. The idea that Enoch was already living in Paradise when Noah was born must lie behind a similar episode on the birth of Noah found in the Genesis Apocryphon. Cf. 1QGenApoc I, III, V, in which the place where Enoch lived is referred to as *preyn*, which, P. Grelot has suggested, is Paradise. Cf. *RB* 65 (1958), pp. 44-5; *VT* 11 (1961), pp. 30-8. For discussion and further reference cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I* (Rome, 1971²), pp. 187-91.

³⁴ This is why it is difficult to judge whether the appendix was originally part of *EE* alone or part of the corpus as a whole.

with an incident in which Enoch, while already in Paradise, is once more involved in terrestrial affairs on the occasion of Noah's birth.

f. The Book of Parables—This book was intentionally omitted from the above discussion since it contains certain features which do not conform to the overall biographical pattern which we have found to be present in the other books. *BP* is made up of three parables which Enoch addresses to the inhabitants of the earth. The parables focus on two main topics: on the one hand, the Day of Judgement with its reward for the Just and punishment for the Wicked, and, on the other, a description of the places revealed to Enoch in his travels with the angels. Though *BP* gives its own version of these topics and has many features not found in the other books, yet the topics themselves are familiar and are to be found in the other Enochic works too. What is peculiar to *BP* is its tendency to combine topics which, in the books, are kept apart. This is particularly evident in comparison with *BW*, which precedes *BP* in the Ethiopic collection. *BW* too is occupied with the Final Judgement and Enoch's journeys, but these topics are kept apart and it is evident that each derives from a different literary source. Significantly, also in *AB* the sojourn with the angels is not mixed, as it is in *BP*, with matters of future history. Similarly, *BD* confines itself to questions concerning future history.

The tendency of *BP* to combine distinct elements is apparent also in its biographical framework. Unlike other Enochic works it does not restrict itself to a limited period or single topics, but aims at giving a complete review of Enoch's life: from his vision of the future to his final ascension.³⁵ Moreover, the clear distinction made in the other books between the various periods in Enoch's life is blurred in *AB*. These features of *BP* suggest, therefore, the lateness of this work in comparison with the remaining Enochic books. This conclusion is reinforced also by the fact that *BP* was not among the books found at Qumrân. It may, therefore, be plausibly argued the *BP* is a later addition to the corpus and that initially the corpus comprised only the writings found at Qumrân.

IV. Conclusion

The foregoing analysis has attempted to show that the works ascribed to Enoch in the Ethiopic constitute a literary corpus with a

³⁵ This ascension shows signs of a later stage of development, as compared with the heavenly ascent of Enoch recorded in *BW* xiv.

definite theme and structure. This emerges from the arrangement of the various parts in accordance with the biographical information imparted by the pseudepigraphic framework. Each composition appears to have a distinct biographical reference which decides its place in the corpus. Together the works review the main events in Enoch's life, following the biblical chronology as elaborated by agadic amplifications. I have consequently concluded that the Ethiopic corpus was conceived as a comprehensive testimony to Enoch's accomplishments in action as well as in learning.

The biographical sequence seems to be clearly present in the four earlier works found at Qumrân, namely the *BW*, *AB*, *BD*, *EE* and the appendix. It was therefore suggested that the corpus originally comprised these works alone. I suggest, too, that the manuscript 4QEn^c may attest an early form of the corpus at Qumrân, but the evidence for this is inconclusive.

As for the *BP*, both literary and historical considerations, as well as its absence from the Qumrân collection, seem to indicate that it was not part of the original corpus but a later addition to it.³⁶

Finally, if the above reconstruction is correct, it may be concluded that the Enochic corpus was not composed on the pattern of the Pentateuch but had a different literary purpose.

³⁶ Perhaps during this stage the length of *AB* was drastically reduced, as is apparent from the much longer Aramaic version discovered at Qumrân. Cf. *Books*, pp. 7-8.