

GRANT MACASKILL

THE ENTANGLED ENOCH: 2 ENOCH AND THE CULTURES OF LATE ANTIQUITY

*Declaration of Funding: This project was funded by a British Academy Mid-Career Fellowship,
awarded 2020, of £131,002*

This monograph has been accepted for publication. This is the accepted manuscript, prior to
copy-editing and typesetting by the publisher.

<https://brill.com/display/title/69998>

Series: Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 28

Publisher: Brill (Leiden)

2024

Acknowledgements.

This monograph is the principal output of a British Academy Mid-Career Fellowship, which ran through the academic year 2021–2022. I am deeply grateful to the British Academy for this award and for all that it has made possible. In particular, I would like to thank Ken Emond, Charles Hamilton and Helen Langan for their help in the administrative process associated with the award. Historically, the research that led me to this project was also funded by the British Academy, through the Postdoctoral Fellowship that I held at the beginning of my career (which enabled me to publish an edition of the Slavonic Texts of 2 Enoch) and then through a small research grant on the Enoch literature and Contemporary Theology, principally associated with Philip Esler. My debt to the Academy, then, is enormous, and I am sincerely thankful for the support that it has provided to my work, to my career and to my subject area. During the process of application for this fellowship, Loren Stuckenbruck and John Collins played crucial roles and I am likewise indebted to them.

More broadly, my work at the University of Aberdeen is supported by the Kirby Laing Foundation and the development of this project would not have been possible without their generosity in funding my position. Along with the Foundation itself, I want to extend thanks to Katy Hockey and J. Thomas Hewitt, who successively held the Kirby Laing Postdoctoral Fellowship before their appointment to permanent positions at the University and whose collegial support made the development of this project possible. J. Thomas was particularly involved in helping with doctoral supervision during the period of my research leave; without that assistance, I could not have completed the work within the funded period. I also want to thank Graeme Benvie, who acts as the principal liaison between the University and the Foundation and whom we consider to be a vital member of our department.

The department of Divinity at the University of Aberdeen is a remarkably collegial and supportive place to be and the project has benefited immeasurably from that context. I want to thank all colleagues in the department, but especially Tom Greggs, Philip Ziegler and Paul Nimmo, who played specific administrative roles in the department that were connected to this submission. In the School of Divinity, History, Philosophy and Art History—the bigger unit in which we are

embedded—Paula Sweeney and Beth Lord (as successive Heads of School) and Robert Frost (as internal reviewer) also played important roles in the development and administration of my research. In the wider University, Sir Iain Torrance has been both practically and intellectually supportive, with his characteristic wisdom. I am sincerely grateful to all.

Some of my doctoral students were especially impacted by this study and were patient with me during the period of leave. I pass on thanks in particular to Melissa Tan, Rachel Danley, Hongchang Cho, Robert Costello, Michael de Fazio, Lisa Igram, Nick Mackison, Eric Russ, Cindy Cheshire, Olga Vasiloglou, Kyongmo Kim, Chris Lane, Brett Daane, Paloma Herrera, Daniel Thorpe, Andrew Wade and Andrew McNeil. Jonathan Berglund, as well as being patient with my circumstances as a supervisor, also collated and formatted the cumulative bibliography and deserves special thanks.

I continue to owe thanks to colleagues at the University of St Andrews, where the seeds of this research developed. David Moffitt, Elizabeth Shively (now at Baylor), Madhavi Nevader, T.J. Lang, Bill Tooman and Matt Sharp have all been crucial conversation partners at some point in its development and the library team have continued to be as helpful as ever, facilitating access to the collections there (and often extending loan periods beyond their normal limits). In the wider research community in Scotland, Matt Novenson, at the University of Edinburgh, has been a helpful dialogue partner. Across the U.K., George Brooke, Catrin Williams, Philip Esler and John Barclay have played important roles in working through some of the issues. Richard Bauckham kindly shared a draft of his forthcoming work on the Son of Man, which contained a useful engagement with the Parables of Enoch. Internationally, I am continually grateful to Christfried Böttrich, Basil Lourié and Andrei Orlov for their generosity as conversation partners, fellow students in this particular stream of Enoch's wisdom. I am also indebted, as always, to Alexander Panayotov, for helping me to source secondary literature; he has continued to be a close friend since our days as postdoctoral fellows in St Andrews.

Two people are owed special thanks for their role in the development of this book. The first is the songwriter/recording artist Rie Sinclair. Conversations with Rie—whom I know through the work of the Centre for Autism and Theology—were the key factor in nurturing my sense that the work of

Deleuze and Guattari has particular heuristic value to the study of the pseudepigrapha in late antiquity. The second is Annette Yoshiko Reed. As co-editor of the SVTP series, Annette provided the first stage of critical review on the monograph and then coordinated the peer review process after the initial revisions had been made. The book is generally richer and, at specific points, is more nuanced and careful because of Annette's input and her incredible diligence as an editor.

I am grateful also to the anonymous reviewers who gave helpful pointers to relevant research and caught some residual errors in transliteration. At Brill, Marjolein van Zuylen, Laura Morris and Suzanne Mekking have all been wonderfully supportive in the process of taking this project from proposal to completion.

Finally, I want to thank my family. The end of the project coincided with an extended period of illness for my wife, Jane, and this is a time that we will remember as difficult but blessed. During the last months of the fellowship, my father's health declined after his 25 year journey with cancer. He passed away shortly before the final edits were completed. His own mother had passed away just two years previously, at the age of 106, as I was about to begin the study. Those two deaths coincided with the project's beginning and end in ways that I cannot help but dwell upon and that represent something important to me about the passing of generations, the technological changing of the world and the fragile survival of Gaelic language and culture.

Grant Macaskill,

Aberdeen, November 2023.

Dedication

In memory of Annabella (Annabal Louis) Macaskill, 1914–2021, and Allan Louis Macaskill, 1941–
2023.

Mar chuimhneachan air Annabella MacAsgail, 1914–2021, agus Ailean Louis MacAsgail, 1941–2023.

Pill o m' anam, gu d' shuaimhneas, Salm CXVI, 7.

<i>Chapter 1. The Entangled Enoch</i>	1
<i>Chapter 2. Reviewing the Provenance of 2 Enoch</i>	41
<i>Chapter 3. Reviewing the Date, Provenance and Composition History of the Parables of Enoch</i>	91
<i>Chapter 4. Storehouses and Measures: Parallel Patterns in Metrology and Meteorology in the Parables of Enoch and 2 (Slavonic) Enoch.</i>	115
<i>Chapter 5. God, Enoch and the Secrets: Theology, Cosmology, Cosmogony, Eschatology</i>	150
<i>Chapter 6. God, Wisdom and Humanity in the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch</i>	198
<i>Chapter 7. Bodily Ascents and Ontological Transformations</i>	241
<i>Chapter 8. Practical and Symbolic Liturgy, Votive Offerings, and the Cult of the One God in 2 Enoch</i>	279
<i>Chapter 9. Animal Offerings and Ritual Theorizing in 2 Enoch</i>	308
<i>Chapter 10. Concluding Synthesis: The Entangled Enoch</i>	337

Chapter 1. The Entangled Enoch

All attempts to locate the intellectual background of 2 Enoch have failed. There must be something very peculiar about a work when one scholar, Charles, concludes that it was written by a hellenized Jew in Alexandria in the first century B.C., while another, J. T. Milik, argues that it was written by a Christian monk in Byzantium in the ninth century A.D. ...

It would go a long way toward solving the mystery of 2 Enoch if we could discover a religious community that venerated it on its own terms. If the work is Jewish, it must have belonged to a fringe sect ...

In every respect 2 Enoch remains an enigma. So long as the date and location remain unknown, no use can be made of it for historical purposes.

Francis I. Andersen, 1983.¹

Introduction

This monograph constitutes a sustained effort to reframe, reorient, and ultimately reimagine the study of the Book of the Secrets of Enoch,² the work typically labelled by scholars as 2 Enoch.³ This lengthy pseudepigraphon is preserved in several versions in Church Slavonic collections that date from the 14th to the 17th centuries, with a disputed additional fragmentary witness also claimed for the work in earlier Coptic writings from Nubia.⁴ There is general agreement that the book has a core that can be traced back to antiquity, but—as the catena of quotations above from Francis Andersen

¹ Francis I. Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch: A New Translation with Introduction,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Volume 1: *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden State: Doubleday, 1983), 91–222; quotations from 95, 96 & 97 respectively.

² The title used of the book in its various manuscripts is subject to extensive variation, but the elements are encountered with enough consistency for this to be regarded as a fair representation. For the evidence, see Grant Macaskill, *The Slavonic Texts of 2 Enoch*, *Studia Judaeoslavica* 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

³ I discuss the history of scholarship on this work in Chapter 2.

⁴ Joost L. Hagen, “No Longer ‘Slavonic’ Only: 2 Enoch Attested in Coptic from Nubia,” in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*, ed. Andrei Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini and Jason Zurawski (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 5–34. See also, however, the critical reflections in Christfried Böttrich, “The Angel of Tartarus and the Supposed Coptic Fragments of 2 Enoch,” *EC* 4 (2013): 509–21.

indicates—2 Enoch has confounded the attempts of its modern scholarly interrogators to locate or categorize it more precisely, and thereby to facilitate its use in the study of ancient religion. It has variously been identified as a work of Judaism, of Christianity, or of a fringe sect, but no real consensus has emerged. Since 1983, when Andersen's words were published, there have been several landmark studies of the book,⁵ but the findings reached therein are quite divergent. Much, of course, turns on its highly recensional character, and on the debates relating to the identification of original and redactional features. Those debates are themselves contingent on the contested definitions of Judaism and Christianity in antiquity and on methodological questions about the features by which they are differentiated; they are further shaped by reconstructions of their relationship to each other through antiquity. The discussion of 2 Enoch is driven by these issues of categorization and their place in the pursuit of origins; the fact the discussion has yielded little agreement may be significant of deeper issues in the discourse.

My goal in this monograph is not simply to add to this discussion, but to reframe it. I will argue in this chapter that the framework within which 2 Enoch has been analyzed reflects the dominance of a particular set of conceptualizations that shape how we think of religious literature in antiquity and how we think that such literature should be analyzed. These are embedded in our scholarly language, in our very linguistics and in our interpretative habits, and cause us to give priority to some factors that may be of subsidiary importance while, correspondingly, neglecting elements that should have primary significance. In particular, the analysis of 2 Enoch has given functional priority to the role played by groups in generating the work, often treating these groups as if they were clearly defined species with linear trajectories of development that sometimes involves branchings and divisions. Consequently, it has approached 2 Enoch with a set of quite rigid categories, with *categorization* itself often the driving concern. Correspondingly, our analysis of the work has neglected the generative dynamics that might not be reducible to the level of the group itself or of inter-group relations. My reflections on this problem are not intended to exclude or even to minimize the role that groups may have played in the generation of ancient literatures, but to contextualize this role and to complicate it. As such, my alternative framing of what 2 Enoch might

⁵ These are discussed in detail in Chapter 2.

signify affirms much of the detail in recent analyses of the book,⁶ while offering a different synthesis of that detail and an alternative explanatory account.

I will argue that 2 Enoch reflects the creative involvement of learned and erudite tradents in Syria in late antiquity, at the key stage in the formation and transmission of the work in which it attains its recognizable form. These figures are comfortable drawing on eclectic philosophical and mythological traditions, including those of early Judaism, and turning these to ends aligned with their own commitment to the proper worship of the One God, the Creator. This commitment includes some polemical resistance to ideas that would also be rejected by the retrospectively authoritative voices of both Jewish and Christian traditions, so that 2 Enoch appears at points to be quite “conservative” by their standards. At the same time, the work clearly embodies the beliefs and practices of people who cannot easily be placed with our typically deployed categories of “Jew” or “Christian,” overly shaped as they are by those authoritative voices. The evidence for these embodied beliefs appears to be woven through the very core of the work—it cannot be isolated and removed as obvious interpolation. I will not minimize the significance of this evidence in order to identify 2 Enoch with a Jewish or a Christian authorship, but neither will I portray the authorship of the work as primitive or peripheral—fringe—in a way that presumes the normativity of the dominant surviving traditions of Judaism and Christianity and the boundedness of the groups they purport to represent. Rather, I will argue that 2 Enoch is representative of the colourful and complicated religious world of late antiquity, in which the roles of defined groups and networks are only ever *part* of the generative dynamic that gives rise to literature, and in which local-ness may play a more determinative role than is typically recognized. It is to all of this that I gesture with the language of “entanglement.”

This involves some sustained reflection on the possibility that the scholarly approach to 2 Enoch has been limited by the categories and imaginative frameworks that govern the field of biblical studies and the cognate areas of research in Judaism and Christian origins, particularly in the significance attached to the well-known and clearly-bounded groups operative in antiquity. By “imaginative frameworks,” what I mean is the complexity and richness of the ancient worlds that

⁶ In particular, much of the detail in the works of Christfried Böttrich and Andrei Orlov—discussed in Chapter 2—will be affirmed, particularly those details that highlight points of connection with early Jewish and rabbinic thought. My reframing of the discussion may, in fact, allow some resolution of the points of significant divergence between their constructive accounts of the work.

we reconstruct in our imagination—including, crucially, their dynamic aspects—onto which we map the literature that we study. If our acts of “world building” are too narrowly reliant on a particular body of sources wrongly considered representative of the whole world, if they are too heavily modelled on what we are familiar with from our contemporary experience, or if they operate with categories that are too static—too fixed—then our analysis of the works we study will be too simplistic. It will actually distort our whole approach to these works, as we seek to place them in the fictive landscape that we have created, which often unwittingly reflects the colonial instincts and values that have shaped the worlds of modern scholarship.

While the problems that emerge as a result of this distortive world building have been especially significant for the study of 2 Enoch, they bear on many other pseudepigraphical and formally anonymous works from antiquity. These we may unwittingly have placed in the wrong boxes—because they can, with just a little work, be *made* to fit within these—and have then subsequently misused, in ways that sustain the distortive accounts that we favour. The arguments developed in this monograph, and the approach taken particularly with respect to 2 Enoch, will therefore have broader programmatic implications for the study of such pseudepigrapha and their significance within the study of religion and philosophy in antiquity. In turn, this will have implications for the study of the various literatures with which these pseudepigraphical works are obviously entangled, the material forms of which only emerge in late antiquity or in the medieval period.⁷

The task itself, as I pursue it within this study, continues to involve the core activities that scholars will expect. I will engage in close examination of 2 Enoch, in its various forms, and will carefully compare its contents with other remains from antiquity, both literary and material. Within this, particular attention will be paid to the Ethiopic Parables of Enoch, which I will show to have some quite distinctive parallels to 2 Enoch. The detailed comparison of the two works that I develop here will identify several striking points of correspondence in their themes and imageries, suggestive of a particular relatedness within the broader Enoch traditions, but it will also highlight some dramatic differences in the development of these very themes. My analysis of the Parables

⁷ Notably, such writings include the Jewish Hekhalot literature and Islamic traditions. I will not deal with these in any detail within the volume, though will incorporate some discussion of the Hekhalot texts, particularly the so-called 3 Enoch, but simply note that if the relevant pseudepigrapha are approached differently, much of the conversation about their relationship to these other writings and about the processes involved in their emergence changes.

will support the broad tendency of recent scholarship to identify the work as a product of early Judaism—although my re-imagining of the task will allow this category to be rather complicated—and the points of commonality and divergence between it and 2 Enoch will serve to illustrate the different complex of influences visible in the latter work. A full chapter will therefore be given over to reviewing the literature on the provenance of the Parables (Chapter 3). This will facilitate much of the comparative task, but, in the context of my reconceived iteration of the project, the review will also help to open reflection on how the categories that I seek to complicate in the rest of this chapter have shaped both the study of the Parables and the attempts to locate these with respect to other Enochic traditions.

The reframing of the task also permits and prompts me to examine some similarities with material typically omitted from the study of both 2 Enoch and the Parables (or if it is incorporated, it is generally only as a witness to the legacy of these works and their influence outside their primary contexts). This material includes Sethian and Manichaean texts—which are often treated as too late and too “marginal” to be of generative significance for 2 Enoch, and are instead taken to reflect the dissemination of Jewish influence—as well as “orthodox” theological responses to these. My approach will challenge the presumptive frameworks and intellectual maps that tend to cause the neglect of such works, seeing in them a tacit colonialism, and my reframing of the task will facilitate the emergence of new possibilities for what we might consider the Enochic work to signify.

This study will not solve the “enigma” or “mystery” of 2 Enoch, to use Andersen’s language; in fact, I will argue that we need to affirm its enigmatic status as a matter of intellectual humility and wisdom. We simply do not have access to all of the data that would be required to decisively place the work and, even if we did, would need to acknowledge that our attempts to order and make sense of the data would still involve the imposition of our own values upon it.⁸ We would still be required to construct a world in which to place the work, and such acts of construction typically draw upon the schematics with which we are familiar. Rather, by allowing 2 Enoch to be its enigmatic self, the study will seek intentionally to give the book space to challenge its interrogators, to destabilize their constructs, to invite a reimagining of the worlds from which it emerged. By an intentional

⁸ This point will be considered in a forthcoming study of memory and forgetting by Annette Yoshiko Reed. The work is still in progress and there are, at this stage, no further bibliographic details to include.

commitment to *not* eradicating what we find difficult to categorize in 2 Enoch, we can make proper use of it in our chastened study of antiquity.

In what remains of this chapter, then, I offer a critical reflection on the models of analysis that have typically been brought to bear on the discussion of the pseudepigrapha and related writings from antiquity. My reflection is particularly concerned with the conceptual metaphors and linguistics of the task, as these betray and reinforce imaginative aspects of analysis that need to be carefully considered. Without necessarily discarding these, I will draw upon elements of cultural philosophy to offer a more complicated and fluid imaginative rendering of the reality from which our pseudepigraphical texts emerged, drawing particularly on the work of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. I will then consider the problems in our approach to groups and networks and their influence over the production of writings in antiquity. Following this, I will reflect on factors particularly related to the “frontier” quality of the Levant, making explicit some of the colonial aspects that are entangled with these. Finally, I will offer some preliminary reflections on how all of these considerations might relate to Syria in late antiquity, as a possible context for the emergence of 2 Enoch.

1. Renewing the Imagination and Reconsidering Metaphors: On Trees, Rhizomes and the Ecology of Concepts

I invoke the language of the *imagination* from the beginning of my study. It may seem unscientific and imprecise, but it exposes something vital for us to recognize: the analysis and interpretation of ancient writings is always conditioned by our imagination, both in terms of the world we place the works within and the terms with which we correspondingly analyze them. As soon as we start using terms like “roots” or “branches” or “trajectories,” we are engaging imaginative metaphors to explicate or categorize the phenomena of the works that we study, metaphors that are built into our scholarly linguistics because of common presumptions about generative contexts.⁹ If, without recognizing it, we have used (or, more likely, inherited) the wrong metaphors, then our analysis will

⁹ Eva Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) offers a sophisticated exploration of the relationship between such metaphors and the those governing the conceptualizing of literary production itself, particularly that of the book. The theme runs through her study, but see especially the discussion in the subsection “The Bibliographic Imagination: Book as Metaphor,” 9–11.

be distorted; it may appear to be careful and scientific—neutral—but it will constitute an act of interpretative violence, of powerful imposition, often transmitted habitually across generations of scholarship, without being questioned. The answer cannot be to exclude all such metaphors, for the cross-domain mapping of metaphors is built into the structure of language itself (nicely illustrated by my use of the words “mapping” and “structure” and now also by “illustrated”);¹⁰ rather, it is to be constantly reflective upon the metaphors we use and how they are shaping our approach.

For those of us who work with the literatures and practices of religion in antiquity, it is particularly important to reflect upon the metaphors by which we consider the relationships of concepts and ideas. Crucially, we will ask different questions of the writings we consider, and explore different answers, if we allow that the phenomena encountered in them are not best explained by being mapped linguistically onto the development of trees—which grow and branch through the expression of their own internal genetics—but rather onto an ecosystem, where the emergence of new ideas reflects an essential heterogeneity, a generative difference expressed through the organic interaction of living things. The tree imagery that we commonly use in relation to texts and their contents aligns with a particular way of thinking about group development and its relationship to evolving ideas; the less commonly encountered imagery of an ecosystem invites complication and complexification, considered in dynamic or living terms. The description of ecosystems and ecologies uses a different lexicon to that of trees (even if the vocabulary list overlaps), but it also deploys these with a different grammar and syntax, reflecting its distinctive interest in the dynamics of what is being considered.

This insight draws upon the cultural philosophy of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari,¹¹ which is particularly concerned with the non-linear, acentered complexity that is generative of cultural goods and conceptual significations. Deleuze and Guattari intend their project to be “at once a

¹⁰ This insight is developed in the area of research known as cognitive linguistics, including particularly the sub-field of conceptual metaphor theory. While legitimate criticisms can be made of this approach, it draws attention to the embeddedness of metaphors in all of our language-acts. The classic study of conceptual metaphor theory is George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980). For a recent development of the approach, which responds to and incorporates criticism, see Zoltán Kövecses, *Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020).

¹¹ Although widely developed in their work, the concept is developed in especially pertinent ways to biblical studies and historical theology in Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Mille Plateaux: Capitalisme et Schizophrénie 2* (Paris: Edition de Minuit, 1980); English edition: *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (trans. Brian Massumi; Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1987; London: Athlone Press, 1988; Repr. London: Bloomsbury, 2013), esp. in the introductory essay (“Rhizome.”). The concepts I reference here are all laid out in this chapter. All page numbers follow the 2013 edition.

transcendental and a materialist analysis,”¹² and hence to reach beyond reductive categories without losing sight of the material connections that give rise to emergent realities. While it has been widely drawn into the cognate tasks of theology and philosophy, surprisingly little has been made of its potential value to the tasks of biblical studies, although some recent work by Bradley McLean has begun to explore its significance, particularly for the study of the New Testament and Christian origins.¹³ McLean, to his credit, seeks to develop a thoroughgoing implementation of the “schizoanalysis” that is the programmatic intent of Deleuze and Guattari; for my part, I seek to draw more modestly upon some of the core insights woven through their work.

Deleuze and Guattari recognize the extent to which modern Western scholarship (in keeping with much traditional thought throughout the pre-modern periods) is typically driven by genealogical interests that seek to identify species and to pursue their origins, tracing their developments through differentiation, diversification and dialectics. This is the logic of the tree.

It is odd how the tree has dominated Western reality and all of Western thought, from botany to biology and anatomy, but also gnoseology, theology, ontology, all of philosophy ...: the root foundation, *Grund, racine, fondement*. The West has a special relation to the forest, and deforestation; the fields carved out from the forest are populated with seed plants produced by cultivation based on species lineation of the arborescent type; animal raising, carried out on fallow fields, selects lineages forming an entire animal arborescence ... The West: agriculture based on a chosen lineage containing a large number of variable individuals.¹⁴

For Deleuze and Guattari, this essential tree logic determines how everything is evaluated and assessed, or even identified, according to the concerns of lineage and species, as these are defined by “arborescence.” This is true in the disciplines of the humanities as much as in science. We look for

¹² Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane; New York: Viking Penguin, 1977; repr. London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 132.

¹³ Most extensively, see Bradley H. McLean, *Deleuze, Guattari and the Machine in Early Christianity: Schizoanalysis, Affect and Multiplicity* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2022). The work was published too late in my own process for me to interact in detail with it, but it connects in interesting ways to my own findings. In McLean’s case, there is a more thoroughgoing exploration of the approach taken by Deleuze and Guattari and its relevance to the study of the New Testament, particularly their practice of “schizoanalysis”; my approach draws more basically on their imaginative model of the rhizome.

¹⁴ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 18–19.

trees and we find trees. Every part of the tree we identify is in some sense made of the same stuff; sometimes alien growths may have attached themselves, like funghi or ivy, but these can be removed without compromising the identity of the tree. Other trees may grow nearby and may look very similar, but the careful researcher will recognize that they are, in fact, of a different species and should also be considered “other” or “alien” (although occasionally we may encounter “grafts”). The growth of trees is impacted by external forces and factors, but the truly determinative stuff is treated as interior to the tree itself.¹⁵

By contrast to tree logic, or arborescence, Deleuze and Guattari advocate an anti-genealogical approach that recognizes and promotes heterogeneity itself as the essential reality and the generative factor in the development of concepts and cultural goods. Their primary alternative to the model of the tree, as a metaphor by which we commonly imagine development through time, is the model of the rhizome. This web-like, subterranean network that links tubers and fungi is, for Deleuze and Guattari, a metaphor for non-linear connectedness and of the complex interaction of signs and states.

Unlike trees or their roots, the rhizome connects any point to any other point, and its traits are not necessarily linked to traits of the same nature; it brings into play very different regimes of signs and even non-sign states.¹⁶

¹⁵ In an early article on the prospects of applying Deleuze and Guattari to New Testament studies, Bradley McLean summarized the interiority of the tree image in these terms:

A tree organizes its parts according to principles arising out of its own interiority and self-sufficiency. It germinates from a solitary seed or acorn, and, sustained by a developing system of roots, forms first a trunk and then branches that proliferate according to a genetically pre-established growing pattern: one branch subdivides into two, two branches into four, etc., until one day its many branches spread out into a great canopy of leaves. Every component of this tree is integrated into this coherent organic vertical system: outer branches connect with their supporting branches, which in turn, connect with other branches, a pattern which repeats itself until the trunk is reached. In a similar manner, the roots can be traced back to the trunk. According to a temporal rather than spatial mode of analysis, every part of the tree can be traced back chronologically to a single originating principle, a germinating seed.

Bradley H. McLean, “Re-Imagining New Testament Interpretation in Terms of Deleuzian Geophilosophy,” *Neotestamentica* 42 (2008): 51–72, quote from 53.

¹⁶ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 22.

They intend the image of the rhizome, however, to represent something more thoroughly ecological than, in its strictest sense, it might be understood to label.¹⁷ This can be recognized once the metaphor of the rhizome is connected to their other favoured image of *machines seeking connections*. “Machines” are not, as we might expect from the language, inorganic devices or mechanisms that are designed to perform specific tasks. As Deleuze and Guattari use the imagery, everything is in some sense a machine, something that works by engaging other surfaces in complex ways. A human is a machine, and a group of humans is a machine. A text is a machine. Wasps, viruses and bacteria are also machines, crawling over pollen laden flowers or invading cells. These machines transfer genetic material from one place to another and facilitate new connections and recombinations. Such connections may sustain sameness, as another rose grows that is the same as its parent strain, but they may also generate newness, and may play a role in the appearance and evolution of new entities, new strains or even new species.

Once the language of the machine is appreciated, the image of the rhizome can be seen as a symbol not just of the web-like, non-linear connections between tubers, but of entire ecologies. As such, it is “anti-genealogical,”¹⁸ because an ecology is not subject to the logic of the genealogy.¹⁹ It is important to note that there are “knots of arborescence in rhizomes and rhizomatic offshoots in roots,”²⁰ so that the two models do not exist in opposition but contextualize each other. The complexity and non-rigidity of this is such that the one seeking to describe it must maintain a

¹⁷ On this ecological quality, particularly as a descriptor of Guattari’s thought, see Hanjo Berressem, *Felix Guattari’s Schizoanalytic Ecology* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2020).

¹⁸ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 11, 23.

¹⁹ As a mode of evaluative thought, defined by its cognitive metaphors, they see the rhizome as more characteristic of “the East”:

The East presents a different figure: a relation to the steppe and the garden (or in some cases, the desert and the oasis), rather than the forest and field; cultivation of tubers by fragmentation of the individual; a casting aside or bracketing of animal raising, which is confined to closed spaces or pushed out onto the steppes of the nomads ... Does not the East, Oceania in particular, offer something like a rhizomatic model opposed in every way to the Western model of the tree? (Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 18–19.)

As a characterization of East and West, this is surely overdrawn, and Deleuze and Guattari themselves pull back from their own rhetorical positioning in the paragraphs and pages that follow; nevertheless, the discussion highlights the extent to which Western scholarship projects its own favoured metaphors, and the associated analytical models, onto its consideration of history.

²⁰ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 21.

principled commitment to “anexactitude,” to allowing that “anexact expressions are utterly unavoidable.”²¹

For all this necessary acknowledgement of the limits to our capacity for precision, the rhizomatic account of cultural ecology gives distinctive purchase on the emergence and development of concepts and practices. It challenges a discourse that tends to portray them as progressively evolving within a rather self-contained tradition, punctured only at select points, and instead allows for the ceaseless and non-linear phenomena of localized recombination (to maintain the genetic language used above) to be the true drivers of emergence. For biblical studies and historical theology, these insights provide a helpful counterbalance to the often-tacit presumption that our task is *principally* about tracing the evolution of ideas, considered as trajectories, as essentially linear (if not straightforward). They also alert us to the danger of over-simplifying the complexity of factors involved in the development of ideas, by presuming that those factors are effectively limited to what is available within the life of a group, or to what the group obviously opposes in the world outside its bounds, or to the occasional goods that cross the border into the group’s cultural territory and are naturalized.

Our scholarly models often presume that the integrity of the boundary around groups is punctured only in these specific ways, which ascribes a certain fixity of identity to the group and maps the development of ideas onto this (I will consider this further in the next section). The insights of Deleuze and Guattari invite a different identification of the task, one interested in exploring literature and material culture as epiphenomena of localized connections, developing through time but not necessarily in a way that can be labelled a trajectory. This invites some self-awareness about whether we are seeking to press the evidence of our various pseudepigrapha into the description of trees (whether Jewish or Christian), and need instead to allow for non-linear connections to be at the heart of our study.

More subtly, it invites reflection on whether we are led astray by the presumption that the group is the thing with an ontology, capable of effecting influence on the ideas in development, rather than allowing that the interactions between the desiring machines involved constitutes its

²¹ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 21.

own “social ontology.”²² This reality may occur at the group level, but will seldom do so *only* at this level, unless the group is of a particularly isolated sort.

There is a further interesting point to be explored here, as the image of the rhizome is considered in geographical or spatial terms. Spatial and territorial matters are woven through Deleuze and Guattari’s work, linking their account of trees and rhizomes to other categories of identification and evaluation and to other philosophies interested in the spatiality of power and identity. As well as being non-linear, the rhizome is “acentered” and resistant to descriptive approaches that require a presumptive centre. This is not to ignore the attempts to claim a centre—such claims are, indeed, interrogated—but to recognize that they are always subject to the positionality of the claimant and should not be accepted without question to have a broader representative value. This has implications for how we consider localized nodes of connection and places of particular entanglement. Those who inhabit the places in which those nodes occur may “centre” and map their world in ways that do not conform to the values of the globalized networks into which they may be incorporated, which may be differently centered. Later in this chapter, I will reflect on how a similar concern is articulated in the context of nissology, island studies, and how this relates to the problem of colonialism.

For Deleuze and Guattari, the concern with acenteredness also entails the indexing of arborescent logics to territorial imaginations. The language of “deterritorialization” runs through their project, often interwoven with discussions of genealogy and species. This, too, has a particular relevance for biblical studies and adjacent areas of scholarship in the study of religion. I noted above that we tend to frame the relationship between groups and ideas or literatures in ways that invoke the borders between species or nations. Borders can be contested and occasionally they can be punctured; sometimes, things can cross borders. Mostly, however, borders define limits and therefore identities, in ways that are clean and buffered. When ideas or traditions are considered to pass across our defined borders, then, we imaginatively represent this as an act of immigration,

²² This is an important element in Deleuze and Guattari, developed further in the scholarship that draws upon their approach. See, for example, the collection of essays in Martin Fuglsang and Bent Meier Sørensen, eds., *Deleuze and the Social* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006).

On the ontologizing of groups, and with an interrogation of the essential conceptualizing problems in “groupism,” see Rogers Brubaker, “Ethnicity without Groups,” *European Journal of Sociology* 43 (2002): 16–189.

probably followed by some process of naturalization.²³ We allow that ideas have crossed into Judaism from Persian thought, for example, but tend to view these as discrete border crossings, at particular points in the evolution of Israelite and Judaeen religion, as with the emergence of apocalyptic or the conceptuality of the “mystery,” the *raz*. We tend not to think of Persian religious influence (or Indian or Chinese, for that matter) as something of continual, existential relevance—as something always “in the air.”²⁴ Similarly, and of distinctive relevance to this project, we treat many pseudepigraphical writings as works that may have originated within a cleanly defined Judaism, within one of the demarcated sub-groupings that constitute its internal variegation, and then crossed into Christianity, after which point the works are naturalized with the addition of obviously Christian interpolations. These may be legitimate descriptions of what has happened, but they may also be dangerous oversimplifications of more rhizomatic realities, of more complex entanglements.

A subtle point of scholarly self-critique can emerge through reflection on Deleuze and Guattari’s account. While they urge readers to “make a rhizome,”²⁵ they recognize that the instinct towards arborescence, and its preoccupations with purity and speciation, has been pervasively effective, not just in modernity, but throughout the history of cultures. The desires that drive machines to make connections can also desire their own repression,²⁶ and rhizomes can be as despotic as trees.²⁷ By acknowledging the ancient antecedents of modern tree logic, and the despotic potential of rhizomatic thought, the categories of Deleuze and Guattari provide some useful philosophical purchase on the perennial phenomena of control and of “othering,”²⁸ as the practices and beliefs that are generated by localized encounters with difference are presented as

²³ The problem of using the language of “border” and the associated figuration of cultures, communities and heritage as nations or states is threaded through Barbara Meyer, *Jesus the Jew in Christian Memory: Theological and Philosophical Explorations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020); see, esp. 165–66. This observation is made particularly in relation to strategies and unwitting acts of “othering” and while she uses it critically in relation to the conceptualising of Christian and Jewish difference, she also applies it to the Christian treatment of Islamic traditions about Jesus.

²⁴ Such language is used of “esoteric” interests in the region by Markus N.A. Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*, WUNT II:36 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990), 20.

²⁵ “Schizoanalysis, or pragmatics, has no other meaning: Make a rhizome. But you don’t know what you can make a rhizome with, you don’t know which subterranean stem is effectively going to make a rhizome, or enter a becoming, people your desert.” *A Thousand Plateaus*, 292.

²⁶ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 251

²⁷ Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 21.

²⁸ For an extended account of “otherness” as a concept relevant to the study of Jewish and Christian identities, and its use in relation to Christological positions, see Meyer, *Jesus the Jew in Christian Memory*, esp. 149–57.

marginal or alien. The subtle point of relevance to our own area of study is this: when modern scholars, often formed by the complex colonial phenomena of “orientalism” analyzed by Edward Said,²⁹ approach ancient examples of such discourse, we can too simplistically valorize particular strands of religion in antiquity as “true” or “central” and others as “false” or “marginal.”

The standard use of the term “syncretism” often reflects this, labelling as it does the compromising of a purer form of religion with alien elements. Once a more rhizomatic model is adopted, recombination can be seen as the true universal, the necessary generative connection that always occurs within heterogeneity, and the question of whether a particular outcome constitutes something unacceptable or incompatible with core matters of conviction can be treated in a more nuanced way.³⁰ I will highlight some important examples of this in the study of 2 Enoch, which, for all its eclectic strangeness, is often strikingly “conservative” in its essential theology, apparently resisting specific points of gnostic cosmogony that are considered unacceptable while happily incorporating other mythological elements.

Before concluding this section of my discussion, it may be important to offer a brief comment on how this ecological approach relates to the various scholarly treatments of “influence” and “commonality,” particularly those concerned with the relationship of eastern and western thought. From the mid-20th century onwards there has been a sustained interest in eastern influence on western thought and on the development of Israelite traditions, particularly cosmogonies.³¹ Although some of this discussion reflects a certain “orientalizing” tendency (as per Said’s analysis of this), much has offered interesting reflection on how influence was mediated, considering the significance of trade routes and, as importantly, skill and craft routes (by which skilled workers would travel, sharing their traditions on the way). More recent research has considered the

²⁹ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978).

³⁰ This is often considered in relation to orientalism, but there are important points to be reflected upon here in relation to localized linguistic cultures within the West or North, that may preserve values quite at variance from the dominant intellectual culture of the common language. In my own Gaelic background, for example, Calvinist commitments were able to accommodate belief in divination (“second sight”) or in fairies and the otherworld, in ways that anglophone Calvinism seldom could. There is, I think, more to be done to consider the anthropology of such internal minority language cultures in relation to the refraction of ideas.

³¹ In relation to influence on Greek thought, seminal works include Martin West, *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971); idem, *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Element in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997); Walter Burkert, *Die orientalisierende Epoche in der griechischen Religion und Literatur* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1984); idem, *Da Omero ai Magi La tradizione orientale nella cultura greca* (Venice: Marsilio, 1999). In relation to Israelite and Jewish traditions, see Othmar Keel and Silvia Schroer, *Schöpfung: biblische Theologien im Kontext altorientalischer Religionen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2002).

possibilities of a *koine*, a common cultural stock, often linked to particular zones, some of which might be labelled as “open contact zones” and others as “intense contact zones,”³² the former involving a context of general cultural mixing and the latter a situation of conquest and cultural imposition. This discussion is valuable and has been increasingly attentive to the range of factors involved in cultural exchange. My use of Deleuze and Guattari’s insights can be aligned with it, but still invites reflection on the instincts to arborescence that may limit such reflections, including a tendency to focus on large zones and to show less interest in the localized machineries.

This brief engagement with the cultural philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari is intended to invite reflection on the extent to which, in our descriptive and analytical activity, we embody constructive instincts that are far from neutral and that are heavily shaped by our colonial past. While their philosophical work is not primarily concerned with the descriptive and analytical work of the historian or philologist, it is undoubtedly relevant to how we reflect upon our own methodological prejudices, particularly as these are shaped by underlying cognitive metaphors. My engagement with their insights is not naïve to the complexities of their political discourse and of the philosophies of power and economy that they draw upon; neither is it naïve to the criticisms that might be levelled against their engagement with the fields of psychology and philosophy.³³ A full affirmation of Deleuze and Guattari’s work is not required for us to be able to apply their insights to the legitimate destabilizing of our scholarly constructions and the opening of imaginative alternatives.

This invites reflection on the possibility that 2 Enoch has proven to be so difficult to locate because our approach to classification is primarily defined by models of genealogy and speciation, and is less alert to the dynamics of conceptual ecology. In the next section, I turn to consider particularly how this relates to the functional prioritization of groups and networks in our models of tradition and literary emergence. My intention is neither to deny nor to minimize the significance

³² See the various essays in Robert Rollinger and Kordula Schnegg, eds., *Kulturkontakte in antiken Welten: vom Denkmodell zum Fallbeispiel. Proceedings des internationalen Kolloquiums aus Anlass des 60. Geburtstages von Christoph Ulf*, Innsbruck, 26. bis 30. Januar 2009 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014). Of particular value in this volume is Christoph Ulf’s own reflection on the issues (“Reconsidering Cultural Contacts,” 507–65). I am grateful to Anna Angelini for guiding me to (and through) much of this literature.

³³ As, for example, in Theodore R. Schatzki, *The Site of the Social: A Philosophical Account of the Constitution of Social Life and Change* (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002), 92–95, 217–21, 239–40, 249–50.

of groups, but to relativize them with respect to the wider cultural ecology of antiquity, to contextualize them within the functional dynamics of a social ontology.

2. Relocating and Refiguring Groups and Networks in the Rhizome of Antiquity

At the heart of my attempt to reimagine the approach to 2 Enoch is a sense that the debates of which it has been part are, like much of our scholarly work, driven and defined by an over-simplistic prioritization of recognizable groups and networks in the analysis of literary remains. The need to move beyond crude categories of “Jew,” “Christian” and “other” is now widely (if not universally) recognized, as is the danger of relying on particular “authoritative” sources—those that reflect the traditions that would eventually take on a normative significance for Judaism and Christianity—for our reconstruction of ancient identities. Many scholars recognize that the use of these simplistic categories, and the presumption that they can legitimately be defined according to the standards articulated by these authoritative sources, has had a distortive effect on the study of religion in antiquity. I would suggest, however, that the attempts to move beyond this have remained limited in crucial respects by the essential problem (an over-reliance on the religious group or network as the primary generative factor), and that the study of works like 2 Enoch is compromised by this. The discussion of Deleuze and Guattari above will prove useful to our analysis of this limiting problem.

a. *Complicating the Classification of Groups*

Some have sought to overcome the simplistic scholarly approach to groups and texts by developing a more precise and granular schema or spectrum of the groups that may have been involved in the production of the works that we seek to classify. James Davila’s study, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian or “Other?”*³⁴ exemplifies this approach, providing a detailed schema of known groups in antiquity, arranged in relation to Judaism and Christianity, and discussing the key features that might allow writings to be identified as the works of these groups.

³⁴ James R. Davila, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian or Other?*, JSJSupp 105 (Leiden: Brill, 2005)

Davila seeks to build on two programmatic essays by Robert Kraft³⁵ that argue for the necessity of treating the manuscript contexts in which the pseudepigrapha are found—which are generally not Jewish—as of primary significance for the methodologies with which they are studied. Rather than bypassing these in the attempt to retrieve an originally Jewish work, usually by isolating the putative original and extricating it from its context,³⁶ Kraft argues for the need to take seriously the creative vitality and generative importance of the manuscript contexts, and of the transmissional worlds that may have fed them, allowing the study of these to play an appropriately determinative role in all use of the work in question.³⁷ Attempts to reconstruct the prehistory of a text should not take priority over this and should be treated as necessary only when these contexts cannot by themselves explain the presence of certain features, such as those that might be considered signature features of a Jewish authorship. Davila’s project seeks to develop this, by offering a complex and detailed account of the groups that may have been involved in the generation of the writings, intended to problematize still further the presumption that the presence or absence of certain features will indicate either a Jewish or a Christian authorship.

Davila’s study does a very effective job of complicating the standard approach to the groups behind the pseudepigrapha and offers some valuable reflection on the elements within texts that might be taken as markers of particular viewpoints. It also allows that some works may remain difficult to categorize definitively because of the overlapping commitments held in common by multiple groups. It is, however, still defined by an essential commitment to approaching works and

³⁵ Robert A. Kraft, “The Pseudepigrapha in Christianity,” in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha*, ed. John C. Reeves, SBLEJL 6 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 55–86, and “The Pseudepigrapha and Christianity Revisited: Setting the Stage and Framing Some Central Questions,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 32 (2001): 371–95.

³⁶ The publication of pseudepigrapha collections, such as Charlesworth’s *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, gives a physical embodiment to this tendency. Particularly illustrative of the issues at stake is the renaming of certain extracted works as an act of explicit re-identification. For example, the collection lists one particular set of extracts as “Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers,” masking the fact that these are, in fact, selected chapters from a late antique Christian work, probably traceable to Syria, known as the Apostolic Constitutions. See D. R. Darnell, with David Fiensy, “Hellenistic Synagogue Prayers,” in Charlesworth, *OTP* 2, 671–98. See further David A. Fiensy, *Prayers Alleged to be Jewish: An Examination of the Constitutiones Apostolorum*, Brown Judaic Studies 65 (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1985). Fiensy concludes that Jewish prayers are less extensively represented in the Apostolic Constitutions than the publication in Charlesworth might suggest.

³⁷ This concern has been reflected in the development of the “new philology” and a number of works that seek to take seriously the vitality of the pseudepigrapha within the manuscript cultures in which they are found. For an excellent example and a discussion of the relevant scholarship, see Liv Ingeborg Lied, *Invisible Manuscripts: Textual Scholarship and the Survival of 2 Baruch*, STAC 128 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021).

analyzing their features principally as the products of groups, and, moreover, of groups that are accessible to historical identification.

Such an approach, I would suggest, requires an essentially static definition of the groups in question: it considers them as *species* (or as *classes* in a taxonomy) and is characterized by the presumptive values that relate to *speciation* and thereby to classification. It is entirely consistent with this that Davila turns to (somewhat obsolete) theories of biological classification to develop his methodological framework, although he is hardly alone in doing this.³⁸ In turn, the use of biological concepts results in an analytical linguistic that loads the significance of certain features of the texts, or the putative groups behind them, in particular ways. Davila is, for example, happy to describe some Jews as “syncretistic,” but this term implies that the religious values being combined are *essentially* alien to each other, that there is some kind of pure form of each species of religious thought that is in some sense compromised by the combination. I will argue later in this chapter that the use of such language obscures the dynamic reality of how supervenient cultures shape the beliefs and practices of people and groups within them, such that the truly effective factor is not the identity of the group, but the vibrancy of the culture in which they are embodied. To recognize this is not to exclude or even to minimize the roles played by groups and networks, but to relativize and contextualize them within a bigger picture of cultural factors, and to acknowledge that our knowledge of the groups that may have been involved, particularly at the local level, is fragmentary at best.

It is also, perhaps, worthy of note that Davila describes these groups as representing a “continuum” of attitudes to Jewish, Christian and pagan or Hellenistic identity markers.³⁹ Positively, this represents a useful acknowledgement of the artificiality of the boundaries often presumed to separate sub-groupings. It is interesting that one occurrence of the word occurs alongside a reference to the seminal collection of essays edited by Adam Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed, *The Ways that Never Parted*,⁴⁰ and is accompanied by the recognition that “the question of whether a

³⁸ Davila specifically invokes the work of Jonathan Z. Smith, “Fences and Neighbors: Some Contours of Early Judaism,” in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism, Vol. II*, ed. William Scott Green (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980), 1–25. Smith appropriates the “polythetic” model of biological classification, which has then been developed in his subsequent work. It is worth noting that the approaches to classification that inform Smith’s account have largely been replaced in the biological sciences by models informed by genetics, such as that of cladistics.

³⁹ See, e.g., Davila, *Provenance*, 36–39, 48–49, 59, 228.

⁴⁰ Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds., *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).

pseudepigraphon is Jewish or Christian becomes much more difficult, if not entirely irrelevant.”⁴¹ The language of the continuum is, however, vulnerable to a rather linear conceptualization, something to which I am sensitive because of my work on autism and the concept of the autistic spectrum.⁴² This is often conceived as a graded line, usually representing levels of “functionality” and effectively mapped as a two dimensional, monochrome line that is shaded in density from high to low; those involved in autism advocacy, often using the neurodiversity model, will frequently call for a multi-dimensional account of the spectrum, in which the various colours of autistic characteristics combine in a unique way, with distinctive levels of saturation, in each autistic individual. This is never reducible to high and low function, because that is to simplify a spectrum to a single band within its true complexity and then to judge that band according to a normalized standard. There is, I think, an obvious correspondence between this criticism and the continuum model, and also an obvious point of contact with the complex account of cultural recombination discussed above in relation to Deleuze and Guattari. It is worth noting that the various essays in the Becker and Reed volume noted above resist any such linearity in their conceptualizing of the relationships in question.

b. Reconsidering the Normativity of the Networks and their Literatures

Others have recognized the problem that is constituted by the prioritizing of particular literary remains that are presumed to have normative status for all within the groups that they purport to represent. Here, the major concern is that the surviving literary works that principally govern our study of religion in antiquity are associated with “networks of literate cultural providers.”⁴³ There is a growing sensitivity among scholars about the extent to which these works represent quite narrowly the views of particular literate elites, who are concerned both with the intellectual qualities of their groups’ commitments and with the boundaries that distinguish their groups from

⁴¹ Davila, *Provenance*, 48.

⁴² Grant Macaskill, *Autism and the Church: Bible, Theology, Community* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2019).

⁴³ I draw this language from Stanley Stowers, particularly “The Concept of ‘Community’ and the History of Early Christianity,” in *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 23 (2011): 238–56 and “The Religion of Plant and Animal Offerings Versus the Religion of Meanings, Essences and Textual Mysteries.” Pages 35–56 in *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice: Images, Acts, Meanings*, ed. Jennifer Knust and Zsuzsa Varhelyi (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 35–56.

others. The writings of such people may not be representative of the wider population, including those who may be associated with the group or network (and who may identify themselves as faithful Jews or Christians). Scholars have become increasingly sensitive to reconstructions of early Judaism and Christianity that have failed to take this into account, and that have consequently considered aberrations from the standards articulated in these works to constitute marginal or fringe practice. Taken as a proportion of the populace, including the populace that shares a certain commitment to a particular god, the educated elite represented by these texts may subscribe to the minority position on matters of religious or intellectual propriety, but their generation of a literary legacy—particularly as this is approached by scholars who inhabit cultures in which literacy levels are high and in which literacy is thus normalized—has the effect of making their sensibilities appear to be normative for the group they represent.

The growing commitment to approaching material evidence on its own terms, rather than through the prism of the writings associated with the tiny proportion constituted by the literate elite, is an important corrective to this. It is all too easy, however, to allow this corrective simply to generate new and equally problematic binaries. To speak of “networks of elite literate culture providers” can frame the matter in such a way that those who do not subscribe to the values of those networks are presumptively categorized as “non-elite” and “non-literate.” For many in antiquity, this would undoubtedly have been the case, and the discussion reminds us of the need to be careful about projecting the literacy culture of the modern North back onto the ancient world. But there may also have been elite, erudite persons—people capable of generating written works like the pseudepigrapha—whose values aligned with the networks on many points and who may indeed have participated in the life of the network, but who did not subscribe to all of the values articulated by its authoritative figures.

Here, it is particularly interesting to consider how “authority” may have been judged, assigned or weighed at the local level, as the symbolic capital of localized leadership interacted with that of the transnational networks, whether religious or philosophical. A number of studies have highlighted the extent to which religiously aligned communities in antiquity were led by powerful local figures, who would have been wealthy and learned.⁴⁴ Such figures may well have participated

⁴⁴ This, at least, seems to have been the case in Jewish communities. See Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society: 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).

in the life of a given transnational religious or philosophical network, but they may also have participated in the lives of other locally present networks, and in other highly local cultural practices. Various accounts from antiquity attest (often critically) such mutual participation across the putative boundaries between groups and these are paralleled in contemporary contexts today.

Viewed from the perspective of the international network representative, such participation might threaten the purity of identity and constitute a “syncretism”; viewed from the perspective of the local, including the local leader, such participation is simply a matter of social life, of being.

While we need to be careful in using contemporary examples to illustrate or to probe this phenomenon, some useful insights can be drawn from anthropologically oriented studies. Kwame Appiah, for example, relates the story of he and his father—an elder in the Methodist church in his native Ghana—pouring out libations to their ancestors, in keeping with Asante practices, without any sense that this might transgress the singular commitment to the God of Jesus Christ that is central to the Methodist tradition, as a Christian church:

For many in Asante, religion—what anthropologists call “traditional religion”—is not merely sacrament; it is government ... There are forms to process, exchanges to be proffered, takes to be paid, mainly in the form of libations, salutations, and sacrifices ... And these practices are taken by most people—Asante Catholic bishops and Imams included!—to be perfectly consistent with having other confessional allegiances, with being Muslim or Christian.⁴⁵

In my own background of Gaelic Calvinism, in the Western Isles of Scotland, elements were preserved even into the 19th and 20th century—particularly in domestic and village life—that would be regarded outside the tradition as “superstition,” including the veneration of local seers marked by the “second sight,” the honoring of sea spirits by local elders and the practicing of healing rituals involving blessed relics.⁴⁶ It is, perhaps, noteworthy that the prevalence of these elements was

⁴⁵ Kwame Anthony Appiah, *The Lies that Bind: Rethinking Identity—Creed, Country, Colour, Class, Culture* (London: Profile, 2018), 65–67, quotation from 66. I am grateful to Matthew Novenson for directing me towards Appiah’s reflections on this point.

⁴⁶ Although the study is of a popular and less academic sort, and is distinctly negative in its evaluation of the phenomena, John MacLeod, *Banner in the West: A Spiritual History of Lewis and Harris* (Edinburgh: Birlinn, 2008), 95–103, provides a well-research set of examples. The practice of making offerings to the sea god Seonaidh (sometimes rendered Shony) is also discussed by Donald MacLeod, “Celtic Spirituality,” in *Worship and Liturgy in*

eroded as Anglophone Calvinism became more influential in the culture, amplified in more recent times by the declining numbers of Gaelic speakers. It is also particularly noteworthy that the formal or organizational networks constituted by the major denominations with which the island religion is associated, headquartered in the city of Edinburgh and emblematically tracing its lineage to Geneva, would not have considered such practices to be representative of their practice. That is, the “official line” is not representative of actual practice, particularly in the context of linguistically distinctive localities.

It is important to recognize that the discourse around identity, and particularly how it relates to belief, has developed quite significantly in the last few decades, not least because of the sharpened self-consciousness about the colonial pasts within disciplines like anthropology and sociology. Appiah’s work, cited above, is emblematic of this shift, but so too is my invoking of Gaelic culture from Scottish islands. The discipline of nissology, island studies, involves a distinctive assertion of the critical discourse, to which I will return in the next section, and there are some promising examples of its relevance to biblical studies. It gives particular focus to the simple but powerful insight that underlies the recent shift across the disciplines: those whose perspectives are defined by their involvement with centres of power in global networks (whether empires or corporations) will tend to evaluate the world accordingly, categorizing things according to their grades of proximity or distance, centrality or remoteness, and measuring their value against such standards. To be erudite is to be “urbane”; to be uncultured is to be “parochial,” “rural,” “rustic.” Pagan.⁴⁷

As the developing discourse has challenged such centering, it has invited a fresh evaluation of the communities treated as marginal, whether at the level of national or continental characterizations (as in the phenomena of orientalism) or at the level of local ones, as with islands. There is, I would suggest, an important analogy between the kind of acentering advocated in developing critiques⁴⁸ of the colonial legacy—emblemized by the nissological challenge to

Context: Studies and Case Studies in Theology and Practice, ed. Duncan B. Forrester and Doug Gay (London: SCM, 2009), 36–49 (specifically 46–47).

⁴⁷ The heritage of this word, and its associating of the rural context with idolatry and ignorance, is long, reminding us that the phenomena of colonialization and marginalization that we consider are embedded in the historical texts that we consider, as well as being part of our contemporary world.

⁴⁸ These critiques involve the recognition that the very language and task of decolonizing can be subject to “settler colonialism,” especially when undertaken in the context of contemporary neo-liberalism. See the analysis in Eve

consider the world as an archipelago—and that of Deleuze and Guattari’s rhizomatic model. What the representative of the powerful centre, itself the thing that is “remote” from the viewpoint of the local, would regard as uncultured syncretism may be appreciated without any question within a community for which it is a matter of long heritage, even if the thing evolves in its perceived significance through its encounter with the religion or philosophy brought by the network.

Bringing these insights back to antiquity, we can consider that the encounter between the networks and local religious life was likely to be complicated. It would not simply have involved a binary opposition of insider and outsider, but a constant and perhaps often tense negotiation between the values of those committed to the identity of the networks and those more liminal to these, with whom they may nevertheless have shared a broader commitment to the God of Israel and/or Jesus. Here, then, polemics might emerge, but not always between groups; rather, they may have been polemics around ideas and values, all coloured by other intersections—for example, with the philosophies or with locally important religious traditions. To speak of such possibilities is not speculative or fanciful: there are plenty of examples in antiquity of collisions between local cultures and the representatives of the networks, often with interesting features of local negotiation.⁴⁹ Bound up with this is the complex matter of the relationship between local solidarity and identity,

Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, “Decolonization is Not a Metaphor,” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1 (2012): 1–40. I am grateful to Annette Yoshiko Reed for drawing my attention to this article.

⁴⁹ The interaction between Vigilantius and Jerome (*Contra Vigilantium* 7) over the lighting of lamps by day is one example of this, discussed further in Chapter 8. Vigilantius sees the daily religion of Syrians as polluted by local paganism and superstition, with lights incorporated into day-time worship; Jerome challenges him, with a Christological defense of the practice. Both figures are literate cultural providers and participate in the authoritative network of the church, but Jerome’s theology is coloured by local influences.

Davila himself interacts with this evidence for mutuality across putative group boundaries, but it is interesting that he does so in order to show that a given writing presumed to be Jewish may, in fact, be the work of a Christian author. That is, he is interested not in pursuing the possibility that the boundaries between groupings may not actually be as determinative for identity as often presumed, but simply in arguing that a written work may have been mistakenly ascribed to a particular group. His discussion of Chrysostom exemplifies this. Chrysostom’s legacy is used both as a window onto the lives of Syrian Christians who regularly attended the synagogue (and were sharply criticized for it; *Provenance*, 47) and as an example of a Christian author whose works, at points, lack obvious Christian signature features (*Provenance*, 84–89). The end to which Davila orients this discussion is to some extent legitimate: he challenges the presumptions that knowledge of (and sympathy towards) Jewish traditions is necessarily a marker of Jewish authorship and that the absence of Christian signature features is good evidence for a non-Christian authorship. He is still, however, oriented by the conviction that a given pseudepigraphon should be categorized with respect to a defined group, even while challenging the criteria by which this classification is undertaken; his work does not engage seriously with the possibility that the categories may not be meaningfully distinctive at the local level.

by which religious and philosophical convictions function with (and perhaps are subordinated to) a common local identity that may have distinctive linguistic features.⁵⁰

My point here is that there may be textual works generated by literate and erudite people, evincing values or reflecting traditions that do not align with our reconstructions of known groups or networks in antiquity, the apparent oddness of which should not be assumed too quickly to represent the handiwork of a “sect” or a “fringe community.” They may be representative of the wider religious values of a less bounded community, even among the wealthy and literate, in ways shaped by local dynamics. They may bear witness to the polemics of conflicting ideas, rather than conflicting groups, but also to the sheer vitality of imaginative tropes and traditions, as they take on new life in new contexts. This recognition constitutes an important corrective to the tendency of scholars to address the over-prioritization of particular textual traditions primarily through a turn to material evidence; alongside that material evidence is textual evidence, the true significance of which has been misappraised.

One further point must now be considered in relation to the values of groups and networks, and their local embodiments, and it concerns the extent to which their values are genuinely determined by their claimed emblematic commitments or are shaped by emergent cultural factors. I use the word “emergent” as a label for the phenomena of culture and influence because of some sophisticated philosophical reflection on the value of that word to capture the complex directions of generative influence (in contrast, for example, with “supervenient”). The language of emergence, as some have used it, is attentive to the ways that a newly identifiable thing might be constituted by the interactions of elements in the world that lies under it, to which it is never reducible. An identifiable “person” emerges from the complex interactions of the elements in their neurophysiological constitution, with each other and with their environment, and this kind of emergent agency is paralleled at the social, cultural and institutional level. But the language of

⁵⁰ In my own heritage, to which I have already gestured, identification with a particular island or archipelago and with the communities that still speak Gaelic generates a solidarity that transcends the distinctions between religious traditions; to be a Gael and an Uibhisteach creates a solidarity between those of different faith associations, one shared with the diaspora, and a differentiation from others who may well live in the island communities, but are “Galls,” foreigners, lowlanders or non-Gaels. This is not reducible to the identity of the group; it is a more complex and dynamic matter, defined more by culture and language-heritage than by group. This parallels the contemporary phenomena seen in local contexts in, for example, modern Palestine, where to be “Nablusi” is to share and celebrate a local identity associated with that town and its dialects, a solidarity that is capable of sustaining the religious diversity within the tradition.

emergence is also attentive to the “downward causality” that this new thing can then effect on its constituent elements: as the “person” emerges, they shape and reshape the reality of their constitution, as their affective and appetitive identity is effectively enacted.⁵¹

This is relevant to how we might think about the emergence of identifiable cultures and sub-cultures. A Jewish work from Syria or Babylon in late antiquity might take on qualities from the emergent or recombinant “Syrian” culture to which it has contributed, even if it has at its core elements that entered its world from Egypt. The modern phenomenon of localized television show remakes might function as a kind of analogy to this, and might cast some interesting light on the details: the *US Office* is marked by a different kind of humour to the UK original, even if the apparent details of plot and character are the same, and something similar can be said about *Call My Agent!* and *Ten Percent*.

I invoke such examples from comedy to make a very serious point: cultures and sub-cultures may, in reality, be more subtly determinative for the qualities evinced in a particular work, even the product of a particular group, than the purported alignment with a wider tradition. The features claimed to reflect definitively a particular tradition may prove to be both superficial and rather elastic, with the truly determinative elements of thought operating at an underlying level.

This point can be illustrated—though with acknowledged caution—in relation to contemporary evangelicalism. As a movement, evangelicalism is often concerned in principle with maintaining its intellectual and moral boundaries, its differences from both the obviously “non-Christian” and from the forms of Christianity that it regards as assimilated to worldly standards; in order to do this, it will position itself as the true heir of the apostolic church and of biblical teaching, in essential continuity with the believing communities of the New Testament. It will, accordingly, see itself as a tradition with a distinctive theology.⁵² Much serious analysis, however, considers

⁵¹ For a useful introduction to the relevant literature, sensitive to its implications for the tasks of theology, biblical studies and the study of religion, see Matthew Croasmun, *The Emergence of Sin: The Cosmic Tyrant in Romans* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 22–56. Croasmun considers the Sin that Paul describes in Romans to be a “person-identification” and not merely a “personification,” which allows a particular evaluation of systemic or structural evil to be developed.

⁵² Some care needs to be taken with this point. Some of the publications labelled as “evangelical theology” are translations from German and represent a distinctive form of Lutheran or *evangelische* thought. Older Anglophone works, particularly from the Scottish tradition, represent the binary of “evangelical” and “Moderate” parties, which were distinguished not by the features typically associated with contemporary evangelicalism, but by particular approaches to individual faith and piety. All of these points of distinction actually highlight my point, that the word labels a rather elastic movement, shaped in all of its iterations by contemporary cultural factors.

evangelicalism not primarily to constitute a doctrinally defined tradition, but a sociological movement, one that is essentially, but often unwittingly, characterized by distinctively modern and Western concepts of the self, of time, of community and of economy.⁵³ To claim this is not to dismiss the doctrinal commitments and decisions that may characterize evangelical belief, nor to neglect genuine points of continuity in their detail with older theologies; neither is it to pass judgement on the value of evangelical positions. Rather, it is to acknowledge that what makes modern evangelicalism distinctive is precisely the refraction of older concepts through modern values and the selection of key emphases according to the intellectual context of modernity, not least its particular interest in the individual. The most characteristic quality of modern evangelicalism is its modern-ness.

Furthermore, it is possible to distinguish the qualities of British evangelicalism from those of American evangelicalism, reflecting the differences in underlying culture and values.⁵⁴ These differentiated qualities are not static, and an interesting role is played by the publishing houses and media that play a role in forming network identity, the influences of which have changed over the last two centuries. The point here is that what is arguably most determinative for modern evangelicalism is not what it itself considers to be determinative—the Bible and biblical theology—but rather modernity, and that in its distinctively British and American forms. Ironically, a community preoccupied with the problem of syncretism is shaped by a distinctive fusion of modern value and ancient myth.

⁵³ The classic study of this is David Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London: Routledge, 1988). While focused on evangelicalism in Britain, the core observations about the sociological qualities of evangelicalism, that it is essentially a social movement or grouping rather than a theologically distinct tradition, can be transferred more broadly. See also the assessment of Bebbington's claims and their legacy in the collection of essays in Michael A.J. Haykin and Kenneth J. Stewart, eds., *The Emergence of Evangelicalism: Exploring Historical Continuities* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2008).

⁵⁴ This is one of the key elements in Bebbington's analysis, in *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*. A much-discussed opinion piece in the *New York Times*, by the late Timothy Keller, highlighted some of these differences. In "How Do Christians Fit Into the Two-Party System? They Don't," *New York Times* (September 29, 2018), Keller relayed this story:

I know of a man from Mississippi who was a conservative Republican and a traditional Presbyterian. He visited the Scottish Highlands and found the churches there as strict and as orthodox as he had hoped. No one so much as turned on a television on a Sunday. Everyone memorized catechisms and Scripture. But one day he discovered that the Scottish Christian friends he admired were (in his view) socialists. Their understanding of government economic policy and the state's responsibilities was by his lights very left-wing, yet also grounded in their Christian convictions. He returned to the United States not more politically liberal but, in his words, "humbled and chastened." (<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/09/29/opinion/sunday/christians-politics-belief.html>)

Of course, there may be groups that preserve a traditional identity much more carefully and intentionally within a wider culture. Here, we can compare evangelical churches to the various Orthodox churches maintained in Britain and America. My point is not that we should neglect the possibility of such identity maintenance, but that we should not too quickly presume a model based on it. There is, in particular, a danger of reaching for the category of the ghetto when dealing with more complex phenomena of identity and tradition.

3. On Frontiers, Colonialism and Orientalism (With Some Insights from Nissology)

In addition to the points noted above, which are broadly transferable to the discussions of texts and their emergence, there are some distinctive geographical issues that bear on the study of the works considered in this monograph and on that of the wider corpus of the pseudepigrapha. These are particularly linked to the “frontier” quality of the broad territory in which the literature emerged, located as it is within Asia as much as within Europe and between the Balkans and Africa. To use the word “frontier” is, of course, to employ language suggestive of colonialization and imperial dynamics; used with care, such language opens important lines of reflection on the distinctive local cultures that might emerge in contexts located within the often-contested borderlands of empires.

Much of the discourse that frames the study of the pseudepigrapha remains overly determined by a certain “Mediterraneanism” that homogenizes local cultures into a single thing and that understands that thing in categories natural to the West. The Mediterranean thus becomes a core element in the Occidental analysis of early Jewish and Christian traditions, with little sustained reflection on the frontier quality of Roman Syria, including Palestine, except as the Eastern frontier of Western empire.⁵⁵ The writings associated with early Judaism and early Christianity are primarily approached in the social and intellectual terms associated with the Greek and Roman cultures that left such an imprint on the West—their importance renewed but refracted by the Renaissance—using models of social identity that are defined by what is familiar from Southern Europe.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ For sustained reflection on this, see Annette Yoshiko Reed, “Beyond the Land of Nod: Syriac Images of Asia and the Historiography of ‘The West,’” *History of Religions* 49 (2009): 48–87.

⁵⁶ This point has been considered in recent work on anthropology. See Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed, 1999; 3rd Edition, London: Bloomsbury, 2021); the theme is pervasive in Matthew Engelke, *Think Like an Anthropologist* (London: Penguin, 2017).

To appreciate the relevance of this requires patient self-reflection on the terms of our scholarly discourse. We can rightly acknowledge that the territories historically known as the Levant sit on the edge of the Mediterranean and were under Greek and then Roman rule during the centuries around the turn of the era; the influence of those empires and their cultures was, of course, enormous. While acknowledging this, however, we also need to recognize that their influence was not total. The designation of the region as “the Levant” in the early modern period essentially acknowledged its quality as a frontier space between Europe and Asia, though this was an act of naming bound up with the dynamics of the orientalism seminally examined by Edward Said.⁵⁷ Asian influences were ever-present in the Levantine mix, but were often subjected to a kind of “othering” by those whose own perspective was more cleanly positioned in the West. Often, this involved an association of the Western intellectual world with “civilization” and the Eastern with the sub-civilized exotic. The presence of Western “schools” and networks in the Levant could be considered, then, in rather missional terms and the interference of Asian philosophy and religion treated as a residual alien presence, occasionally manifesting in a “syncretism” that civilized thought would, in time, eradicate. Such an account of the thought world of the Levant has characterized much modern thought and is built into the very models and linguistics that we apply to religion in antiquity. It also had some ancient analogues.

If the Mediterranean is at the centre of our intellectual and conceptual map, then the territories on its edges (even if they are the focal point of our study) will always be treated as marginal. If, however, we move the map, so that the area associated with the writings we consider is central, a very different evaluative framework emerges, and with it a different linguistics. Now, the Asian is not the marginal other, the alien exotic, but the present reality, the mundane; it may not even be named, because it is assumed, woven into the fabric of culture and thought for all from this place.

This imaginative act of moving the map needs to be pressed further, for it can be performed according to the various scales of maps that we use. The global map can be shifted to centre on the Levant, an act that destabilizes our colonially influenced identifications of centre and margins, but as we move to finer scales of maps, and begin to consider the intersectional factors at work, the very notion of a centre becomes further complicated. Empires, nations, powers and networks may have

⁵⁷ Said, *Orientalism*.

identified centres, hubs that represent particular points of importance in their identity and organization; local communities may consider themselves, or their place, to constitute an alternative centre. Each considers the other to be remote, but history tends to treat the cities at the heart of empires as the actual centre.

The categories at stake are further destabilized in important ways by the contemporary discipline of island studies, nissology.⁵⁸ Island communities are commonly labelled as “remote,” a designation that often implied that they are culturally and linguistically “marginal.” In keeping with this, islands are frequently represented as primitive or backward. But all of this is to view them from the standpoint of the colonial centers that have typically occupied them, to adopt what some nissologists will label a “continentalist” viewpoint. From the perspective of London or Edinburgh, the island my family comes (off the northwest coast of Scotland) from is remote, associated with an irrelevant language and with strange religious values; but from our perspective, they are the remote ones. Equivalent dynamics obtain for other island communities, such as the Caribbean,⁵⁹ and for non-island communities that are remote from the primary centre of administrative power. Some practitioners of nissology therefore advocate the adoption of the island perspective as a point of insight into what they term “the global archipelago,”⁶⁰ a category that invites a principled acentering as a response to the dynamics of globalization. This is somewhat equivalent to the image of the rhizome discussed above.

The nissological approach also encourages a particular granularity of scale in the analysis of the dynamics, an awareness that island groups themselves will have different centres within themselves, often defined by local dialect. Islanders will feel complex solidarities, linked to language and dialect and also to historical associations with different powers. The island that my family comes from, for example, is a bilingual space in which one of the languages is itself a hybrid of a traditional Celtic language (Scottish Gaelic) and the old Norse that dates from the period of Scandinavian rule, represented particularly in place-names and family names; the other language is the English of the colonizing power in which we are today incorporated. The culture is a blend of

⁵⁸ This area of research has begun to be represented in biblical scholarship. See, for example, Jione Havea, Margaret Aymer, Vernon Steed, eds., *Islands, Islanders, and the Bible: RumInations* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015).

⁵⁹ Most of the essays in Havea, et al., *Islands, Islanders and the Bible*, are focused on the Caribbean.

⁶⁰ Christian Depraetere, “The Challenge of Nissology: A Global Outlook on the World Archipelago - Part I: Scene Setting the World Archipelago,” and “The Challenge of Nissology: A Global Outlook on the World Archipelago - Part II: The Global and Scientific Vocation of Nissology,” *Island Studies Journal* 3 (2008): 3–16 and 17–36.

these linguistic heritages, the dominance of powers that we continue to feel both kinship with and alienation from.

There is a certain liminality⁶¹ to the identity of those who live “on the edge of the world,”⁶² a moving between cultures that is often linguistically shaped, as we cross back and forth from the world of Gaelic into the world of English, from the world centred on the administrative hubs of the islands and their parishes, to the one centred on Edinburgh, London and New York. But what for us is experienced as a *dynamic* liminality is, for the one looking from the urban centre of the economic network, simply a marginality, and one that is often represented in culturally dismissive terms, equivalent to those used of the east and of the indigenous in colonial discourse. Islanders are regularly portrayed as backward, traditional, and even with tropes of savagery, often by media outlets that identify themselves by their progressive values.

These phenomena are strikingly similar to those described in the study of orientalism, particularly in Said’s seminal work, and this is why I draw them into the discussion of the ancient Levant. The world of the ancient Levant may not have been an island archipelago, but it was subject to the same identifications that affect all communities located at the edge of the geographical extent of given empires, particularly those adjacent to competing empires. There were, as with island communities, especially complex solidarities and liminalities at work, the latter not as simple as the category sometimes used in sociology for a state of directional transition, but rather the fluid movements between worlds and the entanglement of values from each. It might initially seem strange to apply the insights of nissology to the study of non-island contexts like Syria or Palestine, but once the parallels between places that exist in the overlap of empires is recognized, the value becomes clear.

⁶¹ The liminality is explored by Moray Watson, “The Idea of Island in Gaelic Fiction,” *The Bottle Imp* 21 (2008). Published online: <https://www.thebottleimp.org.uk/2017/06/the-idea-of-island-in-gaelic-fiction/>. Watson’s exploration of liminality is, interestingly, anchored in Homi Bhabha’s *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994). In the same issue of *The Bottle Imp* as Watson’s essay, a sophisticated treatment of the “othering” of islanders and the often contradictory elements of identity is found in Kevin MacNeil, “Portable Rootedness and Other Contradictions: Some Thoughts on Contemporary Hebridean Poetry,” <https://www.thebottleimp.org.uk/2017/06/portable-rootedness-and-other-contradictions-some-thoughts-on-contemporary-hebridean-poetry/>.

⁶² I take this designation from the title of a song by the Scottish band Runrig, whose principal songwriters are from the Western Isles and write in both Gaelic and English; the song, *The Edge of the World* (Calum MacDonald, Rory MacDonald, 1991) captures the sense of complex identity, centred on multiple edges at once, of civilization and of the Atlantic.

Recognizing this allows a fresh appreciation of the relationships that linked, for example, the Manichaeans to the Jews, with the Elchasites playing an important part in this. With the map recentered, we are less likely to portray the Manichaeans as a marginal, if large, sect and Elchasites as a movement on the fringes of Jewish Christianity. In fact, the scale and significance of Manichaeism is entirely recast by the recentring of the map, in ways that we will see to be quite significant for 2 Enoch. But it also allows us to recognize that even these categories do not function in a way that totalizes identity, particularly in these culturally complex spaces. As relevant as it is to the study of these typically marginalized groups, it is relevant also to how we evaluate the incorporation of cultural symbolism like zodiacs into the architecture of synagogues in late antiquity. And it is relevant to whether we think that by mapping the presence of known groupings, particularly those associated with western cultures, in the ancient Levant, we have even begun to build a picture of religious identity in that world. A decolonized intellectual humility requires us to admit that we have not.

For those interested in studying the embodiments of religion in this area, this requires us to be alert to two interlocked problems. The first is that much of what we deal with in the representation of people, place and religion in antiquity is rendered through the equivalent dynamics of perspective that we have just discussed: the world is often described from the perspective of those in antiquity who were associated with the powerful centres and their networks, functionally marginalizing those from outside those centres. The second problem is that modern urban readers who share the equivalent perspective may not even notice this first factor, so normalized is their viewpoint from the heart of the modern empire.

This is particularly relevant to how we evaluate the significance of groups and networks in this particular geographic space of the Levant. There is no question that philosophical and religious networks, maintained through trade routes, played a key role in unifying the discourse and practices groups around the Mediterranean. But the dynamics of such networks would undoubtedly have been different as one moved inland from the Mediterranean, away from the relative speed and safety of transmission afforded by sea routes and further into a world that belonged within Asia as much as within Europe or North Africa.

If our imagination allows that texts emerged from places populated with people associated with diverse ethnic and religious particularities, who interacted within (and identified with) a

shared culture characterized by distinctive local colour—and who sometimes shared spaces or institutions—then the relationship between Jewish, Christian and “other” elements in any given text might be much more complicated and, actually, much less mechanical. A work may reflect the complex entanglement of religious and ideological traditions within a culture, and the growth of stories within this, such that to envision a single crossing point from Judaism into Christianity (and even to reduce these identities to singular terms) is grossly and distortively over-simplistic. If that is the case, then we need to consider the models that might help us to figure and conceptualize mutual cultural dynamics and to reflect on how these might relate to the demonstrable existence of groups within a culture.

4. The Distinctive Significance of Syria as Provenance

When I first began this project, centred on the comparison of 2 Enoch and the Parables of Enoch, I expected a different geographical context to suggest itself as the common place through which both works had passed and in which they were entangled. As I will discuss (by way of review) in Chapter 2, much of the research on the provenance of 2 Enoch has considered it most likely that the work was composed in Egypt, though it has debated whether the authors were Jewish or Christian. Particular elements in the astronomical and cosmological imagery seem most obviously to reflect Egyptian culture and there are philosophical representations of time and being that seem heavily shaped by the kind of Platonic conceptuality seen also in Philo. Fragments of a Coptic work that has been identified as 2 Enoch (though it is not universally agreed to be so) and that dates to the 7th century have been seen as supporting a theory of Egyptian origin.⁶³ The Egyptian church, specifically its Alexandrian community, played a key role in transmitting texts to other churches and into other languages, with particularly strong connections to both the Ethiopic and the Slavonic environments running through the monastic networks. Given the prominence of the Jewish community in Alexandria, it would be easy to imagine that a work like the Parables of Enoch might be brought from Palestine to Alexandria, where it might contribute to the generation of new Enochic writings. I expected that my own work would consolidate the evidence for an Egyptian provenance of 2 Enoch and would suggest that the pathway taken by the Parables into the Ethiopian

⁶³ Hagen, “No Longer ‘Slavonic’ Only.”

context would run through Egypt, where also the form of the Book of Enoch that we know from the Ethiopic manuscripts may have come into being.

As I compared two Enochic works to each other and to writings of better-established provenance, however, I found that the strongest similarities were with works generally considered to be of Syrian provenance. My initial study, published as an article in *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*, was limited in its scope and in the claims that I made therein concerning provenance, but it suggested that a broader exploration of the entanglement between the Parables and 2 Enoch and the culture of Syria in the early centuries of the common era and through late antiquity might prove fruitful.⁶⁴ That study has been incorporated into this one with little change (Chapter 4). In many ways, it serves only as a launching point for the present study, which both affirms its findings and takes them in directions that I could not have anticipated.

Once the possibility of a Syrian context for entanglement is considered, the explanatory potential of this region for the history and character of the Enochic works—their content and their eventual transmission into Ethiopic and Slavonic—becomes increasingly evident. We know that the Syrian church (using this term in distinction to “Syriac”) was especially influential on Ethiopia, quite probably in the transmission of scriptural texts, although there are some significant debates about the character and timing of such influences and how they relate to the Syriac language.⁶⁵ Syrian text types have long been recognized as one of the dominant strands in the biblical material, although only recently has the evidence begun to be systematically and exhaustively collated, and

⁶⁴ Grant Macaskill, “Meteorology and Metrology: Evaluating Parallels in the Ethiopic Parables of Enoch and 2 (Slavonic) Enoch,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 29 (2019): 79–99.

⁶⁵ For an early overview of the evidence, detailed for its time, see Edward Ullendorf, *Ethiopia and the Bible: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1967* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), 31–55; Ralph Lee, *Symbolic Interpretations in Ethiopic and Early Syriac Literature*, *Eastern Christian Studies* 24 (Leuven: Peeters, 2017) argues for lines of influence in interpretation that are traced to the Aksumite period. Both Ullendorf and Lee recognize the significance of the traditional association of Frumentius with Ethiopia, although the specific connection between that bishop and the Syrian/Syriac church remain subject to some discussion, and also the importance of the tradition concerning the Nine Saints and their arrival in Aksum. The potential veracity of these traditions bears on the evaluation of the putative influence of Syriac Christianity (as a form of Christianity shaped by Jewish thought) on Ethiopian culture. Others have been critical of the approach taken by Lee, but it is worth noting that their concerns typically bear on the question of Syriac influence and its possible dating, rather than on the wider matter of the relationship between the Ethiopian literary heritage and the Syrian one, which included Greek texts as well as Syriac. See Alberto Camplani, “Paths of Cultural Transmission Between Syria and Ethiopia: About a Recent Book on Symbolic Interpretations,” *Aethiopica* 24 (2021): 261–72. For my purposes, while these debates will yield important granular insights, to be discussed later, they do not problematize the central observation that there are strong connections between the literary heritage of the Syrian area and that of Ethiopia, of a kind that might contextualize the transmission of the Parables of Enoch.

a full analysis is still to be undertaken.⁶⁶ Alexandria has always had an emblematic function in the imagination of the Ethiopian and Eritrean church, but its influence was mediated through Syria, as with the coming of Frumentius, traditionally remembered as sent by Athanasius from Alexandria. However much the story of Frumentius may need to be complicated with its various layers of historical detail, it establishes traditions that link Ethiopia to both Egypt *and* Syria, but it is the latter that has the most immediate significance.⁶⁷ The role of Syria in the transmission of writings to the Slavonic contexts is less obvious, but important nonetheless and well documented.⁶⁸

Crucially, while the Syrian church was itself shaped by the Alexandrian one, with a particular dependency on Egyptian cosmology and astronomy visible even to a late period (something to which I will return in this study), Egyptian thought was often re-coloured and recombined into something genetically new in the frontier context of Syria, as it encountered other significant influences from the east.⁶⁹ So, the presence of Egyptian imagery in 2 Enoch might as easily point to a Syrian as to an Alexandrian context and we would need to ask whether there is evidence that points to one more than the other. Such evidence is present, I think, in a number of specific points of contact or parallel with literature generally understood to have been written or edited in Syria during the period of late antiquity, notably the Apostolic Constitutions, but also in a number of broader parallels with the philosophy, theology and anthropology that seem to have been characteristic of that place. There are elements that seem to resemble most obviously the

⁶⁶ Work to document and analyze more definitively the multitude of biblical manuscripts in the Ethiopic tradition has been undertaken recently in the context of the *Textual History of the Ethiopic Old Testament Project* (THEOT), led by Ethiopian scholar Daniel Assefa. See Daniel Assefa, Steve Delamarter, Garry Jost, Ralph Lee and Curt Niccum, "The Textual History of the Ethiopic Old Testament Project (THEOT): Goals and Initial Findings," *Textus* 29 (2020): 80–110. The Project itself highlights the extent to which many of the claims made about the Bible in Ethiopia are based on limited samples of the evidence.

⁶⁷ Lee, *Symbolic Interpretations*, sees the stories about Frumentius and those about the Nine Saints as reflecting some kind of significant Syrian influence in the Aksumite period, remembered through these traditions precisely as Syrian. Even if the character of some details might be queried historically, he nevertheless considers this to providing support for his claim that parallels to Ephrem's interpretations of Scripture in the Ethiopic tradition reflect the direct influence of Syrian tradition. It is worth noting that even those who reject such a claim see a more generalized (i.e., less direct) influence of Ephrem's legacy in the wider region.

⁶⁸ Basil Lourié, in particular, has explored the issue in a number of works. Of particular importance is his article, "Direct Translations from Syriac into Slavonic: A Preliminary List," in *Πολυστον : scripta slavica Mario Capaldo dicata*, ed. Christiano Diddi (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Indrik"/ Издательство "Индрик," 2015), 161–68. In an indefinitely delayed essay ("The Slavonic Solunskaja Legenda [The Thessalonican Legend] and Its Syriac Original," available online at https://www.academia.edu/7489459/Solunskaja_Legenda_The_Legend_of_Thessalonica_as_a_Translation_from_Syriac), Lourié notes that his arguments on particular works have been positively received by Bulgarian slavists and more heavily criticized by Russian scholars.

⁶⁹ On this point more broadly (i.e., not simply in relation to Egypt, but also in relation to Greek and Roman thought) see Reed, "Beyond the Land of Nod."

language and imagery of Neoplatonism, of the kind that was especially influential in Syria during the late antique period. It is possible that these elements may anticipate the kind of Neoplatonism that became established in later centuries, representing a kind of bridge between middle Platonism and Neoplatonism, but we must also consider the possibility that 2 Enoch is indeed a rather late work.

Importantly, the connections between the literature of the Syriac church and the literatures of early Judaism are extensive and locating 2 Enoch within this matrix involves careful reflection on the kinds of intersection that it may embody. These may involve the transmission of earlier works that are influential in the worlds in which they are subsequently read, but also the vibrant mutuality that affects the emergence of new texts within this culture. We need to be careful how we construe the relationship between the later Syriac church and Judaism, but clearly the closeness of Aramaic linguistic cultures allowed a particular kind of likeness to emerge and cultural transmission to take place, with a distinctive kind of “Jewish Christianity” developing in the area,⁷⁰ one with different refractions of the Jewish heritage to those encountered in Egypt. George Brooke has explored the textual connections between extant Syriac literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls that suggest there were lines of cultural transmission between Judea (especially Qumran) and Syria; from this, he has revitalized Krister Stendahl’s proposals for how the early Jewish Christ movement in Syria might relate to the composition of Matthew’s Gospel⁷¹.

If it is indeed correct—and I will restate the caution with which I advance it several times in this chapter—then it has implications for how these specific Enochic works are used in the reconstructions of early Judaism and early Christianity. Much of what is read as evidence for the development of early Jewish mysticism, for example, might reflect later preoccupations with theurgy, in contexts where the lines between Jewish, Christian and other are difficult to draw, as

⁷⁰ I will discuss this point in more detail later in the present chapter. At this point, I cite the extensive work of Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Jewish-Christianity and the History of Judaism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018; repr. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2020; all page numbers are based upon the 2020 version).

⁷¹ George J. Brooke, “Hot at Qumran, Cold in Jerusalem: A Reconsideration of Some Late Second Temple Period Attitudes to the Scriptures and Their Interpretation,” in *Ha-’ish Moshe: Studies in Scriptural Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature in Honor of Moshe J. Bernstein*, ed. Binyamin Y. Goldstein, Michael Segal and George J. Brooke, STDJ 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 64–77. The significance of this for Matthew is noted in his essay, “Inspecting ‘The School of St. Matthew,’” in *Krister among the Jews and Gentiles: Essays in Appreciation of the Life and Work of Krister Stendahl*, ed. Paula Fredriksen and Jesper Svartvik, Studies in Judaism and Christianity (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 2018), 101–21. In a personal correspondence, Brooke indicated that he thought my “hunch” was probably correct.

they are in Syria in Late Antiquity. Nicola Denzey's colourful description of Edessa is worth quoting at length in this regard, to allow the rhizomatic potential of the place to be appreciated.

... Edessa was as far conceptually from Rome as it was geographically—its culture was flavored by Parthia and Armenia, by the Syriac language rather than by Greek or Latin, and by the presence of the desert and more constant contact with Persia and India than with the city of Rome.

Edessa itself was in Bardaisan's day predominantly a pagan city, with traditional forms of religion remaining in place well into Late Antiquity. Surrounded by desert, Edessa's high degree of urbanism necessitated that Christians, pagans and Jews would have had to interact closely with one another. Strolling through the streets of the city, you could take your pick of places to worship: shrines to the goddess Dea Syria, to Baal, or to the ancient Semitic triumvirate of Attis-Atargatis-Nebo, with their elaborate décor and gilded images of the deities. There were astrological temples set up to Marilaha, the local deity who ruled the cosmos through the seven planets. If you were Jewish, you could find a number of synagogues to frequent; the Jewish community in Edessa was also ancient. The Edessan King Abgar VII bar Isates (109–116 C.E.) hailed from the royal house of Adiabene, which had converted to Judaism. His conversion bears witness to the level of prestige which the Jews of Edessa held. They may have communicated with the substantial Jewish community of Babylon, who were by the second century of the Common Era assembling the Babylonian Talmud which is still central to modern Judaism today.⁷²

A work that emerges from such a context might reflect the confluence of these influences, with the recombination of their elements generating something that is at once like and unlike the various traditions that feed material into it and consequently almost impossible to identify as one thing or another. The modern difficulty in categorizing Bardaisan illustrates this effectively, as does the divide within the tradition on how he is evaluated.⁷³ If we allow that he should properly be called

⁷² Nicola Denzey, "Bardaisan of Edessa," in *A Companion to the Second Century "Heretics,"* ed. Antti Marjanen and Petri Luomanen (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 161–62.

⁷³ See Ute Possekkel, "Bardaisan's Influence on Late Antique Christianity," *Journal of Syriac Studies* 21 (2018): 81–125.

Christian, then it is striking that his cosmogony appears entirely to lack any Christian or Jewish signature features, more thoroughly resourced by philosophical traditions that include the Timaeus and Pythagorean accounts, but with Iranian and Indian influences also at work.⁷⁴ Placing 2 Enoch, along with a number of other works often treated as windows onto developments simply within Judaism, might allow a more satisfying (if necessarily open-ended) evaluation of its significance, as a product of complex cultural entanglement in late antiquity.

This, indeed, is the point that Annette Yoshiko Reed has made about much of the literature drawn into the discussions of Jewish Christianity and its relationship to prior streams of Jewish thought.⁷⁵ Reed's work draws, *inter alia*, on an important study by Shlomo Pines on connections between Sefer Yetzirah and the Pseudo-Clementines, specifically in their anthropomorphic representations of the divine body; Pines cautiously suggests that the connections reflect intersecting influences in late antique Syria and not simply the internal evolution of ideas within Judaism or Christianity.⁷⁶ The relevance of this to the representation of the divine form in 2 Enoch has not, I think, been fully considered; it has implications for those approaches that have tied the content of 2 Enoch 39 quite closely to developing Jewish mystical traditions (even if these were originally influenced by Babylonian thought), but without seriously considering the possibilities found in the diverse cultures of late antiquity. In an earlier essay on 2 Enoch, Pines traces connections with Zoroastrian thought, an influence that might make particular sense if the work were composed in Syria (although Zoroastrian ideas circulated more widely and are represented also in Egypt).⁷⁷ All of this invites reflection on the various colours that might be detectable in a work from that geographical context in late antiquity.

⁷⁴ For a recent re-evaluation of Bardaisan's position in relation to Jewish, Christian and other traditions, see Ilaria Ramelli, *Bardaisan of Edessa: A Reassessment of the Evidence and a New Interpretation* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2009).

⁷⁵ Reed, *Jewish Christianity*, in toto.

⁷⁶ Reed, *Jewish Christianity*, 342–44, discussing Shlomo Pines, "Points of Similarity between the Exposition of the Doctrine of the *Sefirot* in the *Sefer Yetzira* and a Text of the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*: The Implications of this Resemblance," *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 7 (1989): 63–142.

⁷⁷ Shlomo Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch", in *Types of Redemption: Contributions to the Theme of the Study-Conference Held at Jerusalem 14th to 19th July 1968*, ed. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky and C. J. Bleeker (Leiden, Brill, 1970), 72–87.

Conclusions and Prospects: Towards the Entangled Enoch

This chapter has been intended as a programmatic introduction to what will follow in the rest of the volume. I have deferred the reviewing of previous scholarship on 2 Enoch and the Parables of Enoch until the next two chapters and have, instead, sought to consider the broader issues within the practice of scholarship that frame these. My comments on the scholarly agenda have been developed particularly in relation to the discipline of Biblical Studies, especially as focused on the New Testament and on the study of Second Temple Judaism. A certain co-dependency exists between these areas of research in the modern academy and while it would be easy to identify contemporary examples of ideologically aware scholarship, it remains the case that the work undertaken historically in the field (and much that continues to be undertaken) still sees a particular kind of analysis to be central: the tracing of genealogical relationships between identifiable and defined groups, treated as species.

Such an analysis is especially challenging for works like 2 Enoch. We need to allow that the generative factors involved in a work of this kind are non-linear, mediated by cultural influences and not just group dynamics (even if groups and networks are part of the mix). I invoked the imagery developed by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari to conceptualize this and to provide an alternative heuristic metaphor: we may be dealing not with a singular tree, with roots and branches and a common trunk, but with a rhizome, with an essential diversity that involves points of intersection and connection. Properly understood in relation to Deleuze and Guattari's related imagery of machines seeking connections, the image of the rhizome is really one of local ecology, in which trees are present, but are entangled with other organisms; it may be possible to disentangle the tree from the ecology as a whole, but to do so would be an act of violence, hacking away all of the things that have made it *this* tree, with this particular shape and quality, and that bring to flourishing the true significance of this tree in this ecological place, where it feeds and is fed. The rhizomatic approach has a particular value for our study of how conceptual goods emerge, one that has been undervalued by biblical scholarship and its cognate tasks to date.

Put in such terms, the study of the pseudepigrapha can continue to make a certain use of appropriately granular categories of analysis, such as those developed by Davila, to associate texts with particular groups, provided the limits of this approach are recognized and provided categories of liminality are properly affirmed. Our knowledge of the groups that existed in antiquity is limited

and is often shaped too decisively by the representation of these groups in the texts produced by a particular literate minority within them, themselves often preoccupied with defining their own particular grouping. Davila's scheme is more granular than most, and thus particularly useful; it also resists the equally problematic tendency to segregate or separate the grains, rather than simply to distinguish them. In the end, though, it is still defined by the concept of the group and how to associate a text with a group, based on its characteristics.

This book is avowedly *not* intended to resolve the enigma of 2 Enoch, but rather to consider what it might attest of the cultural worlds in which its authors and editors lived, worked and worshipped. The result of this book should not be a surer sense of how 2 Enoch and the Parables of Enoch can be cited in relation to New Testament research, but a richer sense of what the works mean and what the works represent, in themselves and as epiphenomena to complex cultures in antiquity, perhaps as the handiwork of a literate liminal. Late antique Syria will have a particular prominence in my analysis, but even if my arguments for this context are considered to be unpersuasive, I hope that the approach will invite a new imagining of what pseudepigrapha research can look like.

While the study that follows is principally concerned with 2 Enoch, it will involve extensive comparative study with the Parables of Enoch, which shares with the Slavonic work a distinctive interest in certain themes and tropes, though develops these in quite different ways. In what follows, then, after two extensive reviews of scholarship on each work respectively (Chapter 2 and Chapter 3), I will develop four chapters that compare particular points of correspondence and divergence between the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch (Chapters 4–7) and link them to the cultures with which they appear to be entangled. I will then develop two chapters that are more exclusively focused on 2 Enoch (Chapters 8 and 9) and on the evidence that the devotional practices encountered in that book are best explained as reflecting the context of Late Antiquity, and probably Syria. I will then close the study with a synthesis that draws all of the findings together and moves to a more programmatic reconsideration of debated pseudepigrapha like the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch as the works of “a literate liminal,” a category that I develop cautiously with particular reference to the self-identified liminality of remote communities.

Postscript: A Note on Translations

In what follows, I will generally provide my own translation of 2 Enoch, except where otherwise indicated. The translation of 1 Enoch will generally follow that provided in the two volumes of commentary on 1 Enoch by George Nickelsburg and by George Nickelsburg and James VanderKam.⁷⁸ This is also available as a standalone translation,⁷⁹ but I presume that serious academic readers are likely to want the further critical detail provided by their commentary. My use of their translation is not naïve to the critical evaluations of their work and of their decisions to reconstruct the text at points. I use it simply because I am not a specialist in Ethiopic translation and manuscript research. Where relevant, I note critical interactions with their translation.

⁷⁸ George W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001); George W.E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of Enoch, Chapters 37-71*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011).

⁷⁹ George W.E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: The Hermeneia Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012).

Chapter 2. Reviewing the Provenance of 2 Enoch

In this chapter, I will review the major studies that have discussed the date, provenance and transmission of 2 Enoch or, to conceptualize these issues slightly differently, that have attempted to “locate” the work and its various embodiments, physical and hypothetical. I use this language of embodiment because, as I will discuss further below, the manuscripts preserve multiple recensions of 2 Enoch, each of which might be considered a distinct embodiment of the work, and there is a debate around which might be most representative of the original work and how each might have developed within the Slavonic environment, or those environments through which the work passed prior to its translation into that language. There are, then, several *physical* embodiments of the work and scholars have divergently aligned these with hypothetical Vorlagen. Identifying the origin of the work has been especially fraught, with even less agreement than is visible in the case of current scholarship on the Parables of Enoch, which will be considered in Chapter 3.

The goal of this discussion is not to provide an exhaustive literature review or to resolve the issues of debate, but rather to identify some of the key elements in the primary material around which the debate has tended to revolve and to consider how these elements are framed by conceptualizations of the contexts for composition and transmission. It is helpful to both coordinate and distinguish these two strands of discussion—the details and the frames within which those details are interpreted—as we move forward, since this will allow us to affirm much of what others note and to engage with their work at both levels.

If readers are to make sense of the debates around the date and provenance of 2 Enoch, they need at least a basic awareness of the manuscript evidence and its recensional associations. I will discuss these matters briefly in the first section of the review, and will then trace them through the second section, which will discuss the flurry of academic interest in Slavic scholarship in the late 19th and early 20th century. After these initial reviews, I will examine the major contributions to the study of the origins of 2 Enoch that have been developed by specific scholars in non-Slavic scholarship. Here, I will seek to be particularly attentive to the role that conceptual frames play in the work of each scholar. What I mean by this will become clear in due course.

Although I will discuss the early phases of Slavic research into 2 Enoch in this chapter, I will largely bypass for now the current scholarship that is specifically interested in the period of transmission within the Slavonic environment and with the philological matters pertaining to this.

Much of this work is also interested in the immediately preceding or adjacent literary cultures (primarily, that of the Byzantine monastic contexts), with their explanatory value in relation to specific elements within the work, but it is less concerned with questions of origin or even with more remote stages of transmission. I will draw this research into the detail of later chapters, but it is less relevant to the concerns of the present one.

An Overview of Manuscripts and Recensions

The discussion that follows requires some awareness of the manuscript evidence for 2 Enoch; although I will discuss the early stages of publication for this, in section 2, as the various witnesses entered public and scholarly domains, even this can be confusing without some sense of the overall picture that would later emerge. Also, the conventions for listing and identifying the manuscripts evolved through this process and some way of mapping those early publications onto the identifiers used today will be helpful.

Generally, scholarship identifies 10 major manuscripts of 2 Enoch itself and about the same number of “fragments,” which are really excerpts from the book, and are often explicitly identified as such in the works wherein they occur. There are also further manuscripts of a work known as *Merilo Pravednoe*, *The Just Balance*, which is a juridical text in its own right, with its own form and limits, but which is universally accepted to be derived from the instructional material of 2 Enoch. Because the manuscripts will be referred to quite often throughout the book, it is helpful to list them here, along with the various alternative designations encountered in the scholarship:

Table 1: The Manuscripts of 2 Enoch¹

¹This table is reproduced from my edition, *The Slavonic Texts of 2 Enoch*, *Studia Judaeoslavica* 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2013). The abbreviations are as follows:

BAN Library of the Academy of Sciences, St. Peterburg
 GIM State Historical Museum, Moscow
 IHP Institute of History and Philology, Nezhin
 KBM Kirill-Belozerskij Monastery
 NLB National Library, Belgrade
 RM Rumjancevskij Museum, Moscow
 TSS Trinity-St. Sergius Monastery

MANUSCRIPT	SYMBOL IN SOKOLOV ²	SYMBOL IN VAILLANT/ ANDERSEN/ BÖTTRICH	SYMBOL IN ORLOV	EXTENT	DATE
1. LONG RECENSION					
BAN 13.3.25	Ja	J	J	1-71:4	15 th -16 th Century
NLB 321	A	R	R	1-73:9	16-17 th Century
GIM Hludov	P	P	P	1-68:7	17 th -18 th Century
RM 3058	-	P ²	P ²	28:1-32:2	18 th Century
2. SHORT RECENSION					
GIM Uvarov 3(18)	U	U	U	1-72:10	15 th Century
BAN 45.13.4	-	A	A	1-72:10	16 th century
MS 387(3)	-	Syn	Syn	71,72	16 th Century
TSS 793	-	Tr	Tr	Summary of book and chapters 67 and 72	16 th Century
GIM Barsov	B	B	B	1-72:10	17 th Century
RM 578	-	Rum	Rum	General account of 1-67, summary of 68-70, excerpt of 71-73:1	16 th Century
KBM 27 (1104)	-	No. 41	K	71-72	17 th Century
Vrbnika (Ivšic)	-	No.42	I	71-72 and loose summaries of parts of the book.	17 th Century
3. VERY SHORT RECENSION					
NLB 151/443	N	N	N	1-67:3	16 th Century
VL 125	V	V	V	1-67:3	16 th Century
GIM Barsov ²	B ¹	B ²	B ²	1-67:3	18 th Century (1701)

VL The Austrian National Library, Vienna

²Where a symbol is not listed against Sokolov's edition, it is because he does not allocate a symbol to the text. In most cases, he refers to such texts by their full catalogue listing.

Gennadius	-	G (Böttrich: No. 38)	G	65:1-4; 65:6-8	
IHP 39	-	Chr	Chr	11:1-15:3; 16:1-8; 24:2-33:5; 37:1-2; 40:1-42:5; 47:2-48:5; 58:1-6.	17 th Century
RM 590 (155)	-	Chr ²	Chr ²	11:1-15:3	18 th Century
4. MERILO PRAVEDNOE					
TSS 15	-	MPr	MPr	Excerpts from 40-65	14 th century
TSS 253	-	TSS 253	TSS 253		
TSS 489	-	TSS 489	TSS 489		
TSS 682 (330)	-	TSS 682 (330)	TSS 682 (330)		
RM 238	-				

The earliest witness to 2 Enoch itself is from the 15th century, but there are older manuscripts (14th century) of a work that is explicitly and unquestionably derivative of it, the juridical work Merilo Pravednoe. There is now also an alleged witness to the text in a 9th century Coptic manuscript from Nubia, identified by Joost Hagen;³ this was initially accepted quite widely to be a manuscript of 2 Enoch, with recensional implications that I will consider below. Christfried Böttrich has suggested that it may, in fact, preserve part of a different work, the Angel of Tartarus,⁴ but others have added support to Hagen's identification.⁵

The manuscripts attest two major recensions of the work—a long version and a short—but arguably also two further recensional categories of “very long” and “very short.”⁶ The differences in length involve a combination of detail and extent: readings in the longer recensions will often

³ Joost Hagen, “No Longer ‘Slavonic’ Only: 2 Enoch Attested in Coptic from Nubia,” in *New Perspectives on Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*, ed. Andrei Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini and Jason Zurawski, *Studia Judaeslavica* 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 5–34. An edition of the fragments themselves remains to be published.

⁴ Christfried Böttrich, “The Angel of Tartarus and the Supposed Coptic Fragments of 2 Enoch,” *Early Christianity* 4 (2013): 509–21. Criticisms are also made by Florentina Badalanova Geller, “Unde malum? the Watchers Mythologeme in The Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch,” *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch, Neue Folge*, 9 (2021): 1–45, esp. 3–4.

⁵ L. Navtanovich, “Is There Indeed a Coptic Enoch?” *Scrinium* 18 (2022): 440–451.

⁶ The very long form is found only in R, which is close enough in form and extent to J and P that it may be unhelpful to categorize it separately, but the very short form is strikingly different from the short.

contain details not found in the shorter ones and there are extended blocks of material that are not found in the shorter ones, particularly in the section of the text devoted to the creation account. It is important to note, however, that it is not always the case that the longer recensions contain longer versions of specific pericopae; sometimes the shorter recensions have more detail or content that is not found in the longer.

It is also important to be aware that attempts to construct a stemma are complicated and suggestive of some missing links; the very short recension manuscripts, for example, will often agree with those of the long recension on points of detail, which complicates explanations of how these may have emerged in relation to the short recension. Although some have dismissed the idea,⁷ it may be that the best explanation for the evidence is that more than one version of 2 Enoch was translated and that it already circulated in multiple recensions prior to its crossing into Slavonic literature.⁸ The consistencies that might be cited as evidence for a single translation, which then gave rise to recensions within the Slavonic environment, could be explained by scribes translating second or subsequent versions with access to the first colouring their work. If a shorter version of the book was translated first, it may have exercised an influence over subsequent translations of longer versions, something that might be reflected in stylistic differences between the material common to both recensions and that found only in the long recensions. A proposed stemma of relationship that overlooks this might be very misleading indeed and consequently I am reluctant to do more than list the families that can be identified. As we will see, debates about the priority of recensions have been a significant part of the scholarship on 2 Enoch and are wrapped up with questions of origin.

One last comment needs to be made in this section, to orient the reader to what follows. There is no consistent chapter division in the manuscripts, with significant differences between the recensions, and this is reflected in the various editions and publications of the work. The chapter and verse divisions in Vaillant's edition and translation, which follow the short recension and are often cited in mid-late 20th century studies that reference 2 Enoch, are completely different from

⁷ See Liudmila Navtanovich, "The Provenance of 2 Enoch: A Philological Perspective. A Response to C. Böttrich's Paper, "The "Book of the Secrets of Enoch" (2 Enoch: Between Jewish Origin and Christian Transmission. An Overview)," in Orlov et al., eds., *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch*, 69–82, esp. 74–76.

⁸ The idea was proposed by N. Schmidt, "The Two Recensions of Slavonic Enoch," *JAOS* 41 (1921): 307–12 and taken up in A. de Santos Otero, "Libro de los Secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo)," in *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento*, ed. A. Díez Macho (Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1984–1987), 4:147–202.

those in Andersen's and Böttrich's translation, which admit the additional chapters of the long recension and do not relegate these to an appendix. The ordering of chapters 36–39 in the latter is also quite different from the equivalent material in the short. This can be bewildering for any who seek to work with the book. In what follows, I use the chapter and verse scheme that is found in Andersen's and Böttrich's work, since this is the one most widely employed in current scholarship and it allows easier comparison across the recensions than does Vaillant's division. I am not entirely comfortable doing this, since it gives a certain functional priority to the long recension, but it seems to me that it is the least bad option.

The First Stages of Academic Research into 2 Enoch: Modern Slavic Scholarship

Before turning to the “modern” academic study of 2 Enoch that has emerged over the last two centuries, I consider it important to note something about our manuscript witnesses that is too often overlooked, which is that they are themselves mostly the product of the early modern period. The earliest known manuscript of 2 Enoch dates to the 15th century, although there are older manuscripts (14th century) of Merilo Pravednoe; most of the manuscripts and excerpts of the work date to the 16th and 17th centuries. This means that our manuscripts are largely themselves works of modern scholarship, albeit “early modern” for the most part and based outside of the emergent modern university. Sometimes the scholarship was of an ecclesiastical kind, preserving the stories as saintly lives and edificational writings, and sometimes civic, as with the legal purpose of Merilo Pravednoe. I make the observation to remind readers of the lateness of the manuscripts themselves, but also to complicate the picture and to challenge the instinct to place the manuscripts in the category of “ancient text,” separated sharply from that of modern scholarship.⁹ Properly, the observation should also complicate our presumptions about the involvement of scribes and copyists during the period of Slavonic transmission and the tendency to view their activity as careless or as the obvious context for the introduction of error; these were educated people, conducting their work in a world of emergent intellectual revolutions and literary vitality. This is actually true of scribes and copyists through the centuries, who are too often presumed to be

⁹ On the implications of this point for the Enoch literature more broadly, see the various essays in Ariel Hessayon, Annette Yoshiko Reed, and Gabriele Boccaccini, eds., *Rediscovering Enoch? The Antediluvian Past from the Fifteenth to Nineteenth Centuries*, SVTP 27 (Leiden: Brill, 2023).

unskilled or ignorant, but it is true in a distinctive way of the early modern scholars who copied the manuscripts.¹⁰

Academic research into the Slavonic traditions about Enoch began in the middle of the 19th century, with the publication of A. Vostakov's descriptions of the manuscripts in the Rumjancevski Museum,¹¹ which was soon followed by similar work that noted Enoch manuscripts in the collections associated with the libraries of the Trinity St Sergius Lavra.¹² In 1862, the first scholarly collection of Slavonic apocrypha to be published (by Pypin)¹³ drew upon these publications and established the existence of a distinctive Slavonic version of the Enoch writings that were beginning to receive much attention in English and German scholarship. In 1863, Tichonravov published a further collection of apocryphal works, with additional manuscript evidence for MPr and a manuscript from Trinity St Sergius Lavra (n. 793) that contained the Melkizedek story (2 Enoch 70–72) attached to the description of Enoch's farewell (2 Enoch 67).¹⁴ Another set of witnesses associated with the name of Enoch and containing cosmological material was published by Popov in 1869,¹⁵ from what would turn out to be a key manuscript (Chr), with more witnesses published by Viktorov shortly afterwards.¹⁶

All of the publications to this point were of what might be categorized as “fragments” or “excerpts,” containing parts of the work (and now that we can place them against the full text, we can see that they are sometimes non-contiguous parts); or, in the case of the Merilo Pravednoe

¹⁰ On this point, see Liudmila Navtanovich's response to Christfried Böttrich. The latter questions the argument that the long recension has been expanded by a redactor on the grounds that this would require a remarkable level of learning and expertise on the part of the editor. In reply, Navtanovich writes: “I would point out that in the history of Slavic literacy, we have had some *extremely learned* experts.” (Italics original). See Navtanovich, “The Provenance of 2 Enoch: A Philological Perspective,” 72. This is also reminiscent of Elena Dugan's comments on the Ethiopic manuscripts of 1 Enoch and scholarly prejudice towards their tradents. See her essay, “When Enoch left Ethiopia: On Race and Philological (Im)possibilities in the Nineteenth Century,” in Hessayon et al., eds., *Rediscovering Enoch*. I will discuss Böttrich's arguments in more depth below.

¹¹ А. Востоков, *Описание русских и словенских рукописей Румянцевского Музея* (С. Петербург, 1842).

¹² А.В. Горский and К.И. Невоструев, *Описание славянских рукописей Московской Синодальной Библиотеки* (Москва, 1859, 1862)

¹³ А. Н. Пыпин *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины* (Памятники старинной русской литературы, издаваемые Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 3; С.-Петербург, 1862), 15–16.

¹⁴ Николай Саввич Тихонравов, *Памятники отреченной русской литературы* (2 тома; С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863) 1.19–23, 26–31.

¹⁵ А. Попов, *Обзор хронографов русской редакции* (Москва, 1869)

¹⁶ А.Е. Викторов, *Очерк собрания рукописей В.М. Ундольского, в полном составе* (*Славяно-русские рукописи В.М. Ундольского описанные самим составителем и бывшим владельцем собрания с номера 1-го по 579-й. Издание Московского Публичного и Румянцевского Музеев*) (Москва, 1870); *Каталог славяно-русских рукописей приобретённых Московским Публичным и Румянцевским Музеями в 1868 г. после Д.В. Пискарёва* (Москва, 1871); *Описи рукописных собраний в книгохранилищах Северной России* (С.-Петербург, 1890).

manuscripts, they were of a separate but clearly dependent work that represented only strands of content from its source. In 1872, Porfir'ev provided a preliminary analysis of the Slavonic Enoch material discovered to date, arguing that there was little evidence for direct dependency upon the Ethiopic book; any connection must have been mediated through another work, presently lost.¹⁷

In 1880, Popov published for the first time a manuscript of that whole work which he had found in a library collection associated with A. Chludov.¹⁸ The manuscript in question, P, is of the long recension and is especially interesting because it contains a reference to the date and location of its preparation (1679, Poltava) and is dedicated by its scribe, the Hegumen Gennadij of Poltava, to the prince Aleksander Konstantinovič Ostrožskij. In light of the full work, Popov affirmed and developed Porfir'ev's claim, that the work represented a distinctive Enoch book and was only loosely connected to the version attested in Ethiopic. As Böttrich notes, Popov's publication initially seems to have received little attention, even from others working on the growing body of manuscript witnesses, such as Stojan Novaković, who published another version of the full work—this time, from the very short recension manuscript that we tend to designate “N,” which was preserved in Belgrade (and would later be destroyed when that city was bombed in the Second World War).¹⁹ It was mentioned, however, in a German bibliographical article by E. Kozak on Slavic apocrypha²⁰ and this brought the work to the attention of R.H. Charles—at the time working on the Ethiopic Book of Enoch—along with Novaković's publication of N, Tichonravov's publication of numerous fragments, and M.I Sokolov's 1886 identification of the manuscript R (also found in Belgrade and, like N, destroyed in 1941). Sokolov's developing work was shared with Charles, though it would be several years later that it was actually published, as he continued to obtain manuscripts from libraries and private collections.²¹ Charles recruited W.H. Morfill to translate the work and offered his own analysis, which will be discussed below, but it is worth noting here that their first English

¹⁷ I.Я. Порфирьев, *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях* (Казан, 1872), 231. As Böttrich notes (*Weltweisheit*, 22), Porfir'ev maintained this thesis in subsequent publications, only incorporating further manuscript details.

¹⁸ А. Попов, “Южнорусский сборник 1679 года,” *Библиографические материалы Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских*, 3.9 (Москва, 1880): 66–139.

¹⁹ S. Novaković, “Апокриф о Еноху,” *Starine* XVI (1884): 67–81.

²⁰ E. Kozak, “Bibliographische Übersicht der biblisch-apokryphen Literatur bei den Slaven,” *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 18 (1892): 127–58.

²¹ See the discussion of this process in Böttrich, *Weltweisheit. Menschheitsethik. Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch*, WUNT II:50 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 27.

translation was based on still limited manuscript resources, with complete versions only of the long/very long recensions (P and R) and of the very short (N).

Slavic research on the Enoch material continued in the decades that followed. Sokolov's initial work on R was released in 1899, with his work then completed posthumously by M. Speranskij;²² this volume continues to be one of the key resources for accessing full versions of the primary texts, though its format makes thorough comparison of variants difficult. Notably, Sokolov considered R to be a superior witness to the work, being older and lacking some of the corruptions encountered in P. Although his judgements have been criticized, a recently published Croatian Glagolitic fragment of the work, which probably bears witness to a very early stage of transmission in the Glagolitic alphabet, has provided a measure of support, corresponding most closely to readings preserved in R.²³

Alongside Sokolov's publications, another capstone work of this early period of Slavic research was provided by A.I. Jacimirskij, who included a chapter on 2 Enoch in his bibliographical survey of the Slavonic apocrypha.²⁴ This lists around 40 manuscripts and fragments, although a number of these are of Merilo Pravednoe and some are simply of references to the Enoch material

²² М.И. Соколов, "Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий. VII. Славянская Книга Еноха. II. Текст с латинским переводом," *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 4 (1899): 1–112; "Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий. VII. Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного. Тексты, латинский перевод и исследование. Посмертный труд автора приготовил к изданию М. Сперанский," *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 4 (1910): 1–167. Speranskij's arrangement of the material can be difficult for readers to follow. The following quotation from Florentina Badalanova Geller covers the problems well:

There is an unusual feature of Sokolov's posthumous publication, edited by Speranskii, since the page numbering of the edition of the Monuments from 1910 was intended to represent a continuation of Sokolov's earlier publication from 1899. Hence the page numbers and table of contents of the 1910 volume reflect Sokolov's earlier edition of MS No 321 of the National Library in Belgrade (chosen by him as the primary witness to the longer recension) and the 17th cent. Barsovian MS (as a text representing the shorter recension); the edition of these two MSS ended on page 107. Speranskii's publication of the second part of the MSS edited by Sokolov (Chapter 'Тексты') therefore begins on page 109, rather than page 1. After Speranskii completes his edition of Sokolov's text-edition, he then adds a second part to this work, namely Sokolov's research notes (Chapter 'Исследование'), now beginning on page 1. For this reason, references to Sokolov's works may be confusing to the reader. Sokolov's 1899 edition also includes variants from an 18th century MS (pages 108ff.), which is not reflected in Speranskii's table of contents.

Florentina Badalanova Geller, *2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch: Text and Context* (Berlin: Max-Planck-Institut für Wissenschaftsgeschichte, 2010), 4.

²³ See J. Reinhart, "A Croatian Glagolitic Excerpt of the Slavonic Enoch (2 Enoch)," *Fundamenta Europaea* VI/VII (2007): 31–46.

²⁴ А.И. Яцимирский, *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности* (Списки памятников) *Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные* (Петроград, 1921), 81–88.

(rather than constituting witnesses of the content of the book).²⁵ Some of the works listed in the bibliography have subsequently been destroyed and others have moved into national libraries, so the work needs to be used with care, but it remains, alongside Sokolov, as one of the most important resources for research into the Slavonic Enoch literature. In particular, it allows the Enoch literature to be situated within the context of the wider Slavonic literary environment (including its translational heritage from other languages) and not merely approached as a vestige of pre-Slavonic culture. Some of the key recent scholarship on 2 Enoch to have emerged from within the Slavic contexts has continued this interest, notably that of Florentina Badalanova-Geller²⁶ and Liudmila Navtanovich,²⁷ although the latter is principally interested in the linguistic and philological analysis of 2 Enoch with a view to reaching text-critical decisions.

The phase of research within Slavic scholarship that culminated with Jacimirskij's bibliography provides most of the key context to the discussion of origins and transmission that would emerge subsequently in non-Slavic scholarship. It is worth noting one further contribution, however, that was made some decades later.

The contribution in question is that of Nikita Meščerskij, who contributed a flurry of studies²⁸ in the 1960s that revisited the questions of translation and transmission, agreeing on points and challenging on others the arguments developed by the French Slavist, André Vaillant (discussed below). Meščerskij agreed with many of Vaillant's conclusions about the character and provenance of individual manuscripts, allowing this to inform his account of the history of the text

²⁵ For an accessible summary of the most important entries, see Florentina Badalanova Geller, *2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch: Text and Context* (Berlin: Max-Planck-Institut für Wissenschaftsgeschichte, 2010), 12–15.

²⁶ See, in particular, Badalanova Geller, *2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch* and "Heavenly Exiles and Earthly Outcasts: Enochic Concepts of Hermetic Knowledge and Proscribed Lore in Parabiblica Slavica (Fifteenth-Nineteenth Centuries)," in Hessayon et al., eds, *Rediscovering Enoch*, 375–96.

²⁷ Л.М. Навтанович, "Лингвотекстологический анализ древнеславянского перевода книги Еноха," (Ph.D. diss.; С.-Петербург, 2000); "Одеания ею пению раздаанию' в славянском переводе книги Еноха," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 53 (2003): 3–11.

²⁸ Nikita Александрович Мещерский, "Следы памятников Кумрана в старославянской и древнерусской литературе (К изучению славянских версий книги Еноха)," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 19 (1963): 130–47; "К истории текста славянской книги Еноха (Следы памятников Кумрана в византийской и старославянской литературе)," *Византийский Временник* 24 (1964) 91–108; "Проблемы изучения славяно-русской переводной литературы XI–XV вв.," *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 20 (1964): 198–206; "К вопросу об источниках славянской Книги Еноха," *Краткие Сообщения Института Народов Азии* 86 (1965): 72–78; "К вопросу о составе и источниках Академического Хронографа," *Летописи и хроники. Сборник статей* (Москва, 1973) 212–19; "Апокрифы в древней славяно-русской письменности: Ветхозаветные апокрифы," *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР* (вып. 2, часть 1; Москва, 1976): 181–210.

as it was transmitted in the Slavic environment (including, particularly, the conviction that the short recension is earlier than the long). He also broadly agreed with Vaillant’s arguments that the book was the product of Jewish Christianity. By contrast to Vaillant, however, he argued that the work was not transmitted into Slavonic from a Greek original or even an intermediate version—a proposal that is particularly reliant on some evidence particular to the long recension, such as the ADAM acronym in 2 Enoch 30:13—but rather on a medieval Hebrew work, directly translated into Slavonic. Meščerskij’s argument was based on the presence of Hebraisms in what he considered to be the older parts of the book, which contributed to his differentiation of the shorter core from the longer form of the work; elements of this argument have recently been taken up and developed by Liudmila Navtanovich.

There is certainly some evidence for direct translation of Hebrew works into the Slavic languages during the period to which we can date the manuscripts of 2 Enoch, although it is matter of debate as to whether the provenance and dialect character of the individual manuscripts can be made to align with the evidence for the geographical location of such activity.²⁹ It is also, of course, difficult to evaluate the significance of Semitisms in any given text; the presence of Hebrew or Aramaic words could reflect their passing into the stock of mystical and magical traditions³⁰ and the persistence of apparently Hebraistic grammatical constructions could reflect the influence of a translational Greek style. For these reasons, Meščerskij’s thesis has generally been treated with caution; the study of Greek inscriptional evidence and iconography has also further provided further evidence that a Greek version of the work may have circulated in the Balkans until the early modern period and this may more readily account for its translation into Slavonic.³¹ It is also important to note that, as well as features such as the ADAM acronym, 2 Enoch contains a number of Greek calques, including repeated occurrences of the word *στούχι*, from *στοιχεῖα*, as a designation of a class of heavenly beings.

I would suggest that these linguistic issues can be approached in different terms in the context of the methodological programme that I develop in this study, particularly if we acknowledge that what is categorized as “Aramaic” influence might include Syriac. While there is

²⁹ Cf., for example, the discussion in Moshe Taube, *The Logika of the Judaizers: A Fifteenth Century Hebrew Translation from Hebrew* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 2016).

³⁰ The fascination with the status of the Hebrew language itself, visible in A,U at 23:2 may also reflect this.

³¹ See the discussion of this in Badalanova Geller, “Heavenly Exiles and Earthly Outcasts.”

undoubtedly a particular value in identifying an original language, there is also a distinct value in recognizing what the apparent blending of linguistic influences might attest by way of the linguistically complex cultures that might have played a role in the emergence of a work. We may, in other words, want to ask whether particular cultures might be distinctively marked by this blending of Greek and Hebrew or Aramaic linguistics.

Reviewing the Debates in Non-Slavic Scholarship

R.H. Charles

As noted in the previous section, shortly after Popov's publication of a full version of the Slavonic Enoch, R.H. Charles collaborated with W.R. Morfill to make an English translation available.³² Although the two had access to Sokolov's developing work, and some awareness therefore of the manuscripts that he was preparing for publication, they were primarily reliant on P and N, published by Popov and Novaković, respectively, and on Tichonravov's publication of shorter fragments. The Melchizedek account in R, to which they had access through Sokolov, was considered a separate work and published as an appendix.

Charles proposed (with characteristic confidence) that the book was the work of a Hellenistic Jew from Egypt and that it must have been written between 0–50 CE. This identification, for Charles, reflects, in the first instance, his belief that the work was composed (in its full form) in Greek. This observation was linked to the derivation of Adam's name from the Greek names for the four cardinal points and their stars, an acronymic association that only works in Greek.³³ The significance of this particular segment of the text for the dating of the whole work reflects his conviction that the long recension (which he and Morfill designate as "A" and translate from the manuscript P) is the original form and that the short recension ("B")³⁴ is simply a resumé of the whole work, with some "capricious" rearrangements of material. He does, it should be noted, claim that several parts of the work were incorporated from earlier Hebrew source material, because of the presence of untranslated Hebrew words, and sees these sections as paralleling the Testament of

³² R.H. Charles, "Introduction," in W.R. Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896), xi–xlvii.

³³ In 2 Enoch 30:13, the name ADAM is specified as from "the four components," east (Anatolē), west (Dusis), north (Arctos), and south (Mesembria). I will discuss this further in Chapter 6.

³⁴ This was based on the manuscript N, which is actually of the very short recension.

the 12 Patriarchs, which he also flatly categorizes as pre-Christian; the full work, however, must have been translated from Greek.

Charles sees this as reflecting the Hellenistic Judaism of Egypt for the following reasons. First, he notes multiple parallels with the writing and thought of Philo, particularly in relation to the conceptualizing of creation, especially that of the human, but also in relation to the soul and to bodily resurrection, and the representation of angels and heavenly beings. This is interesting and is a thread to which I will return in detail in Chapters 5 and 6, because it is worth dwelling on whether these points of similarity may actually point not to the middle Platonist influences in Philo but to the Neoplatonist interests of later antiquity or even to the lines that may connect them through the intervening centuries. Perhaps also interestingly in this regard, Charles notes the common reprobation of swearing in 2 Enoch and in Philo's *Special Laws*. Second, Charles "does not find a single echo of the whole Messianic teaching of the Old Testament," despite finding evidence of familiarity with "almost every book of the Old Testament"; this he considers to reflect the values of a Hellenized Jew of Egypt.³⁵ Third, Charles notes the presence of imagery that would most obviously be linked to Egypt, such as that of the phoenix and the crocodile-headed chakedras, which leads him, fourthly, to note what he considers to be the generally "syncretistic" character of the creation account. Again, here, we might reflect on the possibility that such imagery might be better explained in a context such as Syria in late antiquity, given the fascination of a figure like Iamblichus with Egyptian mythology and the general interest in Egyptian astronomy that is visible in late antique Syrian culture.

Having discussed the evidence for an Egyptian provenance, Charles then traces the parallels between 2 Enoch and other writings, effectively moving back through the centuries to the New Testament and the early Jewish writings. In certain regards, his listing of perceived parallels is a valuable resource for anyone seeking to consider 2 Enoch within the landscape of late antiquity, but there are two characteristics of his study that need to be treated with particular caution by the contemporary reader. First, he largely considers the parallels as matters of *textual* dependency and influence, with little discussion of other categories of relationship; second, he typically presumes that 2 Enoch is the older work, leaving traces of influence on later ones, despite that fact that at this point in his discussion he has not proposed a dating for the work. All of this, of course, reflects

³⁵ All quotations from Charles, "Introduction, in Morfill, *Book of the Secrets*, 1896, xvii.

Charles's project more widely, particularly his distinctive interest in a diversity within Judaism that might exist alongside what he regards as more rigid and legalistic elements, and many of the assumptions of philological scholarship at the time. It lacks an imagination of more fluid or complex kinds of relationships that might explain the parallels than simply that of textual influence and pays little attention to the possibility that 2 Enoch might itself receive and synthesize elements from other texts at a much later point. It also operates with what would now be regarded as a very simplistic mapping of "Hellenistic Judaism" onto its presumed centre in Egypt, but while this tendency in scholarship is often critiqued, an Alexandrian provenance is still widely maintained and advocated by later work on 2 Enoch.

The issue of dating is largely determined by these elements in the discussion of language, provenance and relationships with other literature. The sections that Charles considers to have been written in Hebrew, he also believes to be "quoted" in the Testament of the 12 Patriarchs, which he believes without qualification to be pre-Christian. Therefore, those sections (whose extent, in fairness, he considers difficult to establish with precision) are "pre-Christian." For the rest of the work, he believes that we can "with tolerable certainty discover the probable limits of its composition."³⁶ The early point of those limits is established by its obvious dependency on the Wisdom of Solomon and on the wider text of 1 Enoch; interestingly for us, he notes a distinctive affinity in the demonology of 2 Enoch and "the latest interpolation" of 1 Enoch, i.e., the Parables. Based on his views of the dating of these works, this entails an earliest date of 30 BCE. The latest point in the limits he considers to be 70 CE, since (1) the temple is still standing, (2) the book seems to be known to the New Testament writers and (3) it is known also to the authors of the Epistle of Barnabas and of the later half of the Ascension of Isaiah.

The problems with Charles's approach to textual relationships (points 2 and 3) is one that I have already noted. The first of his points, though, illustrates something important: the text seems to presume some kind of operative cult, practicing within a particular place of worship, and there is nothing to suggest that this has been disrupted. For Charles and others who have followed him, this straightforwardly indicates that the work was written before the fall of the temple. Aside from the observation that there was another temple that may have coloured the picture—that of Leontopolis—this element also neglects the possibilities of liturgical contexts that may not have

³⁶ Charles, "Introduction," in Morfill, *Book of the Secrets*, xxv.

cherished or remembered the Jerusalem temple in the same way, either because they are non-Jewish or because they are embodied in contexts removed in place and perhaps time from the Jerusalem temple, with connections to it that are figural or symbolic. These are possibilities that I will consider further in Chapters 8 and 9, but the following quotation will serve nicely to illustrate Charles's reading (which, in its own way is sensitive to the contents) and to invite reflection on alternative contexts:

The author was a Jew who lived in Egypt, probably in Alexandria. He belonged to the orthodox Hellenistic Judaism of his day. Thus he believed in the value of sacrifices, xlii 6; lix. 1, 2; lxvi. 2; but he is careful to enforce enlightened views regarding them, xlv. 3, 4; xl. 4, 5; in the law, li. 8, 9; and likewise in a blessed immortality, 1. 2; lxxv. 6, 8-10; in which the righteous shall wear 'the raiment of God's glory, xxii. 8. In questions affecting the origin of the earth, sin, death, &c., he allows himself the most unrestricted freedom and borrows freely from every quarter. Thus, Platonic (xxx. 16, note), Egyptian (xxv. 2, note), and Zend (lviii. 4-6 notes) elements are adopted into his system. The result is naturally syncretistic.

The date (1-50 A.D.) thus determined above makes our author a contemporary of Philo.³⁷

The point that I will explore in later chapters is whether this might as (or more) readily be explained in a different context to that of 1st century Egypt. The "enlightened" affirmation of sacrifice and ritual is, for example, highly characteristic of Neoplatonist thought in late antique Syria, following the catalytic contributions of Iamblichus, where it is entangled with reflections on celestial hierarchies and with Pythagorean concepts, and all in an environment with its own distinctive kinds of cultural blendings, what Charles would call "syncretism."³⁸

³⁷ Charles, "Introduction," in Morfill, *Book of the Secrets*, xxvi. The various numerals refer to chapters in the subsequent translation and to his own notes to this.

³⁸ I have come to find the word unhelpful, at least in relation to locating works like 2 Enoch within their conceptual and religious worlds. Everything is a syncretism of some sort. See, further, my comments in Chapter 1.

André Vaillant

On almost every key point, André Vaillant's discussion of 2 Enoch, attached to his 1952 critical edition and French translation of the text,³⁹ disagrees with the conclusions reached by Charles. Vaillant was not the first to argue for a much later date—although in the intervening decades, the most celebrated contribution came not from a biblical scholar but from the astronomer A.S.D. Maunder⁴⁰—but the depth and breadth of his analysis, published in the context of the first true “critical” edition of the work, would establish the points of detail and the parameters of all subsequent debate. Vaillant was a Slavist, rather than a biblical scholar or a specialist in Jewish traditions, and this is at once the great strength of his work and one of its great weaknesses; or, at least, it is one of the reasons that his arguments have been repeatedly challenged by biblical scholars and specialists in Jewish history. The historical possibilities that Vaillant considers are, as we will explore through this work, too narrow; nevertheless, his identification of the *kind* of culture from which 2 Enoch might have emerged continues to have value, particularly as scholarship continues to nuance the discussion of “Jewish Christianity.”

Vaillant also worked in an era and a context governed by a particular set of values about text criticism and what an edition of texts ought to accomplish, i.e., reconstructing the original form of the text. The values around text criticism have developed, however: as well as recognizing the danger of a reconstructed text being, precisely, a construct—a creative work that corresponds to the decisions of the critic and not to any actual text—developments in philology have become increasingly interested in facilitating genuine comparison of readings, without favouring one that is deemed earliest. For this reason, and to allow the range of interests that those studying manuscript variants might bring to the texts, my own 2013 edition of the texts was more diplomatic in character than Vaillant's, publishing exemplar texts and listing the variants as transparently as possible. While many of these simply reflect orthography and dialect, it is nevertheless either sobering or exciting—depending on one's goal—to note that there are some 5,000 footnotes in that book, most listing multiple variants. This is not to say that Vaillant's arguments for the priority of

³⁹ A. Vaillant, *Le Livre des Secrets D'Hénoch: Texte slave et Traduction française* (Paris: Institut d'Études slaves, 1952).

⁴⁰ Annie S.D. Maunder, “The Date and Place of the Writing of the Slavonic Book of Enoch,” *The Observatory* 41 (1918): 309–16. Maunder and her husband Walter were polymaths, with a deep and extensive interest in astronomical elements in historical cultures. Most famous for their study of the Maunder Minimum, a period of low sunspot activity from 1645–1715, they also published on Indian and Iranian astronomy.

the short recension, which I will discuss below, should be dismissed; in fact, I am inclined to agree with him in broad terms (although I also want to suggest some possibilities that he does not consider). But they reflect a particular ideology of text-critical work and this should not be overlooked; Vaillant's edition should be an important part of the discussion of 2 Enoch and its text base, but should not be allowed to operate as the exclusive or primary basis for work on the text.

Vaillant considers the short recension, represented by A and U, to be closest to the original (though, as one of the many points where the inconsistent listing of manuscripts in the history of research can create confusion, he uses "A" as the label for the hypothetical original translation, witnessed in varying degrees of badness by the extant manuscripts). The material unique to the long recension (represented by J, P, R) he considers to have been added within the Slavic environment itself and to confuse an otherwise coherent work:

... débarrassé des fantaisies des réviseurs slaves qui troublaient Charles dans la rédaction longue supposée originelle, il présente un ensemble parfaitement cohérent, qui restitue sans aucun disparate une œuvre de la littérature chrétienne primitive.⁴¹

Interestingly, the Christianity that he understands to be generative of the work is distinctively that of Jewish Christianity. He finds an allusion to the work in Origen (*De princ.* I, iii, 2), which refers to Enoch's account of God's creative activity (found only in 2 Enoch and not in 1 Enoch), alongside a citation of the Shepherd of Hermas. This evidence he initially cites in relation to the existence of the book in antiquity (although Milik will later disagree with the identification), and then later returns to the juxtaposition as unsurprising, given the links with Jewish Christianity:

... ce sont deux bons témoins de l'assignement du genre apocalyptique chez les Judéo-Christiens de culture grecque.⁴²

I stress this point at this stage in my review because the category of Jewish Christianity, and some of its distinctive embodiments in specific localities, has received fresh attention in recent years,

⁴¹ Vaillant, *Le Livre des Secrets*, viii.

⁴² Vaillant, *Le Livre des Secrets*, xiii

particularly in the work of Annette Yoshiko Reed,⁴³ and Vaillant's claims from the mid 20th century may be revisited fruitfully in the light of these. The wider evidence that Vaillant cites to support his claim is particularly linked to the titles used of God (the common preference for Lord and the occasional use of "eternal Lord" to render "eternal God") and the occurrence of Hebraisms and their common Greek renderings in the text. Hence, πρὸς Δ(ς)⁴⁴ ΛΙЦЕΜЪ (*pred(ũ) licemũ* "in front of the face of") is commonly encountered as equivalent to יְהוָה in Hebrew, but ВЪ ЛИЦЕМЪ *vũ licemũ* ("in the face of") is also found, corresponding to the Greek εἰς πρόσωπον or ἐν προσώπῳ. All of these he sees to reflect a distinctively Jewish Christianity that favours Greek, but he also considers evidence that suggests a direct knowledge of Hebrew, particularly in the proper nouns that are encountered. He allows that the references to the "ophanim" might reflect the influence of 1 Enoch, but sees the names Adoil and Aruchas as reflecting hybrid puns, playing on Hebrew words in a Greek register: Adoil, for example, he considers to be derived from Ad-o (his eternity), with the angelic suffix "el" added and then corrupted in translation. Other angelic names, similarly, maintain significant and contextually appropriate Hebrew etymologies, as do some of the names of human characters, such as Nir (from נֵר, "lamp"). Here, though, we might ask a question that presses a little beyond those asked by Vaillant but that has begun to feature in more recent studies of linguistic evidence for provenance:⁴⁵ might the occurrence of such words reflect their circulation and popularity in a culture that looks to Hebrew for emblematic or arcane resources? This may, in fact, connect well with some of the theories of Jewish Christian authorship: the author(s) of 2 Enoch may not have significant personal knowledge of Hebrew, but may come from a culture that still trades on Hebrew words, particularly in certain contexts of describing angelic beings.⁴⁶

Before moving on from Vaillant's discussion of the cultural provenance of the work, it is worth noting his particular observations about what he labels the "culture grecque" from which it emerges,

⁴³ Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Jewish Christianity and the History of Judaism: Collected Essays*, TSAJ 171 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018).

⁴⁴ The final jer, ם, is typically omitted in late manuscripts, of the kind represented by 2 Enoch. In some cases, the abbreviation is marked by the inclusion of a *pajerok*, a stroke written above the word, but this is not always found. I will generally add the omitted character in brackets in the text that follows.

⁴⁵ See, e.g., James R. Davila "(How) Can We Tell if a Greek Apocryphon or Pseudepigraphon has been Translated from Hebrew or Aramaic?," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 15 (2005): 1–61.

⁴⁶ There is a certain parallel with my own background in Scotland, where Gaelic is a minority language, spoken by only a few thousand of us, but where some Gaelic words continued to be transmitted and used by the wider population, in ways that are largely fair to their original meaning, and are often linked to issues of national fictive identity. The words are, almost invariably, misspelled or mispronounced.

the marks of Hellenism. Here he notes a number of elements that are in line with the evidence used by Charles to argue for an Alexandrian provenance, including the use of phoenix imagery and the interest in philosophical and cosmological explications of eternity. Where Charles's insistence on an early date means that the closest links are made with Philo, however, Vaillant's identification of the work as Christian means that he considers instead the similarities of such imagery with that encountered in Gnostic thought. This is a theme to which I will return in later chapters, because important questions can be asked about whether the best explanation for this is, in fact, the presence of such imageries and preoccupations in certain cultural environments, where Manichaeism and emergent Neoplatonism may have coloured the discourse even of those who were not subscribers to their beliefs as such.

Vaillant offers a careful and sophisticated analysis of the translation, which serves as the basis for his evaluation of the recensions. He notes a number of features that point specifically to the period of Old Church Slavonic, as distinct from Church Slavonic (the terminology used of the periods varies and Vaillant uses the standard French, "vieux slave"), and to the western forms of the language, concluding that the translation was probably made in Macedonia (probably Pannonia) in the 10th century. As general evidence that the translation was made in this early period of the written language, he notes the use of future imperfects, the non-prepositional use of the locative and the preservation of the 3rd person dual desinence -te, while also noting that the scribes of the extant manuscripts—even the best of which is a later transmission—were clearly confused by some of the older, obsolete words and mutilated or eliminated these.⁴⁷ The western character of the text is reflected in the preservation of some older forms of aorists and by some traces of Old Macedonian words that have been confused with visually similar Slavonic ones. Given the period and location of translation, the original would have been written in Glagolitic script and Vaillant traces some of the evidence that the different indexing of letters to numbers in Glagolitic and Cyrillic has generated some of the variation and confusion in numbers encountered in the manuscripts.

Vaillant's analysis of the recensions begins with a consideration of the alterations, insertions and corrections— "heureuses ou malheureuses"⁴⁸—found in R, which he attributes to the work of the "premier réviseur." These include the additional material on Satanael, on the creation of Adam,

⁴⁷ Vaillant, *Le Livre des Secrets*, xiii–xiv.

⁴⁸ Vaillant, *Le Livre des Secrets*, xv.

and on astronomy; he sees such material as derived from various sources, including the Adam and Eve literature, the Conversation of the Three Hierarchs, and the wider “question-answer” genre, represented in Slavonic literature by the erotapokriseis traditions.⁴⁹ He challenges the earlier claim of Sokolov that the long recension is quoted or echoed in a homily by Cyril of Turov, and was therefore the version in circulation during the 12th century in Russia: Vaillant shows that the homily in question is wrongly attributed to Cyril and, in any case, that the two works independently draw upon a quotation from Gregory of Nazianzus. In short, Vaillant highlights that the additional material found in the long recension can largely be found elsewhere, circulating independently in the Slavic environment, but often with origins in antiquity. The language that characterizes the long recension is typically later in character, with older Slavic forms displaced by newer ones (e.g., the older *niktože* replaced by *nikto* and *niedinůže* by *niedinů*; or the use of *čto* and *kto* for *iže*; he also discusses a number of specific verb-form examples) that are characteristic of Middle Bulgarian or of Serbian. Vaillant notes that these markers are principally found in the additional or unique material of the long recension, clearly distinguishing this from the older material common with A, U, which has also been edited, but preserves more of the older forms.

Vaillant offers an interesting caveat to his analysis, however: “Toutefois, le réviseur est un lettré,”⁵⁰ a scholar who can both reconstruct or restore old words effectively. Here, he is careful to note that some of these words continued to be used in Serbian, Croatian and Bulgarian, but the caveat acknowledges something that others have pressed: there are actually a number of traces of older Slavonic sensibilities—words and constructions—visible in the long recension. The linguistic contrast is, then, less clean than Vaillant’s core thesis might claim. More recent studies have highlighted that some of the material unique to the long recension, particularly that dedicated to the description of the sun, is actually characterized by more archaic language, suggesting that it was also transmitted into the Slavic environment at an early stage.⁵¹

⁴⁹ For a useful discussion of this literature, see Anisava Miltenova, “Slavonic Erotapokriseis: Sources, Transmission, and Morphology of the Genre,” in *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity*, ed. Lorenzo DiTommaso and Christfried Böttrich, eds., with the assist. of Marina Swoboda (TSAJ 140 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).

⁵⁰ Vaillant, *Le Livre des Secrets*,

⁵¹ See, e.g., Francis I. Andersen, “The Sun in 2 Enoch,” in *L’église des deux Alliances: Mémoires Annie Jaubert (1912–1980)*, ed. Basil Lourié, Andrei Orlov and Madeline Petit, *Orientalia Judaica Christiana* 1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 1–38.

Vaillant then discusses the work of the second reviser, noting the further alterations and insertions encountered in J and P, which are closely related. Interestingly, however, he devotes no discussion to the very short recension. This is interesting, because as others have subsequently noted (and as will be reflected in the detail of my own study), the very short recension often agrees with the long recension against A, U; this is not just a matter of wording, but can also be a matter of extent. In principle, there is no difficulty in reconciling this with Vaillant's stemma, since he does not present the manuscripts as dependent upon each other, but as each defectively witnessing to chains of transmission from the original. He favours U not because it is a parent text in any sense but because it is "de beaucoup le meilleur, ou plutôt le moins mauvais"⁵² and functionally this means he always dialogues with the other manuscripts and their evidence. Nevertheless, the agreement of the very short manuscripts with the long suggests that decisions on the relative value of readings should remain somewhat tentative and should be made on a case by case basis.

J.T. Milik

In his publication of the Aramaic Enoch fragments—the same work in which he argued that the Parables was a later Christian work—Milik⁵³ built upon Vaillant's analysis, particularly his identification of the short recension as closer to the original. But where Vaillant placed the work within the context of early Jewish Christianity, Milik saw it as the work of a 10th century Byzantine monk. Milik is dismissive of the potential allusion to 2 Enoch that Vaillant finds in Origen, considering him more obviously to have in mind the "terrestrial and celestial worlds" described "in great detail" in the Book of Watchers and in the Astronomical Book. Although I am inclined to see the work as emerging later than Vaillant believes it to have done—and question whether the allusion in Origen is indeed to what we might recognize to be 2 Enoch—Milik's claims here need to be challenged. Contextually, it is very clear that Origen is concerned with how God relates to the created world and with issues of contingency and immanence, the relationship between being and non-being, created and uncreated, and specifically in relation to the status of the Holy Spirit.⁵⁴ As

⁵² Vaillant, *Le Livre des Secrets*, XXV.

⁵³ J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4, with the Collaboration of Matthew Black* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).

⁵⁴ The relevant quotation occurs within the section of the work devoted to the consideration of the Spirit :

That all things were created by God and that there is no being that exists which has not received its existence from him is established from many declarations throughout the whole of Scripture, while those claims falsely

we will see in Chapters 5 and 6, this is much more obviously the kind of reflection that we encounter in 2 Enoch than in any of the parts of 1 Enoch, and is colored by Platonic language and imagery; there is a meaningful question to be probed, however, about whether the particular qualities of language might point to the Neoplatonist context, rather than a middle Platonist one.

Milik affirms Vaillant's claims about the lateness of the long recension, allowing the additional material found therein to be bracketed from the discussion of date and provenance for the core work. His own analysis focuses on several points of parallel with other literatures and cultural phenomena, including the links between the names of Arioch and Marioch, the angels set over the earth, and Hârût and Mârût of Muslim literature and various other points of contact with Islamic traditions about Idris. Others, of course, might suggest that these points of contact reflect the vitality of the Enoch traditions within Islam, and that they point to the subsequent uptake of imagery found in 2 Enoch. Vaillant is also especially interested in the representation of Melchizedek as a nephew of Noah, and not a son, something that he sees to reflect the monastic transmission of vocation from (unmarried) uncle to nephew, a marker of the Byzantine and medieval periods.

The most precise piece of evidence that Milik discusses, however, concerns the use of the phrase *книги испещрены зморуениемъ* (*knigi ispeščreny zmureniemŭ*)⁵⁵ in 22:11 of the books brought to Enoch in heaven for him to write. Milik understands this phrase to contain a corruption of *surmaiographos*, from the verb, *surmaiographiein*, "to write in miniscule," which he finds attested (and then rarely) only in the 9th century:

advanced by some regarding matter coeternal with God or unbegotten souls, in which they would have it that God implanted not so much existence but quality and order of life, are refuted and rejected. For even in that little book called The Shepherd or The Angel of Repentance, composed by Hermas, it is thus written: 'First of all, believe that there is one God who has created and arranged all things; who, when nothing existed before, caused all things to be; and who contains all things, but himself is contained by none.' And in the book of Enoch similar things are transcribed. But up to the present time we have been able to find no passage in the holy Scriptures in which the Holy Spirit is said to be made or created,¹⁹ not even in the way that we have shown above that Solomon speaks of Wisdom.

Translation from John Behr, *Origen: On First Principles* (2 Volumes; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), I: 69.

⁵⁵ Milik here reproduces the form of the expression found in B²; there is actually a good deal of variation across the manuscripts, but Vaillant tentatively considers this to preserve the most primitive reading and translates it as "biggarés de smyrnium," (*Le Livre des Secrets*, 26–27); Andersen ("2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 141) renders it as "mottled with myrrh."

It appears to be a neologism not found before the beginning of the ninth century; so we may conclude that the Greek author of the *Secrets of Enoch*, perhaps also a Studionite monk, probably lived in the 9th or else 10th century.⁵⁶

Milik's argument has not been considered persuasive. It rests a great deal of weight upon a particular hypothetical reconstruction, linked to just one word, and on the value of the limited witnesses to *surmaiographein* and its cognates. Myrrh is also mentioned as the fragrance of the heavenly oil with which Enoch is anointed in 22:9, and may simply recur in the imagery here as a sensory evocation of heavenly or sacred status. We might also ask whether it would be imaginable that the heavenly books would be written in miniscule (particularly given the emblematic significance of Hebrew that emerges in 23:2) or even whether they were already written or were presently blank: although Andersen translates *πογλαγολι εμδ* (*poglagoli emu*) as "read to him,"⁵⁷ Vaillant understands the command to Vereveil as "dicte-lui."⁵⁸

Few today, then, would consider Milik's arguments for the date and provenance of 2 Enoch to be persuasive, but the value of his study should not be overlooked. While all of his observations need to be followed through carefully—something illustrated by his misrepresentation of Origen's reference to Enoch—his approach generally takes seriously the need to trace back from the manuscript witnesses themselves the points of contact with other contextual witnesses and to claim an early date only where required to give a satisfying account of the phenomena in the text. Some of the points of contact that he notes may not, in the end, be successful in accounting for the emergence of the text, but they may be important to our reflections on its survival: most are unconvinced by the claim that Byzantine monastic vocational practices explain the depiction of Melchizedek as Noah's nephew, but readers within those traditions might have found a detail like that to be amenable to their own experience and values.

Francis I. Andersen

⁵⁶ Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 112

⁵⁷ Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 141. R reads *skazi*, which would mean "tell" and would not naturally mean "read."

⁵⁸ Vaillant, *Le Livre des Secrets*, 27.

Written just a few years after the publication of Milik's study, Francis Andersen's translation of 2 Enoch⁵⁹ reaffirmed the value of the long recension (though without claiming in any simple sense its priority) and offered an admirably open discussion of date and provenance. The translation was Andersen's contribution to the two-volume *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* compendium edited by Charlesworth and, as with so many of the contributions to that collection, it is important to look beyond the "headline" date inserted by the editor to the substance of the translator's introductory comments. Here, Andersen writes: "In every respect, 2 Enoch remains an enigma."⁶⁰ In building towards this statement, he offers this candid assessment of previous research on the provenance of the work:

All attempts to locate the intellectual background of 2 Enoch have failed. There must be something very peculiar about a work when one scholar, Charles, concludes that it was written by a hellenized Jew in Alexandria in the first century B.C., while another, J.T. Milik, argues that it was written by a Christian monk in Byzantium in the ninth century A.D.⁶¹

Andersen himself remains careful not to close the debate around its origins too quickly. He considers the arguments for a Christian authorship, as advanced by Vaillant and others, to be problematic, since the work seems to have little interest in repentance and mercy and lacks obvious signs of belief about the salvific role of Jesus in Christian soteriology. There is a reference to Enoch's carrying away of human sin (64:5), but nothing obviously Christological that has not very clearly been interpolated. The greatest significance of this for Andersen is what it reveals of the stringent moralism that appears to characterize the work. In fact, that same moralism—and an associated lack of interest in mercy—he considers to point away from any mainstream form of Judaism, when read in conjunction with the distinctive understanding of calendar, cosmology and sacrificial practice, and also the utter lack of interest in sabbath: "If the work is Jewish, it must have belonged to a fringe sect."⁶²

⁵⁹ Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch."

⁶⁰ Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 97

⁶¹ Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 95.

⁶² Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 96.

Andersen's discussion of the "syncretism" that characterizes the work is at once dismissive and suggestive:

It has no intellectual strength, for there is no system, and the attempt to be philosophical is spoiled by unreflective folk notions. 2 Enoch could derive from any region in which Jewish, Greek, Egyptian and other Near-Eastern ideas mingled."⁶³

His construal of such synthesis, though, is slanted in interesting ways by the leading question of whether this is window onto such syncretism specifically at the turn of the era. As a result of this, he specifically labels the descriptions of celestial hierarchies or the heavenly origins of Adam as "proto-gnostic"⁶⁴ and does not discuss the possibility that they reflect later Manichaean influence or that of Neoplatonic cosmologies. Such suggestions, of course, could be challenged by those who would note that the work as a whole (even in its shorter form) is incompatible with Manichaean or Neoplatonist thought. As I suggested in Chapter 1, however, and will explore in Chapters 5 and 6, this neglects the possibility that the influences in question are a matter of local colour and culture, reflecting a more complicated interplay of literatures and ideologies.

It is also the case that while Andersen is interested in what the text reveals about "syncretism" within Judaism, his core categories of Jewish and Christian identity remain rather clean-cut and are essentially defined by the positions of the authoritative networks. If the work is to be described as either Jewish or Christian, then its beliefs are labelled "marginal if not deviant."⁶⁵ Once again, I note simply that the recent developments in the study of Jewish Christianity and Christian Judaism, as well as the study of liminal communities whose identity might be highly determined by local colour and practice, invite fresh reflection on the kind of religious outlook that might be witnessed here. In principle, Andersen's refusal to foreclose the debate remains open to such possibilities, but the terms of his own contribution are heavily shaped by the scholarly contexts of the 1970s and 1980s. Nevertheless, his resistance to a trajectory of study that had started to look like a consensus on the work's Christian origin has proven to be pivotal.

⁶³ Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 96.

⁶⁴ Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 96.

⁶⁵ Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 97.

For subsequent research into 2 Enoch, Andersen's greatest contribution is probably his reassertion of the value of the long recension and his decision to represent the recensions in diplomatic form on facing pages, with a critical apparatus of sorts to allow variants to remain visible, a format that facilitates the line-by-line evaluation of the readings represented by each recension. Where Vaillant's critical edition and translation presented the additional material of the long recension separately to the short text, and consequently out of context, Andersen's kept that material in its proper place, allowing a more straightforward analysis of the details. Not only does this allow the reader to appreciate and evaluate the motility and fluidity of the material—i.e., where words and phrases are found in different places and with different significance according to the distinct characteristics of longer or shorter context—but it also allows the numerous points where the long recension readings agree with those of the very short recension against the short text of A,U. Partly as a result of this, Andersen is also determined to highlight the problems in the short text, the elements that suggest it has suffered from some kind of mutilation, and to note how the long recension escapes some of these. This is particularly the case in relation to the account of creation, where he sees the short recension as skeletal and fragmented and the longer account as more plausibly shaped by the traditions of Genesis 1. I will return to this point below, in considering Böttrich's work, which develops this case, and again in Chapter 6. In subsequent essays, he has also shown that the traditions about the sun, as preserved in the long recension, are characterized by archaic language and by old traditions traceable to antiquity.⁶⁶

Andersen's reaffirmation of the long recension has been influential on a number of subsequent studies. Christfried Böttrich, for example, used the long recension as his main exemplar of the work in his German translation and commentary, and developed further the case for the priority of this. My own edition of the Slavonic Texts of 2 Enoch followed Andersen's approach by setting the evidence of J and A on facing pages and listing variants against these in the footnotes.

⁶⁶ Francis I. Andersen, "The Sun in 2 Enoch," in *L'église des deux Alliances: Méorial Annie Jaubert (1912–1980)*, ed. Basil Lourié, Andrei Orlov and Madeline Petit, *Orientalia Judaica Christiana* 1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 1–38.

Christfried Böttrich

Andersen's resistance of the tendencies to prioritize the short recension and to claim a Christian authorship was strongly influential on Christfried Böttrich's work, particularly his extended study *Weltweisheit. Menschheitsethik. Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch*,⁶⁷ and his translation-commentary, *Das slavische Henochbuch*.⁶⁸ In the latter, Böttrich used the long recension (and specifically the manuscript R) as the basis for his translation, evaluating variant readings throughout, and developed a detailed study of the redactional history of the text, which he traced to early Judaism, prior to the fall of the temple in Jerusalem, but composed in Alexandria and subsequently elaborated by interpolations reflecting Jewish mysticism, early Christianity and Byzantine chronographical traditions. Böttrich's arguments for the priority of the long recension really develop Andersen's challenges to Vaillant; in particular, he maintains that the creation account found in the long recension is internally coherent and well-integrated into the wider context of the book (though with one block of material—on Satanael—interpolated), while that of the short has been cut back to a barely intelligible summary that does little to anticipate what is found elsewhere in the work. The reason for this cut he principally sees as a function of the material contexts of transmission within the Slavonic environment: the short version was transmitted initially in chronographical collections that trace world history and that have removed the material from 2 Enoch because it is already covered in earlier sections of the work. Like Andersen, he thinks that any work emerging from circles shaped by biblical writings would employ the 7-day schema found in the longer recension. I will return to this point in Chapter 6, but would note here that I consider it as plausible to see the details of the 7-day scheme as interpolations into the text, precisely intended to address apparent discrepancies with the biblical material. Israel's scriptures themselves contain several creation accounts beyond Genesis 1 and if Andersen is correct that the text seems to show limited interest or awareness in Jewish cultures as we know them, and of the details of Israel's scriptures more widely, then would we necessarily expect the work to reflect the schema of Genesis 1? Might we not expect something that is shaped by those other cultures involved in the creative dynamic that Andersen calls "syncretism"?

⁶⁷ Christfried Böttrich, *Weltweisheit. Menschheitsethik. Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch*, WUNT II:50 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992)

⁶⁸ Christfried Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*, JSRZ V 7 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1996).

For Böttrich, while the longer recension is favoured over the short, it is “mit der ursprünglichen Textgestalt noch nicht einfach identisch.”⁶⁹ In his early works, Böttrich still articulates a relatively high degree of confidence in the possibility of distinguishing the interpolations from the core of the work (803); while still maintaining his findings, he has moved to a rather more cautious or tentative holding of these in his later writings.⁷⁰ The interpolations he identifies are:

- (1) Jewish mystical interpolations.⁷¹ In 20:3 and in 21:6–22:3, the scheme of 7 heavens, in which the divine throne is located in the seventh heaven, is expanded to one of 10, with the names of 8th–10th heavens corresponding to those found in Rabbinic writings, notably b.Ḥagigah 12b. Böttrich also sees a “Fremdkörper” in 39:3–8, in the gap between two parts of the book, where Jewish mystical reflection on the body of God, as reflected in Shi‘ur Qomah speculation. Noting correspondences between the language used here and in 22:1, Böttrich considers it likely that the same editor is responsible for the interpolations. Böttrich also wonders if the analogical discussion of standing before a king and standing before God, in 46:1, might reflect rabbinic influence, but here is more cautious to reach a conclusion, recognizing that there is potentially wider stock of such imagery in antiquity. He is a little more confident in seeing the astrological material in 68:1–4, evidently at odds with its context, as having rabbinic parallels. It is worth noting here that Böttrich’s analysis of 39:3–8 and 46:1ff would subsequently be part of a debate with Andrei Orlov,⁷² who considers these elements to be part of the core logic of the work, in keeping with his own project of identifying 2 Enoch as a bridge between earlier and later mystical traditions in Judaism and one heavily shaped by polemics.

There is one further and subtle observation to be made. By placing “Jewish mystical expansions” at the beginning of his discussion, ahead of all analysis of Christian redaction, Böttrich functionally treats the work and its development as reflecting a

⁶⁹ Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*, 802.

⁷⁰ See, particularly, his essay “The ‘Book of the Secrets of Enoch’ (2 En): Between Jewish Origin and Christian Transmission. An Overview,” in Orlov et al, eds., *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch*, 37–68.

⁷¹ Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*, 803.

⁷² See A. Orlov, “The Melchizedek Legend of 2 Enoch,” *JSJ* 31 (2000): 23–38; Christfried Böttrich, “The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reaction to Andrei Orlov,” *JSJ* 32 (2001): 445–70, and Andrei Orlov, “On the Polemical Nature of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reply to C. Böttrich,” *JSJ* 34 (2003): 274–303. It is in the last of these essays that Böttrich’s identification of interpolations is challenged most strongly.

process that took place at stages hosted by different groups, with a “border crossing” from Judaism to Christianity taking place at some point in that process. Such a modelling may not be intended—in reality, Böttrich’s imagination of the relationship may be more complex and fluid and his later work has allowed more space for this to be developed—but it is hard to avoid its being inferred from the structure of his analysis. As we have seen already, analysis of the relationships between texts preserved in Jewish and Christian contexts has developed more fluid models of generative mutuality, so that Jewish mystical influence need not be seen as a function of transmission within an identifiably Jewish group.

- (2) Böttrich then notes a number of points where he considers the work to contain early Christian interpolations.⁷³ Some of these involve calendrical details intended to bring the text into closer alignment with the calendars used by Christians (Roman and Julian); while dismissive of Maunder and Fotheringham’s arguments for a very late authorship, Böttrich recognizes that the details they discuss need to be explained by recourse to calendrical developments through the course of the centuries. Böttrich also notes that the description of Satan’s fall (in 2 Enoch 31:4–5) is distinctively coloured by Christian tradition, along with some of the details about Adam’s life in Paradise. The prohibitions on swearing (2 Enoch 49:1–2) also show signs of Christian alteration, bringing them into line with Matthew 5:37 and James 5:12, yet he sees these as modifying the details of the underlying prohibition—quite at home in early Judaism—and not simply inserting a new detail. The most explicit example of Christian interpolation that he finds is in the typologies of Christ and Melchizedek and Christ and Adam, found in 2 Enoch 71:32–37 and 72:6–7.
- (3) Finally, Böttrich finds traces of alterations and interpolations made at the hands of Byzantine copyists and chronographers.⁷⁴ The triadic schema of 7 phoenixes, 7 cherubim and 7 six-winged creatures is a modification from the original description, with the ophanim transformed into phoenixes.⁷⁵ Böttrich also allows Milik’s

⁷³ Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*, 803–5.

⁷⁴ Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*, 805.

⁷⁵ Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*, 805. Here he affirms the finding of Émile Turdeanu, “Une curiosité de l’Hénoch slave: Les phénix du sixième ciel,” *Revue des études slaves* 47 (1968): 53–54.

explanation for the heavenly books being mottled with myrrh, accepting that the 9th century neologism could explain the detail, but he simply sees this as an interpolation. Lastly, he sees the content of 2 Enoch 73 (only found in R) as obviously secondary, reflecting later Christian traditions about the flood and the dimensions of the ark.

Working, then, with a repaired version of long recension as the best witness to the original work (the repairs allowing him to reject the calendrical arguments of Maunder and Fotheringham for a late date), Böttrich argues for an early Jewish authorship of Hellenistic character, probably in Egypt. This is a position he has continued to maintain, but with an increasingly visible caution as he has engaged seriously with the developing methodological discussions around establishing the provenance of pseudepigraphical works. For Böttrich, once the obviously Christian interpolations are removed, the portrayal of Enoch lacks the typical features of Christian authorship and aligns best with the earlier stages of Jewish tradition, in which Enoch is portrayed positively, without the tensions and hostilities visible in some later rabbinic traditions.⁷⁶ Clearly, however, given the highly exalted status of Enoch as a mediatorial figure, the account belongs at a relatively advanced point within this.

In terms of dating the work more specifically, Böttrich recognizes that the representations of sacrificial practice, as seemingly ongoing activities, and the lack of anything about the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem do not necessarily require that the work was composed before 70 C.E. He offers one piece of evidence, however, that he considers indicative of an early date. By lining up the various dates and timescales linked to Enoch's ascent and return, he calculates that the date of Methusalem's (i.e., Methuselah's)⁷⁷ installation as priest falls on 17th Tammuz, the summer solstice according to calendrical detail found in 48:2. The description of Methusalem's face as shining like the sun (in 69:10) is symbolically linked to this, even if it draws upon the language used of Simon in Sirach 50:5–7.⁷⁸ Böttrich's key observation is that the whole account of the 3 day festival is celebratory and lacks any trace of the mourning that would come to be associated with that date from the second century onwards, commemorating the fall of the temple. The argument turns on

⁷⁶ Böttrich here ("The 'Book of the Secrets of Enoch'," 53–54) follows the analysis of Enoch traditions developed by Marcel Poorthuis, "Enoch and Melchizedek in Judaism and Christianity: A Study in Intermediaries," in *Saints and Role Models in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. M. Poorthuis and J. Schwartz (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

⁷⁷ A range of spellings and variant forms of this name are encountered in the manuscripts.

⁷⁸ Böttrich, *Das Slavische Henochbuch*, 812–3; cf. also Böttrich, "The 'Book of the Secrets of Enoch'," 54–56.

two points: first, that the intended reader would identify the timeline that links the dates and durations of Enoch's ascent, descent and return to heaven and, second, that 17th Tammuz does indeed correspond to the summer solstice in 48:2. The latter point is challenged (though indirectly) by Basil Lourié's study of the calendar in 2 Enoch.⁷⁹ Even if Lourié's own reconstruction is not persuasive—and it involves a number of hypothetical reconstructions—it highlights the difficulty of attempting such a precise synthesis of elements in a work that involves such a degree of numerical corruption.

Böttrich also offers an analysis of the social context of the author and audience and this is worth quoting at length:

Er ist gekennzeichnet durch erfolgreiche Arbeit, Besitz, und Vorratshaltung, die ihn in die Lage versetzen, seinen Pflichten zur Sozialfürsorge sowie dem Vollzug von Opfern und Stiftungen nachzukommen. Der Sprachgebrauch läßt einen städtischen Hintergrund vermuten und bedient sich vorzugweise einer Metaphorik aus Handel und Gewerbe. Neben nationaler Verbundenheit (eventuell Sklavenfreikauf) steht ein pragmatisch bestimmter Universalismus. Als Adressaten des SIHen sind also die Gebildeteren und Wohlhabenderen in einem jüdischen Zentrum zur Diaspora—und damit wohl am wahrscheinlichsten in Alexandria—zu sehen.⁸⁰

These are invaluable observations and I will return to their implications in Chapters 8 and 9, but my concern there will be to ask whether there might be better candidates than Alexandria and whether, indeed, the cultic language might point to a different kind of religious culture than that of Alexandria prior to the fall of the temple in Jerusalem. Might the text reflect a context where worshippers arrange their own offerings in the space of offering and expect a certain kind of return for this? Might the indication that they are wealthy, with land and merchandise (both, perhaps, of agricultural sort) point away from a priestly authorship and thereby suggest non-priestly involvement with the cult?

⁷⁹ Basil Lourié, "Calendrical Elements in 2 Enoch," in Orlov, et al., eds, *New Perspectives*, 191–220; Böttrich graciously acknowledges the implications of Lourié's study, if correct.

⁸⁰ Böttrich, *Weltweisheit*, 192.

The parts of Böttrich's analysis of 2 Enoch all fit together and depend upon each other. The priority of the long recension and the conviction that its parts are coherent and integrated, once some interpolations are removed, means that he sees the work as a window onto early Jewish theology and ethics, providing background to New Testament thought. One crucial element within this is the Adamic anthropology reflected in the creation account; 2 Enoch is understood as the source (or, at least, as an example of the source thought) for the tradition that would then be disseminated in its own right, becoming more diverse along the way, as the so-called Adam Octipartite/Septipartite.⁸¹ Another is the ethical schema, which he considers to be principally governed by the Noachic covenant and its background, rather than the Mosaic law; this has the capacity to be universal in scope, in ways not limited to the Jewish or Israelite people. Finally, the Melchizedek section—also integrated into the work as a whole—provides resources for thinking about an exalted mediatorial figure, and hence casts light upon later Christology, especially where this invokes cultic themes.

Much, then, relies on the priority of the long recension. Here Böttrich builds on Andersen's work and does so in opposition to the conclusions reached by Vaillant. His work is critiqued by Liudmila Navtanovich,⁸² whose own work is focused on linguistic and philological issues and who broadly agrees with Vaillant in seeing the short recension as closest to the original.⁸³ The fact that so much of the additional material found in the long recension circulates independently in the Slavic environment is part of the evidence that she considers, leading her to the conclusion that the expansion or elaboration of the work took place in the Slavonic context. Hagen's tentative identification of a Coptic fragment with the short version of 2 Enoch provides further support for this. Navtanovich finds no reason to entertain the further possibility that two versions of 2 Enoch might have been translated into Slavonic, which would allow the long recension to retain a distinctive value as text witness to its Vorlagen.

While I am broadly in agreement with Navtanovich's assessment—not least because she is a specialist in Slavic linguistics, to whose expertise I would generally defer—there are some cautionary points to be made of this stance. First, and simply, there are numerous works that are

⁸¹ On this, see also his dedicated study of these traditions, *Adam als Mikrokosmos: Eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995).

⁸² See, notably, her "The Provenance of 2 Enoch."

⁸³ Л.М. Навтанович, "Лингвотекстологический анализ древнеславянского перевода книги Еноха," (Ph.D. diss.; С.-Петербург, 2000).

known to have been translated more than once, in more than one version.⁸⁴ The response that the general levels of agreement in word choice where the manuscripts share material points to a common source within the Slavonic context is valid to a point, but neglects two possibilities. First, a second translation may have been made with the first to hand, exercising some influence on the translation of the latter. Here, it is interesting to note some arguments developed by Basil Lourié, who has suggested that the long recension was translated after the short recension and effectively made use of this, with the additional material incorporated from a work transmitted in (and translated from) Syriac. The relevant evidence for Lourié's claims lie in the mutation of names and spellings found particularly in the long recension that are most readily explained as reflecting common linguistic phenomena in Syriac.⁸⁵ Second the translations may have interfered with each other in transmission. This leads to a further observation, which is that some of the works for which we have two or more versions actually circulated alongside each other, sometimes within the same collections or even the same manuscripts; this is true, for example, of the Adam Octipartite/Septipartite traditions.⁸⁶ In addition, while there are linguistic features cited by Navtanovich and, before her, Vaillant that suggest a difference in character between the additional material of the long recension and the short recension, it is also true that there remain archaic linguistic features in the additional content of the long recension and that the material preserves traditions traceable to late antiquity. One important example of such traditions is found in the description of the heavenly bodies in 30:3–6, which evinces an explicit interest in the connection between those bodies and the newborn through horoscopes, but represents this as a matter of

⁸⁴ See, for example, Diana Atanassova-Pencheva, "Multiple Translations and their Context: Praxis de stratilatis in the Medieval South Slavic Tradition," *Scripta & e-Scripta* 16-17 (2017): 267–78. During the same congress at which this work was first presented (the 23rd International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Belgrade 2016) Dieter Stern delivered a paper entitled "Double Translations of Byzantine Hagiographic Texts: Reflections on the Slavonic Translations of the Life of St Eupraxia of Tebes." To the best of my knowledge, the paper has not been formally published. In both cases, the authors noted the lack of systematic attention paid by scholarship to the phenomena of multiple translation; both also considered the likelihood that translations were not made independently, but that later translations were developed in consultation with (or with an intent to correct) earlier ones. The implications for linguistic study of 2 Enoch are enormous.

⁸⁵ B. Lourié, "Slavonic Pseudepigrapha, Nubia, and the Syrians," in *The Other Side: Apocryphal Perspectives on Ancient Christian "Orthodoxies,"* ed. Tobias Nicklas, Candida R. Moss, Christopher Tuckett and J. Verheyden, *Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus / Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments*, 117 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017): 225–250.

⁸⁶ See my discussion of this in Grant Macaskill, "Adam Octipartite: A New Translation with Introduction and Notes," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Non-Canonical Scriptures*, Volume 1, ed. Richard J. Bauckham, James R. Davila and Alexander A. Panayotov (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 3–22.

divine appointment; this is strikingly similar to Bardaisanite teaching, and what is important about this observation is that this “astral determinism” would later be critiqued in the Syrian tradition. Traces of such teaching in the long recension reflect the inclusion of some ancient traditions that later became unpopular or even anathema; I will suggest in Chapter 6 that the divergences between the recensions may bear witness to the ideological conflicts of late antiquity. Alongside this, of course, is the simple observation that the additional material of the long recension preserves ancient traditions of a 364 day calendar (although the details have been rather damaged in transmission), so even if not original to 2 Enoch, this material draws on traditions and literary fragments that go back to antiquity. Finally, we may note that the stylistic differences between manuscripts also mark the common material, if not so strikingly. While, then, I am inclined to agree with Navtanovich, and think the short version is likely to be closer to the original, I am also wary of excluding the evidence of the long recension and think that, in principle, we need to be open to the possibility that 2 Enoch was already circulating in different forms prior to its translation into Slavonic.

Although Böttrich has maintained his positions on the major elements of his reconstruction, he has listened sensitively and openly to the various challenges and counterpoints, with his own account becoming more nuanced but also more tentative in tone. This shift also corresponds to his growing involvement in projects focused upon the wider collections of Slavonic material that contextualize (and, in some cases, contain) the Enoch books and the associated traditions, such as those on the composition of Adam, the Melchizedek traditions,⁸⁷ and the palaeia/paleja texts.⁸⁸ One intriguing suggestion has emerged from this: Böttrich notes that it is a desideratum that the Enoch works are thoroughly compared with Slavonic witnesses to the Corpus Dionysiaca. This is an astute observation on the commonalities between the two bodies of literature, but the significance of any similarity may not quite be what Böttrich would consider it to be: through the body of my own discussion, I will suggest that the connections may reflect the presence of Neoplatonic influences that point to a context in late antiquity.

⁸⁷ Christfried Böttrich, “Melchizedek among Russian Saints. The History of Melchizedek between Jews and Slavs,” in *The Bible in Slavic Tradition*, ed. Alexander Kulik, Catherine Mary MacRobert, Svetlina Nikolova, Moshe Taube and Cynthia M. Vakareliyska, *Studia Judaeoslavica* 9 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 373–90.

⁸⁸ Dieter Fahl, Sabine Fahl and Christfried Böttrich, *Die Kurze Chronographische Paleja: Einführung, Kommentar, Indices - Краткая Хронографическая Палея: Введение, комментарии, индексы* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2019).

I close my discussion of Böttrich with a quotation from his contribution to the Naples meeting of the Enoch Seminar, which captures nicely his evaluation of the qualities of 2 Enoch in relation to both Judaism and the intellectual world of antiquity:

To sum up, 2 Enoch deserves much more attention among scholars who deal with Early Judaism. There should be no debate about its place in all studies of the Enoch tradition (at least as the most important witness to its ongoing history) and, with caution, included among the spectrum of theological issues around the turn of the era.

For the honorable Enoch Seminar, 2 Enoch should be accepted as a legitimate child. A little bit strange sometimes and self-willed, but really talented and generally lovable!⁸⁹

I will argue in this study that the work probably took recognizable form a little later in antiquity than Böttrich thinks (while remaining open to the possibility that it preserves older traditions). I am also wary of using the imagery of the child, since this invokes a particular schema of genealogical relationship that I here seek to complicate. Despite these differences, I find Böttrich's affirmation of the talent visible in 2 Enoch to be admirable and find his language of its legitimate strangeness to be suggestive, if still determined by a particularly normalized account of early Judaism. It invites reflection on whether there might be contexts in which this apparently strange brilliance may, in fact, be quite normal.

Andrei Orlov

The last of the major contributors to the discussion that I will consider here is Andrei Orlov. Orlov's arguments can be considered somewhat more briefly, not because they are less important, but because they are concerned less with issues of date/provenance and more with the place that 2 Enoch occupies in the trajectory of Jewish mysticism. That is not to say that the issue of dating is ignored by Orlov: one key section of his early work offers a distinctive contribution to the discussion and triggered a lively interaction with Böttrich.⁹⁰ For the most part, however, Orlov is interested in

⁸⁹ Böttrich, "The 'Book of the Secrets of Enoch' (2 En)," 67.

⁹⁰ Andrei Orlov, "The Melchizedek Legend of 2 Enoch," *JSJ* 31 (2000): 23-38; Christfried Böttrich, "The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reaction to Andrei Orlov," *JSJ* 32 (2001): 445-70, and Andrei Orlov, "On the Polemical Nature of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reply to C. Böttrich," *JSJ* 34 (2003): 274-303.

2 Enoch as a witness to developments in Jewish mystical traditions that are obviously later than what is encountered in some texts and earlier than what is encountered in others—i.e., traditions that represent intermediate stages of development in Jewish mysticism—and its status as a witness to these can be accommodated in a rather broad range of times and places. This suppleness is particularly reflective of Orlov’s methodological prioritizing of traditions and not, principally, texts; the question of textual relationships and dependencies is, if not quite bypassed, then at least deemphasized. As with Badalanova-Geller’s work, Orlov’s will provide some important observations with which I interact in later chapters on the detail of what is encountered in 2 Enoch and how it relates to traditions that we often speak of as “mystical,” a label that is itself both broad and controverted; some of the detail in my own discussion will consider the possibility that some of these elements might reflect theurgy, rather than mysticism as such.

Orlov’s project, developed across a number of works, broadly supports, refines and extends the earlier hypothesis of Gershom Scholem about the development of Jewish mysticism from early apocalyptic.⁹¹ Scholem himself drew back from some of the elements his earlier claims, moving to a more complicated position, but the broad outlines of his original argument have remained influential. Importantly, the approach sees the “subterranean” traditions to be partially witnessed by texts written while they are in process and in play, so that the developments are not primarily those of textual dependency and influence, but the evolution of traditions within Judaism.

As is often characteristic of tradition-centred approaches, the driver for evolution in Orlov’s account is the dialectic force of polemics. Here, Orlov utilises the reconstructions of Jewish diversity that are developed particularly by Gabriele Boccaccini⁹² and sees the group behind 2 Enoch as representing particular traditions shaped by opposition to other Jewish groups (or by resistance to their traditions). 2 Enoch thus represents a particular strand, or stage, of “Enochic Judaism.” Orlov argues that one can discern in the Slavonic apocalypse a consistent polemical pattern whereby roles and qualities of other eminent or exalted figures are transferred to Enoch (or to another figure who is not considered a threat to Enoch’s status), with those figures being diminished in importance or marginalised as a result. The roles are distinctively mediatorial in sort and the qualities are

⁹¹ Gershom Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (2nd ed.; New York: Schocken, 1945; first published 1941).

⁹² Particularly Gabrielle Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) and his earlier work *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300BCE-200CE* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992). Boccaccini’s work develops lines established by Paolo Sacchi, *L’apocalittica giudaica e la sua Storia* (Brescia: Paideia, 1990).

associated with their functions. In *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*,⁹³ Orlov explores three of these: Adam polemics, Moses polemics and Noah polemics, in each case exploring parallels between the representation of Enoch and the representation of these other figures and showing how the Enochic “hero” is developed and his pre-eminence asserted. The vocabulary of conflict and competition is ubiquitous in Orlov’s analysis, as reflected in this comment on the Noah polemics:

It represents a domestic conflict that attempts to downgrade and devalue the former paladin who has become so notable that his exalted status in the context of mediatorial interactions now poses an imminent threat to the main hero of the Enochic tradition.⁹⁴

In the Noah polemics, for Orlov, sacerdotal issues are particularly important, with the priestly role and status being transferred to Melchizedek through the introduction of the otherwise unknown character of Nir, Noah’s younger brother. Where, as noted above, Milik sees this as reflecting Byzantine monastic practice, Orlov sees it as a polemical solution to Noah’s threateningly elevated status; the unthreatening figure of Nir can be allowed the status of being the parent of Melchizedek (the wonder-child), while Noah becomes just another member of the community. For Orlov, this is evidence that the text is likely to have been composed before 70 CE, since the priestly or sacerdotal elements in the Noah traditions particularly characterise Second Temple texts and are dropped from parallel traditions about a wonder-child, as in the description of Cain’s birth in the Latin *Life of Adam and Eve*.⁹⁵

This polemical factor became a sharp point of disagreement between Orlov and Böttrich in a lively exchange in *Journal for the Study of Judaism*,⁹⁶ which had a particular bearing on the status of the material that Böttrich considers to be the result of Jewish mystical interpolation. For Orlov, the material concerned with the glory of the divine face and the measure of the divine body—and Enoch’s unique encounter with these—fits perfectly within the polemical strategy of the work and represents its intermediate character between the limited exaltation of Enoch in the early tractates and his elevated status as Metatron in 3 Enoch and rabbinic writings. Orlov also considered

⁹³ Andrei A. Orlov, *The Enoch Metatron Tradition*, TSAJ 107 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).

⁹⁴ Orlov, *Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 319.

⁹⁵ Orlov, *Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 331.

⁹⁶ See note 70 above.

Böttrich's arguments about the use of solar imagery in the description of Methusalem, which we have seen to be linked to his arguments about the dating of Methusalem's installation to 17th Tammuz, to neglect the polemical significance of the description, as part of the anti-Noah polemics. Böttrich, however, finds no evidence for polemical structuring of the work and, in fact, sees the drive of 2 Enoch as towards integration or assimilation, establishing the basis for the unity of Jewish and Hellenistic knowledge, ethics and cult in the primeval story of Enoch, with the Noachic element serving to universalize the ethical dimension, as the law for all humanity and not just Israel.

Like Böttrich, I am less persuaded that polemics are at work in the text, at least not extensively. For my part, this reflects a sense that modern scholars can expect polemics too readily because of the place that polemical analysis (underpinned by quasi-Hegelian principles) has played in models of religious evolution, such as the Baur hypothesis. Modern scholars often see the correspondences between figures within traditions as competitive, rather than as aggregative or mutual. The overlap of elements in the representation of Enoch and other figures, such as Adam or Moses, need not reflect perceived competition between the heroes of different groups, but rather a kind of resonance between them or an aggregation of themes, images and tropes in the culture. The cultural aspect, as discussed in Chapter 1, is important and is in its own way reflected in Orlov's argument, as he acknowledges the influences of Mesopotamian elements on the development of Enoch traditions, but these are considered differently if we see them as reflecting "colouration" rather than "polemics" and if we allow that the context may have been one of later antiquity, in similarly eclectic thought worlds to those that resourced the Hekhalot literature. This is not to deny that polemics could be present, but we need to demonstrate that elements are polemical and not more readily explicable in other terms. Within 2 Enoch, there may be some elements that are obviously oppositional, such as the condemnation of binding-practices other than the one advocated in the text or of those who reject the laws of the fathers, but the polemics in these are *evident*, they are unmistakable from the detail of the text. Orlov's case for polemics would require of the readership a remarkable degree of sensitivity to the narrative dynamics of the text itself, framed knowingly by the texts presumed to trigger the polemics in the first place. As well as assuming a certain readerly instinct—that ancient readers would readily perceive the polemics at work—this also requires that those triggering texts or traditions are coeval or older than 2 Enoch, but the dating of many of them is wrapped up in the same set of problems as 2 Enoch itself; their provenance is also a matter of debate.

Having offered this critical comment on the framing of his analysis, I would also offer an affirmatory one on its detail. Orlov's work is invaluable in highlighting countless points of connection, correspondence or even equivalence between 2 Enoch and other texts preserved among the pseudepigrapha and the rabbinic collections. His analysis is also enormously helpful in probing whether traditions are more or less primitive in relation to each other. On all of these points, Orlov is attentive to details that others have neglected and provides a rich resource for any who want to explore the web of connections that links 2 Enoch to other literatures. As his work has continued, the interest in connections with Jewish works has also been developed richly in relation to Christian works in the Syrian and Egyptian traditions, where he has explored connections with various writings including the Macarian Homilies.⁹⁷ These observations can be framed differently, however, than they are in Orlov's account, where the direction of travel is generally *within* Jewish traditions and then *from* these *into* Christian ones. The approaches we considered in Chapter 1—those that consider the entanglement of Jewish, Christian and Other—offer different possibilities for how the connections are explained, and the evaluation of which (if any) of these frameworks accounts best for the evidence will involve an assessment of how well the data mesh with and are intelligible within the frame. Might, for example, the interest in the extent of the divine body reflect currents in the religious culture of Syria in late Antiquity, as attested by the Audiani? This may well be connected to the development of Shi'ur Qomah mysticism, but need not be located simply on a trajectory of Jewish speculative thought; rather, Jewish thought might be coloured by the same features visible in Christian thought (and that of the less easily categorized "others") in the broad territory in which they are situated. My discussion of this in Chapters 6 and 7 will pick up on these points.

Further Contributions: Pines, Himmelfarb, Reed and Alexander.

A number of briefer studies can now be noted, as works that have engaged 2 Enoch within the context of broader projects. Precisely as a result of their broader goals, they have offered distinctive

⁹⁷ Andrei A. Orlov, "Vested with Adam's Glory: Moses as the Luminous Counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Macarian Homilies," *Christian Orient* 4 (2006): 498-513.

purchase on the cultural elements present in the work and what these might reveal of its relationship to other works.

The first of these is, in my view, one of the most important discussions on the cultural and conceptual influences that can be detected in 2 Enoch, but while it is often cited, its *major* contribution is frequently passed over because of interest in one specific detail that it explores, a potential point of halachic distinctiveness. In 1970, Schlomo Pines offered an insightful and suggestive analysis of the eschatology of 2 Enoch,⁹⁸ in which he explored evidence for Zoroastrian influence on this feature of the work; in his *Encyclopedia Judaica* entry for 2 Enoch,⁹⁹ he also suggested that the book was heavily influenced by Iranian thought.

Pines is somewhat unconvinced by Vaillant's identification of the work as Christian, considering the lack of Christian signature features to tell against this; he also cautiously explores some evidence for a Semitic original, though is careful to avoid overstating the significance of this evidence, recognizing that it may conceivably reflect the influence of LXX or other translations of the Bible. His major interest is in the representation of eschatological hope as a kind of merging with a "great age" in which there is no time. This he considers to reflect Zoroastrian beliefs and therefore to suggest Iranian influence. As further support for this possibility, he notes the distinctive descriptions of binding practices for sacrificial offerings and the logic associated with these. He suggests that the practices described might align with those of the *minim* whose approach to offering is condemned in m.Tam 4:1 and b.Tam 31b; hence, the group behind 2 Enoch might be a "fringe" group or sect, considered to be beyond the pale by their rabbinical counterparts. This observation has frequently been picked up by readers of Pines and has been drawn into debates about whether there is evidence for halachic interest in the work.¹⁰⁰ Less attention, it seems to me, has been paid to the claim that is actually central to Pines's argument, namely that the rationale for the proper binding of animals is attached to their dignity and to the role that they will play in bringing accusation against those who have mistreated them at the judgement.¹⁰¹ Pines considers

⁹⁸ Shlomo Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," in *Types of Redemption*, ed. R.J. Zwi Werblowsky and C. Jouko Bleeker, *Studies in the History of Religions. Supplements to Numen* 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 72–87.

⁹⁹ Schlomo Pines, "Enoch, Slavonic Book of," in *Encyclopaedia Judaica* VI, ed. Cecil Roth (Jerusalem: Keter, 1971), cols. 797–99.

¹⁰⁰ See further my discussion in Chapter 9.

¹⁰¹ See further my discussion in Chapter 9.

this to parallel Zoroastrian accounts of the involvement of animals in judgement and to add further support to the evidence for Iranian influence.

Martha Himmelfarb considered 2 Enoch in the context of her work on heavenly ascents in Judaism. Where 2 Enoch is often encountered simply as a citation, tucked away in a footnote, her study interacts with the work in some detail and she is admirably sensitive to the problems that attend its use, drawing upon it with genuine care. Her discussion of provenance aligns with many others, but with a restraint and an openness missing from much of the scholarship on the work:

My own guess is that the standard view of the provenance of 2 Enoch, although it was arrived at without adequate grounds, is more or less correct. My view is based on two considerations, one negative and one positive: 2 Enoch does not look like medieval Christian apocalypses, but it shows many similarities to apocalypses that clearly belong to the early centuries of this era. An Egyptian location seems plausible, as I shall argue later in this chapter. There is nothing in 2 Enoch that requires or even suggests particularly Christian concerns. This does not eliminate the possibility of a Christian author, but it makes a Jewish author more likely.¹⁰²

The evidence that Himmelfarb considers to point in the direction of an Egyptian provenance lies particularly in the creation account: she notes the extensive presence of Platonic language and imagery which, for her, is best explained as a phenomenon reflecting the Alexandrian context.¹⁰³ It is noteworthy, perhaps, that she reaches such a conclusion despite her general wariness of presuming that Alexandria should function as the default context for non-Palestinian, Hellenistic Judaism. Her identification of Platonic discourse is interesting in relation to my own discussion of this imagery in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6. While the language *could* be explained as reflecting Middle Platonism in first century Alexandria, it may be better accounted for in the context of Neoplatonism in late antiquity. For my purposes here, the most important point is her core observation that the pervasive presence of Platonic language is a vital piece of evidence for the provenance of the work.

Himmelfarb also offers some careful critique of Pines's arguments, particularly in relation to the binding of animals and the possibility that this reflects the practices of the minim. She is

¹⁰² Martha Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 38.

¹⁰³ Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 43.

unpersuaded by his particular interpretation of the verbal evidence in the Mishah,¹⁰⁴ but more importantly (and more intriguingly for me), she finds problems in the identification of the condemned practice as “sectarian”:

The basis of Pines's claim is the Venice first edition of the Babylonian Talmud, according to which one amora suggests that it is in order to avoid the practice of the heretics (*minim*). But according to most printed editions, it is to avoid the practice of the gentiles (*goyim*). In his discussion of the passage from m. Tamid, Saul Lieberman notes that the Greeks and Romans do not seem to have bound their sacrifices, although the Egyptians did, and suggests that the discussion in the Talmud refers to the practice of some "Oriental cult."¹⁰⁵

This observation does not void Pines's argument, particularly in relation to the Zoroastrian or Iranian qualities that he identifies in 2 Enoch. It does, however, invite reflection on a different possibility, that the influences are not to be associated with a sect, but rather with Jews whose practices are considered troubling to the rabbis because they are too closely aligned with those of the *goyim*.

Annette Yoshiko Reed has also explored the evidence that is generally taken to reflect an Egyptian background.¹⁰⁶ Her essay is, in its own terms, an experimental reflection on the dialogue between Mesopotamian astronomy and Jewish cosmology, as represented in the earlier Enoch works preserved at Qumran, and the Greek philosophical context distinctively represented in Roman Egypt. The possible identification of a Coptic fragment of 2 Enoch, supporting the priority of the short recension, is something of a warrant for this experiment, but in reality, its value emerges more from its conclusions, its careful identification of evidence for hybridization or dialogue

¹⁰⁴ Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 43:

On close examination, however, Pines's reading of m. Tamid 4:1 is not without difficulties. The passage contrasts the incorrect and correct ways of tying the lamb for the daily whole offering: "The lamb was not [wholly] bound (*kpt*), but only tied (*'qd*)." The difference between the two verbs the Mishnah contrasts here is not obvious in ordinary usage, and it is not reassuring that the earliest authority who can be cited in favor of Pines's understanding is the eleventh-century commentator Rashi.

¹⁰⁵ Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 43. The citation of Saul Lieberman is to his *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1950), 158.

¹⁰⁶ Annette Yoshiko Reed, "2 Enoch and the Trajectories of Jewish Cosmology: From Mesopotamian Astronomy to Greco-Egyptian Philosophy in Roman Egypt," *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 22 (2014): 1–24.

between traditional Mesopotamian and Jewish elements and developing Greek philosophical traditions, particularly in their Egyptian contexts. As well as the general evidence for the influence of Platonism, including particularly the role of the *Timaeus* in resourcing theological language about creation and cosmos, she notes points of contact with Ptolemy and the Corpus Hermeticum, as works both emblematic of the Egyptian interest in philosophical cosmology and illustrative of its features.

Within the context of this study, Reed sees the evidence as broadly supporting the attempts to locate 2 Enoch as an early work of Egyptian provenance, although this perspective is advanced rather cautiously and without any particular agenda: the aims of the study are less about establishing provenance and more about exploring the dynamics of cultural dialogue. What we need to consider further, however, is the possibility that these same phenomena might have emerged at a later point and perhaps in a different context. The flourishing of interest in philosophical cosmology and astronomy in Egypt left a legacy that continued to be influential for centuries to come. Not only so, but there was a particular renewal of interest in all things Egyptian in the context of Syria in late antiquity, reflected and perhaps driven by Iamblichus, whose work also became widely influential in the eastern empire. Syrian astronomy continued to preserve the heritage of Egyptian scholarship until a late stage.¹⁰⁷ If this is taken into account, then it is possible that Reed's conclusions can be sustained, but remapped somewhat. They are, I think, distinctively illustrative of a rhizomatic account, but perhaps the particular location within the rhizome is a different one.

One last study can here be mentioned, before I turn finally to the landmark discussion of 2 Enoch represented by the 2009 Naples Seminar. Philip Alexander, in his essay, "From Son of Adam to Second God,"¹⁰⁸ paid particular attention to the similarities between the account of Enoch's exaltation in 2 Enoch and the representation of Metatron in the so-called 3 Enoch, arguing that the bodily character of Enoch's ascent in the Slavonic apocalypse is radically atypical of early Jewish

¹⁰⁷ Although concerned with a later period, the insights developed in this discussion, and the context surveyed is relevant. Émilie Villey, "Syriac Astronomical Texts (500-700 CE): Christian Voices defending Ptolemaic Astronomy," in *New Themes, New Styles in the Eastern Mediterranean: Christian, Jewish, and Islamic Encounters, 5th-8th Centuries*, ed. H. Amirav and F. Celia (Leuven: Peeters, 2017), 205-31. Cf. the collection of earlier seminal work by François Nau, *Astronomie et Cosmographie Syriaque: Recueil d'articles de François Nau*. ed. Emilie Villey and Henri Hugonnard-Roche (Piscataway: Gorgias, 2014).

¹⁰⁸ Philip Alexander, "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformations of the Biblical Enoch," in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*, ed. Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren (Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1998), 87-122, esp. 104.

apocalyptic and is distinctively similar to what is encountered in the rabbinic text. This observation is an important element in Orlov's account of the transitional significance of 2 Enoch, as a key stage in the development of Jewish mysticism, but I note it here for two reasons. First, it suggests that there may particular value in exploring further the bodily character of Enoch's ascent in 2 Enoch and asking whether there might be points of connection with other apocalyptic writings, including the Parables of Enoch, which is a particularly important comparative work for this study. Second, given the lateness of 3 Enoch as a written text and even of the traditions that it textualizes, it invites a rather different reflection on whether the connections between the works might be better explained in the context of late antiquity, with closer geographical proximity to the Babylonian context in which 3 Enoch took form. It is important to recognize here that scholarship on the Hekhalot literature has progressed significantly in recent years and is increasingly interested in the mutuality of its development with Christian traditions in late antiquity.¹⁰⁹ As I will discuss in Chapters 6 and 7, there are elements at work in the Christian theologies of eastern Syria at the time that appear to be connected to the accounts of Enoch's transformation and also of the divine body that may have been influential on the development of the Jewish traditions, particularly when the role of the shared culture, and the mutuality of traditions, is taken seriously.

The 5th Enoch Seminar: Naples 2009. No Longer Slavonic Only?

A little more space needs to be dedicated in this final section to the 5th meeting of the Enoch Seminar, which was dedicated to the discussion of 2 Enoch. The contributions to this meeting were published in the volume, *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*, the subtitle reflecting the announcement and discussion of Coptic fragments that pre-dated the known manuscripts of 2 Enoch by several centuries.

These fragments were identified as representing blocks of text from 2 Enoch 36:3–42:3 by Joost Hagen, as part of his research into manuscripts uncovered by excavations in Nubia. Hagen himself did not work directly with the manuscripts but with notebook transcriptions by J.M. Plumley, who discovered them while directing excavations in Qasr Ibrim in 1972, and with three

¹⁰⁹ For an overview, see Ra'anan Boustan, "The Study of Heikhalot Literature: Between Mystical Experience and Textual Artifact," *Currents in Biblical Research* 6 (2007): 130–60.

partial and low quality photographs. The contents of these were published by Hagen in the conference volume, with the many lacunae reconstructed using parallels in the Slavonic manuscripts of 2 Enoch. Hagen himself was rather more cautious in his identification than the title of the book suggests, because of the limited extent of the primary text, and was careful to consult others at the conference about whether his reconstruction was persuasive, but he noted the implications of his findings if correct. First, the preservation of fragments of 2 Enoch in an Egyptian context would provide a kind of support for the claims that the work originated in Egypt. This needs to be treated with a little care, however: the fragments are still relatively late and there is some evidence that works could migrate into Egypt from other territories, particularly from Syria. Second, the fragments correspond specifically to the short recension, with some of the material only found in the long recension missing from these fragments (e.g., 40:6–7, the text moving straight from 40:5 to 40:8) and the ordering of the material seemingly following that preserved in U (i.e., 36, 39, 37, 40) and not what is preserved in R (36, 37, 38, 39). They also appear to contain material found in 36:3–4 that is only preserved in A and U. Hagen, then, sees the fragments as witnessing the form also represented by A and U, which is significant because the terseness and the difficulties in making sense of these verses have been taken by Andersen and Böttrich as evidence for the inferiority of the short recension at this point.

Böttrich has subsequently probed the identification of the fragments as being witnesses to 2 Enoch, highlighting the various assumptions that need to be made for the work to be so identified, and exploring the particular problems associated with the “angel of Tartarus.”¹¹⁰ His arguments are not presented as a refutation, but as a cross examination by an *advocatus diaboli*, exposing points of vulnerability in the argument to avoid their certainty being overstated. Any who would make use of the Coptic fragments owe it to themselves and to scholarship to read Böttrich’s discussion.

Beyond Hagen’s contribution, the conference rehearsed many of the discussions that have already been covered in this chapter, though with the energy that emerges by having advocates of contrary positions engage with each other in a congenial environment: the priority of one recension over the other, evidence for dating early or late, interest or disinterest in halachic matters, evidence for particular calendrical commitments—all of these issues were debated and the published

¹¹⁰ Böttrich, “The Angel of Tartarus.”

contributions are valuable as recent and nuanced articulations and analyses of the various positions.

The representation of scholarship was tilted towards two particular constituencies, however, with two other groups largely unrepresented. The majority of contributors would be categorized as “biblical scholars” and mostly shared a primary interest in early Judaism or Second Temple Judaism; a few scholars were there as specialists either in the Slavonic pseudepigrapha or in Slavic literature and linguistics. Conspicuously, at least to the clear eyes of hindsight, there were no specialists in late antiquity or medieval literature; to particularize this, there were no specialists in Jewish-Christianity or in Byzantine apocalyptic, and no specialists in Neoplatonism. There were no voices, then, speaking in detail to the factors that may have been at work in the period from the 3rd to the 12th centuries, or even the period slightly earlier than this, particularly within the circles believed to have transmitted the work during the common era. To put one ramification of this rather bluntly, none of the voices we might have expected to be able to offer expert evaluation of the claims of Vaillant and Milik about the history of the work prior to its translation into Slavonic were present. To note a related point: the discussions lacked voices to represent plausible alternatives to the thesis that the work was written in Egypt by a Jewish or Christian author or to account for its transmission routes and its contexts for growth and development.

Conclusions

The purpose of this chapter was not to provide an exhaustive literature review of scholarship on the dating, provenance and transmission of 2 Enoch, but rather to identify the core issues and the frameworks within which they are interpreted. This discussion will provide an important context to the detailed study that follows, but it also highlights some of the distinctive issues of framing that can usefully be disrupted in my own engagement with the material.

The most obvious of these issues is the predominance of a model that centres on bounded groups and their textual legacies. Scholarship has been preoccupied with the question of whether 2 Enoch is Jewish or Christian and with the markers that might indicate its crossing of the border between the two. There are exceptions: Reed has been interested in the cultural recombination generated in the Egyptian environment, and her findings could be decoupled from an account of

Jewish authorship without jeopardizing their integrity; Vaillant was interested in the kind of Jewish Christianity that sustains both identities. Nevertheless, for the most part, the scholarship has been shaped by accounts of groups and their boundaries.

Linked to this, the eccentricity of 2 Enoch has been represented as that of fringe group or a sectarian movement, “marginal if not deviant.”¹¹¹ Such categories continue to presume boundaries and definitions that separate such communities from their “parents.” This conception of sectarian groupings is potentially quite different from the more fluid or liminal categories that I discussed in Chapter 1 and it raises further problems for how we account for the fact that 2 Enoch eventually came to be circulated as edificational literature in monastic circles.

This also affects the way that the ideological or polemical elements in the texts are treated. Polemics have been central to some accounts of 2 Enoch and challenged by others, but most hold in common that they reflect inter-group dynamics of one sort or another. This, in turn, affects the way that 2 Enoch has been plotted onto the developing trajectories of Jewish or Christian belief. In general terms, less interest has been shown in the possibility that the work might attest something of the mutuality of Jewish and Christian traditions—again, the border crossing model means that it is typically treated as one or the other until its point of migration—and, instead, it is taken as a window onto the somewhat linear, inner development of Judaism. The possibility that the polemics may reflect the encounter of ideological values in a complex culture, shaped by the mutual interaction of Jewish, Christian, Manichaean and “other” influences has, I think, been neglected. Importantly here, the influence of Mesopotamian thought is generally linked to an early stage of the Enochic traditions; what is brought into dialogue with Greek philosophical and cosmological discourse is carried over from the early stages of the Enoch traditions. There has been less sustained reflection on the possibility that Mesopotamian traditions might *continue* to exercise an influence on the development of 2 Enoch, as something in the air.

Here, again, shifting the discourse away from a simple account of groups and towards the level of mutual culture is vital. This does not mean that we neglect groups and communities, but that we consider how local aspects of culture might have shaped the development of discourse through time, in ways that do not necessarily conform to the model of the trajectory and in ways that may transcend the interests of any one group. Such attention to locality and its fashions may,

¹¹¹ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 97.

in its own way, reorient the geographical aspects that have been present in the study of 2 Enoch. In particular, the renewed flourishing of Platonic discourse in late antiquity, particularly in Syria, and the associated interest in Egyptian religion and philosophy could mean that something generally considered to be early and Egyptian is actually later and Syro-Mesopotamian. Distinguishing the two may not be straightforward, and we may need to remain tentative in our conclusions, but probably comes down to the combination of issues that are encountered and whether, as a distinctive recombinant, it can be better explained in one context or the other.

All of these matters connect in particular ways to the recensional features of the manuscripts and to how these are treated by scholars. When the principal task is defined according to the identification of origins, and when this identification is itself linked to a model of classification that involves sets of signature features, then the recensions will be evaluated accordingly. The goal in such analysis is the identification of the earliest and purest form of the work, and the recategorization of apparently secondary material as interpolation, but the standards of purity that are presumed may distort the identification: the work may come from a more eclectic culture than such analysis allows. Furthermore, the framing of the analysis in such terms does not accommodate adequately the capacity of the recensional work to attest its own vitality, as something that may have been subject to diversification and development even in its period of emergence. If much of the additional material preserved in the long recension appears to be ancient (e.g., the traces of astral determinism, the vestiges of a 364-day solar calendar), but not thoroughly integrated into the work, and if the short recension appears subject to redaction at points, then it may be the case that both recensions bear witness to the dynamics of diverse and contested ideologies in the culture(s) from which the work came.

This last point bears on my own practice throughout the rest of this study. I will most often focus on the material that is common to both recensions, functionally treating the short recension as the best witness to this. That said, at points, the long recension manuscripts (J, P, R) preserve readings of the common material that should be preferred over the short recension exemplars (A, U), with support to be found in their agreement with the very short manuscripts (V, N, B²) or with the distinctive witness of the manuscript B; these points of agreement highlight that A, U have been altered or corrupted in the context of their transmission in Slavonic. Often, though, I will explore the evidence of both recensions, tracing the distinctive content of each in relation to developing

theological cultures. As I will note in Chapter 5, for example, there are points where the long recension is more heavily coloured by the Neoplatonic interest in negative theological language than is the short; this may reflect developments in late antiquity or the medieval period and not just the contexts of transmission in Slavonic.

A Postscript to Chapter 2: Samaritan Contexts for 2 Enoch?

After I had completed the substance of this book, though before it entered production, I was contacted by Daniel Olson and invited to read the draft of a study in which he argues that 2 Enoch is a Samaritan work. Since the work is still unpublished and may change significantly as various colleagues offer critical feedback, I will not attempt to summarize or to evaluate the arguments here. I will, however, offer the following brief reflections. First, Olson recognizes that the debates over the origins and provenance of 2 Enoch have failed to reach any consensus because they have been limited by the categories of “Jewish” and “Christian”; his suggestion of a Samaritan authorship is intended as an alternative to this binary and even if he is not correct, it constitutes a welcome disruption of the usual terms of debate. Second, Olson’s approach is oriented towards associating 2 Enoch with a defined group, even if that group is not one that has generally been drawn into the debates about the origins of 2 Enoch. My study is seeking to complicate all such approaches to 2 Enoch, but this is not to say that Olson’s findings are unhelpful; it may well be the case that, in the rhizome of late antiquity, Samaritan traditions contributed to the entangled growth of the Enochic literatures. The likelihood of this would be greater if 2 Enoch did indeed emerge in the broad territory of Roman Syria. Point by point, the parallels and divergences will need to be considered and Olson’s work, if and when published, will provide a valuable focus for this. I would suggest, however, that particular care will need to be taken over points of wording that may reveal something of developing religious and philosophical discourse and the fashions thereof. There may be general parallels to be traced between 2 Enoch and Samaritan traditions (e.g., in themes of creation), the significance of which takes on a different tone when the precise correspondences between 2 Enoch and philosophical treatments of *creatio ex nihilo* are recognized.

Shortly after Olson shared his work with me, Ruairidh Mac Mhannain Bóid invited me to read the draft of an edition of an Aramaic work preserved in the *Asâṭîr*, the Samaritan book of stories

about the ancients. Bóid sees a complex interaction with 2 Enoch (or the traditions behind it) to be reflected in the *Asâṭîr*, with elements of the Enochic work—including its representation of Enoch himself—being polemicized in the Aramaic work that was eventually incorporated into the *Asâṭîr* (in Chapters XI and XII thereof) but that was originally an independent Samaritan tractate. Bóid argues that the original work was written in the early second century CE. This could have significant implications for the dating and provenance of 2 Enoch, but it is worth noting that some of Bóid's arguments are contingent on 2 Enoch itself being early. Again, too, there remains the difficult question of whether any such reactions are to what we can properly identify as 2 Enoch, in distinction to fluid traditions that may have been circulating through the region, but not yet integrated into this coherent literary work.

Olson's and Bóid's studies remain unpublished, and I am deeply grateful to both authors for sharing the drafts with me. However the arguments for Samaritan contexts may be evaluated overall, they introduce significant new points of comparative detail into the discussion of 2 Enoch that is undoubtedly relevant to our reflections on the conceptual ecology from which the work may have emerged.

Chapter 3. Reviewing the Date, Provenance and Composition History of the Parables of Enoch

This chapter reviews the previous scholarship interested in the origins or provenance of the Parables of Enoch. There are a number of points of similarity between the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch, which I will explore in the following three chapters, and these suggest that the two works have a distinctive relationship to each other within the broader streams of the Enoch traditions. The comparative study of these similarities will also demonstrate some striking differences in the development of the themes and images in question, however, and the analysis of these will contribute to a more nuanced locating of the two works, which will have particular significance for the study of 2 Enoch. The pursuit of this comparative task will be facilitated and enriched by a detailed review of the scholarship that has debated the origins or provenance of the Parables of Enoch, somewhat in parallel to the review of the equivalent scholarship on 2 Enoch that I undertook in Chapter 2. The character of the review will be a little different for the Parables, however. This reflects the differences in the scholarship on the two works: where the study of 2 Enoch has been limited to a relatively small number of scholars, whose projects have often been driven by quite different agendas, the study of the Parables has been quite populous and the contributions of the various scholars have commonly revolved around a number of issues, the interpretation of which has been the key to the debate. It makes good sense here to engage with that debate primarily in terms of those issues, and to consider how these have been approached within the intellectual frameworks brought to the discussion by the scholars in question.

Reviewing the Dating and Provenance of the Parables of Enoch

There would be little value here in providing a study-by-study literature review of the debate about the date and provenance of the Parables: the history of contributions has been detailed elsewhere and it involves a good deal of repetition as positions are asserted, challenged and reasserted by turn.¹ It is more

¹ E.g., Darrell L. Bock, "Dating the *Parables of Enoch: A Forschungsbericht*," in *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*, ed. Darrell Bock and James H. Charlesworth, *Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies* 11 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 58–113. The study is stilted but detailed and it provides a useful bibliographical resource. A more interesting and reflective revisiting of the scholarship is provided by the slightly earlier study of David W. Suter, "Enoch

valuable to identify the nodal points of the debate, both textual and contextual, which I will do below. That said, one particular contribution to the debate has been definitive for all subsequent discussion, although in largely negative or reactive terms: few have agreed with it and most have devoted energy to explaining why they reject its claims. The contribution in question is that of J.T. Milik, whose edition of the Aramaic fragments of 1 Enoch² included an extended reconstruction of the history of the Enoch literature from antiquity onward and constituted “a rude shock”³ to the study of the Parables, departing as it did from the early date and Jewish authorship claimed by others like Charles and Sjöberg (whose work I will note briefly below in relation to Milik’s claims). For our purposes, Milik’s study is especially interesting because his dating of the Parables is connected to (and is even somewhat contingent upon) the dating of 2 Enoch.

Milik’s starting point is the absence of attestation for the Parables in the fragments found at Qumran:

It seems to me quite certain that it did not exist during the pre-Christian period, in an Aramaic or Hebrew text, since not one fragment of it, Semitic or even Greek, has been located in the very rich assortment of manuscripts from the caves of Qumrân.⁴

This is just one element in a broader evaluation of the external evidence relevant to the dating of the work. He finds no trace of the work until it is attested in “the early Middle Ages, and even then indirectly by the stichometry of Nicephorus and by the Slavonic Enoch.”⁵

On one level, while the major points of Milik’s analysis of the textual history have justly been challenged, his willingness to take seriously the historical contours of the witness tradition itself is

in Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Book of Parables,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007). For those who may be interested in the early stages of the modern discussion, a usefully detailed listing of works on 1 Enoch as a whole (including translations) can be found in R.H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1893), 6–21.

For readers more broadly interested in the modern engagement with 1 Enoch, this recent volume contains a wealth of fascinating and important discussion: Ariel Hessayon, Annette Yoshiko Reed, and Gabriele Boccaccini, *Rediscovering Enoch? The Antediluvian Past from the Fifteenth to Nineteenth Centuries*, SVTP 27 (Leiden: Brill, 2023).

² Joséf T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976).

³ Matthew Black, “The Parables of Enoch (1 Enoch 37–71) and the Son of Man,” *Expository Times* 88 (1976), 5–8 (quote from 5).

⁴ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 91.

⁵ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 92.

admirable. On another level, however, the significance he ascribes to the absence of the work from Qumran, reflected in the quote above (and particularly in his use of the word “since”), surely goes beyond the proper limits of that collection. I will return to this observation below, but here will simply note with Sacchi⁶ that the same is true for most of the pseudepigraphical texts that we have and that are believed to have been composed after 100 BCE, which have been preserved for us largely by Christian tradents.

Milik acknowledges the overlap of the messianic terminology and conceptuality encountered in the Parables with that of the New Testament, particularly the gospels, but sees this as a result of Christian authorship, rather than as evidence for pre-Christian Jewish messianism.⁷ A pivotal element in his dating is what he considers to be “two striking parallels”⁸ between the Parables and the Sibylline literature. The first he notes is between 1 Enoch 61:6 and Sib. ii. 233–7, where the spirits of the Titans, the Giants, and those who died in the flood are brought for judgement. This trope is, in fact, shared also with the Apocalypse of Peter, but Milik sees the form in the Parables as most closely aligned with (and, actually, dependent upon) the more concise version in the Sibylline literature.⁹ The second parallel is between the description of a Parthian invasion in 1 Enoch 56:5–7 and Sib v. 104–10, both of which Milik takes to be allusions to the campaigns of Sapor 1 in 260–270 CE. To this historical allusion, Milik adds another, seeing the representation of the kings and the mighty who cause blood to flow (1 Enoch 47:1–4 and 62:11) as a memory of the persecutions of Christians that were decreed by Decius and Valerian in the middle of the third century.¹⁰

These core elements of Milik’s argument involve strikingly different analyses of the evidence to those of his predecessors, who mostly wrote, of course, before the discovery and publication of the Qumran material. R.H. Charles—whose 1893 work is often treated first in surveys of 1 Enoch, but who himself reviewed a host of prior studies¹¹—argued for a date early in the 1st century BCE, partly on the basis of the representation of the “kings and the mighty” as enacting bloodshed that called for divine

⁶ Paolo Sacchi, “Qumran e la datazione del Libro delle Parabole di Enoc,” *Henoch* 25 (2003): 149–66, the relevant comments on what he considers to be a poorly formulated question are found on 166.

⁷ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 92.

⁸ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 92.

⁹ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 93.

¹⁰ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 96.

¹¹ See footnote 1 above.

retribution.¹² He considered this to reflect a period of violent hostility internal to the Jewish people, as the Hasmoneans dealt with those who opposed them, particularly the Pharisees. For Charles, this contrasted with pro-Maccabean sentiments in the earlier parts of the collection (before internal divisions emerged) and with the more diffuse concern about the wealthy in the Epistle of Enoch, driven by what we might today label as systemic or economic injustice and reflecting a period of less obvious violence; the authors of the Similitudes have “graver and more abundant reason” for their grief.¹³ Noting the status that the Pharisees enjoyed from 79–70 BCE in relation to the Hasmoneans, and noting the absence of any mention of Rome as a significant power, Charles argued that the work was most likely to have been written prior to 79 BCE. The distinctive messianism of the work meshed with this, reflecting the influence of Daniel and the emergence of new messianic theologies after the period of the Maccabees. The reference to the Parthian invasion was essentially irrelevant to the core dating, since he regarded it as an interpolation. By contrast, in his 1946 work, Erik Sjöberg¹⁴ saw the allusion in 56:5–8 as quite pivotal for dating the work, and considered it most obviously to be shaped by the events of 40 BCE, since the details of the account—brief as it is—coheres with the description of events found in Josephus.

Milik, by contrast to both of these authors, had the evidence of the Qumran discoveries at hand. The interesting point here is that the internal evidence—references to invasions, events and to structural violence—can be mapped onto multiple potential contexts; the absence of the Parables from Qumran was really a catalyst for Milik to engage in a fresh reflection on the range of possibilities. Even if his conclusions have largely been rejected, his argumentation highlights something important about the ongoing vitality of the work, the capacity of its imagery to function with renewed significance for tradents encountering realities equivalent to those described within it. To anticipate a point that I will return to below, this highlights something interesting about the plasticity or indeterminacy of such allusions, which in turn connects to their potential for multivalency.

This brief summary of Milik’s argument and contrasting of its elements with the previous approaches of Charles and Sjöberg does little justice to its detail. In fact, his study is full of comparative

¹² R.H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1893), 29–32.

¹³ Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, 30.

¹⁴ Erik Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch*. Skrifter Utgivna av kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund 41 (Lund: Gleerup, 1946), esp. in the discussion on 35–9.

treasure that is often passed over in the rush to refute his conclusions. It provides enough, however, to orient us in relation to the debate and the nodal points around which arguments have been clustered, particularly once its essential differences from the earlier approaches are grasped. To a detailed discussion of these nodal points I now turn.

1. The Absence of the Parables from Qumran and the Lack of Early External (i.e., Manuscript and Citation) Evidence.

The absence of the Parables from the fragments found at Qumran is significant, but it is hardly decisive for a judgement on the date or provenance of the work in the way that Milik takes it to be. It is important to bear in mind just how unusual it is to have such an extensive collection of manuscript witnesses from antiquity as we have with the Scrolls from the Judean desert, how many lines of good fortune had to intersect for us to enjoy such historical resources, and the simple fact that several of those lines only crossed each other in the winter of 1946/47. Even then, the resources are limited and still subject to debate or reconstruction, so that the landscape continues to change and develop, even now. As immense as its significance is, the evidence from Qumran is not total. For most ancient writings, we are reliant upon much later manuscripts, usually medieval or even modern, and establishing date and provenance involves the evaluation of internal evidence and triangulation with external usage.

The true importance of the Parables' absence from the Qumran finds is rather in its implications for how this particular work might have related to those Enochic works that had apparently already been unified in the Qumran manuscripts, possibly transmitted as a testament of sorts,¹⁵ the importance of which is reflected in the number of surviving manuscripts. Where these works appear to be linked in their manuscript heritage, the Parables stand apart. Even if we discover an as-yet-unknown fragment of the Parables among the Scrolls, the evidence leads us to expect that it will be part of a distinct manuscript witness from those associated with the Enochic testament.

¹⁵ This is the category of writings claimed for the Enochic collection at Qumran by George W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 21–26.

Some have suggested that the Parables might have been excluded intentionally from Qumran because of its interest in the moon, perceived to be a point of incompatibility with the primary Enoch literature and the general interest in the solar calendar.¹⁶ But this is probably to presume a rigidity to calendrical interest and an inability to accommodate dissonance that is not reflective of the Qumran collection as a whole (which includes biblical material that is not strictly in line with the solar calendar and a good deal of material that is simply not “sectarian”). If the absence of the Parables from Qumran points to anything, it is more likely that the work did not circulate in the communities to which the group was linked than that it was deliberately excluded, which might be a function of date or of geography.

What seems to me to have been rather neglected in the discussion is a thorough reflection on the theology proper of the Parables in relation to that of the Enoch literature found at Qumran and of other writings from that context. By this, I mean that there has been little serious discussion of how God is represented and how essential convictions about the identity of God might bear upon the other phenomena of the book, including its messianism. This observation does not depend on the arguably forced distinction in western traditions between theology proper and economy, but simply acknowledges that ancient thinkers—including those in the Jewish and Christian traditions—could display sustained interest in the qualities or properties of God, coloured by philosophical reflection. Some strands of scholarship have tended to pass over this too quickly, often simply categorizing such features as “monotheism,” in their desire to move onto the contested or polemical elements of theological debate, such as the role of covenant or Torah or the origin of evil. As I will discuss further in Chapter 5, the Parables tends to represent God in more static and less immanent terms than the Enoch literature preserved at Qumran, with a more developed interest in the roles of intermediary figures in both providence and deliverance. This affects the representation of angels, but also the representation of the Messiah, the Chosen One (or Son of Man)¹⁷ who takes on characteristics and functions that would, in biblical literature and in much of the literature from Qumran, be associated with Israel’s God; this is

¹⁶ Jonas C. Greenfield and Michael E. Stone, “The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes,” *HTR* 70 (1977): 51–65.

¹⁷ I will discuss the several forms of expression that are usually translated in these terms in Chapter 5; at this stage, it is sufficient to note that the expression as used in the Parables is subject to the same debate that bears on its usage in the New Testament, i.e., whether it functions as a title or simply represents an idiomatic construction used to designate a person.

true not least in relation to the association of this figure with the throne of glory, one of the striking points of similarity between the Parables and the representations of Jesus in Matthew’s gospel (which I will note further below). This is not to presume that the literature preserved at Qumran is characterized by a homogeneous theology, but to recognize that when the theology proper of the Parables is taken into account, it may draw attention to similarities or affinities with particular cultures of “god-talk” that have not enjoyed sustained attention to date in the discussion.

A serious engagement with the absence of the Parables from Qumran needs to reflect upon such matters of essential theology and to ask how they may relate to the possible routes of transmission by which the Parables might have arrived in Ethiopia.

2. The Similarities and Differences with Demonstrably Early Enoch Material.

The last point noted above leads us directly into the question of the affinities and disparities between the Parables of Enoch and the Enoch material preserved at Qumran, which might be considered narrowly (i.e., the other parts of 1 Enoch) or more broadly (i.e., Jubilees, the Book of the Giants and, on some readings, the Self-Glorification Hymn).¹⁸ Beyond this, scholarship has debated perceived affinities with other writings and has often, indeed, seen such affinities to have greater value in dating the work than the purported allusions to historical events (which I will discuss further below). Given some of the distinctive issues that relate to parallels with the New Testament, I will discuss these separately below. All of these points will be considered in more detail through the body of this study; here, I simply provide an overview of their significance for discussion about the provenance of the Parables.

In its present form in the Ethiopic Book of Enoch, the work is introduced as “[the] second vision that he (Enoch) saw” (ራእይ : ዘርእየ : ካልአ, *rā’ayā zarā’āya kāle’*),¹⁹ an addition that is typically considered

¹⁸ See Eric Miller, ‘The Self Glorification Hymn Re-examined.’ *Henoch* 32 (2009): 307–24.

¹⁹ The full line reads: ራእይ : ዘርእየ : ካልአ : ራእየ : ጥብብ : ዘርእየ : ሄኖክ : ወልደ : ያሬድ : ወልደ : መላልኤል : ወልደ : ቃይኖን : ወልደ : ሄኖስ : ወልደ : ሴት : ወልደ : አዳም :: “The second vision that he saw, the vision of wisdom that Enoch saw—the son of Jared, the son of Mahalalel, the son of Kenan, the son of Enosh, the son of Seth, the son of Adam.” My translation, adapted from Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 85; their translation itself omits the opening The interest in tracing the genealogy to Adam is one that I will return to in Chapter 5, as it may connect in interesting ways to Sethian elements in antiquity.

redactional—a means of gluing the work into its new context, where it is nested within the earlier Enoch writings. As I will discuss further in Chapter 7, the designation introduces particular complications to the timeline of Enoch’s visions and ascents.

Another crucial detail in the text is also often considered a redactional insertion, though this is a matter of significant debate, and again it bears on how the material in the Parables relates to the Aramaic Enoch literature; specifically, it bears on whether the material was originally associated with Enoch at all. In 71:14, having to this point described the enthronement and glory of the Chosen One in various cycles as an onlooker, Enoch is himself told: “you are that Son of Man”²⁰ (አንተ : ውእቱ : ወልደ : ብእሲ ; *ʾanata wəʾetu walāda bəʾasi*) This identification follows the seer’s own experience of glorification or what might even be called divinization (71:11). Some have argued that the whole passage in 1 Enoch 71—effectively the epilogue to the Parables—is an interpolation, perhaps intended to re-map the representation of an originally distinct messianic figure onto Enoch (and possibly as a later counter to Jesus-devotion).²¹ It is also true that its constituent parts can be translated differently, with ውእቱ (*weʾetu*) taken as a copula, rather than as a demonstrative; this allows the reader to identify Enoch as the human addressee, but not as the exalted figure, so that the distinction between the seer and the Chosen One is maintained.²² The debate around the significance ascribed to the apparent identification of Enoch is an increasingly nuanced one, interested not just in the question of whether there are elements in the book that anticipate and build towards this climactic disclosure, but also in the evidence provided by the interpretative traditions of the Ethiopic church, reading the received form of the text.²³ I want to return to this point in the body of my own study, because I think that some consideration of “figuration,” approached as a hermeneutically sophisticated practice shaped by the conceptual discourse of theological traditions (including those of late antiquity), has the potential to add further nuance to the conversation and to overcome some of the residual binaries that remain.

²⁰ The significance of this verse, and the debates around how it should be understood, is almost entirely masked in Isaac’s translation. Isaac, “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch: A New Translation and Introduction,” in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 1, 5–91, at 50.

²¹ On this point, see Suter, “Enoch in Sheol,” 426, citing Michel Jas, “Hénoch et le Fils de l’Homme,” *La Revue réformée* 30 (1979): 105–19.

²² It is possible to read ውእቱ, *weʾetu* as a copula, rather than as a demonstrative, which allows the reader to understand Enoch as the human addressee, but not as identified with the exalted figure.

²³ As an example of this, see Daniel Olson, “Enoch and the Son of Man in the Epilogue of the Parables,” *JSP* 18 (1998): 27–38.

Whatever may be concluded in relation to these two possible interpolations, the Parables are clearly related to the Enoch literature preserved at Qumran in some way. There is a general agreement that the Parables constitute a revision of the Book of the Watchers, with general replication of its structure and specific parallels in some points of wording.²⁴ These are not readily explained by recourse to an oral tradition or to an independent interpretative tradition associated with biblical material; they suggest a dependency of sorts on the Book of the Watchers as a body of writing. Parallels with other parts of the Enochic corpus as preserved at Qumran are more difficult to establish. There are some obvious connections with the Astronomical Book in the representation of cosmological details, but also some significant differences, particularly in schematic elements of the cosmology; the key device of the gates from which the heavenly bodies and meteorological phenomena emerge, for example, is absent from the Parables, which instead prioritizes the imagery of storehouses/treasuries and links these to the “secrets” that Enoch learns. I will discuss these further in Chapters 4 and 5. Likewise, there are some points of broad equivalence between the historical material in 56:5–57:3 and that encountered in the Dream Visions, specifically the Animal Apocalypse), but it is not possible to establish whether this reflects dependency on that text, which was itself an originally independent work, or simply the influence of a common tradition.²⁵ Similarly, there are some correspondences with the social aspects of the Epistle of Enoch, particularly the representation of relations between the poor and the powerful, but there are also differences. Where the Epistle of Enoch reflects divisions within the Jewish or Israelite community, and considers the rich to be unfaithful in their actions towards their own kin, the Parables evince no such perception; the critique is directed in a broader way to the kings and the powerful. In all, then, the Parables show clear dependency upon the Book of the Watchers, but present little evidence of *direct* influence by the other parts of 1 Enoch.

The most obvious difference between the Parables and the other parts of what we now label 1 Enoch is its developed and distinctive messianism, centred on the figure of the Chosen One or Son of

²⁴ See Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 55–56 for a tabulation and discussion of the comparative detail. Perluigi Piovanelli describes the Parables as a “sort of midrashic rewriting of the Book of the Watchers.” See his “A Testimony for the Kings and the Mighty Who Possess the Earth’: The Thirst for Justice and Peace in the Parables of Enoch,” in Boccaccini, *Enoch and the Messiah*, 363.

²⁵ See the discussion in Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 53–4, 57.

Man.²⁶ The significance attached to the latter expression has been intertwined with the debates concerning the dating of the book and whether “son of man” functions as a title or simply as a pronominal or self-referential idiom. At its most simplistic, scholarship debated whether traditions about the Son of Man figure in the Parables lay behind the representation of Jesus in the gospels, or whether the influence might run in the other direction, if the Parables was the later work. The work of Geza Vermes, Maurice Casey and others disrupted this debate helpfully, provoking reflection on the possibility that the expression “son of man” has no titular value in itself, but might have aggregated such associations in the reception of traditions outside the context of Palestinian Judaism.²⁷ One interesting dimension of this discussion is its specific focus on Galilean Aramaic, though some have been critical of the claims made about the early Galilean dialect on the basis of later rabbinic evidence.²⁸ It is a point at least worth considering in coordination with the evidence brought forward by some for a Galilean provenance for the Parables. The debate remains somewhat open, with specific discussion of how the expression is used in Daniel and in Ezekiel leaving room for the “apocalyptic son of man” to function as a figure in specific contexts that seem to allude to those works. It has highlighted, however, the tendency in much scholarship to be interested in a *potentially* superficial and unimportant point of equivalence—the use of the expression Son of Man—at the expense of attention to more significant titular strategies and the scriptures or material associations that might resource these.²⁹

While the representation of the Chosen One, and particularly his exaltation-glorification, is generally considered to distinguish the Parables from other parts of 1 Enoch, its affinities and disparities with other writings in the wider Enochic corpus and in the literatures of antiquity have been variously

²⁶ There is a massive literature on this. For a useful inroad, with much of the bibliography, see the following exchange of views from the Enoch Seminar, published in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*: Sabino Chialà, “The Son of Man: The Evolution of an Expression” (153–178), Helge S. Kvanvig, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch” (179–215), John J. Collins, “Enoch and the Son of Man: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig” (216–227) and Klaus Koch, “Questions Regarding the So-Called Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig” (228–237). A massive study of the Son of Man traditions is forthcoming from Richard Bauckham (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2024) and includes a chapter devoted to the Parables.

²⁷ Geza Vermes, “Appendix E: The Use of *בר נש/בר נשא* in Jewish Aramaic,” in *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* ed. Matthew Black (3rd edition; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), 310–30. Maurice Casey, “The Use of the Term ‘Son of Man’ in the Similitudes of Enoch,” *JSJ* 7 (1976) 11–29.

²⁸ See the discussion of this point in Paul Owen and David Shepherd, “Speaking Up for Qumran, Dalman and the Son of Man: Was Bar Enasha a Common Term for ‘Man’ in the Time of Jesus?” *JSNT* 23.81 (2001): 81–122, esp. 88–96.

²⁹ For a brief discussion of this, with relevant bibliography, see my “Matthew and the Parables of Enoch,” in Bock and Charlesworth, eds., *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*, 218–30.

assessed. Daniel Boyarin and Peter Schäfer, for example, have seen the representation of this figure to reflect an early binitarianism found also in other Jewish writings from the time, including some preserved among the Dead Sea Scrolls. In Boyarin's case,³⁰ this effectively anticipates and furnishes the core elements of incarnational thought in early Christianity. Schäfer,³¹ while agreeing with the core claims about two powers in heaven, considers Boyarin's claims about incarnation to mishandle the spatial dimensions of the evidence: the Chosen One does not descend into human form and status, but rather, the direction of travel is all upward. Andrei Orlov, meanwhile, notes the parallels with the exaltation of Enoch and his identification with the figure of Metatron in writings preserved in later corpora, including the Hekhalot literature and the rabbinic texts, and links these to the exaltation traditions about other figures.³²

For Orlov, however, the Parables constitute a kind of "dead end,"³³ branching off the main line of the mystical traditions associated with the divine throne, which he considers to run more clearly through 2 Enoch. Interestingly, he sees the distinctive representation of the Messiah in the Parables as reflecting a greater degree of influence from biblical traditions, while the main line of Enochic tradition that runs through 2 Enoch is more shaped by Mesopotamian influences.³⁴ Orlov's commitment to extending and developing Gershom Scholem's account of the trajectory of Merkavah mysticism³⁵ is evident here, and this will be a point of conversation for us to develop in the body of the study to follow; some research into Jewish-Christian traditions has suggested that what is taken to be reflective of Jewish ascent traditions might be more readily explained as reflecting the influences of Christian or pagan thought, particularly in its Neoplatonist iterations of late antiquity. Here, the most significant point to

³⁰ See Daniel Boyarin, *The Jewish Gospels: The Story of the Jewish Christ* (New York: New Press, 2012), esp. 85–95. Some of the elements of Boyarin's argument are anticipated in his, "The Gospel of the Memra: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John," *Harvard Theological Review* 94 (2001): 243–84.

³¹ Peter Schäfer, *Two Gods in Heaven: Jewish Concepts of God in Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020), 45–53.

³² Andrei Orlov, "Roles and Titles of the Seventh Antediluvian Hero in the Parables of Enoch: A Departure from the Traditional Pattern?" in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 110–36.

³³ Cf. William Adler, "A Dead End in the Enoch Trajectory: A Response to Andrei Orlov," in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 137–42.

³⁴ Andrei Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, TSAJ 107 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).

³⁵ The famous iteration is found in Gershom Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (2nd Ed. New York: Schocken, 1945; First published 1941). Scholem continued to develop his theory, softening and nuancing many of its early claims, in subsequent work. For further discussion and critical evaluation, see Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Jewish Christianity and the History of Judaism* (2nd edition; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2020), 331–34.

note is Orlov's conviction that the Parables is somewhat out of line, both with earlier Enochic writings and with later traditions about Enoch and Metatron in Judaism. As I will note further in Chapter 5, his correct observations about the influence of biblical traditions on the messianism of the Parables need to be balanced with a recognition that the representation of God is, in many ways, quite different from anything found in the biblical traditions, evincing the effects of philosophical reflection on God's being. This recalls the point made earlier, that for all the discussion of the concepts at work in the Parables, little has been said specifically on the theology proper. Yet precisely this feature calls for some reflection on the contexts that might give rise to such an account of the divine.

In light of the methodological reflections developed in Chapter 1, one of the striking features of this particular discussion of the Parables is the programmatic significance of evolutionary language and the linked concept of a "trajectory." Elements in the messianism of the Parables have been considered in relation to how they might relate to evolving ideas in Jewish and Christian thought, but with the concept of evolution deployed typically driven by a progressive or developmental understanding; it is linear, even if there are dialectic branches that constitute "dead ends." It is worth considering how the discussion might be redirected if the non-linear imagery of the rhizome³⁶ is allowed to disrupt it. Here, the local qualities of theology, properly god-talk, and their relation to the depiction of divine intermediaries, especially the messiah and the angels, and to cosmology might reshape the discourse about the sort of Jewishness or Christianity represented by the Parables. In turn, the particular contributions that it might make to the ecology of Jewish and Christian thought—never static, but also never linear, never subject to the logic of the trajectory—might be re-evaluated.

In connection with this, it is noteworthy that the Parables incorporate material that can be linked to the Noah literature also preserved at Qumran (obviously connected to the Enochic traditions through the stories of the Flood). While these are typically referred to as redactional additions, and present some stylistic features that set them apart from other parts of the book,³⁷ they are also rather well integrated into the book and include some of the key passages about the figure of the Chosen One. Importantly, the Noachic material is also broadly paralleled in Manichaean traditions, through its particular Book of the Giants. The standard approach will regard the Manichaean material as a particular appropriation of

³⁶ For the significance of this image in the work of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, see the discussion in Chapter 1.

³⁷ See the discussion of composition history, below.

the Jewish Enoch-Noah traditions, a secondary and derivative corpus representing a clear direction of travel and a kind of border crossing from what is recognizably Judaism into something “other,” an Oriental gnosticism of sorts. A rhizomatic approach, however, can allow that even if the Manichaean works are later witnesses, they attest the kinds of conceptual blending that occur particularly in frontier worlds. Here, it is worth reflecting on the fact that our terminology for ancient geographical regions recognizes, but also often separates, their frontier identities: Roman Syria, Syro-Palestine and Syro-Mesopotamia are different labels that are seldom coordinated as they should be. The connections between both the Parables and 2 Enoch with the Manichaean traditions that emerged in this frontier region will be fascinating for us to explore and will raise important questions about lines of geographical and cultural connection, which have often been marginalized (in multiple senses) by a scholarship often principally interested in retrieving something about Palestinian Judaism and its trajectories.

All of this may remain distinctly relevant to the study of the New Testament, but perhaps not in the way that the debate has functioned historically within the discipline. Rather than providing “background” to the messianism of the New Testament, or even immediate “context,” it may bear witness to the distinctive ways that both theology proper and the depiction of divine intermediaries was coloured in the frontier contexts of Roman Syria, with its particular blend of cultures and linguistics.

We might frame the point provocatively by considering the analytical language used by Matthew Novenson, that scholars should consider the “grammar of messianism.”³⁸ For Novenson, this is a way of framing the *Sprachspiel* of messianic interpretations and the principles that seem to govern them. Might the grammar look different, however, for those inhabiting the complex linguistic world of Roman Syria, as bi- or tri-lingual Aramaic-Greek (and perhaps Hebrew) speaking communities engaged in talk about God and intermediaries? There is good reason to think that this might be the case, and much of what I discuss in Chapters 5 and 6 (in relation to Wisdom and the secrets revealed to Enoch) will highlight this. If so, it is worth considering whether the local-linguistic aspect might be more important than the temporal, such that later texts from a similar culture are more illuminating than co-eval texts from the Mediterranean west. An observation of this kind is somewhat in alignment with the principles of social-scientific/anthropological interpretation of the New Testament, where the study of contemporary

³⁸ Matthew V. Novenson, *The Grammar of Messianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

groups and their dynamics is held to yield valid insights for the interpretation of ancient texts from comparable cultures; that approach has tended to emphasize the Mediterranean as the key context for comparison, however, in a way that I seek to press back upon.

3. The Presence of Imagery and Language that is Similar to that Encountered in the New Testament.

All of this prepares us for the question of the specific parallels between the Parables and the New Testament, most notably in the representation of the messiah and, from this, in the representation of divine identity itself. Obviously, for those who date the work early, the Parables provides either a background to, or a parallel development of, the kind of messianism seen in the New Testament, with its emphasis on an exalted or even divine Christ. This, in turn, is sometimes related to the question of how God is identified within the context of a less strict monotheism: the Parables might support the idea that early Judaism already presented a kind of binitarianism, with two distinct but unified figures identified as the One God.³⁹ For those who date it later, the similarities might be explained instead as a result of Christian influence, a claim that would allow simple accounts of Jewish monotheism to remain unthreatened.

A common theme in the work of those who see the Parables as “pre-Christian” is the absence of a characteristically Christian identification of the messianic figure as Jesus, or of other obviously Christian ways of representing salvation. This is somewhat facile. As discussed in Chapter 1, a number of scholars have shown that Christians could prepare works that lacked obviously Christian features and did not need to label Christological representation for it to be recognized as such. The presumption that Christological representation needs to be explicitly marked reflects, I suspect, a modern lack of sensitivity to figuration and its connections with underlying ways of conceiving participation.

What is especially interesting about the discussions of similarities with the New Testament is that the most specific connections identified are with the Gospel of Matthew, which happens to be the part

³⁹ See the discussion of contributions by Daniel Boyarin and Peter Schäfer above.

of the New Testament that also exhibits some parallels with 2 Enoch. Particularly striking among the similarities between Matthew and the Parables is in the language used of the Son of Man, who is seated on “his” throne of glory and from there acts as the judge of humanity (Matthew 19:28 and esp. 25:31; cf 1 Enoch 51:3, 55:4, 61:8, and esp. 62:5). While the contextual accounts of judgement are quite different in the two works, the precise wording about the Son of Man’s enthronement shows a high degree of similarity, once we have allowed for the different languages in which the texts are preserved. The similarity might be explained in several ways: one of the texts might be influenced by the other, both might share a common tradition about an enthroned son of man—what is often referred to as the apocalyptic Son of Man—or the texts might commonly reflect an interpretative tradition concerning the messiah, shaped by distinctive recombinations of biblical material about the Chosen One or the Servant. For those who date the Parables as post-Christian, the similarity is most easily explained as reflecting the influence of Christianity and particularly of Matthew’s gospel. For the larger number who see the Parables as earlier, either pre-Christian or contemporary with the emergence of the Jesus movement, the similarity is more suggestive of some kind of contextual association. As noted above, some of the discussion inevitably revolves around the significance of “son of man,” and whether it functions with titular significance, but even if such significance is excluded, there is still a striking degree of overlap in the way the texts draw upon Isaianic traditions.

The striking parallel with Matthew 25:31 and its context is not the only similarity, although the others are more broad. Matthew contains a significant amount of unique material (that is, not found in the other gospels) that can be categorized as apocalyptic according to some typologies.⁴⁰ At the same time, it is also characterized by the extensive (and extended) use of sapiential forms and motifs and has a particular interest in the figure of the apocalyptic scribe as representative of the ideal prophet or disciple.⁴¹

⁴⁰ See, for example David C. Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew* SNTS Monograph Series 88 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996). Sim uses Klaus Koch’s typology of the apocalyptic genre and its characteristic features as the basis for identifying Matthean redactional developments of an apocalyptic sort; he then combines this with the older presumption that apocalyptic literature was typically associated with oppressed or threatened communities to reconstruct the qualities of “the Matthean community.” This general approach exemplifies the “bounded community” model of analysis that I seek to depart from in the present volume, although Sim’s study is a good example of the scholarship attempting precision within its own parameters.

⁴¹ David Orton, *The Understanding Scribe: Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal* JSNT Supplement Series 25 (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1989).

This observation is significant because, while the areas of discussion outlined above have been central to the debates about the dating of the Parables, there has also been a more peripheral discussion about the evidence that might link the work particularly to Galilee. Much of this is part of a broader consideration of the evidence throughout 1 Enoch that might suggest that its constituent parts reflect familiarity with the geography of Galilee; the composition of the work in Aramaic is also a relevant detail. In the case of the Parables, we can add to this evidence the debated parallels with the messianic imagery utilized by the Jesus movement, which originated in Galilee. For our purposes, the interesting point in this is the possibility that the Parables might be a work of distinctively northern character. If the Parables is associated with an authorship from Galilee, it is not difficult to imagine that it might have been transmitted northwards into Syrian communities, whether Jewish, Christian or other. Matthew is, of course, most commonly seen as a work emerging from the distinctive Jewish Christianity of Syria (with northern Palestine/Galilee sometimes treated as part of this region, geographically distinct from southern Palestine).⁴²

4. The possibility that the Parables contains allusions to specific historical events.

The presence of purported allusions to historical events has also played a significant role in attempts to date the Parables.⁴³ The most important of these is the “prediction” of the invasion by the Parthians and Medes in 56:5–8, which presents Jerusalem as a hindrance to these forces and makes no reference to its destruction. Erik Sjöberg took this as evidence that the work was written in the 1st century BCE, with this description corresponding to the Parthian invasion of 40–37 BCE, a view that has been both advanced and critiqued, with alternative historical allusions being proposed along the way. Hindley, for example, argued that the defeat of the Parthians by Trajan in 115–117 CE might have prompted expectations about a fresh Parthian invasion in response, writing:

⁴² For an overview of recent scholarship, see John Kampen, *Matthew within Sectarian Judaism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019), 13–22. While I am less interested in the sectarian elements that Kampen focuses on, and am generally wary of extending this particular group category too widely and allowing it too much explanatory value, Kampen’s study is an invaluable contribution to research on the distinctive qualities of Matthew’s gospel.

⁴³ For an overview and analysis of the scholarship and the evidence itself, see Ted M. Erho, “Historical-Allusional Dating and the Similitudes of Enoch,” *JBL* 130 (2011): 493–511.

Certainty is probably not to be attained, but this attempt to define the historical situation which might have given rise to the sections in the book which alone seem to have a determinate historical background suggests that it originated during or soon after the Parthian campaign of Trajan. Moreover, if the evidence relating to the Parthian invasion of Syria and the earthquake at Antioch be admitted, then one might venture to suppose that the author was a resident of Antioch in the first decades of the second century A.D.⁴⁴

As intriguing as Hindley's argument might be for my argument, it must be noted that all such interpretations of 56:5–8 have been challenged effectively by Michael Knibb, who has repeatedly noted the likelihood that the verses simply draw upon biblical material, such as Ezekiel 38–39, to articulate a stereotypical prophetic trope of invasion and deliverance.⁴⁵ David Suter has further noted that the Parthians might simply be swapped for their predecessors the Persians in the handling of the apocalyptic motif of invasion.⁴⁶ Even Nickelsburg and VanderKam acknowledge that “the passage's echoes of the prophetic tradition weaken its validity as a reliable witness to the date of the Parables.”⁴⁷ Despite this, they still see the description as aligning with Josephus's account of the Parthian invasion in 40 BCE and follow Sjöberg in considering the absence of any reference to the destruction of Jerusalem during an invasion to indicate that the work was written before 70 CE.

Knibb's earlier assessment of this absence remains pertinent, however:

I am not convinced by Sjöberg's view that the Parables much be dated from before 70 CE because there is no allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem. Not every work written after that time must automatically refer to the Fall of Jerusalem.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ Hindley, “Towards a Dates for the Similitudes of Enoch,” *NTS* 14 (1967–68): 557–65, quote on 564.

⁴⁵ David W. Suter, *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch* SBL Dissertations 47 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), 12.

⁴⁶ David W. Suter, *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch*, 12.

⁴⁷ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 60.

⁴⁸ Michael A. Knibb, “The Date of the Parable of Enoch: A Critical Review,” *New Testament Studies* 25 (1979): 345–59, quote on 358.

While making this point, Knibb remains cautiously open to a dating in the late first century CE, with the events of the Jewish war playing a role in the composition of the Parables. Perhaps the most important point is precisely the caution with which he takes this position, and the grounds for that caution: if purported allusions are too vague in detail to reliably indicate recent events, and could equally reflect the influence of biblical tropes and stereotypes, then we should be careful not to allow them undue significance. We might add further that once such elements begin to circulate they may themselves become “stock” elements within a tradition.

This bears also on the claimed allusion to Herod Antipas’s visit to Callirrhoe in 1 Enoch 67:4. If that event does indeed lie behind this, then it establishes a terminus post quem of 4 BCE for this particular part of the book, but the significance for the dating of the work as a whole is quite limited. The text in question occurs within a section of the Parables typically regarded as a Noachic redaction or interpolation; the material to which it is added may be significantly older. But the allusion could also become a stock tradition, or could even be developed later, in light of Josephus’s description of the event. It should be kept in mind that Josephus’s writings were transmitted widely among Christian groups, and are attested in multiple languages.⁴⁹

As a summary statement, the comments with which Ted Erho concludes his detailed review of the scholarship on putative historical allusions are worth noting here:

[T]he study of this issue is certainly not closed but has simply reached an interim conclusion: the historical-allusional method is ineffective as a means of dating the Similitudes of Enoch.⁵⁰

Erho’s comments need to be framed, however, by his acknowledgement that there is a broad consensus among scholars that agrees on a date of composition for the Parables sometime between 50 BCE and 100 CE; what has failed to emerge through attention to the putative historical allusions is anything more precise than this 150 year span.

⁴⁹ There are also problems in associating 67:4 with Herod’s visit to Callirrhoe. See Erho, “Historical-Allusional Dating,” 507, especially note 41.

⁵⁰ Erho, “Historical-Allusional Dating,” 510.

5. The Distinctive Representation of Social and Economic Factors, Including the Identification of the Kings and the Mighty Ones.

I noted briefly above the similarities and differences between the representations of injustice in the Parables and in the Epistle of Enoch and some of the ways that these have been taken. This will connect in interesting ways with the representation of the poor and the wealthy in 2 Enoch, as I will note below. Mostly, the discussion of the Parables has focused on whether the imagery of “the kings and the mighty” is linked to internal Jewish factionalism or division and to whether specific events or periods of persecution might lie behind the imagery of bloodshed that is used. Without denying the validity of such discussions, it may be helpful here to consider the perspectives offered on such imagery by ideological criticisms and their theological voices.⁵¹ Often, such criticisms articulate the perspective of the marginalized and the liminal, linked to the intersections of social, ethnic/racial factors, along with those of gender and sexuality. In recent years, the word “intersectional” itself has come to label critical approaches sensitive to the complexity with which the dynamics of power are embodied.⁵² Various lines of entitlement and disentanglement will often converge or collide within the individual or the community. What I want to highlight here is the extent to which such power dynamics—when they are recognized—will be perceived and represented in terms of violence.⁵³

⁵¹ I mean here the range of critical approaches that recognizes the role of underlying and often unexamined ideologies in the biblical and theological scholarship of colonial modernity, as well as in historical literature. These are often labelled in association with particular viewpoints (black, feminist, queer, et cetera), but to do so often functionally presumes a neutrality in the practice of historical inquiry cherished and developed by the modern western university, overlooking its essential “whiteness.” On this point, see David G. Horrell, *Ethnicity and Inclusion: Religion, Race, and Whiteness in Constructions of Jewish and Christian Identities* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020).

⁵² See the collection of essays in Patricia Hill Collins and Sirma Bilge, eds. *Intersectionality* (Cambridge: Polity, 2016). The editors capture the core insights in these terms (14):

Intersectionality investigates how intersecting power relations influence social relations across diverse societies as well as individual experiences in everyday life. As an analytic tool, intersectionality views categories of race, class, gender, sexuality, class, nation, ability, ethnicity, and age – among others – as interrelated and mutually shaping one another. Intersectionality is a way of understanding and explaining complexity in the world, in people, and in human experiences.

⁵³ This insight can be articulated in terms of “structural violence,” a phrase derived from Johan Galtung, “Violence, Peace, and Peace Research,” in *Journal of Peace Research* 6 (1969): 167–91. Such language has been important in liberation theologies, which have typically seen the context of ancient Galilee as equivalent to those encountered by the impoverished throughout history. See, especially, the works of Jon Sobrino, *Jesucristo liberador: Lecture histórica-teológica de Jesús de Nazaret* (San Salvador: UCA, 1991), translated as *Jesus the Liberator: A Historical-Theological View* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1993); and *La fe en Jesucristo: Ensayo desde las víctimas* (San Salvador: UCA, 1999) translated as *Christ the Liberator: A View from the Victims* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 2001). The extent to which the translation titles obscure

In the modern history of scholarship dedicated to the discussion of “apocalyptic,” much has been written about the genre as constituting the literature of the oppressed. This is undoubtedly too simplistic as a generalization, as the discussion of 2 Enoch throughout this work will highlight, but some apocalyptic texts undoubtedly present stereotypical features of writings associated with those who have experienced systemic violence and marginalization. This can occur within a given culture or society, but it can also have geographical dimensions, as highlighted by recent work on biblical interpretation in the global south or in islanded communities, that are often treated as colonies, plantations or trade-routes, all to be exploited.⁵⁴ This may be interesting as we seek to locate the Parables and its route of transmission. What if its sense of vulnerability to the exploitation of kings and powerful ones reflects a place that is always at the contested boundaries of adjacent empires, like Palestine itself—and, perhaps, particularly Galilee—but also the wider territory of Roman Syria, always on the dual edges of empires and kingdoms?

The Composition of The Parables of Enoch

Having reviewed the debates about the origins of the Parables, I turn in this final section of the chapter to discuss the issue of composition history and redaction, which has already emerged as a theme threaded through what has been considered above. There is general agreement that the final form of the Parables, broadly supported by the manuscript evidence, reflects a number of redactional developments, some of which appear intended to glue the work into the context of the earlier Enoch material and others of which reflect the more extensive incorporation of material that may have circulated independently. Of the former, the labelling of the section as a “second vision” is an obvious example and, in the view of some, another is constituted by chapter 71, functioning as an epilogue of sorts. Of the latter, we have both smaller units that may well have been distinct traditions, such as the

Sobrinó's concerns, in an effort to map his project onto the Christology of Schillebeeckx it its own example of colonialism. See Robert Lasalle-Klein, “Jesus of Galilee and the Crucified People: The Contextual Christology of Jon Sobrinó And Ignacio Ellacuría,” *Theological Studies* 70 (2009): 347–76.

Matthew Croasmun has recently explored how structural violence of this kind can be identified in personal terms, ascribed a kind of agency or personhood in its emergence from the system that generates it. See his *The Emergence of Sin: The Cosmic Tyrant in Romans* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

⁵⁴ Jione Havea, Margaret Aymer, Vernon Steed, eds., *Islands, Islanders, and the Bible : Ruminations* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015).

description of Wisdom's descent and rejection in 1 Enoch 42, but also more extensive units of text that are generally categorized as Noachic traditions or interpolations and are, importantly, typically seen as having been added to the earliest text of the Parables, as distinct from at a late stage of the work's development.⁵⁵

The Noachic units explicitly associate the visionary material with Noah and not Enoch (e.g. 65:1; 67:1), though the older figure is often a character in the narrative, as Noah's great grandfather (65:2), highlighting the close connectedness of the two traditions. The Noachic material shares an emphasis on judgement with the rest of the Parables, though the symbolism of the Flood has a particular prominence that is distinctive within the landscape of the Parables as a whole (while obviously being an established feature of the Enoch traditions outside the Parables). With those earlier traditions, the Noachic material also shares an interest in the actions of the Watchers as constitutive of evil and violence, showing less interest in the kings and the mighty ones who are elsewhere in the book the representatives of injustice and evil. An important detail emerges in correspondence with this particular concern about the sin of the Watchers: where the word "secret(s)" is mostly used in the Parables to refer in a positive way to the special knowledge revealed to and through Enoch, in the Noachic sections it is used with negative force of the angels' sharing of dangerous knowledge .

While exhibiting such distinctiveness within the Parables, and such close equivalence to Enochic traditions outside them, these Noachic interpolations are nonetheless well-integrated into the text of the Parables. They incorporate some of the key terminology found elsewhere in the work that is not typical of the Enoch and Noah traditions elsewhere, e.g., in the preference for the epithet "Lord of Spirits," and broadly mirror the concerns of the work as a whole with justice, even if the Watchers are more prominent in these sections than powerful humans. As such, it is difficult to establish whether the Noachic interpolations were genuinely independent material spliced into the Parables, with some redaction to make them fit, or were instead new versions of Noachic traditions composed within the same circles as the Parables, perhaps under the influence of the parts of the work already extant, and subsequently integrated into the text.⁵⁶ If the latter, then an interesting possibility emerges, that the

⁵⁵ See Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 20. See also Vered Hillel, "A Reconsideration of Charles' Designated 'Noah Interpolations' in 1 Enoch 54:1–55:1; 60; 65:1–19:25," in *Noah and his Book(s)*, ed. Michael Stone, Aryeh Amihay, and Vered Hillel, SBLEJL 28 (Atlanta: SBL, 2010), 41–44.

⁵⁶ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 296.

Noachic material incorporated into the Parables might have a distinctively close connection to the Noachic traditions in Manichaean literature, their own Book of the Giants.⁵⁷

Although there is general agreement about the compositional complexity of the Parables, there is some divergence about how this is explained and how it is factored into the study of the book. For some, much of the compositional development took place in the early stages of the book's development, long prior to its translation into Ethiopic; for others, it may reflect developments within the Aksumite context. Some have sought to emend the ordering of the text, to recover the perceived conceptual flow of the material;⁵⁸ others are critical of such attempts to recover the original, not least because it can constitute a judgement of sorts on those who have transmitted the work, effectively deemed to be lacking the sophistication needed to recognize the problem.

Conclusions

This brief review of the debates concerning the dating, provenance and composition history of the Parables serves to frame the detailed analysis that will follow in my own discussion, and has been intended both to summarize and to destabilize the project of locating the Parables. It orients us in relation to some of the major issues that have dominated the landscape of research into the Parables and that will be threaded through the present study. It also, however, calls attention to the points of neglect, the issues that have largely been overlooked as a result of the driving concerns of research on the Parables.

Most notably, research has been interested in the issue of date and provenance in order to make justifiable claims about the relevance of the Parables to our reconstructions of either ancient Judaism or ancient Christianity, or possibly the relationship between the two. Similarly, it has often been interested in the composition history of the work in order to delineate the relevance of different parts of the book for such a task. When scholars have considered "affinities" with other literatures, it has principally been in terms of evident parallels between specific texts or passages, and their wording, or in terms of "developing" concepts like messianism.

⁵⁷ On this material, see John Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions*, MHUC 14 (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992).

⁵⁸ This is conspicuously true of Nickelsburg and VanderKam's commentary and translation.

Less interest shown in the essential theology of the work, its particular way of representing God, and in what this might signify about the encounters that the work embodies, between Jewish traditions and other influences. Correspondingly, there has been less interest shown in the generative significance that this essential theology might have in its encounter with other influences and the people associated with them. Here, the underlying problems with the linear idea of the trajectory, paired to an evolutionary model of religious thought and practice, are particularly problematic. If the Parables of Enoch are considered with non-linear models of generative influence, in which they are the product of recombinant material and give rise in turn to fresh recombinations—which may not evolve but may nevertheless leave a trace of colour in the subsequent mix—then the issues of date, provenance, composition and legacy look very different and invite new questions. Instead of asking about the evolution of messianic beliefs and their roles in emergent binitarianism, we might ask about why the conception of God has become one that involves intermediaries, enacting roles that are associated with Godself in earlier traditions. We might then ask how this leaves its mark on other literatures, with 2 Enoch and the Manichaean traditions drawn into this conversation. If, as we noted in Chapter 1, Syria and Palestine are considered as frontier contexts, alongside the quite different context of Roman Egypt, then such issues of generative connection can be informed by our growing understanding of the worlds of influences and encounters that are relevant.

Framed in such terms, some of the issues of composition history take on fresh significance. The connections between the Noachic material preserved in the Parables and the equivalent material in Manichaean traditions, when approached with a less linear model and more of a rhizomatic one, become suggestive of some of the particular entanglements that may have involved the Parables. This is especially true when the programmatic significance of “groups” and “communities” is challenged, when those categories remain as factors but are decentered from the discussion.

This does not need to be set in opposition to the broad consensus that the Parables were composed sometime between 50BCE and 100CE. In fact, as I will note in later Chapters, there are some striking differences between the Parables and 2 Enoch in the rendering of shared themes, such as Wisdom, that make sense if those parts of the Parables come from Jewish circles in this early period and 2 Enoch is framed by Jewish-Christian interactions, among other factors, in later antiquity. But rather than the range of dates functioning to categorize the Parables primarily as a product of “Second Temple

Judaism,” I am more interested in how they might locate the Parables within the web of generative influences at local levels that might be at work from the Herodian period to late antiquity, and in how the integration of elements such as the Noah material might be shaped by those dynamics. If David Suter is correct to see the Parables as reflecting a kind of proto-Hekhalot Judaism, and to allow that this might (at least in part) emerge in later centuries, what might this say about the role of other influences in the frontier worlds on this area of Jewish literature? How might this be complicated further when we allow that those other influences might include Jewish cultures other than the rabbinic, that the Hekhalot texts might preserve just one refraction—the rabbinic one—of wider traditions within the Jewish imagination of heaven.

Here, the absence of the Parables from the Qumran finds is significant to me, not as something that calls their earliness or their Jewishness into question, but as something that indicates their (broadly conceived) circle of origin to have been different from the other parts of what eventually became the recognizable Ethiopic Book of Enoch. This invites a further point of reflection. While those specifically interested in the Ethiopic literature itself have devoted some energy to considering the paths of transmission by which the Parables might have come to the Ethiopian context, those who have sought to establish the origins of the work have generally paid little attention to those contexts through which it might have passed along the way. The methodological insistence that we start with manuscript witnesses and work back through the plausible pathways that might be necessary to explain the eventual attestation of a work has, for the most part, been undervalued in research into the provenance of the Parables.

Chapter 4. Storehouses and Measures: Parallel Patterns in Metrology and Meteorology in the Parables of Enoch and 2 (Slavonic) Enoch.

This chapter reworks and develops the preliminary examination that I published in the *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* of a dense set of correspondences in the meteorological and metrological language of the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch, considered in relation to a range of other texts that use similar language.¹ In its original form, as an independent article, that study represented a first attempt to trace these similarities and to reflect upon their significance. In the context of this book, the substance of that article serves a more mature purpose: it anchors the extended comparative discussion that will follow and serves as a launching point for a deeper analysis of the connections with works usually associated with Syria in late antiquity that were only briefly noted in the original (particularly with the Apostolic Constitutions). While reproduced with limited change, then, it has taken on dramatically new significance that I could not really have anticipated when I first published that article.

There is one element of the discussion that I have modified more significantly in the present context, and this reflects one of the programmatic themes that has already started to emerge in this study. In my original article, I compared the parallel patterns encountered in the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch to the so-called 3 Enoch, drawing on some of the older translations of the latter work and the scholarship principally interested in its inclusion of older traditions. The discussion of 3 Enoch and the wider body of Hekhalot literature has progressed significantly in recent years, however, with new scholarly editions of the literature appearing and some important disruptions occurring in the conversations about formational influence. Here, then, I modify the discussion to reflect such developments. The importance of this to the volume as a whole is not merely a matter of being up-to-date, but of beginning to open new lines of reflection on the relationships between the various works. I have noted already the interest of some scholarship in locating the Parables and 2 Enoch on trajectories linked to the emergence of the Hekhalot literature, but the more recent discussions of the latter offer

¹ Grant Macaskill, "Meteorology and Metrology: Evaluating Parallels in the Ethiopic Parables of Enoch and 2 (Slavonic) Enoch," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 29 (2019): 79–99.

alternative possibilities to explain the points of equivalence and divergence, linked to the complicated mutuality of traditions in late antiquity. In the context of this study as a whole, this opens fresh ways of positioning both the Parables and 2 Enoch in relation to Jewish traditions, non-Jewish influences and the emergence of the Hekhalot texts; as such, it invites new reflection on the value of 2 Enoch to the scholarly discussion of that emergence.

My concern in this chapter is to examine the descriptions of “storehouses” or “treasuries,” in which are contained various meteorological elements, and of a “righteous balance/scale” that is associated with both meteorological order and divine judgement. While the terminology itself is not confined to the Enochic works, and has some biblical backgrounds that must be considered, the distinctive combinations in which it is found here suggest a particularly close relationship between the traditions found in The Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch. A comparison with the use of similar language in other ancient texts will highlight points of overlap, some of which show some interesting geographical clustering in Syria (at least, according to the usual decisions about their provenance), but it will also throw into sharper relief the particular degree of similarity between the Parables and 2 Enoch, especially when considered in relation to the other tractates that comprise 1 Enoch.

I will begin by documenting the use of this language and imagery in the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch, evaluating these in relation to the Enochic literature preserved at Qumran, and particularly the Astronomical Book. This will constitute the largest section within the study. I will then examine the biblical material that provides at least part of the background to the language and imagery before turning to some partial parallels in the Dead Sea Scrolls. After a brief consideration of a significant parallel in the rabbinic tractate *b.Ḥagigah* 12b, I will consider some quite striking correspondences in the work we today commonly designate as 3 Enoch. I will then consider a number of parallels in several other pseudepigraphical works, which will raise an interesting question about either a provenance or a stage of transmission in Syria. Finally, by way of conclusion, I will offer a synthetic reflection on the evidence that will here set the stage for some of the details considered in greater depth in later chapters.

Storehouses, Treasuries and Measures: Documenting Parallels in The Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch

Meteorological and cosmological language is found at several key points in the text of the Parables of Enoch, with notably dense accounts in the first and third parables, located in chapters 41/43 and 60/69 respectively. In 2 Enoch, the material is distributed more widely, though with a number of particularly dense clusters built into the structure of the book; the meteorological imagery that I will consider here is located in 2 Enoch 5–6 and 40, and the cosmological or astronomical material is found in 11–16, 30 and 48. Because the material in the Parables is more tightly located, I will allow it to anchor my study, with the material from 2 Enoch discussed and tabulated in relation to it. For the sake of focus, my study will also principally focus on the material found in the first Parable, as it is found in chapters 41 and 43, with the material from the third Parable discussed in comparison to this. The material in these two chapters is conceptually unified; it may, in fact, originally have been a single account within the text, a different arrangement than is currently reflected in the manuscripts, where the unity and flow of chapters 41 and 43 is fractured somewhat by the text of chapter 42.² The table below uses the standard recent translations, but I will offer some comments on both in the discussion that follows.

Parables of Enoch	2 Enoch (Longer Recension)
41:3 And there my eyes saw the secrets of the lightnings and the thunder, and the secrets of the winds, how they are divided to blow upon the earth, and the secrets of the clouds and the dew. And there I saw whence they proceed in that place, and from there they saturate the dust of the earth.	5:1 And there I perceived the treasuries of the snow and ice (or “frost”; see discussion below) ² and the angels who guard their terrible storehouses. And the treasury of the clouds, from which they come out and go in.

² This is reflected in the presentation of the text in George Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 37–82*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), with chapter 42 lifted out and relocated to before this block of material. Their reconstruction of the text is also reflected in the separately published translation, George Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: The Hermeneia Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012).

<p>41:4 There I saw closed storehouses, and from them the winds are distributed; the storehouse of the hail and the winds, the storehouse of the mist and of the clouds, and its cloud abides over the earth since the beginning of the age.³</p>	<p>6:1 And they showed me the treasuries of the dew, like olive oil ... and the angels who guard their treasuries, and how they are shut and opened.⁷</p> <p>40:8 And the dwelling places of the clouds, their organization and their wings, and how they carry the rain and the raindrops—all this I investigated.</p> <p>40:10 I wrote down the treasuries of the snow and the storehouses of the cold (or “ice/frost”, see discussion below) and the frosty winds. I observed how, depending on the season, their custodians fill up the clouds with them, and their treasuries are not emptied.⁸</p>
<p>41:5 And I saw the storehouses of the sun and the moon, from which they emerge and to which they return, and their glorious return, and how the one is more praiseworthy than the other, and their splendid course. And they do not leave the course, and they neither extend nor diminish their course. And they keep faith</p>	<p>Chapters 11–16 describe in detail the gates of the sun and moon and the paths that they follow.</p>

³ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 142.

⁷ Translation from Francis I. Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch: A New Translation and Introduction,” in James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Volume 1: *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (New York: Doubleday, 1983), 112.

⁸ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 166.

<p>with one another according to the oath that they have <sworn>.⁴</p>	
<p>43:1 And I saw other lightnings and stars of heaven; and I saw that he called them by their names, and they listened to him.</p>	<p>40:9 And I wrote down the rumble of the thunder and the lightening; and they showed me the keys and their keepers, where they go in</p>
<p>43:2 I saw a righteous balance, how they are weighed according to their light, according to the breadth of their spaces and the day of their appearing. (I saw how) their revolution produces lightning, and their revolution is according to the number of the angels, and they keep their faith with one another.⁵</p>	<p>and come out, by measure. They are raised by means of a chain and they are lowered by means of a chain, so that he does not drop the clouds of anger with terrible injuries and violence, and destroy everything upon the earth.⁹</p>
<p>60:11 And the other angel who went with me and showed me what is hidden told me what is first and last in heaven in the height and beneath the earth in the abyss, and at the ends of heaven and on the foundation of heaven, and in the storehouses of the winds, how the winds are divided and how they are weighed and how the springs of the wind are (divided and) numbered, according to the power of the</p>	<p>40:11 I wrote down the sleeping chambers of the winds and I saw how their custodians carry scales and measures. At first they place them in the scales and secondly in the measure, and it is by measure that they release them skilfully into all the earth, lest the earth should be rocked by violent gusts.¹⁰</p>

⁴ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 142.

⁵ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 142.

⁹ Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch, 166.

¹⁰ Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 166.

<p>wind and the power of the moon and according to the power of righteousness.</p> <p>Cf:</p> <p>69:23 And there are preserved the voices of the thunder and the light of the lightnings. And there are preserved the storehouses of the hail and the storehouses of the hoarfrost, and the storehouses of the mist and the storehouses of the rain and the dew.⁶</p>	
--	--

As I noted in Chapter 2, 2 Enoch is found in multiple recensions of varying length, with numerous differences in specific points of contact. Importantly, for all that such variations are encountered, the core detail that I seek to trace here is contained in all recensions: the variation is found at the level of the lexical detail and syntax of each manuscript.¹¹ Where relevant in what follows, I will note and evaluate the points of divergence.

a. Storehouses and Treasuries

The Ge'ez of 1 Enoch 41:4 opens with a reference to Enoch's seeing the "storehouses" (*mazāgebt*, መዛግብተ) from which the winds are distributed. This is the equivalent of *θησαυροί*, used precisely with such significance in The Book of the Watchers (in 1 Enoch 17:3 and 18:1, to which we will return below); as such, it could legitimately be translated as "storehouses" or "treasuries." The singular "storehouse"

⁶ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 304.

¹¹ The most extensive differences between the recensions that is relevant to our argument here occurs in the material found in Chapters 11–16, where the longer recension contains a more elaborate description of the sun and moon, containing multiple details not found in the shorter recension. For present purposes, these are not relevant.

(*mazgab* መዝገበ) is then deployed several times, associated in turn with hail, winds, mist and clouds. There are some minor variations between the manuscripts, with “the winds” omitted from several manuscripts (and visibly deleted in EMLL 2080),¹² and “cloud(s)” encountered in both singular and plural, but generally the list of elements is consistently represented. The word translated as “hail” (*barad*, ቤረድ) is a straight equivalent to the Hebrew ברד, though it can also be used in Ethiopic for “hoarfrost.”¹³ It is found again, however, in 69:23, where it is paired with *ashataya* (አሰሐትያ), which also (and more exclusively) means “hoarfrost.” We should rightly see *barad* in both 41:4 and 69:23, then, to have its more common meaning of “hail.” The term, “storehouses,” meanwhile, is repeated again in 41:5, where it is used of the places in which the sun and the moon are kept. It is important to note that Enoch’s vision of these is represented, in 41:3, as an event by which he learns cosmological secrets (*hebu’at*, ኅቡአተ), which are specified to include not only the secrets of the winds and the lightning/thunder, but also the secrets of the clouds and the dew. That last element is not mentioned in the subsequent description of the storehouses and their contents.¹⁴

Where the terminology about storehouses in the Ge’ez texts is consistent, the Slavonic terminology found in 2 Enoch 5:1–2 is subject to a degree of variation and, importantly, uses two different terms. The text of 5:1–2, in all of the manuscripts, repeatedly uses *sūkrovišta/sokrovišta* (сѹкровица/сокрѡвица),¹⁵ the word used to translate θησαυροί in, for example, the Old Church Slavonic translations of Job 38:22.¹⁶ The manuscripts also inconsistently use another word, *xranilicę/ela*

¹² Noted in Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *2 Enoch 2*, 142.

¹³ Wolf Leslau, *Concise Dictionary of Ge’ez* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010), 98.

¹⁴ Jonathan Ben Dov has argued that the term “secrets” effectively functions as an equivalent term for storehouses or treasuries, as if they are used interchangeably. See his “Exegetical Notes on Cosmology in the Parables of Enoch,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007). Ben Dov is undoubtedly correct that the two concepts have become closely associated, and, as will be seen from my interaction with this article in what follows, I find his analysis of the texts to be convincing. I am less convinced, however, that the terms have become interchangeable in the way that he suggests. The fact that, in 41:3, Enoch moves to his elaboration of the secrets about the distribution of the winds using “how” (*af*, አፍ), rather than “from which” indicates that the secrets in question are not principally understood to be places: he has learned how the winds are distributed principally, not where they are stored. Ben Dov’s argument makes good sense of how this relates to the various biblical texts in which storehouses for the wind are noted, but makes less sense of the grammar of the verse itself.

¹⁵ Illustrating the effects of dialect, J and V read сѹровица. P and B read сокрѡвица. Other variants can be identified, but none has any significance for translation. See Macaskill, *Slavonic Texts of 2 Enoch*, 50–1.

¹⁶ Again, dialect effects result in this occurring as хранилица/хранилица/хранилицѡν. Macaskill, *Slavonic Texts of 2 Enoch*, 50–1.

(ХРАНИЛИЦА/Ѧ/Δ), which designates a guarded place. In the longer recension, this word occurs in 5:1, in parallel with *sŭkrovišta*:

And there I perceived treasures (*s[ŭ]krovišta*) of snow and ice and angels who guard (*drŭžat*, ДРЪЖАТ) their terrible storehouses (*xranilice*).¹⁷

The manuscripts of the other recensions (i.e., short and very short) have the cognate verbal form *khranęšta* (ХРАНАЦА, “they guard”) in the place occupied by the noun *xranilica* in the longer texts, and repeat *sŭkrovišta/sokrovišta* as the object of the verb:

And they showed me there treasures (*sokrovišta*) of the snow and cold, terrible angels guarding (*xranešta*) their treasures (*sokrovišta*).

The shorter recension, meanwhile, does use the noun *xranilica*, but it does so at a different point. The noun occurs in combination with *sŭkrovišta/sokrovišta* in 5:2, which actually represents—as is often the case—a fuller version of the text than is found in the longer recension.¹⁸ The inconsistencies between manuscripts appear to reflect transmissional corruption or confusion of the cognate nominal and verbal forms, which are visually similar and easily misread in manuscripts that lack spaces between words.

Two important points can be made. First, the occurrence of nominal forms in both recensions (if at different points) suggests that both nouns were part of the original text.¹⁹ Second, and perhaps more importantly, it is significant that even at their points of variation, the two recensions are insistent on using a verb to indicate that angels “guard” the treasures.

The meteorological elements listed in 2 *Enoch* 5:1–2 are snow, ice/frost and clouds. The manuscripts of the short recension have the word *xladnaa* (ΧΛΑΔΗΔΑ “cold”) for the second of these, but this is likely to be a corruption of the original reading: the manuscripts of the longer recension

¹⁷ It also occurs in the chapter title found only in the manuscript P. Because of the effect of dialect, it occurs in the title as ХРАНИЛИЦА. The inconsistency with the form found in the text itself reflects the secondary character of the chapter titles.

¹⁸ First, the shorter recension, and its version includes both terms: *xranilišta* (because of the dialect, the term is here *xranilitsa*) and *sŭkrovišta* (again, because of dialect, the term is here *sokrovišta*)

¹⁹ The point is made by Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 112.

(J, P, and R) agree with those of the very short recension (V, N)²⁰—which are normally closer to the readings found in the short recension—and also with the reading in B, an intermediate text type. All of these manuscripts read *golotna* (ΓΟΛΟΤΝΑ)²¹. This word also occurs in the short recension texts, in a parallel pairing, at 40:10, which suggests that it has been altered here by scribal corruption. The discussion is important, because *golotna* can be translated as either ice or, more normally, frost. *2 Enoch* 6 follows this with a description of the treasuries of the dew. As we have noted, “dew” is not listed in relation to a storehouse in the Ethiopic text, but it does occur in the immediate context, listed as one of the secrets that Enoch is given access to in his vision.

The subsequent mention of the storehouses and treasuries in 40:10 is doubly interesting. First, both of the words that we have seen to be used (*xranilišta* and *sūkrovišta*) occur in the text, reinforcing the sense that they are used almost as poetic equivalents. Second, the *xranilišta* are specified to be of “the frost/ice and chill winds” (my translation). This point is masked somewhat in Andersen’s generally reliable translation, which wrongly here renders *golotnaa* as “cold” rather than as “frost” or “ice.” Once the point is recognised, we can see that, effectively, we have the same selection of elements found that we have seen in the Ethiopic.

For present purposes, I will pass over a detailed comparison of the sections of each book that speak of the sun and the moon and will simply offer some brief observations. First, the Ethiopic text continues its description of the storehouses seen by Enoch to include those in which the sun and moon are kept. There is no parallel to this concept in *2 Enoch*, although much of the language used of the luminaries otherwise is quite similar. To make this point clearer: while both books contain discussions of the sun and the moon, and some similarities exist between these, only the *Parables of Enoch* includes these heavenly bodies in the schema of storehouses. In this, at least, *2 Enoch* is closer to the *Astronomical Book* in its conceptuality, preferring to speak of gates through which the heavenly bodies pass. Second, it may be noteworthy that the inclusion of the resting places of sun and moon within the schema of the storehouses is not anticipated by the description of the secrets that Enoch is shown in 41:3.

b. Measures

²⁰ One manuscript of the very short recension, B², is closer to A and U: it reads *xolodna*.

²¹ Sometimes occurring as ΓΟΛΟΤΝΑΔ/Λ.

After the interruption of the vision of the cosmological secrets with the account of wisdom's descent and return to heaven, which some consider to reflect clumsy redaction,²² the Parables of Enoch returns in 43:1 to its description of the heavenly phenomena. The vision now recounts the secrets of the stars and lightening, perhaps linking them because they are considered to be made of the same stuff: the material of light.²³ It is worth noting that classical thought was, at points, preoccupied with the nature of the substance of which stars were made, with this connected in certain strands of Greek philosophy to the concept of the *stoicheia* (elements) and, specifically, to that of *pneuma*. Both Engberg-Pedersen²⁴ and Thiessen²⁵ have recently argued that the association of stars with *pneuma* is a crucial element in the apostle Paul's thought, as he sees the fulfilment of the promise to Abraham—that his descendants would be like the stars—to be constituted by the presence of *pneuma*, the stuff of stars, in believers. The proximity of this to one of the occurrences of the title “Lord of Spirits” (እግዚአ መኖፍስት) may be suggestive that this is at least part of the picture.

The activity of the stars is governed by a righteous balance (*madāləw šədq*, መዳለው ጽድቅ) that Enoch sees. The Lord of Spirits calls the stars by name and they are weighed according to their light, size and the timing of their appearance. In broad thematic terms, this is linked to what we encounter in the Astronomical Book (1 Enoch 72–82), but this particular metrological device is not paralleled there.

It is important to note that this is not the first occurrence of a “balance” in the Parables of Enoch. The imagery also occurs in 41:1, where Enoch intimates that he saw “all the secrets of heaven, and how the kingdom is divided, and how human deeds are weighed in the balance.”²⁶ Standing, as it does, at the beginning of the account, this would suggest that the image of the balance has a certain controlling function over the Parable as a whole: Enoch will see how the Lord of Spirits will weigh both the heavenly spirits—the stars and the lightening—and the human ones. This makes sense of the association between the bodies of light and the spirits of righteous humans, which have been divided from the

²² See footnote 2, above.

²³ Hence 1 Enoch 44: “some of the stars rise and become lightening, and they cannot abandon their form.” Trans. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, 1 Enoch 2, 142.

²⁴ Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010)

²⁵ Matthew Thiessen, *Paul and the Gentile Problem* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

²⁶ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, 1 Enoch 2, 136.

darkness by the Lord of Spirits (41:8–9); it also makes sense of the transition from the description of the stars/lightening and their weight to the naming of the righteous who dwell on earth (43:4).

Neither is this the last use of metrological imagery in relation to cosmology and meteorology in the Parables of Enoch. It occurs again in chapter 60:12–13, in a passage that draws upon much of the same imagery that we have seen already and that is followed by an extended description of the storehouses of the winds. An angel shows Enoch:

[what is] ¹² in the storehouses of the winds, how the winds are divided and how they are weighed, and how the springs of the winds are (divided and) numbered, according to the power of the wind, and the power of the light of the moon, and according to the power of righteousness. And the divisions of the stars, according to their names, and (how) all the divisions are made. ¹³ And the thunders, according to the places where they fall, and all the divisions that are made among the lightnings, that they may flash, and their host, that they may obey at once.²⁷

The dominant metrological imagery here is of dividing, rather than weighing, as such. Nevertheless, the process of division requires the winds to be weighed, and this is part of a process governed by the power of “righteousness.” The detail that follows describes each distinctive wind (60:14–23) and the roles of the angels as they bring them out of their specific storehouses. The imagery of the balance is interwoven, then, with a detailed schema within which the concept of the storehouse/treasury plays a key structuring role, and within which the roles of angels in relation to the meteorological phenomena is a matter of interest.

2 Enoch does not parallel this perfectly, but it does associate the phenomena of thunder and lightning with some kind of measure/balance (*měra*, МѢРА, 40:9). Here, the thunder and lightning are carefully weighed out and distributed by means of a chain, in order to protect the clouds and the earth. Once again, the image of the measure is part of a wider scheme here in the text. In 40:11, it is encountered again, with the angelic custodians who guard the chambers (*ložnitsa*, ЛОЖНИЦА) of the winds using

²⁷ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 224.

“scales and measures/balances,”²⁸ ensuring that the winds are released in a controlled way, in order to avoid causing destruction to the earth.

Interestingly, this is followed by a description of Enoch’s vision of those who have been judged and condemned (2 *Enoch* 40:13) which, in the manuscripts of the longer recension, is preceded by a brief description of Enoch’s role as the one who has measured all things (2 *Enoch* 40:12). This is most likely to be a secondary addition at this point in the text, but it is one that reflects a theme found elsewhere in the book, that a key part of Enoch’s role has been to measure the creation (see, esp., 43:1).²⁹ Probably more important is the observation that the subsequent chapters develop a picture of the *relative* qualities of each time and each person (43:2) that leads to an account of their being weighed for judgement:

“On the day of the great judgement, every measure and every weight and every scale will be exposed as in the market, and each one will recognize his measure, and, according to measure, each shall receive his reward.” (44:5, short recension).³⁰

On one level, this is simply the stock imagery of justice and equity,³¹ but it is found here in the context of a developed scheme that links this justice, through the imagery of the righteous balance, to the cosmological equity that Enoch himself has measured. Sinners live in violation of the cosmic order that God has established, while the righteous live in line with it. Hence, while the details are different, the scheme is similar to that which we saw to be at work in the Parables of Enoch. Interestingly, much of the ethical material from this particular section of 2 *Enoch* is condensed into the medieval juridical/ethical tractate *Merilo Pravednoe* (“The Righteous Balance”).

²⁸ Some of the manuscripts list only scales, *привѣсы*, *privěsy*.

²⁹ On this point, see Andrei Orlov, “The Origin of the Name ‘Metatron’ and the Text of 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 11 (2000): 19–26. Orlov’s case that the origin of the name Metatron might be explained by considering the Slavonic *prometaya*, an obscure term which occurs in *Merilo Pravednoe*, a juridical text based upon 2 *Enoch*, but which is generally corrupted in other manuscripts, is somewhat speculative. His analysis of the significance attached to Enoch’s activity of measurement, however, and of the possibility that the Greek form *metron* might lie in the background of this obscure is helpful.

³⁰ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 173.

³¹ Joachim Schaper, “The Weight of Justice: Counting, Weighing, and Measuring in Ancient Israel’s Social and Intellectual Worlds,” in *Congress Volume, Aberdeen 2019: The 23rd Congress of the International Organisation for the Study of the Old Testament*, ed. Grant Macaskill, Christl Maier and Joachim Schaper, VTSupp 192 (Leiden: Brill, 2022), 1–16.

c. The Imagery of Storehouses and Measures within the Primary Enoch Literature

How does this overlapping imagery relate to the wider corpus of works that we label 1 Enoch? There are certainly some connections: in 17:3 and 18:1, part of the Book of the Watchers, Enoch sees storehouses/treasuries (*mazāgebt*) containing, respectively, the stars and the thunders, and the winds. In the case of the latter, there are some biblical source texts (notably, Psalm 135:7) that might influence the use of imagery. The concept of a storehouse or treasury in which the stars are kept is a distinctive development, however, although one that might be traced elsewhere in Second Temple literature, including that of the LXX.³² In a limited sense, then, the use of storehouse imagery in 17:3 and 18:1 might have contributed to its occurrence in the Parables and in 2 Enoch.

An interesting difference can be identified through careful comparison of the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch with the Book of the Watchers, however, and it is one that we will see to be mirrored in some of the other works that we will consider. Where the imagery of the storehouse or treasury is structurally significant in the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch—that is, it is an image that governs the structuring of the material, extended over a significant part of the work, within which the terms are repeated multiple times—in the Book of the Watchers it is effectively a detail, occurring in the context of a range of cosmological images, some of which are influenced by biblical terminology. The use of balance imagery, meanwhile, is a distinctive extension of the meteorological accounts of both The Parables of Enoch and Slavonic Enoch, in both of which, again, it has a structural rather than incidental significance, reflecting an integrated account of creational order and ethics. This is not paralleled by the other parts of 1 Enoch.

Building on the work of VanderKam,³³ Jonathan Ben-Dov has recently observed the lack of literary dependence of The Parables of Enoch on the Astronomical Book:³⁴ while both include cosmological material, and clearly belong within a broadly shared tradition, the description of the heavenly bodies in The Parables seems to present little, if any, evidence of influence by the language or concepts of the

³² See Ben-Dov, “Exegetical Notes,” 144–5.

³³ James C. VanderKam, “The Book of Parables within the Enoch Tradition,” in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 81–99.

³⁴ Ben-Dov, “Exegetical Notes.”

Astronomical Book. By contrast, Ben-Dov notes some more precise points of correspondence between The Parables and some rabbinic texts, which we will consider below. At the same time, and by way of contrast, he notes the apparent dependency of 2 Enoch on the calendrical scheme of the Astronomical Book, particularly in the lengthy description of the movements of sun and moon in 2 Enoch 11–16. This observation is sound, but Ben-Dov does not consider the extent to which The Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch might distinctively relate to each other, on some of the very same points of terminology that he discusses. As we seek to analyse the origin and transmission history of these works, it is significant that the terminology and conceptuality of 2 Enoch suggests close entanglement with *both* the Astronomical Book *and* the Parables of Enoch, while those two works show little evidence of close entanglement with each other.

2. Biblical Backgrounds

There are some obvious biblical backgrounds to this material; these have clearly contributed some of the language encountered in the texts considered above and we will note their effects on other ancient texts in due course.

The language of the “good storehouse” (אוצרו הטוב) is found in Deuteronomy 28:12.

The LORD will open for you his rich (or “good”) storehouse, the heavens, to give the rain of your land in its season and to bless all your undertakings (NRSV)

יפתח יהוה לך את אוצרו הטוב את השמים לתת מטר ארצך בעתו ולברך את כל מעשה ידך

ἀνοίξαι σοι κύριος τὸν θησαυρὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀγαθόν, τὸν οὐρανόν, δοῦναι τὸν ὑετὸν τῇ γῆ σου ἐπὶ καιροῦ αὐτοῦ εὐλογῆσαι πάντα τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου.

In b.Ḥagigah 12b, which I will consider below, this is used as the base text for the description of the sixth heaven, *Makon*, in which the storehouses of the terrible elements are found; the existence of such

storehouses is represented as an inference from the specific form *את אוצרו הטוב*, “the *good* storehouse,” taken to imply that there must also be a storehouse of bad things.

A more developed biblical description of such storehouses is found in Job 38:22. Here, the storehouses contain, specifically, the snow and the hail, but the text also speaks of other meteorological elements that parallel, to some extent, what we saw in the Enochic texts.

²² “Have you entered the storehouses (*אוצרות*, *θησαυρούς*) of the snow, or have you seen the storehouses of the hail,

²³ which I have reserved for the time of trouble, for the day of battle and war?

²⁴ What is the way to the place where the light is distributed, or where the east wind is scattered upon the earth?

²⁵ “Who has cut a channel for the torrents of rain, and a way for the thunderbolt,

²⁶ to bring rain on a land where no one lives, on the desert, which is empty of human life,

²⁷ to satisfy the waste and desolate land, and to make the ground put forth grass?

²⁸ “Has the rain a father, or who has begotten the drops of dew?

²⁹ From whose womb did the ice come forth, and who has given birth to the hoarfrost of heaven?

(Job 38:22–29, NRSV).

It is, of course, clearly significant that the imagery of the storehouse or treasury in Job is used to contrast the limit of Job’s knowledge and power with that of God, precisely by implying a negative answer. This is precisely the opposite of what we see in the Enochic texts, which are intended to show Enoch’s privileged enjoyment of such knowledge, partly through their rhetorical contrast with Job 38:22. More importantly for my purposes, however, while a range of elements is listed, they are associated with a corresponding range of images associated with their locations: there is a “way” to where the light emerges, a “channel” through which the torrents pass; the text asks rhetorically whose “womb” the ice came from and whether the drops of dew were begotten by a father. The point of this observation is to note that the image of the storehouse is not a controlling device in Job 38, but rather an incidental detail, associated with just two of the elements (snow and hail). This contrasts with the Ethiopic and Slavonic Enoch material that we studied, where it is a developed concept by which the material is structured.

Something similar may be said about Jeremiah 10:13. Here, the true and exclusive creative and providential activity of God is described, in order to assert his uniqueness over the false gods (see Jeremiah 10:11–12, 14–16).

¹² It is he who made the earth by his power, who established the world by his wisdom, and by his understanding stretched out the heavens.

¹³ When he utters his voice, there is a tumult of waters in the heavens, and he makes the mist rise from the ends of the earth. He makes lightnings for the rain, and he brings out the wind from his storehouses. (Jer 10:12–13, NRSV)

That closing expression is also encountered in Psalm 135:7. In both texts, the image of the storehouse in which the winds are stored is simply one detail among several stock meteorological images, piled up in order to emphasize the creative and providential uniqueness of God. Psalm 33:7, likewise, uses the language of “storehouses,” now associating these with the seas and their deeps (תהומות, ἄβυσσος), but here, too, it is simply one of several cosmological details, brought together to describe the unique sovereignty of God in creation, exercised simply through the authority of his word. It is important to note that in Jeremiah 10:13, while the MT describes God bringing wind (רוח) from his storehouses, the LXX reads light (φῶς).

What, though, of the imagery of balance and measure? The language of the “righteous/just balance” is probably influenced by Job 31:6, where it is used of Job’s hope that he will be judged fairly.

ישקלני במאזני צדק וידע אלוה תמתי

ἰσταίη με ἄρα ἐν ζυγῷ δίκαιῳ, οἶδεν δὲ ὁ κύριος τὴν ἀκακίαν μου.

let me be weighed in a just balance, and let God know my integrity! (Job 31:6, NRSV)

As I have noted already, however, this is a well-established trope in ancient literature, a point explored in depth recently by Schaper.³⁵ Hence, other biblical passages that employ the metrological imagery in

³⁵ Schaper, “The Weight of Justice.”

relation to justice (e.g., Daniel 5:26–8) might be considered relevant, but not distinctively so. The suggestion that Daniel 5:26–8 might have distinctively influenced 1 Enoch 41:1, most recently made by Nickelsburg,³⁶ is not without substance, but neither is it strictly necessary when the imagery was so common in relation to concepts of justice.

The association of weight and measurement imagery with God's architectural activity in creation is also found in the biblical material, notably in Isaiah 40:12.

Who has measured the waters in the hollow of his hand and marked off the heavens with a span, enclosed the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales and the hills in a balance? (Is. 40:12, NRSV)

It is again noteworthy, however, that the image of the scales/balance used here is simply one of a range of measuring devices used by God in his role as architect or master-builder. The controlling image is that of construction, with the scales functioning as an incidental—if important—detail. It is specifically the mountains and hills that are measured in these devices; nothing is said about the substances of light, or of wind, or otherwise of climate. By contrast to the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch, where the imagery is used of ongoing or contemporary meteorological processes, Isaiah 42 uses the imagery of a historical event of construction.

Having surveyed the biblical texts, I can now offer four general observations, by way of conclusion to this section, and in order to highlight the distinctions between the biblical and Enochic material. First, the imagery of “storehouses” in the biblical material itself is exclusively used of meteorological elements or of the sea. As Ben-Dov has noted, it is not used of light or of the heavenly luminaries, apart from in LXX translations.³⁷ Second, where the imagery of “storehouses/treasuries” is used, it is part of a wider range of images intended to highlight the uniqueness of God in distinction to the false gods; it is not, itself, the controlling image in a scheme. Third, God's providential activity is associated very directly with the elements stored in these places: there are no intermediary beings, such as angels, mentioned in the accounts, since the concern is to emphasize God's distinctive sovereignty. Fourth, where the

³⁶ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 137.

³⁷ See Ben-Dov “Exegetical Notes,” 144–45.

imagery of “measure” or “scales” is used, it is likewise part of a wider scheme, to which it merely contributes one detail, which is defined by the depiction of God as a master builder, directly involved in the construction of the cosmos.

3. Parallels in the Dead Sea Scrolls

A number of the Qumran texts contain the language of the storehouse or treasury, associated with the meteorological elements. 11Q14 Fr. 2 Col ii, 8, for example (paralleled by 4Q285, fragment 1) refers to God opening his good storehouse and sending down blessing, in the form of rain and dew, elaborated as “early” and “late” rains. This is clearly an expansion of Deuteronomy 28:13, since the specific expression *אִיצְרוֹ הַטּוֹב* is used, with storehouse remaining in the singular. The storehouse/treasury image is also found in the Rule of the Community, in 1QS X, 2.

¹ at the times ordained of God: when light begins its dominion— each time it returns— and when, as ordained, it is regathered into its dwelling place;

² when night begins its watches— as He opens His storehouse and spreads darkness over the earth— and when it cycles back, withdrawing before the light;

³ when the luminaries show forth from their holy habitation, and when they are regathered into their glorious abode; when the times appointed for new moons arrive³⁸

The association of darkness with a storehouse may well reflect the influence of Isaiah 45:3. This is interesting, as Ben-Dov has seen this verse to have been particularly influential on the combination of the language of “secrets” and “storehouses in” in the Parables of Enoch.³⁹ More interesting, however, is the fact that while the word “storehouse/treasury” occurs only once, and might therefore be seen as just one image among several, the other images that are used are also of places of residence: the light has a “dwelling place” (*מֵעוֹן*) and the luminaries have a “holy habitation” (*זְבֵל קִדְשׁ*). These nouns are found in

³⁸ Translation Michael Wise, Martin Abegg and Edward Cook, “Serek le’anshey ha-Yahad,” in D.W. Parry, and E. Tov, eds., *Dead Sea Scrolls Reader. Part 1, Texts Concerned with Religious Law* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 37.

³⁹ Ben-Dov, “Exegetical Notes,” 147. See, however, my comments above, in footnote 14.

biblical texts that describe God's own place of residence in the heavens,⁴⁰ and they are also among the technical names for the specific heavens in b.Ḥagigah 12b, which we will consider below. There is nothing to suggest that the terms are used here with the same significance that they have in the latter text—the details associated with them are entirely different—but it is noteworthy that they function here within an extended description of places of containment or residence, which plays a structuring role within the text.

We also find the imagery of the scales/balance being used within the Scrolls, with a form similar to the one that we saw to be used in the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch: the scales/balance of justice. The expression occurs in 4QInstruction, in 4Q418 fragment 126, column II, 3–4:

[... n]ot one of all their host ever rests ...

And y[ou, understandi]ng one, truthfully measure all resources of men ... for with an eph[a]h of truth and a measure of righteousness (משקל צדק) God apportion[s] all [their] deeds ...]

He has spread them out, in truth he has established them and by all who delight in them [they] are studied.⁴¹

This is not the only occurrence of the image,⁴² but it is a particularly significant one. The language of the “measure of righteousness” is used in close proximity to a description of the unresting “host,” which is probably a reference to the stars and their movements. The specific word for measure here, משקל, is not the same one used in conjunction with צדק in Job 31:6 (מאזנים); it is more obviously a functional parallel to the term *ephah*. Furthermore, the construction with צדק here appears to be genitival, rather than adjectival. Broadly, though, we seem to encounter here something similar to what we saw in our Enochic texts, that is, an image of God's righteous dealings with human beings linked to his ordering of the heavenly bodies through metrological imagery. What is distinctively interesting about these occurrences is that they fit within a broader schema of God's regulative justice and the illumination of the addressees of the work to be able to live according to it and, indeed, to be righteous in their own

⁴⁰ For מעון see Deut 26:5, Jer 25:30, Psalm 68:5. For זבל see Isaiah 63:15.

⁴¹ Translation, Matthew J. Goff, *4QInstruction* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2013), 274.

⁴² See also fragment 127 6.

judgments. That is, the imagery is not simply one detail within the account, but has a more programmatic significance.⁴³ Furthermore, it is closely linked in 4QInstruction to the core concept of revealed wisdom, the *raz nihyeh*. Earlier in column II, partially preserved in fragment 123, the expression is used immediately before a reference to the weighing of deeds, and shortly after a reference to the entrance of the years and the departure of the periods.

Any parallels with the Enochic material are of a broad kind, however, and are a matter of the proximity of certain concepts (i.e., the measure and the order of the heavenly bodies) rather than the kind of direct linkage that we saw in those texts. Moreover, there is no evidence of the specific *combination* of details that we saw there, where the balance/measure language is used as part of a pattern with the language of the storehouse or treasury.

4. A Rabbinic Parallel in bḤagigah 12b

As noted already, bḤagigah 12b also develops the imagery of the storehouses, referencing Deuteronomy 28:12 along the way.

Makon is that in which there are store(house)s⁴⁴ of snow (אוצרות שלג) and store(house)s of hail (ואוצרות ברד), and the loft of harmful dews (עליית טללים רעים), and the loft of raindrops (עליית אגלים), the chamber of the whirlwind and storm (וחדרה של סופה וסערה),⁴⁵ and the cave of vapour (ומערה של קיטור), and their doors are of fire, for it is said: The Lord will open unto thee His good storehouse,⁴⁶ the heavens" (Deuteronomy 28:12), which indicates the existence of a storehouse that contains the opposite of good.⁴⁷

⁴³ For the programmatic significance of the *raz nihyeh* within 4QInstruction, and its relationship to cosmic order, see Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 72–114, and Goff, *4QInstruction*, 19–23.

⁴⁴ I have amended the translation, which uses the word “stores” for the sake of terminological consistency.

⁴⁵ וסערה is omitted by R. Elijah of Wilna.

⁴⁶ I have, again, amended the translation (which uses “treasure,” rather than “storehouse” to translate אוצר here).

⁴⁷ Translation, Isidore Epstein, *The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Mo'ed* (London: Soncino Press, 1938).

The elements here are somewhat similar to those encountered in the Ethiopic and Slavonic material (snow, hail, dew, mist), and while the language of “storehouses” (אוצרות) does not occur exclusively, but alongside the parallel terms “loft” (עליה), “chamber” (חדר) and “cave” (מערה), there is clearly a structuring concern to discuss the places where the elements are stored. This is different to what I noted in the biblical material, where the mention of such places is merely one detail among many. It is noteworthy, however, that what are listed as kept in these storehouses are exclusively bad and harmful things, used for the punitive purposes that are detailed in the wider text of Deuteronomy 28. This triggers a question in the Gemara as to whether such things are in heaven or are on the earth. The text draws upon Psalm 148:7 (which lists meteorological elements, but without any mention of storehouses) and Psalm 5:5 (which indicates that evil cannot sojourn with God) as it debates whether the evil things can reside in heaven or must be stored somewhere on earth.

While similar to the Enochic material in certain regards, then, the Bavli passage differs from it in its distinctively negative description of the storehouses. It also, at this point, shows no interest in associating the storehouses with particular angels and their activity; while the priestly activity of Michael is mentioned earlier in the chapter, taking place in *Zevul*, and a group of ministering angels is described as reciting songs by night, in *Ma'on*, there is no description of such beings being involved in God's providential operations in relation to the weather, which are associated only with him.

5. Parallels in Sefer Hekhalot (3 Enoch) and the Hekhalot Literature

There are several points in the Hekhalot literature, in the macroform commonly designated as *3 Enoch*, that parallel more closely what we find in the Ethiopic and Slavonic material, though still not perfectly. As I noted at the beginning of this chapter, the study of the Hekhalot literature⁴⁸ has developed

⁴⁸ The term Hekhalot/Heikhalot corresponds to “palaces” and reflects the thoroughgoing interest in the heavenly spaces described by the various rabbinic heroes, which gives a *certain* cohesion to the complicated and diverse elements encountered in the writings.

significantly over the last few decades.⁴⁹ Peter Schäfer's editions of the various texts,⁵⁰ and his subsequent German translations,⁵¹ along with the more recent English translations produced by James Davila⁵² have been an important part of this, with the synoptic comparison of material that they facilitate making possible a renewed discussion of the complex relationships between the various texts and the cultures that may have shaped them. The word "text" needs to be used with particular care here, for we are really talking a range of manuscripts that diverge and converge quite fluidly through time; the identification and reconstruction of discrete works from the manuscript witnesses is a complicated and rather artificial activity. The *Synopse* published by Schäfer et al. was of particularly importance precisely because it did not prioritize and pursue a critical text, artificially extracted from the actual witnesses and then reified through publication. The synoptic format highlighted what Boustán describes as the "radically unstable"⁵³ quality of the literature and led Schäfer to develop a particular set of terms that might be more appropriate to the scholarly analysis of the material than those traditionally used.

I employ the term *macroform* for a superimposed literary unit, instead of the terms *writing* or *work* to accommodate the fluctuating character of the texts of the Hekhalot Literature. The term macroform concretely denotes both the fictional or imaginary single text, which we initially and by way of delimitation always refer to in scholarly literature (e.g., *Hekhalot Rabbati* in contrast to *Ma'aseh Merkavah*, etc.) as well as the different manifestations of this text in the various manuscripts. The border between micro- and macroforms is thereby fluent: certain definable textual units can be both part of a superimposed entirety (thus a "macroform") as well as an independently transmitted redactional unit (thus a "microform").⁵⁴

⁴⁹ For a useful overview and analysis of the developments, and an excellent introduction to the literature itself, see Ra'anan S. Boustán, "The Study of Heikhalot Literature: Between Mystical Experience and Textual Artifact," *Currents in Biblical Research* 6 (2007): 130–160.

⁵⁰ Peter Schäfer, in collaboration with Margarete Schlüter and Hans G. von Mutius, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, TSAJ 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981); Peter Schäfer, *Geniza-Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, TSAJ 6 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1984).

⁵¹ Peter Schäfer, *Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literatur*, TSAJ 17,22,29,46 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1995).

⁵² James R. Davila, *Hekhalot Literature in Translation: Major Texts of Merkavah Mysticism*, JJTPSupp 20:1 (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

⁵³ Boustán, "The Study of Heikhalot Literature," 130, 134.

⁵⁴ From Peter Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism* (trans. A. Pomerance; Albany, NY: State University of New York Press), 6, n. 14.

The renewed analysis of the Hekhalot literature that has emerged from these important publications has been shaped further by conversations about the mutuality of Jewish, Christian and “other” traditions in late antiquity and by the disruption of the “parting of the ways model,” which have opened space for reflection on the influence of Neoplatonic and Gnostic thought on the development of the Hekhalot writings; it has also involved serious reflection on developments in the rabbinic culture through the medieval period and how these may have been shaped at local levels, factors that bear on the redactional developments visible within the Hekhalot texts themselves.⁵⁵ Given our discussion of cultural heterogeneity in Chapter 1, and my judicious use of Deleuze and Guattari’s image of the rhizome, Boustan’s comments are particularly noteworthy:

Heterogeneity in both literary form and religious sensibility is a constitutive feature of all Heikhalot compositions.⁵⁶

This bears in a particular way on the study of the so-called 3 Enoch, which is really a macroform identifiable within the various manuscripts of the Hekhalot literature (§§1–80 according to the divisions in Schäfer’s edition). The title⁵⁷ is notoriously problematic⁵⁸ in its isolation of the work from the Hekhalot manuscripts in which it is embedded and its ignoring of the actual title found in these (Sefer Hekhalot), its relocating of the macroform to the scholarly construction of a coherent Enoch tradition (or even compendium),⁵⁹ and in its re-identification of the work’s central visionary figure, who is properly Rabbi Ishmael and not Enoch. It is so routinely used, however, that it is difficult to avoid employing the designation here. Certainly, the work is resourced by the complex Enoch traditions that

⁵⁵ As illustrative of both points of sensitivity, see Annette Yoshiko Reed, “From Asael and Šemihazah to Uzzah, Azzah, and Azael: 3 Enoch 5 (§§7–8) and Jewish Reception-History of 1 Enoch,” *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 8 (2001): 105–36.

⁵⁶ Boustan, “The Study of Heikhalot Literature,” 131.

⁵⁷ The title “3 Enoch” was first used by Hugo Odeberg, *3 Enoch, or the Hebrew Book of Enoch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928) and intentionally labelled the work in relation to the recently published anthologies of pseudepigrapha (which included 1 Enoch and 2 Enoch).

⁵⁸ See Annette Yoshiko Reed, “Categorization, Collection, and the Construction of Continuity: 1 Enoch and 3 Enoch in and beyond ‘Apocalypticism’ and ‘Mysticism’” *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 29 (2017): 268–311, esp. 271. See also Reed, “From Asael and Šemihazah,” 105, n. 2 for further relevant bibliography concerned with the problem of the Western scholarly title.

⁵⁹ By this, I mean the new thing that is effectively reified by pseudepigrapha anthologies that publish the various works as 1 Enoch, 2 Enoch and 3 Enoch. See Reed, “Categorization, Collection and the Construction of Continuity,” 275.

are widely encountered in the late antique and medieval periods (the use of plurals in this sentence should not be overlooked), but such elements contribute only some of the materials found in the work. Further, even in relation to rest of the Hekhalot literature, this macroform is generally considered to be rather late, representing variously across its different iterations the complicated developments that characterize the corpus.

In the context of the present study, these observations have a particular value that redefines the significance of this sub-section of my argument. In my preliminary article, the comparative treatment of “3 Enoch” with 2 Enoch and the Parables was intended simply to highlight some points of common distinction from the Aramaic Enoch literature preserved at Qumran and, at the same time, to highlight the extent to which 3 Enoch was marked by its own particular developments and interests. Together, these observations were intended to highlight the distinctive similarities of the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch, when compared to the wider extant traditions. This element of significance remains, but now the comparison *also* invites reflection on how the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch might have functioned within the complex heterogeneity that may have played a role in the emergence of this macroform. This extended quotation concerning 3 Enoch from Annette Yoshiko Reed sets up this reflection nicely:

It is even possible that the textual formation of this work may have been marked by varied and multiple contacts with earlier Enochic traditions in different forms and channels. Just as its form seems to remain fluid, so this fluidity may to have enabled different types of contact and continuity with the Book of the Watchers and other earlier Enochic texts and traditions—as perhaps accruing in the course of its movement through different locales. Some parallels simply seem to reflect the widespread diffusion of ideas from the Book of the Watchers across the Mediterranean and the Near East, while others seem to point to the vibrant afterlives of Second Temple Jewish traditions about Enoch, angels, and demons especially in “magical” and other transcreedal contexts in Sassanian Babylonia; still others hint at more direct literary connections, perhaps even including the “back-borrowing” of some of the extracted materials from 1 Enoch preserved by Byzantine Christian chronographers.⁶⁰

⁶⁰ Reed, “Categorization, Collection and the Construction of Continuity,” 287.

Without considering the present study to have any terminal or decisive significance for the kinds of questions that Reed and others are asking of 3 Enoch, my interest in locating 2 Enoch more rhizomatically in the context of late antiquity (and tentatively in Syria or Sasanian Babylonia) might provide fresh resources to the discussion. The connections between 2 Enoch and the Hekhalot literature that have been explored by others, most extensively by Andrei Orlov,⁶¹ might then be reframed.

This important preamble to the study of 3 Enoch/Sefer Hekhalot will be relevant not only to the discussion that follows in this chapter, but also to other points in this monograph where I consider points of contact with the work (notably Chapter 7) and to my concluding synthesis (Chapter 10). While all too brief, it establishes the key points that need to frame the comparative analysis that follows. The actual quotations from the work will continue to make use of Philip Alexander's translation, which still serves as the reference translation in English for many, though I will supplement this with details from Schäfer's edition (particularly the synopsis section numbering) to facilitate robust evaluation of the complex textual evidence.

In 3 Enoch/Sefer Hekhalot, Enoch himself, in his exalted state as Metatron, is put in charge of all the heavenly treasuries and storehouses (10:6, §13 and 48c:3, §72);⁶² it is not specified at either point that these contain the meteorological elements, though elsewhere in the vision (37:2, §55) Enoch speaks of treasuries of lightning and storehouses of storms, arranged in circles that are positioned relative to other circles containing meteorological phenomena (hurricane blasts and winds):

between one tongue and another is a circle of treasuries of lightning (אוצרי ברקים); behind the treasuries of lightning is a circle of hurricane blasts; behind the hurricane blasts is a circle of storehouses of storm (גנוי סערה); behind the storehouses of storm is a circle of winds, thunderclaps, thunders, and sparks; behind the sparks is a circle of tremors.⁶³

⁶¹ For bibliography, see Chapter 2.

⁶² See Philip Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," in James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Volume 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (New York: Doubleday, 1983), 264, 311. Cf. Peter Schäfer, *Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literature I: §§1–80*, TSAJ 46 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 33 and 166. For the synoptic text, see Schäfer, *Synopse* 8–9 and 36–37.

⁶³ Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," 290. Cf. Schäfer, *Übersetzung I*, 125; Schäfer, *Synopse* 26–27.

It is interesting that the text does not simply repeat the biblical term אִיצַר, but now also uses גִּנֵּן. This is somewhat similar to what we saw in the Slavonic material, where two words are used with equivalent force. Similarly, the association of these terms with Enoch's learning of the heavenly and creational secrets (see, especially 3 Enoch 11, §14 and 48c, §72) parallels what we see in the Parables and 2 Enoch.

In certain regards, however, the material in 3 Enoch is much more radically interested in celestial hierarchies than anything we saw in the Parables of Enoch and in 2 Enoch. Like these books, 3 Enoch is interested in the involvement of the angels in the oversight of the storehouses and the management of the meteorological processes. Here, however, that interest has developed to the point where each of the angels is named in relation to their area of responsibility, as reflected in §18 (3 Enoch 14:4).

Gabriel the angel of fire

Baradi'el, the angel of hail;

Ruḥi'el, who is in charge of wind;

Baraqi'el, who is in charge of lightning;

*Et cetera ...*⁶⁴

This would appear to reflect a much more developed angelological scheme than that seen in the Parables and in 2 Enoch. The interest in the celestial hierarchy might reflect the developing interest in such schemata visible from late antiquity onwards, through the influence of the corpus associated with Pseudo-Dionysius, but the preoccupation with names may be more reflective of the widespread interest in “magic.”⁶⁵ Even this interest, however, is made to serve the developed account of the awesomeness of the divine throne and the elevated status of Enoch. The angels named in chapter 14 react fearfully to Enoch, as Metatron, who becomes the keyholder and manager of the various stores, thus taking the role played by the angels themselves in the Parables and in 2 Enoch. The Hekhalot literature, moreover, seems much more concerned to indicate Metatron's detailed and exclusive knowledge of the content of

⁶⁴ Alexander, 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 267. Cf Schäfer, *Übersetzung I*, 41; Schäfer, *Synopse* 10–11.

⁶⁵ Cf. the comments made more generally about the work by Reed, “Categorization, Collection and the Construction of Continuity,” 287.

the storehouses than to explain the regulation of the weather. In the Oxford Bodleian Manuscript 2257/4, an excerpt from Ma'aseh Merkavah 3 (§546) is incorporated into the macroform of 3 Enoch (the appendix 22b in Alexander's translation), apparently to communicate something of this thoroughgoing knowledge:

³How many bridges are there? How many rivers of fire? How many rivers of hail?

⁴How many treasuries of snow? How many wheels of fire? How many ministering angels? There are 12,000 myriads of bridges, six above and six below; 12,000 myriads of rivers of fire, six above and six below; 12,000 treasuries of snow, six above and six below; 24,000 myriads of wheels of fire, twelve above and twelve below, surrounding the bridges, the rivers of fire, the rivers of hail, the treasuries of snow, and the ministering angels.⁶⁶

Interestingly, too, the lengthy passage that describes the winds (3 Enoch 23, §35)⁶⁷ does not make use of the metrological imagery that I noted to be significant in the Parables; rather, it brings together an array of biblical texts that speak of the winds and combines their imagery. In fact, there is only one point in 3 Enoch where scales/balance imagery is used, in 18:20 (§27).

Why is his name called Šoqedhozi? Because he weighs men's merits in scales in the presence of the Holy One, blessed be he.⁶⁸

So, while there appears to be more entanglement with the content of Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch than is seen in the biblical material or even in b.Ḥagigah, then, there are also some telling differences. 3 Enoch appears to be radically more developed in its angelological scheme and in its concern with the distinctive status of Enoch. It also shows less interest in the meteorological processes themselves, which occur only in relation to these schematic concerns.

⁶⁶ Alexander, 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," 304–5.

⁶⁷ Alexander, 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," 307–8. Cf. Schäfer, *Übersetzung I*, 87–93.

⁶⁸ Alexander, 3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," 273. Cf. Schäfer, *Übersetzung I*, 66.

6. Parallels in other “Pseudepigrapha”

When we turn to consider other pseudepigraphical texts, many of which are of uncertain dating and provenance, we find a number of rather general similarities that are, nevertheless, important to catalogue, as well as some more suggestive points of parallel.

In 2 Baruch, which has come to us in Syriac, there is a brief mention of the “treasuries of the light,” listed among the range of secrets revealed to Moses by God. The proximity to the language of revealed secrets is particularly interesting given the programmatic significance of such language to both the Parables and 2 Enoch, which is the central topic of the next chapter. I note here that the term “secrets” has a rather comprehensive significance in 2 Baruch that includes providential and cosmological realities, as much as eschatological ones:

Only you know the length of the generations,
and you do not reveal your secrets to many.
You make known the multitude of the fire,
and you weigh the lightness of the wind (2 Baruch 48:3–4)⁶⁹

Here, then, the “secrets” cover both providence, with a certain eschatological orientation associated with “the generations,” and cosmology. When the language recurs in 54:5, it again blends eschatology with providence: the secrets of God’s plans and of his mighty works are revealed to spotless ones who are faithful to the Law, while others remain in darkness. It is especially noteworthy, then, that when Moses is taken into heaven by God, he learns of:

...the multitude of the angels which cannot be counted, the powers of the flame, the splendor of lightnings, the voice of the thunders, the orders of the archangels, the treasuries of the light, the changes of the times ... (2 Baruch 59:11).⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Translation, A.F.J. Klijn, “2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch,” in Charlesworth, *OTP* 1, 635.

⁷⁰ Translation, A.F.J. Klijn, “2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch,” in Charlesworth, *OTP* 1, 642.

It is also noteworthy that the listing of this treasury occurs directly after that of “the orders of the archangels,” and immediately before “the changes of the times.” Although the possible connection of these within the kind of schema that we saw in the Enochic texts is not developed, it may be suggestive of an original context in which these things were associated with each other, or within which traditions existed that linked specific angels to the treasuries of light and to their operation within the calendar. Elsewhere in the book, we find the traditional biblical imagery of treasuries for the rain (10:11) and also the image of a treasury containing righteous deeds for the godly.

4 Ezra also contains a reference to “treasuries of light,” (6:40), contained in an expanded description of the divine command in Genesis 3. This reflects a wider concern within that book to assert God’s sovereignty over creation, and hence the demands of a singular devotion to Israel’s God. Importantly, however, while this reference contributes to the growing postbiblical tradition of treasuries that contain light, it has no programmatic or structural significance. Another interesting parallel to the Enochic material is found in 5:37, which speaks of the “closed chambers” in which the winds are stored; the expression is similar to the one found in Parables of Enoch 41:3. It may be important to note that while 4 Ezra also shares the language of “secrets” with 2 Baruch, it uses this language with a narrower significance: the secrets revealed are eschatological, not cosmological or providential.

Testament of Levi 3:2 is often noted as a parallel text to those in the Enochic corpus that speak of storehouses for the elements. While neither “storehouse” nor “treasury” is used, the text describes the heavens that Levi has seen, the lowest of which “contains fire, snow, and ice, ready for the day determined by God’s righteous judgment.” One striking feature of this text (which is not paralleled in the Aramaic Levi Document) is that these elements are represented as substances of punishment. The parallel with the Enoch texts, which are interested in the elements as they contribute to meteorological phenomena and not only as they function in the eschatological judgement, is actually quite limited. If anything, there is a closer parallel to b.Ḥagigah 12b, although this is also limited, since the elements listed do not entirely correspond.

A limited correspondence can also be noted in Pseudo-Philo 32:7, and its description of God’s appearing at Sinai (Exodus 19&20).

And then when the world's foundation was moved, the heavenly hosts speeded the lightnings on their courses, and the winds brought forth noise from their chambers, and the earth was shaken from its firmament, and the mountains and cliffs trembled in their joints, and the clouds lifted up their floods against the flame of fire so that it would not burn up the world.⁷¹

The text is of particular interest because it combines the traditional biblical concept of storehouses (here, “chambers”) for the wind with a particular way of describing the lightning as being governed by the heavenly hosts. Whether the hosts in question are angels or stars, the description moves beyond the biblical description in Exodus 19:16/20:18, in ways that seem to assume an involvement of the heavenly hosts with the activity of lightning.

Finally, and most interestingly, I note a set of correspondences with a prayer recounted in the Apostolic Constitutions 8.12.6–27. Here, in line with the original form in which this section of my research was published, my discussion is limited to noting some of the points of correspondence in the meteorological imagery. In Chapter 6, I will explore the further points of connection with creation imagery and the representation of Wisdom that I merely note below.

The Apostolic Constitutions is a work generally considered to have been composed in Syria, in the late 4th century, although it presents itself pseudepigraphically as the handiwork of the twelve apostles. The work shows complex dependency on the Didascalia Apostolorum (from which the apostolic pseudepigraphy is drawn) and on the Didache; the dependency of several parts of the Apostolic Constitutions on Jewish synagogue prayers has also long been claimed, based on some similarities with the prayer traditions in rabbinic writings.⁷² I will consider these in greater depth in

⁷¹ Translation, Daniel J. Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo: A New Translation and Introduction,” in James H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Volume 2: Expansions of the “Old Testament” and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works* (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 346.

⁷² For a further discussion, and strong arguments in favour of seeing the text as drawing upon Jewish prayers, see David Fiensy, “Redaction History and the Apostolic Constitutions,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 72 (1982): 293–302. Fiensy’s fuller study should also be consulted, however, and it is important to stress that what he would eventually regard as traceable to synagogue prayers is considerably less extensive than the text published in Charlesworth’s *OTP*. See David Fiensy, *Prayers Alleged to be Jewish: An Examination of the Constitutiones Apostolorum*, *Brown Judaic Studies* 65 (Chico: Scholars Press, 1985).

Chapter 5, in relation to the complicated portrayal of “Wisdom.” The verses I consider here are, indeed, categorized in the Charlesworth *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* as a Hellenistic Synagogal Prayer, albeit one now containing many Christian interpolations. Whether the work is indeed of Jewish origin—and the methodological issues around such identifications in that volume are notorious—the parallel with *The Parables of Enoch* and *2 Enoch* is interesting, perhaps even more so when we allow the term “Jewish” the capacity to label particular forms of Christianity that were vibrant in Syria in late antiquity.

Apostolic Constitutions 8.12.19 is the first of the points where we encounter some interesting points of equivalence to the meteorological imagery in *2 Enoch* and *The Parables of Enoch*.

For you are the one ... who brought light out of the treasuries, and at the contraction of this (light), the one who brought the darkness for rest for the living creatures moving about in the world;⁷³

On one level, this may simply add to the body of texts that we have noted to use the language of “treasuries” in relation to the storage of light. The wider context, however, contains some further suggestive similarities:

For you filled your world, and divided and arranged it ...
 with cycles of years.
 with numbers of months and days;
 with arrangements of customs;
 with courses of rain-producing clouds, for the generation of fruits, and the care of living creatures;
 (and with) a balance of winds,
 blowing when they are ordered by you. (Apos. Con. 8.12.15).⁷⁴

⁷³ Translation, D.R. Darnell, “Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers,” in Charlesworth, *OTP* 2, 691.

⁷⁴ Translation, D.R. Darnell, “Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers,” in Charlesworth, *OTP* 2, 691–92.

The language here is suggestive of the interest in the cycles of the luminaries that is seen in the Enochic material. This, of course, is hardly a parallel specific to the Parables or 2 Enoch, and there is inadequate detail to see this as having any kind of polemical force that would be indicative of specific calendrical commitments. The fact that it is closely followed by a reference to the “balance” of the winds, though, is interesting. It is not identical to the metrological imagery used in the Parables and in 2 Enoch, but does represent something that we have really only seen to be found in those works: the use of metrological imagery in relation to meteorological processes.

Although it is not part of the substance of my concern in this chapter, I note also that there are some interesting similarities in subsequent account of the creation of man (Apos. Con. 8.12:16–17) to the one found in 2 Enoch, with some interesting points of particular equivalence to the long recension. Both associate the creation of the human with the activity of Wisdom, also represented as the object of divine address, and both represent man as a microcosm, at least if the additional material of the long recension is admitted.⁷⁵ The interest in Wisdom is, of course, a widely found idea in ancient Christian literature and a prominent element in Patristic thought, but the fact that it coincides so closely with the imagery discussed above suggests that a more extensive comparison of these texts with the Apostolic Constitutions, tracing these other points of common detail, would be beneficial. I will undertake such a comparison in Chapter 6.

Concluding Synthesis

In this final section, then, I turn to an evaluation of the evidence that has been considered throughout, offering a set of conclusions and some suggestions that will be developed further in the later chapters of this book.

First, the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch are distinctive in their development of an extended scheme within which the imagery of the storehouse functions as the governing device within accounts of meteorology. While the imagery is widely found in the biblical material and in postbiblical texts, these

⁷⁵ For an extended discussion of this, see Christfried Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos: Eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1995).

texts are distinctive in developing it in an extended way, with the imagery of the storehouse and/or treasury governing the account. Most texts use the storehouse/treasury image as part of a wider range of images associated with the meteorological elements or, in the postbiblical literature, with light and luminaries. Even those texts that do contain more extended accounts of the places in which the meteorological elements or luminaries are contained, such as the Rule of the Community, do not use the storehouse as the principal image, but include it within a wider list of heavenly places. The closest parallels are found in bḤagigah 12b and 3 Enoch 37 (§55), which is undoubtedly significant, but both are marked by a number of differences. In the case of bḤagigah 12b, the storehouses are associated with elements reserved for eschatological punishment—there is no interest in meteorology, as such—and in the case of 3 Enoch 37/§55, the real interest is in the divine throne. 3 Enoch 48c/§72, which refers in a broader way to the storehouses, is also uninterested in meteorology itself; it is more clearly driven by a concern to show Metatron's position of delegated authority over the angels.

Second, both the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch use the imagery of the balance/scales in relation to meteorological phenomena, with this use of the imagery structurally interwoven with its traditional deployment in relation to justice and judgement. A limited parallel to this can be traced in the use of measure-imagery in 4QInstruction, which also links creational ordering and providence to God's judgement and the moral life of those to whom the *raz nihyeh* has been revealed. 4QInstruction, however, does not contain anything that corresponds to the image of a meteorological balance. Apostolic Constitutions 8.12.6–27 is the one other text that includes such a picture and that develops it in conjunction with the imagery of the storehouse. Its correspondence with Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch is far from perfect: the elements associated with both the balance and the storehouse are different in the three texts. Nevertheless, the similar pattern of combination must be considered significant, and that significance would grow if the other points of similarity noted above are sustained through more careful and extensive comparative work.

Third, both the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch link the imagery of the storehouses and that of the balance to the activity of angelic figures who are responsible for the oversight and management of the meteorological elements. This sets these works apart from the biblical texts, which represent the management of the elements as something done by God himself. A similar interest in the angelic custodians is seen in Sefer Hekhalot (the so-called 3 Enoch), but the imagery in that text appears to

reflect a much more developed account, with the angels responsible for each element named. In addition, *Sefer Hekhalot* systematically shifts the roles of management and oversight onto Enoch himself, as Metatron. This suggests that while there are, indeed, real connections between this work and *both* the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch, *Sefer Hekhalot* is representative of a later tradition that has developed with a further set of preoccupations. The Syriac Baruch, meanwhile, might represent a fairly broad paralleling of this cluster of associations, though not one that appears to require any kind of literary dependency.

Fourth, even between the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch, the parallels are close, but are not of a kind that suggest direct literary dependency of one work upon the other. The distribution of the language and imagery is different in the two works, and although there are quite striking similarities, the correspondence is not of a word-for-word kind, even allowing for the kinds of changes that might have been introduced through translation into different language families. Rather, the similarities are of a kind that suggest a particular entanglement of traditions, within which certain tropes had a measure of popularity. We might note, however, that this traditional relationship still appears to be closer than that which VanderKam considers to exist between the Parables of Enoch and the *Astronomical Book*. That is, within a broader common tradition of heavenly ascent and the revealing of cosmological secrets, the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch appear to be connected within a closer sub-tradition. Differently from the Parables, 2 Enoch does contain a calendrical schema that appears to be somewhat dependent on the one found in the *Astronomical Book*, but the key word here is “somewhat”: the schema is notoriously messy in the manuscripts and is undoubtedly hybridised with other traditions about the heavenly bodies drawn from outside of Judaism. We should be careful, then, of using the calendrical imagery in 2 Enoch to suggest a closer relationship to the *Astronomical Book* than to the Parables. Nevertheless, we can begin to see how our study of this imagery allows us to engage in some “triangulation” of the Parables of Enoch, 2 Enoch, and the Aramaic Enochic literature to which we have witnesses among the Qumran finds.

This leads me to offer a preliminary suggestion concerning the routes of transmission and entanglement that may have played a generative role in the life of the two works now preserved exclusively in Ethiopic and Slavonic, respectively. The similarity that we have noted between the sub-tradition that they appear to represent and the *Apostolic Constitutions* is particularly interesting

because the latter work is widely believed to have originated in Syria.⁷⁶ There might be a number of explanations for the similarity, but it is not the only potential link to Syria that might need to be factored into the discussion. I have also noticed, of course, the broad parallel in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch. More importantly, the Parables of Enoch has a demonstrably close connection to some of the imagery in Matthew's Gospel, which is widely held to have been composed in Syrian Antioch; most notable of these is the representation of the Son of Man seated on the throne of his glory.⁷⁷ There are also some similarities between the extended use of the beatitude form in Matthew's Gospel and in 2 Enoch. Once these observations are brought together, they suggest that Syria may be an important part of the picture.

Clearly, more needs to be done to evaluate this possibility—all that I have done here is to identify a small number of limited parallels—but it may have powerful explanatory value in relation to the emergence and vitality of the works in question, the traditions that they may have channelled, or the traces they may have left. The mutual influence of Christian and Jewish traditions in the area is well-known and the role played by the Syrian church in shaping the wider culture of the Greek-speaking early Christian world is significant. To this point, the question of how a Syrian context of origin or transmission may have affected the traditions preserved in the Parables of Enoch or 2 Enoch has not yet received much attention. My suggestion is that a more detailed comparison of these two texts with works of Syrian provenance might highlight other points of contact and open new pathways for reflection on the origin and development of these challenging works. The following chapters will offer further support for this and, more importantly, will highlight the generative implications of framing the works—especially 2 Enoch—in a Syrian context, and reading them in relation to the cultures of late antiquity.

⁷⁶ See Fiensy, "Redaction History and the Apostolic Constitutions," 293. See also G. Rouwhorst, "Jewish Liturgical Traditions in Early Syriac Christianity," *Vigiliae Christianae* 51 (1997): 72-93.

⁷⁷ See Grant Macaskill, "Matthew and the Parables of Enoch," in Darrell L. Bock and James H. Charlesworth, *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 218-30.

Chapter 5. God, Enoch and the Secrets: Theology, Cosmology, Cosmogony, Eschatology

Introduction

The motif of disclosure or revelation is central to the broad genre of apocalyptic, where it is often developed through “stock” imagery such as heavenly books and explaining angels.¹ While the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch share much of this with other exemplars of the genre, it is also striking that the word “secrets” occurs with a particular frequency and with a governing conceptual significance in these two works. The Parables of Enoch uses the word widely of the truths disclosed to and through Enoch and, crucially, deploys the motif of a revealed secret to distinguish the chosen righteous and the sinners: it is to the former that the the Son of Man, who has himself been hidden in secret, will be revealed. For its part, 2 Enoch uses the word in its very title (though in ways rendered inconsistently across the manuscripts): the work is typically named with some variant of “The Book of the Secrets of Enoch.” The frequency or force with which the word “secrets” is used in these two books sets them apart from the other early Enoch literature and, indeed, from other pseudepigrapha. At same time as it distinguishes these books from other early pseudepigrapha, it constitutes a significant parallel with Sefer Hekhalot/3 Enoch, taking further the connections that that I began to explore in Chapter 4 but also necessitating reflection on the divergences.

As significant as the programmatic importance that is associated with the word “secrets” is the range of revelatory content to which the word is attached, which includes theological, cosmological and cosmogonic truths as much as eschatological ones, and—as just noted—the very identity of Enoch or

¹ The emphasis on disclosure is common to all of the main definitions of “apocalypse” and “apocalyptic,” though the details of the categories, how they are analyzed and what they are taken to signify vary widely. Although the literature is massive, see particularly the classic studies by Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1982), which places less emphasis on the eschatological aspect of apocalyptic and more on the revelatory and spatial, and John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (New York: Crossroad, 1984; 2nd Edition, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998). The latter incorporates Collins’s classic definition from his contribution to *Semeia* 14, which is positioned as an essentialist alternative to Klaus Koch’s approach, which compiled a list of stock themes and elements and saw the genre as represented by works containing many but not all of these. Koch’s key study was *Ratlos vor der Apokalypik : eine Streitschrift über ein vernachlässigtes Gebiet der Bibebwissenschaft und die schädlichen Auswirkungen auf Theologie und Philosophie* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1970), published in English with the rather less humble title, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy* (London: SCM Press, 1972).

the Son of Man. The embracive quality of the revealed secrets demands some serious reflection on the representation of the relationship between God and the cosmos, between what we might call theology proper and economy, and on the depiction of Enoch within this. As I noted in the reviews of scholarship in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3, this has been a major point of neglect in work on the Parables of Enoch and has also been somewhat lacking in work on 2 Enoch. Attention to these elements and how they affect the representation of Wisdom as an agent (which I will consider in detail in Chapter 6) casts light on the developments within the Enoch literature represented by the Parables and 2 Enoch and then, distinctively, in *Sefer Hekhalot*. Obviously, such elements invite comparison with the way that the language of the *raz*, and especially the *raz nihyeh*, is used at Qumran and noting both the similarities and the differences will be instructive for our task in this chapter and in Chapter 6.

The Distribution of “Secrets” in the Parables of Enoch and 1 Enoch

Before considering in detail any of the occurrences of the word “secrets,” it is helpful to consider the words that are used and to build even an impressionistic picture of their occurrence. In the Ethiopic of 1 Enoch, the word used of “secrets” is ገቡአት *həbuʿat*. Outside of the Parables, the word occurs twice in the Book of the Watchers, in 9:6 and 10:7, where it refers specifically to what the angelic watchers have revealed to humans, thereby transgressing the propriety of heaven and earth. Elsewhere, in the Epistle of Enoch, there is also a passing reference to Enoch’s recounting of his vision to Methuselah being done “in secret” (107:3) before an occurrence of the word in the very last line of the Epistle that is preserved with variation in some manuscripts: “So ends the vision of the secrets of Enoch” (108:15).² The conflicting attestation suggests that this occurrence is probably a result of redaction. So, the vocabulary of secrets and secrecy occurs at important but rare points in the primary Enoch literature, with mainly negative associations, and with one obviously positive occurrence (108:15) likely to be secondary. In addition to this, there is a distinct vocabulary for “mystery” and “mysteries,” to which I will return later.³

² This form is represented in BM 491 (BL Or. 491); BM 485 (BL Or. 485) and Berlin Orient II.29 have “secret vision.”

³ The singular “mystery” occurs in the Animal Apocalypse, in 89:1, where it refers to a salvific revelation, that made to Noah. Interestingly, the word *meštir* is a loanword from Greek. For further examples, see below.

By contrast, as Nickelsburg and VanderKam note, the “noun or adjective translated ‘hidden (things)’ or ‘secrets’ occurs in the Parables forty-seven times, at least thirty-two of them in the more original parts of the book.”⁴ The precise number of occurrences is subject to some variance across the manuscripts, but the impression that the word has an extensive and, crucially, *governing* conceptual importance distinctive to the Parables remains strong. As we saw to be the case with the imagery of storehouses and measures discussed in Chapter 4, this is not merely incidental detail, but is programmatic, shaping how other elements of the account are rendered and developed. Some of the occurrences (65:6, 69:9,16) maintain the pejorative usage of the word encountered in the Book of the Watchers, designating the truths that the angels should not have disclosed; interestingly, these uses of the word are found in particular passages that are often categorized as Noachic interpolations into the Parables.⁵ The largest proportion of the occurrences, however, use the word more positively, of the sacred and redemptive knowledge revealed to and through Enoch, particularly about cosmology and eschatology. Some of these are coordinated in ways that appear to be structurally or strategically significant, coordinated with the “hiddenness” of the Son of Man.

The repeated use of the word “secrets” in 1 Enoch 41 illustrates the linkage of cosmology and eschatology in the secrets that Enoch learns:

41:1. After this, I saw all the secrets of heaven,
 How the kingdom is divided,
 And how human deeds are weighed in the balance⁶

⁴ George W.E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of Enoch, Chapters 37–71*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011), 41. For context on the reference to “more original” parts, see the discussion of “composition history” in Chapter 2 of the present study.

⁵ 65:6 (cf. 65:11, which mentions the angels’ revealing of hidden things); possibly also 68:2. The occurrences of the words are embedded in extended descriptions of the angels’ reprehensible disclosure of heavenly secrets. For a recent discussion of the arguments for the interpolated character of this material, see Vered Hillel, “A Reconsideration of Charles’ Designated ‘Noah Interpolations’ in 1 Enoch 54:1–55:1; 60; 65:1–19:25,” in *Noah and his Book(s)*, ed. Michael Stone, Aryeh Amihay, and Vered Hillel, SBLEJL 28 (Atlanta: SBL, 2010), 41–44.

⁶ Transl. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 136. The ellipsis that separates this quotation from the next represents 41:2, which describes Enoch’s seeing of the dwelling places of the chosen and of the sinners, but it also represents a more extensive break in the reconstruction of the text by Nickelsburg and VanderKam, who reorder the material in these chapters significantly. Their ordering of the material lists 41:1–2, 9 followed by 42:1–3 (the account of Wisdom’s descent that I discuss in the next chapter), followed by 41:3–8 and 43 ff. To avoid becoming lost in the detail of arguments for redactional ordering, which I find uninteresting, I would simply note that the eventual placement of the material in the actual manuscript witnesses reflects the thematic association of these verses and the extensive structuring significance

...

41:3. And there my eyes saw the secrets of the lightnings and the thunder,
 And the secrets of the winds, how they are divided to blow upon the earth,
 And the secrets of the clouds and the dew.⁷

This is a passage that I have considered already in Chapter 4, in relation to the similarity of metrological and meteorological imagery encountered in the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch. For the purposes of the present chapter, there are two points to note. First, the motif of secrets learned by Enoch governs this portion of the text; it is not an incidental detail, one among several, but is *the* major concern here developed. Second, the secrets are both eschatological and cosmological (specifically, meteorological) in character. In the verses that follow, the imagery of heavenly storehouses is developed, also in ways that seem to govern the detail of the descriptions; Jonathan Ben-Dov goes as far to suggest that the words “storehouses” and “secrets” become nearly equivalent in meaning.⁸ As noted in Chapter 4: we might infer further that since both eschatological and cosmological details are categorized as “secrets” that they are considered to be unified, or that they are “of a species.”⁹

There are a number of points in the Parables where similar language is used of Enoch’s knowledge. In 59:2, he describes seeing the secrets of the thunder; immediately before this, he speaks of his eyes seeing the “mysteries” (from 𐤎𐤓𐤌𐤓, *mestir*) of the lightning and the lights and their judgments. This might suggest that “secrets” and “mysteries” are essentially equivalent, a point that I will discuss further below, but here they are associated with different components of the heavenly lights and of a lightening blast: “mystery” is associated with the visual phenomenon and “secrets” with the auditory one (though

of the motif of the secrets. The principal “difficulty” in view for Nickelsburg and VanderKam is that of where 42:1–3 should be placed and how these verses, wherever they are placed, seem inevitably to disrupt the flow of material about secrets.

⁷ Transl. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 142.

⁸ Jonathan Ben-Dov, “Exegetical Notes on Cosmology in the Parables of Enoch,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 143–50.

⁹ This observation parallels some of the core points on the integration of eschatological, creational and ethical elements in ancient Jewish and Christian texts that I discuss also in my *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, JSJSupp 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2007). There, I discuss the issues particularly in relation to the trope of the revealing of wisdom to a particular category of people through a revealer figure, and how it is connected to both external and internal (i.e., constitutional or noetic) factors, but the alignment itself is much more widely discussed in scholarship. See, for example, Matthew Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*, STDJ 50 (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

cf. 41:3, where “secrets” is used of both). More significantly, what Enoch learns is how they can function as either blessing or curse and how these possibilities are to be distinguished. That is, Enoch learns how to read “providence” in relation to immanent divine judgement; he learns how to interpret meteorological signs as disclosures of divine will:

They flash for a blessing or for a curse, as the Lord of Spirits wills (59:1)

...

He showed me the sound of the thunder for peace and blessing or for a curse, according to the word of the Lord of Spirits (59:3)¹⁰

The motif of the secrets occurs again in 1 Enoch 61, where it is now connected in interesting ways to imagery of measurement. Enoch sees long cords given to the angels, who fly to the north, “in order that they may measure.” The imagery probably draws upon Zechariah 2:1–5 and Ezekiel 40:3,¹¹ in both of which the prophet sees a man with a measuring line in his hand, who measures the scale of Jerusalem. These parallels may suggest that the measurements particularly constitute the dimensions of the place of residing for the righteous, but the language presses the imagery more extensively towards the soteriological or paraenetic significance of these measurements:

These will bring the measurements of the righteous,

And the ropes of the righteous to the righteous,

So that they may rely on the name of the Lord of Spirits forever and ever.

And the chosen will begin to dwell with the chosen,

And these are the measurements that will be given to faith,

And they will strengthen righteousness.¹²

¹⁰ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 224.

¹¹ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 243.

¹² Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 243.

The measurements that strengthen faith, however, also include disclosures of “all the secrets of the depths of the earth.” Here, the language of secrets initially appears to be used of knowledge about the hidden things of creation, the things beneath the surface, but the statement is developed with particular reference to those who have been destroyed and devoured, by the desert, by beasts, by fish. These ones will return on the day of the Chosen One, “for no-one will be destroyed in the presence of the Lord of Spirits” (61:5).¹³

Interestingly, while Enoch sees the angels who take these measurements, and therefore is involved in the chain of revelation, his role as mediator of these secrets is less explicit than is the case with the cosmological secrets. The measurements are shared with the righteous and chosen ones and while Enoch’s role in their transmission may be implied, it is not emphasized in the same way that it has been in relation to meteorology.

This reflects the identification of the righteous *as a collective* as the custodians of the revealed secrets. Later in chapter 61, they will be represented in terms similar to those used of Enoch:

And all of his deeds and all of his mighty acts, as many as he has done, he has revealed to the righteous and the chosen in the name of the Lord of Spirits (61:13)¹⁴

It is important to note, however, that this communication of the secrets to the righteous follows the enthronement of the Chosen One upon the throne of glory, where he passes judgment on the holy ones in the heights of heaven, and on “their secret ways” (ፍኖቶሙ : እንተ : ኅቡአት ; *fənotomu ’ənəta ḥəbu’āt* 61:9). So, corresponding to the glorification of the righteous through their participation in the glory of the Chosen One, knowledge of the deeds of God and the measurements of the righteous are represented as a participation in the secret knowledge of the Son of Man who is (on some readings of 71:14 at least)¹⁵ identified with Enoch, the one who has seen God’s secrets.

Indeed, the disclosure of the Son of Man is itself represented as the revealing of a secret in 1 Enoch 48:6–7 and 62:7. The latter reads:

¹³ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 243.

¹⁴ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 247.

¹⁵ See the discussion of this point in Chapter 2 and in Chapter 7 of the present volume.

For from the beginning the Son of Man was hidden,
and the Most High preserved him in the presence of his might,
and he revealed him to the chosen.¹⁶

This parallels the imagery in 48:6–7, in which the Son of Man is chosen and hidden before the creation of the world but revealed to the chosen and righteous. In fact, there are a number of parallels in the wider passages in which the respective verses occur, contained within the broad scenario of the enthronement of the Chosen One and the inauguration of eschatological reversal. One thread within this is characterized particularly by the imagery of wisdom, and the spirit by which—or by whom—it dwells within the Chosen One (see, especially, 49:3–4) and his people (61:11, which largely replicates the former). This is most obviously resourced by the imagery of Isaiah 42, one of the Servant passages that is widely acknowledged to shape the representation of the Chosen One in the Parables,¹⁷ but it also evokes the wider representation of Wisdom as an agent encountered within the book. I will discuss this further in Chapter 6, but I here note that the same imagery (and the same cluster of underlying textual resources) used of the Chosen One in chapter 48 is recapitulated in chapters 61 and 62, but now applied to the collective of “the chosen.”¹⁸

This solidarity between the Chosen and the chosen is linked to the revealing of the former, as the one who has been hidden. The verbal form $\text{ḥ}ab'a$, (*ḥab'a*, “to hide, conceal, make secret”), cognate to the word “secrets,” occurs twice in 1 Enoch 62:6–7.

And the kings and the mighty and all who possess the land
will bless and exalt him who rules over all, who was hidden ($\text{ḥ}ab'u$, *zakhabu*).

¹⁶ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 254.

¹⁷ For a useful overview of the discussion, listing some of the key scholarship, see Kai Akagi, *Proclaiming the Judge of the Living and the Dead*, WUNT II:494 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), 42–44.

¹⁸ It may be noteworthy that some have seen a similar pattern in the influence of the Isaianic Servant texts on Paul’s writings, with the alternation of the singular and plural/collective representation of the Servant in Deutero-Isaiah underlying a similar alternation in the apostle’s thought. See J. Ross Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul "In Concert" in the Letter to the Romans*, NovTSupp 101 (Leiden: Brill, 2001) and Mark S. Gignilliat, *Paul and Isaiah's Servants: Paul's Theological Reading of Isaiah 40-66 in 2 Corinthians 5:14-6:10*, LNTS 330 (London: Bloomsbury, T&T Clark, 2007).

For from the beginning (first), the Son of the progeny of the mother of the living (ወልደ : እጻለ : እመሕያው, *walda ’əgʷala ’əmahəyaw*) was hidden (ኅቡእ, *ḥəbuʿa*), and the most high preserved him in the presence of his might, and he revealed him to the chosen.

¹ En 62:6–7.

ወይሴብሕዎ : ወይባርክዎ : ወያሌዕልዎ : ነገሥት : አዚዛን : ወኸሎሙ : እለ : ይእኅዝዎ : ለምድር : ለዘይመልክ : ኸሎ
: ዘኅቡእ :: እስመ : እምቅድም : ኅቡእ : ኮነ : ወልደ : እጻለ : እመሕያው : ወዐቀቦ : ልዑል : በቅድመ : ኅይሉ :
ወከሥቶ : ለኅሩያን

The entitling of the Son specifically as “the Son of the progeny of the mother of the living” deserves brief comment. This particular form occurs only in the third parable (and in the concluding material in 70–71, if we treat that separately). It is effectively equivalent to “Son of Man,” and is widely used in the Ethiopic bible to translate *ἄνθρωπος*, *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*, and *ἀνῆρ*.¹⁹ Care should be taken, then, not to overdraw the significance of its occurrence in the third parable, which also employs *walda be’si*. Having said this, the particular construction invites, even if it does not demand, two figural connections that might further identify the Son for the reader. First, the identification of the Son by reference to “the progeny of the mother of the living,” links him obviously to Eve, but also to her surviving and generative offspring.²⁰ The potential of this designation to evoke the particular figure of Seth is significant. I choose the words “potential” and “evoke” carefully: for some ancient readers, links of this kind may not intuitively be made because Seth is not a traditionally important figure to them, but for others—perhaps those contextualized in communities that receive and transmit the Parables—the capacity of this language to make the text distinctively “Sethian” would be very real.²¹ Second, for the Christian readers

¹⁹ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 114.

²⁰ This particular association is made by Helge Kvanvig, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch,” in Boccaccini, *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 179–215, esp. 194–95.

²¹ This observation addresses the legitimate points raised in Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 114–15, concerning Kvanvig’s argument, specifically that the evidence is less cleanly divided within the text of *1 Enoch* than he claims. My point is that these elements have a capacity to evoke a reader response in those who approach them with Sethian commitments. I use that term, rather than “gnostic” to note that a Sethian element in the conceptualizing or explication of salvation—the appearance of a second Adam, a renewed “image” and “likeness” of God (Gen. 5:3)—might have been more widespread in early Jewish and Christian thought than has been recognized.

who received this functionally as Christian literature, that figuration can also be aligned with Mary and Jesus. As with all figuration, this does not eclipse the identity of the original referents, but invests them with further significance.

The repetition of “hidden” has the effect of binding the identity of the Son of Man to the wider emphasis on the disclosure of secrets. Within the final form of the Parables, this connects in obvious ways to the identity of Enoch himself and his comprehensive discovery of divine secrets, but also to the community that venerates him.

God in the Parables of Enoch

Having noted the distinctive emphasis that the Parables of Enoch place on the disclosure of secrets to and through Enoch, I turn now to consider the distinctive theology of the work. Here, I use the word “theology” in its stricter sense, as it concerns the representation of God, within god-self (theology proper) and in relation to the world (divine economy). The sharp separation of these two categories (theology and economy) may be artificial, and may reflect some particular developments in the Western tradition, but there is value in using the language to draw attention to the fact that ancient writers often exhibit a clear interest in questions about the distinctive qualities of the gods and how these relate to their function or presence in relation to the cosmos. There has been a certain tendency in some circles of biblical scholarship to presume a disinterest in such matters among Jewish thinkers (often identified with “Hebrew” thought), linked to the assertion of a straightforward monotheism.

As I noted in Chapter 1, there is a live discussion about the legitimacy of the term “monotheism” as a descriptor of Judaism in antiquity and this bears on how we might describe the representation of Enoch as a divinized or deified figure. One of the key threads in the debate concerns the representation of the high or highest god and how the uniqueness of this one among the host or hierarchy of divine beings is explicated. Using the language of theology and economy with appropriate caution and flexibility may allow us some distinctive traction on the issues at work in our texts, particularly in relation to the imagery used of divine beings that mediate divine agency within the cosmos. The singularity with which Israel’s God is identified may not be a matter of exclusive divinity, *per se*, but of an exclusive category of divinity, a particular kind of “godness.”

What is most striking about the Parables of Enoch in this regard is nicely captured by Nickelsburg and VanderKam, though I will offer some critical comments on the second part of the quotation, and this will lead to consideration of a *somewhat* contrastive approach taken by Stuckenbruck:

The virtual omnipresence notwithstanding, the deity is rarely depicted as an active character, and is rarely the subject of a non-stative verb. Far more often he is the object of a verb or he is a figure who *is* something or is in some state of being.

... The verbs of which he is the subject tend not to be verbs of action: he speaks, he commands, he sees, he reveals or shows, he chooses, he is the source of mercy and long-suffering, he seats the Chosen One on the throne of his glory, he provides the garments of life.²²

I would suggest that, in fact, these verbs of speech and command *are* verbs of action, and precisely because they are locutionary. Their active and involved quality emerges more explicitly if we approach them with the insights of speech-act theory. To speak and to command is to perform an activity that brings about a new state of being (or, at least, it is when the one who speaks is sovereign). This particular act of locution is thus *perlocutionary* in quality and constitutes a specific kind of “self-involvement” with the intended outcomes; while there may be mediatorial agents involved, the one speaking and commanding is still to be identified as the principal agent, the involved actor.²³

Nevertheless, what the observation highlights is that God’s agency is, in the Parables, characteristically a mediated one: it is mediated by angelic figures, by Wisdom, by the Chosen One, by Enoch (who may himself, in fact, be identified with or as the Chosen One/Son of Man, depending on what we make of 71:14). Hence, God as agent is typically represented as remote from—other to—the earthly realm, with which his real involvement must be accomplished through mediation; his will is

²² Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 42. Italics original.

²³ On speech-act theory, see Richard S. Briggs, *Words in Action: Speech Act Theory and Biblical Interpretation* (London: T&T Clark, 2001). Briggs offers a nuanced critical analysis of the theory and its appropriation in theology and biblical hermeneutics in recent decades; for our purposes, what is particularly noteworthy is the concept of the “self-involvement” of the one who speaks, which is of distinct relevance to concepts of creational and providential speech-agency.

executed by or through those whom he elects and commands.²⁴ Further, and more directly in line with the observation of Nickelsburg and VanderKam, his bearing upon the state of the earth and upon the state of his mediators is represented as a function of his being, of what he is, and not just as a function of his activity. To put this in different terms, the ontology of the cosmos and the ontology of cosmic mediators is determined by the ontology of God.

This richer account is reflected in a somewhat different reading of the theology proper in the Parables developed by Loren Stuckenbruck.²⁵ Stuckenbruck's study is a rare (perhaps unique) example of a detailed study—if only at the sketch level accommodated by a single chapter²⁶—of the actual “god-talk” represented in the Parables. He recognizes the distinctive emphasis on mediation in the work, and its correlation with a particular way of thinking about God's qualitative otherness, his separateness from the created order of the world, but he also recognizes that the interest in the hierarchical mediation of God's purposes is precisely driven by a commitment to assert ongoing divine involvement. This, moreover, is something that he locates within the wider theological discourse of the book, including its representation of divine properties and attributes and its usage of divine titles. Thus, in relation to the uses of “Most High” (a title, the significance of which I will return to below), he notes:

Unmittelbar darauf wird Gott als Haupt der Tage, der auf dem Thron seiner Herrlichkeit sitzt, mit Engeln um ihn ringsherum, beschrieben, so dass von hier aus Gott mit dem Seher durch einzelne Engel spricht. Der Text mag den Eindruck erwecken, dass der Titel „Allerhöchster“ Gott in einem entfernten Verhältnis zu Henoch darstellt. Doch dürfte diese Annahme irreführend sein. In der zweiten Hälfte von Kapitel 60 erfolgt eine Auflistung von meteorologischen Phänomenen (z. B. Frost, Schnee, Nebel, Tau, Regen), die mit Winden bzw. Engel- Geistern in Verbindung gebracht werden (60,12–22). Der Text nennt Gott am Schluss (V. 22) „Allerhöchster, der im Himmel ist“ und erklärt, dass die Nahrung auf der Erde, die durch Bewässerung beschert wird, (obgleich) durch die Engel vermittelt, letztendlich von ihm stammt, d. h. auf seine

²⁴ Indeed, the point is precisely that by designating figures as “chosen” or “elect,” their identity is defined by the purposive work of God in their choosing.

²⁵ Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “Gottesbilder in den Henoch-Gleichnissen (1 Hen 37 – 71): Ein Überblick,” in *Gottes-Bilder: Zur Metaphorik biblischer Gottesrede*, ed. Veronika Burz-Tropper (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2022), 109–28.

²⁶ This is the language that he uses himself in Stuckenbruck, “Gottesbilder,” 127.

Fürsorge für die Schöpfung zurückzuführen ist. Der Text will an dieser Stelle nicht eine Distanz Gottes von der geschaffenen Weltordnung implizieren, sondern zeigt den Allerhöchsten als in die Umwelt involviert.²⁷

In parallel to my own point concerning speech-act theory, Stuckenbruck further notes:

Aufmerksamkeit gebührt der Terminologie, die auf die Absichtlichkeit von Gottes Tätigkeit hinweist. Das Drama, vor allem wie die endzeitlichen Schicksale zustande kommen, entspricht Gottes Willen (*faqad*), seinem Befehl (*te'zaz*) und seinem Wort (*qal*). Was geschieht, geht aus Gottes bestimmender Intentionalität hervor, die sich realisiert hat, sich gegenwärtig realisiert und noch zu realisieren hat.²⁸

Although he has not used the imagery in any publications, Stuckenbruck has elsewhere drawn parallels between this representation of God and the operation of a CEO, who remains distinctly and responsibly involved with functioning of a business, but does so from the “top floor,” through various levels of intermediary leadership.²⁹

This particular blending of elements related to mediation is interesting because it differs at once from religious and mythical accounts that are quite happy to portray God or the gods as acting in the world (including the meteorological traditions found in the biblical writings that were discussed in Chapter 4) and from core elements in the earlier Greek philosophical traditions, which will portray gods as part of or even essential to the cosmos.³⁰ In many regards, it resembles much more the kind of interest

²⁷ Stuckenbruck, “Gottesbilder,” 118.

²⁸ Stuckenbruck, “Gottesbilder,” 120.

²⁹ This memorable image was used in a lecture that Stuckenbruck gave in the summer of 2022, in Addis Ababa, connected to the content of the essay that I here interact with.

³⁰ I note this in light of a recent paper by Alex Long, of the University of St Andrews, on the topic of the presence of gods within the cosmos in Greek poetry, mythology and philosophy. Alex Long, “Exile and Withdrawal: Gods and the Cosmos from Early Greek Philosophy to Aristotle,” presented to *Gods in and Out of the Cosmos*, St Andrews, June 2023. The paper will appear in due course, I hope, in a volume edited by Matthew Sharp. Similar themes are covered in Vilius Bartninkas, *Traditional and Cosmic Gods in Later Plato and the Early Academy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023). See also Carl Séan O’Brien, *The Demiurge and Ancient Thought: Secondary Gods and Divine Mediators* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), which also traces some of the concern to differentiate the high god from the cosmos in philosophical and theological treatments from later antiquity.

in celestial hierarchies that characterizes the later Neoplatonist theologies of figures like Pseudo-Dionysius, also driven by a concern to assert, simultaneously, divine otherness and real involvement. To be clear, this is not to claim that the Parables is shaped by that developed Neoplatonist thought, which it likely predates, but rather that it shares with it an interest in what we might call the radical transcendence of God. Its imaginative presentation of this theme might have proven attractive to later readers preoccupied with this theme, including Neoplatonists whom we might categorize as “orthodox” and Sethian groups who are typically not categorized with such generosity. We might legitimately ask whether there were geographical aspects to these developments; I will discuss later in this chapter the particular interests in Platonism that are visible in the broad region constituted by Syria and Mesopotamia through late antiquity. If the representation of divine transcendence in the Parables is affected in any sense by Platonism, however, it is not characterized by the technical language and imagery that I will discuss in relation to 2 Enoch, below.

As I noted in my study of the meteorological imagery in Chapter 4, there are obvious connections between the imagery of providential mediation in the Parables of Enoch and that encountered in 3 Enoch/Sefer Hekhalot, but also some important differences in the level of detail known about the mediatorial hierarchies: where the Parables is marked by a *somewhat* static representation of God and a broad tendency to present secondary figures as mediating the divine will, Sefer Hekhalot has a highly detailed scheme of named angels, operating within a systematized hierarchy. The potential connections of both works to popular Platonism, in its different stages and distributions, might be important to how we explain the similarities and differences. Platonism had a complex influence on theological discourse in antiquity, varying in significance as its own character developed through recombination with other philosophical and religious interests. As artificial as it might be, the typical distinction between Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism,³¹ the emergence of which is particularly entangled with theurgic interests in late antiquity, recognizes this complexity and usefully labels the particular sort of Platonism that was particularly influential on Christian theologies in late antiquity (see further, below). Many of those whose thought was shaped by Platonism may not have been

³¹ The distinction between the two may be artificial, and is certainly not universally affirmed, but it remains a useful way of acknowledging the different phenomena visible in Neoplatonism, particularly the blending of different authorities with Platonic sources.

Platonists, as such; they did not represent Plato as a decisive authority and may even have been critical of the tradition. Nevertheless, the categories of Platonic discourse gave particular purchase on issues of transcendence and immanence and the incorporation of Neopythagorean elements, particularly in relation to the numerical status of the One, gave this discourse a particular value to those seeking to differentiate their god from others. The categories of Platonism have a certain capacity to assimilate with West Asian religious mythology, as Emma Wasserman's work on Paul shows,³² and this has widely been neglected in the study of both early Judaism and Christian origins. What is particularly important about this is that the Neoplatonism of late antiquity is marked by a particular interest in celestial hierarchies, explored most famously by Pseudo-Dionysius. Rather than seeing the portrayal of God and the mediators in the Parables as a "dead end" in the Enochic trajectories, we should consider the possibility that what we encounter reflects the differing influences of philosophically-influenced theology, with *Sefer Hekhalot* particularly influenced by the Neoplatonist interest in hierarchies, entangled as it was in some contexts with theurgic and "magical" interests. If this is allowed, a meaningful connection between the Parables and the *Hekhalot* literature can be considered, without the need for a linear trajectory to be considered and then rejected.

An important point emerges from the interest in divine ontology and mediation in the Parables, specifically in relation to the positioning of the Chosen One/Son of Man in the mediatorial hierarchy. This person is very distinctively placed above all creation, including over other heavenly beings, and is assigned roles to enact the divine will that reflect an especially close identification with (or proximity to) God. A distinctive kind of ontological likeness appears between the mediator and the one whose will he enacts. As Stuckenbruck notes:

Nach 48,2–3 wird ihm, bevor die Himmelskörper erschaffen werden, vom Herrn der Geister ein Name gegeben. Der Text verleiht dem Menschensohn durch diese Namensgebung eine der Schöpfung überlegene Stellung. Gegen Ende der dritten Bilderrede (69,20–26) verpflichtet der Text die Namen des Herrn der Geister und des Menschensohns ineinander.³³

³² Emma Wasserman, *Apocalypse as Holy War: Divine Politics and Polemics in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018).

³³ Stuckenbruck, "Gottesbilder," 122.

I will explore this ontological element further in Chapter 7, where I will analyze Enoch's transformation: this is not merely an angelomorphic glorification but, more properly, a deification, a transformation by which Enoch comes to share in what God is. This need not be seen as compromising the commitment to the uniqueness of Israel's God, if we allow for categories of participation that may not be native to modern thinking.³⁴ Here, the point of note is that mediatorial "activity" can involve the mutual participation—the co-inhabiting—of two ontologies, two kinds of be-ing, the created and uncreated. The Chosen One participates in the being of God, quite uniquely among creatures; the chosen ones, meanwhile, participate in the chosen-ness of the Chosen and thereby, through sharing in chains of being, participate in the life of God. They are glorified derivatively, through the deification of the one by whom they are identified. This way of thinking about participation is distinctively at home in Platonic thought, in its different stages of development and diffusion (by which I mean its influences on those who are not technically Platonists, since they do not ascribe decisive authority to Plato, but are clearly dependent on its categories).

Stuckenbruck's study highlights that both an ontological and a functional distinction remains between the Chosen Ones and the angels, such that to use the word "angelomorphism" may be misleading. The Chosen One is an exalted human creature, a *walda sab'*, whose status and nature as human is not lost in his exaltation (and is vital to his capacity to exalt others), while the angels are beings

³⁴There is a wealth of scholarly reflection on categories and conceptualizations of participation in antiquity and the medieval period, including (but not confined to) various species and stages of Platonic thought. The distinctive problems with participatory concepts in modern thought are famously traced by Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2007). The various contributions to the theological-philosophical-ethical movement known as Radical Orthodoxy have also highlighted the problems generated by distinctively modern dualisms, which are traced beyond the usual ascriptions of culpability to the nominalism that emerged from the legacy of Duns Scotus (although it is not only the Radical Orthodox that have seen Duns Scotus as a catalytic contributor). See Catherine Pickstock, "Duns Scotus: His Historical and Contemporary Legacy," in *Modern Theology* 21 (2005): 543–74. It is of illustrative significance that John Milbank, one of the principal voices in Radical Orthodoxy, provides a foreword (co-authored with Aaron Riches) to the second edition of Gregory Shaw's *Theurgy and the Soul: The Neoplatonism of Iamblichus* (2nd Edition; Kettering, Oh: Angelico Press/Sophia Perennis, 2014; 1st Revised Edition, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995). Whether or not the identification of Duns Scotus and nominalism as the key culprit can be fully sustained, and whether that influence is as extensive or pervasive as claimed, the discussion highlights the deep structural difficulties that moderns can bring to the analysis of participation in antiquity. In relation to one of the recurrent themes of this book, this generates particular problems for the analysis of ancient "monotheism," since that label was only coined in modernity. There are analytical deployments of that word that are aware of this and appropriately careful—notably Joachim Schaper, *Media and Monotheism: Presence, Representation and Abstraction in Ancient Judah*, ORA 33 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019)—but many are simply unaware of the backdrop to their use of categories.

native to the heavenly realm. The Chosen One functions in ways that are equivalent to the angels, who also enact divine intention, but that are not identical to these. The angels mediate cosmic and climatic processes (see Chapter 4), while the Chosen One mediates divine justice and the knowledge of God. Hence, we need to be careful about how we label this equivalence.

While the discussion above highlights the continued concern visible in the Parables with divine involvement in the created order, these particular features of mediation nevertheless distinguish the theology of the Parables of Enoch from the rest of 1 Enoch and from the further scriptural material that resources it. In the biblical material, and in other parts of 1 Enoch, God is often represented as the warrior accompanied by his heavenly armies, or as the one who is directly involved in providential processes; here, those functions have been transferred to the Chosen One and the angels, respectively, and God himself is considered aloof. Contrast, for example, 1 Enoch 1:3b–4 with 1 Enoch 51 and 62:

1 Enoch 1:3b–5

3b “The Great Holy One will come forth from his dwelling,

4 and the eternal God will tread from thence upon Mount Sinai.

He will appear with his army,

he will appear with his mighty host from the heaven of heavens.

5 All the watchers will fear and <quake>,

and those who are hiding in all the ends of the earth will sing.

All the ends of the earth will be shaken,

and trembling and great fear will seize them (the watchers) unto the ends of the earth.³⁵

1 Enoch 51: 3–5

3 And the Chosen One, in those days, will sit upon my throne,

and all the secrets of wisdom will go forth from the counsel of his mouth,

for the Lord of Spirits has given (them) to him and glorified him.

³⁵ George W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 142.

- 4 In those days the mountains will leap like rams,
 and the hills will skip like lambs satisfied with milk;
 and the faces of all the angels in heaven will be radiant with joy,
- 5 For in those days, my Chosen One will arise
 and the earth will rejoice, and the righteous will dwell on it,
 and the chosen will go upon it.³⁶

1 Enoch 61:

- 8 And the Lord of Spirits seated the Chosen One upon the throne of glory;
 and he will judge all the works of the holy ones in the heights of heaven,
 and in the balance he will weigh their deeds.
- 9 And when he lifts up his face
 to judge their secret ways according to the word of the name of the Lord of Spirits,
 and their paths according to the way of the righteous judgment of the Lord of Spirits,
 they will all speak with one voice,
 and bless and glorify and exalt
 and sanctify the name of the Lord of Spirits.
- 10 And all the host of the heavens will cry out and all the holy ones in the heights,
 and the host of the Lord—the Cherubin, the Seraphin, and the Ophannin—
 and all the angels of power and all the angels of the dominions,
 and the Chosen One and the other host who are on the dry land and over the water
 on that day.³⁷

³⁶ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 180. Although I have used their translation, I have not replicated their reconstruction of the verse order (following R.H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1893], 100), which moves 5a to before 2.

³⁷ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 247.

The distinction should not be pressed too far; in the biblical and Enochic material, angels act within the sphere of creation to enact God's sovereignty, as in the judgement accounts of 1 Enoch 9–16 or in a biblical text like Daniel, and earthly agents can act in service of God's will, whether knowingly or not (e.g., Cyrus in Isaiah 44:28). Still, the depiction of God in the Parables of Enoch is of a non-immanent entity, one who exercises his rule through intermediaries. Consequently, the work also evinces a particular interest in those intermediaries, both angelic and messianic. Indeed, the characteristic epithet of God in the Parables of Enoch is “the Lord of Spirits.” I have discussed this title already in Chapter 4; here, the point that I want to highlight is simply that the term identifies God with respect to beings that enact—or mediate—his will to the cosmos and, indeed, to those that fail in their obligations to mediate his will.³⁸ For the author(s) of the Parables, God is a sovereign who operates through intermediaries.

The Book of the Secrets of Enoch

In 2 Enoch, the core word for “secrets” is the noun ТАИНИ (*taini*); a directly equivalent adjectival form is also encountered (ТАИНЪ/-ЪИ, *tainŭ/tainyi*) and a distinct but cognate adjectival form, ПОТАЕННЫИ (*potaennyi*). The latter is encountered in one version of the title of the book, that attested by A and U:

From the secret book(s), (Ѡ КНИГЪ ПОТАЕННЫХЪ, *ot[ŭ] knigŭ potaennyxŭ*) concerning the rapture of Enoch the Just.³⁹

³⁸ The concept is so widespread in The Parables that it is difficult to choose the best verses with which to illustrate it. Note, for example, 69:22, which may well be an interpolation, but one that intentionally develops the association of divine regulation of providence with spirits.

³⁹ In my discussion of this construction in *The Slavonic Texts of 2 Enoch*, *Studia Judaeoslavica* 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 270, I followed Andersen's reading of A,U and listed these manuscripts as representing the book as singular. Andersen (“2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 102) takes the Ѡ as partitive, effectively corresponding to a Hebrew construction, meaning “one of ...” I am less sure now that this is the significance of the construction in A,U, which most obviously indicates the plurality of secret books associated with Enoch and the dependency of the transmitted work upon these. I am grateful to Dr Logan Williams for raising the matter in conversation, which prompted me to revisit the translation.

The form of the title used in A/U is unusual, however, with most of the other versions using some form of the genitive, “book(s) of the secrets of Enoch.”⁴⁰

Long Recension:

R: “The books of the holy secrets of Enoch.”

P: “The book of the secrets of Enoch, son of Ared, a wise man and beloved of God ... Of the life and dream of Enoch.”⁴¹

Very Short Recension:

V/N: “And these are the books of the secrets of God, a revelation to Enoch.”

B²: “The book of the secrets of God, a revelation to Enoch, which he saw there, and about the story (or ‘legend,’ *КАЗАННІЕ*, *skazanie*) of paradise.”

Rum: “From the secret books of Enoch, the story (‘legend,’) of the birth of Melchizedek, how he was born from the dead body of Sophonim.”

There are exceptions. J reads, more simply, “The word⁴² of Enoch, how the Lord took him to heaven,” and P² has “The book of Enoch, son of Ared, from the Pearl of Great Price.”⁴³ B, interestingly, has “The Life of Enoch the Just/Righteous Enoch,” transforming the work into the genre of a *vita*, a “saint’s life”. Merilo Pravednoe has “from the book of the righteous Enoch,” but the legal—and hence public—orientation of this work provides a good explanation for why a reference to “secrets” may have been removed. Despite these exceptions, the broad agreement of the long recension manuscripts with those of the very short ones, despite the range of surrounding detail that varies between the manuscripts (much reflecting the specific range of material preserved), suggests that the form encountered in A/U is the secondary one. In most of the manuscripts, it is not primarily the case that Enoch’s books are secret, but that they contain the secrets that were revealed to Enoch.

⁴⁰ B also contains a title, but has modified it to “The Life of Enoch the Just/Righteous Enoch,” transforming the work into the genre of “saint’s life” (*vita*). MPr has “from the book of the righteous Enoch,” but the legal—and hence public—orientation of this work provides a good explanation for why a reference to “secrets” may have been removed.

⁴¹ A note concerning the copying of this manuscript is added (found in the ellipsis in the quotation above): “copied in the city of Poltava, near the Church of the House of the Resurrection of the Lord God and our Savior, the Lord Christ. In the year from the creation of the world and ... the salvation of the LORD God our Saviour Jesus Christ, 1679.

⁴² СЛОВО (*slovo*) literally means “word,” but can be used of a literary work, story or biography, as reflected in Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 102. It occurs here without the article, but grammatical abbreviations are common in manuscript headings and titles. The literal translation is used here to allow the range of possible meanings and potential overtones to remain visible. The same word, *slovo*, is used to mark chapters in P.

⁴³ This reflects its heavy abbreviation: the manuscript omits all of the material through chapters 27, beginning with the creation story in 28, but it typically follows P.

The occurrence of the word “secrets” in the title of the book reflects its use at pivotal moments in the book. Unlike in the Parables, the word is not used extensively in 2 Enoch, but it does occur at key points that define Enoch’s role as heavenly scribe in terms of the learning and recording of secrets. In 24:3, for example, we read:

And to my angels I have not explained my secrets; neither have I proclaimed to them their composition, nor my endless⁴⁴ and inconceivable creation which I conceived. And to you I am making them known today (24:3, A).

There are some interesting variations between the readings, but the recensions share a common emphasis on the uniqueness of what is revealed to Enoch: these are secrets undisclosed even to the angels. This, of course, is central to the very identity of the book: it contains and communicates what Enoch learns. Importantly, as with the Parables, the secrets listed here include cosmological truths as well as eschatological ones. In fact the connecting of the cosmological and the eschatological truths revealed is particularly important and sets the use of the word “secrets” in these books apart from what we find in 4 Ezra, where it is used more narrowly of eschatological events still to happen.⁴⁵ In the short recension, there is a further reference to Enoch’s learning of divine secrets that seems to place more emphasis on future events, but it is attested only in A/U and in a section of the book that is textually one of the most difficult in the whole work:

And you will be seeing⁴⁶ my secrets, and you will be a scribe to my servants (or “priests”)⁴⁷ since you will be writing down everything that has happened on earth and that exists on earth and in the heavens, and you will be for me a witness of the judgment of the great age (36:3, A).⁴⁸

⁴⁴ This word represents one of the points of divergence between the manuscripts, with its significance that of an adjective qualifying creation (“endless”) or a noun representing a quality of the Lord (“endlessness”).

⁴⁵ See, e.g., 4 Ezra 10:38, 12:39, 14:5,6.

⁴⁶ The future sense of the passage is realized through the repeated use of *будещи* (*budeši*), hence the periphrastic constructions.

⁴⁷ The word *рабъ* (*rabŭ*) typically means “servant,” but it can have the meaning of “priest,” particularly in texts of western Slavic, according to J.Vašica, “Jazyková povaha Zakona sudné ho ljudem,” *Slavia* 27 (1958): 529—30.

⁴⁸ This is Andersen’s translation of the line in question (“2 [Slavonic Apocalypse of] Enoch,” 161); I cannot improve upon it.

Some of the language here is characteristic of 2 Enoch more widely, particularly that of “the great age,” which I will discuss further below. The support for its authenticity as part of the original text of 2 Enoch is more questionable, however. In relation to the argument developed here, this matters little, since the key emphasis on Enoch as a scribe of secrets is represented elsewhere, but it may shape how we evaluate the emphasis on eschatology in this particular verse.

One interesting observation might be offered in relation to the link between Enoch’s knowledge of the secrets and his writing of books. Although the recensions are divided on the actual numbers, the manuscripts all link the communication of the divine secrets to Enoch to the production of books:

And I sat down for a second period of 30 days and 30 nights, and I wrote down accurately. And I proclaimed (исповѣдѣхъ, *ispověda[xǔ]*) 300 and 60 books. (23:6, A)

And I sat down for a second period of 30 days and 30 nights, and I wrote everything accurately. And I wrote (написѣхъ, *napisa[xǔ]*) 366 books (23:6, J)

For all its brevity, the detail is not peripheral to the accounts; rather, it serves as the capstone statement to an account that has represented Enoch’s installation to the role of heavenly scribe. In the previous chapter (22:10–11), after Enoch’s anointing and clothing with heavenly oil and garments, the Lord summons the angel Vereveil to bring out the books from the storehouses and give Enoch his pen.⁴⁹ I will say more about the transformation of Enoch in Chapter 7, but here will note several features of the text that relate specifically to this interest in books.

First, as visible in the translations above, the long and short recensions vary in the second verb used of Enoch’s activity; the long recension manuscripts, followed by those of the very short recension (N, V, B²) repeat the verb “write down” (написати, *napisati*), where the short recension uses исповѣдати (*ispovědati*). This verb has a range of translational equivalents, but all have a rather public quality that

⁴⁹ The long recension manuscripts J and R specify the pen to be скорописаніе, an adjective that suggests it is for writing quickly; the cognate noun is used of a speed scribe. The inference is that the books contain enormous amounts of content and that Enoch had to write quickly.

are often associated with religious activity: “confess,” “proclaim,” “announce.” Although this verb might suggest something of the sacred status of the works, I am inclined to think that the form in A/U is secondary and has arisen by an error in reading, probably through interference from the word “accurately” (ИЗВѢСТНО, *izvēstno*); the agreement of the very short and the long manuscripts suggests that the short recension is here, as is often the case, most heavily altered. This means that the emphasis on the secret qualities of the books remains strong.

Second, Andersen notes that the representation of the angel Vereveil, while probably informed by the figure of Uriel, may also be coloured by traditions about Thoth, the scribe to Osiris, as these are represented in Eusebius.⁵⁰ Eusebius (*Praeparatio Evangelica* I.ix–x) incorporates some discussion of the Phoenician author Sanchuniathon, purportedly drawing upon the translation of his work in Philo of Byblos; the history of the account is difficult to evaluate, but more important than its claims to reliability or authenticity is the fact that it was preserved by a historian writing in late antiquity in Caesarea. The story of Sanchuniathon involves the human author learning the theological and cosmogonic secrets contained in Thoth’s books—that deity being the one who invented letters. The parallels are limited—Sanchuniathon learns these secrets through research and not through any kind of direct disclosure—and Andersen notes that many of the motifs are shared with Mesopotamian myth. The connection is interesting to note, however, since it reflects something of the interest in Egyptian and Phoenician mythology in late antiquity, which evinces some fascinating recombinations of Platonic, Neopythagorean and Egyptian elements. Further, the representation of Osiris in this section of Eusebius’s work has some interesting points of similarity with that of the Lord in 2 Enoch, emphasizing his fiery and radiant qualities.

Third, and most importantly, the prominence of the interest in books needs to be given appropriate weight, for it is a theme that takes on fresh significance in the legacy of Mani. Recent scholarship on Manichaeism, shedding the historical tendency to treat it as a marginal or deviant movement (partly as a result of a decentering of the map traditionally focused on the Mediterranean), has paid fresh attention to the significance of the religion in the development of cultures of books and writings. It is important to Manichaeism that its prophet “wrote down” what he had received and that

⁵⁰ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 140, note “f.”

these writings became constitutive of a canon. Mani's predecessors—including Zoroaster, Buddha and Jesus—had failed to leave writings, a situation that left their teaching vulnerable to subsequent corruption.⁵¹ While apparently informed by Jewish traditions about writings associated with Adam, Enosh and others, the faith associated with Mani develops a more thoroughgoing interest in the book and the writing down of books as one of its centrally identifying motifs. The impact of this on Iranian and then global cultures of writing and book production is now appreciated:

Mani occupies a central place in Iranian culture and more generally in the history of writing ... The prophecies of Mani and Muhammed each constitute a religion of the book. Such a religion, in order to give voice to God, must possess clarity of language and writing.⁵²

A case could be made that 2 Enoch 24, or the traditions behind it, has been influential on this aspect of Manichaeism, as one of the pseudepigraphical texts that played a role in its development, but we also need to consider the possibility that 2 Enoch here represents a later tradition itself shaped by the Manichaean interest in books. 2 Enoch 24 may, in fact represent a challenge of sorts to the status of Mani.

God and Cosmos in 2 Enoch: Eclectic Philosophy and Elements of Platonism

The representation of God in 2 Enoch is heavily coloured by philosophical language and imagery, particularly shaped by Platonic traditions about the transcendent One, while retaining an emphasis on divine immanence and reciprocal involvement with ritual. The latter theme will be considered in greater detail in Chapters 8 and 9 of the present volume, but the combination of elements is important to note at this stage, since it might be suggestive of a specific stage in the development of Platonic traditions. The presence and influence of such elements colors the “theology proper” of 2 Enoch, the representation of the Lord's own qualities and identity, but also the linked anthropology and the wider account of cosmogony. These elements will be considered in more detail in the next chapter, since they

⁵¹ Nicholas J. Baker-Brian, *Manichaeism: An Ancient Faith Rediscovered* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2011), 65. The observation is based on statements to this effect in *The Chapters (Kephalaia)* 7.18–8.28. The role of Manichaeism in the development of book culture is considered extensively through Baker-Brian's Chapter 3 (61–95).

⁵² Michel Tardieu, *Manichaeism* (trans. M.B. DeBevoise; Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 33.

are particularly closely linked to the representation of Wisdom. Consequently, there will be some necessary overlap between this chapter and that one, as we consider the paired themes of theology and divine economy, the “secrets” revealed to Enoch.

As noted already above, in my discussion of the Parables and the Hekhalot literature, Platonism is commonly categorized according to various periods of its development and popularity, which are entangled with Pythagorean thought and sometimes occur in an eclectic blend with other philosophical influences, particularly Stoicism. A broad distinction is typically maintained between Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism, with Plotinus usually seen as the key transitional figure who gives distinctive identity to the kinds of Platonic thought that will follow, although the Syrian philosopher Numenius can also be argued to have played a key role in the shift. Not all agree that such a distinction between the phases should be maintained, but as Riccardo Chiaradonna writes:

The distinction between Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism is controversial, but it remains helpful in that it makes it clear that there are important differences in the philosophical background of Platonist philosophers before and after Plotinus.⁵³

This appreciation of the backgrounds or, perhaps more appropriately, the *contexts* of Platonist philosophers is the key point for my own reflection, but it is also one that can rightly be reframed in the light of my concern with non-linear connections. What Platonic discourse might transmit generatively in its entanglement with other localized cultural factors might be different before and after Plotinus (or perhaps Numenius). Importantly for the study of 2 Enoch, Philo of Alexandria has also been considered to have been influential on the development of the Platonic traditions, with some of the characteristic elements in Neoplatonism sometimes claimed to be legacies of his thought, particularly that of divine ineffability. As we seek to consider the distinctive ideas present in the theology of 2 Enoch, and to ask about possible contexts for these, we need to reflect upon ideas that may have been absorbed from an early Alexandrian world, but that may also reflect the persistence of those same ideas in later cultures

⁵³ “Aristotle’s Physics as an Authoritative Work in Early Neoplatonism Plotinus and Porphyry,” in *Authority and Authoritative Texts in the Platonist Tradition*, ed. Michael Erler, Jan Erik Heßler, & Federico M. Petrucci (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press., 2021), 163–77; quotation 163. On the distinction itself, see George Boys-Stones, *Platonist Philosophy 80 bc to 250 ad. A Study and Collection of Sources in Translation*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 2–6.

shaped by Platonism. The key to differentiating these is likely to be the combination of ideas that are encountered and the orientation of these to particular concepts of God and the life of fidelity to this one.

There are two striking and interlinked features of the representation of God in 2 Enoch that may help us to locate the work in relation to these developing traditions: (1) the use of negative language in the depiction of God (2) the occurrence of a developed version of *creatio ex nihilo*. What is particularly important is the combination or co-occurrence of these features and their deployment to represent the categorical uniqueness of a transcendent God who may nevertheless be known through consideration of analogy.

Before turning to consider the first of these elements (the discussion of creation will mostly be deferred until Chapter 6), I need to stress that my goal is not to identify 2 Enoch as a work of Platonism, as such, but rather that its core imagery for God appears to be coloured by elements characteristic of Platonic discourse, functioning within an eclectic mix. The defining mark of Platonism, for those who inhabit Platonic networks, is a veneration or a prioritization of Plato himself, or his thought, and there is clearly nothing of such a concern in 2 Enoch. Platonic influences are widespread at particular points in antiquity, however, particularly in Christian circles, and the coloration of works with their language is precisely what we might expect from those who are erudite and perhaps involved on the margins of networks, but are not subscribing members of the networks themselves.

Negative Language, Measurement, and the Categorical Uniqueness of the Lord

There are two points in the text of 2 Enoch where the use of negative language about God's being—describing what God “is” by saying what God “is not”—is particularly striking; both of these involve descriptions of the divine appearance, of its aesthetics. The first is in 2 Enoch 22, a section headed in some manuscripts with the title “Concerning the Appearance.” Here, Enoch sees the Lord, his throne, and his attendants. As noted by Anderson,⁵⁴ the use of negative language is more developed in the long recension manuscripts, but elements are preserved also in the short. For comparison, I will discuss both, starting with the version in the short recension manuscripts A and U, paralleled in B.

⁵⁴ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 137, note e.

22:1–3 (A):

1. Concerning the Appearance of the Lord. I saw the Lord. His face, the Lord's, was strong and illustrious and terrible/frightening.
2. Who is there (ἐῖ)⁵⁵ to give an account of the scope/composition/dimensions⁵⁶ of the being (ἰσχυρεῖ) of the face of the Lord, strong and very frightening, or his many-eyed and many-voiced, and the made-without-hands, very great throne of the Lord, or the standing ones⁵⁷ who are with him, the cherubim and seraphim armies, or his immutable (ἠεπρεμῆνοε) and ineffable (ἠεἰσποβῆδαμοε),
3. and not-silent (insilent?) and glorious composition (εὐδ'γενίε)?
4. And I fell down prostrate, and did obeisance to the Lord.

While obviously coloured by theophanic traditions, including those preserved in earlier parts of the Enochic corpus, this particular description is characterized by a combination of positive language about God (“strong and terrible”) and the creatures attending his throne—the latter distinctively described with compounds of “many”—and the negative language of “immutable” (*nepreměnoe*, ἠεπρεμῆνοε) and “ineffable” (*neispovědamoe*, ἠεἰσποβῆδαμοε), along with the differently negated “made-without-hands,” which is here applied to the divine throne, though is paralleled elsewhere in the description of God.

The linkage between the being of God and immutability and ineffability requires some attention to the grammar of the passage, and also some sensitivity to the possible confusion of words in the transmission of the text. The account opens with the question: “Who is there to give an account of the

⁵⁵ This abbreviated form is typically used for the form εστῦ (*estŭ*), “there is/is there” The long recension reads εσμῦ (*esmŭ*) “I am/am I.”

⁵⁶ The word in the short recension (paralleled in the very short mss) is *obŭeti*. This is probably to be read as a noun and the word usually means embrace or encircling (in fact, it often means “hug!”). The word is used earlier in the book, describing the extent of the sun’s journey. Andersen’s translation reflects this idea of “scope”. Technically, the form could also be the cognate verb, in its infinitive form.

⁵⁷ The word used here is στῶληνε, *stoēnie*. Although cognate to the verb for standing, the noun can also be used of presence or of permanence.

scope of the being of the face of the Lord?" Crucially to the interpretation of what follows, two of the words in the genitive chain, "being" and "face," are neuter; this is significant because the endings of the key describing words that follow end with *-ое*, which is characteristic of the neuter singular in the compound declension. These terms are, then, most obviously descriptors that function adjectivally in relation to "being" or "face." The occasional use of the pronominal form *єго* can cause either confusion or nuance, since it can be read as both masculine and neuter, allowing it to associate terms with "being," "face" or "Lord." Recognizing these factors in the grammar of the passage highlights that the two compounds of *mnogo*—"many-eyed" (*mnogoōčinoe*, *МНОГОУЧИННОЕ*) and "many-voiced" (*mno[g]ogla[s]noe*, *МНОГОГЛАВНОЕ*)—are properly to be read in relation to the divine being or face; the endings do not allow these to be read, in A and U, as independent beings ("many-eyed/voiced ones")⁵⁸ or as characteristics of the throne that is mentioned immediately afterwards, since the latter is masculine. Interestingly, in the passage of Eusebius's *Praeparation Evangelica* that I noted above, the historian quotes from Diodorus a description of Osiris that traces the name to his having many eyes and proceeds to describe the radiance of his face (I. ix). The initial series of neuter singular descriptors is broken by a reference to the "made-without hands, very great throne of the Lord" (*be[z]rükotvore[n]y prěvelikiy pr[ěs]t[o]lŭ G[ospo]dŭ bĕrŭkotvoryĕ prĕvelikyĕ prŭtŭlŭ gđŭ*) and the standing ones, cheruvim and seraphim armies. But, importantly, the description then resumes the use of the neuter singular forms for the key negative terms "immutable" and "ineffable." This may reflect a return to the central concern with "the being of the face," but there is also another possibility to be considered, if the noun (*služenie*, *СЛУЖЕНІЕ*) that ends the description is understood not as "service" (as does Andersen), but as "composition" or "constitution," from *izloženie* (*sŭloženje*). It is not uncommon to find dialect transformation of the "o" to "u" and, likewise, the elision of jers, even voiced ones. Further, there might be good reason for an erudite copyist to consider such a correction to be a necessary reversal of a previous error: *izloženie* is typically used of complex entities composed of different things, and would thus be a word at odds with notions of divine simplicity (themselves part of the Platonic discourse about God). For the same reason, it can be used of the coupling in sexual intercourse. A scribe may have sought to repair a reading considered flawed by substituting a word used of service. If this has indeed happened,

⁵⁸ As by Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 137.

then the passage may open with a reference to the divine being and close with a reference to the divine composition, even if the latter term would be theologically problematic.

Regardless of whether this last reconstruction is convincing, the terms “immutable” and “ineffable” are most obviously used in theological and philosophical traditions of the highest reality, the one that is categorically distinct from everything else and beyond the reaches of language itself. In traditions that utilize such language theologically, this is the one God whose being is radically distinct from that of other divine beings and is sometimes even considered to be beyond being itself. I will comment further on the significance of these words below, but here note that they are terms we would expect to be used of God, and not of other heavenly beings, and the case endings support the conclusion that they are in some way being applied to this.

The long recension is more thoroughly and intentionally negational in its account, to the extent that Andersen labels it as inclining to “the way of negation,” although he also qualifies this terminology, as I will discuss further below.⁵⁹ Where “ineffable” (НЕИСПОВѢДАЕМОЕ, *neispovědaemoe*) occurs only once in the short recension, it occurs three times in the long, but does so alongside other negated adjectives.

And on the 10th heaven, Aravoth, I saw the appearance of the face of the Lord,⁶⁰ like incandescent iron brought out of a fire, and it sparks and glows. Thus, I myself saw the face of the Lord, but the face of the Lord is ineffable, wondrous and supremely awesome and supremely frightening. Who am I to give an account of the incomprehensible (*neōbětōe*, НЕУВѢТІТОЕ) being of the Lord, and of his face, so extremely wonderful and ineffable, and how abundant is his knowledge and his many voices, and the supremely great and not-made-by-hands throne of the Lord, and how many stand⁶¹ all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, and their never-silent singing? Who can give an account of his beautiful appearance, immutable and indescribable, and his great glory? And I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord. (22:1–4, J)

⁵⁹ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 137, note “e.”

⁶⁰ R here reads, “I looked the Lord in the face.”

⁶¹ At two points in the description, both J and R have in place of ΕΛΙΚΟ, (*eliko*, “how many/how much”) the word ΛΗΚΧ (*likū*, choir stall). This makes sense contextually as an image of heavenly liturgy, but I am inclined to see it as a medieval or early modern alteration.

The differences between the recensions are significant, but often core points of equivalence are detectable: the negated “incomprehensible” (НѢУВѢКѢТРОЕ) of the long recension is cognate to the unnegated form found in the short, “scope” (УВѢЛѢТН *obĭeti*), and the essential significance of both is the same: the being of God is beyond human comprehension and exceeds all capacity for measurement. The preoccupation with dimensions, even if the possibility to measure them is negated, is common to both. This is a theme that will emerge also in 2 Enoch 39, which I will consider below, at which point I will examine the potential Platonic qualities of the concept.

Andersen is basically correct, I think, in his evaluation of the level of divergence visible in 2 Enoch 22, that much of it reflects scribal discomfort⁶² with the overt description of the Lord’s appearance, and particularly the use of fire imagery: the very short recension manuscripts remove the whole of the description and only describe Enoch’s prostration (from line 4), while the short manuscripts lack the fire imagery encountered in line 1 of the long version. The latter is also encountered in both recensions in 39:3, however, and the additional material in the long recension may represent some duplication of this. Either way, it is clear that the depiction of God as fiery is represented across the manuscripts in 2 Enoch. As well as the connections with representations of Osiris in antiquity (the popularity of which took on renewed importance in late antiquity through the influence of Iamblichus) here may be some significance to the developed use of fire imagery of God in relation to Zoroastrian influence and also in relation to the liturgical practices that I will discuss in Chapter 8, where the burning of lamps “before the face of the Lord” is a core activity. One element of the symbolism involved in such an activity may be an iconic representation of a deity essentially identified with fire.⁶³ It may be worth noting here that this would be at odds with the representation of Elchasai’s teaching in Epiphanius’s *Panarion* (19.3.5–7). If the polemical account is to be trusted, Elchasaite teaching apparently condemned the incorporation of fire imagery into liturgy, favouring water-imagery because of its links to baptism.

Interestingly, here in chapter 22, Andersen suggests that the short recension tends towards using “more abstract ideas.”⁶⁴ He seems to see this as evidence of modification, but it may also be the case that

⁶² I am less persuaded by his use of the word “embarrassment” to describe this. Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 136, note c.

⁶³ This point was suggested in conversation with Alexi Chantziantoniou, whose current doctoral research concerns such liturgical symbolism. I am grateful for his interaction with my emergent reflections.

⁶⁴ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 137, note c.

these are closer to the original and reflect philosophical terminology which, somewhere in the chain of transmission, proved difficult for a scribe to live with. At any rate, the long recension manuscripts preserve a much more systematically negational account, deploying several words that are effectively equivalent to the Greek alpha-privatives characteristic of negative discourse in Platonism; even the description of the temple is aligned with this system, employing the prefix ἠε- (*ne-*, “not”) rather than ἄβ- (*bez-*, “without”). Both recensions, however, preserve the key terms “immutable” and “ineffable.”

Andersen argues that the sense of the latter construction, at least in the long recension, is not that the Lord’s face *cannot* be described, but *should* not be described, i.e., that such an act is prohibited, not impossible. This might align the account a little more with some of the sensitivities evinced in the Merkabah traditions, and with the kind of force that the language appears to have in Paul (2 Cor 12:4) but I am not persuaded that he is correct here. Enoch does, after all, seek to describe the face, at least in the long recension, where the term occurs with greatest frequency. Rather, the construction seems intended to acknowledge the limits of the human to comprehend and of language to describe this being, which is precisely its significance in the Platonic traditions.

In fact, the term “ineffable,” translating the Greek ἄρρητος, is particularly important in Platonic discourse about The One and in the development of negational modes of language to speak of the Highest. These become a distinctive feature of Neoplatonism, including the Christian examples of this, but are traceable back to earlier phases of Middle Platonism and its entanglement with Pythagorean philosophy.⁶⁵ Philo is often credited with the programmatic significance that the term comes to have in the Platonism that comes after his particular eclectic philosophy, a point that might lend some support to the claim for an Alexandrian provenance for 2 Enoch, but the language was used prior to this and Philo may not have been representative of anything more than a tiny minority within Judaism, even in Alexandria.⁶⁶ The occurrence of the title “The One,” elsewhere in the long recension (24:4) might provide some further support for Philonic influence and Alexandrian provenance, but that title is also used widely in the Platonic traditions. All of the language could be readily explained in a later context, after Neoplatonism became widely influential in Late Antiquity, and the key question to be asked

⁶⁵ For the development of this, see Deirdre Carabine, *The Unknown God. Negative Theology in the Platonic Tradition: From Plato to Eriugena* (Leuven: Peeters Press, 1995; repr. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2015).

⁶⁶ Carabine, *The Unknown God*, 194–5.

concerns the combination of such language with other elements that might reflect later modes of negative discourse: is there a distinctive *combination* of ideas that makes better sense against a Neoplatonic backdrop than a Middle Platonic one? Tentatively, I would suggest that two elements in this chapter and in chapter 39 point in this direction: an interest in the negation of measurement and a conscious attention to the necessity of analogy. In order to explore these, then, I turn to 2 Enoch 39.

2 Enoch 39: 3b–6 (*Short Recension*)

3. You, on one hand,⁶⁷ hear my words, out of my lips/mouth,⁶⁸ a human being, created like you; I, on the other hand, have heard the words from the fiery lips of the Lord.

For the lips of the Lord are a fiery furnace, and his words are the fiery flames that come out. You, my children, you see my face, like you, created as a human being; I, however, I am one who has seen the face of the Lord, like iron made incandescent from fire, emitting sparks.

4 For you look into (my) eyes, a human being, created like you; but I have looked into the eyes of the Lord, like the rays of the shining sun and terrifying the eyes of a human being.

5. You, children, you see my right hand signing⁶⁹ to you, a human being created like you;⁷⁰ but I, I have seen the right hand of the Lord, signing to me, who fills heaven.

6. You, you see the extent of my body, the same as your own; but I, I have seen the extent of the Lord, without-measure and without-analogy, who has no end.

⁶⁷ I use this English contrastive construction to capture the sense of *ВЫ БО ... АЗЪ ЖЕ* (*vy bo ... azŭ že*)

⁶⁸ The Slavonic term for mouth is intrinsically plural in form and is equivalent to “lips.” The endings of apposed pronouns are plural, which might support a deliberately plural sense (e.g., in “my lips”), but

⁶⁹ The Slavonic verb encountered in A and U is *pomavati* (*ПОМАВАТИ*), which means “to make signs or to nod.” Andersen’s “beckon” captures its meaning, but may obscure an underlying image of *signification*. The long recension manuscripts, supported by B, use the participle of *pomagati* (*ПОМАГАТИ*, “to help”).

⁷⁰ A and U actually both here read “us/ourselves.” The preposition varies only in the first letter and the second person form is to be preferred: it makes better sense in context and is consistent with the pattern of the contrast.

Although there are significant differences between the manuscripts in the arrangement of the material in this chapter, the actual language used shows a high level of agreement. As in Chapter 22, the use of fire-imagery in the depiction of the Lord is striking and moves beyond anything of a similar sort in the biblical material. What is especially notable about the description, however, is the combination of analogy and disanalogy. The representation of God moves from what is visible in human experience—the human form itself, particularized in Enoch, as he stands in the sight of his children—to an account of the divine extent. On one level, this is simply a comparison of lesser and greater, one that resonates with the concept of the *imago dei*, the Enochic iteration of which I will consider in Chapter 6. On another level, however, it articulates both the necessity of analogical language and its limits, the “absolute qualitative distinction” between the highest God and all else.

The terms translated “without-limit” and “without-analogy” are both compound words, *bezměno* (БЕЗМѢНО and *bez-/besprikladno* (БЕС-/БЕЗПРИКЛАДНО), respectively, with the prefix negating the main adjective. The pairing of the two words suggests that the underlying Greek also contained an equivalent pairing, functioning as a formula of sorts. This is especially interesting in relation to the second word, *besprikladno*. This word continues to be used in modern Slavonic with the meaning “unparalleled,” though seems not to be well-attested in older Slavonic literature. The negated concept, *prikładī*, is that of an image or symbol, hence its translation as “without-analogy”: all symbols function as analogical signs for the things that they represent, and the absence by impossibility of a symbol for a particular quality is an indication of its categorical uniqueness. That said, the word can be used in ways that allow this “an-analogical” dimension to slip into the linguistic background, and were it not used here in a formal pairing, we might allow that this is the case. Srežnevsky⁷¹ notes its occurrence in a 12th century document, where it is used of “the unparalleled power (*deržava*, ΔΕΡΖΑΒΑ) of the Lord our God.” The Greek equivalent listed is ἀνείκαστος, which, interestingly, is found in 3 Maccabees 1:28 of a huge roar but is otherwise unattested in the LXX. The Greek term is also used only rarely in extant literature outside the Bible, but it occurs in Athanasius with the meaning of “huge” (in his *Sermo ad Antiochem ducem*, where it is used of a place of judgement and punishment) and there are several occurrences in John Chrysostom where it similarly carries a sense of size. In most of the occurrences in Chrysostom,

⁷¹ I. I. Srežnevskii, *Materialy dlia Slovaria Drevne-Russkogo Iazyka po Pis'mennym Pamiatnikam*, vol. 1 (Saint Peterburg, 1893), 76.

however, it is used of divine qualities, either his *φιλανθρωπία* or his *δύναμις*, the latter specified in one case to be the *δύναμις ἀγάπης*, and is typically employed in exclamatory formulations. Of these, perhaps the most striking for us is in his sermon on Charity:

”Ὡ δύναμις ἀγάπης ἀνείκαστος! ὦ δύναμις ἀγάπης ἀμέτρητος! οὐδὲν τῆς ἀγάπης τιμιώτερον

Here, the point of note is the combination of *ἀνείκαστος* with *ἀμέτρητος*; this is effectively the same combination that we find in 2 Enoch 39. Also worthy of note is *Precatio* 371, where a string of alpha-privatives occurs, applied to the divine being, power and divinity:

Θεὸς ὁ ἅγιος, ὁ ἄναρχος, ὁ φοβερὸς, ὁ ἀόρατος τῆ οὐσία, ὁ ἀνείκαστος τῆ δυνάμει, καὶ ἀκατάληπτος τῆ θεότητι, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης, καὶ παντοκράτωρ.

With Chrysostom, then, we find some striking examples of negative language, including combinations that are similar to what we find in 2 Enoch. Importantly, this shifts the linguistic significance of *ἀνείκαστος* away from its functional usage, as something that might casually be attached to hugeness, into a more intentionally privative or negative field, alongside other alpha-prime words. This reflects the cultural importance of negational discourse in Christian theology in late antiquity.

The particular interest in measurement as a positive concept, but one that must ultimately be negated in relation to the One, is also a feature that takes on prominence in Neoplatonic thought, following its development in Plotinus. Deirdre Carabine notes that *metron* is “not a term afforded much discussion by the Middle Platonists, and by its very nature, it is a term which stands out from all the other positive terms used by Plotinus.”⁷² She continues:

[E]ven though the One is the measure of all things, the One itself is unmeasured, and does ‘not come within the range of number’; ‘for who is there to measure it?’⁷³

⁷² Deirdre Carabine, *The Unknown God. Negative Theology in the Platonic Tradition: From Plato to Eriugena* (Leuven: Peeters Press, 1995; repr. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2015) 113.

⁷³ Carabine, *The Unknown God*, 113, citing V 5,4,13; V 5, 11, 2–3 and VI 6, 18, 6.

It is intriguing, then, that here Enoch points to his own body—with all of its limits—as the comparator for speaking of divine limitlessness that cannot be measured. The concept of measurement is at once affirmed and negated, with the analogical negation resourcing a proper awareness of divine uniqueness. Further, as Orlov has explored, the theme of measurement is pivotal to the book as a whole and to the role of Enoch within it. His suggestion that this function is both the explanation for the strange term *prometaya* that is used of Enoch and for the evolution of the name Metatron may not be persuasive, but his sensitivity to the programmatic significance of measurement as a theme is warranted.⁷⁴ Here, it is noteworthy that *immediately* after his account of the measurelessness of the Lord, Enoch relates in detail to his children how he has measured all things in the cosmos. The absolute uniqueness of the Lord is thus asserted and in such a way that the Lord's measurelessness is effectively the measure of creation.

In connection with this, it is interesting to compare what we find in 2 Enoch 39 with the strategic discussion of analogy in Pseudo-Dionysius, one of the great exemplars of later Neoplatonic thought. The negational strategies are much more thoroughgoing and radical in his work, to the point where the truth of the One is identified as a darkness beyond even light, but there is also a sustained awareness of the need to at once affirm and negate analogy. Pseudo-Dionysius is particularly interested in the divine titles, not just the One, but also those that identify God by means of analogy to things known in creation: being, light, life, truth, wisdom, mind, et cetera.⁷⁵ He is also interested in how these relate to the sensory perceptions of a God who transcends the senses, particularly the visual perceptions recounted in visions:

These are not the only names for God favored by the scripture writers, these drawn from universal or individual acts of Providence or from those provided for. Some too have their origin in spiritual visions which enlightened initiates or prophets in the holy places or elsewhere. For all sorts of reasons and because of all sorts of dynamic energies they have applied to the divine Goodness, *which surpasses every name and every splendor*, descriptions of every sort—human, fiery, or amber shapes and forms; they praise its eyes, ears, hair, face, and hands, back, wings,

⁷⁴ See Andrei Orlov, "The Origin of the Name 'Metatron' and the Text of 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 21 (2000): 19–26.

⁷⁵ See *Divine Names* 596B.

and arms, a posterior and feet. They have placed around it such things as crowns, chairs, cups, mixing bowls and similar mysterious items...⁷⁶

Shortly after, the author prays that “God should allow me to praise in a divine way the beneficent and divine names of the unutterable and unnameable Diety.”⁷⁷ The language is striking in its use of negation, but also in its simultaneous affirmation of the necessity of analogy, not just in conceiving the transcendent God, but in the very act of praising this one. To praise a transcendent God involves the use of speech to address the One who is beyond all speech, speaking names to one who is unnameable. Praise itself, then, necessitates analogy, while also necessitating that its analogous quality and the limits of this are properly acknowledged. This is not an occasional or sporadic feature of Pseudo-Dionysius’s writings, but rather a thread that runs through it. He will go in, in the same work, to use the analogy of unified light in the atmosphere of a room illuminated by several lamps to communicate the being of the One:

But turn now to that unity above being. I say that it surpasses not only the union of things corporeal, but also the union of souls, and even that of minds themselves. These minds purely, supernaturally, and thoroughly possess the godlike and celestial, *but they do so in a participation proportionate to their participations in the unity which transcends all things.*⁷⁸

The logic of analogy and its limits, the pivot of all symbolism, underpins the relationship between positive and negative language in the use of symbols: the “dissimilar similarities” (Celestial Hierarchy, 141D, p.151) between the perceptible and the transcendent make contemplation, praise and participation possible, within their intrinsic and recognized limits. I have illustrated this using Pseudo-Dionysius, but his thought on these points stands in a line that can be traced back through Proclus to Iamblichus, particularly his *On the Mysteries*.⁷⁹

⁷⁶ *Divine Names* 597B. Translation, Colm Luibheid, *Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works* (New York: Paulist Press, 1987), 57.

⁷⁷ *Divine Names* 597C. Translation, Luibheid, *Pseudo-Dionysius*, 58.

⁷⁸ *Divine Names* 641C. Translation, Luibheid, *Pseudo-Dionysius*, 62.

⁷⁹ See P. Rorem, “Iamblichus and the Anagogical Method in Pseudo-Dionysian Liturgical Theology,” *Studia Patristica* XVII, ed. E.A., Livingstone (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982), 453–60.

Creation in 2 Enoch: Being and Non-Being, Visibility and Non-Visibility, Nothing Itself.

The second feature that might help to locate 2 Enoch is its particular account of creation and the use of language that seems intended to represent this as being *ex nihilo*. Actually, there may be elements in this that reflect still further the influence of Platonism, but we need to approach these with some awareness of their context in the book. It is important to repeat the point, that I am not seeking to claim 2 Enoch as a work of Platonism, but as a work coloured by its discourse, and likely in its later embodiments. This is especially important here because some of the elements that are encountered are difficult to square with Platonism in its more “scholastic” contexts, where Plato himself is the authoritative voice.

The account of creation in 2 Enoch 24,⁸⁰ in both recensions, opens with a systematized emphasis on God’s role in creating everything from non-being into being:

Before anything was, from the beginning, whatever is I created from non-being into being (*ōt[ū] nebytia v bytie, ὠ̄ НЕБЫТІА В БЫТІЕ*), and from the invisible things into the visible (*ōt[ū] nevidimi[x] vŭ viděniū, ὠ̄ НЕВИДИМІ ВЪ ВИДѢНІИ*). 2 Enoch 24:2, A.

Notably, the recensions all preserve some sense that God existed among other invisible things before his creation of the visible world:

Before any visible things existed, and the light had opened itself, I, in the midst of the light, I moved around, like one of them, in the invisible things, as the sun moves around from east to west and from west to east. (2 Enoch 24:4, A)

In addition, much of God’s work in creating the visible things involves his summoning and commanding of other invisible things, as illustrated in the description of Adail’s descent into visibility:

⁸⁰ Unusually, the section has a title in A: “Concerning the Construction of Creation.”

And I commanded the lowest things (*preispodni*[хѣ], прѣисподнѣ): “Let one of the invisible things ascend⁸¹ visibly!” And Adail emerged, extremely large. And I looked at him, and, behold, in his belly he had a (or “the”) great age. And I said to him, ‘Dissolve yourself, Adoil,⁸² and let become visible what is dissolved from you.’ And he dissolved himself, and there came out from him the great age. And thus he bore all the creation which I had wished to create. And I saw how good it was. (25:1–3).

Much of God’s creative work in 2 Enoch involves such commandments, reminiscent of the commandments in Genesis 1, but here many of the commandments are directed to elements or entities that already exist as “invisible” things. In the case of Adail, that entity seems to contain all of the raw material for creation, presented as “the great age”; I will return to discuss this concept later, as its potential equivalence to Zoroastrian eschatology has been raised by others and deserves to be probed further.

Some of this is redolent of earlier creational accounts that are essentially disinterested in the origins of matter, but the emphasis on the totality of God’s creative involvement—“whatever is, I created from non-being into being”—is striking. Sometimes this is reflected with a degree of grammatical redundancy: the pronoun “I” is gratuitously replicated after the first person verb form “I said” in the construction “I said to him ‘Dissolve yourself, Adoil.’” Also striking is the concern to assert that God’s creative design is entirely his own; he is specified to be the architect and maintainer of the visible cosmos:

"And now, Enoch, whatever I have explained to you, and whatever you have seen in the heavens, and whatever you have seen on earth, and whatever I have written in the books—by my supreme wisdom I have contrived it all—I created from the lowest foundation and up to the highest and out to their end.

⁸¹ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 145, translates ДА ВЪЗЫДЕТЪ (*da vzydetŭ*) as “let ... descend,” but the verb ВЪЗИТИ (*vŭziti*) indicates ascent and not descent, an upward direction that makes better sense of the summoning of one of the lowest things.

⁸² The name is inconsistently spelled in A, as both Adail and Adoil.

There is no counselor and no successor, only myself, eternal, not made by hands. My unchanging thought is (my) counselor, and my word is (my) deed. And my eyes behold all things. If I turn my face away, then all falls into destruction, but if I look at it then it is stable. (33:3–4)⁸³

So, God is ascribed exclusive status as the creator of “being from non-being” and this is paired with an ongoing involvement with every level of existence. This frames some of the difficult details in the cosmogony—particularly the role of the primeval, originally non-visible, entities Adoil and Arukhas—in the creation of the visible cosmos. The creation of the visible cosmos begins with God’s calling twice to the lowest things and summoning two entities to come out visibly; Adoil and Arukhas come out in turn, the first disintegrating himself on the divine command to yield all of the creation that God wishes to create and the second becoming solid and black to serve as the foundation. An interesting symmetry occurs: after Adoil’s disintegration, God commands the light to be the foundation for the highest things and states that there is nothing higher than the light, “except Nothing itself,” and after calling forth Arukhas to serve as the lowest foundation he states that there is nothing lower than the darkness, “except Nothing itself.” The something of creation is, thus, framed above and below by Nothing.

This is important because such language is characteristic of theological Platonism. God is not a thing and the identification of God as Nothing, the No-Thingness that is beyond all being, is a distinctive marker of Platonic thought in theological register. This also becomes a factor in the development of what are generally categorized as “gnostic” cosmologies and, indeed, some of what is encountered in their early iterations of *creatio ex nihilo* in, for example, Basilides. The account in 2 Enoch has a certain similarity to these, with Adoil and Arukhas perhaps resembling archons, but it also differs in key regards. It lacks the imagery of “seed” and the concern with the Holy Spirit that is found in Basilides, for whom also the divine involvement was itself confined to the initial act. Hence, the insistence upon ongoing divine involvement also differs from what is found in Basilides.

In these differences, 2 Enoch resembles rather more the later accounts of *creatio ex nihilo* that emerged in the wake of Theophilus of Antioch. The density of interest in this theme within the early Syrian context has been noted by Gerhard May, who allows (without insisting) that Basilides may have

⁸³ Here, I follow the translation of Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 157.

received some elements of his schema from that context, based on the plausibility of the claim that Basilides was originally from Syria.⁸⁴ Certainly, it was in Syria that the doctrine first attained recognizable form, with the work of Theophilus. This articulation of the doctrine was, to a large extent, intended to resist the cosmogonies that had developed in the range of gnostic circles that can be identified, which ascribed the creation of the material world to agents other than God, whether associating it with Sophia, angelic beings or archons. Theophilus's own account involved an extended commentary on Genesis 1–3, marked by a concern to remain close to the text and to sustain a literal reading of this, and as such *looks* quite different to what we encounter in 2 Enoch. The concerns, however, align with the pseudepigraphon, where the involvement of other entities in the process of creation is strictly subordinated to the divine command, by which the continuous involvement of God with the creation is maintained. In fact, while the significance of the names Adoil and Aruchas remains a matter of speculation, along with their connection to other cosmogonies, the most obvious feature of the account is that they act only by divine commandment. It is worth stressing here that this feature is not accidental or occasional in 2 Enoch, but is closely connected to the central ethical preoccupation of the work with the status of the Lord as creator and the nature of fidelity as obedience to created order.

The combination of technical terminology most obviously associated with the Platonic influence on early Christian theology, including in its gnostic iterations and in the responses to these by other Christians, points to a date later rather than earlier in antiquity. Certainly what we find in 2 Enoch is radically more developed in philosophical terms than the rather rudimentary assertion of creation from nothing in 2 Maccabees 7:28. There are, I think, elements in the account that can be interpreted as a polemical resistance of certain ideas present in some “gnostic” traditions, about the independent agency of other entities in the creation of the material world, and this would also support the suspicion that the account is later rather than earlier. I will trace further examples of this in Chapter 6. In this regard, we might categorize 2 Enoch as very “conservative,” and its theological-philosophical commitment to the uniqueness of God as creator could be explained in relation to Christian responses to Gnosticism but

⁸⁴ Gerhard May, *Creatio Ex Nihilo: The Doctrine of “Creation out of Nothing” in Early Christian Thought* (trans. A.S. Worrall; 2nd Edition; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2004), 77. Originally published as *Schöpfungs aus dem Nichts: die Entstehung der Lehre von der creatio ex nihilo* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978).

also, plausibly, Jewish responses. This would be especially true in communities with substantial Jewish presence, such as both Syria and Egypt.

Yet the cosmogony retains details that do not obviously fit with the “accepted” creation traditions of Judaism or Christianity. The long recension, arguably, has been modified to resemble more closely the biblical account; I will discuss this further in Chapter 6. The short recension, meanwhile, is quite different from this; a case can be made that some details have been excised from it because they proved difficult for scribes to live with. Even if this has happened, however, elements remain that might point to a more liminal provenance, among people whose beliefs and, as importantly, whose *discourse* is shaped by that of the late antique accounts of *creatio ex nihilo*, and the debates between these, but whose cosmogonies continue to incorporate elements from surrounding mythologies.

It is an interesting exercise in triangulation to compare what we find in 2 Enoch with the representations of cosmogonical material in Bardaisan of Edessa and the writings of his followers. Much of what I have said of 2 Enoch is true also, it would seem, of Bardaisan’s account of creation (although we are reliant on second-hand sources for any sense of what this may have contained). While generally identified with Jewish Christianity, Bardaisan apparently developed an account of creation that showed little interest in Genesis 1–2 and drew, instead, on philosophical sources, notably Plato’s *Timaeus* and the writings of Democritus.

... since Christian doctrine was still inchoate in the second century, there were no parameters which had as yet been established between “pagan” and “Christian” physics and metaphysics and thus no parameters to transgress. For this reason, Bardaisan understood himself as “Christian” following a set of criteria very different from those which delineated Christians even a century later; Bardaisan lacked a Christian cosmology because, in second-century Edessa, such a category had not yet been developed.⁸⁵

Much of this resonates with the picture of creation encountered also in 2 Enoch, and may speak to the interest in the elements and in the labelling of some entities within the heavenly armies as *stoichi*.

⁸⁵ Nicola Denzey, “Bardaisan of Edessa,” in *A Companion to Second-Century Christian 'Heretics,'* ed. Antti Marjanen, and Petri Luomanen (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 168.

Bardaisan's cosmogony appears to have been shaped by the demiurgic qualities of the Platonic traditions, with God making use of pre-existent matter; this is reminiscent of 2 Enoch's representation of God's commanding the invisible things but differs in the key regard that the transformation from non-visibility into visibility parallels the transformation from non-being to being. So, while there are a number of similarities that might allow us to see a common cosmogonical discourse in 2 Enoch and Bardaisan, there is one striking difference that might suggest that the pseudepigraphon has been influenced by the later traditions of *creatio ex nihilo*.

I will return to this point of comparison with Bardaisan in the next chapter, for there are some further points of connection and contrast with his anthropology in the work and some of these appear to be entangled with the differences between the long and short recensions.

Comparing The Parables and 2 Enoch to Sefer Hekhalot

We are now in a position to consider more closely the similarities and differences between the Parables, 2 Enoch and the various forms of Sefer Hekhalot in the development of the motif of revealed secrets. At several key points in the Sefer Hekhalot manuscripts, Enoch (as Metatron) is identified as the one appointed to have unique knowledge of God's secrets. In Synopse §12, he describes how God has opened to him 300,000 gates of understanding; this imagery provides a pattern for what follows, as an equivalent number of gates are opened for various truths, including prudence, life, love and Torah. In Synopse § 14 (corresponding to 3 Enoch 11:1–2 in Odeberg and in Alexander's translation), Metatron tells Ishmael that from his installation as heavenly scribe, the Holy One has revealed to him all mysteries of Torah and secrets of wisdom, including the "orders of creation" as revealed before the maker of the world.⁸⁶ The interest in celestial hierarchies throughout Sefer Hekhalot is closely linked to this, with the orders and ranks of angels associated with the cosmic orders. Metatron's role and status as custodian of these secrets is closely linked to his exaltation, described in the next Synopse (§15, corresponding to 3 Enoch 12) where Enoch is dressed in a glorious cloak and crowned, before being named the lesser YHWH.⁸⁷

⁸⁶ Cf. Schäfer, *Übersetzung* I, 34; Philip Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," in Charlesworth *OTP* 1, 264.

⁸⁷ Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," 265.

The apparently divine status of Enoch-Metatron is, of course, a matter of conflict in the rabbinic traditions, with some strands concerned by his encroachment of divine uniqueness and recounting his removal from office.⁸⁸ Here, though, Enoch is encountered as a glorious king, a splendid sage, whose rule is linked to the totality of his knowledge of the secrets that have been disclosed to him.

In general terms, there are similarities to the glorification of the Son of Man in the Parables and to the glorification of Enoch in 2 Enoch 22, although the imagery in *Sefer Hekhalot* is closer to the latter,⁸⁹ as is the first-person voicing of the account. I will discuss this further in Chapter 7, where I will also consider some of the links between the royal imagery used of Enoch and that used elsewhere of Adam. Here, I note two points. First, while the representation of Enoch/Metatron as the exalted custodian of divine secrets places him among and, in key regards, above various angelic figures, the imagery and language may be shaped most significantly by Mesopotamian traditions associated with human diviners and oracle-givers. This point has been argued by Daphna Arbel, among others,⁹⁰ who has made the case that the labelling of various princely figures trembling and shrinking from Metatron in *Synopse* §17—the princes of the אלים, the אראלים and the טפשרים—draws upon terminology used of human diviners and does not refer to ranks of angels. The imagery, at this point, is intended to show Metatron's superiority to other human seers and reflects the complex development of the *Hekhalot* traditions in late antiquity or the early medieval period. Of course, this imagery is bound up in complicated ways with other Mesopotamian traditions, notably those concerning King Emmeduranki as the great diviner and scholar of heavenly secrets. The influences of these divinatory traditions on the early development of the Enoch literature, and more generally on Jewish apocalyptic thought, is widely recognized⁹¹ and has been explored quite thoroughly by Andrei Orlov in relation to “the

⁸⁸ For a discussion of the relevant texts, which include some recensions of 3 Enoch itself, see Peter Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009), 321–22.

⁸⁹ This point is made by Philip Alexander, “3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 247.

⁹⁰ Daphna Arbel, “Enoch-Metatron—The Highest of all Tapsarim: 3 Enoch and Divinatory Traditions,” *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 15 (2008): 289–320. For further bibliography, see 292, note 6. Of particular importance is A. Jeffers, *Magic and Divination in Ancient Palestine and Syria* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 105–9.

⁹¹ See, for example, John J. Collins, *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 59–74; 339–50.

Enoch-Metatron tradition.”⁹² There is a tendency, however, to frame these influences in terms of evolutionary trajectories, with the Mesopotamian influences crossing into the Jewish context and generating something new that then grows over time. Collins writes of the early Enoch literature:

“Despite the influences of Enmeduranki on the figure of Enoch, the Jewish sages who produced the Enochic literature were by no means diviners of the Babylonian sort. Rather they represented a Jewish alternative to the diviners ... In accordance with Jewish tradition, they rejected most methods of divination and omen-seeking. What one finds in the Enochic apocalypses is ultimately a new phenomenon.”⁹³

The macroform of 3 Enoch, a much later work than those discussed here by Collins, cannot be described in such neat terms. Few would contest that the work is a more complex recombination of divinatory and “magical” traditions, shaped by later accounts of celestial hierarchies. What Arbel’s work highlights—particularly when placed within more recent discussions of the ongoing life of Enoch traditions in late antiquity and the medieval period in eastern contexts such as Sasanian Babylonia⁹⁴—is that this may also reflect Mesopotamian influences, not at a putative origin point but as part of an ongoing encounter. In the terms used by Deleuze and Guattari, the machines continue to make connections through antiquity ... and even through modernity.⁹⁵

This has implications for how we consider the developments visible across the Enochic traditions. I use the word “across” here rather than “within” to indicate the geographical alongside the temporal and to avoid any suggestion that development of the tradition is simply an interior phenomenon. Rather than seeking to place the different representations of Enoch as the knower of

⁹² As reflected in the title of his book Andrei Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, TSAJ 107 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); Orlov devotes his first substantive chapter (23–39) to a discussion of Enmeduranki as diviner, expert in secrets, mediator, scribe and priest.

⁹³ Cf. Collins, *Seers, Sibyls and Sages*, 343.

⁹⁴ See, here, Annette Yoshiko Reed, “From Asael and Šemihazah to Uzzah, Azzah, and Azael: 3 Enoch 5 (§§7-8) and Jewish Reception-History of 1 Enoch,” *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 8 (2001): 105–36; see also her “Categorization, Collection, and the Construction of Continuity: 1 Enoch and 3 Enoch in and beyond ‘Apocalypticism’ and ‘Mysticism’” *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 29 (2017): 268–311, esp. 271. See also Ra’anan S. Boustán, “The Study of Heikhalot Literature: Between Mystical Experience and Textual Artifact,” *Currents in Biblical Research* 6 (2007): 130–60.

⁹⁵ See the various essays in Ariel Hessayon, Annette Yoshiko Reed and Gabriele Boccaccini, eds., *Rediscovering Enoch? The Antediluvian Past from the Fifteenth to Nineteenth Centuries*, SVTP 27 (Leiden: Brill, 2023).

secrets somewhere on a trajectory traceable within a neatly buffered tradition—in which the Mesopotamian elements cross the border early and are then naturalized to something more obviously Jewish—we need to allow that they may reflect ongoing but non-linear phenomena of encounter and recombination. The elements in 2 Enoch that look more like the macroform 3 Enoch may be best explained not with recourse to evolution, but to the shared machinery of ideas that they may have encountered within a particular geographical space; undoubtedly, ideas will have developed within this space, and been shared through routes of influence, but they cannot be reduced to single lines or trajectories. The analyses of 2 Enoch and *Sefer Hekhalot* can, then, be more fruitfully coordinated if they are understood in rhizomatic terms.

This is also relevant to how we draw the Parables into this discussion. Orlov has helpfully demonstrated some of the points of divergence between the Parables and 2 Enoch in the portrayal of Enoch as seer, noting that the Mesopotamian influences are especially visible in 2 Enoch, but that the Parables draws much more upon imagery from the “Hebrew Bible,” particularly in the titles that are given to the exalted figure.⁹⁶ His account of the Enoch-Metatron tradition sees a continuity between 2 Enoch and the *Hekhalot*/*Merkavah* traditions that is particularly linked to the Mesopotamian thread that has run through the Enochic traditions from the beginning, with the Parables, by contrast, representing a kind of dead end, as Messianic concerns constructed from the Hebrew Bible are imposed on this. We have seen in this chapter a number of striking similarities between the Parables and 2 Enoch, however. The significance of the biblical material to the Parables, meanwhile, actually represents a stronger point of correspondence with *Sefer Hekhalot* than with 2 Enoch, since the Torah has a particular programmatic significance to the *Hekhalot* work which I will consider below. Again, then, rather than placing the works on trajectories, we might consider what they attest of non-linear recombinations.

This brings me to the second observation about the distinctive representation of Enoch as the knower of secrets in *Sefer Hekhalot*. One of the most striking features of this is the interest in associating the Torah with Enoch’s knowledge of the secrets. This explicit move represents a significant development from either of the other Enochic works and seems to reflect the idea of a “pre-

⁹⁶ Orlov, “Roles and Titles of the Seventh Antediluvian Hero.” I place “Hebrew Bible” in quotation marks to capture his use of this terminology.

existent” Torah.⁹⁷ The inclusion of the Torah among the secrets disclosed to Enoch in heaven clearly incorporates something not found in 2 Enoch. Neither is it found in the Parables, although the dense incorporation of elements from Israel’s scriptures there makes the difference less striking.

This is clearly connected to the preoccupation with the rabbis in the Hekhalot literature. Those who seek to map the Enoch traditions onto an evolutionary trajectory have argued that the disinterest in Torah in the early Enoch literature reflects the complexity of early Judaism and the marginal if not excluded status that the Mosaic Torah had for some in the Second Temple period;⁹⁸ the Hekhalot literature is therefore taken to represent a legacy of the absorption of Enochic traditions into Torah-oriented piety. This is not the only way to frame the differences, however, even if the Parables and 2 Enoch are considered to be Jewish. The period in which the Hekhalot literature began to emerge *qua* literature is actually only a little later than the point where rabbinic Judaism began to play a leading role in the synagogue, defining itself at once in relation to non-rabbinic Judaism and to Christianity, and it should not be difficult to imagine a world in which traditions associated with other groups were being revalorized precisely in the sorts of ways visible in the macroform of 3 Enoch. These are the kinds of “back-borrowings” that Reed notes in the context of late antiquity and factoring them into our analysis opens the way for a very different analysis of the differences and similarities between the Parables, 2 Enoch and 3 Enoch.

Conclusions

By way of segue to the conclusions to this chapter, I note an interesting thread that has run through the scholarly discussions of negative theology in Platonism and that I think has a certain relevance to what I have considered here. It has been argued that the some of the key elements in negative theology, particularly the notion of a God who is unknowable, reflect the influence of “radically oriental” ideas.⁹⁹

⁹⁷ That is, pre-existing the rest of the creation. This idea is developed in the Genesis Rabbah 1:1 and is linked to the Wisdom traditions that I will discuss in Chapter 6.

⁹⁸ For an overview of the debates, see my “Law and Lawlessness in the Enoch Literature,” in *Law and Lawlessness in Early Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. David Lincicum, Ruth Sheridan and Charles Stang, WUNT 420 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), 29–48.

⁹⁹ The claim was notably developed by Eduard Norden, *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1913). The language of “radically oriental” I take from Carabine, *Unknown God*, 52.

The thesis has been supported and critiqued by turn, with Carabine developing a careful case that the raw materials can be found in the Platonic traditions themselves and do not need to be explained with recourse to eastern influence.¹⁰⁰ For my purposes, the issue of origin and influence is less important than the observation that unquestionably lies beneath the debate, which is the degree of similarity that might be identified between negation in Platonic discourse and traditions of “mystery” in Eastern thought, including both Egyptian and Persian thought and probably also wider Asian thought within the lands linked by the legacy of Alexander’s empire. Whether or not negative discourse in Platonism was generated by Oriental influences, that similarity facilitates the kinds of fusion that are certainly visible in the later Neoplatonic traditions (which are, of course, deeply invested in Egyptian culture, even when they are generated in Syria). Might it also have facilitated representations of God that are not marked by the use of technical terminology or jargon, but nevertheless exhibit an increasingly marked sense of divine beyondness? I noted above Emma Wasserman’s study of divine warfare in Paul,¹⁰¹ in which she sees his discourse as resourced particularly by Middle Platonism, but also incorporating elements from West Asian mythology; obliquely, I think, this supports the suggestion I make here.

This allows an interesting synthetic analysis of what I have considered in this Chapter. Both the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch are marked by a particular interest in the secrets that are revealed to and through Enoch, with the language used in ways that are radically more developed than in most other pseudepigrapha and that include not just eschatological secrets, but also cosmological, cosmogonic and properly theological. The radical nature of the theological strand—the actual god-talk—is precisely the thing that has been neglected. The closest analogue to the interest in the secrets is 3 Enoch, with The Parables and 2 Enoch resembling this in different ways. 3 Enoch clearly has its own developments of the theme, but it is surely significant that the work most closely resembling the Parables and 2 Enoch is not part of the primary Enoch literature attested from Qumran, but is a later document associated with the Babylonian phase of rabbinic traditions.

The representation of God in the Parables, its theology proper, draws heavily upon biblical resources, yet it clearly recasts these in such a way as to radically emphasize the “otherness” of God.

¹⁰⁰ Carabine, *Unknown God*, 52–70.

¹⁰¹ Wasserman, *Apocalypse as Holy War*.

Correspondingly, it also displays an increasingly detailed interest in the roles of mediators, both the angelic figures and the Son of Man. Yet, with the possible exception of the enthronement of the Chosen One, this does not move *dramatically* beyond what is encountered in Second Temple literature. Importantly, too, the emphasis on the otherness of God is developed through the use of scriptural material, even if this is utilized in distinctive ways and with unique titular strategies employed, and lacks the technical terminology of the philosophical traditions.

The representation of God in 2 Enoch shares with this an emphasis on the categorical uniqueness and essential otherness of God, with a similar interest in the role of mediatorial figures in creation, providence and eschatology. Enoch himself takes on a particular significance within the picture, as the one who uniquely knows the secrets of creation and the cosmic measurements. Distinctively, however, 2 Enoch utilizes technical language most obviously associated with Platonic traditions of negative discourse. It does this, however, in casual combination with elements that are distinctively awkward in the dedicated discourse of earlier (Middle) Platonism: it uses anthropomorphic imagery quite freely and without any need to comment, and it places an emphasis on personal reciprocity (explored further in Chapters 8 and 9) that does not sit comfortably with the philosophical discourse of Middle Platonism, including its expressions within Judaism. Further, for all the interest in mediation, there is a certain emphasis on divine immanence specifically in relation to specific creative acts (which I will explore in Chapter 6) and in relation to the reciprocation of votive offerings that is not easily placed within the discourse of earlier Platonism. Finally, there is a particular interest, developed both positively and negationally, with the concept of analogy.

I find it easier to explain the use of technical negational language and the presence of the developed interest in negation in 2 Enoch by situating the work in later antiquity, after the growth in popularity and influence of Neoplatonism as a mode of specifically theological discourse that was capable, especially after the contributions of Iamblichus, of affirming diverse religious practices and rituals. By situating the work at a later point in Antiquity, we can account for the presence of technical language as a diffused cultural phenomenon, particularly as part of the accepted way to talk about the highest God, without this language necessarily indicating a commitment to Platonism itself. In this sense, it is comparable to the contemporary popularity of language from the philosophical study of deconstruction, widely used without serious intellectual commitment to the values of that movement.

At the same time, it becomes important to note that the very same philosophical-theological discourse, that of Middle Platonism moving towards what might be labelled (if somewhat artificially) as Neoplatonism, was also a crucial factor in the emergence of the various “gnostic” groups and their distinctive accounts of God and creation. Potentially, then, the use of Neoplatonic terminology and strategy could be entangled with competitive discourse, with polemics about how the relationship between God and the creation is rightly to be understood. For 2 Enoch, the highest God, *is* the creator of the material cosmos. If this is polemical, however, the polemics are not obviously oriented towards competition between groups, but between ideas. This is theological argument, not inter-group attack. This theme will emerge further in Chapter 6, as I consider the portrayal of Wisdom.

Finally, while such discourse could have emerged broadly within the area of western Asia and the eastern Mediterranean, there are already some particular contact points emerging with the Syrian articulations of Neoplatonism. It is, I think, relatively easy to imagine that a work like the Parables of Enoch could be composed sometime in the later second temple period, by authors deeply invested in the Scriptures of Israel and whose thinking about God is influenced by “Oriental” qualities of reflection. The overlap of Noah/giant traditions with both Qumran and with later Manichaean literature might support suspicions that the work was composed somewhere with demonstrable links to both, even if at different stages, and as noted in Chapter 1, Syria is such a context. If the Parables circulated in Syria, it is easy to imagine that it might have been one of the resources that would eventually filter into the traditions of those who wrote 2 Enoch in that broader territory, combining its themes and some elements of its imagery with the technical language of Neoplatonism. This may also be connected to the distinctive interest in associating Enoch with the production of books, an emphasis that should not be passed over too quickly nor treated simply as a matter of competition between groups in Judaism interested in different cultural heroes. If the book is allowed to be later, it may reflect a counterpoint to Manichaean traditions.

Although the suggestion that these elements point to a context in Syria, in late antiquity, is made cautiously, with an acknowledged degree of speculation, further elements will emerge in the chapters that follow that will support it.

Chapter 6. God, Wisdom and Humanity in the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch

This chapter continues the study of the disclosure of “secrets” to and through Enoch, but here I focus on one particular figure that is deployed within this, that of Wisdom and their¹ relationship to humanity. I separate this material into a chapter of its own simply because of the scale of discussion that it requires, but the observations that I make will essentially align with and extend those made in Chapter 5, where I considered the representation of God and the “secrets” in the Enochic works. Once again, here, I will highlight the extent to which the Parables can plausibly be located within the developing theology of early Judaism and its internal variegation, a claim that is hardly original but that can now be developed with particular reference to the representation of Wisdom. I will further explore evidence to suggest that the imagery in question is then developed in 2 Enoch to accommodate or incorporate the complex interest in *analogia*, particularly around the human body and the divine form, that is especially prominent in the various species of Syrian theology in late antiquity. Here, we can unpack in more detail the parallels noted briefly in Chapter 4, between 2 Enoch and the Apostolic Constitutions, and this will allow us to explore some further examples of Syrian theology interested in how the human body might function analogically.

In what follows, I will largely use the language of “figure” in references to Wisdom. This allows us some suppleness and some constructive ambiguity around the question of whether, in any given case, Wisdom is best categorized as a personification, a hypostasization or an identified person. The word “figure” can accommodate all of these and by using this word, we can leave open the possibility that the texts might exhibit some blending, collapsing, or remapping of the various functions.² This will allow us to consider the similarities and differences in the complex figurations at work in the works that are our primary focus and in those that might run parallel to (or intersect with) them in antiquity.

¹ I use the pronoun with its accepted significance as gender neutral at this point, to anticipate a discussion that will need to consider whether Wisdom is regarded in gendered terms.

² The language of “figuration” (in distinction to “typology,” at least as this word has been used in modern theology, particularly in Protestant works) has received renewed attention in recent years, particularly in relation to theological interpretation and the strategies by which pre-modern writers in various traditions coordinated texts through the perceived correspondences between the figures represented in them (e.g., Christ and Wisdom, or the Christian and the Psalmist). While the approach has been particularly popular in relation to Christological exegesis, it also provides useful categories for thinking about early Jewish, early Christian and “pagan” interpretation, and the way that their various approaches utilize the association of figures.

Wisdom and Creation Outside the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch: Some Framing Considerations

The representation of Wisdom as a figure is wrapped up with a number of the great dialectics in the history of modern biblical scholarship, several of which run through the substance of the present study. Wisdom has been seen as an alternative to Torah, or as an alternative identification *of* Torah; Wisdom has been seen as a distinctively female divine being alongside Israel's God, a second power in heaven, or as a representation *of* Israel's God, a feminine personification of a divine virtue; Wisdom has been seen as a figurehead for the theologies rejected by Jewish apocalyptic, or as the figure at the heart of the apocalyptic development of the wisdom traditions.

I use the word "dialectics" for two reasons. First, when the use of that word is affirmed (even if critically) and its philosophical history appreciated, it highlights that apparent oppositions have a way of generating fresh resolutions and new possibilities.³ Second, when such an application of the word is considered *self*-critically, it can highlight that we have a tendency as modern scholars to read vibrant multiplicity in a way that reduces it to contested binaries, drawing a line of evolution or progress through the middle of those dialectics, in ways that I have already challenged with reference to the work of Deleuze and Guattari.⁴ We too easily read multiplicity through the eyes of evolutionary dualists and

³ This is obviously to invoke the insights of Hegel, while the rest of the paragraph will articulate cautions about how these might be appropriated. It is worth noting that Hegelian thought has a complex significance for the geographical areas in view within the present study. It has played an influential and often distortive role in Western evaluations of "the Orient" and of Islamic thought (as well, of course, as its function in shaping Western self-identification); this includes some local instantiations within Syria and the surrounding areas through colonial activity. But it has also been received and appropriated within the modern Islamic and Christian philosophies that have emerged in these areas. For a helpful and detailed discussion, see Lorella Ventura, *Hegel in the Arab World: Modernity, Colonialism, and Freedom* (Cham: Palgrave MacMillan, 2018).

⁴ This comment recognizes the legacy of Hegelian dialectics as an analytical frame or paradigm for the study of historical texts within the context of biblical studies. Much of this can be traced back to the influence of (and reaction to) F.C. Baur's account of Christian origins and development; even where the claims of that account are rejected, models of development have often continued to work with models of polemics, oppositions and resolutions. For an analysis of the early influence of Hegelian dialectics on biblical studies during the 19th Century, framed within the study of theology and religion and affecting not only Baur but also his critics and their counter-constructions, see Johannes Zachhuber, *Theology as Science in Nineteenth-Century Germany: From F.C. Baur to Ernst Troeltsch* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013). The naïveté around Hegelian influences in biblical studies is not merely unfortunate, but is dangerous. Hegelianism, working in conjunction with other elements of modern thought and with its essential emphasis on "progress," was a major factor in the development of "racial" interpretations of the biblical material. See Shawn Kelley, *Racializing Jesus: Race, Ideology and the Formation of Modern Biblical Scholarship* (London: Taylor and Francis, 2002).

The language of "multiplicities" that I use here is an intentional echo of some key critical voices in the philosophical response to the legacy of Hegelian dialectics. In particular, it is drawn from the work of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari,

force it into the categories that are more comfortable to us. We should be prepared to encounter something messier, more colourful and perhaps less obviously “directional” in the traditions and tropes about Wisdom.

The book of Proverbs—at least, some strata of what would later be redacted into the work we recognize in scripture—is sometimes seen as the “fountainhead”⁵ of the Jewish Wisdom tradition, though one fed by groundwater from other ancient, international traditions, particularly those of Egypt.⁶ The Egyptian influence has been traced through formal parallels in specific collections of parallels⁷ and also through the conceptual similarities of Wisdom and Maat,⁸ this being a pervasive, polysemic and quite elastic concept, generally linked to the order of the cosmos and the alignment of agents to this.⁹

A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987; transl. from *Mille Plateaux: Capitalisme et Schizophrénie*, Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1980). This work quite intentionally expresses and overlays the voices of a multiplicity of thinkers and artists; their acknowledgement of the multiplicity of intellectual and social practices that might contribute to cultural goods and philosophical legacies is an invaluable one for the analysis of ancient works that may be works of art as much as intellect. See, further, my discussion in Chapter 1.

⁵ See, for example, Ben Witherington III, *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 19.

⁶ See the important early study by Paul Humbert, *Recherches sur les sources égyptiennes de la littérature sapientiale d'Israël* (Mémoires de l'Université de Neuchâtel 7. Neuchâtel: Secrétariat de l'Université, 1929). It is worth noting the extent to which the critical study of the Egyptian material was actually framed by its relevance to that of the Hebrew Bible and the growing recognition that this has created problems in the categorization and analysis of specific Egyptian works:

When the discipline evolved in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Egyptological classifications of texts were strongly influenced by the Hebrew Bible. What resembled the Wisdom category in that corpus got put into an Egyptian “Wisdom” category that was never well defined, especially not according to an emic perspective. Consequently, without much discussion, many Egyptian compositions came to be labeled as “Wisdom” by scholars, resulting in a quite inhomogeneous group, which makes a meaningful analysis rather difficult.

Quote from Joachim Friedrich Quack, “Wisdom in Egypt,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Wisdom and the Bible*, ed. Will Kynes (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 103–120; quotation from 103. The question of “eastern” influence on Israelite and Jewish traditions has also been revisited more programmatically in recent years, as I noted in the discussion of “influence” in Chapter 1.

⁷ The Teaching of Amenemope, published in 1923, was particularly important in the identification of such parallels; there are striking points of formal similarity with Proverbs 22:17–23:11. These are nicely represented in John H. Walton, *Ancient Israelite Literature in its Cultural Context* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 192–3.

⁸ This is also commonly represented as Ma’at. The possible influence of traditions about Maat are discussed briefly by Gerhard von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel*, 153, and in greater detail by Christa Kayatz, *Studien zu Proverbien 1–9* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1966), 76–119.

⁹ Maulana Karenga, *Maat, the Moral Ideal in Ancient Egypt: A Study in Classical African Ethics* (London: Taylor & Francis Group, 2003), 6, writes:

The etymology of Maat ... suggests an evolution from a physical concept of straightness, evenness, levelness, correctness, as the wedged-shaped glyph suggests, to a general concept of rightness, including the ontological and ethical sense of truth, justice, righteousness, order—in a word, the rightness of things A study of the literature on Maat, as well as other relevant texts, reveals immediately that Maat has many interrelated meanings, ethical and

Both Wisdom and Maat can be represented as female figure and this allows for some interesting blending with the imagery used of Isis in Egyptian religion. The portrayal of Isis is not static—it develops over time and has some distinctive local qualities—but some of the traditions, particularly in the Ptolemaic era, attest a somewhat summodeistic portrayal of the god, with the qualities, roles and identities of other deities and powers understood to be expressions of this one, including Maat. Judith Newman writes:

During the Ptolemaic era, Isis absorbed or was associated with many other deities throughout the region and thus one of her frequent epithets was *myrionymos*, according to Plutarch, the one who is invoked, “by many names.”¹⁰

While earlier traditions about Isis or Maat may have been influential on the development of Proverbs 8 (and there has been a good deal of discussion about which of these might have been most influential and whether other Israelite traditions may have contributed),¹¹ the developments through the Ptolemaic period may be especially significant for later works that draw upon its imagery, such as Sirach 24, which I will discuss below. There has been a long-running debate about the significance of Wisdom’s representation in imagery shaped by traditions about Maat and Isis in Proverbs, particularly in chapter 8: is Wisdom a personification of an attribute (and, if so, an attribute of God or of creation) or is she a

otherwise, and thus, has been defined in various ways depending on the emphasis any given author wished to make in a given text.

¹⁰ Judith Newman, “Hybridity, Hydrology, and Hidden Transcript: Sirach 24 and the Judean Encounter with Ptolemaic Isis Worship,” in *Jewish Cultural Encounters in the Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern World*, ed. Mladen Popović, Myles Schoonover, and Marijn Vandenberghe, JSJSupp 178 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 157–76, quotation from 162. Her quotation is from Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 12–19 (355d–358d).

¹¹ In addition to the works noted in footnote 7, above, see also Claudia Camp, *Wisdom and the Feminine in the Book of Proverbs* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), which considers the representation of women and wisdom more broadly in the book. Elizabeth A Johnson, “Jesus the Wisdom of God: A Biblical Basis for a Non-Androcentric Christology,” *ETL* 61 (1985): 261–94. For the possibility that the imagery preserves traditions about a female god in Israelite thought, see Bernhard Lang, *Frau Weisheit: Deutung einer biblischer Gestalt* (Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1975) and *Wisdom and the Book of Proverbs: A Hebrew Goddess Redefined* (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1986). In evaluating the various scholarly contributions, it is important to pay attention to the insights offered by Francesca Stavrapokolou, “The Ancient Goddess, the Biblical Scholar, and the Religious Past: Re-imagining Divine Women,” in *The Bible and Feminism: Remapping the Field*, ed. Yvonne Sherwood (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 495–513. Stavrakopolou shows that scholarly readings of feminine imagery in ancient literature often press this into distinctly androcentric and heteronormative constructs of gender. This invites some ongoing self-critical reflection among those considering the representation of Wisdom in female terms and, as we will note below in relation to Sirach, some awareness of the non-binary gender fluidity sometimes at work.

distinct agent, an identified person, whether that person is a distinct female deity or a female identification of the one god?¹²

Perhaps importantly, one factor in this debate concerns the contrastive pairing of Wisdom and Folly, both represented as female figures.¹³ For Ben Witherington III, that pairing makes obvious that we are dealing with personification, since the identification of Wisdom as a personal agent would require an equivalent identification of Folly; for him, it makes better sense to see both as personifications of the essential characteristics of virtue and vice.¹⁴ Citing Ringgren, he also invokes the “strict monotheism” of Israelite religion as a factor precluding the identification of such personifications as real deities. Only later, in his view, will Wisdom be identified as a person in her own right. This, however, begs a number of questions. First, what if—as we have discussed in Chapter 1—Israelite religion, like the Judaism that emerged from it, was not “strictly monotheistic” in the sense that he assumes? It is feasible to imagine the rhetoric here might reflect an artificial attempt to categorize and thereby limit the significance of what is in the text; by speaking of figuration, we can allow that the linguistics at work involve a certain ambiguity, and one that is not just about whether Wisdom and Folly are agents, but also about whether they are internal or external operators, to use the language of Miryam Brand.¹⁵ Do they figurally represent internal qualities, even if these are of the alignment or misalignment of inner states to “the grain of the universe,”¹⁶ or do they represent external agents of order and chaos, capable of leading the human into participation in one or the other? The ambiguity inherent in the linguistics allows for a supple combining of internal and external dynamics (and one that we might note has some interesting points of equivalence to Zoroastrian thought, the “dualism” of which is commonly misrepresented).

¹² For an excellent overview and discussion, not only of the discussion around Wisdom, but also of the other female figures in Proverbs, see Nili Shupak, “Female Imagery in Proverbs 1-9 in the Light of Egyptian Sources,” *Vetus Testamentum* 61 (2011): 310–23.

¹³ On the gendered dimensions of this, and its social significance, see Carol A. Newsom, “Women and the Discourse of Patriarchal Wisdom: A Study of Proverbs 1–9,” in *Gender and Difference in Ancient Israel*, ed. Peggy L. Day (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 142–60.

¹⁴ Witherington, *Jesus the Sage*, 43.

¹⁵ Miryam T. Brand, *Evil Within and Without: The Source of Sin and Its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Judaism* *Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements* 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013).

¹⁶ To invoke the title of Stanley Hauerwas’s Gifford Lectures, St Andrews, 2001, published as Stanley Hauerwas, *With the Grain of the Universe: The Church’s Witness and Natural Theology* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2001).

These same questions of figural significance emerge in the study of the traditions about the *yetzer*, the human inclination, and the powers in which it participates, bearing also on the depiction of the spirits of light and darkness associated with these.¹⁷ While these traditions, at least as we have received them, are later, some of the insights recently developed by Ishay Rosen-Zvi and developed by Benjamin Wold¹⁸ can, I think, fruitfully be brought back to the study of the material in Proverbs and the traditions that develop its key figures of Wisdom and Folly. Rosen-Zvi, tracing the development of the *yetzer* concept, notes that already in some texts from Qumran, this language is used “in a demonological semantic field,”¹⁹ the linguistics implying that it is conceived as an agent that can be rebuked or escaped, but without explicitly identifying it as such. This emphasis on linguistics, on the language-play of lexicon and grammar that occupies a particular semantic field, rather than on the categorization of the particular figure as person or personification, is one that I think can usefully be brought to other examples in which the “vice-principle” is identified in personal terms, such as the Sin that crouches at Cain’s door and that takes Paul prisoner or the Iniquity that we will encounter in 1 Enoch 42. For these, it functions not just as a way of making more vivid the reality of the thing in question, but to maintain a linguistic ambiguity about whether the thing should be seen as an internal or an external reality, acting *out* or acting *on*. Something similar might be said of Folly in Proverbs and, importantly, this might allow for a mutuality of identification to emerge between this figure and others that occupy the linguistic domain of the tempter, so that Folly, Sin and Iniquity are understood to be equivalent figures. If that is the case, then Wisdom too might be seen as more than just a personification, but as a linguistically complex figure, open to being identified both as an external agent and an internal state of virtue.

Whatever we make of this, Wisdom is represented in Proverbs 8 as playing a key role in the creation of the world, apparently distinct from the involvement of God. Some later traditions read this quite explicitly in relation to Torah, which is sometimes also represented in personal terms; this may reflect associations made within Proverbs itself, which is now recognized to synthesize various

¹⁷ Ishay Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires: Yetzer hara and the Problem of Evil in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2011). See also the collection of essays in James Aitken, Hector Patmore and Ishay Rosen-Zvi, eds., *The Evil Inclination in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021).

¹⁸ Benjamin Wold, “Demonizing Sin? The Evil Inclination in 4QInstruction and the Dead Sea Scrolls” in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Chris Keith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, WUNT II: 417 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 34–48; “Sin and Evil in the Letter of James in the Light of Qumran Discoveries,” *New Testament Studies* 65 (2019): 78–93.

¹⁹ Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 41.

perspectives on Torah,²⁰. An early example of this is Sirach 24, which draws upon the imagery of Proverbs 8; this text represents Wisdom as the first of God's creatures, playing the defining role in the construction of the cosmos and the operations of providence and then taking a particular form and dwelling among Israel, with all who obey her being blessed. The culmination of this involves an explicit identification of Wisdom with the Torah and the covenant with Israel:

All this is the book of the covenant of the Most High God,
the law that Moses commanded us
as an inheritance for the congregations of Jacob.
It overflows, like the Pishon, with wisdom,
and like the Tigris at the time of the first fruits (Sirach 24:24–5, NRSV)

I will return to this below, for there are some important and heavily discussed points of contact with 1 Enoch 42, but here the point of note is that the Torah is a particular embodiment of Wisdom. The primary or governing identity, then, is Wisdom, but she is perfectly embodied in Torah. This may reflect an absorption of Isis or Maat imagery into a Jewish work, but it may also reflect a counter-claim to the widespread Isis worship of the Ptolemaic period, reflecting the complex history and significance of Sirach itself, as a work with both Palestinian and Egyptian connections. By developing the identification of Torah as the true embodiment of order that underlies the cosmos, as the fountain of life and flourishing for all who will yield to her, Sirach 24 reorients the Egyptian imagery to a Jewish discourse about God and his covenant.

There is *something* of a parallel to this in Wisdom of Solomon, in the sense that Torah is understood to be a particular instantiation of the prior and greater reality of Sophia, but that work is less preoccupied with the status of Torah or with what it means to inhabit a Torah-centred piety than is Sirach. Instead, the divine Wisdom is now the primary thing, associated with or even indistinguishable from the divine *pneuma*.²¹ There are debates about how Wisdom of Solomon should be located within

²⁰ Bernd Schipper, "When Wisdom Is Not Enough! The Discourse on Wisdom and Torah and the Composition of the Book of Proverbs," in *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of 'Torah' in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period*, ed. Bernd Schipper and D. Andrew Teeter (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 55–80.

²¹ John J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 198.

the philosophical landscape of the time: some of its language seems to draw upon Stoicism, but its dominant categories align better with Middle Platonism.²² There are some important points of connection with Philo, whose own philosophy is likewise rather synthetic of the different streams of Greek thought and also combines Stoic language with Platonic conceptuality. It is worth noting that the resultant blending of *logos*, *nomos* and *pneuma* results in a rather gender-fluid semantic domain,²³ but, as with Proverbs and Sirach, Wisdom of Solomon principally develops the female depiction of Wisdom, again probably shaped by Isis imagery. Like Isis, she is a bride (9:2), the spouse of God (8:3) and of Solomon the king (8:9), and she is a saviour (Wisdom 10 & 11).

In later rabbinic writings, perhaps preserving earlier traditions, the identification of Wisdom and Torah is developed still further. In Genesis Rabbah 1:1, there are several points where the Wisdom that speaks of herself in Proverbs 8:22 is identified to be the Torah, presenting herself as the beginning of God's work, providing the plans and schematics according to which the creation is constructed. The words of Proverbs 8:22 justify this identification and underlie the belief that Torah can be numbered among the six things created before the world. Importantly, as one of these pre-existent things, Wisdom-Torah is a communicative entity, an agent who speaks.

All of these works reflect a strong positive connection between Wisdom, Torah, cosmos and practical ethics, even if they vary in their degrees and kinds of interest in the significance of the Law: not only does fidelity to Torah entail the blessing of living in alignment with the design and will of the creator, but in principal that blessing is open to all who will learn from Torah (even if, in practice, Torah is associated especially with Israel, the people among whom Wisdom dwells). Other traditions in early Judaism, however, may represent alternative Wisdom pieties, perhaps less interested in the Torah, or with a sense of its limited capacity to frustrate the inclination towards sin, or perhaps even rather hostile towards it.

One example that is often cited in this regard is the concept of the *raz nihyeh* in 4QInstruction. I mentioned this already in Chapter 5, in relation to the concept of the mystery/secret, but it is appropriate to discuss it here in a little more depth because it is often seen as related to the traditions

²² David Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation, with Introduction and Commentary* (Yale: Yale University Press, 1979), 33; See also Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 200.

²³ The overlaying of Sophia and Logos imagery, in particular, brings a certain fluidity of gender. In 9:1, all things are made by God's *logos*; in 16:12, the *logos* brings healing. In 18:15, the *logos* is depicted as a warrior.

about Wisdom. Like those traditions, and their own equivalence to the representation of Maat and Isis in Egyptian thought, 4QInstruction represents the *raz nihyeh* as a principle of both creational order and eschatological justice, weaving this concept through its own paraenetical material. The *raz* is not represented in obviously personal terms in 4QInstruction—there is nothing equivalent to the developed female imagery of Wisdom encountered in our other texts—and it obviously takes much of its colour from the Persian world. Nevertheless, the parallels with Maat, in particular, are obvious.²⁴

There is some debate about the significance of Torah in 4QInstruction. Arguably, it represents an outlook that ascribes less significance to Torah than to the *raz nihyeh*,²⁵ but we have to ask whether this reflects a negativity towards the Mosaic law or rather an emphasis on the soteriological necessity of a further apocalyptic disclosure or an inspired interpretation of the Law.²⁶ Functionally, the popularity of 4QInstruction at Qumran *alongside* the other scriptures of Israel, elements from which are woven into its own paraenesis, suggests that the community perceived no difficult tension or competition between these sources of authority. A more nuanced interpretation of the evidence would see 4QInstruction as relativizing the functional importance of Torah, if not its emblematic significance, by asserting the necessity of the *raz nihyeh* to true fidelity.

It is important to consider what might be happening here, and how scholars interpret this, a little further. As I have already noted, there is a tendency in scholarship to approach apparent differences as binaries or dialectics, as points of conflict or competition; this has often been linked to the framing of relationships in terms of schools or bounded groups. But some groups may have more permeable or porous boundaries and the existence of “schools” is no longer seen to be the driving factor that it once was. Consequently, imagery that appears to be deployed in competition or polemics may actually represent a less conflictual kind of aggregation or association. This, though, can still result in particular distinctive commitments occupying the primary place of definition within the ideological

²⁴ Pieter Venter, “Did Ms Wisdom of Proverbs 8 Become a Mystery in 4QInstruction?” in *Hervormde teologiese studies* 72 (2016): 1-9.

²⁵ This is the position taken, for example, by Benjamin Wold, *4QInstruction: Divisions and Hierarchies*. STDJ 123 (Leiden: Brill, 2018).

²⁶ This is broadly the approach that I advocated in my *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. JSJSupp 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

complex, effectively controlling the significance of the elements that have been absorbed or seconded:²⁷ Wisdom and Torah may be associated with the *raz nihyeh*, but if the latter is the true key to salvation, then those previous elements must be interpreted through its regulating insights, even if they retain a foundational emblematic significance.

This is a useful segue to considering Wisdom Christology. “Wisdom Christology” has often been invoked in the service of feminist interpretation, since the underlying words for Wisdom in both Hebrew and Greek are feminine and some figurations of Wisdom, as we have seen, are clearly female. Wisdom Christology may be seen as preserving female representations of God-in-creation, often vestigially in writings that are otherwise aligned with androcentric theologies.²⁸ Others, sharing the view that Wisdom Christology is present in early traditions about Jesus, see it as representing a stage in the evolution of the identification of Jesus as a divine mediator, within a model that understands “high Christology” to represent the assimilation of Jewish ways of thinking about “divine” mediators to Greek or Hellenistic ones.²⁹ Still others have argued that the occurrence of Wisdom imagery in some of the earliest strata of the New Testament—including ostensibly in Philippians 2:5–11, the so-called Christ hymn that speaks of his descent and ascent and is sometimes considered a window onto the earliest Christology retrievable—is evidence for an “early high Christology.”³⁰ In Jewish Studies, some have seen the emergence of such Christologies, and their use of Wisdom imagery, simply as Christian particularizations of a wider tendency in early Judaism to think of God in “binitarian” terms.³¹ This is part of the scholarly complication of “monotheism”: Wisdom, or the Memra (when encountered in the Targums),³² is not merely a personification of a divine attribute, but is an individuated agent, whose

²⁷ I use the language here deliberately to invoke the work of Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* JSJSupp 77 (Leiden: Brill, 2003). Najman’s work traces the vitality of traditions associated with Moses, as they are developed in relation to new circumstances; it is, I think, a supple and nuanced way of conceptualising developments, allowing for both conservation and innovation.

²⁸ E.g., in the work of Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad, 1983), *Jesus: Miriam’s Child, Sophia’s Prophet: Critical Issues in Feminist Christology* (New York: Continuum, 1994). See also Johnson, “Jesus the Wisdom of God.”

²⁹ E.g., in the work of James Dunn, *Christology in the Making* (London: SCM Press, 1980).

³⁰ E.g., Witherington, *Jesus the Sage*, esp., 257–66, but also in the book more widely.

³¹ E.g., Daniel Boyarin, “The Gospel of the Memra: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John,” *Harvard Theological Review* 94 (2001): 243–84. Boyarin’s work is taken up in a lively and constructive dialogue in the related account developed by Peter Schäfer, *Two Gods in Heaven: Jewish Concepts of God in Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020).

³² Boyarin, “Gospel of the Memra,” 252–61, deals at some length with various criticisms of the view that the Memra is represented as a mediating agent in the targums.

identity is defined by roles elsewhere associated uniquely with the One God and who can thus be identified *as* God, in some sense. Daniel Boyarin, for example, argues that, when John's Gospel describes the *logos* through whom all things were made as God and then identifies this *logos* with Jesus, this is a particularization of the broader binitarianism associated with Wisdom and Memra in Judaism.

I (and others) have argued elsewhere against some of the claimed identifications and interpretations of Wisdom Christology in the New Testament, particularly those concerning texts that do not actually use the language of Wisdom, but are considered to contain parallels to prominent passages that do (such as Sirach 6 and 51).³³ I have also affirmed some identifications, though without seeing these as constituting pure Wisdom Christologies; rather, I have seen the aggregation and mutuality of traditions about Wisdom and Torah as furnishing some of the imagery used of Jesus as creator and redeemer.³⁴

My arguments, and whether they are correct, are not important to the present context, but a related observation is: by contrast to many of the alleged examples in the New Testament, where the identification of Wisdom is reliant upon possible allusions and parallels, with the naming of Wisdom herself purportedly dropped for reasons of gender,³⁵ there is an *explicitly* developed Wisdom Christology encountered in later Christian writings, including the Apostolic Constitutions. Here, Christ is unambiguously identified as Wisdom and, vice versa, Wisdom is specified to be Christ, with no sense of tension linked to the issues of gender. Wisdom Christology of this kind is particularly well-represented in Jewish Christianity and it is very obviously shaped by the heritage of Jewish imagery that represents Wisdom as a mediator of divine agency in creation, regardless of whether or not this Wisdom imagery constitutes a kind of binitarianism. I will consider specific examples found in Apostolic Constitutions 7.34 and 8.12 later in this chapter because they are formally very similar to some material found in 2

³³ See my *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology*, 115–95, 235–8 and 248–58. The “others” that I note who have also criticised the Wisdom Christology approach include Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), esp. 29, 175. Bauckham allows for some influence from the Wisdom traditions, but sees its formative significance as less important than Dunn, Witherington and others.

³⁴ See, for example, my “Union(s) with Christ: Colossians 1:15–20,” *Ex Auditu* 33 (2017): 93–107.

³⁵ On the gender aspect as an inconvenient detail for such claims, with a response that I find rather unconvincing, see Witherington, *Jesus the Sage*, 293.

Enoch 30; they also occur quite closely to the passages discussed in Chapter 4, in relation to the meteorological storehouses.

If we widen the scope of our investigations into early Christianity, however, the traditions about Wisdom and her role in creation become much more complicated and we need to allow this to contextualize our analysis. The figure of Wisdom is a prominent one in many of the early Christian theologies and cosmogonies that tend to be represented as heretical by the tradition. These include the teaching of the Valentinians, the Ophites and the Sethians (the “Seed of Seth”), well represented in Egypt and Syro-Mesopotamia, but also more widely in the Roman Empire.³⁶ Wisdom is also encountered in Manichaean teaching, but as one of the divine faces, rather than as a distinct agent. In these particular instantiations of Christian religion, Wisdom can play a rather complicated role in the processes of creation and redemption, the complications linked to the status of matter as good or bad, to Wisdom’s relationship to other divine beings, including the Spirit, and to the angels.³⁷

Somewhere in this complex landscape is the teaching of Bardaisan of Edessa, known only through subsequent sources that are sometimes charitable and sometimes hostile to his thought. One of the key sources is *The Book of the Laws of the Countries*, written by Bardaisan’s disciple Philippus. The interest in astrological determinism that is visible in this work is one of the reasons for the complicated reception of the figure in subsequent Christian tradition,³⁸ though it also reveals something of the eclectic combinations of Pythagorean, Stoic and Platonic ideas in late antiquity. In relation to the figure of Wisdom, the important point is that Bardaisan represents the power of the planets to determine fate as something bestowed on them by or through Wisdom, who accompanies God in the act of creation. Philippus, in fact, is careful to stress the contingency of the power that is given to the planets on the power of God himself, “for he who has power over everything is One” (*Book of the Laws of the Countries*, 29).³⁹

³⁶ For the details of these various groups, see M. David Litwa, *Found Christianities: Remaking the World of the Second Century CE* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2022). In some cases, our knowledge of the groups and their teachings is entirely reliant on the writings of historians, apologists and heresiologists in the early church who represent them in negative terms, but there are some writings that can probably be seen as the work of these groups. Litwa’s study is useful in bringing together and analyzing the range of available sources.

³⁷ Various examples of this are discussed by Litwa, *Found Christianities*, 47–8, 86–7, 103–5, 190–1.

³⁸ See Ute Possekkel, “Bardaisan’s Influence on Late Antique Christianity,” *Journal of Syriac Studies* 21 (2018): 81–125.

³⁹ Denzey, “Bardaisan of Edessa,” 171.

There is an interesting parallel to such a way of thinking about the heavenly bodies in 1 Enoch 30:6, in a section of the work that is preserved only in the long recension. Following a description of various planets and stars being placed on their respective tracks (30:3) and given their roles in the regulation of day and night (30:4–5), the passage links the movement of the sun to “each animal” that is associated with the twelve months. The Lord is identified as the one who assigns the names of the months and the animals of their seasons, as well as their connection to the “newborn and their horoscopes.”⁴⁰ This identification serves to assert divine sovereignty over the fate of individuals, but with the heavenly bodies and the animals associated with them playing a contingent role in the determination of destiny. I note later in this chapter that the description of the heavenly bodies in these verses does not appear to be well integrated with other parts of the book, so that it appears to have been added into the long recension rather than edited out of it.⁴¹ Given the parallels with debates around astral determinism in late antiquity, however, it constitutes evidence that at least some of the additional material in the long recension can be considered ancient. Further, the controversial quality of this material in antiquity may be relevant to our evaluation of the relationship between the two recensions, particularly in the creation accounts: both long and short recensions may be the products of fluid and contested traditions in late antiquity, such that neither can be considered original and the two need to be examined together, as witnesses to ideologies under debate. I shall return to this later.

One interesting thread that runs through several traditions is that the physical body of the first human is made not by the highest god, often represented as beyond knowledge and language (a motif that reflects the influences of Platonism on these religious groups),⁴² but by the angels or by Wisdom. This account of origins is linked to the translation and interpretation of Genesis 1:27: the plural “our

⁴⁰ The Slavonic here is часотвореніа (*časotvorenia*), which suggests the working or calculation of one’s hours. The translation “horoscopes” is widely used; see, e.g., Vaillant, *Le Livre Des Secrets D’Hénoch*, 101, and Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 150.

⁴¹ This is to assume criteria of consistency that may not stringently be applied to a work from antiquity, particularly given the contexts for conceptual recombinations that are explored throughout this study. Provided it is used cautiously, however, it can allow us to differentiate threads that clearly run through the work from those that appear more brokenly. Such differentiations allow us to challenge some of the arguments for the priority of the long recension.

⁴² This point reflects the general influence of Middle Platonism on the discourse of the period, and the interaction of groups within the wider world shaped by the legacy of the Hellenic culture, even as it moved towards the form that we would categorize as Neoplatonism. For a useful discussion of this dynamic in the philosophical environment that was home to the emergent groups, see Dylan M. Burns, *Apocalypse of the Alien God: Platonism and the Exile of Sethian Gnosticism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), esp 8–31.

likeness” is sometimes taken as incorporating the multiple divine beings, including the angels, on which humans are patterned, but is sometimes also dropped in favour of “the likeness,” with the angels represented as making humanity according to a second model. In either case, the immediate involvement of the highest god with the creation of the human form is rejected and the Genesis account read through an early hermeneutic of suspicion, preserving only traces of the truth.

This contextualizes the Wisdom Christology encountered in the Apostolic Constitutions and in other late antique Christian writings in important ways. It may straightforwardly represent a Christologically motivated development of the biblical and Jewish traditions about the figure of Wisdom and her involvement in creation, but it may also represent a response to those views of Wisdom considered problematic, affirming God’s involvement in the creation of the physical world, insisting on the Trinitarian significance of “our image/likeness” and developing the identification of Christ with both Wisdom and the Spirit (in a way that embraces the gender fluidity intrinsic to the language).

All of this has the capacity to frame what we encounter in the Parables of Enoch and in 2 Enoch; the former most obviously belongs within the landscape of Wisdom theologies in late second temple Judaism, but the latter, I will suggest, seems to incorporate responses to the developing theologies of groups broadly associated with Christianity. This need not mean that it is itself a Christian work. It may reflect Jewish interactions with early Christian communities, or it may be the product of more liminal groupings.

Wisdom in the Parables of Enoch

1 Enoch 42 is often cited as an exemplar of an early Jewish tradition about the descent of Wisdom to earth, and is frequently invoked as an influence on early Christological categories and their narrative frames.⁴³ While the portrayal of Wisdom in 1 Enoch 42 belongs within this broader tradition, it has been seen as something of a counterpoint to the traditional emphasis on Wisdom as an openly inviting figure, bringing blessing by her presence; here, Wisdom descends from heaven but finds no home among

⁴³ Robert G. Hammerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence, Wisdom and the Son of Man: A Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament*, SNTSMS 21. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 19–21. Fred W. Burnett, *Testament of Jesus-Sophia: Redaction/Critical Study of the Eschatological Discourse in Matthew* (Washington: University Press of America, 1981), 94–8.

and in Israel receive your inheritance.’

⁹ Before the ages, in the beginning, he created me,

and for all the ages I shall not cease to be.

¹⁰ In the holy tent I ministered before him,

and so I was established in Zion.

¹¹ Thus in the beloved city he gave me a resting place,

and in Jerusalem was my domain. (Sirach 24:7–11, NRSV)

Where Sirach understands Wisdom to be perfectly at home among Israel, identified especially with the revealed Torah and temple, the account in the Parables presents her as alien to all humanity, with no exception made for Israel. This underpins the essential “apocalyptic anthropology” of the work: for Wisdom to be known and received, she must be disclosed, but the noetic function of the chosen must also be transformed if they are to welcome her.⁴⁶

The contrastive parallelism between Wisdom and Iniquity in 1 Enoch 42:1–3 is striking. The representation of Iniquity probably draws upon Proverbs 7, particularly in the use of “her chambers,” but even this imagery is flipped: here, Iniquity does not need to seek partners but she finds them nonetheless. We might even interpret the imagery as suggesting that Iniquity is the one drawn to the parched human earth, so that the direction of attraction and of movement is into that desolation. It is humans who are the seductors. Iniquity enters those who call her forth from her chambers, as moisture is sucked into dry earth. And, where the imagery in Proverbs and Sirach leads to the description of Wisdom as the one who invites all to dwell with her, this imagery begins with Wisdom as something alien and alienated from the human condition and then moves to describing Iniquity as the thing that finds itself to be at home among them.

That it does so by employing “hydrological” imagery further reinforces the sense that it is in dialogue with Sirach 24: Judith Newman has highlighted the prominence of such imagery in Isis

⁴⁶ This is in line with my argument for the development of “revealed wisdom” in *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology*, in toto. I did not consider the Parables of Enoch in any depth there, but I can note here their general similarity to other apocalyptic works that need not be seen as polemically rejecting Torah, but that relativize its significance (along with that of “Israel”) in relation to the necessity of noetic/cognitive transformation, such that association with the group of wise or chosen ones becomes functionally more important to self-image.

aretalogies and their place in the later verses of Sirach 24, where the Wisdom that dwells among Israel is a fountain of irrigation.⁴⁷

All this is the book of the covenant of the Most High God,
the law that Moses commanded us
as an inheritance for the congregations of Jacob.
²⁵ It overflows, like the Pishon, with wisdom,
and like the Tigris at the time of the first fruits.
²⁶ It runs over, like the Euphrates, with understanding,
and like the Jordan at harvest time.
²⁷ It pours forth instruction like the Nile,
like the Gihon at the time of vintage.
²⁸ The first man did not know wisdom fully,
nor will the last one fathom her.
²⁹ For her thoughts are more abundant than the sea,
and her counsel deeper than the great abyss.
³⁰ As for me, I was like a canal from a river,
like a water channel into a garden.
³¹ I said, "I will water my garden
and drench my flower-beds."
And lo, my canal became a river,
and my river a sea. (Sirach 24: 24–31, NRSV).

Hydrological imagery is also encountered in Wisdom of Solomon 11:4–8, which draws upon the story of Exodus 17 to depict deliverance from thirst as an act of Wisdom and then develops the theme of thirst more widely in relation to wisdom, folly and deliverance. As noted already, Wisdom of Solomon is less concerned with Torah-piety than is Sirach; it also moves further towards seeing Wisdom as a

⁴⁷ Newman, "Hybridity, Hydrology, and Hidden Transcript."

competency that must be given to the individual by God (see Wisdom 9:17–18), or as an agent who opens the faculties of the person to God (especially visible in the particular examples listed in Wisdom 10). Wisdom is not, then, presented as universally available through the reading of Torah, but must enter each person to enable their faculties to respond properly to God in obedience. In the terminology of modern virtue epistemology, this is a “reliabilist” account of virtue, but one in which the divine gift of Wisdom is necessary to the right functioning of the faculties. For the author of Wisdom of Solomon, though, she is still “at home” in many individuals through the history of Israel: she may not be universally present, but she is still widely and effectively seen. By contrast, the account in the Parables of Enoch 42 presents Wisdom largely as an outsider to human experience, excluded by the insistence of folly and by the saturation of humanity with Iniquity. Wisdom finds no place to rest.

All of this suggests that the representation of Wisdom in the Parables of Enoch 42 can be located within the ideological variegation of the early Jewish context. I am generally cautious of using the word “polemics” to describe the differences in the representation of figures or tropes in ancient literature, since we can often project onto it modern sensibilities about the compatibility or non-compatibility of concepts or can presume competitive rather than aggregative dynamics to be at work. This is especially the case when our readings are heavily shaped by a model that associates texts and imageries with groups. But there is such a striking inversion of the account in Proverbs—which is received positively in Sirach—that it is hard not to see something more intentionally *divergent* to be at work.⁴⁸ The key point is this: the divergence is developed using a common stock of images, drawn from a core biblical text, developed as a recognizable trope.

My wariness of accounts that claim inter-group polemics where these are not explicit leads me to be cautious of Nickelsburg and VanderKam’s view that this constitutes an “anti-Mosaic polemic.”⁴⁹ Nevertheless, their observation that the imagery has a certain resemblance to a statement in the Epistle of Enoch (in 1 Enoch 94:5)—about sinners tempting people to do harm to wisdom, for whom no place will be found—is an important one. It highlights that the language of 1 Enoch 42:1–3 has analogues

⁴⁸ This becomes particularly significant if we reconsider the place of groups or schools in the dynamics. Might these simply represent divergences of ideas or ideologies, rather than inter-group conflict, boundary maintenance and exclusion? On the shift away from schools as a model, and the possibilities of imageries associating more fluidly, see the articles by Michael V. Fox and Stuart Weeks in *Was There a Wisdom Tradition? New Prospects in Israelite Wisdom Studies*, ed. Mark R. Sneed (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015): Fox, “Three Theses on Wisdom,” 69–86; Weeks, “Wisdom, Form, and Genre,” 161–78.

⁴⁹ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 139.

elsewhere in the Enoch material, where it again functions to distinguish the righteous from the sinners. One key question to be asked about this *apparent* binary is whether it necessarily reflects polemics between groups, and associated strategies of “labelling,” or instead reflects more universal categories, where sinners and the righteous are more pervasively present in a mixed humanity.

While the passage in 1 Enoch 42 may preserve a previously independent fragment, it is here integrated (even if somewhat raggedly)⁵⁰ into an account that links this anthropological deficiency to the need for deliverance through the appointed mediator. The possibility of human agency being aligned with divine will turns on the special disclosure of Wisdom through her appointed revealer, the Chosen One, and this is entangled with the language of “spirit.” The Chosen One, and the community of the chosen who participate in salvation through his mediation, are characterized by a wisdom that is represented as a pneumatic gift. At several points, the account draws on the imagery of Isaiah 11, combined with that of Isaiah 42, to develop this. The description of the Chosen One in 1 Enoch 49:1 exemplifies this:

For wisdom (or “the spirit of wisdom”⁵¹) has been poured out like water,
and glory will not fail in his presence forever and ever.

For he is mighty in the secrets of righteousness;
and unrighteousness will vanish like a shadow,
and will have no place to stand.

For the Chosen One has taken his stand in the presence of the Lord of Spirits;
and his glory is forever and ever,
and his might, to all generations.

In him dwell the spirit of wisdom and the spirit of insight,
and the spirit of instruction and might,
and the spirit of those who have fallen asleep in righteousness.

⁵⁰ See Dillman, *Liber Henoch*, 152 and Michael A. Knibb, “The Structure and Composition of the Parables of Enoch,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 48–64, esp. 55.

⁵¹ The longer reading is found in some later manuscripts, including Bodleian Bruce 74, Frankfurt Orient Ruppell II 1 and Vatican Éthiop. 71 (labelled as b,c and x in Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 166).

He will judge the things that are secret
 and a lying word none will be able to speak in his presence;
 For he is the Chosen One in the presence of the Lord of Spirits,
 According to his good pleasure.⁵²

The characterizations of the indwelling spirit in 49:3 correspond directly to those of Isaiah 11:2,⁵³ apart from the final one, where “the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD” is replaced with “the spirit of those who have fallen asleep in righteousness.”⁵⁴ Isaiah 11:2 is obviously read in combination with Isaiah 42:1, however, with the term Chosen One and the imagery of God’s delight or good-pleasure obviously corresponding to the latter text, which shares with Isaiah 11 the imagery of the spirit being given to this anointed figure. Read together, these Isaianic texts emphasize that the messianic figure will be characterized by the spirit’s resting upon him and the virtues and capacities imparted by this.

The expression, “the spirit of wisdom” occurs again in 1 Enoch 61:11, where it also functions within a series of characterizations of the spirit and the virtues that it communicates:

They will raise one voice,
 and they will bless and glorify and exult,
 with the spirit of faithfulness and with the spirit of wisdom,
 and with the spirit of long-suffering and with the spirit of mercy
 and with the spirit of judgement and with the spirit of goodness.⁵⁵

⁵² Translation, Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 166.

⁵³ Isaiah 11:2, NRSV, reads:

The spirit of the LORD shall rest on him,
 the spirit of wisdom and understanding,
 the spirit of counsel and might,
 the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the LORD.

⁵⁴ Nickelsburg and VanderKam suggest that this is because the heavenly chosen one would not be characterized in this way, since these would seem to be human qualities not appropriate to the elevated heavenly Son (*1 Enoch 2*, 178). I am not persuaded that this would have been seen as such a problem and think it is better to consider that there is a positive reason for wishing to identify the Son of Man with the spirit of those who have passed with righteousness.

⁵⁵ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 247.

Here, interestingly, the spirit is associated with the heavenly host—the holy ones, the Cherubin, the Seraphin, the Ophanin and the angels of power—but also with “the other host who are on the dry land and over the water.” That is, the heavenly powers are united in voice and spirit with earthly ones. The account of “every spirit of light” joining with “all flesh” to praise the Lord of Spirits coordinates the worship of “the chosen who dwell in the garden of light” with that of the “holy ones who are in heaven” (61:12). The overwhelming impression is of an essentially *pneumatic* liturgical union, with earthly and heavenly beings collectively acting in union with the spirit. The quality of wisdom occurs early in this description, leading the characterization of the Spirit, but not totalizing it or displacing other coordinated qualities. Significantly, the shift from describing heavenly figures to earthly ones in 61:10 turns on the specific figure of the Chosen One: before the mention of this figure, the beings described in this verse are heavenly, but after it they are earthly. The Chosen One is effectively located as the nexus, the integrating point of the collective.

Wisdom, then, is the key to faithfulness and to the right worship of God. But Wisdom is alien to human being and perhaps even to the earthly realm in which humans live,⁵⁶ neither natural nor welcome. Only by the outpouring of the spirit of wisdom, and the virtues that she communicates, can humans be aligned with the angels and join in the cosmic praise of God. Further, this outpouring happens *through* the Chosen One and through the participation of the righteous in him.

The theological anthropology associated with Wisdom in the Parables resembles the one that has been seen to be reflected in the concept of the “inclination,” the *yetzer*, in the Qumran works and in some strands of the rabbinic debates. Where some later rabbinic writings would develop an essentially neutral anthropology, representing humans as agents with dual inclinations (towards good and towards evil) that can and must be trained, the overwhelming impression of the sectarian material at Qumran is that the natural tilt of the person is always towards evil. The possibility of acting well and of being good,

⁵⁶ There may be a presumption that the earthly realm is more widely corrupted by human iniquity, as in the narratives around the flood in the biblical material, where the world is filled with violence because of “flesh” (e.g., Genesis 6:13). I suspect this may be one of the key (and underinvestigated) drivers in Paul’s thought about cosmic corruption and redemption and might be influential in the New Testament more widely. Recognizing this allows us to appreciate how discourse about cosmic corruption might function while still affirming the involvement of the One God in creation, while also drawing attention to how easily works that speak of such a corruption might be remapped onto emergent discourses about the material creation being intrinsically evil.

then, depends on something beyond the person themselves: the giving of the divine spirit of light.⁵⁷ As a theme, that broadly aligns with various of the teachings that are often categorized as “gnostic” and that I discussed in section 1, but the precise differences are significant: there is nothing here to suggest that Israel has been led astray by a tyrannical angel or subordinate deity responsible for the creation of matter. This is important to how we place or locate the Parables, but it is also relevant to how their content might have been read and remapped onto emergent theologies in the early decades and centuries of the common era.

God, Wisdom and the Creation of Man in 2 Enoch

The representation of Wisdom in 2 Enoch differs significantly across the recensions and some of the key debates about the original form of the work run through the relevant segments of the book. This is the case particularly in relation to the account of the creation and, specifically, the creation of humanity. The longer recension contains a fulsome account of creation, its format shaped by the pattern of days of Genesis 1, which culminates in the formation of human beings by God's Wisdom and the imparting of particular qualities to them. The material about the creation of the human parallels quite closely a tradition attested quite widely in Christian manuscripts from the 7th century onward, the so-called Adam Octipartite/Septipartite in which the first human is composed from seven or eight elements of the cosmos.⁵⁸ It is further linked to an account of Satanail's role in corrupting Eve, specifically, through which the first couple are led astray. The short account of creation in the short recension is much briefer, by comparison. It lacks much of the detail found in the longer, most notably the account of human

⁵⁷ For an extensive recent treatment of the *yetzer* concept, see Ishay Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires: Yetzer Hara and the Problem of Evil in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010). His work is also developed and applied to the analysis of the New Testament, specifically the Epistle of James (which is, of course, often seen as representative of a particular kind of Jewish Christianity) by Benjamin Wold, “Sin and Evil in the Letter of James in the Light of Qumran Discoveries,” *New Testament Studies* 65 (2019): 78–93. Wold's work also draws upon Miryam T. Brand, *Evil Within and Without: The Source of Sin and Its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2013). This latter work is especially important to reflection on the essential anthropologies at work and how they relate to soteriology: is evil intrinsic to the individual or environmental (or both) and how does this entail a particular conceptualizing of what salvation involves?

⁵⁸ The traditions are encountered in manuscripts and languages that include Church Slavonic and Old Irish, with parallels even encountered in Norse literature. See my discussion in Grant Macaskill, “Adam Octipartite/Septipartite: A New Translation with Introduction and Notes,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Non-Canonical Scriptures. Volume 1*, ed. R.J. Bauckham, J.R. Davila and A. A. Panayotov (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 3–22.

composition from the elements and the description of Satanail. Instead, it contains the simple and terse statement that, at the end of the creative process, the Lord commanded his wisdom to create humanity.

I have argued elsewhere that the material found only in the long recension is probably secondary.⁵⁹ It is, I think, easier to explain its presence in 2 Enoch as the result of the interpolation of traditions widely attested after the 7th century and found circulating independently in Slavonic literature than to see 2 Enoch as preserving uniquely an ancient tradition that is nowhere else attested in antiquity.⁶⁰ There are also linguistic features throughout the additional material in the long recension that set it apart from the material also attested in the short recension and that are suggestive of redactional activity. I summarize the arguments that I have developed elsewhere here:

1. If the 6-day structure were original, particularly if the book was written in Jewish circles of any sort, we might expect some kind of reference to the Sabbath rest that follows, and might expect this to be reflected in the ethics of the work more widely. That is not the case, however, which suggests that the creational material that is patterned on Genesis 1 has entered the work through the activity of scribes with little interest in the Sabbath. This observation is all the more striking when we consider the place of regular practical worship in 2 Enoch (discussed in more detail in Chapters 8 and 9). Sabbath interest is maintained widely in early Christianity, particularly in Jewish Christianity, which makes its absence here all the more conspicuous.
2. The creation of the human as the image of God is, as we have seen, the basis for much of the ethical detail contained in the instructional material, which might seem to support the arguments developed by Andersen and Böttrich (summarized in Chapter 3) that the longer account of creation is well-integrated into the work as a whole and is presumed by the ethical particulars. But the point of connection is limited to the concept of image-bearing, focused upon the face, and the ethics at no point develop any application of the composition of the human

⁵⁹ Grant Macaskill, "Adam Octipartite/Septipartite." See further my "The Creation of Man in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch and Christian Tradition," in *XIXth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament (IOSOT), Ljubljana 16-20 July 2007, Congress Volume*, ed. André Lemaire. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 133. (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 399–422. I also discuss the matter in *The Slavonic Texts of 2 Enoch* Studia Judaeslavica 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 19–33.

⁶⁰ This point is also made by Liudmila Navtanovich, "The Provenance of 2 Enoch: A Philological Perspective. A Response to C. Böttrich's Paper, 'The "Book of the Secrets of Enoch" (2 Enoch: Between Jewish Origin and Christian Transmission. An Overview)," in Orlov et al, *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch*, 69–82, esp. 72.

from the various elements of the cosmos. This might suggest that a fuller description of humanity as made in the image of God has indeed been excised from the short recension, but it does not support the claim that the extended “Adam Septipartite” version now preserved in the long recension corresponds to this.

3. Much of the cosmological detail in 27:3–28:1 and 30:2–7 is incompatible with that encountered in the ascent narrative of 2 Enoch 3–22, which is shared by both recensions. In particular, the description of the seven crystalline circles on which the planets move is recognized even by Andersen to be incompatible with the schema of the heavens developed in the ascent narrative.⁶¹ Interestingly, he recognizes that the description of the planets seems to be affected by Ptolemy’s *Almagest* and by Pythagorean accounts; I will return to this below.⁶²

4. The description of Satanail/Sotona may be coloured with Slavonic puns that suggest redactional insertion during the period of Slavonic transmission.⁶³ In addition, I have noted that the figure of Satanail is also absent from the account of the Watchers’ rebellion in the short recension; only in the long recension is this figure represented as the leader of the rebellious angels.⁶⁴ It should be clear from my discussion so far that these observations do not support any claim that the additional material in the creation account of the long recension was, *in toto*, added in the context of late medieval or early modern Slavonic transmission. They do, however, require us to keep that context in view as one element in our analysis.

5. While all of these points suggest to me that the additional material in the long recension is secondary—most of it, at least—there are some highly problematic readings in the short recension that are suggestive of a garbled text or that might constitute vestiges of something that has been removed.

⁶¹ Francis I. Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch: A New Translation with Notes,” in James H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (New York: Doubleday, 1983), 91–221, esp. 149.

⁶² Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 149.

⁶³ On this, see Florentina Badalanova Geller, “Heavenly Exiles and Earthly Outcasts: Enochic Concepts of Hermetic Knowledge and Proscribed Lore in *Parabiblica Slavica* (Fifteenth-Nineteenth Centuries),” in *Rediscovering Enoch? The Antediluvian Past from the Fifteenth to Nineteenth Centuries*, ed. Ariel Hessayon, Annette Yoshiko Reed and Gabriele Boccaccini. SVTP 27 (Leiden: Brill, 2023), 375–396.

⁶⁴ See the table in my *Slavonic Texts of 2 Enoch*, 30.

To all of these comments, I here add a further observation. The replication of the formula “and there was evening and there was morning, the x^{th} day” from Genesis 1 exhibits a degree of biblical replication generally not seen in 2 Enoch. Stylistically, it seems to me that the additional material found in the longer version of the creation account is different from the book as a whole, even allowing for the complicated character of the textual witnesses; it has the characteristics of a text that is intended to reconcile traditions.

This does not mean that our task is to ignore the apparently “secondary” material in the creation account, however. As I noted in Chapter 3, it is possible that two recensions crossed the linguistic border into Slavonic and that the longer version had circulated for some time prior to its translation. It is important to affirm the observation made by Liudmila Navtanovich that much of the additional material also circulated independently of 2 Enoch in the Slavonic environment, but that observation should not be considered incompatible with the possibility of multiple translations; rather, it reflects the complexity and fluidity of traditions and of the relationships between individual tropes and the “macroform” of 2 Enoch.⁶⁶ Further, as exemplified by the earlier discussion of parallels to Bardaisan and astral determinism in 30:6, much of the additional material can be considered ancient; even if it is not original to 2 Enoch, it might have been transmitted in close connection with it and might bear its own witness to the thought worlds from which the work arose and through which it passed. The observations of Anderson and Böttrich concerning the damaged state of the short recension can be fruitfully coordinated with this: in the transmissional and developmental context of debates about creation and cosmology in late antiquity, which were not cleanly mapped onto the distinctions between groups or religion, both incorporation and excision may have taken place, giving rise to multiple variant macroforms of the work. I continue to be of the view that the original account of the creation in 2 Enoch is irretrievably lost (in the absence of earlier manuscripts) and that a responsible treatment of its significance requires some critical reflection on the evidence provided by both major recensions.

The table below reproduces the descriptions of the creation of humanity found in the two recensions of 2 Enoch alongside one translation of Adam Octipartite, preserved in a 9th century Latin

⁶⁶ I borrow the term here from Schäfer’s scholarship on the Hekhalot literature, discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4, above, since it seems helpfully transferable to the discussion of the recensions of 2 Enoch, particularly in relation to the creation accounts.

manuscript held in the Vatican library. I select this particular exemplar from among the witnesses because it happens to incorporate two versions of the account and thus to represent quite comprehensively the variants encountered across the different traditions, which makes it a useful text for the comparative task. Most of the parts of the description—wherever they are found—exhibit formal qualities that are indicative of circulating units of tradition, notably their numerical characteristics. These circulating units may well have originated discretely—i.e., the account of human creation from seven or eight elements may have originated independently of the one that links the name ADAM to the four cardinal points—but from a fairly early point, the manuscripts witnesses of the Adam Octipartite/Septipartite account transmit them together, bound to each other. The combination of units found in 2 Enoch, then, is found elsewhere and in manuscript witnesses much older than those of the Slavonic apocalypse, even if the details vary between the various manuscripts. Interestingly, both the septipartite and octipartite versions of the account are transmitted in Slavonic, often in the erotapokriseis that are carried over from the Byzantine legacy.⁶⁷

Adam Octipartite ⁶⁸	2 Enoch 30:8–13 Long recension	2 Enoch 30:8–13 Short Recension
	And on the sixth day I commanded my wisdom to create man out of the seven components:	When I had finished all this, I commanded my wisdom to create man.
Of eight measures he is made. A measure of earth: from this is formed the flesh. A measure of sea: from this salt will be tears. A measure of fire: from this [is] hot breath. A measure of wind: from this [is] cold. A measure of sun: from which [is] the variety of eyes.	His flesh from earth; his blood from dew and from the sun; his eyes from the bottomless sea; his bones from stone; his reason from the mobility of angels and from clouds; his veins and hair from grass of the earth; his spirit from my spirit and from wind.	

⁶⁷On these, see see Anisava Miltenova, “Slavonic Erotapokriseis: Sources, Transmission, and Morphology of the Genre,” in *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity*, ed. Lorenzo DiTommaso and Christfried Böttrich, eds., with the assist. of Marina Swoboda, TSAJ 140 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 279–301.

⁶⁸ From Codex Vaticanus Latinus Reginae Christianae 846, f.106b. Translation from Grant Macaskill, “Adam Octipartite/Septipartite.”

<p>A measure of moon: from this are different kinds of hair. A measure of cloud: from this is the stability of thought. A measure of dew: from this is sweat.</p> <p>This is its interpretation. Man, who of these is formed, cannot be procreated apart from these eight parts, but one of these will predominate in each persons nature/ If, for example, the soil of the earth predominates, he will be made sluggish in his works; if the sea, he will be wise and deep. If the sun, however, he will be bright and attractive;*if the clouds of the sky, he will be in every way light and exuberant. If the wind predominates, he will be swift and hot-headed. If the stones of the earth predominate, he will be hard to look upon or to deal with and will be avaricious. If the Holy Spirit predominates, he will in every part (of the earth) follow the reign of Adam. [If the light of the world predominates, he will be chosen of all, faithful and bright.]'</p> <p>.</p>	<p>And I gave him 7 properties: hearing to the flesh; sight to the eyes; smell to the spirit; touch to the veins; taste to the blood; to the bones—endurance; to the reason—sweetness.</p>	
	<p>Behold, I have thought up an ingenious poem to write: From visible and invisible substances I created man. From both his natures come both death and life. And (as my) image he knows the word like (no) other creature. But even at his greatest he is small, and again at his smallest he is great. And on the earth I assigned him to be a second angel, honoured and great and glorious.</p>	

<p>Since the world was formed of four parts, therefore also four stars were constituted in heaven. From the four is derived the name of Adam. The first star, in the East, is called Anatholi. The second star, in the West, is called Dosi. The third star, in the North, is called Artus. The fourth star, in the South, is called Mesimorion.¹ From these four stars he takes the four letters, that is: from the star Anatholi he takes A; from the star Dosi he takes D; from the star Artus he takes A; from the star Mesemorion he takes M. And he has the name Adam</p>	<p>And I assigned to him a name from the four components: From east—(A), from West—(D), from North—(A), from South—(M). And I assigned to him four special stars, and called his name Adam</p>	
--	--	--

The long recension describes the human being as composed of seven elements and having seven associated properties; this is followed by an “ingenious poem” (30:10) that describes the visible and invisible natures of the human and their status as image. The account then returns to a more narrational form, describing the appointment of the human to function as a glorious “second angel” on the earth, reigning as a king and having God’s own wisdom. The human is described as categorically different from all other creatures: “there was nothing like him on the earth, among my existing creatures”⁶⁹ (30:12). This is followed by another formulaic construction, with the letters of the name “ADAM” linked to the four cardinal points and their associated stars. The account then describes the free will that the human is given and implies that the prohibition of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is a test, to establish whether humans love God, its significance as such extended beyond Adam to his race (30:15). Finally, Adam’s sin is connected—though not straightforwardly—to his lack of knowledge of his own nature.

⁶⁹ Two features of the language are worth noting. First, the word I translate as “like” here is ΠΟΔΟΒΗΝΖ, which is the adjectival cognate of the word used elsewhere of the human as an image or facsimile of God. Second, the word used for a creature is specifically ΤΒΑΡЬ, which might be translated as “handiwork.”

"I Commanded my Wisdom to Create Humanity"

In the short recension, the culmination of God's own first-person account of the creation involves the simple and undeveloped statement that he commanded his wisdom to create humanity (2 Enoch 30:8). For some, the terseness of the short description—both in its description of the creation of humanity and in the account of creation more generally—is evidence that it has been heavily redacted, with objectionable material removed, or material that duplicates or contradicts creation accounts preserved elsewhere in the chronographs wherein they are preserved.⁷⁰ While there are good reasons to see the additional material found in the longer recension as interpolated, as I have argued above, there may still be some validity to the claims that the shorter account has been subjected to some heavy scribal interventions. What remains, however, is actually quite fascinating when framed in relation to the developing traditions of Wisdom and creation in late antiquity.

It is noteworthy that this is the only point in the creation narrative where W/wisdom is named as an intermediary figure. To this point, the account has centered on God's own immanent activity, directly as the subject of the verbs of making and ordering, or his commanding of elements to emerge or to generate other elements, as discussed in Chapter 5. There I noted that God's creative design is entirely his own; he is specified to be the architect and maintainer of the visible cosmos:

"And now, Enoch, whatever I have explained to you, and whatever you have seen in the heavens, and whatever you have seen on earth, and whatever I have written in the books—by my supreme wisdom I have contrived it all—I created from the lowest foundation and up to the highest and out to their end.

⁷⁰ Andersen ("2 [Slavonic Apocalypse of] Enoch," 145), for example, writes:

From this point onward short MSS are fragmentary compared to the full and coherent account of creation that continues in long MSS. Except for trivial details, J, P, and R agree completely in the present chapter, whereas A, U, etc. have only a few words which scarcely make sense. At the very least we would expect the narrative to follow the thread provided by Gen 1."

But we might ask whether the presumption that the account of Genesis 1 would provide the template for the account is legitimate or reflects a certain kind of canonical prejudice, with Genesis 1 and 2 given priority. Even the Hebrew Bible contains multiple different cosmogonic accounts and we should be ready for the possibility that this work reflects a different creation tradition.

There is no counselor and no successor, only myself, eternal, not made by hands. My unchanging thought is (my) counselor, and my word is (my) deed. And my eyes behold all things. If I turn my face away, then all falls into destruction, but if I look at it then it is stable. (33:3–4)⁷¹

In the short recension, these words occur immediately after the reference to God commanding his wisdom to create humanity; in the long recension, several chapters of further material separate the verses, including the detailed description of the human composition and the account of Satanail's rebellion.

These statements are striking, particularly in the placement in the short recension, because they resist any representation of W/wisdom as an independent or quasi-independent entity or agent in creation, despite this being a natural way to read that preceding command. While the material has obvious similarities to the traditions discussed earlier in this chapter about Wisdom, Torah and Memra, it also seems to differ from these in its insistence on qualifying wisdom with the possessive “my” and stressing the exclusivity of the Lord's agency in creation. Hence, where wisdom is presented as playing a comprehensive role, it is specifically and explicitly as a property of God and it is mentioned with such significance only at the end of an account that has centred on the first person narration of God's activity. All of this makes more conspicuous the reference to God directly commanding wisdom—qualified with the possessive “my”—to create humanity.

There are two striking parallels to this expression, both found in literature associated with Syria. The first of these I noted briefly in Chapter 4 and now return to discuss further. At two points in the Apostolic Constitutions (7.34.6 and 8.12.16–17), very similar language is used of Wisdom's involvement in the human creation:

⁷¹ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 157.

And the end of the creation (τέλος τῆς δημιουργίας)⁷² the rational being, the cosmopolitan, you ordained by your wisdom and prepared saying, “Let us make man in our image and our likeness,” presenting him an ornament of the world. You formed his body from the four elements but his soul you made from nothing; and you endowed him with fivefold sense perception and you set the mind as the helmsman of the soul over the senses. (7.34.6)⁷³

And not only did you create the world but you also made man in it the cosmopolitan, exhibiting him an ornament of the world. For you said to your Wisdom, “Let us make man in our image, and let them rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the heaven. Wherefore also you have made him from an immortal soul and a dissoluble body, the one from nothing, the other from the four elements. You have given to him with respect to his soul rational discernment between piety and impiety, observation of justice and iniquity; but with respect to his body you have bestowed the five senses, motion and mobility (8.12.16–17).⁷⁴

These two statements are clearly connected to each other, but the nature of the relationship can be debated: is there a common *Grundlage* that they share? Is one dependent on the other? Or are they more broadly shaped by common and widespread traditions?

In the background of these discussions is the longstanding question of whether Apostolic Constitutions 7 and 8 might incorporate Jewish synagogue prayers. Claims to this effect were made in the late 19th century by K. Kohler⁷⁵ and then again (apparently independently) by Wilhelm Bousset;⁷⁶

⁷² Translations generally use the word “creation” here, but the underlying Greek term is a very particular one, associated with the Demiurge traditions that are part of the complicated, fluid, and sometimes polemical world of cosmogonical discourse in late antiquity. See Carl Séan O’Brien, *The Demiurge and Ancient Thought: Secondary Gods and Divine Mediators* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

⁷³ Translation from David A. Fiensy, *Prayers Alleged to be Jewish: An Examination of the Constitutiones Apostolorum* (Brown Judaic Studies 65. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1985), 65.

⁷⁴ Translation, Fiensy, *Prayers Alleged to be Jewish*, 103–5.

⁷⁵ Kauffman Kohler, “Über die Ursprünge und Grundformen der synagogalen Liturgie: Eine Studie.” *MGWJ* n. F. 1 (1893): 441–51, 489–97. See also his, “The Essene Version of the Seven Benedictions as Preserved in the VII Book of the Apostolic Constitutions,” *HUCA* I (1924): 410–25.

⁷⁶ Wilhelm Bousset, “Eine jüdische Gebetssammlung in siebenten Buch der apostolischen Konstitutionen,” *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen; Philologische-historische Klasse* 1915 (1916): 438–85. Reprinted in *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien: Aufsätze zur Religionsgeschichte des hellenistischen Zeitalters* ed. Antonie F. Verheule, *NovT Supps* 50 (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 231–86.

Erwin Goodenough then developed the claims as part of his own project to consider the shape of Hellenistic Judaism,⁷⁷ giving particular impetus in Anglophone circles to the view that the Apostolic Constitutions preserved Jewish prayers. Extracts from the Apostolic Constitutions are published in Charlesworth's *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, where they are renamed as Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers.⁷⁸ This, of course, can obscure the fact that they have come down to us through Christian transmission and can lead to a certain carelessness in how the material in its final form is categorized. David Fiensy, in his careful study of the material, concludes that actually only a small proportion of the Apostolic Constitutions can shown to incorporate synagogue material. Nevertheless, there are a number of quite striking parallels to the Eighteen Benedictions in these passages, including particularly to the Qedushah (which also has parallels elsewhere in 2 Enoch). These might be explained in various ways that allow for a diffuse or remote influence, but at some points we can detect the hallmarks of "translation Greek," and this might suggest a more direct influence or appropriation from Hebrew or Aramaic.⁷⁹ Most scholars believe that at least some of the content of the Apostolic Constitutions has been adapted from synagogue prayers, but there is a significant debate about the extent of this material and whether some of the adjacent material commonly considered of Jewish origin may, in fact, reflect early Christian liturgies.

Kohler saw much of the material preserved in Apostolic Constitutions 7.26 and 7.33–8 as reflecting Essene traditions, which he understood to be particularly influential on the culture of the synagogue, but his analysis was rather limited in depth;⁸⁰ broadly, however, he considered the Apostolic Constitutions to preserve an Essene version of the Seven Benedictions, a sub-grouping of prayers within the Eighteen Benedictions (the Shemoneh Esreh or Amidah) that would be uttered at morning, noon and evening prayer. Bousset, meanwhile, saw Jewish synagogue prayers also to be preserved in chapter 8 of the Apostolic Constitutions, but refracted through Hellenistic philosophical categories and not

⁷⁷ Erwin R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935), 306–58.

⁷⁸ David A. Fiensy and D.R. Darnell, "Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Volume 2: Jewish Legends and Wisdom*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth (Garden State: Doubleday, 1985), 671–98. The introduction to the collection is provided by Fiensy and the translation by Darnell; it is noteworthy that in his own study of the Constitutions, *Prayers Alleged to be Jewish*, Fiensy concludes that the extent of the originally Jewish material is more limited than previously claimed and is certainly not as extensive as what is published in the Charlesworth collection.

⁷⁹ See Fiensy, *Prayers Alleged to be Jewish*, 212–5.

⁸⁰ Fiensy, *Prayers Alleged to be Jewish*, 3.

Essenism. Goodenough's analysis was closer to Bousset's—both saw more extensive traces of Jewish prayers extending into chapter 8—but his knowledge of the Philonic corpus was deeper and more detailed. This led him to make two interesting observations that are relevant to what we discussed in Chapter 5, about God and the cosmic secrets. First, he argued that the negative language of “non-being” found in 8.12 is not found in Philo and reflects later developments in theology; second, he argued that the interest in the angelic hosts ranked below Wisdom in the heavens is not paralleled in Philo, who avoids discussing angelology.⁸¹ By contrast to Bousset, Goodenough saw Philo as a kind of philosophically enriched mystic, a claim for which he has been extensively criticized⁸² but one that invites reflection on how philosophical language and imagery can be aligned with mystical and esoteric interests.⁸³

Specifically with regard to 7.34 and 8.12.9–20, Bousset saw different redactions of a Stoic-Jewish source, noting in these verses some parallels with Philo in which the parts of creation are itemized and prayed over by the high priest (*Special Laws* 1.97, 210, to which he compares *Creation of the World* 3);⁸⁴ Philo also uses the term “cosmopolitan” of the human in *Confusion of Tongues* 106. Bousset considers all of these points in Philo to recollect somewhat vaguely the prayers of a diaspora synagogue. Fiensy points out, however, that these features in Philo's writings could simply reflect Stoic influence: Cicero also exhibits an interest in extolling creation by listing its various parts (*de. Nat. de.* 2.39), and the representation of man as “the cosmopolitan” is a common feature in Stoic writings.⁸⁵ This is a plausible (and perhaps more defensible) explanation than that they are encountered in Philo as a result of exposure to such ideas in the synagogue. It also means that their presence in the Apostolic Constitutions is not necessarily evidence for the incorporation of synagogue prayers .

Fiensy himself sees the parallel texts about creation in 7.34 and 8.12.9–20 as more likely to be dependent on Christian traditions in the east (his examples are notably from Palestine and Syria),⁸⁶

⁸¹ On angelological interest, see Goodenough, *By Light, Light*, 344; on non-being, see 357.

⁸² Morton Smith, “Goodenough's Jewish Symbols in Retrospect,” *JBL* 86 (1967): 53–68.

⁸³ As noted earlier, Dylan Burns has highlighted precisely this point in relation to the development of the various early Christian theologies that are often categorized as “gnostic.” See Burns, *Apocalypse of the Alien God*.

⁸⁴ Bousset, “Eine jüdische Gebetssammlung,” 455–77

⁸⁵ Fiensy, *Prayers Alleged to be Jewish*, 138.

⁸⁶ Fiensy, *Prayers Alleged to be Jewish*, 138. He cites the liturgy of James, the liturgy of Adai and Mari and the liturgy of John Chrysostom, but he also traces examples in Theophilus of Antioch and Clement of Rome.

although he still agrees that some of the adjacent material is derived from Jewish prayers. From an early stage, numerous Christian liturgies can be identified that extoll the multiple parts of creation as part of their preparation for the eucharist, with the creation of man an element within this, and one connected to the work of Wisdom.⁸⁷ Consequently, Fiensy does not consider these particular quotations to preserve Jewish prayers, but to reflect Christian traditions; when he reconstructs the synagogue prayer that may have been assimilated into the Apostolic Constitutions, most of this detail from 7.34 and 8.12.16–17 is excised. It reads, instead:

Blessed are you, O Lord, king of the ages, who made the universe.

(Praise of God for his power)

O Quickener of the dead.⁸⁸

If he is correct in this conclusion, then the parallels to 2 Enoch in the Apostolic Constitutions are specifically with the parts of the work that reflect Christian compositional activity, which is generally located as happening in Syria in late antiquity .

That said, it is striking that this material probably most directly dependent on Christian traditions shares so much with Philo, even if what is shared is not specifically Jewish in origin or limited to Jewish anthropologies. Both represent the human as made from the four elements, sharing the stuff of the cosmos and with senses suited to this, but also endowed with a rational mind and a soul that is made from nothing:

...the formation of the individual man, perceptible by the external senses is a composition of earthy substance, and divine spirit. For that the body was created by the Creator taking a lump of clay, and fashioning the human form out of it; but that the soul proceeds from no created thing at all, but from the Father and Ruler of all things ... and for this reason, one may properly say that man is on the boundaries of a better and an immortal nature, partaking of each as far as

⁸⁷ Fiensy, *Prayers Alleged to be Jewish*, 137–44

⁸⁸ Fiensy, *Prayers Alleged to be Jewish*, 199.

it is necessary for him; and that he was born at the same time, both mortal and the immortal. Mortal as to his body, but immortal as to his intellect.⁸⁹

The similarities are striking, but not surprising. They reflect the influence and popularity within the Christian tradition of philosophically enriched readings of Genesis 1 shared with Judaism.

But neither Philo's account nor the liturgies cited by Fiensy parallel the distinctive reference to the involvement of "your wisdom" in the creation of man that is encountered in the Apostolic Constitutions 7.34 and 8.12.16, the possessive construction of which parallels "my wisdom" in 2 Enoch 30. Philo dwells on the plural character of "Let us make man in our image" but understands this to indicate the involvement of multiple beings in the creation of humanity, which he considers necessary to account for the presence of negative or vicious qualities in the human without these being ascribed to the direct agency of God (*de Opific* 3. 72). It does not occasion any mention of the Logos at this point in his work. By contrast, there are Christian liturgies—notably that of Theophilus of Antioch (180 C.E.), whom I discussed in Chapter 5 because of his contribution to the emergence of *creatio ex nihilo* as a recognizable discourse—that cite the involvement of "his" *Logos* and *Sophia* in the creational work. Even these, however, lack the quality of dialogue or address that is encountered in both the Apostolic Constitutions and 2 Enoch, in which the Lord commands or speaks to his wisdom; consequently, they do not infer that the plural possessive is used of the image because of what this dialogue entails. In the Apostolic Constitutions, however, the dialogue with Wisdom is clear and, once placed in the wider context, clearly Christological: God's Wisdom is Christ and the plural "our image" reflects divine individuation.

A second parallel to the statement in 2 Enoch 30 is found in the 8th century *Scholion* of Theodore bar Konai, in a section that discusses the teaching of 'Audi, a fourth century "heretic" from Edessa. 'Audi's teachings are reported by Theodore as follows:

⁸⁹ Translation taken from C.D. Yonge, *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged*, (Repr. Peabody, Mass: Hendricksen, 1993), 19. Lurking in the background of this text is the problematic issue of Philo's notion of the double creation of man. See T.H. Tobin, *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation* (CBQM 14, Washington DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983) 102-134 and J.J. Collins, "In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Man in a Wisdom Text from Qumran," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Technological Innovations, New Texts and Reformulated Issues*, ed. F. Garcia Martínez, (STDJ 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 609-618 .

He asserted that Light and Darkness were not created by God, and he taught that God was composite and possessed in all respects the appearance of a human being. He thinks this follows from the verse which states: "Let us make humankind in our image and in our likeness" (Gen 1:26). Since the Scriptures use concrete (?) nouns about him (God), they seek to relate his manifestations and his activities.

... "The world and the created order were made by Darkness and six other powers." It says moreover: "They beheld by how many divinities the soul is purified, and by how many divinities the body was formed." It says further: "They asked, 'Who compelled the angels and powers to form the body?'" And in an apocalypse attributed to John, it says: "(As for) those rulers that I saw, my body was created by them," and it lists the names of the holy creators, when it says, "My wisdom created flesh, understanding created skin, Elohim created bones, my kingdom created blood, Adonai created nerves, anger created hair, and thought created the brain."⁹⁰

This description is interesting in relation to 2 Enoch for several reasons. First, it specifically refers to "my wisdom" as an agent in the creation of the human body and, indeed, lists wisdom first among the agents involved. Second, Wisdom contributes to the creation of a composite body, each element of which is created by a different agent, with the number of elements totalling seven. This is at once like and unlike the longer account of Adam's composition that follows the reference to Wisdom in the long recension: the listed constituent parts of the body and their number basically agree, but the explanation for their derivation is entirely different. The fact that the account *begins* with a reference to "my wisdom" is a significant point of correspondence. Third, 'Audi's teaching, as reported here, seems to present some similarities to the wider description of creation in 2 Enoch, particularly the representation of light and darkness as things uncreated by God.

The differences, of course, are conspicuous. 2 Enoch is insistent that God alone creates and does not present "darkness" as an independent creative agent. 'Audi's account is one that presents the body and the physical world as generated by the "rulers." But the similarities might suggest a degree of local

⁹⁰ Translation from Reeves, *Heralds of that Good Realm: Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions*. Nag Hammadi and Manichean Studies 41 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 116.

coloration and perhaps even locally intelligible polemics or interactions that are, importantly, directed towards ideas more than they are towards groups.

This suspicion may, in fact, be further supported by a later reference to the creation of humanity in the likeness of God. This is found in both recensions, with very little variance in the readings, in 2 Enoch 44.

1. The Lord with his own two hands created the human; and in a likeness of his own face. The small and the great the Lord created.
2. Whoever despises (or “defames” or “insults”) a human's face despises the face of the Lord; whoever loathes a human's face, loathes the face of the Lord. Whoever disdains a human's face, disdains the Lord's face.⁹¹
3. (There is) anger and great judgment (for) whoever spits on a person's face.

Several features of this account deserve to be considered carefully. First, the insistence that the Lord “with his own two hands” created humanity resists any notion that other powers were involved in the construction of the human. This is particularly significant in relation to cosmogonies that present the human body, and other parts of the physical world, as the handiwork of Darkness or of the malevolent archons or, as we saw in our discussion of some 2nd century Christian cosmogonies, the angels. While the statement might be taken as an elaboration of Genesis 1:26–27, read in conjunction with Genesis 2:7 (which suggests a direct involvement by God in the fashioning of the human from the dust), the excess of emphasis on the Lord's immediate and unmediated involvement in human creation is striking.

Second, the language of the iconic correspondence as “the likeness of the face” is unusual. Andersen writes⁹² that typically the words *tselem* and *demut* would be rendered with *οβραζυ* (*obrazŭ*) or *видѣнїе* (*viděnje*), not *ποδοβιη* (*podobije*), at least, not with the latter used in conjunction with *лицε*

⁹¹ The Slavonic verbs are broadly equivalent in meaning, but tend to be associated in translation with different underlying Greek verbs, which allows a little more differentiation of the meanings. *Ουκαριати* (*ukarjati*) is used to translate *ὕβριζειν*, *ἐξυβρίζειν*, *ὕβρειςπροσάγειν*, *λοιδορεῖν*, *ἀντιλοιδορεῖν*, *μέμφεσθαι*, and *ἐξουθενεῖν*. The alternative translations of “insults” or “defames” are thus warranted. *Γηψατι* (*ghřati*) translates *βδελύσσεσθαι*, *μισάσσεσθαι*, *ἀπέχεσθαι*, *δυσχεραίνειν*; *прѣзрѣти* (*prězřěti*) translates *ὑπερορᾶν*, *παρορᾶν* and “disdains” captures well the sense of “overlooking” or “ignoring” the face of a person.

⁹² Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 171, note b.

(*lice*). While this may be true of the full construction, Andersen's comments need to be balanced somewhat, since we do encounter ПОДОБИЕ as a rendering of ὁμοίωσις in James 3:9 in some manuscripts of the Slavonic Bible, where there is also a parallel ethical application of the *imago dei* to the one encountered here; perhaps less impressively, but still relevant, it is used also in Ezekiel 1:26, again of ὁμοίωσις. The use of ПОДОБИЕ rather than one of the other words should not be considered particularly significant, then, and Andersen's rendering of this word as "facsimile" is probably a little over-determined, masking its flexibility to render the word likeness in a range of ways. Andersen is correct, however, to see the combination of ПОДОБИЕ with ЛИЦЕ to be unusual and significant.

I have noted already, in broad agreement with the work of Andrei Orlov,⁹³ that the theme of "the face" is a significant one in 2 Enoch, and it does more than simply carry a Hebraistic locative over into Slavonic. Given what we have noted, the idea that humanity is made in the likeness of the divine face should not merely be considered as an odd piece of phrasing, but as a window onto a genuinely significant way of thinking about the relationship between human and divine being. What is, I think, most striking about this is that the correspondence is represented in physical terms: it is not simply that the human is god-like, but that the human *looks* like God. The human constitution mirrors the divine face. To put this in different terms, "likeness" is about morphology. This is interesting in its affirmation of the physical goodness of the human, a theme that further contradicts the presentation of the physical in the Sethian literature. It is also interesting, though, in presenting the *imago dei* in material and not merely noetic or pneumatic terms.

Such an interpretation of the *imago dei* is not encountered only in Audianism, where we have seen it to be associated with an account of the divine body. It is also developed, perhaps intentionally in opposition to this, in the more widely accepted Orthodoxy of a distinctively Syrian flavour. I note this because of some recent discussion of the *imago dei* in the fifth century Syrian context, which highlights differences between this and classical Alexandrian thought. In particular, this discussion has focused on the Homilies of Narsai, the leader of the school in Edessa after Theodore of Mopsuestia and the founder of the school in Nisibis. Quoting and discussing Narsai, Frederick McLeod writes:

⁹³ E.g., Andrei Orlov, "God's Face in the Enochic Tradition," in *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism*, ed. April D. DeConick (Atlanta : Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 179–193.

[I]n a notable contrast with the Alexandrian tradition which situates God's image in the spiritual part of the human person, Narsai affirms categorically in Homily 56: "In the beginning, when He [the Creator] fashioned our nature, He called it His image"; and more sharply in Homily 66: "The Creator willed to call it [the soul] and the body His image." Image, therefore, for Narsai applies to the whole human composite, body as well as soul.⁹⁴

As McLeod further notes, Narsai is careful to resist any notion that God himself is bodied, and is sensitive to the risks in speaking of a physical image of a non-physical God.⁹⁵ The physical image-bearing of the human does not represent the physical qualities of God, then:

He [the Creator] called him [Adam] an image of His majesty in a metaphorical sense, because everything created is vastly inferior to the divine essence. His [God's] nature is [so] immeasurably exalted over that of creatures [that] it does not possess, as corporeal beings do, a visible image.⁹⁶

But this does not mean that the image-bearing properties of the human are any less physical or are confined to the spiritual quality of their being. Rather, the physical characteristics of the human appearance function as an analogue to the beauty of the divine:

"By his visible appearance [man's] image proclaims [God's] royal authority, and by his [external] features shows the beauty of the One who fashioned him."⁹⁷

⁹⁴ Frederick McLeod, "Man as the Image of God: Its Meaning and Theological Significance in Narsai," *Theological Studies* 42 (1981), 458–68, quotation from, 459.

⁹⁵ Given Andersen's translation of "likeness" as "facsimile," it is interesting to read this comment by McLeod: Thus, because the divine nature is absolutely transcendent, Narsai emphatically excludes any possibility of a "natural" likeness of God, in the sense of a photographic image of God. ("Man as the Image," 459)

⁹⁶ Translation from Frederick McLeod, *Narsai's Metrical Homilies on the Nativity, Epiphany, Passion, Resurrection and Ascension* Patrologia Orientalis 40.1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1979), 39.

⁹⁷ Homily 6. Translation from McLeod, *Narsai's Metrical Homilies*, 72.

The physical rendering of the non-physical beauty of God is not the only way in which the human functions as the image of God, and it is noteworthy that in describing the further aspect of creational vicegerency, Narsai speaks of humanity being set over things “visible and invisible.”⁹⁸ But the rendering of divine beauty is particularly associated with the physical appearance of the human and, hence, with their face.

McLeod also notes another suggestive aspect of the physical *imago dei* in Narsai’s thought, which is both microcosmic and integrative. The human is a “double vessel,” with part of their nature shared with the non-rational members of the cosmos and part shared with the rational, “a visible body and a hidden soul—one man. He [God] depicted the power of his creatorship in him as an image, mute beings in his body and rational beings in the structure of his soul.”⁹⁹ In Homily 4, this idea is expressed in terms of integration or binding: “He [the Creator] has exalted His image with the name of image, in order to bind all [creatures] in him.”¹⁰⁰

This is strikingly similar to the logic of the texts that we have noted in the Apostolic Constitutions. Like the Homilies of Narsai, this work presents the human as a microcosm, with elements of their composition derived from the being of the cosmos, but with a soul that represents something categorically different, sharing in the non-physicality of God, and with a mind that is set over the soul. Fiensy notes that this emphasis on the mind as ruling over the other parts of the human composition obviously reflects Platonic influence.¹⁰¹ I might nuance this, for reasons that will emerge elsewhere in the study as we consider the use of negative (apophatic) language in the representation of God: the Platonic dimension may reflect, quite particularly, the influences of Neoplatonism, with its distinctive blending of interests in philosophy, theology, religion and ritual. This work may well preserve a theological anthropology that originates in the Judaism supported by the synagogue culture of Syria (or Syro-Palestine), but what is noteworthy about it from a geographical point of view is that it is especially

⁹⁸ Homily 1. See McLeod’s footnote 13, “Man as the Image,” 459, where he notes the popularity of the vocational rule idea in Antiochene theology of the image. A similar reading of the image of God concept in Paul has been developed by Haley Goranson, *Conformed to the Image of His Son - Reconsidering Paul’s Theology of Glory in Romans* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2018).

⁹⁹ Homily 66. Text from Alphonse Mingana, *Narsai doctoris syri homiliae et carmina 2* (Mosul: Fraternity of Preachers, 1905) 2:239, cited by McLeod, “Man as the Image,” 461.

¹⁰⁰ McLeod, *Narsai’s Metrical Homilies*, 39.

¹⁰¹ Fiensy, “Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers,” in Charlesworth *OTP* 2, 679.

concerned to represent the physical being of the human as constitutive of the image of God. To return to the point made by Frederick McLeod, with which we began this section, such an emphasis on the image as a function of the *physical* qualities of human being sets this tradition somewhat apart from the Alexandrian tradition that associated the divine image specifically with the spiritual or noetic components of human being. This may be important as we seek to decide whether an Alexandrian or a Syrian provenance would better account for the phenomena encountered in the texts of 2 Enoch.

It is, perhaps, worthy of note that just a few verses later, the short recension makes reference to Enoch's fathers, Adam and Seth, and their handwritings (33:10), where the long recension has the full list of Enoch's forefathers, perhaps filled out to correct the apparent confusion of Enoch with Seth's son Enosh. The Cologne Mani Codex has highlighted the place that "the writings of the forefathers" had in the early Elchaisaite circles from which Mani came and in the later movement associated with the prophet himself; Adam, Seth and Enosh are notable authors of apocalyptic works within this tradition, along with Enoch himself. The reference to Adam and Seth here, then, might provoke some suspicion that the work emerged in a context coloured by Sethian traditions and by reactions to them.

Recognizing this may also give us a renewed, but also reframed, sense of how the additional material in the long recension, Adam Octipartite/Septipartite, might be evaluated. There are good reasons (outlined above) to see this material as an interpolation, though also good reason to regard the short recension as secondary in its own way. I strongly suspect that the book originally contained some discussion of the human composition rather closer to the traditions preserved in the Cave of Treasure or elsewhere in Syrian tradition and that this was displaced by the accounts of Adam's composition that emerged from the 4th-7th century, through the fluid interactions of different strands of Christianity and Judaism. The incorporation of this material into 2 Enoch may well have occurred prior to its translation into Slavonic, if we allow for the possibility that multiple translations may have been made, though not independently (a phenomenon paralleled by other Slavonic texts).¹⁰² It is important to note here that Syria, and especially Edessa, was marked by particularly intense interest in the composition of Adam, with this often linked to matters of astrological interest. Bardaisan, for example, appears to have linked the parts of the human composition to the planets (at least, according to Agapius of Mabbug, *Kitab al*

¹⁰² See the discussion of translational possibilities in Chapter 3.

'*unwan*, 7.4). As Denzey summarizes this: “the mind of humans come from the Sun, the bones from Saturn, the veins from Mercury, the flesh from Jupiter, the hair from Venus, the skin from the moon.”¹⁰³ The hostility towards Bardaisan’s astral determinism in some circles in Syria are heavily entangled with the development of cosmogonic myth and anthropological philosophies and the dynamics associated with this would seem to me to have strong explanatory potential for the two major recensions of 2 Enoch that have been preserved. The fact that Theodore bar Konai claims that Bardaisan credited his astrology to Enoch (*Scholia Mimra* 11:13)¹⁰⁴ takes on fresh significance in relation to this, hinting at the complex entanglement of cosmologies, theologies and philosophies in late antique Syria, with polemics that are not easily reducible to the boundaries between groups, but rather the complicated interactions of ideas and ideologies.

Conclusions

This chapter has developed the discussion of cosmological and cosmogonical secrets that began in Chapter 5, focusing particularly on the representation of Wisdom. The preliminary discussion of Wisdom laid out an important map for what followed, for it highlighted how the personal identification of Wisdom developed not just through time, but also in ways affected by local factors. The Wisdom imagery in early Judaism draws diversely upon traditions associated with Isis and Maat and has its own particular stock of biblical texts that are repeatedly drawn into developing discourses. The Wisdom imagery in early Christianity reflects both Christological remapping—as Wisdom, Christ and Spirit are identified with each other—and divergent cosmogonical mythologizing, particularly as this is driven by the various groups we tend to categorize as gnostic.

Framed by this map, the common interest in the figure of Wisdom represented by the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch can be seen as a point of both connection and divergence. The discourse about Wisdom in the Parables is most obviously connected to the early Jewish context, with some points of fairly direct (if contrastive) connection to the account of Wisdom in Sirach and some parallels to that of Wisdom of Solomon. The account in 2 Enoch, by contrast, presents more obvious connections with the

¹⁰³ Denzey, “Bardaisan of Edessa,” 173.

¹⁰⁴ See F. Stanley Jones, “The Astrological Trajectory in Ancient Syriac-Speaking Christianity (Elchasai, Bardaisan, and Mani),” in his *Pseudoclementina elchasaiticaque inter Judaeochristiana: Collected Studies* OLA 203 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 439.

imagery and language developed in the Apostolic Constitutions. Further examination shows how this dovetails with the Neoplatonic contexts of Late Antiquity and to Christian responses to the various circulating cosmogonies (and associated anthropologies) linked to gnostic groups, particularly those influential in Syro-Mesopotamia. This need not mean that 2 Enoch is Christian, if this term is invoked in a sense that excludes Jewish: it is entirely conceivable that there was mutual concern over the cosmogonies that represented matter as evil and associated the creation of the physical world and the human with the activities of evil beings. Some of the contrastive connections with Sethian writings that I trace in Chapter 7 will add further support to the argument that 2 Enoch took its recognizable form in Syro-Mesopotamia, in a Late Antiquity in which these gnostic traditions circulated.

If this evaluation of the differences between the two Enochic works is correct, even broadly, then it might suggest some interesting possibilities for the line of transmission of the Enochic material. As noted in Chapter 5, there are elements in the Parables that lend themselves to a Sethian reading, although this would require other elements to be lost or reimagined. Taken together with the similarities that bind the Parables to 2 Enoch, these might support the possibility that the Parables of Enoch circulated in Syro-Mesopotamia, contributing elements to developing Sethian traditions (for which the image of a heavenly and hidden Son of Man revealed to the elect could be read as an avatar), but also to the traditions that would coalesce in 2 Enoch with a kind of opposition to those gnostic accounts. The mutual concern of Christians and Jews with cosmogonies considered to be incompatible with their central traditions and beliefs about God would ensure that the discourse was shared by both groups, which might explain how 2 Enoch ended up being transmitted by Christians as edificational literature while also potentially contributing to the development of the traditions behind the Hekhalot literature in Sasanian Babylonia. Perhaps ironic, but perhaps also instructive, is the fact that the longer recension of 2 Enoch would also come to contain cosmogonical elements that originated in Slavic dualist movements.¹⁰⁵ The irony lies in its contradicting of the apparently “conservative” quality of the theology of 2 Enoch; the instructive element lies in the fact that such interpolation is made possible by the shared mythological and cosmogonical backdrop of late antique thought and its ongoing legacy in medieval and even early modern traditions.

¹⁰⁵ See the discussion of this in Badalanova Geller, “Heavenly Exiles and Earthly Outcasts.”

Chapter 7. Bodily Ascents and Ontological Transformations

Introduction

Relatively little attention has been devoted to one feature of 2 Enoch that is actually quite distinctive within the context of apocalyptic writings, namely, the bodily (and not merely oneiric) character of the seer's ascent into heaven and the correspondingly ontological character of their transformation therein. The physical aspect in 2 Enoch is explicit and consistent, with various devices employed to ensure that the reader recognizes this to be something different from the visionary journeys of other figures.¹ The Parables of Enoch does not explicitly parallel this, but I will explore evidence in this chapter that such an idea is present throughout (though masked by redactional features) and is, indeed, quite central to the book's representation of Enoch. Ultimately, it is built into the logic of the book that its central mediatorial figure is transformed from one physical state to another and that others will participate in this state through that figure's mediation. Much of the imagery used in the book emphasizes this and even if the bodily quality of the ascent is less explicitly rendered than it is in 2 Enoch, there is good reason to consider that the work is concerned with the embodiment of its central mediatorial figure.

My intention in this chapter is to trace and to compare these features in 2 Enoch and in The Parables and then to compare these with other works, of more certain Jewish and Christian provenance, that describe heavenly ascents and transformations. This will highlight how unusual the bodily quality is in the two Enoch texts, while also inviting reflection on how the two works might be mapped relative to one another and relative to the wider body of Jewish and Christian writing from later antiquity.

Problematizing “Monotheism” as a Context for “Deification”

Within this analysis, I will be particularly attentive to the question of how what we find in the Enoch writings relates to developing concepts of deification in Late Antiquity, an issue that I discussed in Chapter 1 and to which I return. A substantial body of scholarship in recent decades has grown around these concepts, shaped particularly by renewed critical reflection on “monotheism” and its legitimacy

¹ Philip Alexander, “From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformations of the Biblical Enoch,” in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*, ed. Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren (Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1998), 87–122, esp. 104.

as a label for the distinctiveness of Jewish thought and practice in Antiquity.² Those involved in this reflection do not, typically, question the claim that Israel's God was considered unique by Jews and Christians in antiquity; more subtly, they question whether the uniqueness is a function of being "god" or of being a particular category of god, associated singularly with specific things, especially creation and providence.³ This matters because it allows that the authors of ancient texts might have applied god-vocabulary (most obviously אלהים, אֱלֹהִים or θεός) to figures other than Israel's God, the one also identified by the Tetragrammaton, and might have done so with literal and not analogical significance. So, for example, when angels are designated as *elohim*, as they commonly are in texts from Qumran, the meaning might be straightforward: they belong to a class of being properly called "gods," the existence of which in no way jeopardizes the uniqueness of Israel's God. The demand to worship this God alone, then, might not function as a denial of polytheism, but as a refusal to allow *particular kinds* of veneration to be given to any other deity. This also allows correspondences to be identified between Jewish and "pagan" veneration of the One God,⁴ with the latter often allowing for the existence and worship of multiple, but restricting particular kinds of worship to the highest God. If this establishes often overlooked connections between religious groupings, it also establishes connections with the philosophical traditions that were considered in Chapters 5 and 6 and, indeed, challenges the boundaries that scholars sometimes presume to stand between philosophical and religious traditions. The networks of scholars committed to Platonism played a key role in the emergence of "gnostic" varieties of Christianity, particularly in those geographical contexts where Jewish Christianity flourished.⁵

² See, especially, Silviu Bunta, *The Lord God of Gods: Divinity and Deification in Early Judaism*. Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and its Contexts 35 (Piscataway: Gorgias, 2021) and M. David Litwa, *We Are Being Transformed: Deification in Paul's Soteriology*, (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012). The topic of "monotheism," as a label, was discussed in Chapter 1 of the present work. For convenience, I note here several works of particular importance on the topic: Peter Hayman, "Monotheism: A Misused Word in Jewish Studies?" *Journal of Jewish Studies* 42 (1991): 1–15. Paula Fredriksen, "Mandatory Retirement: Ideas in the Study of Christian Origins Whose Time Has Come To Go," *Studies in Religion* 35 (2006): 231–46. For a more detailed overview of the movement to critique the use of monotheism as a term in the study of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament, and for a sophisticated defense of the term (when used with appropriate nuance), see also Joachim Schaper, *Media and Monotheism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019).

³ Emma Wasserman, *Apocalypse as Holy War: Divine Politics and Polemics in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018).

⁴ Polymnia Athanassiadi and Michael Frede, eds., *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).

⁵ Dylan M. Burns, *Apocalypse of the Alien God: Platonism and the Exile of Sethian Gnosticism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), esp 8–31.

Potentially, this bears on accounts of human transformation, whether these are linked to heavenly ascent, noetic transformation or to eschatological destiny, since humans might be represented as participating in the same state as that embodied by the angels or by other deities identified as lesser to the One God.⁶ The plain sense of at least some of the material preserved at Qumran is that humans can occupy a state that is equivalent to or higher than that of the *elohim*,⁷ i.e., the angels (though I will qualify what I mean by this below). For those religious traditions particularly shaped by the philosophical networks, this notion of exaltation or ascent may involve an emphasis on the mind that *appears* to denigrate the material body and world, though this is often actually about the governing of lower realities by higher ones. The crude reading of the Platonic philosophical traditions as universally negative towards the material has resulted in an equally crude reading of Platonic language in religious traditions. It is a very different thing to insist on an ordering of one's constitution than to insist that part of that constitution is discarded.

Care is required to distinguish between kinds of "participation." For example, we need to ask whether transformed humans share an ontological condition with angels or, differently, a space that is normally accessible only to the latter. If they share an ontological condition with the angels, we need further to ask whether this is properly labelled as "angelic" or as "divine." That is, we need to ask whether angels are a sub-species within the inclusive category of "the gods," to which deified humans may also distinctively belong, so that to use the term "angelomorphic" of humans runs the risk of confusing categories. To probe this complex of issues requires the integration of heuristic insights provided by recent discourse, such as critical spatiality,⁸ but it can also be resourced richly by the strands of historical, systematic and constructive theology that have been interested in *theosis*.⁹ The centrality of

⁶ Examples are considered throughout Bunta, *The Lord God of Gods*.

⁷ This is true, for example, of the Self Glorification Hymn and of the Hodayot more widely, although these preserve complex representations of the human that are often deprecatory.

⁸ For a conceptually sophisticated example of the value of this approach, with particular sensitivity to embodied and performative aspects, see Angela Kim Harkins, *Reading with an "I" to the Heavens: Looking at the Qumran Hodayot through the Lens of Visionary Traditions*. Ekstasis: Religious Experience from Antiquity to the Middle Ages 3 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012). See also Melissa Pula, "Rethinking the Community as Temple: Discourse and Spatial Practice in the Community Rule (1QS)," PhD Thesis, University of Denver, 2015.

⁹ Given the programmatic significance of *theosis* and *theopoeiesis* for Eastern Orthodox soteriologies, the literature is vast. For an overview, see Stephen Finlan and Vladimir Kharlamov, eds., *Theosis: Deification in Christian Theology* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2006); Michael J. Christensen and Jeffrey A. Wittung, eds., *Partakers of the Divine Nature: The History and Development of Deification in the Christian Traditions* (Grand Rapids: Rosemont Publishing and Printing Corp., 2007). An

the motif of “ascent” in those strands is interesting and we might ask whether visual and spatial elements of the imagery and poetics involved have been displaced by an over-emphasis on narrative, and the associated preoccupation with temporal developments, in biblical studies

In relation to this project, the complexities and tensions that are at the heart of the debate concerning monotheism—and the categories that we use to analyze these—are more important than the adoption of any position within it. I stress this because the sophisticated re-assertions of “monotheism” as an appropriate label for certain beliefs about the gods in antiquity (and not just among Jews and Christians) have highlighted the presence of rhetorical strategies that work precisely by negation or nullification of the claims to divinity associated with gods other than the One God. The standard application of the label “made by hands” to idols and their shrines exemplifies this and is sometimes developed extensively, as it is in Isaiah 45, so that the other gods are ultimately dismissed as “non-gods.” A number of scholars have suggested that the evidence of Isaiah should not be claimed as representative of all Jewish thought,¹⁰ but it was clearly an important and influential work and where we find its influence clearly visible, we should take seriously that its distinctive polemical strategies to negate the status of other divine claimants might be at work.

There are two points that I want to make in relation to this. First, there is something of a tension visible in the early Jewish writings between the rhetoric of gods as real powers and that of gods as human inventions, empty of all intrinsic significance isolable from the agency of the idolater. To describe this as “tension” may, in fact, project a perception of non-compatibility onto the discourse that ancient Jewish thinkers would not recognize; perhaps we would be wiser to say that they could, at points, affirm the existence of other beings properly called gods and sometimes called demons and, at other points, refuse to ascribe these any kind of independent existence. Crucially, of course, the polemics are often

important collection is forthcoming: Paul Gavrilyuk, Andrew Hofer, O.P., and Matthew Levering, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Deification* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, anticipated 2024)

¹⁰ M. David Litwa, *We Are Being Transformed*, 230, writes:

Many scholars still assume that monotheism was a doctrine which revolutionized the consciousness of all Jews after (though some claim before) the exile (sixth century B.C.E), a doctrine which grew increasingly rigid and uniform in the centuries preceding the common era. To prove this thesis, many scholars are prepared simply to wave the wand of Second Isaiah (seen as something of an architect of exclusive monotheism), while side-stepping the issue of how far this prophet can be seen as representative of Second Temple Judaism as a whole.

attached not to the deities themselves but to the practices of worshipping their idols.¹¹ The desire to prove or to deny “monotheism” can flatten the diversity that might be visible not just between works but even within them. In 1 Corinthians 10, for example, Paul both denies that the idol is anything, reaffirming his commitment to the uniqueness of God (10:19), and also associates it with demons (10:20–21). Second, it is possible that the distinctive colouring of these themes is influenced by geographical and temporal factors. Among these might be included the development of Christian theologies of deification and the various currents of practical worship within the Roman Empire, in which idol worship declined and was then renewed. Also, of course, they may be coloured differently by the local combinations of eastern and western influence; the colouring of deification and demonization in a geographical context more directly affected by Iranian thought might be rather different to that visible in one shaped by Greek philosophical thought. The work of a figure like Iamblichus shows how difficult—but also how rewarding—it is to disentangle the threads and to appreciate the localized factors of colour.

Visionary Ascent in the Aramaic Enoch Literature and other Apocalypses

The first reference to Enoch’s ascent in the Aramaic Enoch literature preserved at Qumran is found in 1 Enoch 12:1, which seems to be loosely based on Genesis 5:24. Whether the Enoch literature as a whole grows from that verse, or the Genesis verse represents a brief summary or even suppression of circulating early forms of the Enoch story, elements of the verse pepper the various descriptions of Enoch’s ascent, and especially the language of Enoch’s being “taken.” The description in 12:1 refers to a period of absence from the earth and from other human beings, a theme that will recur in other

¹¹ See Matthew V. Novenson, “The Universal Polytheism and the Case of the Jews,” in *Monotheism and Christology in Greco-Roman Antiquity*, ed. Matthew V. Novenson, Nov.T.Supp. 180 (Leiden: Brill 2020), 32–60. Noting that in the Old Greek translation of Psalm 95:5 the word *δαίμόνια* is used in place of the “idols” (אֱלִילִים) encountered in the MT, Novenson points out,

In short, the Greek psalmist grants gentile gods greater ontological status than his Hebrew predecessor had done. A daemon may not be a high god, but it is quite a lot more than a statue. (53)

He continues,

I strongly suggest ... that we often mistake idol polemics in our sources for metaphysical claims. (58)

descriptions of his ascent. But where the Genesis text describes only one such departure, the narrative here appears to describe a period of heavenly sojourn in which Enoch stands in the presence of God, from where he then departs to meet the rebel watchers, who ask him to write a petition in their behalf (12:3–13:6). Enoch separately goes “to the waters of Dan in the land of Dan, which is south of Hermon,” and there, reading the petition to God, he falls asleep and has visions of heaven (13:7–8; 14:2), which he recounts (in a location specified to be “Abel-Main, which is between Lebanon and Senir) to the “sons of heaven.”

There are, then, two strands of ascent account in the Book of the Watchers that are closely interwoven but are technically distinct and actually consecutive: one in which Enoch is taken bodily into heaven to be in the presence of God, and the other in which he sees the heavenly spaces in a dream. The latter, of course, is the one that occupies the largest part of the Book of the Watchers.

The detailed description of Enoch’s visionary ascent begins in 14:8, where various cosmological and meteorological elements summon and carry him into the heavens. There, Enoch sees (and feels)¹² a vision of a great house made of hailstones, in which he falls on his face with fear, before another door opens into a “greater house” built of tongues of fire (14:9–13; 14–17). Enoch describes a throne upon which is seated the Great Glory; the core imagery of the *ophanim* and the cherubim seems to be resourced by the details of Ezekiel’s visions of the chariot (Ezekiel 1), but with this now embedded in a description of the heavenly temple or palace.¹³ The house is off-limits for the angels, and none can look upon the face of the one on the throne “because of the splendor and glory; and no flesh could behold him” (14:22).

Enoch is brought by one of the angels from his position of prostration to the door of the fiery house, although his face remains bowed until he is told by God to fear not and to “come here” (15:1), where he is addressed as the “righteous man and scribe of truth” (15:1). The implication of that command

¹² Note the comments made by George Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 259.

¹³ The heavenly spaces that Enoch sees are typically understood to invoke temple imagery. So, most notably, Martha Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), especially 13–28. Philip F. Esler, *God’s Court and Courtiers in the Book of the Watchers: Reinterpreting Heaven in 1 Enoch 1–36* (Eugene: Cascade, 2017) has challenged the priority of temple imagery and argued that the imagery is better understood with reference to royal courts in the Ancient Near East. The complication of the imagery is welcome, but I am inclined to see the two imageries as shaping each other, particularly in a context where the temple is associated with the acknowledgement of divine rule and in which royal rulers could be portrayed in divine terms. Himmelfarb herself (*Ascent to Heaven*, 13) notes that the imagery in the Book of the Watchers adapts elements originally framed in terms of a royal court.

seems to be that Enoch is invited beyond the door and into the immediate presence of God in the fiery house. Nickelsburg comments:

Given this view of God, it is paradoxical that Enoch gets as far as he does ... By whatever means, Enoch is enabled to negotiate the fiery barriers. When he collapses within the temple, God dispatches one of the holy ones to rehabilitate him and bring him to the threshold of the holy of holies (14:24–15:1). Enoch's is a special case. The whole tradition leads us to suppose that it is his special righteousness that enables him to enter God's presence. In short, our passage is an interpretation of Genesis 5:24.¹⁴

It should be noted, however, that this particular event occurs in a visionary and not a bodily ascent; this may be part of the explanation for what Nickelsburg describes as a “paradox.” Enoch does not, at this point, enter God's presence in the flesh (cf. 14:21 – “no flesh could behold him”). Consequently, for all that his perception of the heavenly space draws upon the range of bodily senses (cold, heat, etc), the vision does not involve any bodily change on his part. The subtle point is that if Genesis 5:24 does lie behind this, then it is here mapped onto the visionary experience of Enoch within a dream, in which his righteousness makes possible a specific kind of vision; elsewhere, the same verse will be used of physical translation. The two appropriations of the verse in Genesis may be linked, but they are not the same.

Ascent and Ontological Transformation in the Parables of Enoch: An Embodied Turn?

The introduction of the Parables of Enoch in the extant Ethiopic versions describe its contents as a “vision” (ረእይ, *rā'ey*), but this reflects redactional work by which an apparently independent book is incorporated into the bigger Enochic collection. In the terms of the book itself, Enoch's ascent into heaven is described in 39:3:

¹⁴ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 260.

In those days, a whirlwind snatched me up from the face of the earth and set me down within the confines of the heavens.¹⁵

There are three notable differences from the description of Enoch's translation to heaven in The Book of the Watchers, as we find it in 1 Enoch 14:8. First, the word used there is simply "winds" (Eth: ነፋሳት, *nafasat*), and not "whirlwind(s)" (ዐውሎ ነፋስ/ ነፋሳት፣, *'awlo nafās/nafāsāt*) as here. Second, although the winds have a particular role in bearing Enoch up into the heavens in the Book of the Watchers 14:8, they do not do so in isolation from other cosmological bodies and forces: he is invited by clouds, summoned by mist and his way is prepared by the speeding of the stars and lightening. By contrast, in the Parables 39:3, it is simply the whirlwind that carries Enoch up. Third, the word "vision" is repeated multiple times in 14:8 and its context, including one occurrence that specifically qualifies the activity of the winds to bear Enoch up: it is "in (the) vision" (በረእይ, *bera'ey*).

The imagery in the Parables seems obviously inspired by that of 2 Kings 2:1&11, where Elijah is taken to heaven in a whirlwind.¹⁶ Whirlwind imagery is also used of the divine chariots in Isaiah 66:15 and Jeremiah 4:13, though this may reflect more common descriptive tropes about military chariots than the divine throne itself (cf., Isaiah 5:28; 21:1). The textual connections with the Elijah story are important because there the imagery is of a physical or bodily assumption into heaven, or at least a translation *from* earth, rather than a visionary or ecstatic one. The same figuration of Enoch and Elijah, and the same recombination of elements from their stories, is visible also in 70:1–2, as we will see below.

After being "set down" in heaven, Enoch sees "another vision" of the dwelling places of the holy ones and their resting places. The words ረእየ ካልኦ (*rā'eya kāl'a*) should probably be considered secondary, as noted in Nickelsburg and VanderKam,¹⁷ since they seem intended to bring the Parables into line with the wider corpus, with its preceding visionary material. In fact, the word *rā'ey*, vision, occurs only three times in the Parables: in 37:1, 39:4 and 52:1. Here in 39:4, it is missing from one of the manuscripts (the relatively old Lake Tana 9). The cognate verb, *re'ya* does occur often in the book,¹⁸ but we should be careful of presuming that its significance is visionary, as distinct from visual: it is important

¹⁵ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 109.

¹⁶ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 109.

¹⁷ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 111

¹⁸ See the list of occurrences in Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 85, note 1.

that Enoch sees things, so that he might fulfil his role as their revealer, but the whirlwind imagery suggests that he sees it with his physical eyes. In fact, the expression “my eyes” recurs multiple times (39:5,6,19; 41:2,3; 52:1, 53:1; 54:3; 59:1), and in 52:6, the angel of peace specifies that Enoch has seen the metal mountains with his own eyes. Admittedly, a similar expression occurs in 86:1, paired with the word “vision,” but this is specified to be while Enoch is sleeping. Here in the Parables, by contrast, the term seems to emphasize the reality of Enoch’s presence. It is, then, striking that the third occurrence of *rāʿey*, in 52:1, is followed immediately by a reference to Enoch’s carriage in the whirlwind. The physicality of Enoch’s ascent is invoked to emphasize that his seeing of these things was accomplished by his presence.

A second ascent is described in 70:1–2, although the text involves a textual variant that affects aspects of its meaning quite significantly:

After this, while he was living, his name was lifted up into the presence of that Son of Man
and into the presence of the Lord of Spirits,
from among those who dwell on the earth.
He was lifted up on the chariots of the wind,
And his name departed <from> among them.¹⁹

The textual variant of note centres on the dual or singular occurrence of the preposition *𐤒𐤋𐤍* / *𐤒𐤋𐤍𐤅* (*baḥab/baḥabēhu*, “unto”) in 70:1. If this preposition occurs twice, before both the Son of Man and the Lord of Spirits, then we would expect it to have the same meaning in both occurrences and, most obviously, with that sense being locative; if it occurs only once, however, it is possible to read the text as indicating that it is the Son of Man’s “name” that is elevated into the presence of the Lord of Spirits, or even “by” that figure.

Based on the shorter reading, Daniel Olson provides this alternative translation to the standard one:

¹⁹ Nickelsburg and Vanderkam, *1 Enoch 2*, 315.

Afterwards it came to pass that the living name of that Son of Man was exalted by the Lord of Spirits above all those who live on the earth. 2. He was raised aloft on a chariot of wind and his name became a household word.²⁰

When Olson first proposed this reading²¹ and argued that it represented the original meaning of the verse, it was primarily on text-critical grounds, based on claims that the shorter reading was the one supported by the earliest manuscripts.²² In the debate that has followed, however, all parties—including Olson—have recognized that the issues cannot be settled merely on the basis of textual criticism, since both readings can now be shown to have early attestations.²³ Mostly, the factors that have moved to the centre of the discussion concern the internal grammar and syntax of the reading, but the question relates also to the identification of Enoch as the Son of Man and whether this is secondary or original. On this, I will have more to say below.

There is a general agreement among all readers that the word “name” essentially corresponds to “person,” so that the exaltation of the name is not merely about a reputational elevation, but a personal one. We might even say that it is a “total” elevation, in order to capture the range of overtones involved: the person is elevated in every way and in every sense. That the word “name” is used in this way is demanded by the imagery of the chariot that is used in the second of these verses; this is an image of translation from one place to another and is naturally suggestive of the whole person, rather than merely the reputation. At the same time, by using the word name, the reputational aspects of identification are maintained. The exaltation of the person, then, is represented in total or embracive terms: this person is exalted, with all the reputational implications that this involves.

While this is the case, one element of the debate about the translation of these verses concerns the grammatical coordination of the word “name” and the word “living” in $\dot{\text{H}}\text{S}\text{M}\text{A}$ $\dot{\text{H}}\text{Y}\text{A}\text{W}$ (*semu heyāw*). The

²⁰ Daniel C. Olson, “Enoch and the Son of Man’ Revisited: Further Reflections on the Text and Translation of *1 Enoch* 70.1–2,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18 (2009): 233–40; quote from 234.

²¹ See his earlier, “Enoch and the Son of Man in the Epilogue of the Parables,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18 (1998): 27–38. Note: the volume numbering is correct, despite the same number being used for editions of the journal over a decade apart.

²² This represented a change from previous scholarly positions, which had generally favoured the longer reading on the grounds that the manuscripts *then* known to attest the shorter reading were later and, in one case, marked by frequent omissions of words. See the comments in Nickelsburg and Vanderkam, *1 Enoch* 2, 316.

²³ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 316

standard translation since Dillman’s work, based on the longer reading, is “his name, while living.” Olson argues that had such a meaning been intended, a more natural construction would have employed the additional word እንዘ (*’enza*, “while”) or added a pronominal suffix to “living.”²⁴ He regards the standard translation as a forced attempt to make sense of the long reading, traceable to Dillman, who “had no knowledge of the shorter textual reading and had no choice but to try to make sense of the longer.”²⁵ Dillman’s sheer competency as a translator, shaped by his extensive descriptive work on Ethiopic should not be forgotten, however, and Olsen’s citation of examples from two pages of Lambdin’s textbook are perhaps inadequate to challenge the perceived plausibility of that reading. Michael Knibb clearly finds Olson’s conclusion bewildering, writing: “it is not the case that the rendering of *semu heyaw* by ‘his name during his lifetime’ or ‘his name while he was living’ is implausible.”²⁶ Nickelsburg and VanderKam agree with Knibb and also describe Olson’s biblical example of the expression “living name” as “doubtful”:

Numbers 14:21 Gk. ἀλλὰ ζῶ ἐγὼ καὶ ζῶν τὸ ὄνομά μου “But as I live and as my name lives”), may well be a double or expansive translation of the Heb. וְאֵלֶיךָ אֲנִי (“But as I live.”)

It is important for readers to be aware of the debate concerning the coordination of these words, but for my purposes the translational options all maintain the same underlying point: linguistically, the name-person that is exalted is in the condition of “livingness” and not “deadness.” The details of the debate, including the debated relevance of Numbers 14:21, however, highlight how closely the name and the person are associated within this condition of livingness.

A more important point of debate arises in relation to the significance of ባሕባ, *bahaba*. Olson reads this instrumentally: “his name was exalted *by* the Lord.” Here, the implications of the variant reading are

²⁴ He writes (Olsen, “Revisiting,” 236):

If ‘his name while he was still alive’ was the intended meaning in 1En.70.1, one would expect to find እንዘ : ስሙ : አያው or ስሙ : አያው somewhere in the textual tradition, but no 1 Enoch manuscript has either of these. In my opinion, if translators are going to continue rendering the phrase as ‘his name while he was still alive’, they should at least apprise their readers that they are being asked to accept a usage of ‘living’, ‘alive’ (አያው), that is grammatically peculiar, and possibly anomalous.

²⁵ Olson, “Revisited,” 236.

²⁶ See Michael Knibb, “The Translation of 1 Enoch 70:1: Some Methodological Issues,” in *Biblical Hebrew, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Michael P. Weitzman*, ed. Ava Rapoport-Albert and Gillian Greenberg, JSOT Supps 333 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 340–54; quote, 349.

particularly clear: if the preposition occurs twice, then it makes best sense to read it with its locative, rather than instrumental sense.²⁷ Knibb notes that the parallel occurrences of ተለዓለ *tala'āla* should (contra Olson) be translated with the same, and not different, senses. In the second, the use of chariot imagery unambiguously indicates that “lifted up” or “exalted” signifies translation from one place to another. If the two occurrences of the verb are treated as parallel, then, it makes better sense to read the proposition associated with the first—whether it occurs once or twice—as having locative significance. What is in view is *where* the name is and—as importantly—where it no longer is.

The last point leads to some consideration of በማዕከሎም, *bamā'ekalomu*, at the end of verse 2. Olson rightly notes that “the Ethiopic Old Testament በማዕከለ overwhelmingly translates ἐν μέσῳ, and only in isolated instances does it stand for ἐκ μέσου (e.g. in the expression ‘out of the midst of the fire’ in Deut. 5:4; 10:4).”²⁸ The rarer use is attested, however; it is not absent from the Ethiopic translations of the Bible. Further, Olson again seems to neglect (or even refuse) the structural parallelism with the final clause of 70:1, that the name was lifted up “from among those who dwell on the earth.”

Here, a further point can be noted. If, as most believe, the imagery of the chariot in 70:2 draws upon 2 Kings 2:11, the same text that provides the whirlwind imagery encountered in 39:3, then it may be significant that the chariot there functions precisely to separate Elijah from Elisha:

As they continued walking and talking, a chariot of fire and horses of fire separated the two of them, and Elijah ascended in a whirlwind into heaven. 12 Elisha kept watching and crying out, “Father, father! The chariots of Israel and its horsemen!” But when he could no longer see him, he grasped his own clothes and tore them in two pieces. (2 Kings 2:11–12, NRSV)

That is, the chariot of fire separates the one who ascends in the whirlwind from the one who remains upon the earth. In 2 Kings 2:11, the chariot and the whirlwind can be interpreted as separate entities; here, the construction makes them a single thing, the chariot of wind. But the backdrop is a text that describes physical removal—so physical, indeed, that Elijah’s mantle is left behind.

²⁷ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 317. As noted there, even Olson concedes that the manuscript evidence for longer vs shorter readings is in “stalemate,” so the significance of the dual occurrence cannot be ignored.

²⁸ Olsen, “Revisiting,” 238.

Given what we have noted of the links between whirlwind and chariot imagery, it is interesting to note that in the Latin version of the Life of Adam and Eve, Adam sees Michael coming with a “chariot like the wind, and its wheels were afire” and is then “caught up to the Garden of the Just” (*Vita* 25:3, Stone-Anderson, 32E), where he sees the divine throne. There is nothing in that text to suggest that the translation is anything other than bodily and the account ends with Adam being expelled from that place. I note this not as background to what we find here—the dating of the *Vita* is very difficult to establish and I think it is unlikely that it predates this—but rather because it bears witness to a particular, distinctive and also comparatively rare tradition of bodily translation to heaven, either by whirlwind or chariot.

This emphasis on total removal or translation is further emphasized by the language of 70:3, “from that day, I was not reckoned among them.” In the first instance, Enoch is “set” between two winds, between the north and the west, where he sees “the first fathers and the righteous, who were dwelling in that place.” Immediately after this, Enoch’s spirit is taken away and it ascends to heaven (71:1); a further reference to his spirit follows in 71:5, where Michael takes Enoch’s spirit to the heaven of heavens. Between these two occurrences of the word “spirit,” the passage describes Michael’s activity of bringing Enoch to “all the secrets” and showing him the secrets of mercy and righteousness, and the secrets of the heavens and the stars, the luminaries and the angels. A further occurrence of “spirit” occurs in 71:6, where Enoch’s spirit sees the circle that encircles the “house of fire,” the heavenly temple, around which are “Seraphin and Cherubin and Ophannin ... who sleep not but guard the throne of his glory.”²⁹

These references to Enoch’s spirit might seem to be at odds with the claims that I have made to this point, that the text is describing his removal in actual or bodily terms. I want to suggest, however, that these occurrences constitute a shift in the idiom of ascent and sight within this concluding account that is deliberate and that progresses towards the identification of Enoch with the Son of Man. Enoch’s recounting of his ascent effectively “others” his body, dissociates his self from it, in a way that has not been visible in the narration of the Parables to this point. When he sees the Head of Days, however, the bodily or fleshly aspect of the account is renewed:

²⁹ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 320.

And I fell on my face,
 And all my flesh melted,
 And my spirit was transformed (71:11)³⁰

Importantly, the description of Enoch's transformation is followed by a reference to the blessings "that went forth from my mouth" which "were acceptable in the presence of that Head of Days."³¹ That is, immediately after describing Enoch's fleshly transformation, there is a reference to his mouth and to the divine presence. All of this has the effect of building a picture of Enoch being physically in the presence of God.

This sudden reaffirmation of the physical coincides with the key moment of identification. At the precise moment when the othering of Enoch's body and spirit is broken down, so is the othering of Enoch and the Son of Man:

And he came to me and greeted me with his voice and said to me,
 "You are that Son of Man who was born for righteousness,
 And righteousness dwells on you,
 And the righteousness of the Head of Days will not forsake you." (72:14).³²

This, I think, is significant. If the identification of Enoch with the Son of Man is redactional, then this might suggest that the whole of chapter 71 is intended to lead to this moment of identification and shares in the redactional strategy. Whether or not this is the case, we are left with something that is categorically different from most apocalyptic visions, since it emphasizes the bodily, the somatic-ontological transformation of Enoch.

Nickelsburg and VanderKam itemize a number of parallels between the account here and that of 1 Enoch 14.³³ The list is impressive and there is no doubt that the passage from the Book of the Watchers

³⁰ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 320.

³¹ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 320.

³² Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 321.

³³ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 325. Their table also notes similarities with 1 Enoch 17:1–4, although these are fewer in number and overlap with those of 1 Enoch 14.

has contributed to what we encounter here. It is surprising, however, that they are content to collapse Enoch's prostration with his transformation in their table of parallels. In 1 Enoch 14 and in 1 Enoch 71, Enoch falls down on his face, but only in the Parables is that face melted and his spirit transformed. There is, I think, a good reason for that difference: Enoch is now bodily in the presence of God, as the Son of Man, and this necessitates a change that reflects the statement in 1 Enoch 14:22: "no flesh can behold his splendor." The extensive list of similarities between the two passages highlight this one point of dramatic difference.

The description of Enoch's fiery transformation and identification as the Son of Man, the Chosen, links back in important ways to the description of the great judgement in 1 Enoch 62–63. This is one of the passages in which the Son of Man is represented as seated upon "the throne of his glory" (62:2,3,5), often seen as a parallel to Matthew's unique account of the enthroned Son of Man who judges the sheep and the goats (Matthew 25:31–46).³⁴ In the Enochic work, the account ascribes a particular significance to the recognition of the Chosen One by the humans assembled before him. "The kings and the mighty and the exalted and all who possess the land"³⁵ (62:1,9) will recognize the Son of Man—who up until this point has been "hidden" (62:6)—and will worship him and petition for mercy. This, though, will be denied them:

But the Lord of Spirits himself will press them,
 So that they will hasten to depart from his presence;
 and their faces will be filled with shame,
 and the darkness will grow deeper on their faces (62:10)³⁶

The reversal of fortunes for these figures of power is interwoven with that of the congregation of the chosen and holy, the members of which will stand in his presence on that day. The contrast of the two groups is depicted particularly through the symbolism of the face: where the faces of the powerful are

³⁴ See my "Matthew and the Parables of Enoch," in *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*, ed. Darrell Bock and James H. Charlesworth, *Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 11* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 218–30.

³⁵ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 254.

³⁶ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 254.

darkened and cast down, as in the quotation above and again in 63:11, the faces of the chosen ones cease to be cast down (62:15) as they put on their garment of glory (62:15,16). In fact, part of the blessing that will be enjoyed by the righteous is *not* seeing the faces of the unrighteous who have been cast down.

The role of the Son of Man in this scenario is not only that of judge; he is also in an important sense the mediator of glorification. The mediatorial aspect of his work is visible in the correspondences of language used of this figure and of his people, particularly the Chosen One/the chosen and the Righteous One/the righteous. It is highlighted further by the description of the congregation as standing in his presence (62:8) and dwelling with him (62:14). The description of their glorification, which is anticipated earlier in the Parables (58:1–4, i.e., right at the beginning of the third parable) with the imagery of sun and light, can thus be seen to involve a correspondence of state with the Son of Man. There is a particular kind of solidarity³⁷ developed in the text, whereby what is predicated of the mediator is predicated also of his people: he, and they, are chosen, righteous and glorified. Yet, they remain distinct, and the lines of predication do not entail confusion: his identity is non-substitutable and his enthronement remains unique.

Bodily Ascent and Ontological Transformation in 2 Enoch

The narrative of Enoch's ascent into heaven in 2 Enoch begins with a description of the scribe waking from a dream to find that the angelic figures he saw within it are actually present with him in the physical world. The key elements of this are found in 2 Enoch 1:6:

A: I had arisen from my sleep, and the men were standing with me in reality/actuality.

J: Then I awoke from my sleep and saw in actuality/reality³⁸ those men, standing before me.

³⁷ This particular word is used by J. Thomas Hewitt, *Messiah and Scripture: Paul's "In Christ" Idiom in Its Ancient Jewish Context*. WUNT II: 522 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020). Hewitt uses the word to avoid some of the more blurry possibilities that might be conveyed by the word "participation" in order to focus on this particular sense of mutual predication, such that what is said of one can be extended to those united to them.

³⁸ The placement of *javě* is different in J, R, and P, placed immediately after the verb "I saw."

The differences between the major recensions here are minor, though interestingly the key word $\text{A}\text{B}\text{T}\text{E}/\text{I}\text{A}\text{B}\text{T}\text{E}$ (*evě/javě*, “in reality/actuality”)³⁹ varies in position, located at the end of the sentence in A,U and following the verb “to see” in J,P,R. Both locations place a certain stress on the word, but the significance of that stress might be slightly different in the two locations. The very short recension lacks the words “standing with me in reality,” but the fact that they are consistently contained, even if variously arranged, in A,U and J,P,R suggests that they are original. Even were they secondary, however, the versions are consistent in depicting Enoch’s sight of these men as something that begins within a dream but continues after he wakes.

It is important to note the details in the description of the two figures, since these will be relevant to the subsequent representation of Enoch’s transformation into one who resembles the angels. The men are initially described as “huge” (2 Enoch 1:4), of a size not seen on the earth. Enoch then recounts their appearance:

J: Their faces were like the sun shining; their eyes like burning lamps; from their mouths fire was emerging; their clothing (was) variegated singing/foam/cloth, appearing like many purple robes;⁴⁰ their wings were more glistening than gold; their hands whiter than snow.

A: (Their) faces were like burning lamps,⁴¹ from his⁴² mouth (something) like fire⁴³ proceeded. Their clothing was various singing/foam⁴⁴ and their arms were like wings of gold.

³⁹ The differences in orthography reflect stages in dialect and script and do not change the significance of the word.

⁴⁰ The additional “appearing like a manifold purple robe” (*vidom mnogo bagry*) is unique to J. The singular form of *bagry* (“purple robe”) matches “clothing” and the addition of *mnogy* (usually “many”) is probably best captured with “manifold,” and understood to parallel “various/variegated.”

⁴¹ V, N, B read “their faces were like the shining sun, their eyes were like burning lamps.” B² reads similarly: their faces shone like the sun, their eyes like burning lamps.”

⁴² V and N agree with the singular “his” found in A and U. B and B² agree with the plural “their,” as found in the longer manuscripts.

⁴³ The construction in A and U lacks a subject/topic of comparison; it simply reads “from his mouth like fire proceeded.” J, P and R lack the comparative *jako* and read more cleanly. Before preferring this, however, we might consider the stylistic use of “like” in theophanic texts influenced by Daniel 7 and ask whether it marks the angelophanic material here.

⁴⁴ While this image seems bizarre, it is quite consistently attested across the manuscripts; the variations are simply of dialect and orthography, with the words themselves not varying.

There are some differences between the recensions that need to be discussed. First, while A/U lack the opening words, which describe the faces of the men as “like the sun shining,” these are found in all other manuscripts, including those of the very short recension; this is strong evidence that they have been lost in A/U, rather than being added. Second, the manuscripts are quite consistent in reproducing the description of their clothing as being ПѢНИЮ/ПѢНИЄ РАЗДАНИЮ/РАЗДАНИЕ (*pěniju/pěnie razdaniju/razdanie*); there is a good deal of variation in the representation of these words, including some differences in declension, but the stems themselves are mostly consistent. Andersen translates the expression as “various singing,” which reflects his decision to see ПѢНИЮ/ПѢНИЄ as instances of the neuter noun ПѢНИЄ (*pěnije*), “singing/song.” Vaillant,⁴⁵ followed by Badalanova Geller,⁴⁶ however, identifies the noun as the feminine ПѢНА (*pěna*) “foam.” This is warranted by the forms in A/U, ПѢНИЮ РАЗДАНИЮ, which can be seen as the instrumental case of ПѢНА and the agreeing adjective; predicates are often formed with the instrumental case in Church Slavonic.⁴⁷ This allows us to identify a visual meaning in the language, rather than the kind of synaesthesia that Andersen is left with, in which the visual or tactile significance of textile is remapped onto the auditory significance of song. The forms of the word encountered in most of the manuscripts, however, end in -іє/Ѧ, which can be explained as a case-ending of ПѢНИЄ, “singing,” but not of ПѢНА, “foam”; this might suggest that A/U has sought to correct a perceived error, so we should be careful not to dismiss the difficult reading too quickly. The meaning of РАЗДАНИЮ/РАЗДАНИЕ is also a matter of debate. As an adjective, it is unattested in Slavonic, although the noun РАЗДАНИЕ occurs with the meaning “distribution” and the cognate verbs РАЗДАВАТИ, РАЗДАТИ and РАЗДАТИ all occur with nuances of the meaning “to distribute.” Andersen translates it as the adjective “various,” which is speculative but aligns with the meaning of РАЗЛИЧНО, which is found in V,N and B² (although this form is adverbial). Badalanova Geller seems to leave the word untranslated.⁴⁸ Because of his bewilderment at the meaning of ПѢНИЮ/ПѢНИЄ, Andersen describes the text here as “incorrigibly corrupt,” and further notes that a reference to singing here would seem to be out of place.

⁴⁵ A. Vaillant, *Le Livre des Secrets D'Hénoch: Texte slave et Traduction française*, (Paris: Institut d'Études slaves, 1952), 5. See, particularly, note “4,” where he comments on the decision to amend the reading, allowing him to translate as “d'écume.”

⁴⁶ Florentina Badalanova Geller, 2 (*Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch: Text and Context* (Berlin: Max-Planck-Institut für Wissenschaftsgeschichte, 2010), 31.

⁴⁷ See Horace G. Lunt, *Old Church Slavonic Grammar* (Seventh Revised Edition. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2001), 151.

⁴⁸ Badalanova Geller, 2 (*Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch*, 31

Once the alternative reading of “foam” is recognized, however, the text might begin to make sense, though the limiting of this word to A/U needs to be weighed carefully. This would suggest, though, that the clothing of the angels is perceived to be foamy in form, perhaps like sea waves or like clouds, with the adjective suggesting movement.

There is another option, that I have not seen considered anywhere. In modern Greek, one of the words used of cloth is *πανάι*. The word is not common in Classical Greek and there is, consequently, no translational equivalent for it in the Slavonic versions of the Old Testament. Is it possible that what we have is actually a calque, which may even at one point have been recognizable as a label for particular kinds of cloth? It is, for example, the term that is used of a sail-cloth (*πανάι πλοίου*). This, I think, makes immediate sense of the text and particularly when the overlaps with the description of the angelic warrior in Daniel 10 are recognized.

The description of the men leaves the reader with an impression of heat and light: they shine, they burn, and they exude fire from their mouths. They are, after all, “fireborn” (1a:5),⁴⁹ and this reflects the significance that fire has as a theme in 2 Enoch, particularly in the accounts of creation and in the lists of heaven. Andersen astutely notes, however, that fire is a derivative substance, contingent upon and secondary to light.⁵⁰

The description of the two men shares some elements with that of the heavenly warrior in Daniel 10:

I looked up and saw a man clothed in linen, with a belt of gold from Uphaz around his waist. His body was like beryl, his face like lightning, his eyes like flaming torches, his arms and legs like the gleam of burnished bronze, and the sound of his words like the roar of a multitude (Dan 10:5–6, NRSV).

There are differences, though. That figure has no wings; the metal to which his limbs are compared is bronze, and not gold; his face is like lightning, and not the sun; from his mouth is a roaring voice, rather than flame. Something similar could be said for the parallels with Revelation 1:14, 16—although there

⁴⁹ The term does not occur in J/P/R.

⁵⁰ See Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 104, note (i).

the comparison of the face to the sun is made—and 19:12. We are dealing not so much with clear dependency on prior texts as with a trope concerning the splendour of heavenly or angelic figures, resourced by various biblical texts and by the underlying imagery of *seraphim* and *cheruvim* (cf. 1a:6).

Enoch's response to seeing the men is, understandably, one of fear. What is of particular note is that this fear affects his own face (1:7).⁵¹ J and P here use the verb *измѣниса* (*izměnice*), “was changed,” but most other manuscripts use some form of the root *облѣщи* (*oblěšti*), “to cover,” generally with the particle *са*. V and N have no indirect object associated with “covered”: Enoch's face is simply described as “covered from fear.” B and B² add the instrumental of *рѣданіе* (*rydanije*), “wailing,” providing an indirect object for the verb: here, Enoch's face is “covered with wailing (or grief) from fear.” R also has an indirect object, uniquely reading *зраніем* (*zraniem*). Vaillant sees this as a corruption of *срѣніемъ* (*srěniemǔ*) and claims a meaning shaped by this idea of “whiteness”: Enoch's face becomes covered with white, i.e., hoar-frost. But *зраніем* could be a variant of *зърѣніе* (*zǐrěnije*), another word for “appearance” (although this suggests a different original translation; the word is not simply a variant of the root encountered in A, U and P);⁵² this might best be rendered with “my face was covered by the appearance of fear.” For all the variation in detail, the meaning is consistent in most of the manuscripts: Enoch's appearance is altered by his seeing of these men and the fear that this elicits, but the use of the word “covered” suggests that this alteration is a superficial change.⁵³

⁵¹ Most of the manuscripts associate the verb, which occurs with some variation (see discussion in main text), directly with Enoch's face. This is true of V,N,B,B² and J (contra Andersen's note, “2 [Slavonic Apocalypse of] Enoch, 104, note v). P shares a root form with A, U: *вѣдѣніе/привидѣніемъ* (*věděnie/pribiděniemǔ*). R, uniquely, has *зраніем*, as discussed in the main text, above.

⁵² I discussed the significance of the point that this may illustrate in Chapter 3. I remain open to the possibility that more than one translation of 2 Enoch was made as it crossed into the Slavonic languages, but that the translations were not necessarily independent. A scribe might have translated a Greek version of 2 Enoch that diverged somewhat from a known form of the work, with the earlier translation naturally shaping decisions in overlapping material. This would explain the localizing of apparently later forms of Slavonic in the additional material of the longer recension; these are simply not subject to the same degree of influence from an earlier translation.

⁵³ This conclusion about the significance of 1 Enoch 1:7–8 differs from that reached by Andrei Orlov, “Glorification through Fear in 2 Enoch,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 25 (2016): 171–88 (see, especially, comments on 171–2), though the overall conclusions are closely aligned. Orlov has been especially attentive to the significance of “face” imagery in 2 Enoch, recognizing that the significance of the frequency with which the used in 2 Enoch does not simply reflect the influence of positional idioms (corresponding to “in front of”), but reflects something more intentionally concerned with the face itself. See also his “God's Face in the Enochic Tradition” in *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism*, ed. April D. DeConick. (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 179–193

A, U use a different verb, БЛЫЦАТИ СѦ (*blīštati cę*), occurring as БЛЕЦА СѦ (*blešta cę*). That the variation is a result of corruption in Slavonic transmission is fairly obvious, given the overlap in the consonants. The agreement of most other manuscripts against this would suggest to me that the A,U form is secondary, but it is interesting nonetheless. The verb essentially means “to shine” or “to glitter” or, capturing its reflexive sense, “to be radiant.” Generally, then, it is used of luminosity, as in the translation of Luke 24:4, where it is used of the angels at the tomb of Jesus. Andersen suggests that another verb may be intended here, БѢЛИТИ (*bělitī*), “to make white,” and supports this by noting the mobility of vowels often encountered in the manuscripts and the frequency with which they are dropped; hence, he suggests that the meaning may be that Enoch’s face is “blanched.”⁵⁴ This seems unlikely to me; while vowels can indeed be omitted or travel, this is less typical when the vowel is a stressed one within the actual stem, as it is here, unless the word is routinely abbreviated, which this is not. It is more likely that the form in A, U is explained by the omission of the initial “o” and the “correction” of the stem to БЛЕЦА СѦ, with its standard meaning of luminosity imported because of its occurrence in connection with angelic appearance. The point of interest is that Enoch, as the one who sees the glorious angels, is represented as luminous. Even if secondary, this is interesting in anticipating the transformation that he will later experience.

After he has delivered his first instruction to his sons, an event that further highlights the fact that he is wide awake, Enoch is taken by the men upon their wings (3:1) and carried through the heavens. Multiple verbs are used (“took”, “carried”, “lifted,” “set down”) that collectively convey something of the bodily character of the journey. This is further reinforced by occasional references to Enoch’s own face, which may reflect the apparent Hebraism of “before the face” (пѣдъ лице, *prědŭ lice*) as a translation of לפני, a point that I discuss in more detail below, but has the literal effect of suggesting Enoch’s physical position in relation to what he sees: “They led before my face the elders, the rulers of the stellar orders” (4:1).

After passing through the various heavens, and exploring their various regions, Enoch is eventually brought into the presence of the Lord in 2 Enoch 20-22. Here, the recensions vary in how the narrative is told in relation to the number of heavens. In all recensions, the angels carry Enoch to the

⁵⁴ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 108, note v.

seventh heaven, where he beholds—initially from a distance—the throne of God and its angelic attendants, which include “the fiery armies of the incorporeal ones, archangels” (20:1, A,U) and the “*otanim* stations.” The latter occur with enormous variation across the manuscripts, which Anderson regards as resulting from scribal confusion over the Hebrew אִוִּפְנִים, “wheels.”⁵⁵ This is correct to a point, but some of the variation reflects what is commonly encountered in Slavonic with “P” and “th” sounds (seen also in the name “Sothonim/Sofanim”). The occurrence of these words here may reflect their significance as part of the “stock” of technical jargon in *Merkabah*-type imagery and the popularity of its tropes about the divine throne. This need not be taken to imply direct involvement of Jewish writers; it could reflect the dissemination of such ideas more widely and the popularity of originally Jewish traditions in the wider area. Enoch also sees the army of cherubim that are “standing in front of the face of the Lord”; the manuscripts vary on whether these are identified further as the “six-winged ones that cover the throne” or whether this designates a further class of being. Only J and P include the actual words that these beings sing, the *qedusha* (“Holy, holy, holy Lord Sabaoth, heaven and earth are full of his glory”); the other manuscripts leave unwritten the words of the song, despite mentioning that these beings sing. This is interesting because a similar phenomenon is visible in some of the liturgical works among the Dead Sea Scrolls; likewise, these invoke the language of Ezekiel 1 and Isaiah 6, but leave unspoken the actual words of the angels. For some, this reflects the qualitative difference that remains between humans and the angels, even in the participatory act of worship: these words are properly to be spoken only by those angels, even if human worship otherwise replicates the angelic activity.⁵⁶

In the long recension, the two men indicate that they have travelled with Enoch as far as they were commanded; they depart and Enoch is left terrified on the edge of the seventh heaven. In the short recension, the men say nothing; Enoch is simply left alone, again on the edge of the seventh heaven. The final stages of Enoch’s journey into the presence of God are led by Gabriel, who repeats the exhortation to be brave and not frightened and commands Enoch, “Stand up, and come with me and stand in front of the face of the Lord forever” (21:3). The significance of the final word should not be overlooked: Enoch is not merely to see the face of the Lord for a time, but is to stand before that face forever. He is, in other

⁵⁵ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 135, note b.

⁵⁶ So, Esther G. Chazon, “Liturgical Communion with the Angels at Qumran,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998*, ed. Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez and Eileen M. Schuller (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 95–105.

words, to be inducted into an eternal role, although he will be allowed a period of furlough from it in which he can return to instruct his children. Gabriel then carries Enoch up, “like a leaf carried up by the wind” (21:5) and places Enoch before the face of the Lord. In the short recension, this occurs within the bounds of the seventh heaven; Enoch is “moved along” by Gabriel to the centre of the heaven. In the long recension, Enoch is carried by the archangel through the 8th and the 9th heavens, Muzaloth and Kukhavim respectively, before being placed in front of the face of the Lord in the 10th heaven, Aravoth. The connections between the long recension and the Jewish mystical traditions preserved in the Bavli (particularly b.Ḥagigah 12) and the Hekhalot traditions are quite obvious here.

Enoch subsequently describes the face of the Lord (22:1–4), which highlights that the locational phrase is not simply—or, at least, is not always—a crude replication of the Hebrew עִנְיָן. I discussed this passage already in Chapter 5, because of its relevance to the analysis of philosophical language in 2 Enoch, but it is helpful to consider it again here in relation to Enoch’s own ultimate transformation. The details vary in extent between the recensions and it is worth reproducing the long and short recensions for comparison:

22:1–3 (A):

1. Concerning the Appearance of the Lord. I saw the Lord. His face, the Lord’s, was strong and illustrious and terrible/frightening. Who is there (עִנְיָן)⁵⁷ to give an account of the scope/composition/dimensions⁵⁸ of the being (сѣщѣе, *sqštee*) of the face of the Lord, strong and very frightening, or his many-eyed and many-voiced, and the made-without-hands, very great throne of the Lord, or the standing ones⁵⁹ who are with him, the cherubim and seraphim armies, or his immutable and ineffable, and not-silent and glorious composition (слѣженіе, *služenie*)? And I fell down prostrate, and did obeisance to the Lord.

⁵⁷ This abbreviated form is typically used for the form עִנְיָן, “there is/is there” The long recension reads עִנְיָן. “I am/am I.”

⁵⁸ The word in the short recension (paralleled in the very short mss) is *obięti*. This is probably to be read as a noun and the word usually means embrace or encircling (in fact, it often means “hug”!). The word is used earlier in the book, describing the extent of the sun’s journey. Andersen’s translation reflects this idea of “scope”. Technically, the form could also be the cognate verb, in its infinitive form.

⁵⁹ The word used here is *стоѣниѣ*, *stoęnie*. Although cognate to the verb for standing, the noun can also be used of presence or of permanence.

22:1–4 (J)

And on the 10th heaven, Aravoth, I saw the appearance of the face of the Lord,⁶⁰ like incandescent iron brought out of a fire, and it sparks and glows. Thus, I myself saw the face of the Lord, but the face of the Lord is ineffable, wondrous and supremely awesome and supremely frightening. Who am I to give an account of the incomprehensible (νεωβέτοε, *neobētoe*) being of the Lord, and of his face, so extremely wonderful and ineffable, and how abundant is his knowledge and his many voices, and the supremely great and not-made-by-hands throne of the Lord, and how many stand⁶¹ all around him, the cherubim and the seraphim armies, and their never-silent singing? Who can give an account of his beautiful appearance, immutable and indescribable, and his great glory? And I fell down flat and did obeisance to the Lord.

The long recension contains much more detail than the short and very short recensions. Perhaps the most significant element of this is the comparison between the face of the Lord and incandescent iron, which is also found in 39:3,5 across the recensions. Andersen believes that the detail here has been expurgated from the short recensions here because of embarrassment at attempts to describe the Lord's face, while being maintained authentically in J and P, but we have to ask why this would not also be the case in chapter 39. Why, in other words, is the expurgation not sustained more consistently throughout the short recension? It is as plausible to see the detail as added to the long recension here precisely because of its inclusion there, as an attempt to generate coherence between the descriptions of the divine face.

Regardless of which reading here might be the original, this description is not an isolated one and that the picture of the divine face is built extensively through the work. The imagery used of the face and its glory is repeatedly that of light and heat: the divine face is incandescent, emitting sparks. His lips are a furnace (39:3,5). Further, the recensions, albeit in different ways, commonly affirm that the description of the face is to be considered sacred and, in some senses, secret; this is not a public matter,

⁶⁰ R here reads, "I looked the Lord in the face."

⁶¹ At two points in the description, both J and R have in place of ελικο, (*eliko*, "how many/how much") the word λικκ, choir stall. This makes sense contextually as an image of heavenly liturgy, but I am inclined to see it as a medieval or early modern alteration.

but is to be held carefully by those who belong to the readership of Enoch's wisdom, which is defined even in the titles of the book as "secrets."

Some of the language used here and in 39:3–6 can be read as reflecting an emergent *Shi'ur Qomah* mysticism, though as I discussed in Chapter 5, it may also be explained as a reflection of philosophical language used in theological Platonism. The two possibilities need not be opposed and their relationship to each other and to 2 Enoch may, to invoke again our common image, be somewhat rhizomatic, so that one must be careful in presuming a direction of development and seeking to locate 2 Enoch somewhere along it.

The short recension of 22:3 refers to the "ВЪБАТИ/ВЪБАТИ (*ōbīṣti/ōbījati*) of the being (сѣще, *suštee*) of the face the Lord." I have left the first word untranslated here because it poses some difficulties in translation. The same word occurs twice in a similar construction in 39:6, attested across the manuscripts, and there it is clearly a noun; here, it is possible to read the word as the verb ВЪБАТИ (*ōbēti*), which can mean "to comprehend" and would form a pairing with ИСПОВѢДАТИ (*ispovēdati*, "to describe").⁶² The parallel in 39:6, however, suggests that what we have here is the noun. Vaillant translates this as "l'étendue,"⁶³ Andersen translates both as "the dimensions" (in 22:3)⁶⁴ and "the extent" (in 39:6),⁶⁵ followed by Orlov in the latter;⁶⁶ Böttrich translates the word at 39:6 as "das Ausmaß,"⁶⁷ In his comments on 39:6, Andersen describes the word as rare, "meaning 'range' or 'compass,'"⁶⁸ but the natural meaning of the noun in later Slavonic literature, where it is more common, is "embrace." Possibly, then, the word has a meaning something along the lines of "circumference." Certainly, in 39:6, the word is associated with the language of measurement: Enoch sees the ВЪБАТІѢ of the Lord, "without measure, without analogy, of whom there is no end," and contrasts this with the ВЪБАТІѢ of his own body, which his sons have seen. This is somewhat paralleled by the language used in 39:5, of the right hand of the Lord that fills heaven. There is some ambiguity as to whether ИСПОЛНЯЮЩИ (*ispolnejušti*)

⁶² A, in fact, appears to contain an inserted conjunction, allowing such a reading.

⁶³ Vaillant, *Le Livre des Secrets*, 25.

⁶⁴ Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 137.

⁶⁵ Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 163.

⁶⁶ See, e.g., in his article "Without Measure and Without Analogy": The Tradition of the Divine Body in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch," *Scrimium* 3 (2007): 231–57.

⁶⁷ Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*, 945. Because the word is missing from the long recension, to which he gives priority, it is not found in his translation of 22:3.

⁶⁸ Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 163, note g.

should be understood in terms of the Lord himself or his hand, but it is clear that the theme is of God's unparalleled size.

All of this may point in the direction of traditions that parallel the interests in the divine extent in *Shi'ur Qomah* mysticism, but it is surrounded by detail that more generally reflects traditions concerning the Merkavah, with the throne attendants again described,⁶⁹ as they were in chapter 21 and language of “glory”/“glorious” repeated in 22:1 and 22:3. It is also worth noting that there is evidence for a certain preoccupation with themes of measurement in Elchaisite circles, but with this concern directed towards the scale of Christ's form and that of the Holy Spirit;⁷⁰ the interest in measurement should not too quickly be presumed to reflect the concerns of *Shi'ur Qomah* mysticism, when it may in fact reflect some of the factors that fed into the development of this strand of later Jewish writing.

The occurrence of these details within the immediate context of 2 Enoch 22 is linked to the transformation of Enoch himself. By the Lord's command, Enoch is extracted from his “earthly clothing” and dressed with “the clothes of glory.” J, R, P add the possessive “my” to glory, specifying that the property is truly God's own, but this is not reflected in the other manuscripts. Enoch is also anointed with “delightful oil,” which is described as like sweet dew and fragrant myrrh and is numinous, “greater than the greatest light ... its shining is like the sun.”⁷¹

As a result of his anointing and his clothing, Enoch becomes “like one of the glorious ones, and there was no observable difference” (22:10). Enoch himself is now glorious and numinous, his appearance sharing in the pattern exemplified by the angelic beings and God himself. We can speak legitimately of a certain angelomorphism here because of the expression “no observable difference”; Enoch's form is indistinguishable from that of the angels. But we should not allow this to obscure other elements in the description that foreground spatial elements. In particular, the clothing that Enoch must shed is “earthly” and his transformation into a state of glory is specifically intended to allow him to stand in front of the face of the Lord forever. In fact, we should highlight that the angels share in a state of glorious being that is supremely embodied—and I use that word carefully—by the Lord. So,

⁶⁹ J, P, R elaborate this further with a description of the heavenly choir stalls.

⁷⁰ Epiphanius Panarion 30.17.5-6. See F. Stanley Jones, “The Book of Elchasai in its Relevance for Manichaean Institutions. With a Supplement: The Book Of Elchasai Reconstructed and Translated,” in his *Pseudoclementina elchasaiticaque inter Judaeochristiana: Collected Studies* OLA 203 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012): 375, 382, 402.

⁷¹ J, P, R read slightly differently—“it is like the rays of the glittering sun”—but the meaning is essentially the same.

while angelomorphism is an element in the description of Enoch's transformation, it is really just part of a fuller account of glory as a heavenly state.

This is further reflected in the description of Enoch's return to earth, the furlough during which he will share instruction with his children. Before he can return, his face must be cooled; the Lord calls one of "the elders" a terrifying angel whose appearance is of snow and ice, to refrigerate Enoch's face. Interestingly, all of the recensions attest that that this act of refreshment is necessary for Enoch's own sake: "because I could not endure the terror of the burning" (37:1). This thought is developed again in 2 Enoch 39, in the context of Enoch's advice to his children:

Dreadful and dangerous it is to stand before the face of an earthly king; terrifying, because the will of the king is death and the will of the king is life. To stand before the face of the King (of Kings):⁷² who will be able to endure the infinite terror of that, or of the great burnings?" (39:8, A).

This should not be passed over too quickly, for it maintains the distinction between Enoch and the angels that attend God; while he is no longer dressed in earthly clothing, he himself is still of earthly origin. It is not natively possible for him to stand before God; a transformation must occur.

To this, however, the long recension adds a further explanation for the cooling of Enoch's face, that otherwise "no human would be able to look at your face" (37:2). The ordering of the chapters bears on how we evaluate this. In the order represented by the longer recension—the order followed by Andersen—the cooling of Enoch's face necessarily precedes his return to earth, allowing him to communicate with his sons. In that of the short recension, it follows a lengthier description of the face of the Lord and simply reinforces that Enoch, even in his glorified condition, is not capable of enduring the presence of the Lord without the respite offered by the elder. Perhaps we need simply to allow the divergent ordering and associated logic represented by the two major recensions to stand, but the point

⁷² J, P and R have this fuller reading, "King of Kings," which is found also in B. The whole clause is missing from V, N and B², i.e., the very short manuscripts. This means that in terms of the attested readings, the simple "king" in A and U is the outlier. The logic of the text, I would suggest, leads us to expect that this clause will compare the earthly king to the heavenly one and this is supported by the use of another negational term, "infinite" (literally, "without ends/limits") and by the use of "burnings," contextually surely intended to evoke the fiery form of God.

that they highlight in their different ways is the same: Enoch's glory is proper to the heavenly space and cannot be endured within the earthly realm, at least, not in its current state.

Madeleine Scopello has noted the similarities between the description of Enoch's transformation and that of the central figure in the Apocalypse of Zostrianos, a 3rd century Coptic text associated with Sethian Gnosticism.⁷³ Zostrianos, whom Dylan Burns argues to be the grandfather of Zoroaster,⁷⁴ is guided through the thirteen aeons of the lower sphere by an angel of light before being baptised and transformed.

I was baptised and I received the image of the Glories there. I became like one of them. I left the airy earth and passed by the copies of aeons after washing there seven times in a living water, one for each of the aeons.⁷⁵

Later in the same work, at the end of his apocalyptic journey Zostrianos is told:

Behold Zostrianos, you have heard all these things that the gods do not know and which are unattainable to the angels.⁷⁶

Scopello considers these two passages to reflect the influence of 2 Enoch, which she rather simplistically treats as the handiwork of a Jewish author, living in Egypt in the Roman period.⁷⁷ The points of resemblance are certainly interesting, although they are perhaps less impressive than Scopello considers them to be and may not indicate the dependency of Apoc. Zostrianos on 2 Enoch as much as the general entanglement of the developing Enoch traditions with Sethian ones. The two points of resemblance are found quite far apart in the Coptic work, diminishing the sense that they reflect the influence of a cluster of ideas, and the Apocalypse of Zostrianos also fails to reproduce the developed visual language found

⁷³ Madeleine Scopello, "The Apocalypse of Zostrianos (Nag Hammadi viii .1) and the Book of the Secrets of Enoch," *Vigiliae Christianae* 34 (1980): 376-385.

⁷⁴ Dylan Burns, "The Apocalypse of Zostrianos and Iolaosa Platonic Reminiscence of the Heracleidae at NHC VIII.1.4," *Le Muséon* 126 (2013): 29-43.

⁷⁵ VIII.1.5.18-20. Trans., Scopello, "Apocalypse of Zostrianos," 376.

⁷⁶ VIII.1.128.15. Trans., Scopello, "Apocalypse of Zostrianos," 378.

⁷⁷ Scopello, "Apocalypse of Zostrianos," 380.

in 2 Enoch 22:10 (“there was no observable difference”). The language may, then, simply reflect wider tropes of glorification.

This leads to one last crucial area of reflection, which concerns the eschatological glorification of other humans in 2 Enoch. A description of this is found in the long recension, in 66:7, but is missing from the short recension manuscripts. The text of Merilo Pravedno, however, includes the same description, but attached to the block of text contained in chapter 65; consequently, Andersen includes this shorter version of the statement in his translation of the short recension. Here, then, as is often the case, the evidence of M.Pr—our oldest witness to 2 Enoch, if obviously secondary—complicates neat solutions to the textual problems. If we follow Andersen in allowing the text of M.Pr to supplement that of the short recension, with which its language most closely agrees, then the statement is found in 65:11, where it is the closing line in the description of the “single age” that will follow the great judgement:

Blessed are the righteous who will escape the great judgement of the Lord great, for (their) faces will shine forth like the sun.

In the long recension, the statement is found at the end of chapter 66, where it is part of the final summary instruction that Enoch delivers to his children:

Blessed are the righteous who escape the Lord’s great judgement, for they will shine forth seven times brighter than the sun.

For in that age, everything is estimated sevenfold; light and darkness and food and pleasure and misery and paradise and tortures.

All of this I have put down in writing, that you might read and understand it.

The location of the statement within this final instruction reflects the formal characteristics that allow it to be seen as a beatitude, a common instructional device in 2 Enoch. The formal significance allows it to follow the guidance on how one should “walk” (66:6). Mostly, however, the instructional beatitudes in 2 Enoch occur in formal clusters or series, and the singular character of this one makes good sense in

its location in the short recension as a simple statement of the blessedness that awaits the righteous in the eschaton.

As Andersen notes, the description of the brightness as “seven times that of the sun” may reflect the influence of Isaiah 30:26, but there are other texts that may have played a role in mediating the imagery and in transforming it into something more schematic, if we allow that 2 Enoch might have taken form in late antiquity. Notably, in *Epistula Apostolorum* 16, Jesus promises that when he returns his face will shine seven times brighter than the sun. The influence of Isaiah 30:26, then, may be somewhat distant, with tropes and traditions shaping what we have here. While MPr is highly abbreviated in character, it is noteworthy that it lacks not only the extended description of sevenfold blessing and misery in the great age, but also the core description of the faces as seven times brighter than the sun. This suggests that the multiplication detail may be secondary, even if what is incorporated is an old tradition.

I will note some parallels to the general description of the shining faces below, where I seek to map the evidence onto the literature of late antiquity. Here, though, I want to note some further details of the context in 2 Enoch that constitute some distinctive parallels with the Parables of Enoch and others that suggest divergence. First, this description follows reasonably quickly after the identification of Enoch as “the one who reveals, who carries away our sins” (64:5). The links with that identification are not merely those of proximity (and the related possibility of a narrative logic connecting the two); Enoch, the mediator, is also enjoined to “glorify” his people in some relation to “the face of the Lord.” There are some differences here between the long and short recensions:

“Bless now your people and glorify the face⁷⁸ of the Lord”

For the Lord has chosen you ... (64: 4–5 A,)

⁷⁸ In the shorter recension, the verb “glorify” occurs as *прослави* (*proslavi*), followed by *на лица гѣни* (*na lici g(ospodi)ni*). The directional significance of the preposition as “towards” suggests to me that the verb should be understood as indicating worship directed towards the divine face. Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 191, inserts the pronoun “us,” as found in V,N and (in a different case) in B², which allows the reading to be aligned a little more closely with the long recension. These manuscripts also use a different preposition to A and U, however, paralleling the use of *предъ* by the long recension. This is not insignificant as evidence; where the very short and the long recensions agree against A and U, it may constitute a good reason to regard the latter as having been altered. To simply insert “us” glosses the significance of the form in A and U, however.

Bless your sons⁷⁹ and all the people, that we may be glorified in front of your face today.

For you will be glorified in front of the face of the Lord⁸⁰ for eternity, because you are the one whom the Lord chose ... (64:4–5, J)

The differences are constituted by the repetition of “glorified” and “in front of the face” in the long recension. The duplication is associated with a parsing of glorification as according to both God and his appointed mediator: the people ask to be blessed in order that they may be glorified in front of Enoch’s face, because he is to be glorified in front of the Lord’s face for eternity. This duplication may be secondary to the long recension, but it is anchored in the description of Enoch’s transformation and installation in chapter 22, where he is glorified in order to serve in front of the Lord’s face for ever. The occurrence of “face” here, then, seems to be more than just the use of a Hebraism; it points to a mediatorial role connected to Enoch’s own encounter with the fiery face of God.

It is also noteworthy that Enoch’s appointment to this mediatorial role is specified consistently across the manuscripts with the word “chosen.” While it is hardly surprising to see this word used of a figure appointed to a mediatorial role by God, the occurrence in this context creates an obvious and particular connection with the Parables of Enoch, where the mediator is characteristically labelled the Chosen One and where, as we have seen, the righteous associated with the chosen one share in his glorification.

Second, the description of the righteous and their shining faces is associated with the great light of the single age that will follow the judgment. I will explore this further in Chapter 9, in relation to the status of animals in the great age, because arguably it reflects the influence of Zoroastrian eschatology, a point made by Schlomo Pines that can be revisited in the context of this study to help map 2 Enoch onto the worlds of late antiquity and, potentially, the ongoing influence of Iranian thought.

⁷⁹ “Sons” is found in P and R, but is missing from J.

⁸⁰ J and P here read, “You will be glorified in front of your face ...” where R reads “You will be glorified in front of the face of the Lord.” Errors in P and J are often replicated and this appears to be an obvious such case, probably brought about by a parablepsis of *прѣдъ лицемъ*.

Parallels Between 2 Enoch and Manichaean or Mandaean Apocalypses

It is worth noting some points of similarity between the language and imagery used in 2 Enoch of the seer's encounter with heavenly beings and the associated disclosure of cosmological/cosmogonic truths and traditions associated with Manichaean and Mandaean thought. Some of the relevant elements, interestingly, are particularly associated with the figure of Enosh (or Anōš), a celebrated figure in these traditions whose representation casts him as one of the messengers of heavenly light, but one who has little significance outside these traditions. This raises the intriguing possibility that the traditions about Enoch and Enosh might colour each other or might be confused. If this is the case, then such influence might be expected to overlap with representations of other figures of redemptive revelation, particularly Seth.

In fact, it is with such a parallel that I begin here. There are some striking points of correspondence between some of the elements that we have seen in 2 Enoch and the Manichaean work, the Apocalypse of Sethel. The name Sethel is a variant of Seth, but is one distinctively associated with Manichaean and Mandaean literature.⁸¹ It is, perhaps, worth noting that some of our independent evidence for the distribution of Sethianism is found in Theodore bar Konai's account of 'Audi of Edessa,⁸² which was discussed in Chapter 6 in relation to the image of God in 2 Enoch. There may, then, more than one point of linkage to that material in 2 Enoch. I reproduce here the translation of the Apocalypse of Sethel from John Reeves:

Also Sethel his son has similarly written in his apocalypse, saying that 'I opened my eyes and beheld before me an [ang]el whose [radiance] I am unable to (adequately) represent [lig]htning to me ... (3 lines lost) ... [Wh]en I heard these things, my heart rejoiced and my mind changed and I became like one of the greatest angels. That angel placed his hand upon my right (hand) and took me out of the world wherein I was born and brought me to another place

⁸¹ John Reeves, *Heralds of That Good Realm: Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions*. Nag Hammadi and Manichean Studies 41 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 112.

⁸² Reeves, *Heralds*, 115.

(that was) exceedingly great. Behind me I heard a loud uproar from those angels whom [I] left behind [in] the world which the[y pos]sessed ... (at least 2 lines missing) ...'

M[any things simil]ar to these are described in his writings, and as he was transported by that angel from world to world, he revealed to him the awe- some secrets of (divine) majesty.⁸³

The first suggestive parallel to be considered is with the first encounter with the angels who take Enoch up through the heavens. As I have noted, 2 Enoch is distinctively insistent that this happens for the seer not in a dream but in the waking state:

Then I awoke from my sleep and saw **in actuality**⁸⁴ those men, standing before me (2 Enoch 1:6).

There is no explicit reference to Enoch's opening of his eyes, but this is surely implied by the pairing of verbs for waking and seeing. Commenting on Sethel's encounter with the angel, Reeves comments:

[T]he initial phrase 'I opened my eyes and beheld before me ...' ... is a rather peculiar expression in this context, possessing no precise parallels in biblical literature.

... Possibly Sethel was asleep, and he was awakened by his angelic visitor, much as Jesus the Splendor rouses the sleeping Adam in the Manichaean anthropogony.⁸⁵

So, we have two accounts that describe a scenario that is uncommon within apocalyptic writings and do so in ways that use overlapping imagery and language:

Ap. Sethel	2 Enoch
I opened my eyes	I awoke from sleep

⁸³ Reeves, *Heralds*, 111–12.

⁸⁴ The placement of *javě* is different in J, R, and P, placed immediately after the verb "I saw."

⁸⁵ Reeves, *Heralds*, 118.

and beheld	and saw
before me	before me

The similarities between the two texts extend to the description of the angelic beings. The Apocalypse of Sethel preserved in the Mani Codex describes the angel as having a radiance that the seer is unable to represent and then continues to attempt a description of this radiance. The text is broken, with several lines missing, although the word “lightning” is partially preserved ([ἀστ]ραπαῖ). It seems likely, then, that there is a longer description of the figure’s splendour. Again, there are some similarities with Enoch’s encounter with the two men that he sees after he awakens (which actually begins in his state of dreaming):

4. Two very enormous men appeared to me, such as I had never seen on the earth.
5. Their faces were like the sun shining; their eyes like burning lamps; from their mouths fire was emerging; their clothing (was) variegated cloth, appearing like many purple robes; their wings were more glistening than gold; their hands whiter than snow. And they stood at the head of my bed and called me by my name.

The description commences with a description of the incomparability of the two men: as with Sethel’s visitor, there is no earthly analogue that can be utilised by the seer as a figure to represent the appearance being. This is followed by a complex description of their splendour that is dominated by interest in their colourful radiance. There is nothing that specifically corresponds to the imagery of lightning used in the Sethel account, but that description is only fragmentary. It is quite possible that the missing lines contained more that parallels what we see in 2 Enoch.

There are also some interesting points of similarity between Enoch’s reaction of a paralyzing fear that is addressed through the speech of the highest god or the angels and fragments from the Mandaean Book of Anōš that are discussed by Reeves and which he compares to the similar imagery in the Apocalypse of Enosh:

After contemplating the structure and constituents of the created order, and then concluding that the world was governed by evil powers, Enosh reports: "When I saw that the world was created thusly, I *trembled and shook*, and my body, which had been straight, was bent. Groans came forth from my heart, *my feet quaked, and they could not stand firmly in their places*." Mandā de-Ḥayyē then appears and asks Enosh: "Little Enosh, why are you frightened? Why do you shake and tremble? Why is your body bent, why does your heart groan, and why do your feet quake in their places?" ... Yet another instance of the same anatomical diction is found in the twelfth book of the *Right Ginzā*, where Enosh is also the speaker: "When I saw that being of Light, *my body quaked and trembled, and my feet could not stand in their places*."⁸⁶

It is important, of course, that in the first example cited here by Reeves, Enosh's crippling fear emerges from his contemplation of the created order, as evidence of evil powers. This is at once a matter of correspondence and divergence with both the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch, where Enoch learns the secrets of creation that are credited to God's own handiwork. Yet, similar imagery is also used of Enosh's response to the being of Light, in the second example, lifted from the *Right Ginzā*. The trope, then, is not only one of a response to evil, but can also be used of a response to glory.

Reeves's observation of distinctive parallels between the various works centres on the recurrent imagery of feet that are unable to remain standing in place. This imagery is not encountered in the Enoch texts, but there are nevertheless some interesting points of correspondence, which will emerge most sharply if I translate extracts from the text of 2 Enoch 20, 21 and 22 with some crude replication of the vocative forms:

And I was terrified and I trembled. And the men picked me up and said to me, "Courage Enosh; do not fear." (20:1b–2a, A)

And the Lord sent one of his glorious ones to me, Gabril. And he said to me, "Courage Enosh; do not fear. Stand up, and come with me, and stand in front of the face of the Lord forever." (21:3, A)

⁸⁶ Reeves, *Heralds*, 147.

And the Lord, with his own mouth, called to me, “Courage, Enosh; do not fear. Stand up, and stand in front of my face forever” (22:5, A)

Without being naïve around the significance of Enosh as the vocative in the Slavonic manuscripts,⁸⁷ I represent the material in this form here to highlight the similarities and contrasts with the Anōš text. It is, I think, conceivable that a trope circulated in antiquity, perhaps with a deliberate play on the names of Enoch and Enosh, that involved the imagery of fear and of being able or unable to stand, though it is worth noting that interest in Enosh seems primarily to be a phenomenon of Syro-Mesopotamia.⁸⁸

These similarities between 2 Enoch and the Sethian and Mandaean texts are striking, if quite localised to particular points within the texts. We might note also a certain similarity between the portrayal of the Son of Man in the Parables, as a heavenly figure revealed in order to share his salvific knowledge of the divine secrets with his chosen people, and the various “avatars” of the Sethian and Mandaean traditions.⁸⁹ Regardless of the original significance of the phrase, Son of Man,⁹⁰ its capacity to generate a perceived resonance or correspondence with Enosh/Anōš traditions in its reception should not be underestimated. This is true also of the variant form “Son of the Mother of the Living”: Seth, it should be kept in mind, is that Son of Eve. This is not intended to imply anything Sethian in the origins of the Parables, but a distinctive potential for the Parables to be absorbed into textual resources of the Sethian groups.

But it is also striking that the same works have sharply contrastive cosmogonies. The anxiety felt by Enosh over the evidence that the order of nature attests the involvement of evil beings in its creation

⁸⁷ Much has been made of the fact that one such example of the vocative Enosh in the manuscript A (in 10:4) appears to preserve a different reading, “Ionoshe” (“Youth”), a reading encountered several times in V, including at the points translated above. This has been taken as a parallel to the use of the title “Youth” of Metatron. As I have noted previously, I am unpersuaded by this: in the manuscript B, the initial form Je (IĚ) is often written in a way that is barely distinguishable from Io (IŎ), and the vocative occurs in the form IĚNOUĚ, reflecting the standard iotization of the name Enoch in that manuscript. Orthographically, then, it is easy to explain how the variant could have arisen at some point in the Slavonic manuscript tradition and been incorporated into A. See my discussion in *The Slavonic Texts of 2 Enoch*, 14–5.

⁸⁸ Such a play on Enoch and Enosh is not implausible and there are a number of points where the Apocalypse of Enosh seems to draw upon the traditions preserved in 1 Enoch. See Reeves, *Heralds*, 148. For the Syro-Mesopotamian context, see his discussion of the Enosh texts generally (Reeves, *Heralds*, 141–61), which includes his observation that the celebration of Enosh as a redemptive light-bringer is distinctively Mandaean.

⁸⁹ Seth himself is the principal avatar in this tradition, but his identity is figurally linked to other revealers. See the excursus in Reeves, *Heralds*, 126–9.

⁹⁰ See my discussion of the debate concerning whether it should be considered a title, in Chapter 2.

is fundamentally different from what is encountered in either the Parables or in 2 Enoch. The latter, however, as I explored in Chapters 5 and 6, seems particularly concerned to reject the kind of cosmogonical views encountered in the Syro-Mesopotamian works. The combination of resemblance and difference would make sense if 2 Enoch took form in late antiquity, in the contexts where these works were popular. The connections with Sethianism could be explained in an Egyptian context, but are perhaps more readily explicable in a Syro-Mesopotamian one, particularly if the Mandaean connections are also significant.

Conclusion

The Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch both draw upon the accounts of Enoch's ascent found in the Aramaic Enoch literature, particularly the Book of the Watchers. In the Aramaic material, Enoch's experience of the heavenly realm is linked to both a bodily and a visionary or oneiric ascent, and most of the vision that he reports is associated with the latter. In the Parables, some of the key material associated with Enoch's dream vision in the Book of the Watchers is recalled, but is now associated with his actual assumption into the heavenly realm and his installation as the enthroned Son of Man. At several points, Enoch's narrative is described as a vision, but these appear to be redactional additions, intended to embed the Parables within the Book of Enoch. In the climactic section of the book, Enoch quite suddenly begins to speak of his journey as something done in his spirit. I have argued that this "out of body" emphasis is strategic and contributes to the progress of the narrative towards Enoch's identification with the Son of Man. When he is once again "in body," the body that he inhabits, which is melted and reformed, is that of the Son of Man, the Chosen and Righteous One.

If the Parables moves away from the visionary quality of the primary Enoch material, essentially extending the actual or bodily elements associated with Enoch's sojourn with the watchers and his final translation to heaven, 2 Enoch decisively and deliberately abandons it. Much of the imagery about Enoch's transformation in 2 Enoch parallels what is seen in the Parables, but it takes it further in ways that emphasize the bodily quality of Enoch's ascent and the physical nature of his transformation. These are closely linked to the imagery of the divine face, which runs through the book and cannot be reduced simply to the significance of a locative idiom. While this combination of developments results in a

portrayal of the exalted Enoch that is similar to the representation of Metatron in 3 Enoch, it also incorporates details that present interesting similarities to traditions preserved in specifically Syro-Mesopotamian streams of Gnosticism, both Sethian and Mandaean, with which the Parables can also be seen to have a more general set of correspondences, through their imagery of a heavenly avatar, associated with the Son of Eve. In 2 Enoch, however, these elements function alongside the strands of a radically different cosmogony, such that it makes sense to see this as a later work, evidently contradicting those Sethian and Mandaean works.

At one level, the findings of this chapter simply confirm the distinctive closeness of the Parables and 2 Enoch within the wider corpus of the Enoch literature; their mutual resemblance constitutes a difference from the primary Jewish material preserved at Qumran. On another level, however, the findings are further suggestive of the thread that I have been pursuing through this study, that the distinctive details of each work appear to make sense within quite different contexts. The elements of the Parables are distinctive when compared to early Jewish traditions, but there are enough points of contact to see them as emerging from this world; the elements of 2 Enoch, however, seem to be shaped much more obviously by traditions in later antiquity, particularly those associated with Syria and Mesopotamia.

Chapter 8. Practical and Symbolic Liturgy, Votive Offerings, and the Cult of the One God in 2 Enoch

Introduction

In the next two chapters, I will consider some material in 2 Enoch that is particularly concerned with regular liturgy and practical worship and that seems to reflect a different context to that of the Parables; I will explore some problems with reading this as reflecting known Jewish practice from the second temple period and will seek to locate it in relation to the liturgical cultures of late antiquity. The division of the material into two chapters is simply intended to make the discussion more manageable for the reader, avoiding a single chapter of such length and density that it would be difficult to follow. In the present chapter, I will discuss a range of offerings that are represented, and the significance attached to these, but will largely exclude from my analysis the descriptions of animal sacrifice. These descriptions will be considered in the next chapter (Chapter 9), along with some of the sacrificial theorizing that 2 Enoch itself renders. The separation of the chapters should not lead readers to feel that the content of each is isolable from the other, however. Key themes will run through both and some of the details will co-occur within specific passages in 2 Enoch.

Most of the discussion in these chapters will be dedicated to the study of 2 Enoch, but it is important to frame what we find there by comparison with the Parables of Enoch, which contains little material concerned with liturgical or cultic praxis. What we encounter in the Parables takes the form of references to angelic praise or to the eschatological praise of the chosen ones; this is interesting in its own way, and parallels some of the discussion of heavenly liturgy that we find in 2 Enoch,¹ but it lacks the references to offerings and sacrifices made by faithful humans that are encountered in the latter.

¹ This is discussed by Andrei Orlov, "Celestial Choirmaster: The Liturgical Role of Enoch-Metatron in 2 Enoch and Merkabah Tradition," in *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 14 (2004): 3–29. Orlov approaches the material as the product of 1st century Judaism and as part of the stock from which Merkabah traditions will develop. It will be clear by now that while agreeing with his identification of parallels, I think there may be different ways to explain these.

Importantly, it also lacks the distinctive emphasis on the reciprocity of the divine response to these that run as a thread through both chapters.²

2 Enoch and Practical Worship

By contrast to the Parables of Enoch and even to the Epistle of Enoch, which is presented as testamentary instruction and therefore contains extensive moral guidance and paraenesis, 2 Enoch contains a significant volume of instructional material that is concerned with what we might call regular practical worship. In fact, the form and placement of this material suggest that regular “offering” is equivalent to, or constitutive of, fidelity to the Lord; it is encountered at programmatically important points in the work and in paraenetic forms that represent it as practical wisdom. What such offering involves and signifies, however, needs to be probed, with an awareness of how such meaning might have developed for the communities in which the work was authored and transmitted.

Enoch’s Instruction Before His Ascent

The significance of practical worship emerges in the first block of instruction that the reader encounters in 2 Enoch. After Enoch wakes from his initial dream to find the two huge angelic guides standing before him “in reality” (2 En 1:6),³ he is commanded by them to tell his sons, Methuselah and Rigim, “all that they are to do on earth” (2 En 1:9) during his absence. This block of teaching is delivered prior to Enoch’s ascent, and is not informed by all that he sees during this and the subsequent heavenly sojourn, but it is presented nonetheless as the teaching of a pre-eminent scribe of wisdom, as the various titles of the book all attest. Its moral force is developed and extended by what follows—i.e., by what Enoch will deliver by way of instruction after his return—rather than being corrected or challenged.

The core of the instruction is simple: Enoch’s sons are not to turn away from God, but to walk before his face and keep his commandments (2 En 2:2). Immediately, however, this is developed by

² We also encounter some standard references to idolatry in the Parables, but these are less obviously or centrally connected to monotheistic imperatives than we will find to be the case in 2 Enoch.

³ See the discussion of this phrase in Chapter 7.

reference to practices of offering, with some variation across the manuscripts that may reflect the remapping of specifically sacrificial practices onto other forms of cultic or liturgical activity:

2 Enoch 2:2, Long Recension:

Do not detest the prayers of salvation, so that the Lord will not curtail the works of your hands. And do not be ungenerous with the gifts of the Lord and the Lord will not be ungenerous with his goods⁴ and love-gifts in your storehouses. And bless the Lord, both with the first-born of your herds⁵ and with the firstborn of your infants,⁶ and a blessing will be on you forever.

2 Enoch 2:2, Short Recension:

And do not refuse the sacrifice(s)⁷ of your salvation, and the Lord will not refuse the work of your hands. Do not be ungenerous with the gifts of the Lord and the Lord will not be ungenerous with his goods, and in your storehouses. Bless the Lord with the firstborn of your flocks and your oxen,⁸ and you will be blessed by the Lord forever.

Several textual points require comment before I discuss the broader conceptual issues. First, the negated verb that precedes “prayers/sacrifices” varies across the manuscripts. The long recension mss. J and R⁹ read **ѠМРАЗИТЕ** (*ōmrazite*), which could here mean either “detest” or “make/become detestable/odious,” although the latter meaning is normally rendered with the reflexive particle *сѣ* in older Church Slavonic. The short manuscripts generally read **ѠВРАТИТЕ** (*ōt[ŭ]vratite*, “turn away/refuse”); in contemporary Bulgarian, the word has come to mean “hate,” which might accommodate a historical significance that is closer in equivalence to **ѠМРАЗИТЕ** than the lexicons of Church Slavonic would lead us to expect. B has **ѠКРУПИТЕ** (*ōskrupite*, “encircle”), which seems to be a corruption, though one that could make a kind of sense; it may possibly be suggestive of binding practices (which will be encountered elsewhere in the

⁴ This word is suggestive of things that are stored up, as in a *thesaurus*.

⁵ This could be “herds” or “flocks.”

⁶ The reading in J (*vnučjet*) means “grandchildren”. R reads “youth” (*ionot*). I have translated as “infants” here to capture the common element of age, but perhaps the idea of “descendants” is in view.

⁷ This word (*žrbty*) could be singular or plural.

⁸ For “firstborn of your flocks (and) oxen,” B reads, “the firstborn of your youths (*ionoš v[āšī]x*)” (cf. R)

⁹ In the long recension, the phrase is only found in these manuscripts; P omits this clause.

work) or simply of squirreling away what should open-handedly be given to the Lord. For all the variation in detail, however, there is a common emphasis on maintaining the proper pattern of offering, expressed through a negation of its opposite. Second, the noun that follows this verb varies across the manuscripts between “prayers” (МОЛИТВЫ, *molitvy*, in J,P,R) and “sacrifice(s)” (ЖРЪТВЫ/ЖЕРТВЫ, *zrŭtvy/žertvy*, in other manuscripts). The differences may reflect alterations introduced in the late medieval and early modern contexts in which the manuscripts as we have them were transmitted: the language of “prayer” may have been preferable, being more easily read in terms of Christian practice. But we need to be careful not to presume this, nor to map the language onto oppositions between (early) Jewish and (later) Christian practices. As I will discuss in Chapter 9, it is a mistake to assume (1) that sacrificial practices involving animals ended in 70 C.E. and (2) that Christians did not participate in such practices.¹⁰ Also, both Christians and Jews could use the language of sacrifice in both literal and symbolic ways that often blended with the language of prayer.¹¹ So, there is no reason to suggest that one reading is more Christian or Jewish, earlier or later, simply on the basis of such language.

Both recensions qualify this first noun with a variant of σπένια, *sp(a)senia*, which can mean “repentance,” but more commonly means “salvation,” translating the Greek σωτηρία. If the word carries the meaning of “repentance,” then the prayers or sacrifices might be of a specific sort, associated with formal acts of confession and reparation, but if it carries its more widely encountered meaning of “salvation,” then the reference might be more inclusive of all formal liturgical practice. Contextually, I would suggest that this latter interpretation makes sense: whichever reading might be original, prayer or sacrifice, the phrase follows the all-embracing moral exhortation to walk before the Lord’s face and keep his commandments, and exhortation inclusive of all liturgical practice would naturally follow this.

I would also suggest that the subsequent exhortations read most naturally as denoting the offering of goods specifically to God. It is possible that the prohibition of acting ungenerously with the gifts of the Lord (*darovŭ g[ospod]a*, ΔΑΡΟΒΣ ΓΑ) is concerned with generosity towards other people, wherein the

¹⁰ See Kateryna Kovalchuk, “The Encaenia of St Sophia: Animal Sacrifice in a Christian Context,” in *Scrinium IV* (2008): 161–203.

¹¹ This obviously becomes the case in later Judaism, as attested by the Numbers (Bamidbar) Rabbah 18:21 and in Berakhot 26b:4–7, but it is also visible in the earlier Judaism of the second temple period. See Jeremy Penner, *Patterns of Daily Prayer in Second Temple Judaism* (STDJ 104; Leiden: Brill, 2012), especially his Chapter 1, “Sacrifice and Daily Prayer,” 35–72.

“gifts” are the material blessings one has received from God, but the word ДАРЪ is most frequently encountered in biblical translations as a technical term for sacred or sacrificial offerings (for example in Slavonic translations of Matthew 5:23,24 and 8:4). Paired as it is with a reference to God’s blessing upon storehouses, it is suggestive of regular offerings that relate to crops, such as firstfruits and qorban. This is followed by a positive exhortation to bless the Lord with “firstborns.” Here, too, there is some variation in the pairings encountered in the manuscripts: all have a variant of the word “flocks” (*stadnymi*, СТАДНЫМИ), which can also mean “herds” (i.e., it can be used of ovine and bovine); to this, A and U add “oxen” (*nyty*, НУТЫ), J adds a word that most obviously means “grandchildren” (*vnučēt*, ВНОУЧѢА), R and B add ЮНО̄/ЮНОШЬ (*junot/junoši*, “youth”). There is enough orthographic and phonetic similarity between the readings for this second word to suggest that the variation arose in the Slavonic context, perhaps motivated by a concern about the suggestion of child sacrifice, prompting the alteration in A, U to a reading that pairs flocks and herds. Most obviously, however, the command relates to the offering of firstborn, both animal and human, although the latter is obviously symbolically refigured in the Jewish and Israelite traditions.¹²

Most interestingly, the instruction is shaped by a rhetorically developed emphasis on reciprocity, with a strikingly visible parallelism between verbs used of the worshipper and of God. The word translated above as “be ungenerous” is the verb ЛИШИТИ (*lišiti*, “to deprive,” “to withhold” or “to act ungenerously”); in all manuscripts it is used of the person bringing the gift and of God’s response to this.¹³ To those who are not ungenerous, God will be not ungenerous. Similarly, those who “bless” the Lord with their firstborn will be blessed by him forever. This emphasis on reciprocity might be seen simply as a manifestation of the *act-consequence* principle commonly seen in instructional writing, but we will find it to be developed in significant ways later in the book, becoming a characteristic pattern in 2 Enoch.

Some of these characteristics are thrown into sharper relief if we compare 2 Enoch 2:2 with Deuteronomy 28:1–4, with which it shares a general stock of imagery about faithfulness and reward and

¹² The complexity of this transformation is at the heart of Jon Levenson’s classic study, *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son* (New Haven: Yale, 1993).

¹³ In J and R, further, one of the words used for what God gives in response to the bringing of “gifts” is ДАРЮЛЮБЕЗНІИ (*daroljubeznyxi*), “love-gifts,” a word that incorporates ДАРЪ.

which should probably be seen as the principal source for many of the Jewish traditions about this. There, too, the divine blessings associated with obedience are directed towards progeny, crops, flocks and herds and are expressed in terms of the sharing of God's own storehouse.:

⁴Blessed shall be the fruit of your womb, the fruit of your ground, and the fruit of your livestock, both the increase of your cattle and the issue of your flock ... ⁸The LORD will command the blessing upon you in your barns (בִּאֲסַמִּיךָ, ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις σου), and in all that you undertake; he will bless you in the land that the LORD your God is giving you.

¹¹The LORD will make you abound in prosperity, in the fruit of your womb, in the fruit of your livestock, and in the fruit of your ground in the land that the LORD swore to your ancestors to give you. ¹² The LORD will open for you his rich storehouse (אֵת אוֹצְרוֹ הַטּוֹב, τὸν θησαυρὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀγαθόν), the heavens, to give the rain of your land in its season and to bless all your undertakings. (Deut 28: 4,8, 12 NRSV).

There are some notable differences, however, and while these might be simply a reflection of the fictive setting, long before the establishment of the people of Israel or the giving of the law to Moses, they may also be reflective of the contexts in which the work emerged. In particular, it is notable that while the blessings are associated with the keeping of “commandments,” in obvious equivalence to Deuteronomy 28:1, the focus and the proportions in 2 Enoch 2:2 effectively devolve this concern onto regular prayer and liturgy. It is also notable that the “national” elements found in Deut 28—the elevation of the nation over others (e.g., Deut 28:1, 10) and the defeat of enemies (Deut 28:7)—are absent in Enoch’s instruction, with the emphasis instead falling on personal or domestic prosperity. Perhaps most striking, though, is the use of parallel verbs that I noted above, which has the effect of casting divine reciprocity as a matter of “like for like.” Where Deuteronomy indicates that the one who obeys will be blessed, an asymmetrical reciprocity, 2 Enoch indicates with thoroughgoing symmetry that the Lord will bless the one who blesses, give to the one who gives, be generous to the one who is generous.

Enoch's Instructions After His Ascent and Return

After his ascent and sojourn in heaven, Enoch is directed again to instruct his sons (36:1–4), during the 30-day period that he will spend on earth before being brought back to the presence of God in the heavens. Much of the material in his instruction is concerned with justice and the treatment of the poor, often in a way that identifies the reader or addressee as a person executing judgement, as in 42:7: “Blessed is the one who carries out righteous judgement, not for the sake of payment, but for justice.” This status as judge might suggest that the addressee is a person of some social influence, although it could also be argued that the instruction simply reflects the socio-economic context of much traditional wisdom, such as Sirach (i.e., one of reasonable wealth). Woven through this instructional material are also several references to sacrifice and offering (including some specific directions for binding animals when they are offered, which I will consider in Chapter 9).

2 Enoch 42:6 – A Beatitude on Liturgical Fidelity

The first significant example is found in 2 Enoch 42:6, which opens an extended block of beatitudes that is similar in form to the Matthean Beatitudes. There is a reasonable level of agreement across the manuscripts, so I here reproduce the version encountered in J, with the more significant variants in A,U noted against this.

Blessed is the one who reverences the name of the Lord and who serves before his face always (A/U: “ceaselessly”), and who organizes his (A/U: omit the possessive pronoun) gifts with fear, offerings of life, and who lives this life and dies correctly (2 Enoch 42:6, Ms. J)

The combination of “serves” (послужить, *poslužiti*) with “before his face” could carry a certain priestly overtone that might in some older contexts be linked to the role of the judge noted above.¹⁴ The verb

¹⁴ The function of priests as magistrates or judges is stated by Josephus in *Against Apion* 2.187. There has been a significant debate about the extent to which this role was taken over by non-priestly groups, particularly those associated with the

used of the person's actions in relation to the "gifts" and "offerings" might be understood to reflect this further: *uychniti* (*uĉniti*) implies that the person "sets out" or "organizes" what is offered and does not merely bring it. The use of two words for what is offered, moreover, indicates that there are multiple categories of offering, which further builds the impression of a comprehensive liturgy.

The occurrence of the possessive pronoun "his," however, even if it is a secondary addition to those manuscripts in which it is found, highlights other possibilities for how the language and imagery might be understood. The construction would suggest that the one who makes or brings the offering is the same one who presents it. This may point in the direction of a different liturgical context than that of the Jerusalem temple and, indeed, of any context where the access to the place of offering might be restricted to a priestly class. Various options might be considered, although we will need to consider the further evidence for liturgical and cultic practice in 2 Enoch before we evaluate them in relation to the data of the text. In Jewish contexts, recent archaeological research has highlighted the role that the synagogue may have played in the collecting of offerings outside Jerusalem while the temple was still in operation. Some of the proposals for interpreting the artwork on the stone found in the Magdala synagogue have suggested that it may represent the firstfruits, gathered in the synagogue before being sent on to Jerusalem.¹⁵ The construction of temple areas in later synagogues, and the evocation of the temple in mosaics, may also have been suggestive of a perception that the local synagogue *figured* the temple in some sense, such that spaces within the synagogue accessible to anyone might be mapped onto the temple spaces open only to priests.¹⁶ But there are also possibilities more obviously associated

Pharisees, in the late second temple period. On this, see E.P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE–66 CE* (London: SCM, 1992), 170–82. The contours of the debate reflect the evaluation of sources from the late second temple period with the evidence of the New Testament and of later Jewish writings, notably the Mishnah. Without attempting any kind of resolution of the debate, I might note that the shift to figures other than priests holding such roles is clear in the later writings.

¹⁵ In their co-authored study of the Magdala synagogue stone, Richard Bauckham and Mordecai Aviam agree that the wheels carved on the opposite short side represent the Merkavah, effectively representing what is identified to dwell within the holy of holies. They disagree, however, on the symbolism on the upper surface of the stone, with Aviam seeing a twelve petalled rosette that represents both the zodiac and the showbreads, and two ceremonial coal rakes, and Bauckham seeing various firstfruits to be depicted. Bauckham's proposal is that the stone would have been used for the collecting or offering of firstfruits, before they were sent to Jerusalem. See Mordechai Aviam and Richard Bauckham, "The Synagogue Stone," in *Magdala of Galilee: A Jewish City in the Hellenistic and Roman Period*, ed. Richard Bauckham (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2018), 135–160.

¹⁶ On the development of synagogue architecture, and the incorporation of temple symbolism (including extensive further bibliography), see Rachel Hachlili, "Torah Shrine and Ark in Ancient Synagogues: A Re-evaluation," *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 116 (2000): 146–183. The incorporation of torah shrines evoking the temple is a feature of

with Christian piety. Through late antiquity, it was increasingly common for wealthy homes to have private shrines or areas of worship; rural estates, meanwhile, often had private buildings that were designated as “temples.” There are references to “the house/temple of God” elsewhere in 2 Enoch (51:4) and some of the variations in terminology, particularly the replacement of the word “temple” with “house” or even “church,” have been read as reflecting Christian redaction of language that is more obviously Jewish in character. The existence of such temples on rural estates, however, and their place in regular piety, highlights the limits of such interpretations: references to the temple may, in fact, reflect late antique Christianity, rather than early Judaism. In fact, given what we have noted of the connections of 2 Enoch to the economy of rural landowners, the possibility that estate temples are in view takes on fresh significance.

2 Enoch 45

A further instruction on worship is found in 2 Enoch 45. Here, there is a little more divergence between the readings, but the core elements align:

A/U:

1. Whoever makes oblations/sacrifices (прѣдъ, i.e., прино[сы], *prinosy*) before the face of the Lord: the Lord will make perfect (оуправитъ, *upraviti*) his profits (снисканїа, *sniskania*).
2. Whoever makes numerous (or “multiplies” оумножитъ, *umnožitŭ*) lamps in front of the face of the Lord: the Lord will make numerous (оумножитъ) his storehouses/treasuries.
3. Whether the Lord needs bread or lamps or sheep or oxen, by this the Lord tests human hearts.

J:

later synagogues and the developments happen only at a later stage in Palestine. Nevertheless, there is evidence that the early synagogues in Galilee (i.e., from the first century) incorporated more limited temple symbolism. The imagery on the front (short side) of the Magdala synagogue stone is rather obviously of the temple, with the menorah positioned at its centre, flanked by the pillars of the temple. The other carvings on the stone are subject to more significant debate, as noted in my previous footnote. See Aviam and Bauckham, “The Synagogue Stone,” 135–160.

1. Whoever hurries/speeds (оускорит[ъ], *uskorit[ŭ]*) to make (сътвори[тъ], *sŭtvorit[ŭ]*) a good oblation before the face of the Lord: the Lord will hurry to/speed the profits of his work, and will not make for him the just sentence.
2. Whoever makes numerous (J,P: множӣ, *množi[tъ]*; R: оумножитъ, *umnožitŭ*) lamps before the face of the Lord: the Lord will make his treasuries numerous in the highest kingdom.
3. Whether the Lord needs/demands (требѹеть, *trĕbuetŭ*) bread or lamps or sheep or oxen or any kind of sacrifice is nothing. He demands/needs (требѹеть) clean hearts, and by all of these he tests human hearts.

The recensions have, in common, an emphasis on the reciprocity and equivalence of the divine response to human acts of sacrifice; once again, this is developed through the close paralleling of the verbs used of the human act and the divine response. They also have in common a concern to deny any divine *need* for what is sacrificed, as if there is any contingency of divine being upon what is offered; instead, they present the significance of sacrificial offerings as means by which human hearts are tested. I will return to this in Chapter 9, where I consider the theorizing about the significance of sacrifice encountered in 2 Enoch.

There are some differences between the recensions in the opening line, and we need to consider these carefully. Where the short recension uses one verb for the human act (творити, *tvoriti*, “to make”) and a different one for the reciprocal divine response (оуправити, *upraviti* “to perfect”), the long recension employs two verbs symmetrically of both human sacrifice and the divine response (оускорити, *uskoriti*, “to hurry/be prompt,” and сътвори[тъ], *sŭtvorit[ŭ]*, “to make”), although it breaks them into two distinct divine actions. The first of these scans awkwardly because of the relationship between the verb and the object, but the core meaning is clear: when one is swift to bring an offering, God is swift to ensure that the worshipper is profited. In describing this outcome, the long recension also has a combination of nouns (“profits” and “works”), where the short has only one (“profits”).

The second divine action described in the long recension is unparalleled in the short one: the Lord will refrain from “making” a just sentence for the one who brings the offering. This has the interesting effect of particularizing the kind of offering/oblation and the purpose with which it is offered. The word translated as “oblation” in all manuscripts is приносъ, *prinosŭ*, which can be widely

used of different sacrifices and liturgical offerings, including the burnt offering and the Eucharist. The second divine action described in the long recension—the declining to pass a just sentence—suggests that the offering in question is here identified as an offering for sin that is brought without delay, so that an outcome of condemnation is avoided. This emphasis on promptness is actually missing from the short recension—Andersen’s translation¹⁷ is incorrect at this point—so that the reciprocity does not lie in the speed with which an offering is brought and profits blessed, but simply the rewarding of a gift with corresponding material blessing. Interestingly, *принѡцъ* can also be used with the sense of “profit,” which might cast light on a symmetry or poetical play present in an earlier iteration of the line but now somewhat lost in translation, whereby the bringing of a sacrifice was paralleled by the return of profit. Some form of tithe or offering of firstfruits may therefore be in view.

While there is significant variation across the witnesses in the content of line 1, the manuscripts are consistent in their representation of the act described in line 2, and of the divine response to it: for the one who “multiplies” or “makes numerous” lamps before the face of the Lord, the Lord will multiply their treasures or storehouses. This is the same word that we encountered in our discussion of the meteorological elements. The imagery may be used with a literal sense, suggesting a readership that is involved in agricultural business of some kind, or it may be used figuratively of wealth but it occurs here, again, within the stylized pattern of reciprocity that we have seen to be developed in 2 Enoch, with the verbs used of the divine response paralleling those of the human act.

What might the language of making lamps numerous before the face of the Lord describe? It is important to bear in mind that while the Slavonic word used here (*свѣтилникъ* *světilnikŭ*) etymologically designates a light source, the word could refer not just to lamps used for illumination, but also to those used for the burning of incense. The locating of this act “before the face of the Lord” specifies that it takes place in a space considered holy.

It is possible that the imagery points to Jewish practices. Obviously, there are lamps used in temple, synagogue and domestic spaces, attested in archaeology and in later tradition, which have multiple burning heads. As well as the temple lampstand itself, there are symbolic lamps located in front

¹⁷ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 173.

of the Torah shrine in the synagogue, a feature attested from the second century onward;¹⁸ there is also the practice of lighting a Hannukah menorah in the domestic space, with successively more heads lit each night, which might seem more suggestive of the language of multiplication; lastly, and also within the domestic space, there is the lighting of the Shabbat Havdalah candle or lamp. The lighting of such lamps is well established by the first century CE, with Seneca famously critical of the practice (*Epistulae* 95:47). Mordechai Aviam has also suggested that, at least in Galilee, there may have been a “more regular daily (or nightly) activity that involves the religious and spiritual place of light,”¹⁹ a proposal he makes because of the significant proportion of lamps imported to the region from Jerusalem (despite evidence for more local production). To Aviam, the effort and expense associated with such imports suggests that the lamps were of special religious significance, associated with Jerusalem as the cultic centre of Judaism, but he finds it difficult to imagine that this can be explained by the use of lamps only in a weekly practice.

Such options seem unlikely as explanations for what we find in this text, however, and are problematized by other elements in the imagery. In the case of domestic lamp rites: it would seem odd for a Jewish writer to describe these as lit “before the face of the Lord,” not least because such lamps were placed in windows or over doors. It is also hard to see why the lighting of these particular multiples would invite reciprocal blessing from God upon the individual—whose heart is demonstrated to be good by their performing of such actions—and it is particularly difficult to connect such reciprocal blessing to the agricultural image of the storehouse, except through the more general connection of all such acts of faithfulness to Deuteronomy 28. This same logic would exclude any representative function associated with a priestly individual acting in behalf of others, as their representative: it is the one who makes the lamps numerous who is blessed, not those whom they represent.²⁰ It is more natural to read this reference to the lighting of lamps as denoting some form of votive offering, brought by the person who hopes to be blessed materially by God in demonstration of their piety.

¹⁸ Rachel Hachlili, “Torah Shrine and Ark in Ancient Synagogues: A Re-evaluation,” *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 116 (2000): 146–183.

¹⁹ Mordechai Aviam, “People, Land, Economy, and Belief in First-Century Galilee and Its Origins: A Comprehensive Archaeological Synthesis,” in *The Galilean Economy in the Time of Jesus*, ed. David A. Fiensy and Ralph K. Hawkins (Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 5–48, quotation, 35.

²⁰ A similar Jewish practice, the lighting of the Shabbat havdalah candle, might provide another image of multiple light, but this would also seem to stretch the significance of the imagery beyond its natural limits.

This is interesting because the use of lamps (or candles) for offerings of this kind is certainly encountered in later Christian contexts, where it is formalized,²¹ but the evidence for such practices in the early centuries of the church is more complicated. Early Christian worship, at least as reflected in the writings of the church's "literate cultural providers"²² appears to have used lights primarily for functional reasons, to illuminate proceedings that happened at night or in the darkness, and was not accepted as part of daytime liturgical practices.²³ The ceremonial offering of lights is condemned or denied in several early writings associated with church authorities, with a particular density of such condemnations in 4th century writings;²⁴ this surely reflects the fact that it was actually happening and may have been popular.²⁵ The exchange between Jerome and Vigilantius (*Contra Vigilantium* 7) is interesting here: Vigilantius condemns the presence of pagan elements in Christian worship in the east, including the lighting of candles or lamps in daylight hours as offerings to martyrs, and Jerome claims in response that the lighting of lamps by daytime is simply to manifest happiness in the reading of scripture. He also, though, represents the offering of lights to martyrs as a valid remapping of idol worship onto a legitimate object of veneration, the martyrs. MacMullen comments:

The tension explored by Vigilantius between what he observed in the popular address to the martyrs, and what he and many in the church thought suitably restrained, provoked Jerome, I suppose, because he half-agreed with his former friend; hence the defensive violence of his protest. Hence the admission, too, that all of "us" were recent converts, though he need not have

²¹ The sanctioning of lights in worship by the church institutions seems relatively late, with clear evidence not emerging until around the second millennium. See D.R. Dendy, *The Use of Lights in Christian Worship* (London: S.P.C.K, 1959), esp. 45–71. That said, by the late 5th century there is some evidence of what Dendy (*Use of Lights*, 3) describes as "a new attitude" towards the incorporation of multiple and elaborate lights into worship spaces. I will return to this below.

²² I use this term to evoke the distinction between "first" and "second church" that is probed by Ramsay MacMullen, *The Second Church: Popular Christianity A.D. 200-400* (Atlanta: SBL, 2009) and the uptake of this in the work of Stanley Stowers, discussed below.

²³ A brief comment of Tertullian, in *Apologia XXXV*, is often cited in this regard: "die laeto non laureis postes obumbramus nec lucernis diem infringimus."

²⁴ There is a striking example in Lactantius, *Institut. Div.*, 6.2: "Can he be thought sane who offers the light of lamps and candles to the Author and Giver of all light?" (Trans, Dendy, *Use of Lights*, 2). The 34th canon of the Synod of Elvira condemns the lighting of lamps in a cemetery by day. Cf. also Jerome, *Contra Vigilantium* 7, who indicates that lamps are not lit in daytime. Cf. also Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orat.*, 5.35

²⁵ Dendy, *Use of Lights*, 1–2, seems to embody the view that these orthodox voices represent the practices of most Christians, but MacMullen's analysis of the "second church" and Bowes account of private worship spaces might suggest that, in fact, these practices were widespread and perhaps the norm among the non-elite.

included himself and many others. He would excuse them all for acting only “through ignorance and the simple-mindedness of the laity of this world, or most likely religious women, of whom we must say (Rom. 10.2.), ‘I grant them their zeal for God but they are ill-informed’” (§7).²⁶

This highlights the widespread integration of devotional practices involving lamp-lighting from other religions into Christian contexts, particularly in eastern areas. Leaders like Jerome did not approve of it, but they seem to have found ways to justify or accommodate it. Where the institutional leadership of the church was less influential, however, as in the estate temples and domestic shrines that Kim Bowes considers,²⁷ we might expect the use of lights in votive practices to be affirmed more thoroughly. Bowes does, in fact, note the evidence that suggests incorporation of lamp-lighting rituals into early Christian domestic piety.²⁸ It is worth noting that none of her evidence, at this point, seems to account for emphasis on the proliferation of lamps, specifically, as an act of faithfulness to be rewarded; it is concerned with the lighting of lamps at night or as part of a collective eucharistic meal. She is, however, concerned to show how domestic worship and the emergence of private temples on rural estates provide contexts in which practices of worship encountered in pagan religion could be integrated into Christian devotion, even if they were considered inappropriate by church authorities. In fact, Bowes sees the flourishing of such private worship spaces in later antiquity as a rejection, or at least a relegation, of the authority ascribed to the formal leadership of the church. In this regard, it is noteworthy that the often-cited comments of Gregory of Nazianzus on lights are specifically focused on domestic practices:

Let not our houses be lit with the light of the senses, nor echo with flute and cymbal, for this is the custom of the Greek new moon. Let us not honour God with these ... but with purity of soul,

²⁶ MacMullen, *Second Church*, 30.

²⁷ Kim Bowes, *Private Worship, Public Values, and Religious Change in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

²⁸ Bowes, *Private Worship, Public Values*, 54. The evidence cited in her notes (243), however, is rather thin and might point rather to the all-embracing and mundane values of faith and piety, as prayer and devotion is performed in a range of daily activities. This is especially true of her citation of Tertullian, *De Corona* 3.4.

and mental joy, and with lamps that illuminate the whole body of the Church, that is with godly sights and thoughts.²⁹

Importantly, as is visible here, the dynamics of this tension seem to have been particularly wrapped up with the incorporation into worship of elements common in the religious cultures that surrounded Christians in antiquity, both Jewish and pagan. In Chapter 1, I discussed Ramsay MacMullen's discussion of the "second church" and the tension with which it existed in relation to the standards of the elite cultural providers that he categorizes as the "first church"; estate temples and domestic shrines are part of this complex religious world, as much as the house churches and cemetery worship that he discusses in greater detail. Here, Christian worship of the One God could be coloured by what people surrounded by religious practices of all kinds might see as natural acts of piety and devotion, without feeling the pressure felt among the elite to demarcate their worship from that of others and to justify its philosophical acceptability.³⁰

There is plenty of evidence for the use of lamps as votive offerings in other religious contexts in the area of Roman Syria in antiquity; this, in fact, seems to have been one of the reasons that some early Christian writers condemned the practice.³¹ Of these other cultic contexts, two are particularly noteworthy because the use of votive lights is so prominently associated with them and they present some suggestive points of contact with 2 Enoch. The first is the cult of Demeter, which we know to have been represented in Antioch (or, more correctly, Daphne),³² although, of course, it was widely found through the ancient world. The use of votive lamps in Demeter worship appears to have been strikingly more common than in the worship of other deities³³ and the cult itself was distinctively associated with

²⁹ Orat V. 35, quoted in Dendy, *Use of Lights*, 2 (credited to *Patrologia Graeca*, XXXV, 709).

³⁰ This last comment will be developed further in Chapter 9, where the matter of sacrificial theorizing will be discussed in more detail.

³¹ The association of lamps with pagan practice is prominent in the exchange between Jerome and Vigilantius, noted above.

³² For references to a temple of Demeter at Daphne, see Getzel M. Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Syria, the Red Sea Basin, and North Africa* (University of California Press, 2006), 82. Further evidence for the cult of Demeter at Antioch is discussed by Frederick W. Norris, "Isis, Sarapis and Demeter in Antioch of Syria," *Harvard Theological Review* 75 (1982): 189–207.

³³ For a good discussion of this, see Nancy Bookidis, "The Greek Lamps," in Nancy Bookidis and Elizabeth G. Pemberton, *The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: The Greek Lamps and Offering Trays* (Princeton, New Jersey: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2015), 1–109; esp. 14–22.

agriculture.³⁴ Given the significance of Wisdom in 2 Enoch, and what we noted of that figure in Chapter 5, it may also be noteworthy that the figure of Demeter absorbed much of the imagery traditionally directed towards Isis, and the practice of offering votive lights to Demeter may also have been influenced by the Isis traditions.³⁵ It is not difficult to imagine, then, that Demeter veneration might have exercised an influence on practices of devotion to the One God that were embodied upon rural estates, particularly in contexts where the imagery of Wisdom was also popular.

The second is the cult of *Theos Hypsistos*. This cult was widespread and one of its characteristic features was the regular offering of lamps, something demonstrated by the number of lamps found at cultic sites.³⁶ Interestingly, however, the material evidence suggests that participants in the *Theos Hypsistos* cult were largely from poorer economic backgrounds,³⁷ with the lamps that have been excavated made from less expensive material; by contrast to the Demeter cult, this may not align so well with the comparative wealth that seems to be implied in the imagery of 2 Enoch.³⁸

By way of a summary statement on this discussion of the multiplication of lights in worship: the data do not obviously align with the “sanctioned” practices of either early Judaism or early Christianity, where “sanctioned” denotes the practices that are endorsed by the authorities responsible for the texts that have come down to us, but they may align with the popular practices of communities that would identify themselves as either Jewish or Christian (or, for that matter, as *both Jewish and Christian*). Whether we are speaking of the second church, to use MacMullen’s term, or of the Judaisms not endorsed by the rabbis, the Am(ey) ha-Aretz, there are communities that may conceivably have incorporated elements of pagan worship into their own devotion to the One God and seen this as a simple and uncontroversial expression of faithfulness. My point is precisely that the awkwardness of the

³⁴ Bookidis also notes the prominent use of light in processions dedicated to Isis, as reflected in Apuleias’s description of this in his *Metamorphoses* 11.9.5–6.

³⁵ See Judith H. Newman, “Hybridity, Hydrology, and Hidden Transcript: Sirach 24 and the Judean Encounter with Ptolemaic Isis Worship,” 162. The point is also made by Norris, “Isis, Sarapis and Demeter,” 202.

³⁶ For descriptions of the evidence for lamps in the *theos hypsistos* cult, see Stephen Mitchell, “Further thoughts on the cult of Theos Hypsistos,” in *One God: Pagan Monotheism in the Roman Empire*, ed. Stephen Mitchell and Peter van Nuffelen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 167–208.

³⁷ Mitchell, “Further Thoughts,” 178–9.

³⁸ In Chapter 2, I noted Böttrich’s comments on the evidence that 2 Enoch is associated with wealthy, landowning communities.

imagery in relation to sanctioned practices forces us consider options that might seem fanciful otherwise.

One last point may be worth adding to this discussion. As I have noted already in Chapter 5, Elchasaite teaching seems to have condemned any liturgical use of fire, with worshippers directed instead to the elemental significance of water and its role in baptism. If there are points of connection between 2 Enoch and Elchasaite thought—and their shared astronomical interests may well represent such a point—this will remain a significant point of divergence.

2 Enoch 51:4 – The Thrice Daily Pattern of Prayer

A further instruction concerning regular worship is found in 2 Enoch 51:4. The reference to worship here follows a block of teaching on almsgiving and generosity, in which the addressee is encouraged to lose gold and silver for the sake of a brother and to extend generosity to the widow and orphan. In the long recension, this is elaborated with an admonishment not to hide money in the earth, but to help another “believer” and thereby to escape affliction in one’s treasuries and work (51:2). This is followed by a reference to the day of judgement, linked in complicated ways to the image of a burdensome yoke, which is either to be carried or unfastened—depending on the manuscript—in order to secure a good judgement. It is from this that the reference to worship follows:

In the morning, and at noon, and in the evening of the day, it is good to go to the Lord’s temple, to glorify the author of all things (51:4, A,U)

In the morning of the day, in the middle of the day, and in the evening of the day it is good to go to the Lord’s temple on account of the glory of the (P: “your”) creator.³⁹ For every kind of spirit glorifies him and every kind of creature, visible and invisible (P adds: “praises him”). (51:4 J, P, R)

³⁹ J lacks this reference to the glory of the creator.

The significance of this is twofold. First, the place of worship is referred to as the Lord's temple, $\chi\rho\alpha\mu\zeta$ $\Gamma\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\nu}$, *xramŭ g(ospodi)nŭ*. This reading is attested by most of the manuscripts, although V, N and B² alter it to *house of God* ($\Delta\omicron\mu\tilde{\nu}$ $\beta\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\nu}$, *domŭ b[o]žii*) and B to *church of the Lord* ($\Upsilon\epsilon\rho\kappa\omicron\upsilon\tilde{\nu}$ $\Gamma\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\nu}$, *čerkovŭ g[ospodŭ]nŭ*).⁴⁰ The significance of the shift from $\chi\rho\alpha\mu\zeta$ to $\Delta\omicron\mu\tilde{\nu}$ should not be overpressed: $\chi\rho\alpha\mu\zeta$ can commonly mean "house" and is used with this sense elsewhere in 2 Enoch, e.g., when people return to their homes in 67:3. The combination with $\beta\tilde{\eta}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\nu}$, however, does represent a stylistic shift away from the preference for the title "Lord." Second, the ideal practice to be followed is attendance in worship at this specified place at three points in the day.

This pattern of worship has been identified with Jewish practice, and its presence in 2 Enoch has been debated in relation to the origins of the work. R. H. Charles argues that it parallels the Jewish practice of threefold daily attendance at the temple visible in the Book of Acts;⁴¹ Francis Andersen claims that the practice "seems more Jewish than Christian";⁴² Lawrence Schiffman, meanwhile, sees the pattern as an anachronistic retrojection of later Jewish practices of prayer onto temple practices, since twice daily prayer/sacrifice was the standard pattern in the second temple period.⁴³ Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra⁴⁴ notes the evidence (which is also recognized by Schiffman) for thrice daily prayer, as distinct from sacrifice, among Jews in the second temple period;⁴⁵ he broadly agrees with Schiffman, but prefers the geographical overtones of the verb "project" to the temporal ones of "retroject," seeing the imagery as reflecting the piety of someone living at a distance from Jerusalem. To clarify the difference, Schiffman sees the retrojection as evidence for an authorship outside of what can be identified as Judaism, and in a later period; Stökl sees no reason to exclude a Jewish authorship from the second temple period, provided we allow that they probably lived at a distance from Jerusalem.

The difficulty that all such discussions face is that the pattern of thrice daily prayer is well attested from an early period among Christians and can hardly be cited as evidence for a distinctively Jewish origin. Most cite Didache 8 as an example of the pattern among Jews being carried into Christianity, but

⁴⁰ Andersen ("2 [Slavonic Apocalypse of] Enoch," 179) describes the latter as "an obvious drift to Christian terminology."

⁴¹ Charles, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, 68. He cites Acts 2:15 (9am), 3:1 (3pm) and 10:9 (12pm, noon).

⁴² Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 178.

⁴³ Lawrence H. Schiffman, "2 Enoch and Halakhah," in Orlov et al., *New Perspectives*, 225.

⁴⁴ Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, "Halakha, Calendars, and the Provenances of 2 Enoch," in Orlov et al., *New Perspectives*, 238.

⁴⁵ Notably Daniel 6:10, Psalm 55:17–18 and the references to Acts noted by Charles (see footnote 40, above). Stökl ben Ezra also notes the Didache 8 as bearing witness to Jewish Christian practices roughly contemporary with the New Testament.

thereafter it becomes widely attested in Christian writing on liturgical practice. It is, then, difficult to determine whether it constitutes evidence for Jewish or Christian practices, or even whether such a division is appropriate, given the window that the *Didache* may provide onto Jewish Christianity in its earliest stages. The use of the term “temple” does not help us much with this, either, since the word is commonly used of places of worship, including Christian ones and private spaces.⁴⁶ There were also, of course, Jewish temples outside of the primary one in Jerusalem, notably that of Leontopolis. Böttrich argues against the possibility that this temple is in view—despite its obvious attractiveness within a theory that locates the origins of 2 Enoch in Egypt—because this would conflict with his identification of Akhuzan, the location of the festival described at the end of the book, with Jerusalem.⁴⁷ Leaving aside the question of whether his interpretation of the festival description is correct, the fact is that neither the pattern of prayer nor the use of the word temple yields much evidence to allow us to tie the work to a specifically Jewish context, whether in Palestine or Egypt.

What we should not pass over too quickly is the observation that if the daily worship in the Jerusalem temple were in view, then the opportunity to attend three times each day would be open only to those living in the area. Of course, the whole account could carry this sense, while having a fictional or figurative significance: the pattern followed in the temple, and ideally by those living in Jerusalem, could serve as a template for acts of personal prayer, equivalent to the threefold daily prayers observed in Judaism (*berakhot* 4 and 26). I would suggest, however, that it is most straightforward to read this as referring to a situation where there is a nearby place of worship that can be attended regularly. It is especially appealing to consider the possibility of an estate temple here, since such regular attendance would be easily incorporated into the rhythm of the day for a landowner.

Votive Offerings and Reciprocity: 2 Enoch 61:4&5

One further passage in 2 Enoch is suggestive of votive offerings, and again emphasizes the reciprocity between the act of human worship and that of divine response.

⁴⁶ See Bowes, *Private Worship*, 25, 135.

⁴⁷ Böttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch*, JSRZ V,7 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1995), 975.

Listen, my children, big and small. When a person places a vow upon his heart to bring gifts before the face of the Lord from his own works, and his hand did not make that thing, then the Lord will turn away his face from the works of his hands, and he will not find the works of his hands.

And even if his hands did make it, but his heart is complaining, the illness of his heart will not cease; making complaint without ceasing, he shall not have as much as a single benefit. (61:4–5 Long, J)

When a person places a vow upon his heart to bring a gift before the face of the Lord, and his hands did not do it, then the Lord will turn away the works of his hands and he will not obtain [anything]. Even if his hands did do it, but his heart is complaining, and the illness of his heart does not cease, the complaint is without benefit. (61:4–5 short, A).

There are some features of the versions that need to be noted here. First, the long recension refers to multiple “gifts,” while the shorter recension manuscripts refer to the bringing only of a singular “gift” (ДАРУЪ, *darŭ*). The pronouns subsequently used in J, P, and R are singular, which would suggest that the plural used here is secondary; this is supported by the fact that the very short recension manuscripts also contain the singular form, agreeing with A/U against J,P,R. The difference may sound like a relatively minor one, but it suggests that the gift in question has a particular important attached to it by its bringer; it has what we might label as “singular significance,” in distinction to regular or common offerings. Second, both recensions use a combination of the verb СЪТВОРИТИ (*sŭtvoriti*) and the noun РЪКА (*roka*) “hand,” in relation to the actual performance of the offering. Andersen translates the combination in two different ways according to the recensions, but actually the differences are limited to dialect and orthography, so that the same options present themselves for all the recensions. The verb СЪТВОРИТИ can be translated as “do” or “make,” and the question that presents itself concerns whether the combination with “hand” is suggestive of the personal fulfillment of the act or of personal craftsmanship. The latter is suggested by Andersen’s translation of J, but I think it is unlikely. The presence of “hand” within the text serves a particular rhetorical purpose that emerges in line 5, where it allows a contrast to be made between an external act done by the hand and an internal attitude

associated with the heart. The logic that binds the two lines together is one of performance—was the offering made, and was it made with the right attitude?—not of personal craftsmanship.

Interestingly, at this point, the instruction is framed in negative terms, and the reciprocity is entirely negative. That is, the passage warns against the outcome of *failing* to bring what has been promised. We might cautiously reflect on whether such a warning was particularly occasioned by unfulfilled promises.

The theme of the promised gift continues into the next chapter (62), where it is rendered in more positive reciprocal terms:

Blessed is the person who, in his suffering brings his gifts with faith before the face of the Lord and sacrifices them and then receives remission of sins. But if, before the time comes, he should retract his vows, there is no repentance for him. If the specified time elapses (R adds, “and he does it”),⁴⁸ he will not be well-pleasing (БЛАГОВОЛИТСА, *blagovolitse*), and there will be no repentance after death. For everything before the time and after the time which a person does, both are a scandal before men and a sin before God. (J)

Blessed is the person who, in his suffering, brings a gift before the face of the Lord, for he will find remuneration. And if a person with his mouth appoints a time to bring a gift before the face of the Lord, and he does it, then he will find remuneration. But if the specified time elapses, and he turns away from his promise, his repentance will not be blessed. For every delay creates a scandal. (A)

Consistently with the previous chapter, J and R use the plural form “gifts” here but P uses the singular, both in the main text and in the heading, as do all of the short/very short recension manuscripts. As before, then, the shift to the plural form seems to reflect a reframing of the offering as regular, rather than of singular importance. The reference to suffering, meanwhile, is sustained across the manuscripts and seems to establish a contrast between the blessed person who sees through their promise, despite

⁴⁸ The sense here seems to be that the one who has made the promise fulfils it, but outside the time-frame to which they had committed.

the difficulties that this entails, with those who turn from it because of their material constraints. There is a significant divergence between J, P, R, V, N, B² (i.e., the long and the very short manuscripts) and A, U, B over the nature of the reciprocal divine action; the former include the word $\Gamma\text{Ρ}\text{Β}\text{Χ}\text{Ζ}$, *grēxū*, in a genitive or dative form combined with $\text{Ω}\text{Δ}\text{Α}\text{Ν}\text{Η}\text{Ε}$, *ō[tū]danie*, shifting the meaning of the latter from “remuneration” to “remission of sin.” This emphasis on positive reciprocity is brief, however, and the passage thereafter returns to the negative orientation of the previous chapter, describing the outcome for those who fail to keep their promise. Here, though, the text describes some kind of agreed time-frame within which the promised gift is expected and the “scandal” that will follow if the vow is not fulfilled within this period. The longer manuscripts specify that the failure will be a scandal in human eyes and a sin in God’s sight. This distinction of what we might call horizontal and vertical consequences of the failure is probably secondary, but it is interesting that what is preserved across all of the manuscripts is the dimension labelled as “scandal,” i.e., the social or reputational damage that will be done by the failure to bring this offering.

I want to suggest that this description of votive offerings opens some particular possibilities for the dating of 2 Enoch, which may be combined with other elements to help cast light on its provenance. At the heart of my suggestion is the significance of the emphasis on reciprocity. Michael Satlow has argued that such an emphasis characterizes the votive inscriptions that began to appear in volume in synagogues from the 4th century onward and that can be framed in equivalence to Christian and pagan practices from the time.

[T]he Jewish votive inscriptions from late antiquity represent a distinctive religious *mentalité* that imagines God as an immanent being to be bartered with; they reflect selves in active negotiation with the divine.⁴⁹

Before tracing some of the elements in Satlow’s argument, and considering how they may relate to 2 Enoch, I would highlight his use of the word “selves.” This foregrounds the importance of the individual

⁴⁹ Michael Satlow, “Giving for a Return: Jewish Votive Offerings in Late Antiquity,” in *Religion and the Self in Antiquity*, ed. David B. Brakke, Michael L. Satlow and Steven Weitzman (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), 91–108; quotation from 91.

who makes the offering and their personal negotiation with the God who will bless them and their works. It also bypasses or excludes any interest in priestly mediation, although the context of synagogue inscriptions means that a certain institutional significance remains. The person may have standing within the community associated with the synagogue and the public character of the building and inscription means that their act can entail social honor for both them and the institution that they have supported. Noting this, we can highlight that the texts that we have considered in 2 Enoch place an emphasis on the person— $\Upsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}$, *člověku*—who vows to bring the gift. The word is placed at the beginning of the relevant sentences (61:3, 62:2) in a way that makes them the focal point of the discourse. This can be contrasted with the descriptions of sacrifices and offerings in Leviticus 7, where the offering itself and how it is to be distributed among the priests are the focus of concern. This difference extends to the significance of the person's hands; where Leviticus 7:29 refers to the bringing of the peace-offering (the *shelamim*) with the offerer's own hands, after which the interest returns to the priestly share, 2 Enoch 61:3 presents the reciprocal divine blessing as being on the work of those hands, a feature maintained consistently across the recensions.

Satlow's argument is concerned particularly with this reciprocal dimension, as it devolves upon the individual. He recognizes and traces the evidence for votive offerings through the centuries, including the material in Leviticus 7, and highlights the importance of votives to the wealth of the temples in Jerusalem and in Leontopolis. He notes, too, the apparent routineness of such offerings, as reflected in Judith 4:14. The practice of votive offerings within Jewish and Israelite communities, then, is old and widespread. Yet, Satlow notes, there is little attestation of votive offerings being made after the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E. up until the 4th century, at which point there is a sudden profusion of inscriptions:

Between the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 c.e. and the spread of votive inscriptions in the fourth century, there is scant evidence of Jewish votive practices. A Tannaitic source refers to "a non-Jew who dedicated a beam to a synagogue." A perhaps later rabbinic source asserts that the non-Jew Antoninus (Caracalla?) gave a menorah to a Palestinian synagogue. To my knowledge, only a single rabbinic source—from any time period—mentions the possibility of a Jew making a gift for the synagogue, and this source is theoretical.

If, for the sake of argument, we assume that the near absence of evidence for Jewish votive offerings from archaeological and literary sources between the first and fourth centuries c.e. is not a function of spotty source preservation but reflects a genuinely new development, then the reemergence of Jewish votive practices in the fourth century requires explanation. It cannot be a mere continuation of previous Jewish practices.⁵⁰

The remarkable volume of inscriptions linked to votive offerings, both in Palestine and in Diaspora settings, coincides with the extensive remodelling of the synagogues visible in the period. This is the period particularly associated with the widespread incorporation of zodiac- and Helios-imagery into synagogue decoration, although this phenomenon can also be seen relatively early. The synagogues were, at this stage, primarily associated non-rabbinic streams within Judaism, perhaps those of the *am ha-aretz* who appear to have been less—or, at least, *differently*—interested in Torah interpretation and halakhah.⁵¹ This remodelling, which appears in some contexts to be entangled with the development of Christian church spaces,⁵² seems to reflect a new sacralization of the synagogue space, evoking the temple in its architecture and layout, so that each synagogue becomes a holy place, a house of God. In fact, it is this “vicarious sacrality”⁵³ that provides renewed opportunity to give votive offerings to God,

⁵⁰ Satlow, “Giving for a Return,” 99.

⁵¹ The portrayal of the *am(ey) ha-aretz* in the Rabbinic literature is more complicated than often recognized, with significant development over time, and biblical scholarship often misrepresents both the rabbinic account and its objects. For a recent treatment, see Mira Beth Wasserman, “Rabbis and their Others,” in *A Companion to Late Ancient Jews and Judaism : 3rd Century BCE - 7th Century CE*, ed. Gwynn Kessler and Naomi Koltun-Fromm (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2020), 259–75, esp. 271–4. I will return below to an observation that I nevertheless intimate here, namely, that the arguments of Seth Schwartz for the marginal role of the rabbis during the early centuries of the common era and the correlated arguments for the influence of wealthy “patriarchs” over Jewish communities is, at the very least, suggestive for the analysis of what we here consider. See Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society : 200 B. C. E. to 640 C. E.* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001).

⁵² Satlow, “Giving for a Return,” 100; He notes further Yoram Tsafrir, “The Byzantine Setting and Its Influence on Ancient Synagogues,” in *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*, ed. Lee I. Levine (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1987), 147–57; and Shaye J. D. Cohen, “Pagan and Christian Evidence on the Ancient Synagogue,” in Levine, *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*, 159–81. See also Lee I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2000), 296–302.

⁵³ Satlow, “Giving for a Return,” 99, quoting Joan R. Branham, “Vicarious Sacrality: Temple Space in Ancient Synagogues,” in *Ancient Synagogues: Historical Analysis and Archaeological Discovery*, ed. Dan Urman and Paul V. M. Flesher; 2 vols.; StPB 47 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 2:319–45.

even in diaspora, and that to a large extent explains the surge in inscriptional evidence for votives. The public character of the inscriptions themselves, meanwhile, is newly primary:

If there ever was an epigraphical component to votive offerings to the temple, it was secondary to the gift, whereas for the late antique votives a permanent written notice appears to have been critical. The public notice became an essential component of the personal sentiment.⁵⁴

Satlow further highlights that the apparently novel kind of votive practices reflected in the synagogue inscriptions are connected to the taking of vows. In the synagogue at Sardis, 34 out of the 79 Greek inscriptions associated with votives mention vows, and two of the six Hebrew inscriptions (which are fragmentary) do likewise. He notes that this can be paralleled in the inscriptional evidence from multiple contemporary synagogues in the Diaspora, in Asia Minor, Egypt, Greece and the Balkans. Perhaps significantly, the connections between votives and vows can be paralleled in non-Jewish contexts in the earlier centuries of the common era, with some particularly striking parallels found in excavations in North Central Syria, at Dmêr and Dura-Europos. The public inscription thus serves as a public acknowledgement of the fulfilment of a vow.

Before closing this summary of Satlow's essay, it is worth noting some of the terminology that he lists as being associated with reciprocal divine blessing in the relevant inscriptions. Multiple offerings are listed as "thanksgiving," but many are connected to the terminology of "salvation," often hybridizing these two terms:

God help kura Domna daughter of Julianus [?], and kuros Mari(n) son of Nonnus, having made a thanksgiving offering (eucharizo⁻). Kuros . . . grandson of Helikias made a thanksgiving offering to God and to this holy place, gift for the sake of salvation."⁵⁵

⁵⁴ Satlow, "Giving for a Return," 100.

⁵⁵ Satlow, "Giving for a Return," 92.

The personal reciprocity between the giver and God, then, is represented not in occasional terms, but in comprehensive ones; it is not an isolated blessing, but salvation that is linked to the fulfillment of the vow.

Satlow's synthesis of these elements argues that the profusion of inscriptions linked to votive offerings and the fulfillment of vows reflects a particular *mentalité*, a way of thinking about human-divine reciprocity that understands the deity to be immanent, and the causality of blessing to be similarly direct. A *mentalité* of this kind may not have been unique to late antiquity, but it manifested itself in the practices of vow-linked votive offerings that were associated with localized holy places.

When we bring this discussion into dialogue with what we find in 2 Enoch, it immediately suggests a plausible context for many of the elements we discussed and highlights the difficulties in explaining these elements as coming from the second temple period. While we could easily map some of these elements onto a second temple context, or even onto that of the temple at Leontopolis, the link between the votive offerings and vows would make less obvious sense in that context. Similarly, the directness of the reciprocity, without reference to any priestly figures (cf., for example, Mark 1:44 and parallels), makes sense in the context of an institution that is sacred, but does not operate with a full priesthood, as such. Lastly, the public quality of "the scandal" caused by a failure to bring an offering within the specified time would align with what Satlow highlights to be significant about the inscriptions themselves, that they make the public dimension primary, in a way that is not true of votives in the second temple period. All of this, of course, presumes that the discussion of the votives refers to actual and not fictional practice, but all of the elements seem to suggest real practices.

The mutual influences of synagogue and church in this period, briefly noted above, and the apparent non-involvement of the rabbis opens further options for us to consider. Of the synagogue inscriptions, Satlow notes:

[T]he rabbis rarely mention votives, and when they do, it is almost entirely within an academic or historical (i.e., the biblical or second temple periods) context. Rather, these inscriptions are the work of those whom the rabbis derisively call the *ame ha'arets*, "the people of the land."⁵⁶

⁵⁶ Satlow, "Giving for a Return," 94.

Given what we noted in our earlier discussion of the synagogue in late antiquity, this might allow us to see 2 Enoch as bearing witness to a later (and perhaps localized) stage in the development of non-rabbinic Judaism. This would make sense of other features of the work, notably its insistence on the sole worship of the One God and the observance of traditional institutions (2 Enoch 52:9–10), but with an apparent lack of interest in (or awareness of) the richness of legal instruction in Torah and the complexities of halachic debate that surround this. But it could also bear witness to the thought of a liminal group, one that does not neatly fit our expectations of Christian or Jewish identity, but that is influenced by either or both of these heritages. Either way, the evidence associated with votive offerings would suggest that the work should be placed later, rather than earlier, in antiquity. If we hope to locate it closer to or within the second temple period, then we need to take seriously the fact that the inscriptional evidence for vow-linked votives is associated with non-Jewish groups.

Conclusions

The material that I have considered in this chapter suggests that 2 Enoch emerged in a context where there was regular liturgical practice, including the offering of sacrifices, in which the worshipper or offerer was directly involved in the offering itself. That is to recognize that the text shows little interest in the role that may be played by a priest or intermediary figure in the process of sacrifice and is primarily concerned with how this relates to the one bringing the offering. It is mistaken to assume that sacrificial practices among Jewish and Christian groups necessarily ended after the fall of the temple; this assumption is usually the result of too narrow a conception of the defining borders of these groups, one shaped by the texts of literature cultural providers, without balancing these with the evidence of other writings and of material culture. The lack of interest in priestly involvement with these regular offerings—as distinct from the obvious interest in priestly role in the Melchizedek section—is suggestive of a later context, rather than one associated with the temples in Jerusalem or Leontopolis.

The blessings conditional upon an offering brought in the right way and in the right spirit are agricultural in kind: they involve storehouses and productivity. We can press this observation further and link it to two other features in the text. First, much of the instructional material is directed towards

those wealthy enough to practice charity and care for the poor. Second, as we have discussed in this chapter, the same people are given instruction concerning votive offerings and the scandal occasioned if they should fail to bring their offering within the specified time. While there is an abundance of evidence for votive practices involving those who are not wealthy, the language used of these practices suggests more socially impressive offerings. All of this, I would suggest, points to 2 Enoch emerging not from a context of poverty but of comparative wealth, though with a strong element of social responsibility.

That hardly helps to locate the work by itself, but the principles related to votive offerings make good sense in the context of the surge of inscriptional evidence for votives supporting building work in synagogues, which paralleled the development of such building works by Christian groups of various kinds, in the 4th century. The references to the “temple” or “house of God,” as a place of worship to be attended three times a day, could easily reflect such a context and, actually, this would make better sense than a date in the second temple period, when we might more properly expect references to attending twice.

The heightened emphasis on reciprocity encountered in the descriptions of liturgy in 2 Enoch constitutes a further point of equivalence to this inscriptional evidence associated with late antiquity. The emphasis is quite distinctive when compared both to the biblical traditions about sacrifice and the rabbinic traditions; this is especially interesting because the synagogue culture of late antiquity was one led by the *am ha-aretz* and not by the rabbis.

Some of the practices described, particularly those involving votive lamps, are alien to the “official” practices of both early Judaism and early Christianity. We know that such practices were popular, and our evidence for them is particularly associated with Syria, but they were condemned by representatives of the networks, at least during the early centuries of the common era. The condemnation was, moreover, linked to the popularity of such practices in other religious traditions and cults, notably that of Demeter and Theos Hypsistos.

The fact that such practices were eventually accommodated by official practice may be an interesting detail to consider in relation to the status of those who practiced them. Rather than suggesting that they had the status of a fringe sect, a minority group clearly outside the tradition, it

suggests that they inhabited a particular kind of liminal or fluid space still associated with the network or religion.

Chapter 9. Animal Offerings and Ritual Theorizing in 2 Enoch

This chapter extends and develops the discussion of regular worship in Chapter 8. As noted there, the separation of the two chapters is principally intended to ensure that the material is more manageable for the reader; much of the content will link to what I discussed in Chapter 8 and some of the primary texts will overlap. The division of the material will allow particular attention in this chapter to be focused on the issues that relate to the offering of animals.

At several points in the instructional material in 2 Enoch, the regular offering of animals in practical worship is referenced (45:3; 59:2–3). There are also particular sacrifices mentioned in the interlocked narratives at the end of the book, where several huge festivals involving animal sacrifice are described (68:5–72:5). Two features of the sacrificial descriptions are important to consider, for they provide further evidence that the authorship of the work is not representative of known forms of Judaism in antiquity. The first of these is a characteristic element in the narratives that describe sacrifice, which seem to suggest that the animal is killed “at the head of the altar” (i.e., wherein the altar itself serves as the site of killing), with the implement used labelled as a sacrificial or priestly knife. This is not consistent with the Levitical prescriptions for sacrifice, which separate the killing and butchering of the offering from the act of offering itself, the former performed in a distinct butchering area separate from the altar. Neither is it consistent with the language used of sacrifice in the Mishnah. It does, however, align with the language used of sacrificial killing in other traditions. There are also some interesting points of contact with later Rabbinic traditions that draw upon the language of the *‘aqedah* (Genesis 22) in the interpretative web that shapes their representation of sacrifice and slaughter; these may have influenced non-Jewish discourse, but if this has indeed happened, then the phenomena are more obviously features of late antiquity or even the early medieval period.

The second feature is a distinctive requirement to bind the animal by all four legs that is encountered in both the instructional and the narrative units, reflecting a cohesive representation of sacrificial practice across the book as a whole. This requirement is discussed in some detail by Shlomo

Pines.¹ Pines's observation that the technique in question may be equivalent to a forbidden practice associated with the *minim* in m.Tam 4:1 and b.Tam 31b has been widely discussed, but his more programmatic concern with the rationale for the practice—which, he argues, appears to be informed by an eschatology similar to Zoroastrian thought—has been rather neglected.² I will seek to address that point of neglect in this chapter, but will also consider the rationale for binding in relation to the other instances of sacrificial theorizing and rationale found within the work. In order to frame this analysis properly, I begin with a discussion of developments in the study of sacrifice in antiquity.

Sacrificial Practice and Theorizing in Antiquity: Framing 2 Enoch in its Potential Contexts

It has been a common feature in the analysis of sacrifice to claim a kind of progressive enlightenment from primitive beliefs about contingent deities who need to be sated, sustained or placated by what is offered, or from the essentially violent social-bonding rituals of savage hunters, to more sophisticated beliefs that intellectualize or allegorize sacrifice within philosophies of essence and meaning. This is typically paired with an account that sees animal sacrifice as ceasing under the influence of Christianity and its positive effects on civilized cultures. Much Greek philosophy, from Plato³ to Lucian and beyond, has been read in such terms, as have the biblical prophetic traditions concerning sacrifice that make it of lesser importance than justice (e.g., Psalm 40:6, Isaiah 1:11; Micah 6:6–8), which have been considered

¹ Shlomo Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch", in *Types of Redemption: Contributions to the Theme of the Study-Conference Held at Jerusalem 14th to 19th July 1968*, eds. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky and C. J. Bleeker (Leiden, Brill, 1970), 72–87.

² See Lawrence R. Schiffman, "2 Enoch and Halakhah," in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*, ed. Andrei Orlov and Gabrielle Boccaccini, with Jason Zurawski, *Studia Judaeslavica* 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 221–228, and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, "Halakha, Calendars, and the Provenances of 2 Enoch," *ibid.*, 229–242.

³ An obvious example of this is found in Plato *Euthyphro*, 14–15. It is important to note that this discussion does not critique such a view, as such, but rather presents it as a position agreed by the participants in the dialogue; their differences lie elsewhere. This is important to how we interpret the details of the text and seek to utilize them in the reconstruction of more widely held values; the assumption that it responds to primitive accounts of "needy" deities should be challenged. On this point, see Daniel Ullucci, *The Christian Rejection of Animal Sacrifice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 36:

The idea that the gods do not actually need sacrifice (probably the most well-known so-called critique of sacrifice) is raised, but not as a critique. It is, rather, an obvious fact to which both parties immediately agree. The fact that the gods do not need dead animals in no way invalidates the practice of sacrifice for Plato. His only concern is that people might get the wrong idea about the gods from sacrifice—that they are needy or that sacrifice in some way defrauds them (because they get only the bones while humans get the meat).

to move in this direction, railing against less enlightened elements in Israelite tradition and anticipating its more complete “supersession” in Christianity.⁴

In this interpretation, the human race slowly outgrows animal sacrifice through a series of steps. It begins with enlightened voices like the classical philosophers and the Judean prophets, who critique the act and pave the way for its demise. These preliminary critiques lead directly to Jesus, the so-called cleansing of the Temple, and the rightful abolishment of all sacrifice under the aegis of a Christian empire.⁵

In response to this, Ullucci notes that the standard scholarly label, “critique of sacrifice,” used when describing ancient writing on the topic, itself frames the issue in a particular way that valorizes its elements according to modern Christian values, rendering it as an essential and progressive rejection of the specific practice of sacrificial killing. It both over-simplifies the issues at stake and conflates the relatively scarce examples of genuine rejection of sacrifice (particularly animal sacrifice) with critical reflection on what constitutes appropriate sacrifice. Ullucci argues that works of this kind should instead be considered part of a widespread “debate” about sacrifice that was often concerned with more finely grained issues of rationale and theology,⁶ as authors and traditions competed in the meaning that they associated with the practice. The debate was not crudely about *whether or not* sacrifice should be offered, but about the significance attached to the offering and how this related to theology proper, to beliefs about god(s) and their the nature(s). The problem being addressed, then, was not necessarily the event or act of sacrifice, or its propriety *qua* act, but the beliefs that might underpin this event for some participants, particularly among the poorly (or differently!) educated. Misconceptions about the natures

⁴ Examples of such analyses are widespread in the literature, but need to be located within the landscape of scholarship more widely. An excellent overview and analysis is provided by Ullucci, “Sacrifice in the Ancient Mediterranean: Recent and Current Research,” *Currents in Biblical Research* 13 (2015): 388–439. On the influence of Christian supersessionism on the discussion, see Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 6–10.

⁵ Daniel Ullucci, “Contesting the Meaning of Animal Sacrifice,” in *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice*, ed. Jennifer Wright Knust and Zsuzsanna Varhelyi (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 57–69 (quotations from 59–60). Ullucci here cites Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

⁶ Ullucci, “Contesting the Meaning,” esp. 58.

of the gods or the significance of the act required correction, even where the act continued to be performed. This also meant, of course, that the debate between philosophers was often in reality a matter of clashing theologies, a word I again use here in its proper sense: their disagreements on sacrificial propriety often proceeded from their convictions about what the various gods actually are.

Once again, then, we are confronted by the methodological issues associated with scholarly prioritizing of the writings associated with “networks of literate cultural producers,” who generate the discourse or debate about sacrificial significance.

These people were specialists by virtue of the skills, prestige, and legitimacy derived from their belonging to the perhaps 2 percent or less of people who were literate enough to produce and authoritatively interpret complex, written texts. Although small in number in any one location, they formed a large network due to the mobility and endurance of written texts across time and place. These networks—or fields, to vary the metaphor—were united by a set of common literate practices that allowed skills, writings, ideas, motifs, and so on to cross ethnic, linguistic, and status boundaries. The point of view of these specialists has dominated scholarship on animal sacrifice.⁷

By locating the contributors to this philosophical field within a more complex world of sacrificial practice, attested in material culture, Stowers and other recent scholars on the discourse of sacrifice have highlighted the processes of negotiation and accommodation that were at work across social, civic and economic lines. While the small percentage of the population constituted by the philosophers and their networks engaged in a critical theorizing about sacrifice, a range of practices continued in different contexts, and the discourse bore upon these practices in context-specific ways. Philosophical debate about sacrifice had different implications for civic ritual, associated with the performances of the elite, than it did for “everyday religion”; and, of course, much of it was linked to the meat trade, since most meat sold for food would have been killed according to ritual requirements.

⁷ Stanley Stowers, “The Religion of Plant and Animal Offerings Versus the Religion of Meanings, Essences, and Textual Mysteries,” in Knust and Varhelyi, *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice*, 35–51 (quote from 42).

I want here to offer a qualification to Stowers's argument that I think may be particularly relevant to how we consider the evidence of 2 Enoch and other works like it (i.e., pseudepigrapha and other poetical or narrative works that cannot easily be categorized or located).⁸ If such works are, as I have suggested might be the case through this study, the products of localized groups that may have sat liminally on the edges of the defined networks, and may have participated in more than one of these, then they may provide *textual* or *literary* windows onto the sacrificial practices of those wealthy and literate people who were not interested in the boundaries and values of the network (or, at least, of its champions). The point here is that we cannot simply work with a binary of elite-literate and non-elite-non-literate; in 2 Enoch, we may have the handiwork of elite and literate cultural providers who are not central to the primary network, even if they may have contact with some of its members. An observation of this kind would, I think, be one that Stowers would affirm, since elsewhere he has been critical of the tendency to deploy simplistic binaries.⁹ What it means is that we should not only look to material culture for evidence of sacrificial practices that are at odds with the positions articulated by a particular elite; we may find such evidence also in writings that have generally been treated as marginal.

This evaluation of animal sacrifice in antiquity has significant implications for our study of 2 Enoch, and several points might be noted as especially important. First, although there is some debate on the matter, there is arguably little evidence for animal sacrifice in Egypt in the period of late antiquity.¹⁰ This detail may invite us to treat the theory of an Egyptian provenance for 2 Enoch with a little caution. It may be important to coordinate this observation about practices in Egypt itself with what we know of the fascination with Egyptian mythology in the eastern Roman empire, particularly in the wake of Iamblichus. Iamblichus gave the mythical stock of Egyptian religion renewed significance, and did so precisely in relation to the reaffirmation of ritual practices. This exemplifies the distinctive transmission of Egyptian mythology in a late antique Syrian context, coloured by Neoplatonism (though

⁸ In noting such poetical or narrative works, I have in mind much of the material that circulated in monastic traditions, particularly in eastern contexts, including the genres of question-answer (including the *joca monachorum* and *erotapokrisis* traditions) and the stories about saints. The evidence of the latter is usefully discussed by Kateryna Kovalchuk, "The Encaenia of St Sophia: Animal Sacrifice in a Christian Context," in *Scrinium IV* (2008): 161–203.

⁹ Stanley Stowers, "The Concept of 'Community' and the History of Early Christianity," *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion* 23 (2011): 238–256.

¹⁰ On this, see David Frankfurter, "Egyptian Religion and the Problem of the Category 'Sacrifice,'" in Knust and Varhelyi, *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice*, 75–93; note, however, the critical comments on this by Stowers, in the same volume (Stowers, "On the Religion of Plants and Animals," note 1, occurring on 35).

it was influential far beyond Syria, thanks to the popularity of Iamblichus with Julian). If we encounter Egyptian imagery in a work that also seems to represent animal sacrifice as a present reality, it may be evidence that we are actually dealing with a work written later and from further afield.

Second, as the Christian movement grew in size and influence during the first centuries of the common era, some of its own “literate cultural producers” joined the already established discourse about sacrifice. Drawing upon the cultural heritage of Judaism and Greek philosophy, and operating with a commonly held set of beliefs about the significance of Jesus’ teaching and death in relation to the temple cult, they developed supersessionist accounts of the Jewish sacrificial system that affirmed its value for a time, but considered that time now to be over. Subtly, then, we need to distinguish the ways that this discourse aligned with the widespread debate about sacrificial significance and theology—that is, the nature of the deities—and the ways that it departed from it, adopting a position of wholesale rejection of *actual* sacrificial practice. It is vital to remember that the discourse developed by these individuals does not represent universally the practice of early Christian communities, and some judicious use of mirror reading suggests that network representatives continued to be concerned by the ongoing involvement of Christians in sacrifice. We actually have a number of explicit accounts of animal sacrifice being part of Christian activity, the plain meaning of which has commonly been avoided by a scholarship that wants to see early Christianity as neatly separated from any such practices.¹¹ Here, too, it is important to reiterate the point made above that the divergence in discourse may not simply emerge between elite-literate and common, but between those clearly and cleanly belonging to particular networks and those who participated in them without observing their distinctive concerns about boundaries.

By the time of the emperor Julian, the discourse of rejection seems to have been widely and popularly influential, with the emperor among those concerned by the disappearance of ritual worship of the gods, the abandonment of their shrines and temples. Julian’s love for the work of Iamblichus is associated with that philosopher’s rationale for the performance of ritual, from which he claimed support for his program of restoring sacrificial worship against the backdrop of the atheism of the “Galileans.” Stowers, however, notes that by the fifth century, a certain accommodation of popular ritual

¹¹ See Kovalchuk, “The Encaenia of St Sophia: Animal Sacrifice in a Christian Context.”

is reached, resolving the tensions visible in earlier centuries. Drawing upon MacMullen's distinction between "first and second churches," which I noted in Chapter 1, Stowers writes:

The first church of clergy, other literate elite, and well-to-do property owners worshipped in the rather small spaces of the church edifices and claimed to represent and control the whole Christian population. Here the divine was conceived as remote and hierarchically mediated, as in Trinitarian theology. The masses of Christians, including those only ambiguously so, celebrated in cemeteries with familial dead, in martyr-hero shrines, and in other settings of the religion of everyday social exchange. By the fifth century, those in power were developing or at least allowing a religion that would mediate between the religion of the literate specialist and a religion of everyday social exchange, with the places of saints, martyrs, miracles, and other holy sites spreading across the urban and rural landscape; but ultimate authority rested in the interpreters of books.¹²

In fact, MacMullen's study highlights that even those who worshipped in the "small spaces of the church edifices" might embody practices quite different to what the writings of the "first church" literates, particularly the heresiologists, would lead us to expect. Commenting on the features of the house church excavated in Dura-Europos, including the various apotropaic signs over doors, he writes:

One thing is clear, however: that Dura's Christianity was of its own sort. It constituted a sect, one characterized by "a special doctrine of Salvation, less through obedience to the law than through mystical communication with the divine, a communication with God through Christ as intermediary, seen as the savior who guards Christians against Evil, against the demons and the stars".¹³

The picture of common Christian ritual, then, is more complicated than many presume it to be.

¹² Stowers, "On the Religion of Plants and Animals," 50.

¹³ Ramsay MacMullen, *Second Church: Popular Christianity A.D. 200-400* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009).

This point is particularly important to unpack and brings us once again to the question of monotheism and the existence of other divine beings. Some of the ancient writings that have been understood to “critique sacrifice” actually operate with hierarchies of divine beings that allow material sacrifice to some powers but not to others. This rests on a distinction between the immaterial and material gods: the high god, their offspring, and the lower deities, including the *daimones*, that are properly involved in the material realm and can be worshipped accordingly. The following excerpt from Porphyry’s 3rd century treatise, *On Abstinence from Killing Animals*, illustrates this. I include a fairly lengthy quotation because I think it frames what we encounter in 2 Enoch in interesting ways:

but we shall make, as is fitting, different sacrifices to different powers. To the god who rules over all, as a wise man said, we shall offer nothing perceived by the senses, either by burning or in words. For there is nothing material which is not at once impure to the immaterial. So not even logos expressed in speech is appropriate for him, nor yet internal logos when it has been contaminated by the passion of the soul. But we shall worship him in pure silence and with pure thoughts about him. (Abst. 2.34.1–2)

For his offspring, [however,] the intelligible gods, hymn-singing in words should be added. For sacrifice is an offering to each god from what he has given, with which he sustains us and maintains our essence in being. (Abst. 2.34.4)

[Lastly,] for the gods within the heaven, the wandering and the fixed [...], we should kindle fire which is already kin to them, and we shall do what the theologian says. He says that not a single animate creature should be sacrificed, but offerings should not go beyond barley-grains and honey and the fruits of the earth. (Abst. 2.36.3–4)¹⁴

¹⁴ Translation from Gillian Clark, *Porphyry: On Abstinence from Killing Animals* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), quoted in James B. Rives, “The Theology of Animal Sacrifice in the Ancient Greek World,” in Knust and Varhelyi, *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice*, 188.

Commenting on this, Rives writes, “Porphyry has taken the Platonic notion of a divine hierarchy and has correlated it with a hierarchy of sacrifices, so that the offering corresponds in nature to the deity being honored.”¹⁵ A similar rationale can be traced in other works, including those earlier writings on which Porphyry seems to depend, so that what appears to be a rejection of sacrifice is, in fact, an exclusion of this *specifically* from the worship of the highest deities. The contours of this debate suggest that the practice of offering animal sacrifices to the highest god(s) was a live one, and it is not difficult to imagine that erudite adherents to such a practice may have sought to defend it against its philosophical detractors.

Philo of Alexandria

I have already offered one brief cautionary comment on the Egypt thesis of 2 Enoch’s origins. Given the importance of Egypt as a candidate for the provenance of 2 Enoch, and noting that those who have proposed this have sometimes also supported an early date, it makes sense also here to consider Philo’s contribution to this discourse. The writings of Philo represent a particular strand of Judaism, framed by the particular cultural environments of Alexandria. Philo’s fundamental conception of Israel’s God as ὁ ὢν/τὸ ὢν can be mapped onto the highest god of Platonic thought, but his Scriptures contain detailed laws for the offering of sacrifices to this God, including animals that have been ritually killed and offered. This requires of Philo an account of sacrifice that affirms the propriety of offering animals to the highest god, and not exclusively to lower deities, and yet maintains the immaterial identification of the one to whom they are offered. Consequently, Philo’s distinctive Jewish contribution to the debate involves an affirmation of the material practices of sacrifice, but with the meaning of the acts that are performed interpreted according to the principles of allegory and symbolism, allowing them to *signify* something with respect to the highest god.

Philo is unique amongst ancient Jewish writers on sacrifice in giving focused attention to elucidating the meaning of sacrificial ritual in conceptual terms. Indeed, he not only seeks to

¹⁵ Rives, “The Theology of Animal Sacrifice,” 188.

explain what is signified by the various distinct sacrificial complexes and the ritual actions that compose them, he also offers general observations about the origin and meaning of sacrifice as a religious practice. Philo offers an explicit “theory” of sacrifice as a system of symbolic actions.¹⁶

What they signify, however, he links to the condition of the one bringing the offering. Sacrifices are acts of thanksgiving, intended to honour God for what he is, and they are means of participating in God’s state of blessedness, conceived both as sharing in his goodness and as being delivered from evil.

For if anyone cares to examine closely the motives [τὰς αἰτίας] which led men of the earliest times to resort to sacrifices as a medium of prayer and thanksgiving, he will find that two hold highest place. One is the rendering of honor to God for the sake of Him only and with no other motive, a thing both necessary and excellent. The other is the signal benefit which the worshipper receives, and this is twofold, on the one side directed to obtaining a share in blessings, on the other to release from evils. (1.195)¹⁷

In both of these, the true significance of the sacrifice lies with its subject and not its object, in the one giving thanks and sharing in God’s goodness. The sacrificial practice itself is essential to this significance and another passage quoted by Gilders illustrates this effectively:

The blood is poured in a circle round the altar because the circle is the most perfect of figures, and in order that no part should be left destitute of the vital oblation [ψυχικῆς σπονδῆς]. For the blood may truly be called a libation of the life-principle [ψυχῆς]. So, then, he teaches symbolically [συμβολικῶς οὖν ἀναδιδάσκει] that the mind [διάνοια], whole and complete, should as it moves with measured tread passing circle-wise through every phase of word and intention and deed, show its willingness to do God’s service. (Spec. Laws 1.205)¹⁸

¹⁶ William K. Gilders, “Jewish Sacrifice: Its Nature and Function (According to Philo),” in Knust and Varhelyi, eds., *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice*, 94–105, quotation from 95.

¹⁷ Gilders, “Jewish Sacrifice,” 96.

¹⁸ Quoted in Gilders, “Jewish Sacrifice,” 97.

Thus, Philo's account can accommodate practices that other philosophers would consider unfitting for the worship of the highest God, because the practices are associated with symbolic meaning, linked to the mind of the worshipper. Gilders notes that this also allows Philo to link the value of any given performance of sacrifice to the virtue-state of the one making the offering, to the extent that what is offered corresponds to that state. The victim is identified with the self, provided the self is virtuous:

“He, then, who is adorned with these [virtues] may come with boldness to the sanctuary [τὸν νεών] as his true home ... there to present himself as victim [ἱερεῖον ἐπιδειξόμενος αὐτόν]” (Spec. Laws 1.270)¹⁹

The link between virtue and rationality is, of course, crucial to Philo. The one who is virtuous is in proper alignment with the *logos*, upon which their rational *psyche*, “fashioned after the image of the Self-existent [τοῦ ὄντος] (Spec. Laws 1.81),”²⁰ is patterned. It is their rational *psyche* and, not their base passions, that has been cultivated and so the virtuous person's act of sacrifice facilitates communion with the Self-existent one. This also means that the worth of sacrifice is linked to that virtuous state; a seemingly lesser offering brought by a more virtuous person is reckoned as more valuable than a greater one brought by the unworthy. In all of this, the symbolism of the sacrifice is linked to the state of the one bringing the sacrifice, but specifically to their noetic state, pivotal as it is to their participatory virtue.

2 Enoch: The Head of the Altar and the Sacrificial Knife

The foregoing discussions of animal sacrifice and sacrificial theorizing in antiquity provide useful context for a renewed consideration of the evidence in 2 Enoch, to which I now turn. The first pair of issues that I consider here concerns the specific site of killing and the language used of the killing knife. These two issues need to be treated as a pair; when coordinated, they point away from the practices of any known Jewish cultic setting and are suggestive of a later context.

¹⁹ Gilders, “Jewish Sacrifice,” 98.

²⁰ Gilders, “Jewish Sacrifice,” 98.

The descriptions of animal killing in 69:9–16 and 70:19–21 appear to reflect an expectation that sacrificed animals would actually be killed *on* the altar and that the act of killing effectively constituted the act of sacrifice. The construction “at the head of the altar” (usually ГЛАВѢ ВАТАРАЖЮ, *glavě ōltareǰju*, less commonly ГЛАВѢ ЖРЪТВЪНИКА, *glavě žrŭtvŭnika*)²¹ is used recurrently in the accounts:

And the elders of the people, taking sheep and oxen, tied their 4 legs together, and placed (them) at the head of the altar. And they said to Methusalam, "Pick up the knife! And slaughter them in the required manner in the face of the Lord." (69:12–13)²²

And the people gave heed to Nir the priest and they hurried and they brought (them) and tied (them) up at the head of the altar. And Nir took the knife of sacrifice (ножь жреческыи, *nožŭ žrečeskyi*), and slaughtered all that had been brought to be sacrificed in front of the face of the Lord. (70:19–21)²³

Andersen describes “head of the altar” as a “literal Hebraism.”²⁴ In fact, this Hebrew expression is not found in the biblical material, but it is encountered in the Mishnah (e.g., in m.Yoma 4:3, m.Tamid 1:4, 2:1, 5:5),²⁵ where it describes the place where the sacrifice is offered up, the animal having been killed and divided away from the altar, in the butchering area. That is, in the Mishnah, the term designates the top of the altar onto which the already divided parts of the offering are placed as they are presented, the place of actual sacrifice; it does not designate the place where animals are killed. This reflects the proper distinction between the acts of killing and offering in the conditions of the Torah.²⁶

By describing the animals as tied up (and hence ready to be killed “in the required manner”) at the head of the altar, the accounts in 2 Enoch seem to suggest that this is itself the place of killing. This

²¹ The narrative in general uses both words. While they might be intended to designate specific and distinguishable locations within the cultic site more broadly, the use of both with the term “head” would seem to suggest that the words are used interchangeably.

²² Trans. Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 199.

²³ Trans. Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 203

²⁴ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 199, note t.

²⁵ I am grateful to Jenny Labenz for pointing out these occurrences of the expression in the Mishnah.

²⁶ I am grateful to David Moffitt for drawing my attention to this point.

particular usage of “head of the altar,” which is quite different from that found in the Mishnah, is actually encountered in contemporary colloquial Arabic as the place where ritual killing for food takes place.²⁷ The observation invites some reflection on whether the construction should rightly be labelled, with Andersen, as a “literal Hebraism” or instead considered in broader terms as a “Semitism,” explicable in terms of a cluster of languages, including Syriac and Arabic. This point, indeed, could be extended in principle to many of the apparent Semitisms that have been noted throughout this particular section of the book by Andersen and others. It would require a full-length treatment in its own right, and is therefore beyond the scope of this book, but a differential analysis of the Semitisms encountered in the work remains a desideratum for research on 2 Enoch, and they occur with particular density in the narratives at the end of the book that describe cultic activity. With respect to this specific example, the key point is that the usage does not align with the Mishnah and its account of sacrificial practice, nor with the Torah.

A partial caveat can be offered to these observations and it will be of further relevance to my discussion of the knife, below. There are some points in the Talmud where the language of the *‘aqedah*, the binding of Isaac, is drawn into the matrix of scriptures that inform the laws for ritual slaughter. These are explored at length in two overlapping studies by Jane Kanarek, which heavily inform the discussion that follows.²⁸ The relevance of these passages is that they identify the altar as the place where Isaac bound and laid up to be killed; in using this non-normative instance of sacrificial offering as normative to halachic debate about the knives used in sacrifice, they also potentially facilitate a way of thinking (or writing) about the altar as the site of killing.

Genesis (Bereshit) Rabba 56:6 cites Genesis 22:9 (“and Abraham sent out his hand and took the knife”) in relation to the proper kind of implement used in ritual slaughter: it should be moveable and not fixed to the ground. The passage involves a complex debate that coordinates several scriptures, in ways that implement distinctively Palestinian interpretative technique;²⁹ the base text, however, is that of Genesis 22:9. Kanarek examines an equivalent discussion in the Bavli, in B. Ḥullin 16a, which likewise

²⁷ This observation is based on testimonial evidence from contemporary Palestinian Muslims, shared with me by my colleague, Jakub Zbrzeźny.

²⁸ Jane Kanarek, “He Took the Knife: Biblical Narrative and the Formation of Rabbinic Law,” *Association for Jewish Studies Review* 34 (2010): 65–90; “Abraham’s Knife,” in Jane Kanarek, *Biblical Narrative and the Formation of Rabbinic Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 31–66.

²⁹ Kanarek, “He Took the Knife,” 74.

involves the quotation of Genesis 22:9 as the basis for the requirement that the killing knife is a moveable object.³⁰ Both of these passages are interesting because of their incorporation of Genesis 22:9 into discussions of the qualities of knives used for slaughter; they are not, of course, the only passages in the Mishnah or the Talmud to discuss this topic, but are noteworthy for their use of the Abraham narrative. It is interesting to note that the rabbinic discussions are generally concerned with the kinds of blade that are appropriate to use and with the processes of their purification that may be necessary before use; there is nothing to indicate that there are particular knives used exclusively in the cult.

Kanarek also notes, however, that Genesis 22:9 is drawn into the Bavli's commentary on the requirement to bind the animal foreleg to hindleg, and not by all four legs. The comment in b. Tamid 31b, corresponding to Mishnah Tamid 4:1, reads: "It was taught in a baraita: foreleg to hindleg – like the binding of Isaac, the son of Abraham."³¹ This is interesting because these are the very passages that Pines explores in relation to the binding practices of 2 Enoch. The reason that the Abraham passage is used here is because it furnishes one of the few occurrences of the verb *קָבַע*, "to bind," in a context that also employs the core language of ritual offering. It also, however, has the bound victim placed upon the altar, ready to be killed.

The story of the *'aqedah* takes on extensive significance in rabbinic traditions, particularly in relation to Passover, though also in relation to Rosh Hashanah. The former association is reflected already (if, as Levenson puts it, "obliquely"³²) in Jubilees 18:18–19, in which Abraham initiates a seven-day festival in response to the provision of a lamb, though it hardly anticipates the extent of the later Rabbinic traditions. Targum Neofiti on Leviticus 22:27 also draws upon the story; it associates Isaac not only with the Passover lamb, but with all sacrificially offered lambs, as the archetypal burnt offering.³³ The Avodah *piyyutim* also invoke the story in relation to Yom Kippur.³⁴ So, by late antiquity and the early medieval period, there is a field of discourse that draws the imagery and terminology of the story

³⁰ Kanarek, "He Took the Knife," 77–9. Later in the article, Kanarek explores one particular element in the debate represented in the passage, namely whether the language of Genesis 22:9 should properly be understood in terms of Abraham's zeal, rather than as normative for the sort of knife to be used. See pages 86–9.

³¹ Kanarek, "Abraham's Knife," 49–50.

³² Jon D. Levenson, *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 184.

³³ For a broad discussion of the uptake of Genesis 22 in rabbinic traditions, see Levenson, *Death and Resurrection*, 173–199.

³⁴ Michael D. Schwartz and Joseph Yahalom, *Avodah: Ancient Poems for Yom Kippur* (University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State Press, 2005), 306, translating the Avodah, *Atah Konanta 'Olan be-Rov Hessed*.

found in Genesis 22 into the dialogues and performative recollections of sacrifice, particularly in contexts where certain practices or performances act as substitutes for the temple cult, including the killing of animals for food.³⁵ This may well have shaped the language and imagery of sacrifice used in communities influenced by Jewish thought, even if not neatly identifiable as Jewish.

The description of the sacrificial knife (ножь жрецьескыи, *nožī žrečeskyi*) also requires some comment. The work describes the knife as leaping from the altar into Methusalom's hand (69:16), which reinforces the sense that the altar is the killing site. The adjective "sacrificial" indicates its special significance, but does not correspond to any of the standard terminology for knives used in killing found in Jewish sources (e.g., *sakin*). In fact, the adjective ЖЪРЪЪЪСКЪЪ (*žiričiskū*) is relatively uncommon and is linked specifically to the term for the high priest, so that the expression might appropriately be translated as "the high priestly knife." What is particularly noteworthy about the language is its association of the imagery of sacrifice, the act of offering made by the high priest, with the act of killing itself. The whole scene, in fact, maintains this identification: the priestly knife leaps from the altar into the hands of the one designated as high priest, who then kills the animals in front of the face of the Lord. In terms of the prescribed practices of the Torah, as discussed in the Mishnah, this is simply wrong: there appears to be no distinction in 2 Enoch between the act of killing and the act of sacrifice.

Binding the Sacrifice by Four Legs

One of the most striking features of the practice represented in 2 Enoch is its particular concern with binding the four legs of the animal. Importantly, the concern with the proper practice of binding is represented in the instructional sections of the book and in the Melchizedek narrative at the end of the book, straddling any possible redactional seams between sections. It would, I suggest, be a curious detail with which to be so concerned, if it does not reflect *actual* practice within the community of authorship. If animal sacrifice were merely an imaginative or distantly remembered element in the work, we would

³⁵ This theme emerges in Targum Neofiti Leviticus 22:27; its relationship to the *'aqedah* is explored particularly by Kanarek, "He Took the Knife," 89, drawing on the discussion of the phenomenon more broadly in Michael Fishbane, *The Exegetical Imagination: On Jewish Thought and Theology* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998), 123–35.

not expect *this* to be such an important feature, particularly when it cannot obviously be linked to known traditions within Judaism.

The practice is referenced not only in relation to the sacrificial aspect of killing animals, but also in relation to killing for food. It may well be the case that all killing for food involved a ritual element, so that every such act was in some sense sacrificial, but the two aspects are both delineated and coordinated in 59:2–4:

For a person brings one of the clean animals to make a sacrifice on account of sin, so that he may have healing for his soul. If he brings it to the sacrifice from clean animals and birds (and cereals), then there is healing for that person, and he will heal his soul. Everything that has been given to you for food, bind by four legs, so as to perform the healing properly. And there is healing and he will heal his soul.³⁶

It is not clear what is meant by “healing” here. Andersen suggests that the ritual envisioned may be “magical,”³⁷ but that terminology needs to be used with care, since it can project a set of modern categories and valorizations onto antiquity. Some of Andersen’s comments about the syncretistic character of 2 Enoch, which I discussed in Chapter 2, indicate that his usage of the term is coloured by those projections. Rather than seeking to identify a single ritual associated with healing, it may be better to allow that the text is extending the language of healing (and by extension, wholeness) to both cultic acts of devotion and the proper killing of animals for food.

In his pioneering essay on eschatology and time in 2 Enoch, Shlomo Pines argued that this requirement to bind all four legs runs contrary to the halakhic guidance of m.Tam 4:1 and b.Tam 31b, at least as typically read, and may indeed be the very practice that the tradition preserved in these texts seeks to forbid.³⁸ In these passages, which share some detail and differ on others, the rationale for *not* tying the animal by all four legs is debated by Rabbis Huna and Hisda, with one indicating that it was to avoid showing disrespect to holy things and the other that it was to avoid walking in the statutes of the

³⁶ I follow here Andersen’s translation, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 185.

³⁷ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 185, note c.

³⁸ Pines, “Eschatology and the Concept of Time,” 74–75.

minim or the *goyim*. The different readings—*goyim* and *minim*—are represented in different manuscripts of the Talmud, a point that I noted in Chapter 2 and that will be discussed further below.

Pines discusses the possibility that the debate recounted in these texts might cast light on the practice in 2 Enoch. Favouring the variant reading *minim* in the Talmud passages, he argues that the Slavonic work may attest the “accepted rite of a sect, which repudiated the sacrificial customs prevailing in Jerusalem.”³⁹ He briefly considers the possibility that the group in question was the Essenes, but regards this option as unlikely, since some of the central teachings of 2 Enoch are “not attested in the various texts purporting to give an account of the Essene doctrines or in the Dead Sea Scrolls.”⁴⁰ Seeking to renew and to nuance Pines’s argument, Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra⁴¹ has revisited the sectarian question, providing a less polemically determined option: that it may be the work of a Jewish or Christian author simply unaware of standard temple practice and influenced by local traditions and practices.

Pines sees a connection between the very ideas in 2 Enoch that he believes to be unattested in the Dead Sea Scrolls—“its account of the Creation, its view of animals and its eschatology”⁴²—and the rationale for binding all four legs of the animal. Building on earlier work by Rudolf Otto,⁴³ Pines highlights the parallels between 2 Enoch’s account of animal dignity in chapters 58 and 59 (although he follows the page numbers in Vaillant’s edition and not the chapter breakdown used here) and that encountered in some of the writings of Zoroastrianism.⁴⁴ He is particularly interested in the description of animal souls bringing accusations against those who have mistreated them:

³⁹ Pines, “Eschatology and the Concept of Time,” 75.

⁴⁰ Pines, “Eschatology and the Concept of Time,” 75. The simple association of the Dead Sea Scrolls with the Essenes is made in his footnote 10, which might fairly be described as “of its time.”

⁴¹ Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, “Halakha, Calendars, and the Provenances of 2 Enoch,” in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*, ed. Andrei A. Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini and Jason Zurawski, *Studia Judaeoslavica* 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 229–42.

⁴² Pines, “Eschatology and the Concept of Time,” 75.

⁴³ Rudolph Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man: A Study in the History of Religion* (trans. Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee Wolf. London: Lutterworth Press, 1938), 176–200 (esp. 196–200).

⁴⁴ Pines also notes with surprise the fact that Vaillant seems unaware of Otto’s work (“Eschatology and the Concept of Time,” 75). More recently, the connection between Zoroastrian thought and the representation of animal dignity (and their eschatological agency) in 2 Enoch is briefly discussed by Randall E. Otto, “*J’Accuse: Animal Accusation in 2 Enoch*,” *Journal of Animal Ethics* 11 (2021): 1–10. This study has some value, though the author’s limited familiarity with some of the relevant scholarship in biblical studies, and with some of the technical issues linked to the manuscripts of 2 Enoch, mean that it should be treated with some care. He devotes a section to the sexual abuse of animals, but the relevant material is found only in a secondary heading included in a single manuscript, detailed in the following footnote.

58:6–59:1 (J) Just as is every human soul according to number, so also with animals (скоты̅х̅ /скотѣ̅, *skotyx/skotix*). Not one of the souls that the Lord created will perish until the great judgement. And every animal soul will accuse (ѡклевѣтѣ̅, *ōklevetae[tǔ]*) the humans who have pastured/kept/fed/grazes (пѡсѣ̅, *pase[tǔ]*) them badly.⁴⁵ He who acts lawlessly with the soul of an animal acts lawlessly with his own soul.

58:6 (A) Not closed/excluded (зѡтѡрѣт, *zatvorit[ǔ]*) until the judgement will be the souls of the animals (животна, *životna*) which the Lord has made. All souls will accuse until the judgement. The one who pastures/keeps/feeds/grazes badly their own soul (дѡшю̅ свою̅; *dušju svoju*; V,N,B² all read: the souls of animals, дѡшю̅ скотѣ̅ю̅, *dušu skotiju*; B has an adjectival version of this expression—"animal souls"), commits iniquity against their own soul.

Two words are used for animals. The long recension exclusively uses скотъ̅, *skotǔ*, which can mean animals in a general sense, but can also be used particularly of domesticated animals or beasts of burden; it is often used of oxen, which may be relevant to the specific parallel noted by Otto and Pines. The short recension uses both скотъ̅ and животна, *životna*. The very short recension manuscripts also use скотъ̅ in the penultimate clause of line 6, although A/U instead duplicate the reference to the person's own soul found in the final clause. This double reference to the person's own soul does not align as straightforwardly with the context as does the reading of the very short manuscripts and can readily be explained as a confusion (perhaps by parablepsis) of скотѣ̅ю̅ and свою̅.

The word "soul" occurs multiple times. The specific aspect of the parallel noted by Otto and Pines is that this language of the animal soul is linked to the verb ѡклевѣтѣти (*ōklevetati*) "to accuse."

It is, I believe, evident that this accusation reflects some version of the complaint of the Soul of the Ox against ill-treatment which occurs in one of the Gāthās of Zarathustra (*Yasna* 29) and in an amplified form in the Pehlevi literature (*Denkart* 9, 29).⁴⁶

⁴⁵ P has a chapter break here and a title that appears to confuse what is being described ("Enoch teaches his sons why they should not touch an ox, because of the outflow."). See Andersen's note "a," 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch), 184.

⁴⁶ Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time," 75; see further his excursus, 84.

The link between this prospect of accusation and the necessity of proper binding is stated in 2 Enoch 59: 3–4. The textual evidence here is messy, especially in the short and very short recensions, where the differences are at the level of inclusion or omission of entire verses, but all of the manuscripts have some reference to the necessity of binding and reaffirm that failure to observe this is an act of lawlessness against one's own being.

Pines is interested in this because of its connection to other aspects of eschatology in 2 Enoch, which he considers to reflect Zoroastrian thought. I have considered some of these elsewhere in this study, in Chapter 7, but the further details about animals and eschatology, as well as some about sacrifice, that are found in the wider context of these verses are worth exploring in more detail here.

The account of the involvement of animal souls in the judgement is preceded by a description of the naming of creatures by Adam and the role of the first human as vicegerent. The unique place of the human in the cosmic hierarchy is affirmed, but with a particular emphasis on the unique responsibility that accompanies it; only humans will face the final judgement (58:4),⁴⁷ but the testimony of the animals with which they have been entrusted will be part of this. For those animals, meanwhile, there is—at least according to the short recension manuscripts—“a single place, and a single paddock and a single pasture.” That is, there is a special space in the renewed world in which the domestic animals can graze in timeless peace. The long recension describes, instead, a single special place for humans. This appears to be an alteration, intended to remove a reference to animal immortality that is out of line with later church teaching. The suspicion that the long recension has altered this is supported by the incongruity with the context and the fact that elsewhere 2 Enoch refers to the “many shelters, good houses and bad” (61:2–3) that are prepared for humans; the reading of the short recensions complements this, while that of the long recension contradicts it. The very short recension manuscripts agree with A/U in having a single place in the great age for the animals, but do not elaborate this with the parallel terms “paddock” and “pasture.” It seems likely to me that this is closest to the original reading.

⁴⁷ The wording of the long recension clarifies this further, but in a way that does seem to me to be secondary: “The Lord will not judge a single animal soul for the sake of man; but human souls he will judge for the sake of the souls of their animals.”

The description of this place as belonging to a single age (*věkŭ edinŭ*, ВѢКЪ ЕДИНЪ) and identified with the “the great age” (ВЕЛИКИИ ВѢКЪ, *velikiyi věkŭ*) is a significant part of Pines’s interest in it and one of the prompts that leads him to connect it with some forms of Zoroastrian eschatology. As I discussed in Chapter 5, the cosmogony of 2 Enoch presents “the great age” or “great aion” as contained within the belly of Adoil, the first of the invisible things to emerge into visibility by the Lord’s command (25:1–2, both recensions); this great age/aion contains all of the creation that the Lord wishes to create (25:2) and emerges from Adoil’s self-disintegration. The long recension manuscripts refer to another age/aion, “dark, very large, and carrying the creation of the lower things,” which emerges in parallel from the disintegration of Arukhas, who forms the lower foundation for the creation (26:1–3). Although most of the description of Arukhas is found in both recensions, including the representation of its role as the foundation of the lowest things, the reference to the dark age and to the lower things is found only in the long recension.

Later, in Chapter 65, after a brief reference to the making of the human in the image of the Lord, and near to the description of the eternal pasture, there is a further description of the Lord’s dividing the age into blocks of time. The short recension initially (65:3–4) lists only “times and hours,” where the long recension has a more detailed and poetically arranged schema of time, years, months, days, and hours; the elaborate detail of the latter is reflected in both recensions, however, in the description that follows of the purpose of the division. In the short recension, this description reads as follows:

So that a person might consider the times by the times (ВРЕМЕНЪ ВРЕМЕНИ, *vremeniŭ vremeny*), the endings and beginnings of the years and the ends of the months and the days and the hours, and so that he will give thought⁴⁸ to his own life and death. (65:4, A)

The construction in A and U, ВРЕМЕНЪ ВРЕМЕНИ, has the genitive plural followed by the instrumental plural of ВРѢМА (*vrěmę*, “time,” “season”), hence my translation above. V,N and R have a different noun in the second place, with a plural form of the orthographically and phonetically similar noun ПРѢМѢНА (*prěměna*, “change”), which furnishes the meaning preferred by Vaillant and Andersen: “the changing of

⁴⁸ A and U read simply “give” *dastŭ*, ДАСТЪ; most other manuscripts, across very short and long recensions, have some variant of *da čitet* “that he calculate/consider” (from ЧИСТИ).

the seasons.”⁴⁹ The agreement between the very long and very short recensions is significant; such agreements can suggest that it is the short recension that has been subjected to modification. The actual sense of the construction is hardly changed by this, however: all of the versions indicate that the division of time into units through which one passes should bring about reflection on mortality and should cause the person to order themselves rightly within the time-bound world. The form in the short recension is intriguing, though, in its essential sense that the parts of time are instrumental in bringing about reflection on time itself. The ordering of endings followed beginnings in the short and very short recensions is also intriguing, since it might be read as reflecting an interest, perhaps even of an eschatological sort, in the transformation of end to beginning.

The account of these finite and transient units of time in 2 Enoch 65 leads into the description of eschatological expectation that contextualizes the treatment of animals, as the divisions of time will come to an end and a timeless age will emerge:

The times will cease to exist, and there will be neither years nor months nor days, and the hours will no longer be counted. But there will be/appear a single age. And all the righteous, who escape the Lord’s great judgement, will be united with the great age (65:7, A).

Pines considers this language to reflect the influence of Zoroastrian eschatology, as finite time with its divisions and cycles is superseded by infinite time. He cites evidence from the *Bundahišn* and the *Denkart* that the first of the creatures to be made by Ohrmazd is the Time of the Long Dominion, in which Infinite Time became Finite, “divided into days, months, hundreds of years and so forth, and into the past, the present, and the future.”⁵⁰ This introduction of finitude and division is tied to the conflict between Ohrmazd and Ahriman, the destructive spirit; when the latter is defeated, Finite Time will merge again into Infinite Time:

⁴⁹ Cf. Vaillant, *Le Livre des Secrets*, 62, note 5 (on the textual variant) and 63 for the translation); cf. Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch, 191.

⁵⁰ Pines, “Eschatology and the Concept of Time,” 79.

With his clear vision, Ohrmazd saw that the Evil Spirit would never turn from his attack, that the attack could not be made powerless except by creation, for the creatures would not become animated and begin to move without time, and when time was created the creatures of Ahriman would also be animated. ... So, of necessity, in order to render the Adversary powerless, he created time ... From eternity, he created Time of Long Dominion; some call it “finite time.” From Time of Long Dominion, he created imperishability; that is, the things of Ohrmazd do not perish ... He fashioned Time of Long Dominion as the first creation that was infinite. Before the Mixture, the perpetuity of Ohrmazd was fashioned finite from the infinite. For from the primal creation, when he created the creatures, to the end, when the Evil Spirit will become powerless, there is a measure of twelve thousand years, which is finite, and then it mixes with and turns into infinity. That is, the creatures, too, will be eternal and pure with Ohrmazd.⁵¹

Pines himself notes some differences between the Pahlavi account of time and that of 2 Enoch, the most notable of which is the lack of connection in the Enochic work to any notion of cosmic conflict with an antagonist.⁵² This he considers to reflect the intentional eradication of dualistic elements by the Jewish or Christian groups that may have been responsible for 2 Enoch.

It is important to make two observations in relation to Pines’s argument. First, the dating of the traditions behind the Zoroastrian texts is notoriously difficult, since the manuscripts are late, though the *Bundahišn* itself is conventionally dated to the 9th Century.⁵³ Second, the sources we have attest to a complex and fluid set of traditions, and are clearly incomplete. A vast amount of literature has been lost or forgotten.⁵⁴ To this we might add, in line with much of the reflection in this study as a whole, that

⁵¹ Extracts from *Bundahišn* 1:35–41, translation by Domenico Agostini and Samuel Thrope, *The Bundahišn: The Zoroastrian Book of Creation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 8–9. Pines, “Eschatology and the Concept of Time,” 82, quotes from R.C. Zaehner, *Zurvan: A Zoroastrian Dilemma* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 338. The more recent translation of Agostini and Thrope is to be preferred, and reflects the general rejection of the Zurvanite hypothesis associated with Zaehner and others.

⁵² Pines, “Eschatology and the Concept of Time,” 80–81.

⁵³ Agostini and Thrope, *The Bundahišn*, xix.

⁵⁴ Agostini and Thorpe, *The Bundahišn*, xxi, write:

... a list of the contents of the Sasanian-era Avesta preserved in the Dēnkard indicates that the sacred scripture originally contained four times as much material. Almost everything that did not bear directly on the ritual ceremony, it seems, was lost.

alongside “official” forms of Zoroastrianism there may well have been various forms of localized religion and belief in Iran that were likely to have been coloured by it. For this reason, among others, caution is required in proposing a specifically Zoroastrian influence, as distinct from Iranian influence more broadly. The word “influence,” of course, can have a range of meanings. Provided these points of caution are taken into account, however, we can recognize the value of Pines’s observations and can add to them that recent work on the Bundahišn has seen its distinctive interest in time, finite and infinite, to be a key thread in its complicated tapestry. The distinctive interest in time, and the image of a timeless age that follows the judgement and the end of evil and suffering, is significant because of how it bears on the treatment of animals, both in terms of husbandry and sacrifice.

The account of the judgement leads into the description of sacrificial gifts, part of which we have already discussed in relation to votives, with the first sacrifice described that of the animal or bird brought for the “healing” of the worshipper’s soul. The long recension specifies that this offering is a sacrifice for sin (59:2); this is not as explicit in the short recensions, but may be implied by its relationship to the committing of iniquity in 58:6. The following line refers to animals brought for sacrifice, for which proper binding is a requirement, as “everything you have for food.” It is possible that this is intended to explicate which animals are to be bound in the prescribed manner when bringing specific offerings (e.g., for sin), but I think it is more likely that this reflects the general truth that most meat slaughtered for food at the time was offered to a god as part of sacrificial ritual. Effectively, then, this is a requirement that all animals to be killed for food should be bound by their four legs.

The linkage between the verses describing sacrifice and those describing animal dignity is striking; these verses have not merely been juxtaposed, but are thoroughly integrated. The recurrence of the word “soul” (*duša*, ΔΟΥΨΑ) is key to this and underpins the principle that the creature being offered is to be treated with care or even kindness. The latter point emerges in 59:5, where any “secret harm” caused to the animal is condemned as an “evil custom,” with the same expression being repeated that is used of the one who fails to bind the animal properly: “he acts lawlessly with his own soul (*svoju d[oy]šoy*, СВЮЮ ДІΨΪ).”

What we have, then, is a regulation concerning animal killing that is a specific application of a broader principle of animal dignity, rooted in cosmology and eschatology. Both the regulation and the belief behind are plausibly associated with Iranian thought, with parallels to Zoroastrian texts (although

I stress again that these are relatively late and must be treated cautiously). More subtly, they also appear to embody principles associated with those who rear animals, another possible evidence that 2 Enoch is associated with landowners engaged in animal farming.⁵⁵

It is important to reiterate the remaining difficulties in evaluating the significance of this, which are broadly linked to the debates about Iranian influence more generally on early Judaism.⁵⁶ It is difficult to prove conclusively that the ancient forms of the religion were identical in belief to the texts preserved and therefore to prove a direction of influence. Zoroastrian influence may also have been quite extensive, both temporally and geographically, so this need not reflect a Syro-Mesopotamian context. Nevertheless, alongside the other strands of evidence that I have considered through the course of this study, and given the interesting fact that Bardaisan of Syria appears to have been influenced by Zoroastrian thought,⁵⁷ it might be considered as a distinctive element in the environment of Syria in late antiquity and as most readily explained in that context.

As I noted in Chapter 2, Martha Himmelfarb has been critical of some points of detail in Pines's argument.⁵⁸ The most relevant of these, and the one that is most significant for Pines's claim, is that the better attested versions of the relevant passages in the Talmud actually describe the practices of the *goyim* and not the *minim*. In other words, they prohibit or condemn the following of non-Jewish practices, and not sectarian ones. In relation to the account that I have developed throughout the current study, which draws on the concept of the cultural rhizome, Himmelfarb's criticisms take on a fresh significance. It makes sense that we would encounter a rabbinic prohibition of non-Jewish sacrificial practices if these had been incorporated into common (but possibly localized) practices, among groups who were liminal in some sense rather than sectarian or excluded.

⁵⁵ On this point, see my discussion of Christfried Böttrich's perceptive comments, in Chapter 2.

⁵⁶ See, for example, S. Shaked, "Iranian Influence on Judaism: First Century B.C.E. to Second Century C.E.," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism I*, ed. W. D. Davies and L. Finkelstein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 308-25. See also the discussion in Eibert Tigchelaar and Florentino García Martínez, *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism* STDJ 63 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 227-42 ("Iranian Influences in Qumran?")

⁵⁷ Noted in Vicente Dobroruka, "Hesiodic Reminiscences in Zoroastrian-Hellenistic Apocalypses," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 75 (2012): 275-295.

⁵⁸ Martha Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish And Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 43.

Theorizing Sacrifice in 2 Enoch: On Divine Sufficiency and the Human Condition

2 Enoch also incorporates some intriguing detail concerning the nature of divine-human reciprocity and the significance of sacrificial function, which represents a distinctive kind of theorizing or discourse about sacrifice. This theme is developed quite specifically in 2 Enoch 45:3, the line that closes an account of the reciprocal blessing of the worshipper by God (discussed in detail in Chapter 8).

Short Recension (A):

3. Whether/when (εΓΔΔ, *egda*) the Lord needs/demands (*trebuetĩ*, ТРѢВУЕТЬ) bread or lamps or sheep or oxen, by this the Lord tests human hearts.

Long Recension (J)

3. Whether (J: *eda*, εΔΔ; P: *egda* εΓΔΔ, *egda*) the Lord needs/demands (*trěbuetĩ*, ТРѢВѸЕТЬ) bread or lamps or sheep or oxen or any kind of sacrifice is nothing. He demands/needs (ТРѢВѸЕТЬ) clean hearts, and by all of these he tests human hearts.

Very Short Recension (V,N,B²):

3. The Lord God does not need/demand (НИ ТРѢВУЕТЬ, *ni trebuetĩ*) bread or lamps or sheep or oxen; by this he tests human hearts.

As can be seen, the recensions exhibit some degree of variation, particularly in the particle that qualifies the significance of the verb ТРѢВОВАТИ (*trěbovati*). That verb itself has an interesting range of meanings: its standard lexical entries list both “to need” and “to demand.” Consequently, the qualification and contextualizing of the verb is particularly important.

The very short recension manuscripts are in one sense the least ambiguous, using the simple negation **НЕ**. This is most obviously read as indicating that the deity is in no sense contingent upon the bringing of these things, negating any sense of divine need. It is possible, given the votive quality of the

offerings discussed in the previous chapter, that the statement is intended to indicate that these are not “demanded” (i.e., commanded, mandatory or legislated) offerings, but are of a freewill sort, but I think this is less plausible as a reading. The repeated use of *или* (*ili*, “or”) in the listing of offerings has the effect of presenting this as a comprehensive or representative list, but some of the things on that list *are* required by command elsewhere in the law; even if this is work shows little interest in Torah, as such, such a denial would be problematic. Most obviously, then, the very short recension manuscripts would appear to negate divine need.

J and R read $\epsilon\Delta\Delta$, *eda*, “whether,” which should be read as part of the well attested formula $\epsilon\Delta\Delta$... *или* (“whether ... or ...”) that is encountered here, ultimately negated by the statement “that is nothing” ($\tau\omicron \widehat{\text{н}}\text{ѣ}$, *to ně[ctŭ]*, literally, “that is not”). In Church Slavonic writings, there are examples of $\epsilon\Delta\Delta$ being replaced by $\epsilon\Gamma\Delta\Delta$, the word encountered in A, U and P that more typically means “when” but that can, as a consequence of this substitution, also mean “whether.”⁵⁹ So, it is possible that the form in A, U, P is secondary, with an original reading of $\epsilon\Delta\Delta$ being altered to $\epsilon\Gamma\Delta\Delta$. It is also possible, however, that copyists wanted to soften the expectation of sacrifice from “when” (i.e., something that definitely happens at some point in time) to “whether” (i.e., something that may or may not happen). In either case, the sense of $\tau\Gamma\text{Ѣ}\text{В}\text{О}\text{В}\text{А}\text{Т}\text{И}$ would appear to lean more towards “to demand,” a meaning that would also more appropriately align with the parallel statement found only in the long recension, that God “demands clean hearts.” Strikingly, though, the pairing of this sense with the construction in the second half of the line (“by this/these he/the Lord tests human hearts”) ensures that the emphasis is still on the significance of sacrifice as something attesting the inner state of the one bringing the gift. That is to say, their significance—what they signify—is explicitly located on the human side of the exchange.

All of the recensions agree, then, that the sacrifices reveal the heart condition of the one bringing the offering and that the Lord uses them as a means of testing this. Such an account of sacrifice can be contrasted with those that represent the deity as in some sense or another dependent upon the offering, such that it feeds or sustains them. The discussion above highlights that this contrast does not turn on the precise contextual meaning of $\tau\Gamma\text{Ѣ}\text{В}\text{О}\text{В}\text{А}\text{Т}\text{И}$ but is rather a feature of the construction as a whole. It is important to ask, however, what this contrast might be intended to accomplish, precisely to

⁵⁹ The variation is common, particularly in some manuscripts of biblical texts, and is noted in most lexicons of Church Slavonic.

avoid the presumption that it might simply reject the views of another group. It may be intended as a corrective to popularly circulating ideas—a polemic against opinions or concepts, rather than against groups—or it may be intended as a defense of sacrificial practice against detractors who level such accusations against it. It may, in other words, be an erudite response to an erudite attack.

Whatever may be the case, it is important to recognize that this occurs in close apposition to the radicalized imagery of reciprocity that I discussed in Chapter 8 and this will prove to be important. This combination of ideas allows us to trace both similarities and differences with writings of better-established provenance.

Conclusions: Reconsidering 2 Enoch in the Contours of Antiquity

Having reviewed these various strands of sacrificial theorizing and the related debate concerning the killing of animals, we can reconsider the significance of what is encountered in 2 Enoch, drawing together the elements discussed in this chapter and in Chapter 8.

For all its use of philosophical language that is analogous in many regards to the kind of Platonism encountered in Philo (discussed further in Chapter 5), 2 Enoch seems to have little in common with the understanding of sacrifice represented by the Alexandrian. Certainly, the value of sacrifice is linked in certain regards to the disposition of the worshipper and to the testing of the worshipper's heart, but there is nothing that equates to the virtue-centered understanding of sacrifice found in Philo and, particularly, to the primacy of the rational *psyche* in the virtuous qualities that determine the worth of the sacrifice.

Nevertheless, there does seem to be a certain emphasis placed on the divine freedom from need, the aseity or self-subsistence that means that God is not reliant on the offering of animals to be kept alive. The representation of sacrifice as a means, rather, to test hearts appears to be an explanation of why a God who does not need sacrifices nevertheless expects them. One possibility is that this emphasis is intended as a response to philosophical critique, both of the satirical sort encountered in Lucian of Samosata and of the more didactic sort encountered in Porphyry. In both cases, the negativity towards offering animal sacrifices to the highest god(s) is linked to the values of the philosophical elite: those who are well-educated should simply know better than to offer animals to such as these.

If 2 Enoch does incorporate a response to such views, then it is important to note that it does so *as a text*. That is, it does so as a written work that could only have been generated by members of the literate fraction of society, by those who belong to the educated circles that might be expected to have a different attitude to sacrifice. My suspicion, given the place of agricultural imagery through the work, is that this reflects the kind of liminality associated with rural contexts, with educated patriarchs defending the popular practices of devotion within their communities.

While the polemics around the offering of animals can be traced through the various eras of Greek and Roman culture, it is noteworthy that they came to have particular influence in Late Antiquity, with Porphyry's work a celebrated and influential example. This also, however, broadly coincided with the renewed intellectual defense of pagan ritual that was associated with the reception of Iamblichus and the surge of popular religious practice that it facilitated. Taken together, these factors might provide some explanatory context for a renewed defence of sacrificial practice that involved the killing and offering of animals. A context for the theorizing of sacrifice in 2 Enoch in Late Antiquity would dovetail with the observations made in Chapter 8 about the emphasis on reciprocity in the book and its connections to the distinctive *mentalité* that appears to be reflected in votive inscriptions from the period.

This, of course, need not relate only to the practice of such killing for primarily religious purposes. It could equally reflect the religious coloration of regular killing for meat production, as the involvement of the deity in agriculture is acknowledged through the proper devotional aspects involved in routine killing, much as would be visible today in shechita, halal or qurban practices. The fact that killing for food is specifically referenced alongside the offering of sacrifice, in relation to the requirement to observe proper binding practices, would support that possibility.

If this combination of evidence makes best sense in late antiquity, we can add to it the evidence for Iranian or Zoroastrian influence, as traced by Otto and Pines. If they are correct, that evidence would constitute further support for the emergence of 2 Enoch as a recognizable work broadly in Syro-Mesopotamia. Zoroastrian influence need not be identified narrowly with Parthian or Sasanian culture, but it is certainly at its strongest in these contexts, with implications for the Syrian cultures that sat in the frontier. We know that it was a factor in the emergence of Bardaisanism and this may attest a local cultural phenomenon that continued through later centuries. This would also help to explain the

closeness of connection and the transmission of ideas between 2 Enoch and the Hekhalot literature, traced elsewhere in this study. Given the elements traced in other chapters of the present work that are suggestive of particular points of equivalence to the Syrian context, I think it is more likely that 2 Enoch took form there, and not further north or east.

Various elements suggest that the group—broadly defined—from which the work arose was liminal to the forms of either Judaism or Christianity that are represented as orthodox by the authoritative voices of each tradition. The binding practices specified in the work and the apparent killing of animals on the altar run contrary to rabbinic halakhah. This can now be coordinated with the discussion of votive practices in Chapter 8; these run contrary to the accounts of proper worship advanced by the authoritative voices of the church and are not in line with rabbinic evidence. This need not mean that 2 Enoch represented a small or marginal group; the liminality is with the representation of Judaism or Christianity preserved in particular writings. In fact, once we take into account the demonstrable facts that 2 Enoch was both transmitted as edificational literature by Christians and is clearly entangled with the Metatron traditions preserved in the Hekhalot literature, which it may have resourced, we are forced to reckon with a scale of influence that suggests the community of authorship was closely entangled with both, even if it conformed to neither.

Chapter 10. Concluding Synthesis: The Entangled Enoch

In this final chapter, I will rehearse the major findings of this book, but will also develop an integrative synthesis of those findings that will move beyond what has been discussed so far. This will include some further reflection on the parallels that the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch distinctively exhibit with the Gospel of Matthew. These were noted in Chapter 1 but were not explored in depth; with the benefit of the complex evidence examined through the body of the present work, I can now return to them and offer some careful reflections on the phenomena and how they might be explained.

In addition to pursuing the implications of my study for 2 Enoch, I will also consider the programmatic implications that it has for research into the pseudepigrapha more widely—particularly those that have been difficult to categorize or to locate—and for the role that such texts may play in the study of religion in antiquity. My project has involved sustained reflection on the imaginative frameworks and interpretative values that are typical of modern scholarship, often tacitly ordered by the valorizations of modern “enlightenment” and shaped by the contexts of colonial pasts. Approaching 2 Enoch with a different conceptualizing of the task itself (even when many of the constituent practices within the task remain the same) has opened fresh possibilities for the evaluation of the pseudepigraphon. As proponents of the various disciplines invested in the study of religion in antiquity seek humbly to address the legacies of their history, they may find themselves similarly reassessing the status and significance of literary works previously considered “marginal.”

Complicating Models and Culturing Rhizomes

In Chapter 1, before reviewing in detail the scholarship on the provenance of 2 Enoch and the Parables of Enoch (Chapters 2 and 3), I considered the need to reframe the study of debated pseudepigrapha, shifting it away from models that are overly determined by the notion of trajectories in the development of demarcated religious traditions and groups. A reframed approach to works of debated provenance such as these needs to take seriously the implications of both local and international cultures for the qualities of works that develop within them and needs to complicate the perceived role played by group

dynamics. The existence of groups and the effects of their dynamics—both inner-group and inter-group—are undoubtedly relevant to the study of the phenomena visible in our texts, but the evaluation of these factors needs to be complicated on at least three fronts.

First, we need to acknowledge how little we actually know about the complexity of religious thought and practice in antiquity. This is the case not least because of the relative proportions of the literature and material culture that have survived and that have been lost. It is simply a matter of intellectual humility to acknowledge that our knowledge is limited to the point where attempts at categorization can be dangerously under-informed. Such categorization is pseudo-scientific.

Second, we need to recognize that our understanding of specific groups or communities in antiquity has often given too much priority to particular items of textual evidence, those associated with “elite cultural providers” who may be particularly interested in aligning or demarcating the identity of their group with and from others and whose values may not be truly reflective of the groups they purport to represent. As well as shaping perceptions about the character and extent of overarching religious traditions (e.g., Judaism and Christianity), this tendency is linked both to the concept of the “community,” in the sense of the bounded and identifiable group, and also to that of the “network,” whether this is of a religious or philosophical sort (the two, of course, not being mutually exclusive). There is a growing acknowledgement of the need to correct such a tendency by paying appropriate attention to material culture and non-textual evidence, by which more can be discovered about the lived religion of the populace and their everyday devotional lives. This, however, has sometimes been approached with its own unfortunate binary of elite-literate vs non-elite-non-literate. Where there needs to be further development—and I hope that this work will play a role in this—is in the use of specific kinds of *textual* evidence as a means of investigating the qualities of those who may represent a literate class, and thus are also “elite cultural providers,” but who cannot easily be located within the cleanly defined intellectual or ideological worlds of the (ultimately) dominant traditions, the known communities and the recognizable networks.

Third, we need to consider the significance of *cultural* influence, including at the local level, and give thought to how we might analyze this. The identification of the emergent culture of a place as a factor in the development of literature has the potential to challenge quite radically our modelling of conceptual exchange. When a “bounded-group” model dominates, we tend to think of texts or traditions

as things that belong to nations or states, existing within borders that, at some point, they may cross. Jewish texts and traditions *cross* into Christianity or into Islam, after which they begin a process of naturalization, the results of which can be isolated from their *Vorlagen*. This will tend to accompany some notion of a trajectory, as the text or tradition develops. Even if the border is considered open to two-way traffic, there will still generally be a presumption that the tradition evolves in a somewhat linear fashion, even if the line is not straightforward or direct. When, however, we shift to the level of culture, a much more complex and much less linear picture of influences and developments emerges. Places affect the kinds of discourse that emerge within their geographical bounds, often through the particular intersections and connections that occur distinctively at this location.

To consider this, I invoked the model of the rhizome developed by Deleuze and Guattari. This is an image of non-linear and acentered complexity which, as they deploy it, serves to emphasize the primacy and priority of diversity in the generation of new cultural goods. That is, novelty does not emerge from some latent property internal to the tradition, creating a new branch through the division and differentiation of an originally singular thing; rather it emerges precisely from the connection of different things that occupy a local space within a web. These organic machines generate *as they connect*, and once this is appreciated, their image of the rhizome can be seen as a holistic way of understanding cultural ecology, and not merely the arrangement of tubers, mosses and funghi. This image—of non-linear, web-type connections—contrasts with that of the tree, which is effectively a conceptualizing of development that is quite singular in its terms, even if the thing itself can be divided into roots, branches and trunk; the tree is its own thing and could be lifted from its environment without ceasing to be what it is. The study of the pseudepigrapha, located as it generally has been within the modern discipline of biblical studies, has generally been interested in what Deleuze and Guattari call “tree logic”; I am here suggesting the need for the logic of the rhizome, of the cultural ecology, to balance or even contextualize this.

Alongside the model of the rhizome, I noted the value of nissology—*island studies*—to the analysis of religious culture in antiquity. At first, this may seem like a strange body of research to draw into the study of literatures primarily associated with mainland bodies, but island studies are typically concerned with cultures that have a distinctive local shape in the overlapping or contested “margins” of colonizing powers. Their status as marginal is not, of course, one that they confer upon themselves: it is

the status they have in the eyes of those associated with the colonizing centres, the imperial cities and the networks based in them. From their own perspective, their place is central, even if there are particular symbolic places that are venerated in its tradition. As such, it may be as much in one world as in another, with linguistic phenomena and characteristics that reflect this. The Western Isles of Scotland are as Nordic as they are Scottish or British, with a local language that hybridizes historical Norse vocabulary with the Celtic language, Gaelic, spoken alongside English. For many centuries, the distinctive linguistic culture of these islands preserved traditions and ways of thinking visible even among those who participated in the denominational networks associated with the imperial centres, the representatives of which were clearly troubled by what they saw. Similarly, the territories that we bundle together as Syro-Palestine were as Asian as they were Mediterranean, with complexes of local languages (some of which have been forgotten) and transnational ones; religious practices in this context are often similarly subjected to criticism by the representatives of the authoritative networks. Nissology invites reflection on the relevance of its categories to non-island contexts, even to the point of framing the world as an archipelago, and it has a distinctive relevance to geographical spaces that are centred in the overlap of empires. The phenomena at work, moreover, operate at different levels of map scale: if there are major empires, there are also minor ones. The more we zoom in on a particular region, the more we will find complicated and fluid relationships between different centres within that region, sometimes warm and sometimes tense.

The discourse drawn from island studies gives distinctive purchase on the kind of liminality that may be characteristic of those who inhabit such spaces and who, in such contexts, may participate in the lives of networked communities. The word “liminality” has come to be used in a range of quite determined ways in the disciplines of modern research, often in relation to a directional transition from one state to another (through a rite of passage or a journey) but sometimes also in relation to dialogue across group boundaries. My use of the word here does not entirely reflect either of these, for all that they may have a certain relevance to this particular project. Rather, I am interested in a kind of liminality that is experienced by many in island communities and that is paralleled by those who belong to minority cultures (often associated with language communities) embedded within dominant cultures. This kind of liminality involves a moving back and forth between worlds (those of the empires and their languages and those of the home itself), or an inhabiting of several at once, such that the borders

between them become blurred and elements from each are carried into the other. Locally significant traditions and practices, including some more commonly associated with different religious networks, may become incorporated into the life of the community, even if instinctively kept out of certain formal contexts.

When the island or the minority home are made normative to the evaluation of this, such liminality is consequently normalized; it is simply what happens. When the centre of colonial authority is normalized, however, the urban hub in which the network may be based, the liminality is othered, made peripheral or marginal, and is often labelled as syncretistic or primitive in some way. These are characteristic labels of colonized peoples, whether still in their colonies or living as minorities within the empire.

The points of equivalence between these phenomena and those considered in relation to “orientalism” are obvious and they are relevant both to our analytical prejudices, as scholars shaped by the modern empires, and to the phenomena of cultural colonization in antiquity. Here, again, Deleuze and Guattari’s insights are useful, for their model of the rhizome is not developed naively; rather, they recognize that cultural ecologies contain knots of arborescence, intellectual despotisms and hierarchies that need to be recognized without being permitted the primacy that they might claim for themselves. The distinctive problem we face is that as modern scholars formed in such knots, we might be unable to recognize anything else in the worlds we visit, not seeing the ecological wood for the trees.

The kind of liminality I describe here may, in fact, be representative of a fairly large proportion of the populace. That is to say, the largest proportion of the “community,” including some of the literate elite, may not have been functionally committed to the boundaries considered important by the network representatives and may have lived in ways that transgressed their definitions. The Am(ei) ha-Aretz and the Second Church exemplify this kind of liminality, with evidence of mutual involvement in each other’s institutions, but, crucially, they represent their own kind of deep piety and radical faithfulness. It is a mistake to presume that they were non-elite and non-literate and, therefore, that they left no literature of their own. A work like 2 Enoch, which seems to modern scholars so syncretistic, may be the handiwork of these literate liminal people. Recent challenges to models of both Jewish and Christian cultures in antiquity have highlighted the role of wealthy local patriarchs in relation to

contextualized communities, a factor that complicates significantly the status and influence of those identified with the wider network at a localized level.

The Significance of Groups within the Cultural Rhizome

This is not to say that groups and networks are irrelevant to our study, but rather to say that their significance needs to be contextualized within something more rhizomatic or ecological, where the truly generative dynamics might occur in the overlapping limina or in the interstitial spaces that cannot be assigned to one group or another. This is important to the methodological framing of research into the provenance of the pseudepigrapha. While there have been some welcome efforts to establish a more detailed or granular picture of the groups who may have been involved in the generation of the pseudepigrapha, and to reassess the criteria by which works are evaluated as belonging to one or other of these groups, these still treat groups themselves as the key factor. It is telling that such approaches typically draw upon models of classification from the biological sciences—and outdated models at that—for the use of these reflects a tendency to approach groups and their texts presumptively as *species* or as *class*, things that are typically categorized in relational “trees.”

One corollary of this preoccupation with groups is a particular way of evaluating apparently polemical elements in the text. Arguably, biblical scholarship and cognate areas of research have reached too quickly for “polemics” as a label for elements found in the text, partly because the scholarly task has been framed by grand accounts of dialectical progress. Even where polemical elements are legitimately identified, however, there is a danger that they are wrongly understood to be driven principally by inter-group dynamics, rather than by the dynamics of complex cultures in which ideas and concepts are contested.

Even when groups *are* involved and when they are genuinely engaging in polemics directed at some “other” (whether real or fictive), their values may be more decisively shaped by the culture that has shaped them than by the lineage and history they consider themselves to occupy. The likeness that future historians will see when considering contemporary evangelicalism will not be with the apostolic or early Reformed traditions that they generally claim as their formative heritage, but with modernity itself, in its different American and British forms. They will find greater similarity between modern

American humanists and modern American evangelicals than they will between the latter and the early churches. This, of course, is itself a gross simplification, since there is immense diversity within evangelicalism, but that only serves to make the point more forcefully. A piece of writing produced by such a group may be marked by polemics focused on boundaries, but what it *actually* signifies might be something else, something that is not in reality exclusive to this group.

It needs also to be considered that there are kinds of groups and communities that *do* preserve a greater continuity with their traditions. The comment made about modern evangelicalism and the heritage of the church may not be so easily transferred to modern Coptic communities, for example. This, however, highlights the role that linguistic factors play in the formation and sustaining of identity. Complex webs of divergence and solidarity can emerge across linguistic borders in spaces where minority languages coexist.

Taken together, these points suggest the value of moving away from approaches to the pseudepigrapha of uncertain origin that are primarily concerned with tracing the association of ideas with groups (or that prioritize this association), and towards approaches interested in how ideas and traditions might develop in non-linear but often localized ways. Importantly, the ideas and the traditions will not be static; it is quite legitimate to acknowledge that things will look different in the second and in the fourth centuries. But the developments will not be linear and there may be particular elements that recur even as they are renewed or transformed in particular places or along particular routes.

I repeat the point that this is not to minimize the role played by groups or to claim that 2 Enoch is not the work of a group. Rather, it is to acknowledge that the factors at work are not reducible to the level of the group—they are more thoroughly ecological—and that our knowledge of the groups that may have been involved is limited. Combining these two points of acknowledgement, we need to recognize that our task may be one of considering what we know of local cultural ecologies, and their non-linear developments through time, than the construction of classificational trees.

Reviewing the Provenance of the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch

My review of the scholarship on the provenance of 2 Enoch and the Parables of Enoch, in Chapters 2 and 3 respectively, was largely intended to resource and contextualize my comparative work in the subsequent chapters. While this monograph is principally concerned with 2 Enoch, and seeks to explore points of connection and divergence between this work and a number of others, the Parables of Enoch occupies a particularly important place in the task. There are a number of distinctive points of equivalence in the two works that suggest a closer relationship between them than has generally been recognized, but there are also some significant points of divergence. Mapping the similarities and differences onto what we know of literature and culture in antiquity may help us to map both works, if tentatively, onto possible contexts and lines of transmission.

There is little benefit here in rehearsing all of the detail from the literature review, since the substantive points are really developed in the course of the constructive research. Several points can, however, usefully be isolated and highlighted here. First, the review highlighted that the discussion of both works has been dominated by a rather simple binary between Jewish and Christian, with each considered as groups or communities and the respective texts considered as the products of groups that may, at some point, have crossed the border from Judaism into Christianity. Groups that cannot easily be located within the traditional definitions of these religions and their known sub-groupings are typically categorized as fringe sects. Second, the review highlighted the extent to which biblical scholarship has been interested in these works precisely in relation to matters of origin and trajectory, with the contested Jewishness of the works a matter of importance primarily in relation to how the works might have functioned in relation to the evolution of beliefs. The trajectories, moreover, are considered in fairly straightforward and linear ways; they progress in a line, even if the line might meander. Third, the question of locality is present in the debates about both, but in ways that reflect further standard binaries in the history of biblical scholarship: there is little in the debate that moves beyond the possibilities of Palestine (although, interestingly in the case of the Parables, a distinctively Galilean provenance has been claimed by some) and Egypt, particularly Alexandria. These two options are themselves shaped by some of the standard categories in biblical scholarship, with Alexandria identified particularly with “Hellenistic Judaism” and Palestine with a “Palestinian Judaism.” The latter

is often tacitly regarded (especially by New Testament scholars) as less coloured by other cultural influences.

Once the wider region of Roman Syria is recognized to be a frontier space and is moved to the center of the map, the problems with this kind of approach become clear: influences from the East and West, and (often neglected) North and South are always at play, with the Judaism of Palestine shaped by philosophical, cultural and religious traditions from the Mediterranean and Asia. The former has generally been emphasized, and the latter subordinated, perhaps unconsciously. Alexandrian Judaism undoubtedly had its own distinctive local qualities—although some care should be taken not to presume that Philo is necessarily personally representative of these—but these should not be mapped onto a Palestinian-Hellenistic binary. Furthermore, the Alexandrian culture was celebrated internationally, with many of its goods transmitted in other cultures. There are some especially important examples of this in the Syrian heritage, notably in relation to astronomy and religious philosophy, but those iterations of Egyptian culture are marked by a distinctive colouration that reflects the influence of other local factors.

Brought to the scholarship on the provenance of the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch, these insights highlight the need to disrupt the hegemony of a particular set of scholarly categories and its shaping effect on the analysis of the works. A greater attention to local factors and a decoupling of these from the model of the trajectory are required. This does not mean adopting a synchronic approach (although there may be benefits in this in relation to particular questions), but rather breaking the presumed identification of “diachronicity” with “trajectory”: the former term can properly be used to acknowledge that the temporal moment is one of many factors in the rhizomatic intersection of influences, where the latter ascribes a linearity of development, and a certain force of progress, that is artificial. Once the concept of the trajectory has been complicated in this way, the character of the relationship between the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch may also be reframed, as points of commonality and divergence can be identified, and the respective age of the works recognized, without the need to plot these onto a line of development that will end somewhere else.

One final point may be noted here, in relation to the review of scholarship on provenance. Surprisingly little has been focused specifically on the “theology proper” of the two works, that is, their respective discourse on the nature of God and God’s being. The word “theology” may be used, but often

in a broad and not a specific way. This observation is important because the underlying discourse about the nature and being of God and the gods may affect multiple points of detail within the books and may reveal particular influences to be at work.

Common Patterns in The Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch

Chapter 4 incorporated and developed the preliminary study that I published in the *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* concerning some of the similarities in the metrological and meteorological imagery in the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch. In its original, independent form, the study traced these suggestive correspondences and noted some limited parallels that could be noted in other ancient literatures from antiquity, with the evidence taken to indicate a particularly close relationship between the Parables and 2 Enoch within the broader Enochic corpus and some promising lines of investigation into connections to the Syrian environment. Placed within the context of the present work, that initial exercise takes on new significance as the starting point for a study that does not simply broaden its scope to consider further detail, but also presses down deeper into the relevant texts and contexts. The surface detail considered in Chapter 4, of shared patterns of imagery, can now be seen to reflect shared theologies proper, yet there are also significant differences that reflect particular developments—“developments,” not necessarily “trajectories”—in the theological landscape of late antiquity. Those suggestive points of contact with the Apostolic Constitutions, in particular, are considered in greater detail in Chapters 5 and (especially) 6, in relation to providence, cosmogony, and the significance of the *imago dei*, but the value of the comparison is not in identifying the origin of 2 Enoch as located in the same circles; rather, it is in placing both works within a world of discourse about God and cosmos that appears to reflect late antique religious culture, particularly in Syro-Mesopotamia. This, of course, is the same world that would play a formative role in the development of the rabbinic material as writings.

That initial study was focused on the similarity of patterns in the imagery about metrology and meteorology and the involvement of God and the angels with this. In subsequent chapters, I traced further similarities, including in the radically developed or programmatic emphasis on the disclosure of heavenly secrets to Enoch, the common interest in the personal figure of Wisdom, and in the

representation of Enoch's ascent and transformation as physical or bodily, linked to his installation to an eternal and mediatorial role in heaven.

In each case, these common patterns also distinguish the Parables and 2 Enoch from the Enochic material known from Qumran, even though both show clear points of dependency upon this, which suggests a particularly close relationship between the two books that are our primary concern in this study within the context of the Enoch literature more broadly. The similarities are not of a kind that suggests direct textual dependency of one work on the other, however; while there are common patterns, there is not the kind of close replication of language and structure—even allowing for the effects of translation—that might indicate that 2 Enoch is dependent upon the Parables. Instead, they are of a kind that suggests a common tradition, of a kind that might be explained with reference to culture and the popularity of tropes and images within a culture. This observation, now set within the context of a study concerned with cultural influences, partially affirms and partially redirects Orlov's argument that the Parables constitutes a kind of dead-end or side-branch in the Enochic traditions. The Parables may not play a role in advancing some of the key themes that seem to exhibit a development from the early Enochic literature to the later rabbinic Enoch traditions, and may not serve as a bridging text. But this does not mean that they are unimportant to the *growth* of the swirling stock of Enoch traditions, when these traditions are considered rhizomatically; the growth of a rhizome is different from the growth of a tree. Framed in such a way, they may be radically more important to the emergence of 2 Enoch than has previously been recognized.

This observation also connects to one significant point of development in the content of Chapter 4 when compared to the article in *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* that it draws upon. In the original article, I devoted part of the discussion to the so-called 3 Enoch, but treated in isolation from the Hekhalot literature as a whole. In this monograph, I have reworked the engagement with this particular macroform to take into account developments in the study of the Hekhalot literature and to recognize the lateness of the 3 Enoch macroform within this complex and fluid body of writings. This is not just a matter of scholarly thoroughness. The matters of discussion in current research into the Hekhalot literature, particularly in terms of their relationship to eclectic traditions and cultures in late antiquity and the early medieval period, dovetail in interesting ways with my observations about 2 Enoch. In both cases, the textual forms themselves are non-stable, bearing material witness to the

fluidity of their content. But in both cases, too, the thing that has an identifiable coherence—as a recognizable book or a macroform—carries marks that suggest it took form later rather than earlier. I agree with those who have seen connections between 2 Enoch, the rabbinic writings and the Hekhalot literature, but I am inclined to think that these reflect a common emergence *as writings* in late antiquity, within the particular contexts and dynamic factors of Syria and Sasanian Babylonia.

Coloration and Context, Cultures and Fashions

The initial comparison of the common patterns in the Parables and 2 Enoch suggests that the latter is more schematized, possibly indicating that it represents a development of the imagery found in the former. Our growing sensitivity to the problem with the “trajectory” model should make us wary of reaching a judgement too quickly on this matter, but the further exploration of the common patterns of imagery and their relationship to other cultural works from different times and places within the broader sweep of antiquity seems to support the conclusion. Here, notably, the thread of theology proper becomes important to the study, since much of the imagery encountered in the two works seems to be shaped by the contours of discourse about God and divine being in antiquity, with the imagery of divine economy—the engagement of God with the cosmos and the distinctive place of the human within this relationship—linked to this. The distinction between theology proper and economy is, in certain regards, artificial; this is not least the case because the involvement of gods in the cosmos, and even as part of the cosmos, is a core element in much philosophical and mythological reflection in antiquity. I use it, however, to draw attention to the evidence that our writers were interested in the question of what their god is and how this god relates to other entities. There is a strand of biblical scholarship that presumes Jewish thinkers in general to be disinterested in philosophical reflection on the nature of deity, Philo being the exception that proves the rule; when such scholarship uses the language of theology, it often does so quite loosely to reference notions of creation or salvation. An unreconstructed notion of “monotheism” often lies behind this tendency: if Jews believed that there is only one god, then philosophical debate about divine nature is effectively made irrelevant. The writings

we study here, however, reflect the influence of developing philosophical reflections on divinity, including those that seek to differentiate the Highest God from the other deities.

The Parables of Enoch are characterized by a particular representation of God as lofty and *somewhat* static: the involvement of God with the cosmos is distinctively rendered as a mediated thing, enacted through intermediary beings, acting in response to divine commands. The insights of speech-act theory can help us to see that this remains a distinctive mode of involvement with the cosmos and its constituent members and processes; it should not be considered as radical a break with the variety of biblical traditions about divine involvement in creation and providence as might be presumed. Indeed, the representation of God in such terms makes dense use of prior scriptural material, of a sort that maintains a sense of continuity with biblical representations of Israel's God. By comparison to both the biblical material and other early Jewish writings, the representation is undoubtedly distinctive, but not in such a way that the Parables appears alien to the landscape of early Judaism.

The representation of Wisdom in the Parables would seem to provide further support for this. In Chapter 5, I traced some of the contours in the traditions about Wisdom as a personal figure, which may include both personifications and person-identifications. These traditions are heavily coloured by other religious imageries from Egypt and Syro-Mesopotamia, with some merging of imageries associated with particular deities and transference from one to the other. For its part, the Parables of Enoch seems to be especially closely related to the Jewish discourse about Wisdom in the late second temple period, with some obvious points of resemblance or even debate with the traditions found in Sirach and also in Wisdom of Solomon. The apparently intentional contrastive parallel with Sirach, in particular, suggests that the Parables can be placed within the ideological debates of the late second temple period.

By contrast, the references to Wisdom in 2 Enoch exhibit some quite striking parallels to imagery and language used in the Apostolic Constitutions, a work generally held to have been composed in Syria, with both works connecting that figure to the creation of humanity. The sections of the Apostolic Constitutions that 2 Enoch resembles may have incorporated material from Jewish synagogue prayers, although some careful analysis suggests that the specific points of overlap are with the material added by Christians. The similarities take on further significance when compared to some of the accounts of creation typically clustered under the heading "gnostic," including reports of the fourth century Syrian teacher 'Audi that are found in the later writings of Theodore bar Konai; both 2 Enoch and the Apostolic

Constitutions present the creation of man in terms that appear polemically insistent on the direct involvement of God in the creation of the human, with Wisdom acting in direct obedience to the divine command. The detail of the creation account in 2 Enoch can readily be explained in the context of later antiquity, particularly in Syria (or Syro-Mesopotamia), as a rather “conservative” response to these various gnostic cosmogonies. This suggestion gains some support from the parallels I noted in Chapter 7 between the language used in Sethian and Mandaean texts of Enosh’s fear and some passages in 2 Enoch.

The suggestion is also supported by some of the technical language in 2 Enoch that reflects a developed account of *creatio ex nihilo*, of the kind that only emerges from the later part of the second century onwards, in Syria, and does so in response to the same kind of gnostic cosmogonies that appear to be challenged in the account of Wisdom’s involvement in the creation of the human. That language is connected to the influence of Platonic thought on theological discourse (with the early gnostic movements also influenced by this, of course), and emerges also in the use of negative language to affirm the categorical uniqueness of the highest god. Examples of such language can be found also in Philo, but it becomes widely used in Late Antiquity, as Neoplatonism become particularly and widely influential on theological discourse. The fact that it is combined in 2 Enoch with the imagery of measurement may be especially significant, since this is a feature in the development of Platonic negative theology that only occurs later. Here, too, the terminological differences in the theological discourse of 2 Enoch and the Parables become particularly striking: for all its resonances with the imagery of a highest God, the Parables of Enoch lacks this kind of technical Platonic language, which would make sense if the work comes from an earlier point in Antiquity, when Platonism was less culturally dominant and its language less pervasively influential than it was in later Antiquity.

If these suggestion are correct, then it raises an interesting question about what 2 Enoch might attest in relation to the mutual concerns of Jews, Christians and those not easily categorized as either to resist representations of God and the cosmos that were considered unacceptable. Here, it seems to me an important observation that the polemics in 2 Enoch appear to be directed towards circulating beliefs and not necessarily towards groups; they are ideological, not sociological in quality. If 2 Enoch is Jewish, then it is striking that it has so much in common—such common cause—with Christian writings concerned by the beliefs being advocated by some influential movements. If it is Christian, it is striking

that that it engages in a response to these by drawing on Jewish mythologies. If it is “other,” then it is striking how theologically conservative that other is, when measured against the traditions of both Judaism and Christianity. Where Andersen suggested that the work must have been associated with a fringe group, a view that in certain regards I affirm, I am suggesting that it has a remarkable amount in common with the Jewish and Christian groups that did not accept gnostic or Sethian theologies and cosmogonies.

Those beliefs were widespread in the West Asian and Eastern Mediterranean, but the particular parallels identified seem to be with works typically associated with Syro-Mesopotamia, with Syria and Sassanian Babylon. This is interesting, given the close similarity between the representation of Enoch’s bodily ascent and physical transformation in 2 Enoch and in the Hekhalot literature. The Parables also, arguably, has an account of Enoch’s ascent and transformation that emphasizes its bodily qualities, but the details are not as obviously close to those of 3 Enoch as are those of 2 Enoch. Rather than seeking to force all of this back into the context of Second Temple Judaism, I suggest it can be read fruitfully in relation to the fluid contexts of late antiquity.

If it is allowed that 2 Enoch may have taken textual form quite late in antiquity and in the context of Syria or Sasanian Babylonia, then we might reflect on two other features of the work. The first is the scale of interest in the number of books that Enoch wrote in his capacity as heavenly scribe, as reported in 2 Enoch 23:6. While there may be a number of traditions and influences at work on this imagery, the resemblance to the interest in books associated with Manichaeism is striking; this would be unsurprising if 2 Enoch took form in a geographical context and in a time period where Manichaeism was particularly influential. The second is the extensive use of fire imagery, both in the formation of the cosmos and in the representation of the Lord. Again, there may be a number of traditions and influences at work, including elements in the biblical material, but the density and scale of the imagery is far beyond what is encountered in scripture. The association of fire and divinity may reflect the influence of Iranian thought, though there are also some correspondences with representations of Osiris.

Devotional Practices, Divine Reciprocity and the Logics of Sacrifice in 2 Enoch and Late Antiquity

Chapters 8 and 9 were focused particularly on the evidence for actual devotional practice in 2 Enoch, with the Parables now set to one side because of its lack of such detail. That point itself is interesting, of course, especially when considered in relation to the amount of evidence about such practices in 2 Enoch, but it does not require detailed analysis.

The first key observation to be made about the references to regular devotional piety in 2 Enoch is that some of them are rather difficult to map onto second temple Judaism, whether in the context of Palestine, Alexandria or some other diaspora location. In particular, the imagery about multiplying lamps before the face of the Lord—with the generosity involved in the offering of many lamps rewarded in kind by God—is difficult to align with Jewish practices from that period. In fact, it is also difficult to align this with the formally approved position of the literate tradition of the early church. Clearly lamp lighting was popular in early Christian circles, but it was also criticized in the writings of some early Church figures, particularly because of its similarity to pagan practices. Interestingly, the lighting of lamps was especially popular in the Demeter cult and in the cult of Theos Hypsistos, and both of these might have influenced the circles in which 2 Enoch emerged; Demeter is especially closely associated with agricultural blessing, and 2 Enoch seems to reflect an agricultural setting, and Theos Hypsistos was a “monotheistic” movement (the name of which resonates with the biblical story of Melchizedek), affirming the priority of worship due to the highest god, a concern closely aligned with the celebrations of the One in 2 Enoch. It is not difficult to imagine that in the common piety which existed on the edges of the theological networks—not just among the illiterate non-elite, but also among literates disinterested in the values of the networks *as networks*—these cults coloured the perception of what devotional piety to the One God who ruled harvests, flocks and herds might look like. The liturgical deployment of fire (in the form of votive lamps) appears to be at odds with the values associated with the Elchaisites, a point that is worthy of note as we consider how 2 Enoch might align with Jewish and Jewish Christian groups in antiquity.

The second noteworthy feature of the devotional imagery in 2 Enoch is its radical emphasis on divine reciprocity. The elements can certainly be traced to biblical imagery, but there is a systematic

reworking of these to emphasize that God will respond in kind to the one who brings offerings; the verbs used of the devotional act and the verbs used of the divine response are characteristically identical or symmetrical, in a way that moves beyond anything encountered in the underlying biblical material. Of particular interest in this picture is the representation of promises to bring votive offerings and the divine response to their fulfilment and non-fulfilment. Drawing on the work of Michael Satlow, I noted the inscriptional evidence for a particular flourishing in the practices of votive offering among Jews in late antiquity, apparently paralleling a similar popularity among Christians. What is particularly interesting about Satlow's study is his observation that this flourishing appears to be linked to a distinctive *mentalité* about divine reciprocity and immanence, of a kind that renders the votive as a kind of bartering act. Taken together with the other strands of evidence considered here, this contributes to a picture within which 2 Enoch functions as part of the religious culture of late antiquity.

2 Enoch also contains elements that appear to represent a particular theorization of sacrifice, or at least a response to philosophical critiques of sacrifice. This is linked to the offering of lamps and also of animals (a point that I will consider further below). The understanding of sacrificial significance is, interestingly, rather different from the one found in Philo, and emphasizes the role of the sacrifice in the testing of the offerer's heart. There is no indication that bloodless sacrifices are considered superior, and there is arguably a response to the charge that the bringing of animal sacrifices reflects an uneducated way of thinking about the gods (or, at least, the Highest God), i.e., that they need such offerings as sustenance. 2 Enoch advocates a divine aseity, affirming that God is non-contingent, but it also insists that sacrifice remains important, and seems to reflect an existential concern that the killing of animals is undertaken with proper observance of regulations. While it is possible to make sense of this in an earlier context, I suggest that it is most readily explicable in the context of late antiquity, in the wake of Lucian of Samosata's satire and Porphyry's arguments about the killing of animals (and probably further examples of which we are today unaware), but also in the wake of the revitalizing of pagan sacrifice that followed Iamblichus. All of this makes a plausible context in which to read what appears to be a "pro-animal-sacrifice" work, concerned to resist the allegation that animal sacrifice is theologically, intellectually and philosophically defective. Far from seeking to plot 2 Enoch onto a trajectory of beliefs about sacrifice, this is about recognizing that the detail of 2 Enoch might make best

sense at a particular moment in the generation of discourse about sacrifice and in its cultures of performance, both of which are more complicated and fluid than traditional models typically allow.

If these elements suggest that 2 Enoch emerged from late antiquity, other details reinforce the growing suspicion that it may have done so in the broad geographical context of Syro-Mesopotamia. Pines's arguments for Zoroastrian influence, both on the practices of animal binding and the underlying rationale for these, do not *necessarily* indicate such a provenance—Zoroastrian influence was widespread, as was Iranian influence more generally—but taken in conjunction with the other strands of evidence that are suggestive of an origin in Syria or Sassanian Babylon, they are most readily explained as reflecting that provenance.

Towards an Account of Transmission

Given all that I have written to this point, I seek here to avoid the language of origins and trajectory, but some account of the relationship between the Parables of Enoch and 2 Enoch needs to be given, since the connections and divergences of these two books was the original warrant for this study. Here, too, the similarities that both works show with Matthew's Gospel can be considered, although there is no need to do so in any detail or with any depth.

Much of the study has reinforced the widely held opinion that the Parables of Enoch is probably a work that emerged in early Judaism, during the second temple period or shortly afterwards. The support for this view provided by the present study largely lies in the points of contrast with 2 Enoch, where the influence of apparently later factors is so visible. The Parables of Enoch lack the kind of developed theological Platonism found in 2 Enoch, along with the evidence for a developed and widely influential discourse of *creatio ex nihilo*; they also lack the apparent pushback on emergent gnostic theologies, of the kind specifically connected to Syro-Mesopotamia. The discourse around Wisdom in the Parables seems not just vaguely but quite specifically shaped by the imagery of Wisdom found in early Jewish works like Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon, lacking the parallels found in 2 Enoch to the Apostolic Constitutions and, contrastively, with gnostic works. The relative lack of interest in any regular cultic or devotional practice when compared to 2 Enoch is also striking and might, actually, suggest that the work

was produced at a time when the cult was centered in Jerusalem and could both be taken for granted and, on a daily basis, be treated as less immediately relevant.

It is not possible to link the Parables to a specific location, and the various claims for a Galilean provenance should be regarded as speculative (with any suggestion of a consensus for this challenged). It is quite plausible, however, given the links that can be traced between the Dead Sea Scrolls and the heritage of Syrian Christianity, to think that the work might have been composed in Syro-Palestine during the first century CE and transmitted within the Syrian environment, particularly with the movements and displacements of people that occurred in the wake of the Jewish war with Rome. The Parables would have retained its identity in this space, and it may well have been here that it was incorporated into the wider Enoch collection, giving rise to what we recognize as the Book of Enoch, but it may also have influenced other local traditions, including the emergent Christian traditions represented in the Gospel of Matthew and eventually also the Sethian and Manichean traditions that drew upon Enochic and Noachic traditions. It seems likely to me that it was in this context that 2 Enoch would eventually emerge, but only at a later stage, inheriting not only some detail from the Parables (though in such a way that suggests a wider cultural popularity and not necessarily a direct textual influence) but also a cultural library of other texts shaped by the Enochic legacy and also by the development of philosophical-religious discourse, some of which articulated ideas that needed to be resisted. Framed in these terms, the influences and tensions can be appreciated as cultural factors rather than *necessarily* as inter-groups dynamics.

This would also help to explain the similarities between 2 Enoch and Matthew, which are different to those that link the gospel to the Parables. In the case of the Parables of Enoch, the links with Matthew include some general points (the apparent interest in the scribe, as an apocalyptic figure, the developed interest in the figure of Wisdom, represented in terms that are similar to those found in Sirach, and perhaps the *mashal* as a formal feature) and the specific parallels in the representation of the enthroned Son of Man. While 2 Enoch shares some of the general parallels, particularly in relation to the apocalyptic scribe (with its own representation of Wisdom more closely linked to the later explicit iterations of Wisdom Christology than to Matthew's interest in Wisdom figuration), the links are more for the most part formal in character. The extensive use of sapiential forms like beatitudes, developed beyond what is encountered elsewhere in Jewish and Christian scripture, is an interesting parallel,

particularly when we note that there is little connection between the content of the beatitudes. The statements about swearing are more closely connected in terms of content, but there is no evidence of direct textual influence. By locating the connection at the level of the culture in Syria, and the potential role played by the Jewish-Christian groups in the area who have often been associated with circulating versions of Matthew's gospel, we can explain the various points of connection between Matthew and 2 Enoch without having to suggest any points of direct influence. As far as my thesis here is concerned, nothing turns on this, but it does illustrate the potential value of shifting the discourse to the level of culture and away from texts.

The Pseudepigrapha and the Literate Liminal: Programmatic Implications

I offer here, finally, some reflections on the programmatic implications of this study for research into pseudepigrapha of debated origins and the importance that they may have to the study of religion in antiquity. My category of "the literate liminal" can now be seen to have particular value, when the study of these two Enochic works is framed as a contribution to the wider discussion of religious literature and phenomena.

Much, or even most, of the research into the pseudepigrapha has been shaped by the academic agenda of biblical scholarship and by the dominant models that it employs, which I discussed in Chapter 1 and in Section 1 of this chapter. Such scholarship is generally interested in origins and trajectories, as these relate to categorized groups and sub-groups, the beliefs and praxes of which are reconstructed from the textual legacies associated with their dominant authoritative traditions. This has had a distortive influence on scholarly treatments of antiquity, since the beliefs associated with the networks of elite cultural providers, comprising only small fraction of the populace, are considered representative of the population more extensively. While such approaches have been helpfully disrupted in recent decades, the alternatives often introduce their own problematic binaries, with "elite" often opposed to "popular" and this opposition further mapped onto "literate" and "non-literate." The key element that is often overlooked (or, perhaps better, is presumed without being adequately complicated) is that of the "network"; more attention needs to be paid to the possibility that there may be some who are wealthy

and literate, erudite and educated, but are not committed to all of the values that may differentiate one network (whether philosophical or religious) from another. This does not mean that the people in question are entirely outside the network, or are unaffected by its local presence, but that they occupy a liminal position, the liminality of which allows them also to participate in other networks or groups, or to share in their practices. I have noted multiple examples of such liminality in the course of this study: the Christians castigated by Chrysostom for attending synagogues, those castigated by Vigilantius for lighting votive lamps during the day, the Jewish Am(ei) ha-Aretz who incorporated Helios and zodiac imagery into their synagogues, the Sethians who fused Platonic categories with local mythologies. At some points, the liminality may turn into exclusion, but it can also move in the other direction, with a closer integration or absorption of the liminal and their goods, often accomplished through an accommodation of their perceived eccentricities.

I have argued through this study that 2 Enoch, in particular, is a work of such “literate liminals.” As apparently eclectic, evidently strange, and seemingly incohesive as its elements are, it also evinces a striking “conservatism” on many theological matters. I use this word with an awareness of its anachronism, because it captures the alignment of 2 Enoch with more recognizably Jewish and Christian traditions and the theological values that are advocated in these, often *against* those that we tend to categorize as Gnostic. It is difficult to fit 2 Enoch neatly into the well-known streams and groupings of Jewish or Christian tradition, but it is also impossible to associate with the known alternatives, the values of which it explicitly rejects. To categorize it as liminal allows us to explain this, but as a written text, it must also be seen as the handiwork of wealthy, erudite, literate people. In fact, it seems to represent at points the commitment of these people to defending their practices in an erudite way to philosophical detractors. In its own way, the Parables of Enoch may also be seen as the work of the literate liminal, with an essential theology that emphasizes the lofty otherness of God in ways unique within early Judaism and that may well reflect Iranian influence, but that nevertheless share raw scriptural materials with other Jewish traditions. The liminality of both works allows them also to be integrated into Christian traditions, whether with the status of scripture or of edificational literature.

I suspect that many of the other pseudepigrapha that have proven difficult to categorize as Jewish or Christian can also be approached as the works of the literate liminal. The first major implication of this is that they may provide a commonly neglected window onto both lived religion and its associated

discourse in antiquity. Where some have sought to correct the over-reliance on particular texts by turning to material culture, this invites reflection on how these difficult-to-categorize texts might also contribute to a more complex account, once they are freed from an agenda that seeks to categorize them according to the categories of the dominant traditions.

The second major implication is that they may bear witness to the particular local qualities of this liminality. In my study of the Parables and 2 Enoch, this interest in localism remains rather broad; it is Syria that I have in view, as the geographical locale through which many of the lines of intersection run. That elements in the detail point towards Syria rather than Egypt, despite the sharing of many features that originate in the latter, is important and may be relevant to the study of other texts commonly linked to Alexandrian Judaism, but it remains the case that my interest in local dimensions still fairly broad. I suspect further work pursuing the approach might find evidence that links 2 Enoch more tightly to a particular region.

This prompts me to acknowledge the limitations of this particular study and to note the lines of further investigation that it invites. I have not engaged in any sustained way with some of the obvious representatives of late antique Syrian literature, such as the Macarian writings or those associated with Ephrem. Neither have I explored in depth the works that are often coordinated with the discussion of the Apostolic Constitutions, such as the Pseudo-Clementine literature. There is already some comparative work that considers the points of similarity and difference between 2 Enoch and these corpora, but this has tended to frame the relationship in terms of Jewish traditions and their influence, such that the Syrian material functions as evidence for the ongoing existence of Jewish mysticism somewhere in its background. The work I have developed in this study suggests that there is value in returning to this comparative task with a different set of framing questions, informed by the conceptualizations of mutuality and liminality developed here.

The pseudepigrapha, then, have the capacity to resource a new appreciation of the kinds of religious discourse practiced in antiquity by wealthy, erudite people (including, perhaps, those who functioned as local patriarchs) whose beliefs and practices were liminal to, and not entirely outside of, the known traditions of Judaism and Christianity. Of course, some of these might be categorized precisely as Jewish-Christianity or Christian Judaism. To return to the imagery used earlier: if the map is moved so that the frontier world of Roman Syria is placed in the centre, such literate liminality is less

easily regarded or labelled as marginal or fringe. The linguistics of liminality are not the same as the linguistics of marginalization; the latter is more distinctively centrist or even colonial in its instincts.

With this recognized, a further programmatic implication can be noted. If these pseudepigrapha provide evidence for a literate liminality that is coloured by local elements in the rhizome, and if the map is shifted to allow this liminality to be seen as a generative factor in local thought, then this might also have implications for the study of earlier texts, including those of early Judaism, of the New Testament, and of the early Christian movement. My study has been attentive to diachronic elements, to features that suggest an emergence of 2 Enoch in late antiquity rather than in the second temple period, but some of the generative factors that give rise to those features might be present in the same local environment at earlier points. Here, the distinction between a diachronic awareness and the assumption that this entails a trajectory is pivotal: a local culture, particularly a frontier one, might present certain generative features throughout its history that are more relevant to the study of writings emergent within it at any point than are putative parallels with contemporary literature that is culturally more remote. To probe this point: might there be greater benefit in reading philosophically charged New Testament works, such as Paul's letters, in conjunction with Syrian or Arab Neoplatonist writings than with contemporary Roman philosophy? This is, of course, too stark a formulation of the question, but it highlights that where the temporal adjacency (and hence relevance) of the Roman literature is widely recognized and factored into research, the geographical-cultural adjacency of later literature is not. If we are truly to decolonialize the study of the biblical material, the map needs to be shifted and the relevance of the local and not merely the temporal affirmed to literate liminals, among whom I suspect can be numbered New Testament authors and those who produced many of the pseudepigrapha that have eluded neat categorization.

Concluding Comments

My goal in this study was never to solve the enigma of 2 Enoch, but to reconsider its significance when framed within a complex account of conceptual ecologies in antiquity. It is valuable precisely because it is enigmatic, and because that status is truly reflective of the limits of our knowledge and analytical capacities and not its own intrinsically marginal qualities. By affirming and exploring this, we can allow

2 Enoch to destabilize our categories and to complexify helpfully our accounts of religion in antiquity. The findings are programmatic for the study of the pseudepigrapha more widely, particularly those of uncertain origin, and invite extensive reconsideration of what these works might signify and how this might relate to the various figures and communities that may have been involved in their composition and transmission, including the monastic groups that played such a key role in the preservation of these works.

The study has established a number of fruitful lines of investigation and has explored some important points of local conceptual entanglement. As I reach the conclusion, I am aware of how much remains to be explored, but the study has established some useful parameters for that exploration. In particular, the presence of eclectic philosophical elements in the cosmogonical material (including, particularly, Pythagorean ideas) might be explored further in the context of late antique Syria. Here, I think detailed comparison of this material and the instructional content of 2 Enoch with the representations of Elchasaite writings and those of Bardaisan is likely to be of value, particularly if cross-compared with Origen and with the Chaldean Oracles.

Given what we know of Bardaisan's cosmogony, and the influences on earlier Elchasaite and later Manichaean thought, it may also be fruitful to engage in comparative study with Indian cosmogonies and Chinese ones. Even here, however, the study invites a different approach to some that have been attempted in the past. Rather than seeking to reconstruct an underlying ur-myth, identifying this with an Indo-European religious tradition—an approach visible in previous research on the Adam Octipartite traditions—the study suggests that we should consider the elastic and recombinant qualities of cosmogonies to be of greatest interest, particularly as these are reflected at local levels.

This leads to a final suggestion, which is that future research into 2 Enoch would benefit from the insights of specialists in late antique and early medieval Syrian culture, particularly in relation to the distribution and local development of traditions and ideas and the inter-relationships of these with neighbouring areas. I have gestured quite broadly to Syria in this study, although often noting certain centres of activity in relation to particular threads in theological and philosophical debate. Antioch, for example, was home to some of the key developments in cosmogonical discourse that appear to be reflected in 2 Enoch (*creatio ex nihilo*), yet the eclectic cosmogony of the pseudepigraphon seems more broadly like what is seen in Bardaisan of Edessa. I have also gestured to Sasanian Babylonia, as a context

that may readily account for Iranian influences; the representations of animal slaughter, meanwhile, show some similarities to Armenia. Specialists in the developments of Syrian and Syriac culture in late antiquity and the early medieval period may see in the particular blending of elements in 2 Enoch the markers of particular local contexts, whether tightly at the level of specific cities, or more loosely at the level of regions that find themselves on one or other side of ideological drifts.

It should be clear that my argument leaves room for the possibility that 2 Enoch incorporates traditions and concepts that can be traced back to early Judaism. My findings are not straightforwardly opposed to those of the scholars who have argued that the work is early and Jewish; neither, for that matter, are they straightforwardly opposed to the developing arguments for Samaritan influence. Rather, by noting the prominence and centrality of features that are most readily explained in the context of late antiquity, I am arguing that the work recognizable as 2 Enoch—the Book of the Secrets of Enoch—emerged from its underlying traditions and formative influences at this later stage and in this particular cultural context. 2 Enoch is a witness to the vitality of those traditions, their capacity for renewal through recombination, and a witness to the complex mutualities of cultures in antiquity.

Cumulative Bibliography

Note: Modern works in Russian are listed in a separate section, to avoid confusion over the alphabetical ordering of entries.

- Adler, William. "A Dead End in the Enoch Trajectory: A Response to Andrei Orlov." Pages 137–42 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Agostini, Domenico, and Samuel Thrope, eds. *The Bundahišn: A New Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- Aitken, James, Hector M. Patmore, and Ishay Rosen-Zvi, eds. *The Evil Inclination in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- Akagi, Kai. *Proclaiming the Judge of the Living and the Dead: The Christological Significance of Judgement in Acts 10 and 17*. WUNT II:494. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.
- Alexander, Philip. "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch." Pages 223–315 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1: Apocalyptic Literature & Testaments*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- . "From Son of Adam to a Second God: Transformations of the Biblical Enoch." Pages 87–122 in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998.
- Andersen, Francis I. "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch: A New Translation with Introduction." Pages 91–222 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- . "The Sun in 2 Enoch." Pages 1–38 in *L'église Des Deux Alliances: Mémorial Annie Jaubert (1912–1980)*. Edited by Basil Lourié, Andrei A. Orlov, and Madeline Petit. *Orientalia Judaica Christiana* 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. *The Lies That Bind: Rethinking Identity: Creed, Country, Colour, Class, Culture*.

London: Profile, 2018.

Arbel, Daphna. "Enoch-Metatron — The Highest of All Tapsarim? 3 Enoch and Divinatory Traditions." *JSQ*

15.4 (2008): 289–320.

Argall, Randal A. *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation and Judgment*. SBLEJL 8. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Assefa, Daniel, Steve Delamarter, Garry Jost, Ralph Lee, and Curt Niccum. "The Textual History of the Ethiopic Old Testament Project (THEOT): Goals and Initial Findings." *Textus* 29.1 (2020): 80–110.

Atanassova-Pencheva, Diana. "Multiple Translations and Their Context: Praxis de Stratilatis in the Medieval South Slavic Tradition." *Scripta & E-Scripta* 16–17 (2017): 267–78.

Athanassiadi, Polymnia, and Michael Frede, eds. *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.

Aviam, Mordechai. "People, Land, Economy, and Belief in First-Century Galilee and Its Origins: A Comprehensive Archaeological Synthesis." Pages 5–48 in *The Galilean Economy in the Time of Jesus*. Edited by David A. Fiensy and Ralph K. Hawkins. *Early Christianity and Its Literature* 11. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.

Aviam, Mordechai, and Richard J. Bauckham. "The Synagogue Stone." Pages 135–60 in *Magdala of Galilee: A Jewish City in the Hellenistic and Roman Period*. Edited by Richard J. Bauckham. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2018.

Badalanova Geller, Florentina. *2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch: Text and Context*. Berlin: Max-Planck-Institut für Wissenschaftsgeschichte, 2010.

———. "Heavenly Exiles and Earthly Outcasts: Enochic Concepts of Hermetic Knowledge and Proscribed Lore in Parabiblica Slavica (Fifteenth-Nineteenth Centuries)." Pages 375–96 in *Rediscovering Enoch? The Antediluvian Past from the Fifteenth to Nineteenth Centuries*. Edited by Ariel Hessayon, Annette Yoshiko Reed, and Gabriele Boccaccini. SVTP 27. Leiden: Brill, 2023.

_____. "Unde malum? The Watchers Mythologeme in The Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch," *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch, Neue Folge*, 9. (2021): 1–45.

Baker-Brian, Nicholas. *Manichaeism: An Ancient Faith Rediscovered*. London: T&T Clark, 2011.

Bartninkas, Vilius. *Traditional and Cosmic Gods in Later Plato and the Early Academy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023.

Bauckham, Richard. *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Bebbington, David. *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s*. London: Routledge, 1988.

Becker, Adam H., and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds. *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Texte Und Studien Zum Antiken Judentum 95. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Behr, John. *Origen: On First Principles*. 2 vols. *Oxford Early Christian Texts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Ben Ezra, Daniel Stökl. "Halakha, Calendars, and the Provenances of 2 Enoch." Pages 229–42 in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*. Edited by Andrei A. Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini, and Jason Zurawski. *Studia Judaeoslavica* 4. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Ben-Dov, Jonathan. "Exegetical Notes on Cosmology in the Parables of Enoch." Pages 143–50 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Berressem, Hanjo. *Félix Guattari's Schizoanalytic Ecology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2020.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Black, Matthew. "The 'Parables' of Enoch (1 En 37-71) and the 'Son of Man.'" *Expository Times* 88.1 (1976): 5–8.

Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

- , ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- . *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Bock, Darrell L. "Dating the Parables of Enoch: A Forschungsbericht." Pages 58–113 in *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*. Edited by Darrell L. Bock and James H. Charlesworth. Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 11. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013.
- Bockmuehl, Markus N. A. *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. WUNT II:36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990.
- Bookidis, Nancy. "The Greek Lamps." Pages 1–109 in *The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: The Greek Lamps and Offering Trays*. Edited by Nancy Bookidis and Elizabeth G. Pemberton. Princeton: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2015.
- Böttrich, Christfried. *Adam als Mikrokosmos: eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch*. Judentum und Umwelt 59. Frankfurt: Lang, 1995.
- . *Das slavische Henochbuch*. JSRZ V 7. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1996.
- . "Melchizedek among Russian Saints: The History of Melchizedek between Jews and Slavs." Pages 373–90 in *The Bible in Slavic Tradition*. Edited by Alexander Kulik, Catherine Mary MacRobert, Svetlana Nikolova, Moshe Taube, and Cynthia M. Vakareliyska. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- . "The Angel of Tartarus and the Supposed Coptic Fragments of 2 Enoch." *EC* 4.4 (2013): 509–21.
- . "The 'Book of the Secrets of Enoch' (2 En): Between Jewish Origin and Christian Transmission. An Overview." Pages 37–68 in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*. Edited by Andrei A. Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini, and Jason Zurawski. Studia Judaeoslavica 4. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- . "The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reaction To A. Orlov." *JSJ* 32.1–4 (2001): 445–70.
- . *Weltweisheit. Menschheitsethik. Urkult: Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch*. WUNT II:50. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.
- Bousset, D. Wilhelm. "Eine jüdische Gebetssammlung in siebenten Buch der apostolischen Konstitutionen." Pages 231–86 in *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*. NovT Supps 50. Leiden: Brill, 1979.

- . “Eine jüdische Gebetssammlung in siebenten Buch der apostolischen Konstitutionen.” Pages 438–85 in *Nachrichten von der Königlichen gesellschaft der wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse*. Edited by Anthonie F. Verheule, 1916.
- Boustan, Raʿanan S. “The Study of Heikhalot Literature: Between Mystical Experience and Textual Artifact.” *Currents in Biblical Research* 6.1 (2007): 130–60.
- Bowes, Kimberly Diane. *Private Worship, Public Values, and Religious Change in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Boyarin, Daniel. “The Gospel of the Memra: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John.” *HTR* 94 (2001): 243–84.
- . “The Gospel of the Memra: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John.” *HTR* 94.3 (2001): 243–84.
- . *The Jewish Gospels: The Story of the Jewish Christ*. New York: The New Press, 2012.
- Boys-Stones, George. *Platonist Philosophy 80 BC to 250 AD: A Study and Collection of Sources in Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- Brand, Miryam T. *Evil Within and Without: The Source of Sin and Its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature*. *Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements* 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.
- Branham, Joan R. “Vicarious Sacrality: Temple Space in Ancient Synagogues.” Page 2:319–45 in *Ancient Synagogues: Historical Analysis and Archaeological Discovery*. Edited by Dan Urman and Paul Virgil McCracken Flesher. 2 vols. *StPB* 47. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Briggs, Richard. *Words in Action: Speech Act Theory and Biblical Interpretation*. London: T&T Clark, 2001.
- Brooke, George J. “Hot at Qumran, Cold in Jerusalem: A Reconsideration of Some Late Second Temple Period Attitudes to the Scriptures and Their Interpretation.” Pages 64–77 in *Hā-ʾish Mōshe: Studies in Scriptural Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature in Honor of Moshe J. Bernstein*. Edited by Binyamin Y. Goldstein, Michael Segal, and George J. Brooke. *STDJ* 122. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

- . “Inspecting ‘The School of St. Matthew.’” Pages 101–21 in *Krister among the Jews and Gentiles: Essays in Appreciation of the Life and Work of Krister Stendahl*. Edited by Paula Fredriksen and Jesper Svartvik. Studies in Judaism and Christianity. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 2018.
- Brubaker, Rogers. “Ethnicity without Groups.” *European Journal of Sociology* 43.2 (2002): 163–89.
- Bunta, Silviu Nicolae. *The Lord God of Gods: Divinity and Deification in Early Judaism*. Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and Its Contexts 35. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2021.
- Burkert, Walter. *Da Omero ai Magi: la tradizione orientale nella cultura greca*. Critica. Venice: Marsilio, 1999.
- . *Die orientalisierende Epoche in der griechischen Religion und Literatur*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1984.
- Burnett, Fred W. *The Testament of Jesus-Sophia: A Redaction-Critical Study of the Eschatological Discourse in Matthew*. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1981.
- Burns, Dylan M. *Apocalypse of the Alien God: Platonism and the Exile of Sethian Gnosticism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.
- . “The Apocalypse of Zostrianos and Iolaos: A Platonic Reminiscence of the Heracleidae at NHC VIII,1.4.” *Le Muséon* 126.1–2 (2013): 29–43.
- Camp, Claudia V. *Wisdom and the Feminine in the Book of Proverbs*. Bible and Literature Series 11. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- Camplani, Alberto. “Paths of Cultural Transmission Between Syria and Ethiopia: About a Recent Book on Symbolic Interpretations.” *Aethiopica* 24 (2021): 261–72.
- Carabine, Deirdre. *The Unknown God. Negative Theology in the Platonic Tradition: Plato to Eriugena*. Leuven: Peeters, 1995.
- Casey, Maurice. “The Use of the Term ‘Son of Man’ in the Similitudes of Enoch.” *JSJ* 7.1 (1976): 11–29.
- Charles, R. H. “Introduction.” Pages xi–xlvii in *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*. By W. R. Morfill. Oxford: Clarendon, 1896.
- . *The Book of Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1893.

- Chazon, Esther G. "Liturgical Communion with the Angels at Qumran." Pages 95–105 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Chialà, Sabino. "The Son of Man: The Evolution of an Expression." Pages 153–78 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Chiaradonna, Riccardo. "Aristotle's Physics as an Authoritative Work in Early Neoplatonism Plotinus and Porphyry." Pages 163–77 in *Authority and Authoritative Texts in the Platonist Tradition*. Edited by Michael Erler, Jan Erik Heßler, and Federico M. Petrucci. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- Christensen, Michael J., and Jeffery A. Wittung, eds. *Partakers of the Divine Nature: The History and Development of Deification in the Christian Traditions*. Grand Rapids: Rosemont Publishing and Printing Corp., 2007.
- Clark, Gillian, ed. *Porphyry: On Abstinence from Killing Animals*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000.
- Cohen, Getzel M. *The Hellenistic Settlements in Syria, the Red Sea Basin, and North Africa*. London: University of California Press, 2006.
- Cohen, Shaye J. D. "Pagan and Christian Evidence on the Ancient Synagogue." Pages 159–81 in *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Lee I. Levine. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1987.
- Collins, John J. "Enoch and the Son of Man: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig." Pages 216–27 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- . "In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Man in a Wisdom Text from Qumran." Pages 609–18 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Technological Innovations, New Texts and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by F. García Martínez. STDJ 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.

- , ed. *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. JSJSupp 54. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity*. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- Collins, Patricia Hill, and Sirma Bilge. *Intersectionality*. Cambridge: Polity, 2016.
- Croasmun, Matthew. *The Emergence of Sin: The Cosmic Tyrant in Romans*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Davila, James R. *Hekhalot Literature in Translation: Major Texts of Merkavah Mysticism*. JJTPSupp 20. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- . “(How) Can We Tell If a Greek Apocryphon or Pseudepigraphon Has Been Translated from Hebrew or Aramaic?” *JSP* 15.1 (2005): 3–61.
- . *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* *Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements* 105. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi. Repr. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- . *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1987.
- . *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. Repr. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- . *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. New York: Viking Penguin, 1977.
- . *Mille Plateaux*. *Capitalisme et Schizophrénie* 2. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1980.
- Dendy, D. R. *The Use of Lights in Christian Worship*. London: SPCK, 1959.

- Denzey, Nicola. "Bardaisan of Edessa." Pages 159–84 in *A Companion to Second-Century Christian "Heretics."* Edited by Antti Marjanen and Petri Luomanen. Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 76. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Depraetere, Christian. "The Challenge of Nissology: A Global Outlook on the World Archipelago Part I: Scene Setting the World Archipelago." *Island Studies Journal* 3.1 (2008): 3–16.
- . "The Challenge of Nissology: A Global Outlook on the World Archipelago Part II: The Global and Scientific Vocation of Nissology." *Island Studies Journal* 3.1 (2008): 17–36.
- Dillmann, August. *Liber Henoch Aethiopice, ad quinque codicum fidem editus, cum variis lectionibus*. Leipzig: Vogel, 1851.
- Dobroruka, Vicente. "Hesiodic Reminiscences in Zoroastrian–Hellenistic Apocalypses." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 75.2 (2012): 275–95.
- Dugan, Elena. "When Enoch Left Ethiopia: On Race and Philological (Im)Possibilities in the Nineteenth Century." Pages 276–307 in *Rediscovering Enoch? The Antediluvian Past from the Fifteenth to Nineteenth Centuries*. Edited by Ariel Hessayon, Annette Yoshiko Reed, and Gabriele Boccaccini. SVTP 27. Leiden: Brill, 2023.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. London: SCM Press, 1980.
- Ebner, Martin. "Wo findet die Weisheit ihren Ort? Weisheitkonzepte in Konkurrenz." Pages 79–103 in *Die Weisheit—Ursprünge und Rezeption: Festschrift für Karl Löning zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Martin Fassnacht, Andreas Leinhaupt-Wilke, and Stefan Lücking. NTAbh 44. Münster: Aschendorff, 2003.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Engelke, Matthew. *Think Like an Anthropologist*. London: Penguin, 2017.
- Epstein, Isidore. *The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Mo'ed*. London: Soncino Press, 1938.
- Erho, Ted M. "Historical-Allusional Dating and the Similitudes of Enoch." *JBL* 130.3 (2011): 493.

- Esler, Philip Francis. *God's Court and Courtiers in the Book of the Watchers: Re-Interpreting Heaven in 1 Enoch 1-36*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2017.
- Fahl, Sabine, Dieter Fahl, and Christfried Böttrich. *Die Kurze Chronographische Paleja: Einführung, Kommentar, Indices - Краткая Хронографическая Палея: Введение, комментарии, индексы*. Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2019.
- Fiensy, David A. *Prayers Alleged to Be Jewish: An Examination of the Constitutiones Apostolorum*. Brown Judaic Studies 65. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.
- . "Redaction History and the Apostolic Constitutions." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 72.4 (1982): 293.
- Fiensy, David A., and D. R. Darnell. "Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers." Pages 671–97 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.
- Fiensy, David A., and Ralph K. Hawkins, eds. *The Galilean Economy in the Time of Jesus*. Early Christianity and Its Literature 11. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- Finlan, Stephen, and Vladimir Kharlamov, eds. *Theosis: Deification in Christian Theology*. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2006.
- Fishbane, Michael A. *The Exegetical Imagination: On Jewish Thought and Theology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Fox, Michael V. "Three Theses on Wisdom." Pages 69–86 in *Was There a Wisdom Tradition? New Prospects in Israelite Wisdom Studies*. Edited by Mark R. Sneed. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Frankfurter, David. "Egyptian Religion and the Problem of the Category 'Sacrifice,'" Pages 75–93 in *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice*. Edited by Jennifer Wright Knust and Zsuzsanna Várhelyi. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Fredriksen, Paula. "Mandatory Retirement: Ideas in the Study of Christian Origins Whose Time Has Come to Go." *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 35.2 (2006): 231–46.

- Fuglsang, Martin, and Bent Meier Sørensen. *Deleuze and the Social*. Deleuze Connections. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.
- Galtung, Johan. "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research* 6.3 (1969): 167–91.
- García Martínez, Florentino. *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism*. Edited by Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. STDJ 63. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Gignilliat, Mark S. *Paul and Isaiah's Servants: Paul's Theological Reading of Isaiah 40-66 in 2 Corinthians 5:14-6:10*. Library of New Testament Studies 330. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Gilders, William K. "Jewish Sacrifice: Its Nature and Function (According to Philo)." Pages 94–105 in *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice*. Edited by Jennifer Wright Knust and Zsuzsanna Várhelyi. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Goff, Matthew J. *4QInstruction*. Wisdom Literature from the Ancient World 2. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- . *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*. STDJ 50. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Goodenough, Erwin R. *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935.
- Goranson Jacob, Haley. *Conformed to the Image of His Son - Reconsidering Paul's Theology of Glory in Romans*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2018.
- Greenfield, Jonas C, and Michael E Stone. "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes." *HTR* 70.1/2 (1977): 51–65.
- Hachlili, Rachel. "Torah Shrine and Ark in Ancient Synagogues: A Re-Evaluation." *Zeitschrift Des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 116.2 (2000): 146–83.
- Hagen, Joost L. "No Longer 'Slavonic' Only: 2 Enoch Attested in Coptic from Nubia." Pages 5–34 in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch*. Edited by Andrei A. Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini, and Jason Zurawski. *Studia Judaeoslavica* 4. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Hamerton-Kelly, Robert G. *Pre-Existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man: A Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament*. SNTSMS 21. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

- Harkins, Angela Kim. *Reading with an "T" to the Heavens: Looking at the Qumran Hodayot through the Lens of Visionary Traditions*. Ekstasis: Religious Experience from Antiquity to the Middle Ages 3. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012.
- Harrington, Daniel J. "Pseudo-Philo: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 297–377 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.
- Hauerwas, Stanley. *With the Grain of the Universe: The Church's Witness and Natural Theology: Being the Gifford Lectures Delivered at the University of St. Andrews in 2001*. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2001.
- Havea, Jione, Margaret Aymer, and Steed Vernyl Davidson, eds. *Islands, Islanders, and the Bible: Ruminations*. Semeia Studies 77. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Haykin, Michael A. G., and Kenneth J. Stewart, eds. *The Emergence of Evangelicalism: Exploring Historical Continuities*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2008.
- Hayman, A. Peter. "Monotheism—A Misused Word in Jewish Studies?" *Journal of Jewish Studies* 42.1 (1991): 1–15.
- Hessayon, Ariel, Annette Yoshiko Reed, and Gabriele Boccaccini, eds. *Rediscovering Enoch? The Antediluvian Past from the Fifteenth to Nineteenth Centuries*. SVTP 27. Leiden: Brill, 2023.
- Hewitt, J. Thomas. *Messiah and Scripture: Paul's "in Christ" Idiom in Its Ancient Jewish Context*. WUNT II: 522. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.
- Hillel, Vered. "A Reconsideration of Charles's Designated 'Noah Interpolations' In 1 Enoch: 54:1–55:1; 60; 65:1–69:25." Pages 27–45 in *Noah and His Book(s)*. Edited by Michael E. Stone, Aryeh Amihay, and Vered Hillel. SBLEJL 28. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Hindley, J. C. "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch. An Historical Approach." *NTS* 14.4 (1968): 551–65.

- Horrell, David G. *Ethnicity and Inclusion: Religion, Race, and Whiteness in Constructions of Jewish and Christian Identities*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020.
- Humbert, Paul. *Recherches sur les sources égyptiennes de la littérature sapientale d'Israël*. Mémoires de l'Université de Neuchâtel 7. Neuchâtel: Secrétariat de l'Université, 1929.
- Isaac, E. "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 5–91 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1: Apocalyptic Literature & Testaments*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- Jas, Michel. "Hénoch et le Fils de l'Homme." *La Revue réformée* 30 (1979): 105–19.
- Jeffers, Ann. *Magic and Divination in Ancient Palestine and Syria*. Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East 8. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Johnson, Elizabeth A. "Jesus, the Wisdom of God." *ETL* 61.4 (1985): 261–94.
- Jones, F. Stanley. "The Astrological Trajectory in Ancient Syriac-Speaking Christianity (Elchasai, Bardaisan, and Mani)." Pages 432–49 in *Pseudoclementina Elchasaiticaque Inter Judaeochristiana: Collected Studies*. OLA 203. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.
- . "The Book of Elchasai in Its Relevance for Manichaean Institutions. With a Supplement: The Book of Elchasai Reconstructed and Translated." *Pseudoclementina Elchasaiticaque Inter Judaeochristiana: Collected Studies*. OLA 203. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.
- Kampen, John. *Matthew within Sectarian Judaism*. The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019.
- Kanarek, Jane L. *Biblical Narrative and the Formation of Rabbinic Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- . "He Took the Knife: Biblical Narrative and the Formation of Rabbinic Law." *Association for Jewish Studies Review* 34.1 (2010): 65–90.
- Karenga. *Maat, the Moral Ideal in Ancient Egypt: A Study in Classical African Ethics*. London: Taylor & Francis Group, 2012.

- Kayatz, Christa. *Studien zu Proverbien 1-9: eine form- und motivgeschichtliche Untersuchung unter Einbeziehung ägyptischen Vergleichsmaterials*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1966.
- Keel, Othmar, and Silvia Schroer. *Schöpfung: biblische Theologien im Kontext altorientalischer Religionen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2002.
- Keller, Timothy. "How Do Christians Fit Into the Two-Party System? They Don't." *New York Times*, 29 September 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/09/29/opinion/sunday/christians-politics-belief.html>.
- Kelley, Shawn. *Racializing Jesus: Race, Ideology, and the Formation of Modern Biblical Scholarship*. London: Taylor & Francis Group, 2002.
- Klawans, Jonathan. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Klijn, A. F. J. "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch." Pages 615–52 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1: Apocalyptic Literature & Testaments*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- Knibb, Michael A. "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review." *NTS* 25:3 (1979): 345–59.
- . "The Structure and Composition of the Parables of Enoch." Pages 48–64 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- . "The Translation of 1 Enoch 70:1: Some Methodological Issues." Pages 340–54 in *Biblical Hebrew, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Michael P. Weitzman*. Edited by Ada Rapoport-Albert and Gillian Greenberg. JSOT Supps 333. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Koch, Klaus. "Questions Regarding the So-Called Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig." Pages 228–37 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

- . *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik: eine Streitschrift über ein vernachlässigtes Gebiet der Bibelwissenschaft und die schädlichen Auswirkungen auf Theologie und Philosophie*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1970.
- . *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and Its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Studies in Biblical Theology Second Series 22. London: SCM Press, 1972.
- Kohler, Kaufmann. "The Origin and Composition of the Eighteen Benedictions with a Translation of the Corresponding Essene Prayers in the Apostolic Constitutions." *HUCA* 1 (1924): 387–425.
- . "Über die Ursprünge und Grundformen der synagogalen Liturgie: Eine Studie." *MGWJ* 37 (1893): 441–51, 489–97.
- Kovalchuk, Kateryna. "The Encaenia of St Sophia: Animal Sacrifice in a Christian Context." *Scrinium* 4 (2008): 161–203.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. *Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Kozak, E. "Bibliographische Übersicht der biblisch-apokryphen Literatur bei den Slaven." *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 18 (1892): 127–58.
- Kraft, Robert A. "Setting the Stage and Framing Some Central Questions." *JSJ* 32.4 (2001): 371–95.
- . "The Pseudepigrapha in Christianity." Pages 55–86 in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by John C. Reeves. SBL EJS 6. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Kvanvig, Helge S. "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch." Pages 179–215 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Lang, Bernhard. *Frau Weisheit: Deutung einer biblischen Gestalt*. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1975.
- . *Wisdom and the Book of Proverbs: A Hebrew Goddess Redefined*. New York: Pilgrim, 1986.
- Lassalle-Klein, Robert. "Jesus of Galilee and the Crucified People: The Contextual Christology of Jon Sobrino and Ignacio Ellacuría." *Theological Studies* 70.2 (2009): 347–76.

- Lee, Ralph. *Symbolic Interpretations in Ethiopic and Early Syriac Literature*. Eastern Christian Studies 24. Leuven: Peeters, 2017.
- Leslau, Wolf. *Concise Dictionary of Ge'ez: Classical Ethiopic*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010.
- Levenson, Jon D. *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son: The Transformation of Child Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Levine, Lee I. *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- , ed. *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1987.
- Lieberman, Saul. *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine: Studies in the Literary Transmission Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in the 1 Centurey B.C.E. – IV Century C.E.* Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America 18. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950.
- Lied, Liv Ingeborg. *Invisible Manuscripts: Textual Scholarship and the Survival of 2 Baruch*. STAC 128. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021.
- Litwa, M. David. *Found Christianities: Remaking the World of the Second Century CE*. London: T&T Clark, 2022.
- . *We Are Being Transformed: Deification in Paul's Soteriology*. Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft Und Die Kunde Der Älteren Kirche 187. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012.
- Long, Alex. "Exile and Withdrawal: Gods and the Cosmos from Early Greek Philosophy to Aristotle." St Andrews, 2023.
- Lourié, Basil. "Calendrical Elements in 2 Enoch." Pages 191–220 in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*. Edited by Andrei A. Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini, and Jason Zurawski. Studia Judaeoslavica 4. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- . "Direct Translations from Syriac into Slavonic: A Preliminary List." Pages 161–68 in *Дидди Πολυιστωρ: Scripta Slavica Mario Capaldo Dicata*. Edited by Christiano Diddi. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Indrik" / Издательство "Индрик," 2015.
- . "Slavonic Pseudepigrapha, Nubia, and the Syrians." Pages 225–250 in *The Other Side: Apocryphal Perspectives on Ancient Christian "Orthodoxies"*. Edited by Tobias Nicklas, Candida R. Moss,

- Christopher Tuckett, and J. Verheyden. *Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus / Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments*, 117. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017.
- . “The Slavonic Solunskaja Legenda (‘The Thessalonican Legend’) and Its Syriac Original.” *The Syriac Voice in the Dialogue of Cultures: Syriac, Persian, Caucasian, and Slavonic Interlocutors, Eastern Mediterranean Texts and Contexts*. Edited by C. B. Horn and C. Villagomez, n.d.
https://www.academia.edu/7489459/Solunskaja_Legenda_The_Legend_of_Thessalonica_as_a_Translation_from_Syriac.
- Luibheid, Colm, ed. *Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works*. New York: Paulist, 1987.
- Lunt, Horace G. *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*. 7th rev. ed. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001.
- Macaskill, Grant. “Adam Octipartite/Septipartite: A New Translation with Introduction and Notes.” Pages 3–22 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Non-Canonical Scriptures. Volume 1*. Edited by Richard J. Bauckham, James R. Davila, and Alexander A. Panayotov. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.
- . *Autism and the Church: Bible, Theology, and Community*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2019.
- . “Law and Lawlessness in the Enoch Literature.” Pages 29–48 in *Law and Lawlessness in Early Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by David Lincicum, Ruth Sheridan, and Charles M. Stang. WUNT 420. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.
- . “Matthew and the Parables of Enoch.” Pages 218–30 in *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*. Edited by Darrell L. Bock and James H. Charlesworth. Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 11. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013.
- . “Meteorology and Metrology: Evaluating Parallels in the Ethiopic Parables of Enoch and 2 (Slavonic) Enoch.” *JSP* 29.2 (2019): 79–99.
- . *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. JSJSupp 115. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- . “The Creation of Man in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch and Christian Tradition.” Pages 399–422 in *XIXth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament (IOSOT), Ljubljana 16-20 July 2007, Congress Volume*. Edited by André Lemaire. VTSupp 133. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

- . *The Slavonic Texts of 2 Enoch*. Studia Judaeoslavica 6. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- . “Union(s) with Christ: Colossians 1:15–20.” *Ex Auditu* 33 (2017): 93–107.
- MacLeod, Donald. “Celtic Spirituality.” Pages 36–49 in *Worship and Liturgy in Context: Studies and Case Studies in Theology and Practice*. By Duncan B. Forrester and Doug Gay. London: SCM Press, 2009.
- MacLeod, John. *Banner in the West: A Spiritual History of Lewis and Harris*. Edinburgh: Birlinn, 2008.
- MacMullen, Ramsay. *The Second Church: Popular Christianity A.D. 200-400*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.
- MacNeil, Kevin. “Portable Rootedness And Other Contradictions: Some Thoughts On Contemporary Hebridean Poetry.” *The Bottle Imp*, 2008. <https://www.thebottleimp.org.uk/2017/06/portable-rootedness-and-other-contradictions-some-thoughts-on-contemporary-hebridean-poetry/>.
- Maunder, Annie S. D. “The Date and Place of the Writing of the Slavonic Book of Enoch.” *The Observatory* 41 (1918): 309–16.
- May, Gerhard. *Creatio Ex Nihilo: The Doctrine of “Creation out of Nothing” in Early Christian Thought*. Translated by A. S. Worrall. 2nd ed. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2004.
- . *Schöpfung aus dem Nichts: Die Entstehung der Lehre von der creatio ex nihilo*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978.
- McLean, Bradley H. *Deleuze, Guattari and the Machine in Early Christianity: Schizoanalysis, Affect and Multiplicity*. London: Bloomsbury, 2022.
- . “Re-Imagining New Testament Interpretation in Terms of Deleuzian Geophilosophy.” *Neotestamentica* 42.1 (2008): 51–72.
- McLeod, Frederick. “Man as the Image of God: Its Meaning and Theological Significance in Narsai.” *Theological Studies* 42.3 (1981): 458–68.
- . *Narsai’s Metrical Homilies on the Nativity, Epiphany, Passion, Resurrection and Ascension*. Patrologia Orientalis 40.1. Turnhout: Brepols, 1979.

- Meyer, Barbara. *Jesus the Jew in Christian Memory: Theological and Philosophical Explorations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Milik, J. T. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.
- Miller, Eric. "The Self-Glorification Hymn Reexamined." *Henoch* 31.2 (2009): 307–24.
- Miltenova, Anisava. "Slavonic Erotapokriseis: Sources, Transmission, and Morphology of the Genre." Pages 279–301 in *The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity*. Edited by Lorenzo DiTommaso and Christfried Böttrich. TSAJ 140. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Mingana, Alphonse. *Narsai doctoris syri homiliae et carmina 2*. Mosul: Fraternity of Preachers, 1905.
- Mitchell, Stephen. "Further Thoughts on the Cult of Theos Hypsistos." Pages 167–208 in *One God: Pagan Monotheism in the Roman Empire*. Edited by Stephen Mitchell and Peter van Nuffelen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Mroczek, Eva. *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Najman, Hindy. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. JSJSupp 77. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Navtanovich, Liudmila. "Is There Indeed a Coptic Enoch?" *Scrimium* 18 (2022): 440–451.
- _____. "The Provenance of 2 Enoch: A Philological Perspective. A Response to C. Böttrich's Paper "The "Book of the Secrets of Enoch" (2 En): Between Jewish Origin and Christian Transmission. An Overview." Pages 69–82 in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*. Edited by Andrei A. Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini, and Jason Zurawski. *Studia Judaeslavica* 4. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Newman, Judith. "Hybridity, Hydrology, and Hidden Transcript: Sirach 24 and the Judean Encounter with Ptolemaic Isis Worship." Pages 157–76 in *Jewish Cultural Encounters in the Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern World*. Edited by Mladen Popović, Myles Schoonover, and Marijn Vandenberghe. JSJSupp 178. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Newsom, Carol A. "Women and the Discourse of Patriarchal Wisdom: A Study of Proverbs 1–9." Pages 142–60 in *Gender and Difference in Ancient Israel*. Edited by Peggy Lynne Day. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.

- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E., and James C. VanderKam. *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 37-82*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011.
- . *1 Enoch: The Hermeneia Translation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.
- Norden, Eduard. *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913.
- Norris, Frederick W. "Isis, Sarapis and Demeter in Antioch Of Syria." *HTR* 75.2 (1982): 189–207.
- Novaković, S. "Apokrif o Enohu." Pages 67–81 in *Starine XVI*, 1884.
- Novenson, Matthew V. *The Grammar of Messianism: An Ancient Jewish Political Idiom and Its Users*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- . "The Universal Polytheism and the Case of the Jews." Pages 32–60 in *Monotheism and Christology in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. NovT Supps 180. Leiden: Brill, 2020.
- O'Brien, Carl Sean. *The Demiurge in Ancient Thought: Secondary Gods and Divine Mediators*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Odeberg, Hugo. *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928.
- Olson, Daniel C. "Enoch and the Son of Man in the Epilogue of the Parables." *JSP* 9.18 (1998): 27–38.
- . "'Enoch and the Son of Man' Revisited: Further Reflections on the Text and Translation of 1 Enoch 70.1-2." *JSP* 18.3 (2009): 233–40.
- Orlov, Andrei A. "Celestial Choirmaster: The Liturgical Role of Enoch-Metatron in 2 Enoch and Merkabah Tradition." *JSP* 14.1 (2004): 3–29.
- . "Glorification through Fear in 2 Enoch." *JSP* 25.3 (2016): 171–88.
- . "God's Face in the Enochic Tradition." Pages 179–93 in *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism*. Edited by April D. DeConick. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 11. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

- . “On The Polemical Nature of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reply to C. Böttrich.” *JSJ* 34.3 (2003): 274–303.
- . “Roles and Titles of the Seventh Antediluvian Hero in the Parables of Enoch: A Departure from the Traditional Pattern?” Pages 110–36 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- . *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*. TSAJ 107. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- . “The Melchizedek Legend of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch.” *JSJ* 31.1–4 (2000): 23–38.
- . “The Origin of the Name ‘Metatron’ and the Text of 2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch.” *JSP* 11.21 (2000): 19–26.
- . “Vested with Adam’s Glory: Moses as the Luminous Counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Macarian Homilies.” *Christian Orient* 4.10 (2006): 498–513.
- . “‘Without Measure and Without Analogy’: The Tradition of the Divine Body in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch.” *Scrinium* 3.1 (2007): 231–57.
- Orton, David E. *The Understanding Scribe: Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal*. JSNT Supplement Series 25. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1989.
- Otero, A. de Santos. “Libro de los Secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo).” Page 4:147-202 in *Apócrifos Del Antiguo Testamento*. Edited by Alejandro Díez Macho. Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1984.
- Otto, Randall E. “*J’Accuse* : Animal Accusation in 2 Enoch.” *Journal of Animal Ethics* 11.1 (2021): 1–10.
- Otto, Rudolph. *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man: A Study in the History of Religion*. Translated by Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee Wolf. London: Lutterworth, 1938.
- Owen, Paul, and David Shepherd. “Speaking Up for Qumran, Dalman and the Son of Man: Was Bar Enasha a Common Term for ‘Man’ in the Time of Jesus?” *JSNT* 23.81 (2001): 81–122.
- Parry, Donald W., and Emanuel Tov, eds. *Dead Sea Scrolls Reader. Part 1, Texts Concerned with Religious Law*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Penner, Jeremy. *Patterns of Daily Prayer in Second Temple Period Judaism*. STDJ 104. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

- Pickstock, Catherine. "Duns Scotus: His Historical and Contemporary Significance." *Modern Theology* 21.4 (2005): 543–74.
- Pines, Shlomo. "Enoch, Slavonic Book Of." *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 6:cols. 797–99.
- . "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch." Pages 72–87 in *Types of Redemption: Contributions to the Theme of the Study-Conference Held at Jerusalem 14th to 19th July 1968*. Edited by R. J. Zwi Werblowsky and C. Jouco Bleeker. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- . "Points of Similarity between the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Sefirot in the Sefer Yezira and a Text of the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies: The Implications of This Resemblance." *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 7 (1989): 63–142.
- Piovanelli, Perluigi. "A Testimony for the Kings and the Mighty Who Possess the Earth': The Thirst for Justice and Peace in the Parables of Enoch." Pages 363–79 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Poorthuis, Marcel. "Enoch and Melchizedek in Judaism and Christianity: A Study in Intermediaries." Pages 97–120 in *Saints and Role Models in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Marcel Poorthuis and Joshua J. Schwartz. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Possek, Ute. "Bardaisan's Influence on Late Antique Christianity." *Journal of Syriac Studies* 21.1 (2018): 81–126.
- Pula, Melissa P. "Rethinking the Community as Temple: Discourse and Spatial Practice in the Community Rule (1QS)." Ph.D. diss., University of Denver, 2015.
- Quack, Joachim Friedrich. "Wisdom in Egypt." Pages 103–20 in *The Oxford Handbook of Wisdom and the Bible*. Edited by Will Kynes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Wisdom in Israel*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1972.
- Ramelli, Ilaria L. E. *Bardaisan of Edessa: A Reassessment of the Evidence and a New Interpretation*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2009.

- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. "2 Enoch and the Trajectories of Jewish Cosmology: From Mesopotamian Astronomy to Greco-Egyptian Philosophy in Roman Egypt." *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 22.1 (2014): 1–24.
- . "Beyond the Land of Nod: Syriac Images of Asia and the Historiography of 'The West.'" *History of Religions* 49.1 (2009): 48–87.
- . "Categorization, Collection, and the Construction of Continuity: 1 Enoch and 3 Enoch in and beyond 'Apocalypticism' and 'Mysticism.'" *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion* 29.3 (2017): 268–311.
- . "From Asael and Šemihazah to Uzzah, Azzah, and Azael: 3 Enoch 5 (§§7-8) and Jewish Reception-History of 1 Enoch." *JSQ* 8 (2001): 105–36.
- . *Jewish-Christianity and the History of Judaism*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2022.
- . *Jewish-Christianity and the History of Judaism*. TSAJ 171. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.
- Reeves, John C. *Heralds of That Good Realm: Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions*. Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 41. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions*. MHUC 14. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992.
- Reinhart, J. "A Croatian Glagolitic Excerpt of the Slavonic Enoch (2 Enoch)." *Fundamenta Europaea* 6/7 (2007): 31–46.
- Rives, James B. "The Theology of Animal Sacrifice in the Ancient Greek World." Pages 182–202 in *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice*. Edited by Jennifer Wright Knust and Zsuzsanna Várhelyi. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Rollinger, Robert, and Kordula Schnegg, eds. *Kulturkontakte in antiken Welten: vom Denkmodell zum Fallbeispiel: Proceedings des internationalen Kolloquiums aus Anlass des 60. Geburtstages von Christoph Ulf, Innsbruck, 26. bis 30. Januar 2009*. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.
- Rorem, P. "Iamblichus and the Anagogical Method in Pseudo-Dionysian Liturgical Theology." Pages 453–60 in *Studia Patristica*. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. Oxford: Pergamon, 1982.

- Rosen-Zvi, Ishay. *Demonic Desires: Yetzer Hara and the Problem of Evil in Late Antiquity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.
- Rouwhorst, G. "Jewish Liturgical Traditions in Early Syriac Christianity." *Vigiliae Christianae* 51.1 (1997): 72–93.
- Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1982.
- Runrig. *The Edge of the World*, 1991.
- Sacchi, Paolo. *L'apocalittica giudaica e la sua storia*. Biblioteca di cultura religiosa 55. Brescia: Paideia, 1990.
- . "Qumran e la datazione del Libro delle Parabole di Enoc." *Henoch* 25.1 (2003): 149–66.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.
- Sanders, E. P. *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE-66 CE*. London: SCM Press, 1992.
- Satlow, Michael L. "Giving for a Return: Jewish Votive Offerings in Late Antiquity." Pages 91–108 in *Religion and the Self in Antiquity*. Edited by David Brakke, Michael L. Satlow, and Steven Weitzman. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006.
- Schäfer, Peter. *Geniza-Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur*. TSAJ 6. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1984.
- . *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*. TSAJ 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981.
- . *The Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.
- . *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- . *Two Gods in Heaven: Jewish Concepts of God in Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020.
- . *Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literature*. TSAJ 17. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987.
- . *Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literature*. TSAJ 22. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989.
- . *Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literature*. TSAJ 29. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991.

- . *Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literature I: §§1–80*. TSAJ 46. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.
- Schaper, Joachim. *Media and Monotheism: Presence, Representation, and Abstraction in Ancient Judah*. Orientalische Religionen in Der Antike 33. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.
- . “The Weight of Justice: Counting, Weighing, and Measuring in Ancient Israel’s Social and Intellectual Worlds.” Pages 1–16 in *Congress Volume Aberdeen 2019*. Edited by Grant Macaskill, Christl M. Maier, and Joachim Schaper. VTSupp 192. Leiden: Brill, 2022.
- Schatzki, Theodore R. *The Site of the Social: A Philosophical Account of the Constitution of Social Life and Change*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. “2 Enoch and Halakhah.” Pages 221–28 in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*. Edited by Andrei A. Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini, and Jason Zurawski. Studia Judaeoslavica 4. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Schipper, Bernd. “When Wisdom Is Not Enough! The Discourse on Wisdom and Torah and the Composition of the Book of Proverbs.” Pages 55–80 in *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of ‘Torah’ in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Bernd Schipper and D. Andrew Teeter. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Schmidt, Nathaniel. “The Two Recensions of Slavonic Enoch.” *JAOS* 41 (1921): 307–12.
- Scholem, Gershom. *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*. 2nd ed. New York: Schocken, 1946.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. New York: Crossroad, 1983.
- . *Jesus: Miriam’s Child, Sophia’s Prophet: Critical Issues in Feminist Christology*. New York: Continuum, 1994.
- Schwartz, Seth. *Imperialism and Jewish Society: 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Scopello, Madeleine. “The Apocalypse of Zostrianos (Nag Hammadi Viii .1) and the Book of the Secrets of Enoch.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 34 (1980): 376–85.

- Shaked, S. "Iranian Influence on Judaism: First Century B.C.E. to Second Century C.E." Pages 308–25 in *The Cambridge History of Judaism I*. Edited by W. D. Davies and L. Finkelstein. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Shaw, Gregory. *Theurgy and the Soul: The Neoplatonism of Iamblichus*. 2nd ed. Kettering, OH: Angelico, 2014.
- . *Theurgy and the Soul: The Neoplatonism of Iamblichus*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995.
- Shupak, Nili. "Female Imagery in Proverbs 1-9 in the Light of Egyptian Sources." *Vetus Testamentum* 61.2 (2011): 310–23.
- Sim, David C. *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*. Monograph Series / Society for New Testament Studies 88. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Sjöberg, Erik. *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch*. Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund 41. Lund: Gleerup, 1946.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. "Fences and Neighbors: Some Contours of Early Judaism." Pages 1–25 in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Volume 2*. Edited by William Scott Green. Brown Judaic Studies 2. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. 3rd ed. London: Bloomsbury, 2021.
- . *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed, 1999.
- Smith, Morton. "Goodenough's Jewish Symbols in Retrospect." *JBL* 86.1 (1967): 53–68.
- Sneed, Mark R., ed. *Was There a Wisdom Tradition? New Prospects in Israelite Wisdom Studies*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Sobrino, Jon. *Christ the Liberator: A View from the Victims*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2001.
- . *Jesucristo Liberador: Lectura Histórico-teológica de Jesús de Nazaret*. San Salvador: UCA, 1991.
- . *Jesus the Liberator: A Historical-Theological Reading of Jesus of Nazareth*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1993.
- . *La fe en Jesucristo: Ensayo desde las víctimas*. San Salvador: UCA, 1999.

- Sreznevskii, I. I. *Materialy dlia Slovaria Drevne-Russkogo Iazyka po Pis'mennym Pamiatnikam*. Vol. 1. Saint Petersburg, 1893.
- Stavropoulou, Francesca. "The Ancient Goddess, the Biblical Scholar, and the Religious Past." Pages 495–513 in *The Bible and Feminism: Remapping the Field*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Stowers, Stanley. "The Concept of 'Community' and the History of Early Christianity." *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion* 23.3 (2011): 238–56.
- . "The Religion of Plant and Animal Offerings Versus the Religion of Meanings, Essences and Textual Mysteries." Pages 35–56 in *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice*. Edited by Jennifer Wright Knust and Zsuzsanna Várhelyi. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "Gottesbilder in den Henoch-Gleichnissen (1 Hen 37 – 71): Ein Überblick." Pages 109–28 in *Gottes-Bilder: zur Metaphorik biblischer Gottesrede*. Edited by Veronika Burz-Tropper. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament Band 232. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2022.
- Suter, David W. "Enoch in Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Book of Parables." Pages 415–43 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- . *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch*. SBL Dissertations 47. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Swartz, Michael D., and Joseph Yahalom, eds. *Avodah: An Anthology of Ancient Poetry for Yom Kippur*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005.
- Tardieu, Michel. *Manichaeism*. Translated by M. B. DeBevoise. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2008.
- Taube, Moshe. *The Logika of the Judaizers: A Fifteenth-Century Ruthenian Translation from Hebrew. Slavic Texts Presented Alongside Their Hebrew Sources with Introduction, English Translation, and Commentary*. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 2016.
- Taylor, Charles. *A Secular Age*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Thiessen, Matthew. *Paul and the Gentile Problem*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Tobin, Thomas H. *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation*. CBQM 14. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983.

Tsafir, Yoram. "The Byzantine Setting and Its Influence on Ancient Synagogues." Pages 147–57 in *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Lee I. Levine. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1987.

Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1.1 (2012): 1–40.

Turdeanu, Émile. "Une curiosité de l'Hénoch slave: Les phénix du sixième ciel." *Revue des études slaves* 47 (1968): 53–54.

Ullendorff, Edward. *Ethiopia and the Bible: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1967*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Ullucci, Daniel C. "Contesting the Meaning of Animal Sacrifice." Pages 57–69 in *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice*. Edited by Jennifer Wright Knust and Zsuzsanna Várhelyi. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

———. "Sacrifice in the Ancient Mediterranean: Recent and Current Research." *Currents in Biblical Research* 13.3 (2015): 388–439.

———. *The Christian Rejection of Animal Sacrifice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Vaillant, A. *Le Livre des Secrets D'Hénoch: Texte slave et Traduction française*. Paris: Institut d'Études slaves, 1952.

VanderKam, James C. "The Book of Parables within the Enoch Tradition." Pages 81–99 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Vašica, J. "Jazyková povaha Zakona sudné ho ljudem." *Slavia* 27 (1958): 529–30.

Venter, Pieter M. "Did Ms Wisdom of Proverbs 8 Become a Mystery in 4QInstruction?" *HTS* 72.4 (2016): 1–9.

Ventura, Lorella. *Hegel in the Arab World*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.

- Vermes, Geza. "Appendix E: The Use of $\text{בֵּר נִשְׁ/בֵּר נִשָּׂא}$ in Jewish Aramaic." Pages 310–30 in *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. Edited by Matthew Black. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.
- Villey, Émilie. "Syriac Astronomical Texts (500-700 Ce): Christian Voices Defending Ptolemaic Astronomy." Pages 205–31 in *New Themes, New Styles in the Eastern Mediterranean: Christian, Jewish, and Islamic Encounters, 5th-8th Centuries*. Edited by Hagit Amirav and Francesco Celia. *Late Antique History and Religion* 16. Leuven: Peeters, 2017.
- Villey, Émilie, and Henri Hugonnard-Roche, eds. *Astronomie et Cosmographie Syriaques: Recueil d'articles de François Nau. L'Œuvre des grands savants syriacisants : scholars of Syriac: collected works / comité scientifique*: André Binggeli. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2014.
- Wagner, J. Ross. *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul in Concert in the Letter to the Romans*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Walton, John H. *Ancient Israelite Literature in Its Cultural Context: A Survey of Parallels between Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Texts*. Library of Biblical Interpretation. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Wasserman, Emma. *Apocalypse as Holy War: Divine Politics and Polemics in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018.
- Wasserman, Mira Beth. "Rabbis and Their Others." Pages 259–75 in *A Companion to Late Ancient Jews and Judaism: Third Century BCE to Seventh Century CE*. Edited by Gwynn Kessler and Naomi Koltun-Fromm. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2020.
- Watson, Moray. "The Idea of Island in Gaelic Fiction." *The Bottle Imp*, 2008.
<https://www.thebottleimp.org.uk/2017/06/the-idea-of-island-in-gaelic-fiction/>.
- Weeks, Stuart. "Wisdom, Form, and Genre." Pages 161–78 in *Was There a Wisdom Tradition? New Prospects in Israelite Wisdom Studies*. Edited by Mark R. Sneed. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- West, Martin L. *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.
- . *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

- Winston, David, ed. *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation, with Introduction and Commentary*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.
- Wise, Michael, Martin Abegg, and Edward Cook. "Serek Le'anshey Ha-Yahad." Page 37 in *Dead Sea Scrolls Reader. Part 1, Texts Concerned with Religious Law*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Witherington III, Ben. *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Witakowski, Witold. "Syrian Influences in Ethiopia." Pages 782–4 in *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica: Volume 4. O–X*. Edited by Siegbert Uhlig. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011.
- Wold, Benjamin G. *4QInstruction: Divisions and Hierarchies*. STDJ 123. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- . "Demonizing Sin? The Evil Inclination in 4QInstruction and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 34–48 in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Chris Keith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. WUNT II: 417. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.
- . "Sin and Evil in the Letter of James in Light of Qumran Discoveries." *NTS* 65.1 (2019): 78–93.
- Yonge, Charles Duke. *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged*. Repr. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993.
- Zachhuber, Johannes. *Theology as Science in Nineteenth-Century Germany: From F.C. Baur to Ernst Troeltsch*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Zaehner, Robert Charles. *Zurvan: A Zoroastrian Dilemma*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.

Modern Works in Russian:

- Викторов, А. Е. *Каталог славяно-русских рукописей приобретённых Московским Публичным и Румянцевским Музеями в 1868 г. после Д.В. Пискарёва*. Москва, 1871.
- . *Описи рукописных собраний в книгохранилищах Северной России*. С.-Петербург, 1890.

- . *Очерк собрания рукописей В.М. Ундольского, в полном составе (Славяно-русские рукописи В.М. Ундольского описанные самим составителем и бывшим владельцем собрания с номера 1-го по 579-й)*. Москва: Московского Публичного и Румянцевского Музеев, 1870.
- Востоков, А. *Описание русских и словенских рукописей Румянцевского Музея*. С.-Петербург, 1842.
- Горский, А. В., and К. И. Невоструев. *Описание славянских рукописей Московской Синодальной Библиотеки*. Москва, 1859.
- Мещерский, Никита Александрович. “Апокрифы в древней славяно-русской письменности: Ветхозаветные апокрифы.” Pages 181–210 in *Методические рекомендации по описанию славяно-русских рукописей для Сводного каталога рукописей, хранящихся в СССР*. Москва, 1976.
- . “К вопросу о составе и источниках Академического Хронографа.” Pages 212–19 in *Летописи и хроники. Сборник статей*. Москва, 1973.
- . “К вопросу об источниках славянской Книги Еноха.” *Краткие Сообщения Института Народов Азии* 86 (1965): 72–78.
- . “К истории текста славянской книги Еноха (Следы памятников Кумрана в византийской и старославянской литературе).” *Византийский Временник* 24 (1964): 91–108.
- . “Проблемы изучения славяно-русской переводной литературы XI–XV вв.” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 20 (1964): 198–206.
- . “Следы памятников Кумрана в старославянской и древнерусской литературе (К изучению славянских версий книги Еноха).” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 19 (1963): 130–47.
- Навтанович, Л. М. “Лингвотекстологический анализ древнеславянского перевода книги Еноха.” Ph.D. diss., С.-Петербург, 2000.
- . “‘Одеания ею пению раздаанию’ в славянском переводе книги Еноха.” *Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы* 53 (2003): 3–11.
- Попов, А. *Обзор хронографов русской редакции*. Москва, 1869.
- . “Южнорусский сборник 1679 года.” Pages 66–139 in *Библиографические материалы*. Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских 3.9. Москва, 1880.

- Порфирьев, И. Я. *Апокрифические сказания о ветхозаветных лицах и событиях*. Казан, 1872.
- Пыпин, А. Н. *Ложные и отреченные книги русской старины*. Памятники старинной русской литературы 3. С.-Петербург: Графом Григорием Кушелевым-Безбородко, 1862.
- Соколов, М. И. "Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий. VII. Славянская Книга Еноха. II. Текст с латинским переводом." *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 4 (1899): 1–112.
- . "Материалы и заметки по старинной славянской литературе. Выпуск третий. VII. Славянская Книга Еноха Праведного. Тексты, латинский перевод и исследование. Посмертный труд автора приготовил к изданию М. Сперанский." *Чтения в Обществе Истории и Древностей Российских* 4 (1910): 1–167.
- Тихонравов, Николай Саввич. *Памятники отреченной русской литературы*. 2 vols. С.-Петербург/Москва, 1863.
- Яцимирский, А. И. *Библиографический обзор апокрифов в южнославянской и русской письменности (Списки памятников) Выпуск 1. Апокрифы ветхозаветные*. Петроград, 1921.

