

NOTES

IMPLICATIONS OF THE NEW ENOCH LITERATURE FROM QUMRAN

The recent publication of a long-awaited book will certainly renew interest in Enoch literature. Years ago R. H. Charles wrote: "The Book of Enoch is for the history of theological development the most important pseudepigraph of the first two centuries B.C."¹ Charles wrote that estimate about *1 Enoch* or the so-called Ethiopic Enoch, for prior to the discovery of Qumran Cave 4 in 1952 the Enoch literature was known only in ancient versions. Now a good part of the Aramaic original of that literature has been published by J. T. Milik (with the collaboration of Matthew Black) in *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*.² And it turns out that this is an extremely important book, which will long be studied by students of intertestamental literature, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Aramaic language, and NT theology.

ENOCH AS INTERTESTAMENTAL LITERATURE

As a piece of intertestamental literature, the Ethiopic Enoch has been known since the end of the fifteenth century, being preserved among writings revered in the Abyssinian Church. It was only in 1821 that it was translated into a modern European language by Richard Laurence. The widely-used translation of it by R. H. Charles appeared in 1912, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch Translated Anew from the Text with Introduction, Commentary, Critical Notes, and Appendices*.³ The Ethiopic, Greek, and Latin forms of the book had been recognized as translations from a Semitic original, but it was always debated whether that original was Hebrew, or Aramaic, or part Hebrew and part Aramaic (like the Book of Daniel). And even in the various versions it was obvious that *1 Enoch* was the result of a long process of redaction. Now it is clear that that process began with an Aramaic original which differed considerably from the known form of *1 Enoch*. Since many of the fragments from Qumran Cave 4 date from the second and first centuries B.C., it seems clear that we have recovered much of a significant piece of intertestamental literature, composed probably toward the end of the third century B.C. and used by Palestinian Jews during the last two centuries prior to Christianity.

¹ "Book of Enoch," *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books 2* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913) 163.

² Oxford: Clarendon, 1976. Pp. xv + 439 + pls. I-XXXII. £30/\$66.

³ Oxford: Clarendon, 1912. A revised form of it is found in *APOT 2*, 163-281. Charles had used 29 Ethiopic MSS to establish his critical text.

It has been customary to speak of five parts of *1 Enoch*:⁴ (1) The Book of Watchers, chaps. 1-36, which recounts the visions of the righteous Enoch, who learns of God's judgment on Azazel and the Watchers (the names given to "the sons of God" in Gen 6:1-4), those who brought sin to the earth; Enoch is begged to intercede on their behalf and journeys to the ends of the earth. (2) The Book of Parables (*mesallé*), chaps. 37-71, discourses of Enoch about the coming judgment, heavenly secrets, journeys, Noah and the flood, and especially about a mysterious figure called by different titles ("Messiah," "Elect One," "Righteous One," and "Son of Man") who is to execute judgment on the kings and the mighty of this earth. (3) The Astronomical Book of Enoch, chaps. 72-82, or the Book of the Heavenly Luminaries, in which the movements of the heavenly bodies are made known to Enoch according to a calendar of 364 days. (4) The Book of Dreams, chaps. 83-90, apocalyptic visions with covert historical references to a contemporary crisis which will come to an end in eschatological judgment. (5) The Epistle of Enoch, chaps. 91-108, which speaks of woes against sinners (the rich and the mighty), admonitions for the righteous to be steadfast in view of the coming judgment, and descriptions of the judgments to come. Chaps. 106-7 are sometimes separated from the last part as the Book of Noah, since it describes his miraculous birth, which presages the salvation to come to the righteous. This brief summary of *1 Enoch* reveals that it is an important piece of apocalyptic intertestamental literature.

ENOCH IN QUMRAN LITERATURE

As part of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Aramaic original of much of this Enoch literature has been recovered in fragments from Qumran Caves 1, 2, 4, and 6. The most important Enoch fragments were found in Qumran Cave 4. It has yielded seven fragmentary MSS (4QEn^{a-e}), dating from the first half of the second century to the last third of the first century B.C. These seven copies preserve parts of the Book of Watchers, the Book of Dreams, and the Epistle of Enoch. Four other fragmentary MSS (4QEnastr^{a-d}), dating from the end of the third century B.C. to the early years of the first century A.D., preserve a form of the Astronomical Book, greatly expanded beyond what we know of its counterpart in *1 Enoch*. This work really formed a separate piece of literature in those times, being copied in independent scrolls. These fragments from Qumran Cave 4 were discovered by the Bedouin and the archeologists in 1952 and recognized as such. It was only subsequently discovered that at least two of these MSS (4QEn^c and probably 4QEn^e 2-3) contained part of another Enoch-related work, the Book of Giants,

⁴ For the sake of simplicity I normally use here Milik's titles for these parts of *1 Enoch*; earlier discussions have often used others.

which exists in other fragmentary texts from the same cave (4QEnGiants^{a-e(?)}). This book has also been found to be represented among previously unidentified or misidentified fragments from other caves that had already been published (two from Cave 1: 1Q23 and 1Q24;⁵ one from Cave 2: 2Q26 1;⁶ and one from Cave 6: 6Q8⁷). The Book of Giants is likewise preserved in canonical Manichean writings.⁸ Since most of these fragments were copied in the last two centuries of the pre-Christian era—4QEnastr^b is the only one written in the Herodian script and dated from the first century A.D.—one has the impression that interest in the Books of Enoch waned even among the members of the Qumran sect.

What is significant here is that five parts of Enochic literature are preserved in the Qumran fragments: (1) The Astronomical Book; (2) The Book of Watchers; (3) The Book of Giants; (4) The Book of Dreams; and (5) The Epistle of Enoch. Milik speaks of an Enochic pentateuch (p. 58). But what is even more significant is the absence of the Book of Parables among the numerous fragments that have been recovered from the various Qumran caves. This may be a sheer coincidence, but it is almost certainly not such⁹—and to this I shall return later on. What seems to be evident, therefore, from the Qumran Enochic material is that it preserves a form of that literature which is more elaborate and older than that known to us from *1 Enoch*; it represents the Books of Enoch known to Palestinian Jews of pre-Christian and early Christian periods.

ENOCH IN ARAMAIC

Milik's publication is likewise important for the study of the kind of Aramaic used in Palestine in these periods. It swells the corpus of Aramaic texts from that area which has come to light mostly in the last thirty years.¹⁰ Not long ago a scholar such as W. F. Albright could write:

⁵ See D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955) 97-99.

⁶ See M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân: Exploration de la falaise: Les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q: Le rouleau de cuivre* (DJD 3; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962) 90-91.

⁷ *Ibid.* 116-19.

⁸ See W. B. Henning, "The Book of Giants," *BSOAS* 11 (1943-46) 52-74; "Ein manichäisches Henochbuch," *SPAW Philos.-histor. Kl.*, 1934/1, 27-35; "Neue Materialien zur Geschichte des Manichäismus," *ZDMG* 90 (1936) 1-18.

⁹ See J. Albertson, "An Application of Mathematical Probability to Manuscript Discoveries," *JBL* 78 (1959) 133-41; cf. H. E. Robbins, "Comments on a Paper by James Albertson," *ibid.* 347-50.

¹⁰ D. J. Harrington and I have gathered these texts into an edition which is presently in the press and, we hope, will appear in 1977: *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts (Second Century B.C.—Second Century A.D.)* (BibOr; Rome: Biblical Institute). Unfortunately, this volume of Milik's Enoch texts arrived too late for incorporation in our manual; but the Enochic texts that he had published in preliminary form earlier have been included.

"There are no Aramaic literary works extant from the period between the third or second century B.C. and the second or third A.D., a period of over three hundred years."¹¹ This Albright first wrote in 1949, but it remained unchanged in his revised text of 1960. But now the Aramaic Books of Enoch join the *Genesis Apocryphon* and the *Targum of Job*¹² as clear examples of literary works copied at least, and most likely composed as well, in these periods of ancient Palestine. They obviously bear on the entire problem of the "language of Jesus" and of the Semitic substratum of NT writings. Further comments on specific details which bear on this problem I shall reserve for another time and place. But no little part of the importance of Milik's publication lies precisely in this area.

ENOCH AND NT THEOLOGY

As for the relevance of this new Aramaic Enoch literature to the study of NT theology, it is the absence of the Book of Parables (*1 Enoch* 37-71) that is significant. No little part of Charles's estimate of the importance of the Book of Enoch, quoted at the beginning of this discussion, was based on the presence of this part of the book. There Enoch attributes to a mysterious figure four titles, "Messiah," "Elect One," "Righteous One," and "Son of Man." Aside from 11QMelchizedek,¹³ in which there may be a combined attribution to one figure of titles which are of distinct origin and of discrete meaning in the OT, the Parables of Enoch have often been cited as the sole instance of such combined application in allegedly pre-Christian Jewish literature. Hence this part of Enoch literature was often thought to provide the evidence for a pre-Christian Jewish practice of conflating OT titles and attributing them to one figure. It was thus considered to be the Palestinian background for the multiple attribution of OT titles to Jesus of Nazareth in the NT. Furthermore, the application of "Son of Man" to an individual in the Parables of Enoch has often been regarded as an important link in the development of that phrase. It is used in Dan 7:13, 18 in a symbolic, corporate sense for the "saints" in Israel who are to inherit the kingdom and possess it forever. But nowhere else in known Jewish literature of pre-Christian times is it found in a titular sense applied to an individ-

¹¹ *The Archaeology of Palestine* (Pelican Books; Baltimore: Penguin, 1960) 210. The comment quoted above was made in the context of Albright's discussion of C. C. Torrey's attempt to translate the Gospels into Aramaic.

¹² See N. Avigad and Y. Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1956); cf. my commentary, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1: A Commentary* (BibOr 18A; 2d ed.; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1971); J. P. M. van der Ploeg and A. S. van der Woude, *Le targum de Job de la grotte xi de Qumrân* (Koninklijke nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen; Leiden: Brill, 1971).

¹³ See my discussion of this text, "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11," *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: Chapman, 1971; paperback reprint, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974) 245-67, esp. 254.

ual. Hence, appeal was often made to the Parables of Enoch as an important link in the development from the corporate sense of Daniel 7 to the titular, individual sense of the strange Greek phrase applied to Jesus, *ho huios tou anthrōpou*. Now if the pre-Christian Palestinian form of the Books of Enoch lacked the Parables and its application of "Son of Man" to an individual in a titular sense, the origin of that peculiar Greek phrase applied to Jesus many times over in the NT becomes even more problematic. Was the phrase ever used as a title for an "apocalyptic Son of Man"? This question has been raised and hotly debated in recent times,¹⁴ and it is no little affected by the evidence in this volume now published by Milik and by a thesis that he associates with it. Thus the evidence of the Aramaic Enoch literature from Qumran concerns an important item of NT Christology.

THE NEW ENOCH LITERATURE FROM QUMRAN

Before I go into further details about the bearing of this new material on the last problem mentioned, I should describe the contents of Milik's book. For it is not a simple presentation of the texts of the Qumran fragments with photographs, translations, and notes. Those who are acquainted with the format of the series, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* (of Jordan), published by the Clarendon Press, which has thus far presented in five volumes the *editiones principes* of many of the texts from Qumran and murabba'at, will not find here the same mode of presentation. This is a volume *hors de série*. Milik was faced with the problem of trying to make the different Aramaic Enoch texts intelligible, and his indefatigable labors and research led him into all sorts of unexpected areas (e.g., the relation of the Qumran fragments to the Book of Giants in Manichean, patristic, and early medieval literature). This means that what one finds in this volume is a presentation of some Enochic texts together with an elaborate account of the genesis and growth of Enoch literature and a thesis about its development.

The purpose of the book is stated by Milik as follows: "to present, in transcription (with restorations), and with translation and notes, all the fragments identified among the manuscripts of Qumrân Cave 4 as forming part of different Books of Enoch" (p. 3). The book has four main parts: (A) An elaborate introduction, which discusses (1) the Aramaic Books of Enoch in Persian and Hellenistic times (the Astronomical Book, the Book of Watchers, the Book of Dreams, the Epistle of Enoch, and the Book of Giants—and a section devoted to Enochic references in Essene texts from Qumran); (2) the early versions of the Books of Enoch (Greek, Latin, Coptic, and Syriac; the Ethiopic Book of Enoch); and (3)

¹⁴ See, e.g., R. Leivestad, "Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man," *NTS* 18 (1971-72) 243-67; B. Lindars, "Re-enter the Apocalyptic Son of Man," *NTS* 22 (1975-76) 52-72.

works attributed to Enoch in Romano-Byzantine and medieval times (the Book of Parables and other Enochic writings in Roman and Byzantine times; Slavonic Enoch [or 2 *Enoch*] and other Enochic writings in the Middle Ages; Enoch in cabbalistic literature). This introduction occupies 135 pages. (B) Texts, translations, and notes: 4QEn^{a-c}, 4QEnastr^{b-d}, 4QEnGiants^a (and a partial reconstruction of the Book of Giants from various sources, along with its later history). The bulk of the book (pp. 137-339) is devoted to this section. An appendix to it (pp. 340-62) provides a "diplomatic" transcription of the fragments 4QEn^{a-c}, i.e., the bare transcription of these seven texts without the restorations of lacunae which Milik has supplied in his earlier discussion of them. (C) Indexes (passages of Enoch preserved in Aramaic; Aramaic-Greek-Ethiopic glossary; quotations; and general subjects). (D) Thirty-two photographs of the fragments: 4QEn^{a-c}, 4QEnastr^{b-d}, 4QEnGiants^a 2-13.

One cannot help but be impressed by the fascinating literature that Milik publishes in this volume and by the engaging way in which he has set forth the results of his long labors and research on this difficult body of material. He has presented most of it with his usual clarity and erudition, and all who use this book will stand in his debt for decades to come. The Aramaic texts in themselves are not particularly difficult to read or interpret, despite their fragmentary character, but the relation of them to *1 Enoch* and the ancient versions of that book is the source of the main problems. Milik has, in general, handled them well; and even if one will not agree with all of his solutions to these problems, one has to acknowledge his careful work, his insights, and the resulting thesis about Enoch literature that he presents.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENOCH LITERATURE

Milik sees the development of Enoch literature in the following way: (1) The oldest part of this literature is the Astronomical Book, which contains an elaborate calendar of the movements of the sun and the moon in a framework of 364 days, cosmographic information, and moral considerations. This lengthy work was composed in the Persian period and is alluded to by the Hellenistic Jewish historian Eupolemus, whose *History of the Jews* was completed in 158 B.C.,¹⁵ by Ben Sira 44:16, and by *Jubilees* 4:24 (compare *1 Enoch* 81 and 1-36) and 4:17 (referring to the calendar of 4QEnastr^{a, b} and *1 Enoch* 80-82).

2) The Book of Watchers, preserved by itself in copies a and b of 4QEn, which are dated to the early second century B.C., seems to have been brought to Qumran from elsewhere. Its final form is the work of a Judean author of the third century, who incorporated into it an earlier source (= *1 Enoch* 6-19). It was copied along with other parts of Enoch in

¹⁵ See 1 Macc 8:17; Eusebius, *Praepar. evang.* 9, 17, 2-9 (GCS 43/1 [1954] 502-3).

such texts as 4QEn^{c-f}. It is alluded to in 4Q Testament of Levi^a 8 iii 6-7 (= Greek *Testament of Levi* 14:3-4), a work that Milik thinks is Samaritan in origin and composed in the course of the third century B.C. The Book of Watchers is also alluded to in *Jubilees* 4:21-22, which contains a reference to both the angelological part of it (= *1 Enoch* 6-16) and to its cosmographic part (= *1 Enoch* 17-36). The 4Q fragments reveal that this Book of Watchers existed at Qumran in "essentially the same form as that" now known in the Greek and Ethiopic versions. Its relation to the story of the sons of God and the daughters of men in Gen 6:1-4 is problematic, and Milik is prone to think that part of it (chaps. 6-19) may even be earlier than the definitive version of the first chapters in Genesis.

3) The Book of Dreams, found in fragments of 4QEn^{c-f}, contains only Enoch's second dream (a tableau of world history from creation to the eschatological kingdom of God, often presented in zoomorphic terms). It exists here in a form less developed than that of the Ethiopic Enoch and agreeing with that found in two Greek texts of this book. It contains a résumé of the Book of Watchers with significant alterations; so it is clearly later than it. Moreover, it contains (*1 Enoch* 90:16) an allusion to the battle of Bethzur between the Maccabees and Lysias (see 2 Macc 11:6-12), which was fought in 164 B.C. Hence Milik dates this book to "the early months of the year, during the few weeks which followed the battle."

4) The Epistle of Enoch (= *1 Enoch* 91-108), found in the fragments of 4QEn^{c-g} (especially the latter), reveals a more primitive form of this part of Enoch literature. The order of its chapters, which has often been debated, is now clearly determined: 91:1-10 (in a form more fully developed than the Ethiopic), 18-19; 92:1-5 (with pars. 3-5 longer than the Ethiopic); 93:1-10; 91:11-17; 93:11-14 (quite different from *1 Enoch*); 94:1 onwards (with some scattered divergences). Since 4QEn^g was copied toward the middle of the first century B.C., it is a *terminus ante quem* for the composition of the Epistle. It was most likely composed by a Jewish scribe living in a seaport town on the Palestinian coast dominated by Hellenistic culture. He drew upon the Astronomical Book of Enoch, but makes only brief allusions to the Book of Watchers (= *1 Enoch* 91:15; 100:4). Indeed, the Epistle contradicts the Book of Watchers about the origin of sin; it did not come from heaven, but human beings have created it themselves. It thus denies the myth of the descent of the Watchers of heaven and their union with women (= *1 Enoch* 98:4-5). The Aramaic form of the Epistle also contains part of the summary of the Book of Noah (= *1 Enoch* 106-7) and it seems to have been an ancient appendix, "very probably to the whole Enochic corpus" (p. 57).

5) The Aramaic Book of Giants seems to have been composed some

time between *Jubilees* (which does not mention it among the works attributed to Enoch in 4:17-24) and the earliest Qumran copy, 4QEnGiants^b, "copied in the first half of the first century B.C." (p. 57). If the *Damascus Document* (CD 2:18) depends on the Book of the Giants, as is not unlikely, then the latter would have been composed somewhere between 128/125 and 110/100 B.C. Milik shows that 4QEnGiants^a was a part of 4QEn^c and occurs there in this order: Book of Watchers, Book of Giants, Book of Dreams, Epistle of Enoch. Moreover, this order (Watchers followed by Giants) is reflected in quotations of Enoch literature preserved in the *Chronography* of George Syncellus, a ninth-century Byzantine writer.

Thus by the first century B.C. "a pentateuchal collection of the writings attributed to the antediluvian sage" was in use in Palestine.

6) Enoch literature is known to exist in various ancient versions. The most important translation is the Greek, which exists in several MSS; the most important of them are the fifth/sixth-century Codex Panopolitanus, found in a Coptic cemetery in Akhmîm-Panopolis in Upper Egypt in 1886-87 (containing two mutilated translations of part of the Book of Watchers), a tachygraphic MS, Vatican Gr. 1809, an extract of a Byzantine chronicle (containing a passage from the Book of Dreams, = 1 *Enoch* 89:42-49), Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 2069, dating from the end of the fourth century (containing fragments of the Book of Dreams, = 1 *Enoch* 85:10-86:2; 87:1-3), and a fourth-century papyrus codex, six leaves of which were acquired in 1930 by the University of Michigan and eight leaves by the Chester Beatty Library of Dublin (containing the greater part of the Epistle of Enoch). Extensive extracts from the Book of Watchers are also found in the *Chronography* of George Syncellus. The Greek evidence suggests the independent circulation of various Enochic works, which, however, does not preclude "the existence of more comprehensive collections which might have imitated the Aramaic Enochic Pentateuch in two volumes put together in the course of the first century B.C. by Judaeans scribes, or rather, to be more exact, by the Essene copyists of Qumrân" (p. 76). From the survey of the Greek versions and quotations of the Enoch literature, Milik concludes: "All these indications show clearly in my opinion that at the beginning of the fifth century there did not yet exist an Enochic Pentateuch such as we know it through the Ethiopic translation, with the book of Parables in the second place. The Greek archetype of this collection goes back at the earliest to the sixth or seventh centuries . . ." (p. 77).

7) The situation is no different in the case of the other ancient versions, Latin, Coptic, and Syriac. What exists in these versions or in quotations from Enoch in writers who use these languages are materials found in the Book of Watchers and the Epistle.

8) Today at least 34 MSS of the Ethiopic Enoch are known to exist, and a new critical edition of them is being prepared by Michael Knibb of King's College, University of London. But it is already evident that the "Ethiopic version was made from a Greek text of the Christian Enochic Pentateuch (with the Book of Parables as a second member)" (p. 88). "The date of the Ethiopic translation is not known; the fifth or the sixth century has been suggested, but without any really valid proof" (*ibid.*).

9) The Book of Parables (= *1 Enoch* 37-71) is really a misnomer; a better title would be the "Second Vision of Enoch" (used in 37:1 itself). Moreover, the "parables" are really sapiential discourses of Enoch, who is not the sole important figure in this section. For the book actually contains the following parts: Introduction (37:1-4); First "Parable" of Enoch (38-44); Second "Parable" of Enoch (45-57); Third "Parable" of Enoch (58-59); the Vision of Noah (60-64); Account of Noah's Visit to Enoch in Paradise (65-66); the Word of the Lord to Noah (67-68:1); Words of Michael (68:2-69:29); Epilogue (70-71). It is clear that the author of this part made use of Jewish Enochic writings (especially the Book of Watchers, but also certain passages in the Astronomical Book, The Book of Dreams, and the Epistle).

Milik's reasons for regarding this as a Christian Greek composition, which was substituted for the Book of Giants, not prior to the fifth century A.D., are the following: (a) Not one fragment of this writing, either Semitic (Aramaic or Hebrew) or Greek, has been located in the very rich assortment of MSS from the Qumran caves. (b) The Book of Parables makes use of the LXX. (c) It "draws its inspiration from the writings of the New Testament, the Gospels especially, beginning with the titles of the pre-existent Messiah: 'Son of Man' (Matt 9:6, 10:23, 12:8, etc.) and 'Elect' (Luke 23:35)" (pp. 91-92). (d) It is not likely to be an early Christian work, since no quotation of it is recorded between the first and fourth centuries, when quotations of other Enochic literature abound. (e) The earliest attestation of the Book of Parables is from the "early Middle Ages," being referred to in the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus (patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 806-15) and reflected in *2 Enoch* (see below). (f) As for its literary genre, the Book of Parables is related to Sibylline literature, especially its second and fifth books. (g) The reference to the Parthians and Medes in *1 Enoch* 56:5-7 reflects the events of A.D. 260-70, the terrible years of anarchy and invasion in the middle of the third century: the victories of Sapor I, the imprisonment of Emperor Valerian, the expeditions of Aurelian against Palmyra. (h) *1 Enoch* 47:1-4 and 62:11 are understood by Milik to refer to the persecution of Christians under Decius and Valerian (A.D. 249-51 and 257-58). (i) *1 Enoch* 61:1 refers to angels taking "to themselves wings" and flying. But save for the Seraphim and Cherubim, "early Jewish literature is not familiar with any winged angels. . . . The first undeniable piece of

evidence on the subject is that of Tertullian" (p. 97, *Apolog.* 22:8). Finally (j) Milik interprets *1 Enoch* 60:1, where the date of Enoch's vision is given as "the year 500, in the seventh month, on the fourteenth day of the month," as a reference not to the feast of Tabernacles but to "the seventh Christian month and accordingly the Easter feast" (p. 97). It is obvious that Milik has not come to this conclusion about the Book of Parables as a Christian Greek composition without long and serious consideration and extensive argumentation. On the basis of this view of the growth and development of Enoch literature, Milik writes: "So far as the New Testament is concerned, it will be necessary henceforth to dismiss definitively all the alleged references to the Book of Parables, since the latter is a Christian work of the third century, if not later" (p. 74).

10) Two last stages of the development of the Enoch literature which Milik describes in detail are the emergence of *2 Enoch*, or Slavonic Enoch, sometimes also called the Book of the Secrets of Enoch, and the medieval Hebrew *Enoch 3*, part of cabbalistic literature. Milik dates the Greek original of Slavonic Enoch to the ninth or tenth century A.D., and argues strongly that *3 Enoch* was dependent on Slavonic Enoch.

This lengthy exposé of Milik's description of the growth and development of Enoch literature and of his thesis that the Book of Parables was substituted in Christian times for the earlier part, the Book of Giants, which was made part of the Manichean canon—and perhaps was the reason for the Christian substitution—hardly does justice to the detail and wealth of information that he provides for his ideas. On the heels of it Milik presents the new Aramaic texts, which are in general carefully edited and translated. I shall comment elsewhere on details of this aspect of his work. Here we are interested in the implications of this publication, and these evoke several comments, for the book is not without its problems.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE NEW ENOCH LITERATURE

First of all, despite the claim set forth in the purpose of the book, quoted above, Milik has not presented in it "all the fragments . . . forming part of different Books of Enoch" (p. 3). The major texts, 4QEn^{a-c}, are indeed published here along with major parts of the Astronomical Book and his reconstruction of the Book of Giants from various sources (6Q8 1:1-6; 2:1-3; 1Q23 1+6+22:1-5; 9+14+15:1-6; 4QEnGiants^a 1-13; 4QEnGiants^b 2:3-10, 13-16, 20-23; 4QEnGiants^c 1:3-10; 2:18). But photographs are supplied only for 4QEn^{a-c}; 4QEnastr^b 6, 7, 23, 25, 26, 28, 4QEnastr^{c-d}; 4QEnGiants^a (those for the texts of 1Q, 2Q, 6Q are available elsewhere, in DJD 1 and 3). The reason why some of the texts of the Book of the Giants are incompletely published is that they belong to the lot of Aramaic fragments entrusted to J. Starcky for publication. Pre-

sumably Milik has had access to the Enoch material in Starcky's lot, since the latter has given him permission to publish here the transcription of such pieces as 4QEnGiants^{b, c}. But it is clear that Milik has not presented here even all of the Enoch material that belongs to his own lot, e.g., 4QEnastr^a and various fragments of 4QEnastr^b. The upshot of this process is that we still do not have access to "all the fragments . . . forming part of different Books of Enoch." This is regrettable.

Secondly, it is still not clear from Milik's book just how many further fragmentary texts of the Book of Giants exist or have been identified to date. At one point Milik says that he has been able to locate "about ten, if not twelve, of the manuscripts of this book among the Qumrân fragments, both published and unpublished" (p. 4). But later on he says that "up to the present" he has "located six copies of the Book of Giants among the manuscripts of Qumrân: the four manuscripts cited above (1Q23, 6Q8, 4QEnGiants^{b, c}), a third manuscript from the Starcky collection, and 4QEnGiants^a published below. There are also five other manuscripts too poorly represented to allow a sufficiently certain identification of the fragments: En^c 2-3 . . . , 1Q24 . . . , 2Q26, and two groups of small fragments entrusted to the Starcky edition" (p. 309). This seems to say that, in addition to 4QEnGiants^a (in Milik's lot), there are five other fragmentary texts of the Book of Giants in Starcky's lot, and in all six fragmentary texts of this book from Qumran Cave 4 alone (4QEnGiants^{b, f}). But then one should consult p. 365.

Thirdly, though Milik admits that the relation between the Book of Giants and the rest of the Aramaic Enoch literature from Qumran is at times a bit tenuous (see his remark on 4QEn^c 2-3 quoted above), I think that he has proved his point that one part of the Enochic pentateuch in pre-Christian Jewish Palestine was the Book of Giants. The relation of 4QEnGiants^a and 4QEn^c set forth on p. 310 clinches the matter. I am also ready to go along with his thesis that at some point in the Christian era the Book of Parables was substituted for the Book of Giants (and perhaps as a reaction to the Manichean use of the latter). But it is far from certain, in my opinion, that the Book of Parables, which we know only in its Ethiopic form, is derived from a Christian Greek composition. I trust that I have been fair in my summary of Milik's arguments set forth briefly above and fitted with my own letters (*a-j*). But I must admit that I find many of them unconvincing. That no fragment of the Parables has been found in the Qumran caves is striking, indeed, but that is still an argument from silence.¹⁶ That the Parables make use of

¹⁶ I realize that an argument from silence has at times some validity and have on occasion made use of it myself. But to speak of the "very rich assortment of manuscripts from the caves of Qumrân" (p. 91), in which no fragment from this part of Enoch is found, is to stretch a point slightly in that in such a very rich assortment scarcely twenty fragments of the other parts of Enoch have been recovered.

the LXX is no argument that this book is consequently Christian; it may say something about its Greek *Vorlage*, but this is an area of study that needs much scrutiny in the light of all the modern developments in Septuagintal study, and Milik's few words on the matter have not revealed the detailed study that the issue would require. That the Book of Parables "draws its inspiration from the writings of the New Testament, the Gospels especially" (p. 91) is the biggest difficulty that I have with Milik's thesis. He refers to Matt 9:6, 10:23, 12:8 and Luke 23:35 and implies that that is proof enough for this "inspiration." The Matthean passages use the title "Son of Man," and I have already touched upon this problem earlier in this review. R. H. Fuller has, among others, noted that "the Son of man in the Similitudes [= Parables of Enoch] lacks the distinctively Christian differentia, viz., the identification with Jesus of Nazareth in his ministry . . . and in his passion . . ." ¹⁷ Indeed, I should even go further and say that the Parables as a whole lack any specific Christian differentia. One can read those chapters in *1 Enoch* and fail to see anything specifically Christian in them. ¹⁸ Hence this raises the question about the origin of what a Christian redactor may well have substituted for the earlier Aramaic Book of Giants. Is it possible that we are dealing here with another piece of Enochic literature, possibly of Jewish origin, ¹⁹ that came into existence in pre-Christian or early Christian times? For it is hard to imagine that, if a Christian hand were responsible for the Greek composition that Milik postulates, it would not be more blatantly obvious. I raised this question not long ago, only to learn from Jonas C. Greenfield that he had made a similar suggestion in his "Prolegomenon" to the recent reprinting of H. Odeberg's *3 Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch*. ²⁰ This constitutes the

¹⁷ *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (New York: Scribner, 1965) 37-38.

¹⁸ What should be noted here is that the four titles attributed to the mysterious figure of the Parables are all derived from either the OT or Palestinian Jewish literature. Because they resemble the combined application of titles of distinct OT origin to Jesus in the NT, that does not make of them Christian titles. Hence the search for Christian differentia in the Parables will have to concentrate on other elements than these titles.

¹⁹ In this connection it might be wise to recall that Milik himself once admitted this possibility: "The 'Similitudes' are probably to be considered the work of a Jew or a Jewish Christian of the first or second century A.D., who reutilized the various early Enoch writings to gain acceptance for his own work and gave the whole composition its present form" (*Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* [SBT 26; London: SCM, 1959] 33). In an earlier French form of this book, *Dix ans de découvertes dans le Désert de Juda* (Paris: Cerf, 1957) 31, he spoke only of "l'oeuvre d'un judéo-chrétien du second siècle de notre ère."

²⁰ New York: Ktav, 1973, xvii: "The question, independent of evidence from the Scrolls, was dealt with in detail by Erik Sjöberg [*sic*] in his study *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch* (Lund, 1946). He convincingly demonstrated that the Similitudes were a unit and that the supposed Christian element was no more than a chimera." Milik's book makes no mention of Sjöberg's work. — See further A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1961) 300.

biggest difficulty with the arguments that Milik has proposed for his view of the Book of Parables as a Greek Christian composition.²¹

If he is right, however, that the Book of Parables is a Greek Christian composition of Byzantine times, then obviously one cannot appeal to the use of "Son of Man" in it in a titular sense applied to an individual to explain the development from the symbolic, corporate sense of the phrase in Dan 7:13, 18 to the individualistic use of the Greek phrase *ho huios tou anthrōpou* applied to Jesus in the NT. But if the Book of Parables should rather be regarded as a separate piece of earlier Enochic literature, possibly stemming even from pre-Christian Palestine — an origin that is not yet definitively excluded — then perhaps the apocalyptic Son of Man has not yet made his exit.

Finally, the Aramaic form of the Epistle of Enoch that has now been recovered — the title is explicitly preserved in the Greek Chester Beatty-Michigan papyrus codex, *Epistolē Enōch*; see also 100:2 — will have to be studied for its bearing on ancient epistolography, and in particular on NT epistles. Recent studies in ancient epistolography²² have been seeking to explore the ancient forms of letters and epistles. The Epistle of Enoch, with its woes and admonitions, is a good example of a text that may now be brought in for comparison with NT material.

These, then, are some of the implications of the new Enoch literature from Qumran. This important publication of texts from Qumran Cave 4

²¹ As for the rest of the reasons given by Milik, that listed as (d) is again an argument from silence. — No one will contest the relation of the Book of Parables to the Sibylline literature; but that relation does not immediately imply Christian provenience. Moreover, one would have to ask in which direction the influence moves. The same would have to be said about the relation of the Book of Parables to Pseudo-Philo's *Liber antiquitatum*. — The reference to the Parthians and Medes has just as plausibly been explained as a reflection of the invasion of Palestine by the Parthians in 40 B.C. (see J. C. Greenfield, "Prolegomenon," xvii). Still another explanation relates it to the Parthian campaign of Trajan (J. C. Hindley, "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch: An Historical Approach," *NTS* 14 [1957-58] 551-65). — As for the argument about winged angels, Milik's reasoning here is a bit specious, in that it supposes that the "angels" of *1 Enoch* 61:1 are otherwise anthropomorphic, which is not per se evident. There is enough in the OT about winged celestial beings, seraphim among them (e.g., Isa 6:2), to provide a Jewish explanation of that Enoch passage. — Finally, the relation of the date of Enoch's vision to Easter is highly speculative; and Milik does not explain the connection of this feast with the seventh month.

²² A group of American and Canadian scholars has been pursuing this topic in recent years at the annual meetings of the Society of Biblical Literature. It developed out of a seminar in Pauline letters, which was at times devoted to the relation of them to other Greek letters of antiquity. In time the question of ancient epistolography was broadened to other languages as well, and at one point the study of Aramaic epistolography was treated. See my article "Some Notes on Aramaic Epistolography," *JBL* 93 (1974) 201-25. The Epistle of Enoch was not treated in that study. But it seems that a discussion of it would have further material to add to it.

by Milik will demand hours and hours of further study. But the general issues that it raises have at least been aired here.²³

Catholic University of America

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.

²³ See further M. Black, "The 'Parables' of Enoch (1 En 37-71) and the 'Son of Man,'" *ExpTim* 78 (1976-77) 5-8; "The Fragments of Aramaic Enoch from Qumran," *La littérature juive entre Tenach et Mischna: Quelques problèmes* (ed. W. C. van Unnik; RechBib 9; Leiden: Brill, 1974) 15-28.