

Michael Langlois

Moses versus Enoch? On the Reception of the Mosaic Torah in the Book of Enoch

One may be surprised to find a contribution dealing with the Book of Enoch in a volume on "the Reception of the Torah in Deuterocanonical Literature." Is Enoch also among the deuterocanonicals? As a matter of fact, the Book of Enoch is part of both the shorter and longer lists of 81 biblical books recognized by the Church of Ethiopia. As such, it is naturally included in modern, printed Ethiopic bibles. It thus qualifies as "canonical" or, more specifically, "deuterocanonical" – even though such terms are foreign to the vocabulary of the Church of Ethiopia.

What, then, can be said about the reception of the Torah in the Book of Enoch? The following essay will assess various theories, ranging from frontal opposition to wholehearted acceptance, and explore a solution that takes into account the redaction history of both the Book of Enoch and the Mosaic Torah.

Moses versus Enoch

The Book of Enoch may be perceived as strongly opposing the Mosaic Torah. Andreas Bedenbender, for instance, talks about a rivalry between two "sides, 'Moses' and 'Enoch'."¹ Each side gathers around a central character, to the extent that one may speak of a "Mosaic Judaism" versus an "Enochic Judaism." These two competing trends within ancient Judaism did not converge before the second century BCE, when there may have been a "beginning rapprochement between Enochic and Mosaic Judaism."²

According to this view, such diametrical opposition was, in fact, due to political tensions between competing priestly families: Mosaic Judaism was the product of the Zadokite dynasty, whereas Enochic Judaism was, in Gabriele Boccaccini's words, "a nonconformist, anti-Zadokite, priestly movement of dis-

¹ Andreas Bedenbender, "The Place of the Torah in the Early Enoch Literature," in *The Early Enoch Literature*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins, JSJSup 121 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 65–79, 77. See also Andreas Bedenbender, "Traces of Enochic Judaism within the Hebrew Bible," in *The Origins of Enochic Judaism: Proceedings of the First Enoch Seminar, University of Michigan, Sesto Fiorentino, Italy, June 19–23, 2001*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and Randal A. Argall, Henoch 24 (Torino: Zamorani, 2002), 39–48, 44.

² Bedenbender, "Place of the Torah," 78.

sent.³ Boccaccini is famous for popularizing the concept of Enochic Judaism but insists that “special credit for the rediscovery of Enochic Judaism as an autonomous form of Judaism goes to Paolo Sacchi and George Nickelsburg.”⁴ Indeed, Nickelsburg views Enochic wisdom as an “alternative” to the Mosaic Torah;⁵ in the Book of Enoch, it is not Moses who is the agent of divine revelation, but Enoch. Such a preeminence cannot be accidental: the authors of the Book of Enoch are “acquainted with the Pentateuch,”⁶ yet on occasion the redactor “transfers the role of mediator, recipient of revelation, and lawgiver from Moses to Enoch.”⁷ John Collins likewise states that “in the early Enoch literature, Enoch, not Moses, is the mediator of revelation. (...) This is not to say that the Torah was unknown or unheeded in Enochic circles; the entire Animal Apocalypse is a paraphrase of biblical history.”⁸

The choice of Enoch as a central figure, able to champion the authority of Moses and to serve as a superior mediator, is due to his unique position: unlike other antediluvian patriarchs, who simply “lived” and “died,” Enoch “walked with God” and suddenly disappeared (Gen 5:21–24).⁹ He is thus the perfect candidate to receive and mediate divine revelation. And, according to Collins, “the revelation to Enoch is anterior to that of Moses and in no way subordinated to it.”¹⁰ The competition between Moses and Enoch might even be reflected in the structure of their respective corpuses: both the Mosaic Torah and the Book of Enoch are literally pentateuchs, that is, composed of five books. This five-book structure is attested by one of the oldest Ethiopic manuscripts of the Book of Enoch in which marginal numerals indicate the beginning of the second,

3 Gabriele Boccaccini, “Introduction: From the Enoch Literature to Enochic Judaism,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 1–16, 6.

4 Boccaccini, “From the Enoch Literature to Enochic Judaism,” 4.

5 George W.E. Nickelsburg, “Enochic Wisdom: An Alternative to the Mosaic Torah?,” in *Hesed Ve-Emet: Studies in Honor of Ernest S. Frerichs*, ed. Jodi Magness and Seymour Gitin, BJS 320 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 123–32.

6 George W.E. Nickelsburg, “Enochic Wisdom and Its Relationship to the Mosaic Torah,” in *The Early Enoch Literature*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins, 1st ed., JJSJup 121 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 81–94.

7 Nickelsburg, “Enochic Wisdom and Its Relationship to the Mosaic Torah,” 89.

8 John J. Collins, “Enochic Judaism and the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Early Enoch Literature*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins, JJSJup 121 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 283–300, 297.

9 See e.g. Michael Langlois, *Le premier manuscrit du Livre d'Hénoch: Étude épigraphique et philologique des fragments araméens de 4Q201 à Qumrân*, *Lectio Divina* (Paris: Cerf, 2008), 21–4.

10 John J. Collins, “How distinctive was Enochic Judaism?,” *Meghillot – Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* 5–6 (2008): 17–34, 31.

third, fourth and fifth booklets.¹¹ Milik noted that the second of these booklets, the Book of Parables, was absent from the Dead Sea scrolls, but he replaced it with the Book of Giants and thus concluded that in “the first century B.C. there existed in all probability the Pentateuch of Enoch.”¹²

So here we are, with two champions on the ring, Moses versus Enoch, each one with his own Pentateuch, his own followers, fighting against each other. According to this view, the reception of the Mosaic Torah in the Book of Enoch is a negative one. In fact, rather than speaking of a “reception,” one could talk of a “rejection” of the Mosaic Torah in the Book of Enoch. Yet, in spite of all its persuasive arguments, this theory is not without its flaws.

Moses with Enoch

A dualistic view of Judaism, in which Moses and Enoch would be two diametrically opposed figures, is probably too simplistic. As pointed out by James VanderKam, “the separation into different types of Judaism, the highlighting of oppositions, is too rigid if it does not allow space for the many examples of cross-fertilization attested in the sources.”¹³ Loren Stuckenbruck likewise disagrees with Boccaccini’s dualistic view of Enochic versus Mosaic Judaism. Not that he does not see any form of polemic in the Book of Enoch against other Jewish groups, but he questions the identity of these opponents. They do seem to have “competing written traditions,” but “is this a matter of one adhering to Enochic tradition in contrast to others (the opponents) who perhaps adhere to Mosaic tradition, as Boccaccini would have us believe? Hardly so.”¹⁴

If Enoch and Moses are not against each other, then, what is the nature of their relationship? Is there really no latent rivalry between them? Do they simply ignore each other perhaps? Not at all, according to Paul Heger, who appeals to

11 I.e. ¶ “2” in 1 En. 37:4, ¶ “3” in 1 En. 72:1, ¶ “4” in 1 En. 83:1, and ¶ “5” in 1 En. 92:1; cf. Ephraim Isaac, “The Oldest Ethiopic Manuscript (K-9) of the Book of Enoch and Recent Studies of the Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4,” in *Working with No Data: Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin*, ed. David M. Golomb and Susan T. Hollis (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 195–207, 202.

12 József Tadeusz Milik, *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 4.

13 James C. VanderKam, “Mapping Second Temple Judaism,” in *The Early Enoch Literature*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins, JJSJup 121 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 1–20, 20.

14 Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “Pentateuch and Biblical Interpretation,” in *The Qumran Legal Texts between the Hebrew Bible and Its Interpretation*, ed. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange, CBET 61 (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 43–58, 52.

rabbinical authorities and argues that “the later rabbis would not have asserted that Enoch entered Paradise alive, together with Elijah and other prominent personalities, if they had understood the text of *1 Enoch* as opposing the Mosaic tradition.”¹⁵ Heger agrees that there aren’t many references to the Torah in the Book of Enoch, but does it mean that Moses or his Torah are rejected, or even ignored? Absolutely not. On the contrary, knowledge and acceptance of the Mosaic Torah are presupposed by the Book of Enoch. In line with Richard Bauckham, Heger states that “the Torah is assumed as a basic standard and that there was, therefore, no need to mention it.”¹⁶ The alleged opposition between Moses and Enoch is thus nowhere to be found. It is solely based on arguments *ex silentio* and Heger, appealing once again to the authority of the rabbis, reminds us that they “do not accept *ex silentio* evidence.”¹⁷

A similar line of argumentation could be drawn from the Ethiopic tradition, where both the Mosaic Torah and the Book of Enoch were included in the Bible without raising issues of oppositions or contradictions. Enoch and Moses walk hand in hand among the patriarchs and heroes of the faith. They complement each other, and no one is trying to replace the other. The fact that Enoch is presented as a priest is not considered a threat against Moses or Aaron. Indeed, a prayer of the preparatory service for the liturgy of the Ethiopian Church reads: “I pray and I beseech thee, O Lord my God, as Thou wast well pleased with the offering of Abel thy beloved, and the sacrifices of Enoch, Noah, and Abraham, and the incense of Aaron...”¹⁸ Here Enoch – together with other patriarchs – is entitled to perform sacrifices without casting any shadow on Moses or Aaron, who is mentioned right after them.

On the basis of both Jewish rabbinical and Christian Ethiopic traditions, one could thus argue in favor of a plenary reception of the Torah in the Book of Enoch. This view, however, is probably as simplistic as its opponent, and has

15 Paul Heger, “Enoch: Complementary or Alternative to Mosaic Torah?,” in *Challenges to Conventional Opinions on Qumran and Enoch Issues*, ed. Paul Heger, STDJ 100 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 163–204, 203. For a shorter version of this chapter, see Paul Heger, “Did Enochians Exist? Answer to Boccaccini,” in *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Nóra Dávid et al., FRLANT 239 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 402–12.

16 Heger, “Complementary or Alternative,” 176. See Richard Bauckham, “Apocalypses,” in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, ed. Donald A. Carson, Peter T. O’Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid, WUNT 2.140 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 135–87.

17 Heger, “Complementary or Alternative,” 166 n. 19.

18 Leslie Baynes, “Enoch and Jubilees in the Canon of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church,” in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*, ed. Eric Farel Mason et al., JSJSup 153 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 2:799–820, 813.

several flaws too. It is based on arguments *ex silentio* combined with later traditions that may or may not reflect the historical realities behind the composition of the Enochic and the Mosaic corpora. Before jumping to the conclusion that the reception of the Torah in the Book of Enoch is perfect, complete, without any issue or reservation, let us have a closer look at the textual evidence.

Moses in Enoch (and vice versa)

To prepare for this essay, I read (once more) the whole Book of Enoch, paying attention to elements which might be compared to the Mosaic Torah, whether references, allusions, agreements or disagreements. I found over a hundred passages – not counting repetitions such as the numerous mentions of fallen angels which are all reminiscent of Gen 6:1–4. Moses is not mentioned by name, since he is not a contemporary of Enoch, but he does appear in Enoch’s visions of the future, where we expect him to be. In particular, the Animal Apocalypse, which depicts salvation history using animals to represent various characters from creation to eschaton, tells (1 En. 89:16 ff) the story of Moses’ birth, flight, vocation, leadership, the exodus, the crossing of the Red Sea, the theophany on Mount Sinai... It even tells (v. 36) of Moses’ transformation into a divine being! Such divinization is consistent with the corresponding passage in Exod 34:29, where the skin of Moses’ face is said to have horns; this, of course, is reminiscent of Mesopotamian iconography where divine beings are easily recognized thanks to their horns.¹⁹ Moses then builds the tabernacle, keeps leading the people and, according to a textual witness, eventually leaves without dying: he is just nowhere to be found (v. 38).²⁰ In other words, Moses escapes death just

19 See, e.g., Thomas Römer, *Les cornes de Moïse. Faire entrer la Bible dans l'histoire*, Leçons inaugurales 206 (Paris: Collège de France, 2009). In light of such a clear parallel between 1 En. 89:36 and Exod 34:29, Nickelsburg’s alternative explanation that “perhaps the author has a problem with the image of a sheep building something” must be abandoned; see 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), 381. In the Animal Apocalypse, men represent divine beings such as the archangels (1 En. 87:2). In Exod 4:16 and 7:1, Moses is said to be a “god” (אֱלֹהִים).
20 One of the earliest manuscripts, *Ṭana 9*, reads ወለኩንገሥታው *wasakabu k’əllommu* “and they all lay down” rather than the more common reading ወለኩንገሥታው *wasakaba wak’əllommu* “and he lay down. And they all...” According to the latter, Moses is the only one who lies down, possibly referring to his death and burial. But according to the former reading, Moses is not the one who lay down, and there is therefore no mention of his death and burial. This variant is recorded in Knibb’s apparatus but not in his translation and commentary; see Michael A. Knibb, ed., *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea*

like Enoch! Overall, though the Book of Enoch does not say much about Moses, it has only good things to say about him, perhaps even better than the Mosaic Torah itself where Moses ends up dead and buried (Deut 34:5–6)!

If we now turn to the Mosaic Torah, what do we read about Enoch? Again, not much, but Enoch is present where we expect him to be, that is, in the genealogy between Adam and Noah. As mentioned earlier, Enoch is said to have “walked with God” or “journeyed with the gods” (Gen 5:22, 24) whereas other patriarchs simply “lived.” Besides Enoch, such close proximity and experience with the divine is credited to Noah alone (Gen 6:9) in the entire Mosaic Torah. But there’s more: contrary to other antediluvian patriarchs, Enoch is not said to “die”; he mysteriously disappears because God takes him (Gen 5:24). Of course, there have been attempts at interpreting this verse in a negative way, meaning that Enoch became wicked and that God killed him.²¹ But that is just not what the text says. If the author had wanted to depict a wicked Enoch, he could easily have done so, as can be observed for other characters elsewhere in Genesis and in the other Books of Moses. The fact is that the Mosaic Torah only has good things to say about Enoch, just like the Book of Enoch only has good things to say about Moses.

So how could scholars end up depicting such rivalry between Enoch and Moses? I believe this is due to a classic case of circular reasoning. For instance, Andreas Bedenbender assumes such rivalry and must therefore find a way to depict a negative image of Enoch in Gen 5. He argues that an Enochian would have expected a much more laudatory portrait of his champion, to the extent that the short description of Gen 5 would have offended him: “Why should the Enochians adopt a postexilic addition smuggled into the Torah by their sworn enemies? And apart from the question of chronology and from his genealogical position, the Enoch of Gen 5 turns out to be ‘un-Enochic’ if not ‘anti-Enochic.’”²² Even the duration of Enoch’s life, 365 years (Gen 5:23), which legitimates Enochic astronomical traditions, is seen as offensive to Enochians who promote a 364-day calendar.²³ Bedenbender’s tendency to antagonize and to polarize is blatant, to the point that even an explicitly positive testimony about Enoch is turned into a neg-

Fragments, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 1:309, 2:206. Cf. Ephraim Isaac, “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, (London: Darton Longman & Todd, 1983), 1:5–89, *ad loc.*, n. e3. Nickelsburg does not seem aware of this variant reading and concludes that “perhaps the author wishes to counter stories about Moses’ assumption”; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 382.

²¹ See e.g. Langlois, *Le premier manuscrit*, 26–8.

²² Bedenbender, “Place of the Torah,” 72.

²³ Bedenbender, “Place of the Torah,” 74.

ative statement almost qualified as anti-Enochic. The same goes with other positive testimonies that contradict the Moses-versus-Enoch theory.

In a sound scientific approach, a theory is checked against evidence and, if the evidence speaks against it, the theory has to be corrected. But in that case, the opposite happens: the evidence is twisted to fit the theory. Even worse, the theory appears to be reinforced in the process. This is a textbook case of circular reasoning, and it occurs over and over again.²⁴ As a matter of fact, Andreas Bedenbender himself confesses that “the argument, admittedly, is partly circular.”²⁵ Rather than imposing our assumptions and theories on a text, let us try and listen to what the text says in order to derive theories from the text.

This digression on epistemology and methodology is not superfluous: as we will see, other assumptions have led to extreme views such as total rejection or plenary acceptance of the Mosaic Torah in the Book of Enoch.

Moses and Enoch

The complexity of the relationship between the Mosaic Torah and the Book of Enoch may be delineated through the following observations:

First, there is no equation between the characters, their books, and eponymous Jewish groups. Talking about the figure of Enoch is not the same as talking about the Book of Enoch, nor is it the same as talking about Enochic Judaism. In the case of Gen 5, the positive testimony about Enoch does not imply an endorsement of a putative Enochic Judaism; nor would a less positive testimony imply a rejection of said group. Likewise, a reference to Moses in the Book of Enoch, as in 1 En. 89, does not imply an endorsement of a so-called Mosaic or Zadokite Judaism. Even more so, a lack of reference to Moses does not imply a rejection of said group.

Second, knowledge of the Mosaic Torah by the authors of the Book of Enoch should not be taken for granted. Scholars such as Baukham and Heger consider the Mosaic Torah as a prerequisite of the Book of Enoch, whose authors do not waste time repeating what the reader is expected to know. They emphasize the fact that Moses is no less present in Enoch than in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Twelve, or Daniel.²⁶ But this argument assumes, once again, that those prophets knew and upheld the Mosaic Torah. Heger emphatically asks: “To

²⁴ See e.g. Bedenbender, “Place of the Torah,” 66, 67, 76, 77, 79.

²⁵ Bedenbender, “Place of the Torah,” 77.

²⁶ See e.g. Heger, “Complementary or Alternative,” 167.

whom are Enoch's narratives and prophecies directed? In the absence of Mosaic law, they must refer to all humanity, Israelites and Gentiles alike.²⁷ In other words, Heger cannot imagine Israel without the Mosaic Torah. Yet, there is no evidence that ancient Israelite religion was based on, or upheld, or even knew the Mosaic Torah.

Even more surprisingly, this assumption is also found among proponents of a rivalry between Moses and Enoch: they too presuppose the priority of the Mosaic Torah over the Book of Enoch. Hence their conclusion that, if Moses is not mentioned in the Book of Enoch as much as he should, it is because Enochians reject the Mosaic Torah. Yet, epigraphical and archaeological evidence is inconclusive,²⁸ and the earliest manuscripts seem to date to the Achaemenid period.²⁹ This does not mean that the Mosaic Torah did not exist in any form before, but that we should not take it for granted. Likewise, the earliest manuscripts of the Book of Enoch date to the second century BCE, but linguistic features point to earlier redactions in the Achaemenid period.³⁰ And of course, this does not mean that the Book of Enoch did not exist in any form before.

Third, traditions and books should not be confused. For instance, the fact that the Book of Enoch knows about the divinization of Moses on Mount Sinai does not mean that the author had at hand a copy of the Mosaic Torah as we know it. Likewise, the fact that the Book of Genesis refers to sons of gods mating with daughters of men before the Flood (Gen 6:1–4) does not mean that the author is referring to the Book of Enoch as we know it. In both cases, it is possible that the authors knew of only one part of the book – the Book of Exodus rather than the whole Pentateuch, for instance, or the Book of Watchers rather than the whole Book of Enoch. Or perhaps they knew only about a section of the book, namely, the Sinai narrative or the Watchers' fall, which may have circulated independently before they were incorporated into a larger corpus. Traditions found

in the Book of Enoch are deeply rooted in Ancient Near Eastern culture and literature,³¹ both Mesopotamian³² and northwest Semitic.³³ Such traditions were well known to a number of biblical authors, who refer to them without necessarily endorsing the books or literary corpora from which they are known to us.

In the Book of Exodus, for instance, the Covenant Code exhibits a number of striking parallels with the Code of Hammurabi.³⁴ Yet, the fact that biblical authors knew about traditions found in that Code does not imply that they endorsed it, or even that they knew about the Code as it is exhibited today in the Louvre. Likewise, the Book of Ezekiel knows about a hero named Daniel, who is not to be confused with the homonymous hero of the eponymous biblical book, but whose story was found at Ugarit.³⁵ Does this mean that Ezekiel upheld or even knows the Ugaritic epic as we know it? Of course not.

The same can be said about authors of Enochic literature. In the Aramaic Book of Giants, one of the fallen angels' offspring with daughters of men is called "Gilgamesh."³⁶ This name undoubtedly refers to the famous Mesopotamian hero whose epic is now well known.³⁷ This is not to say, however, that the author of the Book of Giants had in his library the Gilgamesh epic in one of the editions that we know of, nor that he would accept or reject the ideology of this epic. Such examples illustrate the need to be cautious before drawing

31 See e.g. James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*, CBQMS 16 (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984); James C. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995).

32 See e.g. Helge S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*, WMANT 61 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988); Helge S. Kvanvig, *Primeval History: Babylonian, Biblical, and Enochic: An Intertextual Reading*, JJS 149 (Leiden: Brill, 2011).

33 See e.g. Michael Langlois, "Shemihazah et compagnie(s): Onomastique des anges déchus dans les manuscrits araméens du Livre d'Hénoch," in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008*, ed. Kattell Berthelot and Daniel Stöckl Ben Ezra, STDJ 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 145–80.

34 e.g. Exod 21:22–25 || Code of Hammurabi § 209–214.196–200; Exod 21:28–29 || § 250–252.

35 See e.g. Michael Langlois, "Loïn des yeux, non du cœur: l'héroïsme selon Daniel," in *Le jeune héros: Recherches sur la formation et la diffusion d'un thème littéraire au Proche-Orient ancien*, ed. Jean-Marie Durand, Thomas Römer, and Michael Langlois, OBO 250 (Fribourg: Academic Press, 2011), 242–58.

36 4Q530 2 ii+6–12(?) 2; 4Q531 22 12. For the *editio princeps*, see Émile Puech, "Qumrân grotte 4, XXII: Textes araméens, première partie (4Q529–549)," DJD XXXI (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 28–32; 74–7.

37 See e.g. the recent edition by Andrew R. George, ed., *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic: Introduction, Critical Edition, and Cuneiform Texts*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

27 See e.g. Heger, "Complementary or Alternative," 167.

28 For instance, the Ketef Hinnom amulets do not prove the existence of the Mosaic Torah. They merely attest the existence of a prayer very similar to the one found in Num 6:24–6. One might even argue that this prayer was later adapted and integrated by a redactor of the Book of Numbers. I am not saying that this is my opinion, especially since the dating of these amulets is complicated by stratigraphical and paleogeographical issues; see e.g. Gabriel Barkay et al., "The Amulets from Ketef Hinnom: A New Edition and Evaluation," *BASOR* 334 (2004): 41–71.

29 In a recent publication, I suggest higher dates than traditionally ascribed to some of the so-called "paleo-Hebrew" Dead Sea scrolls; see Michael Langlois, "Dead Sea Scrolls Palaeography and the Samaritan Pentateuch," in *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Michael Langlois, CBET 94 (Leuven: Peeters, 2019), 255–85. Yet, even a date in the Achaemenid period says little about the existence and status of the Mosaic Torah in the Iron Age.

30 For paleogeographical and linguistic dating, see Langlois, *Le premier manuscrit*, 66–8, 453.

conclusions from the presence or absence of references to the Mosaic Torah in the Book of Enoch and vice versa.

Fourth, the Mosaic Torah and the Book of Enoch are not theologically homogeneous or consistent. The Book of Enoch, for instance, is said to ascribe the origin of evil to the fallen Watchers, who not only sinned by their union against nature with daughters of men, but revealed to them a number of skills leading to sorcery, seduction and war, among others (1 En. 8:1–3). The Mosaic Torah, on the other hand, is said to ascribe the origin of evil not to fallen angels, but to Adam and Eve, who disobeyed God's word and ate of the forbidden fruit (Gen 3:6). These conflicting views on primeval sin have been so much emphasized that they have become the very definition of Enochic Judaism. In Boccaccini's words: "At the center of Enochic Judaism was neither the temple nor the torah but a unique concept of the origin of evil that made the 'fallen angels' ... ultimately responsible for the spread of evil and impurity on earth."³⁸ Yet, the Book of Enoch also states that "lawlessness was not sent upon the earth; but men created it by themselves" (1 En. 98:4).³⁹ Obviously, the Book of Enoch is not as theologically homogeneous as one may think.⁴⁰

Likewise, the Mosaic Torah does mention the story of the fallen angels even though this account departs from the previous narrative of, and explanation for, the origin of sin on earth.⁴¹ Such heterogeneity in the Pentateuch is nothing new and has led to the development of the famous documentary hypothesis. Within this framework, P (the priestly redactor) seems to be more open towards Enochic traditions, since he speaks highly of Enoch in Gen 5 (as opposed to the parallel genealogy in Gen 4) and does mention the story of the fallen angels in Gen 6. He even refers to one of the watchers by name in Lev 16, where the Yom Kippur scapegoat is said to go to "Azazel" (v. 8.10.26), who is none other than the tenth leader of the fallen angels in the Book of Enoch.⁴² By comparison, J (the Yahwist) does not seem as knowledgeable of Enochic traditions, or perhaps is not as open as P towards them.⁴³ Ironically, then, the priestly redactor would be the best ally of the so-called Enochians who, according to Bedenbender, re-

³⁸ Boccaccini, "From the Enoch Literature to Enochic Judaism," 6.

³⁹ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 468.

⁴⁰ See e.g. Stuckenbruck, "Pentateuch and Biblical Interpretation," 56.

⁴¹ Philip R. Davies, *On the Origins of Judaism* (London: Equinox, 2011), 123.

⁴² Langlois, "Shemihazah et compagnie(s)."

⁴³ This does not necessarily imply that J's purpose is to contradict Enochic traditions; see Davison, *On the Origins of Judaism*, 129.

jected the Mosaic Torah precisely because it was in the hands of the priestly redactors responsible for Gen 5!⁴⁴

This example illustrates the need to be more cautious when ascribing a given theology to the Book of Enoch or to the Mosaic Torah. One cannot simply state that they are in diametrical opposition or in perfect harmony. A passage of Enoch may be in agreement with a passage of the Torah, while another passage of Enoch may disagree with another passage of the Torah. So where does that lead us in terms of the reception of the Mosaic Torah in the Book of Enoch?

Conclusions

First, not every author of the various sections of the Book of Enoch necessarily knew about the Mosaic Torah. Some of the traditions found in 1 Enoch may be quite old, going back to a time when the Pentateuch as we know it was not yet in existence. In that case, no reception of the Torah should be expected. Quite the opposite, actually: there are clear signs of a reception of Enochic traditions in the Mosaic Torah, especially in Gen 5–6 and in Lev 16.

Second, there is a probable overlap between the redaction history of the Mosaic Torah and that of the Book of Enoch. Both of these corpora were written over a long period of time spanning centuries. They both include ancient traditions whose origins can be traced to the second millennium BCE at the latest, while the last redactional phases cannot be dated earlier than the Hellenistic period. Even if we suppose that the Mosaic Torah was more or less completed by the Achaemenid period, earlier than the Book of Enoch, this leaves plenty of time for them to get to know one another, to borrow traditions from each other or to react against them.

Third, the Mosaic Torah and the Book of Enoch occasionally disagree with each other and with themselves. The fact that the Book of Enoch sometimes – and, I would say, rarely – contradicts the Mosaic Torah should not be interpreted as a total rejection. It could, at best, be a reaction against a few passages or tendencies, and even in such cases I would wonder who is reacting against whom: is Enoch reacting against the Mosaic Torah, or is the Torah reacting against Enoch?

There's more: for each alleged case of contradiction against each other, the same discrepancy may be observed within each corpus. There is no greater degree of mutual disagreement than inner contradiction. If the traditional JEDP

⁴⁴ Bedenbender, "Place of the Torah," 70–2.

theory does not satisfactorily explain the intricacies of the Pentateuch,⁴⁵ how could a simplistic theory of Enochic versus Mosaic Judaism account for the complexity of the textual evidence at our disposal?

Fourth, the Mosaic Torah and the Book of Enoch accommodate a wide and overlapping spectrum of tendencies within ancient Judaism. There may, indeed, have been groups interested in liturgy and rituals alone, who would dedicate most of their time reading or rewriting Leviticus, with no interest whatsoever in revealed wisdom. At the other extremity of the spectrum, there may have been groups interested in ecstasy and apocalyptic experiences alone, who would not care at all about the amount of flour and wine accompanying various sacrifices, and who would rather take pleasure in reliving over and over again the otherworldly journeys of Enoch. But judging by the contents of the Mosaic Torah alone or the Book of Enoch alone, it seems that most people were somewhere in between, somehow interested in both legal issues and patriarchal narratives, admonitions and encounters with divine beings.

The reception of the Mosaic Torah in the Book of Enoch is just as multifaceted as ancient Judaism itself. This complex relationship explains why Enoch was strongly rejected by certain Jewish and Christian authorities while, at the same time, canonized by others.

Bibliography

- Barkay, Gabriel, Marilyn J. Lundberg, Andrew J. Vaughn and Bruce Zuckerman. "The Amulets from Ketef Hinnom: A New Edition and Evaluation." *BASOR* 334 (2004): 41–71.
- Bauchman, Richard. "Apocalypses." Pages 135–87 in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Edited by Donald A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid. WUNT 2.140. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Baynes, Leslie. "Enoch and Jubilees in the Canon of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church." Pages 799–820 in vol. 2 of *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*. Edited by Eric Farrel Mason, Samuel L. Thomas, Alison Schofield and Eugene Ulrich. JSJSup 153. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Bedenbender, Andreas. "The Place of the Torah in the Early Enoch Literature." Pages 65–79 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. JSJSup 121. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Bedenbender, Andreas. "Traces of Enochic Judaism within the Hebrew Bible." Pages 39–48 in *The Origins of Enochic Judaism: Proceedings of the First Enoch Seminar, University of Michigan, Sesto Fiorentino, Italy, June 19–23, 2001*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Randal A. Argall. Henoch 24. Torino: Zamorani, 2002.

⁴⁵ See e.g. the classical work by John Van Seters, *The Pentateuch: A Social-Science Commentary*, 2nd ed. (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015).

- Boccaccini, Gabriele. "Introduction: From the Enoch Literature to Enochic Judaism." Pages 1–16 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Collins, John J. "Enochic Judaism" and the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 283–300 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. JSJSup 121. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Collins, John J. "How distinctive was Enochic Judaism?" *Meghillot – Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* 5–6 (2008): 17–34.
- Davies, Philip R. *On the Origins of Judaism*. London: Equinox, 2011.
- George, Andrew R. ed. *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic: Introduction, Critical Edition, and Cuneiform Texts*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Heger, Paul. "Did Enochians Exist? Answer to Boccaccini." Pages 402–12 in *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Nóra Dávid, Kristin de Troyer, Armin Lange and Shani Tzoref. FRLANT 239. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.
- Heger, Paul. "Enoch: Complementary or Alternative to Mosaic Torah?" Pages 163–204 in *Challenges to Conventional Opinions on Qumran and Enoch Issues*. Edited by Paul Heger. STDJ 100. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Isaac, Ephraim. "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch." Pages 5–89 in vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. London: Darton Longman & Todd, 1983.
- Isaac, Ephraim. "The Oldest Ethiopic Manuscript (K-9) of the Book of Enoch and Recent Studies of the Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4." Pages 195–207 in *Working with No Data: Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin*. Edited by David M. Golomb and Susan T. Hollis. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987.
- Knibb, Michael A., ed. *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Kvanvig, Helge S. *Primeval History: Babylonian, Biblical, and Enochic: An Intertextual Reading*. JSJSup 149. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Kvanvig, Helge S. *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*. WMANT 61. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.
- Langlois, Michael. "Dead Sea Scrolls Palaeography and the Samaritan Pentateuch." Pages 255–85 in *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Michael Langlois. CBET 94. Leuven: Peeters, 2019.
- Langlois, Michael. "Loin des yeux, non du cœur: l'héroïsme selon Daniel." Pages 242–58 in *Le jeune héros: Recherches sur la formation et la diffusion d'un thème littéraire au Proche-Orient ancien*. Edited by Jean-Marie Durand, Thomas Römer, and Michael Langlois. OBO 250. Fribourg: Academic Press, 2011.
- Langlois, Michael. "Shemihazah et compagnie(s): Onomastique des anges déchués dans les manuscrits araméens du Livre d'Hénoch." Pages 145–80 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stöckl Ben Ezra. STDJ 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Langlois, Michael. *Le premier manuscrit du Livre d'Hénoch: Étude épigraphique et philologique des fragments araméens de 4Q201 à Qumrân*. Lectio Divina. Paris: Cerf, 2008.

- Milik, Józef Tadeusz. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrān Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch: Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- Nickelsburg, George W.E. "Enochic Wisdom: An Alternative to the Mosaic Torah?" Pages 123–32 in *Hesed Ve-Emet: Studies in Honor of Ernest S. Frerichs*. Edited by Jodi Magness and Seymour Gitin. BJS 320. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Nickelsburg, George W.E. "Enochic Wisdom and Its Relationship to the Mosaic Torah." Pages 81–94 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. JSJSup 121. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Puech, Émile. *Qumrān grotte 4, XXII: Textes araméens, première partie (4Q529–549)*. DJD XXXI. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001.
- Römer, Thomas. *Les cornes de Moïse: Faire entrer la Bible dans l'histoire*. Leçons inaugurales 206. Paris: Collège de France, 2009.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "The Pentateuch and Biblical Interpretation in the Enoch Literature from the Second Century BCE." Pages 43–58 in *The Qumran Legal Texts between the Hebrew Bible and Its Interpretation*. Edited by Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange. CBET 61. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.
- Van Seters, John. *The Pentateuch: A Social-Science Commentary*. 2nd ed. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015.
- VanderKam, James C. "Mapping Second Temple Judaism." Pages 1–20 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. JSJSup 121. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- VanderKam, James C. *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. CBQMS 16. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.
- VanderKam, James C. *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*. Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.

Ryan Stokes

Mosaic Torah and Defense against Demons in the Book of *Jubilees*

Beliefs about demons, evil spirits, and other maleficent superhuman beings thrived in the centuries just prior to the turn of the era. One needs only to compare the literature of the Hebrew Scriptures with some of the Qumran texts or with the writings of the New Testament to observe the impressive extent to which ideas about harmful superhuman beings arose and developed in the mid to late Second Temple period. The Hebrew Scriptures have extremely little to say about such beings, whereas later literature is rife with references to them and presumes a rich theology about their nature and their place within the created order.¹

Demons, evil spirits, and (the Prince of) Mastema figure prominently in the second-century BCE book of *Jubilees*. With respect to its view of these beings, *Jubilees* occupies a position developmentally somewhere between the biblical literature, on the one hand, and some of the Dead Sea Scrolls and early Christian literature, on the other. These harmful beings are not quite the enemies of good and of God that they would very soon become, but they have taken on more responsibility for the world's problems than they have in the earlier texts. Also, *Jubilees* is not entirely uniform in its presentation of the Prince of Mastema and harmful spirits, but comprises a variety of perspectives on maleficent superhuman beings, some of which stand in tension with one another. Some passages, for instance, speak of the Prince of Mastema as the enemy of God's people who attempts to thwart God's plan to bless them (e.g., Jub. 48:1–4). Other passages incorporate this hostile figure into a systematic presentation of the superhuman realm, one in which the Prince of Mastema and harmful spirits are in league together, function within the limits established by God, and serve the divine purpose of distinguishing Israel from the other nations of the world (Jub. 15:31–32). It is this latter view of evil spirits/demons and their leader that is the focus of the present contribution. The essay considers, in particular, how *Jubilees* appeals to pneumatology/demonology in service of its larger purpose of promoting Torah observance. It argues that *Jubilees* presents itself as the ultimate revealed Torah through which God offers Israel protection from evil spirits.

¹ That is not to say that all texts are equally concerned with evil superhuman figures. Many texts from this period diminish their importance or ignore them altogether (e.g., 1 En. 98:4).