"3 Enoch and the Enoch Tradition," in Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection (ed. G. Boc...

Lawrence Schiffman

ENOCH AND QUMRAN ORIGINS

New Light on a Forgotten Connection

Edited by

Gabriele Boccaccini

Associate Editors

J. Harold Ellens and James Alan Waddell

with the collaboration of

Jason von Ehrenkrook, Ronald Ruark, and Aaron Brunell

3 Enoch and the Enoch Tradition

Lawrence H. Schiffman

In his pioneering work *3 Enoch, or the Hebrew Book of Enoch*, first published in 1928, Hugo Odeberg, in effect arguing for the validity of the name he had given the work with the authorization of Robert H. Charles (see Greenfield 1973, xxi), assembled a long list of comparisons between 1 Enoch and 3 Enoch (Odeberg 1928, 43-51).[1] After examining these parallels, he maintained (1) that 3 Enoch was dependent upon 1 Enoch and (2) that considerable development of these common ideas had taken place between the composition of 1 Enoch and the later 3 Enoch. We should remember that Odeberg (41) dated the main body of 3 Enoch to the second half of the third century c.e., a date most contemporary scholars would see as too early. Indeed, Heinrich Graetz (1859; cf. Odeberg 1928, 24-30) had dated the text to the Geonic period (seventh-eleventh centuries). Gershon Scholem (1965, 7 n. 9) dated the work to the fifth-sixth centuries. Josef T. Milik (1976, 123-35) dated it as late as the ninth-tenth centuries, but his view has not carried much weight. In light of other evidence for the diffusion of these ideas, Philip Alexander accepts the Scholem dating of the fifth-sixth centuries (Alexander 1983, 225-29).

Bearing in mind that the sources of 3 Enoch no doubt are to be dated earlier, and remembering the complex literary history of 1 Enoch (Milik 1976, 1-58; VanderKam 1984, 76-140), even if Odeberg has overstated their relationship, we should recall that George F. Moore postulated subterranean "channels of com-

munication if not literary acquaintance" (Moore 1927-30, 2:281). We today know so much more about second temple literature and its survival into the Middle Ages (Reeves 1994; Schiffman 1997-2001) that a reinvestigation of the relationship of 1 Enoch and 3 Enoch would seem to be in order. In this way we can extend the chronological limits of the thorough study of the Enoch tradition by James VanderKam (1995) that ended in 300 c.e. by discussing 3 Enoch. It is therefore to the relationship of this much later text to the earlier Enoch tradition that we devote this study.

Odeberg argued that the twin aspects of dependence and development were most apparent in the conception of Enoch. In 1 Enoch he is an ancient "saint-man" who was worthy of receiving disclosures about the future and celestial wonders, mostly in visions. He is the authority behind the secrets in the books bearing his name. Enoch's translation is also central. These aspects are said to occupy the Enoch-Metatron parts of 3 Enoch (Odeberg 1928, 51).

This view, argued Jonas Greenfield, is much oversimplified. Greenfield asserts that the decision to call the book 3 Enoch is in fact an error. The manuscripts uniformly call it *Sefer Hekhalot*, except for MS Oxford, which has a later addition, *Sefer Hanoch*, that Odeberg records as if it were in the same hand.

More importantly, Greenfield notes that Enoch does not appear as an independent entity in the book, but only as assimilated to Metatron, who delivers much *hekhalot* material to Rabbi Ishmael. Further, he draws a distinction regarding the role of Enoch-Metatron in 3 Enoch and the role of Enoch in 1 and 2 Enoch and in the Genesis Apocryphon (2:19-26) (Greenfield 1973, xxi-xxiii).[2] In these other works Enoch's translation to heaven and his vision, even his transformation into a companion of the angels, do not render him inaccessible to humans. In 1 and 2 Enoch he returns to earth. In the Genesis Apocryphon he is accessible to Methuselah. He never turns into an archangel or Prince of the Presence *(Sar ha-Panim)*. We may describe the journey of the "authentic Enoch" as "ascension (or vision) and return."

However, in 3 Enoch, Enoch is transformed into Metatron and cannot return to earth or to human fellowship. In other words, we may say, following Greenfield's observations, that the Enoch tradition, as it was absorbed into *hekhalot* circles, was later accommodated to *merkavah* traditions in that Enoch, already translated into heaven, was now translated into Metatron (Greenfield 1973, xxxii).

---

1. On 3 Enoch see Gruenwald (1980, 191-208), Schäfer (1992, 123-38), and Mopsik (1989, 7-91), where a French translation and detailed commentary are presented. The manuscript evidence is available in Schäfer (1981).

2. For the text of the Genesis Apocryphon passage, see Fitzmyer (1971, 52-55, 93-96).

Charles's Examples

We will begin by examining the original list of parallels between 1 Enoch and 3 Enoch provided by Charles (1912, lxxix-lxxxi). We need to bear in mind that Charles's knowledge of 3 Enoch was based on the partial edition of Adolph Jellinek (1967, 5:170-90) and an Oxford manuscript.[3]

1. According to 3 Enoch 4, Rabbi Ishmael ascends to heaven and receives revelations from Metatron, who says he is Enoch, son of Jared, translated into heaven at the time of the flood to be an eternal witness against sinful contemporaries. Of course, in 1 Enoch there is no Metatron and claims are made of revelation by Enoch. According to 1 Enoch 14:8, Enoch is borne to heaven, a notion also found in 70:2, but this notion is so widespread as to be of little significance for dependence. 3 Enoch 4 has Enoch-Metatron say he was lifted up to heaven to be a witness against the sinfulness of the generation of the flood. Charles points out allusions to this sinfulness in 1 Enoch 5:4-6 and 14:1-7, but these texts do not claim that Enoch was translated as a witness. Again, the sins of this generation are not a significant parallel.

2. According to Charles (1912, lxxx), Enoch-Metatron had been instructed by the Angel of Wisdom in the mysteries of the creation of heaven and earth of past, present, and future, and of the world to come. Parenthetically, this list reminds us of the *razim*, "mysteries," of the Qumran books of Mysteries (Barthélemy and Milik 1955, 102-7; Schiffman 1997, 31-123) and other wisdom texts. In fact, 3 Enoch 8 makes God himself the teacher of wisdom who educationally transformed the young Enoch-Metatron. Charles cites as parallels to his approach 1 Enoch 93:10 (Apocalypse of Weeks), which alludes to the eventual instruction in such wisdom of the Elect — not a very close parallel.[4] Again, these works are not parallel here.

3. Charles pointed to the idea that until humans turned to idolatry, Adam and his generation beheld God's glorious presence, until the angels Aza and Azazel led humanity astray. In fact, 3 Enoch 5 says they simply went astray and the fallen angels appear only to object to Enoch's presence in heaven. Enoch is blamed for introducing idolatry. Only then did Uza, Aza, and Aziel teach them magical praxis. Charles's comparison to 1 Enoch 6:6 fails because it places the idolatry in the time of Jared, not Enosh or Enoch, and in 1 Enoch 6 the fallen angels caused the evildoing, they did not just teach magic, which indeed is a parallel motif in these texts. Both texts, by the way, associate wealth with stimulating the transgression. The evil machinations of Azazel are somewhat parallel, but this is also a reflection of common exegesis of the scriptural Azazel demon (Lev 16:8, 10, 26). But in 3 Enoch it is humans who cause evil, whereas in 1 Enoch it is the fallen angels.

4. Charles notes that 3 Enoch describes the seven heavens, their hosts of angels, and the courses of the sun, moon, and stars.[5] At the outset we need to note that these chapters describe the angelic hierarchy in military terms[6] and that the heavenly aspect is discussed only from the point of view of the angelic hosts and their military ceremonial activity. Another dominant theme is the heavenly account books and their angelic scribes. Further, the overall theme is angelic support of the divine *merkavah*. 1 Enoch 72-82, cited by Charles (1912, lxxx) as parallel, is actually totally different. It consists of astronomical data and description, and Charles does not understand the "leaders" of 75:1 to be angels. Bottom line — 1 Enoch includes a calendar text and describes the heavens astronomically, and 3 Enoch is an angelic *merkavah* text similar to the *Sefer ha-Razim* (Margaliot 1966, 65-109), and has absolutely no astronomy in it. Further, the angelic hosts of the seven heavens and above are not described in 1 Enoch. Again, Charles's parallel is specious.

5. Charles points to the idea, at the end of a long description of the winds in 3 Enoch 23, that the winds enter Eden and absorb fragrant odors that are brought before the righteous in the end of days. He cites as parallel 1 Enoch 24:4-25:7. This text discusses one fragrant tree reserved for the end of days in what is essentially the Garden of Eden. As he notes in his commentary (Charles 1912, 53), this is the tree of life. There are no winds here and no mixed fragrances here. Again, this is not much of a parallel.

6. He then refers to 3 Enoch 24-26, which describe God's multiple chariots and then the Ophanim and Seraphim and their archangels. The presence of Ophanim and Seraphim with Cherubim in 1 Enoch 61:10 and 71:7 is quite minimal as an example of agreement, since none of the details of the accounts match and there is no multiplicity of chariots (*merkavot*) in 1 Enoch. While it is true that in both texts angels intercede for humans, in 3 Enoch 26 the Seraphim destroy the Satan's written indictments against Israel and in 1 Enoch 40:3-7 one of the four archangels intercedes for humanity to forefend against the Satans. Similarity, yes, but no real dependency can be observed.

7. A sort of heavenly librarian is described in 3 Enoch 27, who gives books and records to God and may read before him. 1 Enoch 89:61-64, 70-76 describes a divine recorder who is told to record and reads only his own records. 1 Enoch 98:7-8 and 104:7 refer to recording transgressions, but the parallel here is tenuous. In 3 Enoch there is no writing, only reading.

---

3. Odeberg lists four Bodleian (Oxford) manuscripts that he used (17-18).
4. En 63:11-21, cited by Charles, does not exist.

5. Charles refers to chaps. 18-22, but the account actually starts in chap. 17.
6. For this motif in early Jewish magical and mystical texts, cf. Levine (1970).

8. 3 Enoch 35–40 concerns camps of angels in the heavens reciting *qedushah*, the heavenly fiery stream, camps of the *shekhinah*, and the behavior of ministering angels and other parts of God's angelic retinue. These descriptions are widespread in *hekhalot* texts and in related ritual poetry *(piyyut)* (Altmann 1946). Enoch's praise of God in 1 Enoch 39:10-13 is not relevant, despite Charles's insistence to the contrary; but he also cites 1 Enoch 61:10-12. Here we have a description of the praise of God on the day of judgment, not daily praise in the present, as in 3 Enoch. But the doxology of this text has no relation to the Isaianic *trisagion* "Holy, Holy, Holy . . ." (Isa 6:3) that is the main theme of 3 Enoch in these chapters. So all that is parallel here is a brief reference to eschatological praise that hardly compares with the centrality of *qedushah* praise in 3 Enoch.

9. Charles (1912, lxxx–lxxxi) lists together a number of aspects of chapters 41–47 of 3 Enoch that we will look at one by one. Chapter 42 describes the repositories of rain, snow, hail, thunder, and lightning. 1 Enoch 60:11-21 is indeed parallel, except that the details of these accounts are different. In 3 Enoch 43–44 all the classes of righteous and evildoers are described in terms of their punishments and evil deeds. Then, in chapter 47 Metatron shows Rabbi Ishmael angels that are being punished for uttering praise of God at the wrong time or inappropriately. Charles compares 1 Enoch 18:11-16 and 1 Enoch 21, but here it is not angels but stars that are punished for coming out at the wrong time. This is referred to in 21:10 as the prison of the angels, and if the stars and angels are identical there is again some parallel, but no direct dependence. But in 1 Enoch 19:1 the punished angels have had relations with women, and none of these 1 Enoch texts mentions incorrect or poorly timed praise of God by the angels, the main offense in the 3 Enoch passage.

Metatron does show Rabbi Ishmael the ages of the world from Adam up through the messianic redemption (3 En 45), and the destruction of God's enemies (3 En 48a). 3 Enoch 45 mentions the messiah son of Joseph and the wars of "Gog and Magog." Charles cites 1 Enoch 56:5–57:2, which does talk about the end of days, but in very different terms. In fact, the specifics of this messianic vision have no parallels in 1 Enoch, despite some references Charles cites to the end of days.

What this detailed set of comparisons shows is that the initial assumptions about the relationship of these books were grossly exaggerated. In fact, I have so far found no evidence at all that the author of 3 Enoch was directly influenced by 1 Enoch.

Odeberg Parallels

I now turn to a detailed study of the parallels assembled by Odeberg (1928, 43-51) to show the dependence of 3 Enoch on 1 Enoch and its development of the ideas it supposedly inherited. In approaching this list I will not point out the irrelevance of examples but concentrate instead on trying to assemble some legitimate parallels. Whereas the Charles list proceeded in the order of 3 Enoch, Odeberg assembled his list in the order of 1 Enoch. I, however, have tried to group the phenomena under discussion.

1. *Angelic Designations.* Exceedingly common in 1 Enoch is the term "Watchers," which gives its name to an entire book of Enoch (1 En 6-36). It occurs in the phrase *'irin we-qadishin,* "Watchers and Holy Ones," in 3 Enoch 28. Watchers and holy ones also appear in 1 Enoch, but seem to be derived there directly from Daniel 4:10, 14, and 20. Shemiḥazah, the leader of the fallen angels in 1 Enoch, is not found in 3 Enoch. Asael and Azael do appear as part of the triplets Uzza, Azza, and Azziel in 3 Enoch 4–5, where two figures have been expanded to three in a fashion only possible if influence is indirect. Some angel names in 1 Enoch do appear in 3 Enoch, e.g., Berakiel (1 En 6:7, 8:3; 3 En 17).

According to 1 Enoch, there are four angels of presence — Michael, Uriel (or Penuel), Raphael, and Gabriel. 3 Enoch refers to four great princes over the camps of the divine presence *(shekhinah),* but their names are not given. In 1 Enoch they are sometimes referred to without names (four presences) (Odeberg 1928, 50). 1 Enoch uses the term "angels of destruction," which is similar to 3 Enoch's *mal'akhe ḥabalah,* "angels of destruction" (3 En 31; 33; 44). 1 Enoch 61:10-12 does enumerate types of angels, but the level of specificity of 3 Enoch is not even aspired to or imagined. Both texts, however, share the idea that the number of angels is enormous or even infinite, but this notion derives from a common source, Daniel, or its source. Both texts also work with systems of seven archangels and four angels of presence that have to be harmonized (cf. 1 En 20 and 87:2). This reconciliation is performed in totally different manners by the two texts.

2. *The Myth of the Fallen Angels.* We have already alluded to the different angelic leadership described in the two texts. Also, there is no full enumeration of the fallen angels in 3 Enoch. In fact, this myth is widespread in Jewish texts (Bamberger 1952; Jung 1974). As already mentioned, the role of the fallen angels is not the same in both texts. In 3 Enoch, after Enoch leads humanity astray, the angels, whose fall is not mentioned, teach humanity magic (3 En 5). The same angels oppose Enoch-Metatron (3 En 4). Odeberg (1928, 43) claims this as an example of a direct parallel, but it seems indirect to me.

3. *The Divine Throne.* 1 Enoch 14:8–15:1 is a chariot vision (cf. chap. 71). Both of these texts, like many others, build their *merkavah* visions on combin-

ing Ezekiel's (chaps. 1; 10) and Daniel's visions (7:1-14) of the world of the divine, and so parallels are to be expected. The almost equivalent quotations in 1 Enoch 15:3 and 3 Enoch 5 refer to different subjects. In 1 Enoch it is addressed to Enoch by God in a throne vision. In 3 Enoch the quotation is addressed by the ministering angels to God himself. In 1 Enoch 25:3 the throne plays a part in judgment, presumably at the end of days. This notion is also found in 3 Enoch (e.g., 26 [end]), except that it applies to the present, not to the end of days.

4. *Dramatis Personae*. The final comparison we will cite from Odeberg is that of the dramatis personae. Here I refer to the large amount of material about the Elect One in 1 Enoch (Puech 2000; Fitzmyer 1974).[7] Here Odeberg (1928, 47) notes that many of the features of the Elect One and Son of Man in 1 Enoch are transferred to Metatron in 3 Enoch. Enoch is indeed called an Elect One *(bahir)* in 3 Enoch 6. The term "Son of Man" does not occur in 3 Enoch. The Elect One, according to 1 Enoch 45:3 and the like, will sit on the throne of glory, and Metatron clearly derives from *meta thronos,* literally "along with the throne," despite the philological objections (Odeberg 1928, 125-42; Lieberman 1980). Metatron sits on a throne in 3 Enoch 10 *et alia,* but he never sits on the divine throne, as Odeberg notes (47).[8] 3 Enoch 48c, probably a later addition, does closely parallel 1 Enoch. There is one final central difference, not explicated by Odeberg: whereas Enoch appears in 1 Enoch as the revealer of hidden secrets, in 3 Enoch Rabbi Ishmael appears as an intermediary, always conveying what Enoch-Metatron told him in a vision. Thus, the role of Enoch/Enoch-Metatron is completely different in these works.

It is worth saying a few words to summarize our discussion of Odeberg's lists of parallels between 1 and 3 Enoch, remembering that our investigation was not comprehensive. Basically, we have found a few striking verbal parallels and some parallel ideas, along with a vast corpus of material that has both similarities and differences. All this seems to argue for a relationship less than that of dependence and calls for a much more cautious approach than the name 3 Enoch would imply.

Odeberg's 2 Enoch Parallels

Before drawing conclusions from what we have surveyed, it is worthwhile to look at the relationship of 2 Enoch to 3 Enoch. We can begin with Odeberg's

summary discussion (Odeberg 1928, 60-63) after his fuller comparisons (52-60). He concludes that 3 Enoch is based on the same traditions as 2 Enoch "to a considerable extent." Moreover, he observes that in 3 Enoch the development of these traditions is further advanced than in 2 Enoch and (and this is most doubtful) "that, apparently, the conceptions of 3 Enoch in most cases are direct continuations on the lines of development begun by 2 Enoch" (60). To illustrate this assertion he discusses a number of topics.

1. *Angelology.* He says the tendency toward systematization in 2 Enoch, compared with 1 Enoch, has yielded the very complex schema of 3 Enoch. This need not be the case, since *Sefer ha-Razim* and a variety of *hekhalot* texts have similar angelology. Further, what these collections really share is the complex of heavens and angels, even of thrones, but the specifics are quite different, as he himself indicates in his detailed discussion.

2. *Concept of Enoch.* Odeberg argues that 2 Enoch represents a stage between 1 Enoch and 3 Enoch chronologically; "speaking metaphorically, [it is] on the straight line connecting 1 Enoch to 3 Enoch." This overstatement is one with which I clearly disagree; but he is correct that in 1 Enoch the essential feature is Enoch's visions and revelations, whereas in 2 Enoch the transformation of Enoch into a celestial being is central. Yet in 2 Enoch he is still below Michael. He is not yet ruler of all the angels and vice-regent of God. This is accomplished only with the identification of Enoch with Metatron in 3 Enoch. This is correct, but already points away from linear development to a more complex situation. It is only through the merger of a complex of Enoch traditions with those of Michael, Metatron, and other *hekhalot* archangels that 3 Enoch's approach comes about. This disproves Odeberg's linear, simplistic approach.

3. He correctly notes that regarding judgment and the fate of souls, 2 Enoch parallels 1 Enoch more closely than it follows 3 Enoch, which actually adheres to the rabbinic approach. But this is because of the general rabbinic milieu, even of the *hekhalot* texts such as 3 Enoch, that is sufficient to guarantee their general adherence or assimilation to rabbinic theological norms (Swartz 1996, 174-205). Perhaps most simplistic is Odeberg's statement that "2 Enoch must have been well known to the circle from which 3 Enoch originated."

4. *Close Parallels.* Several close parallels between 2 and 3 Enoch are striking and indicate at least indirect influence, if not Odeberg's "direct dependence."

a. 2 Enoch and 3 Enoch have three, not two, leaders for the fallen angels.
b. The heavenly librarian has the same name and function in 2 and 3 Enoch.
c. Both books have Enoch first instructed by angels, then by God himself (Odeberg 1928, 61).

---

7. 4Q534 1 i 10 refers to *behir 'elaha,* "the elect of God" (Puech 2001, 133-34).

8. About this section of 1 Enoch, Odeberg comments that "the differences are, however, greater than the resemblances" (1928, 47).

Odeberg also notes that there are more of what he sees as later developments in 2 Enoch than in 3 Enoch, some of which are later additions, but some in our view are simply variant ideas.

After this roundabout tour and critique of the views of others, it is time to return to the work of our colleague James VanderKam. The notion of a developing literature of "booklets" that he has explored so carefully regarding 1 Enoch (VanderKam 1984, 17-101) is clearly the correct method with which to understand the eventual emergence of 2 and 3 Enoch as well. These works are composites of documents that were themselves put together from other minor protodocuments, a phenomenon clearly emerging from the results of VanderKam's detailed research, especially when coupled with Milik's approach to 1 Enoch, even if all of Milik's views are not accepted. The close relation of our official Enoch literature — or better, the various booklets — with other texts (not just traditions) highlights the value of this literary-historical model. Had I sought to work on 2 Enoch and its relation to 1 Enoch, this approach would have been enough to provide a model to understand the development of 2 Enoch.

There is another aspect, totally ignored by Odeberg, since it was not yet known in his time. It turns out that "booklets," or better, short treatises, are the building blocks of all the *hekhalot*-type texts, as shown by Peter Schäfer (1983). In fact, texts as we know them, independent compositions, are a misnomer for these "texts," since different manuscripts have different mixes of common, but not always present, building blocks. With this model in mind we can grasp that, like 1 Enoch and 2 Enoch, 3 Enoch is such a composite.

However, 3 Enoch is not just a composite of text traditions such as those found in 1 and 2 Enoch. The circle that produced, exported, composed, redacted, copied, and studied traditions like those in 1 Enoch and 3 Enoch produced various booklets which still circulated in different forms and in different languages after the so-called 1 and 2 Enoch came into being as redacted texts. Some of the original documents circulated in translation. These traditions somehow mixed with those of the *hekhalot* trend and were redomesticated as part of the emerging textual tradition of late rabbinic/early medieval Jewish esotericism. The results of this combination remain fully clear in the passages in 3 Enoch that harmonize the persona (if we can use this term) of Enoch with that of Metatron native to the *hekhalot* corpus. But let us not forget how Metatron himself, in this text, or better, in the booklets that preceded it, had inherited or superseded the roles of other heavenly figures, like Michael and Akatriel, all found in related *hekhalot* literature (Scholem 1965, 43-55).

What all this means is that any linear view of the relationship between 1 and 3 Enoch, let alone 1, 2, and 3 Enoch, is a gross oversimplification. Vander-

Kam's "booklet" theory holds for every one of these texts, but in the case of 3 Enoch the wide streams of both Enochic and *hekhalot/merkavah* traditions flowed together, just as streams had flowed together to create earlier Enoch materials. So VanderKam was right for his corpus, and to a great extent even for the later material, but for 3 Enoch the *merkavah* side cannot be minimized.

One final comment: Odeberg clearly should have realized this, in view of the detailed studies in his introduction and commentary that connect 3 Enoch to the *hekhalot* texts. But his desire to find another "pseudepigraphical" text — and to call it 3 Enoch — caused him to exaggerate the Enochic features.

A return to his detailed notes, even if based on out-of-date textual materials, will provide a gold mine for understanding how booklets of Enochic material and booklets of *hekhalot* material somehow were merged in a tradition that continued to have its impact on later Jewish mystical tradition.