

# REASSESSING JUDE'S USE OF ENOCHIC TRADITIONS

(WITH NOTES ON THEIR LATER RECEPTION HISTORY)

Peter J. Gentry and Andrew M. Fountain  
(pgentry@sbts.edu & af@chri.st)

## Summary

*A particular reference in the book of Jude to Enoch is commonly claimed to indicate canonical status for 1 Enoch. The origins and textual transmission of the Enochic traditions are described and reassessed for non-specialists and correlated with claims for inspiration made before, during, and after the period of Second Temple Judaism. The function of Jude's use of Enoch is interpreted within the literary structure of his work and the context of the NT, with implications for the later history of Christianity and Islam.*

## 1. Introduction

A consensus exists today – nearly equivalent to established fact – that when Jude in the New Testament refers to Enoch in vv. 14-15, he is quoting a book<sup>1</sup> now referred to as *1 Enoch*, and that this citation raises the question as to whether or not this book was considered canonical or Scripture by at least some early Christians.<sup>2</sup> The statement of James VanderKam is a clear example:

---

<sup>1</sup> James C. VanderKam, '1 Enoch, Enochic Motifs, and Enoch in Early Christian Literature' in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*, ed. James C. VanderKam and William Adler (Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 4; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996), 36.

<sup>2</sup> See discussion in Peter Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 135-36.

The two works just surveyed [Barnabas and Jude] exhaust the first-century Christian references to the writings of Enoch. Jude cannot be located with certainty but may come from Syria/Palestine; Barnabas is somewhat more securely situated in Egypt. The writers of both works accord high status to Enoch's words – they are prophecy and scripture.<sup>3</sup>

Note that for Vanderkam 'Scripture' can exist without canon; other scholars would view canon as corollary of Scripture.

The genuineness of Enoch is discussed as early as Tertullian, *On the Clothing of Women* 1.3.<sup>4</sup> This is significant, since these traditions influenced Christianity mainly in Egypt/North Africa, Asia Minor, Palestine, and Syria. That is to say, Christianity in the West was largely unaffected by the Enoch traditions.

Before reassessing Jude's use of the Enoch traditions, some description of the contents, origin, and textual transmission of these traditions is necessary. While the details of textual transmission are fairly well known to specialists, non-specialists may not know just how fluid or scant the evidence is for the early forms of the text. It is for this reason that the details are given in a more complete than abbreviated fashion.

## 2. Sections of Enoch According to the Putative Order of Composition

A complete (?) version of *1 Enoch* is known only in Ethiopic. That the Ethiopic version is a *collection of traditions* is evident from the fact that it is divided into eight major sections and that each section has a different history in terms of composition and integration into the book we have at present. The sections are listed as follows in their putative order of composition:

1. Book of Heavenly Luminaries (chaps 72–82)
2. The Book of the Watchers (chaps 1–36)
3. Enoch's Two Dream Visions (chaps 83–90)
4. Two Pieces of Testamentary Narrative (81:2–82:3; 91)
5. The Epistle of Enoch (chaps 92–105)
6. An Account of Noah's Birth (chaps 106–107)
7. Another Book by Enoch (chap. 108)

---

<sup>3</sup> VanderKam, '1 Enoch', 40.

<sup>4</sup> Athanasius, *Paschal Letter* 39.1 clearly excludes the Enochic traditions.

## 8. The Book of Parable (chaps 37–71)

9. The Book of the Giants (not in Ethiopic book of *Enoch*)

'The Book of the Giants' is not considered formally part of *I Enoch*, at least measured by the so-called 'complete version' that is transmitted in Ethiopic, but contains material directly related to it. This confirms that at the earliest stages there was a body of loosely related traditions growing in connection with the person of Enoch. Not all materials connected to the Enoch traditions were eventually integrated into the Ethiopic *I Enoch*.

For our purposes at present, we may mention the dates assigned to the three earliest sections of *I Enoch* and major reasons given for these dates, aside from the evidence of the manuscripts, which will be listed shortly. Although much recent research has been done on *I Enoch*, I begin with the 1992 article by Nickelsburg in the *Anchor Bible Dictionary*.<sup>5</sup>

**1. The Book of Heavenly Luminaries (Chaps 72–82)**

Part of the evidence for considering the 'Book of Heavenly Luminaries' as the earliest is that the discussion of the function and structure of celestial (mainly) and terrestrial phenomena belongs to the bitter debate in some sectors of Judaism in the second century BC about whether a lunar or solar calendar was divinely instituted. *Jubilees* 4:17,21 and 6:35-38, it is argued, cite *I Enoch* to attack the lunar calendar as 'gentile'.

**2. The Book of the Watchers (Chaps 1–36)**

This is considered the second-oldest section of *I Enoch*, dating probably to the second half of the third century, and, according to Nickelsburg, reflects a developing accretion of traditions that stem from the fourth century. Nickelsburg states, 'it is likely that in the original form of this myth [expanding upon the narrative of Genesis 6–9] the watchers were sent by God to instruct humankind in useful arts (cf. *Jub.* 4:15; 5:6; *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* 8:13)'.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> George W. E. Nickelsburg, 'Enoch, First Book of' in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman, vol. 2 (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 508-16.

<sup>6</sup> Nickelsburg, 'Enoch, First Book of', 510.

### 3. Enoch's Two Dream Visions (Chaps 83–90)

The first vision foresees the Flood while the second provides an allegorical 'Apocalypse of History' from Adam to the eschaton. Dependence upon materials in the book of Daniel indicates it must have been composed before Judas's defeat of Nicanor, 161 BC, according to Nickelsburg.

### 4. Other Sections<sup>7</sup>

There is no pre-Christian evidence for Sections 7 and 8, the first part of Section 4, or for the arrangement in the Ethiopic Version.

## 3. Origin of the Enochic Traditions

Writing before the turn of the twentieth century, Nickelsburg concisely states that the book is 'a collection of traditions and writings composed between the 4th century B.C.E. and the turn of the era, mainly in the name of Enoch, the son of Jared (Gen 5:21-24)'.<sup>8</sup> More recently, major scholars in the field, such as Loren T. Stuckenbruck, place the writing down of the earliest sections of *1 Enoch* in the third century BC.<sup>9</sup> An important point, as stated by Stuckenbruck, is that each of these groups of compositions 'circulated in a form that differed variously from the text-forms in which they would eventually be received in the Ethiopic tradition'.<sup>10</sup> We must think, then, in terms of a growing collection of Enochic writings. Free-standing works, not initially collected together, were eventually combined according to a process not at all clear at the present time.<sup>11</sup>

David Jackson proposes that the various themes and topics in *1 Enoch* derive from three different paradigm exemplars. One, speculations on ethnic deviation based on Genesis 6:1-4, he calls the 'Shemikhazah Exemplar'. A second, speculations about cultural deviation based on Genesis 6:5 and Deuteronomy 29:29, he labels the

<sup>7</sup> See also Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 'Evaluating the Discussion concerning the Original Order of Chapters 91–93 and Codicological Data Pertaining to 4Q212 and Chester Beatty XII Enoch' in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 220-23.

<sup>8</sup> Nickelsburg, 'Enoch, First Book of', 508.

<sup>9</sup> Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 8.

<sup>10</sup> Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, 8.

<sup>11</sup> Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, 8-28.

'Aza'el Exemplar'. The third, matters of liturgical deviation based upon Jeremiah 33:19-21, Jackson describes as 'the Cosmic Exemplar'.<sup>12</sup>

Stephanie Dalley compares features in the Enochic traditions to elements of stories in the Arabian Nights as well as in the ancient Gilgamesh Epic to show just how far back some of the features in these stories/traditions can be traced.<sup>13</sup> Here I would add a cautionary note because neither Jewish sources in Second Temple Judaism nor modern Enochic scholars have noted the contribution to interpretation of Genesis 6:1-4 derived from discourse grammar features identified in the last decades.

Interpretation of the temporal expressions 'those days' and 'afterwards' that occur in verse 4 is significant. For purposes of discussion, a literal translation of this verse is useful:

The Nephilim were on the earth in those days and also afterwards when the sons of God had relations with human women and they bore children for them. They were the heroes who were from the ancient past, men of renown.

Two main possibilities exist for interpretation of the temporal expressions. If one interprets 'those times' to be the times described in verses 1-3, then what is distinguished are the times before the flood from the times after the flood. The relative clause introduced by 'afterwards' would seem to indicate that the cohabitation of angelic and human beings continued after the flood. One might conclude that the Nephilim were the product of such unions (cf. Num. 13:22,28,33).

Yet a different interpretation is possible. The expression 'afterwards' (*'aḥrê-kēn*) usually occurs in the second of two verbal sentences: the first sentence says that event X did or will happen; the second says that subsequent to the event in the first sentence, event Y did or will happen.<sup>14</sup> Here we must note that the expression *'aḥrê-kēn* is modified by a relative sentence which refers specifically to the event

---

<sup>12</sup> David R. Jackson, *Enochic Judaism: Three Defining Paradigm Exemplars* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 30, 88, 139.

<sup>13</sup> Stephanie Dalley, 'Gilgamesh and the Arabian Nights', *JRAS* 1 (1991), 1-17, esp. 13-16.

<sup>14</sup> Although this pattern is standard or usual, it is not the only kind of construction, as Genesis 41:31 shows. All instances of *'aḥrê-kēn* in biblical Hebrew have been analysed.

in verse 2.<sup>15</sup> Therefore one could assume that ‘those days’ means before the cohabitation of divine and human beings. Verse 4 would then comment that the Nephilim were on the earth before the business of angelic and human beings cohabiting and also afterwards and therefore had nothing to do with these unions.

This latter interpretation is strengthened by considerations of discourse grammar. Verse 4 consists of two clauses or sentences, the first verbal, the second verbless. Both are marked by asyndeton (i.e. no conjunction or connector at the beginning of the clause/sentence). In the first, the verb is non-initial. This pattern marks a commentary or explanatory digression and is a feature of discourse grammar tested throughout Classical Hebrew.<sup>16</sup> The fact that the first sentence is subject initial indicates a new topic. The relative sentence in verse 4 correlates this new topic with the events of verse 2. The verbless clause is a further comment on the Nephilim. They were the heroes from the distant past. This may mean the distant past with reference to the writer, or it may indicate a period long past with reference to the event of 6:2. Therefore the writer would be demythologising the Nephilim. These heroes of ancient times were there before and after the events of 6:2 and were not necessarily related to them at all. Thus, verse 1 describes an increase in female humans, verse 2 a cohabitation of angelic and human beings, verse 3 concludes that the result is still human and therefore under God’s judgement, while verse 4 states that all this has nothing to do with the well-known Nephilim. Since the word Nephilim is not otherwise explained, they must have been well known to the ancient (first) readers of this text.

What this digression shows, then, is that if one assumes that Genesis 6:1-4 is referring to a union of angelic and human beings, this is *not connected to the causes of the flood*.<sup>17</sup> Although the date of the Torah is debated, it is the most authoritative source in the variegated Judaism of the Second Temple. In addition, according to 2 Peter 2:4 and Jude 6,

---

<sup>15</sup> This is apparently the only occurrence of *’aḥrê-kên* where it is modified by a relative sentence. The Oxford Lexicon adduces 2 Chronicles 35:20, but the parallel is not exact or compelling.

<sup>16</sup> See Stephen G. Dempster, ‘Linguistic Features of Hebrew Narrative: A Discourse Analysis of Narrative from the Classical Period’ (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1985).

<sup>17</sup> For a complete discussion, see Peter J. Gentry and Stephen J. Wellum, *Kingdom through Covenant: A Biblical–Theological Understanding of the Covenants* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2012), 149-53.

the judgement of the angels was separate from the judgement of the flood. Thus, much of the speculation based on Genesis 6:1-4 in the Enochic traditions rests on an incorrect reading of the Hebrew Text. Since readers may fail to appreciate the significance of this apparent digression to exegete Genesis 6:1-4, allow us to make it plain. First, those who produced the Enochic traditions did not properly understand Genesis 6:1-4. Moreover, specialists studying the Enochic traditions today similarly do not seem to have grasped the correct meaning of the text in Genesis.<sup>18</sup> And it is a correct interpretation that is at the root of the entire problem, both ancient and modern, as we shall see below.

## 4. The Textual Witnesses of 1 Enoch

### 4.1 The Ethiopic Text

The only complete (?) version of Enoch is in Ethiopic. It is a translation based on both a Greek version as well as a copy of the Aramaic parent text and made between the fourth and sixth centuries AD. Michael A. Knibb prepared an edition based upon some thirty-three manuscripts, the oldest of which dates to the fifteenth century AD.<sup>19</sup>

More recent scholarship, however, demands a brand-new critical edition of the Ethiopic version. Loren T. Stuckenbruck has shown that what Knibb did not realise is that the Ethiopic manuscripts belong to two recensions: Ethiopic I includes ten or eleven parchment manuscripts and represents an older tradition while that of Ethiopic II is represented by over fifty manuscripts, forty of which are listed by Stuckenbruck and represents a later tradition.<sup>20</sup> Since we now have double the manuscripts and the edition of Knibb is tied largely to Ethiopic II, it is outdated. This problem will be addressed again briefly below.

---

<sup>18</sup> This approach is not considered in the otherwise majestic treatment of the topic in Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *The Myth of Rebellious Angels* (WUNT 335; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 3-7.

<sup>19</sup> Michael A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978).

<sup>20</sup> Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91-108*, 16-28.

## 4.2 The Aramaic Text<sup>21</sup>

Numerous fragments, many of them extremely small, from Qumran Cave 4 are as follows.

Symbol ~ means ‘corresponds to parts of’

### 4Q201 En<sup>a</sup> ar (= Milik 4QEn<sup>a</sup>).<sup>22</sup> 200-150 BC.

Contents: probably Eth 1–36

a <sub>1</sub> i	~ Eth 1:1–5
a <sub>1</sub> ii	~ Eth 2:1–5:6
a <sub>1</sub> iii	~ Eth 6:4–7:5
a <sub>1</sub> iv	~ Eth 8:3–9:3

### 4Q202 Enb ar (= Milik 4QEnb).<sup>23</sup> c. 150 BC.

Contents: probably Eth 1–36

b <sub>1</sub> ii (frags. a and c)	~ Eth 6:1–4
b <sub>1</sub> ii (frags. d, e, and g)	~ Eth 6:7–7:1
b <sub>1</sub> ii (frags. j and k)	~ Eth 7:5–8:1
b <sub>1</sub> iii (frags. p and q)	~ Eth 8:3–9:1
b <sub>1</sub> iii (frag. w)	~ Eth 9:4
b <sub>1</sub> iv (frags. y, b’, and e’)	~ Eth 10:9 and 11f.

### 4Q204 Enc ar (= Milik 4QEnc).<sup>24</sup> 30–1 BC.

Contents: ~ Eth 1–36, 83–90, 91–107

c <sub>1</sub> i	~ Eth 1:9–2:3 and 3–5:1
c <sub>1</sub> ii	~ Eth 6:7
c <sub>1</sub> v	~ Eth 10:13–19 and 12:3
c <sub>1</sub> vi	~ Eth 13:6–14:15
c <sub>1</sub> viii	~ Eth 18:8–12
c <sub>1</sub> xii	~ Eth 30:1–32:1
c <sub>1</sub> xiii	~ Eth 35–36
EnGiants <sup>a</sup> 9	~?? Eth 84:2–4
EnGiants <sup>a</sup> 10	~?? Eth 84:6
c <sub>4</sub>	~ Eth 89:31–36
c <sub>5</sub> i	~ Eth 104:13–106:2
c <sub>1</sub> 5 ii	~ Eth 106:15–107:2

Note: 4Q203 = EnGiants<sup>a</sup> ar (= Milik EnGiants<sup>a</sup>).<sup>25</sup>

<sup>21</sup> J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976). Hereafter Milik, *BE*.

<sup>22</sup> Milik, *BE*, 139-63, 340-43, pls. I-V; re-edition: Stuckenbruck, *DJD* XXXVI (2000), 3-7, pl. I.

<sup>23</sup> Milik, *BE*, 164-78, 344-46, pls VI-IX.

<sup>24</sup> Milik, *BE*, 178-217, 346ff, pls IX-XV.

**4Q205 En<sup>d</sup> ar (= Milik 4QEn<sup>d</sup>).<sup>26</sup> 30–1 BC.**

Contents: ~ Eth 1–36, 83–90

Copy from Aram<sup>c</sup>

d <sub>1</sub> xi	~ Eth 22:13–23:3
d <sub>1</sub> xii	~ Eth 26:2–6
d <sub>2</sub> i	~ Eth 89:11–14
d <sub>2</sub> ii	~ Eth 89:29 f.
d <sub>2</sub> iii	~ Eth 89:43 f.

**4Q206 En<sup>e</sup> ar (= Milik 4QEn<sup>e</sup>).<sup>27</sup> 100–50 BC.**

Contents: ~ Eth 1–36, 83–90

e <sub>1</sub> xxii	~ Eth 22:3–7
e <sub>1</sub> xxvi	~ Eth 31:3–32:3
e <sub>1</sub> xxvii (frag. f)	~ Eth 32:6
e <sub>4</sub> i (frag. b)	~ Eth 88:3–89:6
e <sub>4</sub> ii (frag. c)	~ Eth 89:7–8
e <sub>4</sub> ii (frags. b, d)	~ Eth 89:12–16
e <sub>4</sub> iii (frag. e)	~ Eth 89:27–29

Note: Here belong also frags. 2–3 EnGiants<sup>f</sup> <sup>28</sup> and frag. 5 En<sup>c</sup> ar.<sup>29</sup>**4Q207 En<sup>f</sup> ar (= Milik 4QEn<sup>f</sup>).<sup>30</sup> 151–125 BC.**

Contents: ~ Eth 86:1–3

f <sub>1</sub>	~ Eth 86:1–3
----------------	--------------

**4Q212 En<sup>g</sup> ar (= Milik 4QEn<sup>g</sup>).<sup>31</sup> c. 50 BC.**

Contents: ~ Eth 91–107

g <sub>1</sub> ii	~ Eth 91:18–92:2
g <sub>1</sub> iii	~ Eth 92:5–93:4
g <sub>1</sub> iv	~ Eth 93:10 + 91:11–17
g <sub>1</sub> v	~ Eth 93:11–94:1

**4Q208 Enastr<sup>a</sup> ar (= Milik 4QEnastr<sup>a</sup>).<sup>32</sup> c. 200 BC.**

Contents: Phases of Moon

vaguely like Enoch 73

<sup>25</sup> Milik, *BE*, 310–17, pls XXX–XXXII; Stuckenbruck, *DJD XXXVI* (2000), 8–41, 49–66, pls I–II; Puech *DJD XXXVII* (2000), pl. I (frag. 1); Puech *DJD XXXVII* (2008), pl. XXVI (frag. 14).

<sup>26</sup> Milik, *BE*, 217–25, 353–55, pls. XVI–XVII.

<sup>27</sup> Milik, *BE*, 225–44, 355ff, pls. XVIII–XXI.

<sup>28</sup> Milik, *BE*, 235–36; re-edition: Stuckenbruck, *DJD XXXVI* (2000), 42–48, pl. II.

<sup>29</sup> Puech, *DJD XXXVII* (2008), 521–22, pl. XXVI.

<sup>30</sup> Milik, *BE*, 244–45, 359, pl. XXI.

<sup>31</sup> Milik, *BE*, 245–72, 360–62, pls. XXI–XXIV.

<sup>32</sup> Tigchelaar, Garcia Martinez, *DJD XXXVI* (2000) 95–131, pls. III–IV.

**4Q209 Enastr<sup>b</sup> ar (= Milik 4QEnastr<sup>b</sup>).<sup>33</sup> c. 0.**

Contents: Phases of Moon

astr.b <sub>1-22</sub>	Table of Phases of Moon
astr.b <sub>23</sub>	~ Eth 76:14–77:4
astr.b <sub>25</sub>	~ Eth 78:10
astr.b <sub>26</sub>	~ Eth 78:17(?)–79:2
astr.b <sub>28</sub>	~ Eth 82:9–13

**4Q210 Enastr<sup>c</sup> ar (= Milik 4QEnastr<sup>c</sup>).<sup>34</sup> c. 50 BC.**

Contents: Phases of Moon

astr.c <sub>1 ii</sub>	~ Eth 76:3–10 and 76:13–77
astr.c <sub>1 ii</sub>	~ Eth 78:6–8

**4Q211 Enastr<sup>d</sup> ar (= Milik 4QEnastr<sup>d</sup>).<sup>35</sup> c. 50–1 BC.**

Contents: Phases of Moon

astr.d <sub>1 i-iii</sub>	~ following 82:20 (Autumn and Winter)
---------------------------	---------------------------------------

**Summary:**

Manuscript	Number	Range of Contents	Date Copied
4QEn <sup>a</sup> ar	4Q201	1:1 – 12:6	1st half 2nd BC
4QEn <sup>b</sup> ar	4Q202	5:9 – 14:6	mid 2nd BC
4QEn <sup>c</sup> ar	4Q204	1:9 – 107:2	last 3rd I BC
4QEn <sup>d</sup> ar	4Q205	22:13 – 89:44	Last 3rd 1st BC
4QEn <sup>e</sup> ar	4Q206	18:15? – 89:30	1st half 1st BC
4QEn <sup>f</sup> ar	4Q207	86:1–3	3rd quarter 2nd BC
4QEn <sup>g</sup> ar	4Q212	91:10 – 94:2	mid 1st BC
4QEnastr <sup>a</sup> ar	4Q208	73:1 – 74:9	ca. 200 BC
4QEnastr <sup>b</sup> ar	4Q209	73:1 – 82:13	early 1st AD
4QEnastr <sup>c</sup> ar	4Q210	76:3 – 78:8	mid 1st BC
4QEnastr <sup>d</sup> ar	4Q211	following 82:20	2nd Half 1st BC
pap7QEn gr	7Q4, 8, 11-13	98:11? – 103:15	c. 100 BC

Greek Scroll at Qumran (=pap7QEn gr supra)<sup>36</sup>

<sup>33</sup> Milik, *BE*, 278-96, 360-62, pls. XXV-XXVII, XXX; re-edition: Tigchelaar, Garcia Martinez, *DJD* XXXVI (2000) 132-71, pls V-VII.

<sup>34</sup> Milik, *BE*, 284-88, pls. XXVIII, XXX.

<sup>35</sup> Milik, *BE*, 296-97, pl. XXIX.

<sup>36</sup> See Peter W. Flint, 'The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7,' in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 224-33.

Manuscript	O'Callaghan	Others
7Q4:1	1 Tim. 3:16	1 En 103:3–4
7Q4:2	1 Tim. 4:1, 3	1 En 98:11 or 105:1
7Q5	Mark 6:52–53	
7Q6:1	Mark 4:28	
7Q6:2	Acts 27:38	
7Q7	Mark 12:17	
7Q8	Jas 1:23–24	1 En 103:7–8
7Q9	Rom. 5:11–12	
7Q10	2 Pet. 1:15	
7Q11	—	1 En 100:12
7Q12	—	1 En 103:4
7Q13	—	1 En 103:15
7Q14	—	1 En 103:12
7Q15	Mark 6:48	

### 4.3 The Greek Text<sup>37</sup>

Fragments Cited in Syncellus (died after 810 AD)

Gr <sup>Sync</sup> a	= Eth 6:1–9:4
Gr <sup>Sync</sup> b	= Eth 8:4–10:14
Gr <sup>Sync</sup> c	= Eth 6:1–9:4–
Gr <sup>Sync</sup> d	= Eth 6:1–9:4

Codex Panopolitanus (Akhmim Manuscript – 6th c.)

Gr <sup>Pan</sup>	= Eth 1-32
Gr <sup>Pan</sup> a	= copy of 19:3–21:9

Codex Vaticanus Gr. 1809 (11th c.)

Gr <sup>Vat</sup>	= Eth 89:42–9
-------------------	---------------

Chester Beatty-Michigan Papyrus (4th c.)

Gr <sup>CB</sup>	= Eth 97:6–107:3
------------------	------------------

(?)Fragments of Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 2069 according to Milik<sup>38</sup>

Fr. 1r + 2r	= En. 85:10–86:2
Fr. 1v + 2v	= En. 87:1–3
Fr. 3v	= En. 77:7–78:1
Fr. 3r	= En. 78:8

<sup>37</sup> See Matthew Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece* (Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum Quae Supersunt Graeca; Leiden: Brill, 1970) and idem., *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha; Leiden: Brill, 1985).

<sup>38</sup> Milik, *BE*, 19, 75-77.

4.4 Latin (9th c.)

BL MS. Royal 5 E. xiii = En. 106:1–18

4.5 Coptic = En. 6:1–7

4.6 Syriac<sup>39</sup>

Citation of En. 6:1–7 in Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* 1:4 (12th c.)

4.7 Old Latin Patristic Witnesses

Although the critical edition of the *Vetus Latina* will be cited shortly, the citations in Pseudo-Cyprian and Pseudo-Vigilius are, by and large, the basis of the text in the *Vetus Latina* edition and deserve separate treatment, as below.

Pseudo-Cyprian *Ad Novationum* [253/7 or later]

Pseudo-Vigilius Thapsensis, *Contra Varimadum* 1:13 [445-480]

5. Simplification of the Early Textual Transmission<sup>40</sup>

Apparently, the Enochic traditions were first written down in composition groups as follows:

1. Astronomical Book	1 Enoch 72–82	AB	3rd BC
2. Book of Watchers	1 Enoch 1–36	BW	3rd BC
3. Epistle of Enoch	1 Enoch 91 – 108	EE	2nd BC
4. Book of Dreams	1 Enoch 83–90	BD	2nd BC
5. Book of Parables	1 Enoch 37–71	BP	1st BC/AD
The Book of Giants	Qumran	BG	2nd BC

Manuscript evidence for combinations of composition groups is as follows:

4QEn <sup>c</sup>	BW, BG, BD, EE	last third 1st BC
4QEn <sup>d</sup>	BW, BD	last third 1st BC
4Qen <sup>e</sup>	BW, BG(?), BD	first half 1st BC

<sup>39</sup> See Sebastian Brock, ‘A Fragment of Enoch in Syriac,’ *Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1979), 626-31.

<sup>40</sup> James C. VanderKam, ‘1 Enoch’, 33-34.

Thus the composition groups integrated as *I Enoch* as we have it today may well be due to Christian as well as Jewish transmission. It is interesting that 'The Astronomical Book' is claimed to be earliest, but was not integrated into *I Enoch* before the first century AD. Much of the textual transmission, especially before this time, is extremely fragmentary.

## 6. Comparison of Texts: Enoch 1:9 and Jude 14b-15.

Aramaic (Milik)

<sup>9</sup> [כדי יאתה עם רבו] את קדישון [הי למעבד דין על כולה ויובד כול רשיעין]  
[וייכח לכול ב] שרא על עובד [י רשעהון כולהון די עבדו ומללו לארשעה]  
[ועל כול מלין] רברבן וקשין [די מללו עלוהי חטין רשיעין <sup>2</sup> אתבוננא]

<sup>19</sup> [When He comes with the myri]ads of [His] holy ones, [to execute judgement against all; and He will destroy all the wicked, and will convict all f]lesh, with regard to [all their] works [of wickedness which they have wickedly committed in deed and in word, and with regard to all the] proud and hard [words which wicked sinners have spoken against Him.]

Milik tacitly acknowledges that the reconstruction of the text is based on comparison with the text of Jude and the two citations of Jude in the Latin Fathers.<sup>41</sup> The actual text in Aramaic preserves about six words.

1 Enoch 1.9: ὅτι ἔρχεται σὺν ταῖς μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων, καὶ ἀπολέσει πάντα τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς, καὶ ἐλέγξει πᾶσαν σάρκα περὶ πάντων ἔργων τῆς ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν ἡσέβησαν καὶ σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν λόγων, καὶ περὶ πάντων ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς.

Text in common with Jude 14-15 is underlined.

Jude 14-15: Προεφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τούτοις ἔβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ Ἐνὼχ λέγων· ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν κύριος ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ **15** ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων καὶ ἐλέγξει πᾶσαν ψυχὴν περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν ἡσέβησαν καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς.<sup>42</sup>

Ethiopic 1 Enoch 1.9: And behold! He comes with ten thousand holy ones to execute judgement upon them, and to destroy the impious, and to

<sup>41</sup> Milik, *BE*, 185.

<sup>42</sup> Kurt Aland et al., *Novum Testamentum Graece* (28th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012); Jude 14-15.

contend with all flesh concerning everything which the sinners and the impious have done and wrought against him.

The Ethiopic Text just cited is from Knibb's edition. We are in a difficult position at this point, since no critical edition of the Ethiopic version has been produced as yet. Nonetheless, Loren T. Stuckenbruck has very kindly allowed me to consult a forthcoming publication which deals critically with the text of *I Enoch* 1. Below is a comparison of his new translation of *I Enoch* 1:9 based on a critical analysis of all sources including better manuscripts in Ethiopic, with that of G. E. Nickelsburg:<sup>43</sup>

Nickelsburg

Look, he comes with the myriads  
with the myriads  
of his holy ones,  
to execute judgment on all,  
and to destroy all the wicked,  
and to convict all humanity  
for all the deeds  
that they have done,  
and the proud and hard words  
that the wicked sinners  
spoke against him.

Stuckenbruck

And behold, he will come  
with myriads  
of his holy ones,  
to execute judgment against them all  
and to destroy the wicked ones  
and to reprove all flesh  
for everything the wicked  
have done  
and for the proud and hard words  
that the wicked sinners  
have uttered against him.

In footnotes in four places Stuckenbruck notes witnesses that make *I Enoch* 1:9 closer to the text of Jude and in one place different from Jude.

Pseudo-Cyprian, *Ad Novatianum* 16 [CSEL 3:3 Appendix 167]:

*sicut scriptum est: ecce venit cum multis milibus nuntiorum suorum facere iudicium de omnibus et perdere omnes impios et arguere omnem carnem de omnibus factis impiorum quae fecerunt impie et de omnibus verbis impiis quae de Deo locuti sunt peccatores.*

Pseudo-Vigilius Thapsensis, *Contra Varimadum* 1:13 [CCSL 90, 28]:

*Et in epistula Iudae apostoli: Ecce veniet dominus in milibus, facere iudicium et perdere omnes impios, et arguere omnem carnem de omnibus operibus impietatis eorum [Judg. 14b-15a].*

Vetus Latina, K Text (North Africa):

*ecce venit cum multis milibus nuntiorum suorum facere iudicium de omnibus et perdere omnes impios et arguere omnem carnem de omnibus*

---

<sup>43</sup> George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *I Enoch: A New Translation* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2004). The translation of Loren T. Stuckenbruck will appear in a forthcoming volume edited by Lorenzo DiTommaso.

*factis impiorum quae fecerunt impie et de fr̄es̄ locuti sunt et de omnibus verbis impiis quae de deo locuti sunt peccatores.*

Vetus Latina, T Text (Italy)

*ecce venit dominus in sanctis milibus nuntiorum suis facere iudicium et arguere omnem et de omnibus duris quae locuti sunt contra eum peccatores.*

The critical edition distinguishes a North African version (K) from an Italian version (T) for this part of the textual tradition.

Vulgate Jude 14–15

<sup>14</sup> *prophetavit autem et his septimus ab Adam Enoch dicens ecce venit Dominus in sanctis milibus suis*

<sup>15</sup> *facere iudicium contra omnes et arguere omnes impios de omnibus operibus impietatis eorum quibus impie egerunt et de omnibus duris quae locuti sunt contra eum peccatores impi<sup>44</sup>*

Based on the versions in Greek, the text in Jude and the text in Enoch have 72 per cent of all words in common. A newer version in Ethiopic might make 1:9 a bit closer to the text in the Greek *I Enoch* or the text of Jude than that of Knibb. The text in Jude could be considered an abbreviated or adapted citation. If Jude 14b-15 is a citation of *I Enoch*, then Jude has cited the text fairly freely.

Admittedly, the figure 72 per cent is not that heuristic or helpful. Yet there are significant differences between the Aramaic fragment and the text in Jude. There is no mention of 'flesh' or 'proud' words in the Greek, although these are strong themes in Jude (σάρξ in Jude 7,8,23 and 'pride' in Jude 6,8,10,16). These differences are also confirmed by the Syriac. If these words had been known to Jude it is unlikely they would have been omitted. This suggests the version preserved in the Book of Enoch is significantly different from the version known to Jude.

Another possibility is that both *I Enoch* and the reference in Jude go back to a common tradition in Judaism, much like Paul's reference to Jannes and Jambres as the names of the magicians opposing Moses (2 Tim. 3:8). Elsewhere their names are known in the Aramaic Targums and in Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 30.1.11.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>44</sup> Robertus Weber and R. Gryson, *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (5th revised edition; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1969), Jude 14-15.

<sup>45</sup> Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, Exod. 1:15. For discussion, see Albert Pietersma, *The Apocryphon of Jannes & Jambres the Magicians: Edited with Introduction, Translation & Commentary* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 119; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 50-51.

The most recent research on the statement in *Jubilees* is by Jacques van Ruiten and he concludes:

that the author of *Jubilees* knew much about the Enochic traditions. He is strongly influenced by this material. However, in my opinion it is not possible to say that *Jubilees* is dependent on the *text* of 1 Enoch. The wording of the two is too different.<sup>46</sup>

## 7. Enoch and Inspiration in Second Temple Judaism

Various parts of Jewish tradition are in agreement that inspiration ceased with the prophets Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi. This can be seen in *prospect*, in *retrospect* from the period of the second century BC and in *retrospect* from the Rabbinic Period.

### 7.1 Zechariah 13:2-6: Prediction of the Cessation of Prophecy

2 And on that day, declares the Lord of hosts, I will cut off the names of the idols from the land, so that they shall be remembered no more. And also I will remove from the land the prophets and the spirit of uncleanness. 3 And if anyone again prophesies, his father and mother who bore him will say to him, 'You shall not live, for you speak lies in the name of the Lord.' And his father and mother who bore him shall pierce him through when he prophesies (ESV).

This is a prediction of the end of prophecy, although the expression 'on that day' usually is a reference to the future, left unspecified and in vague terms.

### 7.2 Confirmation in the Second Century BC

The cessation of prophecy is demonstrated historically in two ways. Positively, there is awareness in Second Temple Judaism that inspiration has ceased:

1 Maccabees 4:46, 9:27, 14:41

1Q Serek Hayahad 9:11-12

Three times in 1 Maccabees the author indicates that the leaders and or people did not know the correct course of action to take because there was no prophet. One example entails the purification and

---

<sup>46</sup> Jacques van Ruiten, 'A Literary Dependency of *Jubilees* on 1 Enoch?' in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 90-93, see p. 93.

reconstruction of the altar after the desecration by Antiochus IV Epiphanes:

And they took counsel concerning the altar of whole burnt offering, which had been defiled, as to what they should do with it. And there fell to them a good counsel, to tear it down so that it would not become a reproach to them because the nations defiled it. And they tore down the altar and put away the stones on the mount of the house in a suitable place until a prophet would come to give an answer concerning these things. (1 Macc. 14.44-46, NETS)

This is a clear statement that according to the some in the Maccabean period no one was speaking for God at this particular period of time in Jewish history. Not only does 1 Maccabees not make any claim to divine inspiration, but the author specifically denies that the book is inspired by God by declaring that no one was speaking for God at this time.

The *Rule of the Community* describes a leader, priests, levites, and men of the assembly all ranked for the authority of their statements within the Community.<sup>47</sup> The rules for the leader or master make him entirely reliant on what has been revealed. There is no mention of anyone speaking directly for God at this time. Decisions are made by the community. And according to 1QS 9:11, the rule is in effect 'until the coming of the prophet and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel'.

Negatively, the emergence of pseudepigraphical literature is a clear testimony to the cessation of inspiration, since authors appeal to authoritative figures in order to claim divine inspiration. The corpus of Pseudepigrapha clearly shows this:

Apocalypse of Abraham	Greek Apocalypse of Ezra
Apocalypse of Adam	Revelation of Ezra
Testament of Adam	Vision of Ezra
2 Baruch	Prayer of Jacob
3 Baruch	Testament of Job
4 Baruch	Prayer of Joseph
Apocalypse of Daniel	Prayer of Manasseh
More Psalms of David	Testament of Moses
Eldad and Modad	Apocalypse of Sedrach
Apocalypse of Elijah	Odes of Solomon

---

<sup>47</sup> James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) and Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), see Column 6.

1 Enoch	Psalms of Solomon
2 Enoch	Testament of Solomon
3 Enoch	Testament of the Three Patriarchs
Apocryphon of Ezekiel	Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs
Fourth Book of Ezra	Apocalypse of Zephaniah

The statement of John Van Seters on the pseudepigrapha summarises well that pseudepigraphy constitutes evidence of a negative type and shows that inspiration had ceased. Since he dates the book of Daniel to the second century BC, apparently the people were fooled in the case of Daniel.

However, Childs objects to this historical-critical notion of authorship as modern and anachronistic, but our notions of author (*auctor*) and authority (*auctoritas*) are certainly ancient. This is especially the case with the canon. All the works within a 'canon' must be attributed to an author who bears the appropriate authority, and for Scripture this could only be satisfied by divine inspiration from the age of revelation that ended with Ezra. The closest parallel to this is, of course, the establishment of the Greek classics, especially Homer, the rival of Moses. Notions of authorship in the case of the Hebrew Scriptures seem to have been directly influenced by the conceptions of the Hellenistic world. At the very time that the limits of the Scriptures were being debated, the ancient world knew a great deal about pseudepigraphy and the attribution of false authors to texts in order to gain authority for the views expressed in those writings. The book of Daniel is a rather blatant example of an instance in which a pseudepigraphy succeeded in deceiving the rabbinic 'canonizers.'<sup>48</sup>

### 7.3 Confirmation in Rabbinic Period

The Rabbis agreed that the canon was closed and had been closed for a long time:

With the death of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi the latter prophets, the Holy Spirit ceased out of Israel. Despite this, they were made to hear through a *bath kol*. (Tos. *Sotah* 13:2, baraita in Bab. *Yoma* 9b, Bab. *Sotah* 48b and Bab. *Sanhedrin* 11a)

The *bath kol* in the citation of rabbinic sources literally means 'daughter of a voice' and refers to more occasional and less reliable forms of revelation.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>48</sup> John Van Seters, *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the 'Editor' in Biblical Criticism* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 373.

<sup>49</sup> On *bath kol*, see Roger Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 375-76.

Alex P. Jassen provides an excellent survey on the decline of prophecy and modified modes of revelation in the Second Temple period.<sup>50</sup> He concludes:

The Dead Sea Scrolls further point to shifting conceptualizations of the meaning of prophecy. The expanded prophetic narratives and the Pesharim give voice to the blurred lines between composition and interpretation. The authors of these texts interpret ancient prophetic writings while simultaneously claiming to extend the compositional and revelatory setting of the older texts. For the sectarians behind the Dead Sea Scrolls, prophecy was not an institution solely associated with the prophets of ancient Israel. Rather, they regarded their own exegetical, juridical, and sapiential activity as extending the oracular and revelatory activities of the ancient prophets. The sectarians, like other Jews in the Second Temple period, recognized the changing nature of revelation and the language of prophecy. Accordingly, the Dead Sea Scrolls often utilize new terminological markers for prophecy and presume a disjunctive nature between ancient and contemporary modes of revelation. Notwithstanding this acknowledged rupture, the sectarian communities of the Dead Sea Scrolls fashioned their self-identity to reflect the belief that they represented the contemporary heirs of the ancient prophets.<sup>51</sup>

Many readers and scholars may find this extensive excursus on 'the end of prophecy' irrelevant since the consensus today is that Judaism in the Second Temple Period was variegated. Our argument does not assume that Judaism was a coherent whole, but this does not mean that there was no 'mainstream' or 'standard' view.

Philo may attribute prophecy to the playing of muses on vocal chords (Philo, *De Plantatione* 126–129), but how can a Jewish philosopher from Alexandria influenced by Platonism be regarded as standard for Judaism? The claims for authoritative teaching or revelation observable in 1QH<sup>a</sup> and 1QpHab 2:2–3 for the Teacher of Righteousness only illustrates the *bath kol* referred to by the early rabbis and constitutes evidence for the struggle in different sects over establishing authoritative teaching in the light of the fact that prophecy in the canonical sense had ceased. Nor do charismatic voices from Honi to Akiva in early rabbinic Judaism controvert this. Josephus distinguishes a *mantis* from a *prophētēs* (*War* 1.78–80). Prophets in the New Testament like Agabus are not necessarily on a par with the

---

<sup>50</sup> See Alex P. Jassen, 'The Prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Prophets*, ed. Carolyn J. Sharp (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 353–72.

<sup>51</sup> Jassen, 'The Prophets', 371.

prophets of canonical Scripture. Thus the argument that Second Temple Judaism was variegated does not yield the frequent overstatement that there were no standard views in Judaism during this period regarding canon or other beliefs.

#### 7.4 Warnings in Paul about Genealogies and Myths

Several times Paul warns Timothy and Titus not ‘to devote themselves to myths and endless genealogies, which promote speculations rather than the stewardship from God that is by faith’ (1 Tim. 1:4,6, 4:7, 6:4; 2 Tim. 2:23; Titus 3:9). The Jewish traditions in *1 Enoch*, and particularly in the *Book of Watchers*, are precisely endless genealogies of angels which could not be proven and speculations on Genesis 6:1-4.<sup>52</sup> Therefore, the Enochic traditions could well be what Paul had in mind. At least, they fit perfectly the description of the foolish myths he opposes. The claim that the letters to Timothy and Titus were seeking to criticise Enochic traditions is not peripheral to the argument here since there is a possibility that if this claim is true, it might represent an attitude shared by the author of Jude. Nonetheless, this argument is not necessary for our conclusion.

### 8. The Literary Structure of Jude

#### Andrew M. Fountain

The following literary structure of the book of Jude is the work of Andrew M. Fountain. A review of previous scholarship has not uncovered any similar structure.<sup>53</sup>

<sup>52</sup> It is possible or even probable that the Jewish people no longer properly understood Genesis 6:1-4 in the second century BCE. For example, a text-linguistic approach to exegesis clearly shows that the author is making the point that the Nephilim are not the offspring of angels and humans. See Peter J. Gentry and Stephen J. Wellum, *Kingdom through Covenant* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2012), 149-51.

<sup>53</sup> Richard J. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC; Waco, TX: Word, 1983); Charles Bigg, *St. Peter and St. Jude* (ICC; T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1978); Peter H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude* (Pillar New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006); Curtis P. Giese, *2 Peter and Jude* (Concordia Commentary; St Louis: Concordia, 2012); Gene L. Green, *Jude and 2 Peter* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008); Michael Green, *The Second Epistle General of Peter and the General Epistle of Jude: An Introduction and Commentary* (Tyndale New Testament Commentaries; Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1987); Walter Grundmann, *Der Brief des Judas und der zweite Brief des Petrus* (Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament; Evangelische Verlagsanstalt: Berlin, 1974); Norman Hillyer, *1 and 2 Peter, Jude* (NIBC; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992); Steven J. Kraftchick, *Jude, 2 Peter* (Abingdon New Testament

The literary structure indicates three examples from canonical history and one from non-canonical history and then this pattern is repeated. The significance of this literary structure must be spelled out since apparently the point is difficult to grasp for some.

Characteristic features of Hebraic/Jewish literature have been described and explored elsewhere.<sup>54</sup> Repetition is basic to all Jewish literature in particular. The discourses that are repeated function like the left and right speakers of a stereo system. It allows the reader to consider an idea like a holograph or Dolby Surround Sound. If every topic is discussed at least twice, there are a number of possible arrangements that arise naturally from this fact. If 'A', 'B', and 'C' represent three topics, one could arrange them as ABC::A'B'C' or ABC::C'B'A' just to mention a couple of six possibilities. The pattern ABC::C'B'A' is called chiasmic because, like the Greek letter chi, the repeated half forms a mirror image of the first half. Chiasmic patterns fulfil several functions. One function is to clearly demarcate text as a unit that is not connected to what precedes or follows.

In the literary structure of Jude, the chiasmic presentation of the examples from canonical history unite and separate them from those drawn from non-canonical Jewish traditions. This clearly separates Enoch from canonical literature and puts it in the same category as the *Assumption of Moses*, at least from the point of view of the author of Jude.

---

Commentaries; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002); Douglas J. Moo, *2 Peter, Jude* (NIV Application Commentary; Grand Rapids: Grand Rapids, 1996); Jerome H. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude* (Anchor Bible Commentary; New York: Doubleday, 1993); John Painter and David A. deSilva, *James and Jude* (Paideia Commentaries on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012); Pheme Perkins, *First and Second Peter, James, and Jude* (Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching; Louisville: John Knox Press, 1995); Ruth Anne Reese, *2 Peter & Jude* (The Two Horizons New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007); Alois Stoger, *Der Brief des Apostels Judas/Der zweite Brief des Apostels Petrus* (Düsseldorf: Geistliche Schriftlesung Patmos-Verlag, 1963); Richard B. Vinson, Richard F. Wilson, and Watson E. Mills, *1&2 Peter, Jude* (Cacon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2010); Anton Vögtle, *Der Judasbrief/Der zweite Petrusbrief* (Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament; Düsseldorf: Benziger Verlag, 1994); Duane F. Watson, 'The Letter of Jude' in *The New Interpreter's Bible* vol. 12, ed. Leander E. Keck et al. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998). These commentaries were researched by Matthew Miller.

<sup>54</sup> See Peter J. Gentry, 'The Literary Macrostructures of the Book of Isaiah and Authorial Intent' in *Bind up the Testimony: Explorations in the Genesis of the Book of Isaiah*, ed. Daniel I. Block and Richard L. Schultz (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2015), 227-54.

### Three examples from canonical history of rejecting God's authority and punishment

<sup>5</sup>But I want to remind you, though you once knew this, that the Lord, having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed those who did not believe.

<sup>6</sup>And the angels who did not keep their proper domain, but left their own abode, He has reserved in everlasting chains under darkness for the judgment of the great day;

<sup>7</sup>as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities around them in a similar manner to these, having given themselves over to sexual immorality and gone after strange flesh, are set forth as an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.

<sup>8</sup>Likewise also these dreamers defile the flesh,  
reject authority,

and speak evil of angels [lit. glorious ones].

### *Illustration of third point from extra-canonical history*

<sup>9</sup>Yet Michael the archangel, in contending with the devil, when he disputed about the body of Moses, dared not bring against him a reviling accusation, but said, 'The Lord rebuke you!' <sup>10</sup>But these speak evil of whatever they do not know; and whatever they know naturally, like brute beasts, in these things they corrupt themselves.

### Three examples of individuals from three eras of canonical history

[*Cain: the shameful wanderer*] <sup>11</sup>Woe to them! For they have gone in the way of Cain,

[*Balaam: to profit themselves*] have run greedily in the error of Balaam for profit,

[*Korah: a traitor and power seeker in the body*] and perished in the rebellion of Korah.

[*Korah: a traitor and power seeker in the body*] <sup>12</sup>These are spots in your love feasts, while they feast with you without fear, serving only themselves.

[*Balaam: no profit to others*] They are clouds without water, carried about[c] by the winds; late autumn trees without fruit, twice dead, pulled up by the roots;

[*Cain: the shameful wanderer*] <sup>13</sup>raging waves of the sea, foaming up their own shame; wandering stars for whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever.

### *Illustration of third era (pre-flood) from extra-canonical history*

<sup>14</sup>Now Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied about these men also, saying, 'Behold, the Lord comes with ten thousands of His saints, <sup>15</sup>to execute judgment on all, to convict all who are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have committed in an ungodly way, and of all the harsh things which ungodly sinners have spoken against Him.'

Note that Jude is warning readers about some who ignore divine authority. He presents examples from the Old Testament in two triads bound together by chiasmic arrangement. After each triad comes an example drawn from outside the canon of the Old Testament. As we shall see, in each case he is using what he might regard as speculative traditions from Second Temple Judaism to refute the point made by these extra-canonical Jewish traditions.

Although this analysis of the literary structure shows that the author distinguished references to the Old Testament from references to other literature, the claim made below that Jude is using the Enochic traditions against those who held to them does not depend on adopting the literary structure proposed.

## 9. The Function of Jude's Appeal to Jewish Traditions

At the Second Enoch Seminar in Venice, Italy, 2003, Paolo Sacchi, one of the eminent scholars in the field, gave a paper entitled 'History of the Earliest Enochic Texts'. He makes the following interesting observations concerning the *Book of Watchers*:

The origin of evil in the world lies in an angelic sin that contaminated the whole world.<sup>55</sup>

The impure truly exists in nature as an outcome of angelic sin. Impurity is the root of evil in history. Besides, the devil continues his work in this world.<sup>56</sup>

The focus, then, and central message of the *Book of Watchers* is to demonstrate through genealogical and narrative speculations on the angels mentioned on Genesis 6:1-4 that chaos and evil in the world are due to angelic sin. In view of this, it seems that the function of Jude's reference to the Enochic traditions is to demonstrate and emphasise – the word ungodly appears four times – that evil in our present world is due to human rebellion against God and cannot be blamed on angels. Jude, then, uses the Enochic traditions *against* those following them. As shown above, Jude seems to have a better exegesis of Genesis 6:4 than those in the Enochic traditions.

---

<sup>55</sup> Paolo Sacchi, 'History of the Earliest Enochic Texts' in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 402.

<sup>56</sup> Sacchi, 'History of the Earliest Enochic Texts', 402.

The reference to the dispute of Michael, the archangel, with the devil over the body of Moses appears to function in precisely the same way. Here we have another reference to speculative traditions from Second Temple period, the *Assumption of Moses*. Scholars are agreed that the comment of Jude is a clear reference to the lost ending of this work.<sup>57</sup> Jude refers to this work to show that the greatest angel of all did not have authority to rebuke the devil but committed the issue to God himself. Hence, all appeal to angelic authority is worthless.

In sum, Jude is appealing to Jewish traditions to use these traditions against those who follow them. Although not proven, he may be rebuking Christians for ignoring Paul's warnings and paying attention to 'endless genealogies and foolish myths'.

10. Influence of the Jewish Enochic Traditions in History Two aspects of history subsequent to this should be noted. First, Syriac Christianity did not heed the warnings of Paul. Already in the writings of Aphrahat (c. 280–345 AD) we see the angel Gabriel receiving the prayers of Christians and determining whether or not they will be heard in heaven.<sup>58</sup> Attention to angels is advanced and developed in Syriac Christianity. Further details are tracked down in the major study by Annette Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature*.<sup>59</sup> The major areas affected geographically were Egypt, Palestine, Syria and Asia Minor. Doubtless Christianity in the West was spared this influence not because of superior spirituality, but because it was cut off linguistically from the Jewish traditions.

Second, Patricia Crone has demonstrated that the Qur'an has at least five distinct instances where it is directly dependent on the *Book of Watchers*.<sup>60</sup> Although the angelic genealogies are not in the Qur'an, much of Islam today follows an elaborate genealogy of angels and the

---

<sup>57</sup> Johannes Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 10; Leiden: Brill, 1993), 270–85.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Aphrahat, *On Fasting* 14, *On Love* 15, *On Prayer* 13.

<sup>59</sup> Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

<sup>60</sup> Patricia Crone, 'The Book of Watchers in the Qur'an' in *Exchange and Transmission Across Cultural Boundaries: Philosophy, Mysticism and Science in the Mediterranean World—Proceedings of an International Workshop Held in Memory of Professor Shlomo Pines at the Institute for Advanced Studies, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 28 February–2 March 2005*, ed. Haggai Ben-Shammai, Shaul Shaked, and Sarah Stroumsa (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 2013), 16–51.

teaching that angelic sin is responsible for evil and impurity in our world, and avoids the biblical doctrine of chaos and death due to sin by the first *humans*.

Tracing the connection between earlier groups, whether Christian or Jewish, that held to the Enochic traditions and later Islam is not possible on the basis of our current evidence. Note that we have citations from the *Book of Watchers* in the Ἐκλογὴ Χρονογραφίας, or *Extract of Chronography*, of Syncellus, who died shortly after 810 AD. Since Syncellus was drawing on earlier sources, we can assume that the *Book of Watchers* was known in Byzantium in the fifth or sixth century AD. The fact that Michael the Syrian cites the *Book of Watchers* in Syriac, however, does not mean that there was a version in Syriac. Michael Syrus was dependent on a translation of the work of Annianus into Syriac for his information. Annianus and his older contemporary Pandorus were monks in Egypt deeply influenced by the Enochic traditions.<sup>61</sup> The influence of monks from Egypt upon Syriac Christianity can be attested by their graves at Mar Gabriel at Tur Abdin in eastern Turkey, a Syriac Orthodox monastery in operation since 390 AD.<sup>11</sup>

## 10. Conclusions

1. Fragments of *The Book of Watchers* are attested as early as the end of the third century BC. Nonetheless, from a methodological point of view, reconstruction of an extremely fragmentary text on the basis of the text of Jude is inadequate for a claim that Jude is citing *The Book of Watchers*. We know little of how the Jewish Enochic traditions were written down. Possibly Jude is appealing to a common Jewish tradition rather than a specifically known book or text. While not wishing to be a minimalist, we cannot beg the question at this point. If Jude is citing an established text, the textual transmission of this established text and its relation to the citation in Jude is still somewhat unclear.

2. The literary structure in Jude clearly separates examples drawn from canonical Scripture and those drawn from non-canonical or extra-

---

<sup>61</sup> Sebastian Brock, 'A Fragment of Enoch in Syriac', *Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1979), 626-31. See further Muriel Debié, *L'Écriture de l'Histoire en Syriaque: Transmissions interculturelles et constructions identitaires entre hellénisme et islam* (Late Antique History and Religion 12; Leuven: Peeters, 2015), 344, 348-49, 426, 458.

biblical Jewish traditions. The reference in Jude 6 is clearly to Genesis 6:1-4 and cannot be shown to be dependent on the speculative material that became *The Book of Watchers*. This is further supported by the relationship between 2 Peter 2:1-9 and Jude, wherein Peter cites only canonical examples.

3. Apostolic reference to extra-biblical traditions are found elsewhere, such as Paul's mention of the names of the magicians who opposed Moses. This is no reason to insist that they revered these details or traditions on a par with canonical Scripture.

4. Jude is using the Jewish Enochic traditions to counter their own assertion that evil in the world is due to angelic impurity. Rather, evil is due to human rebellion against God, as taught in Genesis 3. This statement can be true whether one argues that *The Book of Watchers* is or is not an aetiology for evil's origin,<sup>62</sup> or whether one argues that *The Book of Watchers* contains various aetiological perspectives for evil's origin.<sup>63</sup> We know that, eventually, blaming evil's origin on angelic sin became significant in Islam. Jude is using the tradition to counter this perspective, a perspective already in Jewish tradition in the second century BC.

---

<sup>62</sup> For the view that the entire Enochic Tradition is blaming evil on angelic sin, see Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), and idem., *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001). Others, such as David Suter, 'Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6-16', *HUCA* 50 (1979/80), 115-35, have argued that *The Book of Watchers* is not an etiology for evil, but a paradigm for how individuals become evil.

<sup>63</sup> So Ryan E. Stokes, 'Reading the Book of Watchers on the Origin of Evil', paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, GA, November 22, 2016.