

thus be seen to relate to various factors, including theological reservations regarding the form of the risen Jesus.⁶² In addition, it is not impossible that the discretion of artists in their attempts to pictorialize the resurrection might relate to their rejection of the details provided by the extra-canonical writers, just as conceivably as it might reflect their wholesale adoption of the canonical versions.

*I ENOCH AMONG JEWS AND CHRISTIANS:
A FRINGE CONNECTION?*

Lawrence VanBeek

One of the ways to find connections between groups of peoples is the literature they use to define themselves. Connections can be expressed through actual titled works, or simply through the use of common genres. Particular sectors of Judaism and Christianity had just such a connection in the Enochic literature.

The intrigue of *I Enoch*, and particularly *The Book of the Watchers*, is that it appears to have been highly regarded by the Essenes and was adopted and used by some New Testament authors as well as some Apostolic and some Church Fathers. *I Enoch* then fell into disuse by the power parties, or at least literary groups within both Judaism and Christianity. The 'Enochic Christians' had much in common with 'Enochic Jews'. Although there are strong disagreements between the groups, the similarities in authority, angelology and ethics (or at least decorum) are telling of their commitment to the literature.

This essay will focus on the common use of *I Enoch* by the Essenes and Christians, its priority and its demise and its effect on the communities who used it. I will also explore how literature helps to bring an unconscious cohesiveness to two groups that appear to be fundamentally different.

Jewish Use of I Enoch

I Enoch and Jubilees

I Enoch appears to have had a prominent place in *Jubilees* and the Qumran literature, which attest to the authority given to some of the Enochic corpus.¹ *Jubilees* was dependent upon *I Enoch*, but was not

1. We could also include the *Testament of Naphtali* from the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, possibly written about the same time as the Dead Sea Scrolls, c.

62. Kartsonis (*Anastasis*, p. 39) mentions doctrinal traps attendant to the depiction of the resurrection, traps relating to the fact that a Christology of Christ's death had not yet fully defined.

exclusively dependent upon it. Several works² have discussed the person of Enoch in the apocalyptic literature, as well as antecedents of Enoch in other literature. Heinrich Zimern (1902) and Pierre Grelot (1958) see a comparison of Enoch in Berossus's *Babyloniaca* (c. 280 BCE), where Enoch is identified with King Euedoranchos (Zimern 1902: 530-43). H. Ludin Jansen (1939) saw a comparison between Enoch and the Babylonian Ea, and with other figures associated with Ea such as Gilgamesh. James VanderKam sees parallels and possible antecedents of Enoch the culture bringer with Taautos (Thought to the Egyptians, Thoth to the Alexandrians), the Phoenician culture bringer (1984: 182), and supports the figure of Enoch being a Jewish version of the Mesopotamian diviner-king Enmeduranki (1984: 116). The main value of these works—particularly Grelot and VanderKam—is, for the purpose of this essay, that they show *Jubilees* as not solely dependent on the Enoch literature. What needs to be shown is that, even if *Jubilees* is not completely dependent upon the Enoch literature, it is dependent to some degree, and sees *1 Enoch*, particularly *The Book of the Watchers*, as authoritative.

Although it is true that *Jub.* 4.16-25 gives a portrait of Enoch that goes beyond what is found in *The Book of the Watchers*, *The Book of Dreams* and the *Astronomical Book* of *1 Enoch* (VanderKam 1984: 180-83), *Jubilees* is partly dependent upon these sources and considers them to be authoritative.³ *Jubilees* uses *1 Enoch* in 4.16-25; 5.1-12; 7.21-22; and 21.10.

Along with *Jubilees'* use of *1 Enoch*, there are some passages that give Enoch credit for having written authoritative words. *Jubilees* 4.17-18 says:

[Enoch] was the first of mankind who were born on the earth who learned (the art of) writing...who wrote down in a book the signs of the sky in accord with the fixed pattern of their months so that mankind would know the seasons of the years according to the fixed patterns of each of their months...[he] made known the days of the years; the months he arranged, and related the Sabbaths of the years.

150 BCE (Kee 1983: 778), which mentions the watchers being responsible for the flood in 3.5.

2. These works are critiqued in VanderKam 1984: 11-20.

3. This is still the case even if, as VanderKam suggests, the writers of the Enochic literature had no scruples against incorporating (with modifications) pagan mythological material into their books (1984: 188).

These words point to the *Astronomical Book* in *1 Enoch*, and tie them in with the patriarch Enoch, showing the author of *Jubilees'* belief in the authority of the *Astronomical Book*.

Jubilees 4.19 says: 'While he slept he saw in a vision what has happened and what will occur—how things will happen for mankind during their history until the day of judgement. He saw everything and understood. He wrote a testimony for himself and placed it upon the earth against all mankind and for their history.' These words are a summary of *1 Enoch* 1-36 generally and point specifically to the proem and central theme of *1 Enoch* as shown in *1 En.* 1.1-9. *Jubilees* 21.10 says:

Eat its meat during that day and on the next day: but the sun is not to set on the next day until it is eaten. It is not to be left over until the third day because it is not acceptable to him. For it was not pleasing and is therefore commanded. All who eat it will bring guilt upon themselves because this is the way I found [it] written in the book of my ancestors, in the words of Enoch and the words of Noah.

These words again point to the writings of Enoch,⁴ and show that the author of *Jubilees* considered all three parts of *1 Enoch* pre-dating *Jubilees* as authoritative for himself and his audience.

The Use of 1 Enoch at Qumran

The Qumran community considered parts of *1 Enoch* to be authoritative, and also appears to have considered *Jubilees* to be authoritative.⁵ Fifteen copies⁶ of *Jubilees* were found in five caves at Qumran. The number of copies alone may not be enough to show the value of the book at Qumran, but there is enough when that evidence is added to the direct mention of *Jubilees* in the *Damascus Document*⁷ (García Mar-

4. 'The words of Noah' may also point to the *Noah Apocryphon*.

5. Lawrence Schiffman (1990) suggests that the people of Qumran were Sadducees, and Norman Golb (1989) suggests that the caves were not part of Qumran but were a depository for documents hidden by people from Jerusalem escaping Romans in the first Jewish Revolt. For a critique of these views, see VanderKam (1994: 92-97). Though the identification of the Qumran people is still a matter of some debate; I agree with VanderKam (1994: 71-98) that the Essenes are still the best case for the inhabitants of Qumran and for the authors of some and collectors of the works known as the Dead Sea Scrolls.

6. VanderKam suggests that there may have been 16 copies (1989b: 153).

7. VanderKam mentions that CD 10.7-10 may also refer to *Jub.* 23.11 and 4Q228 in the statement about the age limit for judges being 65 years old 'for this is the way it is written in the division of the days' (1989b: 154).

tínez 1996: 39). CD 16.2b-4a states: 'And the exact interpretation of their ages about the blindness of Israel in all these matters, behold, it is defined in the book of the divisions of the periods into their Jubilees and their weeks'. The 'Book of the Divisions of the Periods into their Jubilees and Weeks' is a reference to the book of *Jub.* 1.1: 'These are the words regarding the divisions of the times of the law and of the testimony, of the events of the years, of the weeks of their jubilees throughout all the years of eternity as he related [them] to Moses on Sinai when he went up to receive the stone tablets—the law and the commandments...'

Another point showing that the Qumran documents considered *Jubilees* to be authoritative is that the book of *Jubilees*, as VanderKam says, 'blatantly advertises itself as divine revelation' (1994: 153). *Jubilees* 1.7 says, 'now write the entire message which I am telling you today...'; 1.8 says, 'then this testimony will serve as evidence'. These words point to a revelation beyond the Pentateuch, because they claim to be evidence to the descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob after they turn and serve foreign gods. If Qumran, or at least some members of that community, used a book that claimed to be revelation, then they must have to some degree accepted the claims of the book to which they allude. However, VanderKam points out that there is evidence that 4QpGen^a shows that the '*Jubilees* = chronology' of the flood was not accepted by all the documents at Qumran. Some calendrical texts used a schematic lunar calendar that *Jubilees* condemned, so not all the documents from Qumran agreed with all the details of *Jubilees* (VanderKam 1994: 154-55). Still, if the majority of the Qumran community saw *Jubilees* as authoritative and *Jubilees* used parts of *1 Enoch* as authoritative, then this would be at least one factor in seeing *1 Enoch* as authoritative at Qumran.

Fragments of four books of *1 Enoch*—*The Book of the Watchers*, *The Book of Dreams*, the *Astronomical Book* and *The Epistles of Enoch*—were found in four caves at Qumran. *The Similitudes (Parables)* is missing from Qumran but *The Book of the Giants* (which is not part of the extant Ethiopic book of *1 Enoch*) was found there. (See García Martínez [1996: 467-519] for the specific locations of the fragments.) No part of *1 Enoch* was found in caves 3, 5, 7,⁸ or 8, 10 and 11, while

8. Recently Ernest A. Munro, Jr (1997: 307-12) and Emil Puech (1997: 313-23) have argued that cave 7 contains seven fragments in Greek from *1 En.* 100, 103

caves 1, 2, 4 and 6 contained parts of *1 Enoch*. Though Qumran documents do not introduce *1 Enoch* in the authoritative manner that they do *Jubilees*, there are three factors that make *1 Enoch* appear to have had authority at Qumran. First, the number of extant fragments from different copies of sections of the book. Secondly, like *Jubilees*, parts of *1 Enoch* claim for themselves revelation through God's angels. Thirdly, some of the angel stories that expand on the story of Gen. 6.1-4 can be traced to *The Book of the Watchers*, or at least to *Jubilees*, which gets its story of the angels marrying the daughters of men from *The Book of the Watchers*.

1 Enoch 1.1-3; 12.4; 13.7; 14.8; 15.1-2; and 16.2 all show a consciousness of revelation from God or the angels. There are conversations with Uriel, Raphael, Raguel and Michael (who are said to be holy angels) in 21.4-10; 22.6; 23.4; 24.6; 27; 32; and 33. There are also places where Enoch is aware of revelatory visions. The dream visions begin with and say throughout either 'I saw', or 'I looked and understood' (83.1-2; 85.1; 86.1; 87.1; 88.1; 89.2-3, 21, 51, 57; 91.1, 8, 9, 14, 15, 17, 20, 26, 29, 34, 36, 37). The letters also suggest self-consciousness of revelation in 93.2.⁹ There is too much evidence for the self-consciousness of revelation in *1 Enoch* for *Jubilees*, the *Genesis Apocryphon* or the *Damascus Document* to use it without their knowing that it claimed authority for itself; and if they were willing to use it with that knowledge, they likely agreed with it. CD 2.16b-19¹⁰ says,

For many wandered off for these matters; brave heroes yielded on account of them from ancient times until now. For having walked in the stubbornness of their hearts the Watchers of heaven fell; on account of it they were caught, for they did not follow the precepts of God. And their sons whose height was like that of cedars and whose bodies were like mountains fell.

This portion of the *Damascus Document* is not verbatim *1 En.* 7.2 (Black 1985: 28): 'And they became pregnant by them and bore great

and 105. (Munro says they all come from 103.3-4, 7-8.)

9. *The Similitudes* also show a self-consciousness of revelation, but since they have not been found at Qumran, they are not included here.

10. This portion is found at Qumran in fragments: 4Q270 (4QD^e), which is fairly broken and does not include the information about the size of the sons of the Watchers from CD 2.19; and 4Q267 (4QD^b), now part of 4Q266 (4QD^a); this fragment is very broken, but does mention 'mountains' in v. 19.

giants of three thousand cubits; and there were [not] born upon the earth off-spring [which grew to their strength].¹¹

However, the sentiment is the same in *1 En.* 7.2 and CD 2.16-19. The *Damascus Document* likely did not get this information from *Jubilees*, since the extant accounts of *Jubilees* do not contain information on the size of the giants, so it is probable that the information on the size of the giants in CD 2.16-19 is a loose rendition of *1 En.* 7.2.

The *Genesis Apocryphon* (1Q20apGen 2.1-18) tells a story about Enoch's grandson Lamech. Lamech is angry with his wife Bitenosh because she is pregnant and he fears that the watchers have made her pregnant and that her son will be one of the giants. Bitenosh swears that she was not made pregnant by 'any foreigner, or watcher, or son of heaven' (v. 16). In 2.18-26, Lamech has his father Methuselah seek out the advice of his father Enoch. This story is not contained in Genesis or in *Jubilees*, but it is a fairly close rendition of *1 Enoch* 106-107 (except that Lamech's wife Bitenosh is mentioned by name only in *Jub.* 4.28 and not in *1 Enoch* or the Genesis account); therefore, the story in the *Genesis Apocryphon* could be built upon both *Jubilees* 4 and *1 Enoch* 106-107. The *Genesis Apocryphon* also mentions the written work of Enoch in 19.25: 'I read in front of them the [book] of the words of Enoch [...]', after which the text is fragmented and vague, and does not necessarily point to *1 Enoch*, but *1 Enoch* is our most likely candidate for the words read here.

1 Enoch in Jewish Literature outside Qumran

1 Enoch does not show up a great deal in the Jewish literature outside of the material of the Dead Sea Scrolls found at Qumran, but there is some evidence for it.¹² *1 Enoch* is referred to in *Testament of Reuben* 5:

11. 2Q20 does not show the size of the offspring. *The Book of the Giants* fragments at Qumran closely connect the giants with the nephilim, but do not mention their size.

12. Gabrielle Boccaccini (1998) argues that the Essenes mentioned by Philo and Josephus were committed to the Enochic corpus, part of which was rejected by the Qumran community on the basis of its deterministic stance and the Enoch literature's interest in free will of humans and angels. Boccaccini includes in the Enoch corpus: the Temple Scroll, books of *1 Enoch*, and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. He says that Qumran accepted the earlier Enochic literature but turned away from the later books, particularly *The Letter of Enoch* and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

Women are evil my children... It was thus they allured the Watchers before the flood; for, as a result of seeing them continually these [Watchers] lusted after one another, and they conceived the act in their minds and changed themselves into the shape of men and appeared to them [the women] when they were having intercourse with their husbands. And the women lusting in their minds after their phantom forms, gave birth to giants.

The *Testament of Reuben* either uses *1 Enoch* or one of the books that uses *1 Enoch*. The *Testament of Reuben*, however, does not follow the same line of responsibility. The *Testament of Reuben* makes the women responsible for the actions of the watchers; this is also different from the Christian authors who make the angels responsible.¹³ *Testament of Reuben* 5 may be Christian, but the story is from a Jewish source and does not deviate at all from the purpose of the book.¹⁴ *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* make the watchers responsible, and Gen. 6.1-4 does not assign responsibility to anyone or even openly suggest that anything unrighteous has been done.

Testament of Naphtali 3.5-4.1 mentions that the watchers changed their order and the Lord cursed them at the flood, and 'mentions that I have read in the writing of Enoch that you yourselves will forsake the Lord'. The provenance of the *Testament of Naphtali* is the same as that of *Testament of Reuben* except that a copy of the *Testament of Naphtali* (though possibly different from the *Testament of Naphtali* in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*) was discovered in the caves at Qumran. The *Testament of Naphtali* does mention the watchers, and though it does not mention sexual sin, it concentrates on the watchers changing their order.

13. There is one possible exception. In 2 *Apol.* 5, Justin Martyr says 'the angels transgressed this order and were enticed by women'. From what Justin says, it is uncertain whether the responsibility lies with the watchers or the women, though the watchers is more likely.

14. The study of the provenance of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* has had a varied history. H. Dixon Slingerland's (1977: 112-14) thorough review of the study on the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* concludes that they were either composed or redacted by a Christian community. M. de Jonge (1984: 508-12) agrees with Slingerland that the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* are Christian, but does allow that there were other testaments in Hebrew and Aramaic and that there is a Jewish background to the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

*Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*¹⁵ mentions the names Shemhazai and Azazel, the chief angels of the watcher, and the story found in *1 En.* 6.3 and Gen. 6.4. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* 5.24, speaking of Enoch, says ‘and he was called Metatron, the Great Scribe’. The connection with Metatron seems to come from after 425 CE (Maher 1992). This at least says that Enoch traditions were not completely ignored or crept back into favour (to a minor extent) in Jewish literature after Augustine was rejecting portions of *1 Enoch* in Christian literature.

Summary

Jubilees used *1 Enoch* as authoritative literature, and Qumran used both *Jubilees* and some of the books of *1 Enoch* authoritatively; so for at least one segment of Judaism—the Qumran Essenes—some books of *1 Enoch* were authoritative literature. The watcher story shows up several times in the literature at Qumran, and then the hard evidence for the story disappears from Jewish literature except for the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, which have an uncertain provenance. The re-emergence of the story in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* is puzzling. After Qumran, *1 Enoch* was picked up by Christians who seemed to honour or disparage it in turn until the time of Augustine, who openly denied the possibility of the watcher story.

Christian Use of *1 Enoch*

Jude, 2 Peter and the Apostolic and Church Fathers give evidence to the place of *1 Enoch* in the first three centuries of the Church. 2 Peter follows Jude in using *1 Enoch* as authoritative literature. The Apostolic and Church Fathers’ views on *1 Enoch* vary, but it is an important sign of the importance of *1 Enoch* that the Church debated the authority of *1 Enoch* in the centuries following the New Testament. The vast majority of the allusions are from the watcher story.

The New Testament

2 Peter apparently alludes to the book of *1 Enoch* in 2.4,¹⁶ by using Jude 6: ‘For if God did not spare angels who sinned but cast them into

15. Maher (1992: 11–12) lists four scholars that date *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* after the seventh century CE.

16. Charles (1913: 180–81) lists a great many other portions of the New Testament that may borrow language from *1 Enoch*, but these are all very small

the darkness of Tartarus to be kept for judgement’ (2 Pet. 2.4); ‘but the angels who did not keep their own domain but left their own abode He has kept unto the judgement of the great day in eternal bonds under darkness’ (Jude 6). Several modern commentators argue that the author of 2 Peter has followed Jude 6 on this (Bauckham 1983: 248; Sidebottom 1982: 68, 113; Neyrey 1993: 197).¹⁷ Bauckham (1983: 246) says that 2 Peter is partially dependent on Jude 6, but is independently drawing on paraenetic tradition that also lies behind Jude 5–7. The paraenetic traditions are in Sir. 16.7–10; CD 2.17–3.12; *3 Macc.* 2.4–7; *T. Naph.* 3.4–5; *m. Sanh.* 10.3.¹⁸ Sirach was written in the first quarter of the second century BCE (Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 10). The *Damascus Document* is a document written at some point in the second century BCE to the first century CE; *3 Maccabees* is from the third century BCE.¹⁹ E. Bickerman (in Collins 1984: 347–48) suggests that *T. Naph.* 5.8 was written before the expulsion of the Syrians in 141 BCE, and the parallels with the Qumran scrolls may reflect the early Hasmonean period, but there is also much paraenetic material that could come from any time in the Hellenistic or Roman era. As we have seen, most of this paraenetic material that 2 Peter is seen to have used relies on either *Jubilees* or portions of *1 Enoch*. If this is true, then at least two New Testament books—2 Peter and Jude—use *1 Enoch* as an important source for their material.

Bauckham (1983: 247) contends that 2 Peter was unfamiliar with the text of *1 Enoch*, for the echoes of *1 Enoch* in Jude 6 are lost in 2 Pet. 2.4. However, 2 Peter puts the story of the flood for the destruction of the ancient world and the salvation of Noah directly after the story from the watchers, which is what the book of *Jubilees* does in 5.1–11. This ties the flood directly to the judgment due to the corruption of people,

references and many could come from other portions of the Old Testament. Two interesting ones, however, are Rev. 14.20, ‘blood came out even to the horses bridles’ (cf. *1 En.* 100.3: ‘the horse shall walk up to the breast in the blood of sinners’); and Rom. 8.38; Eph. 1.21; Col. 1.16, ‘angels...principalities...powers’ (cf. *1 En.* 61.10 ‘angels of power and...angels of principalities’).

17. Norman Hillyer (1992: 19) sees a common source for Jude and 2 Peter. Stott (1995: 160) sees 2 Peter as being earlier than Jude.

18. For a study of these passages, see Berger (1970: 1–47) and Schlosser (1973: 13–36). Bauckham (1983: 46) mentions that Lührmann (1977: 131) corrects Berger’s view on Sir. 16.6–10.

19. See Nickelsburg 1984: 33, 80.

which came from the corrupt angels (watchers) and their sons the giants. The flood was still against mankind, for the watchers were bound in the depths of the earth for the great judgment and the giants killed each other.

Genesis 6.1-4 tells a similar story, putting the story of the sons of God marrying the daughters of men and creating the nephilim just before the story of the flood. However, the Genesis account does not include the aspect of the watchers being bound in the depths of the earth until the day of the great judgment, which *Jub.* 5.10 and 2 Pet. 2.4 include.²⁰ Both 2 Peter and *Jub.* 5.1-11 are shortened versions or capsules of *1 Enoch* 6-11, where the deluge of *1 En.* 10.10 is a direct result of the activities of the watchers corrupting mankind in *1 Enoch* 6-10.²¹ 2 Peter's purpose was different from but dependent on Jude,²² but the author may possibly have known the story of the watchers from sources other than Jude. Most importantly for our purpose, the *Book of the Watchers* did underlie 2 Pet. 2.4-5 just as it did Jude 6 and 14.

2 Peter 1.20, 21 and 3.2 add strength to the argument of the authority of the watcher tradition from *1 Enoch*. Though the meaning of these verses is disputed, most scholars hold that 2 Peter is referring to the words of Old Testament prophets. *1 Enoch* stands alongside portions of the Old Testament in the midst of 2 Peter's argument, which relies on the authority of Old Testament prophetic words.

There is fair bit of debate as to the meaning of τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον (the prophetic word) in 2 Pet. 1.19. Bauckham (1983: 224) outlines the views as: (1) Old Testament messianic prophecy; (2) the entire Old Testament understood as messianic prophecy; (3) a specific Old Testament prophecy; (4) Old Testament and New Testament prophecies; (5) 2 Pet. 1.20-2.19; and (6) the transfiguration itself as a prophecy of the parousia. Bauckham (1983: 224) prefers a modified version of (2), which would say that the eschatological message is based on 1.19, which refers to Old Testament prophecy, and 1.16-18, which refers to their own eyewitness account mentioned in 1.16-18. Other

20. CD 2.17-3.12 also includes the story of the watchers just before the story of the flood.

21. Note that *3 Macc.* 2.4 and *T. Naph.* 3.5 also connect the watchers with the flood.

22. Jude's argument is against those who fell from grace or disobeyed God. 2 Peter's argument is for God's just judgment (Neyrey 1993: 198-99).

than Neyrey (1993: 178-82), who holds to (6), all allow that τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον points to the Old Testament prophecies. Even Neyrey allows this, in that the emphasis he makes is because the 'issue is not the source of the prophecy but its interpretation' and he allows that 3.2 points to 'holy prophets' who seem also to be the Old Testament prophets (Neyrey 1993: 182).

Though there is some trouble with the exact interpretation of 2 Pet. 1.20-21, it is clear that 'prophecy of scripture' (1.20) and 'A prophecy...men of God being carried along by the Holy Spirit spoke' (1.21) point to the authoritative words of prophets; and that 2 Pet. 3.2, 'to remember the words having been previously spoken by the holy prophets', points to the words of authoritative prophets before the New Testament writers since 'and by your apostles' distinguishes the apostles separately.²³

2 Peter 1.20, 21 and 3.2 show a view of Old Testament prophets' words being authoritative for the author of 2 Peter. Sandwiched in these verses that show a high view of the Old Testament is a portion from *The Book of the Watchers*. It would appear that the author of 2 Peter would also have a high regard for *The Book of the Watchers*, either from personal knowledge, or, as Bauckham (1983: 246) has suggested, from others (such as Jude 6) who showed a personal knowledge of the book. 2 Peter uses the watcher story as an example of God's ability to punish the unrighteous, but he is not so interested in the details of the story as the outcome for the watchers, who are treated as real examples.

Jude also uses *1 Enoch* authoritatively. The introduction, 'and to these ones even Enoch the seventh from Adam prophesied saying', shows that Jude considered the words of Jude 14, and the book of *1 Enoch* from which they came, to be authoritative. This is shown in two ways: first, Jude used an introductory formula which resembles that of several portions of the New Testament, particularly Mt. 15.7 and Mk 7.6; secondly, Jude pointed to the fulfilment of a prophet's words in Jude's own time, which is also common in the New Testament writings.

23. Sidebottom (1982: 118) would disagree and says that both prophets and apostles in 2 Pet. 3.2 point to New Testament writers since there is no mention of Old Testament proof texts to follow; both Bauckham (1983: 283) and Neyrey (1993: 227) counter Sidebottom, saying that there is a distinction that prophets refer to ancient prophets and the commandment of 'our lord and saviour' points to the words of the New Testament apostles.

B.B. Warfield (1982: 843-44),²⁴ in an article on inspiration, shows some of the formulas used to introduce works that were considered 'Scripture' by the New Testament authors. Warfield does give preference to the term 'it is written' or 'it is said', but these are by no means the only terms used. Often the term 'it is written' is used (Mt. 4.4; Mk 1.2; Lk. 24.46), and sometimes 'according to the scriptures' is used (1 Cor. 15-16; Acts 8.35; 17.3; 26.22; Rom. 1.17; 3.4, 10; 4.17; 11.26; 14.11; 1 Cor. 1.19; 2.9; 3.19; 15.45; Gal. 3.10; 13; 4.22, 27). He also mentions, 'Therefore, as the Holy Spirit says, Today when you hear his voice' (Heb. 3.7 quoting Ps. 95.7); and '...who by the mouth of our father David, thy servant did say by the Holy Spirit, "why did the Gentiles rage...?"' (Acts 4.25 quoting Ps. 2.1). Sometimes 'it is said' replaces 'it is written' (Heb. 3.15; Rom. 4.18; also Lk. 4.12 replaces the 'it is written' of Matthew). Warfield, therefore, correctly leaves some room here for other introductory formulas and evidence for other introductory formulas for inspired writings.

It would appear also that Jude would consider Enoch and his words as historical. Bruce Metzger (1951: 306) says that the New Testament frequently recognizes the instrumentality of human authors such as Moses, David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Hosea, Joel and Enoch.²⁵ Metzger's words correspond with what was said earlier about introductory formulas being varied and referring to authoritative individuals as well as works, or at least referring to the individuals to whom the authoritative works are ascribed. Many of these formulas use forms of λέγω (I say) which Jude also uses. Most of the λέγω formulas point to the prophet Isaiah (Rom. 9.27; 10.19; Jn 12.38, 39; Mt. 3.3; 4.14; 8.17; 12.17; Acts 28.25, 26), but other prophets are mentioned also (e.g. Jeremiah in Mt. 2.17; Mt. 27.9 is interesting, in that it ascribes to Jeremiah a prophecy from Zech. 11.12, 13). The book of Hosea is mentioned in Rom. 9.25 (rather than the prophet himself), but generally, individuals are mentioned for the works that are ascribed to them and most of the references point to fulfilments in the days of the New Testament writers, similar to the way Jude remarks about an individual prophet whose words are fulfilled in his day.

24. Also see Warfield's chapter "It says:" "Scripture says:" "God says:" (1948: 299-351).

25. Metzger (1951: 303) lists the passages where individuals are referred to by a variety of formulas.

In a couple of instances the formulas used in the New Testament to refer to a prophet from an authoritative book closely resemble the wording of Jude 14. In Mt. 13.14, prophecy is in the form of a noun rather than a verb, but the sentiment is similar to Jude and again the prediction of Isaiah is said to be fulfilled in the people of Matthew's day.²⁶ The second instance, in Mt. 15.7, has ὑποκριταί, καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν περὶ ὑμῶν Ἡσαΐας λέγων ('hypocrites, well Isaiah prophesied concerning you, saying...'); which is almost the same formula used in Jude 14, προεφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τούτοις ἔβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ Ἐνώχ λέγων ('to these even Enoch the seventh from Adam prophesied, saying...'). A parallel to Mt. 15.7 in Mk 7.6 adds 'as it is written', both of which point to a prophecy from an authoritative book, even though one has the term 'as it is written' and the other uses 'says'. More importantly both passages use the word 'prophesied' in a similar manner to Jude 14, so Jude's formula is not unique to him. Jude's formula also resembles that of other Jewish literature. Metzger (1951: 299) mentions that in the Mishnah כִּי כָתוּב ('it is written', or 'for it is written') is the most often used formula with over 300 occurrences.

Qumran also had a number of ways of introducing such material (Bauckham 1990: 227). Bauckham's example of 4QAgas (4Q180) shows the use of pesher on an apocryphal work, similar to the pesharim Qumran uses for other scriptural works. This is comparable, he suggests, to Jude's use of pesher for an apocryphal work. Joseph Fitzmyer (1960: 303), in a work examining the quotation formulas in the *Damascus Document*, the *Manual of Discipline*, the *War Scroll* and *Florilegium*, noted that the New Testament tended to use the formulas of fulfilment or realization, where such formulas are almost non-existent at Qumran, likely because Qumran was looking forward, whereas the New Testament was looking at the culmination of events in Christ. As Fitzmyer mentions, F.F. Bruce (1988: 64) said 'the New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament is not only eschatological, but also Christological. Jude does this seeing the fulfilment of Enoch's words in his present day (v. 14).'²⁷ Fitzmyer (1960: 305) then shows that the use

26. Kaiser (1985: 212-13; also 43-44) also deals with the problem of past particularity having present significance for the New Testament writers. Gundry mentions that the use of ἀναπληροῦν (fulfil) suggests that there was a consciousness that the text had a meaning for Isaiah's day as well as a meaning for the New Testament times (Gundry 1975: 213).

27. Fitzmyer (1960: 305) lists four types of quotations at Qumran and in the

of the formula 'as God has said by means of the prophet Isaiah'²⁸ from CD 4.15 is a reference to the *Testament of Levi* in the Greek *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, but concludes that the introductory formula needs not make it canonical like the books that are found in later canonical lists. The formula alone may not be enough, but in the case of *1 Enoch*, where such a formula is combined with other evidence, then the case becomes much stronger.

A strict adherence to two or three introductory formulas does not fit the evidence of the Mishnah, Qumran or, most importantly for our purposes, the New Testament. In addition, there is ample evidence from the New Testament to suggest that Jude's introduction formula to the quotation he attributes to Enoch fits the introductory formula that is used of several prophets to which Old Testament books are ascribed, particularly the formula of Mt. 15.7 and Mk 7.6. The evidence suggests, as Bauckham claimed, that Jude intended the words of Enoch in v. 14 to be considered inspired prophecy. Jude 6 alludes to the watcher story and v. 14 quotes from *1 Enoch*, both of which seem intended to show that judgment upon the opponents of Jude's audience is imminent and certain.

Apostolic and Church Fathers

Several of the Apostolic and Church Fathers saw *1 Enoch* as authoritative.²⁹ *1 Enoch* is mentioned in *Barn.* 4.3; 16.5; Justin Martyr, *2 Apologia* 5; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5.1.10; Origen, *Contra Celsum* 5, 52; Tertullian, *De cultu fem.* 1.3.50; and Didymus the Blind. Bigg summarizes the view of *1 Enoch* by the Church Fathers:

In short, at the time when Barnabas wrote, Enoch was held to be an inspired book, it retained this reputation more or less throughout the second century, and from that date onward was emphatically condemned and the ground of the condemnation was its attribution of carnal lust to heavenly beings (1946: 309).

New Testament: (1) literal or historical; (2) modernized; (3) accommodation; (4) eschatological. Jude's reference fits the eschatological type of quotation. For treatments of the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament, see Beale (1994) and Kaiser (1985: 43-57; 212-13).

28. García Martínez (1996: 35) places the expression in CD 4.13.

29. VanderKam (1996: 34-102) gives a thorough review of the watcher story in Christian literature, including the gnostic literature.

The epistle of *Barnabas* is an anonymous work to an uncertain, likely Egyptian, audience. It has an uncertain date from either the first century, based on the ch. 6 reference to the ten kings, or to about 132 CE based on the reference to the rebuilding of the temple in ch. 16. Neither of these dates is without difficulty, but a date of late first or early second century CE is suitable (Lake 1977: 337-38; Coxe 1885: 133; Staniforth 1968: 189-90; Grant 1964: 78-79). The letter was quoted as Scripture by Clement of Alexandria, but was not considered so highly by Jerome (Kraft 1978: 263).

Barnabas 4.3 says, 'the first offence is near concerning which it is written, as Enoch said, "For unto this the master has shortened the seasons and the days"'. 'It is written, as Enoch said' fits very well with the New Testament introductory formula used of authoritative works. After using the introductory formula, the epistle makes an editorial comment based loosely on Enochic writings. Kraft (1965) suggests that two weak candidates for the passage are *1 En.* 89.61-64; 90.17; or *2 En.* 34.1-3. It is odd, but not without precedent, that such a specific formula is followed by such a loose rendering (cf. Mt. 27.9, discussed above, where Matthew introduces Jeremiah, but quotes Zechariah). It is also possible, though not likely, that *Barnabas* is quoting a portion not extant today or, somewhat more likely, a portion by a work other than Enoch. What is important, however, is the introductory formula and that the author used the name of a work, suggesting that the author would have considered his source to be authoritative. *Barnabas* 16.5 is said by Grant (1964: 77) to be a direct quotation from *1 Enoch* 89, which would fit nicely with its preceding paragraph, since it is introduced with the words, 'for it says in scripture'. Unfortunately, *1 Enoch* 89, though related to the symbolism of *Barn.* 16.5, does not contain a direct quotation, but *Barn.* 16.5 might be a summary of *1 En.* 89.45-77. There is mention of a tower in 89.50, 54, 67, of the Lord abandoning his sheep in 89.54-56, and of sheep of the pasture in 89.54, all of which are present in *Barn.* 16.5. Another problem, though not insurmountable, is that *1 Enoch* 89 is not particularly eschatological; it refers to the period of the Judges to the time of Alexander the Great (Black 1985: 78-80). However, authors of the New Testament sometimes interpreted a prophet's words for their own time, such as the use of Isa. 7.14 being interpreted as pointing to Jesus Christ. In summary, it would appear, though not conclusively, that the author of *Barnabas* was aware of the book of *1 Enoch*, and used it as Scripture.

Justin Martyr (fl. c. mid-second century) uses *1 Enoch's* account of the angels in *2 Apologia 5*: 'The angels transgressed this order and were enticed by women and begat children, the ones which are called demons; and enslaved the remaining human race to themselves, partly through magic writings and partly through fears and the punishment they brought, and partly through teaching them to offer sacrifices and incense and drink offerings of which they needed after they were enslaved by lustful passions'. Where Justin got these exact words is uncertain, but they can be traced to *The Book of the Watchers*. '[T]he angels transgressed this order and were enticed by women' points to *1 En. 6.1*. Justin mentions that the children were of the women and angels were δαίμονες (demons), which is not found in Jude or 2 Peter. He also states that the angels subdued men by μαγικῶν γραφῶν (magic writings), which is not quite the same as *1 En. 8.3* which says that Semhazah taught spell-binding, and Hermoni taught the loosing of spells, magic, sorcery and sophistry. *1 Enoch 7* mentions that the offspring of the angels devoured man, but not that the angels in particular brought fear. Justin's account varies according to his purpose, but shows a clear reliance on the book of *1 Enoch*, or on some source that itself relied on *1 Enoch*.

Clement of Alexandria (150–214 CE) was versed in philosophy, archaeology, poetry, mythology and literature. He often used anthologies and florilegia, but also clearly knew the Scriptures—he quotes the Old Testament around 1500 times, and the New Testament around 2000 times—as well as classical literature, with over 360 citations (Quasten 1954a: 5-6). *Stromata* is one of Clement of Alexandria's theological writings. He mentions Enoch in *Strom. 5.1.10, 2*. Clement uses Philo as a source in *Stromata*, calling him a Pythagorean who proved the antiquity of Jewish philosophy (*Strom. 1.135.3*; Grant 1988: 180-81). Clement, *Strom. 5.1.10* says that the philosophers were thieves taking their principle dogmas from Moses and the prophets. After this, he adds a portion of *1 Enoch* from *The Book of the Watchers*:

To which we shall add that angels who had obtained the superior rank, having sunk into pleasures, told to the women the secrets which had come to their knowledge; while the rest of the angels concealed them, or rather, kept them against the coming of the Lord. Thence emanated the doctrine of providence, and the revelation of high things; and prophecy having already been imparted to the philosophers of the Greeks, the treatment of dogma arose among the philosophers, sometimes true when

they hit the mark, sometimes erroneous when they comprehended not the secret of the prophetic allegory.

Clement uses the words of an ancient to show that Greek philosophers retrieved their ideas from earlier prophets, of which, presumably, Enoch was one. Later, Photius (*Lexicon 109*) blames Clement in severe terms for adopting the account of angelic sin (Bigg 1946: 309).

Tertullian (155–220 CE) became a Christian in 193 CE (Quasten: 1954a: 246-47; Barnes 1985: 1-2).³⁰ He mentions *1 Enoch* in *De cultu fem. 1.2, 3*.³¹ In 1.2, Tertullian speaks at length of ornaments and make-up on women being traced back to the fallen angels' dealing with women in *The Book of the Watchers*. He mentions 'those angels, who rushed from heaven on the daughters of men' and then says that they taught the women about metallurgy and eye make-up and jewellery (from the metallurgy). Because the angels were ill masters, they taught lustful things. He then interprets the watchers story for his own, saying, 'women who possessed angels (as husbands) could desire nothing more', but that they became worse for their lusts. Tertullian stated that men would judge angels because of the actions of the watchers. There is much that could be said about Tertullian's feelings on make-up or his interpretative skills and methods, but what is important here is that Tertullian used the watcher story as an actual event to support his own thesis. In 1.3, Tertullian defends the genuineness of the prophecy of Enoch:

I am aware that the Scripture of Enoch which has assigned this order (of action) to angels is not received by some because it is not admitted into the Jewish canon either. I suppose they did not think that, having survived the deluge, it could have safely survived that world-wide calamity, the abolisher of all things. If that is their reason then let them recall to their memory that Noah, the survivor of the deluge was a great grandson of Enoch himself, and he, of course, had heard and remembered, from domestic renown and hereditary tradition, concerning his own great-grandfather's 'grace in the sight of god', and concerning all his preachings since Enoch had given no other charge to Methuselah than that he should hand on the knowledge of them to his posterity... If Noah had not

30. Coxe (1963: 3-5) felt that Tertullian was born 145 CE and died about 240 CE.

31. There are other mentions of *1 Enoch* in Tertullian's writings: *Orat. 12.5*; *De cultu fem. 7.1-4*, but these two could also point to Gen. 6.1-4. *Apol. 35.12* also mentions *1 Enoch* (see Daniélou 1977: 162-67).

had this by so short a route there would still be this to warrant our assertion of this scripture: he could have equally renewed it under the Spirit's inspiration... Jewish literature is generally agreed to have been restored through Ezra... By the Jews it may now seem to have been rejected for that reason just like all the other (portions) nearly which tell of Christ... To these contradictions is added the fact that Enoch possesses a testimony in the Apostle Jude.

This portion shows the very strong sentiment by Tertullian that (for him) *1 Enoch* was inspired Scripture.³² Important also is his belief that Jude considered it to be Scripture. Tertullian shows us that, at the same time that Origen was rejecting *1 Enoch*, others were strongly defending its inspiration. Origen said that *1 Enoch* was 'generally' not accepted by the churches as Scripture, but there were those who would defend its status while recognizing that by the second century the 'Jews' were rejecting it.

Origen (185–254 CE) mentions *1 Enoch* in his argument with Celsus. All that is known of Celsus's *Logos alethes*, or 'True Account' (c. 178 CE³³), is from Origen's lengthy quotation in his *Contra Celsum* from c. 248 CE (Grant 1988: 133, 136). Celsus took some of his points straight from the Academy (a group of Plato's successors who opposed all Stoic doctrines), against which Origen would argue the normative Stoic doctrine, or, if Celsus argued from a Stoic position, Origen would argue using the Academy's argument (Chadwick 1965: x-xi). What is more important for the argument of this paper is that Origen follows some of his predecessors such as Clement,³⁴ Justin, Tatian, Theophilus and Athenagoras in using the traditional apologetic developed in the Hellenistic synagogue which shows that Moses and the prophets were earlier than the Greek philosophers and therefore a source of their learning (Chadwick 1965: ix). In *Cels.* 5.52-53 Origen quotes Celsus's argument: 'If they say that [God] is the only one, they would be convicted of telling lies and contradicting themselves. For they say that others have also often come, and, in fact, sixty or seventy at once, who became evil and were punished by being cast under the earth in chains.'

32. Tertullian also makes a clear reference to *1 Enoch* in *De idololatria* 4 and 9.

33. Chadwick (1965: xxiv-xxviii) gives the arguments for the date of Celsus and concludes that it was written between 177–80 CE.

34. Munck contended that Origen was a pupil of Clement of Alexandria (1933: 224-29). Though Chadwick disagrees with this, he does agree that Origen was influenced by Clement (1965: 9).

Origen argues in 5.54 that, 'Celsus misunderstood what was written in the book of Enoch'. This at least tells us that Origen was familiar with a book he called the book of Enoch, which contained Celsus's argument from what is presently known as *The Book of the Watchers*. Origen goes on to say, 'the books entitled Enoch are not generally held to be divine by the churches'. Origen knew that many churches, of his association anyway, were inclined to disregard Enoch. 'Generally' implies that there was some argument in Origen's day as to the inspiration of *1 Enoch*. Origen does not here directly give his opinion on the book, but suggests in 5.55 that he himself is uncertain as to 'the truth...about the Sons of God who desired the daughters of men'.

In *De prin.* 1.3.3, Origen shows a distinction between his view of *1 Enoch* and Scripture. He gives a quotation from Hermas and then says, 'And in a book of Enoch we also have similar descriptions. But up to the present time we have been able to find no statement in holy scripture.'

After the second century CE, as has been pointed out by Bigg (1946: 309), *1 Enoch* was condemned due to its position on the carnal lust of heavenly beings.³⁵ The main reason for the decline of the use of *1 Enoch* is its explicit terms about the actions of the angels in Gen. 6.1-4—a position that both Jude and 2 Peter defend.

Conclusion

The works of 2 Peter and the Apostolic and Church Fathers mentioned above show that *1 Enoch* was argued by factions of the Church to be authoritative. That there was debate at all shows the prominence of the book through the first three centuries of the Common Era. After Augustine, there is little mention of *1 Enoch* in Christian literature; and after Qumran, there is little mention of *1 Enoch* in Jewish literature. The power parties or at least the prolific parties either suppress or ignore the book, but the continued use of *1 Enoch* and the Watcher story shows a connection between the thought of the two groups. This cohesiveness was ignored or denied by those who would eventually become the 'keepers of truth'.

35. Charles (1913: 184) also notes that Augustine (of Hippo) condemned the book in *Civ.* 15.23.4; 18.38, and then the book is explicitly condemned in *Apost. Const.* 6.16 and after that fell into disuse in the Western Church, except in Georgius Syncellus's *Chronographia*, which preserves fragments of it.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barnes, T.D.
1985 *Tertullian* (Oxford: Clarendon Press),
- Bauckham, R.
1983 *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC, 50; Waco, TX: Word Books).
1990 *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark).
- Beale, G.K.
1994 *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts: Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House).
- Berger, K.
1970 'Hertherzigkeit und Gottes Gesetz, die Vorgeschichte des anti-jüdischen Vorwerts in MC 10:5', *ZNW* 61: 1-47.
- Bigg, C.
1946 *The Epistles of St Peter and St Jude* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark).
- Black, M.
1985 *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- Boccaccini, G.
1998 *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
- Bruce, F.F.
1988 *The Canon of Scripture* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press).
- Campanhausen, H. von
1955 *The Fathers of the Greek Church* (trans. S. Godman; New York: Pantheon Books).
- Chadwick, H.
1965 *Origen Contra Celsum* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Charles, R.H.
1913 *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, II (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Collins, J.J.
1984 'Testaments', in M.E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984): 331-44.
- Coxe, A.C.
1885 *The Apostolic Father with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus* (ANF, 1; repr., Grand Rapids: Zondervan).
1963 *The Writings of the Fathers down to AD 325* (ANF, 3; Grand Rapids: Zondervan).
- Daniélou, J.
1977 'The Origins of Latin Christianity', in D. Smith and J.A. Baker (trans.), *An Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicea*, III (London: Westminster Press).
- Fitzmyer, J.A.
1960 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament', *NTS* 7: 297-333.

- García Martínez, F.
1996 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated* (ed. W. Watson; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- Golb, N.
1989 'The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Perspective', *The American Scholar* 58: 177-207.
- Grant, R.
1964 'An Introduction', in *idem* (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary*, I (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons).
- Grant, R.M.
1988 *Greek Apologists of the Second Century* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press).
- Grelot, P.
1958 'La légende d'Énoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: Origine et signification', *RSR* 46: 181-220.
- Gundry, R.H.
1975 *The Use of the Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel* (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- Hillyer, N.
1992 *1 and 2 Peter, Jude* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson).
- Jansen, H.L.
1939 *Die Henochgestalt: Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-Filos. klasse I; Oslo: Dybwad).
- Jonge, M. de
1984 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', in H.F.D. Sparks (ed.), *The Old Testament Apocryphal Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Kaiser, W.C.
1985 *The Use of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody Press).
- Kee, H.
1983 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', *OTP*, II: 775-828.
- Knibb, M.A.
1978 *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Kraft, R.A.
1965 'Barnabas and the Didache', in R. Grant (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary*, I (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons).
1978 'The Letter of Barnabas', in J. Sparks (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson).
- Lake, K.
1977 *The Apostolic Fathers* (LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Lührmann, D.
1972 'Noah and Lot (Lk 17:26-29)—ein Nachtrag', *ZNW* 63: 130-33.
- Maher, M.
1992 *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press).
- Metzger, B.
1951 'The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the New Testament and the Mishnah', *JBL* 70: 297-307.
1987 *The Canon of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

- Munck, J.
1933 'Untersuchungen über Klemens von Alexandria', *Forschungen zur Kirchen und Geistesgeschichte* 2: 224-95.
- Munro, E.A., Jr.
1997 'The Greek of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7 (7Q4, 7Q8, & 7Q12 = 7Qen gr) = Enoch 103: 3-4, 7-8', *RevQ* 18: 307-12.
- Neyrey, J.H.
1993 *2 Peter, Jude* (AB, 37c; New York: Doubleday).
- Nickelsburg, G.W.
1984 'The Bible Written and Expanded', in M. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press), pp. 90-97.
- Puech, E.
1997 'Sept fragments de la lettre d'Henoch (1 Hen 100, 103 et 105) dans la grotte 7 de Qumran (=7QHen gr)', *RevQ* 18: 313-23.
- Quasten J.
1954a *Patrology*, I (Westminster, MD: The Newman Press).
1954b *Patrology*, II (Westminster, MD: The Newman Press).
- Schiffman, L.
1990 'The New Halakhik Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect', *BA* 53: 64-73.
- Schlosser, J.
1973 'Les jours de Noe et de Lot: Apropos de Luc, 17:26-3', *RB* 18: 1-36.
- Sidebottom, E.M.
1982 *James, Jude, 2 Peter* (NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
- Skehan, P., and A. Di Lella
1987 *The Wisdom of Ben Sirach* (New York: Doubleday).
- Slingerland, H.D.
1977 *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Historical Research* (SBLMS, 21; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
1992 *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (SBLMS, 12; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- Staniforth, M.
1968 *Early Christian Writings* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books).
- Stott, J.
1995 *The Message of 2 Peter and Jude* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press).
- VanderKam, J.C.
1977 *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press).
1984 *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS, 16; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association).
1989a 'The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text', in *CSCO*, Vol. 510.
1989b 'The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text', in *CSCO*, Vol. 511.
1994 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
1996 '1 Enoch, Enochic Motifs, and Enoch in Early Christian Literature, in J. VanderKam and W. Adler (eds.), *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (Assen: Van Gorcum).
- Van Winden, J.C.
1971 *Early Christian Philosopher* (Leiden: E.J. Brill).

- Vaughan, C., and T.D. Lea
1988 *I, II Peter, and Jude* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan).
- Warfield, B.B.
1948 *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House).
1982 'Inspiration', *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, II, pp. 839-49.
- Williamson G.A. (trans.)
1965 *Eusebius: The History of the Church* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books).
1984 *Eusebius: The History of the Church* (New York: Dorset Press).
- Wintermute, O.S.
1983 'Jubilees', *OTP*, II, pp. 35-42.
- Zimern, H.
1901 *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der babylonischen Religion: Die Beschwörungstafeln Surpu, Ritualtafeln für den Wahrsager, Beschwörer und Sänger* (Assyriologische bibliothek, 12; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs).

Christian-Jewish Relations through the Centuries

**edited by
Stanley E. Porter and
Brook W.R. Pearson**

**Journal for the Study of the New Testament
Supplement Series 192**

Roehampton Papers 6



Copyright © 2000 Sheffield Academic Press

Published by
Sheffield Academic Press Ltd
Mansion House
19 Kingfield Road
Sheffield S11 9AS
England

Typeset by Sheffield Academic Press
and
Printed on acid-free paper in Great Britain
by Bookcraft Ltd
Midsomer Norton, Bath

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library

ISBN 1-84127-090-3

CONTENTS

Abbreviations	9
List of Contributors	13
STANLEY E. PORTER AND BROOK W.R. PEARSON	
Introduction: Christian-Jewish Relations into the Next Century	15
Part I	
CHRISTIAN-JEWISH RELATIONS IN THE ANCIENT WORLD	
CRAIG A. EVANS	
Root Causes of the Jewish-Christian Rift from Jesus to Justin	20
STANLEY E. PORTER AND BROOK W.R. PEARSON	
Ancient Understandings of the Christian-Jewish Split	36
✓ CRISPIN H.T. FLETCHER-LOUIS	
Wisdom Christology and the Partings of the Ways between Judaism and Christianity	52
BROOK W.R. PEARSON AND FELICITY HARLEY	
Resurrection in Jewish-Christian Apocryphal Gospels and Early Christian Art	69
✓ LAWRENCE VANBEEK	
<i>1 Enoch</i> among Jews and Christians: A Fringe Connection?	93
JACQUELINE C.R. DE ROO	
The Concept of 'Works of the Law' in Jewish and Christian Literature	116
STANLEY E. PORTER	
Was Paul a Good Jew? First	