

ENOCH AND THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

SBL Press

EARLY JUDAISM AND ITS LITERATURE

Rodney A. Werline, Editor

Editorial Board:

George J. Brooke

Esther Glickler Chazon

Kelley N. Coblenz Bautch

Steven D. Fraade

James S. McLaren

Number 44

SBL Press



ENOCH AND THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

Reminiscences, Allusions, Intertextuality

Edited by

Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Gabriele Boccaccini

SBL Press



SBL PRESS

Atlanta

Copyright © 2016 by SBL Press

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to the Rights and Permissions Office, SBL Press, 825 Houston Mill Road, Atlanta, GA 30329 USA.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Enoch Seminar (7th : 2013 : Camaldoli, Italy) | Stuckenbruck, Loren T., editor. | Boccaccini, Gabriele, 1958- editor.

Title: Enoch and the Synoptic Gospels : reminiscences, allusions, intertextuality / edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Gabriele Boccaccini.

Description: Atlanta : SBL Press, 2016. | Series: Early Judaism and its literature ; number 44 | Includes bibliographical references.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016021816 (print) | LCCN 2016022688 (ebook) | ISBN 9780884141174 (paperback) | ISBN 9780884141198 (hardcover) | ISBN 9780884141181 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Ethiopic book of Enoch—Congresses. | Bible. Gospels—Congresses.

Classification: LCC BS1830.E7 E56 2016 (print) | LCC BS1830.E7 (ebook) | DDC 229/.913—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2016021816>

Printed on acid-free paper.



CONTENTS

Abbreviations	vii
Introduction: 1 Enoch and the Synoptic Gospels: The Method and Benefits of a Conversation Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Gabriele Boccaccini	1
Narrative Depictions of Altered States of Consciousness in 1 Enoch and the Synoptic Tradition André Gagné	19
The Revelatory Experiences of Enoch and Jesus: A Comparison between the Book of the Watchers and the Synoptic Tradition Daniel M. Gurtner	31
Unusual Births: Enochic Traditions and Matthew's Infancy Narrative Amy E. Richter	45
Enoch and the Synoptic Birth Narratives: A Thought Experiment Anders Klostergaard Petersen	73
Heavenly Beings in the Enoch Traditions and Synoptic Gospels Kelley Coblenz Bautch	105
The Parables of Enoch and Luke's Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus Leslie Baynes	129
Forgiveness of Sins: An Enochic Problem, a Synoptic Answer Gabriele Boccaccini	153

“Son of Man”: Its Origin and Meaning in Second Temple Judaism Lester L. Grabbe	169
Matthew’s Day of Judgment in the Light of 1 Enoch Daniel Assefa	199
The Demonology of 1 Enoch and the New Testament Gospels Archie T. Wright.....	215
1 Enoch 6–11 Interpreted in the Light of Mesopotamian Incantation Literature Henryk Drawnel.....	245
Enoch, Jesus, and Priestly Tradition Joseph L. Angel.....	285
Jesus among Wisdom’s Representatives: 4QInstruction Benjamin Wold.....	317
The Veneration Motif in the Temptation Narrative of the Gospel of Matthew: Lessons from the Enochic Tradition Andrei A. Orlov.....	337
Bibliography	363
Contributors.....	405
Index of Ancient Sources.....	409
Index of Modern Authors.....	440

SBL Press

ABBREVIATIONS

AARSR	American Academy of Religion Studies in Religion Series
AAWG	Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen
AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
AbrNSup	Abr-Nahrain Supplements
AcOr	<i>Acta Orientalia</i>
AfOB	Archiv für Orientforschung; Beiheft
AGAJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
Ahw	<i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i> . Wolfram von Soden. 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1965–1981.
AJP	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
Aland	Kurt Aland, ed. <i>Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum</i> . 13th ed. 1985. Repr., Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1990.
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
BDAG	Walter Bauer, Frederick W. Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BHS	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> . Edited by Karl Elliger and Wilhelm Rudolph. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983.
BibInt	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
BibInt	Biblical Interpretation Series
BibLeb	<i>Bibel und Leben</i>
BibOr	Biblica et Orientalia
BN	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>

<i>Brev</i>	<i>Bible Review</i>
BSR	<i>Bulletin for the Study of Religion</i>
BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BTS	Biblical Tools and Studies
CAD	<i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> . 21 vols. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1956–2006.
CahRB	Cahiers de la Revue biblique
CAL	Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon
CANE	<i>Civilizations of the Ancient Near East</i> . Edited by Jack M. Sasson. 4 vols. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1995.
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CEJL	Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature
ConBNT	Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament Series
CRINT	Compendium Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CRRAI	Compte rendu, Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
CSSH	<i>Comparative Studies in Science and History</i>
CTL	<i>Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics</i>
CTU	<i>The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani, and Other Places</i> . Edited by Manfred Dietrich, Oswald Loretz, and Joaquín Sanmartín. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1995.
CurBR	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
DCH	<i>Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> . Edited by David J. A. Clines. 9 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 1993–2014.
DDD	<i>Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible</i> . Edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DNWSI	<i>Dictionary of North-West Semitic Inscriptions</i> . Jacob Hoftijzer and Karen Jongeling. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
DSSSE	<i>Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition</i> . Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998.
EDSS	<i>Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> . Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. 2 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000

EJL	Early Judaism and Its Literature
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>ErJb</i>	<i>Eranos-Jahrbuch</i>
<i>EstBib</i>	<i>Estudios bíblicos</i>
<i>EstEcl</i>	<i>Estudios eclesiásticos</i>
<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
FAOS	Freiburger altorientalische Studien
FCNTECW	Feminist Companion to the New Testament and Early Christian Writings
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten and Neuen Testaments
GAAL	Göttinger Arbeitshefte zur altorientalischen Literatur
HBM	Hebrew Bible Monographs
<i>HBT</i>	<i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i>
HdO	Handbuch der Orientalistik
<i>Hen</i>	<i>Henoch</i>
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>Imm</i>	<i>Immanuel</i>
<i>JAAR</i>	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>
<i>JANER</i>	<i>Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JCTCRS	Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies
<i>JEOL</i>	<i>Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Gezelschap (Genootschap) Ex oriente lux</i>
<i>JGRChJ</i>	<i>Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism</i>
<i>JHI</i>	<i>Journal of the History of Ideas</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JR</i>	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
<i>JSHJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus</i>
<i>JSHRZ</i>	Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>

JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSP	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
JSS	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KAI	<i>Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften</i> . Herbert Donner and Wolfgang Röllig. 2nd ed. 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1966–1969.
KTU	<i>Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit</i> . Edited by Manfred Dietrich, Oswald Loretz, and Joaquín Sanmartín. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1995.
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LSS	Leipziger semitische Studien
LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
MC	Mesopotamian Civilizations
MdB	Le Monde de la Bible
MNTS	McMaster New Testament Studies
MTSR	<i>Method and Theory in the Study of Religion</i>
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NTM	New Testament Message
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
Or	<i>Orientalia</i>
OTP	<i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> . Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983–1985.
PTMS	Princeton Theological Monograph Series
PTSDSSP	Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece
R&T	<i>Religion and Theology</i>

RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
Rec.	Recension
RevQ	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
RIMA	The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods
RSV	Revised Standard Version
RVV	Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten
SAACT	State Archives of Assyria Cuneiform Texts
SAOC	Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SHR	Studies in the History of Religions
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SO	Symbolae Osloenses
SP	Sacra Pagina
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StPohl	Studia Pohl
StPohlSM	Studia Pohl Series Maior
StudNeot	Studia Neotestamentica
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigraphica
SymS	Symposium Series
TBN	Themes in Biblical Narrative
TCL	Textes cunéiform, Musée du Louvre
TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.
TDOT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry. Translated by John T. Willis et al. 15 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–2006.
TLG	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: Canon of Greek Authors and Works</i> . Edited by Luci Berkowitz and Karl A. Squitier. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
TUAT	Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments. Edited by Otto Kaiser. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1984–.

VC	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
VCSup	Vigiliae Christianae Supplements
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Alten und Neuen Testament
ZA	<i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie</i>
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

SBL Press

1 ENOCH AND THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS: THE METHOD AND BENEFITS OF A CONVERSATION

Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Gabriele Boccaccini

The essays of the present volume, which emanate from papers given at the Seventh Enoch Seminar held in Camaldoli on 21–26 July 2013, strike up a conversation between the Synoptic Gospels of the New Testament, on the one hand, and the early Enochic tradition preserved in 1 En. 1–108, on the other. The significance of the latter for assessing the diversity of Second Temple Judaism has not gone unnoticed and, indeed, has been subject to a rapidly increasing number of studies since J. T. Milik's monograph on the Aramaic fragments from Qumran Cave 4 in 1976.¹ However, our understanding of the relationship of early Enochic traditions to Christian origins, despite notable exceptions (having mostly to do with the Son of Man figure in the Book of Parables in 1 En. 37–71), is not as well developed. While this circumstance can be variously explained,² the need and value of drawing comparisons has long been recognized.

1. J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments from Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976). Among numerous scholarly monographs and articles, we note those of the Enoch Seminar published since 2002; for a bibliography, see [http://www.4enoch.org/wiki4/index.php?title=Enoch_Seminar_\(2001-\),_learned_society](http://www.4enoch.org/wiki4/index.php?title=Enoch_Seminar_(2001-),_learned_society).

2. Two factors can be briefly noted here. The first involves the practical challenge of expertise: many scholars whose primary focus is the interpretation of the New Testament simply do not have the expertise to deal with a wide range of languages in which the Enoch tradition survives (mostly Ge'ez, with more fragmentary remains in Greek, Aramaic, Latin, Syriac, and Coptic). Second, as is the case with other collections of Second Temple texts, reference to Enoch traditions as a conversation partner for Christian origins has fallen victim to the misleading partition of New Testament writings as simply "Christian" (and therefore of an essentially different character), thereby minimizing ways they can be understood as expressions of Jewish tradition in their own right.

It was just over a hundred years ago, in 1912, that the well-known biblical scholar R. H. Charles made the following remarkable claim: “The influence of 1 Enoch on the New Testament has been greater than that of all the other apocryphal and pseudepigraphal books taken together.”³ Since then, considerable evidence has been forthcoming for Jewish tradition relating to the Second Temple and medieval periods. This development is not only noticeable through a series of new discoveries (for example, fragments and manuscripts from the Cairo Genizah, the Dead Sea Scrolls, inscriptions from the Mediterranean world, and further finds of texts in various languages copied in Christian manuscripts), but also through a burgeoning of editions, commentaries, and publications that have begun to demonstrate the impact of this material for the interpretation of texts and traditions preserved in the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament. Now, the rhetorical claim by Charles on the importance of 1 Enoch was no doubt calculated in order to draw attention to a tradition that had only been reintroduced to the broader Western world during the previous century, beginning with translations of a few passages by A. I. Silvestre de Sacy into Latin (1800), by Richard Laurence of the whole into English (1821), and by Andreas Gottlieb Hoffmann into German (1838).⁴ Thus already during the nineteenth century a number of scholars could recognize the significance of 1 Enoch for recovering Jewish traditions that were circulating before the turn of the Common Era. Charles’s comparative claim, however, took scholarly assessment of the relationship between the early Enochic tradition and the New Testament to a new level. Not only was he maintaining that the significance of 1 Enoch is “greater” for the New Testament than all other noncanonical (from a Protestant perspective) Jewish books

3. R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1912), xcvi (see further ix–xii).

4. A. I. Silvestre de Sacy, “Notice du Livre d’Enoch,” *Magasin Encyclopédique, ou Journal des Sciences, des Lettres et des Arts* 6.1 (1800): 369–98. De Sacy translated 1 En. 1:1–16:3, 22:5–7, and 32:1–6. Latin was, of course, the scholarly vernacular of his day; Richard Laurence, under the full title, *The Book of Enoch the Prophet: An Apocryphal Production, Supposed for Ages to Have Been Lost; but Discovered at the Close of the Last Century in Abyssinia; Now First Translated from an Ethiopian Ms. in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford: Parker, 1821; 2nd ed. 1833); Andreas Gottlieb Hoffmann, *Das Buch Henoch in vollständiger Uebersetzung mit fortlaufendem Commentar, ausführlicher Einleitung und erläuternden Excursen*, part 2: *Uebersetzung und Commentar au Kp. 56–105, nebst Excursen* (Jena: Crocker, 1838).

taken together, Charles was more specifically describing the nature of this significance in terms of “influence.”

It is not for us in the present volume to weigh whether the details of Charles’s assertion are correct; that this scholar, who was so familiar with other compositions from the Second Temple period known at the beginning of the twentieth century, could venture such a claim at all is in itself perhaps more important than anything else. Hardly anyone would doubt that the authors of 1 Pet 2:18–22, 2 Pet 2:4–5, and Jude 6 and 14–15 knowingly drew on traditions from 1 Enoch, with the first three texts arguably referring to the rebellious angels tradition known through 1 En. 6–11 and the last-mentioned text citing 1 En. 1:9 directly. One can also advance the argument that these texts, whether understood as “allusions” or “quotations,” presuppose some knowledge on the part of their respective audiences regarding the source traditions being used. Even if one accepts these points, however, questions emerge in how one adjudicates the influence of 1 Enoch on other New Testament texts and, indeed, whether the significance of the early Enochic tradition for reading and interpreting the same is exhausted by “influence.” Of course, there are other possible ways of construing the interrelationship between texts; in this respect, terms such as *intertextuality* (when applied in a broad sense⁵) or *echoes* (as introduced by Richard Hays⁶) are frequently used. Here we may have in mind cases in which the reading of a text is enhanced by the knowledge of another text or text-tradition without necessarily having to put forth an argument for overt use on the part of the original communicator or detailed knowledge thereof on the part of the receiver. The illumination here would be *extrinsic*, that is, per-

5. Julia Kristeva initially coined the term to denote written communication in which readers of a text recognize that it is making use of other texts also known to them; see her *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980). Many other critics have, however, used the term to denote relationships between texts that may lie outside the consciousness of writer and reader; cf., e.g., Roland Barthes, “Death of the Author,” in *Image, Music, Text*, trans. Stephen Heath (London: Fontana, 1977), 142–54; and the assessment of the problem in Mary Orr, *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts* (Cambridge: Polity, 2003), 168–82.

6. Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 14–21, for whom “echo” constitutes a “poetic” form of “intertextuality,” drawing on the work of John Hollander, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981).

ceived by interpreters removed in time (and perhaps even location) from or without direct access to an original or early communicative setting. Even beyond this, regardless of any intrinsic or remote perspective on a connection between texts, one can ask what may happen to the understanding of a text if it is simply placed in conversation with another. In this instance, without being obliged to posit a generative connection of any sort, interpreters may find themselves exploring what happens when texts, through comparison and contrast, are allowed to speak to one another, sometimes in a privileged way, sometimes within a larger web of texts that have been brought together. To be sure, the choice of conversation partners would not be entirely arbitrary; enough thought structures or language are already shared to render a comparative analysis useful. If, however, it turns out that no line of influence or generative connection can be posited, does it follow that the enterprise is of less value?

The possibilities for relating texts just discussed are of particular relevance for the present volume's focus on traditions preserved in 1 Enoch, on the one hand, and a broad spectrum of passages in the Synoptic Gospels, on the other. There is, for example, not a single instance among the New Testament gospels in which 1 Enoch is quoted in any formal way. In addition, the figure of Enoch is only once mentioned, and passingly so, in Luke 3:37. This does not, of course, have to signify that 1 Enoch has played no role in the shaping of any part of the gospel tradition, nor does this have to mean that a conversation between the two bodies of literature cannot be mutually illuminative. The Apocalypse of John provides an analogical case in point. Hardly anyone doubts that the book draws on writings from the Hebrew Bible such as Isaiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah, Daniel, and Exodus. The identification of this series of connections, though, is based at most on allusion, not formal citation that names the source text. At the same time, one can make a careful argument in certain instances that Enochic tradition, not unlike some of the Hebrew Bible books mentioned above, has played a role in shaping particular words, phrases, and motifs in the text. Even if such an argument is found unconvincing, to what extent does knowing about the existence of motifs and thought structures in 1 Enoch help us to describe the character of John's Apocalypse?⁷ To what extent

7. Cf. Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Mark D. Mathews, "The Apocalypse of John, 1 Enoch, and the Question of Influence," in *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*, WUNT 335 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 281–325.

can “influence” and intertextual perspectives in these senses be attributed to the way one interprets the Synoptic Gospels? While drawing any comparisons, for example, one has to remember that the goal and presentation of the two texts were different: whereas the Synoptics were designed to be read immediately and present the ministry of Jesus leading up to the time of his death and aftermath, the early Enoch texts were intended as a repository of secret teachings revealed to Enoch but disclosed to recipients just before the end of time.

Despite the differences of emphasis between 1 Enoch and the Synoptics and the absence of explicit evidence for the use of Enoch tradition in the Synoptics, it is understandable that we would want to look for connections or even influence in some form. Such a scholarly itinerary is supported by a plausibility structure. We know in principle that traditions in 1 Enoch shaped the thought world of a number of Second Temple writings in relation to matters such as the provenance and effects of evil, the structure of the cosmos, poverty and wealth, the bifurcation of humanity along the lines of “the righteous” and “the wicked,” the partition of time and eschatology, postmortem existence, the notion of “revealed” knowledge, and early “biblical” interpretation. We also know that most of 1 Enoch was composed before the turn of the Common Era. If, within this framework, points of meaningful contact are found between the gospel tradition and 1 Enoch—which is lesser known and often less respected by Jewish and Christian scholars, students, leaders, and laity—we learn something about traditions that became markers of religious identity during the first four hundred years CE and well beyond.⁸ If we wish to carve a place for a consideration of Enoch tradition (not to mention the study of Second Temple Judaism more generally) within the broader scene of the study of Near Eastern and Mediterranean antiquity, biblical studies, and indeed—for some—theology and human well-being, it is tempting to overargue the case; after all, there is a certain self-interest that makes Enoch specialists want 1 Enoch to provide a key voice within the complex milieu of traditions shaping the thought world of Judaism in its varied forms around the

8. See Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “The *Book of Enoch*: Its Reception in Second Temple Jewish and in Christian Tradition,” *Early Christianity* 4 (2013): 7–40. For a continuously updated account of the history of reception of 1 Enoch, prepared by Gabriele Boccaccini and Pierpaolo Bertalotto, see the website www.4enoch.org.

turn of the Common Era. As much as this aim shapes and even sharpens the questions put to texts such as those of the New Testament, one does well to beware in saying ultimately less when attempting to claim too much. There is a place for a rhetorical presentation of ideas in order “to try them out,” but hopefully that is but a stepping-stone on the way toward a more ultimate goal.

Thus, in line with the discussion above, the essays of this volume, taken as a whole, are doing more than simply seeking out influences to describe how 1 Enoch relates to traditions that emerged in written form from the Jesus movement. In terms of meaning or significance, there is nothing lost when saying that some traditions found in 1 Enoch contributed to the world of thought within which the convictions and ideas found in the New Testament took shape. Indeed, formulated in this way, such arguments give 1 Enoch texts more space to be read with integrity, that is, without bending them to fit into readings of other texts. It also offers space to read the New Testament writings with more integrity as well. At the same time, we look for insights that can emerge when these respective collections are placed in conversation with one another. To our minds, this conversation—without claiming in each case that a given Enochic tradition supplies the only or decisive background or context for a text in the gospels—is what the present volume seeks.

There are a number of ways in which we may be able to talk about the relationship between 1 Enoch and the Synoptic Gospels in terms of influence. One of the areas that has been highlighted time and again, while met with skepticism from some quarters, has had to do with the Book of Parables (1 En. 37–71). The essays of Daniel Assefa and Lester Grabbe will focus on this question. In brief, if the dating of the Parables can be situated before the Common Era or even, with a later dating to sometime in the first century CE, preserves tradition that goes back to that time, it is hard not to think of a connection between the Son of Man figure (also called Anointed One and Elect One) as presented there with the way a figure with the same designation is depicted in Matthew’s Gospel. In both cases, the Son of Man denotes a heavenly figure who executes divine judgment on behalf of God as the present age comes to a close. There is, at the very least, a connection if the appeals to independent interpretation of the son-of-man-like figure in Daniel (7:13–14) in common ways does not provide a sufficient explanation. A connection, it seems, is certain. However, is this a literary one? That is possible too, but less certain. Ideas and traditions can be shared without positing literary dependence. On the heels of yet

more recently publications on the matter,⁹ and the added use of a broader textual base (see below), the issue will continue to merit attention beyond the confines of this volume.

Having noted a possible genetic connection between early Enochic tradition and the presentation of Jesus as Son of Man in the Synoptic Gospels, we should also acknowledge that the use of material from 1 Enoch in relation to an interpretation of the gospels does not require historical claims of “influence” in order to be fruitful in some way. It suffices here to mention several areas, a couple of which are explored in more depth by the essays of this book.

First, as for example 1 En. 15–16 make clear, illness, suffering, and evil activities among humanity are linked with the influence of spirits that emerge from giants, offspring of the “sons of God” and “daughters of humanity,” who, for the atrocities they committed before the great flood, were punished by being made to exist in a disembodied state. In their contributions to this volume, Henryk Drawnel and Archie Wright explore, respectively, the ancient Near Eastern background to this narrative and its impact on the gospel narratives (see further below). As the product of an unsanctioned mix between angelic and human beings, they also represented a breach of the created order. The Enochic tradition considered the spirits of the giants to be what remains of defeated powers, which, however, have not yet been destroyed; their annihilation lies in the future. This narrative throws the activity of Jesus, as presented in the Synoptic Gospels, into the spotlight as one who does not destroy unclean or evil spirits at any time,¹⁰ relocating them instead to a position where they can be managed or remain remote. A postexorcism threat of return remains (cf. Luke 11:24–26 // Matt 12:43–45). Thus, rather than treating exorcism in the Synoptic tradition as material that celebrates the destruction of evil, the Enochic tradition places one in a better position to recognize Jesus’s activity and even the exorcistic activity of others as a treatment of some forms of suffering without pretension that they are simply removed

9. See the volume of essays edited by James H. Charlesworth and Darrell L. Bock, *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*, JCTCRS 11 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), including “Select Bibliography on ‘the Son of Man’ and the *Parables of Enoch*” on 373–90 (prepared by Charlesworth and Blake Jurgens).

10. An exception is Matt 8:32, according to which, arguably, it is “the demons” (v. 31) that had entered the herd of swine that met their death in the waters; according to the parallel in Mark 5:13, the herd, numbering two thousand, drowned in the sea.

altogether or can be wished away. In this sense, one can engage the gospel tradition, beginning with some of its underlying sources, in a constructive conversation with the field of psychiatric medicine. There are, to be sure, many differences between ancient (and even contemporary) reports of exorcism and the ways mental health problems, for example, are dealt with today.¹¹ In neither case, however, is the discourse so much devoted to ridding sufferers of problems altogether as it is, ultimately, to managing them.

Second, we offer an observation that follows from the point just made: The Enoch tradition, mostly the Book of the Watchers (1 En. 1–36) and also to some extent the Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 85–90) and the Apocalypse of Weeks (93:1–10 and 91:11–17)—along with some Dead Sea Scrolls and related texts—can understand evil experienced by people as already defeated, for example, when God exercised power and during the great flood. The expectation that evil in all its forms will be eradicated in the end, expressed as it is in 1 En. 10:16–22, draws on terminology reminiscent of the deluge in Genesis (Gen 6:5–9:17; cf. further Isa 65:17–25; 66:22–23). Such hope, to be sure, is a matter of describing the *Endzeit* in terms of *Urzeit*. However, there is more: what God can be thought to have enacted in the *Urzeit* functions to guarantee the eschatological annihilation of evil. Many, if not a majority of, New Testament theologians have argued that the presentation of Jesus in the gospels, and the apostle Paul, although drawing heavily on an “apocalyptic” worldview, nevertheless modified it in one fundamental point: rather than adopting a framework of two eons, as Jewish apocalyptic is assumed to have forthrightly espoused, Jesus and Paul depict God as one whose activity on behalf of humans to defeat evil has moved into the sphere of the present, thus providing assurance that evil will be obliterated in the future age. For Jesus it happened, for example, through exorcisms and healings; for Paul it happened through God’s activity in Jesus’s death and resurrection. The claim here is that Jews of an apocalyptic persuasion would never have thought about time in this way as well. The Enoch tradition, the Book of Jubilees, and some Dead Sea texts help us recognize that the notion of evil operating as a defeated power and that such evil can, on this principle, be curbed or managed in the present,

11. For a comparison, see Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “The Human Being and Demonic Invasion: Therapeutic Models in Ancient Jewish and Christian Texts,” in *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*, WUNT 335 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 161–86.

perhaps *contributed to*—rather than contrasted with—the understandings of time reflected in the gospel tradition and the writings of Paul.

There is a third way in which a conversation with demonology that emerges from the Enoch and related literature sheds light on the Synoptic presentation of Jesus. At issue is the label *unclean* when applied to the term *spirit*. As already noted above and as several recent studies have underscored, the spirits coming from the giants as they were disembodied are deemed to have been products of defilement, an unholy union of angels and humans (1 En. 15:3–4). In Mark’s Gospel the suspicion that Jesus’s exorcisms evince an alliance with Satan is parenthetically explained by a comment in 3:30: “for they were saying, ‘He has an *unclean spirit*.’” The Gospel of Mark does not really answer this charge, except to assert the superiority of Jesus to his opponents and to reinforce this through his authority in debate; in addition, the audience of the Markan narrative would have known that Jesus had the Spirit of God since his baptism (1:10). If Matthew and Luke’s Gospels knew of the charge that Jesus has an unclean spirit (as it appears in Mark, for example), they did not draw on it directly, but rather drew on a much older tradition to represent Jesus another way: as one born of the *holy* Spirit (Matt 1:18, 20; cf. Luke 1:35).¹² If read from this perspective—one that can be traced back to Enochic tradition—the role of the Spirit in Jesus’s birth, whatever that may have meant in relation to claims about his divinity as it came to be understood, may have provided one way to answer the charge that Jesus was acting in league with that which is unclean, whether this was through his association with sinners (Mark 2:16 // Matt 9:11 // Luke 5:30; cf. Luke 15:2) or through his exorcisms. A plausibility structure for the notion that the adjective *holy* was intended at some stage as a contrast to *unclean* is supplied by the stories of Noah’s birth found in 1 En. 106–107 and the Genesis Apocryphon (at 1Q20 II–V).

The three examples presented here in brief illustrate how a conversation with Enochic tradition can be profitable, without requiring a close-knit argument that the one tradition has had an influence upon the other. Some of the essays in this volume reflect an attempt to make such a conversation possible. This view does not obviate that in other instances influence can be more plausibly demonstrated, and several essays indeed

12. For a fuller argument, see Stuckenbruck, “Conflicting Stories: The Spirit Origin of Jesus’ Birth,” in *Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 142–60.

advance an argument to this effect. If 1 Enoch and the Synoptic Gospels are to be compared at any point, it remains to reflect on challenges that accompany such an analysis. We are, in each case, dealing with collections of texts that are not only ancient but whose precise historical contexts are at each turn not immediately apparent.

As far as the Synoptic Gospels are concerned, complications arise as one distinguishes between the time of composition of a gospel as a whole and the times in which the respective traditions they preserve initially took shape. Since the sociopolitical landscape of Judea and the eastern Mediterranean world changed significantly between the time of Jesus and the latter part of the first century CE, this distinction is important for determining the provenience of this or that tradition. Text-critical problems aside, the span of time covered by traditions transmitted through the Synoptics embraces a period of some seventy years.

Whereas the complications regarding the literary, socioreligious, and political gospels—underscored by social-scientific and historical-exegetical disciplines—are well documented (even if consensus is hard to attain), we do well to be reminded what the title “1 Enoch” describes. Here we are dealing with a collection of some twenty (perhaps more) traditions that, taken together, reflect up to four hundred years of writing, collecting, and editing activity on the part of devout Jews who did not in each case share the same milieu, wrote at different times under distinguishable sociopolitical circumstances, and were driven by contrasting motives. Whereas the Synoptic Gospels offer a narrative focusing on selected traditions about Jesus that include both deeds and teachings and that culminate in his passion and its immediate aftermath, 1 Enoch is a collection of pieces that, framed by a title or short third person narrative, are mostly written under the name of the prediluvian patriarch, while one section is formally anonymous (chs. 6–11) and a few others are attributed to Noah. In the Ethiopic manuscript tradition, the 108 chapters are clearly divided into five major sections (Book of the Watchers, chs. 1–36; Book of Parables, chs. 37–71; Book of Heavenly Luminaries, chs. 72–82; Book of Dreams, chs. 83–90; Epistle, chs. 91/92–105), followed by two shorter additions (Birth of Enoch, chs. 106–107; Eschatological Admonition, ch. 108). First Enoch therefore covers a much greater time frame than do the Synoptic Gospels, taken singly or together, even if we take a few of the later small additions into account (e.g., Mark 16:9–20; Luke 22:43–44).

In addition to the differences in form, content, and time span covered, perhaps an even greater difficulty for comparative analysis relates to the

text. The text-critical work of the New Testament gospels, which today has a very large text base at its disposal, continues to develop and refine both its methods and focus for study. The result so far has been, on the whole, to establish a remarkably stable text. This situation is more than we can say for 1 Enoch. Part of the challenge might seem that our most comprehensive version of the work is preserved in Ge'ez (often referred to as Classical or Old Ethiopic), for which our textual evidence dates back to around the turn of the fifteenth century.¹³ The reception of the book in the Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church as *Mäṣḥāfä Henok* in Ge'ez manuscripts reflects a series of contexts from the fifteenth through the twentieth centuries that are very different from those in which 1 Enoch was composed during the Second Temple period, not to mention those of the early fragmentary Jewish materials in Aramaic from the Dead Sea (third to first centuries BCE) and the Christian Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Coptic evidence from the fourth century CE and later.

Despite the significant headway made by scholars in relation to the earlier, non-Ge'ez materials, we can and should continue to pose a number of questions; these issues relate, for example, to manuscript reconstruction, the function of texts as artifacts, and the fragments' respective codicological contexts. Since the Aramaic fragments cover only about 5 percent of text corresponding to 1 Enoch and the Greek fragments barely 20 percent, it becomes impossible to deal with anything approaching the work as a whole without reference to the Ge'ez version. This is not without difficulties; indeed, those unacquainted with 1 Enoch studies would have grounds for marveling that for a text of 108 chapters stemming from the Second Temple period we should rely so heavily on manuscripts that date no further back than 1400 CE. It should be noted, however, that compared to early Jewish writings preserved through other language traditions (e.g., Greek, Latin, Syriac, Armenian, Georgian, Slavonic), *Mäṣḥāfä Henok* has suffered very little obviously Christianizing emendations and interpolations,¹⁴ something that holds for the Ge'ez manuscript tradition as a whole. Notwithstanding the transmission of manuscripts of 1 Enoch as they were being read and used in an avowedly Christian setting, the

13. The currently earliest manuscript from Daga Estifanos on Lake Tana is microfilm number EMMML 8400 at the National Archives Library Agency in Addis Ababa.

14. To be sure, some manuscripts contain marginal notes by scribes that indicate the Christian context of the book's reception. For a good example, cf. EMMML 2080 from Hayq Estifanos, in which such scribal notes have yet to be properly studied.

degree of overlap between the Ge'ez text and its counterparts, even the Aramaic fragments from the Dead Sea, suggests that it can be studied with a view to anchoring it within a more original Jewish context.

With respect to the text itself, the last critical edition of 1 Enoch was produced by R. H. Charles in 1906, while in 1978 Michael Knibb made an important contribution by collating a number of manuscripts around the text of a manuscript from the Rylands Library in Manchester that preserves the later, more standardizing text (Eth. II).¹⁵ Charles listed thirty-two manuscripts, of which he was able to make full use of twenty-four and partial use of others. Knibb's collations focused mostly on seven copies of the earlier, though more varied recension (Eth. I), including the important Tana 9 not known to Charles; the latter, also labeled among the Addis Ababa National Library microfilm collection as EMMML 8292, served as a significant point of departure for Ephraim Isaac's translation in James Charlesworth's *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (1983). A number of text-critical studies underlie several translations of all or part of 1 Enoch that have since been published: Siegbert Uhlig (1984), Patrick Tiller (1993), and of course the work of George Nickelsburg and James VanderKam (2004 and 2012).¹⁶ Today's comparative work owes a tremendous debt to these and others scholars for what they have provided us in the way of a workable text.

However, recent listings of known manuscripts, such as those provided by Uhlig and by Nickelsburg and VanderKam,¹⁷ which number forty-nine or fifty,¹⁸ do not account for the actual number of known manuscripts

15. Michael A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), esp. 2:21–37 for a discussion of the Ethiopic evidence.

16. Siegbert Uhlig, *Das äthiopische Henochbuch*, JSHRZ 5/6 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1984), 463–780; Patrick Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*, EJL 4 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993); George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004); Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch: The Hermeneia Translation*, rev. ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012).

17. Uhlig, *Das äthiopische Henochbuch*, 470–77; George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 15–17; and George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 37–82*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 4–6.

18. In these lists, the slight variance depends largely on whether one counts Tana 9 and Tana 9a (both now under the siglum EMMML 8292) as texts from the same manuscript or numbers them separately.

now available for study, nor do they include emerging important evidence for the text. This point aside, we now know of the existence of up to 150 manuscripts of 1 Enoch, of which over a hundred can readily be studied.¹⁹ Of the latter group, at least twenty-six texts preserve the older, less standardized recension of the book, and among the currently known yet inaccessible manuscripts there are sure to be more. The integration of this additional evidence for the text, some of which may be reckoned among our most important textual witnesses, will provide us with readings that, in not a few places, lead to small yet significant differences in translation. Future work on 1 Enoch, whether it is taken on its own or compared with another body of texts (as in the present volume), will be in a better position to sift through evidence than up until now has been the case.

The multiple approaches to thinking about the relationship between 1 Enoch and the Synoptic Gospels outlined above put us in a better position to introduce briefly the contributions that occur in this volume. In his discussion entitled “Narrative Depictions of Altered States of Consciousness in 1 Enoch and the Synoptic Tradition,” André Gagné offers a conceptual framework for reading texts that depict Enoch and Jesus undergoing religious experiences. Over against the notion that visionary travel and encounters are strictly a matter of the mind (and therefore not the body), Gagné draws on cognitive science in order to demonstrate how much what many may explain as literary creations in fact reflect a coming to terms with the web of experience that emerges from a particular sociocultural setting. Daniel Gurtner’s contribution, “The Revelatory Experiences of Enoch and Jesus: A Comparison between the Book of the Watchers and the Synoptic Tradition,” follows Gagné’s piece with an overview and comparison that focuses more fully on the texts. Gurtner’s comparison underscores that whereas Enoch’s mediatorial activity in the Book of the Watchers of 1 Enoch is primarily a function of his identity as messenger to the rebellious angels, Jesus’s revelatory experiences relate more immediately to his own identity as an end in itself (i.e., as “Son of God”). Neither Gagné nor Gurtner claims that 1 Enoch has influenced the Synoptic Gospels directly; instead, they underscore the common sociocultural and religious framework within which the traditions present the figures of Enoch and Jesus, respectively.

19. For the first of two installments that describes both known manuscripts and some of this additional material, see Ted M. Erho and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “A Manuscript History of *Ethiopic Enoch*,” *JSP* 23 (2013): 87–133.

Two essays in this volume focus on the birth narratives of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke and engage in a series of comparisons and contrasts with material from 1 Enoch. In her study on “Unusual Births: Enochic Traditions and Matthew’s Infancy Narrative,” Amy Richter argues what it means to read the story of Jesus’s birth in Matthew’s Gospel in conversation with the tradition of rebellious angels in 1 Enoch: much in contrast to the latter, Jesus’s birth, which occurs without sexual interaction, introduces righteousness into the world. Holding forth the possibility that Matthew’s Gospel is aware of the Enochic myth, Richter suggests that such a background “helps make sense of why Matthew told his story in the particular way he does.” Anders Klostergaard Petersen argues along different lines in his piece on “Enoch and the Synoptic Birth Narratives: A Thought Experiment,” by asking what it means for 1 Enoch not to offer a birth narrative for its protagonist (Enoch), while Matthew and Luke’s Gospels do (Jesus). In adjusting the Weberian definition of charismatic authority, Klostergaard Petersen is able to situate 1 Enoch closer to Paul, who by analogy did not consider it significant to include a birth narrative about the center of his message (Jesus).

In “Heavenly Beings in the Enoch Traditions and the Synoptic Gospels,” Kelley Coblenz Bautch focuses on the place and function of angelology. Noting the common thought world of these sources as well as the popularity of Enoch traditions in early Christian literature, she observes that Matthew’s Gospel (as well as the other New Testament gospels) is circumspect with regard to the presentation of angels. In contrast to the prominent and distinctive roles accorded angels in apocalyptic literature like the Enochic booklets and other early Christian writings, the Synoptic Gospels’ restraint, for example, in associating angels with the realm of the dead has to do especially with the latter’s aims to secure the prominence of Jesus in the narrative. Writing on “The Parables of Enoch and Luke’s Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus,” Leslie Baynes engages in a series of critical comparisons between both the Enochic tradition (esp. 1 En. 62–63) and the Si-Osiris myth to establish the complex yet arguable background that shaped Luke 16:19–31. In particular, the case for influence is strongest in parallels in Luke and the Book of Parables not shared with other literature: “the plea of the rich in direct discourse for mercy from the flame of Sheol and the reigning heavenly figure’s consequence refusal.”

In addition to Baynes’s essay, three further studies in this volume focus on the potential significance of the Book of Parables for interpreting the gospel traditions. In “Forgiveness of Sins: An Enochic Problem, a Synop-

tic Answer,” Gabriele Boccaccini argues that the presence in the Book of Parables (at 1 En. 51:1–5) of those who are among neither the “righteous” nor the “sinners,” but who repent and receive mercy, helps unlock the background of Jesus’s message of repentance to take place before the final judgment. Without claiming a literary dependence of the gospel tradition on the Book of Parables, Boccaccini argues for the possibility that the presentation of Jesus as one who extends forgiveness to his contemporaries carries out what the Enochic tradition envisions for the period just before the end.

The essay on “‘Son of Man’: Its Origin and Meaning in Second Temple Judaism” by Lester Grabbe reexamines the much debated expression that is applied to Jesus in the gospels on the basis of its precursor in Dan 7, its usage in 4 Ezra 13, and its function in the Parables of Enoch. Among several conclusions, Grabbe’s study supports the view that the expression in the gospel traditions is not the equivalent of “I,” and is not merely the result of borrowing from Daniel; it is precisely for its titular (and messianic) use that the Enochic Parables provide evidence.

Picking up on the significance attributed to the Son of Man figure in the Book of Parables, Daniel Assefa, in “Matthew’s Day of Judgment in the Light of 1 Enoch,” compares the Enochic tradition with the scene of eschatological judgment in Matt 25:31–46. Following the views of several New Testament interpreters and taking the influence of 1 Enoch on the Matthean text as a point of departure, Assefa undertakes a comparison that not only underscores common features and places but also puts into sharp relief the element of surprise in Matthew’s scene, which functions to exhort readers to vigilance by warning them about the unexpected.

We have already mentioned the question of the Enochic contribution to our understanding of demonology in the Synoptics. In this regard, Archie Wright, in his essay on “The Demonology of 1 Enoch and the New Testament Gospels,” offers a more in-depth treatment of this topic, identifying both the Book of the Watchers of 1 Enoch and other Jewish writings (e.g., Jubilees, selected Dead Sea texts) as sources that illuminate a tradition “that influenced the demonology of the gospels” (e.g., Mark 5:1–20 // Luke 8:27–36 // Matt 8:28–34). Wright’s discussion also demonstrates how much discourse on demonology in these works is bound up with a theological anthropology whose growing emergence can be already detected in 1 En. 15–16.

In a significant study entitled “1 Enoch 6–11 Interpreted in the Light of Mesopotamian Incantation Literature,” Henry Drawnel explores a here-

tofore much overlooked ancient Near Eastern background (the Marduk-Ea incantation) that helps to account for much of the literary structure of 1 En. 6–11. In light of this, Drawnel then examines “possible points of influence” of the Enochic myth on several passages of the Synoptics (Mark 1:27 // Luke 4:36; Matt 12:28 // Luke 11:20).

Joseph Angel offers an essay entitled “Enoch, Jesus, and Priestly Tradition.” Although emphasizing that sacerdotal portrayals of Enoch in 1 Enoch cannot be said to have influenced the use of priestly traditions to depict Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, motifs that accrued to Enoch and that were likewise associated with ideal priestly figures (e.g., 4Q541 and the Self-Glorification Hymn among the Dead Sea texts) do illuminate the Jesus tradition, including the presentation of Jesus as the eschatological revealer of divine wisdom in Matt 11:25–30.

Though not focusing on priestly tradition as such, Benjamin G. Wold’s study, “Jesus among Wisdom’s Representatives: 4QInstruction,” places both Jesus and Enoch traditions in conversation with the presentations of an anonymous *maskil* in 4QInstruction and the Self-Glorification Hymn. The comparison affirms the degree to which exclusivist associations with wisdom by exalted figures are intertwined with claims to authority and legitimacy.

Finally, in “The Veneration Motif in the Temptation Narrative of the Gospel of Matthew: Lessons from the Enochic Tradition,” Andrei Orlov engages in a study that involves early Enoch tradition stemming not from 1 Enoch but from the Slavonic or 2 Enoch, and its relation to the temptation narrative of Jesus in the wilderness, especially as set out in Matt 4:1–11. Based on a comparison with a complex web of scenarios involving refusals to venerate “pseudo-representations” of Deity in both the Primary Adam Books and Enochic tradition (2 En. 21–22), Orlov concludes that the temptation narrative deconstructs and reconfigures such a motif in order to affirm the divinity of the human protagonist, Jesus.

As editors, we would like to thank Rodney Werline, general editor of the Early Judaism and Its Literature series of SBL Press, and members of the series board for accepting the present manuscript for publication, and Nicole Tilford for her help in seeing the manuscript to publication. In addition, we would like to thank Seth Bledsoe, Elisabeth Fischer, Lina Aschenbrenner, and Anna Kellerer at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München for editorial assistance in preparing the manuscript.

Last but not least, we would like to thank our sponsors, the Department of Near Eastern Studies and the Institute for Humanities of the

University of Michigan, the Michigan Center for Early Christian Studies, and the Alessandro Nangeroni International Endowment. Thanks to their generous support, the Enoch Seminar, born in 2001 as an informal biennial meeting of specialists in Second Temple Judaism, has developed into a structured organization, to which new activities have been added, including the Enoch Graduate Seminars, the Nangeroni Meetings, and the online encyclopedia 4 Enoch. The present volume marks yet another significant step in an ongoing project of research to which a growing number of scholars from around the world are contributing.

SBL Press