

¹ It is scheduled to appear this year (1988) as Vol. 3 in the Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series.

² Chapter I. This consensus includes many scholars: in this investigation, I enter into dialogue with Gert Jeremias, Hartmut Stegemann, Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, Philip R. Davies, and Frank M. Cross, Jr. in particular.

³ This group of scholars includes most recently Barbara Thiering and Robert Eisenman. Among earlier scholars, J.T. Teicher belongs to this camp. In a future publication, I hope to give more attention to these theories.

⁴ Chapter II.

⁵ Chapter III.

⁶ The serek literature seems to be the oldest, according to accepted palaeographical datings. Thiering and Eisenman have raised questions about the accuracy of the early datings of Qumran scripts.

⁷ Chapter IV. The relevant passages in Josephus, Philo, and Pliny (as well as 1-2 Maccabees) are evaluated.

⁸ Chapter V deals with CD; VI with 1QpHab, 1QpPs37, and 4QpNah; VII with 4QTest; and VIII with 1QH. Upon close analysis, 4QTest and 1QH prove to offer no clear testimony on the history of the Qumran community.

⁹ Philip R. Davies (The Damascus Covenant, Sheffield 1978, p. 16) provides a good summary of various views of the chronological notes in CD I.

¹⁰ See note 5 above.

¹¹ The majority of reconstructions of Qumran history depend much more on Josephus, Daniel, 1-2 Maccabees or early Christian history witnessed primarily in the New Testament than on the information preserved in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

¹² Hartmut Stegemann, Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde, Bonn 1970, pp. 98-116, 202-206, also Chapter 4 notes 328-29.

Ryszard RUBINKIEWICZ

THE BOOK OF NOAH (1 Enoch 6-11) AND EZRA'S REFORM

The Book of Enoch (1 Enoch) is a collection of the texts written in different periods and by different authors. One such text is the Noahitic Fragment (1 Enoch 6-11) belonging formerly to the cycle of Noah. At present it makes a part of the Book of the Watchers (1 Enoch 1-36)¹. The period when this text was written is difficult to establish. P. Sacchi expressed the opinion that at least the fragment 1 Enoch 6-8 was written before the year 400 B.C.² G.W.E. Nickelsburg claims that the struggles of the giants depicted in 1 Enoch 6-11 echo the wars of the diadochs after the death of Alexander the Great³. He dates the composition of the text to the turn of the third century B.C. F. Corriente and A. Piñero attribute it to approximately the beginning of the II cent. B.C.⁴ However it seems that it is possible to prove that this text dates back to the time of Ezra's reform. I have expressed occasionally this opinion in my book Eschatologia Hen 9-11 a Nowy Testament (Lublin 1984)⁵ and now I would like to develop this position.

I

The text of 1 Enoch 6-11 consists of two traditions integrated into one literary unit⁶. The first and older one (1 Enoch 6-8) is connected with the name of Shemihaza, the leader of the fallen angels who took wives for themselves and begot large giants (1 Enoch 7:1-2). We find here the theme of the benê 'elo-hîm and the giants of Gen 6:1-4 in its developed form. The second tradition (1 Enoch 9-11) is associated with the fallen angel Asael (Azazel) who is presented as a teacher of all iniquity on the earth (9:6). This part of the Book

of the Watchers may be called the Apocalypse of Noah. The whole earth must be restored because it was defiled and ruined by the teaching of the fallen angels and their issue.

According to 1 Enoch 6-8 (cycle of Shemihaza) the main cause of the iniquity upon the earth is the sin of the supernatural beings. This sin destroyed an order fixed in the world: the inhabitants of the heavens wanted to live like men (1 Enoch 6:2-5; cf. 12:4; 15:2-6). This is something similar to the sin of Adam and Eve who wanted to be like the 'elohim (Gen 3:5). The misdeed of Shemihaza and his adherents is qualified as "a great sin" (1 Enoch 6:3). The expression occurs five times in the Bible (Gen 20:9; Exod 32:21.30.31; 2 Kgs 17:21) and except Gen 20:9 where it relates to adultery, it generally refers to the sin of idolatry. It is a well known fact that adultery in biblical language is another word for apostasy (Exod 34:15-16; Jer 3:1-5; Hos 2:7 etc.). The same meaning has the expression "to forsake the Lord" (Deut 28:20; Josh 24:16.20; Judg 2:12; 10:10.13; Isa 1:4 etc.). This is close to the Greek term *miainein* - to defile (EnochGr 7:1) or "to be promiscuous with (the women)" (1 Enoch 7:1). These terms in the Bible often have metaphorical meaning and they serve as a designation for apostasy (Ezek 20:30-31; 28:8; Mal 2:11; Zeph 3:4; Hos 9:1; Deut 8:20). The fallen angels perpetrated a similar deed. They have forsaken the heaven and committed adultery with women (1 Enoch 6-7; cf. 15:3).

The epithets given to the progeny of the fallen angels are also very significant. The giants are called "the bastards", "the reprobates", "the children of adultery" (1 Enoch 10:9). These terms, besides their basic sense, also have metaphorical meanings referring to the idolaters in Israel (Hos 2:6; 4:12; 5:4; Ezek 23:17; 29:29 etc.). All these terms in 1 Enoch 6-11 gravitate then around one common idea: the apostasy from the Lord on behalf of idolatry. It was the "great sin" of the angels, but *mutatis mutandis* also of Israel.

The tradition connected with the name of Asael presents another point of view. According to 1 Enoch 9-11 the fundamental cause of all misfortune on the earth was the teaching brought by the fallen angels and not, as it is in 1 Enoch 6-8, their marriage with the women: "The whole earth has been ruined by the teaching of the works of Azazel, and against him write down all sin"⁷ (1 Enoch 10:8).

What was this teaching?

It is easy to distinguish two threads in it. The first one is connected with the cycle of Shemihaza and it develops the theme of idolatry: The fallen angels taught the men "charms and spells, and showed to them the cutting of roots and trees" (1 Enoch 7:1 cf. 8:3). The second one, connected with the cycle of Asael, reflects the main achievements of the material culture of that time. Asael taught men "to make swords, and daggers, and shields and breast-

plates. And he showed them the things after these, and the art of making them: bracelets, and ornaments, and the art of making up the eyes and of beautifying the eyelids, and the most precious and choice stones, and all (kinds of) coloured dyes" (1 Enoch 8:1-2). We find here a specific kind of the synthetic presentation of the material products which served the men and women. At the same time, the enumeration of precisely these products introduce the reader to the climate of the wars, unfair competition, and machinations of court. It is necessary to stress that the critique of Asael's teaching is not directed against the material culture at all, but rather against a persuasion that the knowledge limited exclusively to such a culture is the one and only knowledge worthy of notice. We would have here to do with some rudimentary confrontation of the materialistic outlook of life with the religious one. It is obvious that the estimation of the first one is negative here.

Both these threads mentioned above are complementary to one another and they reflect two dangerous tendencies in Israel: (1) The imitation of the other peoples in respect to their culture and their religion (cf. 2 Kgs 17:10-17) and (2) the development of their happiness on earth without the help of God. It was in flagrant conflict with the teachings of the prophets who indicated that the accumulation of wealth while refusing to recognize the Divine Law was a cause of the inevitable destruction (cf. Isa 3:16-24; Amos 6:4-6).

II

And now how does this matter stand in relation to Ezra's reform?

It is not necessary to discuss here the difficult chronological problem of Ezra. The year 458 or 398 B.C. presumed to be the dates of Ezra's coming to Jerusalem, may only serve as a point of orientation. The problem which interests us deals with the main assumptions of the religious reform of that time. It is easy to imagine that the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., the Babylonian captivity and the later moral decline of the Jewish people was comparable to the flood in the days of Noah. The earth needed to be cleansed because, to use the words of Jeremiah - the leaders of Israel "defiled the Land" of the Lord, and made His "heritage an abomination" (Jer 2:7 cf. Hos 4:4-10; 6:9; Mic 3:11; Isa 28:7-13). As we know, the word "earth" (or precisely "Land") refers to two aspects in the Bible. The first one is found in the older traditions (J and E) and emphasizes the act of the endowment of the land to Abraham and his issue. The second one, represented by the deuteronomistic and priestly tradition, emphasizes the cultic value of the land promised and granted to Abraham. This Land is the property of the Lord and it is not allowed to be desecrated⁸.

And what may profane the Land? The Land is defiled by the harlotry (Lev 19:29), by the bloodshed (Num 35:29-34; Deut 21:6-9; Ps 106:38-39) or by the body of the dead (Deut 21:22-23). Generally speaking the profanation of the Land is caused by the violation of the Divine Law (Isa 24:5-6). But what most defiles the Land is the cult of the idols. Firstly, the "unclean land" is the land of the gentiles (cf. Amos 7:17). In the light of this, it is clear why one of the fundamental conditions for living in the Promised Land was the full separation of the Jews from the other peoples (Josh 23:12-13). Therefore, the reader of 1 Enoch 6-11 educated in the tradition of the Fathers easily could guess what he had to do so that the Land, which after the time of the exile became again his property and which he found "desolated and ruined" (1 Enoch 10:8) could be clean and holy anew. First of all it was necessary to cleanse it of the idolatry, which as we have seen was the fruit of the teaching brought by the Watchers. It was necessary to removed from it the "sons of the fornicators", "the bastards" (1 Enoch 10:9), namely the progeny of the mixed marriages. It is interesting to note that the term manzer (bastard) signified a child born out of wedlock (Deut 23:3), but also a child whose mother was of non-Jewish origin (Zech 9:6; Neh 13:25). The mixed marriages were always considered a menace to the Jewish religion (cf. 1 Kgs 11:1-8). In brief, it was necessary to effectuate the program for regeneration which found its expression in Ezra's reform (Ezra 9-11). According to Ezra 9:2 the main sin of the Jewish leaders was that "they have desecrated the holy race with the peoples of the lands". "The priests and the Levites have not separated themselves from the peoples of the lands with their abominations" (Ezra 9:1 cf. 10:18-19; Neh 13:28); Isa 56:1 comes out against "the watchmen" who "are without knowledge". The prophet compares them to the dogs having "a mighty appetite; they never have enough" (Isa 56:11). The analogy to the giants, who "devoured all the toil of men, until men were unable to sustain them" (1 Enoch 7:3) suggests itself. The inhabitants of Jerusalem are called "sons of the sorcerers, offspring of the adulter and the harlot" (Isa 57:3), "children of transgression, the offspring of deceit" (Isa 57:4). The sons of the Watchers have the similar epithets: bastards, reprobates, sons of the fornicators (1 Enoch 10:9).

It can be asserted that all that is found in 1 Enoch 6-11 could very well relate to the time of Ezra's reform. Even the struggles of the giants, which for Nickelsburg² reflect the wars of the successors of the Alexander the Great, may in fact refer to the wars between the world powers of that time (Babylonia, Persia, Egypt, Greece).

If this analysis is correct, it may be concluded that the text of 1 Enoch 6-11 could be thought of as a composition supporting Ezra's reform. Conse-

quently, the date of the redaction of 1 Enoch 6-11 would be the fifth or the beginning of the fourth century B.C. This would have implications for the study of other literary compositions of the Persian period, and particularly significant implications for the study of biblical texts of this period.

Notes

¹ See J.H. Charlesworth, A History of Pseudepigrapha Research [in:] Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II/1 (1979), p. 74; H.C. Cavellin, Leben nach dem Tode im Spätjudentum und im frühen Christentum I; Spätjudentum, ibidem p. 253.

² P. Sacchi, Il "Libro dei Viginalti" e l'apocalittica, Henoch 1 (1979), p. 80. Idem, [in:] P. Sacchi (ed.), Apocrifi dell'Antico Testamento (Torino, Classici UTET 1981), pp. 438-440.

³ G.W.E. Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah; a historical and literary introduction, Philadelphia (Fortress) 1981, pp. 50-52.

⁴ F. Corriente, A. Piñero, Libro 1 de Henoc [in:] A. Diez Macho (ed.), Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento, Vol. IV, Madrid (Editiones Cristiani-dad) 1985, p. 21.

⁵ For the German translation see: R. Rubinkiewicz, Die Eschatologie von Henoch 9-11 und das Neue Testament (Oesterreichische Biblische Studien 6) Klosterneuburg 1984.

⁶ For the detailed analysis see my Eschatologie von Henoch 9-11, pp. 28-33.

⁷ The English translation of the 1 Enoch is of M.A. Knibb (E. Ullendorf), The Ethiopic Book of Enoch. A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments, Vol. I-II, Oxford (Clarendon Press) 1978.

⁸ See W.D. Davies, The Gospel and the Land. Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine, Berkeley (Univ. of California Pr.) 1974, pp. 15-35.

⁹ See note 3.