

6.0. 1 Enoch in the Ongoing Tradition

6.1. Introduction: The Figure of Enoch

Although the alleged author of the Enochic corpus is the righteous figure of Genesis and his righteousness is taken for granted throughout (cf. the stock epithet, “the righteous one”), the Enochic corpus emphasizes his roles as sage, seer, and scribe. As sage and seer, he is the recipient of revealed wisdom about the nature of the cosmos and the course of its history from primordial times to the eschaton. The manner in which he receives his revelations is partly reminiscent of biblical prophecy, but the biblical tradition of his walking with God (*elohim*) is interpreted to refer to a long sojourn with the angels (*elohim*), who provide guided revelatory tours of the universe. In his role as scribe, he transmits his wisdom by writing it down in the idiom of biblical prophecy and Jewish sapiential tradition.

Enoch is, of course, a human being, the son of Jared and the father of Methuselah; however, his travels with the angels, his acquiring of knowledge otherwise withheld from humanity, his presence in the heavenly throne room, and his functions as intercessor and de facto recorder of the deeds of humanity all draw him into the sphere of angelic prerogative. Thus, when chap. 70 identifies him as the son of man who will judge—even if this is a secondary interpretation—it is bringing the tradition to a logical conclusion.

6.2. Judaism

Although the canon of the Hebrew Scriptures, fixed around the end of the first century C.E., included no writings ascribed to Enoch, a careful sifting of Jewish writings from the previous centuries attests a substantial and dynamic use of the Enochic corpus. The authors of this period develop and transform Enochic traditions and motifs, and occasionally reflect an earlier shape of traditions that 1 Enoch has modified. The survey that follows focuses on texts that indicate significant use and influence of the traditions in 1 Enoch, and in the process it treats most of the early postbiblical texts that mention the figure of Enoch.

6.2.1. The Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira

Writing in the first decades of the second century B.C.E., at the same time as (or shortly after) some of the Enochic writings were composed, this Jerusalem scribe had a high regard for Enoch and some of the writings ascribed to him, but also indicated considerable reserve about some of the teaching promulgated in his name (see §5.1.1.3). References to Enoch frame ben Sira’s hymn in praise of Israelite heroes (44:16*; 49:14*). At 16:7* he cites the rebellion of the giants as an example of sin and divine punishment, an interpretation of Gen 6:1–4* that parallels the story of the watchers in 1 Enoch 6–11. At other points ben Sira deals with issues central to 1 Enoch but in ways that differ very much from the

Enochic authors, for example, deprecating mythic eschatology ([16:17–23*](#)) and divination through dreams ([34:1–8*](#)).

6.2.2. Pseudo-Eupolemos

This anonymous, perhaps Samaritan writer of the early second century B.C.E. refers to Enoch as the one who discovered astrology and knows, possibly secondhand, that Enoch transmitted to his son Methuselah celestial information, received from the angels.

6.2.3. *The Book of Jubilees*

This revised version of [Genesis 1—Exodus 12](#) claims to have been written by Moses on Mount Sinai at the dictation of an angel of the Presence. Composed between 168 and 150 B.C.E., it may be the earliest attestation of the Enoch traditions apart from the Enochic corpus itself.

6.2.3.1. The Authority of Enoch

Among *Jubilees*' additions to the biblical text are five interpolations of material from 1 Enoch and about Enoch ([4:15–26](#); [5:1–12](#); [7:20–39](#); [8:1–4](#); [10:1–17](#)). Since they allegedly come from the mouth of an angel, these additions certify the authority of Enoch, the first scribe and seer, and the written material attributed to him. Indeed, he is depicted as a figure parallel with but prior to Moses, the alleged recipient and transmitter of *Jubilees*. Enoch learned his history, astronomy, and cosmology under the tutelage of angels, just as Moses was learning the chronology and course of history and the eternal Torah from the angel of the Presence; and Enoch wrote down everything as a testimony ([4:18](#), [19](#), [24](#), [7:39](#); [10:17](#)), just as Moses was writing his account as a testimony ([1:1](#), [4](#), [9](#), [26](#), [29](#); [2:33](#); [3:14](#)).

With these Enochic interpolations from the Book of the Watchers the author of *Jubilees* assumes the existence and authority of a written corpus ascribed to Enoch, which he is satisfied to cite or briefly summarize. His treatment of the Mosaic Pentateuch is different. He rewrites the whole historical record that precedes the putative moment of *Jubilees*' composition, supplementing the Pentateuch's narrative with Enochic narrative and other haggadic tradition. He derives the authenticity of his narrative from the angel of the Presence and supplements it with detailed Torah whose eternal authority is ascribed to the heavenly tablets to which the angel appeals. Furthermore, although the angel dictates the chronological framework of Israel's history, its chronology is documented by reference to the Enochic writings that serve as the book's astronomical and calendrical basis ([4:17](#), [21](#)).

The Enochic traditions to which the author of *Jubilees* appeals include major parts of the corpus we know as 1 Enoch: the Book of the Watchers; some form of the Book of the Luminaries; the Animal Vision; and, if not the whole Epistle, at least the testamentary scene in [81:1–82:4](#) and the Apocalypse of Weeks now at the beginning of the Epistle. In addition, the author refers explicitly to traditions about the descent of the watchers and Enoch's heavenly activity to which 1 Enoch only alludes.

Thus for the author of *Jubilees* Enoch was Moses' predecessor as the writer of authoritative scripture that functions as testimony, and the content of that scripture was of major import for the

readers of *Jubilees*. If the Enochic corpus was an alternative to (parts of) the Mosaic Torah (see [§5.1.1.4](#)), the author of *Jubilees* still found the Enochic material useful and authoritative, and he employed it and appealed to it while explicitly asserting the validity, authority, and centrality of Moses-as-he-interpreted-him, who was the witness and scribe like Enoch.

6.2.3.2. *Jubilees*' Use of Enochic Traditions about the Watchers

6.2.3.2.1. The Descent of the Watchers: *Jub.* [4:15](#)

Jubilees [4:11–33](#) covers roughly the same material as the Sethite genealogy in [Genesis 5](#), but with additions about Jared and, especially, Enoch. According to [4:15](#), Mahalalel's wife Dinah bore him a son, "and he called his name Jared, for in his days the angels of the Lord, who were called watchers, descended to earth to teach the children of men and to do judgment and truth upon the earth." Three points tie the text to 1 Enoch [6–11](#) and distinguish it from [Gen 6:1–4*](#): the name "watchers"; the reference to their descent; the placing of that descent in the days of Jared, the father of Enoch (see comm. on [106:13d–15](#)).

The purpose ascribed to the watchers' descent differs, however, from 1 Enoch [6–11](#) and epitomizes a tradition to which 1 Enoch only alludes (see comm. on [8:1](#); [86:1](#)). In 1 Enoch [6–11](#) the descent is an act of rebellion, while according to *Jubilees*, God "sent" them ([5:6](#)) to instruct humanity and to practice justice and faithfulness. Although the motif of forbidden instruction appears in 1 Enoch [6–11](#), especially in connection with the watcher chieftain Asael, in *Jubilees* the watchers' instruction is an antidote to the wickedness that entered the world after the fall. The tradition of an initial positive angelic mission will resurface in several early Christian texts (see [§§6.3.2.7](#), [9–10](#), [12](#), [16–17](#), [19](#); [6.3.4.1](#)). Other of *Jubilees*' references to the story of the watchers reflect the influence of the Enochic Book of the Watchers.

6.2.3.2.2. Narrative about the Watchers' Sin and Judgment: *Jub.* [5:1–13](#)

Jubilees [5](#) returns to the Sethite genealogy ([4:33](#) || [Gen 5:32*](#)) and recounts the events in [Gen 6:1–4*](#), including nonbiblical details drawn from 1 Enoch [6–11](#). The "corruption" of "all flesh" reaches its climax when "they began to devour each other" (*Jub.* [5:2](#)), an element central to the giants' activity in 1 Enoch [7:3](#). The reference to Noah's favor with God ([5:5](#); cf. [Gen 6:8*](#)) is the first of a series of details that appear *in the same order* in 1 Enoch [10](#). (a) Sariel is sent to Noah ([10:1–3](#); cf. *Jub.* [5:5](#)). (b) Raphael is sent to bind Asael the revealer ([10:4–8](#); cf. *Jub.* [5:6](#)). (c) God sends Gabriel to provoke a war of mutual extermination among the giants ([10:9–10](#) and [14:6](#); cf. *Jub.* [5:7–9](#)), and the motif of long life ([Gen 6:3*](#)) is interpreted with reference to the giants ([10:10](#); *Jub.* [5:9](#)). (d) The fathers of the giants witness their sons' destruction and are then incarcerated in the depths of the earth until the great judgment ([10:11–14](#); cf. *Jub.* [5:10](#)). (e) There is the promise of a new creation in which sin will disappear and all will be righteous ([10:20–21](#); *Jub.* [5:12](#)).

6.2.3.2.3. Noah's Retrospective Reference to the Prediluvian Events: *Jub.* [7:20–39](#) || 1 Enoch [9–10](#)

After *Jubilees*' account of the flood (chaps. [5–6](#); cf. [Genesis 6–9](#)), Noah instructs his sons by recalling the events that led up to the flood. Again, *Jubilees* includes nonbiblical details from 1 Enoch [6–11](#). The watchers' intercourse with the daughters of men brought "uncleanness" to the earth (*Jub.* [7:2](#); 1 Enoch

[7:1–2](#)). The watchers’ offspring are of three classes with the same names as in 1 Enoch [7:2](#), and the wording of *Jub.* [7:27](#) closely parallels 1 Enoch [9:9](#). The end of Noah’s instruction (*Jub.* [7:34–37](#)) revises material in [Genesis 8–9](#) after the fashion of 1 Enoch [10:16–19](#), presenting the motif of agriculture both metaphorically and literally.

6.2.3.2.4. Kainam Transmits the Watchers’ Teaching: *Jub.* [8:1–4](#) || 1 Enoch [8](#)

Reference to the watchers’ forbidden instruction is missing in *Jub.* [4:15](#) and [5:6](#) but appears in [8:3](#), where Kainam, the son of Arpachshad, discovers and copies an inscription containing the watchers’ astrological teaching, thus connecting postdiluvian astrology with the prediluvian teaching.

6.2.3.2.5. Noah’s Final Instructions and *Jubilees*’ Demonology: *Jub.* [10:10–18](#) || 1 Enoch [12–16](#)

Although the aforementioned details in *Jubilees* parallel 1 Enoch [6–11](#), *Jubilees* [10](#) interprets the story of the watchers in a way that parallels 1 Enoch [12–16](#). According to the latter, the death of the giants releases from them their spirits, who wreak havoc on humanity until the eschaton. According to *Jubilees* [10](#), the watchers were the fathers of the demons that cause sickness and lead humanity to sin. The dramatic scene in chap. [10](#), reminiscent of [Job 1](#), is foundational for the demonology that runs through *Jubilees*. It also prepares for a replication of the function of Kainam’s story. According to *Jubilees* [12](#), Abram’s interest in the signs of the heavenly bodies is not tied to Kainam’s inscription but reflects the activity of the evil spirits who are the progeny of the watchers ([12:16–20](#)).

6.2.3.3. The Use of Traditions about Enoch’s Life and Activity: *Jub.* [4:16–27](#)

Having tied the descent of the watchers to the Sethite reference to Jared and his times ([4:15](#)), the author of *Jubilees* returns to that genealogy to record the birth of Enoch (*Jub.* [4:16](#)) and describe his life and activities. This section reveals the author’s knowledge of most of the major parts of the Enochic corpus, as well as some traditions to which it only alludes.

6.2.3.3.1. Enoch the Sage, Seer, and Writer: *Jub.* [4:17–20](#)

These verses summarize Enoch’s activity, describing him as the first writer, sage, and seer. The repetition of the verb *ṣaḥafa* (“to write”) and the noun *maṣḥaf* (“book, writing”) in vv [17–23](#) indicates that the traditions associated with Enoch are thought of as *written* traditions—the compositions of Enoch “the scribe” (see [§5.2.4.2](#)).

The contents of these traditions are first summarized as “knowledge and wisdom” (v [17](#)), generic terms in 1 Enoch for the content of that corpus (see [§4.2.5.5](#)). Within this wisdom and knowledge, pride of place is given to a “book” that contains “the signs of heaven according to their order” and “the seasons of the year” (v [17](#)). The author refers to some form of the material preserved in the Book of the Luminaries, which constitutes the basis for the calendrical and historical framework of the *Book of Jubilees*.

Next, the author states:

He was the first who wrote a testimony,

and he testified to the children of men among the families of the earth.

And he recounted the week(s) of the jubilees,

and he made known to them the days of the years,

and he set in order the months,

and he set in order the Sabbaths of the years,

as we made them known to him. (v [18](#))

Here, as in [4:19](#), [22](#), [24](#); [7:39](#); [10:17](#), the author of *Jubilees* uses a second generic term for Enoch's writing and activity; it is a "testimony" to, for, and concerning the generations of the children of men. As in v [17](#), its contents are, first of all, calendrical. There may also be a reference to the Apocalypse of Weeks with its division of history into heptads, which was revealed to Enoch by the holy ones (1 Enoch [93:2](#)).

The passage continues ([4:19](#)):

And what was and what will be he saw in the vision of his sleep, as it will happen to the children of men in their generations until the day of judgment. Everything he saw and understood, and he wrote his testimony and placed the testimony on earth concerning all the children of men for their generations.

The passage refers to the Animal Vision (1 Enoch [85–90](#)) and its detailed account of human history, which Enoch saw in a vision of his sleep ([85:1–3](#); [86:1](#)). However, the author of *Jubilees* refers to this as a "testimony"—a term not used in 1 Enoch [85–90](#)—and summarizes it in language used at the beginning of the summary of human history in the Apocalypse of Weeks ([93:2](#)). Verse [20](#) of chapter [4](#) returns to the Sethite genealogy and elaborates on it, recording Enoch's marriage to Edni and the birth of Methuselah. This chronological notice agrees with 1 Enoch [83:2](#) and [85:3](#), placing Enoch's dream visions before his marriage.

6.2.3.3.2. Enoch's Time with the Angels: *Jub.* [4:21–22](#)

Verse [21](#) informs us that after he was sixty-five years old he spent six jubilees, or 294 years, with the angels, "who showed him everything that is on the earth and that is in the heavens, the rule of the sun; and he wrote everything." Although this looks like a reference to the Book of the Luminaries with its emphasis on the sun, the mention of a plurality of angels showing him "everything" on earth and in heaven suggests a reference to the whole of the Enochic journey tradition recorded in 1 Enoch [17–36](#), which includes a summary statement about Enoch's time with Uriel and his writing the Book of the Luminaries (1 Enoch [33:3–4](#)). The final statement about Enoch's life concerns his testimony to the angels (1 Enoch [12–13](#)), which 1 Enoch [12:2](#) places during his time and activities with the watchers and holy ones.

The chronology of Enoch's life presented by *Jubilees* is as follows. Between his sixtieth and sixty-fourth years, he was married (*Jub.* [4:20](#)). In his sixty-fifth year, Edni bore him a son, Methuselah. During George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (ed. Klaus Baltzer; Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001).

the next 294 years (six jubilees), he was touring the universe in the company of the angels. At some point during that period, he was sent to preach against the rebel watchers. He then returned to human company and wrote his testimony for humanity, presumably being taken by God at the end of the three hundred years mentioned in [Gen 5:22](#)*. This differs slightly from 1 Enoch, where [81:1–82:2](#) states that he returned to earth for the last of the three hundred years, in order to write down what he saw and leave his testimony for his children and the rest of humanity (*Jub.* [4:19](#); [7:38–39](#); [10:17](#)).

6.2.3.3.3. Enoch’s Departure for Paradise and His Subsequent Activity: *Jub.* [4:23–24](#)

In his sixty-fifth year, the angels conducted Enoch to the Garden of Eden. His presence in paradise is presumed in the Enochic story of Noah’s birth (1 Enoch [106:8](#)) and in 1QapGen [2:23](#), and the idea appears in the original conclusion of the Book of Parables (1 Enoch [70](#)).

Jubilees’ description of Enoch’s activity in paradise is more difficult to connect with other extant Enoch traditions. According to [5:23–24](#), “he writes down the condemnation and judgment of the world and all the wickedness of the children of men.” Moreover, “he was set there as a sign that he should testify against all the children of men, that he should recount all the deeds of the generations until the day of condemnation.” As the imperfect tense indicates, Enoch is involved in the process of composing a running account of human deeds and history. Playing the role elsewhere attributed to the angels (see [Excursus: Heavenly Books and the Angelic Scribes](#)), he is the heavenly scribe who records the deeds that he sees in order to provide testimony for the judgment. The role may be a development of his role as the scribe who writes the angelic indictment in chap. [14](#).

The closest and most detailed parallel to this idea occurs in the section of the *Testament of Abraham* that describes the heavenly judgment, at which Enoch presents evidence from the books of human deeds that he has written (see [§6.3.3.4](#)). The idea is also attested in the long text form of *2 Enoch* [36:2–3](#). After Enoch transmits his books to his children, he ascends to heaven a second time to write down everything that happens on earth, and to serve as God’s witness at the judgment. Although *2 Enoch* and the *Testament of Abraham* are usually dated much later than *Jubilees*, *Jub.* [4:23](#) may epitomize a longer tradition that surfaces again in these two works. A form of that tradition may be hidden elsewhere in 1 Enoch (see [§3.1.2.2](#)). In the Animal Vision he sees himself ascend to paradise before the flood ([87:3–4](#)), where he views the history of humanity, pleads like an angel ([89:57–58](#)), and returns to earth in connection with the judgment of the deeds that he had seen (see comm. on [90:31](#)). This same process of ascending, seeing the deeds of humanity, and returning to earth appears in the broader framework of 1 Enoch. In [81:1–82:4](#) + [91:1–10](#), [18–19](#) + [93:1–10](#); [91:11–17](#), Enoch inspects the heavenly tablets and their record of all the deeds of humanity and returns to earth to recount their content to his sons.

Finally, *Jub.* [4:25](#) refers to Enoch’s burning incense “on the mount,” presumably the Garden of Eden. The priestly activity is consonant with 1 Enoch [13](#), where Enoch acts as a mediator for the rebel angels (see comm. on [13:4–5](#)). It may also fit with Enoch’s assuming the angelic function of heavenly scribe (see [Excursus: Heavenly Books and Angelic Scribes](#)). Enoch’s location in the heavenly sanctuary is also consonant with his presence there in chap. [14](#) and [87:3–4](#).

George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (ed. Klaus Baltzer; Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001).

6.2.3.3.4. Enoch as Witness and the Author of a Testimony

The terms “testimony” and “testify” appear four times with reference to Enoch’s written accounts of all the deeds of all generations of humanity until the day of judgment. In [4:18](#) and [10:17](#) the terms are not associated with a particular writing. In [4:19](#) they refer to his record of the Animal Vision, and in [4:24](#) they denote the book he writes as heavenly scribe. In [7:38–39](#) Noah, near the time of his death, commands his sons, as Enoch had commanded and testified to his son Methuselah and his sons’ sons, and as Methuselah had commanded Lamech, and Lamech, Noah. Thus testimony involves not only a record of deeds but deathbed commandments that specify what such deeds should be.

In this context Enoch’s written works are presented as typical testamentary material. The father commands the children how to live and foresees that they will not heed his word. Because they have been told about this ahead of time, both the commandments and the predictions will serve as testimony against them. The prototype for this concept appears in the last chapters of Deuteronomy, with reference to Moses’ predictions about Israel’s future. This biblical text has affected the wording and shaping of the Enochic corpus itself, just as the wording of the *Jubilees* passages reflects the wording of the testamentary section in 1 Enoch [81:1–82:4](#) (see [Introduction to chaps. 81–82](#)). What is striking about the *Jubilees* passages is their definition of Enoch’s writings as “testimony,” their statement that Enoch was the first to write a testimony (or testament), and their description of the universal import of this testimony. Enoch is a patriarch, whose writings affect *all humanity*. His children are all human beings of all generations until the judgment. Moses wrote the law and testimony for Israel, but Enoch’s commands and predictions are relevant for all. In this respect, he is nonpareil, because he is the lawgiver, prophet, and witness who speaks to all. There can be no competition between Enochic and Mosaic tradition, because they are of different sorts.

6.2.4. The Genesis Apocryphon

The Genesis Apocryphon, extant in only one copy, from Qumran Cave 1, reflects the influence of the Enochic tradition in several ways. Its opening columns ([1Q20](#)) probably told the story of the watchers and the women. Columns [1–5](#) recounted the story of Noah’s birth in a fuller form than in 1 Enoch [106–107](#). This version appears to be dependent on 1 Enoch [106–107](#) rather than on a common source, and, in any event, the Apocryphon’s version of Enoch’s oracle was longer than in 1 Enoch [106–107](#). The story of Noah’s life (see col. [6](#)) employs terminology at home in the Epistle of Enoch. The story of Abram and Sarai in Egypt (cols. [19–20](#)) has been influenced by the plot and language of the story of the watchers and the women. As a running revision of episodes in Genesis, the Apocryphon recalls the narrative parts of the *Book of Jubilees*, though scholars debate the precise relationship between these texts. Nonetheless, although it depends on a work that knows, respects, and uses the Enochic tradition (see [§6.2.3](#)), the Apocryphon’s use of these traditions has not been mediated through *Jubilees*. Thus *Jubilees* and the Genesis Apocryphon are related examples of the ongoing life of the Enochic tradition.

6.2.5. The Aramaic Levi Document

An association between Enochic tradition and the Qumran Aramaic Levi document is indicated by the similarity between the account of Levi's call to be high priest and Enoch's commissioning as prophet to the rebel watchers, although this association must be deduced in part from the Greek *Testament of Levi*, which is Christian in its present form. Points of similarity include the setting of both texts in Upper Galilee near Mount Hermon, a heavenly ascent for the purpose of commissioning, and the polemics against the Jerusalem priests (see comm. on chaps. [13–14](#), passim).

6.2.6. Enoch at Qumran

Qumran provides an identifiable location in ancient Judaism for the substantial use and influence of the Enochic traditions. The evidence is diverse. Cave 4 yielded eleven manuscripts of various parts of 1 Enoch, dating from the early second century B.C.E. to the early first century C.E. (see [§2.1.2.1–2](#)). Also preserved are fragments of nine manuscripts of the Enochic Book of Giants, dating from the first half of the first century B.C.E. to the early first century C.E. (see [§2.1.2.3](#)). Thus the Enochic tradition was alive and well at Qumran, although extant copies from the first century C.E. have been found for only the Book of the Luminaries and the Book of Giants. The complete absence of any fragments of the Book of Parables at Qumran suggests that the Parables were composed outside Qumran, though in circles that transmitted the Book of the Watchers—a work that itself was composed outside Qumran before the establishment of the community there.

The influence of the Enochic tradition at Qumran is evident also in the community's possession of (multiple copies of) texts that employ or quote from the Enochic texts. These include the *Book of Jubilees* (eight copies) and a related text (three copies), the Genesis Apocryphon (one copy), a fragmentary Hebrew text from Cave 1 that contained a form of the story of the watchers very close to 1 Enoch [6–11](#) ([1Q19](#)), a *pešer* on the story of the watchers (4Q180-181), a commentary or expansion on the Apocalypse of Weeks (4Q247), and the Damascus Document (eight copies), which knows the story of the rebellion of the watchers and a tradition about the giants (CD [2:16–20](#); see comm. on [7:2](#)) and also appeals to the authority of the *Book of Jubilees* (CD [16:2–4](#)). Alongside these texts that explicitly use the Enochic tradition are several others that appear to have employed the tradition, while ascribing it to others or using them anonymously. These include: the Aramaic Levi Document (see above); 1QH [12\[4\]:29–40](#), which presents an anthropologized form of the eschatological tradition in 1 Enoch [1–5](#); and the Book of Daniel, whose vision of the heavenly throne room in chap. [7](#) is based on the account in 1 Enoch [14](#) (see comm. on [14:8–16:4](#), n. [6](#)).

In addition to the use of Enochic literary traditions at Qumran, attested in the manuscript collections in Caves 1 and 4, we should note two descriptions of the community's origins found in sectarian texts that parallel descriptions of origins in 1 Enoch (CD [1:3–16](#) and 1QS [8:5–7](#); cf. 1 Enoch [90:6–7](#); [93:7–10](#) + [91:11](#)). Both sets of passages place the texts in a community that construes itself as the eschatological Israel constituted by divine revelation.

The proliferation of Enochic and quasi-Enochic material in the Qumran library suggests two scenarios. (1) The Qumran community attracted people who prized the Enochic texts and others closely related to them, and who brought their copies of these texts with them. (2) The community provided an

ambience that fostered the copying and use of these texts and the incorporation of their traditions into new texts.

The Enochic texts and others related to them probably served several functions at the Qumran community. (1) The Enochic and calendrical material was fundamental for community life and religious observances. (2) Multiple copies of works like the component parts of 1 Enoch, of Daniel, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Testament of Amram indicate that these apocalyptic texts were wholly compatible with the worldview and religious thought of the community in several ways. (a) They informed and undergirded the community's high eschatological consciousness; (b) they informed and supported the community's dualistic cosmology; (c) they were consonant with Qumranic claims to possess special revelation. (3) The story of the watchers and the women spoke to several central concerns of the community. It provided a warning against human immorality and heresy, a critique of the perceived pollution of the Jerusalem cult, and an aetiology of the demonic realm that played an important role in the Qumran worldview.

These parallels and connections notwithstanding, the Qumranites developed their own profile and identity as an eschatological community, which was committed to observance of their own version of divine law. Three aspects of the Qumranic profile differ from their counterparts in 1 Enoch. (1) Although the Qumran corpus contains many sapiential texts, many other texts attest that the notion of covenant and adherence to the Mosaic Torah stood at the heart of their Israelite self-identity in a way that is strikingly absent in 1 Enoch's sapiential ethic and eschatology (see above [§4.2.5.1–6](#)). (2) The myth of demonic origins and operations in 1QS [3–4](#) differs from the explanation offered in the versions of the story of the watchers in 1 Enoch and *Jubilees*. (3) In their later history, the Qumranites tied their eschatology to the biblical prophets rather than to primordial, pseudonymous Enochic revelation (see [§5.1.1](#)), in keeping with the developing authority of the texts that would constitute the Hebrew Bible.

6.2.7. The Wisdom of Solomon

Both the figure of Enoch and the Enochic traditions are crucial for the author of the Wisdom of Solomon. Enoch is removed from his traditional place in the list of the righteous in chap. [10](#) and is cited in [4:10–15*](#) as the prime example of the exalted righteous one who is central to chaps. [2–5](#). Although the author alludes to [Gen 5:24*](#), several features of his Enochic profile differ from the brief biblical notice. The explicit location of Enoch's life and departure in a time of wickedness reflects postbiblical tradition (e.g., 1 Enoch [106:13](#); contrast 1 Enoch [93:3–4](#)). Different from known early traditions, however, the author sees Enoch's removal as a way to preserve the patriarch's righteousness from contamination. Although this idea is paralleled in Philo and the rabbis (see [§6.2.8, 14](#)), it appears to be an ad hoc interpretation intended to provide a precedent for the short lives of the righteous—a special concern in [Wis 4:7–9*](#). This use of the Enoch figure, which has been informed by the use of language from [Isa 57:1–2*](#), also diverges from the Enochic tradition, and its portrayal of Enoch is unique.

In addition to demonstrating an interest in the figure of Enoch, the Wisdom of Solomon draws on traditions found in the Enochic corpus. Most striking are the parallels between the story of the scene of the righteous one's exaltation in [Wis 4:20–5:8*](#) and the description of enthronement of the Chosen One

George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (ed. Klaus Baltzer; Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001).

in 1 Enoch [62–63](#). Pseudo-Solomon’s use of Davidic royal traditions (albeit to democratize them) also fits with the Parables’ conflation of Servant and royal traditions. By construing this exaltation as part of the broader portrayal of the humiliation and exaltation of the righteous one, the Wisdom of Solomon is more faithful to the Isaianic source of both texts. Thus Wisdom’s simple dependence on the Parables is not indicated. But Wisdom’s citing of Enoch as the prime example of the exalted righteous one and the Parables’ identification of Enoch as the Chosen One (chap. [71](#)) suggest that there was some contact with Enochic tradition at this point. Further evidence of this contact appears in [Wis 2:1–4:9*](#), whose form, content, and wording evidence some striking parallels with 1 Enoch [102:6–103:15](#), and in 1 Enoch [108:8–9](#), [13](#), whose parallels to the early chapters of the Wisdom of Solomon seem to attest common tradition (see comm. on [108:7–10](#), [11–13](#)).

The detailed parallels stand in the framework of a broader set of similarities between 1 Enoch and the Wisdom of Solomon. Wisdom’s philosophical overlay and rhetoric notwithstanding, its dualistic worldview, mediated by a revealed knowledge of heavenly mysteries, its interest in cosmological secrets, and its focus on theodicy and eschatology closely parallel 1 Enoch’s construction of reality. In addition, it parallels 1 Enoch by rooting ethics in a sapiential tradition rather than in the Mosaic Torah (see [§5.1.1.2–4](#)). That the Wisdom of Solomon never refers to Enoch by name is a function of the author’s expunging all proper names from his text. At the same time, it allows him to celebrate his own sapiential hero, Solomon. This, in turn, fits with his broad use of democratized royal traditions, especially in chaps. [1–9](#).

6.2.8. Philo of Alexandria

Although there is no evidence that Philo knew 1 Enoch, his interpretation of [Gen 6:1–4*](#) knows and interprets the reading ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ found in a good number of Greek biblical MSS. In *Gig.* [2–4](#) (§§6–18), he states that souls, demons, and angels are names for the same thing, and he interprets [Gen 6:1–4*](#) to refer to the descent of certain souls into human bodies (see below, [§6.3.2.13](#) on Origen). In *Q. Gen.* [1.92](#), he recognizes that “angels of God” translates “sons of God” and provides the earliest evidence for interpreting the latter expression to refer to “good and excellent men” (LCL Sup. 1:61), who will eventually be identified with the Sethites.

6.2.9. Josephus

Josephus appears to know a complex interpretive tradition of [Gen 6:1–4*](#) (*Ant.* [1.2.2–3.1 §§68–74](#)). The progeny of Seth, he states, were learned and virtuous, and part of their learning included “the science of the heavenly bodies and their orderly array” (σοφίαν τε τὴν περὶ τὰ οὐράνια καὶ τὴν τούτων διακόσμησιν; translation in LCL 4:33). This knowledge they preserved on two stelae that would withstand destruction by fire or water. The Sethites, however, fell into sin. Josephus proves this by citing Genesis and interpreting “angels of God” to refer to the Sethites. The tradition about the stelae is paralleled in two texts: in *Adam and Eve* [50](#) Eve commands her children, including Seth, to write the events of Adam’s and her lives on two stelae; in *Jub.* [8:1–4](#) Kainam discovers an astrological inscription left by the watchers before the flood. Thus Josephus conflates the Enochic tradition about the watchers mating with women and instructing them with a Sethite tradition about stelae, and then he interprets [Genesis 6](#) to refer to the George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (ed. Klaus Baltzer; Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001).

Sethites rather than to the watchers. He does not seem to be aware of the Enoch provenance of the story of the watchers (cf. *Ant.* [1.3.4](#) §85; [9.2.2](#) §28).

6.2.10. *4 Ezra 11–13 and 2 Baruch*

4 Ezra 11–13, written ca. 95 C.E., is an interpretation of [Daniel 7](#) that portrays the “son of man” figure with characteristics drawn from Davidic royal texts and, perhaps, Second Isaiah’s Servant tradition. This conflation indicates the ongoing life of the conflate tradition about the Chosen One preserved in the Enochic Book of Parables. A parallel contemporary tradition is found in *2 Baruch 36–40*, whose descriptions of the Messiah are tied to an interpretation of [Daniel 7](#).

6.2.11. *2 Enoch*

This text of uncertain date and provenance, composed in Greek and preserved in Old Church Slavonic in two major text forms, provides the best example of a document that has been influenced by an Enochic corpus very similar to 1 Enoch. As a whole it is shaped as a testamentary account, which is more explicit than it is in 1 Enoch (cf. [§3.1.3.1](#)). Enoch is the first person narrator throughout. The angels appear to him in a dream (cf. 1 Enoch [12](#)) and instruct him to prepare for his departure (*2 Enoch 1–2*). He ascends to heaven, has a vision of God, and is commissioned to write his books (chaps. [3–36](#); cf. 1 Enoch [12–35](#)). He is then brought down to earth and given a period of time to instruct his children (*2 Enoch 36–66*; cf. 1 Enoch [81:1–82:4](#); [91–105](#)). The account of his removal from earth (*2 Enoch 67*), which is missing in 1 Enoch (unless chap. [71](#)—a secondary addition to the Book of Parables—preserves an earlier, related tradition), concludes the Enochic narrative. However, the story of the miraculous conception and birth of Melchizedek (*2 Enoch 71*) is the counterpart of 1 Enoch [106–107](#).

The purpose of Enoch’s ascent is the acquisition and recording of information of importance for Enoch’s family and spiritual descendants. This information, which relates to the cosmos and God’s creation of it, as well as to eschatology, is obtained on the way up through the spheres and at the throne of God (chaps. [3–37](#)). In its form—an ascent that culminates at the divine throne with a commissioning—this section corresponds to 1 Enoch [12–16](#). Enoch’s journey to places of cosmological and eschatological significance corresponds to the journeys described in 1 Enoch [17–19](#) and [20–36](#) and to the detailed accounts in 1 Enoch [72–77](#).

The cosmological and eschatological contents of the various spheres are described by means of the same literary forms that 1 Enoch employs to recount their respective counterparts. Enoch’s visions of the celestial phenomena in the first and fourth heavens (chaps. [3–6](#), [11–17](#)), like their counterparts in 1 Enoch [17:1–18:6](#), [33–36](#), and [72–77](#), are related in a straightforward manner. He sees (or the angels show him) certain heavenly phenomena, which he recognizes, names, and describes. When the seer describes the visions of eschatological import in the second, third, and fifth heavens (*2 Enoch 7–10*, [18](#)), he employs the form familiar from the visions in 1 Enoch [18:6–19:2](#) and especially chaps. [21–27](#) and [32](#): journey, vision, seer’s comment or question, interpretation (see Introduction to chaps. [20–36](#), [§ Literary Form and Structure](#)). In his description of the rebel angels, the seer distinguishes between two groups (as does 1 Enoch): the *grigori* (ἐγγήγοροι=“watchers”), who sinned with the women (*2 Enoch 18*); and

George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (ed. Klaus Baltzer; Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001).

their “brethren” ([18:7](#)), called “apostates” (chap. [7](#)), who may correspond to the angels as revealers. Significant for this author’s purpose are his descriptions of paradise and hell in the third heaven (chaps. [8–10](#)). The complementary lists of sins and good deeds in these chapters correspond to similar lists in Enoch’s instruction later in the book and reflect the strong ethical emphasis in the book.

Enoch’s ascent terminates in the divine throne room in the seventh heaven (in the tenth heaven in the long recension, which adds [21:6–22:1a](#)). Although the scene closely parallels 1 Enoch [14:15–16:4](#), here Enoch is commissioned not to take a book of indictment back to the “watchers” (1 Enoch [13:10–14:1](#)), but to write books of cosmological and ethical teaching. Before he does this, he is transformed into the glory of an angel, an event that corresponds to Enoch’s appointment as Son of Man in 1 Enoch [71](#). After the seer has copied these 366 books at the angel’s dictation, the scene climaxes with God’s lengthy account of creation—heretofore unknown even to the angels (*2 Enoch* [24–30](#)). Commenting on his own narrative, God stresses his uniqueness as Creator and his total sovereignty in the heavens (chap. [33](#)), and he reveals that the flood will come because the human race refuses to acknowledge him as the one God (chap. [34](#)). As a remedy for this situation God commissions Enoch to bring to earth books that stress creation as a rationale for ethics.

Enoch’s instruction is an epitome of the books he has written, and it is divided into three parts (chaps. [39–56](#), [57–63](#), [64–65](#)). The first part is addressed to his children, although it has no formal introduction in the present state of the short recension. Enoch asserts the divine origin and universality of his knowledge (cf. the parallels between chaps. [33–40](#) and 1 Enoch [81](#), [91](#), [93](#) discussed at comm. on [93:11–14](#)), and he interweaves descriptions of the celestial and eschatological phenomena he has seen with ethical exhortations in the form of blessings and curses that correspond to the exhortations and woes of 1 Enoch [94–104](#).

6.2.12. 3 Enoch

3 Enoch is a complex, layered text of Jewish Merkabah traditions that was composed probably in the fifth or sixth century C.E. and that indicates some loose knowledge of the Enochic tradition. Of special interest are similarities to the angelology of 1 Enoch and parallels to the accounts of Enoch’s ascent in 1 Enoch [14–16](#) and [71](#). Especially noteworthy is the similarity between Enoch’s metamorphosis into the archangel Metatron in *3 Enoch* 3–15, which parallels Enoch’s appointment as Son of Man in 1 Enoch [71](#) (though the term is not used in *3 Enoch*) and his transformation into angelic glory in *2 Enoch* [22](#). This connection between Enoch and the angels also parallels the ascription of angelic functions to Enoch in the *Book of Jubilees* (see [§6.2.3.3.3](#)) and the *Testament of Abraham* (see [§6.3.3.3](#)).

6.2.13. The Targumim

The Targumim of [Gen 6:1–4](#)* tend to override the angelic interpretation of “sons of God,” rendering the biblical expression as “sons of the nobles” or “sons of the judges.” Targum Pseudo-Jonathan is more complex, however. Its rendering of vv [2](#)* and [4](#)* knows the Enochic traditions: “The sons of the nobles saw that the daughters of men were beautiful (they painted their eyes and adorned their hair and walked about naked), and they thought about indulging in sex and took wives for themselves from all that they

George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (ed. Klaus Baltzer; Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001).

desired... Shemihazai and Uziel fell from heaven and were on earth in those days” (וחמון בני רברביא)
ית בנת אנשא ארום שפירן הנון וכחלן

ופקסן ומהלכן בגילוי בשרא והרהירו לזכו ונסיבו להון נשין מכל שמחזאי ועוזיאל הנון
(דאתרעיו ביומיא האינון ... נפילין מן שמיא והוּו בארעא).

6.2.14. The Rabbis

Although the rabbis tended to reject the angelic interpretation of [Gen 6:1–4*](#), an occasional hint of the tradition about the rebel angels occurs in the rabbinic writings. In *b. Nid.* 61a the giants Sihon and Og are said to be descendants of Shamhazi, and in *b. Yoma* 67b Azazel is associated with Azael. Enoch himself, however, is scarcely mentioned in the early rabbinic tradition, and *Gen. Rab.* 5:24 indicates some distinctly negative attitudes toward the patriarch. Although this is consonant with broader negative attitudes toward apocalyptic literature among the rabbis, it should be set side-by-side with the high valuation of Enoch in *3 Enoch*, which derives from circles that cherished Merkabah mysticism (see [§6.2.12](#)).

6.2.15. Synthesis

The texts I have surveyed indicate in various places knowledge and use of almost the whole Enochic corpus. *Jubilees* refers to the Book of the Luminaries, the Book of the Watchers, the Animal Vision, and if not the whole Epistle, the Apocalypse of Weeks and the corpus’s shape as a testimony. The Qumran MSS. attest all of the corpus except the Parables and chap. [108](#). *2 Enoch* knows the corpus’s shape as a testament, possibly with the Parables in their present location. The Wisdom of Solomon attests the traditions about the Son of Man, probably in an Enochic context, and the same tradition reappears in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*; in the Aramaic Levi Document, the tradition of Enoch’s call is applied to Levi.

The tradition about the watchers’ intercourse with women appears in *Jubilees*, the Genesis Apocryphon, the Damascus Document, 4Q180-181, and Josephus. As an interpretation of [Genesis 6](#), it is reflected back into the Greek translation of that text. A developing countertradition, identifying “the sons of God” in Genesis as sons of Seth or other humans, first appears in Philo and Josephus and continues in the Targumim and the rabbis. That their mating with women generated a horde of demons whose activity continues until the eschaton is central to *Jubilees*’ revision of Genesis and Exodus, and it appears in 4Q180-181, where Asael is identified as Azazel. The watchers’ primordial sin, determinative of evils to come, is construed as forbidden revelation in *Jubilees*, Josephus (now attributed to the sons of Seth), and, indirectly, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan. The older tradition that God sent the angels to instruct humanity in righteousness, implied in 1 Enoch, is explicit in *Jubilees*. The story of the watchers as a paradigm of sin and punishment is appealed to in the Damascus Document and Sirach.

Enoch’s authority as the recipient and revealer of correct astronomy and a right calendar is foundational to *Jubilees* and is known by Pseudo-Eupolemus. Enoch is the recipient and transmitter of eschatological revelation in *Jubilees* and the Genesis Apocryphon, and the eschatological character of his

George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (ed. Klaus Baltzer; Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001).

writings was doubtless crucial at Qumran. Cut loose from the name Son of Man, the eschatological revelations about the Son of Man have a significant afterlife in the Wisdom of Solomon, *4 Ezra*, and *2 Baruch*. Enoch's role as scribe, which 1 Enoch relates specifically only to his writing of the angelic petition and in general to his authorship of the whole corpus, is mentioned in *Jubilees* also with reference to his role as the recorder of the sins of humanity. This function expands the angelic character of his activity, as does *Jubilees'* reference to his service as priest in paradise. His metamorphosis into an angel is explicit in the final stratum of the Parables and may be implied in [Wisdom 5](#), where the righteous one—whose paradigm was Enoch—is exalted among the sons of God and holy ones. It will be developed in both *2 Enoch* and *3 Enoch*.

To what extent 1 Enoch functioned as authoritative scripture among Jews is uncertain. It has that role for the author of *Jubilees*, and for awhile it must have had that character at Qumran. Both instances involve persons and communities that were the spiritual descendants of the authors and first audiences of the Enochic texts. In the Wisdom of Solomon, *4 Ezra*, and *2 Baruch*, the Enochic traditions are transformed and reused in pseudepigraphic contexts, in revised and interpreted form, as authoritative accounts of God's activity as judge and savior. The exclusion of the Enochic works from the canon of the Hebrew Bible was probably due to complex factors in the sociology and religious thought and practice of late Second Temple Judaism. Among these would have been the rabbis' dissociation from the apocalyptic circles that created and cherished these works and, with the exception of the undisputed Daniel, their disinclination toward apocalyptic speculation and the authority that undergirded it.

6.3. Early Christianity

Among twentieth-century Christians, only the Ethiopian Church and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints consider the Enochic writings to be authoritative. Otherwise, to the extent they are even known, they are viewed at best as a curiosity.

The situation was altogether different in the early centuries of the Common Era. Because the early church arose in the circles of apocalyptic Judaism, the Enochic texts and traditions were known and significantly influenced early Christian thought. Sometimes the knowledge of specific texts was direct; in other cases influence was indirect. Enochic ideas about the Chosen One/Son of Man left their mark on first-century Christian eschatology and christology. In the following two centuries various sectors of the Western church and their intellectual leaders alternatively embraced and distanced themselves from the Enochic tradition. Tertullian and Origen, in particular, turned to the primordial prophet as an authority to undergird their teaching. In time, however, the fortune of the Enochic traditions waned in catholic Christianity under the influence of Augustine, the church's increasing proclivity for philosophical theology, and the widespread use of the texts in heretical circles.

Two articles by H. J. Lawlor and James VanderKam—separated from one another by almost a century—have provided comprehensive treatments of the Christian usage of 1 Enoch. Editions of 1 Enoch since 1897 have mainly taken over Lawlor's list, prefacing it with a list of Jewish and NT texts that contain motifs or expressions found in 1 Enoch.

George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (ed. Klaus Baltzer; Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001).

Page 14. Exported from [Logos Bible Software](#), 11:28 AM March 24, 2016.

In the present discussion of early Christian texts I confine my treatment of NT texts primarily to passages about the Son of Man, which are dependent on the tradition in the Book of Parables. I have written independently of VanderKam's article and drew most of my post-NT citations from Lawlor's article. The major additions to his compendious list come from the Nag Hammadi codices, unknown in 1897, and from Ethiopian sources, which Western editions of the book have almost uniformly ignored. The texts that I discuss include: quotations of 1 Enoch, whether or not the text identifies the Enochic source; material that derives ultimately from 1 Enoch, although this source is not identified; explicit references to Enochic writings that cannot be certainly located; passages that may depend on 1 Enoch. In addition to sketching a picture of the extent to which 1 Enoch and Enochic material was known and the regard and disregard in which it was held, in this section I consider the specific ways in which Christian authors used the Enochic materials.

6.3.1. New Testament and Early Gospel Tradition

Although [Jude 14–15*](#) is the only NT *quotation* of 1 Enoch, the influence of traditions from this collection is widespread. Most pervasive are the Son of Man christologies that have influenced the Synoptic Gospels and their sources, the Fourth Gospel, the Pauline epistles, the Epistle to the Hebrews, perhaps the Epistle of Jude, and the Book of Revelation. Many of these texts attest the conflation of Son of Man, messianic, and Servant traditions that characterized 1 Enoch's portrait of the Chosen One/Son of Man and its recurrence in *4 Ezra*.

6.3.1.1. Early Son of Man Christology

The earliest explicit references to Jesus as Son of Man occur in Mark and in material derived from Q, the hypothetical sayings source that Matthew and Luke used along with Mark to create the major part of their Gospels. [Mark 13:26*](#) and [14:62*](#) quote [Dan 7:14*](#) in their reference to the coming of the Son of Man. But the judicial function of the Son of Man in these passages and in [Mark 8:38*](#) and its Q parallel ([Matt 10:32–33*](#)||[Luke 12:8–9*](#)) reflects the *interpretation* of [Daniel 7](#) in the Parables of Enoch rather than simple dependence on [Daniel 7](#), where the one like a son of man is enthroned after the judgment. The connection between 1 Enoch [62–63](#) and [Mark 8:38*](#) par. is especially close; both portray the Son of Man as the heavenly vindicator of the persecuted righteous. Another indication of the influence of Enochic Son of Man traditions appears in the Q saying in [Matt 24:26–27*](#), [37–39*](#)||[Luke 17:22–37*](#), where the days of the Son of Man are likened to the days of Noah. This typology of flood and final judgment is typical of the Enochic texts in general (see [§4.2.4.4](#)) and appears also in the Book of Parables (chaps. [53–57](#); [60–63](#)).

6.3.1.2. Mark

Mark's christology is a complex conflation of Son of Man traditions and the notion that Jesus is the Son of God. The latter term in Mark denotes Jesus' status as a divine being. The ambiguous term "Son of Man" denotes the human being in whom the Son of God is incarnate but also suggests that this "son of man" will be the "Son of Man" who comes to judge. The two notions merge in [2:12*](#), where "the son of man" already exercises "on earth" the authority that [Dan 7:14*](#) anticipates after his exaltation when he has come on the clouds of heaven. Similarly, in [Mark 14:62*](#), Jesus warns Caiaphas that he will see this

human being as that Son of Man, who will judge him for rejecting Jesus' claims to be Son of God and Messiah. The conflation of Son of Man terminology and Servant theology appears in Mark's passion predictions ([8:31](#)*; [9:12](#)*, [31](#)*; [10:33–35](#)*, [45](#)*).

6.3.1.3. Matthew

Matthew supplemented the Son of Man tradition he received from Mark and Q by recourse to additional Enochic traditions. Especially important is the great judgment scene in [Matt 25:31–46](#)*, which reflects the correspondence between the Chosen One and the chosen ones in 1 Enoch [62–63](#). In [Matthew 25](#) people are judged on the basis of their positive or negative treatment of the Son of Man, which occurs when they respond to “the little ones,” whose heavenly vindicator is the Son of Man. The reference to the Son of Man as “king” expresses the traditional conflation of Danielic and royal motifs. [Matthew 10:32–33](#)*, a form of the saying attested in both Mark ([8:38](#)*) and Q (cf. [Luke 12:8–9](#)*), makes explicit the movement from an early tradition in which the Son of Man was to be Jesus' vindicator to the identification of Jesus *as* Son of Man and hence *his own* vindicator. This option, which differs from [Matthew 25](#), corresponds more to the form of the tradition in [Wisdom 2–5](#) (see [§6.2.7](#)) than its form in 1 Enoch [62–63](#). In addition to Matthew's use of Enochic Son of Man material, at [22:11–13](#)* the evangelist may reflect knowledge of the Enochic myth of Asael.

6.3.1.4. Luke-Acts

Although his eschatology seems to tone down the imminent expectation of the parousia in Mark, Luke continues to employ the eschatological Son of Man traditions received from Mark and Q. In one tradition found neither in Mark nor Matthew ([Luke 18:1–8](#)*), a judge's response to the plea of an importunate widow is a foil to the coming of the Son of Man, who will vindicate *his* chosen ones. As both [Luke 22:69](#)* and [Acts 7:56](#)* indicate, Luke has radicalized eschatology by positing the present, or imminent, heavenly enthronement of the Son of Man (cf. also [Matt 26:64](#)* and [28:16](#)*, where the risen Christ describes himself in Danielic language about the enthroned son of man). This viewpoint is close to that of the Parables of Enoch, which guarantees the vindication of the righteous and chosen by reporting events that are already taking place in heaven (cf. 1 Enoch [61:8](#); [62:2](#); and [49:2](#), where the son of man stands in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, as he does in [Acts 7:56](#)*). Another possible connection between Luke and the Parables is Luke's use of the terms “Righteous One” and “Chosen One” with reference to Jesus. Finally, in addition to the use of Son of Man traditions, Luke's treatment of the topic of riches, the rich, and God's judgment indicates many similarities to the Epistle of Enoch, and he may well have known that text or read it at one time.

6.3.1.5. John

John's use of “Son of Man” is integral to his many-faceted portrait of Jesus. The term is usually accompanied by elements familiar from Jewish traditions or the Synoptic Son of Man passages. It is associated with judgment ([5:25–29](#)*, which echoes [Dan 7:14](#)*; and [John 9:35–39](#)*) and with Jesus' humanity and his death. Most striking are his uses of the verbs ὑψόω (lift up, exalt, [3:13–16](#)*; [8:28](#)*), which John uses only in conjunction with “Son of Man,” and δοξάζω (glorify, [12:23–41](#)*; [13:31](#)*), which he applies to Jesus mainly in connection with his proper name or the term “Son of Man.” Both terms denote a status traditionally ascribed to the Son of Man in the future, but both are also used of the Servant

of the Lord in the LXX of Second Isaiah. This tendency to make the Son of Man the subject of verbs that Second Isaiah applies to the Servant parallels the Synoptic tradition, especially the passion predications. Thus in his use of the Jewish tradition attested in the Book of Parables and *4 Ezra*, John employs the Enochic term “son of man” but with the nuance in [Wisdom 2–5](#) that the exalted one is identical with the persecuted one.

6.3.1.6. The Epistles of Paul

Although the apostle Paul never uses the term “Son of Man” and never calls Jesus “the Chosen One,” his statements about Jesus’ parousia and his function as eschatological judge appear to have been influenced by Synoptic Son of Man christology and thus mediately by the Enochic tradition. His earliest extant epistle, 1 Thessalonians, is stamped by the expectation of the imminent parousia and a concern that Christians be worthy to stand in Christ’s presence ([1:10*](#); [2:19–20*](#); [3:13*](#)). The description of the parousia in [4:13–18*](#), attributed to “a word of the Lord,” is related to the Markan apocalypse’s description of the coming of the Son of Man ([13:26–27*](#)), and [1 Thess 5:1–11*](#) reflects the Q tradition in [Matt 24:43–44*](#)||[Luke 12:39–40*](#), while [1 Thess 5:17*](#) recalls the conclusion of Luke’s prediction of the future ([Luke 21:34–36*](#)). The description of the parousia in [1 Thessalonians 4](#) is complemented by [1 Cor 15:23–28*](#), which employs language from the royal [Psalm 110](#) and from two biblical texts that speak of the “son of man” ([Dan 7:14*](#); [Ps 8:6*\[5*\]](#)). [Psalm 8:6*\[5*\]](#) seems to have been applied to the glorified Jesus by association with [Daniel 7](#), and [1 Cor 15:24*](#) reverses language from [Dan 7:14*](#), so that the parousia is the moment when Jesus “gives” *back* to God the “kingdom” that God “gives” *to* one like a son of man, according to [Daniel 7](#). This happens after Jesus has defeated every “rule” and “power” (cf. [Dan 7:14*](#)), which he does in his non-Danielic function as judge. The conflation of [Psalm 110](#) and [Daniel 7](#) mirrors [Mark 14:62*](#), and the term “father” ([1 Cor 15:24*](#)) suggests, in addition, the title “Son of God” (e.g., [Mark 8:38*](#)).

The absence of the term “Son of Man” from the Pauline corpus can be ascribed to the expression’s incomprehensibility to Paul’s Gentile audience, whereas κύριος (Lord) was both familiar and suitable to denote Jesus’ glorified state. This raises an additional question about the Aramaic expression *Marana tha* (Our Lord, come!). Does its reference to the Lord’s coming imply Jesus’ exaltation and his coming as judge, and do these notions derive from a Son of Man tradition?

One final possible parallel between Paul and Enochic tradition is in the Animal Vision. In the latter, an eschatological figure is born as a white bull—as Adam was in this vision’s allegory ([90:37](#); cf. [85:1](#))—and all humanity is transformed into white bulls ([90:30](#)). This soteriological notion parallels Paul’s understanding of Jesus as the second Adam, into whose image all believers (notably the Gentiles) will be transformed.

6.3.1.7. Revelation

The best literary analogy to the Johannine Apocalypse is the Enochic Book of Parables. Both texts describe the seer’s ascent to heaven ([Rev 4:1–2*](#); 1 Enoch [39:3](#)) and record similar throne visions ([Rev 4:2–11*](#); 1 Enoch [40:1–10](#)), and both are dominated by heavenly and earthly visions of events relating to the judgment. John’s knowledge of Synoptic Son of Man traditions is evident in both [Rev 1:7*](#) and [3:3*](#). Moreover, the Apocalypse conflates traditions about the Danielic Son of Man, the Davidic Messiah, and George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (ed. Klaus Baltzer; Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001).

perhaps the Servant of Second Isaiah, thus indicating knowledge of a conflate tradition that parallels that attested in the Parables of Enoch and the contemporary apocalypse, *4 Ezra* (see above, n. [51](#)). Knowledge of another part of 1 Enoch is attested in [Rev 20:1–3*](#), [10*](#), where Satan is locked up in the pit for a thousand years (cf. 1 Enoch [10:12–13](#)), later to be pitched into eternal fiery destruction.

6.3.1.8. The Epistle of Jude

The author of the Epistle of Jude has an especially close relationship to Enochic and other noncanonical traditions. Verses [14–15*](#) quote 1 Enoch [1:9](#) verbatim, describing it as a prophecy of Enoch the seventh from Adam. For Jude the epiphanic protagonist in 1 Enoch is identified as “the Lord, “ that is, Jesus (cf. vv [17*](#), [25*](#)). This identification is paralleled in 1 Enoch [52:6](#), where the appearance of God in [1:9](#) is interpreted with reference to the appearance of the Chosen One. In addition, the author knows the story of the watchers’ rebellion and incarceration ([Jude 6*](#)) and employs the tradition as an example of the divine punishment that will befall false teachers in the end time. This concern with false teachers is a feature of the Epistle of Enoch (see comm. on [98:4](#)).

6.3.1.9. 2 Peter and 1 Peter

Drawing on the Epistle of Jude, 2 Peter employs the story of the watchers’ rebellion and imprisonment for purposes similar to Jude ([2:4–5*](#)) and embellishes it with motifs from Greek myth.

The author of 1 Peter works from an apocalyptic worldview similar to that of 1 Enoch (see [§4.1](#)). The eschaton and the final judgment are imminent, and the reader can take comfort in the knowledge that, in spite of present tribulation, heaven holds a reward, as yet unseen, for the righteous ([1:3–12*](#)). In addition, the author, alluding to the tradition about the watchers, attributes to Jesus a journey to the underworld that parallels Enoch’s interaction with the rebel watchers ([3:19–20*](#)), and compares baptism to the purifying effects of the flood (cf. [10:21](#)). With its criticism of braiding hair, decoration of gold, and wearing fine clothing, [1 Pet 3:3*](#) may also reflect the story of the watchers. 1 Enoch [8:1](#) includes gold ornamentation and dyes among the watchers’ forbidden revelations. The ornamentation of hair, mentioned by Tertullian in a treatise heavily influenced by 1 Enoch (see [§6.3.2.9](#)), is also mentioned in a Jewish tradition that reflects 1 Enoch (*Tg. Ps.-J. Gen 6:2**; see above, [§6.2.13](#)).

Finally, striking parallels between 1 Peter and 1 Enoch [108](#) may indicate the Petrine author’s knowledge of Enochic traditions (see [Excursus: Parallels between 1 Enoch 108 and 1 Peter](#)).

6.3.1.10. The Church as the Eschatological Community of the Chosen Constituted by Revelation

The Enochic authors believed that they were members of the eschatological community of the chosen constituted by revelation (see [§4.2.5.7](#)). This revelation, although it was the possession of a select group of Israelites, was to be proclaimed to “all of the sons of the earth,” in the hope that they too would be saved at the time of the judgment. The early church was governed by a similar idea. They were the chosen of the end time, commissioned to proclaim to all the Gentiles the eschatological salvation that emanated from Israel. The authority for this mission is tied to a series of epiphanies in which the risen Lord appears for the purpose of commissioning apostles to the Gentiles ([Matt 28:16–20*](#); [Luke 24](#); [Gal 1:11–17*](#)), and

the mandate reappears in the apocalyptic review of future history that Jesus recited on the Mount of Olives ([Mark 13:10](#)* par.).

The parallels with the Enochic tradition should be noted with caution. The Enochic authors posited some sort of *revealed law* as the touchstone for salvation in the judgment. Nonetheless, the NT notion parallels 1 Enoch more closely than it does the Qumran community, where eschatological awareness did not involve a mission to the Gentiles. The structural similarities between the Enochic and NT notions of eschatology and proclamation deserve closer study.

6.3.2. Early Orthodox Tradition

6.3.2.1. 1 Clement 19–20

As part of his moral instruction, Clement of Rome (ca. 100 C.E.) cites the example of the obedience of the inanimate creation. The passage closely parallels 1 Enoch [2–5](#) and [101](#) and seems to reflect knowledge of either 1 Enoch or a Jewish instructional tradition on which 1 Enoch also drew (see [Excursus: Traditions about Nature’s Obedience and Humanity’s Disobedience](#)).

6.3.2.2. Papias

According to Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 5.33.3) Papias, bishop of Hierapolis (ca. 130), attributed to Jesus of Nazareth a saying about the fecundity of the earth that derived originally from 1 Enoch [10:19](#) (frg. [1](#)). The extent of Jesus’ saying about the fertility of vine, seed, and oil exceeds even the proportions described in *2 Bar.* [29:5](#), which itself multiplies astronomically the figures in 1 Enoch. Papias frg. [4](#) further indicates knowledge of the version of the watchers story that posits a divine commission that is violated (cf. *Jub.* [4:15](#); above, [§6.2.3.2.1](#)). “Papias says thus, word for word, ‘But to some of them—clearly the holy angels of old—he gave authority to give order (διακοσμήσεως) to the world, and he commanded them to exercise their authority well.’ And he says immediately after that, ‘But it happened that their order (τάξις) came to nothing.’ ”

6.3.2.3. The Epistle of Barnabas

Writing ca. 135–38 C.E., probably in Egypt, the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas* paraphrases 1 Enoch [89:56](#), [60](#), [66–67](#) with reference to the destruction of the temple, introducing his source with the formula, “For Scripture says” (λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή, [16:5](#)). To support the notion of a new temple, he quotes loosely 1 Enoch [91:13](#), again introducing it as Scripture (“For it is written,” γέγραπται γὰρ, [16:6](#)). In *Barn.* [4:3](#) the author quotes a text of uncertain origin, which describes the tribulations of the end time, introducing it with the words, “concerning which it is written, as Enoch says.” Although the quotation may be spurious, the attribution to Enoch, alongside the genuine Enochic quotations, indicates that the author’s community ascribed scriptural authority to the writings of Enoch the prophet.

6.3.2.4. The Apocalypse of Peter and The Gospel of Peter

Composed in the first half of the second century C.E., perhaps in Egypt, the *Apocalypse of Peter*, an account of his tour of hell, draws on the tradition of which the Book of the Watchers is a fountainhead.

The author seems also to have known the Book of Parables. Chapter 4 parallels closely 1 Enoch [61:5](#), and *Apocalypse of Peter* 13 appears to paraphrase 1 Enoch [62:15–16](#); [63:1](#), [7–9](#).

The motif of Jesus' journey to the underworld (see [§6.3.1.9](#)) recurs in the *Gospel of Peter* 39–42, where the object of his preaching is not “the spirits in prison” (i.e., the fallen angels), but “the dead” in general. The description of the two angels who accompany Jesus from the tomb is reminiscent of the two angels who accompany Enoch to heaven in 2 *Enoch* [1](#) and [3](#). The Gospel, composed in the second century, was known in Syria around 200 C.E. and in Egypt in the second or third century. An incomplete copy is preserved in the later Egyptian codex that also contains 1 Enoch [1–32](#) and the *Apocalypse of Peter* (which is also dependent on 1 Enoch, see [§2.2.1](#)).

6.3.2.5. Justin Martyr

In his *Second Apology* (5:2), written in Rome between 148 and 161 C.E., Justin ascribes the origins of sin to the watchers, referring to the angels' assignment to look after humans and earthly things (ὁ θεὸς ... τὴν μὲν τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν πρόνοιαν ἀγγέλοις ... παρέδωκεν) (cf. *Jub.* [4:15](#); above, [§6.2.3.2.1](#)). His knowledge of the story in 1 Enoch is evident in the details of his account. The angels had intercourse with women, thus violating their order (τάξις; cf. 1 Enoch [15:3–7](#)), and they begat demons (1 Enoch [15:9–16:1](#)). Moreover, they (the demons) revealed magic to humans (cf. 1 Enoch [7:1](#)) and became the cause of all manner of sin (cf. [10:8](#)). This focus on the havoc wreaked by the demonic progeny of the angels is consonant both with 1 Enoch [15:9–16:1](#) and the extension of the notion in *Jubilees* [10](#) ([§6.2.3.2.5](#)). Justin recognizes the parallel between the story of the watchers and Greek myths about the amours of the gods (see comm. on chaps. [6–11](#)). Asserting the authority of the Jewish story, however, he claims that the Greek poets and mythmakers ascribed to the gods the deeds of the wicked angels.

6.3.2.6. Athenagoras

In his *Plea for the Christians* (177 C.E.), this Athenian apologist devotes considerable space to the topic of the demons and their activity, also identifying them as the progeny of the rebel angels (chaps. [24–25](#)). Like Justin he ascribes to the angels a responsibility to exercise divine providence (πρόνοια) over creation. Their sin was to fall in love with virgins (cf. comm. on [15:4](#)) and procreate giants who constitute a demonic realm. Two details in Athenagoras's account parallel 1 Enoch. The angels are unable to ascend to or command a view of heaven (ὑπερκόπτω), having fallen from there (cf. 1 Enoch [13:5](#) and [14:5](#)). The demons are identified as the “souls” (ψυχαί) of the giants, who “wander” (πλανῶ) over the earth causing trouble (cf. 1 Enoch [15:11–16:1](#)).

6.3.2.7. Irenaeus

Irenaeus, a native of Asia Minor, probably Smyrna, who became bishop of Lyons (ca. 180 C.E.), makes several references to the sin of the angels (*Adv. haer.* [1.10.1](#), [3](#); [1.15.6](#); [4.16.2](#); [4.36.4](#); [4.37.1](#), [6](#); *Dem.* 18). Although these references indicate knowledge of the tradition about the angels' intercourse with women ([4.36.4](#)), different from Justin and Athenagoras, Irenaeus never attributes to them the begetting of children who would become a demonic horde that foster sin in the world. He cites the tradition, rather, to prove that sin, a function of free will, meets with divine judgment. Irenaeus's knowledge of the Enochic source of the tradition about the angels is indicated in *Adv. haer.* [4.16.2](#): although he was a man, Enoch

was sent as God's legate to announce judgment to the angels (1 Enoch [12:4–5](#); [13:4–7](#); [15:2](#)). In addition, his reference to Enoch's role as witness at the judgment indicates knowledge of other traditions attested in *Jubilees* and the *Testament of Abraham* (see [§6.2.3.3.3](#) and [§6.3.3.3](#)). His reference to Azazel in connection with astrological prognostication and the magical arts ([1.15.6](#)), while it does not correspond exactly with 1 Enoch [8:1](#), is close enough to indicate that the elder whom he cites had at least secondhand knowledge of the tradition. A final, clear reference to the Enochic tradition appears in the *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* 18, where he refers not only to "illicit unions" but also to many details in the lists of teaching in 1 Enoch [8:1–3](#) and [9:8](#): roots, herbs, dyeing, cosmetics, sorcery, and hate-producing potions.

6.3.2.8. Minucius Felix

A distinguished lawyer who lived in Rome ca. 200, Minucius Felix composed a Latin apology for Christianity entitled *Octavius* after its Christian protagonist. In chap. [26](#) Octavius refutes his pagan opponents' appeal to the use of divination by ascribing its origins to demons, "insincere, wandering spirits, degraded from their heavenly vigor by earthly stains and lusts" (*Spiritus sunt insinceri, vagi, a caelesti vigore terrenis labibus et cupiditatibus degravati*), weighed down and immersed by vices. Any direct association with 1 Enoch is tenuous. Authority for this view of demons is found by appeal to Socrates and Plato, not a surprising move in an argument with a pagan. Nonetheless, Minucius's reference to the defilement of the fallen spirits may indicate a connection with the story in 1 Enoch (cf. [7:1](#); [10:8](#), [11](#); [12:4](#); [15:3–4](#)); along with the motif of wandering, it appears in Athenagoras (see [§6.3.2.6](#)) and later Christian texts dependent on 1 Enoch (Commodianus, Lactantius; see [§6.3.2.16–17](#)).

6.3.2.9. Tertullian

More than any other early church theologian, Tertullian of Carthage indicates knowledge of 1 Enoch and defends its authenticity and inspiration. He does so, first, in two works that date from around 210 C.E. In *De cult. fem.* [1,2](#), he supports his argument for modest apparel by arguing that ornamentation—jewelry, dyed cloth, and cosmetics—and the arts and technology that have produced it (as well as knowledge of herbs, the practice of magic, and astral prognostication) were revealed by rebellious and lusting angels. In chap. [3](#) he identifies the source of this information as "the writing of Enoch" (*scriptura Enoch*). Although he acknowledges that some doubt its authority because it is not in the Jewish canon (*armarium Iudaicum*), he defends its authenticity. Enoch transmitted his traditions to Methuselah with the command that he pass them on to his posterity (cf. 1 Enoch [82:1–3](#)). Citing [2 Tim 3:16*](#), with its reference to inspired Scripture, Tertullian exhorts his readers to heed Enoch, since he had preached about the Lord, Christ. He concludes by citing Jude's testimony about Enoch. He returns to this subject in *De cultu feminarum* book [2](#), which was originally a separate work, again undergirding his criticism with the authority of Enoch (2.10). The influence of the story of the watchers and the women is likely in Tertullian's treatise *De virginibus velandis* (chap. [7](#)), where Paul's command in [1 Cor 11:2–16*](#) is applied to virgins by means of a detailed and tortured exegesis of [Gen 6:1–2*](#) that contains elements found only in 1 Enoch (the identification of the sons of God as "angels" and their sinful lust; cf. *De oratione* [23](#)). That virgins were the object of the angels' lust is also asserted by Athenagoras (see [§6.3.2.6](#)).

Tertullian's other references to 1 Enoch occur in *De idololatria*. Criticizing the making and worshiping of idols (chap. [4](#)), Tertullian quotes the Decalogue and then states that Enoch, who had

George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (ed. Klaus Baltzer; Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001).

preceded Moses, had predicted that the demons, the spirits of the angelic apostates, would turn all the elements of creation into idolatry. The passage does not quote 1 Enoch but may reflect 1 Enoch [19:1](#). Several lines later, however, Tertullian prefaces a verbatim quotation of 1 Enoch [99:6–7](#) (for details, see textual notes, ad loc.) with the statement that the same Enoch condemned in advance the worshipers and makers of idols. In chap. [15](#), in what may be another allusion to 1 Enoch [19:1](#), Tertullian condemns dedicatory inscriptions, stating that they had been predicted by the Holy Spirit “through the most ancient prophet Enoch” (*per antiquissimum prophetam Enoch*).

Taken together, these references indicate Tertullian’s knowledge of the Book of the Watchers, chaps. [81:1–82:3](#), and the Epistle of Enoch. His references to Enoch’s prediction of Christ may indicate knowledge of the Book of Parables, although these comments may refer to 1 Enoch [1](#), which he cites later with reference to the Epistle of Jude. Like Jude, he considers Enoch to have been a prophet and the author of this text.

6.3.2.10. Cyprian

In his treatise *De habitu virginum* ([12–14](#), ca. 250 C.E.), Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, proscribes the wearing of ornaments and dyed clothes. Dyeing, jewelry, eye paint, and other facial cosmetics “sinning and apostate angels put forth by their arts, when, lowered to the contagions of earth, they forsook their heavenly vigor” (*peccatores et apostatae angeli suis artibus prodiderunt quando ad terrena contagia devoluti a caelesti vigore recesserunt*, [14](#)). That Cyprian uses Tertullian’s treatise *De cultu feminarum* seems beyond dispute; his firsthand knowledge of 1 Enoch is less certain. His reference to their forsaking their heavenly vigor parallels verbatim the same word in Minucius Felix (see [§6.3.2.8](#)).

6.3.2.11. Ad Novatianum

This treatise against Novatian, falsely ascribed to Cyprian but probably written in North Africa between 253 and 257, strings together a series of citations about the coming judgment (chaps. [16–17](#)), among them a verbatim quotation of 1 Enoch [1:8](#), introduced by the words “as it is written” (*sicut scriptum est*). The inclusion of a phrase not found in [Jude 14–15](#)* (see textual n. [d](#) on 1:9) indicates that this Christian author is not quoting from the NT epistle.

6.3.2.12. Clement of Alexandria

Clement’s *Eclogae propheticae* (ca. 200 C.E.) is a collection of excerpts from gnostic writings with brief commentary in which it is not always possible to separate the excerpts from Clement’s commentary. Chapters 1–2 quote and comment on the Song of the Three Young Men in [Daniel 3](#) (LXX). In chap. 2, [Dan 3:54](#) and its reference to God looking upon the abyss is likened to a statement by Enoch, “And I saw all matter” (καὶ εἶδον τὰς ὕλας πάσας, GCS *Clement* 3). The quotation is usually seen as a rough paraphrase of 1 Enoch [19:3](#). The preserved Greek of 1 Enoch (τὰ πέρατα πάντων) and its Ethiopic translation seem to refer to Enoch’s seeing the ends of the earth (see comm. on [19:3](#)). But the Greek in Clement may be an attempt to take the concluding statement of chaps. [17–19](#) as a summary of the contents of the whole section, in which Enoch has seen the whole of the created world. The same quotation appears in Origen (see [§6.3.2.13](#)). The name of Enoch appears again in *Eclogae propheticae* 53. Chapters 51–63 comment on [Psalm 19](#). With respect to the demons’ knowledge of Christ, chap. 53 states, George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (ed. Klaus Baltzer; Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001).

“Already Enoch says that the transgressing angels taught humans astronomy and prognostication and the other arts” (ἤδη δὲ καὶ Ἐνώχ φησιν τοὺς παραβάντας ἀγγέλους διδάξαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀστρονομίαν καὶ μαντικὴν καὶ τὰς ἄλλας τέχνας, GCS *Clement* 3. Thus the text summarizes 1 Enoch [8](#), identifying it as an Enochic composition and in some indefinite way connecting demonic knowledge with angelic revelations. The motif of angelic instruction appears also in *Stromata* 5.1.10.2. After mentioning the Greeks’ “theft” of ideas from Moses and the prophets, Clement states that certain angels of high rank, “having sunk into pleasures, uttered unspeakable things to the women, which had come to their knowledge” (κατολισθήσαντες εἰς ἡδονὰς ἐξεῖπον τὰ ἀπόρρητα ταῖς γυναῖξιν ὅσα γε εἰς γνῶσιν αὐτῶν ἀφῖκτο, GCS *Clement* 2). The passage appears to paraphrase 1 Enoch [16:2](#) (see [comm.](#)).

6.3.2.13. Origen

Clement’s eminent successor in Alexandria refers to the writings of Enoch five times. He considers them to be the authentic products of the patriarch and cites them as Scripture; however, he also indicates that others in the church do not hold this opinion. In *De princ.* [1.3.3](#) (220–230 C.E.), he states that God’s creation of all things “is established from many declarations of the whole Scripture” (*ex multis totius scripturae adsertionibus conprobatur*). As examples he quotes Hermas *Mandate* 1 and then states, “But also in the book of Enoch things similar to this are described” (*Sed et in Enoch libro his similia describuntur*). Precisely what passage(s) Origen has in mind is not clear. Possibilities in 1 Enoch include [82:7](#), [84:2](#), and [93:10](#), although none of these passages makes Origen’s point in so many words. A closer parallel to the Hermas passage is 2 *Enoch* [24:2](#).

A second passage in *De principiis* ([4.4.8](#)) makes a double reference to 1 Enoch. Commenting on [Ps 139:16*](#), Origen states, “But also in his book Enoch said, ‘I have walked as far as imperfection’ ” (*Ambulavi usque ad imperfectum*). He is quoting 1 Enoch [21:1](#) (ἐφώδευσα ἕως τῆς ἀκατασκευάστου), where Enoch recounts his journey to the chaos that lies beyond the ends of the earth. Allegorizing the spatial reference in the passage, Origen reads it to refer to the prophet’s mental journey back through the visible creation “until it arrived at the beginning, in which it saw imperfect matter without qualities” (*usquequo ad principium perveniret illud, in quo imperfectam materiam absque qualitatibus pervideret*). The move was doubtless justified by the fact that the Greek hapaxlegomenon ἀκατασκευάστου occurs only at [Gen 1:2*](#). Commenting on the matter, he adds, “For it is written in that same book of Enoch, ‘I have seen all matter’ ” (*Universas materias perspexi*). This Enochic passage is usually identified as 1 Enoch [19:3](#) (ἴδον ... τὰ πέρατα πάντων), the same passage quoted in Greek in Clement *Eclogae prophetae* 2 (see [§6.3.2.12](#)). The proximity of 1 Enoch [19:3](#) and [21:1](#) supports the identification. Moreover, Origen’s interpretation—that Enoch saw all of matter, as its parts are divided one from another—is quite possibly an exegesis of the Gk. τὰ πέρατα in the sense of “boundaries” that separate (i.e., = ὀρίσματα).

In his *Commentary on John* [6:42](#) (§217) (ca. 226–229), Origen indicates some ambivalence about the Enochic writings. To support the interpretation of “Jordan” to mean “their descent” (κατάβασις αὐτῶν), he appeals to the etymologically related Jared, which means, he says, “going down” (καταβαίνων), “because he (Jared) was born to Mahalel—as it is written in Enoch (if it pleases one to accept the book as holy)—in the days of the descent of the sons of God to the daughters of men” (ἐπειδὴ περ γεγένηται

τῷ Μαλελεηλ, ὡς ἐν τῷ Ἐνώχ γέγραπται, εἶ τῷ φίλον παραδέχεσθαι ὡς ἅγιον τὸ βιβλίον, ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ καταβάσεως ἐπὶ τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν ἀνθρώπων). Origen refers to 1 Enoch [6:5](#), which he knows to have come from the book ascribed to Enoch, and he cites the passage because he considers its source to be Sacred Scripture. At the same time, he suggests that some do not consider it to be such. Having made his major point, he adds, “Some have thought that this descent makes enigmatic reference to the descent of the souls into the bodies, ‘daughters of men’ being taken as a tropological expression for the earthly tent” (ἦντινα κατάβασιν αἰνίσσεσθαι τινες ὑπελήφασιν τὴν τῶν ψυχῶν κάθοδον ἐπὶ τὰ σώματα, θυγατέρας ἀνθρώπων τροπικώτερον τὸ γήινον σκῆνος λέγεσθαι ὑπειληφότες). He will refer to the same allegorical exegesis in *Contra Celsum* 5.55 (see below).

Origen’s ambivalence toward the Enochic writings reappears in his *Num. Hom.* 28.2 (ca. 244). Commenting on [Heb 10:1](#)* and speculating that there are named places in the heavens, he quotes [Ps 147:4](#)* and then says of the names of the stars, “Concerning which (names) many secret and hidden things are contained in the books that are called Enoch’s. But since these books do not seem to be considered authoritative among the Hebrews (*sed quia libelli ipsi non videntur apud Hebraeos in auctoritate haberi*), for the present we defer citing as an example the things that are named there and pursue our investigation from the things that we have in hand whose authority cannot be doubted.” Origen appears here to be referring to the astronomical section of Enoch, to either [82:10–20](#) or some part no longer preserved in the Ethiopic text. His ambivalence about the text involves an inclination to cite it and a recognition that it may not carry the authority necessary to make his point.

Origen’s final reference to the Enochic writings appears in *Contra Celsum* [5.52–55](#). The work was composed ca. 250 in response to Celsus’s critique of Christianity, which was written ca. 178. According to Celsus, Jesus might be regarded as an angel, but if this was the case, he was not the first or only angel to have descended. “For they (the Christians) say that others came often, indeed sixty or seventy together, who became wicked and are punished in chains, having been buried in the earth, whence come the warm springs, which are their tears” (ἐλθεῖν γὰρ καὶ ἄλλους λέγουσι πολλάκις, καὶ ὁμοῦ γε ἐξήκοντα, ἢ ἑβδομήκοντα· οὓς δὴ γενέσθαι κακοῦς, καὶ κολάζεσθαι δεσμοῖς ὑποβληθέντας ἐν γῆ· ὅθεν καὶ τὰς θερμὰς πηγὰς εἶναι τὰ ἐκείνων δάκρυα). In responding to Celsus, Origen asserts: (a) the source of Celsus’s information is doubtless the things written in Enoch; (b) Celsus appears not to have read Enoch, since he does not understand its contents; (c) Celsus does not seem aware that “in the churches the books that bear the name of Enoch do not at all circulate as divine” (ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις οὐ πᾶν φέρεται ὡς θεῖα τὰ ἐπιγεγραμμένα τοῦ Ἐνώχ βιβλία); (d) the mating of the sons of God and daughters of men is mentioned already in Genesis (which Celsus has not recognized), and a certain allegorical interpreter before Origen has interpreted this to refer to the desire of certain souls for corporal life; (e) no one would ever say that warm springs, which are mainly fresh water, could emanate from the salty tears of angels.

On two points Origen is certainly correct. Celsus’s statements about the descent of the angels derive ultimately from the Enochic writings, and they are sufficiently garbled that one doubts whether Celsus read the texts in question. One of these confusions, however, may derive from a mixture of two passages in 1 Enoch. According to [13:9–10](#), Enoch announces judgment to the watchers as they sit

George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (ed. Klaus Baltzer; Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001).

weeping at “Abel-Main.” In [67:4–13](#) hot springs are said to emanate from the angels’ underground place of punishment. Finally, one must consider Origen’s claim that the churches do not accept the books of Enoch as divine. This strongest of Origen’s negative statements about Enoch seems not to be a development of Origen’s previous ambivalence, but an acknowledgment of fact, which is one of several arguments that Origen uses to serve his purpose. Since his opponent cites material from Enoch, Origen emphasizes the book’s questionable status “in the churches.” At the same time, the words of Celsus indicate that the stories about the watchers were known and transmitted in Christian communities (λέγουσι).

From this survey I conclude the following. Origen knew parts of 1 Enoch (the Book of the Watchers, the Book of the Luminaries, and probably the Book of Parables) well enough to quote, paraphrase, and summarize an occasional passage and to recognize Celsus’s misrepresentation of the material. Origen considered the texts to be authentic and Enoch to be a prophet, whose writings were “Scripture.” He occasionally cited the book, quoted a passage, and even exegeted it, in order to support his exegesis of a biblical text or to make a point that he could or would not base on a biblical text. At the same time, he acknowledged that the Enochic writings were not universally accepted as Scripture, and sometimes, with an eye to the possible skepticism of his readers, he did not invest a great deal in the probative value of these texts.

6.3.2.14. Julius Africanus

Africanus, a friend of Origen, was the first of a long line of chronographers (over a thousand years) who would quote from 1 Enoch to fill out their timed saga of human history from creation to the eschaton (see [§6.3.2.22](#)). Parts of Africanus’s *Chronographia* (ca. 221) have been preserved by the ninth-century Byzantine chronographer George Syncellus. The second section, concerning the watchers (περὶ τῶν ἐγγηγόρων), states, “When there was a multitude of humans on the earth, the angels of heaven joined with the daughters of men. In some copies I found ‘the sons of God’ ” (πλήθους ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἄγγελοι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ θυγατράσιν ἀνθρώπων συνῆλθον. ἐν ἐνίοις ἀντιγράφοις εὗρον, οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ). The references to multiple MSS. with variant readings suggests that Africanus is quoting from the Bible (LXX MSS.). But the interpretation “angels of heaven” seems to reflect “watchers, the sons of heaven,” in 1 Enoch [6:1](#). Africanus prefers “sons of God” and interprets the passage to refer to the sons of Seth and the daughters of Cain. Nonetheless, he knows the story preserved in 1 Enoch because he states that if “angels” is the correct reading, this must refer to “those who dealt in magic and sorcery, and, moreover, transmitted to the women the knowledge of the movement of the stars and the meteors, from whom they bore children, the giants, on account of whom wickedness came” (τοὺς περὶ μαγείας καὶ γοητείας, ἔτι δὲ ἀριθμῶν κινήσεως, τῶν μετεώρων ταῖς γυναιξὶ τὴν γνῶσιν παραδεδοκέναι, ἀφ’ ὧν ἐποίησαν τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς γίγαντας, δι’ οὓς τῆς κακίας ἐπιγενομένης).

6.3.2.15. Anatolius of Alexandria

In his Paschal Canon [5](#), Anatolius, a native of Alexandria and bishop of Laodicea (ca. 270), cites the astronomical section of “the Book of Enoch” to prove that “with the Hebrews the first month lies around the equinox.”

6.3.2.16. Lactantius

In his *Divine Institutes* 2.15, Lactantius (ca. 305) states that “when the number of humans had begun to increase” (cf. [Gen 6:1*](#), “begun”), God sent (*misit*) angels for the protection and improvement (*tutelam cultumque*) of the human race. They, however, defiled themselves through intercourse with women (*mulierum congressibus inquinavit*) and spawned half-breed demons, unclean spirits (*immundi spiritus*), who wander (*vagantur*) over the earth causing all manner of evil. They were the inventors of idolatry, astrology, and magic, and taught humans to make images and statues (2.17). Whether Lactantius actually knew 1 Enoch can be disputed, since he never cites it though he often refers explicitly to other sources such as the Sibyl. But his reference to the sending of angels as teachers parallels *Jub. 4:15* (see [§6.2.3.2.1](#)) and the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* (see [§6.3.4.1](#)) and their use of an old tradition presumed in 1 Enoch. Moreover, the introductory quotation of [Gen 6:1*](#), the references to the angels’ defilement through intercourse, their inability to return to heaven, and their invention of astrology and magic, taken together, point to 1 Enoch as a proximate or remote source. Other parallels between 1 Enoch and elements in Lactantius’s eschatology may indicate knowledge of mixed traditions that had been informed by 1 Enoch (*Inst. 7.19*).

6.3.2.17. Commodianus

According to the *Instructiones* [3](#) of this Christian poet, whose home is unknown and whose date is disputed, the angels visited the earth at the behest of God, who wished to beautify it (*exornasset*). The beauty (*forma*) of women caused them to sin, and because the angels were defiled with them (*coinquinati*), they could not return to heaven. As rebels against God, they uttered words against God (*contra Deum verba misere*), who, in turn, uttered a sentence against them (*Altissimus inde sententiam misit in illis*). Their children were giants and they taught the arts of dyeing and other things. When they died they were the object of idolatrous worship, and in bodiless form they wander (*vagi*) about, subverting many bodies. Like Lactantius and the author of the *Pseudo-Clementines*, Commodianus knows the old tradition of a divinely appointed mission, and the motif of ornamentation may parallel the Pseudo-Clementine story about angels changing into stones. In other respects, the passage parallels Lactantius but also contains elements in 1 Enoch (the women’s beauty, the uttering of words against one another [[1:4](#)], the teaching of dyeing [[8:1](#)]).

6.3.2.18. Hilary of Poitiers

In his commentary on [Ps 133:3*](#) (*Tract. super Psal. 132.6*, CSEL 22:689), the bishop of Poitiers (356–367) correctly identifies Hermon as a mountain in Phoenicia. He knows of an unidentified book that mentions that “angels, desiring the daughters of men, when they descended from heaven, gathered on this mountain Hermon, at its peak” (*angeli concupiscentes filias hominum, cum de caelo descenderent, in hunc montem Hermon maxime excelsum conuenerint*). He also knows that the name means “*anathema*” but gives no details as to why, and he adds that in the present day Gentiles venerate the mountain with profane religion and thus attest the meaning of its name, that is, their worship is *anathema*. The passage is striking because, different from all other Christian writers mentioned above, Hilary mentions the association of the watchers story with the peak of Mount Hermon.

6.3.2.19. Epiphanius

George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (ed. Klaus Baltzer; Hermeneia—a Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001).

Epiphanius of Salamis begins his *Panarion* (375–377 C.E.) with a description of the era of Barbarism (*barbarismos*), the ten generations from Adam to Noah. Having mentioned the name of Jared (1.1.3), “According to the tradition that has come to us, at that time the practice of evil began to occur in the world. It was also there from the beginning through the transgression of Adam and then through the fratricide of Cain. But now in the times of Jared and thereafter, there was sorcery and magic, debauchery and adultery and iniquity” (ὡς δὲ ἡ παράδοσις ἢ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐλθοῦσα, ἐντεῦθεν ἤρξατο ἡ κακομηχανία ἐν κόσμῳ γίνεσθαι... Νῦν δὲ ἐν χρόνοις τοῦ Ἰάρεδ καὶ ἐπέκεινα φαρμακεία καὶ μαγεία, ἀσέλγεια, μοιχεία, τε καὶ ἀδικία). Like *Pseudo-Clementine Homily 8* (see §6.3.4.1), it relates the story of the watchers to the sinful time from Adam onward. The inclusion of these events is important, because Epiphanius has received a “tradition” about them. Although this source is often cited as the *Book of Jubilees* (4:15), the only correspondence with that passage is “in the times of Jared.” A closer correspondence is found in 1 Enoch 6:6 (ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἰάρεδ). Moreover, the list of vices corresponds to 1 Enoch 8:1–2 and has no counterpart in *Jubilees*. It seems best to assume that Epiphanius knew a form of the story of the watchers, which purported to tell of the origin of substantial evil, and he felt compelled to mention the events it narrated as the origin of a new kind of evil in the world. The lack of any ascription of the tradition to Enoch is in keeping with other early Christian sources that are citing common tradition, removed from an Enochic identification.

6.3.2.20. Jerome

Three times Jerome refers to the book of Enoch as “apocryphal.” Twice he does so in connection with its quotation in Jude (*De viris illustribus 4*, 393 C.E.; *Comm. in Ep. ad Tit.* 1.2, ca. 387 C.E.). His third reference, though it does not name the book, is directed toward its contents. In his Homily 45 (*Brev. in Ps.* 132:3, ca. 400 C.E.), he comments on the same verse of [Psalm 133](#) as Hilary (see §6.3.2.18), “We have read in a certain apocryphal book that at the time when the sons of God were descending to the daughters of men, they descended to Mount Hermon and there entered into an agreement to come to the daughters of men and marry them. The book is very explicit and is counted among the Apocrypha. The ancient interpreters have sometimes spoken of it. We mention it, however, not as authoritative, but to call it to your attention.... I have read about this apocryphal book in the book of a certain person, who used it to confirm his heresy.... He says, the sons of God who descended from heaven came to Hermon and coveted the daughters of men. They are angels descending from heaven, he said, and souls that desired bodies, since bodies are the daughters of men” (*Legimus quendam librum apocryphum, eo tempore quo descendebant filii Dei ad filias hominum, descendisse illos in montem Ermon, et ibi inisse pactum, quomodo uenirent ad filias hominum, et sibi eas sociarent. Manifestissimus liber est, et inter apocryphos computatur, et ueteres interpretes de ipso locuti sunt nonnulla: nos autem dicimus, non in auctoritatem, sed in commemorationem. ... Legi in cuiusdam libro, de isto libro apocrypho suam haeresim confirmantis. ... Filii, inquit, Dei, qui de caelis descendebant, et uenerunt in Ermon, et concupierunt filias hominum, angeli, inquit, sunt de caelestibus descendentes, et animae quae desiderauerunt corpora; siquidem corpora filiae hominum sunt*, CCSL 78:280–81). Jerome’s association of the story of the watchers with [Ps 133:2*](#) may well reflect his knowledge of Hilary’s commentary (see §6.3.2.18). But his reference to the angels’ pact, not mentioned by Hilary, derives from his personal knowledge of the book (*legimus*). His comment about a person who supports his heretical idea about the descent of souls by referring to the Enochic text may be an allusion to Origen (see §6.3.2.13). He then goes on to suggest

(rightly) that the similarity between the book he has just condemned and the teaching of the Manichaeans indicates that the latter drew their ideas from the Book of Enoch (see [§6.3.4.3](#)).

6.3.2.21. Rufinus

In his commentary on the Apostles Creed [15](#) (400 C.E.), Rufinus notes that “when God made the world in the beginning, he set over it and appointed certain powers of celestial virtues, by whom the race of mortal men might be governed and directed [quotation of [Deut 32:8*](#)]. . . . But some of these, as he who is called the prince of this world, did not exercise the power which God had committed to them according to the laws by which they had received it, nor did they teach humanity to obey God’s commandments, but taught them rather to follow their own perverse guidance. Thus we were brought under the bonds of sin” (translation of *NPNF* vol. [3](#)) (*Ab initio Deus cum fecisset mundum, praefecit ei et praeposuit quasdam virtutum caelestium potestates, quibus regeretur et dispensaretur mortalium genus. . . . Sed et horum nonnulli, sicut et ipse qui princeps appellatus est mundi, datam sibi a Deo potestatem, non his quibus acceperant legibus temperarunt: ne humanum genus divinis obedire praeceptis, sed suis parere praevaricationibus docuerunt; et hinc adversus nos peccatorum chirographa scripta sunt*). Although the passage cites Deuteronomy and refers to “the prince of this world” (i.e., Satan), Rufinus also indicates knowledge of the version of the story of the watchers that describes their initial commission and their illegitimate teaching, though it is uncertain whether he knew its Enochic provenance.

6.3.2.22. Augustine of Hippo

In his *De civitate Dei* (ca. 420 C.E.), Augustine twice emphasizes the apocryphal character of the Book of Enoch (15.23; 18.38). The first reference follows a long discussion of [Gen 6:1–4*](#) in which he argues against the notion that “the sons of God” were angels. He knows that this viewpoint is expressed in writings ascribed to Enoch. That there were genuine, divinely inspired Enochic writings is proven from the statement in the Epistle of Jude. They are not accepted as canonical, however, because the people in antiquity who could have attested them as such did not do so.

Augustine’s second reference to the writings of Enoch occurs in a section on prophecy. Again he refers to Jude, but argues that the lack of attestation of these ancient writings is good reason to doubt their authenticity and not to accept their authority. They are passed around only by people who use them to support whatever they wish. Whether Augustine had firsthand knowledge of 1 Enoch, or any part of it, is doubtful, since he accepts the authenticity of the part of chap. [1](#) quoted in Jude but rejects the veracity of the story of the watchers, which follows right after the prologue. In any case, his rejection of the writings is tied to his rejection of material contained in them.

6.3.2.23. The Chronographers

At the same time that the Enochic writings were losing favor among the orthodox theologians of the West, sections of the Book of the Watchers were preserved in the tradition of Christian chronography that continued for many centuries in the Byzantine and early medieval periods. Pandorus and Annianus of Alexandria wrote separate chronographies during the reign of the bishop Theophilus (388–416 C.E.). Both employed the material from the stories of the watchers to supplement the history and chronology of

Genesis with a view toward showing divine purpose and order in history and with an eye toward eschatological speculation.

In his chronography, written in Constantinople at the beginning of the ninth century, George Syncellus transmitted and redacted the Enochic extracts of Pandorus. While finding this material useful for his chronographic purposes, he warned his readers that it contained “fabulous material” and material opposed to ecclesiastical tradition, which had been “corrupted by Jews and heretics.” The theological judgments of people like Jerome and Augustine was clearly at work. For Syncellus and others of his colleagues, the story of the watchers was not about angels but about the sons of Seth mating with the daughters of Cain. Other Byzantine chronographers, however, harking back to third-century sources and interpretations known to Julius Africanus (see [§6.3.2.14](#)), interpreted the story of the watchers to refer to angels, who bred evil spirits and introduced magic.

The use of Enochic materials for chronographic purposes appears again in the twelfth-century chronicles of George Cedrenus, who uses material from Syncellus, and of Michael of Syria, who cites Annianus as his source (above [§2.5](#)).