

RBL 02/2010



Stuckenbruck, Loren T.

1 Enoch 91-108

Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature

Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007. Pp. xiv + 855. Hardcover.
\$189.00. ISBN 9783110191196.

Archie T. Wright
Regent University
Virginia Beach, Virginia

1 Enoch 91-108 continues the high standard of scholarship previously produced in the Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature series edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck et al. The present volume will greatly assist the growing number of scholars and students who are interested in the all-important Enochic traditions. This particular volume of 1 Enoch material offers the reader a well-informed view of the adoption of the Enoch traditions and how the authors were using this material to explain various developments in Jewish theology and worldview during the tumultuous Second Temple period.

The volume is divided into six chapters. In chapter 1 (introduction, 1-48), Stuckenbruck offers his methodology for examining the closing chapters of 1 Enoch. He suggests that these seventeen chapters should be treated “as five independent literary units,” a sound approach to this eclectic collection of chapters. He divides the material in the following fashion: Apocalypse of Weeks (93:1-10; 91:11-17); Exhortation (91:1-10, 18-19); Epistle (92:1-5; 93:11-14; 94:1-105:2); Birth of Noah (106:1-107:3); and Eschatological Admonition (108:1-15). He goes on to argue that these writings contain some of “the earliest strands of the Enochic tradition,” which are represented in the Book of Watchers (1:1-36:4) and the Astronomical Book (esp. 72:1-80:8; 82:4-20). Dating the material

generally to the second century B.C.E., Stuckenbruck suggests it was “edited into a collection of revelatory disclosures made by Enoch to his son Methuselah.” In addition, he argues that chapter 108 was added to the existing material in the late first century C.E. The remainder of the introduction offers a brief overview of each of the five sections, which are discussed thoroughly in the five chapters of commentary that follow; Stuckenbruck’s reconstruction of the transmission of the Enochic material to its present form; and a discussion of the Ethiopic manuscripts that preserve these chapters. The introduction closes with a list of works cited for the entire volume. In particular, Stuckenbruck’s discussion of the stages of literary growth of 1 En. 91–108 offers a thorough discussion of the development of this complex collection of traditions. Stuckenbruck’s discussion of the Ethiopic version of 1 En. 91–108 witnesses to his ongoing meticulous work as a text scholar. He has left no stone unturned in examining all the manuscripts available that play a part in the discussion of these chapters.

The second chapter begins the tedious work of a very well researched commentary on the five sections represented in the work. Chapter 2, “Apocalypse of Weeks (93:1–10; 91:11–17),” consists of an introduction (49–64) and the commentary section (65–152). The introduction consists of a discussion of the “text traditions” of the Apocalypse of Weeks, including the Ethiopic, Aramaic, and Coptic. Within this discussion Stuckenbruck offers the manuscript evidence that may explain the disjointedness of the Apocalypse of Weeks. As such, he argues that the Apocalypse of Weeks was “originally an independent work composed by an author who was not the author of any other parts of 1 Enoch.” However, he suggests that the Apocalypse of Weeks was not preserved as a freestanding piece in either the Ethiopic or Aramaic copies but was transmitted within the context of the larger 1 En. 91–105 during the late second century B.C.E. The second section of the Apocalypse of Weeks introduction discusses the central nature of the “Division of Time” in the Apocalypse. Key to the section is the author’s interest in the numbers ten and seven. There are ten periods in history, with each period labeled as a “week.” The third introductory section includes an outline of the “Weeks” and a description of the content. The fourth section discusses the date of the text. Stuckenbruck argues against Milik’s proposal that the document dates from the early first century B.C.E., while proposing that the document dates from the early second century B.C.E. based upon the author’s allusion to the Book of Watchers and also the allusion in Jub. 4:18 to the Apocalypse of Weeks. The final section of the introduction discusses the authorship of the text and also its relationship to the Epistle of Enoch and Exhortation. The commentary portion of the chapter offers a verse-by-verse discussion that covers the various extant language versions and linguistic and text-critical notes and provides in-depth comments on the content. The insightfulness of this work is astonishing and will offer those scholars examining the document a wealth of information and commentary for decades to come.

Chapter 3, “Exhortation (91:1–10, 18–19),” consists of an introduction (153–56) and a commentary (157–84). The first section covers the Ethiopic and Aramaic text traditions. Stuckenbruck notes that the Exhortation is interrupted in the Ethiopic tradition by the inclusion of the concluding portion of the Apocalypse of Weeks. However, the Aramaic evidence reveals that the Exhortation was not interrupted by the Apocalypse of Weeks, as in the Ethiopic version. In addition, the Aramaic preserves a longer text in several places than what is extant in the Ethiopic tradition. The second section includes a “Literary Analysis” of the work that discusses the text’s relationship to Apocalypse of Weeks and Epistle. Also included is a subsection that discusses the ideological and terminological links with other 1 Enoch works. Stuckenbruck offers a brief discussion on the Exhortation as an independent tradition and also on the dating, which he argues is likely during the “second half of the 2nd century BCE.” As before, the commentary section follows and offers a verse-by-verse discussion and a comprehensive collection of comments related to each of the significant verses.

Chapter 4, “The Epistle of Enoch (92:1–5; 93:11–14; 94:1–105:2),” consists of an introduction (185–216) and a commentary (217–605). This is by far the longest section of the volume, covering nearly four times the space as the second-longest section, Apocalypse of Weeks. The first section of the introduction offers a discussion of the Ethiopic, Greek, and Aramaic text traditions. In the second section, “Introduction to the *Epistle*,” Stuckenbruck states that the title of this work is uncertain. The current title, Epistle of Enoch, emerges from the Chester Beatty-Michigan Papyrus, which identifies the document in several places as an “epistle.” A subsection of this introductory portion includes a thorough outline of the text. A second subsection offers a “Literary Analysis” of the text, which discusses the “Different Origin of the Frame and Body,” “Recurring Forms,” “Woe-Oracles,” “Oath-Formula,” “Disclosure Formulae,” “Instruction on the Two Ways,” “Imputed Speech,” and “Makarism.” A third subsection discusses the “Use of Intertextuality with Formative Traditions.” The third section of the introduction offers a detailed discussion of the date and social setting of the text, in which Stuckenbruck offers a date of early second century B.C.E. based on the allusion to the Epistle in Jubilees. A fourth section discusses the author and community of the text. As with the previous chapters, a commentary section follows. The manuscript detail that is offered in this particular chapter suggests a remarkable diligence on the part of Stuckenbruck, who has painstakingly examined the manuscripts and noted each variant for each significant verse. He is certainly to be commended for spending the many years it took to bring this volume to fruition.

Chapter 5, “Birth of Noah (106:1–107:3),” consists of an introduction (606–16) and a commentary (617–89). This portion of 1 Enoch is one of the more complex traditions of the material. Stuckenbruck argues that the Birth of Noah was “an originally independent tradition” that was integrated into Ethiopic 1 Enoch. It also appears at the conclusion of the Chester Beatty-Michigan Papyrus as part of the Epistle. It is also found in the Aramaic manuscript 4QEnoch^c 5 i a, in which it is separated from the Epistle. It is possible the author of the Book of Watchers was aware of this story and integrated the birth of Noah tradition at 10:1–3. It is clear, as noted by Stuckenbruck, that the author of Birth of Noah was aware of the Watcher tradition from the Book of Watchers by revealing the fear of Lamech that Noah was the child of one of the fallen Watchers. However, Stuckenbruck contends that Birth of Noah was “originally an independent work and not entirely at home in the Enoch tradition”; this, he argues, is apparent from the editorial attempts to draw in themes from previous Enochic traditions (106:19–107:1). His point would be helped had he perhaps offered a version of the story that excluded the other Enochic traditions and perhaps suggested some other reason for the story, perhaps one that supported Noah’s righteousness and thus legitimized God choosing him for survival on the ark. The second section of the introduction offers a summary of the story and its significance, that is, the importance of Noah as a symbol of the righteous who will be rescued in the eschaton. The third section offers a discussion of Birth of Noah in the context of Enochic and other early Jewish traditions. The figure of Noah is referred to in the Book of Watchers 10:1–3 as the “son of Lamech.” Noah figures prominently along with Enoch in the Book of Giants. In addition, he is incorporated into the Animal Apocalypse, in which he is identified in a revelation given to Enoch concerning the fallen angels and giants (1 En. 86:1–88:3). The figure of Noah is also referred to in the Similitudes, the Book of Dreams, and, as mentioned, the Animal Apocalypse. These references all place Noah in the midst of the flood narrative or the story of the fallen Watchers. Stuckenbruck goes on to list the various other early Jewish texts that mention Noah: Genesis Apocryphon, Jubilees, and the Aramaic Levi Document. The fourth section of the introduction discusses the Ethiopic, Aramaic, Greek, and Latin text traditions of Birth of Noah. The introduction closes with a brief discussion of the dating of Birth of Noah. For Stuckenbruck, “it is necessary to distinguish between the original tradition and its shape when it was integrated into the Enochic corpus.” He offers a *terminus ante quem* of the last third of the first century B.C.E. for the inclusion of chapters 106–107 into the Enoch writings, while a *terminus ab quo* is established as the middle of the second century B.C.E. As with the previous chapters, a commentary section follows the introduction.

The closing chapter of the volume, chapter 6, “Eschatological Admonition (108:1–15),” consists of an introduction (690–94) and a commentary (695–743). The introduction to the Eschatological Admonition opens with a summary of the work, which notes the

somewhat carefree title of “another book which Enoch wrote.” The text is addressed to Enoch’s son Methuselah and to the righteous who will follow him. The text offers an exhortation to the righteous who will find themselves under persecution (108:7–8, 10) but are told to wait till the eschaton, when the wicked shall be destroyed and they shall be rescued. The second section of the introduction describes the structure of chapter 108 in a brief outline form. In the third section’s discussion of the textual traditions, Stuckenbruck reminds the reader that this chapter is extant only in the Ethiopic tradition (similar to the *Similitudes*). However, it is suggested that the Ethiopic is derived “from a Greek *Vorlage* which, in turn, reflects Jewish ideas current in the Second Temple period.” However, Stuckenbruck does not push the idea that there was a Semitic original to this chapter. The fourth section of the introduction discusses the Eschatological Admonition’s relationship to Enochic and other early Jewish traditions. Most notable is the theme of the punishment of the wicked in the eschaton and their final destruction—similar to that noted in *Book of Watchers* 17:1–22:14. Stuckenbruck describes four other points that stand out in the relationship to other Enochic texts: (1) Methuselah’s role in the revelation between Enoch and his descendants; (2) the obedience to the law (108:1); (3) the piety of the righteous; and (4) the righteous are said to shine as they do in the *Epistle*. The final section of the introduction discusses the dating of Eschatological Admonition, in which Stuckenbruck suggests a date “toward the mid- to latter part of the 1st century [C.E].” As with the previous chapters, a commentary” section then offers a verse-by-verse discussion that covers the various extant language versions, linguistic and text-critical notes, and in-depth comments on the noteworthy verses of the section.

The volume closes with three indices: an index of references, which includes the Hebrew and Greek Jewish Scriptures, Deuterocanonical Writings, New Testament, Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Dead Sea Scrolls and related texts, ancient inscriptions, Apostolic fathers, New Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, rabbinic literature, classical and ancient Christian writers and works, and other texts; an index of names and subjects; and an index of authors.

Stuckenbruck’s *1 Enoch 91–108* is a well-constructed and extremely detailed scholarly work. He has attempted to discuss the many complex issues found in the text, language, and interpretation of a portion of one of the key documents of the Second Temple period, *1 Enoch*. It is clear he has spent an extraordinary amount of time poring over the extant documents and fragments that are identified as part of these five sections of *1 Enoch*. There are a few minor errata throughout that may be expected in a commentary of this length. Stuckenbruck has produced a volume that deserves the full attention of scholars (and, with some hesitation due to its complexity, also laypersons) studying early Jewish literature and in particular *1 Enoch*.