

[129] NOAH AS ESCHATOLOGICAL MEDIATOR TRANSPOSED:
FROM 2 ENOCH 71–72 TO THE CHRISTOLOGICAL ECHOES
OF 1 ENOCH 106:3 IN THE QUR'ĀN

CARLOS A. SEGOVIA, *Universidad Camilo José Cela, Spain*

Introduction. Mediatorial figures in Second Temple Judaism

Second Temple Judaism knew a vast range of mediatorial figures whose attributes and functions differed from one context to the other.¹ Yet within the apocalyptic tradition we find these figures both expanded and enriched. A series of eschatological mediators—be they angels, humans, or imprecise, mixed figures—come to announce the divine judgment and the final renewal of the world, and hence take part in a cosmic drama that is no longer confined to—though it is of course *a contrario* deduced from—the limits of a purely accumulative history.

In apocalyptic literature eschatological mediators may be commissioned either to instruct a human figure, to imprison the rebellious angels and destroy their progeny, or, finally, to renovate the earth (so Sariel, Raphael, Michael and Gabriel in 1 En 10, respectively). They may be alternatively depicted, however, as those who communicate the events of the eschaton to the righteous (so Enoch in most parts of 1 Enoch² and Abraham in the Apocalypse that bears his name). Furthermore, a single eschatological mediator may be introduced as he who shall gloriously arise in the end time, vindicate the righteous, sit upon God's throne to preside the divine judgment, and disclose all the secrets of wisdom (so the Chosen One, who as is widely known receives other various names and attributes, in 1 En 46; 48–51; 61–62); or—to mention another outstanding example and as we shall see—as he who will cleanse the earth of evil and whose seed shall endure beyond destruction. Obviously, this enumeration makes no claim to exhaustivity. Yet it points to the complex framework of apocalyptic imagery.

These figures are, on the other hand, deeply interrelated. A certain figure may be simply modelled upon another one whose specific characters it readapts, whereas other figures develop some features not included in any previous model.³ A twofold hybrid procedure can be also documented: [130] adoption

[129] ¹ See e.g. Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet: Religious and Intellectual Leadership in Ancient Israel* (Louisville, KY/London: Westminster John Knox, 1995).

² On whose plausible testamentary character see George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 21–26, 335–37. See for discussion Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 14–16.

³ Cf. Robert Henry Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or Little Genesis* (London: SPCK, 1902) 35; Dorothy M. Peters, *Noah Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conversations and Controversies of [130] Antiquity*, Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 26 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 9.

(reinterpretation) and innovation (which can sometimes depend on a former reinterpretation) may well converge at times. Be that as it may, we must deal quite often with either explicit or implicit transpositions—a term which I propose here to understand according to its musical meaning: a very same motif can be transposed to a different key and thus produce its analogon. The following pages aim chiefly at examining some recurring traces of the Noah story within this fascinating *ars variationis*, both during the Second Temple period and thereafter.⁴

The Noah story in 1 Enoch, 1QapGen, 4Q534–36, and 1Q19–19bis

The Birth of Noah (1 Enoch 106–107). 1 En 106–107 recounts (a) the miraculous birth of Noah (106:1-3), (b) Lamech’s surprise and *méfiance* towards him (106:4a), (c) the latter’s appeal to Methuselah begging him to ask Enoch about the newborn child (106:4b-7), (d) Methuselah’s speech to Enoch (106:8-12), and both (e) Enoch’s answer to Methuselah—through which we learn that Noah will be righteous and blameless, that he will temporarily withdraw all iniquity from the earth and be Lamech’s remnant, and that accordingly he and his sons will be saved from the flood (106:13–107.2)—and (f) Methuselah’s consequent answer to Lamech (107:3c); to which (g) a brief explanation of Noah’s name is appended (107:3d). Noah’s astonishing qualities (106:2-3) are most remarkable:⁵ “(106:2b) His body was whiter than snow and redder than a rose, (106:2c) his hair was all white and like white wool and curly. (106:2d) Glorious <was his face>. (106:2e) When he opened his eyes, the house shone like the sun. (106:3a) And he stood up from the hands of the midwife, (106:3b) and he opened his mouth and praised the Lord <of eternity>” (cf. 106:10c-11). We shall find again some of these prominent traits—by means of which Noah is outlined as an eschatological mediator⁶—ascribed to other figures. The idea that the end [131] time will somehow resemble the flood—which is described as “the first end” in 93:4c (cf. Luke 17:26)—has encouraged certain transpositions of the Noah story, from which the Enochic tradition possibly developed itself as such (see below the comments on 1QapGen, 4Q534–36, and 1Q19–19bis) and of which 1 Enoch still offers other various accounts.

The Book of Watchers (1 Enoch 10:1-3). The first of these is found in the Book of Watchers. In 1 En 10:1-3 Sariel reveals to Noah that the earth is about to perish so that he may preserve himself alive and escape from the deluge. We then read that “from him a plant will be planted, and [that] his seed will endure for all the generations of eternity” (10:3), which closely parallels Abraham’s description in 93:5b-c.

The Similitudes of Enoch (1 Enoch 60:1-10, 23-25; 65:1–69:1). In 1 En 65:9, 6-8, 10-12 it is Enoch who instructs Noah after being solicited by the latter (65:2, 4-5, 3) prior to the imminent destruction of the earth (65:1). Noah is introduced in 65:11c as pure and blameless and his name is included amidst the holy ones (65:2a). We are also told that he will be preserved amongst those who dwell on the earth (65:12b), and that a fountain of the righteous and the holy will flow from his progeny (65:12d-e). Vv 1-3

⁴ Those writings which merely follow or comment on the Biblical narrative of the flood will not be mentioned in what follows. I would wish to thank Andreas Bedenbender, J. Harold Ellens, Emmanouela Grypeou, Basile Lourié, Pierluigi Piovanelli, and most especially Daniel Assefa, on the other hand, for their insights and critical comments upon the first draft of this paper.

⁵ I give henceforth Nickelsburg’s and VanderKam’s reading and translation of 1 Enoch; see George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. Vanderkam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004). The Ethiopic, Greek and Latin versions present several textual variants (Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 536–37; Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, 622–25) which, for the most part, are not relevant for our purpose. This notwithstanding, the Eth. text of 1 En 106.3b (ወተናገረ፡ ለእግዚአብሔር፡ ድጋቅ፡ *wa-tanāgara la-’əgzā’a šədq* [“and spoke to/with the Lord of righteousness”]) should be taken into account in light of what will be further below said about Qur’ān 3:46

⁶ Of a quasi-divine origin, one should add, albeit Noah is depicted as only human: cf. 1 En 106:4-7, 10-12 (i.e. Lamech’s doubts about his son’s nature); 106:16-18; 107:2 (i.e. Enoch’s [131] answer to Methuselah); 14:20 (where the Glory of God is described as “whiter than much snow”); and 46:1 (where God’s own head is said to be “like white wool”). Cf. also Dan 7:9.

of ch. 67 offer a shorter and slightly different version of Noah's blessing in the form of a divine oracle. Noah's vision of the flood follows in vv 67:4–69:1; cf. Enoch's vision of the flood and the final judgment in 60:23, 1-10, 24-25.

The Book of Dreams (1 Enoch 83–84; 89:1-8). In the first dream vision Enoch narrates to Methuselah his dialogue with his grandfather Mahalalel and his vision of the flood (83), which leads him to pray God (84). The Animal Apocalypse draws too on the Noah story (vv 89:1-8); Noah is now said to be born a bull (i.e. a man) who later became a man (a heavenly being?)⁷ by means of an angelic instruction (89:1a-b; cf. 70:1-2; 71:14; 2 En 21:2–22:10).

The Epistle of Enoch (1 Enoch 93:4-5, 8). As noted above 1 En 93:4 refers to the flood as a “first end” (93:4c); cf. additionally 93:4d and 93:8d. The plant symbol formerly applied to Noah is transposed in 93:5b to Abraham.

The Genesis Apocryphon and other Dead Sea Scrolls presumably related to the Apocalypse of Noah (1QapGen, 4Q534–36, and 1Q19–19bis). 1QapGen 1–5:25 parallels 1 En 106–107. A reference to “the Book of the Words of Noah” (v, 29) is then made to introduce the second major part of the scroll (up to cols. 17/18), in which Noah summarizes his life and relates a series of visions concerning the fault of the rebellious angels and [132] his mission before dividing the earth amongst his sons; the symbolism of the righteous plant is used in the extant fragments of cols. 13–15. The claim that 1QapGen cols. 1–5 or 5–17/18 and 1 En 106–107 could draw on a previous Book—or, as labelled by Robert Henry Charles,⁸ Apocalypse—of Noah, which Florentino García Martínez identified in 1981 with 4Q534⁹ and has frequently been posited since August Dillmann¹⁰ as the point of departure of some of the earliest Enochic writings (namely 1 En 6–11),¹¹ is disputed—as is the relationship between 4Q534–36 and 1Q19–19bis.¹² If such dependence were confirmed, however, one would be somewhat compelled to consider the Noah story as the eldest explicit apocalyptic-like mediatorial motif in Second Temple literature.

Excursus A. A brief re-examination of the differences between the Noah traditions, Noah's role in 1 Enoch, and the Apocalypse of Noah

As Darrell Hannah writes regarding 1 En 37–71, “[s]cholars who accept that portions of a ‘Book of Noah’ have been either interpolated into the text of the Parables or have served as source material for the original composition of the Parables include both earlier commentators such as August Dillmann,¹³ Heinrich Ewald,¹⁴ Robert Henry Charles,¹⁵

⁷ See Paul A. Porter, *Metaphors and Monsters: A Literary-Critical Study of Daniel 7 and 8*, Coniectanea Biblica: Old Testament 20 (Lund: Gleerup, 1983), 53; Patrick A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*, Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 4 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993) 259, 295–96; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 375.

[132] ⁸ Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1893) 14, 19, 25, 33, 61, 71, 86, 106, 146.

⁹ Florentino García Martínez, “4QMes ar. y el Libro de Noé,” *Salmanticensis* 28 (1981): 195–232; idem, “4QMess Ar and the Book of Noah,” in idem, *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 9; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 1992), 1–44; idem, “Interpretations of the Flood in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Interpretations of the Flood*, ed. F. García Martínez, and G. P. Luttikhuisen, Themes in Biblical Narrative 1 (Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 1999), 94–95.

¹⁰ August Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch übersetzt und erklärt* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1853).

¹¹ See e.g. Józef T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 55; Paolo Sacchi, *L'apocalittica giudaica e la sua storia*, Biblioteca di Cultura Religiosa (Brescia: Paideia, 1990) 101, 103, 108, 110, 156–57, 210, 242, 266, 273

¹² See Wayne Baxter, “Noachic Traditions and the *Book of Noah*,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 15.3 (2006): 179–94.

¹³ Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, xxxviii–xliv; idem, “Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments: Die Henoch- und Noah-Schriften,” in *Real-Encyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, ed. J. J. Herzog (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1883, 2nd ed.) 12.350–52.

¹⁴ Heinrich Ewald, “Abhandlung über des äthiopischen Buches Henoch: Entstehung, Sinn und Zusammenstzung,” *Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zum Göttingen* 6 (1854): 107–78.

¹⁵ Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, xlvi–lvi.

and François Martin,¹⁶ and more recent scholars as Albert-Marie Denis,¹⁷ George Nickelsburg,¹⁸ Ephraim [133] Isaac,¹⁹ Siegbert Uhlig,²⁰ Matthew Black,²¹ Florentino García Martínez,²² and John Collins.²³ Thus, he adds, ‘the existence of material from a Noah apocryphon within the text of the Parables continues to be widely recognized today, and probably represents the majority view.’²⁴

This statement can be also applied to other sections of the Enochic corpus, 1 En 106–107 amongst them. Yet the idea that 1 Enoch could draw upon a previous Book or Apocalypse of Noah has not been undisputed in recent scholarship.²⁵ I shall now attempt to briefly re-examine this subject in light of some of the methodological and conceptual distinctions made by Dorothy Peters in a recent and useful book,²⁶ although I will not assume her conclusion concerning the hypothetical existence of a Book of Noah, which she seems to deny following Devorah Dimant whereas I, on the contrary, regard as quite plausible.

Whilst addressing the problem of the “Noahic” characterization of Enoch in 1 Enoch, Peters proposes to distinguish between (a) the Noah oral and literary traditions that may have influenced the composition of certain parts of 1 Enoch, (b) the role played by Noah in those oral/literary traditions and in the Enochic corpus, and (c) the hypothetical existence of a Book of Noah that could draw upon those very same oral/literary traditions and be moreover considered as the source of a number of Noahic narratives and motifs present in 1 Enoch.

Her conclusions regarding this complex question are as follows: (1) When the Noah narratives present in the earliest strata of 1 Enoch (e.g. in 1 En chs. 6–11) were recontextualized into the final form of the Enochic corpus, some Noahic traits were transferred to Enoch in so far as in the previous oral/literary Noah traditions from where such traits were originally taken by the authors of 1 Enoch Noah did not appear clearly enough as a righteous flood survivor free of the Babylonian characters that presumably presented him as a giant. (2) The late Noahic narratives in 1 Enoch (e.g. those found in chs. 106–107) were in turn patterned after the Enoch narratives already developed in other earlier parts of the corpus, and Enoch’s traits were thus transferred back to Noah. Peters [134] supports her first conclusion, which seems to me very likely, upon the omission of Noah’s transformation into a heavenly being in 4Q206 and upon her own reading of the original Noah traditions—provided they once existed—against the background of the giant flood narratives found in 6Q8 and other related documents such as the Midrash of Shemhazai and ‘Aza’el studied by Loren T. Stuckenbruck and John C. Reeves, whose interpretations she basically follows.²⁷ Regarding the existence of a Book or Apocalypse of Noah, however, she sides with Dimant, according to whom such hypothetical book, if it ever existed, would have been written—judging from its alleged quotations in 1 En 6–11—in “third person style and not, as one would expect of a *Book of Noah* or an *Apocalypse of Noah*, in an

¹⁶ François Martin, *Le Livre d’Hénoch: Documents pour l’étude de la Bible, traduit sur le texte éthiopien* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1906), lxii–lxxxviii.

¹⁷ Albert-Marie Denis, “Le Livre grec d’Hénoch (éthiopien),” in idem, *Introduction aux pseudepigraphiques grecs de l’Ancien Testament*, *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* 1 (Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 1970) 17.

¹⁸ Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (Philadelphia/London: Fortress Press/SCM, 1981), 220–21.

[133] ¹⁹ Ephraim Isaac, “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983) 1.38 n. 54e, 40 n. 60a.

²⁰ Siegbert Uhlig, “Das äthiopische Henochbuch,” in *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, ed. H. Lichtenberger, and W. G. Kümmel (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1984) 5.6.578, 599, 618.

²¹ Matthew Black, *The Book of Enoch* 225, 239.

²² See the works referred to in n. 8 above.

²³ John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge: W. B. Eerdmans, 1998, 2nd ed.) 180.

²⁴ Darrell D. Hannah, “The Book of Noah, the Death of Herod the Great, and the Date of the Parables of Enoch,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, ed. G. Boccaccini (Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge: W. B. Eerdmans, 2007) 469–77 (quotation on pages 472–73).

²⁵ See e.g. Devorah Dimant, “Two ‘Scientific’ Fictions: The So-Called Book of Noah and the Alleged Quotation of Jubilees in CD 16:3-4,” in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran and the Septuagint Presented to Eugen Ulrich*, ed. P. W. Flint, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam, *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 101 (Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2006), 230–49.

²⁶ Peters, *Noah Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 29–61.

[134] ²⁷ See John C. Reeves, “Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993): 110–15; Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translations and Commentary* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997); idem, “The Origins of Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Interpretation of Gen 6:1-4 in the Second and Third Centuries B.C.E.,” in *The Fall of the Angels*, ed. Ch. Auffarth, and L. T. Stuckenbruck (Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2004), 87–118.

autobiographic style.”²⁸ Thus Peters considers unlikely that 1 En 106–107 could draw on a previous Noah apocryphon inasmuch as the latter must be considered, in all probability, as a fictitious book, and draws from this her second conclusion.

With all due respect, this negative argument on the Apocalypse of Noah, and *a fortiori* Peters’ second conclusion, are far from being convincing. To put it briefly, the style of the Noahic fragments in 1 En 6–11 need not be the style of its textual source. In other words, the incorporation of certain materials taken from one text into another one may be done quite freely. The third person style narrative characteristic of 1 En 6–11 tells us nothing about the style of the Book of Noah; it only tells us something—which is altogether different—about the style of 1 En 6–11. In rigour, neither the existence nor the non-existence of a hypothetical Book of Noah can be deduced from such formal comparison.

As Michael Stone reminds us, “the burden of the proof falls [indeed] on those scholars who would deny the authenticity of the Book of Noah titles and sections *a priori* and not on those who would assert it.”²⁹ It seems well within the evidence to conclude, therefore, that an Apocalypse of Noah could have existed after all, i.e. regardless of the distinctions that ought be made between such hypothetical book, the Noah traditions included in it and in other various texts like 1 En 106–107, and the role played by Noah in each of them.

It should be also noted, in addition, that if an Apocalypse of Noah or at least certain parts of it are either preserved or implicitly referred to in 1Q19–19bis and 4Q534–36—as García Martínez has persuasively argued—this would not only force us to see in 1 En 10:1–3; 60:1–10, 23–25; 65:1–69:1; 83–84; 89:1–8; 93:4–5, 8; 106–107, on the one hand, and in 1QapGen 1–17/18, on the other hand, more or less clear reminiscences of and/or direct borrowings from that book: it would also contribute to place it—given the references to the “Chosen One of God” who is also said to be “Light to the nations,” and his [135] opponents, contained in 4Q534 1 1:9–10—within the broader history of reciprocal relations existing between Jewish apocalyptic literature and the Isaianic corpus.³⁰ Judging from this and from what will be said in the next section, the import of the Noah apocalyptic tradition can hardly be dismissed in spite of its unclear origins, nuanced transmission and fragmentary witnesses.

The Noah story transposed, from 2 Enoch to the Qur’ān

Excursus B. The Noah/Melchizedek story in 2 Enoch and the Fifth Enoch Seminar: Some preliminary observations

Due to the many doubts set forth in past and present scholarship about its precise nature, I have always regarded 2 Enoch a rather enigmatic work. During the Fifth Enoch Seminar we thoroughly discussed its provenance, textual witnesses, date of composition, contents and context, and it would be unfair to say that I personally have not learned a good deal on these matters. But I departed from Naples with the very same sceptical impressions I carried with me at my arrival.

Is 2 Enoch to be considered a Jewish text—and if so, is it to be regarded as pre- or post-70? In either case, which is its place in relation to the earlier Enochic tradition and to the later Merkabah mysticism? Is 2 Enoch, on the contrary, to be regarded as a Christian work—and if so, where, when, and by whom was it written? Is it rather to be considered—as provocatively suggested by Lawrence Shiffman in the concluding session—as neither Jewish nor Christian—but if so, where does it belong? I doubt whether the possibility that 2 Enoch might be both a Jewish and a Christian work—i.e. a Jewish one with Christian interpolations—, or perhaps something else not so easily definable, may help us to ascertain its nature. In the end we do not know—or at least I have not been able to infer—what kind of work we are looking at and talking about.

All this would not matter so much, however, as far as one could recognize in 2 Enoch different mediatorial traditions. And this is certainly the case. Enoch, Adam and Melchizedek traditions permeate 2 Enoch through and through. This was indeed not only our surest point of departure—as the title of the Seminar wisely consigned: it was

²⁸ Dimant, “Two ‘Scientific’ Fictions,” 234.

²⁹ Michael E. Stone, “The Book(s) Attributed to Noah,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 13 (2006): 4–23 (quotation on page 17).

[135] ³⁰ On which see Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, 26; Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979, 2nd ed.); Blenkinsopp, *Opening the Sealed Book: Interpretations of the Book of Isaiah in Late Antiquity* (Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge: W. B. Eerdmans, 2006); as well as the cross-references to the Isaianic corpus in Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 582.

also the only topic on which everyone finally agreed and the most relevant one on which the contributions of those scholars who work on Second Temple traditions, Christian apocalyptic, and both Slavonic and Coptic literature, had much to say. I must definitely not be counted amongst them: as one who has been working to present on comparative religions and Islamic philosophy, I am but an outsider in most of these fields, though progressively moving towards their study. Yet [136] there was something that puzzled me from the very beginning after reading together 1 En 106–107 (on which I was already working) and 2 En 71–72, and on which I thought it would be worthwhile to discuss. Hence this paper, which was initially conceived as a short paper.

To put it shortly: when asking about the role played by Enoch, Adam and Melchizedek in 2 Enoch, should we not also ask about Noah, i.e. about the Noah tradition(s) underlying the final chapters of 2 Enoch? In fact, just as 1 Enoch ends—if we put aside its lately appended chapter, i.e. 1 En 108—with an account of Noah’s miraculous birth, 2 Enoch—but I am far from being the first one to notice it—ends with an account of Melchizedek’s virginal birth which closely resembles 1 En 106–107. This can hardly be casual.³¹ And it is doubtless most interesting. So that was the first point I wanted to make. If, on the other hand, 2 Enoch is to be dated—as Andrei Orlov proposed—before the destruction of the Jerusalem temple (i.e., if it is to be regarded as a pre-70 work), should we not regard 2 En 71–72 as the first documented, though indirect, occurrence of the Noah story outside 1 Enoch and the Noahic fragments from the mid-Second Temple Period? That was my second point. It goes without saying that the first textual occurrence does not mean the only one. But there again some surprises awaited me, for I found—whilst working on the influence exerted by the Enochic corpus and other apocalyptic writings upon the Muslim scriptures—that at least certain sparks of the Noah story even reached the Qur’ān.

The Noah story knew many different adaptations in Jewish, Christian, and Muslim literature from the 1st to the 8th/9th centuries CE. What follows in this section is an attempt to survey them concisely.³²

2 Enoch 71–72. The story of Melchizedek in 2 En 71–72 is, as I have suggested, modelled upon the Noah story in 1 En 106–107. A fundamental difference is to be observed, however, in the account of Melchizedek’s virginal birth—as well as in his and Nir’s priestly condition. It should be noted too that 2 En 71:18 reproduces more or less verbatim 1 En 106:3b: ‘he [= the new born child] spoke . . . and blessed the Lord.’ Besides, the [137] analogy between the flood and the eschaton—which is already present e.g. in 1 En 93:4-5 and 8-10—is amplified in 2 En 72:6 through the reference there contained to ‘another Melchizedek’ who will be born in the end time.

Apocalypse of Abraham 11:2, Joseph and Aseneth 22:7, and Revelation 1:14. YHWH’s angel and Abraham’s guide to the heavenly realm is described in ApAb 11:2 as having ‘the hair of his head [white] as snow.’ This description is dependent upon Noah’s portrayal in 1 En 106:2a—rather than upon Dan 7:9—in so far as the figure thus depicted is not YHWH himself but an angel. The very same motif occurs again in JosAsen 22:7, where it is used to describe Jacob, i.e. Joseph’s father. We read that ‘his [= Jacob’s] head was snow-white, and the hairs of his head . . . extremely thick,’ a possible allusion to their ‘woolen’ nature (cf. 1 En 106:2a). Likewise Rev 1:14 portrays Christ in the following terms: ‘His hair was as white as snow-white wool, and his eyes flamed like fire’ (REB). The parallelism with 1 En 106:2 (not only 106:2a, but also 106:2b) is even closer in this case.

[136]³¹ On the possible reasons for the transfer of Noah’s traits to Melchizedek see Andrei A. Orlov, “Noah’s Younger Brother Revisited: Anti-Noahic Polemics and the Date of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch,” *Henocho* 26 (2004): 1–15.

³² I am grateful to the works of Joseph A. Fitzmyer (*The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 [1Q20]: A Commentary* [Biblica et Orientalia 18A; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 2004, 3rd ed.] 79), Michael Stone (“The Axis of History at Qumran,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. E. G. Chazon, and M. E. Stone, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 31 [Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 1999], 134–49), George Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch 1*, 540–41, 543; *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005, 2nd ed.] 221, 224), Andrei Orlov (“Noah’s Younger Brother Revisited”), and Loren Stuckenbruck (*1 Enoch 91–108*, 627, 629), who have diversely commented (a) on the similarities between the Noah story in 1 Enoch and 1QapGen, the Melchizedek story in 2 Enoch, and the infancy narratives about Jesus in Matthew, Luke and the Protevangelium of James; and (b) on the Noahic depictions of Jacob, Yahoel and Jesus in Joseph and Aseneth, the Apocalypse of Abraham and the Book of Revelation.

Matthew 1:18-19. Joseph's cautiousness towards Mary's mysterious pregnancy in Matt 1:18-19 runs parallel to—in spite of not being identical with—Lamech's suspicion of his wife in 1QapGen ii (cf. 1 En 106:4a).

Matthew 1:20, Luke 1–2, and Protevangelium of James 19:2. Jesus miraculous and supernatural conception—which contrasts with its denial in the case of Noah in 1 En 106:18b; 107:2—is also reminiscent of the Noah story.

In addition, we find some echoes of the newborn Noah's ability to speak in two writings where such ability is transferred to the newborn Jesus.

Arabic Gospel of the Infancy 1:2, and Qur'ān 3:46; 19:29-30. We read in the former that 'Jesus spoke when he was lying in the cradle and said to his mother: "Verily I am Jesus, the Son of God, the Word [of God], whom thou hast brought forth as Gabriel the angel announced to thee. My father has sent me for the salvation of the world"'. The affinities between the opening sentence and the Noah story in 1 En 106:3 are evident in spite of their differences: Noah stood up (or, according to the Eth. version, was taken) from the hands of the midwife and then praised the Lord (or else spoke to/with the Lord of righteousness); Jesus, in turn, spoke to his mother whilst lying in his cradle. An echo of this very same motif is found too, twice, in the Qur'ān, whose source seems to be the aforementioned Arabic gospel. Cf. Q 3:46 (Arthur John Arberry's translation here and hereinafter).³³ 'He [= Jesus] shall speak to men in the cradle, and of age, and righteous he shall be'; and 19:29-30: 'Mary pointed out to the child then; but they said: "How shall we speak to one who is still in the cradle, a little child?" He said: "Lo, I am God's servant; God has given me the Book, and made me a Prophet"'. The concluding statement in Q 3:46 is especially noteworthy, for its allusion to the righteous (pl.): *ومن الصالحين wa mina-[138]ṣṣāliḥīna*, 'and he will be counted amidst the righteous,' implicitly evokes the Eth. text of 1 En 106:3b, where 'righteousness' (ጸድቅ: *ṣədq*) is attributed to God (see n. 5 above).

Are we to find here a proof of the limited yet significant influence exerted by the Old Testament pseudepigrapha upon the composition of the Quranic text,³⁴ whose style John Wansbrough has insightfully defined as 'referential' by reason of 'its allusive and its elliptical character: allusion to an oral/literary tradition already familiar, and ellipsis in the intermittent and occasionally distorted treatment of that tradition'?'³⁵

Doubtless, and in spite of its study having been hitherto almost neglected,³⁶ some narrative patterns, sentences, phrases, terms, and ideas in 1 Enoch have a more or less strict parallel in the text of the Qur'ān, which draws on the former in a *découpage*-like manner. This seems quite clear if we compare Q 7:36; 10:6; 16:81; 24:41, 44, 46, and 1 En 2–5.³⁷ In my opinion, the following parallelisms—which include

[137] ³³ Arthur John Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted: A Translation*, 2 vols. (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1955).

[138] ³⁴ On which see Saïd Amir Arjomand, "Messianism, Millennialism and Revolution in Early Islamic History," in *Imagining the End: Visions of Apocalypse from the Ancient Middle East to Modern America*, ed. A. Amanat, and M. T. Bernhardtson (London/New York: I. B. Tauris, 2002), 106–25; idem, "Islamic Apocalypticism in the Classical Period," in *The Continuum History of Apocalypticism*, ed. B. McGinn, J. J. Collins, and S. J. Stein (New York/London: Continuum, 2003) 380–413; Geneviève Gobillot, "Apocryphes de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament," in *Dictionnaire du Coran*, ed. M. A. Amir-Moezzi (Paris: R. Lafont, 2007) 57–63.

³⁵ John Wansbrough, *The Sectarian Milieu: Content and Composition of Islamic Salvation History* (New York: Prometheus Books, 2006, 2nd ed.), 24; see also idem, *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation* (New York: Prometheus Books, 2004, 2nd ed.), 1, 40–43, 47–48, 51–52, 57–58.

³⁶ See however Alfred-Louis de Prémare, *Les fondations de l'Islam: Entre écriture et histoire* (Paris: Seuil, 2002), 305 n. 9; idem, *Aux origines du Coran: questions d'hier, approches d'aujourd'hui* (Paris: Téraèdre, 2004) 113 n. 111.

³⁷ A more detailed study on these textual parallels—and on the reception of 1 Enoch within formative Islam, on which see also below, Excursus C—will be found in my article, "Thematic and Structural Affinities between 1 Enoch and the Qur'ān: A Contribution to the Study of the Judaeo-Christian Apocalyptic Setting of the Early Islamic Faith," in *The Coming of the Comforter: Where, When, and to Whom?: Studies on the Rise of Islam in Memory of John Wansbrough*, ed. B. Lourié, C. A. Segovia, and A. Bausi, *Orientalia Judaica Christiana* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press), forthcoming.

both interfragmentary conceptual correspondences and structural concordances between the two corpora—should be highlighted:

Table 1: Intertextual correspondences between 1 Enoch 2–5 and the Qur’ān [139]

	1 Enoch	Qur’ān
A/A’	2:1-2 + 5:1	24:41
B/B’	2:2 + 4:1	24:46
C/C’	2:4 + 5:1 + 5:2	24:44 + 10:6
D/D’	4:1	16:81
E/E’	5:4	7:36

If we put side by side e.g. the parabolic use of natural order in 1 En 2:1-2; 5:1 and Q 24:41 and both the *Scheltwort* and the consecutive *Mahnwort* in 1 En 5:4 and Q 7:36—i.e. certain rhetorical formulae which are common to prophetic and apocalyptic literature—we may obtain the following conceptual, i.e. non-literal, schemes:

Table 2: Conceptual correspondences between 1 Enoch 2:1-2 + 5:1 and Qur’ān 24:41

A	Contemplate			the trees	
A+A’		the heavens	the earth		—they extol God.
A’	Hast thou not seen			the birds?	

Table 3: Conceptual correspondences between 1 Enoch 5:4 and Qur’ān 7:36

E	But you have turned aside		spoken		words		God’s majesty.		you!
E+E’		and		proud		against		There shall be no peace for	
E’	But those that deny God’s signs		Wax				these.—		Them!

The fact that these and other lexical, syntactical, and rhetorical coincidences bear upon a single text, namely 1 Enoch 1–5, proves them to be non-hazardous. Thus the influence of 1 Enoch upon the Qur’ān—which deserves as such a broader detailed study—goes therefore far beyond the non-conclusive yet symptomatic assimilation of the Biblical Enoch and Idrīs, the Quranic prophet ‘raised [by God] high in heaven’ (Q 19:56–57).³⁸ Furthermore, an indirect influence of certain Enochic motifs on the [140] composition of the Quranic text ought not be disregarded—the Noah story may well be illustrative. There is, in rigour, no reasonable way to demonstrate the influence of the Eth. text of 1 Enoch 106:3 upon Qur’ān 3:46; the difference between the two verbal roots—to both of which the idea of ‘righteousness’ is nonetheless inherent—from which the Eth. noun $\text{ḥ}ḥḏ$ *ḥḥḏ* and the pl. Arab. active participle صالحون *ṣāliḥūn*/ṭn derive could easily be objected. Yet one cannot avoid seeing in Q 3:46; 19:29-30 an indirect echo—via the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy—of the Noah story. Probably—together with those studied

[139] ³⁸ Cf. Yoram Erder, “The Origin of the Name Idrīs in the Qur’ān: A Study of the Influence of Qumran Literature on Early Islam,” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 49.4 (1990): 339–50; Arjomand, “Messianism, Millennialism and Revolution in Early Islamic History”; John C. Reeves, “Some Explorations on the Intertwining of Bible and Qur’ān,” in *Bible and Qur’ān: Essays in Scriptural [140] Intertextuality*, ed. J. C. Reeves, Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 24 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 44–52.

by Crispin Fletcher-Louis³⁹ and by Andrei Orlov in his paper on the date of 2 Enoch—one of the latest documented ones.

In sum, we are dealing here with an ongoing tradition the roots of which may well go back to the early Second Temple period, and within which 2 Enoch 71–72 must be doubtless placed, but whose effective history (*Wirkungsgeschichte*) is still not entirely clear to us. In any case, a careful reading of vv 2-3 of the first chapter of the Birth of Noah may shed new light on its continuity and variations. Yet this is not to claim that the many problems we must reckon with can be thus solved in such a simple way. To put it shortly: How did Noah's apocalyptic traits come to be reinterpreted in so many different contexts through so many centuries? Obviously, this and other similar questions are in need of a thorough study. If my paper has contributed to make such necessity a bit more evident my purpose in writing it will have been achieved.

Excursus C. 1 Enoch and the Qur'ān

The very fact that the Qur'ān was composed after the canonical, apocryphal and pseudepigraphic writings in usage in the 'sectarian milieu'—to use Wansbrough's well-known expression—from within which the Islamic faith gradually emerged between the late 7th and the mid-8th century⁴⁰ may explain the inclusion of apocalyptic and Enochic materials of parenetic nature in the Muslim scriptures, although this will not be in evidence as long as Quranic scholars remain refractory to the historio-critical method developed by their colleagues in the Biblical field. Credit goes, however, to Saïd Amir Arjomand, Alfred-Louis de Prémare and Genèvieve Gobillot for calling attention to the influence exerted by certain Old Testament pseudepigrapha upon the composition of the Quranic text. Besides, the study of Eastern Dyophysite, Miaphysite, Byzantine-Orthodox, and Judaeo-Christianity in the 7th-8th centuries, on the one hand, and on the other the study of [141] certain indeterminate monotheistic groups which lived at that time or shortly before in Syria and Mesopotamia, should contribute to clarify the contour lines of the sectarian milieu out of which formative Islam developed and within which the late Arab religion evolved, somewhat marginally, prior to the emergence of Islam—which may be in turn regarded as its corollary.⁴¹

An alternative possibility would be to trace back Muslim knowledge of 1 Enoch to the times of the so-called Muslim migration to Abyssinia in the early 7th century, first reported by Ibn Ishāq—a Muslim historian from the 8th century. Narratives of Islamic origins present the inconvenient of being late-composed and not always reliable. Yet the presence of Ethiopic loanwords in the Qur'ān, which was first studied by Theodor Nöldeke⁴² and Arthur Jeffery⁴³ and has been recently re-examined by Manfred Kropp,⁴⁴ is of much interest here, since it points at the very least to the transmission of certain ideas that could have taken place quite early indeed. Unfortunately, however, this is all we can say with some degree of assurance. Thus it is not possible to give a precise date for the incorporation of Enochic materials into the Qur'ān, in so far as there is no inner evidence in the Qur'ān itself or elsewhere as to when this happened. Besides, one ought to consider whether such materials were orally communicated, textually transmitted to, or simply collected and reworked by, the editors of the Qur'ān, but here again no definitive conclusion can be reached due to the lack of any source information on the subject. In like manner, one cannot a priori decide whether such materials were introduced after the Aramaic text of 1 Enoch or after its Ethiopic translation. As I have argued, a possible connection between the Qur'ān and the Ethiopic text of the Birth of Noah (1 En 106–107) should be taken into account. Yet regarding the Quranic reuse of the Noah/Jesus story its source rather seems to be the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy. Hopefully, further research will help to make this point clear.

³⁹ Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 42 (Leiden/Boston: E.J. Brill, 2002), 49–55.

⁴⁰ See also Yehuda D. Nevo and Judith Koren, *Crossroads to Islam: The Origins of the Arab Religion and the Arab State* (New York: Prometheus Books, 2003), 169–354.

[141] ⁴¹ See on the Arabs Jan Retsö, *The Arabs in Antiquity: Their History from the Assyrians to the Umayyads* (London/New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003).

⁴² Theodor Nöldeke, *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Strasbourg: K. J. Trübner, 1910).

⁴³ Arthur Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'ān* (Baroda: Oriental Society, 1938).

⁴⁴ Manfred Kropp, 'Beyond single words: *Mā'ida—Shaytān—jibt* and *tāghūt*. Mechanisms of transmission into Ethiopic (Gə'əz) Bible and the Qur'ān,' in *The Qur'ān in Its Historical Context*, ed. G. S. Reynolds (London/New York: Routledge, 2008), 204–16.

Postscriptum. A few final remarks in dialogue with Daniel Assefa, Andreas Bedenbender, Harold Ellens, Emanouela Grypeou, Basile Lourié and Pierluigi Piovanelli

My main concern when writing this paper was to briefly examine several adaptations of the Noah story within Second Temple literature—2 Enoch included, provided that it may be regarded as a Second Temple work—, a few early Christian writings, and the Qurʾān.

Needless to say, I have limited my study to those transpositions which I knew of and seemed to me noteworthy for the study of Noah as an [142] eschatological mediator. Some short remarks on the insights and critical comments made by Daniel Assefa, Andreas Bedenbender, Harold Ellens, Emanouela Grypeou, Basile Lourié and Pierluigi Piovanelli upon the first draft of this paper at the Fifth Enoch Seminar may be perhaps suitable to end with and useful to the reader.

Daniel Assefa asked me, first of all, about the methodological terminology set forth in the preliminary section of my paper. Why should we speak of ‘transpositions’—a term I borrowed, as said above, from musical terminology—instead of speaking of adaptations, variants, and so on? In my view, musical terminology presents the advantage of focusing very precisely upon the complex relationships existing between unity and multiplicity, and thus may be profitably applied to the study of ongoing ideas that subsist as such beyond their many possible, and contrasting, adaptations⁴⁵.

Turning now to the third section of my paper—i.e. to the one in which I have analysed those variants—I have corrected (see above the references made in the concluding lines of its last paragraph to the works of Crispin Fletcher-Louis and Andrei Orlov) an impression that misled me when writing its first draft. Prior to our meeting in Naples I erroneously thought that the Quranic passages which I mention there were to be considered as the latest documented occurrences of the Noah story outside the Enochic corpus. Orlov’s paper on the date of 2 Enoch—which draws upon Fletcher-Louis’ previous studies—makes clear enough, however, that other variants existed in several rabbinic texts and in the Zohar, where Noah’s traits are transferred to Moses. And during our group discussion Assefa also pointed out that some other variants can be also found within Ethiopic hagiographic literature.

But apart from this and from other different issues concerning the rhetorical pattern of each adaptation—a subject on which Assefa made some highly valuable comments—we basically discussed about when, where, and how, did early Muslims come to know of the Enoch corpus.

I must add, regarding this latter topic, that Emanouela Grypeou remained sceptical about my tentative reconstruction of the process through which early Muslims could have known of 1 Enoch. I, however, maintained my view, according to which, as noted above (see Excursus C), all we can at present say is that the very fact that the Qurʾān was written after the canonical and apocryphal scriptures in usage in the sectarian milieu from within which the Islamic faith gradually emerged between the late 7th and the mid-8th century may explain the incorporation of apocalyptic and Enochic materials into it. That the Ḥadīth literature must be also investigated in this respect—as Ellens lucidly emphasized during the discussion—is, in my opinion too, unquestionable.

Finally, Andreas Bedenbender, Harold Ellens, Basile Lourié and Pierluigi Piovanelli kindly welcomed this humble contribution of mine, which I offered [143] as a work in progress, and pointed out that it represented a new line of research that deserved to be further explored. I am most grateful to them all, as also to Assefa and Grypeou for their critical remarks; to Gabriele Boccaccini for inviting me to participate in the Fifth Enoch Seminar; to Andrei Orlov for including the paper I submitted in one of its main sessions; and to Olga, my wife, for her everyday support and her generous help.

[142]⁴⁵ See e.g. Henry Corbin, *Spiritual Body and Celestial Earth: From Mazdean Iran to Shīʿite Iran*, Bollingen Series 91.2 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977).

Appendix. Table 4: Noah transposed

The following table summarizes the parallels surveyed in sections 2 and 3 (including those already mentioned by other scholars). My own position concerning the existence of a hypothetical Book or Apocalypse of Noah (see Excursus A above) explains the direction of dependence (>) suggested below for each referred passage.

Noah (a) as he who is instructed by God's angels (1 En 10:1-3; 89:1; so too 4Q536) and (b) as he who is able to read the heavenly books (4Q534);	>	(a) (b) so too Enoch in 1 Enoch.
(c) as the seed/plant of righteousness (1 En 10:3; 1QapGen 13-15) and (d) as he from whose progeny a fountain of the righteous and holly will flow (1 En 65:12);	>	(c) so too Abraham in 1 En 93:5.
(e) as the Chosen One of God (4Q534 [which parallels the Isaianic servant] + somehow too 1 En 10:1-3; 65:9, 6-8, 10-12; 67:1-3; 106-107) who (f) is able to foresee the endtime (1 En 10:1-3; 67:4-69.1) and (g) to instruct mankind (4Q534);	>	(e) so too Enoch in 1, 2, and 3 Enoch; the Chosen One in the Similitudes of Enoch; Melchizedek in 2 Enoch; and Jesus in Luke 23:35. (f) (g) so too Enoch in 1 and 2 Enoch.
(h) as he who is exalted/metamorphosed into a heavenly being (1 En 89:1);	>	(h) so too Enoch in 1 En 70:1-2 and the man who shall ascend in the sixth week in 1 En 93:8, later identified with Jesus/Enoch in 1 En 71:14; 2 En 21:2-22.10; and 3 Enoch 1:4; 3:2; 12:5; 48C:7, 9; 48D:1-3 [see also (l) below].
[144] (i) as he who will be nevertheless rejected [like the Isaianic servant] (4Q534);	>	(i) so too Jesus in Luke 2:25-35 and throughout the NT.
and [once more like the Isaianic servant] (j) as Light to the nations (4Q534) [see also (m) below].	>	(j) so too Jesus in the NT.
(k) He was marvelously born (1 En 106-107; 1 QapGen i-v);	>	(k) so too Melchizedek in 2 En 71-72; Jesus in Matt 1:18-20; Luke 1-2; ProtJas 19:2; and somehow too Moses in PRE 48.
(l) his body was whiter than snow and redder than a rose, his head was all white (read in 4Q534) and like white wool and curly (1 En 106:2; cf. also 1 En 14:20; 46:1; Dan 7:9, where a similar description is made regarding the Glory of God and God's own head, respectively);	>	(l) so too (white as snow-white wool) is Jesus' hair in Rev 1:14; Yahooel's hair (which is said to be [white] as snow) in ApAb 11:2; and Joseph's hair (which is said to be snow-white and extremely thick) in JosAsen 22:7.
(m) glorious was his face; when he opened his eyes, the house shone like the sun (1 En 106:2-3);	>	(m) likewise Jesus' eyes are said to be like fire in Rev 1:14; Cain is also depicted in a similar way in the Lat. text of LAE (21:3); so too is Moses in b. Sotah 12a; Exod R. 1:20; Zohar 2.11b.
(n) and when he stood up/was taken from the hands of the midwife he spoke to/with the Lord of eternity/righteousness (1 En 106:3).	>	(n) likewise Jesus is able to speak to his mother from the cradle in the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy 1:2 and Qur'ān 3:46; 19:29-30; the newborn Noah's ability to speak is also attributed to Melchizedek in 2 En 71 and to Moses in Deut R. 11:10.