Henryk Drawnel

"1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch", George W.E. Nickelsburg, James C. VanderKam, Minneapolis 2012 : [recenzja]

The Biblical Annals 2/1, 363-367

2012

BibAn 2 (2012) 363-367

George W.E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch. Chapters 37-82* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012). Pp. xxx, 617. $ 82. ISBN 978-0-8006-9666-1

DRAWNEL HENRYK SDB

Institute of Biblical Studies, John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
address: Aleje Racławickie 14, 20-950 Lublin, Poland, e-mail: hdrawnel@kul.pl

The second volume of the commentary on *1 Enoch* begun by George Nickelsburg in 2001 covers the *Book of Parables* (*1 En.* 37–71) and the *Book of the Luminaries* (*1 En.* 72–82); the first section has been translated and commented upon by Nickelsburg, while the second one is the work of James VanderKam. The book is the result of many years of research by these two scholars of the Enochic tradition. It is therefore not surprising that the quality of this volume is high and the comments reflect opinions that result from a close acquaintance with the Ethiopic text. Both scholars divide their respective parts of the book into two main sections: Introduction (pp. 3-84; 333-407) and Commentary (pp. 85-332; 409-569). The two Appendices (pp. 570-573; 574) present the proposed equivalents of the Ethiopic terms preserved in Greek, Aramaic, or Hebrew. Finally, a bibliography (pp. 575-594) and indices of the cited passages (595-610) and proper names (610-616) close the book. The reviewer intends to concentrate on the portion of the book written by James VanderKam and discuss some of his opinions in light of the reviewer's own research (*The Aramaic Astronomical Book (4Q208-4Q211) from Qumran: Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

VanderKam distinguishes between the Aramaic fragments of the Enochic astronomy and names them the *Astronomical Book*, while the Ethiopic translation from the Greek is called the *Book of the Luminaries*. In his Introduction (pp. 335-407) he discusses in detail manuscript and textual issues related to Qumran Aramaic manuscripts (4Q208-4Q211), fragments of Greek translation (Pap. Oxyrhynchus XVII 2069) and the fully extant Ethiopic version. He also presents in detail shared content and differences between the Aramaic fragments and the Ethiopic text; the literary analysis of the Aramaic and Ethiopic texts is also kept separate. The introductory

chapter dedicated to the sources of the Enochic astronomy stresses contacts with Babylonian astrological literature and indicates some influences on the Jewish astronomical tradition. The last chapter in the introductory section is dedicated to the influence the *Astronomical Book* and the *Book of the Luminaries* exerted on other parts of *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, Qumran texts, *2 Enoch* and Ethiopic literature. The extensive commentary to single sections and chapters (pp. 409-569) is interrupted by only one excursus dedicated to the most difficult passage, 73:4-8 (pp. 436-439). When discussing the meanderings of the Ethiopic and Aramaic astronomical texts VanderKam often refers to earlier commentators. Among those cited most extensively are August Dillmann, Robert H. Charles, Otto Neugebauer, Józef T. Milik, and Jonathan Ben-Dov.

When presenting my division of 4Q208 and 4Q209 into columns VanderKam (p. 353) makes some small mistakes. In Section I (Moon during the night) of the waxing phase, column C does not reflect the moonset to sunrise lunar invisibility period but only the statement about moonset; in Section I (Moon during the night) of the waning phase, column D does not express the sunset to moonset formula but the sunset to moonrise lunar invisibility period. For a full paradigm of the lunar calculation according to Pattern I and II, see Appendices I and II in my *The Aramaic Astronomical Book (4Q208-4Q211)*, pp. 421-424.

When interpreting 73:4-8 VanderKam (pp. 429-439) follows Neugebauer's division of the text and repeats his claim that these verses describe the first two days of the lunar month: day 30 described in vv. 4-7 denotes the first day of the lunar month, while the description of day 1 is contained in v. 8. He further explains that v. 4 describes the time of first lunar visibility, which occurs on the night of day 30 (p. 431). Unfortunately, he does not accept my interpretation of these verses, which is rooted in a proper understanding of the Aramaic lunar calculation in 4Q208 and 4Q209. In the Aramaic text the beginning of the lunar month is not attested, but some parts of the last day of lunar visibility are preserved; hence the comparison imposes itself. Additionally, the lunar day in the Aramaic calculation begins with sunset and lasts the whole night and the following daytime until sunset; hence it is impossible to claim with Neugebauer and VanderKam that the second day of the lunar month is reduced in the Ethiopic text to verse 8 only. The beginning of the second lunar day is described in 73:7d ("And during that night, at the beginning of its day, at the beginning of the moon's day") and the Ethiopic text is unequivocal in that respect. Thus vv. 7d-8 describe the second day of the lunar month, and the lunar day begins with sunset, as elsewhere in the Aramaic text. While the fraction notation of the Aramaic column B (sunset

to moonset) in v. 7d is omitted, the second part of the night correctly gives the verb ("to be dark") and fraction notation (6.5/7), in accordance with the Aramaic pattern. The second part of the nychthemeron begins in v. 8 with the description of daytime, where the Ethiopic expression "during that day" literally corresponds to the Aramaic text. The fraction notations also correspond to the Aramaic pattern (1/7+6/7 = 1) and correctly preserve the numerical content of columns E (sunrise to moonrise) and H (moonrise to sunset). The only problem is the use of the verb *śaraqa* "to rise," the Aramaic counterpart of which never accompanies the fraction notations in column E; additionally, column F has been omitted.

Thus one has to account for 73:4-7c, the verses that speak about the rising of the moon together with the sun and in the same gate. Since v. 7d-e describes the first part of the lunar nychthemeron, the preceding text must describe the precedent time period, that is daytime of the precedent day, not nighttime, as always happens in Aramaic calculation. The lunar nychthemeron begins with nighttime and end with sunset. Thus vv. 4-7c describe the beginning of the new month (v. 4: "and becomes for you the beginning of the month"), not of the lunar day (v. 7d). It is evident that the description of daytime of the beginning of the month (vv. 4-7c) does not follow the pattern of the division of each daytime into two periods. Column E (sunrise to moonrise) and column H (moonrise to sunset) with their respective verbs (קוי and שלט) are omitted, and the Ethiopic verses concentrate on one factor only: the illumination of the lunar disc during daytime. Although v. 4a-c states that the moon rises and becomes visible, the lunar visibility is fictitious, because, according to the Ethiopic text, the moon rises and sets in the same gate together with the sun (4d, 7a, 7b, 7d). This means that the moon is still in conjunction with the sun, i.e., invisible to the observer' eye. All the fraction notations in vv. 4-7c indicate the same value, that is 0.5/7, which the moon takes on from the sun during the invisibility period. Thus the fractions in vv. 4-7c denote the amount of light the moon receives from the sun (col. F in the Aramaic calculation), not the temporal periods of lunar visibility. A similar situation is found in 4Q209 frg. 6 9, which describes the last day of the lunar month. The Aramaic text departs from the regular formulaic phrases of the nychthemeron computation and concentrates on column F – that is, on the illumination of the lunar disc. Although the Aramaic text assumes that the moon is not visible in the night sky anymore, it still states that the moon rises (נפק) with the sun; that is, it follows the sun in its nocturnal travel to the next gate from which it will emerge. The statement about the rising of the moon together with the sun in the night in 4Q209 frg. 6 9 is no less fictitious than the statement in *1 En.* 73:4a-d about the rising

of the moon together with the sun during the day. In both the Aramaic and Ethiopic texts the underlying assumption is that the moon accompanies the sun even when it is invisible in the sky. For a full and detailed explanation of *1 En*. 73:4-8, see my *The Aramaic Astronomical Book (4Q208-4Q211) from Qumran*, Oxford 2011, pp. 267-290.

When discussing my interpretation of 73:4-8 VanderKam states that I introduce changes into the Ethiopic text. I consider it to be a misunderstanding on the part of VanderKam: in my book I do not change the Ethiopic text in vv. 4-8 but I show the differences between the Aramaic regular computation of the nychthemeron and the Ethiopic text. This is the correct way to proceed in order to see what went wrong in the text transmission and led to the corruption of the Ethiopic text. My emendations of vv. 4-8 are reduced to two expressions only in v. 5a (*wa-manfaqu rəḥuq*) and v. 6b (*sābəʿta ʾəda ʾaḥatta wa-manfaqā*). Scholars dealing with the Enochic astronomical texts usually begin their interpretation from the Ethiopic version and then work their way back to the Aramaic fragments; this appears also to be the approach preferred by VanderKam, at least in the case of 73:4-8. This direction of research does not seem to be based on a sound methodological approach. Only when starting with the analysis and interpretation of the Aramaic fragments is the correct approach to the Ethiopic text possible. Otherwise one risks the danger of finding in the Ethiopic text things that are not there, and even worse, of imposing on the Aramaic text interpretations based on an incorrect understanding of the Ethiopic version.

A good example of a mistaken interpretation caused by the disregard of the Aramaic evidence is VanderKam's explanation of 73:8. Following Neugebauer, he claims that verse 8 begins the description of a new lunar day. Hence the first fraction notation (1/7) denotes the illuminated part of the lunar disc, and the accompanying verb (*śaraqa* "to rise") correctly describes the rising of the moon at the beginning of the night. The problem arises with the last clause in the verse: "and it is bright in the rest of its day six seventh parts" (= 6/7). VanderKam affirms that "the pattern, if correctly understood, calls for a statement to the effect that 1/7 of the moon's surface facing the earth is illuminated during the remainder of the second day and that 6/7 of the surface remains dark. But the text says that 6/7 (some Mss. read 7-7) of the surface is lighted" (p. 435). In order to solve the conundrum VanderKam suggests that because, according to him, the entry for lunar day 2 is truncated, the final clause may have resulted when someone combined two (or more) separate items in the list. Thus the verb "to shine" probably comes from an earlier context (vv. 5-7) and its connection with the fraction (6/7) is an accident due to the abbreviation of the verse. VanderKam even

reconstructs the supposedly "original" form of verse 8: "it shines one-seventh part in the rest of its day and is dark six seventh part" (p. 436). Thus his proposal inverts the meaning of the Ethiopic clause in order to accommodate his supposition that the whole of v. 8 describes nighttime.

When verse 8 is compared with the Aramaic calculation it becomes immediately evident that it does not describe the beginning of the night (= new lunar day), but is exclusively dedicated to daytime, i.e. it describes Section II (columns E and H, waxing) of the nychthemeron. The preserved fractions always sum up to form the same integer of one (1/7 + 6/7 = 1). Column F is omitted, while the verb "to rise" in the first part of verse 8 is introduced because the rising of the moon has been omitted in the first part of the nychthemeron (7d-7e; Section I). Consequently the verb קוי that accompanies fraction notations in column E has been substituted by the verb "to rise". Thus the last clause in the sentence in v. 8 ("and it shines in the rest of its day for six seventh parts") does not result from any abbreviation, but properly corresponds (both the verb and fraction) to column H (day 1, waxing period; cf. my *The Aramaic Astronomical Book*, Appendix I, p. 421). Additionally, VanderKam's translation of the clause ("and is bright (*yəbarreh*) in the rest of its day six seventh parts") suggests that the text speaks about the illumination of the lunar surface, which is incorrect. Column H in the Aramaic calculation and in *1 En.* 73:8 also denotes a period of lunar visibility during the day, and it certainly does not refer to the illumination of the lunar surface. Thus the verb *barha* "to shine" correctly renders the meaning of the Aramaic שלט "to rule" that metaphorically indicates the presence of the moon in the daily sky, and in this sense corresponds to the verb אניר that denotes the presence of the moon in the sky during the night in the waxing phase.

Except for these problems with the most difficult part of the *Ethiopic Astronomical Book*, VanderKam's commentary is of outstanding value and should be highly recommended to all those interested in the earliest strata of the Enochic lore.