

New Perspectives on 2 Enoch

No Longer Slavonic Only

Edited by

Andrei A. Orlov and Gabriele Boccaccini

Associate Editor

Jason M. Zurawski



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2012

© 2012 Koninklijke Brill NV ISBN 978 90 04 23013 2

CONTENTS

Abbreviations	xi
Introduction	1
<i>Andrei A. Orlov and Gabriele Boccaccini</i>	

PART ONE

2 ENOCH

No Longer “Slavonic” Only: 2 Enoch Attested in Coptic from Nubia	7
<i>Joost L. Hagen</i>	

TEXT AND DATING OF 2 ENOCH

The “Book of the Secrets of Enoch” (2 En): Between Jewish Origin and Christian Transmission. An Overview	37
<i>Christfried Böttrich</i>	
The Provenance of 2 Enoch: A Philological Perspective. A Response to C. Böttrich’s Paper “The ‘Book of the Secrets of Enoch’ (2 En): Between Jewish Origin and Christian Transmission. An Overview”	69
<i>Liudmila Navtanovich</i>	
2 Enoch: Manuscripts, Recensions, and Original Language	83
<i>Grant Macaskill</i>	
The Sacerdotal Traditions of 2 Enoch and the Date of the Text	103
<i>Andrei A. Orlov</i>	
Excavating 2 Enoch: The Question of Dating and the Sacerdotal Traditions	117
<i>David W. Suter</i>	

CONTENT AND CONTEXT OF 2 ENOCH

2 Enoch and the New Perspective on Apocalyptic	127
<i>Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis</i>	
The Watchers of Satanail: The Fallen Angels Traditions in 2 Enoch	149
<i>Andrei A. Orlov</i>	
Patriarch, Prophet, Author, Angelic Rival: Exploring the Relationship of 1 Enoch to 2 Enoch in Light of the Figure of Enoch	181
<i>Kelley Coblenz Bautch and Daniel Assefa</i>	
Calendrical Elements in 2 Enoch	191
<i>Basil Lourié</i>	
2 Enoch and Halakhah	221
<i>Lawrence H. Schiffman</i>	
Halakha, Calendars, and the Provenances of 2 Enoch	229
<i>Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra</i>	

PART TWO

ADAM, ENOCH, AND MELCHIZEDEK:
MEDIATORIAL FIGURES IN SECOND TEMPLE JUDAISM

ADAMIC TRADITIONS

Adam As a Mediatorial Figure in Second Temple Jewish Literature	247
<i>John R. Levison</i>	
“Better Watch Your Back, Adam”: Another Adam and Eve Tradition in Second Temple Judaism	273
<i>Lester L. Grabbe</i>	

Adamic Traditions in 2 Enoch and in the Books of Adam and Eve	283
<i>Johannes Magliano-Tromp</i>	
Adamic Traditions in Early Christian and Rabbinic Literature	305
<i>Alexander Toepel</i>	
Adamic Tradition in Slavonic Manuscripts (Vita Adae et Evae and Apocryphal Cycle about the Holy Tree)	325
<i>Anissava Miltenova</i>	

MELCHIZEDEK TRADITIONS

Melchizedek Traditions in Second Temple Judaism	343
<i>Eric F. Mason</i>	
Melchizedek at Qumran and in Judaism: A Response	361
<i>Devorah Dimant</i>	
Enoch and Melchizedek: The Concern for Supra-Human Priestly Mediators in 2 Enoch	369
<i>Charles A. Gieschen</i>	
Melchizedek in Some Early Christian Texts and 2 Enoch	387
<i>Harold W. Attridge</i>	
“Much to Say and Hard to Explain” Melchizedek in Early Christian Literature, Theology, and Controversy	411
<i>Pierluigi Piovanelli</i>	
On Adam, Enoch, Melchizedek, and Eve	431
<i>Daphna Arbel</i>	
Bibliography on 2 Enoch	455
<i>Andrei A. Orlov</i>	
Index of Modern Authors	473

ADAMIC TRADITIONS IN 2 ENOCH AND
IN THE BOOKS OF ADAM AND EVE

Johannes Magliano-Tromp

In this contribution I should like to compare a number of traditions on Adam as contained in 2 Enoch with those known from the books of Adam and Eve, with particular attention to the various versions of the Life of Adam and Eve. These writings were written independently of each other, but have in common a number of traditions that are obviously related to each other. Do those traditions have a fixed and intrinsic meaning that stays intact, no matter in which written context they are adopted, or are they flexible, and is their meaning entirely determined by the written context? It will appear that, although the latter alternative is *a priori* much more likely, some Adamic traditions seem nonetheless remarkably stable in the meaning they convey, so that it can be concluded that some stories about Adam and Eve are not just vehicles of whatever meaning, but are chosen by authors and editors of texts because of the meaning they intrinsically convey or evoke.

In the first section, I shall discuss the *Sitz im Leben* of 2 Enoch's and the Life of Adam and Eve's transmission, which I believe to be similar in both cases. Then, selected Adamic traditions in 2 Enoch will be surveyed and interpreted within the context of its transmission; the same will then be done for these traditions in the Life of Adam and Eve.

1. *The Transmission of 2 Enoch and Related Literature in
the Context of Monastical and Popular Christianity*

It is a well-established fact that the Old Testament pseudepigrapha have been transmitted almost exclusively by the Christian Church.¹ Apart from

¹ See, e.g., R. A. Kraft, "Setting the Stage and Framing Some Central Questions," *JSJ* 32 (2001): 371–395; repr. in Kraft, *Exploring the Scripturesque. Jewish Texts and their Christian Contexts*, *JJS*Sup 137 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 35–60; M. de Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature. The Case of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve*, *SVTP* 18, (Leiden: Brill, 2003); J. R. Davila, *The*

chance findings of fragments of Jubilees and 1 Enoch among the Dead Sea scrolls, there are no traces of the transmission of these writings by Jewish communities. However, the realization that this is so, is still of a somewhat general nature.

Students of the pseudepigrapha have often noted that these writings are often found among hagiographical literature of a much more pronounced Christian nature.² Apparently, to the copyists of these writings, the lives of the pre-Christian saints such as Adam, Enoch, Abraham and the Twelve Patriarchs were of no less value than those of the martyrs of the Church, albeit perhaps for different reasons. However, which meaning they had for them, and for which reasons, is rarely investigated.

In what follows, I shall attempt to understand 2 Enoch and the Life of Adam and Eve as writings in which Christian copyists and audiences vested a certain interest. There is reason to believe that a similar value was not attached to these writings by all Christians. In his study on the legend of the cheirograph of Adam, Michael Stone traced this story in various parts of the Christian tradition—including Armenia, the Balkans, and Ethiopia. As a final remark, he notes, that whereas the exegetical tradition underlying this legend is paramount in the hagiographical and iconographical modes of expression in the Eastern churches, it rarely or never occurs in patristic literature: “One is led to speculate about the genres being determinative of this separation.”³ Slightly modified, one might suspect that the gap between patristic and hagiographic literature reflects a sociological divide between urban theologians and less sophisticated forms of Christian thought and belief.

In the case of 2 Enoch, Christfried Böttrich has explicitly designated monastic circles as responsible for this writing’s transmission. Böttrich speculates that the translation of this writing from Greek into Slavonic was made as part of a corpus of ascetic and hagiographical writings. From

Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha. Jewish, Christian, or Other?, JSJSup 105 (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

² E.g., C. Böttrich, *Weltweisheit, Menschheitsethik, Urkult. Studien zum slavischen Henochbuch*, WUNT 2/50 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 103–105; cf. A. A. Orlov, *Selected Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, SVTP 23 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 3–7.

³ “The Legend of the Cheirograph of Adam,” in: *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays*, ed. M. E. Stone, et al., SVTP 15 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 149–166 (esp. 166). Similar conclusions were drawn by myself concerning the reception of the Apocalypse of Moses and the Assumption of Moses, respectively; see J. Tromp, “Origen on the Assumption of Moses,” in *Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome. Studies in Ancient Cultural Interaction in Honour of A. Hilhorst*, ed. F. García Martínez and G. P. Luttikhuisen, JSJSup 82 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 323–340.

there, it was adopted by circles interested in chronography, and hence came to function as a compendium of ethics and morals, initially for bishops and eventually also for the common people.⁴

Simpler reconstructions are conceivable (although not necessarily more likely on that account). One such reconstruction would be that 2 Enoch had from the beginning circulated in and around monasteries, and that those monasteries have always been the locus of both the adoption and the dissemination of popular lore about this patriarch, and of the moral teachings ascribed to him. 2 Enoch, as well as numerous other Old Testament pseudepigrapha, was included in collections of holy lives. Such collections in general seem to have been intended for moral edification, rather than for theological or historiographical purposes. They contain the stories that people in general knew and through which people could be reminded of the proper way to live on God's earth.⁵ Christians with a more urban background, aware of the humble places where the pseudepigrapha were at home, may have deemed it below their standing to refer to these legends and the writings containing them, even if they knew their contents.

I should like to suggest that writings such as 2 Enoch and the Life of Adam and Eve contain traditions that were first of all passed down orally, and were then also recorded in monasteries, perhaps in an effort to contain the development of this folklore within certain limits, or simply because of their usefulness from a homiletical point of view. From this perspective, it is plausible that the oral and the literary transmission were in interaction, an assumption that to a large extent explains the constant process of revision to which these writings were subject.⁶

It is necessary, then, to distinguish between the "official" Christianity of the bishops, patristic authors, and ecumenical councils on the one hand, and what went on in the countryside, on the other.⁷ This should make us

⁴ Böttrich, *Weltweisheit*, 95–107 (esp. 105); cf. the remarks by G. Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, JSJSup 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 202–204.

⁵ Cf. J. Tromp, "The Story of our Lives: The *qz*-Text of the Life of Adam and Eve, the Apostle Paul, and the Jewish-Christian Oral Tradition concerning Adam and Eve," *NTS* 50 (2004): 205–223.

⁶ J. C. Picard, *Le continent apocryphe. Essai sur les littératures apocryphes juive et chrétienne*, *Instrumenta patristica* 36 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), 247–287.

⁷ W. Puchner, *Akkomodationsfragen. Einzelbeispiele zum paganen Hintergrund von Elementen der frühkirchlichen und mittelalterlichen Sakraltradition und Volksfrömmigkeit*, *Kulturgeschichtliche Forschungen* 23 (München: Tuduv, 1997), 13; Picard, *Le continent apocryphe*, 5–6.

cautious in measuring the contents of popular traditions by the standards of official Christianity. We should not be surprised to find in them notions that are hardly warranted by the Church's creed or by the biblical material to which they refer and refrain from designating them, on that account, as heretical.⁸ The study of such writings as 2 Enoch and the Life of Adam and Eve should teach us that notions that may initially strike us as inconceivable in a Christian context⁹ are actually well at home there, because the history of these writings' transmission shows that they apparently were.¹⁰ It is our duty to investigate which meaning these writings may have had in the context where they are actually found (e.g., the Greek and Slavonic churches of the Middle Ages), before we speculate about their meaning in the hypothetical original context of pre-Christian Judaism.¹¹

In the case of 2 Enoch, these matters receive extra urgency in the face of this writing's text-critical situation. In what follows, I shall be referring to the "long" recension as reflected in two recent translations,¹² which is argued by a number of scholars to preserve the most primitive text form. This view is opposed to André Vaillant's hypothesis, in which the "short" recension is presented as the one that comes closest to the original Slavonic translation.¹³ I have not taken Vaillant's text as a starting-point, because in that case there would be much less about Adam and Eve to talk about; in the short recension, these figures are rather marginal.

It is impossible to reach a scholarly consensus about the priority of recensions, as long as the fundamental text-critical issues have not been cleared. Only a *stemma codicum*, based on the certainly secondary nature of readings and thereby establishing the genetic relationships between the available manuscripts' texts, can resolve the question of the priority of text-forms. As long as no serious attempts are made to draw up such

⁸ E. Turdeanu, "Apocryphes bogomiles et apocryphes pseudo-bogomiles," in: *Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament*, ed. Turdeanu, SVTP 5 (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 1–74 (first published in *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 138 and 139 [1950]: 22–52 and 176–218).

⁹ Cf. F. I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985), 1:91–221 (esp. 1:94).

¹⁰ M. de Jonge and J. Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 68–69.

¹¹ R. A. Kraft, "The Pseudepigrapha in Christianity," in *Tracing the Threads. Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha*, ed. J. C. Reeves, Early Judaism and its Literature 6 (Atlanta: SBL, 1994), 55–86 (esp. 75–76).

¹² Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch;" C. Böttrich, "Das slavische Henochbuch," *JSHRZ V/7* (Gütersloh: Gütersloh Verlagshaus, 1995), 781–1040.

¹³ A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch. Texte slave et traduction française*, Textes publiés par l'Institut d'Études slaves IV (Paris: Inst. d'Études Slaves, 1952, 1976²).

a *stemma*, or if its production would appear impossible, there can be no certainty with regard to the priority of recensions. So we are reduced to discussing individual Medieval manuscripts, and should accept the chronological consequences of that discussion.

2. *Adamic Traditions in 2 Enoch*

In what follows, I shall discuss three main motifs in 2 Enoch concerning Adam: (a) Adam and the elements; (b) Adam as ruler of the cosmos; (c) Adam as ruler over the animals.

(a) *Adam and the Elements*

In 2 En 30:8–9 it is related that God, through the mediation of his wisdom, formed man from seven elements (στοιχεῖα),¹⁴ and bestowed him with seven sensory and intellectual capacities. In 2 En 30:13–14 it is stated that his name was formed from four letters (στοιχεῖα), corresponding both to the four corners of heaven, and to four stars.¹⁵ This is a well-known motif, and it is clear that 2 Enoch represents a secondary version of it: in the course of time, the motif developed into a number of variants, which are here brought together and more or less harmonized. In a recent study, Sever Voicu has re-examined the available evidence of this motif and has proposed the following history of its development.¹⁶

SibOr III 24–26 is generally regarded as the earliest witness to Adam's name as an acronym of the four corners of heaven (ἀνατολή, δύσις, ἄρκτος, μεσημβρία).¹⁷ In Pseudo-Cyprian's treatise *De duobus montibus Sina et Sion*,

¹⁴ For this Greek equivalent, see Böttrich, "Das slavische Henochbuch," 915; Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos. Eine Untersuchung zum slavischen Henochbuch*, Judentum und Umwelt 50 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995), 29.

¹⁵ Cf. C. Böttrich, "Biblische Figuren im slavischen Henochbuch," in *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. H. Lichtenberger and U. Mittmann-Richert, *Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009), 303–335 (esp. 320).

¹⁶ S. J. Voicu, "Adamo, acrostico del mondo," *Apocrypha* 18 (2007): 205–230.

¹⁷ It should be noted that these lines are not part of the same writing as SibOr III 93–829, as is indicated by the manuscripts themselves; they are the fragmentary final part of a different Sibylline book, now lost for the greater part (see R. Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and its Social Setting*, SVTP 17 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 66–72). Therefore, SibOr III 1–92 should be studied in its own right (Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles*, 91), and the habit to treat this fragment as, so to speak, more of the same as SibOr III 93–829 (e.g., Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos*, 23–24; Voicu, "Adamo," 207) is to be abandoned. In

probably dating from the third century C.E., the connection is made with four stars; moreover, the numerical value of the letters of Adam's name is counted as forty-six, a number that is subsequently connected to various events in salvation history, including Christ's resurrection. Next, it was Zosimus of Panopolis who, in his treatise on the letter Omega, connected the four letters of Adam's name with the four elements (air, water, fire, earth).¹⁸ At about the same time, the early fourth century, Severianus of Gabala, speculated that Adam was made of material taken from the four corners of the world.

According to Voicu, Augustine of Hippo was instrumental in causing the proliferation of this motif in Western Christianity. In a number of sermons on the Gospel of John, delivered in the year 407, Augustine ruminated on Pseudo-Cyprian's theses; subsequently, numerous other ecclesiastical authors appear to have adopted his views.¹⁹ A great number of variants of this motif come together in the ninth-century treatise *De plasmatione Adam*, written in Ireland, and adopted as an appendix to the Latin Life of Adam and Eve in the eleventh century.²⁰ A further development of the tradition in this text is the connection between the elements from which Adam was made (the number of which had in the meantime grown to eight)²¹ and the capacities and characteristics that were bestowed on Adam.²²

the absence of a thorough study of this fragment, it is premature to simply assume that it can be dated to the second century B.C.E., as is often done.

¹⁸ That Adam (just as the rest of creation) was formed from the four elements (στοιχεῖα), was in itself an ancient and widespread idea (see M. T. d'Alverny, "L'homme comme symbole. Le microcosme," in *Simboli e simbologia nell' alto Medioevo I*, ed. C. G. Mor, et al., Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo 23 [Spoleto: presso la sede del Centro, 1976], 123–183; cf. Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos*, 36–38; A. S. M. Ri, *Commentaire de la Caverne des Trésors. Etude sur l'histoire du texte et de ses sources*, CSCO, Subsidia 103 [Leuven: Peeters, 2000], 141–145). What matters in this connection, however, is the combination of this view with the four letters (στοιχεῖα) of Adam's name and the stars (στοιχεῖα) they represent.

¹⁹ See the survey in d'Alverny, "L'homme comme symbole" (which also includes the Arabic and Islamic tradition); cf. D. Cerbelaud, "Le nom d'Adam et les points cardinaux. Recherches sur un thème patristique," *VC* 38 (1984): 285–301 (esp. 286–289); for the rabbinic variant of this tradition, see A. A. Orlov, "Without Measure and Without Analogy: The Tradition of the Divine Body in 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*," in *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism. Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, A. A. Orlov, JSJSup 114 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 149–174 (first published in *JSJ* 56 [2005]: 224–244); (esp. 160–161).

²⁰ Ed., J. H. Mozley, "The Vita Adae," *JTS* 30 (1929): 121–149.

²¹ The eventual number ranges from seven to eight or even nine in various forms of the tradition; M. Förster, "Adams Erschaffung und Namengebung. Ein lateinisches Fragment des s. g. slawischen Henoch," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 11 (1908): 477–529 (esp. 502–503).

²² Cf. already the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, T. Reuben 2:3–3:1.

This version of the Life of Adam and Eve continues by stating that Adam was formed in the middle of the earth, Bethlehem, where Jesus was born,²³ and was composed of material fetched by the angels from the four corners of the earth. When God wanted to find a name for the man he made, the angels went to the four corners of heaven, and took the first letter of each of these; in this way Adam's name was found.

The organization of the material by Voicu so far is fascinating, because it strongly suggests a gradual expansion of the motif through the ages. Starting from the notion that the four letters of Adam's name were to be connected with stars representing the corners of heaven, the ensuing developments show how these four stars came to evoke the notions of the four elements (which number eventually grew into eight, in turn associated with the human senses and capacities), the four corners of the earth, and the four archangels. The Irish treatise *De plasmatione Adam*, adopted into the Latin Life of Adam and Eve in the eleventh century, clearly seems to be an end point to this development.

Voicu takes us one step further by concluding from this that several pieces of Eastern European literature, such as *The Dialogue of the Three Hierarchs* (eleventh century), are dependent on *De plasmatione Adam*. Indeed, the *Dialogue* contains numerous verbal agreements with *De plasmatione*, and the conclusion of a relationship of literary dependence is inescapable.²⁴ Voicu also concludes that 2 Enoch 30, which he, following Vaillant's reconstruction of 2 Enoch's textual history, regards as a secondary addition from the fifteenth century, depends on *De plasmatione Adam*.²⁵

I am well aware that there are scholars who have very strong opinions about the originality of the "long" recension of 2 Enoch.²⁶ I must confess, however, that I am impressed by Voicu's study. In my opinion, his conclusions pose a very serious challenge to those who wish to maintain both points, namely, that the "long" recension is primitive, and that it was originally Jewish. If the "long" recension, including chapter 30–33, is primitive

²³ Cf. *The History of the Repentance of Adam and Eve* 102, ed. W. L. Lipscomb, *The Armenian Apocryphal Adam Literature*, Armenian Texts and Studies 8 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 233.

²⁴ So already Förster, "Adams Erschaffung," 482.

²⁵ Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets*, 100, regarded this passage in 2 Enoch as dependent on the *Dialogue of the Three Hierarchs*.

²⁶ E.g., A. A. Orlov, "Noah's Younger Brother Revisited: Anti-Noachic Polemics and the Date of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch," in *From Apocalypticism*, Orlov, 379–396 (first published in *Hen* 26 [2004]: 172–187).

and depends on *De plasmatione Adam*, a Jewish origin for 2 Enoch is virtually excluded.

In any event, the history of European Christian literature shows that speculations about Adam's name were very much in vogue, and that the notions in 2 Enoch about the four letters of his name and the seven elements from which he was made (paired to his seven senses and capacities) are various offshoots of a single motif that connected Adam's name with the four corners of heaven.

Although there have been various studies on the history of this motif,²⁷ only a few have discussed its *meaning*. If it is true that this notion was one of the most popular in Christianity, why was that so? Böttrich, in his study of this issue, expresses himself in rather general terms about the meaning of Adam as a microcosmos: "Der Mensch, obgleich krönender Abschluß der Schöpfung und unvergleichbarer Herrscher aller Geschöpfe, ist doch von den einfachsten Bausteinen der Welt genommen und bleibt deren Teil."²⁸ However, as has been shown elaborately by Dominique Cerbelaud, most authors using this motif have linked it directly to Christ and his cosmic rule, understanding the microcosmic nature of Adam as a prefiguration of Christ's subduing the world to his kingship.²⁹ This interpretation of Adam's name is not explicit in 2 Enoch, but we might consider it as a possible frame of reference for the Christian readers and transmitters of this writing, especially since 2 En 30:12, almost immediately following this motif, broaches the subject of Adam's kingship, to which we shall now turn.

(b) *Adam As Ruler of the World*

In 2 En 30:11–12 it is stated that God devised humanity to be the ruler of creation. However, this passage is almost immediately followed by God's decision to provide Adam with the choice between good and evil (2 En 30:15), while knowing very well that Adam was certain to commit a sin

²⁷ See, for instance, the survey in Böttrich, *Adam als Mikrokosmos*, 7–15; and add d'Alverny, "L'homme comme symbole;" Cerbelaud, "Le nom d'Adam;" and now also Voicu, "Adamo."

²⁸ *Adam als Mikrokosmos*, 8.

²⁹ Cerbelaud, "Le nom d'Adam." See, for instance, Hrabanus Maurus, *De laudibus sanctae crucis* I 12, on the four letters of Adam's name signifying the four corners of the world (Cerbelaud's translation, 287): "Et par là il nous est donné à comprendre qu'Adam fut créé Seigneur du monde, figure de celui qui serait le rédempteur et le restaurateur du monde entier, par la croix quadrangulaire. C'est pourquoi on l'appelle le second Adam."

(2 En 30:16), and therefore to lose his dominion. In this way, the author seems to project the outcome of the events back into the divine deliberations preceding their occurrence, in an apparent effort to safeguard God's prescience and providence.³⁰

Chapters 31–32 elaborate upon this motif. They relate that God placed Adam in paradise, and that the devil realized that Adam was to be the ruler of everything on earth (2 En 31:1–3). Because of the sinful essence of his character, the devil contrived a way to end that situation, and he seduced Eve (2 En 31:5–6). God then decided not to condemn anyone or anything he had made with his own hands, but only their wicked deeds (2 En 31:7). God said to Adam that he would have to return to the dust from which he was taken, but that God would accept him again at his “second coming” (2 En 32:1). Some manuscripts add that Adam was in paradise for five and a half hours.

These sections can without effort be read as a meaningful whole. The overarching message is that humankind was destined to rule of the world, but that the devil's evil nature prevented this intention from being fulfilled; however, humanity will still receive what lays in store for them at the second coming of God.

Within the context of 2 Enoch's transmission in the Slavonic church, the second coming of God is most likely Christ's eschatological *parousia*.³¹ This is confirmed by the addition, whether it is secondary or not, that Adam lived in paradise for five and a half hours, an unmistakable reference to the Christian chronological schema that assumed that Christ's first coming took place in the 5,500th year of creation, and that his second can be expected in the 6,000th year. On various occasions in Christian apocryphal literature, the first and second comings of Christ (and their respective dates) are telescoped into one.³² The remarks in the next section about the eighth day (2 En 33:1–2), following a more or less obligatory reference to the Sabbath, seamlessly fit in with these Christian speculations about the chronology of the cosmos.³³

³⁰ See also Böttrich, “Biblische Figuren,” 321.

³¹ Cf. Böttrich, “Das slavische Henochbuch,” 928. It has been suggested that, in the assumed Jewish original of 2 Enoch, the “second coming of God” might refer to God's eschatological advent; so Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 155; Böttrich, “Biblische Figuren,” 321.

³² Tromp, “The Story of our Lives,” 211–212.

³³ O. Hofius, *Katapausis. Die Vorstellung vom endzeitlichen Ruheort im Hebräerbrief*, WUNT 11 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1970), 113–115.

It is clear, then, that this motif can easily be understood within a Christian frame of mind. Humankind's rule over the world, although planned from the beginning of Adam's creation, will only be realized through the coming of Christ. From this perspective, the motif that humanity was created in order to rule the world, anticipates the eschatological fulfillment of that original intention.³⁴

(c) *Adam As Ruler of the Animals*

In 2 Enoch 58 Adam is presented as ruler of the animals. In a farewell address to Methusalem, his brothers, and the leaders of the people, Enoch is depicted as explaining that God descended upon earth to bring together the animals before Adam, who gave names to all of them (2 En 58:1–2). Next, the Lord installed Adam as king of the animals, made the animals mute and obedient to humanity (2 En 58:3).

This passage is the introduction to a curious section on the relationships between humans and animals. It is said that humanity's kingship over the animals implies a great responsibility for the well-being of the animals (2 En 58:4–6), including that of animals that are sacrificed (2 Enoch 59).³⁵ Then, Enoch's speech continues into chapter 63 with various instructions of a moral nature. After a brief interlude, in which Enoch is praised and glorified by his people (chapter 64), chapter 65 resumes Enoch's instructions with prophecies and warnings with regard to the great judgment. This section is completed in chapter 66 with a kind of summary about the omniscience of the Lord, and the place of eternal bliss preserved for the righteous ones.

The exhortation and the prophecies in 2 Enoch 60–66 are of a universal nature. There is nothing in these chapters that presupposes a Christian worldview, but there is nothing in them that is inconceivable in a

³⁴ G. A. Anderson, *The Genesis of Perfection. Adam and Eve in Jewish and Christian Imagination* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001).

³⁵ Böttrich, "Biblische Figuren," 322: "Eine solche Herrschaft verpflichtet." A. A. Orlov, "On the Polemical Nature of 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*: A Reply to C. Böttrich," in *From Apocalypticism*, Orlov, 239–268 (first published in *JSJ* 34 [2003]: 274–303) (esp. 249), distinguishes between "the story of Adam's naming of animals and Enoch's instructions to his children about the protection of animals;" in this, he recognizes 2 Enoch's polemics against the Adamic tradition. However, the story of Adam's creation does not precede Enoch's instructions to his children, but forms an integral part of it, merely explaining why people should be good to animals, in agreement with his role as "originator of the sacrificial instruction"; so again Orlov, "Noah's Younger Brother Revisited," 365.

Christian context either, even if the references to the final judgment do not consider a role for Jesus Christ in that event.

At first sight, things are different in the first two chapters of Enoch's speech, about Adam as ruler of the animals, and the direct relation that is made between that motif and the good care that has to be taken of animals, sacrificial animals in particular. The motif of Adam's rule over the animals is already found in Gen 1:28 (cf. Jub 2:14; Sir 17:2–4), and unproblematic in a Christian context; indeed, it was a popular motif in early and Medieval Christianity.³⁶ However, 2 Enoch 59 directly connects this motif to the question of animal sacrifice. For this reason, this chapter is often taken as one of the clearest indications that 2 Enoch must have been an originally Jewish writing, since it would be inconceivable that a Christian author was the first to pen these lines. 2 Enoch 59 presupposes an actually existing cultic practice, to which the author makes no objection whatsoever, and which does not seem to be discussed in the abstract manner known from the Mishnah.³⁷ Therefore, this section is understood to imply that the author knew the sacrificial cult in the temple of Jerusalem, before it was destroyed in 70 C.E.,³⁸ even if Jerusalem or its temple are nowhere mentioned in 2 Enoch.³⁹

³⁶ See, e.g., H. Maguire, "Adam and the Animals. Allegory and the Literal Sense in Early Christian Art," in *Studies on Art and Archeology in Honor of Ernst Kitzinger*, ed. W. Tronzo and I. Lavin, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 41 (1987): 363–373.

³⁷ See, for instance, Böttrich, *Weltweisheit*, 198–199; Orlov, "Noah's Younger Brother Revisited," 389–390. See also, however, Böttrich, "Biblische Figuren," 322: "Was der Autor des 2. Henoch-Buches in diesem Zusammenhang zum Tierschutz aussagt, ist in der früh-jüdischen und frühen christlichen Ethik ohne Parallele!"

³⁸ Böttrich, *Weltweisheit*, 204; A. M. Denis and J. C. Haelewyck, *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 155; contrast, however, A. Rubinstein, "Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *JJS* 13 (1962): 1–21 (esp. 13–15).

³⁹ It is often assumed that Achuzan or Azuchan (mentioned in 2 En 64:2; 68:5; 70:17; 71:35) stands for the temple in Jerusalem (e.g., Böttrich, *Weltweisheit*, 196), but to me, the evidence on which this assumption is based, seems weak. The text speaks about the altar erected by Enoch (64:2), not about the temple in Jerusalem. It is the same place where Enoch was taken up into heaven (68:5), and where Methusalem was buried (70:17). In 71:35–36 it is also regarded as the place where Adam was made and where he was buried (together with Abel), and it is designated there as the center of the earth. A second Melchizedek (71:34) will be priest and king at that place. This second Melchizedek is undoubtedly a reference to Christ (so Böttrich, "Das slavische Henochbuch," 1029), and the likeliest place where he is here regarded as having performed his office of priest and king is Golgotha, where Adam was buried according to a widespread tradition in Christianity; see B. Bagatti, "Note sull' iconografia di 'Adamo sotto il Calvario,'" *Liber annuus* 27 (1977): 1–32 (with 42 illustrations). Böttrich, "Das slavische Henochbuch," 804, recognizes the Christian character of 71:32–37 (contrast, however, Orlov, "On the Polemical Nature," 239), and claims that it is one of those passages that can easily be excised to recover the originally Jewish *Grundschrift*.

Be that as it may, we are still obliged to ask to what use this passage may have been put in the context of 2 Enoch's transmission by the Slavonic church. One possibility may be that Medieval Christian readers, who no doubt ate meat themselves, considered the patriarch's instructions on proper dealings with animals as relevant to their own way of killing animals before eating them.

This possibility becomes plausible especially if we take note of certain sacrificial rites that were practiced in the Middle Ages, and even until very recently, on the Balkans (including Greece).⁴⁰ Descriptions exist of the ritual slaughter of animals that were subsequently offered to saints (St. George in particular) or to God, followed by a common meal of the sacrificiants. These rituals, performed at specific occasions such as the construction of a house, or a funeral, or also on regular festive days during the summer season, were partly performed by orthodox priests, and on the whole supervised by them. The animals themselves were adorned with candles; prayers accompanying the rituals have been preserved to a great number; a meticulous distinction is reported to have been made between pure and impure animals (that is, animals fit and unfit for sacrifice);⁴¹ and also the demand that the animals are treated in a decent, even loving way is attested.⁴²

Often, these sacrifices are viewed as survivals from the Thracian era, but it has also been forcefully argued that the testimonies that exist, both from the Middle Ages and from the twentieth century, are thoroughly Christian in content.⁴³ Particularly interesting is the fact that the prayers (literarily documented from the early Middle Ages onward) pronounced by the priests are replete with references to Old Testament figures, such as Abel, Abraham, Elijah and other pre-Christian saints, suggesting that the Old Testament presented the models for this sacrificial cult that the

⁴⁰ Puchner, *Akkomodationsfragen*, 54–56, with many bibliographical references, including the standard work by G. N. Aikaterinidis, *Νεοελληνικές αίματηρές θυσίες. Λειτουργία—μορφολογία—τυπολογία*, (Diss. Athens 1979 [*non vidi*]). See also B. A. McClelland, *Sacrifice, Scapegoat, Vampire. The Social and Religious Origins of the Bulgarian Folklore Vampire*, (Diss. University of Virginia 1999), <http://www.stlazaire.com/NewFiles/DISS.html>. I am grateful to Mrs. Rea Matsangou, MA (Leiden), and Prof. Dr. Walter Puchner (Athens) for their help and advice on the following paragraphs.

⁴¹ A. Stahl, "Animal Sacrifices in the Balkans," in *The Realm of the Extra-Human*, ed. A. Bharati (The Hague: Mouton, 1976), 443–451 (esp. 448).

⁴² S. Georgoudi, "L'égorgement sanctifié en Grèce moderne: les 'Kourbánia' des saints," in *La cuisine du sacrifice en pays grec*, ed. M. Detienne and J. P. Vernant (Paris: Gallimard, 1979), 271–307 (esp. 298–299).

⁴³ Georgoudi, "L'égorgement sanctifié," 293–297; Puchner, *Akkomodationsfragen*, 55–56.

doctrines of the Church could not provide.⁴⁴ It is worthy of note that representatives of the official Church used to protest against these practices, but that this apparently has had little effect on the practice in for instance the countryside, or on the involvement of local priests.⁴⁵

It is conceivable that, in the context of the Christian, specifically Greek and Slavonic, transmission of 2 Enoch, chapters 58–59 functioned as a legitimation of the Balkan tradition of ritual animal sacrifice. As a specimen of monastic, hagiographical tradition, 2 Enoch may have functioned as an anchor for this practice, a primordial source that provided legitimacy to a habit that may not have had the bishops' approval, but had to be condoned by them, or tolerated at the least.⁴⁶

To sum up: in our discussion of three Adamic motifs in 2 Enoch, considered in the context of their transmission by Christians, it has appeared that two of them belong closely together in function and meaning. In a Christian context, the motif of Adam as a microcosmos and that of Adam as ruler of the world are both expressions of the conviction that the first Adam prefigured the second, Jesus Christ.⁴⁷

There does not seem to be a similar coherence with the third motif, Adam as ruler of the animals, a motif with clear antecedents in the Old Testament and Jewish tradition. In 2 Enoch it serves to underline human responsibility towards animals, sacrificial animals in particular. I have made an attempt to find a Christian context for this motif in the sacrificial tradition in the Balkans (including Greece), which has existed from the Middle Ages until very recently, perhaps even today. I readily admit to the speculative nature of this contextualization, but not without pointing out that placing the practices described in the context of the Jerusalem cult is no less the work of hypothesis and fantasy.

3. *Literature on Adam and Eve*

In this section, I shall compare the three Adamic traditions as found in 2 Enoch with the way in which they feature in the literature especially

⁴⁴ Georgoudi, "L'égorgement sanctifié," 294–295.

⁴⁵ Georgoudi; cf. Stahl, "Animal Sacrifices," 444.

⁴⁶ Georgoudi, "L'égorgement sanctifié," 292–294.

⁴⁷ Anderson, *The Genesis of Perfection*; cf. also De Jonge and Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve*, 74–75.

devoted to Adam, in particular the various recensions of the Life of Adam and Eve.

(a) *Adam and the Elements*

Comparing the Adamic traditions in 2 Enoch with the Life of Adam and Eve and related literature, it is noteworthy that the interpretation of Adam's name as an acronym is absent in all recensions except in a late offshoot of the Latin tradition incorporating *De plasmatione Adam*.

The enigmatic Greek text of 5:3 might reflect the cosmic nature of Adam, or at least his offspring, when it states that all Adam's sons gathered unto him, "because the world was divided into three parts." Does this mean that, whereas Adam and Eve lived in the East (1:2), their children had gone to the other parts of the world?⁴⁸ The other versions appear to have understood as little of this phrase as we do, leaving it out (Armenian), or interpreting it in a hardly clarifying way (Georgian, Slavonic, Latin).⁴⁹ In any case, no association is made with Adam's name.

The only other instance in which the motif occurs in the Life of Adam and Eve is in the Latin text represented mainly by the fourteenth-century manuscript Arundel 326, already discussed above.⁵⁰ In this version, it forms part of an appendix to the Latin Life of Adam and Eve, in which various traditions are listed, without much coherence with the story itself. One has the impression that the copyist responsible for this version wished to record a number of motifs concerning Adam and Eve as he knew them, but did not want to go through the trouble of integrating them in the narrative that he had been copying. This impression is reinforced by the phrases with which he introduces these extra traditions: "Now one has to know also that..." or, "Furthermore, one should know that..." In this way, several tidbits of knowledge about Adam are merely appended, such as the fact that Enoch's prophecy quoted in Jude 14 was

⁴⁸ Cf. *Asatir* 1:2: "And he gave to Kain the West: and he gave to Hebel the North and the South;" ed. M. Gaster, *The Asatir. The Samaritan Book of the "Secrets of Moses"* (London: Oriental Translation Fund, 1927), 184 (I thank my colleague Dr. Harm W. Hollander for this reference, as well as for his meticulous reading and critique of an earlier draft of this contribution). For a different interpretation, see J. Doehorn, *Die Apokalypse des Mose*, TSAJ 106 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 224.

⁴⁹ G. A. Anderson and M. E. Stone, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve. Second Revised Edition*, Early Judaism and its Literature 17 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 34–34E.

⁵⁰ Mozley, "The 'Vita Adae.'"

written on the same stones that preserved the story of Adam and Eve through the flood; the seven years that Adam stayed in paradise, when he ruled the animals; and then also the eight parts from which Adam was formed; the provenance of the mud from which he was formed, namely, from the four corners of the world; and the provenance of the letters of his name from the four corners of heaven.

In the preceding section we have already seen that the source of this appendix to the Life of Adam and Eve and of 2 Enoch 30–33 is quite likely the same. It is fascinating to observe how two closely related pieces of text show up in approximately contemporary manuscripts in two extreme corners of Europe, in the context of writings that are otherwise unrelated.

(b) *Adam As Ruler of the World*

In 2 Enoch it is stated that Adam was created to rule the world. There is no such statement in the various versions of the Life of Adam and Eve, but there are some related notions.

In the Greek Life of Adam and Eve 39 it is related how God, having just descended on earth for Adam's funeral, bewails Adam's fate, and asks him why he sinned. "If you would have obeyed my command," the author makes him say, "those who brought you down to this place would not have rejoiced" (39:1). The text continues: "However, I tell you that I shall turn their joy into grief, but your grief I shall turn into joy. I shall restore you to your rule, and make you sit on your adversary's throne. He will be thrown down into this place, so that he will see you sitting above him. Then he and those who followed him will be condemned, and he will be sad when he sees you sitting upon his throne" (39:2–3). On the surface, this passage seems to suppose that Adam lost his throne to the devil, but that he will regain it. It is not told in other parts of the Greek Life of Adam and Eve that Adam ever had a throne,⁵¹ or that he lost it to his adversary, the devil.⁵²

In this writing, the only other reference to some kind of rule that humanity lost, is in section 11. There it is related that an animal attacks Seth, who is accompanied by Eve on a journey to paradise, and explains to Eve that the animals' enmity towards humans is due to her sin: "Complain

⁵¹ See, however, Testament of Abraham 11:4–9 (long recension); cf. Testament of Adam (all Syriac recensions) 3:1.

⁵² Cf. Dochhorn, *Die Apokalypse*, 518–521.

about yourself, because the rule of the animals is caused by you" (11:1). As we shall see below, it has been argued that this phrase in 11:1 reflects the notion of the devil's rule on earth; in that case, the inimical animal in sections 10–12 would be no other than the serpent, that is, the devil. However, it is not necessary to interpret Greek Life of Adam and Eve 11:1 in this specific way, if it is accepted that the phrase simply expresses a reversal of fortunes: Once, Adam used to rule the animals, but he has lost that status.

In the Greek Life of Adam and Eve 16:3, it is told that the devil invited the serpent to be his companion in seducing Adam to sin, "so that he will be cast out of paradise, just as we have been cast out by him." This must be a reference to the story of the devil's fall from heaven, a story that is narrated at length in the Armenian, Georgian and Latin versions of the writing.⁵³ The author of the Greek Life of Adam and Eve must have known it in some form, but he has chosen not to narrate it.⁵⁴ It should be noted, however, that the story in the Oriental and Latin recensions explains that jealousy of Adam's status caused the devil to seduce him to sin, but that no mention is made of a throne for Adam, let alone that the devil would, through his evil schemes, have earned a throne of his own. Because the devil had fallen from God's grace, he wanted Adam's downfall as well; in the end, both receive an undesirable existence, and there is no throne for either of them.⁵⁵

⁵³ See especially G. A. Anderson, "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan," in *Literature on Adam and Eve. Collected Essays*, ed. M. E. Stone, et al., SVTP 15 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 83–110.

⁵⁴ Tromp, "The Story of our Lives;" cf. M. E. Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on *The Books of Adam and Eve*," in *Literature on Adam and Eve*, ed. Stone, et al., 43–56.

⁵⁵ The Oriental and Latin recensions of the Life of Adam and Eve tell the story of Satan's fall from heavenly glory, causing his jealousy of Adam and Eve's happy life in paradise (the opposition being, then, that between the devil's former glory, and Adam and Eve's delight). In the Armenian version, it is even explicitly said that the devil from then on lived in sorrow and pains (armLAE 16:2); cf. armgeolatLAE 12:1. See on this matter, G. A. Anderson, "Ezekiel 28, the Fall of Satan, and the Adam Books," in *Literature on Adam and Eve*, ed. Stone, et al., 133–147; cf. Dochhorn, *Die Apokalypse*, 287–288. An original throne for Adam appears in the Coptic *Discourse on Abbatôn* (trans. E. A. W. Budge, *Coptic Martyrdoms etc. in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* [London: Longmans and Co., 1914], 482–491 [esp. 483]), but in this story, Adam's fall does not lead to Satan's rule, either. Instead, kingship is granted to Mouriël, or Abbatôn, the angel of death (Budge, *Coptic Martyrdoms*, 489–490). Cf. the rather confused note in the *History of the Creation and Transgression of Adam* 9: "[The Lord God] put Adam in the middle of the garden because if Adam had kept the Lord's commands, he would have ascended gloriously to the celestial Jerusalem, to the place of the angels who had fallen" (Lipscomb, *The Armenian Apocryphal Adam Literature*, 119).

Greek Life of Adam and Eve 39, then, seems to presuppose yet another story, one that explains how the devil came to rule this world instead of Adam. That story, however, is not told in any of the recensions of the Life of Adam and Eve, except perhaps in the Slavonic, where Satan is told to have given Adam and Eve permission to plow the earth, on condition that they sign a contract, granting world dominion to the devil; Adam signed it, because he knew very well that Christ would eventually annul that contract (slavLAE 33[34:1]-37:1). Many variants of this story exist in the Armenian, Russian and Medieval and Modern Greek tradition, and it is also well attested in Eastern European iconography.⁵⁶ It is clear that the entire story is an elaboration of what is said in Col 2:14, namely that God wiped out the record of our debts and nailed it to the cross. In this interpretation, the Greek word *χειρόγραφον*, “record of debts,” was understood in the sense of “contract,” and Adam and Satan were conceived of as the contract partners, whose agreement was canceled by Jesus’ crucifixion. But even the Slavonic version of the Life of Adam and Eve does not suggest that the devil took over his rule from Adam.

In summary, it can be said that, although Greek Life of Adam and Eve 39 seems to hint at a story in which Adam had to vacate his throne to the devil, this story did not actually exist. Instead, we find stories that relate how both Satan and Adam fell from glory. God’s promise in 39:2–3, that Adam will be seated on the throne formerly occupied by Satan, is a projection into the future of a situation that was commonly assumed to be the reason for the devil’s jealousy in primordial times.

To be sure, the notion that the devil is at present ruling the material world is well known in ancient sources. Moreover, the way in which for instance the Gospel of John speaks about the devil as “the ruler of this world” as a self-evident situation allows us to assume for the moment that this notion was not invented by Christians, but already existed in Jewish circles. However, the projection of the devil’s fall from his throne into a future when Adam’s destiny will be fulfilled—with the devil temporarily occupying the throne intended for Adam—seems to presuppose the Christian schema of the Christ enthroned in heaven as the second Adam, finally bringing God’s intention with humankind to fulfillment. Greek Life of Adam and Eve 39, then, is to be read as an anticipation of the situation

⁵⁶ Stone, “The Legend of the Cheirograph;” cf. Turdeanu, “Apocryphes bogomiles,” 44–49.

brought about by Christ's victory over the devil, through which the original intention of creation was completed.⁵⁷

(c) *Adam As Ruler of the Animals*

As mentioned above, the notion that Adam was intended to rule the animals (2 Enoch 58) is already present in Genesis, Jubilees, and other early Jewish literature.⁵⁸

In Greek Life of Adam and Eve 10–12, however, humanity's rule over the animals (and its loss of that dominion) is problematized. When Adam has fallen ill, he asks Eve and their son Seth to go to paradise and ask for oil from the tree, with which he expects to alleviate his pain (9:3). On their way to paradise, Eve and Seth encounter an animal that attacks Seth. Eve reproaches it for fighting against the image of God, and reminds it of its subordination to the image of God (10). The animal rejects her reproach, and explains that it is because of Eve's transgression that the rule of the animals has come about (11). Finally, Seth tells the animal to disappear from the sight of the image of God until the day of judgment, and so it does (12).

After Seth and Eve's return from paradise, where the favor they asked for was tersely denied (13), Adam instructs his wife to explain to their children how the present situation has come about (14). Eve then begins her flashback by telling that Adam and she were responsible for taking care of the animals in paradise: Adam for the male animals, and Eve for the female ones (15). When the devil seduced the serpent, he began by asking why it ate the stuff Adam weeded, instead of the food from paradise (16:3). After the fall, God announced his verdict on the culprits.⁵⁹ Adam's

⁵⁷ See again Anderson, *The Genesis of Perfection*.

⁵⁸ For the relevant views of Philo of Alexandria, see J. R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism. From Sirach to 2 Baruch*, JSPSup (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 65–88.

⁵⁹ In 2 En 31:7–8 it seems to be said that God decided *not* to curse anything created by himself—in 31:7a, however, the meaning of the text appears to be unclear; see Böttrich, "Das slavische Henochbuch," 927; differently: Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 154. In *The Cave of Treasures*, God explains to Adam that he has cursed the earth because of Adam, but has not cursed Adam himself (5:4). In the same context, God promises Adam to send his son to save him and restore him to his heritage (5:1–9); see also *The History of the Expulsion of Adam from the Garden* 23–27 (ed. Lipscomb, *The Armenian Apocryphal Adam Literature*, 139–141). In the Greek Life of Adam and Eve, the angels pray to God to forgive Adam, because Adam was made in the image of God, by his own hands (33:5; 35:2), and later on in this writing, Adam appears to be pardoned by the Lord for exactly this reason (37:2; cf. Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 185; Doehhorn, *Die Apokalypse*, 479). In 2 En 31:7–8, then, God's decision not to condemn the work of his own hands can be explained as an anticipation of his mercy.

punishments included the disobedience of the animals, over which he once ruled (24:3). The serpent's punishments included enmity between itself and humankind (26:4).

In sections 10–12 it is said that the animal world was once subject to humanity (“the image of God,” here represented by Seth), but that it has taken over dominion because of Eve’s sin. However, there is reason to assume that we should not take the second part of this proposition at face value. The concept that animals are at present ruling humankind is unparalleled, and it should be noted that the animal actually obeys Seth as soon as he tells it to be silent and disappear from the image of God until the day of judgment.⁶⁰ Moreover, the maledictions in sections 24 and 26 explicate that from now on, animals will be disobedient and in a state of enmity, but not that humans will have to obey the animals.

In a recent article Rivka Nir has argued that the animal encountered by Eve and Seth according to sections 10–12 was none other than the devil. She adduces parallels for the notion that the devil is constantly attempting to prevent humankind’s return to paradise, and suggests that it is no coincidence that in the Life of Adam and Eve Seth is attacked at the one moment he is actually on his way to that place. Nir also offers an explanation for the curious ending of the episode, when the animal obeys Seth in removing itself from his sight until the day of judgment. In this brief passage, Seth is designated as the image of God four times, and the day of judgment seems to occupy a prominent position, presumably as the day when the animal’s pretenses concerning the rule over humanity will be annulled forever. Nir proposes to regard the entire scene as an allegory of both the devil’s enmity towards humankind, and his final defeat by Christ, the image of God *par excellence* (cf. 2 Cor 4:4; Col 2:14), prefigured by Seth.⁶¹

I am not entirely convinced by Nir’s argument, especially because of the emphatic way in which the Life of Adam and Eve depicts the beast as a representative of the animal world (see esp. 11:2).⁶² Furthermore, although various secondary versions of the story do indeed identify the animal with

⁶⁰ Dochhorn, *Die Apokalypse*, 265.

⁶¹ “The Struggle between the ‘Image of God’ and Satan in the *Greek* Life of Adam and Eve,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 61 (2008): 327–339; cf. Anderson, *The Genesis of Perfection*, 25–27.

⁶² Cf. the *Combat of Adam*, episodes 8 and 12; ed. A. Battista and B. Bagatti, *Il Combattimento di Adamo*, Studium biblicum franciscanum collectio minor 29 (Jerusalem: Franciscan Print Press, 1982), 40, 49–51; see also Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 165–167.

Satan, it is noteworthy that as many keep the emphasis on its representation of the animal world intact and fail to see a reference to the devil.⁶³

In any case, there seems to be no particular relationship between 2 Enoch and the Life of Adam and Eve in the ways in which they elaborate upon the motif of Adam's rule over the animals. On the contrary, whereas 2 Enoch stresses humankind's responsibility in its dealings with animals, the Life of Adam and Eve emphasizes the inimical relationships between humans and animals. Animal sacrifice plays no role whatsoever in the Life of Adam and Eve, not even in its brief rendition of the story of Cain and Abel.

To conclude this section, it can be said that in the Life of Adam and Eve the motif of Adam's name as an acronym does not occur but in the addition of *De plasmatione Adam* to a late branch of the Latin literary tradition. The motif, originally a variant of the ancient tradition that man was formed from the four elements, has had a long and adventurous history in the Western church, where it was used to express the notion that the entire unfolding and completion of history was *in nuce* already present in Adam at his creation, and thus illustrated divine providence. At the time it was added to the Life of Adam and Eve, this motif was fully developed, and had about the same form as in 2 Enoch.

The motif of Adam's rule of the world occurs in the Life of Adam and Eve in the context of a discussion of Adam's eschatological future. In that future, the devil, the present ruler of this world, will be deposed, and Adam will ascend the throne intended for him in the first place. I have argued that this sequence of events is best comprehended within a Christian frame of mind, in which humankind is represented both by the first Adam, who was defeated by the Enemy, and by the second Adam, by whom the definitive downfall of the devil is effected.⁶⁴ The Christian character of this motif is explicit in 2 Enoch, and its combination in that writing with the concept of Adam as a microcosm now appears to be a natural and organic matter.

Finally, the biblical motif of Adam's rule over the animals is worked out in the Life of Adam and Eve in a way that differs very much from that in 2 Enoch. In neither writing, however, is a relation seen between this

⁶³ Tromp, "Origen on the *Assumption of Moses*," 327–330; cf. Tromp, "The Role of Omissions," 273.

⁶⁴ Cf. M. Simon, "Adam et la rédemption dans la perspective de l'Église ancienne," in *Types of Redemption*, ed. R. J. Zwi Werblowski and C. J. Bleeker, *Studies in the History of Religions* 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 72–87.

motif and the second Adam, Christ. In both writings its etiological function is apparent: 2 Enoch connects Adam's rule over the animals with his (i.e., humankind's) responsibility for animals, and sacrificial animals in particular; in the Life of Adam and Eve it is applied in the description of one of the consequences of Adam's fall and expulsion from paradise, namely the profound change in the peaceful coexistence of animals and humans that once characterized life in paradise.

Conclusions

The preceding observations and deliberations lead to the following conclusions.

(1) If 2 Enoch is read in the context of its transmission by Christians, the traditions concerning Adam's formation from the four elements (and the further development of that motif) and concerning his rule over the cosmos, suspended until the end of time, are part of a particular view on history. In this view, the history of humankind is regarded as a predetermined totality defined by its inception in the first Adam, and completed by the work of the second Adam, Jesus Christ. The intermediate period is to an extent characterized by diabolical seduction and human transgression, but the final completion will bring redemption and the restoration of the world to its initial design.

(2) These two motifs, when they occur in the Life of Adam and Eve and related literature, appear to presuppose the same meaning. The restoration to glory in the eschatological future makes best sense if read in the frame work of the same view on humanity's history: Adam's ascension to the devil's throne is best understood as a reversal of the situation that the Enemy rules this world—a reversal brought about by the second Adam's victory over the devil. The formation of Adam from eight elements and the interpretation of his name as an acronym play no role in the Life of Adam and Eve, except in a late branch of the Latin tradition.

(3) In contrast, the biblical motif of Adam's rule over the animal is put to different uses in 2 Enoch and the Life of Adam and Eve. In both cases, the motif illustrates an aspect of the relationships between humanity and the animal world. In 2 Enoch, it is connected with the question of humans dealing with the animals that are entrusted to their care, whereas in the Life of Adam and Eve it provides the etiological explanation for the enmity that exists between humans and animals (presumably wild animals in particular). Therefore, it appears that the motif of Adam's rule over the

animals is of a somewhat different nature than the other two motifs discussed, in that the former apparently serves as a starting-point for speculation and explanation of the human condition (much in the way many other Adamic traditions do), whereas the latter make the impression of being far more saturated with meaning, and of having been imported into the writings discussed because of their intrinsic meaning.