

“The Lord Will Come with His Holy Myriads” An Investigation of the Linguistic Source of the Citation of 1 Enoch 1,9 in Jude 14b–15

by Edward Mazich

(Collegio di Sant' Anselmo, Piazza Cavalieri di Malta, 5, I-00153 Roma)

I. Introduction

Though it is one of the shorter writings of the New Testament, the Letter of Jude provides its readers with a colorful glimpse into the religious and literary mindset of early Christianity. The author of the epistle is intent on encouraging his fellow believers to hold fast to the faith “which was once for all delivered to the saints” (Jude 3). Along the way he calls to mind some of the great events and personalities of the Hebrew Scriptures – the Exodus and the subsequent disobedience of Israel in the desert (Jude 5, 11b), the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah (Jude 7), and anecdotes regarding Cain, Balaam, and Korah (Jude 11). In addition to these points of reference taken from the Torah, Jude introduces into his argument several vignettes from Jewish works of literature of the intertestamental period. Jude employs two such works in particular, The Testament of Moses, and the First Book of Enoch (1 Enoch). His reference to the Testament of Moses takes the form of an allusion – without mention of its source – to the alleged dispute between Michael the archangel and the devil over the body of Moses. Jude’s use of 1 Enoch is more explicit in that he clearly cites a passage from that book (1 Enoch 1,9; see Jude 14b–15). The language of the source text of this passage – whether the citation is an exact quote or simply an accurate paraphrase – is the subject of the present investigation.

II. Texts and Versions

Since the textual discrepancies among the witnesses to Jud 14b–15 are insignificant in terms of their impact upon the pericope, the reading of Jude 14b–15 used in this article will be that of the 4th edition of the UBS New Testament:

14βιδου ἦλθεν κύριος ἐν ἀγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ 15ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων καὶ ἐλέγξει πῶσαν ψυχὴν περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατ’ αὐτοῦ ἀμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς.

The text of 1 Enoch, for its part, is known in its entirety only in Ethiopic (Ge’ez), though substantial passages are known in Aramaic and Greek versions, and fragments of the work exist in Coptic and Syriac, as well as in Latin patristic quotations. Regarding the Aramaic evidence for 1 Enoch, one finds that sections (some extremely small) of chapters 1–36 and 72–107 are preserved in the Qumran Enochic fragments. Jozef Milik dated the fragment containing part of 1 Enoch 1,9 (4QEn¹i) to the last third of the 1st century

B.C.E.¹ The Greek text of 1 Enoch is preserved in part by a total of five witnesses, only one of which – the 6th-century Codex Panopolitanus, (hereafter, Gk^{Pan}), also known as the Akhmim manuscript or the Gizeh manuscript – contains the passage of the book cited in Jude.²

Given the list of extant witnesses to 1 Enoch in various languages, one can move forward to attempt to answer the question of which version of Enoch was employed by Jude. Several possibilities can be eliminated quickly, clearing the scene for an analysis of the main candidates. From all indications, Ethiopic (Ge`ez) did not emerge as a written language until the 4th century, and literary Coptic does not appear until the late 2nd century at the earliest;³ thus these versions of 1 Enoch can be ruled out as potential sources for Jude. Turning to the Syriac witness to 1 Enoch, in his article on the fragment of 1 Enoch preserved in Michael the Syrian's *Chronicle*, Sebastian Brock demonstrates that Michael's source can ultimately be traced back to a 5th-century Greek language work by the chronicler Annianus of Alexandria. On this point Milik observes: "We must conclude that there are no traces of a special version of the works attributed to Enoch in Syriac literature."⁴ The reader who approaches Jude 14b–15 seeking to determine the language of the Enochic text which Jude used is thus confronted with essentially two possibilities, that of an Aramaic text or a Greek one.

III. 1 Enoch 1,9 in the Epistle of Jude – Comparative Evidence

1. ἰδού

The first point of interest regarding the text of 1 Enoch 1,9 as found in Jude is its very first word, ἰδού. ἰδού attracts some attention in this place since the other extant Greek witness of 1 Enoch, Gk^{Pan}, reads ὄτι. The Ethiopic version, as well as the Latin citations of Pseudo-Cyprian and Pseudo-Vigilius all agree with Jude's reading. James VanderKam observes that the Hebrew phrase כִּי הִנֵּה (For behold!) in Micah 1,3 – a text upon which 1 Enoch 1,4–6 is modeled – is translated literally into Aramaic by אַרְי הָא, and posits that the Aramaic text of 1 Enoch 1:9 may well have begun with אַרְי הָא instead of כְּדִי as Milik proposes, reflecting

¹ J. Milik, *Problèmes de la Littérature Henochique à la Lumière des Fragments Araméens de Qumrân*, HThR 64 (1971) 333–378, here: 335. G. Perez offers an alternative date for this fragment, assigning it to the first half of the first century C.E.: G. Perez, *Apocriphi dell' Antico Testamento: Le Apocalissi*, in: M. Perez-Fernandez (ed.), *Letteratura Giudaica Intertestamentaria*, Brescia 1998, 232–289; here: 235.

² The most recent edition of the text of Gk^{Pan}, along with a study of the work is found in M. Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*, Leiden 1970. Gk^{Pan} contains 1 Enoch 1,1–32,6, the complete text of the first thirty-two chapters of Enoch.

³ T. Lambdin, *Introduction to Classical Ethiopic (Ge`ez)* (HSS 24), Missoula, MT 1978, 1; B. Layton, *A Coptic Grammar* (PLO.NS 20), Wiesbaden 2000, 1–2.

⁴ S. Brock, *A Fragment of Enoch (6:1–6) in Syriac*, JThS 19 (1968) 627–629; J. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, Oxford 1976, 83. Milik makes a similar conclusion with respect to the possibility of a Latin version of 1 Enoch: having reviewed all the known Patristic Latin quotations of 1 Enoch, he observes "there is no irrefutable evidence for the existence of a Latin version of the Enochic writings" *ibid.*, 81.

the continuing influence of the Micah passage on the first chapter of 1 Enoch.⁵ If אֵרַי הָהוּא were the introductory phrase of 1 Enoch 1:9, as VanderKam claims, then one could see how this expression which literally translates into Greek as ὁ τὶ ἰδοῦ could have given rise to two different Greek language text traditions: one (Jude) abbreviating this phrase to the single word ἰδοῦ, and the other (Gk^{Pan}) shortening the expression to ὅτι.

The presence of ὅτι and ἰδοῦ in the respective versions indicates that the Gk^{Pan} codex and the text of Jude likely derive from slightly different attempts to translate an original Aramaic exemplar. Since it is difficult to determine how far removed either Greek translation is from that text tradition, one cannot conclude from this ὅτι / ἰδοῦ discrepancy that Jude himself was employing an Aramaic source text. Thus the examination of this first notable point in the text of Jude does not yield any further information than that which was already known⁶ – that 1 Enoch ultimately stems from a Semitic background.

2. ἤλθεν: An Aramaic Prophetic Perfect?

This initial disappointment is hardly the end however: one need go no farther than the next word of Jude's Enochic quote to find a significant clue as to the linguistic foundation of his source. The Enochic text in Jude begins: ἰδοῦ ἤλθεν κύριος ἐν ἀγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων. The aorist verb ἤλθεν is usually translated by a present tense in modern language Bibles since it is seen as the literal Greek translation of a Semitic prophetic perfect. However, while the prophetic perfect is well-known in Hebrew, that does not mean that it was an acceptable construction in Aramaic, particularly the Aramaic which was in use at the time of the composition of 1 Enoch.

Following the dating provided by Milik, the Aramaic of 1 Enoch would be comparable to that of the Aramaic sections of the canonical Book of Daniel, which are thought to have been composed in the latter half of the 3rd century and the first half of the 2nd century B.C.E.⁷ This linguistic link is important because Daniel yields the only possible witness which has been noted as of yet to the existence of the prophetic perfect in Palestinian Aramaic of this

⁵ For an outline of Enoch's borrowing from Micah 1, see J. VanderKam, *The Theophany of Enoch I 3b–7.9*, VT 23 (1973) 147f; for the suggestion that אֵרַי הָהוּא may have been the opening phrase of 1 Enoch 1:9, see *ibid.*, A Note on a Problem in the Greek version of 1 Enoch i.9, JThS 32 (1981) 136f; as well as Milik, *Books* (see n. 4), 184.

⁶ Though most commentators maintain that Enoch was originally composed in Aramaic, some contemporary scholars propose that at least parts of Enoch were written in Hebrew. Klaus Beyer, for example, argues in favor of a Hebrew original of 1En 37–71 (the citation made by Jude does not stem from this section of 1 Enoch which, as Beyer notes, never appears among the Qumran finds). In a similar vein, Siegbert Uhlig points out the possibility that all of 1 Enoch may have come from a Hebrew original (he does not endorse this view, however). See K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*, Göttingen 1984, 226; and S. Uhlig, *Das Äthiopische Henochbuch (JSRZ V/6)*, Gütersloh 1984, 483–488.

⁷ Milik, *Books* (see n. 4), 25.28. John Collins surveys the recent history of attempts to date the Aramaic of Daniel and then concludes "The balance of probability ... favors a date in the early Hellenistic period for the Aramaic portions of Daniel, although a precise dating on linguistic grounds is not possible" J.J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary*, Minneapolis, MN 1993, 17.

era. The text of Daniel which may be a candidate for this classification is Dan 7,27, observed by Rosenthal and Black, among others.⁸

Dan 7,27a reads:

<p>ומלכותה ושלטנא ורבוהא די מלכות תחות כל-שמיא יהיבת לעם קדישי עליונין</p>	<p>“... and the kingdom and the dominion and the greatness of the kingdoms under all the heavens will be given to the holy people of the Most High.”</p>
--	---

The verb יהיבת in this clause is a perfect passive of the p-îl conjugation. From the context – the account of an apocalyptic dream in which Daniel saw various beasts waging war against the holy ones of the Most High and the ultimate judgment of these beasts, and then speaks with an interlocutor who explains the dream – one understands that Daniel (though he has already seen these things prophetically) is speaking of a *future* judgment to be levied upon the beasts, and a *future* vindication of the holy ones.

Thus one has a verb in the perfect which is used to describe an event that was revealed to a prophet in a dream, but which has still not taken place in reality. In Dan 7,27 then, יהיבת has all the semantic markings of a prophetic perfect.

If the case of Dan 7,27 holds true, and prophetic perfects were in use in the Aramaic of this period, then it would seem likely that a prophetic perfect may indeed lie beneath the ἤλθεν in Jude 14b. After all, the section of 1 Enoch which Jude quotes concerns the impending final judgment of the Lord on the inhabitants of the earth – a clear prophecy.⁹ In addition, Gk^{Pan} and the Ethiopic have present tense and imperfect verbs where Jude has ἤλθεν; if the text of Enoch originally had had an imperfect in this place, there is no reason why Jude would have changed it to an aorist in his epistle. If, however, a prophetic perfect were found in the original Aramaic Enoch, then one could see why the scribes who established the text traditions behind Gk^{Pan} and the Ethiopic manuscripts would have “corrected” this reading by changing the perfect to a present or imperfect, making the text of 1 Enoch more “sensible” for their readers.

⁸ F. Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (PLO.NS 5), Wiesbaden 1995, 60; M. Black, *The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament*, NTS 18 (1971/72) 1–14, here: 10.

⁹ Anton Vögtle prudently cautions that the presence of another aorist verb with a future implication (ἀπώλοντο in v. 11c) in Jude’s work casts some doubt on the likelihood of ἤλθεν pointing to an underlying Aramaic prophetic perfect – instead Jude’s employment of ἀπώλοντο would indicate that his command of the Greek language itself included the use of prophetic aorists. However, there is a key difference between the aspect of these two verbs: ἀπώλοντο serves as an ingressive aorist which describes an act that *has already begun*. On the other hand, ἤλθεν refers to a single unique event which clearly has not yet taken place – the final coming of the Lord in glory. A. Vögtle, *Der Judasbrief. Der Zweite Petrusbrief* (EKK 22), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1994, 73. – Several commentators have described ἤλθεν in Jude 14 as a “proleptic” or “futuristic” aorist; such forms are found in biblical and even classical Greek, yet *always* in the context of a conditional sentence or in the midst of an implied conditional situation. Since Jude 14 is not a conditional sentence, and does contain any implied conditions, it is unlikely that ἤλθεν in this verse is representative of a “proleptic” or a “futuristic” aorist.

The aorist ἦλθεν in Jude 14b does appear then to point to the presence of an underlying prophetic perfect, and therefore to Aramaic (as opposed to Greek) as being the language of the text which Jude used as his source.

3. ἐν / ב

The next place at which Jude's text betrays the possibility of an Aramaic source is in the phrase (still from verse 14b) ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν κύριος ἐν ἀγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ. Gk^{Pan} here gives a different reading: ὅτι ἔρχεται σὺν ταῖς μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς ἀγίοις αὐτοῦ. Aside from the scribal emendation which lengthens the Gk^{Pan} version, one sees another, more subtle distinction between Jude's Greek and that of Gk^{Pan} in their respective choice of prepositions: ἐν ἀγίαις μυριάσιν for Jude as opposed to the σὺν ταῖς μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ of Gk^{Pan}. Of the two readings, Jude presents the *lectio difficilior* since his reading is shorter and does not include the fairly clear "explanation" of οἱ ἄγιοι which Gk^{Pan} features. In addition, Jude's use of ἐν plus a dative to signify physical accompaniment is unusual for Greek;¹⁰ one would expect σὺν with the dative or μετὰ with the genitive to express this relationship. Jude may have translated the Aramaic [יְהוָה קְרִישְׁנָהּ בְּרַבְרָב] as ἐν ἀγίαις μυριάσιν, reflecting in his choice of ἐν the semantic range of the Aramaic preposition ב, which can mean "with," – as it would have meant in this place in the (conjectured) parent text of 1 Enoch – but which most commonly means "in." From a side by side comparison of Jude and Gk^{Pan} one can infer that the original text carried the meaning of physical accompaniment: "with." In all likelihood, Jude translated the ב prepositional prefix of an Aramaic text rather mechanically as ἐν, while the scribe responsible for the Gk^{Pan} text tradition translated the same preposition more fluidly into Greek by the use of σὺν. In light of the range of meanings of the preposition ב in Middle Aramaic and the comparative evidence regarding the meaning of the original text of 1 Enoch given by the Ethiopic version, Gk^{Pan}, and Jude, it seems plausible that Jude was referring to an Aramaic version of 1 Enoch when he cited that work in his Epistle.

4. [רַבְרַב] וְקָשִׁין: Jude's Emended Text

The final point at which Jude shows some sign of reliance upon the Aramaic version of 1 Enoch comes near the end of verse 15, where one reads: ... περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ... The Aramaic preserved at this place in 1 Enoch 1,9 supplies only a few letters: [רַבְרַב] וְקָשִׁין "proud and hard." Jude shortened this phrase in verse 15b to simply τῶν σκληρῶν "the hard (words)." Jude's apparent dependence on the Aramaic text goes somewhat further however, extending into verse 16, which states: ... καὶ το στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα ... The substantive ὑπέρογκα here has the sense of "proud [speech]," or "bombast." After examining Jude 15b–16, Boudewijn Dehandschutter remarks that Jude may have been "adapting the [Enochic] quotation in view of v.16," in which case Jude would have read the Aramaic [רַבְרַב] וְקָשִׁין in his text of 1 Enoch, then used this phrase differently in his own epistle, employing the idea of "hard words" in verse 15b and the concept

¹⁰ It is unusual but certainly not unattested; the BGAD Lexicon cites Plato and Demosthenes, among others, as using ἐν with the dative to describe the relationship of physical accompaniment. In any case, this is not a common verbal construction.

of “bombast” in verse 16.¹¹ Since the known Greek and Ethiopic versions of 1 Enoch emend the text of 1 Enoch 1,9 at this point and lack expressions corresponding to the Aramaic רַבְרַבְנָא, (ὑπέρογκα), it appears likely that Jude was in fact referencing the Aramaic version when he used this phrase (albeit in a modified way) in verses 15 and 16.¹²

V. Conclusion

Whether Jude was paraphrasing a source from memory or citing directly from a text, it seems that his original source was marked by a pair of Semitic features (a “prophetic perfect” – ἤλθεν in Jude 14 – and the use of a pronoun with a broad semantic range to indicate the relationship of physical accompaniment where one would expect (at least in Greek) a more precisely tailored expression – the proposed ἐν – for – א translation of Jude 14). In addition, Jude’s base text likely contained a sequence of words which are present in the Aramaic version of Enoch but absent from the known Greek version of that work (τῶν σκληρῶν and ὑπέρογκα). None of these three features of Jude’s source alone indicates with certainty that Jude was using an Aramaic source; however, their combined appearance in such a short passage does point in that direction.

It will never be proven beyond a doubt, but a preponderance of the literary evidence suggests that Jude made use of an Aramaic version of 1 Enoch when he referred to that work in the letter which he wrote to his fellow Christian believers.

¹¹ B. Dehandschutter, Pseudo-Cyprian, Jude and Enoch: Some Notes on 1 Enoch 1:9, in: Tradition and Re-Interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature. Essays in Honour of Jürgen C. H. Lebram, Leiden 1986, 114–120, here: 119.

¹² The possibility exists that Jude was using a “better” Greek manuscript of 1 Enoch than that which is known today (Gk^{Pan}). This hypothetical manuscript could have contained the word ὑπέρογκα in its rendition of 1 Enoch 1,9 and Jude theoretically could have taken his modified version of 1 Enoch 1,9 from this source.