

formulas. In Ezra–Nehemiah and 1–2 Chronicles, the ultimate cultic authority of liturgical texts and their prescriptions has influenced the understanding of the Torah. As with cultic or liturgical texts regulating the temple cult, the book of Moses itself became authoritative. Ezra–Nehemiah and 1–2 Chronicles thus merge the idea of religiously authoritative literature, whose claim to authority came from the divine message they communicated, with the authoritative claim of cultic and liturgical documents, which were authoritative as documents and not because of their divine message. Out of the blending of these two ideas was born the concept of scripture.

## The Parables of Enoch and the Foundation of the Rabbinic Sect: A Hypothesis\*

by

DANIEL BOYARIN

Among the many interests of Prof. Günter Stemberger's careful and creative scholarship over the decades has been the nexus among second-temple Judaism, early Christianity, and rabbinic Judaism. This offering in his honor is intended as a contribution to that study.

The second booklet of the Ethiopian Enoch, known as *1 Enoch*, namely the Parables of Enoch, may provide important clues for unlocking the mysteries of that nexus.<sup>1</sup> This is a text, apparently originally written by a Jew or Jews in either Hebrew or Aramaic sometime in the first century, translated into Greek in some form of a Greek Bible, and only known to us from a late-ancient translation into Ethiopic. While some parts of the text of *1 Enoch* as a whole are known from other sources (either Aramaic ones or Greek), the Parables have only survived in the Ethiopic version. Their provenance (at the level of generality in which I have given it) seems relatively secure. In a recent, as yet unpublished study of the Parables (also known as the Similitudes of Enoch), Pierluigi Piovanelli uses rhetorical analysis "in order to reconstruct the profile of the implied audience and community" of the Parables of Enoch and compellingly argues that the producers of this document did not belong to an embattled and oppressed sect but identified themselves, in fact, in some important sense with Israel as a whole. His interpretative assumption is that the "kings and the mighty" who are the declared enemies of the author(s) of

\* This paper was originally prepared for the third Enoch Workshop held at Camaldoli, Tuscany in June of 2005 under the auspices of Prof. Gabriele Boccaccini. It will be published, deo volente, in a much expanded form in the volume that emerges from that conference, including a fuller consideration of the evidence in the Hekhalot literature and a more detailed study of the Parables of Enoch themselves. Until then, it is a pleasure and an honor to send this thesis on its maiden voyage in a *Festschrift* for Prof. Stemberger.

<sup>1</sup> For an excellent translation and introduction to the scholarly issues surrounding this work, see G.W.E. NICKELSBURG, J.C. VANDERKAM (eds.), *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, Minneapolis 2004. The Parables, themselves, are there on pp. 50-95.

the Parables are gentile (probably Roman) rulers.<sup>2</sup> What I wish to do here is to explore some potentially highly significant implications of this argument for the investigation of rabbinic literature and for the history of the rabbinic movement as part and parcel of a much larger phenomenon that we might call Judaism. Piovanelli posits two alternative possibilities for conceiving of the place of the Parables of Enoch, writing:

To posit an Aramaic *Urtext* is to stress the continuity existing between the Enochic writings found in Qumran and the Book of Parables, which is, after all, an integral part of the 1 *Enoch* collection. Conversely, to opt for a Hebrew text would emphasize its affinity with the 3 *Enoch* writings, as if the Book of Parables were the forerunner of the *Hekalot* literature.

While I am less than convinced of the necessary ties between language and affinity, I do find that the distinction between Qumranic connections on the one side and *Hekalot* connections on the other side is a deeply compelling one. (I must say, however, that I am rather unimpressed with the arguments offered, on all fronts, for a particular, specific historical background for the text; my own suggestions here are not in any way dependent on any specific dating for the text). It seems to me that Piovanelli is right to stress these different alternatives, not only as mere matters of literary history but as powerful and significant indicators of the social location of the group that formed the text.

Piovanelli's observations on the relatively nonsectarian (or non-sect-like) character of the Parables suggest, in fact, a disjunction between them and Qumran, as there may be no doubt but that the Qumran community is sociologically a kind of sect. As Gabriele Boccaccini has written, at Qumran, we find "the first example of an underground trend of thought that would often resurface in the history of Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism. The outside world is the realm of Belial... The one who does not join the community will not become clean by the acts of atonement, nor shall he be purified by the cleansing waters, nor shall he be made holy by the seas or rivers, nor shall he be purified by all the water of ablutions".<sup>3</sup> Aharon Shemesh has, moreover, argued in two closely-reasoned articles that from a halakhic standpoint, the members of the Qumran community understood themselves as

2 P. PIOVANELLI, "A Testimony for the Kings and Might Who Possess the Earth: The Thirst for Justice and Peace in the Parables of Enoch", paper presented at *The III Enoch Seminar Camaldoli*, 6-11 Giugno 2005.

3 G. BOCCACCINI, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*, Grand Rapids, Mich. 1998, 67.

Israel and all others, including other Israelites, as Gentiles.<sup>4</sup> This is, of course, consistent with other aspects of the ideology of the sectarian scrolls which seem to imply such an identification of the Community with Israel *tout court*.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, Albert Baumgarten has proposed that this is the very definition of Jewish sectarianism: "Ancient Jewish sectarians... turned the means of marking separation normally applied against non-Jews against those otherwise regarded as fellow Jews, as a way of protesting against those Jews, and/or against Jewish society at large. As a result of these actions all Jews were no longer on the same footing; *sectarian Jews treated other Jews as outsiders of a new sort*".<sup>6</sup> At the same time, however, Baumgarten makes clear that there were significant differences in this respect between the "introversionist" and "greedy" Qumranite sectarianism which allowed virtually no value at all to any other form of Judaism and the "reformist" sects of the Pharisees and Sadducees. The latter "hold hopes of reforming the larger society, and have not given up on it or renounced it totally, still perceiving themselves as members of the whole", while the "introversionist sort of sect, by contrast, has so finally rejected the institutions of the society as a whole as to turn in on itself completely, and to rank those outside its bounds as irredeemable".<sup>7</sup> One way to think of this is that a sect describes themselves as having left the larger group, owing to the corruption of that larger group, while a Church, as it were, describes the others as having left (or been pushed out) of the larger group owing to their defalcation from the true way and concomitant corruption, or even as representing a contaminating force that comes from the outside. This does not represent, of course, necessarily a difference in "reality", but it does constitute an important difference in representation and self-fashioning. In terms of discourse, one distinction will be with respect to legitimation. While the "Church" will frequently present itself as the heir to an apostolic succession, the "sect" will as frequently present itself as the heirs to a new revelation. As M.D. Herr has written, "Rabbinic thought projects a definite attitude regarding *continuum* and *continuity* in the chain of Torah transmission. In direct contrast to this approach the writings of the Dead Sea Sect (Damascus Document V,2) contend that the Torah was not known at all from the era of the

4 A. SHEMESH, "The Origins of the Laws of Separatism: Qumran Literature and Rabbinic Halacha", in *Revue de Qumran* 18, no. 2 (1997), 223-241; IDEM, "The One Who Divides Between the Children of Light and the Children of Darkness, Between Israel and the Nations" (in Hebrew), in *Atara l'Haim: Studies in the Talmud and Medieval Rabbinic Literature in Honor of Professor Haim Zalman Dimitrovsky*, ed. by D. BOYARIN et al., Jerusalem 2000, 209-220.

5 BOCCACCINI, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis* (see above n. 3), 66.

6 A.I. BAUMGARTEN, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation*, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 55, Leiden 1997, 9, emphasis original.

7 BAUMGARTEN, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sect* (see above n. 6), 12-13.

Judges until the end of the First Temple period. Even after the destruction, they maintain, the *Torah* was not really understood until the founding of the sect".<sup>8</sup>

As has been frequently pointed out, the sociological situation of the Qumran group answers precisely to the description of a sect in the sense of a group that has broken off from the main part of a religious community in search of greater purity or stringency. In a sense the rhetoric of Qumran in this respect is similar to that of the Fourth Gospel. Indeed, following Boccaccini, it seems more attractive to find the roots of supersessionism, *Verus Israel*, rather than the roots of heresiology in Qumran. This point comes out very clearly in another discussion by Shemesh.<sup>9</sup> Certain members of the House of Israel have been, owing to their righteousness vouchsafed additional revelation, and they – the Dead Sea community – now constitute Israel. The structure is, then, seemingly analogous to Pauline thought, whereby a new revelation has taken place and, whether voluntarily or involuntarily, only some of Israel have heard it, and these constitute a New Israel. Piovanelli, on the other hand, convinces at least this reader that the Parables of Enoch are not the product of a sect, that indeed they show none of the signs of the particular apocalyptic imagery that characterize such groups, that rather the Parabolists, if I may coin yet another term, speak for כלל ישראל against a common outside oppressor, the Romans, of course. As he concludes, "the intended audience to whom the Book of Parables addresses its message of solace and hope is but the ensemble of the Jewish People fallen under the domination of a new and merciless dynasty". Whether or not we need to speak of a full-blown parting of the ways, it seems nevertheless compellingly the case that Qumranic sectarianism and the ethos behind The Parables of Enoch represent distinct forms of Jewish religious imagination and distinctly different types of community. It becomes even less plausible than previously thought to seek to date the Parables on the basis of their absence from the Enoch of Qumran. The suggestion that I want to make is that this conclusion is a highly important one for an understanding of the provenience and inner development of rabbinic Judaism. I wish to offer here a very preliminary sketch of an hypothesis that although it is (intentionally) hidden within rabbinic texts, there is, nonetheless, evidence there to suggest that rabbinic Judaism grows out of a Judaism deeply informed by the sort of religiosity that is manifest in the Parables.

8 M.D. HERR, "Continuum in the Chain of Torah Transmission", in *Zion* XLIV (1979), x, (in Hebrew with English summary).

9 A. SHEMAESH, "Expulsion and Exclusion in the *Community Rule* and the *Damascus Document*", in *Dead Sea Discoveries* 9, no. 1 (2002), 44–74.

### The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch

The fact that in the Parables we find the Son of Man as a redeemer figure without reference to any particular Christian context provides in my view a highly significant clue to the history of Judaism and in particular to the transitions from the Second-Temple to the late ancient forms of the religion.<sup>10</sup> In the present context, it would be hardly apposite to go into the rich and extensive debates and controversies around the term "Son of Man" as used in the Gospels, so I will only sketch out my own view. To my mind, the use of this term as a name for a specific figure is unintelligible in Hebrew, Aramaic, or a fortiori Greek, unless it is an allusion to a specific Son of Man. It is well known by now that the term in its Hebrew and Aramaic originals simply means a human being. A usage such as that of Jesus, referring to himself in both the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel as "the son of man" only makes sense if the son of man is a known figure already in the discursive world of the Gospels, and indeed we do not have to travel far to find out his origins and to what the dominical sayings are alluding, namely Daniel 7, in which the prophet sees two divine figures, one an Ancient of Days and the other "like a human being". This figure, seen by Daniel in his vision, and understood in various different ways as a second divine person and redeemer takes on a life of his own as "the Son of Man" until by the time of the Gospel writers, the term Son of Man is simply another name for the Redeemer, second person, or even junior divinity who is identified with Jesus of Nazareth, or, more precisely, with whom Jesus of Nazareth identifies himself.

A key piece of evidence for this suggestion is provided by the Parables of Enoch, chapter 46.<sup>11</sup> In this chapter we are provided with the following vision:

There I saw one who had a head of days,<sup>12</sup> and his head was like white wool. And with him was another, whose face was like the appearance of a man; and his face was full of graciousness like one of the holy angels. And I asked the angel of peace, who went with me and showed me all the hidden things, about that son of man — who he was and whence he was (and) why he went with the Head of Days. And he answered me and said to him, "This is the son of man who has righteousness...".

10 The term, religion, is both an anachronism and a misnomer in my view, as readers of my recent work will know, but still I find it hard to do without it entirely; cfr. D. BOYARIN, "The Christian Invention of Judaism: The Theodosian Empire and the Rabbinic Refusal of Religion", *Representations* 85 (2004), 21–57.

11 NICKELSBURG, VANDERKAM, *I Enoch: A New Translation* (see above n. 1), 59–60.

12 It is not clear to me how the Aramaic עתיק יומין, something like Ancient of Days, yields "head of days", but this is immaterial for the present case.

The text goes on to describe the messianic and other activities and traits of the Son of Man, activities and traits that are familiar from the figure of Jesus as well. This son of man text is, however, *typologically* earlier than the Gospels in that the close connection with the exegetical source in Daniel is maintained throughout. We know here precisely what son of man we are talking about, the one who comes, in Daniel with the Ancient of Days of the snowy beard and two thrones, as well. In the Gospels, this figure is already free of his exegetical moorings and sailing on his own. This does not, I emphasize, constitute a claim that the Parables of Enoch are earlier chronologically than the Gospels, nor certainly that they influenced the Gospels, but it does enable me to hypothesize a very widespread development of the figure originally known as one *like* a human being and still appearing as such in the Parables but shading over into being the Human Being, with the Gospel representing another typological moment in the development of this form of redeemer myth. Since, as I have already said, there is not the slightest reason to consider the Parables of Enoch a Christian text, as opposed to a Jewish one, I think we have *prima facie* grounds for a wild guess of Son of Man spirituality as being a very widespread form of Jewish belief at the end of the Second-Temple period. Given this, the developments of the Son of Man, through Enoch into Metatron, the one beside the Throne, are not hard to imagine either. Gospel Christianity turns out to be simply one of the best attested forms of Judaism in the first century A.C., and one, moreover, that was seemingly much closer to the heart of general Jewish belief than the rabbinic offshoot of Judaism from which the Son of Man has been quite purged, and possibly so well into late antiquity (if not later than that). My best evidence, for the nonce at any rate, for this latter conjecture is rabbinic literature itself and its apparent attempts to censor, suppress, and quash any such ideas and representations of Godhead.<sup>13</sup>

### Suppressing the Son of Man

One very rich example is from the fourth-century *midraš*, the *Mekilta de-Rabbi Išma'el* to Exodus 20,2:

I am the Lord your God (Exod 20,2): Why was it said? For this reason. At the sea He appeared to them as a mighty hero doing battle, as it is said: "The Lord is a man of war". At Sinai he appeared to them as an old man full of mercy. It is said: "And they saw the God of Israel" (Exod

13 The argument of the next section is a revised (and hopefully improved) version of a thesis first laid out by me in D. BOYARIN, "Two Powers in Heaven; or, the Making of a Heresy", in *Festschrift for James Kugel*, ed. by H. NAJMAN, Leiden 2003, 331-370.

24,10), etc. And of the time after they had been redeemed what does it say? "And the like of the very heaven for clearness" (*ibid.*). Again it says: "I beheld till thrones were placed, and one that was ancient of days did sit" (Dan 7,9). And it also says: "A fiery stream issued", etc. (v. 10). Scripture, therefore, would not let the nations of the world have an excuse for saying that there are two Powers, but declares: "The Lord is a man of war, the Lord is His name". He, it is, who was in Egypt and He who was at the sea. It is He who was in the past and He who will be in the future. It is He who is in this world and He who will be in the world to come, as it is said, "See now that I, even I, am He", etc. (Deut 32,39). And it also says: "Who hath wrought and done it? He that called the generations from the beginning. I, the Lord, who am the first, and with the last am the same" (Isa 41,4).<sup>14</sup>

It is the passage from Daniel that is alluded to, *but not cited* in the anti-"heretical" discourse, the "Son of Man" passage so pivotal for the development of early Christology, that is the real point of contention here and the reason for the citation of the verse Exodus 20,2. There are two descriptions of God as revealed in the Torah, one at the splitting of the Red Sea and one at the revelation of the ten commandments at Sinai. In the first, God is explicitly described as a warrior, that is, as a young man, as it were, while at the latter, as the Rabbis read it, God is described as an elder, full of wisdom and mercy. The problem is the doubling of descriptions of God as *senex* (judge) and *puer* (man of war) and the correlation of those two descriptions with the divine figures of Ancient of Days and Son of Man from Daniel, which together might easily lead one to think that there are Two Powers in Heaven, indeed that God has two persons, a Father-person and a Son-person. These were, of course, crucial loci for Christological interpretations. The citation of God's Name in Exodus 20,2, at the beginning of those same ten commandments, thus answers possible heretical implications of those verses by insisting on the unity of H' in both instances. The text portentously *avoids* citing the Daniel verse most difficult for rabbinic Judaism, vv. 13-14: "I saw in the vision of the night, and behold with the clouds of the Heaven there came one like a Son of Man and came to the Ancient of Days and stood before him and brought him close, and to him was given rulership and the glory and the kingdom, and all nations, peoples, and languages will worship him. His rulership is eternal which will not pass, and his kingship will not be destroyed".<sup>15</sup> The tacit contention with the Logos

14 S. HOROVITZ, I.A. RABIN (eds.), *Mekilta d'Rabbi Ismael*, Jerusalem 1970, 220-221.

15 For another instance in which, also in a polemical context, the Rabbis avoid citing the really difficult part of Daniel 7, see A.F. SEGAL, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports About Christianity and Gnosticism*, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity XXV, Leiden 1977, 132.

(*Memra*) theology of the Targum appears especially strong when we remember that in targumic texts, we can find the Son of Man identified as the Messiah.<sup>16</sup> Furthermore, in a talmudic passage to be discussed below (p. 61; bHag 14a), Rabbi Aqiva himself is represented as identifying the "Son of Man" with the heavenly David, and thus with the Messiah, before being "encouraged" by his fellows to abandon this "heretical" view. This would suggest the possibility that there were non-Christian Jews who would have identified the Messiah himself (necessarily incarnate) as the Son of Man.

In the text of rabbinic literature which deals most extensively (if somewhat obliquely) with Son of Man traditions, namely the second chapter of bHag,<sup>17</sup> we find, on my reading some commanding evidence that such traditions were extant within the circles that produced rabbinic literature itself and that the 3 *Enoch* and the *Hekalot* cannot be neatly separated from those circles at all. I emphasize that I am not referring to early Palestinian rabbinic traditions, the object of the narratives of the Babylonian Talmud, but rather to traditions that I assume were formed in late antiquity and in Babylonia, not to the Rabbis who are told about but to the Rabbis who did the telling.

One of the most evocative and revealing of these texts involves the "heresy" of Rabbi Aqiva in a discussion about the "Son of Man" passage from Daniel:

One verse reads: "His throne is sparks of fire" (Dan 7,9) and another [part of the] verse reads, "until thrones were set up and the Ancient of Days sat" (7,9). This is no difficulty: One was for him and one was for David.

As we learn in a *baraita* [non Mishnaic tannaitic tradition]: One for him and one for David; these are the words of Rabbi Aqiva. Rabbi Yose the Galilean said to him: Aqiva! Until when will you make the *Šekina* profane?! Rather. One was for judging and one was for mercy.

Did he accept it from him, or did he not?

Come and hear! One for judging and one for mercy, these are the words of Rabbi Aqiva [bHag 14a].

As we see from this late third-century or so passage, the second-century Rabbi Aqiva is portrayed as interpreting these verses in a way that certainly would

16 S.O.P. MOWINCKEL, *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism*, trans. by G.W. Anderson, Oxford 1956, 357. See also M. IDEL, *Messianic Mystics*, New Haven 1998, 89.

17 In the expanded version of this paper, more of this chapter will be considered as well. For the nonce, let me just mention the evident parallels (not necessarily genetic in origin, but perhaps so) in interest in meteorological phenomena.

seem consistent with "Two Powers in Heaven",<sup>18</sup> which, given its context, should be identified, I suggest, with speculation about the Son of Man as a second, youthful divine figure alongside the Ancient of Days. The crux is his identification of David, the Messiah, as the "Son of Man" who sits at God's right hand, thus suggesting not only a divine figure but one who is incarnate in a human being as well<sup>19</sup> – "I am [the Messiah] and you shall see 'the son of man' sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven" (Mark 14,62). Hence, his objector's taunt: "Until when will you make the Divine Presence profane"?! that is, imply that the Son of Man has become incarnate in the human figure of the Davidic Messiah. Rabbi Aqiva seems to be projecting a divine-human, Son of Man, who will be the Messiah. His contemporary R. Yose the Galilean strenuously objects to Rabbi Aqiva's

18 In a recent article [D.D. HANNAH, "The Throne of His Glory: The Divine Throne and Heavenly Mediators in Revelation and the Similitudes of Enoch", in *ZNW* 94 (2003), 68–96], Darrell Hannah notes the significance of this text but doesn't do much with it partly, I think, owing to his dependence on earlier traditions of rabbinic scholarship. First of all, it is highly unlikely, *pace* Alan Segal (cautiously), that we are dealing here with a "genuine" tradition about Rabbi Aqiva from early in the second century, this on general methodological grounds. Secondly, the tenor of Hannah's comments indicate that he just doesn't appreciate the force of exegesis in texts such as these. Of course Rabbi Aqiva doesn't speak about one throne but about two; that is, after all, the point of his whole comment, namely to account for two thrones. Although, as I have suggested, the text (and other rabbinic texts) carefully, gingerly avoid actually citing the Son of Man passage in these very verses, it is on these verses that they indeed rely. Rabbi Aqiva's point is that one of the two thrones was for the Ancient of Days and one for David. The *question* to which he is addressing himself, however, namely the seeming contradiction between one verse in which a single throne is spoken of and one in which two thrones are spoken of may itself have in the background the controversy with which Hannah deals as to whether the second person occupies the same throne or an adjacent one with the first person. I simply don't understand how this entire question can be dealt with without paying close attention to the fact that in the *Similitudes*, as in the Gospels, and in early rabbinic literature, the Son of Man is *always* an allusion to the passage in Daniel. Were more attention paid to this simple principle, much less ink would need to be spilt. It is not sitting in heaven that has become suspect (although of course that is what the text says) but the sitting of the Son of Man in such wise that he could be construed as of equal or even near-equal status to the Ancient of Days. The retort to Rabbi Aqiva is precise, implying as it does, a close approach to Christology. By the way, Hannah is slightly mistaken on yet another point about this text; Rabbi Yose the Galilean does not say that the two chairs are for the attribute of justice and the attribute of mercy but for God when he sits in judgment and when he sits, as it were, in mercy, quite a different thing. Even that was too close to binitarianism, it seems, for the later generation that insisted that there aren't two thrones at all but a throne and a footstool. The entanglements of these rabbinic texts with non-rabbinic and Christian texts has not yet been fully unravelled, I think.

19 SEGAL, *Two Powers in Heaven* (see above n. 15), 47.



"dangerous" interpretation and gives the verse a "Modalist" interpretation. Of course, the Talmud itself must record that Rabbi Aqiva changed his mind in order for him to remain "orthodox". The Son of Man, aka "Two Powers in Heaven", is thus not foreign even at the very heart of the rabbinic enterprise. Even a figure like Rabbi Aqiva has to be educated as to the heretical nature of his position. Moreover, as pointed out by Segal, "nor was R. Akiva alone in the rabbinic movement in identifying the figure in heaven as the messiah".<sup>20</sup>

It is not too much to suggest, I think, that the pressure against "Rabbi Aqiva's" position was generated by the explicit identification of the Son of Man with the Logos Incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth. "Orthodox" Jewish versions of this theologoumenon had then to be "corrected" – not incidentally with many of the techniques which Christians were in the post-Nicene era were to use in order to produce the "Fathers" as speaking with one theological voice. Segal also writes, "By the third century... the rabbis seem to be fully aware of the kinds of claims that could be made about a 'son of man' or Metatron or any other principal angel. So they reject the idea of divine intermediaries totally"<sup>21</sup> I would agree with Segal but argue that there is important evidence that they did not do so successfully. In the late-ancient mystical text known as "The Visions of Ezekiel", a secondary divine figure, Metatron is posited on the grounds of Daniel 7,9 f. This is the same figure who in other texts of that genre is called "The Youth" נער, i.e., that figure known by other Jews (e.g., the fourth evangelist) as the "Son of Man"!<sup>22</sup> Putting together the different bits and pieces that other scholars have constructed into a new mosaic, I would suggest that we have a very important clue here to follow. From the text in Daniel it would seem clear that there are two divine figures pictured, one who is ancient and another one who is young. "Son of Man" here in its paradigmatic contrast with the Ancient of Days should be read as youth, young man (as it is even in the rabbinic texts that deny that it represents a second person). The usage is similar to "sons of doves" meaning young of the dove as in Numbers 6,10. It should be noted that the figure of the "Youth" appears as well (at least once) in texts accepted into the rabbinic canon itself, such as *Be-midbar Rabbah* 12,12 and explicitly denoted there as Metatron.<sup>23</sup> We end up with a clear indication of a second divine person, called the Youth (Son of Man), about whom it can be discussed whether he is homoousious, homoiousious, homoian, or anomoian with the first person, and indeed discussions of this sort about Metatron take place in medieval Jewish

20 SEGAL, *Two Powers in Heaven* (see above n. 15), 48.

21 SEGAL, *Two Powers in Heaven* (see above n. 15), 71.

22 SEGAL, *Two Powers in Heaven* (see above n. 15), 67.

23 Contra SEGAL, *Two Powers in Heaven* (see above n. 15), 67 who claims that the name נער is never used in this sense in rabbinic literature (unless I have misread him).

theological and mystical writings.<sup>24</sup> When he is called or calls himself the "Son of Man", this is a citation of the Daniel text.<sup>25</sup> He is called the "Youth", i.e., the "Son of Man" in contrast to the "Ancient of Days". These traditions all understand accordingly that two divine figures are portrayed in Daniel 7, whom we might be tempted to call the Father and the Son. Evidence for this concatenation of Enoch, Metatron, and the Son of Man can be adduced, of course, from the Parables of Enoch at 1 Enoch 71, in which Enoch is explicitly addressed as the Son of Man, and Enoch is, of course, Metatron before his apotheosis.<sup>26</sup> As in the case of the Logos itself, the question is not whether this or that Jewish text influenced the Gospels, nor yet is it whether or not a particular text is or is not "Christian" or Jewish but rather the ways that we can see, increasingly see, the commonalities of tradition histories that cross over what would only later harden into separate "religions".<sup>27</sup> It is not then, as Segal would have it, that "other groups beside Christians were making 'dangerous' interpretations of that verse [Dan 7,9]", as that this commonplace of theological, mystical hermeneutics had become dangerous to the Rabbis and had to be expelled from its original home. For Segal, the "enemy" is still outside, external, marginal to the rabbinic community and religious world: "Identifying the specific group about whom the rabbis were concerned in this passage can not be successful".<sup>28</sup> He still worries that "determining the identity of the group of heretics in question remains a serious problem",<sup>29</sup> as if there were a real group of external heretics to whom the texts refer, while from my point of view, the Rabbis are effectively expelling the Two-Powers heresy from within themselves. The Enoch traditions were indeed, and continued to be right into and through late antiquity, the province of Israel *simpliciter* (including much of the Christian communities) and not of a sect within Israel (of course this doesn't mean that they were of interest to all Jews or all Jewish groups). This approach quite obviates, I think, some traditional forms of posing the question as represented in David Suter's formulation:

24 D. ABRAMS, "The Boundaries of Divine Ontology: The Inclusion and Exclusion of Metatron in the Godhead", in *Harvard Theological Review* 87, no. 3 (July 1994), 291–321.

25 Although Scholem famously interpreted "youth" in these contexts as "servant", there is, therefore, little warrant for this interpretation D.J. HALPERIN, "A Sexual Image in Hekhalot Rabbati and Its Implications", in *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 6, no. 1–2 (1987), 125.

26 See on this also N. DEUTSCH, *Guardians of the Gate: Angelic Vice Regency in Late Antiquity*, Brill's Series in Jewish Studies 32, Leiden/Boston 1999. For Metatron as Enoch, see M. IDEL, "Enoch is Metatron", *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990), 220–240.

27 G. HASAN-ROKEM, "Narratives in Dialogue: A Folk Literary Perspective on Interreligious Contacts in the Holy Land in Rabbinic Literature of Late Antiquity", in *Sharing the Sacred: Religious Contacts and Conflicts in the Holy Land First-Fifteenth Centuries CE*, ed. by G. STROUMSA, A. KOFSKY, Jerusalem 1998, 109–129.

28 SEGAL, *Two Powers in Heaven* (see above n. 15), 71.

29 SEGAL, *Two Powers in Heaven* (see above n. 15), 55.

Black calls for a reassessment of the question of the influence of the Parables on the gospels and indicates that he has committed himself to the proposition that there are pre-Christian Jewish traditions in the Parables, including the Son of Man passages, that have exercised an influence on Christian usage, although we cannot also rule out Christian editing of those traditions. Even so, exercising an influence upon Christian usage is a far cry from when the Parables was taken as *prima facie* evidence for the apocalyptic Son of Man in ancient Judaism.<sup>30</sup>

Once we fully take in that "Christianity" is simply part and parcel of ancient Judaism, this very way of posing the issue becomes immaterial, in my humble opinion.

I would read the famous narrative of Elisha ben Abuya's apostasy, in the sequel to the story of Rabbi Aqiva, where upon seeing a vision of the glorious being named Meṭatron sitting at the right hand of God, he concluded that there are "Two powers in heaven" and became a heretic, as a further oblique recognition and allegorical representation of the fact that this "heresy" was once comfortably *within* "Judaism" and has only lately become *Aḥer*, "Other;" *Aḥer* being, of course, the pejorative nickname for this once "kosher" Rabbi after his turn to "heresy".<sup>31</sup> A brief look at this text will help make this point. According to the Talmud:

Our Rabbis have taught: Four went into the *Pardes*, and who are they? Ben 'Azzai and Ben Zoma, *Aḥer*, and Rabbi Aqiva... *Aḥer* chopped down the shoots. Rabbi Aqiva came out safely...

'*Aḥer* chopped down the shoots': Of him the verse says, "Do not let your mouth cause your flesh to sin" [Eccl 5,5]. What does this mean? He saw that Meṭatron had been given permission to sit and write the good deeds of Israel. He said, but it is taught that on high there will be no sitting, no competition, no... , and no tiredness! Perhaps, G-d forbid, there are two powers! They took Meṭatron out and whipped him with sixty whips of fire. They said to him: "What is the reason that when you saw him, you did not get up before him?" He was given permission to erase the good deeds of *Aḥer*. A voice came out from heaven and said: Return O backsliding ones [Jer 3,14-22] – except for *Aḥer*.

30 D. SUTER, "Enoch in Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Parables of Enoch", paper presented at *The III Enoch Seminar Camaldoli, 6-11 Giugno 2005*.

31 The position I am taking here bears comparison with Walter Bauer, Gerhard Krodel, and Robert A. Kraft (W. BAUER, G. KRODEL, R.A. KRAFT, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, ed. by G. KRODEL, Philadelphia 1971), except that we must avoid entirely such absurd formulations as heresy precedes orthodoxy as if there are real entities and not merely the constructions of particular politically powerful religious parties at particular historical moments.

He said, "Since that man has been driven out of that world, let him go out and enjoy himself in this world!" He went out to evil culture. He went and found a prostitute and solicited her. She said, "But aren't you Elisha ben Abuya?" He went and uprooted a radish on the Sabbath and gave it to her. She said, "He is an other [*Aḥer*]" (bḤag 15a)

This is a remarkable story, that as can well be imagined, has excited much scholarly attention. Yehuda Liebes emphasizes correctly that it is impossible to see this as a narrative of a real Elisha who joined a heretical sect.<sup>32</sup> Segal nicely observes that "in its present context [the story] is an etiology of heresy. It explains how certain people, who had special Metatron traditions, risk the heretical designation of 'two powers in heaven'".<sup>33</sup> This can be pushed a bit further. The structural comparison with Christian etiologies of heresy and heresiarchs suggests that, like those, *Aḥer* represents older theological traditions which have been anathematized as heresy by the authors of the story.<sup>34</sup> Almost certainly underlying *Aḥer*/Elisha's vision of Meṭatron is the same passage in Daniel that "misled" Rabbi Aqiva, taking the "One like a Son of Man" as a separate person. The latter's error was hermeneutical/theological, the former's is visionary/theological, but the error is essentially precisely the same, the assumption that the second throne is for a second divine figure. Whether called Meṭatron or David, the second divine figure is the Son of Man.<sup>35</sup> Locating this "heretical" interpretation right at the heart of the rabbinic academy and indeed among some of its leading figures strongly suggests that these views had been current in the very Jewish circles from which the Rabbis emerged and were eventually anathematized by them and driven out. Meṭatron is punished by being scourged with sixty *pulse* of fire. As we learn

32 Y. LIEBES, *The sin of Elisha: Four Who Entered Pardes and the Nature of Talmudic Mysticism*, Jerusalem 1990, 12 (in Hebrew).

33 SEGAL, *Two Powers in Heaven* (see above n. 15), 62.

34 For comparison to an actual observable historical instance within late ancient Christianity, see V. BURRUS, *The Making of a Heretic: Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy*, Transformations of the Ancient World, Berkeley/Los Angeles 1995.

35 According to this reading, it is the "sitting" that is the crux of the matter, as it invokes the Daniel 7 passage as interpreted, e.g., in Mark with the "Son of Man" sitting at the right hand of God, the source of Rabbi Aqiva's "error" as well, for which see p. 61 above. This passage deserves a longer treatment than I can give it here, particularly in the light of questionable interpretations of the textual evidence that have been offered recently DEUTSCH, *Guardians* (see above n. 26), 48-77. Since these interpretations rely on variant readings within the Ashkenazi ms. tradition as relating to different stages of redaction within the rabbinic period, they rest on a very weak reed, but fuller demonstration of this point as well as reinterpretation will have to wait for another context. In my more expansive text, I plan, as well, to explore the significance of Meṭatron's name, taking it to mean "[The one who is] Beside the Throne".

from bBM 47a, this practice [whatever it quite means in terms of realia] represents a particularly dire form of anathema or even excommunication. The dual inscription of excommunication in the narrative, that of Meṭatron on the one hand and of his "devotee" on the other, suggests strongly to me that it is the belief in this figure as second divine principle that is being anathematized (although somehow the Rabbis seem unable to completely dispense with him – he was just too popular it would seem). A further parallel is instructive. In an amazing passage in Yoma 77a which I cannot discuss here at length, the archangel Gabriel is taken out to be scourged with the sixty *pulse*, because he acted independently of the divine will, another seeming case of "Two powers in heaven". Note that in that story, as opposed to the Aḥer one, the *possibility* of the high angel acting independently is comprehended. It is almost as if not only the heresy of Two Powers but the Second Power itself that is being suppressed in these accounts.

There is another fascinating piece of possible evidence for Jewish virtual worship of Meṭatron as redeemer in late antiquity and its suppression by the Rabbis. In the bSan 38b, we read:

אמר רב נחמן: האי מאן דידע לאהדורי למינים כרב אידית - ליהדר, ואי לא - לא ליהדר. אמר ההוא מינא לרב אידית: כתיב [שמות כ"ד] ואל משה אמר עלה אל ה', עלה אלי מיבעי ליה! אמר ליה: זהו מטטרון, ששמו כשם רבו, דכתיב [שמות כ"ג] כי שמי בקרבו. - אי הכי ניפלחו ליה! - כתיב [שמות כ"ג] אל תמר בו - אל תמירני בו. - אם כן לא ישא לפשעכם למה לי? - אמר ליה: הימנותא בידן, דאפילו בפרוונקא נמי לא קבילניה, דכתיב [שמות ל"ג] ויאמר אליו אם אין פניך הלכים וגו'.

Rav Naḥman said: A person who knows how to answer the *minim* as Rav Idit, let him answer, and if not, let him not answer. A certain *min* said to Rav Idit: "It is written, 'And to Moses he said, come up unto the H' [Exod 24,1].' It should have said, 'Come up to me!'"

He [Rav Idit] said to him: "This was Meṭatron, whose name is like the name of his master, as it is written, 'for My name is in him' [Exod 23,21]."

"But if so, we should worship him!"

"It is written, 'Do not rebel against him' [Exod 23,21] – Do not confuse him with me!"

"If so, then why does it say 'He will not forgive your sins'?"

"We have sworn that we would not even receive him as a guide, for it is written 'If Your face goes not [do not bring us up from here]' [Exod 33,15]" (bSan 38b).<sup>36</sup>

36 I have included the Hebrew here, since the text depends on a pun that Hebrew readers will best understand in the original.

This extraordinary bit of rhetoric needs some glossing and then a deeper consideration of modalities for its reading than it has received so far.<sup>37</sup> The *min* produces a seemingly compelling argument that there are two powers in heaven. God has been addressing the Jewish People as a whole (in chapter 23), informing them that he will send his angel before them and instructing them how to behave with respect to this angel. He then turns to Moses and tells him to come up to H' (the Tetragrammaton), implying quite strongly that H' is not the same person as the speaker of the verse.<sup>38</sup> This is, in fact, precisely the sort of argument that a Justin Martyr would have produced from Scripture to argue for a "second person" (the Logos). Rav Idit turns back to the previous chapter and remarks that verse 21 there explicitly says that "My name is in him [that is, in the angel]". Meṭatron, that angel, therefore could be called by the name H', and it is to him that Moses is being instructed to ascend. At this point, the *min* responds by saying that if Meṭatron is indeed called by the ineffable name, then we ought to worship him as well; in other words, that Rav Idit's own answer can be turned against him. To this, Rav Idit retorts that the verse also says "Do not rebel against him", which by a typical midrashic sleight of hand can be read as "Do not substitute him", that is, even though Meṭatron is called by God's name, do not pray to him. The *min* says if that is what is meant, then why does it continue in the verse and say that he, Meṭatron, will not forgive sins? The *min* is arguing that if the people are being warned not to rebel against Meṭatron, because he is as powerful as God, then it makes sense to tell them that he will not forgive their sins if they do rebel, but if he is no God at all, then it is otiose to tell them that he will not forgive sins. Only if he has the power to redeem sins does it make sense to declare that he will not forgive their sins if they rebel against him. (Of course, the rabbinic reading is: Don't confuse him with me for he cannot redeem sins but only I can. The "heretical" reading, I'm afraid, is much stronger and more adequate to the language.) In other words, the *min* argues that Meṭatron seemingly has precisely the redeemer features that are characteristic of his direct ancestor, Enoch the Son of Man.

I would suggest, moreover, that, in typical midrashic fashion, another verse lies underneath this comment of the *min*. Joshua 24,19 reads: "It will be very difficult for you [lit. you will not be able to] to worship H', for He is a holy God; He is a jealous God; He will not forgive your sins and your iniquities". In other words, the logic would run: if there it remarks of H' that he will not forgive sins and iniquities, then if the same language is being used

37 For previous readings, see SEGAL, *Two Powers in Heaven* (see above n. 15), 68–69, and DEUTSCH, *Guardians* (see above n. 26), 49. For a much older reading, see R. TRAVERS HERFORD, *Christianity in Talmud & Midrash*, reprint 1903, New York 1978, 285–290.

38 The medieval Bible commentary of Ibn Ezra solves this problem by referring to other verses in which a speaker refers to himself by his own name.



here, ought it not indicate that the divine figure being spoken of has the same attributes as H'?"<sup>39</sup> The comparison is rendered even stronger when we notice that exactly the same context is involved in both the Exodus and the Joshua verse, namely the expulsion of the Canaanites from the land of Israel and the warnings to the people of Israel to be worthy of this benefit and to worship H', or their sin will not be forgiven at all. It certainly seems as if the verse in Exodus can be read as equating Metatron to H' and therefore demanding worship for both figures. To this the answer comes that "we" the Jews, through our leader Moses, already have declared that we do not even want him, Metatron, to be our guide in the desert, as the cited verse says: "If Your face goes before us not". In other words, the angelic regent was of such non importance that, far from considering him worthy of being worshiped, Moses would not even accept him as guide.

The rhetoric of this text is quite astounding, and analysis of it should prove illuminating. In this, as in many other cases of such hermeneutical encounters, the *min* certainly seems to have the upper hand to begin with, for there are many, many scriptural texts that support the notion of an angelic vice-regent with many of the powers of God, or even the notion of a virtual second God. Indeed, more than anything else, this very scriptural background may have given the greatest impetus to the various second-God theologies of Jews, including Logos, Memra, Sophia, Metatron, and others. In order to discredit the *min*'s quite straightforward interpretation of the verses in question: "Behold I send before you an angel, to watch over you on the way and to bring you to the place I have prepared. Be careful before him and obedient to him. Do not disobey him, for he will not forgive your sins, for My name is in him". Although, to be sure, the second of these two verses presents difficulties, at the very least it would seem that this – fairly straightforward – translation does imply that this angel has the power to command and to remit sins (which he will not employ), as God has delegated to him something of divine power. The *min* quite reasonably suggests that one ought to pray to such a divine being, Metatron on Rav Idit's showing.<sup>40</sup> In order to escape this seemingly ineluctable conclusion, Rav Idit proposes to read "Be careful before him and obedient to him. Do not confuse him with me, for he will not forgive your sins, for my name is in him". Aside from the fact that this translation renders the verse considerably less coherent in its logic, it also makes this angel seem absolutely

39 SEGAL, *Two Powers in Heaven* (see above n. 15), 131–132, shows that this verse was a locus for controversy between Rabbis and others independently of this particular text.

40 In previous work, I have employed this argument to suggest the possibility that the Logos (now I would include or specify Son of Man) was worshipped in non-Christian Jewish circles, as well, weakening Hayward's argument for this as a unique feature of Christianity (D. BOYARIN, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religions, Philadelphia 2004, chapter 5).

insignificant, hardly worthy of mention, to which Rav Idit answers (and this is his brilliant move) that indeed that is so. The Israelites have already registered their rejection of any interest in this insignificant angel when they insisted that God Himself must go before them and no other, thus dramatizing the rejection of the Son of Man theology that the Rabbis themselves perform.

I am not suggesting, of course, that there was necessarily actually a *min* of the precise sort that this text projects.<sup>41</sup> Where Segal, in general, seeks the actual groups to which *minim* can be posited as belonging – "In order to identify the various sectarian groups, one must also identify the heretical doctrine espoused by those groups and find evidence that the doctrine can be clearly associated with an historical group at the time the rabbinic tradition arose"<sup>42</sup> – my own method and ambitions are quite different. I seek to see how rabbinic Judaism was carving out an orthodox space for itself by naming other Jewish beliefs as heresies, thus possibly (but not always and not necessarily) producing "heresies" and even "heretical" social groups, and likewise for Christianity as well. Thus, my question here will not be to what group did the *min* "really" belong but, rather, what are the Rabbis seeking to accomplish by representing a *min* who argues in this way. This suggests to me that in their project of producing an orthodoxy for Judaism, the Rabbis were disowning a Jewish practice of worship of the second God, the lesser H' [My name is in him], Metatron, the Son of Man.

The famous statement at the end of the narrative of the four who went into Pardes to the effect that Rabbi Aqiva came out "safely [lit. in peace]", while Aher died in infamy, would, on this possible but by no means proven interpretation, then represent a Rabbi Aqiva who turned away from "heresy" to orthodoxy and an Elisha who remained adamant in the old traditions. The drama of *this* parting of the ways *within* Enochic Judaism, as it were, surely is to be set in late antiquity and not before. There is no reason to assume that we are talking about the real Rabbi Aqiva and the real Elisha ben Abuya here, nor about early second-century realities and everything, in fact, that we know of rabbinic literature and its practices of ascription militates against such a conclusion. What we have before us, in my view, is a virtual allegory of different historical trends within historical Judaism, those who remained faithful to the old ways, continuing to believe in the Son of Man, and were declared heretics and those who turned from such beliefs and adopted the

41 But see Justin's Dialogue at 75. Even though for our rabbinic *min*, this angelic vice-regent is Metatron, for Justin, he is clearly the Christ.

42 SEGAL, *Two Powers in Heaven* (see above n. 15), 7. Segal goes so far as to propose that, by dating various shifts within the rabbinic representation of *minim*, we can suggest "a progression and relative chronology of apocalypticism, mysticism, Christianity and gnosticism as historical movements" [SEGAL, *Two Powers in Heaven* (see above n. 15), 18–19].

new, improved, "purer", rabbinic Judaism. It should be noted, however, that both groups are apparently observers of the same basic halakhic norms, at least by late antiquity, and this is, after all, precisely what the Hekhalot literature would lead us to expect.<sup>43</sup>

Piovanelli's comments anent the social background of the Parables of Enoch strongly support, in my opinion, the point of view that I have just sketched in. If the Enochic traditions, as they extend from the Parables forward into 3 *Enoch* and into Meṭaṭron literature, represent indeed the common religious heritage of much of Israel and not particular sectarian formations, as I am convinced they do, then the evidence just offered for such theology in the heart of the rabbinic socio-cultural world is rendered even more cogent. As Pogo would have put it, we have met the heresy and it is us. I would go so far as to suggest (but in a very tentative and preliminary fashion), that on the basis of the rabbinic material adduced it is the Son of Man, Enoch, Meṭaṭron, Christ, who is always at issue when "Two Powers in Heaven" is broached in rabbinic literature. It is, however, not the continuing fact of these traditions themselves that so mobilize the later Babylonian Rabbis, however, to expel from within their own hearts such "heresies", but the way the Son of Man was taken up in Christianity beginning, of course, with the Gospel itself that explains the horror which these late Babylonian rabbinic texts express at the very thought of a messianic figure in human shape sitting at the right hand of the Lord. Rather than being the product or the origin of a Jewish-Christianity, pace Mearns, but also not the product of a Judaism that is *not* Christian, the Son of Man, i.e., the Parables of Enoch and the later avatars of this tradition, such as 3 *Enoch* (the Hebrew Enoch) become a touchstone precisely in the institution of such a Judaism and, moreover, an unsuccessful one to boot as Meṭaṭron (and even the Son of Man by this name)<sup>44</sup> becomes the very heart of later kabbalistic speculation).<sup>45</sup>

### Bibliography

- ABRAMS, DANIEL, "The Boundaries of Divine Ontology: The Inclusion and Exclusion of Meṭaṭron in the Godhead", in *Harvard Theological Review* 87, no.3 July 1994, 291-321.
- BAUER, WALTER; KRODEL, GERHARD; KRAFT, ROBERT A., *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, ed. by G. Krodel, Philadelphia 1971.

43 The implications of this point for the history of so-called Enochic Judaism will be explored in the fuller form of this paper.

44 As I am informed by Moshe Idel with respect to work of his yet to be published.

45 ABRAMS, "The Inclusion and Exclusion of Meṭaṭron" (see above n. 24).

- BAUMGARTEN, ALBERT I., *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation*, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 55, Leiden 1997.
- BOCCACCINI, GABRIELE, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*, Grand Rapids, Mich. 1998.
- BOYARIN, DANIEL, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religions, Philadelphia 2004.
- IDEM, "The Christian Invention of Judaism: The Theodosian Empire and the Rabbinic Refusal of Religion", in *Representations* 85 (2004), 21-57.
- IDEM, "Two Powers in Heaven; or, the Making of a Heresy", in *Festschrift for James Kugel*, ed. by H. Najman, Leiden 2003, 331-370.
- BURRUS, VIRGINIA, *The Making of a Heretic: Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy*, Transformations of the Ancient World, Berkeley/Los Angeles 1995.
- DEUTSCH, NATHANIEL, *Guardians of the Gate: Angelic Vice Regency in Late Antiquity*, Brill's Series in Jewish Studies, Leiden/Boston 1999.
- HALPERIN, DAVID J., "A Sexual Image in Hekhalot Rabbati and Its Implications", in *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 6, nos.1-2 (1987), 117-132.
- HANNAH, DARRELL D., "The Throne of His Glory: The Divine Throne and Heavenly Mediators in Revelation and the Similitudes of Enoch", in *ZNW* 94 (2003), 68-96.
- HASAN-ROKEM, GALIT, "Narratives in Dialogue: A Folk Literary Perspective on Interreligious Contacts in the Holy Land in Rabbinic Literature of Late Antiquity", in *Sharing the Sacred: Religious Contacts and Conflicts in the Holy Land First-Fifteenth Centuries CE*, ed. by G. Stroumsa, A. Kofsky, Jerusalem 1998, 109-129.
- HERFORD, R. TRAVERS, *Christianity in Talmud & Midrash*, London 1903; New York 1978.
- HERR, MOSHE DAVID, "Continuum in the Chain of Torah Transmission", in *Zion* XLIV (1979), 43-56, x-xi, (in Hebrew with English summary).
- HOROVITZ, SAUL; ISRAEL ABRAHAM RABIN, *Mechilta d'Rabbi Ismael*, ed. by S. Horovitz, Jerusalem 1970.
- IDEL, MOSHE, "Enoch is Meṭaṭron", in *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990), 220-240.
- IDEM, *Messianic Mystics*, New Haven 1998.
- LIBES, YEHUDA, *The sin of Elisha: Four Who Entered Pardes and the Nature of Talmudic Mysticism*, Jerusalem 1990, (in Hebrew).
- MOWINCKEL, SIGMUND OLAF PLYTT, *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism*, trans. by G.W. Anderson, Oxford 1956.
- NICKELSBURG, GEORGE W.E., VANDERKAM, JAMES C. (trans. and eds.), *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, Minneapolis 2004.
- SEGAL, ALAN F., *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports About Christianity and Gnosticism*, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity XXV, Leiden 1977.
- SHEMESH, AHARON, "Expulsion and Exclusion in the Community Rule and the

*Damascus Document*", in *Dead Sea Discoveries* 9, no. 1 (2002), 44–74.

IDEM, "The Origins of the Laws of Separatism: Qumran Literature and Rabbinic Halacha", *Revue de Qumran* 18, no. 2 (Décembre 1997), 223–241.

IDEM, "The One Who Divides Between the Children of Light and the Children of Darkness, Between Israel and the Nations" (in Hebrew), in *Atara l'Haim: Studies in the Talmud and Medieval Rabbinic Literature in Honor of Professor Haim Zalman Dimitrovsky*, ed. by D. Boyarin, S. Friedman, M. Hirshman, M. Schmelzer, and I.M. Tashma, Jerusalem 2000, 209–220.

## Sur les expressions « élus de vérité », « élus de justice » et « Elu de justice et de fidélité »

Contribution à l'étude du sociolecte esséno-qoumrânien

par

MARC PHILONENKO

Dès la publication des premiers manuscrits de Qoumrân, il y a plus d'un demi-siècle, les philologues se sont engagés dans l'étude de la langue des textes hébreux découverts. Ces recherches ont porté, le plus souvent, sur la phonétique, la morphologie et la syntaxe, plus rarement sur le lexique. Les enquêtes phraséologiques sont restées rares, en dehors de l'ouvrage déjà ancien de Hans Kosmala qui abonde en observations précieuses.<sup>1</sup>

Or, on relève dans les textes de Qoumrân nombre d'expressions originales, inconnues de la Bible hébraïque. Il faut accorder une attention soutenue à ces locutions spéciales, à leurs parcours souterrains et à leur surgissement: mieux que des parentés de type doctrinal, elles indiquent des filiations. Nous avons proposé de reconnaître en ces locutions un véritable langage de secte, un sociolecte, entendons par là le parler propre à un groupe socio-culturel donné.<sup>2</sup> Un seul exemple, celui des expressions antithétiques « fils de lumière », « fils de ténèbres », propres à la secte et étrangères à la Bible hébraïque, suffit à l'illustrer.<sup>3</sup>

Des tournures idiomatiques de ce type n'ont pu naître, se développer et se fixer que dans un groupe fermé, replié sur lui-même, ayant une conscience exacerbée de sa légitimité et de sa singularité.

Les dénominations que les membres de la secte s'appliquaient à eux-mêmes sont, à cet égard, très significatives. Ils s'appelaient les « saints », les « pieux », les « parfaits », les « volontaires », les « justes », les « pauvres », les « hommes droits », les « élus de Dieu », les « élus de la Bienveillance », les

1 H. KOSMALA, *Hebräer-Essener-Christen*, Leyde 1959.

2 Voir M. PHILONENKO, " 'Faire la vérité'. Contributions à l'étude du sociolecte esséno-qoumrânien ", in *Jüdische Schriften in ihrem antik-jüdischen und urchristlichen Kontext*, éds par H. LICHTENBERGER, G.S. OGEMA, Gütersloh 2002, 251–257.

3 Voir M. PHILONENKO, " La doctrine qoumrânienne des deux esprits ", in *Apocalyptique iranienne et dualisme qoumrânien*, éds par G. WIDENGREN, A. HULTGÅRD, M. PHILONENKO, Paris 1995, 163–211: 167–169.

# STUDIA JUDAICA

FORSCHUNGEN ZUR WISSENSCHAFT  
DES JUDENTUMS

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON  
E. L. EHRLICH

BAND XXXII

---

WALTER DE GRUYTER · BERLIN · NEW YORK

“THE WORDS OF A WISE MAN’S MOUTH  
// ARE GRACIOUS” (QOH 10,12) /

FESTSCHRIFT FOR GÜNTER STEMBERGER  
ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 65TH BIRTHDAY

EDITED BY  
MAURO PERANI

2005

---

WALTER DE GRUYTER · BERLIN · NEW YORK