

Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 2069 and the Compositional History of *1 Enoch*

RANDALL D. CHESNUTT
Chesnutt@pepperdine.edu
Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA 90263

Among the ancient Greek papyri preserved in the Sackler Library at Oxford University is a small cluster of fragments that has not received due attention for its bearing on the compositional history of *1 Enoch*. Recovered from an Oxyrhynchus rubbish dump and published by Arthur S. Hunt in 1927, the five fragments, all inscribed recto and verso, were designated *P.Oxy.* 2069 and dated to the late fourth century C.E.¹ Based on the opening of heaven and the descent of an angel or other emissary envisioned in frg. 1, the largest of the five, Hunt labeled the manuscript an “apocalyptic fragment” but ventured no further identification. In support of this general characterization he cited apparent references to the day of judgment and seventh heaven in frg. 3r and two allusions in frg. 3v to the Red Sea—a scene of destruction perhaps intended as a type of the judgment.

More than four decades elapsed before a direct connection between the “apocalyptic fragment” and any known apocalyptic work was perceived. As late as 1970 the two reference works by Albert-Marie Denis on Jewish pseudepigrapha extant in Greek could do no better than classify *P.Oxy.* 2069 among “fragmenta anonyma”² or “fragments erratiques” under the general heading “les fragments grecs de pseudépigraphes anonymes.”³ Finally, in 1971 Józef T. Milik recognized in these fragments the Greek counterpart of lines known in Ethiopic from *1 Enoch* 77–78 and

¹ Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XVII* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1927), 6–8.

² Denis, in *Apocalypsis henochi graece, edidit M. Black. Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca* (ed. Albert-Marie Denis; PVTG 3.2; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 233–34.

³ Denis, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament* (SVTP 1; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 303–4.

85–87 and in Aramaic from 4QEnastr^c (4Q210) and 4QEn^f (4Q207).⁴ Having thus identified the text, Milik could draw upon the Ethiopic and Aramaic parallels as well as related materials in these languages and in Greek to fill in the lacunae. Without recounting the details of his reconstruction and copious comparison with related texts, we may summarize his three most significant conclusions as follows:

1. Fragments 1 and 2 preserve parts of the Enochic Book of Dream Visions (frgs. 1r–2r = 1 *En.* 85:10–86:2; frgs. 1v–2v = 1 *En.* 87:1–3).
2. Fragment 3 preserves parts of the Enochic Astronomical Book (frg. 3v = 1 *En.* 77:7–78:1; frg. 3r = 1 *En.* 78:8).
3. Fragments 1 and 2 belong to a different codex from frg. 3 even though all three appear to have been copied by the same scribe.⁵

Subsequent scholars have generally embraced the first of these conclusions, cautiously echoed the second but hesitated to build confident conclusions on such scant data, and perpetuated the third by default simply because Milik is the only scholar since the *editio princeps* of 1927 to have rendered an opinion on the matter. In what follows I contend that the first two conclusions are essentially correct while the third is the one that is problematic and must be challenged. Before we take up these points in turn, two preliminary matters should be noted.

First, it is important to observe that Milik never actually saw the papyrus fragments under discussion nor even any photographs. By his own account, after a futile attempt to locate the materials at Oxford, he declared them hopelessly lost and resorted to Hunt's 1927 transcription for his investigation.⁶ Although the published transcription is adequate for identifying the fragments and attempting some provisional restoration, it is no basis for the paleographical and codicological analysis requisite to Milik's third conclusion summarized above. Nevertheless, his claim that the fragments corresponding to 1 *Enoch* 85–87 from the Book of Dream Visions and those corresponding to 1 *Enoch* 77–78 from the Astronomical Book came from different codices has gone unquestioned for forty years,⁷ as conse-

⁴ Milik, "Fragments grecs du livre d'Enoch (P. Oxy. XVII 2069)," *ChrEg* 46 (1971): 321–43.

⁵ Elsewhere Milik wrote: "it is not quite certain whether there is a single codex or two volumes copied by the same scribe" (*The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments from Qumrân Cave 4* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1976], 76; so also idem, "Problèmes de la littérature hénochique à la lumière des fragments araméens de Qumrân," *HTR* 64 [1971]: 372). However, as we shall see, it is the opinion expressed in his 1971 article on the Oxyrhynchus fragments that has carried the day. There he insisted "avec certitude" that the fragments come from different codices and declared this "un fait établi" ("Fragments grecs," 343).

⁶ Milik, "Fragments grecs," 321.

⁷ See, e.g., the Leuven Database of Ancient Books where, under Milik's influence, frgs. 1, 2, and 4 are catalogued separately from frgs. 3 and 5 (<http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/>); the former are numbered LDAB 1087 and the latter LDAB 3178, although in both places all the fragments are

quential as this claim is for our understanding of the shape of the Enochic corpus in the fourth century. Now that the papyri unavailable to Milik are readily accessible at Oxford as well as in high-resolution digital photographs, the conclusions he bequeathed to us should be reassessed.⁸ Having recently spent many hours in Oxford's Sackler Library poring over these fragments, with the expert support of the outstanding team of papyrologists there,⁹ I offer the present study to redress this need.

A second preliminary matter does not pertain directly to Milik's seminal article but has to do with the paleographic dating of the fragments. It now appears that the late-fourth-century date postulated without comment by Hunt and taken for granted by scholars ever since can be lowered somewhat. Without any axe to grind in Enochic studies, the papyrology consultants mentioned previously make a compelling case for an early-fourth-century date based on kinship with the "severe style" of script that peaked in the third century and degenerated in the fourth. The paleographical affinities of the fragments are with the latest stages of this style and fit best in the early rather than the late fourth century.¹⁰ If this date holds, any information that we can glean from *P.Oxy.* 2069 about how the Enochic corpus was configured at the time will predate the Ethiopic compilation by at least one century

recognized to have come from the same scribe. So also Joseph van Haelst, who catalogues frgs. 3 and 5 as #576 and frgs. 1, 2, and 4 as #577, and notes that the latter "appartiennent à une autre codex, mais ils ont très probablement été copiés par le même scribe que celui des fragments 3 et 5" (*Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens* [Série Papyrologie 1; Paris: Sorbonne, 1976], 202-4). Kurt Aland catalogues the five fragments together but notes Milik's judgment that they derive from two codices (*Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri* [PTS 18; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1976], 390). To cite but one specialist in Enochic studies, George W. E. Nickelsburg refers to Milik's view that the fragments derive from separate codices and says only, "If this is correct, they tell us nothing certain about the shape of the Greek Enoch in the fourth century" (*1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2001], 13 n. 37).

⁸ Loren T. Stuckenbruck suggested the same in a brief comment that first sparked my interest in this manuscript ("The Early Traditions Related to 1 Enoch from the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Overview and Assessment," in *The Early Enoch Literature* [ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins; JSJSup 121; Leiden: Brill, 2007], 42 n. 5).

⁹ Special thanks are due to Drs. Dirk Obbink, Maria Konstantinidou, and Daniela Colomo for their expert assistance, both during my time at Oxford and in correspondence since. I am also grateful to the Seaver Research Council of Pepperdine University for funding my stint in Oxford as a Fellow of the Harris Manchester College Summer Research Institute, and to Dr. Kelley Coblenz Bautch for reading an early draft of this article and offering helpful suggestions.

¹⁰ E.g., the copyist regularly drafted a minimal *omicron*, whereas later in the fourth century one would expect a full-sized *omicron* like the *sigma* and the *epsilon*. I am indebted to Dr. Maria Konstantinidou for sharing with me her paleographical assessment, on the basis of which, in my judgment, an early-fourth-century date should now be assumed as the point of departure for future investigation.

and perhaps more than two centuries.¹¹ We shall return to this point but turn attention first to Milik's three conclusions listed above.

I. FRAGMENTS 1R–2R = 1 ENOCH 85:10–86:2;
FRAGMENTS 1V–2V = 1 ENOCH 87:1–3

The first of Milik's conclusions is a matter of consensus and need not detain us long. One can quibble about some particulars of his reconstruction, but there is no doubt that frgs. 1 and 2 preserve small parts of the Animal Apocalypse (*1 Enoch* 85–95)—Enoch's second dream vision in which he foresees Israel's future in a complex allegory with biblical figures depicted as animals and stars. The disastrous intermingling of celestial and human beings that is reported in *Gen* 6:1–4 and that looms large throughout Enochic literature is played out allegorically beginning in *1 En.* 85:10–86:2: Enoch sees a succession of white cattle on earth, the opening of heaven and descent of a star, the star grazing among the cattle, and further tragic mingling of white and black cattle who exchange stalls, pasture, and calves, and begin to moan after one another.¹² What remains in frgs. 1r and 2r corresponds closely to this distinctive scenario, as the following synopsis shows.¹³

¹¹ This assumes the standard dating of the Ethiopic version to the fifth or sixth century c.e.

¹² Most Ethiopic manuscripts attest *yaʾawayyewu*, "moan." Milik's restoration of βροῦσθαι, which follows a single Ethiopic witness that reads *yaḥayyewu*, "live (with one another)," seems less likely than βροῦν or κροῦζειν, which I have adopted in the translation below. Unable to make sense of moaning or lamenting in this context, Matthew Black, followed by Patrick A. Tiller, suggests that a translator confused the Aramaic ܘܘܘܘ, "strike," or ܟܘܘܘܘܘܘܘܘ, "butt," with ܘܘܘܘܘܘ, "moan" (Black, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes* [SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985], 259, 365; Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* [SBLEJL 4; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993], 94 n. 20; so also Daniel C. Olson, *Enoch: A New Translation* [North Richland Hills, TX: Bibal, 2004], 188). However, as Nickelsburg points out, the verb *ʾawyawa* can translate βροῶ or κροῶ and need not mean "lament" (*1 Enoch* 1, 367 n. 2c). Indeed, Siegbert Uhlig uses "schreien" to translate the word and takes it as a cry of sexual passion—a fitting image in the context (*Das äthiopische Henochbuch* [JSRZ 5/6; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1984], 680). Whether the image is lamentation, violence, sexual transgression, or merely cohabitation of what should have remained separate, in the context it expresses the tragic situation that resulted from the primordial breach in cosmic order.

¹³ Here and in subsequent parallel texts, the Ethiopic translation is that of George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation. Based on the Hermeneia Commentary* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2004); the Greek version is my own translation of Milik's restored text except as otherwise noted; and the Aramaic version follows the restored text and translation by Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997, 1998). Letters enclosed in brackets have been restored.

<i>1 En. 85:10–86:3</i>	<i>P.Oxy. 2069, frags. 1r–2r</i>	<i>4QEn^f</i>
85:10. And they began to bear many white cattle, which were like them, and each one followed the other.	and [they followed e]ach other, [being many.]	
86:1. And again I saw with my eyes as I was sleeping. I saw the heaven above, and look, a star fell from heaven,	[And again] as I looked up w[ith my eyes in] sleep I saw [heaven above me,] and I looked, [and behold one star fell] from heaven [into the midst of] the larg[e] ca[t]tle, and it was eating and pastur]ing with t[hem.	[... Again I was lifting my eyes in the dream and I saw the heaven] above [and behold] a star [fell from heaven in the midst of the great bulls and ate and grazed] in the midst of them.
and it arose and was eating and pasturing among those cattle.		
2. Then I saw those large and black cattle, and look, all of them exchanged their pens and their pastures and their calves, and they began to moan, one after the other.	And then I saw t[h]os[e cat- tle, large and black, and behold, all of them ex]chang[ed] the[ir pens and their] pasture [and their calves,] and [they] began to [cry out for each o]th[er.]	Behold, then [I] saw [those bulls, large and black; all of them exchanged their feeds,] their pens and th[eir bu]llock[s and began to live with each other.

Naturally the fragmentary Greek text lacks some things found in the fuller Ethiopic version, and some of the Greek words and phrases that do remain are generic and suitable for any number of contexts: “as I looked up,” “[in] sleep I saw,” “and I looked,” “from heaven,” and “[they] began to.” However, the sequence of these phrases in the thirteen partially preserved lines in the Greek fragments aligns unmistakably with the narrative of *1 En. 85:10–86:2*. This fact combines with distinctive terminology such as “[ex]chang[ed] . . . pasture” to leave little doubt about the identity of frags. 1r–2r with the Animal Apocalypse. As Milik’s restoration brilliantly demonstrates, even the small traces of surviving text fit perfectly into this Enochic context, and the lacunae afford room for the Greek equivalent of either the established Ethiopic wording or the variants attested in some Ethiopic manuscripts.¹⁴

The verso of frags. 1–2 also corresponds closely to the part of Enoch’s vision that is recounted only a few lines later in the Animal Apocalypse. Continuing the

¹⁴ Thus, e.g., at the end of 85:10, where Nickelsburg and VanderKam follow Ethiopic ms group β, group α reads “many,” either as subject (*bezuxān*) or object (*bezuxāna*), and the Oxyrhynchus fragment has room for Milik’s restoration of πολλοί with the apparent sense, “many followed in succession.” See Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 230.

scenario summarized above from *1 En.* 85:10–86:2, Enoch sees many other stars descend from heaven, become bulls, mate with the cows, and beget elephants, camels, and donkeys—all in obvious allegorical imitation of the Watchers' descent and its tragic consequences as narrated in *1 Enoch* 6–8 in the Book of the Watchers. The ensuing hostility among the cattle and their illegitimate offspring causes all the children of the earth to tremble and flee (cf. *1 Enoch* 7–8). As the violent horrors escalate to the point that the whole earth cries aloud, Enoch sees seven heavenly beings with the appearance of white men descend to address the problem. Three of these take Enoch by the hand and whisk him away from the generations of the earth to a high place from which he can observe the punishment of the hybrid creatures and the subsequent course of history (cf. *1 Enoch* 17–36).¹⁵

It is to this last part of the visionary scene, where the earth cries out and celestial beings arrive to intercede, that frgs. 1v and 2v correspond, as the following synopsis brings out:

1 En. 87:1–3

87:1. And again I saw them, and they began to gore one another and devour one another, and the earth began to cry out. 2. And

I lifted my eyes again to heaven, and I saw in the vision, and look, there came forth from heaven (beings) with the appearance of white men; four came forth from that place and three with them. 3. And those three who came after took hold of me by my hand and raised me from the generations of the earth, and lifted me onto a high place, and they showed me a tower high above the earth, and all the hills were smaller.

P.Oxy. 2069, frgs. 1v–2v

[and to swallow] each [other an]d
all [the earth] began to [cry out]. And
again
as I w[as] lifting up [my eyes] i[n] to
heaven, I [saw in the v]ision and be[hold
I saw comin]g out of heaven [those with
the appearance of white] m[e]n; [and
four w]en[t forth from there and three
with them. And the three who ca]me
fort[h afterward grasped] m[y] hand
[and raised me up from the] sons of the
[earth . . .]

¹⁵ The total of seven heavenly beings (four accompanied by three) is not supported by all Ethiopic manuscripts (cf. Ephraim Isaac's translation, "1 [Ethiopic Apocalypse of] Enoch [Second Century B.C.–First Century A.D.]," *OTP* 1:63), but is both well attested here and assumed elsewhere in the Book of Dream Visions (88:1; 90:21–22). See Michael A. Knibb, with Edward Ullendorff, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 2:198. These heavenly emissaries are reminiscent of the archangels—sometimes four, sometimes seven—in the Book of the Watchers. On the fluctuation between four and seven in the Book of the Watchers and the functions of these angels in the administration of the cosmos and in guiding Enoch on his otherworldly tours, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 207, 334, 374; Christoph Berner, "The Four (or Seven) Archangels in the First Book of Enoch and Early Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period," in *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings. Origins, Development and Reception* (ed. Friedrich V. Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas, and Karin Schöpflin; Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2007; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2007), 395–411; and Kelley Coblentz Bautch, "Putting Angels in Their Place: Develop-

Here, as in frgs. 1r–2r, not all of the surviving words and phrases are distinctive, but their succession parallels in a striking way the sequence of events in the Animal Apocalypse, and the lacunae in each line provide suitable space to accommodate the elements missing by comparison with the Ethiopic text. Verbal correspondence with the Ethiopic narrative is sufficient in quantity and order to clinch the identification even in the absence of distinctive or unusual vocabulary. Thus, where *1 En.* 87:1 says that the creatures devoured one another and the earth began to cry out, the characters in the opening lines of our fragment did something (the verb is missing) to one another and all the [earth (or another feminine noun)] began to . . . (the verb is missing). Where *1 En.* 87:2 has Enoch look up to heaven and see a vision in which beings with the appearance of white men come forth from heaven, our fragment reports that someone looked up into heaven and saw a [v]ision in which [those with the appearance of white] m[e]n [came fort]h out of heaven.¹⁶ And just as Enoch says in *1 En.* 87:3 that some of those who came forth took him by the hand and raised him from the generations of the earth to a high place, the narrator in the corresponding point in our fragment refers to “m[y] hand” and describes some action that ends with “from (or of) the sons of the [earth (or another feminine noun)].”

Cumulatively these points of correspondence, together with those that link frgs. 1r–2r with *1 En.* 85:10–86:2, establish beyond reasonable doubt that frgs. 1 and 2 preserve parts of the Animal Apocalypse from the Enochic Book of Dream Visions. On this point Milik was absolutely correct, and his copious comparisons with other Enochic materials in Aramaic, Greek, and Ethiopic are invaluable.

II. FRAGMENT 3V = 1 ENOCH 77:7–78:1;
FRAGMENT 3R = 1 ENOCH 78:8

The second of Milik’s conclusions summarized above—that frg. 3 preserves small parts of the Enochic Astronomical Book—has not won the general acceptance

ments in Second Temple Angelology,” in *‘With Wisdom as a Robe’: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich* (ed. Károly D. Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy; Hebrew Bible Monographs 21; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009), 174–88.

¹⁶ Here, however, the correspondence is not as precise as Milik claimed unless we accept as fact his restoration of the end of line 7. Hunt conjectured only τω. [. . .]οις, but Milik read [ἀ]γθ[ρωπ]οις. Nothing before the dative plural ending οἰς is clear, although the slight traces of ink that survive from the tops of the previous letters are consistent with νθ, and ρωπ would fit the following lacuna nicely. If the word is indeed ἀνθρώποις, we should probably restore before it some form of ὅμοιος and assume with Milik an expression something like ὡς ὁμοιώματα ὅμοια τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, “having likenesses like men,” or “in appearance like the appearance of men,” which is of course consistent with Semitic idiom. See, e.g., 4QEnastr^b (4Q209) frg. 26.4–5.

accorded his identification of frgs. 1 and 2 because the surviving text is so meager.¹⁷ Nevertheless, the following synopsis reveals striking correspondence between the few words that do survive and the geographical description in *1 En.* 77:7–78:1:¹⁸

1 En. 77:5–78:1*P.Oxy 2069, frg. 3v*

77:5. I saw seven rivers on the earth, larger than all the rivers. One of them comes from the west (and) pours its water into the great sea. 6. Two of them come from the north to the sea and pour their water into the Erythrean Sea on the east. 7. The remaining four emerge on the northern side toward their sea, (two into) the Erythrean and two into the Great Sea where they empty themselves, but some say into the wilderness. 8. I saw seven large islands in the sea and on the land—two on the land and five in the Great Sea.
78:1 The names of the sun are as follows: the first Aryares and the second Tomas.

[into the] Erythrean S[ea]
into the G[reat Sea]
much [wat]er
wi]ldernes[s]
[in the] sea
[in] the Erythrean S[ea]
[nam]es are call[ed]
Margin

The correspondence is even closer than the synopsis reveals if the variants in the Ethiopic textual tradition are considered; thus, at the end of 77:8, where the Ethiopic text translated above has “the Great Sea,” other Ethiopic manuscripts have “the Erythrean Sea,” as does our Greek fragment. The parallel configuration of geographical language strongly suggests that frg. 3v represents a Greek version of *1 En.* 77:7–78:1.

As to frg. 3r, distinctive wording that would allow certain identification with *1 En.* 78:8 is lacking. However, several features consistent with Enoch’s description of the fifteen-day waning of the moon do appear in the fragment, as may be seen in the following synopsis:¹⁹

¹⁷ Knibb, e.g., finds the identification of frgs. 1–2 with *1 Enoch* 85–87 “plausible,” but says of the alleged connection between frg. 3 and *1 Enoch* 77–78: “While the identification seems possible, the fragment is too small for much to be made of it” (“The Book of Enoch or Books of Enoch? The Textual Evidence for *1 Enoch*,” in Boccaccini and Collins, *Early Enoch Literature*, 34). In the notes in his own edition of *1 Enoch*, Knibb takes frgs. 1–2 into account but not frgs. 3–5 “in view of their very small size” (*Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2:20; see also 181).

¹⁸ Here again the translation of the Ethiopic follows Nickelsburg and VanderKam (*1 Enoch*), and the Greek version is my own translation of Milik’s restored text. For reasons discussed below, I do not include here (or in the subsequent translation of frg. 3r) Milik’s maximalist reconstruction, but only those parts that can be restored with reasonable confidence. The full Greek text of frg. 3 as restored by Milik is reproduced later in this study.

¹⁹ Again, only those parts of the Greek text that are legible or can be restored with reasonable confidence are included. The speculative and highly suspect nature of Milik’s much more expansive reconstruction of frg. 3, especially 3r, is discussed at length below. The Aramaic fragment, which does not overlap with the Greek but ends almost exactly where the latter seems to

1 En. 78:8

P.Oxy. 2069, frg. 3r

4QEnastr^r, frg. 1, col. 3

78.8. When it is waning, on the first day it decreases to fourteen parts of its light, and on the next day it decreases to thirteen parts of light.

On the third it decreases to twelve parts, on the fourth to eleven parts,

on the fifth it decreases to ten parts, on the sixth it decreases to nine parts,

on the seventh it decreases to eight parts,

on the eighth it decreases to seven parts, on the ninth it decreases to six, on the tenth it

decreases to five, on the eleventh it decreases to four, on the twelfth it

decreases to three, on the thirteenth it decreases to two, on the fourteenth it

decreases to one-half of a seventh part of all its light, and on the fifteenth day the entire remainder is exhausted.

[... The first day, one from the fourtee]nth;
the second day, one from the th[irteenth; *Blank*
the third day, one from the twelfth; *Blank* the fou]rth
[day] one from the elev[enth
...]

day of th[e]

[lig]ht. *Blank.*

And on th[e]
part]s of all th[e

day of t[he]

[of the li]ght.

Blank. And

[s]even pa[rts]

Margin

The repetition of “in the . . . day of” in the Greek fragment is consistent with the day-by-day sequence in the Enochic passage. A clear reference to “all of,” two possible references to “aspects of” or “visible parts of,” and third declension case endings consistent with the genitive φωτός, “of light,” all correspond to the daily diminution of the moon’s illuminated area detailed in the Astronomical Book in terms of “parts” of the full moon. A conspicuous point of contact is the number seven, [ἔ]βδομον, in the last line in the fragment, followed by *omicron*. Whether one follows Milik in reading [ἐν ἔ]βδομον ὄψεων ὄλου τοῦ φωτός]²⁰ or a

begin, is included here because the language it uses to describe days 1 through 4 of the moon’s waning corresponds closely to that used with reference to days 5 and following in the Ethiopic and Greek texts and figures into Milik’s argument discussed below. For the same reason the whole verse in the Ethiopic translation is provided.

²⁰ Milik, “Fragments grecs,” 339. Supplying ὄψεων is plausible even though only the ini-

shorter rendition such as Black's [ἔν ἑ]βδομον ὄ[λου τοῦ φωτός],²¹ the phrase corresponds to the seven parts of light that remain on the eighth day of the moon's waning described in the Enochic passage. From this fixed point the preceding elements in the Greek text align well with the Ethiopic text's description of the moon's waning from the fifth through the eighth day.

There is considerable variation between the Aramaic and Ethiopic texts, and even among the Ethiopic manuscripts, as to how often certain words or phrases are repeated as the fifteen lunar phases leading to a new moon are described in turn (e.g., a verb for "decrease, diminish" and descriptive phrases such as "of the month" after the reference to the successive days, and "of light" or "of its light" following the reference to the visible portion of the moon on a given day in the sequence).²² Therefore, it is hardly surprising that our Greek fragment seems to repeat some such phrases in places where the Ethiopic version translated above does not. With allowance for such variations, the few words that do survive from the six extant lines of frg. 3r align remarkably well with *1 En.* 78:8 and create a strong cumulative case that the fragment represents a Greek form of that Enochic passage. Certainty is impossible based on the few legible words in frg. 3r alone; what confirms the identification is the distinctive movement that the fragment shares with *1 Enoch* 77–78 from language about topographical and geographical phenomena to language consistent with cosmic and astronomical phenomena. The juxtaposition may appear disjointed but is in fact part and parcel of the Enochic worldview from its very earliest expression in the Astronomical Book: the cognitive mapping of both terrestrial and celestial space and the related natural phenomena serves to underscore the order of God's creation and provide assurance of divine judgment by revealing the sites and mechanisms related to rewards and punishments that are built into the structure of the cosmos.²³ The distinctive progression of thought from earth's mountains and rivers in ch. 77 to the motions of the heavenly luminaries in ch. 78 provides the perfect precedent for and parallel to the apparent juxtaposition of ideas in close proximity in our frgs. 3v and 3r.

tial *omicron* survives. Hunt's *editio princeps* gives *upsilon* as the uncertain second letter, causing one to wonder whether traces of the upper part of an *upsilon* or *psi* now abraded were visible to him. In addition, in what may well be the same word in a parallel expression three lines earlier, the final letter is *nu*.

²¹ Black, *Book of Enoch*, 420.

²² See further below on the complex issue of the relationship between the fragmentary astronomical materials from Qumran and the Ethiopic Astronomical Book. Given the level of variation between the Aramaic and Ethiopic, we cannot assume that an intermediate Greek version would correspond verbatim to either, even when the content matches closely.

²³ See George W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Apocalyptic Construction of Reality in *1 Enoch*," in *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium* (ed. John J. Collins and James H. Charlesworth; JSOTSup 9; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 51–64, esp. 56; see

Milik's further association of frg. 5 with the Astronomical Book is interesting but inconclusive: the few partially legible letters of frg. 5v, λουτ, may be from an additional occurrence of the expression ὅλου τοῦ φωτός, which Milik restores several times in frg. 3r; and the occurrence of πύλη, "gate," in frg. 5r could be from the description of the gates through which the sun and moon rise and set according to *1 Enoch* 79.²⁴ These connections are plausible but rest on too slender data to add anything more than slight cumulative support for relating parts of *P.Oxy.* 2069 to the Astronomical Book.

III. TWO CODICES?

Milik's third conclusion—that frgs. 1 and 2 belong to a different codex from frg. 3—will occupy the remainder of this study. Milik adduced two reasons for diverging from Hunt and insisting "avec certitude" that the fragments cannot have come from the same codex.²⁵ One is the different state of preservation and the color variation among the several pieces of papyrus. Here it must be reiterated that Milik never viewed the fragments; his argument rests solely on Hunt's brief comment that the papyrus of frgs. 3 and 5 is "lighter coloured and better preserved than the rest."²⁶ Inspection of the fragments confirms Hunt's basic observation but does not sustain Milik's deduction and in fact argues decidedly against it. In the first place, color differences among papyrus fragments are not reliable indicators of distinct origins. There are too many factors that affect the color of this natural product—not the least of which is variability in the moistening process by which the curled pieces are flattened for preservation—for us to suppose that different coloration means different codices. Color variation greater than what appears here is not unusual among leaves known to be from the same manuscript, or even between the recto and verso of a single folio. It should also be noted that Hunt apparently used "lighter coloured" and "better preserved" synonymously, for apart from varying degrees of discoloration there is no apparent difference in the surface consistency or relative degradation among these fragments; thus frgs. 1r and 2r are slightly darker, but otherwise no more degraded, than the rest. Milik's appeal to "la qualité du papyrus et l'état de conservation des fragments 3 et 5, différents de ceux des autres trois morceaux,"²⁷ exaggerated both the degree and significance of quite commonplace variations.

also Kelley Coblenz Bautch, *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17–19: 'No One Has Seen What I Have Seen'* (JSJSup 81; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 3, 7, 160–61, 190, et passim.

²⁴ Milik, "Fragments grecs," 341.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 343.

²⁶ Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri XVII*, 7.

²⁷ Milik, "Fragments grecs," 343.

Moreover, Milik erroneously assumed that the color patterns observed by Hunt apply alike to the recto and verso of the respective fragments. The assumption happens to be correct in the case of frgs. 3 and 5 but certainly not in the case of frgs. 1 and 2 (nor, apparently, in the case of frg. 4, although here the sample is too meager to say for sure). As is mentioned above, frgs. 1r and 2r are somewhat darker than frgs. 3 and 5, but Milik had no way of knowing that they are also darker than their own verso. Indeed, in terms of the coloration of the papyrus and the clarity of the ink against the lighter or darker background, frg. 1v is much closer to frg. 3 than to its own recto; likewise frg. 2v is much closer in color to frg. 3 than to its own recto. Therefore, the color discrepancies do not line up with the two codices that Milik distinguished. By his reasoning we would have to conclude that frgs. 1r and 1v come from separate codices, as do frgs. 2r and 2v! By thus proving too much, the argument from discoloration proves nothing at all. It affords no grounds for discerning multiple codices and in fact cuts across the particular arrangement by codices that Milik delineated.

Milik's other reason for assigning the extant fragments to two codices was a supposed discrepancy between the length of the lines in frgs. 1 and 2 and those in frg. 3. Because the problematic part of this argument has to do with frg. 3, the Greek text of that fragment as restored by Milik is reproduced here in full.²⁸

Fragment 3v (1 En. 77:7–78:1)

- 1 [εἰς τὴν] ἐρυθρὰν θ[άλασσαν]
- 2 [] εἰς τὴν μ[εγάλῃν θάλασσαν]
- 3 []τα πολὺ ο.[]
- 4 [] να.θεῖρ.[]
- 5 [Καὶ εἶδον ἐπτὰ νήσους μεγάλας ἐν τῇ] θαλάσῃ [ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς]
- 6 [πέντε ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ θαλάσῃ καὶ δύο ἐν] τῇ ἐρυθρᾷ θ[αλάσῃ.]
- 7 [Καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τοῦ ἡλίου οὕτως τὰ πρῶ]τα καλε[ῖται]

Margin

Fragment 3r (1 En. 78:8)

- 1 [Καὶ ἐν τῇ πέμπτῃ] ἡμέρᾳ το[ῦ μηνὸς ἐλαττοῖ ἐν δέκατον ὄψεων]
- 2 [ὄλου τοῦ φωτ]ός. *Blank.* Καὶ ἐν τ[ῇ ἕκτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ μηνὸς ἐλαττοῖ]
- 3 [ἐν ἑνατον ὄψεω]ν ὄλου τοῦ[φωτός. *Blank?*]
- 4 [Καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐβδόμῃ] ἡμέρᾳ τ[οῦ μηνὸς ἐλαττοῖ ἐν ὄγδοον ὄψεων]
- 5 [ὄλου τοῦ φω]τός. *Blank.* Καὶ [ἐν τῇ ὄγδῳ] ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ μηνὸς]
- 6 [ἐλαττοῖ ἐν ἔ]βδομον ὄψ[εων ὄλου τοῦ φωτός]

Margin

²⁸ Ibid., 333, 339. As in Milik's publication, letters enclosed in brackets are restored by him, and letters with dots underneath are only partially visible and should be considered uncertain.

By Milik's calculation the codex that contained these portions of the Astronomical Book averaged around forty-five letters per line, whereas the codex of the Book of Dream Visions partially preserved in frgs. 1 and 2 averaged twenty-eight letters per line.²⁹ This difference would be telling if we actually had a reliable way to calculate the length of the lines in frg. 3—as we have, for example, in the case of frg. 1, where the left margin is visible in 1r and the right margin in 1v. In actual fact, frg. 3 affords us no such luxury. The verso of this fragment preserves parts of seven lines from some indeterminate point within a column, with an average of just over six legible letters per line, and the recto preserves parts of six lines, naturally also in the inner portion of a column, with an average of slightly over six visible letters per line and no more than one partially visible letter on a given line. While the wording and especially the sequence of language in the surviving text justify the identification of the fragment with portions of *1 Enoch* 77 and 78, we simply do not know how much is missing before and after each bit of visible text, much less exactly what is missing. Of the forty-five letters per line that Milik estimated, he had to restore thirty-eight or thirty-nine—around eighty-five percent—or at least posit blank spaces with room for that many letters. Even with the best of comparative materials, restoration on this scale is of doubtful value, as Michael A. Knibb wisely cautions.³⁰ To guess that the leaf originally contained forty-five letters per line is reasonable; to elevate this guess to the status of a fact and then cite it as proof that the leaf cannot have come from a codex known to have only twenty-eight letters per line is circular and specious.³¹

The reconstruction of frg. 3 is especially complicated because there is no other Greek text for comparison and because the Aramaic and Ethiopic forms of the Astronomical Book differ markedly in wording even when their content is similar. It was Milik's own pioneering work on the Qumran Enochic materials that brought attention to the fact that the Aramaic astronomical work presents a much fuller text than the Ethiopic.³² Indeed, it was Milik who theorized that the Astronomical Book was copied separately from the other Enochic works at Qumran precisely because of its inordinate length and that it constituted one volume of a two-volume Enochic pentateuch, the other part of which contained the Book of the Watchers, the Book of the Giants, the Book of Dream Visions, and the Epistle of Enoch.³³ Not

²⁹ Milik, "Fragments grecs," 343.

³⁰ Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2:181.

³¹ Milik acknowledged that his numbers "resteront forcément assez hypothétiques" and yet considered the conclusion drawn from them about two codices to be "un fait établi" ("Fragments grecs," 343).

³² Milik, "Le travail d'édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumrân," *RB* 63 (1956): 49–67; idem, "Le travail d'édition des manuscrits du désert de Juda," in *Volume du Congrès Strasbourg 1956* (VTSup 4; Leiden: Brill, 1957), 17–26; idem, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (SBT 26; London: SCM, 1959), 33; and idem, *Books of Enoch*, 7–8, 274–75.

³³ Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 4–7, 57–58, 181–84, 227, 310.

before the sixth or seventh century C.E., he maintained, was there a Greek archetype for the Enochic pentateuch familiar to us from the Ethiopic compilation, with an abridged Astronomical Book in the third position and the Parables of Enoch in the second position in place of the Book of the Giants;³⁴ earlier in Greek tradition, an Enochic pentateuch similar to that at Qumran persisted in two volumes, with a long Greek version of the Astronomical Book copied separately from the other four Enochic works.³⁵ In keeping with this understanding, Milik argued that *P.Oxy.* 2069 frg. 3 represents a long recension of the Astronomical Book corresponding to that at Qumran rather than to the shorter one preserved in the Ethiopic text, and that it belongs to a different codex from the fragments of the Book of Dream Visions just as the Qumran manuscripts of the Astronomical Book circulated independently from other Enochic works.³⁶

Milik's theory of the compositional history of *1 Enoch* has been roundly criticized on many fronts and finds no supporters among current specialists. The flaws in his conjoining the Book of the Giants with other Qumran Enochic works, discerning at Qumran an Aramaic Enochic pentateuch modeled on the five books of Moses as early as 100 B.C.E., and assigning the Parables of Enoch to a Christian author of the late third century C.E. are well known.³⁷ Not as widely discussed but also problematic are his assumptions about the Greek phase of the tradition. While

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 76–77, 88.

³⁵ Elsewhere Milik seemed to allow for a much earlier Greek archetype of the compilation known to us from Ethiopic, with a résumé of the Astronomical Book in the third position, and even said that the Greek translators “were at pains to shorten the voluminous, prolix, and terribly monotonous original” (*Books of Enoch*, 19; see also 183, 275; and “Problèmes de la littérature hénochique,” 373–74). However, as we shall soon see, whenever actually considering the Greek witnesses, he consistently took pains of his own to construe them as evidence for the same two-part pentateuchal arrangement that he discerned among the Qumran Enochic materials, with a long version of the Astronomical Book as one of the parts, rather than anything approximating a Greek archetype of the Ethiopic arrangement.

³⁶ In the same vein he argued that a reference to the Astronomical Book by the Byzantine chronographer George Syncellus, who in turn drew from the chronicles of the Alexandrian monks Panodorus and Anianus, shows that the book as known in Alexandria around 400 C.E. “still had its long text which faithfully reproduced the Aramaic original” (*Books of Enoch*, 77; see also 19–20). Similarly, he suggested that the Chester Beatty-Michigan papyrus of the Epistle of Enoch was excerpted from a Greek collection that combined the four Enochic books (*Books of Enoch*, 57, 76).

³⁷ See, among many others, Jonas C. Greenfield and Michael E. Stone, “The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes,” *HTR* 70 (1977): 51–65; George W. E. Nickelsburg, review of *The Books of Enoch*, by J. T. Milik, *CBQ* 40 (1978): 411–19; James H. Charlesworth, “The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch,” *NTS* 25 (1979): 315–23; James C. VanderKam, “Some Major Issues in the Contemporary Study of *1 Enoch*: Reflections on J. T. Milik's *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*,” *Maarav* 3 (1982): 85–97; and Devorah Dimant, “The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch,” *VT* 33 (1983): 16–19.

the Ethiopic text of the Astronomical Book is, on the whole, considerably truncated by comparison with the Aramaic, we have no way to determine the relative length of the intermediate Greek version(s). Moreover, as Knibb has noted, the major differences between the (long) Aramaic and the (short) Ethiopic versions occur in the synchronistic calendar in *1 Enoch* 72–75, whereas frg. 3 of *P.Oxy.* 2069 relates to chs. 77–78, where the Aramaic and Ethiopic correspond more closely.³⁸ We cannot assume that the Ethiopic abbreviates the Aramaic at every point to the degree that it does in the synchronistic calendar, much less predict where a Greek text might fall on the continuum between the two.³⁹ Milik, as we have seen, was confident that the Greek Astronomical Book was closer to the prolix Aramaic version than to the Ethiopic abridgment; but with equal plausibility one could suppose that considerable abridgement existed already in the intermediate Greek tradition, such as we find, for example, in the Akhmim (Panopolis) Codex of the Book of the Watchers.⁴⁰ The claim that *P.Oxy.* 2069 frg. 3 contains an average of seventeen more letters per line than frgs. 1 and 2 and therefore represents a long version of the Astronomical Book that cannot have come from the same codex as the fragments of the Book of Dream Visions must be evaluated on its own merits; Milik's larger (and highly dubious) scheme creates no a priori presumption in favor of such an estimation.

Milik's proclivity to reconstruct the text of frg. 3 in such a way that it is longer than the Ethiopic text—and at points even longer than the highly repetitive

³⁸ Knibb, "Christian Adoption and Transmission of Jewish Pseudepigrapha: The Case of *1 Enoch*," *JSJ* 32 (2001): 410.

³⁹ On the extreme complexity of imagining how the Ethiopic Astronomical Book or Book of the Luminaries developed from the Aramaic, see most recently James C. VanderKam, "The Aramaic Astronomical Book and the Ethiopic Book of the Luminaries," in Dobos and Kőszeghy, 'With Wisdom as a Robe,' 207–21. With other scholars, VanderKam doubts that Aramaic and Ethiopic materials are simply grandmother-granddaughter versions of the same work. Developing nascent suggestions by Milik, Otto Neugebauer, and others, he finds it likely that the Ethiopic work amalgamates more than one source of astronomical material, perhaps including not only narrative but also tables with technical data on the movements of the luminaries and calendrical matters such as we find in Ethiopic ms 64 from the Bibliothèque Nationale. The nature of the intermediate Greek traditions, a fortiori, is even less certain.

⁴⁰ See Knibb, "Book of Enoch or Books of Enoch?" 23–26; and idem, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2:17. Knibb finds some plausibility in the old suggestion by Emil Schürer, followed by M. Black and others, that the numerous omissions and other alterations in the Akhmim text resulted from the haste in which the manuscript was copied so that it could be deposited in the grave where it was discovered (Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* [4th ed.; 3 vols.; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1909], 3:269; Black, *Apocalypsis henochi graece*, 8; and Denis, *Introduction*, 18). This notion is rejected by Erik W. Larson on the grounds that the manuscript predates the burial at Akhmim by two to three centuries ("The Translation of Enoch: From Aramaic into Greek" [Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1995], 70–71).

Aramaic in the passage immediately preceding—is palpable. Thus, with regard to the recounting of the lunar phases in *1 Enoch* 78, he insisted that the Greek translation in frg. 3r repeats some form of the verb ἐλαττώ, “to diminish,” or a technical equivalent, each time it describes the moon’s waning by one-fourteenth of its light on each successive day until the light is exhausted on the fifteenth day, whereas in the Ethiopic parallel and apparently also in the Aramaic text in 4QEnastr^c, the verb appears only once at the beginning.⁴¹ In actual fact, no form of ἐλαττώ or any equivalent appears even once in the surviving text; all four occurrences are restored by Milik—in each instance without so much as a single surviving letter or part of a letter. Similarly, Milik asserted that the Greek translator attached the genitival phrase τοῦ μηνός, “of the month,” to the reference to each successive day.⁴² The fact is that τοῦ μηνός never appears in the surviving text of frg. 3r, although in both lines 1 and 4, ἡμέρα appears to be followed by *tau*, and the restoration ἡμέρα τ[οῦ μηνός] is likely in these instances. According to Milik, the Greek translator also repeated the phrase ὅλου τοῦ φωτός, “of all (its) light,” after the reference to the visible fraction of the moon on each successive day, whereas the Ethiopic retains only “of its light” in speaking of the first day, “of light” in speaking of the second day, and “of all its light” with reference to the fourteenth day.⁴³ Again, this represents Milik’s reconstructive guesswork; the only parts of this supposed wording that actually appear in the fragment are two case endings consistent with the genitive φωτός, “of light,” and a single occurrence of ὅλου τοῦ in line 3. Milik even postulated a long blank space, with room for about twenty letters, at the end of frg. 3r, line 3.⁴⁴ The effect is to stretch this line to occupy as much space as the expanded readings proposed for the preceding and following lines. However, once again the speculative nature of the proposal must be recognized; no part of any such blank space is visible.⁴⁵

To introduce verbiage with no precedent in the Aramaic or Ethiopic versions and in other ways expand the Greek text, and then to claim that the lines thus restored are too long to belong to a codex in which other leaves have fewer letters per line, is simply untenable method. It is evident that Milik was predisposed to enlarge the Greek text because of a prior conviction that the Greek Astronomical Book, like the Aramaic, was too long to be copied together with other Enochic books and persisted in this long form as late as the fifth or sixth century. Absent

⁴¹ Milik, “Fragments grecs,” 340.

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ Milik speculated that just as the clauses that describe the successive lunar phases are separated by a small space with room for two or three letters (see lines 2 and 5), the whole cycle from a full moon to a new moon may have been divided into two distinct paragraphs separated by this longer space at the end of line 3 (“Fragments grecs,” 340).

such a predisposition, there is no reason to generate such an inflated Greek text of frg. 3r.

Apparently less assured of how to reconstruct frg. 3v, Milik restored only a few words or parts of words before and after the visible letters in lines 1–2 and none at all in lines 3–4. Even so, regarding this portion of frg. 3v he stated confidently: “Ce très long passage de la version grecque de l’écrit astronomique attribué à Hénoch a été abrégé d’une manière fort drastique par le traducteur éthiopien.”⁴⁶ On what grounds, we must ask, could he claim that these lines represent a “très long passage” of approximately forty-five letters per line when his own reconstructed text of the four lines (including the visible or partially visible letters as well as those supplied) totals only twenty-one, twenty-one, seven, and six letters, respectively? The obvious answer is congruity with the lines reconstructed in frg. 3r and the end of frg. 3v. However, as we have seen, the verbose text that Milik restored in frg. 3r is quite arbitrary and no credible benchmark for predicting the length of other lines on the same leaf. As to the remaining lines of frg. 3v, to which we now turn, Milik was more restrained and adhered to the Ethiopic more closely, but even here there are serious doubts about whether the Greek text should be as long as he supposed.

Hunt, followed by Milik, was probably correct in reading $\nu\alpha.\delta\epsilon\iota\rho$ in frg. 3v, line 4, although after $\nu\alpha$ the letters are only partially visible and it is impossible to be sure. Milik understood these letters to be part of a transliteration of the Aramaic מִדְּבָרִים , “desert,” which the Greek translator took as a proper noun. This explanation is supported by references to the desert in *1 En.* 28:1, where the Akhmim Codex reads $\mu\alpha\nu\delta\omicron\beta\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$ (with the same extraneous *nu* as in our fragment), and 29:1, where the Akhmim text has $\beta\alpha\beta\delta\eta\rho\acute{\alpha}$.⁴⁷ If the restoration $[\mu\alpha]\nu\alpha[\beta]\delta\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha$ or some slight variation thereof is correct,⁴⁸ we still do not know what follows and cannot estimate the length of line 4. Milik suggested $\tau\eta\nu\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\nu$ and/or a blank space at the end of the line as possibilities.⁴⁹ The former proposal is without parallel in the Ethiopic text and seems, once again, to be a function of Milik’s determination to lengthen the lines by all possible means. A blank space at the end of the line is certainly possible and would not be unusual before the beginning of a new thought, but the pattern of introducing a blank space whenever one was needed to make room for forty-five letters in the preceding and following lines is circular reasoning and not actual evidence for lines of that length. If, instead of a blank space, we place at the end of line 4 the three words with which Milik began line 5 ($\kappa\alpha\iota$

⁴⁶ Milik, “Fragments grecs,” 333.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 335–37. Cf. Josh 5:6, where the LXX has $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\ \epsilon\rho\eta\mu\omega\ \tau\eta\ \text{Μαδβαρίτιδι}$ for במדבר .

⁴⁸ Milik also suggested $[\mu\alpha]\nu\alpha[\beta]\delta\eta\rho\alpha$ or the shortened form $\nu\alpha[\beta]\delta\eta\rho\alpha$ as possibilities.

⁴⁹ Milik, “Fragments grecs,” 337. He made these suggestions in his narrative but incorporated neither into his reconstructed text.

εἶδον ἑπτὰ, in keeping with the Ethiopic); and if we eliminate ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς at the end of line 5 (restored by Milik from the Ethiopic, where, Ephraim Isaac notes, it may be an intrusion⁵⁰) and replace it with three words that Milik reserved for the beginning of line 6 (πέντε ἐν τῇ, again restored on the analogy of some Ethiopic manuscripts); then neither line 4 nor line 5 is nearly as long as in Milik's reconstruction.

The complex blend of real and mythical geography in *1 En.* 77:8 is too confused in the Ethiopic manuscript tradition to provide a secure basis for retrojecting lines 5 and 6 into Greek. Milik himself acknowledged: "Ce verset est également fort embrouillé dans la transmission manuscrite gé'ez."⁵¹ The Ethiopic manuscripts vary in the number of islands as well as in their groupings and locations. Most texts are close to that in the translation by Nickelsburg and VanderKam: "I saw seven large islands in the sea and on the land—two on the land and five in the Great Sea,"⁵² but some manuscripts end the sentence with "two in the Erythrean Sea," and there are other variations.⁵³ Milik restored the line: [πέντε ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ θαλάσσει καὶ δύο ἐν] τῇ ἔρυθρᾷ θ[αλάσσει], "[five in the Great Sea and two in] the Erythrean S[ea]." This proposal is reasonable and accords with some of the Ethiopic data as well as the clear allusion to the Erythrean Sea in the Greek fragment, but it is also a conflationary reading that combines and arranges the variants to create a longer line than could be reconstructed in other ways. Moreover, as is noted above, there may be room for at least part of this restored wording on line 5, so that line 6 need not be as long as Milik claimed.

The seventh and final line of frg. 3v, which Milik restored [Καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τοῦ ἡλίου οὕτως· τὰ πρῶ]τα καλεῖται], "[and the names of the sun are as follows: the fir]st is call[ed]," could equally well be restored [Καὶ τὰ τοῦ ἡλίου ὀνόμα]τα καλεῖται], "[and the sun's nam]es are call[ed]."⁵⁴ Thus restored, line 7 has twenty-eight letters, as compared to Milik's forty, and is consistent with the length of the lines in frgs. 1 and 2. The point here is not to argue exclusively for any such reading but to challenge Milik's claim that the lines in frg. 3 are too long to belong to the same codex as frgs. 1 and 2. This claim holds only if we take as the starting point his own reconstruction of frg. 3, which, we have shown, is consistently more expansive than it need be and has all the markings of Procrustean elongation of the text to fit the theory.

⁵⁰ Isaac, "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 56 n. r.

⁵¹ Milik, "Fragments grecs," 337.

⁵² Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 107.

⁵³ Isaac's translation reads "I (also) saw big islands in the sea and the land—seventy-two in the Erythraean Sea" ("1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 56). Isaac describes this reading, based on ms A, as "difficult but better."

⁵⁴ This reading entails the conventional use of a singular verb with a neuter plural subject and the placement of an attributive genitive before the governing noun—also quite common.

One further comment regarding the codicology of frg. 3 is in order. In view of the meager size of the fragment as well as the divergence between the Aramaic and Ethiopic astronomical materials, Milik—hardly a champion of restraint in other guesswork about frg. 3—wisely declined to estimate the number of lines per page in the codex that contained it.⁵⁵ As precarious as any such calculation would be, the following is worth considering: if we were to assume that the Greek text that lies between that preserved in frgs. 3v and 3r (from the middle of *1 En.* 78:1 to the middle of 78:8) is roughly comparable in length to the Ethiopic (*mutatis mutandis* for its retrojection into Greek); and if we were to assume further that the codex originally had roughly the number of lines per page and letters per line that Milik calculated for frgs. 1 and 2 (thirty-five lines per page and twenty-eight letters per line);⁵⁶ then the six partial lines that survive in frg. 3r would fall in the codex precisely where they do fall vis-à-vis the lines partially preserved in frg. 3v, namely, at the very bottom of the subsequent column of text. Of course this codicological fit is hypothetical and proves nothing, but it does illustrate once again that it is not frg. 3 itself or a reasonable restoration thereof—but only Milik's highly speculative and expansive reconstruction of frg. 3—that is incompatible with frgs. 1 and 2.

The failure of Milik's case for two codices among the fragments of *P.Oxy.* 2069 does not by itself prove that the fragments belong to a single codex. Indeed, there is no conclusive test by which to rule out a second codex. However, strong circumstantial evidence points to a single codex, and no evidence at all points in a different direction. That the fragments were copied in the same brown ink by the same scribal hand in the fourth century was recognized by Hunt in the *editio princeps*,⁵⁷ repeated with approval by Milik,⁵⁸ and confirmed by my own analysis in consultation with the Oxford papyrologists named above.⁵⁹ Hunt left no doubt that he considered the fragments to be from the same codex and in fact suggested that they probably represent more than one leaf of that codex largely because he could not see an immediate connection of thought between the apocalyptic language in frg. 1 and that in frg. 3—an apparent disjunction now readily explained by their respective Enochic contexts. Although we know nothing specific about Hunt's recovery of the fragments from the Oxyrhynchus rubbish dump, the mere fact that he offered no rationale for editing them under one siglum and analyzing them as a unit even when he had difficulty correlating their contents suggests that he did not combine them but recovered them together. Nothing whatsoever in the physical evidence or the orthographical, paleographical, or codicological character of the

⁵⁵ Milik, "Fragments grecs," 343.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri XVII*, 6-8.

⁵⁸ Milik, "Fragments grecs," 321, 343.

⁵⁹ See the discussion above on the likelihood that the fragments date earlier rather than later in the fourth century.

fragments attenuates the judgment of their discoverer and editor that they come from the same manuscript as well as the same scribe.⁶⁰

IV. CONCLUSION

In the only published study of *P.Oxy.* 2069 since the *editio princeps* of 1927, Milik correctly identified frgs. 1 and 2 with *1 Enoch* 85–87 and frg. 3 with *1 Enoch* 77–78 but erred in arguing that the two small portions of *1 Enoch* thus preserved represent separate codices. His fundamentally flawed argument was driven by his larger thesis about the compositional history of *1 Enoch* rather than by anything in the manuscript itself, which he never had the benefit of examining. In view of the strong indications that the fragments belong together, and in the absence of any evidence for a second codex, the fragments designated *P.Oxy.* 2069 should be considered parts of the same codex.

If frgs. 1–2 and frg. 3 indeed share a codicological context and represent the Book of Dream Visions and the Astronomical Book, respectively, there are significant implications for the evolutionary history of the Enochic corpus. Although the fragments are too slight to be of great text-critical value, they do provide our only Greek manuscript of any part of the Astronomical Book and our only evidence in any language prior to the Ethiopic compilation that the Astronomical Book was combined with another of the works that comprise what is now called *1 Enoch*. As tempting as it is to construe this combination as evidence of a Greek Enochic corpus—a part of the putative *Vorlage* for the pentateuchal form familiar from the Ethiopic version—circumspection is necessary. We have no way to know whether the two works were copied together merely for practical reasons or as part of an Enochic or other literary construct. Certainly we cannot assume that the pairing was general practice rather than an isolated case. Neither do we know whether

⁶⁰ There is no little irony in Milik's insistence on separating these two fragments that come from the same hand and seem to belong together, for his whole theory of the evolving Enochic literary corpus rests on his equally strong insistence on combining two Qumran manuscripts that other scholars consider separate. Indeed, his primary argument for bringing together 4QEn^c (4Q204) and 4QEnGiants^a (4Q203) into a single scroll is that they appear to come from the same scribal hand. On this combination he builds his hypothesis that by 100 b.c.e. there existed an Enochic Pentateuch in two scrolls, one with the tetralogy of the Book of the Watchers, Book of Giants, Book of Dreams, and Epistle of Enoch copied together, and the other with the Astronomical Book (4QEnastr^{a-d} [4Q208–211]) copied separately because of its great length. In addition to the general critiques of this construct mentioned above, see Loren T. Stuckenbruck's recent studies challenging the use of the Book of Giants in this scheme and the linking of 4Q203 and 4Q204: "Early Traditions Related to 1 Enoch from the Dead Sea Scrolls," 47–52; and "4QEnoch Giants^a ar (Pls. I–II)," in *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (ed. Stephen J. Pfann et al.; DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 8–41, esp. 9–10.

other works were also included. Nor can we infer a great deal about the community that copied and used these texts of which such scant fragments survive. What we can say with confidence is that *P.Oxy. 2069* affords no support for Milik's thesis that a long recension of the Astronomical Book continued to be copied in Greek independently of other Enochic works in the fourth century and beyond. On the contrary, these fragments show that in at least one community of the early fourth century C.E. a Greek version of the Astronomical Book was copied together with the book that immediately follows it in the later Ethiopic compilation, whatever other combinations or single Enochic works may also have circulated. The joining of these two component parts of *1 Enoch* in Greek tradition dates one or two centuries before the Enochic corpus is thought to have been produced in Ethiopic and a millennium before any actual Ethiopic manuscripts preserve such a compilation.