

APPENDICES

Appendix I *Objections Answered*

Since 2006, I have been involved in quite a few online discussions concerning the *Book of Enoch*. Over this time I have heard a number of reasons people have put forward that the *Book of Enoch* should not be considered of value for today. It has been my uniform experience that most of these arguments arise due to incorrect information about the book which has circulated.

In a sense, the entire book, "*Who Really Wrote the Book of Enoch?*", can be read as my response to the many objections I have seen over the years. This section is included to cover some points which deserve further clarifying. In the following few pages I will restate some of the most frequently recurring arguments as well as the responses I have often given to them.

Objection 1. "Just because the Letter of Jude quotes one passage from the Book of Enoch, does not mean Jude endorsed the whole book. In the New Testament, Paul too, quotes from non-Biblical books without endorsing the whole books or their authors."

This is true, but it should be noted that Jude does not simply quote Enoch, but rather says, "*Enoch prophesied*". That Paul quotes some non-Biblical sources because they include valid statements is not the same. (For a much fuller response to this important objection, see page 214, in *Who Really Wrote the Book of Enoch?*)

Objection 2. "All of the copies of the Book of Enoch that have been found do not agree with the Jude quote exactly word for word."

It is the claim of this person that the copies of the *Book of Enoch* which survive have become so corrupt over time, that we cannot now know the contents of the original book. I do not think that is an accurate portrayal of the situation.

The English translation of Enoch's book included in this volume, was translated and revised by Robert Henry Charles in 1912. It is mainly based upon texts in Geez, a Semitic language of Ethiopia. Over the past 2,000-years, these Ethiopic texts followed the following transmission path:

THE BOOK OF ENOCH

From Aramaic > into Greek > into Geez

The text of Enoch which was used by Jude in the New Testament *Letter of Jude*, probably followed a transmission path like this:

From Aramaic > into Greek

How careful were the Ethiopian translators and copyists with the text of Enoch over the past 2,000 years? You be the judge. The following are both examples translated into English:

Enoch 1:9 (R. H. Charles):

Behold! **He** cometh with ten thousands of His holy ones,⁶⁶³ to execute judgment upon all, **and to destroy all the ungodly**; and to convict all flesh of all the works of their ungodliness which they have ungodly committed, and of all the hard **things** which ungodly sinners have spoken against Him.

Jude 1:14-15 (ESV):

Behold, **the Lord** cometh with ten thousands of His saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard **speeches** which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.

Two different transmission routes which diverged around 1,500-years ago and yet the resulting translations into English are remarkably close to one another. That's the sort of differences we see with the texts we use of the books of the Bible to create our modern translations. The Ethiopic texts which we have today deserve a high degree of respect as being reliable examples of the original book. After R. H. Charles' day, a truly ancient copy of the text of Enoch 1:9 was found in Aramaic in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The parchment upon which the above-referenced verse survives has been dated to the third century BC which is more than 1,000 years older than anything else we have. Not only that, it is more ancient than most other surviving texts of the books of the Bible.

These facts which have come to our attention over the past 30 or so years, debunk the old theory put forth by some scholars in an earlier era, that the entire Ethiopic *Book of Enoch* was a forgery written to provide a background for the one verse in Jude. Amazingly, some sites on the Internet (such as Blue Letter Bible at the time of this writing), still perpetuate this disproved view.

⁶⁶³ **“Holy ones”**; the term “holy ones”, is synonymous with “saints”. The New Testament uses the term “saint” to describe the rank-and-file follower of Jesus; it does not apply to a special or elevated class of believer.

APPENDICES

Jude and 1 Enoch as we have it are in fundamental agreement.

Current Misinformation

Many of the old ideas that place doubt in the trustworthiness of Ethiopic Enoch, continue to have an extended life on internet discussion boards. For instance, one person wrote the following,

“A number of somewhat different versions have been found including some with the Dead Sea Scrolls. The versions are different from one another and no one can agree which one is the original.”

The quote above is not an accurate portrayal of the facts. The only complete copies of the *Book of Enoch*, (also known as *1 Enoch*, *Ethiopic Enoch*, and the *Book of the Words of Enoch*), are in one Ethiopic language. The versions of the Ethiopic texts which we have are not widely different from each other. The process by which R. H. Charles arrived at a text for translation purposes is like the process which is used for the preparing the texts of the Bible.

Nevertheless, one continues to read the concerns of writers that the “versions” of Enoch that are out there are very different from one another. I have tried repeatedly to discover why this myth is so persistent. Usually I find people are simply repeating what they have heard or read somewhere. As it occurs to me, I can think of two reasons why this idea seems to have a life of its own and refuses to die.

Richard Laurence’s Misfire

In the early 19th century, Richard Laurence was the first to publish a translation of the *Book of Enoch* into English. It was Laurence’s conviction that the *Book of Enoch* was greatly disordered and would best be served if his translation reordered the passages to the proper sequence he envisioned. He also renumbered the chapters and verses throughout. The result of this as well as his translation work, was less than satisfactory.

The Laurence translation is still widely available and his chapter numbering and versification are widely different from most other translations that have been published since then. I have personally witnessed the confusion this can cause. If two persons are discussing and citing passages from Enoch, yet only one of them is using the Laurence translation the results can be confusing. The perception can be created that “there are different versions” of the *Book of Enoch*. This impression can be especially severe because those who refer to Laurence’s translation often do not realize the versification problem exists.

THE BOOK OF ENOCH

Other “Books of Enoch”

There is another element that causes confusion for some. There are two other compositions in circulation which also bear Enoch’s name. There is an entirely different book referred to by scholars as *2 Enoch*, also known as *Slavonic Enoch* and *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*. The oldest texts of the book are only available in the Slavonic language. There exists no clear ancient mention of this book outside of itself, it was not found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and it is not the book alluded to repeatedly in the New Testament.

There is also a *3 Enoch*. That book claims for itself to have been written by a Rabbi Ishmael, and it too is an entirely different book with no ancient mention outside of itself.

It is possible the contents of these other books have been read by some who thought they were reading the *Book of Enoch* referred to in the Bible. This could be the source of some misunderstandings.

Other Obstacles

Once it has been determined that we are discussing the correct *Book of Enoch* which was referred to by Jude, and once we’ve eliminated the versification problem introduced by the Richard Laurence translation, there sometimes can be resistance to accepting the book as being legitimate on any level. One person wrote me,

“Jude did not quote all of the material written in the Book of Enoch. Even a fraud may present some truth, and Jude recognized this. One quote does not mean Jude endorsed the entire Book of Enoch.”

There is an element of truth in that statement, however, there are some details not taken into account by this poster. It is true Jude did not quote the whole *Book of Enoch*. In fact, Jude didn’t even say he *was* quoting the *Book of Enoch*. Jude says rather he is quoting Enoch the man, descended 7th from Adam. And where do we know Jude got that quote? Jude quoted Enoch 1:9. The idea that Jude under inspiration of the Holy Spirit would knowingly take one verse from a book written by someone other than Enoch, and quote that one verse as if it were the very words of Enoch, is a problem.

Also, Jude would have known the book to which he referred was very popular and in wide circulation. Enoch was widely known in Israel and among Jews in the 1st century. Jude quotes from the book to highlight a prophecy to be fulfilled at the Second coming of Jesus Christ. Jude says he is quoting the ancient patriarch and prophet Enoch, when he quotes that book. Many of Jude’s readers would also no doubt be familiar with the book from which Jude was quoting. The unmistakable impression

APPENDICES

would be left by Jude, that the *Book of Enoch* was indeed a book written by the antediluvian patriarch, Enoch. There really is no way to wiggle out of it... Jude leaves his readers with the impression the *Book of Enoch* was written by the Biblical Enoch.

Further, it has been demonstrated that the book from which Jude quoted, survives to this day. The version of the *Book of Enoch* which has survived has been demonstrated by modern scholarship to be a faithful rendition of the original book which was circulated among the Jews in the days of Jesus and the Apostles.

Objection 3. “Jude is not quoting the Book of Enoch. Rather, both Jude and the Book of Enoch are quoting a common oral tradition.”

This argument seems to ignore the context of the times of the Apostle Jude. By the time Jude wrote his epistle, the *Book of Enoch* had already been a popular widely-known book, and had been for centuries. For Jude to be quoting an oral tradition and not the book bearing Enoch's name, Jude would be negligent to warn his readers that he was not quoting the book they knew, but rather that Jude was referring to an entirely different Enochian source *which just happened to have identical words*.

In addition, when one considers that Jude actually refers to the *Book of Enoch* not once, but as many as seven times in the course of his tiny epistle, this argument seems even more improbable. This is dealt with in greater detail beginning on page 214.

These and many more objections to the *Book of Enoch* are in circulation. The number of objections I've heard seems endless. For many, there seems to be a vague fear of this book. These objections are included here since they seem to have a bearing on whether the *Book of Enoch* we have today can be seen as the same book used by Jude, and whether the Biblical person Enoch could have written it.