

Angel does not note any significant differences between the employment of the Hebrew *Chaoskampf* tradition in wisdom literature or Jewish historiography versus its use at Qumran or in apocalyptic literature. Yet based upon his own presentation, it seems evident that apocalyptic literature is much more explicit in its use of the Hebrew *Chaoskampf* tradition, with its fantastic beasts and heavenly battles, while its appearance in wisdom literature is usually confined to brief, veiled allusions to chaos or to the Divine Warrior (at best). One wishes that Angel would attempt to address the implications of these differences or to explain why they exist.

The above critiques notwithstanding, Angel has produced a valuable study worthy of attention. I heartily recommend *Chaos and the Son of Man* as a helpful collection, analysis, and explication of Second Temple period texts which include the *Chaoskampf* tradition.

David P. Melvin
Baylor University
Waco, TX 76798
David_Melvin@baylor.edu

ENOCH AND THE MESSIAH SON OF MAN: REVISITING THE BOOK OF PARABLES. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Pp. xv + 539. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2007. Paper \$50.00

This volume brings together main and short papers presented at the third Enoch Seminar held at Camaldoli monastery, Italy, June, 2005. The Enoch Seminar is an ongoing research initiative led by Gabriele Boccacini, bringing together international scholars to focus on major documents of “Enochic Judaism,” or, at least, Jewish writings associated with and inspired by Enochic tradition. This includes the collection preserved as *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, and *2 Enoch*, the theme for 2009.

The subtitle more adequately reflects the book’s theme and significance: “Revisiting the Book of Parables,” namely, *1 Enoch* 37–71, the section of *1 Enoch* not preserved at Qumran. Much interest in the past has been on its potential relevance for the evolution of Christology, but its significance is much wider than that and this is reflected in the contributions. Thus of the six parts, only one deals with the “Son of Man.” The work begins with an introduction to previous research, which was characterized by concern with dating, absence from Qumran being taken as an indicator of later origins. Pointing to the conclusions of Sacchi and Nickelsburg, that the work was produced around the turn of the era, Boccaccini reports: “After the Camaldoli meeting, it can now be confidently said that the position of Nickelsburg and Sacchi is confirmed and supported by the overwhelming

majority of specialists in the Enoch literature and Second Temple Judaism” (p. 15). None dated it prior to the Roman period or beyond the end of the first century C.E. This is a major outcome of the seminar.

Part one addresses “The Structure of the Text.” In “Discerning the Structure(s) of the Enochic Book of Parables” (pp. 23–47), George Nickelsburg identifies the threefold structure based on the three parables as reflecting the early shape of the work, which includes some rewriting of the *Book of the Watchers* (1 *Enoch* 1–36), conflated with material from elsewhere. He proposes some rearrangement of the material especially in the first parable around the account of Wisdom’s descent. The work underwent a Noachic redaction, identifiable in four interpolations, which depicts Noah as recipient of the *Book of Parables* and is possibly also responsible for Enoch’s identification as Son of Man in 1 *Enoch* 71. Michael Knibb similarly addresses the “Structure and Composition of the Parables of Enoch” (pp. 48–64), concluding that 70–71 “are a secondary addition” (p. 63) because of their surprising identification contrasted with chapters 37–69, and that the loose structure of the work facilitated the inclusion of Noachic but also other material “on an ad hoc basis over a period of time” (p. 64). Loren Stuckenbruck then notes agreement and disagreement between the two on composition and raises questions for further discussion (pp. 65–71), including on the language of the original. In reviewing both papers on structure (pp. 72–78), Benjamin Wright argues that Nickelsburg’s placement of the account of Wisdom’s descent still leaves problems (pp. 73–74) and underlines the problem of dealing with a work which has survived only in its the Ethiopic version (pp. 77–78).

Part two discusses “The Parables within the Enoch Tradition,” with an opening paper on the topic by James Vanderkam (pp. 81–99) and response by Eibert Tigchelaar (pp. 100–109). Differences include the latter’s disputing the extent of dependence on the *Book of the Watchers*. Andrei Orlov discusses the roles and titles of Enoch in the *Parables* (pp. 110–136) with a response by William Adler (pp. 137–142), and Jonathan Ben-Dov treats the cosmology (pp. 143–150). Part three deals with the Son of Man, Sabino Chialà tracing the evolution of the expression in both Jewish and Christian literature to the end of the first century C.E. (pp. 153–178), by which time “it seems that all ‘Son of Man’ language is attentively avoided” (p. 177), and Helge Kvanvig addressing the Son of Man in the *Parables*, where he sees Enochic and Wisdom tradition shaping the figure (pp. 179–215). John Collins’ response (pp. 216–227) questions the link between Son of Man and Wisdom’s descent and against Kvanvig argues for 1 *Enoch* 71 as secondary. After a further response by Klaus Koch (pp. 228–237), Charles Gieschen (pp. 238–249) proposes that “references to the ‘name’ of the Son of Man in 1 En 37–71 indicate that he shares the Divine Name of the Ancient of days, the

Tetragrammaton” (p. 238), noting a number of parallels, but, surprisingly, not Phil 2:6–11. Gerbern Oegema then compares “the coming of the Righteous One” in Acts and *1 Enoch* (pp. 250–259), suggesting *1 Enoch* 89:52 forms a background for Acts 7:2–53.

Part four discusses “The Parables within Second Temple Literature,” beginning with Gabriele Boccaccini, who provides a broad map of what he sees as different paradigms of the origin of evil: Wisdom, Apocalyptic, Messianic, Covenantal, and Enochic (pp. 263–289), arguing that the *Parables* reflects “a stage in which the encounter and merging of the Sapiential, Messianic, and Apocalyptic Paradigms were still at their inception—a stage that parallels the earliest origins of the Jesus movement” (p. 288). Matthias Henze’s response (pp. 290–298) raises methodological questions about what he sees as “imposing an evolutionary model on the material that is not integral to the texts” (p. 295). Leslie Walck then compares “the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels” (pp. 299–337). While the Synoptic tradition’s earthly, suffering, and future sayings and the Johannine sayings on heavenly origin, authority, and restorative power do not indicate dependence, the situation is different with Matthew’s distinctive sayings. Adela Collins agrees (pp. 338–342). Ida Fröhlich discusses the *Parables* in relation to Qumran literature (pp. 343–351), noting that the former draw not only on the *Book of the Watchers* and Daniel, but also on “ideas and themes known from Qumran,” suggestive that they may date from after Qumran’s demise, possibly the work of Jewish Christians. Finally Kelley Coblenz-Bautch discusses Adamic traditions (pp. 352–360), noting that their presence suggests a situation where a group that still clings to the *Book of the Watchers* was prepared to incorporate other traditions and change emphases.

Part five is about “The Social Setting.” Perluigi Piovanelli (pp. 363–379) argues that the most plausible setting for the book’s origins is the reign of Herod the Great (37–4 B.C.E.), that it alludes to Herod’s visit to the hot springs of Callirrhoe (*1 Enoch* 67:5–11), and that it is not sectarian. Daniel Boyarin (pp. 380–385) takes up the latter positively within a discussion of conservative Jewish movements of the time. Lester Grabbe then discusses the *Parables* and their place in Second Temple society (pp. 386–402), noting among its special features: absence of cosmic upheaval in its images of hope; interest in cosmology; no evident knowledge of Greek; less attention than elsewhere in *1 Enoch* on the fallen angels or on reckoning the end-time; and a pacifist-leaning approach to future change. Then in “Spatiality in the Second Parable” (pp. 403–412) Pieter Venter contrasts the *Parables’* concern with local groups with Daniel’s concerns with world powers.

Part six returns to the major issue of “Dating.” David Suter reviews the possibly pertinent issues: absence from Qumran; Parthians in *1 Enoch* 56:5–

8; knowledge of the destruction of Jerusalem in *1 Enoch* 56:7; Herod's visit to the hot springs at Callirrhoe toward the end of his life (*1 Enoch* 67:4–13); identification of the kings and mighty; evaluating the social context; relation to other Jewish writings; and influence on the New Testament. He accepts influence on some of Matthew's distinctive sayings and sees a pre-70 C.E. date likely, before the suppression of the Son of Man image in later apocalypses (p. 440). In an afterward he notes, however, the possibility that the *Parables* may reflect ongoing Hekhalot tradition which could be post-70 C.E. (p. 443). Michael Stone's response (pp. 444–449) agrees with dating the book either at the turn of the era or late first century C.E., preferring the former, and with a cautious acceptance of possible references to the Parthians and to Herod's hot springs visit. James Charlesworth then brings a further element into the equation, namely the curse on the landowners, reflecting, he suggests, the demotion of Jews from being landowners to being tenants especially during Herod's reign (pp. 450–468). There follow three papers reinforcing the proposed historical references, Darrell Hannah on Callirrhoe (pp. 469–477), Luca Arcari on the Parthians (pp. 478–486), and Hanan Eshel on Matthias Antigonus in relation to the latter (pp. 487–491). These are important, at least, for the date *post quem*, but probably more than that. Finally Daniel Olson points to a possible allusion to the *Parables* in Irenaeus (pp. 492–496), important *ad quem*. To conclude, Paolo Sacchi offers a brief review of the seminar's findings. The volume includes a bibliography of works on the *Parables* 1773–2006.

The collection presents an invaluable concentration of current research, with some significant conclusions, not least on dating, an issue which has dogged discussion. Certainty is not achieved, but a date pre-70 C.E. and most likely around the turn of the era now sits nearer the positive end of the probability scale. This is a rich quarry enhanced by engagement with the text in its own right and not as secondary background to other concerns.

William Loader
Murdoch University
Perth, Australia
w.loader@murdoch.edu.au

THE CAMBRIDGE COMPANION TO THE TALMUD AND RABBINIC LITERATURE. Edited by Charlotte Elisheva Fonrobert and Martin S. Jaffee. Pp. xxi + 412. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. Cloth, \$75.00. Paper, \$24.99.

It might seem a strange way to introduce a collection of essays intended to be “the companion to the Talmud and rabbinic literature” by telling the