AN ENOCHIC CITATION IN BARNABAS 4.3 AND THE ORACLES OF HISTASPES

John C. Reeves

The ancient ‘Enochic library’—works attributed to the seventh antediluvian forefather—must have been a magnificently profuse collection of literature. Judging from the number of alleged citations and allusions to ‘books’ or ‘apocalypses’ of Enoch, a multitude of such compositions apparently circulated in learned circles among Jewish and later Christian (and even Muslim) groups during the Hellenistic, Roman, and Byzantine eras. Surviving assessments of the size of the Enochic corpus range from the implicit ‘three’ or ‘four’ books of Jubilees1 to the inherently plausible ‘thirty scrolls’ of al-Ṭabarî2 up to the assuredly fantastic ‘360’ of Slavonic Enoch.3 Yet despite these testimonies to Enoch’s loquacity, only two indubitably Enochic books have been recovered to date—those conventionally designated Ethiopic (1) and Slavonic (2) Enoch.4

Following the discovery and publication of these works by Western scholars (in 1821 and 1880 respectively),5 some applied themselves to the task of correlating the numerous citations of Enochic books found in ancient and medieval literature with the contents of the newly available texts. While some success was achieved, it must be stated that on the whole the results were disappointing. Many of the alleged citations simply did not correspond to anything contained in either Enochic work. As one scholar observed, ‘the present text [of Enoch] varies considerably from that which was current in the first two or three centuries of our era’ ...6 In light of the testimony of our textual witnesses, and the continuing recovery of ancient literary manuscripts, it might be more accurate to say that the texts of 1 Enoch and 2 Enoch represent only a portion of the Enochic literature that once circulated throughout the Near East, and we might opine that much of the ‘Enochic apographa’, as we might term the numerous alleged quotations, once possessed contextual moorings within the lost corpus of the Enochic library.

The present study will devote itself to the elucidation of one of these alleged Enochic citations—one that is found within the fourth chapter of the early Christian tract known as the Epistle of Barnabas. Barnabas is a virulently anti-Judaic diatribe that nevertheless provides some valuable testimony regarding the evaluation and interpretation of scripture among certain circles in the early church during the first decades of the second century CE. While Barnabas largely confines itself to the exegesis of select biblical passages, in certain eschatological discussions it also quotes Enoch as ‘scripture’, although it identifies this author only once by name, at Barn. 4.3.7 For the purposes of evaluation and discussion, let us examine this Enoch citation within its narrative context.

1. We ought, then, to enquire earnestly into the things which now are, and to seek out those which are able to save us. Let us then utterly flee from all the works of lawlessness, lest the works of lawlessness overcome us, and let us hate the error of this present time, that we may be loved in that which is to come. 2. Let us give no freedom to our souls to have power to walk


3. Barn. 16.5 (= 1 En. 89.56); Barn. 16.6 (= 1 En. 91.13). Both of these quotations are cited as ‘scripture’.


3. 2 En. 10.7 (short version). A variant tradition records this number as ‘366’.

4. The so-called ‘3 Enoch’ is a modern misnomer.

5. Regarding 1 Enoch, the first modern European translation is R. Laurence, The Book of Enoch the Prophet: An Apocryphal Production... Now First Translated from...
with sinners and wicked men, lest we be made like to them. 3. The final stumbling block is at hand of which it was written, as Enoch says, For to this end the Lord has cut short the times and the days, that his beloved should make haste and come to his inheritance. 4. And the Prophet also says thus: 'Ten kingdoms shall reign upon the earth and there shall rise up after them a little king, who shall subdue three of the kings under one.' 5. Daniel says likewise concerning the same: 'And I beheld the fourth Beast, wicked and powerful and fiercer than all the beasts of the sea, and that ten horns sprung from it, and out of them a little excrescent horn, and that it subdued under one three of the great horns.' 6. You ought then to understand (Barn. 4.1-6a). 8

This short passage features three alleged citations, all of which are problematic. The last, attributed to Daniel, would appear to reflect the contents of Dan. 7-8, but most commentators admit that it is at best a very liberal rendition of those biblical verses. The middle one, attributed to 'the prophet', has also been connected with the book of Daniel, since it seems to repeat the oneirocritical message of Dan. 7.24. However, if this is the case, it is somewhat strange that Barnabas does not introduce that citation with the name of 'Daniel', as it does the following one. As some have observed, the present wording of the text of Barnabas gives the misleading impression that 4.4 stems from a different source than does 4.5, which is expressly Danielic. 9 Be that as it may, let us first examine the alleged Enochic quotation in 4.3 before attempting to resolve the problem of 4.4.

The first difficulty is to determine which portion of v. 3 relates the alleged Enochic citation. Is it 4.3a ('The final stumbling block is at hand...'), 4.3b ('For to this end the Lord has cut short the times and the days, that his beloved should make haste and come to his inheritance'), or both? If we compare the structure of the wording of v. 3 with the structure of the other eighty-six direct citations from sources found in Barnabas, we discover that the actual citation always follows the named authority. This of course follows the general pattern of proof-texting practiced in Jewish and early Christian literature. 10 Assuming that the author has not violated the pattern, the Enochic citation should be found after the incipit 'as Enoch says'. Yet this formal consideration has not impressed the editors of what is probably the most authoritative edition of Barnabas, that published in the Sources chrétiennes series. They suggest that 4.3a represents the Enochic quote (despite their own admission that it has no textual correspondent in any work), and that 4.3b represents an idiosyncratic 'commentary' by the author of Barnabas which was perhaps inspired by the general thrust of certain Enochic passages, as opposed to a precise verbatim citation. 11 While this author has profound respect for the judgment of these editors, he is going to operate under the assumption that 4.3b reproduces, in one form or another, the purported Enochic citation.

The next problem is more difficult. Does 4.3b reproduce, correspond to, or even remotely echo textual material found in our extant Enochic works? K. Lake suggested certain passages from the 'Animal Apocalypse' of 1 Enoch; namely, 1 En. 89.61-64; 90.17. 12 These passages have been faithfully echoed in subsequent scholarly discussions of this verse. However, upon examination, one quickly discovers that there is little if any correlation between these passages and the alleged Enochic citation of 4.3b, 13 aside from the rather obvious shared context.


13. These Enochic passages refer to the recording of the misdeeds of the angelic shepherds granted dominion over humankind during the Second Temple period. I discern no specific connections with the language of Barn. 4.3.
of a concern with events expected to transpire at the eschaton. If this
indeed is the basis of this oft-cited correlation, one could easily compose
equally suitable eschatological portions from the remainder of 1 Enoch,
but such a procedure hardly advances the discussion. Surely Barnabas
has a specific citation or cluster of citations in mind, and presumably its
readers did as well.

H.J. Lawlor opined almost a century ago that Barn. 4.3 was not even a
‘free quotation’ of anything in 1 Enoch,14 but his assessment is actu-ally too harsh. As a matter of fact, there is one passage in 1 Enoch
does feature the motif of what we might term ‘time-compression’—
the acceleration of time as the eschaton draws near. J.T. Milik15 has
pointed to 1 En. 80.2 as a possible correlate for Barn. 4.3: ‘But in the
days of the sinners the years will become shorter, and their seed will be
late on their land and on their fields, and all things on the earth will
change, and will not appear at their proper time.’16 This proposed
 correlate with a passage of our present texts of Enoch is probably the best
advanced of this type to date, but it is not without its problems. The
alleged Enochic citation of 4.3 also refers to a ‘beloved’ who is hasten-
ing to claim ‘his inheritance’, motifs which are absent from the text of 1
Enoch as we know it. From whence then do these other features stem?

Does Barnabas use a book of Enoch that we no longer have? Or is it
mistaken in its attribution of this quote to Enoch? When 4.4 cites ‘the
prophet also says’, is it shifting to a different literary source? Is it
Danieleic? Or is ‘Enoch’ being quoted here as well?

A possibility that must be considered is that Barnabas is mistaken in
its attribution of this quotation to Enoch, and that it in fact stems from a
formally non-Enochic source. A very illuminating study of this interpretive
option has lately been published by M. Kister.17 Kister has conclusively
demonstrated that an unattributed and heretofore unattested prophetic
quote quoted in Barn. 12.1 stems from a recently published Qumran apocryphon designated ‘4Q Second Ezekiel’.18 Kister also
suggests that another portion of this same ‘Second Ezekiel’ recounts a
message that is very similar to the Enochic citation of 4.3b. While the
published portion of this part of ‘Second Ezekiel’ still requires some
restoration, enough survives to provide some support for his suggestion.

Therein we read: ‘and the days will quickly hasten until humanity says,
Are not the days hastening so that the children of Israel will inherit? And
the Lord said to me, I will not refuse you, Ezekiel: Behold, I will cut
short the days and the years…”19 Compare again the language of 4.3b:
as Enoch says, For to this end the Lord has cut short the times and the
days, that his beloved should make haste and come to his inheritance’. Here we observe an important correlation with two components of the
alleged Enochic quote of 4.3b: the phenomenon of ‘time-compression’,
and its purpose, eschatological inheritance.

While Kister’s correlation is admittedly attractive, there nevertheless
remain certain problems with his proposed identification, chief among
which are the Enochic and the thematic complex of motifs linking
Barn. 4.3 and 4.4. I would like to propose for consideration a
complementary reading of the Barnabas pericope that draws upon tradi-
tions not normally cited in the interpretation of this passage and that
may shed some light on the linkage of ideas found therein. It appears
that Barn. 4.3-4 exhibits several points of correspondence with the
contents of and traditions about the so-called Oracles of Hystaspes, a
Parthian apocalypse akin to the Sibylline Oracles. This work survives only
in translated Greek and Latin fragments quoted by various
Christian apologists, the most copious of which appear in the seventh
book of the Divine Institutes of Lactantius.20 There are four points of


19. See Strugnell and Dimant, ‘4Q Second Ezekiel’, p. 51 ll. 2-5; Kister,
‘Barnabas 12.1, 4.3’, p. 67 n. 14; M. Kister and E. Qimron, ‘Observations on
4QSecond Ezekiel (4Q385 2-3)’, RevQ 15 (1992), p. 598; J. Windisch,
‘Die Orakel des Hystaspes (Amsterdam: Koninklijke Akademie van
Wetenschappen, 1929); F. Cumont, ‘La fin du monde selon les ages occidentaux’,
RHR 103 (1931), pp. 29-96, esp. 64-96; B. Bidez and F. Cumont, Les ages
p. 359-76; G. Widengren, Die Religionen Iran (Stuttgart: W. Kohhammer, 1965),
pp. 199-207; J.R. Hinnells, The Zoroastrian Doctrine of Salvation in the Roman
potential correspondence to which attention should be directed: (1) the motif of time-compression; (2) the motif of the eschatological ‘ten rulers’ or ‘ten kingdoms’; (3) the motif of ‘the beloved’; and (4) the Enochic ascription. Each of these motifs requires brief development.

(1) The motif of time-compression. As previously stated, the phrase ‘time-compression’ is used to describe a perception that time accelerates its passage as the eschaton approaches. In other words, years, months, and days are progressively shortened, with the result that the natural processes of organic growth and ageing are no longer synchronous with the accustomed advance of the seasons. Examples of passages featuring this motif have already been quoted from Barnabas, 1 Enoch, and ‘Second Ezekiel’; these could easily be supplemented by further examples from both Jewish and Christian texts.21

Interestingly, the Oracles of Hystaspes, insofar as we can reliably reconstruct this work, also contains a passage that features eschatological time-compression. Therein we read: ‘then [i.e., after various woes] the year will be shortened, the month diminished, the day compressed to a brief moment.’22 Given this parallel, some have wished to argue that the motif of time-compression has been borrowed by Jewish apocalypticists from Iranian eschatological traditions,23 but this need not necessarily be the case. Study and reflection upon the ‘historical’ traditions contained in the Tanakh can lead one to conclude that from the period of Adam to the present age life-spans have progressively diminished, and


21. L. Sota 14.10; b. Sota 47b; 2 Apoc. Bar. 20.1; 54.1; 83.1; 4 Ezra 4.26 (cf. v. 33); 6.21; Mk 13.20; Mt 24.22.


will continue to diminish, until the End. A shortening of life-span could be interpreted to reflect an acceleration in time’s motion and thus the maturity process. Hence the phenomenon of premature ageing is a common feature in texts that contain this motif, as in Jubilees where as the eschaton approaches ‘the heads of children will be white with grey hair, and a child three weeks old will look like a man who is a hundred...’24

Does this passage of the Oracles shed any light on Barnabas? All that we can observe at this stage is that the Oracles and Barnabas share the motif of time-compression, hardly grounds for concluding interdependence.

(2) The eschatological ‘ten rulers’ or ‘ten kingdoms’. Barn. 4.4 states: ‘And the prophet also says thus: Ten kingdoms shall reign upon the earth and there shall rise up after them a little king, who shall subdue three of the kings under one’ (Lake). Here we confront a motif that enjoys wide popularity in apocalyptic literature. The final years before the eschaton are periodized in accordance with a predetermined number of secular governments or rulers. These governments as a rule become progressively worse as the eschaton nears, and the military actions associated with these rulers form part of the series of ‘woes’ that precede the direct intervention of the deity. Their enumeration as ‘ten’ also assumes importance in apocalyptic tradition, presumably due to the impact of the vision of the fourth beast with the ten horns ‘who are kings’, as described in Daniel 7, but perhaps ultimately based on an early form of the later tradition concerning the governments of ‘ten universal kings’.25

At first glance, Barn. 4.4 would seem to be Danie1ic. But when one compares the wording of 4.4 with the extant text(s) of Daniel, one discovers significant differences between the text of Barnabas and the biblical versions.26 It is certainly not a verbatim citation, but general


25. See PRE 11; Targ. Sheni 1.1 for examples of this latter motif. Note that the seventh-century Sefer Zerubbabel also features the ‘ten eschatological rulers’ in addition to the figure of Arttulus. Cf. Y. Even-Shemuel, Midrashek ge’ullah (Jerusalem and Tel Aviv: Bialik, 1953), pp. 79-80.

26. I.XX: καὶ τὰ δέκα κράτα τῆς βασιλείας, δέκα βασιλείες στήνονται, καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι βασιλείες μετὰ τούτων στήνονται, καὶ αὐτοὶ διοίκησι κακοὶ ὕψω τούς πρῶτον καὶ τρεῖς βασιλείες ταπεινώσεται. Θεοδοσία: καὶ τὰ δέκα κράτα αὐτῶν, δέκα βασιλείες ἀναστηγήσεται, καὶ ὅπως αὐτῶν ἀναστηγή-

ται ἔτερος, δὲ ὑπορείσει κακοὶ πάντα τοὺς ἡμιροθέν, καὶ τρεῖς βασιλείες ταπεινώσεται.
similarities in content can be observed. Dan. 7.8 reports that while Daniel observed the fourth beast with its ten horns 'another small horn sprouted among them and uprooted three of the former horns...', and 7.24 interprets this same event as 'ten kings shall arise, but another shall arise after them, distinct from the former, and he will subdue three of (the former) kings'. Here the same progression of action is featured that we find in Barnabas: ten kings/kingdoms among whom an eleventh appears, and who subjugates three of the original ten. Yet perhaps most tellingly, despite this obvious similarity, the author of Barnabas does not identify this quotation as a citation from Daniel, but rather ascribes the quotation to an unnamed 'prophet'. As others have noted, the way that Barnabas specifically attributes 4.5 to Daniel permits the supposition that 4.4 actually stems from elsewhere, and one could add, perhaps even from the same Enochic source quoted in 4.3.

Interestingly, a tradition associated with the Oracles of Hystaspes also apparently attests an eschatological 'ten ruler' scheme among the roster of natural 'woes' in that work:

civic quarrels will continually spread abroad and there will be no end of deadly wars until ten kings will emerge simultaneously. They will divide the world to destroy and not to govern it. They will greatly expand their armies and devastate the farmlands... then a mighty enemy from the far North will suddenly rise up against them. When he has destroyed the three who control Asia he will be taken into alliance with the others and will be made their chief.

27. See n. 9 supra.
28. Not everyone agrees that Lactantius, Div. Inst. 7.16.1-3 stems from the Oracles. For example, Bidez and Cumont do not include this material within their collection of the fragments of Hystaspes. However, D. Flusser ('Hystaspes and John of Patmos') has argued compellingly that 7.16.1-3 does in fact derive from the Oracles, and Flusser's perspective will be adopted in the present paper.
29. ... tum discordiae ciuitates in perpetuum servarent nec ullo requies bellis extitibus erit, donec reges decem pariter existant, qui orbe terrae non ad regendum, sed ad consumendum puniturium. Hi exercitibus in immenso auctis et agrorum cubitis destitutis... tum repente aduersus eos hostis potentissimus ab extremitatis finibus plagae septentrionalis orientatur, qui tribus ex eo numero deletis qui tum Asiam obwinebant, adsumetur in societatem a ceteris ac principes omnia constitue tur (Lactantius, Div. Inst. 7.16.1-3). Text cited from L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti, Opera omnia... (CSEL, XIX; ed. S. Brandt; Prague: F. Tempsky, 1890), p. 635; translation cited from McLinn, Apocalyptic Spirituality, pp. 59-60. The motif of the 'enemy from the north' need not be biblically derived. Cumont thinks that it stems from the Oracles; see 'La fin du monde', p. 75 n. 2. The Žanasp-ranag (§ 95ff.) also features

The same eschatological pattern manifests here that we have seen previously in Daniel and in Barnabas.

Among all the texts we have examined so far, it is surely intriguing to note that it is only within two—the Oracles and Barnabas—that the motifs of time-compression and the ten eschatological rulers are contextually intertwined. Are there further hints pointing to a closer connection between Barnabas and the Oracles than has heretofore been recognized?

(3) The 'beloved'. The expression 'his beloved' (ὁ ἤγαγημένος οὐραίος) represents an intriguing cru. Naturally, this is a christological epithet (it always possesses this sense in Barnabas), but, unlike most others, it occurs in a rather limited repertoire of early Christian texts, viz., Barnabas, the Odes of Solomon, and the Christian portions of the Ascension of Isaiah. The latter two texts are normally associated with a Syrian or Palestinian provenance, and are indeed often mined by scholars seeking nuggets of information about the conceptual world of so-called 'Jewish Christianity'. However, whence stems the epithet 'his beloved' in our alleged Enochic citation? Was it already present in Second Ezekiel? (assuming that Kister has correctly identified this source), perhaps modifying ἀντίἀρως...? Was it added by a Christian adator (Barnabas?) to replace the reference to the ἀντίἀρως, as Kister has suggested? Or is there another possible explanation?

Given the emerging connection that seems to exist between the Oracles and Barnabas, it would seem logical to search for any evidence that might point to the use of a title like 'the beloved' within the Parthian apocalypse. Interestingly, such evidence does in fact exist, but it has been seldom noticed. According to the summation of the chapter headings contained in Alci's Book of Mysteries that is supplied by the tenth-century Muslim encyclopaedist Ibn al-Nadim, the second chapter

three rulers who are destroyed by an adversary from the north. See É. Benveniste, 'Une apocalypse arabe: le Zârāsp Namâk', RHR 106 (1932), p. 375. It seems possible that Elchasai's prediction about 'war raging among the impious angels (read: kings?) of the north' (apud Hippolytos, Refutatio 9.16.4) presumes a similar textual basis.
30. Barn. 3.6; 4.8; Odes Sol. 3.5, 7; 7.1; 8.21; 38.11; Asc. Isa. 1.4, 5, 7, 13; 3.13, 17, 18, 28; 4.3, 6, 9, 18, 21; 5.15, 7.17, 23; 8.18, 26; 9.12. See R.H. Charles, The Ascension of Isaiah (London: A. & C. Black, 1900), pp. 3-4.
31. The employment of this epithet is instructive for those seeking to identify the provenance of Barnabas.
(bāb) of this Manichaean text was devoted to ‘the testimony of Vištaspas (i.e., Hystaspes) about the Beloved (al-ḥabīb).

This information raises at least two intriguing questions. Is ‘the testimony of Vištaspas’ that is interpreted by Mani the same work that Western writers know as the Oracles of Hystaspes? To whom does the epithet ‘the Beloved’ refer?

First, it can be demonstrated that Mani knew and utilized the conceptual framework and even the terminology of the Oracles of Hystaspes. The important manuscript discoveries of the present century have provided us with a sizeable sampling of authentic Manichaean apocalyptic texts, and these texts display numerous points of correspondence with the traditions found in our surviving fragmentary Oracles. As an example of such dependence, one might call attention to the ‘Great Fire’ (‘dwr wizr’) which, according to Mani, will consume the created order at the eschaton. This feature looks very much like the world conflagration reportedly found in the Oracles of Hystaspes. Therefore it would seem that Mani knew and used the Oracles. However, as al-Nadim’s testimony suggests and common sense dictates, the form and/or content of the Oracles used by Mani in third-century Mesopotamia was superior to the disconnected fragments that have been haphazardly preserved for us in Christian literature. It seems certain that within the text of the Oracles used by Mani there was reference made to an actor designated ‘the Beloved’—either explicitly in the Oracles themselves, or implicitly; that is to say, a species of derash that interpreted a certain entity (e.g., the Great King) as being equivalent to a revered ‘Beloved’.

But who is ‘the Beloved’? As previously mentioned, the expression ‘the Beloved’ functions as a favorite christological epithet in literature that stems from certain Jewish Christian circles. Thanks to the important information recovered from the recently published Colgone Mani Codex, we now know that Mani is rooted in the same soil. Hence it should not surprise us when we observe that both Mani and the later Manichaean community frequently use this identical epithet—‘the beloved’—to refer to the same entity—Jesus.

Obviously a Parthian apocalypse authored in the pre-Christian era among Zoroastrian circles would feature no blatant christological concepts or language. If the expression ‘the Beloved’ was indigenous


39. Most scholars date the Oracles around 100 BCE, and some would place it considerably earlier.
to the Oracles, it must necessarily refer to someone or something else, perhaps Aryanman, an Iranian yazad whose name signifies 'Friend' and who functions as a divine healer. However, if it is true, as has been recently and brilliantly argued, that the Oracles underwent a series of revisions and adaptations by both Jewish and Christian groups, it is then highly likely that this epithet was reinterpreted or even inserted into the Oracles by one of these latter groups. Presumably it was such a 'revised' version of the Oracles that Mani used, since we are informed that he devoted a portion of his interpretive energies to the elucidation of the Oracles' witness to 'the Beloved'.

Barnabas quotes a text, allegedly Enochic, that features the advent of 'the Beloved' at the eschaton. Either the original or a revised version of the Oracles of Hystaspes apparently incorporated the same figure. The textual complex displayed in Barn. 4.3-4 features time-compression and the tribulations associated with ten rulers. As we have seen, the Oracles of Hystaspes also include these same motifs within the same temporal context. Can these correspondences be coincidental?

(4) The Enochic ascription. This is perhaps the most interesting problem. If Kister is correct, and Barn. 4.3b is in fact 'Ezekielian', why does Barnabas expressly identify it as a quotation from Enoch? Several possibilities suggest themselves. Perhaps Barnabas was simply mistaken; analogous slips in source citation are not unheard of. Perhaps what we know today fragmentarily as 'Second Ezekiel' was in its original context a portion of a larger work ascribed to Enoch—say, a broad vision of Jewish history stretching from creation to the eschaton that incorporated within it a selection of the future oracles or pronouncements of named prophets. Perhaps the autograph of Barnabas originally said 'Ezekiel', but for one reason or another a later copyist altered this name to 'Enoch', and all subsequent versions have followed this archetypal without question. Finally, an intriguing possibility is that either Barnabas or its source has effected an esoteric identification or assimilation between the figures of Enoch and Ezekiel—both, after all, view the kavod hashem; both exhort their contemporaries to refrain from evil and pursue righteousness; and both utter prophecies focused upon eschatological events. Conceivably, when viewed in this way, Ezekiel could be labelled a type of latter-day Enoch.

This sort of interpretive assimilation should not be dismissed out of hand. Remaining within the bounds of Jewish tradition, one thinks of similar identifications proffered, like those of Phineas and Elijah, or of Shem and Melchisedek. If we expand those boundaries to incorporate figures from alien national or religious traditions, we are bound to notice that cross-cultural assimilation or identification of prominent culture-heroes is extremely popular in Hellenistic and even later historiography. The production of the so-called 'universal histories' stimulates this process. When different national or religious figures of like antiquity are depicted similarly in their native traditions, the tendency is to equate the two. For example, the Samaritan antiquarian Pseudo-Eupolemus states 'the Greeks say that Atlas discovered astrology, but Atlas is the same (person) as Enoch'. Now, while it is conceivable that someone may have argued, on the basis of the parallels cited above, that the figures of Enoch and Ezekiel are similar, it seems inconceivable (apart from some early 'true prophet' cyclical pattern) that anyone familiar with biblical

---

41. Flusser, 'Hystaspes and John of Patmos'. passim. Note also Wondisch, Orakel des Hystaspes, pp. 6-9, 45-46.
42. Cf., e.g., Mk 1:2-3.
47. From the Manichaean perspective, Enoch and Zoroaster are in fact the same figure, since each is a human manifestation of the same heavenly entity, the 'Apostle of Light'. See H.-C. Puech, Le manichéisme: son fondateur—sa doctrine (Paris:
material would suggest that Enoch and Ezekiel were one and the same. This interpretation can be safely dismissed given the present state of our knowledge.

I would like to suggest, based on the course of this paper’s argument, that an assimilation (at some point in the exegetical process) of two culture-heroes has in fact transpired; namely, between Enoch and Zoroaster. I suggest this despite my realization that nowhere in the extant literary traditions is such an identification explicitly given. The reasons for offering this correlation are based by and large upon the popular Hellenistic image of the Persian prophet, facets of which do not cohere with authentic Iranian traditions. First, one of Zoroaster’s primary accomplishments (according to Western interpreters) was his discovery and development of astrology. Certain Jewish circles


50. Passages remarking Zoroaster’s association with astrology are conveniently gathered in Appendix V of A.V.W. Jackson, Zoroaster: The Prophet of Ancient Iran attributed the same discovery to Enoch. Secondly, Zoroaster participated in tours of the supernal and nether worlds; Enoch of course shares these ascension experiences. Thirdly, there are persistent traditions that Zoroaster was temporarily or periodically sequestered from mortal company. One might compare the similarly mysterious occultation of Enoch related in Gen. 5.24 and its dependent traditions.

51. Regarding Enoch’s association with astrology, see the end of n. 48 supra and B.Z. Wacholder, ‘Pseudo-Eupolemus’ Two Greek Fragments on the Life of Abraham’, HUCA 34 (1963), pp. 96-97. Note also Theodore bar Konai, Liber Scholiorum, II, p. 286 ll. 5-6: ‘The Chaldaean (heresy) preceded the other heresies in origin, for Bardaisan says that Enoch was the name of its originator’, kldwyrt refers to ‘astrology’.

52. For such traditions relating to Zoroaster, which are often implied in the Avesta, see especially Dēnband 7.3.51-62, 8.14.2-9; Zāsrām 21.21ff., 22.1-13; A. Hultgård, ‘Forms and Origins of Iranian Apocalypticism’, in Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and Near East (ed. D. Holmblom, Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), pp. 400-405. See also the following note. The Coptic Zostrianos (NHC VIII.1) recounts a heavenly tour undertaken by the title character. According to this work’s colophon, Zostrianos is Zoroaster. Parallels between Zostrianos and Enochic literature have been identified by M. Scopello, ‘The Apocalypse of Zostrianos (Nag Hammadi VIII.1) and the Book of the Secrets of Enoch’, VC 34 (1980), pp. 376-85. Note too that the Zoroastrian pseudopigraphon Peri phasēs borrows the narrative setting of Plato’s famous ‘myth of Er’ (Republic 614b-621d), substituting the name ‘Zoroaster’ for that of ‘Er’ (cf. Windisch, Orakel des Hystaspes, pp. 15-16). With regard to Enoch, see I En. 1.2; 14.8-19.3, 21-36, 71; 2 En. 3-12 (short version); Jub. 4.21; Cologne Mani Codex 58.6-60.12. Neither of these lists purports to be an exhaustive listing of the sources.


54. I En. 12.1-2; 87.3-4; 106.7; 2 En. 11.36-38, 13.77-78; 18.1-3 (all short version); Jub. 4.23; Targ. Ps.-J. Gen. 5.24; Sefer Hayashar (apud A. Jellinek, Beit
According to Iranian tradition, a crucial step in the progress of the Zoroastrian religion was taken when Zoroaster succeeded in winning over King Vištasp to his cause. Following his conversion, Vištasp became a fervent champion of the new teachings. Some traditions go further and consider Vištasp a trusted disciple to whom Zoroaster continued to impart subsequent revelations and oracles. It seems possible then that a work thought to derive from Vištasp and his circle, such as the Oracles, could have been considered authentically Zoroastrian. If the 'child' who interprets the dreams of the Hystaspes is Zoroaster, as is sometimes argued, we behold a direct connection of the resultant


55. Presumably not the same figure as the father of Darius I (Hecatius 1.209-10). On Vištasp, see Windisch, Orakel des Hystaspes, pp. 10-13; Jackson, Zoroaster, pp. 56-79; Bidez and Cumont, Les mages hellénisés, I, pp. 215-17.

56. 'Vištasp galt nicht nur als vorbildlicher Glaubiger und Beschirmer der Religion, sondern als Empfänger und Mitläufer von Glaubensoffenbarungen' (Windisch, Orakel des Hystaspes, p. 12). Iranian tradition reports that Vištasp himself was transported to heaven in order to demonstrate the verity of Zoroaster's proclamations; cf. Denkard 7.4.84-86, Pahlavi Rvdayat 47.27-32 (both in apud Moé, Zoroastre, pp. 59, 121); Hultigard, 'Forms and Origins', pp. 401-402. Presumably he could thus speak authoritatively about supernal matters. Moreover, there is one curious context in early Christian tradition (which is in turn dependent upon Iranian traditions) wherein Vištasp is included among an inner circle of Zoroaster's disciples to whom esoteric oracles are revealed of 'messianic' significance. For example, Theodore bar Konai preserves a so-called 'Prophecy of Zaradush' that treats of the future appearance of the 'star over Bethlehem' and its significance, and Vištasp is one of the privileged hearers of this 'oracle' (Liber Scholiorum [ed. Scher], II, pp. 74ff.). For a full discussion, see especially Bousset, Hauptprobleme, pp. 378-82.

57. Lactantius, Div. Inst. 7.15.9: Hystaspes quoque, qui fuit Medorum rex antiquissimus... ad memoriam posterius tradidit: sublatus in etor imperium nomenque Romanum mullo ante praefatus est quam illa Troiana gens condens. 'Hystaspes also, a very ancient king of the Medes... handed on to posterity a wonderful dream concerning the meaning of a boy who uttered prophecies. Long before the Trojan war was founded he announced that the Roman Empire and name would be taken from the world.' Text cited from Bidez and Cumont, Les mages hellénisés, II, p. 366; translation from McGinn, Apocalyptic Spirituality, p. 59. For the proper understanding of this enigmatic passage, see especially Windisch, Orakel des Hystaspes, pp. 45-59. The chronological setting implied for Hystaspes would seem to be dependent upon the traditions attributed to Hermodorus and Xanthos by Diogenes Laerthus, Lives prologue 2; cf. also Plutarch, De Isid. et Osir. 46. For the identification of the vaticinans puer as Zoroaster, see Benveniste, 'Une apocalypse pehlevie', RHR 106 (1932), pp. 378-79; Bidez and Cumont, Les mages hellénisés, II, p. 367; Boyce, History of Zoroastrianism, III, p. 378. Hultigard ('Forms and Origins', p. 401) suggests Janaspes, the successor of Zoroaster. Flusser ('Hystaspes and John', p. 16) suggests that the child is in fact Hystaspes. Windisch labels this episode simply a topos of ancient divinatory scenes, and directs attention to other stories wherein children display mantic gifts.
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