


Noah in the *Animal Apocalypse* (1 En. 89:1–9)

Henryk Drawnel

The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin

henryk.drawnel@kul.pl

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4425-315X>

ABSTRACT: The Aramaic description of the flood in 1 En. 89:1–9 has survived in two fragments from Qumran (4Q206 frg. 8 I and frg. 9), which contain a shorter text than the Ethiopic translation. This article is an analysis of the presentation of the figure of Noah in the longer version of the Ethiopic *Animal Apocalypse* in the context of the Ethiopic *Book of Enoch* and in relation to Mesopotamian traditions associated with the flood. After being told the secret about the flood by a “man” (an angel), Noah, the white bull, works as a carpenter and builds a huge boat. After the flood, transformed into a “man” (a supernatural figure in the symbolism of the *Animal Apocalypse*), he leaves his three sons. This description of Noah brings him closer to the main characters of the flood in Mesopotamian sources.

KEYWORDS: Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Ethiopic *Enoch*, *Animal Apocalypse*, flood, Noah, Mesopotamian flood myth

1. Description of the Flood and Its Main Character in the *Animal Apocalypse*

The *Animal Apocalypse* (1 En. 85–90), which is part of the Book of Dreams (1 En. 83–90) in the Ethiopic pseudepigraphic *Book of Enoch*, describes in an allegorical way the history of humanity and Israel from the creation of a man to the eschatological times, based on the events found in the biblical narrative.¹ In the literary structure of this apocalyptic work of allegorical nature, the brief narrative about the flood (1 En. 89:1–9) ends the prehistoric time in which human beings commit violence – the murder of Abel (the red calf) by Cain (the black calf) (1 En. 85:4–6).² The cause of the flood; however, is not only the violence and evil in the world of humans but also the crime in the world of angels that involves the supernatural beings mixing with women and procreating offspring (86:1–5). The fallen

1 The *Animal Apocalypse* is dated to the early period of the Maccabean Wars, 165–160 BC, cf. P.A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (EJL 4; Atlanta, GA: Scholars 1993) 61–82; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1. A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2001) 8.

2 The literary structure of the flood (1 En. 89:1–9) and of all human history including the flood (1 En. 85:3–89:9) is presented in H. Drawnel, “The Literary Structure of the Flood Account in the *Animal Apocalypse*,” *BibAn* 13/3 (2023) 398–403, 411–415. In this study, all references to the literary structure of the flood in the *Animal Apocalypse* are based on the quoted article.

angels are allegorically presented as stars (86:1, 3) while their offspring, the giants, are shown as elephants, camels, and wild donkeys (86:4; 88:2).³ After the fall and the violence of the giants, three angels allegorically presented in the Apocalypse as white men (87:2), take Enoch away from the Earth to save him from the waters of the flood (87:3–4) while four others handle the fallen angels and their offspring and instruct Noah, allegorically presented as a white bull, about the upcoming disaster (88:1–89:1a). This story, which is a reinterpretation of the myth of the fallen angels (*1 En.* 6–11), is a direct introduction to the description of the flood (*1 En.* 89:1–9), in which the white bull and his three sons are rescued in the boat built by Noah while the camels, elephants and wild donkeys (the giants) die along with the bulls (mankind) and other animals (89:4).⁴

The discovery and publication of the manuscripts from Qumran have shown that the Ethiopic narrative of the flood in the *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 En.* 89:1–9) is longer than its partially preserved text in the Aramaic manuscript, 4Q206 8 I + 9, dated to the middle of the first century BC.⁵ In the Aramaic text, there are no interpolations that introduce the cosmographic theme of a high roof stretched over the Earth (89:2), the theme of an enclosure (89:3) going around the whole Earth, and the motif of darkness and mist covering the water (89:4). Those additions find their justification in the central, fourth part of the literary structure of the flood (89:4), in which the author of the longer version describes the dramatic death of humankind, the giants and animals found inside a huge enclosure filled with water.⁶

Apart from the editorial additions on the cosmography of the universe, the longer version gives some information about Noah, either by changing the verbs used in the Aramaic text or by adding new interpolations. Just before the flood, one of the four angels, presented allegorically as white men, passes on to Noah/the white bull a secret (89:1a), after which the latter is transformed into a man (89:1a), i.e., according to the language of the *Animal Apocalypse* he receives the status of an angel, a supernatural being. This event described at the beginning of the flood narrative is also repeated at the end of it (89:9a) to emphasize

3 Józef T. Milik (*The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* [with the collaboration of M. Black] [Oxford: Clarendon 1976] 240) explains the animal allegory of the descendants of the Watchers through onomatopoeia with three terms used to refer to the giants in the Old Testament and in the Book of *1 Enoch*: *gibbôrîn* – *gəmallîn* (camels); *nəpîlîn* – *pîlîn* (elephants); *elioud* (Greek translation) – *ärādîn* (wild donkeys).

4 The *Codex Ashburnham* (Pentateuch) is dated to the 5th–7th century AD and is now kept in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (Nouv. Acq. Lat. 2334). Folium 9 of the Codex contains a miniature presenting the ark on the waves of the flood, while dead men, animals and two giants, depicted as men of great stature, can be seen in the water. This scene presents what is allegorically described in *1 En.* 89:4: not only men and the giants but also animals die in the waters of the flood, cf. Drawnel, “The Literary Structure of the Flood Account,” 410–411 and n. 41. The image of Folium 9 was published in R.A. Clements, “A Shelter Amid the Flood: Noah’s Ark in Early Jewish and Christian Art,” *Noah and His Book(s)* (eds. M.E. Stone – A. Amihay – V. Hillel) (EJL 28; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature 2010) 292, fig. 3. Clements quotes *Jub.* 7:20–26 and *Pirque R. El.* 22 as the source of that image; however, the cited works mention the giants, but not their death in the flood along with people and animals.

5 Cf. H. Drawnel, *Qumran Cave 4. The Aramaic Books of Enoch.* 4Q201, 4Q202, 4Q204, 4Q205, 4Q206, 4Q207, 4Q212 (in consultation with É. Puech) (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2019) 342–343.

6 Cf. Drawnel, “The Literary Structure of the Flood Account,” 398–403.

its importance for the presentation of the figure of Noah. Moreover, in the longer version, the white bull “hews a great boat” (89:1b), where the verb (“to hew”) used in the Ethiopic text describes the work of the main character of the flood as the work of a carpenter, while 4Q206 8 I, 14b (89:1b) only mentions that Noah “built” the boat, without explicit reference to the type of profession and the size of the boat. Finally, unlike in the cases discussed above, the Aramaic text expands the final moment of building the boat by using two verbs to depict the fact of covering the boat over Noah and his three sons (4Q206 8 I, 14b [89:1b]), while the Ethiopic text uses only one verb.

Leaving aside the issue of cosmographic additions in the Ethiopic review of the flood in the *Animal Apocalypse*, the remainder of this study is an analysis of the added information about Noah and the construction of the boat presented at the very beginning of the narrative and, in the case of Noah’s metamorphosis, also towards its end. All the analyzed phrases or sentences are not there in the biblical text, from which it is difficult to derive them unambiguously; they also do not appear in the remaining part of the *Animal Apocalypse*, the *Book of Dreams* or the entire *Book of Ethiopic Enoch*.⁷ Leaving unresolved the case of why both Noah and the whole humanity before the flood are presented allegorically as bovinds, this article focuses on the very tradition of the Ethiopic *Book of Enoch*, in which Noah is presented in a slightly different way than in the Qumran manuscript 4Q206 8 I.

The second research horizon is the Mesopotamian flood tradition, which had a tremendous impact on the biblical narrative of the flood and seems to have had an indirect influence on the way of presentation of Noah by the author of the *Animal Apocalypse*. Furthermore, the *Book of Enoch*, especially its oldest part, the *Astronomical Book* (1 En. 72–82; 4Q208–4Q211), is linked to the cuneiform literature.⁸ An additional argument for referring to Mesopotamian literature is the observation, made at the beginning of the twentieth century, that the darkness covering the waters of the flood in 1 En. 89:4 also appears in Tablet XI of the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, which contains the Mesopotamian version of the flood.⁹

The direct and genetic dependence of the presentation of Noah in the *Animal Apocalypse* on the Mesopotamian narratives is questionable, considering, on the one hand, the allegorical character of the text of the *Animal Apocalypse* and, on the other hand, the individual mythological motifs that do not concern the main narrative. Giving some extra information about Noah and his boat in the context of the description of the flood

⁷ Briefly describing the content of the *Animal Apocalypse*, Milik (*The Books of Enoch*, 42, n. 4) indicates the usefulness of examining the Old Testament texts, which are the basis for the *Apocalypse*, to present the information introduced by the author of the *Apocalypse* without relying on the biblical text. The interpretation of the figure of Noah in the Ethiopic description of the flood, undertaken in this study, is a small-scale implementation of Milik’s desideratum.

⁸ Cf., e.g., H. Drawnel, “Moon Computation in the Aramaic Astronomical Book,” *RevQ* 23 (2007) 3–41; H. Drawnel, *The Aramaic Astronomical Book (4Q208–4Q211) from Qumran. Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2011); H.S. Kvanvig, “The Mesopotamian Background of the Watcher Story,” *Hen* 39/1 (2017) 134–155; A. Annus, “On the Origin of Watchers: A Comparative Study of the Antediluvian Wisdom in Mesopotamian and Jewish Tradition,” *JSP* 19 (2010) 277–320.

⁹ F. Martin, *Le livre d’Hénoch traduit sur le texte éthiopien* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané 1906) 203.

known from ancient Mesopotamian sources shows the dynamism of the development of those traditions both in the *Animal Apocalypse* and Mesopotamian sources. Pointing out the similarities by no means obliterates the differences between the two traditions, the quoted Mesopotamian texts are merely a demonstration of the conceptual background of the tradition that had a profound impact on shaping the perceptions and narratives about the flood in ancient Israel.¹⁰ Rather than mentioning a direct dependence on Mesopotamian literature, it is more appropriate to speak of the use by the editors of the ancient Near Eastern tradition of universal catastrophe present in its oldest form in the cuneiform literature.

2. Noah in the Ethiopic Account of the Flood

The analysis of the additions concerning Noah and cosmic metaphors shows that some of them echo the description of the flood found in the literature of ancient Mesopotamia, presenting the story about the flood. The most important of them is the myth about the flood – and its main character, *Atrahasis* – whose oldest tablets come from the Old Babylonian period.¹¹ The very composition, which is an Akkadian version of the myth of the destruction of humanity already present in the Sumerian poem, in which Ziusudra¹² is the main character, was incorporated into the structure of the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, where it is

-
- 10 For a discussion on the reading of Old Testament texts in the context of the literature of the ancient Near East, cf., e.g., W.W. Hallo, “Compare and Contrast: The Contextual Approach to Biblical Literature,” *The Bible in the Light of Cuneiform Literature. Scripture in Context III* (eds. W.W. Hallo – B.W. Jones – G.L. Mattingly) (Lewiston, NY: Mellen 1990) 1–30; P. Machinist, “The Question of Distinctiveness in Ancient Israel: An Essay,” *Ah, Assyria... Studies in Assyrian History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to Hayim Tadmor* (eds. M. Cogan – I. Eph'al) (ScrHier 33; Jerusalem: Magnes 1991) 196–212; B.A. Strawn, “Comparative Approaches: History, Theory, and the Image of God,” *Method Matters. Essays on the Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of David L. Petersen* (eds. J.M. LeMon – K.H. Richards) (Atlanta, GA: SBL 2009) 117–142. All of the above-mentioned articles and many others emphasize the cultural and historical proximity of the religious literature being compared for correct methodological research, mention showing not only similarities but also differences and, finally, the usefulness of searching for and applying *tertium comparationis* taken from another cultural background. Although the first two principles are successfully applied in this study, going beyond the scope of the Semitic literature of the ancient Near East means going beyond the subject matter of this article, which focuses on the presentation of the figure and actions of the main character of the flood. Moreover, the Hittite tablets from western Anatolia, from Ugarit, and finally the later biblical tradition draw from the literature of ancient Mesopotamia, cf. B. Schmidt, “Flood Narratives of Ancient Western Asia,” *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East* (ed. J.M. Sasson) (New York: Scribner 1995) IV, 2337–2351, particularly 2338–2343. In the literature of ancient Egypt, there is no flood as a cosmic catastrophe caused by the gods, the purpose of which was to wipe out humanity, cf. *ibidem*, 2338.
- 11 Cf. the dating of individual *Atrahasis* tablets in N. Wasserman, *The Flood. The Akkadian Sources. A New Edition, Commentary, and a Literary Discussion* (OBO 290; Leuven: Peeters 2020) 14–16.
- 12 On the tablet from the late Old Babylonian period, there is the text of the Sumerian myth dated to earlier times, cf. A. Poebel, “A New Creation and Deluge Text,” A. Poebel, *Historical Texts* (PBS 4/1; Philadelphia, PA: University Museum 1914) 7–70, particularly 69; M. Civil, “The Sumerian Flood Story,” *Atra-Hasis. The Babylonian Story of the Flood. With the Sumerian Flood Story by M. Civil* (eds. W.G. Lambert – A.R. Millard) (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1969) 138–172, particularly 138.

found in Tablet XI.¹³ Although the “canonical” text of the Epic is dated to the eleventh century BC, the clay tablets with copies of that text from later centuries indicate the vitality of that tradition in Akkadian literature until Hellenistic times.¹⁴

In most cases, the new mythical motifs in the longer version of the flood narrative in the *Animal Apocalypse* do not relate to the entire plot describing the causes of the flood and its course,¹⁵ but are rather allusions to or echoes of particular motifs present in Mesopotamian literature and are the result of the contact at the level of a common cultural tradition rather than of direct knowledge of cuneiform writing. The editor of the extensive description of the flood did not intend to change the main narrative, in which the waters of the flood descend from the upper regions of the universe (1 En. 89:2; cf. Gen 7:17) and ascend from its lower spaces (1 En. 89:3; cf. Gen 7:17). New information about the figure of Noah only brings the whole narrative closer to Mesopotamian literature and their selection is based

-
- 13 All Akkadian texts that contain a description of the flood quoted in this study are taken from the new edition, Wasserman, *The Flood*. Quoting the text and translation of Tablet XI of the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, Wasserman relies on the edition of this tablet in A.R. George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic. Introduction, Critical Edition and Cuneiform Texts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2003) I, 702–725. The related narratives about the flood in the cuneiform literature, from the Sumerian poem, through the Akkadian *Atrahasis*, to Tablet IX of the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, are reinterpretations of earlier material with the addition of a number of elements not found in the earlier texts; the best-preserved text is Tablet XI of the *Epic of Gilgamesh*. The description of the development of the flood myth in the cuneiform literature can be found in the comprehensive publication by Y.S. Chen, *The Primeval Flood Catastrophe. Origins and Early Development in Mesopotamian Traditions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2013); Y.S. Chen, “Major Literary Traditions Involved in the Making of Mesopotamian Flood Traditions,” *Opening Heaven’s Floodgates. The Genesis Flood Narrative, Its Context, and Reception* (ed. J.M. Silverman) (Biblical Intersections 12; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias 2013) 141–190.
 - 14 The *Epic of Gilgamesh*, the “canonical” version of which was written in the Middle Babylonian period, was known in the first millennium BC, partially preserved on tablets from the Neo-Assyrian and Late Babylonian periods, while copying its text was often didactic, cf. George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 30–31, 35–36. In the Hellenistic period, Berossos, the priest of the god Bel-Marduk, left a shorter description of the flood in Greek, where the main character is called Xiusudros, or Sumerian Ziusudra, cf. S.M. Burstein, *The Babyloniaca of Berossus* (Malibu, CA: Undena 1980) Book 2 and M. Lang, “Book Two: Mesopotamian Early History and the Flood Story,” *The World of Berossos. Proceedings of the 4th International Colloquium on “The Ancient Near East between Classical and Ancient Oriental Traditions”, Hatfield College, Durham 7th–9th July 2010* (eds. J. Haubold et al.) (Classica et Orientalia 5; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2013) 47–60. When writing about Noah and the biblical flood in *Antiquitates Judaicae*, Flavius Josephus demonstrates his knowledge of the Mesopotamian tradition through the writings of Berossos and identifies Noah with the main character of the Mesopotamian flood, see L.H. Feldman, “Josephus’ Portrait of Noah and Its Parallels in Philo, Pseudo-Philo’s ‘Biblical Antiquities’, and Rabbinic Midrashim,” *PAAJR* 55 (1988) 31–57, particularly 46–47.
 - 15 The much greater dependence of Gen 6–9 on the Mesopotamian flood narratives has been explored many times, cf., e.g., C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (BKAT 1/1; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag 1974) 536–545; G. Fischer, *Genesis 1–11* (HThKAT 1/1; Freiburg: Herder 2018) 406–409; E. Noort, “The Stories of the Great Flood: Notes on Gen 6:5–9:17 in Its Context of the Ancient Near East,” *Interpretations of the Flood* (eds. F. García Martínez – G.P. Luttikhuisen) (TBN 1; Leiden: Brill 1999) 1–38; G.A. Rendsburg, “The Biblical Flood Story in the Light of the Gilgamesh Flood Account,” *Gilgamesh and the World of Assyria. Proceedings of the Conference Held at Mandelbaum House, the University of Sydney, 21–23 July, 2004* (eds. J. Azize – N. Weeks) (ANESSup 21; Leuven: Peeters 2007) 115–127; H.S. Kvanvig, *Primeval History. Babylonian, Biblical, and Enochic. An Intertextual Reading* (JSJSup 149; Leiden: Brill 2011) 209–233.

on the desire to present Noah as a positive character who stays in touch with angels and is elevated to the status of angels.

2.1. “He taught him the secret”

Although the Aramaic text of that part of the verse has not survived until today (4Q206 8 I, 13–[14a] = 1 En. 89:1a), the reconstruction of the Aramaic line based on the Ethiopic text suggests that the short sentence “he taught him the secret” is part of the original, shorter version of the flood.¹⁶ The sentence that introduces the flood narrative mentions another, fourth angelic being, who teaches the white bull, i.e. Noah, the secret. The information about the instruction addressed to Noah is a reinterpretation of the myth about the fallen Watchers, more specifically, of the text 1 En. 10:2–3, where God sends Sariel/Uriel to the son of Lamech to:

1. tell (λέγω) him to hide away (Κρύψον σεαυτόν);
2. reveal (δέλω) to him that the end is coming and the Earth will perish,
3. inform him about the upcoming flood (κατακλυσμός) and the destruction of everything on the Earth;
4. teach him (διδάσκω) to survive (literally “escape”) (ὅπως ἐκφύγῃ)¹⁷ so that his offspring (τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ) could live forever.¹⁸

The author of the *Animal Apocalypse* did not directly repeat any of this information passed on by God to Sariel; however, the verb “taught” in the sentence “taught him the secret” links that statement with point 4 in 1 En. 10:3 the didactic activity of the angel concerns the way of saving Noah and his offspring from the waters of the flood.¹⁹ Thus, the angel’s teaching is about ensuring the survival of the flood, in contrast to the teaching of the fallen angels, which, in the *Book of Watchers*, resulted in the desolation of the Earth and the death of a man (1 En. 7:1; 8:1; 8:3; 9:6). Similarly, the term “secret” in the *Animal Apocalypse* does not seem to mean only the way of constructing the ark or the very fact of the arrival of the flood but indicates that this knowledge, hidden from a man, is supernatural knowledge to which a man has no access and the purpose of which is saving a man.

¹⁶ Cf. 4Q206 & I + 8 I, 13 in: Drawnel, *Qumran Cave 4*, 371, 374–375.

¹⁷ Synkellos adds: “(teach) the righteous son of Lamech what he has to do to keep his soul alive”; see the Greek text in A.A. Mosshammer, *Georgii Syncelli Ecloga chronographica* (BSGRT; Leipzig: Teubner 1984) 25.

¹⁸ The Greek ms. Panopolitanus edited by Matthew Black (“Apocalypsis Henochi Graece,” *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece – Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum Quae Supersunt Graeca* [eds. M. Black – A.-M. Denis] [PVTG 3; Leiden: Brill 1970] here 24).

¹⁹ A development of the image of Noah as a person knowing the secrets ultimately coming from God in 4Q534 II, 8 is the presentation of an unnamed character, probably Noah, as the one who will get to know the secrets of humanity, רַי אִנְשָׁא, and the secrets of all living beings, רַי כּוּל חַיָּא; see É. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4. XXII. Textes araméens. Première partie: 4Q529–549* (DJD 31; Oxford: Clarendon 2001) 132, 140; J.A. Fitzmyer, “The Aramaic ‘Elect of God’ Text from Qumran Cave IV,” *CBQ* 27 (1965) 348–372, particularly 150. The same manuscript, in an earlier context, 4Q534 I, 3–4, mentions the didactic process of its main character, as a result of which he will learn three books. More on the character of Noah in 4Q532–4Q534, cf. D.M. Peters, *Noah Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Conversations and Controversies of Antiquity* (EJL 26; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature 2008) 101–106.

In that dimension, *māstir* – “secret” – passed on by the angel as part of the didactic process in the *Animal Apocalypse* (cf. 1 En. 10:2: δελόω), is the antithesis of “eternal secrets” (1 En. 9:6: τὰ μυστήρια τοῦ αἰῶνος) coming from heaven, revealed (δελόω) by the fallen angel, Asael, to mankind, and the secret (μυστήριον) passed on (διδάσκω) by all fallen angels to their sons and to humanity (1 En. 10:7).²⁰ In both cases, the secrets revealed by the rebellious angels have catastrophic consequences for the Earth and people, causing the destruction of humanity and a wound that needs to be healed (1 En. 10:7). The biblical text, in which God directly reveals the truth about the flood to Noah,²¹ does not use the term μυστήριον (Aramaic ܡܝܨܬܝܪܐ) to refer to the information about the upcoming destruction and the way of saving humanity. That concept, assuming knowledge known only to God and revealed to Noah through the angel, was introduced by the author of the *Animal Apocalypse*.²²

The Context of Mesopotamian Flood Narratives

Describing the entire event of the flood with the term “secret,” the content of which is reserved for gods and is revealed to the main character of the narrative, is also the case of the compositions about the flood found in Mesopotamian literature. In the Old Babylonian poem, *Atrahasis*, the upcoming destruction of all life, especially of a man on the Earth, decreed by Enlil and other gods, was the knowledge that human beings should not know (C₀ iv 1’–7’), while the *Epic of Gilgamesh* adds information that the gods sealed that information with an oath (*Gilg.* XI, 14–18). *Atrahasis*, the main character of the flood, finds out about the upcoming catastrophe in a dream, and then, he turns to Ea (sum. Enki), the god of wisdom and exorcism, asking him to reveal the meaning of the dream to him: “teach ([w]ud-di-a) me the meaning [of the dream] so that I may kn[ow its reason] and look for its purpose” (C₂ i 13’–14’). Ea, trying to keep up appearances, does not address the character of the flood directly but speaks to the reed wall revealing the information about the flood indirectly and instructing Atrahasis how to build a boat to survive the flood (C₂ i 15 – C₁ i 35).²³

²⁰ 1 En. 65:11b unequivocally relieves Noah of any suspicion of knowing the secrets of the fallen angels (64:2) passed on to mankind (65:6) that bring the flood to the Earth. The author of the Parable appears to be unfamiliar with the tradition of the “man”/angel teaching Noah the secret about the upcoming destruction.

²¹ On the manner in which the information about the flood is communicated to the main character in Gen 6 and in Mesopotamian texts about the flood, see. R.T. Stanton, “Asking Questions of the Divine Announcements in the Flood Stories from Ancient Mesopotamia and Israel,” *Gilgamesh and the World of Assyria. Proceedings of the Conference Held at Mandelbaum House, the University of Sydney, 21–23 July, 2004* (eds. J. Azize – N. Weeks) (ANESup 21; Leuven: Peeters 2007) 147–172. 1 En. 89:1a is not taken into account in the article.

²² The text subsequent to the *Animal Apocalypse*, the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1Q20 VI, 11–12), conveys information about Noah’s dream vision, in which he is informed about the sin of the fallen angels (VI, 19–20), after which the Aramaic text calls the received knowledge “the secret” (ܡܝܨܬܝܪܐ). In the next verses of the *Genesis Apocryphon* (VI, 13–14), the “great Watcher” appears, who, through a vision, speaks to Noah as a messenger of the “[Great] Holy One.” The text of 1QapGen VI, 13–14 is based on 1 En. 10:2–3; however, it is rather doubtful that the appearance of the term “secret” in the context of the experienced vision (VI, 11–20) was influenced by 1 En. 89:1.

²³ In the oldest review of the poem, which has survived until today, *Atrahasis* (early Old Babylonian period) Ea communicates the decision of gods to the main character (C₀ iv 1’–7’) who cries in response while kneeling before Ea (C₀ iv 8’–10’), Ea turns to him as his slave/servant (*wa-ar-di-šu* C₀ iv 11’–12’; C₂ i 15–16), interprets his crying as crying due to the upcoming destruction of a man (*ni-ši* C₀ iv 13’), the gesture of kneeling

The didactic dimension – the instruction on how to build the boat – is clearly present in the narrative of the Babylonian poem. In C₀ iv 16'–19', Ea, after revealing the gods' decision to exterminate a man, adds a remark about the task (*šiprum*) to be completed,²⁴ which Atrahasis, without the instruction from the god of wisdom, is unable to perform: "There is a task (*ši-ip-ru-ú*) to be done, but you, you do not know how to complete it." The instruction on how to complete that task (*šiprum*) begins in C₂ i 18'–19' ("Observe well, you, the task [*ši-ip-ra*] that I will tell you") and concerns the need to leave the house and build the boat (C₂ i 20'–35'). After the instruction is given and before the character proceeds to the construction of the boat, the narrator states that Atrahasis accepted the instruction (Akkadian *te-er-tam*²⁵) from Ea (C₁ i 38') and, after the meeting with the inhabitants of the city (C₁ i 39'–50'; *Gilg.* XI, 33–47), there is the description of the performance of the task entrusted to Atrahasis, preserved in fragments in the Old Babylonian review (C₂ ii 9' – C₁ ii 28'), but more elaborated on in the "Ark" tablet (1–33) and in the *Epic of Gilgamesh* (XI, 50–80).

The term "secret" in relation to the flood appears in the *Atrahasis* narrative in the final part, when Enlil discovers with anger that not everyone died in the disaster: "Where did the secret *escape* (*pi-ri!-iš-tum*²⁶) (*ú-ši*)? How did a man survive the destruction?" (C₁ vi 9–10).²⁷ Ea's answer is preserved in *Gilg.* XI, 196–197, where he denies that he had revealed (*petú*) the secret of the great gods and only showed Atrahasis/Ūta-napišti the dream and he heard (*šemú*) the secret of the gods.²⁸ Ea's awkward explanation, however, does not change the fact that he indeed broke his oath and revealed the secret of the great gods.

The fact that the information about the flood was a secret reserved for the gods is confirmed by Ūta-napišti, the main character of the flood, at the beginning of the narrative, in Tablet XI of the *Epic of Gilgamesh*.²⁹ Before revealing the story of the oath of the gods concerning the sending of the flood (*Gilg.* XI, 14–18), Ūta-napišti introduces the entire narrative of the destruction of mankind addressing Gilgamesh: "I will reveal to you, (*lu-up-te-ka*), Gilgameš, a hidden matter (*a-mat ni-šir-ti*) and let me tell you (*lu-uq-bi-ka*) a secret of the gods" (*pi-riš-ti ili*) (*Gilg.* XI, 9–10).

The rhetorical perspective is different than that in the poem *Atrahasis*: here, Ūta-napišti, starting the story about the flood, addresses the external listener, Gilgamesh, while the

is an expression of fear, and therefore respect, towards god (C₀ iv 13'–15'); cf. also ms. U 11; Wasserman, *The Flood*, 18, 96; cf. *Gilg.* XI, 197.

24 It's about building the boats, cf. *šiprum* in C₂ i 19'.

25 See CAD T, 360–361, *tértu*, meaning 2, "instruction, command."

26 For Wasserman's emendation, *pi-ri!-iš-tum*, see Wasserman, *The Flood*, 57.

27 Wasserman, *The Flood*, 36 = *Gilg.* XI, 175–176.

28 For the secret knowledge reserved for the assembly of the gods in Mesopotamia, see A. Lenzi, *Secrecy and the Gods. Secret Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia and Biblical Israel* (SAA 19; Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project 2008) 50–55.

29 Martin, *Le livre d'Hénoch*, 203, n. to v. 1, is the first to point out the similarity of the theme concerning the flood as a secret in *1 En.* 89:1 and in Tablet XI of the *Epic of Gilgamesh*; see also C. Olson, *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch. "All Nations Shall be Blessed". With a New Translation and Commentary* (SVTP 24; Leiden: Brill 2013) 159.

narrator is the one who survived the flood and was subsequently elevated, together with his wife, to the status equal to gods (*Gilg.* XI, 201–206). Thus, the story about the flood presented by Ūta-napišti is, from the point of view of narration, a glimpse into the past, while the entire description of the events related to the flood is the “secret of the gods,” which relates not only to the decision to annihilate mankind but also the method of saving a man and elevating people to the status of being equal to the gods. The main character of the flood shows the way to immortality, what he has achieved, which Gilgamesh seeks in vain throughout the epic.

In the structure of the narrative, in Tablet XI of the *Epic of Gilgamesh* (ll. 196–197), when the god Ea explains his actions to Enlil in the account of *Atrahasis*, the topic of the flood as a secret of the gods and the way of revealing it to mankind recurs: “I, myself, did not reveal (*ul ap-ta-a*) the secrets of the great gods (*pi-riš-ti ili rabûti*): 197. I brought a dream³⁰ to Atrahasis and so he heard the secret of the gods (*pirišti ili*). And now, take your decision about him.”

Based on the above quotes, the decision to send the flood to destroy humanity was understood as a secret that, according to the intention of the gods, was not supposed to be revealed to a man. The indirect disclosure of that secret to a man by one of the gods leads to the construction of a boat and the saving of the main character, his wife, animals, and craftsmen (C₁ ii 36’–38’; *Gilg.* XI, 86). The first part of Tablet XI of the *Epic of Gilgamesh* introduces a different paradigm, according to which the entire message of the narrative about the flood and the salvation of a man is mediated by the main character elevated to the divine status and revealing the narration of the ancient past reserved for the gods.³¹

The presence in the introduction to the brief description of the flood in the *Animal Apocalypse* of a “man”/angel who instructs Noah about the secret certainly does not mean direct knowledge of the story contained in *Atrahasis* and the *Epic of Gilgamesh*. Nevertheless, the instruction given to Noah by a supernatural being concerning the secret in the context of the building of the boat and the upcoming waters of the flood echoes the events in Mesopotamian literature about revealing the secret of the gods to a man and passing on the necessary instructions to save humanity. In both traditions, information concerning the upcoming flood and the way of saving mankind is referred to as a “secret.” While in *Atrahasis* and in Tablet XI of the *Epic of Gilgamesh* the god Ea indirectly reveals the secret to mankind, the *Animal Apocalypse*, reinterpreting God’s

³⁰ Although Noah does not receive the revelation of the upcoming flood in a dream, it should be noted that the entire *Animal Apocalypse*, as a history of humankind, is bound with a literary brace (1 En. 85:3; 90:39–40) when Enoch receives a dream revelation concerning a man and Israel, from creation to eschatological times. The flood narrative is, obviously, part of Enoch’s dream, but it has no direct impact on how the knowledge about the flood is communicated to Noah.

³¹ On the functioning of the secret knowledge reserved for the gods and revealed to Gilgamesh in Tablet XI and throughout the epic, see K. van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 2009) 213–214.

earlier command in *1 En.* 10:2–3, introduces the angel/“man” as the communicator of the same information to Noah/“the bull,” in the didactic context very characteristic of the *Book of Enoch*.³² The Mesopotamian tradition introduces the theme of “instruction” given to a man; however, the didactic vocabulary of the tradition is not as explicit as that in the *Animal Apocalypse*.

2.2. “He became a man”

In the introduction to the flood narrative, just after the angel/“man” instructs the white bull about the secret, the editor of the longer version adds a sentence: “He was born as a bull but became a man” (Ethiopic *kona sab’a*) (*1 En.* 89:1a). This information, missing in 4Q208 8 I, 14, is repeated in the Ethiopic text when Noah leaves the boat (*1 En.* 89:9a): “the white bull that became a man (Ethiopic *kona bə’ase*) came out of the boat.” Thus, at the beginning, just before the building of the boat and after Noah leaves the boat, there is information about Noah’s transformation, which, according to the symbolic language of the *Apocalypse*, means the transition from the status of a man to the status of an angel, a supernatural being. Seven white “men,” who come out of heaven before the flood (*1 En.* 87:2; cf. 9:1; 10:1–15; chapter 20),³³ are supernatural beings called Watchers (עִירִיךְ) in *1 Enoch* and in later literature related to that book.³⁴ The first three take Enoch to paradise before the flood comes (*1 En.* 87:3) while the other four execute God’s judgment on the Watchers and their offspring (*1 En.* 88:1–3; cf. 10:4–13) and pass on to the white bull the secret about the flood (*1 En.* 89:1a; cf. 10:2–3).

Noah’s transformation into a man, like the transformation of Moses – a sheep, into a man before the building of the tabernacle in the desert (4Q204 15 10 [89:36]: הוּא אָנוּשׁ), may be of a practical nature: it would be difficult for a bull to build a boat.³⁵ It seems, how-

32 In the *Book of Watchers* and the *Book of Astronomy*, the angels accompany Enoch and “show” him geographical regions or astronomical knowledge that he is unable to acquire; cf. H. Drawnel, “Priestly Education in the *Aramaic Levi Document* (*Visions of Levi*) and *Aramaic Astronomical Book* (4Q208–211),” *RevQ* 22 (2006) 547–574. Passing over the knowledge about astronomy and mythical geography suggests a connection between the authors of the *Book of Enoch* and the Aramaic scribal community, remaining in cultural contact with the Mesopotamian astronomical knowledge of the Persian and Hellenistic periods, cf. Drawnel, “Moon Computation,” 21–35.

33 The relationship between the figures of angels in the myth about the fallen angels and the “white men” in the *Animal Apocalypse* is discussed by Karina M. Hogan (“The Watchers Traditions in the ‘Book of the Watchers’ and the ‘Animal Apocalypse,’” *The Watchers in Jewish and Christian Traditions* [eds. A. Kim Harkins – K. Colblentz Bautch – J.C. Endres] [Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2014] 107–119).

34 Cf. I. Fröhlich, “The Figures of the Watchers in the Enochic Traditions (1–3) Enoch,” *Hen* 33 (2011) 6–26.

35 See August Dillmann (*Das Buch Henoch* [Leipzig: Vogel 1853] 257) suggests that Noah’s transformation is purely functional; see also Martin, *Le livre d’Hénoch*, 203. However, Patrick A. Tillier (*A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, 259, 295–296) notes that since “men” in the *Animal Apocalypse* represent angels, the transformation of the white bull into a man symbolizes his elevation to the status of an angel. The transformation of Moses into a man (89:36) would have resulted from his privileged contact with God (see Exod 33:11, 18–21; 34:29–35), while the transformation of Noah imitates the transformation of Moses. Noah’s transformation in the longer review of the Ethiopic text. However, is closely associated with the flood, and it is hardly an imitation of the transformation of Moses. The reasons for the transformation of Moses and Noah are not explained

ever, that the editor's intention goes far beyond such a purpose of the transformation. In other places in the tradition associated with Enoch, Noah displays the characteristics of a supernatural being, similar to the sons of heavenly angels (1 En. 106:5). Chapter 106 of the *First Book of Enoch* describes the extraordinary character of Noah, when, at his birth, the infant does not resemble a human being: the color of his body is whiter than snow and redder than a rose, his hair – whiter than snow, his eyes – like the rays of the sun. When he opens his eyes the house shines like the sun, then he gets up, opens his mouth and praises the Lord (106:2–3; 10–11).³⁶

Those extraordinary phenomena are the reason for Methuselah, the father of Lamech, to visit Enoch to determine whether the son of Lamech could be the son of the Watchers (1 En. 106:8–12). Enoch responds negatively and predicts the salvation of Noah and his three sons from the waters of the flood, and Noah's function as the one who will cleanse the Earth of corruption (1 En. 106:13–17).³⁷ Thus, his extraordinary features and appearance as well as the fact of worshipping God foreshadow his active role in freeing the Earth from the corruption caused by the sin of the fallen angels, their sons and mankind.³⁸

By raising Noah to the status of an angel, the author of the *Animal Apocalypse* went much further than the addition to the *Book of Enoch* in chapter 106, although he certainly shared the opinion of the positive role played by Noah before, during and after the flood. The short text, 1 En. 89:1–9, does not refer to Noah's righteousness (Gen 6:9 [P]; 7:1 [J]),³⁹ his perfection (6:9 [P]) and his contact with God (Gen 6:9) that characterize Noah in the biblical text even before the flood.⁴⁰ Those features showing the close relationship of the main character of the flood with God may have contributed to the presentation of the transformation of the white bull into a man, which, according to the longer edition of the *Animal Apocalypse*, took place even before the flood.⁴¹ In the context of the sexual

in the text of the *Animal Apocalypse*; therefore, an accurate interpretation of the relationship between the transformation of Moses and Noah is difficult, if possible at all.

³⁶ A similar tradition concerning Noah's extraordinary appearance and doubts about his origin is found in 1QapGen, column II, cf. J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20). A Commentary*, 3 ed. (BibOr 18b; Rome: Biblical Institute Press 2004) 68–69, 122–138.

³⁷ In *Jub.* 6:2, Noah makes atonement (cf. 1QapGen. X, 13) for the Earth and for all the sins of the Earth, cf. Gen 8:20.

³⁸ 4Q534–4Q536 is probably part of the tradition of late Judaism describing the birth of Noah and his unique wisdom; see Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4*, 129–170; Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic 'Elect of God,'" 140–143.

³⁹ Cf. Ezek 14:14, where Noah appears with Daniel and Job as an example of the righteous who, for the sake of their righteousness, save their lives in a land polluted by sin.

⁴⁰ Cf. *Jub.* 5:19, where reference is made to Noah being shown grace before the flood because of his children, whom he protected from the waters of the flood, and for the sake of his mind, which was righteous in all its ways; cf. Gen 6:8–9; 7:5.

⁴¹ Cf. 1 En. 10:3 (Synkellos) "instruct the righteous" (τὸν δίκαιον); Panopolianus: αὐτόν (= Ethiopic). The theme of Noah's righteous conduct in the context of the flood interpreted as an eschatological event can be found in Second Temple literature, cf. J.C. VanderKam, "The Righteousness of Noah," *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism. Profiles and Paradigms* (eds. J.J. Collins – G.W.E. Nickelsburg) (SCS 12; Atlanta, GA: Scholars 1980) 13–32, esp. 15–27. Cf. also *Jub.* 10:17, where Noah's extraordinary length of life on the Earth is attributed to his righteousness, which was perfect. In later pseudepigraphic literature, there are examples of

relationship of the Watchers with women that happens before the flood (*1 En.* 86:1–6), the transformation of Noah from a white bull into a man is the antithesis of the transformation of the stars descending from heaven into bulls (*albəmta konu*, *1 En.* 86:3) that is, the transformation of the Watchers into men to commit sinful intercourse with the heifers of bulls (*1 En.* 86:4).⁴²

Noah's transformation into an angelic being at the beginning of the narrative influences the interpretation of that character after the waters covering the Earth go away. When Noah and his three sons left the ark, the author of the *Animal Apocalypse* mentions the departure of Noah (*1 En.* 89:9c),⁴³ an event which, in the shorter version of the flood that contains the transformation of the white bull/Noah into a man/angel, can be interpreted as a metaphor indicating the death of the main character of the flood.⁴⁴ However, in the context of Noah's transformation into an angelic being, his departure can hardly be interpreted as death. Although the place where Noah went after the flood is not indicated, his status as a man raised to the dignity of an angel suggests that, as in the case of Enoch (*Gen* 5:24; *1 En.* 12:1–2 [Gr.]; 87:3), his place of stay was in the regions inaccessible to a man, his life continues and he is accompanied by angels. The text, however, does not mention the regions to which the white bull has gone.

Old Testament figures such as Jacob (Joseph's prayer, frag. A) presented as an angel of God, or Adam created as the second angel on the Earth (*2 En.* 30:8–11, ms. A); cf. J.H. Charlesworth, "The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel," *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism. Profiles and Paradigms* (eds. J.J. Collins – G.W.E. Nickelsburg) (SCS 12; Atlanta, GA: Scholars 1980) 135–151. If 4Q534–4Q536 are part of the tradition about the birth of Noah, the expression בְּחִיר אֱלֹהִים – "God's chosen one" in 4Q534 II, 10 ("his calculations [are successful] because he is God's chosen one") in relation to Noah may be a consequence of his future righteousness and, particularly, of him being chosen as the one who survives the catastrophe understood as the judgment of humanity.

- 42 In the tradition of Syriac Christianity (Ephrem, Aphrahat), Noah maintained his sexual purity before the flood, not succumbing to the daughters of Cain, who, in the exegetical Christian tradition, were identified with the daughters of the sons of men in *Gen* 6:1–2. Moreover, while in the ark, Noah maintained his sexual abstinence, wearing *zaynā d-napqūtā* – "the armour of purity" (Ephraem, *Hymnus de fide*, 9). Cf. L. Lieber, "Portraits of Righteousness: Noah in Early Christian and Jewish Hymnography," *ZRGG* 61 (2009) 332–355, esp. 337–341; M. Debié, "Noé dans la tradition syriaque: Une mer de symboles," *RHR* 232 (2015) 585–622, esp. 596–600. One of the Jewish liturgical poems (*piyyutim*) *Abodah* from the 4th/5th century AD describes Noah as pure (*zē*) and innocent (*tm*), cf. Lieber, "Portraits of Righteousness," 335. The former term is added by the author of the poem, while the latter comes from *Gen* 6:9.
- 43 At the beginning of the sentence about the departure of the white bull, the Ethiopic text uses two further demonstrative pronouns "that (*wə'ətu*) yonder (*zēku*) white bull." Tiller (*A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, 268) considers the possibility that, in that sentence, the white bull is Shem, who separates himself from his brothers for the sake of purity. However, the remote deixis pronouns seem to refer to Noah mentioned at the beginning of the verse, while Shem's departure for ritual purity is only Tiller's speculation, unsupported by any argument.
- 44 Robert H. Charles (*The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch. Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text* [Oxford: Clarendon 1912] 191, n. to l. 9) interprets the departure of the white bull this way.

The Context of Mesopotamian Flood Narratives

In the literature of ancient Mesopotamia, all the main characters of the flood, from Ziusudra⁴⁵ in the Sumerian version, through Atrahasis⁴⁶ in the *Akkadian Epic* of the Old Babylonian period, to Ūta-napišti⁴⁷ in Tablet XI of the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, receive the gift of life without end after the flood, become similar to gods and stay in places inaccessible to an ordinary man. In the case of the Sumerian epic, the king of the city of Shuruppak, Ziusudra, the last (the tenth) king before the flood (like Noah – the tenth generation before the flood), receives from the gods, An and Enlil, eternal life like other gods, and resides in the overseas land in the east called Dilmun.⁴⁸

As regards Atrahasis, Enlil, one of the main enemies of humanity before the flood, leads the main character out of the boat, holding his hand, and states, “You will become like a god (*šū-mat-ma it-ti ilī*); [you will receive] life” (ms. Z v 19’).⁴⁹ Then, Enlil orders his wife to stand in front of him and touches Atrahasis’s eyebrows and eyebrows of his wife (ms. Z v 20–21’).

There is a similar text in Tablet XI of Gilgamesh, which mentions Ūta-napišti and his wife kneeling before Enlil, who touches their foreheads and blesses them:

“Before, Ūta-napišti belonged to humanity, but now Ūta-napišti and his wife become like gods (*e-mu-ú kima ilī*), (like) us! Ūta-napišti shall dwell in the distance, at the mouth of the rivers (*ina pi-i nārāti*)! They took me and made me sit in the distance, at the mouth of the rivers (*ina pi-i nārāti*)” (*Gilg.* XI, 203–206).⁵⁰

In Atrahasis and Gilgamesh, elevating the main character of the flood through a ritual to the status equal to gods⁵¹ and placing him in remote regions inaccessible to a man arouses astonishment in the reader because the god, Enlil, is the main enemy of a man in the initial narrative of the flood (C₁ vi 5–10; *Gigl.* XI, 172–176). Such a decision is probably the result of the fact that the main character of the narrative obeys the instructions of Ea, the god of wisdom and protector of mankind, builds a boat and saves the seed of mankind,⁵² which

⁴⁵ Sum. ZIU₄.SUD.RÁ “life of long duration.”

⁴⁶ Akkadian *atra* + *hāsis*, “extremely wise.”

⁴⁷ Akkadian *ūta* + *napištim* “he/I found life.”

⁴⁸ CBS 10673, vi 254–260, cf. Civil, “The Sumerian Flood Story,” 144–145.

⁴⁹ The text comes from Tablet “Z,” copied in the late Babylonian or Persian period, cf. Wasserman, *The Flood*, 99, 101–102.

⁵⁰ The place of stay of the Mesopotamian character of the flood, “at the mouth of the rivers,” is identical to the place of stay of Ziusudra – the eastern regions in the land of Dilmun, identified with today’s Bahrain in the Persian Gulf, cf. E.C.L. During Caspers, “In the Footsteps of Gilgamesh: In Search of the ‘Prickly Rose,’” *Persica* 12 (1987) 57–95.

⁵¹ Wasserman (*The Flood*, 129) emphasizes the uniqueness of the ritual in all Akkadian literature, as a result of which Ūta-napišti and his wife change their status from human to divine.

⁵² Cf. Ziusudra referred to as numun-nam-lú-u₃ urī₃-ak, “the one who saved the seed of humanity”; CBS 10673 vi 11 in Civil, “The Sumerian Flood Story,” vi, 259; in a broader sense, about the introduction of all living things into the ark: in *Gilg.* XI, 27, 84, *zēr napšāti kalama*, “the seed of all living creatures.” As in the Sumerian text, in 1 En. 10:3 (ms. Panopolitanus + Ethiop.), God instructs Sarel to teach Noah how to escape so that his seed (τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ) lasts forever. Synkellos adds: “(teach) the righteous one, the son of Lamech, what he must do to

turns into a tangible profit for the gods through the consumption of the sacrifice offered after the flood (*Atrahasis*, C₁ v 30"–36"; *Gigl.* XI, 157–163). However, an unambiguous motivation for the transformation is not advised.

A Babylonian priest, Berossus, who lived in the third century BC, attributes to Ziusudra's special piety his departure from humanity and staying with the gods. Describing the Mesopotamian narrative of the flood to the Greek reader, Berossus mentions Ziusudra (Greek: Ξίσουθρος) leaving the ark after the waters recede and adds that he disappeared (γενέσθαι ... ἀφανῇ) after making a sacrifice to the gods. Those who remained in the ark came out of it and looked for him, called his name, but did not find him (οὐκ ἔτι ὀφθῆναι) because, due to his piety (διὰ τῇν εὐσέβειαν),⁵³ he went to live with the gods.⁵⁴

The relationship between the deification of the main character of the flood in the Mesopotamian tradition and the elevation of Noah to the status of an angel allows one to assume a thematic similarity between the two narratives. In the Mesopotamian myth, the god/gods grant the main character life without end, he is transformed into a god (*emû kima ilî*) and excluded from humanity. The author of the *Animal Apocalypse*, writing within the framework of the Jewish religion, when talking about Noah's transformation into a "man"/angel assumes a transformation into a supernatural being, although the very transformation is formulated only in a short statement, using the language of allegory.⁵⁵ While in the Mesopotamian texts, granting life takes place after the flood with the participation of one of the most important gods of the pantheon (Enlil + An), in the case of Noah, the transformation into a "man" is introduced before the flood and confirmed also after it is over, and the direct author of the transformation (God) is not mentioned. The departure of the white bull, transformed into a "man"/angel, from its offspring (and, in the context of the post-flood situation – from humanity in general) should be interpreted not as death but as further existence away from humanity. Thus, this motif is close to the Mesopotamian tradition, in

keep his soul alive (τῇν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ εἰς ζώην); cf. in Old Babylonian *Atrahasis*: C₂ i 24' *napišta bulliṭ* "save life!"; ms. Ark I. 5 *napištam šullim* "keep (your) life intact!"

53 Heb 11:7 presents Noah as the one acting in pious reverence (εὐλαβηθεὶς) while building the ark. The Hebrew text emphasizes Noah's faith, which made him heir of righteousness based on faith.

54 The Greek text can be found in the *Chronicle* of Synkellos, cf. F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (F. Gr. Hist.), *Dritter Teil, Geschichte von Staedten und Voelkern* (Hrographie und Ethnographie). C: Autoren ueber einzelne Laender; No. 608a-856 (erster Band: Aegypten-Geten No. 608a-708) (Leiden: Brill 1958) 380, frag. 4b (15). In BM 92687 obv. 10, which contains the Babylonian world map, Ūta-napišti, the main character of the flood in the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, lives in remote regions of the Earth; cf. W. Horowitz, *Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography* (MC 8; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns 1998) 36. Similarly, the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, telling the main character's travels to distant regions of the world, mentions him reaching Ūta-napišti, which is described by the adjective *rūqi* "distant" (*Gilg.* I, i, 40), which defines Ūta-napišti in *Gilg.* XI, i, 1, 205–206, i.e., at the beginning and end of the description of the flood in Tablet XI. The adjective *rūqi* not only indicates that Ūta-napišti is located in remote regions of the Earth but also characterizes him as "unfathomable, difficult to understand," cf. Wasserman, *The Flood*, 120.

55 In that context, one can compare the transformation of Moses/the ram into a man in 4Q204 15 10 (89:36): "the lamb was transformed (וְהָיָה אֶלֶף) and became a man (וְהָיָה אִישׁ)."

which the main character of the flood is removed from the rest of the people and enjoys life as a being equal to gods.⁵⁶

2.3. “He hewed”

After Noah/the white bull was told about the mystery of the flood, he started building a boat to save himself and his three sons. In the Aramaic fragment that has survived until today, the verb expressing effort is the verb עבד “made” (4Q206 8 I, 14b [89:1b]), the semantic equivalent of which is the Hebrew עשה. Considering the flood in Genesis, the subject of the verb עשה, “to do, to make, to perform,” is Noah, working on the construction of the ark. Thus, the use of the verb עבד in the Aramaic text is an allusion to the biblical narrative in which Noah builds the ark (עשה, Gen 6:22; 7:5; cf. 8:6) according to God’s command (עשה, Gen 6:14, 14, 15, 16, 16).

The Ethiopic translation, however, certainly does not reflect the Aramaic עבד in the sentence, “and hewed (*ṣaraba*) a great boat for himself” (89:1b). In classical Ethiopic, the verb *ṣaraba* “to hew” means the work of a craftsman who hews something in stone or works with wood, and the latter meaning is more popular.⁵⁷ Thus, the Ethiopic translation assumes a different Aramaic verb in the original Aramaic (perhaps נגר – “to make, construct using wood” in the Pael⁵⁸ stem) than the confirmed עבד “to make, to perform,” and the change could have resulted from the fact that it was assumed that the material from which the boat was made was wood.

In the later book of the Proverbs, the making of the boat by Enoch is attributed to angels, while the object is called “wood” (’*əṣawa*, probably Aramaic עעין) (1 En. 67:2; cf. Wis 10:4; 14:7).⁵⁹ The change of verb in the *Vorlage* of the Ethiopic text in 1 En. 89:1b implies a deliberate departure from the explicit allusion to the biblical text referred to by the verb עבד in 4Q206 8 I, 14b. The verb *ṣaraba* “hewed” is definitely not used to indicate the material with which Noah works, but to represent him as performing the work of a carpenter while

⁵⁶ Recalling the similarity between Enoch’s transfer to paradise and Ziusudra’s departure after the flood pointed out by Milik (*The Books of Enoch*, 33), Tiller (*A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, 268) suggests that Noah’s departure after the flood is an adaptation of the Babylonian story of Ziusudra’s departure after the flood to stay with the gods, as referred to by the Babylonian priest – Berossus. In this way, Tiller also shows the inadequacy of Milik’s comparison.

⁵⁷ See W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez (Classical Ethiopic). Ge’ez-English / English-Ge’ez with an Index of the Semitic Roots* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2006) 563, “hew, act as a carpenter, do carpentry.” See A. Dillmann, *Lexicon linguae aethiopicae cum indice latino* (Leipzig: Weigel 1865), reprint (New York: Ungar 1955) col. 1274: *dolare, asciare vel fabricari... e lapidibus, ... plerumque a ligno*. Cf. translation in Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 56: *zimmerte sich*, “he hewed for himself.”

⁵⁸ In Syriac, cf. M. Sokoloff, *A Syriac Lexicon. A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann’s Lexicon Syriacum* (Winona Lake, IN – Piscataway, NJ: Eisenbrauns – Gorgias Press 2009) 890, 2#, meaning 2.

⁵⁹ The use of the word “wood” in the Book of Proverbs may be based on Gen 6:14, where God instructs Noah to carve an ark out of resinous wood (עצי גפר). The angels “make” *ṣagabbəru* (impf. from *gabra* “to do, make, perform”) “wood,” implying the Aramaic עבד in the source text, so the allusion to the verb עשה in Genesis remains unchanged.

building the “great boat.” Deriving the image of Noah as a carpenter from the biblical text seems difficult given that Gen 6:14–16 presents God’s instruction to build the ark, while the biblical narrative does not give any details about Noah’s work and only states that he did everything according to God’s instruction (Gen 6:22; 7:5). The inspiration for the change of the original verb in the Aramaic text may have been God’s command in Gen 6:14 to carve the ark out of gopher wood (עֲצֵי גִפְרִי)⁶⁰; however the lack of an explicit allusion in the *Animal Apocalypse* to the type of wood out of which the ark is carved makes such an assumption a speculation difficult to prove.

The Context of Mesopotamian Flood Narratives

Apart from the general similarity of boat-building work, the Mesopotamian sources do not explicitly identify the main character of the flood as a carpenter. In *Atraḥasis*, the eponymous hero announces to the leaders of the city where he lives the necessity to leave the city on the order of god Enki (C₁ i 39–50). The fragmentary text does not make it possible to determine whether *Atraḥasis* revealed the secret of the gods to the inhabitants of the city; nevertheless, not only the main character of the story participates in the construction of the boat but also other craftsmen, including a carpenter: “The carpenter (*na-ga-[ru]*) [carried his axe], a reed-worker [carried his *stone*]” (C₂ ii 11’–12’).⁶¹ Tablet XI of the *Epic of Gilgamesh* completes the missing text and adds young and old people to the list (*Gilg.* XI, 53–54), rich and poor (*Gilg.* XI, 55–56) and other craftsmen (*Gilg.* XI, 73–74).

Although according to the Mesopotamian texts both ordinary people and skilled craftsmen are involved in building the boat, the narrative preserved in the Middle Babylonian review of *Atraḥasis* (ms. Ark) and in the *Epic of Gilgamesh* emphasizes the role of *Atraḥasis* / *Ūta-napištim* as the main constructor; however, without using the noun *naggāru* “carpenter” when referring to him. He is the one who draws the plan of the boat, builds its external and internal structures, six decks, seven levels, nine compartments, covers the inner and outer sides of the structure with tar and supplies all the necessary materials (ms. Ark recto 13–26; verso 32–33; *Gilg.* XI, 57–67). Neither the text of Genesis⁶² nor the brief narrative

⁶⁰ The noun גִּפְרִי is a *hapax* of unspecified meaning, cf. *HALOT*, s.v.

⁶¹ Cf. *Gilg.* XI, 50–51: “the carpenter (¹⁶*naggāru*) carried his axe (*pa-as-[su]*), the reed-worker his *sto[ne]*, [the sailor was carrying his] *agasilikku* axe”; cf. *naggāru* “carpenter,” in *CAD* N/1 p. 112; the noun נָגַר with the same meaning in Aramaic is a loanword from Akkadian *naggāru*. The Mandaean composition “Laws of Ginza” 18 contains a reference to Noah and the flood, in which it is not difficult to notice the indirect influence of the Mesopotamian flood narrative concerning the work of a carpenter: “Then, when there were still eight thousand years left of the years [of Mars, and therefore of the world], the call came to NU of the ark and spoke to him: ‘Build the ark.’ Hence, Nu had the carpenters, who could do the work properly, come and cut down cedars of Harran and [the so-called] female cedars of Lebanon, and he was building for three hundred years”; translation from English after E. Lupieri, *The Mandaeans. The Last Gnostics* (trans. C. Hindley; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2002) 201.

⁶² Gen 6:14–16 contains God’s instruction on how to build the ark and its size; however, in the rest of the narrative, Noah’s building of the ark is summed up with one verse: “And so Noah did; he did everything as God had instructed him” (Gen 6:22).

about the flood in the *Animal Apocalypse* contains a similar description presenting the details of the craftsmanship while the ark is constructed.

2.4. “The great boat”

In the biblical account of the flood, Noah builds *tēbāh* “a chest” 300 cubits long, 50 cubits wide, 30 cubits high (Gen 6:15).⁶³ The Aramaic text of the *Animal Apocalypse* modifies that biblical account by introducing a new expression with the numeral in the function of an indefinite article, ערב חדה – “a certain boat” (4Q206 8 I, 14 [89:1b]). A boat is arguably a more seaworthy object than the chest from the biblical description; however, the Ethiopic text says nothing about the shape of the boat. The Ethiopic translation renders the Aramaic idiom with an expression slightly modified by the text editor: “he hewed a great boat” (*masqara ‘abiya*). Although the Ethiopic term *masqar* may be a translation of the Aramaic ערב,⁶⁴ the addition of the adjective ‘abiya – “great” is definitely not a matter of coincidence or error⁶⁵ but may indicate a need to specify the size of the boat instead, which, in the context of the description of the flood in the *Animal Apocalypse*, is surprising: the only inhabitants of the boat were a white bull and his three sons (1 En. 89:1b).

The Context of Mesopotamian Flood Narratives

Replacing the Hebrew term תבה “chest” with the noun ערב “boat” in the Aramaic text of the *Animal Apocalypse* introduces a major change to the applied way of presentation, bringing the whole narrative closer to Mesopotamian texts, especially Akkadian ones, in the case of which the use of semantically related term *eleppu* “boat”⁶⁶ is common. A Sumerian myth, only fragments of which have survived until today, mentions a huge boat rocked by a strong wind: “And the destructive wind rocked the great boat (ḡis má-gur₄-gur₄) on high

63 This Egyptian loanword appears only in the description of the flood, Gen 6–9, cf. Gen 6:14–16, 18, etc.; the LXX κιβωτός “chest, trunk, cassette”; in Exod 2:3, 5, it refers to the basket in which Moses was placed as a baby; cf. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 564; Fischer, *Genesis 1–11*, 417–419. For the ark and its shape in art, numismatics, language, and literature, see A. Göttlicher, *Die Schiffe im Alten Testament* (Berlin: Mann 1997) 13–131, pl. 1–138.

64 For the Classical Ethiopic masculine noun *masqar* “ship, boat,” see Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez*, 510; Dillmann, *Lexicon linguae aethiopicae*, col. 352. The noun is only used to describe Noah’s ark or boat; it is derived from the verb *saq’ara*, “to pierce, perforate,” and can literally be translated as “hollowed-out (object, thing).”

65 The adjective [רבח] “great” replaced the indefinite article חדה in the Aramaic *Vorlage* of the Ethiopic text; it seems unlikely that the copier accidentally omitted (parablepsis) the adjective רבה. A mistaken transcription of *het* and *dalet* instead of *resh* and *beth* is also unlikely.

66 The Akkadian noun *eleppu* – “boat, ship” – was borrowed into Aramaic, where, in official Christian Palestinian and Targumic Aramaic, it occurs in the form of אלה. Thanks to the tablet supplementing the missing *Atr̥h̥asis* text identified by Irving L. Finkel, it is known that the boat in *Atr̥h̥asis* was circular in shape, “circle, wheel,” *kippatum*, known in modern Iraq as *quffa*: “The boat which you will build, I will draw it out (for you) – a circular plan (*e-še-er-ti ki-[i]p-pa-tim*)” (ms. Ark I 6), Wasserman, *The Flood*, 66, 70–71; *editio princeps* in Y.I. Finkel, *The Ark before Noah. Decoding the Story of the Flood* (London: Hodder & Stoughton 2014) 376–377; cf. also C₁ i 28’ and ms. W I. 2 (neo-Assyrian period), in Wasserman, *The Flood*, 20, 28, 90, 92.

water (l. 205).⁶⁷ In the Akkadian myth of *Atrahasis* and in its later version in the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, the term *eleppu* (^{gis}MÁ) “boat” occurs many times⁶⁸ to describe a vessel as a means of deliverance from the waters of the flood, e.g., in Ea’s speech to Atrahasis/Ūta-napišti: “Leave your house, build a boat” (*bi-ni eleppa* [^{gis}MÁ]), “despise property and save life.”⁶⁹

Manuscript J from Nippur (Middle Babylonian period) is a slight correction of the description concerning the boat built by Atrahasis: *eleppam* (^{gis}MÁ) *rabi-tam bi-ni-ma* (l. 6’),⁷⁰ “build a great boat.” This minor editorial addition resembles a similar procedure in the Ethiopic text describing the flood. In the Ethiopic expression “a great boat” (*1 En.* 89:1b), the adjective “great” is an editorial addition to emphasise the size of the boat built by Noah. This is undoubtedly due to the desire to emphasise the size of the boat and the effort put into its construction. The adjective “great,” as an editorial addition in both the *Animal Apocalypse* and ms. J in the story about Atrahasis, indicate a similar, though independent, scribal editorial activity the purpose of which was to emphasise the size of the boat.

2.5. “The boat covered over them”

The preserved Aramaic text (4Q206 8 I, 15 [89,1b]) mentions covering the boat, as the last structural element completing the construction, only after Noah and his three sons go inside it. The expression *lā’lehomu* “over them,” preserved only in classical Ethiopic, and the passive voice of two Aramaic verbs (הפית וכסית) leave the question of authorship of the completion of the boat not yet covered. The Ethiopic text translates only one of two synonymous verbs (*takadna*, “was covered”), probably the first of them, also used later in the narrative to describe the land covered (הפית / *takadna*) by the waters of the flood (4Q206 8 I, 18 [89:3]). The second Aramaic verb, כסית – “was covered,” is synonymous with the first one and its presence in the Aramaic text may be an exegetical addition based on Gen 8:13, where there is a reference to a removable cover (מכסה) taken off by Noah after the flood waters went away.

It is not clear whether the instruction for building the ark in the text of Genesis directly mentions covering the external part of the ark. The noun צהר (*hapax*) in Gen 6:16 is translated either as a “roof” (from Akkadian *ṣēru* – “back, top”)⁷¹ or “skylight, hatch” (from the

67 Civil, “The Sumerian Flood Story,” 144–145; for the Sumerian term, see Finkel, *The Ark before Noah*, 120. The Sumerian term was borrowed by Akkadian, *makurkurru*; it is a synonym for the common Akkadian word meaning a boat, *eleppu*. It also appears in the Akkadian myth of Atrahasis: ms. J (Nippur, MB [Middle Babylonian period]) 8’: “let her be a *makurkurru* boat (^{gis}MÁ.GUR.GUR) with the name ‘Life saver’ (*našinat napištim*)”; cf. Wasserman, *The Flood*, 78.

68 C₁+C₂ i 22; 25; ii 55’; ms. Ark 4:6. 35, 52; J 6, 13’; U 3’; W 4,6’ (2x), 13’, 15’; z v 15’, 16’; *Gilg.* XI, 24, 27, 77, 85, 89, 94, 95, 142, 143, 173, 199.

69 Atrahasis C₂ i 22–23, in Wasserman, *The Flood*, 39–40; cf. ms. Ark 4–5; *Gilg.* XI, 24–26: “demolish the house.”

70 Cf. Wasserman, *The Flood*, 77–78.

71 Following John Skinner, Claus Westermann (*Genesis 1–11*, 565) compares the Hebrew term with the Arabic *zabr* “back,” and understands it as the upper part of the ark, its roof. Fischer (*Genesis 1–11*, 421) uses both meanings in his translation: “Eine Lichtluke / ein Dach.” Josephus Flavius in *Ant.* 3,2,78 mentions a roof (ὀροφος) covering the ark, but it is difficult to associate the Greek term with Gen 6:16.

base צָהַר – “to be bright.”⁷² Semantically, the Aramaic verb חָפִי in the passive voice “to be covered” may be a reference to the Hebrew verb כָּפַר – “to cover” (Qal) in the expression: “cover ... with tar” (כִּפְּרָת ... בַּכֶּפֶר) in Gen 6:14. The covering of the ark with tar (כֶּפֶר) on the outside and inside in Gen 6:14 is a borrowing from the description of the process of building the boat in *Atrahasis* (C₁ i 33', C₂ ii 13'; ms. Ark, 18–21, 31, 32) and in the *Epic of Gilgamesh* XI, 66 (Akkadian *kuprum* – “pitch” and *ittūm* – “crude bitumen”).⁷³

However, in the expression “the boat was covered” the activities can hardly mean the tarring of the outside and inside of the boat before entering it, described in both Genesis and the Mesopotamian tradition.⁷⁴ It is also unlikely that the Aramaic narrative can be associated with the Mesopotamian *Atrahasis*, who covers the door with tar while inside the ark: “Tar (*kupru*) was brought to him to seal the door” (C₁ ii 51').⁷⁵ The author of the Aramaic text suggests that the whole boat is covered, not just part of it or the door. Moreover, the prepositional phrase *lā' lehomu* “over them,” which supplements the Aramaic sentence, clearly indicates the place that was covered – above Noah and his three sons, who were already inside the boat.

Placing Noah and his three sons in the enclosed space of the boat can be interpreted as fulfilling God's command directed to Noah in 1 En. 10:2: κρύψον σεαυτὸν “hide away,”⁷⁶ the purpose of which is to save himself and his offspring.⁷⁷ Although the command to hide away is addressed to Noah, the passive voice of both Aramaic verbs in 4Q206 8 I, 15 (חִפִּית and כִּסִּית) can be interpreted as *passivum theologicum*, indicating God as the one completing the work of building the boat as a place of refuge for the righteous and his three sons.⁷⁸ Such an interpretation may be indirectly supported by Gen 7:16, where, unlike in the Mesopotamian *Atrahasis* and *Gilgamesh*, God himself closes (וַיִּסְגֵּר) the ark to save those inside

⁷² Cf. HALOT, s.v.; Vg. *fenestra*; LXX ἐπισυνάγωγ; por. *Gilgamesh*, XI, 137: *nappašū*, “small window, gap.”

⁷³ The Hebrew noun כֶּפֶר in Gen 6:14 is a borrowing from the Akkadian *kupru* – “tar, pitch,” used in the poem *Atrahasis*, cf. Kvanvig, *Primeval History*, 226–227. On the tarring of the boat on the outside and inside in *Atrahasis* (Tablet “Ark”) and *Gilgamesh*, cf. Wasserman, *The Flood*, 72–74.

⁷⁴ Edward M. Cook (*Dictionary of Qumran Aramaic* [Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns 2015] 89) translates the Aramaic חִפִּית with “was coated,” suggesting that the verb means covering the surface of the boat with a protective outer layer. This translation seems to be based on the meaning of the verb חָפִי in a different context, e.g., 1Q18 X, I 6 חִפֵּא דְהַב “covered, coated with gold.” Although the Aramaic line is here fragmentary, the Ethiopic text reads the prepositional phrase *lā' lehomu* “over them” and the verb *takadna* – “was covered,” which is used to translate the Aramaic חִפִּית in 4Q206 8 I, 15 (89:1b) (boat) and 4Q206 8 I, 18 (89:3) (land), does not reflect the rendering proposed by Cook.

⁷⁵ Cf. parallel text in the *Epic of Gilgamesh* that leaves out the reference to tar: “I entered the boat and sealed my door. To the one who sealed the boat, the sailor Puzur-Enlil, I left the palace with its goods” (*Gilg* XI, 94–96). Cf. also tablet Ark 59–60: “When I entered the boat, (I ordered:) ‘Caulk the frame of her door’”; Wasserman, *The Flood*, 68, 70.

⁷⁶ The original Aramaic verb translated with the use of Greek κρύπτω is not known; however, the Aramaic חָפִי in Syriac may mean “to hide away,” so its use in 4Q206 8 I, 15 may be an allusion to the encouragement addressed to Noah in 1 En. 10:2.

⁷⁷ See 1 En. 10:3: ὥσως ἐκφύγη lit. “to run away”; cf. § 2.1.

⁷⁸ Cf. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 375, who also quotes 1 En. 67:2: “I will lay my hand on it (the ark) and save it.”

it from the waters of the flood.⁷⁹ Differently from Genesis, the Aramaic text explicitly mentions covering the boat from above, not closing its door. Noah's boat in the *Animal Apocalypse* hewed out of wood is covered from above, there are no windows or doors. It is a safe space of survival for Noah and his three sons.

The Context of Mesopotamian Flood Narratives

As regards the top cover of the boat, the Mesopotamian flood tradition, both in the Old Babylonian reflexes and the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, is clearer than Genesis; therefore it is closer to the *Animal Apocalypse*. When giving the instruction on the construction of the ark, god Ea tells Atrahasis to cover the ark from the top and to secure it from the bottom:

„Roof her over (*šú-ul-li-il-ši*) like the Apsû (= *Gilg.* XI, 31), so that the sun shall not see inside it” (C₁ i 29'–30').

„Let her be roofed over (*šú-ul-lu-la-at*) above and below, let (her) *frame* be very strong” (C₁ i 31'–32').

Fragments of the Middle Babylonian Tablet J from Nippur contain an interpretative addition about covering the boat with a roof: “roof her over with a strong covering” (*šú-lu-la dan-na šú-ul-lil*) (ms. J r. 9' = C₁ i 31'). This addition is probably due to the use of the verb *šullulu* “to cover with a roof, to cover from the top”⁸⁰ in all three quoted places, which comes from the same root as *šulûlu* – “roof.”⁸¹

Conclusions

Based on the analysis of the five new themes introduced in the Ethiopic text of the flood in the *Animal Apocalypse*, there are thematic similarities between the *Apocalypse* and the Mesopotamian tradition. Those similarities consist in the presence of the same terms (e.g. “secret”) used in relation to the upcoming catastrophe and events related to it. There also exist thematic threads related to the similar fate of the main character of the flood (elevation to the divine or angelic status) in the same context of the flood, understood as a universal catastrophe consisting of the destruction of humanity and the saving of a small group of people. The similarities do not indicate direct literary contact or direct borrowings from Mesopotamian texts. The mythical motifs present in the *Animal Apocalypse* are the result of the development of the flood tradition, introduced into the narrative by later editors and associated with the development of the description of the cosmographic universe (high roof, enclosure). In a similar way, the Mesopotamian texts show editorial differences that sometimes bring them closer to the narrative of the *Animal Apocalypse* (e.g. “great boat”). It should be noted, however, that the reinterpretation of Noah in the Ethiopic translation

79 Based on that verse from Genesis, *Jub.* 5:23, states that “God closed (the ark) from the outside on the evening of the seventeenth (day).”

80 Cf. *CAD* Š, *šullulu* A, meaning 1, 239–241.

81 *CAD* Š, *šulûlu* A, meaning 1 “roof, roofing,” 242.

brings him closer to the image of the Mesopotamian character of the flood. Noah, the white bull that was transformed into a man, as the carpenter building the boat in accordance with the revealed secret, is more like the figure of Atrahasis or Ūta-napišti than the exemplary figure from Genesis. Thus, the familiarity with the Mesopotamian traditions about the flood by the Aramaic redactor cannot be completely ruled out; however, in the Enochic text, they constitute an echo of the cuneiform literature rather than prove a direct literary dependence.⁸²

Bibliography

- Annus, A., "On the Origin of Watchers: A Comparative Study of the Antediluvian Wisdom in Mesopotamian and Jewish Tradition," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 19 (2010) 277–320.
- Black, M., "Apocalypsis Henochi Graece," *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece – Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum Quae Supersunt Graeca* (eds. M. Black – A.-M. Denis) (Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 3; Leiden: Brill 1970) 3–44.
- Burstein, S.M., *The Babyloniaca of Berossus* (Malibu, CA: Undena 1980).
- Charles, R.H., *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch. Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text* (Oxford: Clarendon 1912).
- Charlesworth, J.H., "The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel," *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism. Profiles and Paradigms* (eds. J.J. Collins – G.W.E. Nickelsburg) (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 12; Atlanta, GA: Scholars 1980) 135–151.
- Chen, Y.S., "Major Literary Traditions Involved in the Making of Mesopotamian Flood Traditions," *Opening Heaven's Floodgates. The Genesis Flood Narrative, Its Context, and Reception* (ed. J.M. Silverman) (Biblical Intersections 12; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias 2013) 141–190.
- Chen, Y.S., *The Primeval Flood Catastrophe. Origins and Early Development in Mesopotamian Traditions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2013).
- Civil, M., "The Sumerian Flood Story," *Atra-Hasis. The Babylonian Story of the Flood. With the Sumerian Flood Story by M. Civil* (eds. W.G. Lambert – A.R. Millard) (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1969) 138–172.
- Clements, R.A., "A Shelter Amid the Flood: Noah's Ark in Early Jewish and Christian Art," *Noah and His Book(s)* (eds. M.E. Stone – A. Amihay – V. Hillel) (Early Judaism and Its Literature 28; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature 2010) 277–299.
- Cook, E.M., *Dictionary of Qumran Aramaic* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns 2015).
- Debié, M., "Noé dans la tradition syriaque: Une mer de symboles," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 232 (2015) 585–622.
- Dillmann, A., *Das Buch Henoch* (Leipzig: Vogel 1853).
- Dillmann, A., *Lexicon linguae aethiopicae cum indice latino* (Leipzig: Weigel 1865) reprint (New York: Ungar 1955).
- Drawnel, H., "Priestly Education in the Aramaic Levi Document (*Visions of Levi*) and Aramaic Astronomical Book (4Q208–211)," *Revue de Qumran* 22 (2006) 547–574.

⁸² In this context, it should be added that the cosmic motif of darkness accompanying the destruction of a man that occurs during (1 En. 89:4) and at the end of the flood (89:8) is also present in Atrahasis (etūtu, C₁ iii 18'; cf. C₁ iii 13'–14'); cf. also Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, 263–264.

- Drawnel, H., "Moon Computation in the *Aramaic Astronomical Book*," *Revue de Qumran* 23 (2007) 3–41.
- Drawnel, H., *The Aramaic Astronomical Book (4Q208–4Q211) from Qumran. Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2011).
- Drawnel, H., *Qumran Cave 4. The Aramaic Books of Enoch. 4Q201, 4Q202, 4Q204, 4Q205, 4Q206, 4Q207, 4Q212* (in consultation with É. Puech) (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2019).
- Drawnel, H., "The Literary Structure of the Flood Account in the Animal Apocalypse," *The Biblical Annal* 13/3 (2023) 395–417.
- During Caspers, E.C.L., "In the Footsteps of Gilgamesh: In Search of the 'Prickly Rose,'" *Persica* 12 (1987) 57–95.
- Feldman, L.H., "Josephus' Portrait of Noah and Its Parallels in Philo, Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', and Rabbinic Midrashim," *Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research* 55 (1988) 31–57.
- Finkel, Y.I., *The Ark before Noah. Decoding the Story of the Flood* (London: Hodder & Stoughton 2014).
- Fischer, G., *Genesis 1–11* (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament 1/1; Freiburg: Herder 2018).
- Fitzmyer, J.A., "The Aramaic 'Elect of God' Text from Qumran Cave IV," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 27 (1965) 348–372.
- Fitzmyer, J.A., *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20). A Commentary*, 3 ed. (Biblica et Orientalia 18b; Rome: Biblical Institute Press 2004).
- Fröhlich, I., "The Figures of the Watchers in the Enochic Traditions (1–3) Enoch," *Enoch* 33 (2011) 6–26.
- Gelb, I.J. et al., *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (Chicago, IL: Oriental Institute 1956–2010) I–XXI.
- George, A.R., *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic. Introduction, Critical Edition and Cuneiform Texts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2003) I–II.
- Göttlicher, A., *Die Schiffe im Alten Testament* (Berlin: Mann 1997).
- Hallo, W.W., "Compare and Contrast: The Contextual Approach to Biblical Literature," *The Bible in the Light of Cuneiform Literature. Scripture in Context III* (eds. W.W. Hallo – B.W. Jones – G.L. Mattingly) (Lewis-ton, NY: Mellen 1990) 1–30.
- Hogan, K.M., "The Watchers Traditions in the 'Book of the Watchers' and the 'Animal Apocalypse,'" *The Watchers in Jewish and Christian Traditions* (eds. A. Kim Harkins – K. Coblenz Bautch – J.C. Endres) (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2014) 107–119.
- Horowitz, W., *Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography* (Mesopotamian Civilizations 8; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns 1998).
- Jacoby, F., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (F. Gr. Hist.). III. Geschichte von Staedten und Voelkern (Horo-graphie und Ethnographie). C. Autoren ueber einzelne Laender, No. 608a–856 (erster Band: Aegypten-Gen No. 608a–708)* (Leiden: Brill 1958).
- Koehler, L. – Baumgartner, W., *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. Translated and Edited under the Supervision of M. E. J. Richardson* (Leiden: Brill 1994–2000) I–V.
- Kvanvig, H.S., *Primeval History. Babylonian, Biblical, and Enochic. An Intertextual Reading* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 149; Leiden: Brill 2011).
- Kvanvig, H.S., "The Mesopotamian Background of the Watcher Story," *Enoch* 39/1 (2017) 134–155.
- Lang, M., "Book Two: Mesopotamian Early History and the Flood Story," *The World of Berossos. Proceedings of the 4th International Colloquium on "The Ancient Near East between Classical and Ancient Oriental Traditions," Hatfield College, Durham 7th–9th July 2010* (eds. J. Haubold et al.) (Classica et Orientalia 5; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2013) 47–60.

- Lenzi, A., *Secrecy and the Gods. Secret Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia and Biblical Israel* (State Archives of Assyria 19; Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project 2008).
- Leslau, W., *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic). Ge'ez-English / English-Ge'ez with an Index of the Semitic Roots* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2006).
- Lieber, L., "Portraits of Righteousness: Noah in Early Christian and Jewish Hymnography," *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 61 (2009) 332–355.
- Lupieri, E., *The Mandaeans. The Last Gnostics* (trans. C. Hindley; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2002).
- Machinist, P., "The Question of Distinctiveness in Ancient Israel: An Essay," *Ab, Assyria... Studies in Assyrian History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to Hayim Tadmor* (eds. M. Cogan – I. Eph'al) (Scripta Hierosolymitana 33; Jerusalem: Magnes 1991) 196–212.
- Martin, F., *Le livre d'Hénoch traduit sur le texte éthiopien* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané 1906).
- Milik, J.T., *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (with the collaboration of Matthew Black) (Oxford: Clarendon 1976).
- Mosshammer, A.A., *Georgii Syncelli Ecloga chronographica* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana; Leipzig: Teubner 1984).
- Nickelsburg, G.W.E., *1 Enoch 1. A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2001).
- Noort, E., "The Stories of the Great Flood: Notes on Gen 6:5–9:17 in Its Context of the Ancient Near East," *Interpretations of the Flood* (eds. F. García Martínez – G.P. Luttikhuisen) (Themes in Biblical Narrative 1; Leiden: Brill 1999) 1–38.
- Olson, D.C., *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch. "All Nations Shall be Blessed". With a New Translation and Commentary* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigraphica 24; Leiden: Brill 2013).
- Peters, D.M., *Noah Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Conversations and Controversies of Antiquity* (Early Judaism and Its Literature 26; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature 2008).
- Poebel, A., "A New Creation and Deluge Text," A. Poebel, *Historical Texts* (University of Pennsylvania, Publications of the Babylonian Section 4/1; Philadelphia, PA: University Museum 1914) 7–70.
- Puech, É., *Qumrân Grotte 4. XXII. Textes araméens. Première partie: 4Q529–549* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 31; Oxford: Clarendon 2001).
- Rendsburg, G.A., "The Biblical Flood Story in the Light of the Gilgames Flood Account," *Gilgames and the World of Assyria. Proceedings of the Conference Held at Mandelbaum House, the University of Sydney, 21–23 July, 2004* (eds. J. Azize – N. Weeks) (Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement Series 21; Leuven: Peeters 2007) 115–127.
- Schmidt, B., "Flood Narratives of Ancient Western Asia," *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East* (ed. J.M. Sasson) (New York: Scribner 1995) IV, 2337–2351.
- Sokoloff, M., *A Syriac Lexicon. A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum* (Winona Lake, IN – Piscataway, NJ: Eisenbrauns – Gorgias Press 2009).
- Stanton, R.T., "Asking Questions of the Divine Announcements in the Flood Stories from Ancient Mesopotamia and Israel," *Gilgames and the World of Assyria. Proceedings of the Conference Held at Mandelbaum House, the University of Sydney, 21–23 July, 2004* (eds. J. Azize – N. Weeks) (Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement Series 21; Leuven: Peeters 2007) 147–172.
- Strawn, B.A., "Comparative Approaches: History, Theory, and the Image of God," *Method Matters. Essays on the Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of David L. Petersen* (eds. J.M. LeMon – K.H. Richards) (Atlanta, GA: SBL 2009) 117–142.

- Tiller, P.A., *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of I Enoch* (Early Judaism and Its Literature 4; Atlanta, GA: Scholars 1993).
- van der Toorn, K., *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 2009).
- VanderKam, J.C., “The Righteousness of Noah,” *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism. Profiles and Paradigms* (eds. J.J. Collins – G.W.E. Nickelsburg) (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 12; Atlanta, GA: Scholars 1980) 13–32.
- Wasserman, N., *The Flood. The Akkadian Sources. A New Edition, Commentary, and a Literary Discussion* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 290; Leuven: Peeters 2020).
- Westermann, C., *Genesis 1–11* (Biblicher Kommentar, Altes Testament 1/1; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag 1974).