

THE BOOK(S) ATTRIBUTED TO NOAH*

Michael E. Stone

There has been considerable scholarly debate in recent years over whether or not a book of Noah existed. This question is of interest not least because if such a book of Noah did exist, it would be one of the most ancient Jewish works outside the Bible. A book of Noah is cited by Aramaic Levi Document (ALD) 10:10, and, since ALD is dated to the third century or early second century B.C.E., a source document of ALD must have been even older.¹ Pieces of the puzzle of the “dark age” of the history of Judaism in the fourth and third centuries B.C.E. are gradually being found and fitted together, and if the book(s) of Noah turns out to have existed, it will fill in a significant part of this puzzle. Moreover, the relationship between Enoch and Noah, and between the documents bearing their names, demands our attention, though it is beyond our scope in this essay. The disappearance of the book(s) of Noah is a further part of this enigma. If such a work existed and if it was so ancient, then why did it disappear? Is this historical happenstance, or does it reflect changes in the streams of Judaism in the fourth and third centuries, changes that are still beyond recovery? Such issues sharpen the question: Did a book of Noah exist?

The present writer, indeed, expressed a guardedly positive response to this question in a study published in 1999 in which he addressed both explicit references to the book of Noah in ancient pseudepigrapha and also textual

* This paper is presented in honor of John Strugnell, whose contribution in learning and teaching the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Period Jewish literature is *non pareil*. The article originally appeared in *DSD* 13:4–23. It is republished here with errata and additional notes.

1. The early date (early second century B.C.E. at the latest) of ALD has recently been challenged by Kugel 2007. The crux of his argument rests on the relationship between ALD and Jubilees, on the one hand, arguing that ALD is dependent on Jubilees, and on the supposedly Hasmonean date of ALD implied by the application of royal, i.e., Judahite language to Levi, on the other. These issues are complex, and I intend to broach them in a future publication. Suffice it to say here that I remain unconvinced by Kugel’s demurrers on my dating. On one aspect of the issue, see n. 22 below.

fragments, not explicitly attributed to a book of Noah, but that many scholars consider “Noachic.”² In the present essay, I do not seek definitively to resolve issues of the composition, indeed of the very existence of a book(s) of Noah, but to contribute to the solution of this contentious issue. To do this, it seems to me most reasonable to take as the point of departure those places in ancient literature where the title “Book of Noah” or a book associated with Noah is mentioned explicitly. A close examination of those texts should provide an initial insight into the question implied by the title of the present essay.

The study here, then, is directed solely toward instances in which the title or the book is actually mentioned. This seems to me to be methodologically justified: it is necessary in my view to distinguish between two categories of texts relating to the book(s) of Noah: (1) those in which the title or a book of Noah is clearly mentioned in an ancient source; (2) those in which scholars, in the course of their study of ancient sources, have come to regard passages of certain works as coming from a Noachic source, even though such an attribution is not explicit in the original. In the search for clarity, it may eventually become necessary to divide the second category itself into two subcategories: texts in which Noah is the central actor or speaks in the first person; other texts that for one or another reason have been regarded as belonging to Noachic literature. In the present study, however, I will consider only the unambiguous cases in group 1, that is, those instances in which the title “Book of Noah” or a book transmitted by Noah is actually mentioned.³

GENESIS APOCRYPHON

The only surviving copy of the Genesis Apocryphon (1QapGen or 1Q20) is a first-century manuscript from Qumran Cave 1. The work is older than that, but more cannot be said securely about its date (see n. 15 below). In the fifth column of the Genesis Apocryphon, line 29, the reading has been found [נוח] [פרשגן כתב מלי] “[copy of] the Book of the Words of Noah,” of which the first word is a restoration. Richard Steiner wrote a detailed discussion of this title, the only book of Noah title surviving in Hebrew or Aramaic from antiquity.⁴ Steiner points out that it occurs following a blank line and so seems

2. Stone 1999, 136–41; 2000, 613–14. In 1996b, I already assembled much material relating to the book of Noah (283–88). See earlier Stone 1971.

3. Hindy Najman (1999, 382 and n. 6) suggests that Noah writings are mentioned in Jub. 8:11 and other places because of the special role of writing: “It is central to *Jubilees*’ notion of divine speech that it be accomplished in writing—indeed, Noah received, recorded and then transmitted the already revealed heavenly tradition.” Such an attitude, of course, bears neither positively or negatively on the question we are seeking to answer here.

4. Steiner 1995.

to be the beginning of a new section that continues, as far as we can tell, until column 17. This material, though fragmentary, is first-person narrative, and it differs from the Noah narrative occurring in columns 2–5 of the same scroll. The subject there is the wondrous birth of Noah, but the narrative is set in his father Lamech's mouth, so the material about Noah is predominantly in the third person.⁵

Chapters 106–107 of the book of Enoch also contain material dealing with Noah's birth. Intriguingly, that narrative, too, is in the third person,⁶ set in the mouth of Enoch, Noah's great-grandfather. The material in 1QapGen columns 2–5 is, therefore, most probably not drawn from the same source as that which starts with the title “[copy of] the Book of the Words of Noah” at the bottom of column 5 of that scroll. The change of framework and speaker, the blank line, and the beginning of a new section seem to indicate this more than does the variation of grammatical person, and they mark the beginning of a different literary source.

Before the identification of the phrase “Book of the Words of Noah” in column 5 line 29 in the Genesis Apocryphon, García Martínez opined that 1QapGen columns 1–17 “contains a summary of the lost *Book of Noah* which is independent of Jubilees.”⁷ He argued that the Genesis Apocryphon is independent of Jubilees, so the Noah material in it is not drawn from Jubilees but from a source it shared with Jubilees.⁸ That source, he maintains, was the book of Noah.⁹ Steiner and others have elucidated the implications of the

5. The relationship between Enoch and Noah is discussed in Nadav Sharon and Moshe Tishel's “Distinctive Traditions about Noah and the Flood in Second Temple Jewish Literature” in the present volume.

6. Scholars have attributed other material in the book of Enoch to a book of Noah, and this material will be dealt with in a separate study (see also Vered Hillel's “A Reconsideration of Charles's Designated ‘Noah Interpolations’ in 1 Enoch: 54:1–55:1; 60; 65:1–69:25” in the present volume). It has, of course, been the object of considerable attention in the past, starting notably with the observations of Charles 1906, subsequently modified in Charles 1912, xlvi–xlvii. See also James 1920, 11–12.

7. García Martínez 1992, 40. On doubts raised about one specific point of García Martínez's reconstruction, see Scott 1997b, 372.

8. This is surmised on the basis of halakic argument by Werman 1999, 173–76. She argues that material shared by Jubilees, ALD, and 1QapGen was drawn with adaptations by Jubilees from the other two works. She concludes: “*Jubilees* knows of a Book of Noah only by hearsay, from these secondary sources that contradict one another as to the nature of this putative work” (181). This conclusion goes beyond the outcome of her convoluted argument there.

9. García Martínez 1992, 40. He supports his contention by a comparative analysis, 40–43. See further Stone 1996b, 286–88. No stand is taken on the existence of a book of Noah by Morgenstern, Qimron, and Sivan in their edition of the material (1995, 32).

new reading; García Martínez's position should consequently be modified, and, if a book of Noah is cited by 1QapGen, the phrase "Book of the Words of Noah" in column 5.29 was most likely its title or, less probably, an introductory lemma.

Dimant singled out the story of Noah's birth as a likely candidate for inclusion in the "Hebrew narrative midrash," the existence of which she postulates, but she denies that this story comes from a book of Noah.¹⁰ I prefer for the moment to leave the determination of this aside but note that it seems to be significant that the narrative of Noah's birth is usually presented in the third person. This may have been the case in 1Q19 frg. 3, the so-called "Book of Noah" from Qumran Cave 1, though the literary framework is lacking that would enable us to transform this tentative assertion into a definite one.¹¹ In 1 En. 106–107 the incident is related by Enoch, and within that first-person literary framework, it is third person narrative.¹² The same is true of 1QapGen column 2, except that there the narrative is set in Lamech's mouth. In 2 En. 71, which is the comparable story of the birth of Melchizedek, the narrative is in the third person and is included within a discourse.¹³ This consideration, it seems to me, effectively diminishes the argument based on first- or third-person style as determining whether the birth story was part of a book of Noah.¹⁴

It is still possible to maintain that the story of Noah's birth was not necessarily part of a book of Noah. After all, the story is either anonymous, as in 1Q19 (but that is probably due to the fragmentary state of 1Q19), or set in the mouth of Noah's father or grandfather. Later it even circulated separately, in Latin at least.¹⁵ In 1QapGen it is not included in the material following the

10. Dimant 1998 is extremely skeptical of the existence of a book of Noah, while gladly admitting the possible existence of "a more comprehensive Hebrew narrative midrash, written perhaps in a style similar to the Aramaic Genesis Apocryphon, which would have included at least some of the materials dealing with Noah, such as his miraculous birth" (146). Her difficulties lie in the specificity and singular nature of the document she posits to be implied by the title "Book of Noah." Hers is an overly rigid understanding of the latter term. A slightly later article making the same points in more detail is Werman 1999.

11. See Barthélemy and Milik 1955, 84–86 and 152.

12. For similar reasons, the fragmentary "third person" narrative of 1Q19 should not be taken too seriously.

13. Here I will not discuss Orlov's (2000b) proposal that the displacement of the birth story from Noah to Noah's nephew Melchizedek resulted from contention about the role of Noah. That view is worthy of detailed discussion elsewhere.

14. See Dimant 1998, 164; in 1QapGen 10:2, Noah is spoken of in the third person. It is interesting to compare the first-person Noah material in columns 5–6 with the first-person Enoch material in the preceding columns 2–3.

15. James 1893. He regards it as a fragment of a Latin version of the book of Enoch (146), while Milik doubts whether such an integral translation ever existed (1976, 80–81).

title “Book of the Words of Noah” but occurs in the Lamech material, three columns earlier. What that title in column 5 of the Genesis Apocryphon does is strengthen the probability of the existence of an ancient book of Noah, parts of which may occur in or have served as a source of the succeeding columns of 1QapGen. It does not make the inclusion of the birth story in such a book of Noah more likely.¹⁶

The usual response of those who would deny the significance of the title’s occurrence in ancient sources is to remark that some of the Enoch quotations in Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs are not drawn from any Enoch work we know and so are fabrications. Consequently, they infer, the mention of the title book of Noah in 1QapGen and Jubilees is equally likely to be the invention of the authors of these works. This argument is, of course, illogical. It is quite possible that the Enoch quotations in Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs were drawn from an Enoch work that has not survived.¹⁷ Moreover, and even more tellingly, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs is a later Christian document, probably from the second century C.E.¹⁸ Its practice in citation cannot be used either to discredit or to verify citations made in 1QapGen, which was written at least three centuries earlier and in very different circles.¹⁹ Instead, seeking comparable instances of citation in ancient sources, we should perhaps consider the quotations of Aramaic Levi Document itself and of Jubilees by the Damascus Document, which are genuine, though sometimes periphrastic.²⁰ This bears upon all the ancient references to a book of Noah that we will discuss later.

Milik does adduce quite a lot of evidence for knowledge of Enoch material in Latin. Lawlor 1897 argues that the Latin version is not a translation from 1 Enoch, but from a book of Noah (see 174–75, 224–25). I have not reached a definite conclusion on this point.

16. The birth of Noah, and in particular the later forms of the story, is discussed in the present volume by Aryeh Amihay, “Noah in Rabbinic Literature,” and Jeremy Penner, “Is 4Q534–536 Really about Noah?” Most recently, see also the discussion of later developments of this material by Orlov 2007, 371–75, 382.

17. See Lawlor 1897.

18. I accept M. de Jonge’s views on the date and origins of Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. These are set forth very lucidly and documented by Kugler 2001, 35–39. A full list of de Jonge’s numerous writings on the topic may be found in DiTommaso 2001, 919–75.

19. Fitzmyer would date the work most probably to the first century B.C.E., but, in fact, there is no evidence except that it is older than its manuscript, 1Q20. That manuscript is dated by paleography to the Herodian period. See Fitzmyer 2000.

20. See Greenfield 1988. In addition, the Damascus Document clearly refers to Jubilees (CD 16:3). Other Qumran texts also apparently refer to Jubilees or another work of the same title, with varying degrees of certainty: see 4Q228 f1i:4; 4Q270 f6ii:17; 4Q271 f4ii:5; and 4Q384 f9:2. On the question of “fake” citations, see also Kaufman 1932.

ARAMAIC LEVI DOCUMENT

In ALD 10:10 we read that the series of ritual commandments given by Isaac to Levi were taken from τῆς βιβλιοῦ τοῦ Νῶε περὶ τοῦ αἵματος, “Of the Book of Noah concerning the Blood.” Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel remarked on the ambiguity of this phrase, which might be read either as a title, “Of ‘The Book of Noah concerning the Blood,’” or as “of ‘The Book of Noah’ concerning the blood,” where the last words designate the subject of the book of Noah.²¹ Whichever interpretation is correct, this is the oldest explicit reference to the book of Noah, for ALD is to be dated to the third or very early second century B.C.E. at the latest.²² Although the phrase we have cited did not survive among the Qumran fragments of ALD, nor in the Genizah Aramaic folios, but only in an excerpt from a Greek translation, there is no reason to doubt its originality.²³ The Aramaic might have been כְּתָב נֹחַ (cf. 1QapGen

21. Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004, 180.

22. *Ibid.*, 19–20.

23. It does not seem that the ideas proposed by Kugler 2008 make any difference to this conclusion. His conclusions seem to go beyond the evidence he adduces, and a “Qumran” reading or recension of ALD cannot be taken as demonstrated, though of course it is possible. Indeed, in principle, each copyist of a work in fact produces an interpretation, and no text-form is identical to any other. An example of a systematic attempt to clarify such differences for one work is the research of Levison, 2000. Greenfield and I showed the existence of at least two recensions of ALD at Qumran on literary grounds in 1996, 43–45, 54–60. So it has a complex literary history, not more than some other works at Qumran, such as S (The Community Rule) and D (The Damascus Document). Kugler’s claim of a Qumran recension to serve sectarian purposes is unproven. The lack of a fragment from some anyway fragmentary witnesses does not show its deliberate composition and insertion in another witness as part of a sectarian recension. This is otherwise demonstrated only by a single variant between a first-person singular and a first-person plural. Kugler is correct that there were different text-forms, though strangely he does not relate his “Qumran” text-form to the different Qumran Aramaic recensions discerned on literary grounds. Instead, he argues on narrow grounds for a theory of Qumran retelling of ALD that is not implausible but that remains unproven. Even if he is right and such a retelling existed, we can, and should, still talk of ALD as a single work. The long and short recensions of Hebrew Jeremiah are just that. The work remains one work, and there is good reason to try to place its parts in some sort of order and not just to deconstruct them into discrete manuscripts. There are sixty-four manuscripts of the Armenian version of Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. They differ from one another, sometimes by the dynamic of copying and sometimes by deliberate recensional activity, with literary and ideological purposes. Are we then to say the work cannot be edited but must be published as sixty-four different compositions? Surely there are other ways of presenting the evidence. So Kugler’s article must be appreciated for raising our consciousness about recensional and tendentious readings of ancient documents, but regarding what happened at Qumran as different

5:29). It seems from ALD that this book of Noah contained all the teaching that ALD attributed to Isaac (i.e., 6:1–10:10) and that Isaac had received from Abraham. Abraham, in turn, so the story goes, drew it from the book of Noah. In 10:3 we read, “[f]or my father Abraham commanded me to do thus and to command my sons,” while in 10:10 we find: “[f]or thus my father Abraham commanded me, for thus he found in the writing of the [B]ook of Noah concerning the blood.”²⁴ The conclusion of Isaac’s teaching is found in 10:10. Next comes the blessing he pronounced in 10:11–14, which has its own beginning, “And now, beloved child...”

The detail, length, and tight structure of this passage of priestly teaching make it probable, in my view, that it comes from a source document, and the title of that source document is explicitly said to be “Book of Noah.” This teaching was also cited by Jubilees, as we shall see in the next paragraph.

Jubilees 21:1–10 records part of the priestly instruction given by Abraham to Isaac. This is another form of the priestly teaching given by Isaac to Levi, according to ALD.²⁵ In Jubilees, Abraham concludes the first part of this instruction with the words: “for so I have found written in the books of my forefathers (in the words of Enoch and the words of Noah).”²⁶ R. H. Charles remarks, “There was probably no ground for the statement made by our author.”²⁷ Yet, one wonders. It seems very likely that, since this chapter of Jubilees is dependent on ALD, the reference to “words of Noah” has been taken from there (ALD 10:10). The additional mention of Enoch is either an expansion of the information in ALD or else Jubilees knew a tradition that the words of Enoch were transmitted through Noah.²⁸

from what happened in other contexts of transmission seems to be unwarranted. At the very most, *non liquet*.

24. All citations from Aramaic Levi Document are drawn from the edition mentioned in note 21, above.

25. The relationship between these two passages will be explored in a subsequent study. Observe, however, that in *TLevi* 9:3, which is radically abridged in comparison with ALD, Isaac attributes part of the teaching to Abraham, without any reference to Noah. However, as has been noted above, *TLevi* is secondary to ALD. V. Hillel in the following chapter of the present volume discusses the Noachic fragments in 1 Enoch, and in her paper “Demonstrable Instances of the Use of Sources in the Pseudepigrapha” in Hempel (forthcoming), she addresses most recently the issue of the interrelations between ALD, Jubilees, and Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.

26. Sparks, 1984, 68.

27. Charles 1902, 134.

28. On this line of transmission of antediluvian knowledge through Noah to Abraham and Levi, see Stone 1999. See also Jub. 7:38–39, but no book is transmitted there. On transmission of Enochic material through Noah, see Orlov 2007, 119–31.

THE BOOK OF JUBILEES

The book of Jubilees was composed sometime in the first third of the second century B.C.E. We have a complete text of it in Ethiopic, fragments in Latin, and a substantial number of fragmentary copies from Qumran.²⁹ Jubilees 10:1–14 is a passage dealing with the demons that afflicted Noah’s children after the flood. Noah prayed to God for help (10:13), and God commanded an angel to teach Noah all the remedies against them (10:10).

10:12 And we explained to Noah all the remedies against their diseases, together with their seductions, and how to heal them with herbs. 10:13 And Noah wrote down everything in a book, as we instructed him about every kind of remedy; thus were the evil spirits kept from doing harm to Noah’s sons. 10:14 And he gave everything he had written to Shem, his eldest son; for he loved him most of all his sons.³⁰

This passage then relates that Noah wrote a book of remedies and transmitted it to his son Shem. A very similar passage was included in the medieval Jewish medical work *Sefer Asaf Harofe*,³¹ and it was translated into English

29. See introductory remarks in VanderKam 2000b.

30. Translation by Charles, revised by Rabin in Sparks 1984, 42. For 10:4, VanderKam, in his translation, reads, “He gave all the books that he had written to his older son Shem for he loved him much more than all his sons” (1989, 59). Betsy Halpern-Amaru observes in a personal communication that the Ethiopic in 10:13 has the singular “book,” while in 10:14 it has the plural. “It seems that there are multiple books and that in an ‘orderly’ way he kept different ‘books’ for the various traditions he would pass on” (letter of 7 April 2005). Yet, as she observed in a later communication, the textual basis for “books” is ambiguous, and VanderKam accepts Charles’s reading and does not read “books.” As for the plural, Halpern-Amaru points to the use of the plural in Jub. 45:16, where Jacob transmits “books” to Levi (letter of 11 April 2005). This latter reading does not seem to me to bear on the issue of the book(s) of Noah.

31. It was introduced into the scholarly discussion by Jellinek 1938, 3:xxx–xxxiii and text on 155. See general discussion in Lewis 1968, 12–14. Werman (1999) regards this as a separate source from Jub. 10:1–14, asserting that “the author of *Jubilees* used material from ... the Introduction of the Book of Asaph, but with changes” (172). Of course, since Jubilees antedates *Sefer Asaf Harofe* by more than a millennium, she must mean that the source used by *Sefer Asaf Harofe* was that used by Jubilees. In fact, Werman was far from the first to put forth this proposal; Charles had already done so in 1902, xlv; see also Himmelfarb 1994, 127. She points out that the story (without any mention of a book) was known to George Synkellos (128; Adler and Tuffin 2002, 36). This assertion demands that the issue of the transmission of the material found in *Sefer Asaf Harofe* be addressed energetically. A beginning of this labor has been made by Himmelfarb 1994.

by Martha Himmelfarb.³² The parallel to Jubilees in Sefer Asaf Harofe concludes:

יִכְתֹּב נֹחַ אֶת הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה עַל סֵפֶר וַיִּתְּנֶהוּ לְשֵׁם בְּנוֹ הַגָּדוֹל

And Noah wrote these things in a book and gave it to Shem, his oldest son.
(cf. Jub. 10:14)

Intriguingly, Sefer Asaf Harofe adds two further book of Noah references of its own in this passage. At the opening it reads: “This is the book of remedies that the ancient sages copied from the book of Shem son of Noah. It was transmitted to Noah on Mount Lubar of the mountains of Ararat after the flood.”³³ The mention of Mount Lubar is a distinctive tradition, and this name of “one of the mountains of Ararat” only occurs elsewhere in ancient Jewish literature in Jubilees and 4QpseudoDaniel^b. It is mentioned in the Byzantine Chronography of George Synkellos as the place of Noah’s burial (cf. Jub. 10:15).³⁴ It is not mentioned in Jub. 10:1–14, which is the pericope to which Sefer Asaf Harofe is parallel. However, it does occur in the next pericope in Jubilees, where it is the site not of revelation of the book of Noah but of some other incidents. This leads us toward the conclusion that Sefer Asaf Harofe was familiar with more of Jubilees-allied traditions than the “medical” passage it is quoting.³⁵ The second reference to a book of Noah in Sefer Asaf Harofe is found in the continuation of the passage quoted above, where the transmis-

32. Himmelfarb 1994, 129–30 published the first English translation of this passage. On pages 130–31 she clearly assumes that the material in Sefer Asaf Harofe draws on a Hebrew source of Jubilees that has been tailored to fit the interests of the author of Sefer Asaf Harofe.

33. זה ספר הרפואות אשר העתיקו חכמים הראשונים מספר שם בן נוח אשר נמסר לנח בלובר ההר מהררי אררט אחרי המבול (Jellinek 1938, 3:155). Here I have departed from Himmelfarb’s translation. It is to be noted that Mount Lubar is mentioned in the verse following this passage in Jub. 10:15, in connection with Noah’s burial. It is also mentioned in Jub. 5:28, 7:1, and 7:15 and further in 1QapGen 12:13 and 4Q244 f8:3 (4Qpseudo-Daniel^b), also apparently in connection with Noah. On Mount Lubar, with a possible etymology, see Steiner 1991.

34. On which, apparently, Synkellos draws; see Adler and Tuffin 2002, 63.

35. See above. As already noted, it is conceivable that both Jubilees and Sefer Asaf Harofe are dependent on a third document. Himmelfarb (1994, 127–36) argues vigorously in support of this view. Another interesting analysis of this passage in the context of *hekhalot* and magical texts may be found in Swartz 1994, 225–26. The question of the origin and date of Sefer Asaf Harofe is debated, but apparently it comes from soon after the middle of the first millennium C.E. See Muntner 2007. A detailed study is Aviv Melzer’s doctoral thesis of 1972. On the date, see 34–57.

sion of the book is traced down to Galenus.³⁶ The reference to a Noachic book in Jub. 10:14, therefore, is accompanied by a medical/demonic explanation of the human state, which also occurs either in a derived form or drawn from a similar source, in the much later Sefer Asaf Harofe.

THE SIMILITUDES OF ENOCH

Similitudes (Parables) of Enoch is the least readily dated and located of the parts of 1 Enoch.³⁷ However, it seems to have been written about the turn of the era or a little later. Similitudes of Enoch (1 Enoch) 68:1 sets the following words in Noah's mouth: "And after this my great-grandfather Enoch gave me the explanation of all the secrets in a book and the parables that had been given to him, and he put them together for me in the words of the book of the Parables (Similitudes)." This statement, coming toward the end of the Similitudes of Enoch, is apparently intended to give it authority. It is intriguing that it occurs in this particular position. The surrounding text has been characterized as Noachic, a claim that will be discussed elsewhere.³⁸ I find myself uncertain about the relationship between this Noachic text and the Enochic context. Whether the surrounding text is Noachic or not, indubitably this particular claim was set in Noah's mouth, who alone could have said "my great-grandfather Enoch." Noah claims that Enoch gave him explanation of all the secrets in a book.³⁹ Thus the expression in Jub. 21:10 is not unparalleled, and the idea was current that Enoch and Noah both had and transmitted books that were connected with one another.⁴⁰

TABULA GENTIUM

In recent years James M. Scott has drawn attention to the *tabula gentium*, the division of the earth among Noah's three sons in Gen 10.⁴¹ This passage

36. Some further references to the book of Noah in medieval literature will be discussed in the appendix below.

37. On the date of Similitudes, see most recently Boccaccini 2007.

38. See Hillel in this volume, 27–45.

39. This line of transmission is mentioned in Jub. 7:38. 1 En. 108:1 speaks of a book Enoch wrote for Methuselah and all who would come after him.

40. These issues were dealt with in a broader context in Stone 1999, especially 138–40. That paper was concerned primarily with the role of Noah as transmitter of antediluvian knowledge. On similar transmission in later sources, see the discussion of Jub. 21:10 above. An early, perceptive, and learned discussion of the Noachic material in 1 Enoch is Schmidt 1926. He discusses 1 En. 68:1 on pp. 122–23.

41. Scott 1997b.

was extensively developed in Jub. 8:10–9:15, apparently in the fragmentary column 12 of 1QapGen, and further elaborated in later sources.⁴² Scott correctly points out that, according to Jubilees, this division was inscribed in a book, as Jub. 8:11 says, “When he summoned his children, they came to him—they and their children. He divided the earth into the lots that his three sons would occupy. They reached out their hands and took the book from the bosom of their father Noah.”⁴³ Scott makes the following points concerning this passage. First, the explicit mention of a book in Jub. 8:11 (and, I venture to add, 8:12) means that the division of the earth was included in a “book of Noah.”⁴⁴ Second, such a book of Noah is distinct from books of Noah on other topics.⁴⁵ He also observes that the division of the earth was the subject of the fragmentary 1QapGen columns 16–17, which confirms the antiquity of this material. Moreover, Gen 10 is already found to have influenced 1QapGen 12:10–12, although it is in tension with it at a number of points.⁴⁶

The above are all the uses of the title “Book of Noah” or explicit references to such a book in Jewish literature from the Second Temple period.⁴⁷ The question remains to be discussed whether these references are fabricated in order to add a patina of authority to the works citing them or whether they indeed refer to an ancient document(s) that actually existed. As I have said, I prefer to assess the use of the titles separately rather than to deal with the titles together with various unattributed literary pieces that scholars have assigned to Noah.

From the analysis above, it emerges that there are four substantial pieces of unique text that ancient documents attribute explicitly to a book of Noah. These are: (1) the extensive material in 1QapGen 5:29–17;⁴⁸ (2) the cultic material attributed to the book of Noah in ALD 6:1–10:10 and the text that is

42. E.g., Stone 1981, 271–77; and works cited by Scott 1997b, 370 n. 8; Charles 1902, 68. See also Eshel 2007.

43. Jub. 8:12 continues, “In the book there emerged as Shem’s lot...” (VanderKam 1989, 52).

44. Scott thus advances García Martínez’s argument considerably; see Scott 1997b, 269–70.

45. *Ibid.*, 370.

46. *Ibid.*, 371–72. The *tabula gentium* material entered Midrash Aggadah associated with R. Moses the Preacher and is discussed by Himmelfarb 1994, 121–23. It was also used in the Ethiopic tradition; see Cowley 1988, 31–33.

47. I have also included a discussion of Jub. 8:11–12, in which an untitled book by Noah is mentioned.

48. The material in cols. 2–5 of 1QapGen is not presented there as part of a book of Noah.

most probably derived from it in Jub. 21;⁴⁹ (3) the magico-medical material that Noah wrote in a book, according to Jub. 10:1–14, which material and attribution are also found in Sefer Asaf Harofe; and (4) the *tabula gentium* that Noah is said to have written in a book (Jub. 10:11–12). First Enoch 68:1, which seems to be part of a subscription to the Similitudes of Enoch, raises issues about the relationship between Enoch and Noah and is problematic and thus best left out of the present discussion.

One of the most vigorous opponents of the existence of a book of Noah has been Devorah Dimant.⁵⁰ I shall discuss her arguments in detail, not because they are better or worse than those of others, but because they are typical. Dimant surveys the references to Noachic books in Jub. 10:21 (surely an error for 10:13), 21:10 and T. Levi 2:3 (Greek). (I assume that by this last reference she intends ALD 10:10; old section 57.)⁵¹ She asserts that “fictional postulation of such works in pseudepigraphic and legendary writings cannot be taken as historical evidence, unless there exists reliable, independent confirmation.”⁵² I find this assertion to be bizarre. Why should citations that are explicitly said to be drawn from a Noachic document, and each of which is associated with a very distinct body of material, be regarded *ab initio* as “fictional postulations”? Dimant offers no reason except that the references are made in “pseudepigraphic and legendary writings.” Indeed, she does not adduce the strongest argument of which I know, namely, the existence of unidentifiable Enoch citations in Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. This has been taken (albeit unjustifiably, in my view) to throw doubt on all quotations in ancient sources. As I have shown above, this argument itself is not

49. Above I have dealt with the additional attribution to Enoch found in Jub. 10:21. See also the paper by C. Werman referred to in n. 8 above.

50. See above, n. 10.

51. Testament of Levi refers to a “book of Enoch” twice, in 10:5 and 16:1, but nowhere to a book of Noah. Following T. Levi 2:3 in one manuscript is a Greek expansion that is actually part of ALD, but it does not contain the reference to a book of Noah either. That occurs in the long passage following T. Levi 18:2 in the same Greek manuscript of Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. So, I am forced to assume that Dimant is confused here. In addition, on pages 144–45, Dimant enumerates passages that have commonly been assumed to derive from a book of Enoch. I forbear to treat this part of her argument.

52. Dimant 1998, 145. I suspect that L. Schiffman would hold a similar view. Compare his article on pseudigrapha (2004), where his “book” in ALD 13:4 is the result of a misunderstanding; see Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel 2004, 206. In general, the instances I am discussing in this article are more complex than his categories would suggest. The mysterious “writing” mentioned (if the editors are correct) in 4Q243 is unclear. See the discussion in DiTommaso 2005, 128–29. His connection of this writing with Adam’s testament is speculative, but it does not seem to have been Noachic either.

convincing.⁵³ Indeed, I maintain that a citation formula, title, or subscription that is associated with a substantial and distinct block of text has a good claim to be considered genuine, unless the work in which it occurs is rife with obviously forged citations. This is not the case in Jubilees, which mentions only books of Enoch and Noah, except for Jubilees itself in the superscription and books of Jacob in the subscription. 1QapGen mentions the book of Enoch twice on column 20, and these two mentions, in addition to the reference to the book of Noah, are its only surviving references to books. Thus the burden of proof falls on scholars who would deny the authenticity of the book of Noah titles and sections a priori, not on those who would assert it.⁵⁴

The second argument adduced by Dimant is that the fragments of the book of Noah “diverge in form and detail” and are “of diverse character.” This case is made not just on the basis of the titled passages but also on the basis of other unascribed passages that scholars have attributed to a book of Noah.⁵⁵ Yet, it seems to me that, even should we group the titled and untitled passages together, this consideration is not convincing. On the one hand, there is no need for there to have been only one Noachic book (or “booklet”). Second, and more telling, we have not a few works from antiquity that contain material of very diverse character. Suffice it, perhaps, to mention the Book of the Watchers in 1 Enoch. If, for example, we had only fragments of chapters 1, 3, 7, 22, and so on of the Book of the Watchers, would we not be able to make Dimant’s argument about their divergence in form and detail and their diversity of character and infer that they do not derive from the same document?

It is my conclusion, therefore, that unless contrary evidence emerges, the titles discussed above do designate an ancient literary work (or works) that has not survived in full but that is being cited. This being the case, in a future study I hope to discuss the relationship of fragments attributed by scholars to a Noachic work to these assured Noachic fragments. A final remark should be made on the Noachic document(s). It was a very old work, of the third century B.C.E. at least, and perhaps older. It fell out of use early, it seems,⁵⁶ and for

53. The title “Book of the Words of Noah” in 1QapGen was unknown to Dimant, for it was deciphered after she wrote her article, but the instance in 1QapGen is no different from those she rejects.

54. The case might be different were these merely passing references. However, in these major, ancient instances, a block of textual material, distinct from its context, follows the reference to the book of Noah.

55. See the similar remarks in Fletcher-Louis 2002, 36.

56. 1Q19, which is preserved in a first-century manuscript, is a Noah birth story, with much in common with 1QapGen 2–3 and 1 En. 106–07, as I have observed. The title “Livre de Noé” was given by the first editors. I shall discuss this story in a future study, but it is not, in my view, necessarily or even particularly probably drawn from a book of Noah.

that reason survives only in these citations. It also seems to have fallen more or less completely out of the memory of the fathers of the church, though a couple of possible references to it survive.⁵⁷ In later Jewish traditions, a book of Noah is mentioned in a number of sources, as well as in medieval and subsequent Christian traditions. Of these mentions, many are later inventions.⁵⁸

If the argument proposed here is accepted as a point of departure, further study is required in order to clarify the contents and character of the book of Noah, as far as is possible. As indicated above, the literary fragments that scholars have attributed to a Noachic source must be investigated anew, and the corpus of texts relating to the birth of Noah should be considered once more. Issues of considerable importance cannot yet be determined. These include the relationship between both the figures and the writings of Enoch and Noah. This is still unclear and will remain so until the literary issues surrounding the book of Noah have been resolved. It is possible that different traditions of learning are here involved, and it is possible that the Noah material was taken over by the Enochic material. If that is the case, and if such a development has a sociological correlative, the question of why remains to be addressed. It may never be answered fully, but even to pose the question is significant for understanding the early development of postexilic Judaism.

Some similar problems with the figure of Noah occur in later sources, particularly in 2 Enoch, and the replacement of Noah in the birth story by Melchizedek is most striking⁵⁹—and it is not the only case. Therefore, it will be necessary also to examine traditions about Noah and later Jewish and Christian retellings of the Noah story, which may preserve elements of old Noah traditions.

For the moment, the modest aim of this paper has, I believe, been achieved. It seems to me more than likely that a book or books of Noah existed in the third century B.C.E. or earlier. Some material drawn from this document is preserved in ALD, Jubilees, and the Genesis Apocryphon.

57. However, see below, in the last section.

58. Fabricius 1713, 240–77; Migne 1856, cols. 640–49. See Schmidt 1926, 113, who discusses many of the references. Compare Stone 1982a, 88–103.

59. See Orlov, cited in n. 13 above. He tends, however, to see polemic and confrontation between traditions in very many instances. This often involves thinking of a single paradigm against which various groups react, while the actual socioreligious reality might have been more complex. His work, however, is very perceptive and stimulates innovative ways of thinking about tradition development.

APPENDIX: SOME LATER INSTANCES OF “BOOK OF NOAH”

In this appendix I give some preliminary information on certain significant medieval sources relating the existence of a book of Noah. These sources do not have any weight in answering the question whether a book of Noah existed in the early postexilic period. They can only illustrate how the medieval Noah traditions developed. The idea of a book of Noah was not foreign to medieval Jews, Samaritans, and Christians. I do not intend the appendix to be exhaustive but to indicate the riches that may be drawn from later traditions.

SEFER HARAZIM AND SEFER RAZIEL

Sefer Harazim is a work of magical character dated to the first millennium C.E., probably toward the middle of that millennium. It has survived in fragments from the Genizah and was published with many variants by Mordechai Margalioṭ in 1966. An English translation was prepared by Michael Morgan and published in 1983. At the start of this work we read:

זה ספר מספרי הרזים שנתן לנוח בן למך בן מתושלח בן חנוך בן ירד בן מהללאל בן קינן בן אנוש בן שת בן אדם, מפי רזיאל המלאך בשנת ביאתו לתיבה לפני בניסתו. ויכתבהו באבן ספיר באר היטב וממנו למד מעשה פלאים ורזי דעת

This is a book of the books of mysteries that was given to Noah, son of Lemech, son of Methuselah, son of Enoch, son of Jared, son of Mehalalel, son of Kenan, son of Enosh, son of Seth, son of Adam, from the mouth of the angel Raziel in the year in which he came to the ark, before entering (it). And he wrote it on sapphire stone very clearly, and from it he learned wonderful acts and secrets of knowledge [etc].

Noah’s role as transmitter of a book of primordial knowledge is clear here,⁶⁰ and he is the one who records the secret knowledge, dictated by the angel Raziel, whose name means “secret of God.”⁶¹ This is the most prominent chain

60. In *Pirque de Rabbi Eliezer* ch. 8 (Jerusalem: Eshkol, [n.d.]), [24]–[26], which is translated in Friedlander 1981, 52–54), a similar genealogy is given for the transmission of “the principle of intercalation” (called in Hebrew סוד העבור “the secret of intercalation”).

61. There are many variants to the text of Sefer Harazim. The chief one, noted by Margalioṭ on p. 113, reads: “This is a book of secrets of knowledge that was revealed to Adam from the mouth of the Angel Raziel in the three hundredth year of the life of Jared, son of Mahalalel, son of Kenan, son of Enosh, son of Seth, son of Adam.” Intriguingly, this genealogy stops in the generation before Enoch. Margalioṭ, however, considers this variant to be secondary; see his note on p. 65. The text was published earlier by Jellinek 1938, 3:159, drawn from Sefer Raziel; see *ibid.*, 3:xxxii.

of tradition to be found in Jewish magical literature.⁶² Michael Swartz has contrasted it with the chain of tradition of the *hekhalot* books, which starts with Moses.⁶³ Intriguingly, he points out that the Moses tradition is also connected with healing, and he has also explored its relationship with *Sefer Harazim* (pp. 28–29). Of course, all this is not evidence for the existence of an ancient book of Noah. I adduce it to illustrate how the Noah traditions developed. The role played by the material from Jubilees or allied with Jubilees in the crystallization of this specific Noachic material in *Sefer Harazim* and *Sefer Raziel* is most significant.

The same angelic name, Raziel, is set on a book that Jellinek cited in his presentation of the book of Noah.⁶⁴ This is a later work, published in Amsterdam in 1701. Margaliot verified the Amsterdam edition against the manuscript and confirmed Jellinek's reading in *Beth Hamidrash*.⁶⁵ The passage cited by Jellinek is quite long and contains much interesting material. The book was revealed by the angel Raziel to Adam, following his prayer of repentance upon his expulsion from Eden.⁶⁶ The book contained secrets of the future and nature and the course of history. The text continues:

And the angel Raziel opened the book and read it to Adam. And it came to pass when he heard the words of this holy book from the mouth of the angel Raziel, he fell upon his face trembling. And he said, "Adam, rise and be strong. Do not fear and be not in awe! Take this book from my hands, and be preserved through it, from it you shall have knowledge and understanding. And make it known to everyone who is worthy of it and it will be his portion."

[21] At the time when Adam took this book, fire burned on the bank of the river, and the angel ascended to heaven in a fiery flame. Then Adam realised and knew that he was an angel of God and that this book was sent from the presence the Holy King. And he kept it in pure sanctity.

And after four generations Enoch, son of Jared, arose and had understanding in the awe of God and conducted himself in purity. He used to wash and sanctify himself in living water (fresh water) and beseech the Creator of all. And in a dream, the place where the book was hidden was revealed, how it was to be handled⁶⁷ and what its function was and its pure sanctity. And he arose early and went to a cave and delayed until midday and through

62. Swartz 1994, 212–17.

63. *Ibid.*, section 2.

64. In fact, in an early printing, *Sefer Harazim* is called "Book of Noah"; see Margaliot 1966, 59–60. See further Blau 1906.

65. See Margaliot 1966, 65 n. 1.

66. Jellinek 1938, 156–67.

67. *Ibid.*, 158.

the sun's power his soul came there, so that the local people should not perceive [יבינו] him. He besought God Blessed be He and ascended (to heaven) in purity and held to the pure Name. And when he understood it, his eyes enlightened all his ways, and he conducted himself through it and continued until he became like the holy ones on high and he was separated from the inhabitants of the earth and was not, for God took him.

For through this book he instructed and gave knowledge of the orbits and the constellations and all the luminaries that serve for each month, and the names by which each orbit is called, and the angels that serve in the four seasons of the year, and he learned the names of the earth and the names of the heaven and also the names of sun and moon. And he continued to honour it with all his might and he learned all wisdom, more than Adam the first man, and he learned that all the generations that came after him did not have strength to withstand it, for it is mighty and glorious. And he hid it until Noah, son of Lamech, arose, a completely righteous man [צדיק תמים] in his generations. And in the 500th year of his life the earth was corrupted by the violent action of the generations and all flesh corrupted their way upon the earth and the cry of the earth rose up to heaven before the throne of glory of the Holy One Blessed be He, and Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord.

And then Raphael, the holy archangel [שר] was sent to him and he said to him, "I was sent through/by the word of God to you to heal the earth and to make known what will be and what (a man) should do and escape." Then he gave him this holy book and taught him how to handle it and what its function was, and what was the sanctity of its purity.

And he said to him, "Hear the word of the Lord. Since you were found to be a perfectly righteous man in your generations, behold, I have given you this holy book and I have made known to you all its secrets and mysteries, to do it in sanctity and purity and modesty and humility, and from it you shall learn to make (an ark) of gopher wood. And you shall enter, you and your sons and your wife and the wives of your sons, to hide for a short time, until the wrath shall pass." And Noah took the book from the hand of Raphael the holy archangel [שר], and when he learned in it the letters that were engraved, the spirit of the Lord rested upon him and he made the ark by length and width with the knowledge that he learned through this holy Name [...].

Then Noah, son of Lamech, hid it before he came into the ark [...]. Then he opened his mouth with the spirit of wisdom and understanding and he blessed the Lord God, the great, mighty and awesome king.⁶⁸

The text continues to relate the transmission of the book to Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Levi, Moses, Aaron, Phinehas, and all the generations. So here we have a legend of a book of Noah, revealed to Adam and transmitted

68. Ibid., 156–58.

to Enoch, to Noah, and then to Levi and through him to the priestly line. It contains many points of interest for the student of Second Temple period texts, and its full exegesis must await a future study. The sources used by *Sefer Raziel*, however, are much more extensive than those preserved in *Sefer Harazim*. Particularly striking is the section on Enoch as well as the transmission from Noah through Abraham to Levi and his sons. The text gives no extracts from the Noachic book but indicates that it is a repository of secret knowledge, including the divine Name by which Noah built the ark. Because of the etymology of Raphael, the connection of Raphael with the revelation of the book to Noah evokes the section from *Jub. 10* and its parallel in *Sefer Asaf Harofe*, even though this angel is not mentioned in the latter work.

THE BOOK OF ASAṬIR

In the medieval Samaritan history entitled *The Book of Asaṭir*, we read in chapter 3:

And Noah sat in Adam's place after Adam's death. In the seventh year (of his life or after Adam's death?) he learned three books of the covenant: the Book of the Signs, the Book of the Constellations and the Book of the Wars, this is the Book of the Generations of Adam.⁶⁹

The work is discussed by J. T. Milik, who sees in the reference to the Book of the Signs (ספר האותות) a possible hint that Adam created the true calendar.⁷⁰ He would interpret the three Noachic books to be related to Enochic writings: “we can recognize in these without much difficulty the earliest compositions attributed to Enoch: the sacred calendars ... the astronomical treatise (1 En. 72–82) and the Vision of Enoch (1 En. 6–19).”⁷¹ I do not find Milik's identifications convincing, the less so since *Asaṭir* relates the three works to Noah and *not* to Enoch. It is intriguing, however, that here once more we have books associated with Noah in a medieval tradition.⁷²

69. The Aramaic text with a Hebrew translation is given by Ben-Ḥayyim 1943; 1944.

70. Milik 1976, 64–65.

71. *Ibid.*, 67–68.

72. Moreover, Milik is surely correct in finding the association of the Book of Signs with Enoch to be significant. I take exception only to his specific identification of the three books that Noah learned with specific parts of 1 Enoch.

OTHER REFERENCES

Hugh J. Lawlor points out that Tertullian, in *De cultu feminarum* 3, apparently knew of no work he regarded as Noachic.⁷³ On the other hand, “Augustine, speaking of Enoch and Noah in *City of God* 18.38,” says that the only reason their writings are not canonical is their excessive antiquity. The Zohar, Berešit, 1.37b and 55b refers to a book of secrets revealed by the angel Raziel to Adam, who transmitted it, via Seth, to Enoch. Noah does not figure in this transmission.

73. Lawlor 1897, 179–80.

This essay was published in *Noah and His Book(s)*, edited by Michael E. Stone, Aryeh Amihay, and Vered Hillel, copyright © 2010 by the Society of Biblical Literature. To purchase copies of this book, call 877-725-3334 [toll-free in North America] or 802-864-6185, fax 802-864-7626, or visit the SBL Store at www.sbl-site.org.