

iers, Epiphanius, Jerome, Rufinus, and Augustine of Hippo all suggest a direct knowledge of the Enoch texts (1 *Enoch*). Whether some of them also occasionally had knowledge of 2 *Enoch* (Origen?) cannot be said with certainty. In the chronographic tradition, extracts and paraphrases of 1 *Enoch* have been found which offer important details about its Gk. translation; this applies to Pandorus and Annianus of Alexandria (4th cent.) as well, George Syncellus (9th cent.), George Cedrenus (12th cent.), and Michael of Syria (12th cent.). Also, a reference to the Jewish Enoch tradition can be shown in a whole series of Gnostic texts, such as, for example, the *Apocryphon of John*, the *Pistis Sophia*, the *Acts of Thomas*, and others.

The Enoch books experienced a special form of reception in Manichaeism (Peters). The founder of the sect, Mani (216–276/77 CE), grew up presumably in the Jewish-Christian milieu of a Syrian baptismal sect. His teaching spread in the East as far as China and had considerable influence well into the 15th century. Not only are there numerous references to the Enoch literature in the Manichaean texts, but, importantly, they have preserved the “Book of the Giants,” which had already been mentioned at Qumran. The entire setting of angelology and the subject matter of judgment from 1/2 *Enoch* forms an integral component of Manichaean religion.

At present, the books of Enoch do not play any discernible role in Christian piety (apart from the Ethiopian church). Only religious denominations such as the Mormons, or various groups among new Christian movements, refer to them in a positive way. The “rediscovery” of the books of Enoch, first in the 19th century and then again after the discoveries at Qumran in the mid-20th century, occurred mostly in the context of biblical studies.

**Bibliography:** ■ Barker, M., *The Lost Prophet: The Book of Enoch and Its Influence on Christianity* (London 1988). ■ Berger, K., “Henoch,” RAC 14 (Stuttgart 1988) 474–545. ■ Böttrich, C., “Konturen des Menschensohnes in äthHen 37–71,” in *Gottessohn und Menschensohn: Exegetische Studien zu zwei Paradigmen biblischer Intertextualität* (ed. D. Sänger; BThSt 67; Neukirchen-Vluyn 2004) 53–90. ■ Böttrich, C., *The “Book of the Secrets of Enoch” (2En): Between Jewish Origin and Christian Transmission. An Overview in New Perspectives on 2Enoch. No longer Slavonic Only* (ed. A. Orlov /G.Boccaccini, Leiden/Boston, Mass. 2012) 37–67. ■ Heiligenthal, R., *Zwischen Henoch und Paulus: Studien zum theologiegeschichtlichen Ort des Judasbriefes* (TANZ 6; Tübingen 1992). ■ Nickelsburg, G. W. E., *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36, 81–108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, Minn. 2001). [Esp. 82–108] ■ Peters, U., *Wie der biblische Prophet Henoch zum Buddha wurde: Die jüdische Henochtradition als frühes Beispiel interkultureller und interreligiöser Vermittlung zwischen Ost und West* (ShtTSt 5; Sinzig 1989). ■ Reeves, J. C. E. (ed.), “Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library,” in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (SBLEJL 6; Atlanta, Ga. 1994) 173–203.

Christfried Böttrich

## Enosh

- I. Hebrew Bible/Old Testament
- II. Judaism

### I. Hebrew Bible/Old Testament

According to Gen 4:26 and 5:6–11, Enosh (Heb. *ʿĒnōš*; LXX Ενωϋ) lived 905 years and was the son of Seth and father of Kenan. He was the third generation of humankind. According to Gen 4:26, it was during Enosh’s lifetime that people “began to invoke YHWH by name.” Enosh is briefly mentioned in the genealogy of 1 Chr 1:1.

Two etymologies have been suggested for the name Enosh. The first, appearing as early as the time of Philo, has been “humanity” (Philo, *Abr.* 7–8 [LCL] 6.8–9; also see HALOT: 70; BDB: 60); the second, as early as the time of Jerome, has been “weak,” “incurable,” or “frail” (from Heb. *ʾānāš*; Jerome, *Liber de nominibus Hebraicis, De Genesi*, also see Akk. *enšum* [CAD 4:166–67]; Maass: 345). Some suggest that the name Enosh is a double entendre, communicating the “frail and mortal” condition of “humanity” (e.g., Keil/Delitzsch: 119).

The statement “it was then that [people] began to invoke YHWH by name” (Heb. *ʾāz hāhāl liqrōʾ bēšēm YHWH*) has received much scholarly attention. It may refer to the “invocation” of YHWH’s name (e.g., Cassuto: 247; Keil/Delitzsch: 120), a more general YHWH worship (e.g., Gunkel: 54; Brongers: 12; see Gen 12:8; 13:4; 26:25; 21:33; etc.), or even an all-encompassing non-YHWH worship (e.g., Westermann: 340). The statement may seem at odds with both Gen 4:3–4, which describes an earlier occurrence of YHWH worship, and Exod 3 and 6, which equate the beginning of YHWH worship with Moses (see Sandmel: 29), though some scholars see no contradiction (e.g., Westermann: 339).

In 1828, Buttman argued that the Cainite and Sethite genealogies of Gen 4 and 5 were essentially duplicates of each other (170–72). Buttman suggested that Adam (“man”) originally began the Cainite genealogy and Enosh (“man”) began the Sethite one (see Hallo/Simpson: 32). Buttman’s theory was bolstered by Robert Wilson, who argued that tribal genealogies are “fluid” by nature and can exist in multiple forms (158–66). Yet, Wilson is himself cautious about the Adam-Enosh interchange, noting that “there is no indication of this... in the present text” (162 n. 63).

**Bibliography:** ■ Brongers, H. A., “Die Wendung *bēšēm jhwh* im Alten Testament,” ZAW 77 (1965) 1–20. ■ Buttman, P., *Mythologus* (Berlin 1828). ■ Cassuto, U., *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*, 2 vols. (Jerusalem 1964). ■ Gunkel, H., *Genesis* (trans. M. E. Biddle; Macon, Ga. 1997). ■ Hallo, W. H./W. K. Simpson, *The Ancient Near East* (New York 1971). ■ Keil, C. F./F. Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament*, vol. 1 (trans. J. Martin; Grand Rapids, Mich. 1989). ■ Maass, F., “*enōsh*,” TDOT 1 (Grand Rapids, Mich. 1975) 345–48. ■ Sandmel, S., “Genesis 4:26b,” HUCA 32 (1961) 19–29. ■ Westermann, C., *Genesis 1–11* (trans. J. J. Scullion;

Minneapolis, Minn. 1984). ■ Wilson, R. R., *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World* (New Haven, Conn. 1977).

David Moster

## II. Judaism

The passive verb *hûhal*, following Enosh's naming in Gen 4:26b, has generated much exegetical interest and a variety of interpretations, largely due to its awkward syntax. What was begun (what kind of worship) and by whom (Enosh or his contemporaries)? Is this understood as an explanation of Enosh's name, as we see with the naming of Seth, his father, in Gen 4:25? The ancient versions and translations further complicate matters by either reflecting a slightly different Heb. text, or reading what was to become the MT differently, so as to render the passive verb of Gen 4:26b active, and taking Enosh as its subject. This is most significantly the case in the LXX's rendering: "He hoped [as if Heb. *hûhal* were *hûhil/hûhl*, from the Heb. root *y-h-l*] to invoke the name of the Lord God." This becomes the basis of interpretation by Greek-writing Jews and early Christians, e.g., Philo of Alexandria's interpretation of Enosh as exemplifying the virtue of hope. Other Second Temple period texts (e.g., Sirach and *Jubilees*) include Enosh among the earliest righteous descendants of Adam, without saying much about him in particular.

Rabbinic interpretations of Gen 4:26b, beginning with our earliest rabbinic ("tannaitic") collections and Aram. translations (*targumim*), take the half-verse to refer not so much to Enosh's own behavior, as to that of the "generation of Enosh," which is claimed to have introduced idolatry ("false/alien worship") as a widespread practice, effectively the converse of the verse's seemingly plain meaning (the origins of true divine worship). This is accomplished either by understanding the biblical words to contain an ellipsis: "Then was begun the calling [of false gods] by the name of the Lord"; or by understanding the passive verb *hûhal* to mean "was profaned" (the same root, *h-l-l*): "Then was profaned the calling upon the name of the Lord." Early rabbinic texts associate a mini-flood of one-third of the world with the generation of Enosh, understood as divine punishment for their idolatrous ways. While later rabbinic traditions occasionally attribute idolatrous practices to Enosh himself, rabbinic interpretation is rarely interested in Enosh the individual, but is frequently interested in his generation as marking the first of a series of steep declines in humankind's behavior between Adam and Abraham.

**Bibliography:** ■ Fraade, S. D., *Enosh and His Generation: Pre-Israelite Hero and History in Postbiblical Interpretation* (Chico, Calif. 1984). ■ Ginzberg, L., *The Legends of the Jews*, vol. 5 (Philadelphia, Pa. 1925). [Esp. 151–52]

Steven D. Fraade

## Enrollment

→ Census

## Ensor, James

The Belgian painter James Sydney Edward Ensor (1860–1949) was known as an artist who used christological imagery. Modern artists, including Ensor, have more than once expressed the lack of public appraisal they had to endure as creative artists, together with their own feelings of alienation and suffering, by referring to the figure of Jesus Christ. In 1887, Ensor exhibited a group of enormous drawings in which Jesus figures, with the title *Les auréoles ou les sensibilité de la lumière* (Hoozee/Heijbroek). In this exhibit, Ensor did not act as a biblical storyteller, but rather as a visionary, inspired by the *chiaroscuro* of the much-admired Rembrandt. "They are not subjects, they are effects of light," Ensor explained (Hoozee/Heijbroek: 61). The drawings caused a big scandal in Brussels and Ensor reacted with a huge canvas (256 x 378 cm) entitled *Christ's Entry into Brussels in 1889* (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, Calif.; see → plate 13) (Swinbourne). His starting point was one of the "scandalous" drawings, *La vie et Rayonnante: L'entrée a Jerusalem* (Life and Radiating: Entry in Jerusalem). Ensor replaced Jerusalem with Brussels as an accusation against his Brussels public, and by implication put himself in the role of Jesus, who has to suffer.

In the middle of his big canvas he placed Jesus, recognizable by his halo, riding on a donkey surrounded by an enormous crowd. In front of him marches a fanfare as a sort of mocking bird. The crowd, representing the society as a whole, includes caricatured heads, some of which are wearing grotesque masques. They all march under the banner "Vive la Sociale," meaning "Long live the Welfare State."

Ensor expressed his feelings and those of other modern artists in his manifesto-like *Entry* as Gustave Courbet had done earlier in his huge allegorical portrait of his artistic life (1855; Musée d'Orsay, Paris). Courbet also alluded to Jesus in his visual citations. But in contrast to Courbet's painting, Ensor used a burlesque style for his *Entry*, based on the traditional Flemish carnival parades, mixing past and present. Jesus figures here as the modern, misunderstood artist who has not yet entered the Welfare State, as the banner promises. Ensor kept the painting in his house until 1929 when it was exhibited for the first time.

James Ensor and his artist friends had established the Society of *Les Vingt*, a group of 20 modern artists who exhibited together and invited avant-garde artists from other countries, especially France, to join them. Founded in 1884 in Brussels, the Society was one of the most important initia-