


Enoch's Vision of the Heavenly Temple (*1 En.* 14:8–25) Reconsidered

Mirjam Judith Bokhorst

University of Halle-Wittenberg

mirjam.bokhorst@theologie.uni-halle.de

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8166-472X>

ABSTRACT: The paper focuses on a reexamination and reassessment of the textual evidence of Enoch's Vision of the Heavenly Temple and of its classical interpretation as a heavenly temple complex. In line with the common scholarly opinion, *1 En.* 14:8–25 has so far been interpreted in the sense of a bipartite or even tripartite temple which resembles the earthly temple in Jerusalem not only in structure but also in appearance. In contrast, this paper claims that this passage of the *Book of the Watchers* provides a twofold vision of two different temples, namely the inferior earthly temple and the ideal heavenly sanctuary. In this way, it articulates one of the most radical temple critiques of ancient Judaism. This interpretation is based on a careful textual analysis and a meticulous discussion of the individual elements of, in particular, the first house, taking into account other ancient Jewish sources such as *Ezekiel*, *Haggai* and the *Animal Apocalypse* which partially have been ignored so far but provide a helpful and illuminating background for the interpretation of Enoch's Heavenly Vision.

KEYWORDS: *1 Enoch* 14, *Book of the Watchers*, heavenly sanctuary/temple, temple critique

Where does God dwell? In ancient Judaism, there were very different answers to this question through the ages. According to the classical Zion theology, which can be mainly found in the older psalms and in the Book of Isaiah, God dwells on Mount Zion in his sanctuary.¹ Zion is the place where heaven and earth meet and where God is enthroned as king. The mythical idea of the mountain of God is accompanied by the belief that the divine presence in the earthly temple ensures the salvation and well-being of the city and makes this place holy. But with the destruction of the Temple of Solomon in 587/586 BC, this belief partly unravels, as the question in Jer 8:19 illustrates: “Is not the Lord in Zion? Or is

This paper is based on the second part of my German dissertation, which I wrote under the supervision of Reinhard G. Kratz and Mladen Popović and which was published under the title: *Henoch und der Tempel des Todes. 1 Henoch 14–16 zwischen Schriftauslegung und Traditionsverarbeitung* (BZAW 530; Berlin – Boston, MA: de Gruyter 2021).

In addition to my two supervisors, I would especially like to thank Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar and Loren T. Stuckenbruck for their advice and critical feedback during my research on this topic. Moreover, I would like to thank Henryk Drawnel for his advice and support in publishing this paper in this journal. Finally, I thank Benjamin Ziemer and Maïke Herzig for reading and commenting on an earlier draft of this paper.

1 Cf., for example, Ps 46; 48; 76; 84; 87; Isa 8:18.

not her King in her?” The loss of the First Temple partly initiates a completely new way of thinking about the possibilities and limits of the earthly presence of God.² Some compositions still adhere to the Zion theology,³ while others perceive the presence of God in the earthly temple as conditional or relativise it, for example with the help of name-theology and glory-theology.⁴ Finally, however, some positions completely reject the idea of an earthly abode—God is so transcendent that he can only dwell in heaven.⁵

As a result of this new thinking, the Second Temple, which now stands on Mount Zion in place of the Temple of Solomon, is perceived and assessed in very different ways, too. The earthly temple is now understood as a house of prayer⁶ or as a meeting place of the people,⁷ provoking disappointment or disillusionment in comparison to the previous building,⁸ but it can also be heavily criticised. Either its deficiency and inadequacy compared to the Solomonic or heavenly temple is criticised⁹ or it is complained that it is defiled by the current priesthood or the people.¹⁰ In this latter case, it is not the institution itself that is called into question, but only the way in which the cult is carried out.¹¹ As different as these exilic and postexilic temple concepts with their points of criticism of the earthly sanctuary may be, the majority of them try to adhere to the principal idea of an earthly temple.¹²

2 Cf., for this and the following, for example, V. Gäckle, *Allgemeines Priestertum. Zur Metaphorisierung des Priestertitels im Frühjudentum und Neuen Testament* (WUNT 331; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2014) 142–177, and Th.A. Rudnig, “»Ist denn Jahwe nicht auf dem Zion?« (Jer 8,19): Gottes Gegenwart im Heiligtum,” *ZThK* 104 (2007) 267–286.

3 Cf., for example, Exod 25:2; 29:45–46; Zech 8:3.

4 Cf., for example, 1 Kgs 6:12–13; Ezek 43:7b–9; Deut 12:11; Ezek 11:23–25; 43:1–9.

5 Cf., for example, 1 Kgs 8:30, 32, 34; Isa 66:1. Cf. Rudnig, “Jahwe,” 282–283.

6 Cf., for example, 1 Kgs 8:30, 33, 35; Isa 56:6–8; 64:10; 2 Chr 6:21.

7 Cf., for example, Luke 2:25, 37, 41; 24:53; Acts 2:5; 3:1–2.

8 Cf., for example, Ezra 3:10–13; Hag 2:3.

9 Cf., for example, 1 *En.* 89:72–73; 91:9; *Jub.* 1:10; 23:21; Tob 14, or in general the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (1 *En.* 93:1–10; 91:11–17). Cf. B. Bibberger, “Unbefriedigende Gegenwart und ideale Zukunft: Gesamtsraelitische Heilsperspektiven in den letzten Worten Tobits (Tob 14),” *BZ* 55 (2011) 272–275; D. Dimant, *From Enoch to Tobit. Collected Studies in Ancient Jewish Literature* (FAT 114; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2017) 124; Gäckle, *Allgemeines Priestertum*, 162–167; M.A. Knibb, “Temple and Cult in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal Writings from Before the Common Era,” *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel. Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (ed. J. Day) (OTS 422; London: Clark 2005) 408; O.H. Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (WMANT 23; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag 1967) 155–156; L.T., Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108* (CEJL; Berlin: de Gruyter 2007) 133, 137–139; D.W. Suter, “Temples and the Temple in the Early Enoch tradition: Memory, Vision, and Expectation,” *The Early Enoch Literature* (eds. G. Boccaccini – J.J. Collins) (JSJSup 121; Leiden: Brill 2007) 208–210; P.A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (EJL 4; Atlanta, GA: Scholars 1993) 39, 340; J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, “Visions of the Temple in the Book of Jubilees,” *Gemeinde ohne Tempel / Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühes Christentum* (eds. B. Ego – A. Lange – P. Pilhofer) (WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1999) 216–218.

10 Cf., for example, 1QS VIII, 4–10; IX, 3–6; XI, 8, or in general the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*.

11 Cf. G.J. Brooke, “The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel* (ed. J. Day) (JSOTSup 422; London: Clark 2005) 424, 428–429; Gäckle, *Allgemeines Priestertum*, 172, 175–177.

12 Cf. Rudnig, “Jahwe,” 284.

The final presence of God on earth is then often expected for the eschatological time of salvation, despite all the original reservations.¹³

According to the common interpretation,¹⁴ Enoch's vision of the Heavenly Temple in the *Book of the Watchers* (1 En. 14:8–25) can only be located with difficulty in this complex picture of different temple concepts. Despite its assumed location in heaven, the temple described in Enoch's vision is usually neither understood as a criticism of the earthly conditions nor as an indication that the true and ideal temple on earth could only be expected for the eschatological future.¹⁵ Although the temple seems to be in heaven, it can be visited and discovered.¹⁶ It also corresponds in its structure and appearance to the earthly temple, as it is described in other ancient Jewish works such as 1 Kgs 6 or Ezek 40–48, although not in detail.¹⁷ According to Martha Himmelfarb, there seems to be a very simple reason for

13 Cf., for example, the Book of Tobit (especially Tob 13–14); the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (1 En. 93:1–10; 91:11–17); the *Animal Apocalypse* (1 En. 85–90) or the *Book of Jubilees* (especially Jub. 1:17, 27–28, 29). Cf. Gäckle, *Allgemeines Priestertum*, 172, and also Ezek 40–48; Joel 4; Mic 4; Zeph 3:16–17.

14 For previous interpretations of Enoch's vision in 1 En. 14:8–25 cf., for example, A. Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch uebersetzt und erklärt* (Leipzig: Vogel 1853) 109; A. Lods, *Le livre d'Énoch. Fragments grecs découverts à Akhmim (Haute-Égypte). Publiés avec les variantes du texte éthiopien traduits et annotés* (Paris: Leroux 1892) 139–140; G. Beer, "Das Buch Henoch," *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments. II. Die Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (ed. E. Kautzsch) (Tübingen: Mohr 1900) 245; R.H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch. Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text, and Edited with the Introduction Notes and Indexes of the First Edition Wholly Recast Enlarged and Rewritten. Together with a Reprint from the Editor's Text of the Greek Fragments* (Oxford: Clarendon 1912) 33; J. Maier, "Das Gefährdungsmotiv bei der Himmelsreise in der jüdischen Apokalypik und 'Gnosis.'" *Kairos* 5 (1963) 22–36; I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 2 revised ed. (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 90; Leiden: Brill 2014) 71–76; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *JBL* 100/4 (1981) 576–581; M. Dean-Otting, *Heavenly Journeys. A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature* (Judentum und Umwelt 8; Frankfurt am Main: Lang 1984) 39–58; M. Black, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch. A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes* (SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill 1985) 147–148; C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta, GA: Scholars 1985) 60; M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York: Oxford University Press 1993) 9–28; 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) 259–266; B. Ego, "Denkbilder für Gottes Einzigkeit, Herrlichkeit und Richtermacht – Himmelsvorstellungen im antiken Judentum," *Der Himmel* (eds. M. Ebner – P.D. Hanson) (JBTh 20; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag 2006) 160–168; B. Ego, "Henochs Reise vor den Thron Gottes (1 Hen 14,8–16,4): Zur Funktion des Motivs der Himmelsreise im 'Wächterbuch' (1 Hen 1–36)," *Apokalypik und Qumran. Dritte Fachtagung zur Qumranforschung 2003 in der Katholischen Akademie Schwerte* (eds. M. Becker – J. Frey) (Einblicke 10; Paderborn: Bonifatius 2007) 105–121; Suter, "Temples and the Temple," 203; K. Coblenz Bantch, "The Heavenly Temple, the Prison in the Void and the Uninhabited Paradise: Otherworldly Sites in the Book of the Watchers," *Other Worlds and Their Relation to this World. Early Jewish and Ancient Christian Traditions* (ed. T. Nicklas) (JSJSup 143; Leiden: Brill 2010) 38–42; Ch.R.A. Morray-Jones, *A Transparent Illusion. The Dangerous Vision of Water in Hekhalot Mysticism. A Source-Critical and Tradition-Historical Inquiry* (JSJS 59; Leiden: Brill 2002) 107–109.

15 For a different, but rather isolated opinion cf., for example, P. Schäfer, *Origins of Jewish Mysticism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2009) 66: "It does not postpone the true and perfect Temple to the eschatological future but rather move it into heaven, where it can be visited and observed, and compared with the deficient earthly Temple."

16 Cf. also Schäfer, *Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, 66, and the previous footnote, respectively.

17 Cf. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 15–16.

this: “[...] the loose correspondence of heavenly temple to earthly seems to reflect the belief that the heavenly temple so transcends the earthly that the correspondence cannot be exact.”¹⁸ Consequently, *1 En.* 14:8–25, in her opinion, does not express any dissatisfaction with the Second Temple in Jerusalem, but rather stresses the glory of God’s heavenly sanctuary.¹⁹—But is that really the case?

In the following, the author would like to take a closer look at Enoch’s vision in *1 En.* 14:8–25 and consider the question of where exactly God dwells here. What is the function of the detailed description of the architecture that Enoch sees, especially against the background of ancient Jewish temple concepts? For a mere authorisation and call of the patriarch, as it is usually understood, it seems much too detailed and almost superfluous in the context of the *Book of the Watchers*.²⁰ And how can it be adequately appreciated that *two* different houses are described in a *twofold* vision,²¹ with the second house also being greater than the first?

By comparison with other temple traditions, the author would like to demonstrate that Enoch’s twofold vision does not describe one single heavenly temple complex but rather two contradictory temple concepts. This juxtaposition, and therefore the author’s suggestion, would imply a criticism of the Second Temple in Jerusalem so that the heavenly sanctuary appears as the only possible dwelling place of God as the transcendent universal ruler. Read in this way, Enoch’s twofold vision fits very well into the picture that is emerging in other ancient Jewish texts: the Second Temple is deficient because it is neither able to keep up with the glory of the true temple nor is it able to contain God.

1. The Place of Enoch’s Twofold Vision in the *Book of the Watchers*

In the final version of the *Book of the Watchers*, Enoch’s twofold vision is part of his dream report to the Watchers in *1 En.* 14–16. After their descent to earth, their intermingling with human women and the begetting of giant sons, the watchers are no longer allowed to return to heaven because of their sin; so, they ask Enoch to write a petition for them and to take the petition up to God (*1 En.* 13:1–6). Enoch’s dream report can be seen as God’s final reaction to the Watchers’ petition. In the chronological order of the narrative, the dream already occurred in *1 En.* 13:7–8, after Enoch fell asleep while reading the petition of the Watchers. But it is only reported when the patriarch goes to the Watchers to rebuke them in God’s name (*1 En.* 13:9–10).

18 Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 16.

19 Cf. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 16.

20 Cf. E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old & The Day of the End. Zechariah, the Book of Watchers & Apocalyptic* (OtSt 35; Leiden: Brill 1996) 184.

21 For a detailed analysis of the twofold structure of *1 En.* 14:8–25, see below.

All in all, Enoch's dream report consists of three different parts:²² 1) The title and the introduction of the dream report anticipate God's negative judgment (1 En. 14:1–7).²³ God rejects the Watchers' petition notwithstanding Enoch's intervention. Enoch has to proclaim the eternal judgment to them again, which includes the prohibition of their return to heaven and announces the destruction of their offspring. 2) In 1 En. 14:8, the dream report takes an unexpected thematic turn. The focus is no longer on the watchers, their misdeeds and the judgment against them. Now it is about Enoch's twofold vision of his translation to heaven and the two houses that he sees: the so-called Vision of the Heavenly Temple (1 En. 14:8–25). 3) Finally, the visual experience of the throne room is followed by an auditory experience: God addresses Enoch directly and asks him to deliver God's message to the watchers (1 En. 15:1–16:4). The watchers are criticised for acting against their nature and the divine order. They behaved like human beings and procreated. Moreover, they are accused of revealing heavenly secrets to human beings. With the pronouncement of the judgment, Enoch's dream report ends and with it the story of the Watchers – from 1 En. 17, the stories of Enoch's journeys through the entire cosmos are told.

2. Previous Interpretations of Enoch's Twofold Vision

Since the first commentaries on the *Book of the Watchers*, the two houses that Enoch sees in his twofold vision have been interpreted as different parts of one and the same heavenly temple complex whose structure is similar to the earthly temple in Jerusalem.²⁴ According

22 Cf. also Newsom, "The Development of 1 Enoch 6–19: Cosmology and Judgment," *CBQ* 42 (1980) 318; Co-blentz Bautch, "The Heavenly Temple," 38–42. For a different outline of Enoch's dream report see for example Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 251–275 (cf. also Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 109; Ego, "Denkbilder für Gottes Einzigkeit," 163). According to Nickelsburg (*ibidem*), the second part of Enoch's dream report ends with 1 En. 14:23; the third part, "the Oracle," begins in 1 En. 14:24, with 1 En. 14:24–15:1 functioning as transitional verses between the vision and the part of speech. The transitional and preparatory function of 1 En. 14:24–25 cannot be denied with regard to the part of speech in 1 En. 15:1–16:4, but in the present author's opinion, it is still formally part of the protagonist's vision experience. As in Dan 10:7–10 or Ezek 1:28b–2:2, the behaviour of the protagonist in 1 En. 14:24–25 represents a reaction to what has happened and experienced in the vision and thus brings the description of the vision, the second part of the dream report, to a clear conclusion. This becomes clear especially by comparison of Enoch's dream report with other prophetic visions and by considering the linguistic structuring features specific to this genre, as they were described, for example, by Achim Behrens in his monograph *Prophetische Visionsschilderungen im Alten Testament. Sprachliche Eigenarten, Funktion und Geschichte einer Gattung* (AOAT 292; Münster: Ugarit 2002) especially 32–75.

23 Cf. V. Bachmann, *Die Welt im Ausnahmezustand. Eine Untersuchung zu Aussagegehalt und Theologie des Wächterbuches (1 Hen 1–36)* (BZAW 409; Berlin: de Gruyter 2009) 75.

24 For references see n. 14. Philip Esler recently put forward a completely new approach (cf. Ph.F. Esler, *God's Court and Courtiers in the Book of the Watchers. Re-interpreting Heaven in 1 Enoch 1–36* [Eugen, OR: Cascade Books 2017] especially 136–152). He understands the *Book of the Watchers* less as a "religious" witness and more as a "political" one. In contrast to all previous interpretations of 1 En. 14 as a heavenly temple complex, he understands the structure described in Enoch's vision as a royal palace, for whose description the palaces of the Achaemenid and Hellenistic kings very likely served as a model. His interpretation is problematic for several reasons, foremost, because he is ignoring how much the *Book of the Watchers* is rooted in the intellectual

to most scholars, this heavenly temple complex has a twofold structure with the second house somehow located inside the first one: the first house is sometimes interpreted as אולם “forecourt” of the temple (cf. 1 Kgs 6:3; Ezek 40:48),²⁵ but more often as היכל “main room” or “outer sanctum” of the temple (cf. 1 Kgs 6:17; Ezek 41:1).²⁶ In line with this, the second house is understood as דביר “inner sanctum” of the temple (cf. 1 Kgs 6:5) or as קדש הקדשים “the holy of holies” (cf. 1 Kgs 6:16; Ezek 41:4).²⁷ Robert Charles and Matthew Black are the only authors to interpret the second house as “the palace of God,” which is in line with their identification of the first house as the forecourt.²⁸ According to the description of Solomon’s temple in 1 Kgs 6, the forecourt is not an integral feature of הַבַּיִת “the house” which is understood as the temple or palace of God as such. Nonetheless, common to all previous interpretations is that the term בַּיִת “house” is understood as a designation of a specific part of the building and not as the building itself.²⁹

Whereas George Nickelsburg noted that, in contrast to the threefold structure of Solomon’s temple (forecourt, main room and holy of holies), there is only a twofold structure described in Enoch’s account of the heavenly temple (main room and holy of holies) and thus no אולם exists,³⁰ Johann Maier and Himmelfarb claim a tripartite architecture with regard to *1 En.* 14:8–25, too.³¹ They agree with Nickelsburg and others³² in interpreting the two houses as היכל and דביר, but ascribe an independent function to the outer wall. According to Maier, this wall simply separates the forecourt,³³ though Himmelfarb, using the Greek version of *1 En.* 14:9 as a point of departure, considers this wall as an actual third-mentioned structure: “In the Ethiopic, it is simply a wall. In the Greek text, however, Enoch passes through a *building* of hailstones and fire. The Greek, then, provides a heavenly structure that matches a three-chambered temple quite nicely.”³⁴ Thus, according to

and scriptural environment of ancient Judaism and adopted to well-known Jewish traditions and compositions that are more likely able to explain Enoch’s vision. Therefore, his approach is not discussed in more detail below. See also n. 59.

25 Cf. Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 109; Beer, “Das Buch Henoch,” 245; Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, 33, and Black, *The Book of Enoch*, 147.

26 Cf. Maier, “Gefährdungsmotiv,” 23; Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 580; Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 60; Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 14; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 263; and Coblenz Bautch, “The Heavenly Temple,” 39. Cf. also Ego, “Denkbilder für Gottes Einzigkeit,” 165, and Ego, “Henochs Reise,” 115. Ego does not explicitly use the term היכל but interprets the first house based on 1 Kgs 6:2–5; Isa 6:4 passim as “Hauptraum.”

27 Cf. Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 109; Beer, “Das Buch Henoch,” 245; Maier, “Gefährdungsmotiv,” 23; Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 580; Dean-Otting, *Heavenly Journeys*, 49; Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 60; Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 14; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 263; Ego, “Denkbilder für Gottes Einzigkeit,” 160–168; Ego, “Henochs Reise,” 105–121; Coblenz Bautch, “The Heavenly Temple,” 39.

28 Cf. Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, 34; and Black, *The Book of Enoch*, 147–148.

29 With regard to Charles and Black, at least in the first case (*1 En.* 14:10).

30 Cf. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 263.

31 Cf. Maier, “Gefährdungsmotiv,” 23; Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 14.

32 See nn. 25 and 26, respectively.

33 Cf. Maier, “Gefährdungsmotiv,” 23. Cf. also Dean-Otting, *Heavenly Journeys*, 49.

34 Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 14 (italics in original). She further writes (*ibidem*, 119–120, n. 29): “The fact that the Greek uses *oikodomē*, building, for the first structure but *oikos*, house, for the other two, could point to

Maier and Himmelfarb, the heavenly temple complex that Enoch visits in his vision also contains a forecourt and is built analogously to its earthly counterpart.

The question of how the two houses are related to each other or how to understand the fact that the second house is greater than the first has received little attention so far. Sometimes, it is assumed that the second house is somehow inside the first, and Enoch, still down on his face, is looking through the open door into the second house.³⁵ Often the combination of the two houses is simply defined as something inexplicable, transcendent, or beyond human imagination, though the size of the second house is hardly thematised or explained in detail. Nickelsburg writes rather generally about the heavenly vision: “The author’s imagery stresses the otherness of this realm. Here fire and snow can coexist. Things are larger than life. God dwells in a house greater than the great one to which it is annexed.”³⁶ Suter argues similarly. In his opinion, magnitude is an index of holiness: “[...] in making the *devir*, the throne room of the temple, larger and more magnificent than the *hekhal*, where the opposite ratio was the case in the various earthly temples.”³⁷ Thus, one could say this fact is simply unexplainable. Another rationale is supposed by Ego: This statement could perhaps have its roots in the fact that the holy of holies was located geographically above the main room.³⁸ However, she immediately concedes: “[...] vielleicht sollte man die Analogie zum irdischen Tempel aber auch nicht überstrapazieren.”³⁹ As a consequence, one could say that scholars have to date failed to illuminate this passage of Enoch’s twofold vision.

In contrast to the relationship between the two houses, the materials from which the walls and the first house are built are widely discussed. The coexistence of fire and snow is almost unique in the context of ancient Jewish temple descriptions. It is considered as something that is only possible in heaven⁴⁰ and that expresses the purest and most transcendent reality.⁴¹ This coexistence is often explained with a dependence on Ezekiel’s vision of the glory of God (Ezek 1)⁴² or by comparing it with the appearance of the snow-capped peak of Mount Hermon⁴³ or Josephus’ account of the Herodian Temple in Jerusalem

the difference between the two inner chambers, where cultic activity takes place, and the vestibule, which serves to separate the sanctuary proper from the area outside and which is not the scene of such activity.”

35 Cf. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 73; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 263–264, especially n. 18; Coblenz Bautch, “The Heavenly Temple,” 40.

36 Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 260.

37 Suter, “Temples and the Temple,” 216.

38 Ego, “Denkbilder für Gottes Einzigkeit,” 165; Ego, “Henochs Reise,” 116.

39 Ego, “Denkbilder für Gottes Einzigkeit,” 165; Ego, “Henochs Reise,” 116.

40 Cf., for example, Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 582; Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 15; and Coblenz Bautch, “The Heavenly Temple,” 40.

41 Cf. Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 109; and Lods, *Le Livre d’Hénoch*, 139. Cf. also Ego, “Denkbilder für Gottes Einzigkeit,” 165; Ego, “Henochs Reise,” 115.

42 Cf., for example, Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 72; Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 582; H.S. Kvanvig, “Henoch und der Menschensohn. Das Verhältnis von Hen 14 zu Dan 7,” *ST 38* (1984) 113; Morray-Jones, *A Transparent Illusion*, 107–109.

43 Cf. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 261; D.W. Suter, “Why Galilee? Galilean Regionalism in the Interpretation of 1 Enoch 6–16,” *Hen 25* (2003) 206–207; Suter, “Temples and the Temple,” 204.

(*J.W.* 5).⁴⁴ Whereas Nickelsburg notices in *1 En.* 14 a general borrowing and systematising of the phenomena of lightning, fire and icy pavement of Ezekiel's vision,⁴⁵ Helge Kvanvig draws especially on the phrase הַקֶּרֶה הַנּוֹרָא in Ezek 1:22 to explain the Enochic polarity of fire and snow.⁴⁶ Normally, the word הַנּוֹרָא is explained as a participle Niph'al of יָרָא "to fear," but reading it with "Aramaic eyes" one could also interpret it as the Aramaic word for "fire" נּוֹרָא.⁴⁷ Accordingly, Kvanvig concludes:

So gelesen, wird das הַקֶּרֶה הַנּוֹרָא רָקִיעַ כְּעֵין הַקֶּרֶה zu 'ein Gewölbe wie brennendes Eis.' [...] Wir finden also, dass die Elemente der Polarität Eis – Feuer in Hen, auch in Ezech vorliegen: Die brennenden himmlischen Gestalten; das Gewölbe in Ezech als *qarah* 'Kristall' oder 'Eis' charakterisiert; und weiter als *nora*, das man aramäisch als 'das Feuer' lesen kann. Die Henochtradenten haben aus diesen Elementen eine neue, spekulative Konzeption gemacht.⁴⁸

Another approach is taken by Maier, followed by Himmelfarb.⁴⁹ According to him, the description of the walls and of the first house is not about the physical quality of fire and snow, but about the visual impression of these materials.⁵⁰ In this line, Maier explains the paradoxical coexistence reduced on their visual quality by means of Josephus' account of the Herodian Temple in *J.W.* 5.222–224, which reads as follows:

The exterior of the building wanted nothing that could astound either mind or eye. For, being covered on all sides with massive plates of gold, the sun was no sooner up than it radiated so fiery a flash that persons straining to look at it were compelled to avert their eyes, as from the solar rays. To approaching strangers it appeared from a distance like a snow-clad mountain; for all that was not overlaid with gold was of purest white. From its summit protruded sharp golden spikes to prevent birds from settling upon and polluting the roof.⁵¹

Thus, according to Josephus' account, the temple was built of white stones and covered with gold everywhere—in the light of the sun or viewed from a distance, the temple could therefore quickly give the impression of a fiery or snow-covered place and exactly this could be reflected in Enoch's description of the temple in the *Book of the Watchers*.⁵² However, it is problematic to explain *1 En.* 14 with a considerably younger source. Noticing this, Himmelfarb, therefore, tries to support Maier's assumption by noting: "Of course Josephus, who is here describing Herod's temple, wrote perhaps three centuries after the *Book of the Watchers*. But the cosmological symbolism of Josephus's account has ancient roots, and

44 Cf. Maier, "Gefährdungsmotiv," 35; Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 15.

45 Cf. Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter," 582.

46 Cf. Kvanvig, "Henoch und der Menschensohn," 106, 113. For the reference to 1 Ezek 1:22, cf. also Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 72.

47 Cf. Kvanvig, "Henoch und der Menschensohn," 113.

48 Kvanvig, "Henoch und der Menschensohn," 113.

49 Cf. Maier, "Gefährdungsmotiv," 34–35; Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 15.

50 Cf. Maier, "Gefährdungsmotiv," 34.

51 Josephus Flavius, *J.W.* 5.222–224 (LCL, 66–68).

52 Cf. Maier, "Gefährdungsmotiv," 34–35.

it may be that this description draws on earlier praise of the temple.⁵³ Hence, both descriptions could be understood as snapshots of a common temple tradition and the heavenly temple would thus correspond to the earthly temple not only in its structure but also in its appearance.

Finally, drawing on one of Nickelsburg's assumptions,⁵⁴ Suter offers another attempt to explain Enoch's description of the houses. In his opinion, Mount Hermon is not only the place of origin of the Enochic traditions and thus of the *Book of the Watchers*; with its snow-covered peak and the surrounding meteorological phenomena, it also serves as a source of inspiration for the vision of the heavenly temple in *1 En. 14:8–25*.⁵⁵ In contrast to Himmelfarb, Suter explains the similarity that can be found between the description of the temple in the *Book of the Watchers* and Josephus' depiction of the Herodian temple, not so much with a common temple tradition, which is closely linked to cosmological symbolism, but rather with the close relationship between both works and Mount Hermon, which can be seen as the starting point of the temple description in both cases: "What the passage from Josephus has in common with the link to Mount Hermon is the association of temple and sacred mountain. For that matter, in comparing visual effect of the temple to a snow-capped mountain, Josephus can only have had Mount Hermon in mind from the standpoint of the region."⁵⁶ With this explanation, Suter reduces the fire, snow and hailstones that Enoch sees in his vision of the first house, not only to their visual aspect, as Maier and Himmelfarb ultimately did but also offers a framework for the tactile perception of these natural phenomena. But how has the absence of pleasure of life been interpreted so far?

The terrifying appearance and the absence of pleasure of life, which frighten Enoch in the first house, have been interpreted positively in previous research, as intense fear is finally understood as a reaction to the divine presence and glory: "To ascend to the heavenly temple is a cause of sheer terror rather than joy. This is no visit to the paradise of delight."⁵⁷ Enoch's falling down on his knees (*1 En. 14:14*) has to be taken as an act of prostration before God as in the case of Ezekiel, although Ezekiel's prostration is never connected with trembling and fear.⁵⁸ Rather, in contrast to the description of Ezekiel's behaviour, "[t]he Book of the Watchers [...] emphasizes the intensity of the visionary's reaction to the manifestation of the divine" and "[...] the glory of God's heavenly temple by making it, rather than the vision of God himself, the cause of Enoch's fear."⁵⁹ The terrifying and awesome appearance of the first house is the reason and cause of reverent trembling and is related to the divine presence in a certain positive way for it represents God's greatness and glory.

53 Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 15.

54 Cf. Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter," 582; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 261–262.

55 Cf. Suter, "Why Galilee?," 206–207; Suter, "Temples and the Temple," 204. Cf. also Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 261.

56 Suter, "Temples and the Temple," 205.

57 Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 263. Cf. also Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 109; Lods, *Le Livre d'Hénoch*, 139; Maier, "Gefährdungsmotiv," 34; Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 16.

58 Cf. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 16.

59 Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 16.

3. A New Reading of Enoch's Twofold Vision

The previous interpretations of Enoch's twofold vision in the sense of one heavenly temple complex are problematic for various reasons. Above all, there is the difficulty in interpreting the two houses as different parts of one temple building.⁶⁰ Strictly speaking, Enoch's vision consists of two separately introduced visions—*1 En.* 14:8–14a and *1 En.* 14:14b–25—in each of which one house is described. According to the common interpretation, the two mentioned houses are actually to be interpreted in two different ways, namely as two different parts of one building. This is linguistically untenable, however, as the same term is used in both cases and no explicit reference to a specific part of the temple is given. In Biblical and Qumran Hebrew and Aramaic, the word בית and בי, respectively, never denotes a part of a building or a temple if it is used in absolute or marked as definite; only in the construct state with a specifying genitive attribute בית or בי can denote a certain building as well as parts or rooms of a building.⁶¹ In Hebrew, בית and היכל can be understood synonymously, as far as היכל is used in the sense of “palace” or “temple.”⁶² But this is not the case in the description of the Solomonic Temple in 1 Kgs 6. Here, בית always denotes the temple in general (cf. 1 Kgs 6:1, 2, 14), whereas היכל only stands for the “main room” (cf. 1 Kgs 6:3, 5).⁶³ Likewise, there is no evidence that בית and דביר or קדש הקדשים can be used interchangeably. However, the common interpretation of Enoch's twofold vision presupposes that the two houses mentioned must be interpreted in two different ways, although the same term is used in both cases and no explicit reference is made to a specific part of the temple.

Moreover, it is remarkable about Enoch's vision as a whole, that the entire description has a twofold, almost parallel structure, though with notable differences:

60 Since Esler, even if he interprets *1 En.* 14:8–25 in contrast to the other researchers as a description of a royal palace and not of a heavenly temple, and understands the wall and the two houses like other scholars as part of one single larger building complex (cf. in particular Esler, *God's Court*, 136–152), the following criticism also applies to his interpretation, even if it is not further elaborated on with regard to the details of his arguments. Finally, it does not matter whether the entire complex is interpreted as a temple or a palace—the difficulty in interpreting the two houses as different parts of one building, which are architecturally correlated with one another, remains the same.

61 Cf. the Hebrew and Aramaic dictionary entries for בית and בי, for example in W. Gesenius – F. Buhl, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*, Reprint of the 17 ed. [1915] (Berlin: Springer 1962) 95–98, 898; *HAL* I, 119–120; II, 1679–1680; E.M. Cook, *Dictionary of Qumran Aramaic* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns 2015) 33; R.G. Kratz – A. Steudel – I. Kottsieper (eds.), *Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zu den Texten vom Toten Meer. Einschliesslich der Manuskripte aus der Kairoer Geniza*. I. ב – נ (Berlin: de Gruyter 2017) 269–273. For examples of its use in the sense of a particular building or part of it, see, for example, Jer 36:22; Amos 3:15; Esth 2:3; 7:8.

62 Cf. M. Ottosson, “היכל,” *TbWAT* II, 409–415.

63 Cf. Ottosson, “היכל,” 409–415.

The Structure and Content of Enoch's Twofold Vision

The first house (14:8–14a) ⁶⁴		The second house (14:14b–25)	
<i>opening formula:</i>		<i>opening formula:</i>	
14:8	“And it was shown to me in a vision as follows: Behold...” translation to heaven	14:14b	“And I saw in my vision: Behold...”
<i>description of the house:</i>		<i>description of the house:</i>	
14:9	a wall⁶⁵ of hailstones burning in fire <u>fear reaction</u>	14:15	a house greater than the former one <u>an open door⁶⁷</u>
14:10	a great house wall(s)⁶⁶ of hailstones	14:16	splendour and greatness of the house <u>reaction of being impressed</u>
14:11	floor of snow <u>ceiling like stars and flashes</u> <u>amongst them are Cherubim</u> heaven of water	14:17	floor of fire <u>above (the floor) stars and flashes</u> <u>ceiling of fire</u>
14:12	wall(s) burning in fire door(s) burning in fire		
<i>inside the house:</i>		<i>inside the house:</i>	
14:13a	Enoch goes inside hot as fire + cold as snow no pleasure of life⁶⁸	14:18	a lofty throne appearance like ice + surrounds like sun
		14:19	sound of Cherubim
		14:20	rivers of burning fire the Great Glory
		14:21–23	clothing brighter than the sun and whiter than snow <u>angels/humans are not able to go inside</u> fire and angels surround God
<i>reaction of the protagonist:</i>		<i>reaction of the protagonist:</i>	
14:13b–14a	reaction of fear falling down	14:24–25	trembling prostration God addresses Enoch

64 In the following overview, those points that occur only in one of the two house descriptions are in bold, those points underlined occur in both parts but at different places and can also have varying meanings.

65 In the sense of a city or town wall (cf. GrPan τείχος and Aeth ἰῶν).

66 In the sense of a wall of a room or of a building (cf. GrPan τοίχος and Aeth ἰῶν).

67 GrPan and Tana 9 differ in their order from the remaining Ethiopic witnesses (= above). According to GrPan and Tana 9, the description of the house begins with the open door, followed by a reference to the house: “And behold, another door, open before me, and the house was greater than the former one [...]”

68 The translation “no pleasure of life” follows Aeth I. In contrast, Aeth II reads “no pleasure and no life,” whereas Tana 9 has “nothing.” The reading of GrPan is ambiguous: The word, in roman-byzantine orthography written ΤΡΟΦΗ, can be interpreted as both τροφή “food” and τρυφή “abundance.” Accordingly, the translation of this phrase could be “no food for life” or “no abundance of life.”

Thus, both parts begin with an opening formula of a vision, then offer a detailed description of the house and its interior, and end with a reaction of the protagonist.⁶⁹ In the descriptions of both houses, the size, floor, ceiling, door and material of the individual components are depicted. Remarkably, the sequence of the elements shown is more or less identical. By use of the opening formula and the reaction of the protagonist, they each offer a clear beginning and end. Therefore, they can also be clearly distinguished from one another with regard to the content and give the impression of two similar buildings, but not correlating parts of one building.

In Enoch's twofold vision, the two houses are related to one another only once, namely in *I En.* 14:15. While the first house is already referred to in *I En.* 14:10 as בֵּיַת רַב "a big house," the second house is qualified in *I En.* 14:15 by comparing it to the first: it is בֵּיַת אַחֲרָן "another house that is greater than this one."⁷⁰ Apart from the use of the term בֵּיַת "house" in both cases and the comparison based on size, there is no other indication of how these two houses relate to one another or how this comparison should be understood. The designation of the second house as בֵּיַת אַחֲרָן "another house" stresses that it is different from the first house (as far as the reconstruction of the Aramaic is correct). Moreover, connecting the temple and its size with the use of the comparative particle can be found only in two other theological statements about the temple. In *2 Chr* 2:4, it is stated that Solomon will build a temple:

והבית אשר־אני בונה גדול כִּי־גדול אלהינו מכל־האלהים:

And the house that I build is great, for our God is greater than all gods.

The earthly temple is not only related to God but also shares in God's greatness and superiority.⁷¹ Nevertheless, as a work of human hands, the temple cannot fully contain God or reduce him to this place (cf. *2 Chr* 2:5).⁷² In other words, the earthly temple may be great, but the divine one is greater and cannot be contained in it. In contrast, the prophet Haggai criticises the poor conditions of the temple. The temple is a ruin, like nothing, but,

⁶⁹ Cf. also Kvanvig, "Enoch und der Menschensohn," 102.

⁷⁰ At least according to the common reconstruction of the Aramaic based on the G^oʿaz version that reads ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ. Cf. for example J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrān Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon 1976) 194; H. Drawnel, *Qumran Cave 4. The Aramaic Books of Enoch, 4Q201, 4Q202, 4Q204, 4Q205, 4Q206, 4Q207, 4Q212* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2019) 233. GrPan has a slightly different reading and omits the corresponding word to אַחֲרָן and ܩܕܝܫܐ respectively: και ὁ οἶκος μείζων τούτου "and the house (was) greater than this one."

⁷¹ Cf. M. Lynch, "Divine Supremacy and the Temple: 2 Chronicles 2 and the Fifth Book of Psalms," *Psalmen und Chronik* (eds. F. Hartenstein – Th. Willi) (FAT 2/107; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2019) 330–331, 333.

⁷² Cf. M. Lynch, *Monotheism and Institutions in the Book of Chronicles. Temple, Priesthood, and Kingship in Post-Exilic Perspective* (FAT 2/64; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2014) 110–113; Lynch, "Divine Supremacy," 332–333.

at the same time, it is a sign of hope for the coming blessings. Thus, the prophet proclaims in Hag 2:9a:

גדול יהיה כבוד הבית הזה האחרון מן־הראשון אמר יהוה צבאות

The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, says the Lord of hosts.

In all three compositions, the keywords בית and גדול (or their Aramaic equivalents בַּי and רַב, respectively) as well as the preposition מִן are used to compare two entities in terms of their size. Like the temple and God in 2 Chronicles and the former destroyed temple and the future glorious one in Haggai, the two houses in the *Book of the Watchers* are related in terms of size. In all three cases, the second entity is the greater of the two because of its direct relation to God or to his glory. Hence, the second one is superior to the first and transcends it. According to this analogy, the two houses that Enoch sees in his twofold vision should be put in contrast rather than be correlated with each other. This would mean that they are not two different parts of the same temple, but rather represent two contradictory concepts. This impression is supported by further observations:

Besides the fact that Enoch's translation by means of natural forces is mentioned only once at the beginning of the description of the first house (1 En. 14:8); there are other important differences between the two houses and also regarding Enoch's behaviour. First of all, the materials of the houses are different. The first house is made of hailstones (1 En. 14:10). The wall that surrounds it, the walls of the building and its floor are also made of hailstones or snow (1 En. 14:9, 10); everything is surrounded by fire or burning in fire (1 En. 14:9, 12). Consequently, the door of the first house burns in fire, too (1 En. 14:12). That way, the first house produces a paradox and at the same time, a terrifying impression.⁷³ The second house, in contrast, is entirely and only of fire (1 En. 14:15, 17) and is characterised by glory, splendour and greatness (1 En. 14:16). Only the door does not burn in the fire, like the door of the first house, but is wide open (1 En. 14:15). Thus, it provides insight into the building without the need to enter it⁷⁴—or, because it is even impossible for Enoch to enter the house as it is described in 1 En. 14:21 with regard to all the angels and fleshly beings.⁷⁵ If the door was not open, Enoch would not be able to see what is inside. Moreover, both the outer and inner walls play no explicit role in the description of the second house. Whereas the inner wall of the house seems to be replaced by flaming fire and angels surrounding the throne (1 En. 14:22), the outer wall seems not even to exist in the conception of the second house.

The previous interpretations of the coexistence of fire and snow or hailstones often focused primarily on the visual appearance of these elements. Accordingly, the whiteness of

⁷³ Cf. also Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 262.

⁷⁴ Cf. Lods, *Le Livre d'Hénoch*, 140; Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, 34.

⁷⁵ Cf. Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, 34; Black, *The Book of Enoch*, 148.

in the Herodian temple was supposed to be an “image of the universe”; on the fabric of the curtain the entire visible vault of heaven was embroidered (*J.W.* 5.212–214). The image of the firmament in ancient temples is, of course, thought of as reality, that is, the image represents the heavenly reality. This could also be the case here with the first house were it not for the particle “like.” This particle suggests that the usual equation of “image (is equal to) reality” has been abandoned in favour of the differentiation between image—“like” (in the first house) and reality (in the second house). With the characterisation of the ceiling as the image of the universe, the first house deviates from the description of the second house in so far as the ceiling of the second house actually consists of flaming fire, and the path of the stars and lightning is indeed between the floor and the ceiling (*1 En.* 14:17). Hence, the paths of the stars and lightning flashes are not depicted on the ceiling, but actually exist in this house. Or to put it another way: the second house is a living, real cosmos, whereas the first house is just its copy.

The two houses also differ with regard to their interiors. The description of the interior of the first house is extremely short: on the one hand, inside it is hot as fire and cold as ice; on the other hand, there is no pleasure of life in it (*1 En.* 14:13). The paradox of the simultaneity of heat and cold contradicts the actual intention of a house in the ancient Levant, which is supposed to offer people refuge from the heat of the day as well as from the cold at night⁸⁶—the first house in Enoch’s vision instead exposes the visitor to consuming interactions of extreme temperature differences that are anything but life-friendly. Likewise, the statement of the absence of pleasure of life is very unusual with regard to other temple descriptions. In ancient thought, a temple is usually viewed as a source of life, fertility, and prosperity⁸⁷ and is usually filled with the glory of God,⁸⁸ his cloud,⁸⁹ or with God himself.⁹⁰ Ps 36:9–10, for example, states the following about the temple:

ירוין ממשן ביתך ונחל עדניך תשקם:
כיעמך מקור חיים באורך נראה־אור:

They feast on the abundance of your house, and you give them drink from the river of your delights.
For with you is the fountain of life; in your light we see light.

Priestertum, 148; C. Ambos, *Mesopotamische Baurituale aus dem 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr. Mit einem Beitrag von Aaron Schmitt* (Dresden: ISLET 2004) 47–50.

86 Cf. also Gen 31:40 and Jer 36:30. The large temperature differences have the consequence, for example, that the corpse of the king (Jer 36:30) will decompose faster.

87 Cf., for example, R.C. Van Leeuwen, “Cosmos, Temple, House: Building and Wisdom in Ancient Mesopotamia and Israel,” *From the Foundations to the Crenellations. Essays on Temple Building in the Ancient Near East and Hebrew Bible* (eds. M.J. Boda – J. Novotny) (AOAT 366; Münster: Ugarit 2010) 399–421; Ambos, *Mesopotamische Baurituale*, 47.

88 Cf., for example, Exod 40:34–35; 1 Kgs 8:11; Ezek 43:5.

89 Cf., for example, 1 Kgs 8:10; 2 Chr 5:13; Ezek 10:4.

90 Cf., for example, Ps 11:4; Hab 2:20.

That the statement of *1 En.* 14:13 contradicts this idea of the temple becomes particularly apparent in the Greek version of the Psalm (= Ps LXX 35:9–10):⁹¹

μεθυσθήσονται ἀπὸ πίότητος τοῦ οἴκου σου καὶ τὸν χειμάρρουν τῆς **τρυφῆς** σου ποτιεῖς αὐτούς ὅτι **παρὰ σοὶ** πηγὴ **ζωῆς** ἐν τῷ φωτὶ σου ὁψόμεθα φῶς.

In Ps LXX 35:9–10, the words τρυφή “delight, pleasure” and ζωή “life” are used to characterise the abundance of God’s dwelling place—according to the Greek version of Enoch’s twofold vision, both features are absent in the first house: τρυφὴ ζωῆς οὐκ ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ. The presence of the typical temple attributes is negated and, apart from the building structure, the house is described as completely empty. Thus, the statement about the first house in Enoch’s twofold vision clearly reverses the usual concept of the temple. This place must be therefore anything but the dwelling of God.

In contrast, the interior of the second house is described in detail (*1 En.* 14:18–23). Enoch sees a lofty throne with the Great Glory (*1 En.* 14:18.20), surrounded by flaming fire (*1 En.* 14:19) and angels (*1 En.* 14:21–23), and characterised by glory, splendour and greatness (cf. *1 En.* 14:16). The second house is the place and source of abundance, glory, and hence life. It is noticeable that negations and comparative particles are used several times to express the inaccessibility and indescribability of God and his place.⁹² On the one hand, Enoch *cannot* describe the house and its glory, splendour and size in its entirety (*1 En.* 14:16), *nor* look at the throne (*1 En.* 14:19), *no* angel can enter *nor* look at God, just as *none* of the flesh can look at him (*1 En.* 14:21), and *none* of those who surround God, approaches or moves away from him (*1 En.* 14:22, 23). In the description of the first house, however, a negation was used only once: namely in Enoch’s observation that there is *no* pleasure of life inside the first house (*1 En.* 14:13). On the other hand, the appearance of the throne and the glory of God is only described indirectly or roughly with the help of comparison. The appearance of the throne is *like* ice, its wheel *like* the shining sun (*1 En.* 14:18), and the garment of great glory is brighter *than* the sun and whiter *than* all snow (*1 En.* 14:20).⁹³ It is remarkable that almost the same word field is used to describe the throne and the deity as for the interior of the first house but with the focus on a completely different aspect. While the description of fire and ice in the first house focused on the physical quality and their physical perception, where the effects of these two elements – heat and cold – are perceived as uncomfortable (*1 En.* 14:13), the comparisons in *1 En.* 14:18 and *1 En.* 14:20 concentrate on the visual impression, that is the appearance of ice, snow and the sun, and the resulting expression of purity. Thus, the negations and

91 The reference is to the Greek since the Aramaic version of *1 En.* 14:13 has not survived.

92 Cf. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 260.

93 This comparative language recalls the description of the Glory in Ezekiel’s vision (Ezek 1:4–28): Here, too, there is a strikingly frequent use of comparisons to represent God’s transcendence. Cf. J.M. Hiebel, *Ezekiel’s Ezekiel’s Vision Accounts as Interrelated Narratives. A Redaction-Critical and Theological Study* (BZAW 475; Berlin: de Gruyter 2015) 80–81, 85–86.

comparative particles make the absolute conceivability of the second house impossible and finally preserve the transcendence of God.⁹⁴ In contrast, none of these stylistic devices can be found in the description of the first house, which therefore appears to be completely describable and accessible.

Finally, Enoch's behaviour and his different reactions to the two houses are remarkable. Enoch is very active with regard to the first house: he goes inside, first approaching the wall (1 En. 14:9), then the house (1 En. 14:10), and finally, he enters it (1 En. 14:13).⁹⁵ But apart from that, he is no longer the subject of a verb of movement. In the vision of the second house, Enoch is completely passive and almost fades into the background as a subject. Only in 1 En. 14:18, it is mentioned how he looks up and sees things. Related to the second house, there are no movements of the patriarch of his own.⁹⁶ Because of the open door, he does not even have to enter to gain a glimpse of the interior, or he is simply not able to enter, like the angels (1 En. 14:21). In any case, in contrast to the first house, a distance is created between the patriarch and the interior of the second house, the enthroned God,⁹⁷ which cannot be resolved by the patriarch himself. Enoch's passivity culminates in 1 En. 14:25: Here Enoch becomes the object of the action of an angel (GrPan) or God (Aeth) and is set up and brought to the door.

It is the same with his reactions to the houses. In the description of the first house, Enoch's reaction of fear represents both the frame and the culmination point. As soon as Enoch reaches the walls, he begins to be afraid (1 En. 14:9). After seeing the entire house, he is "covered by fear" and trembling (1 En. 14:13–14). In the final version of the *Book of the Watchers*, this type of reaction is clearly linked to the idea of judgment and punishment. The reactions of the Watchers to God's judgment (1 En. 1:5; 13:3) and the reaction of Enoch to the prison of the Watchers (1 En. 21:2, 7–9) are described with the same words.⁹⁸ Consequently, at least in the final version of the *Book of the Watchers*, this type of reaction of fear seems to be clearly associated with the idea of judgment and punishment. In line with this, Enoch's fall in 1 En. 14:14 is less a prostration than a falling down out of sheer horror.⁹⁹

Corresponding to Enoch's passiveness, his reaction to the second house is also subordinate to the appearance of the place. His inability to describe anything is mentioned twice: he fails to describe the glory and splendour of the house (1 En. 14:16) and to look up to the throne (1 En. 14:19), and his final reaction, his prostration and trembling, culminates in his restoration by an angel or God to receive his commission (1 En. 14:24–25). But in the second house, he is spared from the enormous fear that he experienced with

94 Cf. also the previous footnote and Ego, "Henochs Reise," 120.

95 Cf. also Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter," 580; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 259.

96 Cf. also Kvanvig, "Enoch und der Menschensohn," 103.

97 Black, *The Book of Enoch*, 148.

98 In 1 En. 14:13–14 as well as in 1 En. 1:5 and 13:3, φόβος + τρόμος + λαμβάνω and 𐤆𐤇𐤆𐤇 + 𐤇𐤓𐤅 + 𐤕𐤍/𐤍𐤕, respectively, are used to describe the reaction of fear. The words predominantly used in 1 En. 21 are φοβερός (and derivatives) and δεινός or 𐤆𐤇𐤆𐤇, 𐤕𐤓𐤏 and 𐤅𐤓𐤏.

99 Cf. also 1 Sam 28:20, where it says that Saul falls with horror and terror.

regard to the first house. While his perception and reaction are very prominent in the vision of the latter, his character fades into the background in the description of the former. In this way, the focus shifts from the subjective experience and involvement of the protagonist, which are central to the description of the first house, to the objective and general portrayal of God's glory, splendour and inaccessibility, which characterise the account of the second house.

All in all, the problems and differences just described with regard to the two houses make it very unlikely that Enoch sees a bi- or even tripartite temple which corresponds to the structure and appearance of the earthly temple in Jerusalem. Rather, it can be assumed that his twofold vision offers two contradictory concepts of the temple. So, it turns out that the first house visually corresponds to God's dwelling, but its materials and interior are to be understood negatively due to their paradox and frightening character. Snow, ice and fire express in this case not purity and transcendence, but destruction and judgment. The simultaneity of heat and cold and the absence of pleasure of life make the first house a place of hostility to life and thus of remoteness of God. This is reflected in Enoch's extreme reaction of fear. In contrast, the second house appears as the true place of God's glory, which is exceptional in everything and superior to the first house which is just a mere broken image. Enoch can therefore only react with amazement and kneel down respectfully. Consequently, this juxtaposition of two temples in the *Book of the Watchers* can be understood as a criticism of any attempt to copy the house of God.

However, it seems to remain suspicious that the two houses are ostensibly viewed during the same heavenly journey and are in close proximity to each other. At least this is what *1 En.* 14:8 could suggest, according to which Enoch is lifted up by the winds and brought up to heaven. It should not be forgotten, though, that the two houses are part of a visionary transcendent reality. The two houses can only be determined indirectly as the earthly and heavenly realisation of a temple through their detailed descriptions and not through the initial translation of Enoch. This is also made clear by the term ὄρασις and ὄραβ “vision,” respectively, which appears three times in the first verse of the description of the vision (*1 En.* 14:8).¹⁰⁰ In the heading, this term initially characterises the entire ensuing event as an overall visionary experience.¹⁰¹ Within the translation, described in the following, the term emphasises that what has now been experienced and seen is part of a realm removed from everyday reality, in which the boundaries between heaven and earth are blurred, if not

100 This is especially noteworthy because the terms ὄραβ, ὄνειρος resp. ἄδραβ “dream” and ὄραβ/ὄραβ, ὄρασις resp. ὄραβ “vision” are used within the *Book of the Watchers* apart from the book title (*1 En.* 1:2 “vision of the Holy One”) only in connection with the dream report (*1 En.* 13:8, 10; 14:1, 4, 8, 14). In contrast, according to *1 En.* 17–19, 21–36, the patriarch does not travel in a dream or vision, but actually moves around, only horizontally. Although Enoch visits all possible places in the world and the ends of the cosmos on his travels, *1 En.* 17–19, 21–36 does not describe a single journey to heaven. Cf. K. Coblenz Bantch, *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17–19. “No One Has Seen What I Have Seen”* (JSJSup 81; Leiden: Brill 2003) 8–9. Thus, Enoch's cosmic travels cannot be regarded as visionary events or experiences.

101 Cf. also Ezek 1:1; 8:3; 11:24; 40:2; Dan 8:1–2.

abolished.¹⁰² Enoch's translation into heaven is, therefore, above all, access to a visionary space. This can be compared with Ezekiel's visions of the temple (Ezek 8–11 and 40–48), which are inextricably linked and can be seen as negative and positive equivalents of each other.¹⁰³ In Ezek 8:3, when spirit/wind¹⁰⁴ lifts Ezekiel between heaven and earth and brings him to Jerusalem, the prophet gets insight into a different reality. In Ezek 40–48, Ezekiel is translated to the same place in the same manner, though in future. The divinely caused change of location explains in both cases (Enoch and Ezekiel) how the event of a vision is “technically” initiated. Thus, it is a matter of the content proclaimed in the vision itself.

This is supported by the way in which the translation of Enoch is described. The natural phenomena mentioned in 1 En. 14:8 can be seen as a cosmic reference to God and thus as an expression of divine action, which in this way becomes visible and tangible on earth.¹⁰⁵ Exactly the same terms will be used later in connection with the description of the glory of God (1 En. 14:15–23). The course of the stars and the lightning that urge Enoch to hurry in 1 En. 14:8 are a central component of the second house (1 En. 14:17) and introduce the description of the throne and the glory of God. The mention of the stars and the lightning in 1 En. 14:11 in the description of the first house can, however, be understood in the same way as a reference, since they are only depicted there and not actually present.¹⁰⁶ Accordingly, the natural phenomena in 1 En. 14:8 refer from the beginning to the glory of God in the second house as the actual goal of the twofold vision (1 En. 14:17).

Furthermore, the fact that Enoch is translated into heaven and sees the two houses, each in a transcendent space, does not necessarily mean that there is no relationship between the content of the vision and earthly reality. It is rather the case that what is seen in the vision is absolutely binding for the earthly reality and can anticipate earthly events or conditions in a visionary way or even address them directly.¹⁰⁷ The detailed description of the first house which frightens Enoch so much, offers numerous elements that are primarily

102 Cf. F. Förg, *Die Ursprünge der alttestamentlichen Apokalyptik* (ABG 45; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt 2013) 100–132, 331–406, who characterises the visions in the Book of Daniel and in the Book of Ezekiel in this way.

103 See below and, in detail, M.J. Bokhorst, *Enoch und der Tempel des Todes. 1 Henoch 14–16 zwischen Schriftauslegung und Traditionsverarbeitung* (BZAW 530; Berlin: de Gruyter 2021) 227–250. Cf. also Th.A. Rudnig, *Heilig und Profan. Redaktionskritische Studien zu Ez 40–48* (BZAW 287; Berlin: de Gruyter 2000) 57, 92, and Hiebel, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts*, 230.

104 For the possibility of translating רוח in Ezek 8:3 as “wind” cf. M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20* (trans. M. Konkel) (HHThKAT; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder 2001) 194, and his commentary on Ezek 3:12 *ibidem*, 98–99.

105 Cf., for example, Jer 10:13 par. 51:16, where a thunder and storm theophany is described with similar words, and Thomas Podella's comment on this (*Das Lichtkleid JHWHs. Untersuchungen zur Gestaltbarkeit Gottes im Alten Testament und seiner altorientalischen Umwelt* [FAT 15; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1996] 170): “Donner, Blitz, Wolken und Sturmwind bilden nach Jer 10,10.12–13 die erkennbare Außenseite Gottes. Nicht eine anthropomorphe Gestalt, sondern die Werkzeuge einer Wettergottheit zeigen das Handeln dieses Gottes weithin sichtbar an.” Cf. also Exod 19:16; 20:21; Ps 18:10; 135:7 and Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 261, resp. Ps 104:2–4, 7 and Podella, *Das Lichtkleid JHWHs*, 232–240, 268–269.

106 See above resp. n. 84.

107 In this context one could refer, for example, to the visions in Dan 7, in which Daniel first sees four animals that rise from the sea and that can be interpreted as four earthly kings, then the Ancient of Days who sits down

used as indications of an earthly temple¹⁰⁸ and thus can be understood as pointing to the temple in Jerusalem, while the design of the second house, together with the enthroned glory, indicates the true temple, which is in heaven.¹⁰⁹ Therefore, the direct juxtaposition of the two houses in Enoch's twofold vision should not be disregarded, but taken seriously and become the basis for proper interpretation.

The interpretation of the two houses in the sense of a juxtaposition of two temple concepts is also confirmed by the immediate context. In the following divine speech in *I En.* 15:1–16:4, the categorical juxtaposition of the two houses in the sense of a heavenly ideal and an earthly image is explicitly taken up by means of the keyword “house/dwelling,”¹¹⁰ and transferred to the spirits of heaven and earth. As for God, there is only one ideal dwelling place for the spirits, which corresponds to the order of creation, namely in heaven (*I En.* 15:7, 10).¹¹¹ These heavenly spirits and their heavenly dwelling are contrasted with the evil spirits who have emerged from the giants, the illegal descendants of the watchers, and who do mischief on earth: “The spirits of heaven: their dwelling shall be in heaven. And the spirits of earth who were born on earth: their dwelling is on earth” (*I En.* 15:10; cf. *I En.* 15:8). As a hostile principle that originated on earth and contradicts the order of creation, their existence and dwelling on earth represent the negative image to the heavenly spirits created by God and their dwelling in heaven. Within the entire dream report, the two houses in Enoch's vision (*I En.* 14:8–25) thus become a paradigm and background for determining the relationship between that which corresponds to the divine order of creation and its perversion.

Moreover, the juxtaposition of two temple concepts, as formulated in Enoch's vision, is not really a new idea in tradition-historical terms. Forerunners of this notion can be found in other Jewish works, albeit with different orientations. Particularly, in comparison with Ezekiel's visions of the temple (Ezek 8–11; 40–48), remarkable parallels can be found.¹¹² These even go beyond the general temple theme and the comparison of a deficient and ideal sanctuary.

First, both works, the Book of Ezekiel and the *Book of the Watchers*, describe visions of the temple (cf. Ezek 8–11; 40–48, and *I En.* 14:8–14a; 14:14b–25) and stand in a temporal connection with the Second Temple. It is therefore not only obvious but also necessary

for judgment, and finally, the Son of Man who comes upon the clouds of heaven. The visions that follow one another actually play on different levels and yet are strictly related to the future fate of earthly history.

108 See here in particular the comparative language e.g. in *I En.* 14:11, which implies that stars, lightning and cherubim are only depicted but not actually present—as is typically the case in ancient earthly temples (cf. the detailed discussion earlier).

109 See here, in particular, the real presence of stars, flashes of lightning and cherubim (e.g. *I En.* 14:17).

110 *κατοίκησις* and *σπηλιε*, respectively (the Aramaic version of *I En.* 15 has not survived).

111 For a similar categorical juxtaposition of the heavenly and earthly world see, for example, Ps 115:3, 16.

112 For the close relationship between the two visions of the temple in the book of Ezekiel and their interpretation as negative and positive equivalents, see, for example, Rudnig, *Heilig und Profan*, 57–58, 92, and Hiebel, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts*, 230.

to compare the two, as various researchers have already done.¹¹³ Likewise, it is remarkable that both describe a deficient, frightening (Ezek 8–11 and *1 En.* 14:8–14a) and an ideal, glorious temple (Ezek 40–48 and *1 En.* 14:14b–25).¹¹⁴ Each book presents these two visions of the temple within one book, each termed “vision”¹¹⁵ and opening with the introductory “I saw/was shown” and/or “behold” (Ezek 8:2; 40:3; *1 En.* 14:8, 14b). In one case these visions directly follow one another (*1 En.* 14) and in the other, they are closely related to one another despite the time gap (Ezek 8–11 and 40–48; cf. the dating).¹¹⁶

Furthermore, both in Ezekiel and in the *Book of the Watchers*, the protagonist is brought to another place by a divine force within a visionary event and is shown two different temples (Ezek 8:1–3; 40:1–2; *1 En.* 14:8). Especially the parallels between Ezek 8:3 and *1 En.* 14:8 in the description of the moment of translation are remarkable:¹¹⁷

Ezek 8:3:

יִשְׁלַח תְּבַנִּית יַד יְדֵי וַיִּקְחַנִי בְצִיצַת רָאשֵׁי וַתְּשֵׂא אֹתִי רוּחַ בֵּין־הָאָרְצִים וּבֵין הַשָּׁמַיִם וַתְּבַא אֹתִי יְרוּשָׁמָה
בְּמַרְאוֹת אֱלֹהִים אֲל־פֶּתַח שַׁעַר הַפְּנִימִית הַפּוֹנֶה צָפוֹנָה אֲשֶׁר־שָׁם מוֹשֵׁב סַמַּל הַקְּנָאָה הַמְקַנָּה:

It stretched out the form of a hand, and took me by a lock of my head; and the **spirit/wind lifted me up** between earth and heaven, and **brought me in visions of God** to Jerusalem, to the entrance of the gateway of the inner court that faces north, to the seat of the image of jealousy, which provokes to jealousy. (NRSV)

1 En. 14:8:

[] לִי זַעֲקוֹן וַיִּקְרָן וּבֵן [] לַעֲלָא וְאוּבֹלְלוּנִי וְאִנְי [] בֵּן

καὶ ἐμοὶ ἐφ' ὄρασει οὕτως ἐδείχθη· ἰδοὺ νεφέλαι ἐν τῇ ὄρασει ἐκάλουν, καὶ ὀμίχλαι με ἐφώνουν, καὶ διαδρομαὶ τῶν ἀστέρων καὶ διαστραπαὶ με κατεσπούδαζον καὶ ἐθορύβαζόν με, καὶ ἄνεμοι ἐν τῇ ὄρασει μου ἔξεπέτασαν με καὶ ἐπήράν με ἄνω καὶ εἰσήνεγκάν με εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.

ወሊተ፡ራእይ፡ከመዝ፡አስተርአየኒ፡ናሁ፡ደመናት፡በራእይ፡ይጸውዑኒ፡ወኒሜ፡ይጸውዑኒ፡ወናጸተ፡ከዋክብት፡መመርቅቅት፡ ያጉጉኡኒ፡ወያጽዕቁኒ፡ወነፋሳት፡ በራዕይ፡ ያስርሩኒ፡ወያጉጉዑኒ፡ ወአነሥኡኒ፡ ሳዕለ፡ ወሰተ፡ሰማይ።

And in a vision I was shown the following: Behold, clouds called in the vision and fog called me and the course of the stars and lightning made me hurry up and troubled me and **winds made me fly in my vision and lifted me up and brought me up into heaven**.¹¹⁸

113 Authors as early as August Dillmann and Robert Charles refer in their brief commentaries on Enoch in the context of *1 En.* 14 to the visions in the Book of Ezekiel (cf. Dillmann, *Das Buch Dillmann*, 109–110; Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, 33–34). Though the focus is often on Ezekiel's account of his calling in Ezek 1–3, a comparison with Ezekiel's visions in general has been the subject of research on *1 En.* 14 since the beginning of Enoch studies and can be found in all current investigations. The studies by Himmelfarb and Nickelsburg are particularly noteworthy here, since in their detailed comparison they not only include Ezek 1–3 but also the two visions of the temple (cf. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 9–20; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 259–266). See in detail Bokhorst, *Tempel des Todes*, 14–15, 215, 234–237.

114 See in detail Bokhorst, *Tempel des Todes*, 227–34 (Ezekiel) and 185–213 (*1 Enoch*).

115 Cf. מראות אלהים (Ezek 8:1–3, 40:2) and רָאָה (1 En. 14:8, 14b). Cf. Bokhorst, *Tempel des Todes*, 236–237.

116 See in detail Bokhorst, *Tempel des Todes*, 163–166 (*1 Enoch*) and 227–229 (Ezekiel).

117 Cf. also Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 262, and Ezek 3:12, 14; 11:1, 24; 43:5.

118 The translation follows GrPan.

Thus, in both cases, the protagonist is lifted up by a divine force during a vision and brought to the place of his vision. In contrast to Ezek 8:3, however, in Enoch's translation not only one spirit/wind is involved, but ultimately a whole collective of natural forces that act as the visible outside of God.

In addition, in both works the juxtaposition of the two temples is determined by the question of the absence or presence of divine glory and the cultic appropriateness of the place.¹¹⁹ In Ezek 8–11, the cultic defilement of the then-existing, earthly Jerusalem temple causes the departure of the glory of God¹²⁰ as well as the destruction of the sanctuary and the annihilation of the people;¹²¹ the new temple in Ezek 40–48, on the other hand, is characterised by cultic purity and holiness and becomes a source of life and blessings through the presence of divine glory.¹²² Likewise, the first house in Enoch's vision seems to be, due to its character and the hostile circumstances, a negative counterpart to the ideal sanctuary (the second house) and is in this respect similar to the temple described in Ezek 8–11. Against this, the divine glory as well as the healing temple rivers are present in the second house, as was also the case with the temple described in Ezek 40–48.

In this way, a loud criticism of cult is expressed in both works, although it is clearer and more explicit in Ezekiel, whereas it is more subtle in the *Book of the Watchers*. On the one hand, there is a certain rejection of human-made things with regard to the design of the interior and wall decoration. The sanctuary in Ezekiel's first vision of the temple (Ezek 8–11) is full of idols and portrayals on the walls with which the people of Israel defiled the house of God.¹²³ Likewise, the first house in Enoch's twofold vision demonstrates the shortcomings of images, since they only imitate what is actually present in God's true dwelling place. In contrast, the new temple in Ezek 40–48 and the second house in *1 En.* 14:14b–25 differ not only from these first two temple concepts but also from the descriptions of the Tabernacle (Exod 25–31; 35–40) and the Solomonic temple (1 Kgs 6–8; 2 Chr 3–7) with regard to the furnishings and design: In both cases, there is neither a rich interior design nor precious materials.¹²⁴ Rather, Ezekiel's new temple impresses with its emptiness and its focus on the return of the glory of God.¹²⁵ The second house in the *Book of the Watchers* appears as the living cosmos, in which the natural and heavenly phenomena function as the environment of God and thus as natural temple decorations.¹²⁶

However, there is also a notable difference between these two temple conceptions. Despite everything, the *Book of Ezekiel* adheres to the idea of an earthly temple and, by

119 With regard to Ezekiel's visions of the temple, cf. Rudnig, *Heilig und Profan*, 57, 92, and Hiebel, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts*, 230.

120 Cf. Ezek 9:3; 10:4, 18; 11:22–23.

121 Cf. Ezek 9:5–8; 11:7–11.

122 Cf. Hiebel, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts*, 210.

123 Cf. Ezek 8:3, 5, 10, 11, 12, 14.

124 For this observation with regard to Ezek 40–48, cf. Hiebel, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts*, 198–199; Podella, *Das Lichtkleid JHWHs*, 205; and Rudnig, *Heilig und Profan*, 38.

125 Cf. also Rudnig, *Heilig und Profan*, 132, and Hiebel, *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts*, 198–199.

126 For a similar notion see, for example, Ps 104:2.

means of the glory theology, challenges the idea that God is bound to his earthly sanctuary. The temple concept in the *Book of the Watchers* seems to go a significant step further and break completely with the idea of an earthly temple. Instead, God dwells in heaven, and only there.

Conclusion

In consequence, it has been shown that Enoch's twofold vision may be interpreted as one of the most radical temple-critical texts of ancient Judaism. Contrary to previous research, which interpreted the two parts of the vision in the sense of a single temple complex, it has become clear that the first house, as a place of the remoteness of God and joylessness, stands in contrast to the second house and can possibly be read as a symbol for the deficient earthly sanctuary in Jerusalem. In contrast, only the second house proves to be the true cosmos and dwelling place of God and thus the ideal heavenly sanctuary. Such a perception and interpretation of this passage also explains the remarkable level of detail in the description of the houses compared to an ordinary throne room vision. In contrast to Isa 6 or Ezek 1–3, for example, Enoch's twofold vision is not only about the legitimation of the protagonist but also about the categorical juxtaposition of the heavenly and earthly worlds. This juxtaposition results in a "decoupling" of the potency of God from his visible presence on earth. The traditional idea of a direct correspondence between the ideal sanctuary and its earthly image seems consequently to be broken. Even if the description of the vision is linked to numerous traditional ideas of ancient Judaism, in this way it presents a very unique idea of the place where God dwells.

Bibliography

- Ambos, C., *Mesopotamische Baurituale aus dem 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr. Mit einem Beitrag von Aaron Schmitt* (Dresden: ISLET 2004).
- Assmann, J., *Ägypten – Theologie und Frömmigkeit einer frühen Hochkultur* (Urban-Taschenbücher 366; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 1984).
- Bachmann, V., *Die Welt im Ausnahmezustand. Eine Untersuchung zu Aussagegehalt und Theologie des Wächterbuchs (1 Hen 1–36)* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 409; Berlin: de Gruyter 2009).
- Beer, G., "Das Buch Henoch," *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*. II. *Die Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (ed. E. Kautzsch) (Tübingen: Mohr 1900) 217–310.
- Behrens, A., *Prophetische Visionsschilderungen im Alten Testament. Sprachliche Eigenarten, Funktion und Geschichte einer Gattung* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 292; Münster: Ugarit 2002).
- Biberger, B., "Unbefriedigende Gegenwart und ideale Zukunft: Gesamtisraelitische Heilsperspektiven in den letzten Worten Tobits (Tob 14)," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 55 (2011) 265–280.

- Black, M., *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch. A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigraphica 7; Leiden: Brill 1985).
- Bokhorst, M.J., *Henoch und der Tempel des Todes. 1 Henoch 14–16 zwischen Schriftauslegung und Traditionsverarbeitung* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 530; Berlin: de Gruyter 2021).
- Botterweck, G.J. – Fabry, H.-J. (eds.), *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*. II. חמץ – גלולים (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 1977).
- Brooke, G.J., “The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel* (ed. J. Day) (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 422; London: Clark 2005) 417–434.
- Charles, R.H., *The Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch. Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text, and Edited with the Introduction Notes and Indexes of the First Edition Wholly Recast Enlarged and Rewritten. Together with a Reprint from the Editor's Text of the Greek Fragments* (Oxford: Clarendon 1912).
- Coblentz Bautch, K., “The Heavenly Temple, the Prison in the Void and the Uninhabited Paradise: Otherworldly Sites in the *Book of the Watchers*,” *Other Worlds and Their Relation to this World. Early Jewish and Ancient Christian Traditions* (ed. T. Nicklas) (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 143; Leiden: Brill 2010) 37–53.
- Coblentz Bautch, K., *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17–19. “No One Has Seen What I Have Seen”* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 81; Leiden: Brill 2003).
- Cook, E.M., *Dictionary of Qumran Aramaic* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns 2015).
- Dean-Otting, M., *Heavenly Journeys. A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature* (Judentum und Umwelt 8; Frankfurt am Main: Lang 1984).
- Dillmann, A., *Das Buch Henoch uebersetzt und erklärt* (Leipzig: Vogel 1853).
- Dimant, D., *From Enoch to Tobit. Collected Studies in Ancient Jewish Literature* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 114; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2017).
- Drawnel, H., *Qumran Cave 4. The Aramaic Books of Enoch, 4Q201, 4Q202, 4Q204, 4Q205, 4Q206, 4Q207, 4Q212* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2019).
- Ego, B., “Denkbilder für Gottes Einzigkeit, Herrlichkeit und Richtermacht – Himmelsvorstellungen im antiken Judentum,” *Der Himmel* (eds. M. Ebner – P.D. Hanson) (Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie 20; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag 2006) 151–188.
- Ego, B., “Henochs Reise vor den Thron Gottes (1 Hen 14,8–16,4): Zur Funktion des Motivs der Himmelsreise im ‘Wächterbuch’ (1 Hen 1–36),” *Apokalyptik und Qumran. Dritte Fachtagung zur Qumranforschung 2003 in der Katholischen Akademie Schwerte* (eds. M. Becker – J. Frey) (Einblicke 10; Paderborn: Bonifatius 2007) 105–121.
- Esler, Ph.F., *God's Court and Courtiers in the Book of the Watchers. Re-interpreting Heaven in 1 Enoch 1–36* (Eugen, OR: Cascade Books 2017).
- Förg, F., *Die Ursprünge der alttestamentlichen Apokalyptik* (Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte 45; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt 2013).
- Gäckle, V., *Allgemeines Priestertum. Zur Metaphorisierung des Priestertitels im Frühjudentum und Neuen Testament* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 331; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2014).
- Gesenius, W. – Buhl, F., *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*, Reprint of the 17 ed. [1915] (Berlin: Springer 1962).
- Greenberg, M., *Ezekiel 1–20* (trans. M. Konkel) (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder 2001).
- Gruenwald, I., *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, 2 revised ed. (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 90; Leiden: Brill 2014).

- Hiebel, J.M., *Ezekiel's Vision Accounts as Interrelated Narratives. A Redaction-Critical and Theological Study* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 475; Berlin: de Gruyter 2015).
- Himmelfarb, M., *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York: Oxford University Press 1993).
- Janowski, B., "Der Himmel auf Erden: Zur kosmologischen Bedeutung des Tempels in der Umwelt Israels," *Das biblische Weltbild und seine altorientalischen Kontexte* (eds. B. Janowski – B. Ego) (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 32; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1991) 229–260.
- Josephus Flavius, *The Jewish War. III. Books IV–VII* (trans. H.St.J. Thackeray) (Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1968).
- Knibb, M.A., "Temple and Cult in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal Writings from Before the Common Era," *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel. Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (ed. J. Day) (Old Testament Studies 422; London: Clark 2005) 401–416.
- Köckert, M., "Die Theophanie des Wettergottes Jahwe in Psalm 18," *Kulturgeschichten. Altorientalische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. Th. Richter) (Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druck und Verlag 2001) 209–226.
- Koehler, L. – Baumgartner, W., *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* (Leiden: Brill 2004) I–II.
- Kratz, R.G. – Steudel, A. – Kottsieper, I. (eds.), *Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zu den Texten vom Toten Meer. Einschliesslich der Manuskripte aus der Kairoer Geniza. I. 8 – 2* (Berlin: de Gruyter 2017).
- Kvanvig, H.S., "Henoch und der Menschensohn. Das Verhältnis von Hen 14 zu Dan 7," *Studia Theologica* 38 (1984) 101–133.
- Lods, A., *Le livre d'Hénoch. Fragments grecs découverts à Akhmîm (Haute-Égypte). Publiés avec les variantes du texte éthiopien traduits et annotés* (Paris: Leroux 1892).
- Lynch, M., "Divine Supremacy and the Temple: 2 Chronicles 2 and the Fifth Book of Psalms," *Psalmen und Chronik* (eds. F. Hartenstein – Th. Willi) (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2/107; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2019) 323–342.
- Lynch, M., *Monotheism and Institutions in the Book of Chronicles. Temple, Priesthood, and Kingship in Post-Exilic Perspective* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2/64; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2014).
- Maier, J., "Das Gefährdungsmotiv bei der Himmelsreise in der jüdischen Apokalyptik und 'Gnosis,'" *Kairos* 5 (1963) 18–40.
- Milik, J.T., *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon 1976).
- Murray-Jones, Ch.R.A., *A Transparent Illusion. The Dangerous Vision of Water in Hekhalot Mysticism. A Source-Critical and Tradition-Historical Inquiry* (Supplements to the Journal for the study of Judaism 59; Leiden: Brill 2002).
- Newsom, C., "The Development of 1 Enoch 6–19: Cosmology and Judgment," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 42 (1980) 310–329.
- Newsom, C., *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. A Critical Edition* (Harvard Semitic Studies 27; Atlanta, GA: Scholars 1985).
- 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).
- Nickelsburg, G.W.E., "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100/4 (1981) 575–600.
- Ottosson, M., "היכל," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* (eds. G.J. Botterweck – H. Ringgren – H.-J. Fabry) (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 1977) II, 409–415.

- Podella, Th., *Das Lichtkleid JHWHs. Untersuchungen zur Gestalthaftigkeit Gottes im Alten Testament und seiner altorientalischen Umwelt* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 15; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1996).
- Rudnig, Th.A., *Heilig und Profan. Redaktionskritische Studien zu Ez 40–48* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 287; Berlin: de Gruyter 2000).
- Rudnig, Th.A., “»Ist denn Jahwe nicht auf dem Zion?« (Jer 8,19): Gottes Gegenwart im Heiligtum,” *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 104 (2007) 267–286.
- van Ruiten, J.T.A.G.M., “Visions of the Temple in the *Book of Jubilees*,” *Gemeinde ohne Tempel / Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühes Christentum* (eds. B. Ego – A. Lange – P. Pilhofer) (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1999) 215–227.
- Schäfer, P., *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2009).
- Steck, O.H., *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 23; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag 1967).
- Stuckenbruck, L.T., *1 Enoch 91–108* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; Berlin: de Gruyter 2007).
- Suter, D.W., “Temples and the Temple in the Early Enoch tradition: Memory, Vision, and Expectation,” *The Early Enoch Literature* (eds. G. Boccaccini – J.J. Collins) (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 121; Leiden: Brill 2007) 195–218.
- Suter, D.W., “Why Galilee? Galilean Regionalism in the Interpretation of 1 *Enoch* 6–16.” *Henoch* 25 (2003) 167–212.
- Tigheelaar, E.J.C., *Prophets of Old & The Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers & Apocalyptic* (Oudtestamentische studiën 35; Leiden: Brill 1996).
- Tiller, P.A., *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (Early Judaism and Its Literature 4; Atlanta, GA: Scholars 1993).
- Van Leeuwen, R.C., “Cosmos, Temple, House: Building and Wisdom in Ancient Mesopotamia and Israel,” *From the Foundations to the Crenellations. Essays on Temple Building in the Ancient Near East and Hebrew Bible* (eds. M.J. Boda – J. Novotny) (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 366; Münster: Ugarit 2010) 399–421.