1 ENOCH IN *JUDE* AND IN THE EOTC "CANON":

DEVELOPING AN ADEQUATE INSIGHT IN SECOND TEMPLE LITERATURE (STL) IN THE VARIOUS ETHIOPIAN CHURCHES FOR A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF EACH OTHER AND FOR THE PROMOTION OF ECUMENISM AND MUTUAL COOPERATION

By

BRUK AYELE ASALE

209540376

Submitted in Fulfilment of the Academic Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In Subject of

NEW TESTAMENT (BIBLICAL STUDIES)

At the

UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU-NATAL (UKZN)

School of Religion, Philosophy and Classics (SRPC) (Pietermaritzburg Campus)

SUPERVISOR

PROFESSOR PAUL BERNARD DECOCK

PIETERMARITZBURG

March 2015

DECLARATION

As required by University regulations, I hereby state unambiguously that this work has not been presented at any other University or any other institution of higher learning other than the University of KwaZulu Natal (UKZN) the School of Religion, Philosophy and Classics (SRPC) (Pietermaritzburg Campus), and that unless specifically indicated to the contrary within the text it is my original work.

BRUK AYELE ASALE

March 06, 2015

As candidate supervisor I hereby approve this thesis for submission

---

PROFESSOR PAUL BERNARD DECOCK

March 06, 2015

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to the many Ethiopian Christians who have strived and become part of ecumenical movement in Ethiopia.

And

Among these Christians, Rev. Gudina Tumsa stood out in being instrumental for the practical initiation of inclusive Ecumenical Council of Churches in Ethiopia. He was murdered for the faith he believed in!

Rev. Gudina Tumsa believed not only in the possibility and inevitability of ecumenism, he rather believed more in the God of the Bible Who has the power to miraculously bring churches into unity. He said:

> It seems to be necessary to remind ourselves of the mighty power of the Bible's God, because there are Christians who argue that there cannot be a unity among the churches. **Biblical faith is based on the impossible, on miracles.** … Miracles are contrary to the laws of nature. Ours is still the God of miracles, and one of the miracles he may perform today is to bring about unity among His churches. **Let us then talk about His Church rather than our churches** (Gudina Tumsa 2003:19).

It is, therefore, to this committed martyr, **the Rev. Gudina Tumsa**, this thesis is dedicated with complements.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

The Epistle of Jude not only used 1 Enoch and some Second Temple Literature as authoritative Scripture, but also it has been significantly influenced by it. Until it disappeared from the Church since the fifth and sixth centuries, except the Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church, 1 Enoch has been used as authoritative Scripture among many Jewish and Christian communities. Unlike any other church, the EOTC is the Church that has preserved the text in Ge'ez in its entirety and made 1 Enoch part of its canon, which is unique both in its concept and extent.

As part of its Scriptures, which has been received as early as the reception of Christianity itself, 1 Enoch has significantly influenced the EOTC directly and other Ethiopian churches indirectly. However, the unifying factor of the Scriptures and the positive role 1 Enoch and other STL would have played, have been misunderstood as a source of differences among Ethiopian churches. This misunderstanding arises from the neglect and misrepresentation of the concept and extent of the canon of the EOTC by the western scholarship, which is permeated Ethiopian Evangelicalism.

So, the central question this thesis asks is: Why do the Ethiopian Churches, Orthodox and Evangelicals, who have the Scriptures in common, who are considered as Trinitarian churches and who have been shaped and influenced by *1 Enoch*, hold strongly opposing views on the STL in general and on *1 Enoch* in particular? *The tripolar African contextual approach*, complement by *the history of reception approach*, and *an ecumenical appreciative approach*, is the best framework to this study. The tripolar African contextual approach helps us to see this from an African/Ethiopian context, against the western approach which tends to assume that all contexts as the same. Whereas the history of reception approach helps us to frame the reception history of both the Scriptures and Christianity to Ethiopia, the ecumenical appreciative approach directs us to positive impacts in cooperation and unity.

The findings suggest that (1) the concept of the canon of the EOTC refers more to the "rule of faith" understanding than a "list of books". (2) 1 Enoch has an impact in shaping the ancient Ethiopian literature, culture, theology, spirituality, chronography and popular religious practices. (3) With all the possible interpretive differences, the Scriptures have more of a

unifying than a dividing effect in the Ethiopian churches, and if other dividing elements are adequately and properly addressed, they can play a positive role in ecumenical unity. (4) Ecumenical unity is indispensable for all Ethiopian churches not only to tackle the challenges of the twenty-first century, but also for their very existence. It is suggested that these findings should be taken positively and seriously for a better future of both citizens and churches in Ethiopia.

Key Terms: 1 Enoch, Amharic Millennium Translation, Angels in Jude, Apocrypha, Authoritative Status of 1 Enoch, Authority, Bible, Canon, Ecumenical Appreciative Approach, Ecumenism, Ecumenism in Ethiopian Churches, Ethiopian Evangelical Churches, Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church (EOTC), Ethiopian Manuscripts, History of Reception Approach, Inspiration, Jude, Legacy of 1 Enoch, Pseudepigrapha, Scripture, Scriptures in Ethiopian Churches, Second Temple Literature, Septuagint, Tripolar African Contextual Approach,

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

1. General Acronyms

AAU	Addis Ababa University
ABD	*The Anchor Bible Dictionary*
BBC	The British Broadcasting Corporation
BBE	The Bible in Basic English
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BSE	The Bible Society of Ethiopia
B.S.P.E.	Berhanena Selam Printing Enterprise
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CCC	The Crossway Classic Commentaries
CCCE	The Council on the Cooperation of the Churches in Ethiopia
CMS	Church Missionary Society
CTM	*Concordia Theological Monthly*
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
EBR	Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception
ECFE	Evangelical Churches' Fellowship of Ethiopia
EDNT	*Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*
EEC	Ethiopian Evangelical Churches
EECMY	The Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus
EGST	The Ethiopian Graduate School of Theology
EKHC	The Ethiopian *Kale Hiwot* Church
EMML	The Ethiopian Manuscripts Microfilm Library
EOC	The Ethiopian Orthodox Church
EOTC	The Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church
EPRDF	The Ethiopian Peoples' Revolutionary Democratic Front
FDRE	The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
GTF	Gudina Tumsa Foundation
HMML	The Hill Museum & Manuscript Library
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*

IBS	The International Bible Society
IDB	*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*
ISBE	*The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*
IES	The Institute of Ethiopian Studies
JBR	*Journal of Bible and Religion*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism*
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTS(S)	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement (Series)
JSOTSS	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic text
NBD	*The New Bible Dictionary*
NIB	*The New Interpreter's Bible*
NIDNTT	*The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*
NIV	The New International Version
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NT	New Testament
NTC	New Testament Commentaries
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
NTT	New Testament Theology
OT	Old Testament
RCC	The Roman Catholic Church
SIL	The Summer Institute of Linguistics
SJOT	*Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*
SJSJ	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
SNTSMS	Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SOAS	The School of Oriental and African Studies
STL	Second Temple Period Literature

TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
UBS	The United Bible Societies
UKZN	University of KwaZulu Natal
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
WCC	The World Council of Churches
ZPEB	*The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*

2. Abbreviations

AD	*Anno Domini* (i.e. referring to years after Jesus Christ was born)
BC	before Christ
B.C.E.	before the Common Era
BTh	Bachelor of Theology
c. (ca.)	*circa* (i.e. approximately)
C.E.	Common Era
cf.	*confer* (i.e. compare)
ch(s)	chapter(s)
diss.	dissertation
E.C.	Ethiopian Calendar
ed(s).	editor(s); edition
e.g.	for example
esp.	especially
et al	*et alia* (i.e., and others)
etc.	*et cetera* (i.e., and other similar things)
f. (ff.)	and the following page(s)
f.n.	footnote
G.C.	Gregorian Calendar
ibid.	same as the above
idem.	the same as previously cited, given or mentioned
i.e.	that is
ill.	Illustrated; illustration
MA	Masters of Arts

ms(s)	manuscript(s)		
MTh	Masters of Theology		
n.	note		
n.d.	no date		
no.	number		
PhD	Doctor of Philosophy		
p.(pp.)	page(s)		
r.	ruled or reigned		
repr.	reproduced / reprinted		
rvd.	revised		
trans.	translator; translated		
v.(vv.)	verse(s)		
vol(s).	volume(s)		

3. Biblical Books (Proto-canonical)

Gen	Genesis	Ex	Exodus
Num	Numbers	Deut	Deuteronomy
Judg	Judges	1-2 Sam	1-2 Samuel
1-2 Kgs	1-2 Kings	Est	Esther
Job	Job	Ps(s)	Psalm(s)
Prov	Proverbs	Isa	Isaiah
Jer	Jeremiah	Ezek	Ezekiel
Dan	Daniel	Joel	Joel
Amos	Amos	Mic	Micah
Nah	Nahum	Hab	Habakkuk
Zeph	Zephaniah	Hag	Haggai
Zech	Zechariah	Mal	Malachi
Mt	Matthew	Mk	Mark
Lk	Luke	Jn	John
Act	Acts	Rom	Romans
1(2) Cor	1(2) Corinthians	Gal	Galatians

Eph	Ephesians	Phil	Philippians
Col	Colossians	1(2) Thess	1(2) Thessalonians
1(2) Tim	1(2) Timothy	Tit	Titus
Heb	Hebrews	Jes	James
1(2) Pet	1(2) Peter	Rev	Revelation

4. Biblical Books (Deutero-canonical)

1 En	1 (Ethiopic) Enoch	Jub	Jubilees
Tob	Tobit	Jdt	Judith
Esg	Esther (Greek)	Wis	Wisdom of Solomon
Sir	Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)	Bar	Baruch
1(2) Macc	1(2) Maccabees	1(2) Es	1(2) Esdras

5. Extra-Biblical Books

2(3) En	*2(3) Enoch*
Sib. Or.	*Sibylline Oracles*
2 Bar	*2 Baruch*
T. Reu.	*Testament of Reuben*
T. Levi	*Testament of Levi*
T. Jud.	*Testament of Judah*
T. Dan	*Testament of Dan*
T. Naph.	*Testament of Naphtali*
T. Ass	*Testament of Asher*
Asc. Isa.	*Ascension of Isaiah*
Pss. Sol.	*Psalms of Solomon*
Barn	*Epistle of Barnabas*

6. The Dead Sea Scrolls

CD	Damascus Document
1QapGen	Genesis Apocryphon

1QH	Thanksgiving Hymns
1QM	War Scroll
1QS	Manual of Disciples
4QFlor	Florilegium
4QDeut	Deuteronomy at Qumran
4Q$_p$Isa	Pesher or Qumran Commentary on Isaiah

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

An adequate introduction to a scholarly work provides the reader with an insight into the process of the study and an understanding of the resulting work as a whole. The present introduction describes (1) the topic of the research and the thesis to be argued, (2) the background and motivation of the work, (3) the research problem and its objective, (4) a review of relevant literature, (5) the methodology employed to conduct the research and (6) brief descriptions of the various chapters.

1.1 Description of the Topic

The title of the study, "*1 Enoch*[1] in *Jude* and in the EOTC[2] 'Canon'[3]: Developing an Adequate Insight in Second Temple Literature (STL) in the Various Ethiopian Churches[4] for a Better Understanding of Each Other and for the Promotion of Ecumenism and Mutual Cooperation," has three focal points in its main part while the sub-topic refers to three related areas of interest. The main foci, *1 Enoch*, *Jude*, and the Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church (EOTC) "canon", are inherently connected to one another. The Epistle of *Jude* uses STL,

---

[1] *Enoch and Jude* (italicised) refer to, respectively, the book of Enoch and the book of Jude while Enoch and Jude (normal script) refer to the characters of the same name. Throughout the thesis, the same distinction is maintained in relation to other books and characters that share a name.

[2] In most scholarly literature, the Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church is identified as EOC (Ethiopian Orthodox Church), leaving out the letter "T" for "*Tewahedo*". However, as this designation is both practically offensive for the church (as it has been imposed externally) and technically incorrect, I prefer, except in direct quotations, to use the full name and its acronym (EOTC).

[3] As there is no distinction between what is called "canonical", "apocryphal", and/or "pseudepigraphical" in the Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church Scriptures, such terms should not be used in this context. However, I am forced to use them in order to help a non-EOTC reader to understand the discussion. A detailed discussion on a number of key theological and biblical terminologies and concepts, and the take of this study on them, is presented in chapter three below.

[4] There are three major categories of denominational orientation in Ethiopian Churches, namely the Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church, the Roman Catholic Church (RCC), and the Protestant churches. In the Ethiopian context, the EOTC is the major church with a membership of above 32 million (43.5% of the total population of the country), followed by the Protestants with a membership of about 14 million (18.6%), while the RCC is the smallest with about half a million members (0.7%) (FDRE 2008). Of the Protestants, excepting a very few "sects", the large majority (more than 98%) is organized under the umbrella of Evangelicals Fellowship. This study, therefore, limits itself by referring to the two major church bodies, the EOTC and the EEC.

especially *1 (Ethiopic) Enoch*,[5] perhaps more extensively than any other New Testament (NT) book. Likewise, the EOTC uses *1 Enoch* and some of STL in an authoritative way that is unique to it.

The three themes of the sub-topic are an adequate insight in STL in particular, and in the Scriptures in general for that matter, a better understanding of Ethiopian churches among themselves and the promotion of ecumenism for their mutual benefit. In contrast to the EOTC, the Ethiopian Evangelical Churches (EEC) reject the STL entirely. However, while the EOTC and the EEC hold opposing positions as regards *1 Enoch,* the influence of this book as well as that of other STL on both church groups is evident. Their apparent opposing views of STL is discussed in this study in order to promote a better understanding of the Scriptures and, hence, of each other.

1.2 Background and Identification of Research Question

This section briefly discusses the motivation of the researcher, the appropriation of text and context, the focus of content and the research question.

1.2.1 Motivation

One of the greatest challenges posed by my undergraduate theological study, leading to perhaps the biggest change in my theological understanding, was the need to adopt a more positive attitude towards STL. Like most of the EEC's believers, I had never noticed the relevance and the strong theological influence of this body of literature on the early Christians. Thus, the particular interest of this thesis has evolved from my study at the Ethiopian Graduate School of Theology (EGST) where this attitudinal change came about. It strongly motivated me to make a contribution on the subject matter of STL.

In addition, I felt motivated to enhance an awareness of the origin and background of the Bible, as I observed that many Ethiopian Christians were unaware of these. A bias of the EOTC towards the LXX translation and uninformed fear on the part of the EEC led to my

---

[5] *1 Enoch* is also known as *Ethiopic Enoch* as differentiated from *2* and *3 Enoch* which are called *Slavonic* and *Jewish Enoch* respectively.

interest in the problem and my decision to investigate it. There is a tendency among many Evangelicals to consider anything related to the EOTC as wrong and to be avoided. However, as I was maturing in my Christian life and pursued my theological studies on a higher level, I began to question some of the discourses directed against the EOTC. I wanted to learn more about the differences and similarities between the EOTC and the Evangelicals in Ethiopia in order to look afresh at viewpoints that had been held and taught thus far.

Furthermore, *Jude*'s direct quotation of *1 Enoch* puts Evangelicals in a very uncomfortable position and many have tried to explain this but never managed to do so in an adequate and satisfactory manner. Some, of course, simply avoid the question while others choose to deny its existence. Others again consider the problem irrelevant as *Jude* is a very tiny book with no major theological significance.

On the other hand, for many younger believers in the Evangelical Churches, *Jude*'s quotation of *1 Enoch* has become increasingly relevant to their efforts to gain a more complete understanding of the overall setting of the origin of the Scriptures. My encounters as a teacher and preacher with seminary students and with attendants at youth programs of local churches challenged me to study the problem closely. However, many veteran ministers and older generation believers with whom I have occasionally conversed about the problem warned that addressing the issue could end up by leading younger church members in a wrong direction. Many also questioned the relevance of the present study for Evangelicals as they have a-clear-cut-Scriptures, sufficient for dogma and spirituality.

Instead, I have come to regard *Jude* as a bridge that connects the two bodies of literature, the STL and the "canonical" books of EEC. Like many other contemporary and later writers, *Jude* highly esteems *1 Enoch* in particular and STL in general. It is equally an authoritative scriptural book that paves the way for a similar usage of STL. Thus, I found it appropriate to use *Jude* as a bridge for bringing about an adequate understanding of the Scriptures among the Ethiopian Churches.

Finally, the full text of *1 Enoch* has been preserved only by the EOTC in Ge'ez[6].[7] This book – the treasure that it represents – has influenced Ethiopian Christian tradition to the extent of making it unique in global Christendom. I wondered to what depth exactly and in which aspects Ethiopian Churches in particular, and the identities of Ethiopian people in general, had been shaped by this book.

Thus, (1) my recent awareness of the STL, (2) the opposing positions of Ethiopian Churches as regards the LXX and the STL in particular, and the extent of the Scriptures in general, (3) the possibility that *Jude* could function as a bridge to use STL in general and *1 Enoch* in particular, and (4) the uniqueness of *1 Enoch* in the Ethiopian context have motivated this study.

1.2.2 Text, Context and Appropriation

The present study follows a clear and focused tri-polar approach[8] which includes a concern for the text, the context, and bringing these two in dialogue. The texts are *Jude*, the corresponding STL texts in general and *1 Enoch* in particular. The context is the Ethiopian Churches. The appropriation this study is looking for is one that will enable the two Church traditions to appreciate each other's concerns and to develop a broader and closer understanding of the place of *1 Enoch* and the STL in the Church in particular and their understanding of the Scriptures in general.

1.2.3 Content

This thesis consists of six key elements.

---

[6] Even though there is no ambiguity in the designation of the language, which is *Ge'ez*, many western scholars refer officially to it as "Ethiopic", probably to associate it with its locus—Ethiopia. This seems misleading as Ethiopia possesses many other languages and not only Ge'ez.

[7] Even if it is essentially true that the full text of *1 Enoch* is preserved only in Ge'ez text, it should be noted that there are important differences between the Aramaic fragments and the Ge'ez materials; for example, the Astronomical Book in the Aramaic fragments is significantly longer than the present *1 Enoch* 78-82 as in the Ge'ez version.

[8] African contextual tri-polar approach is the main theoretical framework of this study. However, in conjunction with this approach, other theoretical frameworks, applicable to various parts of this study, have been employed. The integration of these various theoretical approaches and their adequate employment in this study need to be considered. A chapter is devoted to this question and it is independently also addressed in chapter two.

1. Key biblical and theological terms and the concepts, views, and categories of writing that have contributed to varying positions and misconceptions as regards the place of STL in Ethiopian churches in particular and the global church in general are discussed.

2. *Jude*'s unique usage of Jewish literature, both "canonical" and "extra-canonical/non-canonical", is studied closely to demonstrate its unique place in the NT corpus in this regard.

3. The place of STL and, among the STL, *1 Enoch*'s unique place, both in the book of *Jude* and in other early Christian writings, are identified.

4. The historical background of the preservation of the *Ethiopic Enoch* in the EOTC in particular, and the unique development of the EOTC "canon" in general, are surveyed.

5. The influence of this book on Ethiopian Christianity over the centuries and its role in shaping contemporary Ethiopian Christianity are investigated.

6. A way forward is suggested whereby both the EOTC and the EEC could appropriately and efficiently use the Scriptures and the STL for all their worth in such a way that ecumenism and the mutual fulfillment of their mission may be promoted.

1.3 Research Question and Objectives

The research question or problem, central to this thesis, may be phrased as follows: why do the Ethiopian Churches, Orthodox and Evangelicals, who have the Scriptures in common, who are considered as Trinitarian churches and who have been shaped and influenced by *1 Enoch*, hold strongly opposing views on the STL in general and on *1 Enoch* in particular? In order to answer this question, other relevant questions have to be raised. (a) Jude is one of the most neglected books in the NT – not only amongst the EEC but also globally. Despite its briefness, it poses some of the most difficult and unique problems in NT. Beginning with its canonicity, the book has never held a strong position, equal to that of other books in the history of the Church. Why is that so, despite its canonical status? Should the book continue to be regarded today as it has been for the last twenty centuries? (b) The Book of *Enoch* is in Ethiopia not only preserved, but it also has retained an authoritative scriptural status. Why did the EOTC

preserve that status whereas its authority was rejected by the Church worldwide? What is its legacy for the church in Ethiopia and, as the book has been part of the Scriptures throughout the history of the church, how relevant has it been for the shaping of an Ethiopian Christian worldview? (c) To what extent and why is the EEC attitude towards the STL different from other Evangelicals globally and from the EOTC? (d) Could there possibly be space for the Ethiopian Churches to meet each other for the sake of a better understanding of their various approaches to and perceptions of STL in particular and the Bible in general? Which factors have hindered ecumenism among Ethiopian churches and, in this context, what would be the way forward?

The objectives of this study, therefore, are:

1. To critique the definitions, scope, importance and usage of various theological key terms concerning the Scriptures, authority, canon, and inspiration with special reference to the STL in the NT time and in today's Ethiopian Churches, the EOTC and EECs.

2. To show how the neglect of a closer and deeper reading of the book of *Jude* that, although brief, is exceptionally important for bridging the gap between our contemporary theological understanding and the Christian origins, has contributed to the adoption of extremely divergent positions by Ethiopian Churches in particular and by churches globally in general.

3. To survey and review *1 Enoch*'s preservation history in the EOTC and its lasting legacy in the Ethiopian context.

4. To explore the "canonical" status of the Scriptures in the EOTC as compared to the EEC whereby special attention will be paid to the STL included in the EOTC "canon".

5. To suggest and determine a better way to approach the issue of scriptural understanding within the Ethiopian churches, so that they will be brought closer to each other in ecumenical unity in order to work together for a common mission of the Church rather than being rivals.

1.4 Literature Review

As compared to the other NT books, *Jude* has received much less attention by scholars in the history of the Church. The reasons for this neglect may be its brevity and explicit usage of STL. However, a significant amount of literature on *Jude* has been produced, especially since the final quarter of the last century. *1 Enoch*, on the other hand, has more recently attracted a number of scholars, especially after the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS). The "canon" debate has remained heated among scholars who have argued from varying positions. Since most of the tradition of the EOTC is preserved orally, written literature on the subject is scarce, even though the oral tradition has been very strong. Therefore, my literature review is divided into the following sections: Jude's use of extracanonical books; *1 Enoch'*s scriptural position; the "canon" debate; and Scripture / canon and its influence in the history of EOTC. We begin with a section devoted to literature on methodology and theoretical framework. The actual theoretical framework of the thesis is discussed independently in chapter two.

1.4.1 Theoretical Framework and Methodology

As mentioned above (1.2.2), this study has adopted a clear and focused *tri-polar African contextual* approach as its overarching theoretical framework. It includes concern for the text and the present context of Ethiopia and it considers how to bring these two elements into a dialogue leading to appropriation. The two other complementary approaches relevant to this study are a *history of reception* approach and an *ecumenical appreciative* approach on the basis of some relevant scholarly works.

As far as a tripolar African contextual approach is concerned, the works of four scholars have contributed significantly by articulating and shaping this approach, looking from various angles which are, in my view, complementing each other.

i) Christina Grenholm and Daniel Patte (2000:1-54) have developed a *tripolar interpretive process* consisting of *a Scripture text, the believers' life* and *the religious communities' perception of life*. This process, as they explain, involves "a critical analysis of the text, an analysis of the believer's situation and an elucidation of the theological issues involved in their religious perceptions of life – all of which are integrated in one interpretive process"

(Grenholm and Patte 2000:20). This approach and its process have helped me to offer a contextual exegesis of relevant texts particularly from *Jude* and *1 Enoch*.

ii) Justin S. Ukpong (1994b:17) focuses mainly on "inculturation hermeneutics" and advocates the following tripolar approach: *a context, a text,* and *an interpretive framework*.[9] Ukpong's (1995:5) inculturation theology mainly attempts "to make the African, for that matter any socio-cultural context the *subject* of interpretation." This approach is applied to the Ethiopian religious and socio-cultural contexts.

iii) Similarly, Jonathan A. Draper (2001:148-168) offers a tripolar contextual interpretive approach, consisting of *distantiation, contextualization,* and *appropriation*. Draper (2002:12-24) emphasizes the ongoing interaction between the text and the reader and designates reading as *conversation*. The tendency to openness in the process of this conversation is crucial for this study as it involves and recommends a double stage dialogue between the text and the context on the one hand and between two competing church groups on the other.

iv) Gerald O. West (2003) is one of the staunchest advocates of contextual Bible reading. His main contentions include (a) commitment to engage in biblical reading with what he calls "ordinary readers of the Bible," (b) to embrace and advocate context (West 2001:169-184), (c) to read the Bible in conversation for social transformation (West 2006:401), and (d) to find "a new message from the Bible when we find *a new way of doing Bible Study*" (West 1993:7). Almost all these scholars share some common features in their approaches: (1) their interest in ordinary readers' context, leading them to do the interpretation with these readers and for their benefit; (2) a special emphasis on the neglected African context of oppression, (3) a determined choice for a critical engagement with, and closer reading of, the text under examination, potentially in a different way from the conventional one, and (4) a concentration on making the text relevant to the contemporary situation by transforming the question at

---

[9] Later on, Ukpong (1995:5) extended these to five elements, expanding the "interpretive framework" to include *interpreter, conceptual framework*, and *procedure*. His other relevant works on this topic include Ukpong 1996:189-210; 1997:3-31; 2003:105-122.

stake. How the researcher intends to apply this approach in the present study is discussed in chapter two.

Of the two subordinate approaches applicable to this study, the first one is what is called *Wirkungsgeschichte*, generally translated as *history of reception.* Based on the wider philosophical tradition of scholars like Martin Heidegger (1996) and Paul Ricoeur (1981), the history of reception approach or *Wirkungsgeschichte* is substantially founded by Hans-Georg Gadamer in his landmark work, *Truth and Method* (1975; 2004). Ulrich Luz (1990), among others, goes further in his commentary on *Matthew* reshaping the framework and applying it to a particular text in its reception history.

That the history of reception approach has attracted wider attention in recent times is evident from the publications of a number of major ongoing projects that are basically committed to this relatively new approach. Three of them, namely *The Church's Bible* series,[10] the *Encyclopedia of the Bible and its Reception* (*EBR*)[11] and a recent journal entitled *Relegere*[12] are worth mentioning. However, even if the approach has received wider scholarly attention, it is as yet by no means a firmly established phenomenon and a clearly defined framework.

---

[10] These series of biblical commentaries, with special attention to scriptural interpretation of the first millennium of the Christian era, have commenced publication since 2003, edited by Robert Louis Wilken and published by Eerdmans. The editor summarizes the scope and purpose of the series: "In the early church all discussion of theological topics, of moral issues, and of Christian practice took the biblical text as the starting point, resulting in a substantial library of biblical commentaries and homilies. Unfortunately, this ancient body of writings is now known only in bits and pieces if at all. The Church's Bible series brings this rich classical tradition of biblical interpretation to life once again. Compiled, translated, and edited by leading scholars, these volumes draw extensively from early and medieval commentators, illuminating Holy Scripture as it was understood during the first millennium of Christian history" (Wilken 2014).

[11] *Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception (EBR)* is a thirty-volume project in progress. The first eight volumes have been published in the last six years as an ongoing process with volumes 1 and 2 published in 2009, 3 in 2011, 4 and 5 in 2012, 6 and 7 in 2013, and 8 in 2014. The wide-ranging work is "intended to serve as a comprehensive guide to the current state of knowledge on the background, origins, and development of the canonical texts of the Bible as they were accepted in Judaism and Christianity. Unprecedented in breadth and scope, this encyclopedia also documents the history of the Bible's interpretation and reception across the centuries, not only in Judaism and Christianity, but also in literature, visual art, music, film, and dance, as well as in Islam and other religious traditions and new religious movements" (Allison et al 2010). For an extended review of EBR, see Roberts and Rowland 2011:351-358.

[12] *Relegere* is a biannual critical journal, published since 2011. It engages with themes related to reception history. The journal is open to the public on its webpage and the editors explain the need for its creation as follows: "*Relegere* is an intervention as well as an outlet for publishing and innovative academic works on reception history. Our aims are to facilitate the exploration of new approaches to reception history, to push the field towards a more critical, theoretically sophisticated set of methodologies, and to publish valuable scholarly work on the many and various topics encompassed by religion and reception" (Repphun et al 2011:2).

Rather, it is still the subject of debate and of efforts to reach some level of scholarly consensus.[13] This study may contribute to the ongoing discussion, either by establishing common ground or by disclosing a variety of possible perspectives in the category.

As a second, subordinate but complementary, approach the study develops "an ecumenical appreciative framework". Even if, to the best of my knowledge, there exists no explicit theoretical discussion on the practice of this approach, I assume that most ecumenical discussions inherently presuppose the ecumenical values that are adopted in this study. Most constructive ecumenical discourses in their various ways promote common elements. These elements are reflected, for instance, in the *Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement* (Lossky 1991).

Concerning research methodology, a comprehensive work by Terre Blanche, Durrheim and Painter (2006), containing chapters and articles by about fifty scholars from universities and research organizations around South Africa with a significant representation of UKZN academics, is a standard guide dealing with research design and discussing various methodologies applicable to field and library research. In addition, a book by Chris Hart (2005), although brief and intended mainly as a guide for Masters students, is a user friendly and to-the-point resource. *The SBL Handbook of Style Guide* (Alexander et al. (eds.) 1999) is used as a basic guide and tool for major style-related issues of the thesis.

1.4.2 Jude's use of "Extracanonical" Books

"The Most Neglected Book in the New Testament", the title of an article by D. J. Rowston (1974-75:554-563) seems to be an awakening call, or even a warning, directed at NT scholarship at the beginning of the last quarter of the twentieth century. According to

---

[13] Besides the encyclopedia and the journal that are mainly devoted to the ongoing discussion of the history of reception approach, volume 30 of the *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* (2010) has fully committed itself to an engagement with *Wirkungsgeschichte*.(for an introduction to the complete entries of the volume, see Roberts and Rowland 2010:131-136.) Paradoxically, the articles tend on the one hand to agree on the definition and application of *Wirkungsgeschichte*, whereas on the other hand they give a number of different English translations of *Wirkungsgeschichte* accentuating differing nuances. This is a reflection of the established, but not yet firmly defined, status of the reception history approach. For a detailed discussion see chapter two of this thesis.

Rowston, the major reasons for the neglect of *Jude* are its use of *1 Enoch* and the lack of knowledge of its particular historical situation.

One of the leading NT scholars in the area of General Epistles, Judaism, STL and early Christianity, Richard Bauckham, has conducted extensive research on *Jude* resulting in a significant amount of substantially important material.[14] In one of his major works, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*, Bauckham affirms the appropriateness of the description of *Jude* as "The Most Neglected Book in the New Testament". He ascribes the neglect as partly due to the widely accepted view of *Jude* as dependent on *2 Peter*. Bauckham (1990:134) uses strong words to condemn this neglect: "The tradition of scholarly contempt [i.e. considering *Jude* as nothing but an excerpt from 2 Peter] has [...] led to scholarly neglect of Jude hence to ignorance of Jude."[15] Bauckham mentions as possible secondary reasons for the neglect of *Jude* the book's brevity and its citation of "non-canonical" Jewish writings.

In a more recent article, "James, 1 Peter, Jude and 2 Peter," Bauckham (1997:153-166) again confirms *Jude's* neglect, along with that of some other Catholic Epistles, both by the church and ordinary readers. However, interest in the book on the part of contemporary scholarship has improved. Both in his earliest commentary on *Jude* (Word Biblical Commentary series 1990) and in a recent article in the Anchor Bible Dictionary, Bauckham (1992:1098-1103) thoroughly discusses some highly disputed traditional topics, such as *Jude*'s authorship, date, opponents, addressee, occasion, language and theological themes. Generally, he holds to the Jewish character of the different groups connected to the letter: a Palestinian setting, a Jewish-Christian author and ditto readers, gnostic-oriented antinomian opponents, and an earlier date, about the 50s or 60s. In these works, Bauckham discusses and elaborates on the structure and significance of *Jude* for an adequate understanding of every aspect of the letter.[16]

---

[14] Among the significant works of Richard Bauckham on *Jude* are the following: 1983; 1990; 1992:1098-1103; 1997:153-166.

[15] According to Andrew Chester and Ralph P. Martin (1994:81f.), Luther neglected the book for a similar reason: Jude's dependence on 2 Peter.

[16] For a recent discussion on *Jude*'s structural analysis from different perspectives see David. J. Clark (2004:125-137) and Larry Douglas Smith (2004:138-142). Even if both of these scholars propose different structures for *Jude*, they agree with Bauckham that the structure of the letter is part of the author's technique of conveying his message.

A 2009 PhD dissertation by Boyd A. Hannold (2010), entitled "Jude *in the Middle*: ..." is one of the most recent studies on *Jude*. The thesis uses *Jude* as an illustration of how early Christianity was grounded in Jewish Apocalypticism, an important link between Judaism and Christianity. Besides discussing *Jude*'s use of extracanonical books, Hannold's thesis focuses in the first place on presenting a clearer view of the historical setting in which *Jude* wrote. Secondly, his work develops the theory of connections between Jewish Apocalypticism, early Christianity, and Gnosticism. The debate on the "canonical" status of the various Jewish materials quoted by Jude is not an issue in this study which will be one of the focus areas of my research.

1.4.3 *1 Enoch'*s Scriptural Position

Among Jewish STL, *1 Enoch* is arguably the most researched "pseudepigraphical" work in the last century, especially after the discovery of the DSS containing Aramaic fragments of the book. Most of the scholars in the field have focused predominantly on text and translation of the book, developing and revising their works in conjunction with the continuing discovery of new manuscripts. R. H. Charles, at the turn of the twentieth century, came up with a text (1906) and translation (1912) of the book that have been relied upon for a number of decades.

Three other scholars who worked on the text and translation of *1 Enoch* in its entirety or in parts and from various angles are J. T. Milik (1976),[17] M. A. Knibb (1978) and E. Isaac (1983:5-89).[18] They did so probably without recognizing each other's work. While Milik's edition mainly focuses on the Aramaic fragments, both Isaac and Knibb base their text and translation on the Ethiopic version. Volume one of Knibb's work contains one of the Ethiopic texts with critical apparatus of the Ethiopic and Greek variants. The second volume contains an introduction, an English translation, and notes on the text in which all the major Aramaic evidence is presented and discussed. Nevertheless, neither Milik nor Knibb consider the historical background of this work in the Ethiopian context. They do not address how and why

---

[17] More recently scholars such as Jonas C. Greenfield and Michael E. Stone (1977), George W. E. Nickelsburg (1978), James H. Charlesworth (1979), James C. VanderKam (1982), and Devorah Dimant (1983) have strongly criticized several of Milik's conclusions and assumptions.

[18] Besides these English translations special mention should be made of the German translation by Siegbert Uhlig (1984); this may be the best existing modern translation from Ge'ez.

it was preserved in this church only. This question is one of the central foci of the present thesis.

The only authoritative Ethiopian scholar in the field, Ephraim Isaac, an Ethiopian Jew, has contributed a significant article on *1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch*[19] in Charlesworth's (1983) monumental work, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Isaac's lengthy article mainly consists in a translation of the entire book based on one of the Ethiopic manuscripts and a thorough comparison with some other important manuscripts. In addition Isaac indicates that his brief introduction, sketching the main ideas of the book from an Ethiopian perspective, is an eye-opener for the study of increasingly enduring impact of *1 Enoch* on Ethiopian Christianity over the centuries. Most important is Isaac's introduction where he acknowledges the historical, theological, and cultural influence of the book, and especially its formative impact on the Ethiopian Church. With some exaggeration Isaac (1983:10) contends that "it is hardly possible to understand *any* [italics mine] aspect of the religious tradition and thought of Ethiopia, the country in which it [*1 Enoch*] survived, without an understanding of it." He uncritically generalizes: "What distinguishes Ethiopian Christian theology from that of either Western or Eastern Christendom may well be the emphases on Enochic thoughts" (Isaac 1983:10). The two major deficiencies of Isaac's work, despite the uniqueness of his contribution to the field, are his unwarranted generalization of Enoch's influence on every religious aspect of the Ethiopian Church and his view that probably the sole reason for the Ethiopian Church's distinct position among churches globally is to be found in Enoch's influence. This thesis will therefore specifically research the exact nature of the book's influence on Ethiopian socio-religious characteristics. It will furthermore determine in what measure and respect the Church has to thank *1 Enoch* for its unique position.

Among recent works, a commentary by George W. E. Nickelsburg (2001) entitled *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108*, is of outstanding quality, both in depth and breadth. Nickelsburg treats issues of history, text, text criticism, hermeneutics, exegesis, and form critical study with deftness and precision. This first volume of the study includes a comprehensive introduction, an English translation with critical apparatus,

---

[19] This is how Ephraim Isaac designates the book.

thorough critical commentary mainly focusing on The Book of the Watchers (chapters 1-36), The Dream Vision (chapters 83-90), The Epistle of Enoch (chapters 91-105), and the two appendices — The Birth of Noah (chapters 106-107) and Another Book by Enoch (chapter 108). This monumental work had recently been completed with the publication of a second volume (Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2012) that deals with The Book of Similitudes (chapters 37-82). This tome was co-authored by James C. VanderKam, another renowned scholar in the field.

These major works, along with his many other publications on the field, have made Nickelsburg into an exceptional authority on the study of *1 Enoch*.[20] Besides the extensive commentary on the books mentioned above, the introduction deals in great depth with the unique place of *1 Enoch* in the shaping of Ethiopian Christianity in its entirety.[21] However, in the current thesis I propose to make clear that the influence of *1 Enoch* exceeds the religious aspect. This study will therefore also explore the book's literary and socio-cultural influence on the Ethiopian Church and on the community at large. In addition the indirect influence of *1 Enoch* on Evangelical Christians, of which no mention is made in Nickelsburg's work, is also considered.

Based on their commentary, Nickelsburg and VanderKam (2004) wrote a new translation of the entire book in which they made some changes in the text on the basis of the recent discoveries of the Enochic manuscripts. In this latest edition, they do not seem interested in the preservation history of the book in the Ethiopian context. The present thesis intends to investigate this point.

Noteworthy in relation to our topic - the status of *1 Enoch* in the Christian heritage - is an article and thorough discussion by VanderKam (1996:30-101): "1 Enoch, Enochic Motifs, and Enoch in Early Christian Literature". VanderKam shows a high regard for Enochic literature

---

[20] This is evident from a-two volume book on the dialogue between Nickelsburg and about twenty other scholars on issues related to various apocalyptic writings whereby *1 Enoch* is central, and a six-and-half pages long list of his works in the bibliography of books edited by Neusner and Avery-Park (2003).

[21] Nickelsburg (2006) later on extracted from his book some portions and developed an article on the specific area of *1 Enoch*'s influence on the Ethiopian Church. This article should be considered as a major effort to instigate wider research on the topic.

in general, and for *1 Enoch* and the Story of the Watchers in particular. This regard takes on three forms.   First, he presents a detailed chronological survey of the status of Enochic literature in early Christianity produced by seven major Christian writers, from Jude to Origen. Second, he discusses how the Enochic Angel Story permeated early Christian writing and theological interpretation. And third, he considers the presence of the person of Enoch in the literature. He concludes that the Enochic literature has noticeably influenced most centers of early Christianity from early New Testament times until the early fourth century AD. Because of the depth of the discussion and the breadth of the evidence it presents, VanderKam's article is likely to remain well into the future a major reference in the context of *1 Enoch*'s authoritative status in the Christian literature. However, this remarkable work refrains from making even a single note on the influence of this literature on Ethiopian Christians, in spite of the fact that only in Ethiopia the entire book of *1 Enoch* has been retained.

In addition to all these publications that are evidence of a recent increase of scholarly interest in a closer study of *1 Enoch*, a special forum, the *Enoch Seminar,* was established and since 2001 this forum has dealt with the book itself and other Second Temple Jewish literature. The bi-annual seminar papers that were delivered by distinguished scholars have led to the production of several books , each devoted to a major subject, edited by Gabriele Boccaccini (2007, 2005, 2002) who is the founding director of the seminar (sometimes Boccaccini works with a co-editor as in Boccaccini and Ibba 2009).[22] With all the outstanding contributions in this field, raising the study of *1 Enoch* to another level, the seminar and its publications have yet to touch on the book's connection with, and influence on, Ethiopia. Besides the forum created for publications by the seminar, it has posted an immense quantity of material on a website under the name *4 Enoch: The Online Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*,[23] that

---

[22] Of the seven seminars held from 2001 until 2013, the proceedings of the first six seminars have been published as books. The more recent ones await publication as books and the papers presented at each seminar are posted on the *4 Enoch* website.

[23] Of this thorough online work in progress the scope and breadth are described as follows. "4 Enoch offers a comprehensive and authoritative introduction to scholarly research and fiction in Second Temple Judaism (including Samaritan and New Testament Studies), i.e. the period from Ezekiel to the completion of the New Testament and the Mishnah. It also deals with the roots of Second Temple traditions in the Ancient Israelite Religion, as well as the influence and legacy of those traditions for Christian, Jewish and Islamic origins, up to the time of the completion of the Qur'an. 4 Enoch includes scholarly and fictional works authored from the mid-

is edited by Boccaccini and others and that represents an important resource. This online encyclopedia is arguably the most comprehensive scholarly resource on contemporary discussions of Enochic corpus in particular and the entire Second Temple Judaism in general.

Quite exceptionally, Loren Stuckenbruck, one of the leading experts on Second Temple Judaism studies, is a western scholar who has shown a rare interest in the book of *Enoch*'s influence and its unique place in the Ethiopian context. Besides his numerous works on *1 Enoch*, Stuckenbruck (2013b, 2008, 2000, 1997, 1990) has engaged with questions pertaining to *Enoch*'s influence in Ethiopia in two meaningful ways. Firstly, he has travelled to Ethiopia to visit various locales and to explore, document, and preserve Enochic manuscripts in order to disclose these to a global audience. Secondly, he has established an informal Ethiopian "Enoch Seminar" in which Ethiopian Enochic scholars and interested individuals may participate, creating a vibrant space for discussions on the book's place in the country. As stated above, this is also a core focus of the present thesis.

1.4.4 The Canon Debate

The concept of canonicity remains, still today, a subject of heated scholarly debate. Roger Beckwith's (1985) work, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and Its Background in Early Judaism* was hailed as "a definitive textbook on the subject" (Clifford 2001:160-61) and remains one of the most prominent contributions to the debate of the (OT) canon in the last century, especially amongst Protestant scholars. Both this work and a subsequent article (Beckwith 1991:385-395) put Beckwith in opposition to Albert Sundberg (1969; 1975:352-371; 1988:78-82) who rejects the former's stance that the OT canon had already been closed before the advent of Christianity and who argues for the fluidity of the canon, even after the early period of Christianity. Both scholars have incorporated in their

---

15th century to the present, all around the world, with biographies of scholars and authors and a dictionary of people, places, topics, etc. of Second Temple Judaism & Christian origins. With more than 15,000 pages, '4 Enoch' provides a comprehensive Who's Who of the period, as well as biographies of scholars and authors, and abstracts of scholarly and fictional Works, authored from the mid-15th century to the present, all around the world. Still a work in progress, the Encyclopedia, created in 2009 by Gabriele Boccaccini of the University of Michigan with the collaboration of Carlos A. Segovia of the Camilo Jose Cela University Madrid, is the collective work of international specialists in the field associated with the Enoch Seminar" (Boccaccini [2014]).

reasoning most of the issues that play in this debate but neither makes mention of the EOTC, one of the early Christian Churches, and its position as regards canon. [24]

Another recent and monumental work, edited by Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (2002a), contains contributions from more than thirty scholars in the field. Entitled *The Canon Debate: on the Origins and Formation of the Bible*, it is in two meaningful ways evidence of the ongoing discussions. The book intends "to show how diverse and complex the issue and positions on canon formation are" (McDonald and Sanders 2002b:17). The collected articles seem to respond to almost every question that might arise in this context, from seemingly elementary definitions to advanced and complex arguments. The book incorporates the perspectives of almost all religious communities, addressing issues from the origins of the notion of canon to its future. Debates are balanced with scholars presenting widely differing viewpoints. The book is divided into two parts, the Old / First Testament and the New / Second Testament. However, most of the concepts overlap and are interwoven, which makes the division superficial. In addition to the thirty-two individual articles, resourceful appendices, useful indices, and a selected bibliography add to the high quality of the book. However, in spite of its exhaustive discussions the book fails to address, in any way at all, the canonical concept and the uniqueness of the EOTC in this regard. In all the lengthy argumentations the EOTC's "canon" is not mentioned. Similarly, McDonald (1995; 1988), in his two other major works on the canon debate ignores the EOTC "canon". Hence, the present thesis in its attempt to address a canonical issue related to the EOTC, may turn out to contribute valuable new knowledge on a thus far little researched aspect in the field.

1.4.5 The Scriptures / "Canon" and its Influence in the History of EOTC

The secondary literature on the canonical debate, including the stance of the EOTC, and on the history of *1 Enoch*'s place in, and its influence on, the church as well as on Ethiopian socio-cultural life, is scarce and scattered. The subject has been touched upon only as a side issue and it has hardly attracted any serious attention among scholars. Even if it is very

---

[24] Beckwith (1985: 478-505) only appended a short discussion on the canonical history of the Early Ethiopian Church.

concise, the only existing article on the canon of the EOTC in the last century comes from R. W. Cowley's (1974:318-323) "The Biblical Canon of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church Today". In this article, Cowley outlines five difficulties[25] that he met in the course of his study and that reflect the current confusing situation of the EOTC "canon". The article serves as an indicator for the necessity of further study on the various problems which the present study intends to follow up.

Among a number of books produced by the EOTC, a recent publication on the overall life and beliefs of the church, *The Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church Faith, Order of Worship and Ecumenical Relations* ([EOTC] 1996), is notable. The book comprises twenty-seven chapters, one of which deals with Holy Scriptures according to the church's canon. However, the list is only one among several lists mentioned elsewhere,[26] complicating the canon problem of EOTC. It also contradicts both of Cowley's lists of the EOTC "canon", an issue that lends itself to further investigation.

Some literary works published by the EOTC publishing house in the last few decades and that can be regarded as official church publications, are important for their value in bringing the context of the EOTC to life. Included in this list and of particular importance for my study are the following: books by Aymro Wondmagegnehu and Joachim Motovu (1970)[27] and by Sergew Hable Selassie (1970c), both of which are brief but give valuable information.

Christine Chaillot (2002), a lay woman, has written an introductory book on the life and spirituality of the EOTC. Even though it is based mainly on her personal views, which are mostly uncritical, it could in regard to most of the issues it raises serve as resource material for a critical study. More than the information itself on offer, the book's vast bibliography

---

[25] The five difficulties listed by Cowley are: (1) the concept of canonicity is regarded more loosely by the EOTC than it is by most other churches; (2) the number of canonical books is reckoned to be 81, but this total is reached in various ways; (3) the naming of a book in a list does not necessarily uniquely identify it; (4) some of the books assigned canonical authority have never been printed in Geez, or they have been printed only outside Ethiopia, or they are difficult to obtain; (5) The authorities of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church have never said of an edition of the Geez or Amharic Bible that it was complete (Cowley 1974:318).

[26] For instance the recently published EOTC Bible (Anonymous 2007) contains a different list and Cowley gives two different lists to compare with (Cowley 1974:318-19).

[27] It should be noted that in the Ethiopian naming system what is known as "sure name" or "family name" is absent. In this thesis, therefore, Ethiopians are referred to by their given names.

concerning various aspects of the church is of importance and points the reader to worthy resources.

For a general understanding of the historical background of Ethiopia's socio-cultural, religious and political character, books by Taddesse Tamrat (1972), Donald N. Levine (1974), Edward Ullendorff (1960; 1965; 1968; 1973), and Richard Pankhurst (1961) are significant.[28] A PhD dissertation by Johnny Bakke (1987) is another important document for its description of the relationship between the EOTC and the Protestant Evangelical Churches in Ethiopia. Even though Bakke is not aware of ways in which *1 Enoch* and some other STL have influenced the EOTC tradition, he maintains that the Ethiopian Evangelical tradition is deeply rooted in the EOTC background.

As this literature review indicates, the topic of this study is entirely new to the School of Religion, Philosophy, and Classics of UKZN. There are a couple of works, very remotely related to the subject at PhD or MTh dissertation level as mentioned above. These include Boyd A. Hannold's (2010) PhD dissertation and a MTh thesis by Dingman (2002). However, even these only piecemeal and partially address the issues that this thesis is dealing with. Thus, the present research seems quite innovative.

1.5 Research Design and Methodology

The research concentrates mainly on the study of a few primary texts and manuscripts and, furthermore, on largely secondary literature in various libraries and archives. In addition, the method of the study has involved the conducting of some field research. In other words, the research mainly focuses on library readings with a minor, but definite and significant, component of fieldwork for certain issues that are specifically mentioned.

---

[28] For a detailed and annotated bibliography on wider range of Ethiopian studies until the 90s, with more than 600 main bibliographic entries and categorized under thirty main subject headings, see Munro-Hay and Pankhurst 1995.

1.5.1 Library Research

For most of the textual analysis and exegesis concerning texts from *Jude* and *1 Enoch* and for most other areas covered in the thesis, the libraries of UKZN and others linked to it,[29] as well as four different theological institution libraries[30] in Ethiopia have been consulted. In addition, for further study of *1 Enoch* and the Ethiopian context and background, the researcher has made use of the Institute for Ethiopian Studies' Library Archives at Addis Ababa University,[31] the Library of the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) in London,[32] the Katholieke Universiteit Library in Leuven, Belgium,[33] and the Berlin State Library and the Theological Faculty Library of the Humboldt University in Berlin.[34] Material available in these institutions has significantly contributed to the study.[35]

To study the primary sources of Ethiopian manuscripts for the purpose of the core sections of the research, I have visited the Ethiopian National Museum in Addis Ababa[36] where I was able

---

[29] Most of South African academic libraries and their resources are connected and accessed electronically and there is an inter-library loan system in place to access hard copies. This system has been of great importance in accessing a significant amount of resources all over South Africa. In addition, the Cluster Libraries around Pietermaritzburg were helpful and offered a considerable amount of material related to the research topic.

[30] These include the libraries of Mekane Yesus Seminary (Lutheran), Evangelical Theological College (Evangelical), Ethiopian Graduate School of Theology (Inter-denominational), and Holy Trinity College (Orthodox).

[31] I have done a very close library research at the Institute of Ethiopian Studies library for about two months at the end of 2011 and the beginning of 2012. Most of the rare Ethiopian printed sources in Amharic are available in this library. For instance, the only comprehensive work on the "canon" of the EOTC Bible in Amharic by Dibekulu Zewudie (1995) is found in this library.

[32] I have visited SOAS library for a couple of days during my research trip to London in mid-2013. Even if I have used a limited amount of their material connected to my study, I was astonished by the quality of their Ethiopian collection (as is true for their collections of many other African and Asian publications). The library was rich in all kinds of local publications, especially from the last hundred years that are unavailable (or prohibited) in Ethiopia or elsewhere.

[33] I had the privilege to work in the Katholieke Universiteit Library in Leuven for about two weeks. For this purpose I had prolonged my stay after the sixty-first Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense in June 2012. In this library as well I found some Ethiopian material that I might not have got otherwise.

[34] My three month stay in Germany, mainly in Berlin in 2013, has given me the opportunity to access a huge amount of secondary literature on contemporary discussions around Enochic studies in particular and related areas in general.

[35] I have spent two weeks at the British Library solely researching the Ethiopian manuscripts carefully collected and handled by the library.

[36] I have visited the National Museum in Addis twice, in 2012 and 2013, mainly in search of the EMML readings, even though the list of the EMML that I investigated in my study, originally computed by Loren Stuckenbruck, had by him been graciously made available to me.

to access EMML material, and the British Library in London, where I studied the actual manuscripts.

Even if literary analysis and reader-response criticism are employed to analyze the rich literary strategies of both *Jude* and *1 Enoch*, the governing method used to dissect the historical background of the contexts of both texts is the traditional historical critical method.

1.6.2 Field Research

As part of the field research qualitative interviews have been conducted with (traditional) theological scholars, prominent church leaders and individual members of the laity. Observations have been made on selected cathedrals and earliest monasteries, and on contemporary worship practices. The specific locus of interviewees and of cathedrals that were considered was Addis Ababa as the national center for every aspect of society, currently representative of the entire nation from its diverse religious, ethnic, political, social and economic perspectives. Thus, the qualitative interviews focus on the metropolis where most of the elites are residing.

Interviewees were purposely chosen from both church traditions for the sake of comparing and contrasting the influence of *1 Enoch* in both milieus as well as to evaluate their understanding of the concepts and the extent of their Scriptures. The interviewees were selected as well for their reliable and in-depth knowledge of the canonical position of the EOTC, the historical background of the church's traditions and of the general traditions pertaining to the making of the church over the centuries. Some of the interviewees have been participants in, or keen observers of, the church government and provided primary data on their experiences relating to the EOTC canon. The respondents include clergy (bishops and ordained students in training institutions fall under this category) and congregants, all of them sampled from the two church groups mentioned above.

The tools employed in collecting data are qualitative interviews and participant observation/empirical research. Altogether, twenty-four interviewees were selected, whereby the researcher aimed at representivity by including members of both laity and clergy, of different gender, age, and denominational educational background (including theological

education). In other words, the interviewees represent different groups relevant to the study, in proportion to their presence in the community.[37]

In a skillfully conducted qualitative interview, it is maintained, "the interviewer nurtures the participant to reveal rich and varied data based on his or her understanding of the world, and is thus a partner in the creating of knowledge and data, as opposed to a mere observer" (Emerald Group [2010a]). Therefore, the use of interviews assisted the researcher to get in-depth and reliable information as he was asking relevant questions and spending a long time with the different respondents. Henning (2004:75) describes in-depth interviews as a conversation that builds rapport naturally as the process continues. The conversation involves exploration, clarification and pauses to allow time for thinking. Most of the questions were open ended.[38]

The interviews took the form of face to face interaction in order to generate data always taking account of the convenience of the interviewee. Any intrusion of my personal opinion during the interview was avoided. Initial questions were followed by further probing ones to get more in-depth answers. Data was captured by tape recording and transcribed to be analysed. Permission from the interviewees was sought and their consent to disclosure of their answers was ensured. Each interviewee has been clearly informed about the nature and purpose of the study and they have confirmed their consent with their signatures. The form of "informed consent" is appended to this thesis.[39] Even if the ethics of research have been carried so carefully, the thesis, however, avoids mentioning interviewees by name so that they may not be subjects of some of a blatant criticism.

Observation was the aim of my visits to various monasteries and cathedrals of the EOTC, focusing on the unique iconography and their worship style. Similar observation has been done at various Evangelical churches' worship ceremonies. After collecting data by taking notes during observation and by capturing images with a camera, these were analysed. According to Henning (2004:91), "observation aims to capture actions that demonstrate tacit

---

[37] See Appendix 3.C for different categories of interviewees involved in this study.
[38] See Appendix 3.A for the leading interview questions. In a qualitative interview, the questions are designed to lead on to more probing ones the interview unfolds and specific information surfaces.
[39] For an "informed consent" format used for this study, see Appendix 3.B.

knowledge of people who know the rules of action in a setting in order to fit into that setting."
Thus, the interpretation was attentive to the socio-cultural worldview of those observed.

1.5.3 Data Analysis

Unlike in a quantitative approach, where the researcher is dealing with numbers that can be crunched, in qualitative research "the researcher needs to use intuition, imagination and interpretation" (Emerald Group [2010b]). I transcribed the information gained from interviews, observational notes and pictures and transcribed them into word processing documents. The process of analysis literally means taking apart the words, sentences and paragraphs in order to make sense of, interpret and theorize that data (Henning 2004:127). This process helps to eliminate unstable data, to interpret ambiguous answers and to sort out contradictory data elicited by related questions.

Having analyzed the data thematically in line with the themes and topics that came up during the interviews, the researcher read through the texts highlighting key quotations, insights and interpretations. This helped to determine links between all the coded materials and specific identified major themes. Analysed previews and direct quotations were used to present findings wherever they were relevant to the argumentation in the thesis.

1.6 Structure of Dissertation

This dissertation is composed of eight logically structured chapters in such a way as to address its central question.

1.6.1 Chapter One: Introduction

The introduction provides the reader with an understanding of (1) the background and motivation of the work, (2) the research problem and its objective, (3) the literature review, (4) the methodology and design employed and (5) an overview of each chapter.

1.6.2 Chapter Two: Theoretical Framework

A separate chapter is needed to discuss the theoretical framework as a variety of theoretical frameworks is employed in different chapters. Some of these are partially new and particularly

appropriate to the thesis. Of the three theoretical frameworks on which this work is based the broader one consists in a *tripolar* African contextual model, to be discussed in a manner that fits the thesis. This overarching approach is complemented by the two other frameworks. The first one of these is a *history of reception approach* and explores how *1 Enoch* has been received in the course of history and how it shaped the life of the church. The reception and preservation history of the Scriptures in the Ethiopian church is based on the same conceptual framework. A third approach, an *ecumenical appreciative approach,* is developed in order to adequately achieve the pragmatic objective of this thesis, namely to help Ethiopian churches to come to a better understanding of each other and to develop a closer cooperative relationship.

1.6.3 Chapter Three: Redefining Some Terms and Concepts that Cause Misunderstanding

A number of key theological and biblical terms and concepts, including Scripture, canon/canonical, Bible/biblical, authoritative, inspiration, apocrypha, and STL that have generally been used (or misused) in different ways, are redefined in a way that is adequate for the discussion in this thesis. Some of the terms have been employed in anachronistic ways by certain modern scholars and others have undergone a considerable change of meaning. It is believed that such confusion has contributed to the varying opinions and misconceptions as regards the place of STL in Ethiopian churches in particular, and in the global church in general. This chapter, therefore, specifies the meaning of the terminology as used in the thesis.

1.6.4 Chapter Four: *Jude*'s Usage of Jewish Literature, "Canonical" and "Extra-canonical"

The Epistle of *Jude* is the focus of this chapter. It is maintained that, in spite of its brevity, *Jude* is permeated with Jewish literature, both "canonical" and "non-canonical". Selected texts are analyzed and exegeted so as to make clear that *Jude*'s "extra-canonical" works do have not less legitimacy than the "canonical" works. The "canonicity" of *Jude* in the context of the making of the "canon" in the history of the Church is also argued. This raises the problem that a "canonical" book quotes "non-canonical" works as "canonical". Among these works is *1 Enoch* which is quoted and upheld as prophecy in the Early Church and the Apostolic Church.

The argumentation may enable the reader to understand in what sense the usage of STL has been legitimate and appropriate. This chapter is thus devoted to an issue that Ethiopian Evangelicals tend to avoid confronting, but that ultimately has to be faced. Following the tri-polar contextual method, this chapter represents a stage of distantiation: the text will be critically examined in a process that continues in the next chapter with another text.

1.6.5 Chapter Five: *1 Enoch* in *Jude* and its Place in Early Christian and Jewish Literature

This chapter focuses on the place of *1 Enoch* in *Jude* and other STL. It deals with the usage and the scriptural position of *1 Enoch* in the early Christian and Jewish literature, in line with the self-assertion of its authority. The longstanding popularity of *1 Enoch*, its huge influence on the NT and, paradoxically, the reasons for its decline and disappearance from the global church are identified. This will help us to see that the demise of *1 Enoch* was a later development, after it was kept alive in various Jewish and early Christian writings. This in turn helps us to understand its unique scriptural place.

1.6.6 Chapter Six: Reception, Translation and Preservation History of the Scriptures and "Canon" Formation in the EOTC

Chapter six is the contextual center of the thesis. It focuses on the Ethiopian Churches in general and the EOTC and its "canon" in particular. It embarks on the reception history of Christianity in Ethiopia clarifying the reception history of the Scriptures in general. Following the reception history of both, the chapter lays bare the translation and transmission history of the Scriptures in the EOTC with special emphasis on *1 Enoch* and other "extra-canonical" writings. This brings us to the historical background of the preservation of *1 Enoch* in the EOTC. In the translation history, embracing both early and current translations, the notion of "canon" in the EOTC is studied. A recent translation of the Bible into Amharic as well as the controversy that surrounds it, is included as a case study.

1.6.7 Chapter Seven: The Influence and Legacy of *1 Enoch* in the Making of Ethiopia

Chapter seven presents a major contribution of the thesis as it deals with the influence of *1 Enoch* on Ethiopian Christianity over the centuries and as it explores the book's impact on the

shaping of contemporary Ethiopian Christianity. Besides the religious legacy evident in both Orthodox and Evangelical Christianity, its influence on political, cultural, social, literary, and artistic aspects of Ethiopian society, since its reception are studied. This chapter tries to discover whether it is possible to understand the Ethiopian identity without an understanding of the book of *1 Enoch*. In so doing, the chapter paves the way for appropriation, dialogue and recommendations to be developed in the last chapter. Chapter seven represents a stage of contextualization whereby the Ethiopian context is explored in contrast to the biblical text in question.

1.6.8 Chapter Eight: Appropriate usage of STL in Ethiopian Churches and its Implication to Ecumenical Unity

As the culmination of the dissertation, chapter eight is the appropriation of the context and the text that have been in dialogue. It critically evaluates the future of ecumenism involving the EOTC and the Evangelical Churches as seen from the perspectives of both church groups. In addition, the historical role and influence of the EOTC on Evangelicals are assessed, mainly from the Evangelicals' perspective. The way forward is suggested by indicating how both the EOTC and the EEC could appropriately and efficiently use the STL and the Scriptures in its entirety and for all its worth, for their mutual benefits. The chapter closes with a general conclusion and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Purpose of the Chapter

Traditionally, theoretical frameworks of most dissertations constitute only a section or a sub-section of the introduction to the entire research. This is appropriate and adequate in cases where researchers adopt an already established and developed theoretical approach that does not require an elaborate discussion. What is then basically needed is a precise description of the framework, the reasons for choosing it and in what sense it is specifically applicable to the study in question. They may further discuss the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the framework in relation to its specific task and look at ways to compensate for these.

However, the nature of the present thesis requires an exploration that goes beyond these traditional standards, mainly for two reasons. Firstly, the nature of this study demands more than a single theoretical approach, even if there is one principal framework guiding the thesis as a whole and two subordinate but complementary approaches. Secondly, of these two supplementary approaches, the one is technically new and the other is yet to be firmly established. Therefore, a lengthy discussion is needed – a whole chapter in fact – to explain the why, how, and where of the usage of these three interconnected conceptual approaches. The primary theoretical approach of the present thesis is a *tripolar* African contextual model. The first part of chapter two sets out in what way the theory is applied to the thesis. The second part considers how the second framework – an *history of reception approach* - fits in the historical discussions at a number of points. Finally, among the three theoretical frameworks adopted in this work, an *ecumenical appreciative approach* will be developed in order to adequately achieve the pragmatic objective of the thesis which is to help Ethiopian churches to come to a better understanding of each other that may lead to cooperation and a closer relationship.[1]

---

[1] It should be noted that all the technical terms in regard to the conceptual framework are discussed and explained here in this chapter but this exact terminology is not used in the ensuing parts of the thesis.

2.2 African Contextual Approach

As its primary assumption, this research applies the *tripolar* African contextual approach, clearly defined by Draper, Ukpong, and others.[2] On the basis of a rather similar, if not identical, assumption of three poles of interpretive elements, various scholars propose a relatively new approach or theoretical framework for interpreting and appropriating biblical texts. At the turn of this century, Grenholm and Patte (2000:1-54) came up with the '*tripolar* interpretive process' that comprised three elements — a *text*, a *reader*, and a *religious community*. According to Grenholm and Patte (2000:20), this interpretive process involves reading the text critically, analysing the situation of the reader and explaining key theological ideas that live in the religious community concerned. The three 'poles' are interwoven in a single interpretive process. The concept represents a huge shift from the traditional interpretive focus on one single element, namely the text in its original context. The newly formulated process around three 'poles' would lead to adequate proportional attention being given to the various elements that shape meaning in the interpretive process.

2.2.1 Ukpong's Approach and Emphasis on African Context

Before Grenholm and Patte employed the term *tripolar*, Justin Ukpong, in his extensive engagement with inculturation hermeneutics, repeatedly argued for multi-polar or -dimensional foci in order to appropriate the biblical text to the African context. Very important and evidently bold in Ukpong's argument – and, in turn, very attractive for the purpose of, as well as applicable to, the present study – is his insistence that the *African* element has to be adequately recognized and appreciated. In a critique of the assumptions, prevalent in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, made by western Christian missionaries as regards African culture and worldview, Ukpong (2003:106) writes: "Travelers to Africa, missionaries and anthropologists, notably of the Victorian age, without any basis on scientific investigations, condemned African culture and religion as static and deprived simply because they were different from their own. There was utter disrespect for the African person and

---

[2] For a comprehensive and analytical discussion on the characteristics and development of African biblical scholarship and the various categories, see Holter 2002.

culture." The present research takes into account that, similarly, the Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church, its traditions, practices and values, have not only been eyed with suspicion and treated disrespectfully, but also, at times, been condemned solely for not being compatible with western culture and systems. In spite of the EOTC representing one of the largest Orthodox traditions, it has, from various perspectives, been denied scholarly attention. The present research aims to expose some of this neglect. It is, thus, obvious that the African contextual approach is appropriate for a respectful and attentive engagement with the topic of the thesis, placing it in its Ethiopian/African indigenous context.

One of the major drawbacks of the western missionary approach to the African context, Ukpong (2003:108) believes, was that "many Christian missionaries still saw African culture and religion as 'unchristian'." Surprisingly, in the Ethiopian context, the relatively "new" mission based Evangelical Christians have adopted a similar view of the age-old "indigenized" Orthodox Christianity. Whereas the Orthodox considered Evangelical Christianity as a foreign religion or, more specifically, as መጤ or "newcomers", the latter used to look upon the former as "unchristian" or heathen.[3] The African contextual framework is very critical of such biases and, instead, "calls for tolerance, inclusiveness and appreciation of the other" (Ukpong 2003:118), in a way that promotes ecumenism and mutual respect.[4]

Highly relevant to this study, Ukpong (2003:118-119) finally lists five practical necessities for a serious engagement with the African context which are:

> a) making African contexts the subject of the interpretation of the biblical text,[5] b) being informed by the perspectives of the ordinary African readers of the Bible,[6] c) rooting

---

[3] One of my Orthodox friends, once commented that even if he likes most of the values and practices of Evangelicals, he could not tolerate when they (Evangelicals) called them (Orthodox) አህዛብ i.e., Gentiles. Evidently, it is such kind of negative attitudes to the other which pose a huge obstacle for any kind of ecumenical unity and fellowship.

[4] Even if this thesis seeks for a separate section for *ecumenical appreciative approach*, the African tripolar contextual approach itself somehow implies the values and assumptions of ecumenism where the two approaches are complementing one another.

[5] The present thesis makes of the Ethiopian context its main study topic and interprets the texts connected to the study in a way informed by the Ethiopian worldview and its historical background.

[6] In this connection, this study attempts to be inclusive of the perspective of ordinary people's concerns and aspirations, playing a role in their understanding of the Bible. The information, suggestions and perspectives of ordinary interviewees in the qualitative interviews are given due attention and their points of view are part of the conclusions of the thesis.

interpretive methodologies on African cultural resources,[7] d) paying attention to the interconnectedness of the secular and the religious aspects in concrete issues and in the text,[8] and e) living up to the prophetic vocation of the theologian.[9]

The African context approach, according to Ukpong, correctly perceives "meaning" as a "production" between the text and the reader in the process of reading, unlike the traditional historical-critical-method, where it is assumed that "meaning" is hidden and ready-made behind the text. The African contextual framework "sees the meaning of a text not as hidden in the past history of the text to be discovered through historical research but as *produced* [*italics* original] in the process of reading there is interaction between the reader and the text" (Ukpong 1994a:179).[10]

One of Ukpong's major contributions to the study of inculturation theological models is that he clearly distinguishes these from liberation theological approaches and demonstrates that each has its distinct characteristics. Whereas liberation theology focuses on oppression, Ukpong (1997:5) argues that "the inculturation models focus on worldview, cultural identity, cultural values and disvalues as well as oppression as issues in the context." This distinction entails another methodological difference pertaining to how one may appropriate a text and analyze a given context. On the one hand, context is used as a resource in order to appropriate

---

[7] Methodologically, this study attempts to treat cultural resources as a source of knowledge production helping to understand the context better. These cultural resources include manuscripts, iconographic paintings, amulets, church buildings, stories, proverbs, etc.

[8] Religion affects all parts of the lives of ordinary people and is itself affected by many dimensions of life. This study is attentive to this strong interconnectedness, particularly in the Ethiopian context. For a discussion of four different methodological models based on the Nigerian experience of religion and socio-political order, see Njoku 2008, who critically argues that religion cannot be avoided or divorced from the socio-political discourse in the Nigerian context.

[9] This study consciously and deliberately tries to come up with some suggestions that may help to change the concrete lived experience of many for the better. As the writer of this thesis is motivated by the wish to make the biblical text relevant to the Ethiopian context in an informed but effective way, Ukpong's (2003:119) thought that theologians should recognize their role as prophetic voice is appropriate for, and applicable to, this study.

[10] Reviewing Croatto's (1987) book, Ukpong argues that the nature of the Bible itself and how it was produced is a result of engagements between earlier texts and their later readers over time. He writes; "the bible is a product of a long hermeneutic process comprising God's self revelation in Israel's socio-historical praxis, and Israel's reflection (discourse) on this experience collected in the text. This creates an intimate correlation between event and text, and offers a hermeneutical key to reading the bible" (Ukpong 1994a:189). Croatto (1987:69) argues that in this kind of reading of the text "what is unsaid in what a text says, is said in a contextualized interpretation." As its credibility is the challenge for this kind of interpretation, Ukpong (1994a:188) suggests the Augustinian hermeneutical key of *charitas* as a tool for adjudication where for "any interpretation of the bible to lay claim to participation in the inspiration of the text, it must be found to be in harmony with the central or total message of the bible which is love of God and neighbour. Any interpretation of the bible that is contrary to this must be seen to be erroneous."

the biblical message or to be challenged by the text in inculturation models. On the other hand, it is used to detect the structure of domination and the pattern of struggle against oppression. Ukpong (1997:5) concludes: "while in the *inculturation* models the bible is appropriated with the resources of the context and is also made to challenge it, in the *liberation* models the bible is used as a source to challenge oppression in the context." As this study gives in its analyses special attention to the worldview, values and identities in the Ethiopian context, the inculturation models are more suited for the contextualization of research results.

For instance, one of the inculturation models, by Ukpong listed as[11] "comparative studies" model, looks for parallels between the biblical context and Christian experience in the African context.[12] However, Ukpong (1997:10) criticizes the model as not having been successful because the theologians who employ it "are more concerned with showing that there are parallels between African and biblical religions but not in the concrete results or effects of such parallels." The present study however, goes beyond this limitation and defines parallels that have concrete effects in the Ethiopian context today. For example, the way in which the EOTC uses the Scriptures may be in exact contrast to *Jude'*s use of the Scriptures. They both focus more on the orthodoxy of certain books without necessarily limiting themselves to a strict list of "canon". The result is that the EOTC approach may help one to better understand the role, function, and concept of the Scriptures in present day Ethiopia.

The other example of Ukpong's inculturation models is the so called "Africa-in-the-Bible studies" approach.[13] This "approach seeks to identify the presence of Africa and African peoples in the bible as well as examines their contribution in biblical history. This is a direct

---

[11] In addition to the two models already mentioned here, the comparative studies and Africa-in-the-Bible studies, Ukpong (1997) adds two other inculturation theology models, namely "evaluative studies" and "inculturation hermeneutics". For works on "evaluative studies" models, see Abijole 1988; Igenoza 1988; Kalilombe 1980; MacFall 1970; Onwu 1988; Osie-Bonsu 1990; Sawyer 1968; Ukpong 1994c; Wambutda 1981. For works on "inculturation hermeneutics" models, see Ukpong 1996, 1995, 1994b. The three models under liberation theology include liberation hermeneutics, black theology, and feminist theology. For a detailed discussion of each, see Ukpong 1997:7-25.

[12] See, among others, Williams 1930; Wambutda 1987; Mbiti 1971; Ukpong 1987, whose works have employed the model of "comparative studies" in African and biblical parallels.

[13] For works related to this approach, see Diop 1974; Williams 1976; Peterson 1978; Isaac 1980; Adamo 1993; and Prior 1997.

reaction to the *de-emphasis and exclusion, in the western scholarship, of Africa and its contribution to the biblical story*" (emphasis mine) (Ukpong 1997:12). It is this model that the current study seeks to both follow and substantiate more. As its focus is the Ethiopian context, this thesis will be concerned with the neglect of the Ethiopian context and with demonstrating the gap separating the Ethiopian reality from its image in the wider world. This study is, hence, significantly influenced and informed by Ukpong's approach and the special attention he pays to the African context. With the tripolar African contextual framework as its overarching approach, this thesis intentionally emphasizes the Ethiopian context in order to counter its undue neglect by western scholarship. Ukpong's emphasis on appropriating the African context broadly governs this study. Another important aspect of the framework employed in this research derives from Jonathan Draper's framing of three clear elements as part of the tripolar African contextual approach to which we now turn.

Important is Draper's concept of "conversational exegesis" as the parameter of the tripolar African contextual framework. It is this conversational approach which adequately represents the African way of interaction and communication, whereby the past narratives are appropriated in the light of present life experience. As "conversation is a two way process, in which each of the persons involved can interrogate the other" (Draper 2002:13), it entails careful listening to the other and examining his or her statements before responding to them. Furthermore, "in African tradition, meaning is determined in the community." Draper (2002:13) articulates how this approach, different from the western one, adequately suits the African context in biblical interpretation. He argues:

> … it is because the meaning of a conversation is always linked inextricably to its
> context, the real life situation of the dialogue partners: you cannot have 'disembodied'
> or universal conversation. One might say that the problem is not so much that the Bible
> is text, but that the Western tradition tries to 'fix it as text' in particular confessional
> interpretations (Draper 2002:13).[14]

---

[14] One should consider here that it is unavoidable that there are different particular confessional interpretations, but the problem of modern Western interpretation was that it held that the meaning of the text is fixed in the text and that the way to get at it is placing it in its context of origin. The meaning is then revealed by means of a dialogue between the text and its original context. In this view the context of the reader is totally irrelevant. A reception history approach, which is applied in this study as complementary to the tripolar contextual approach, remedies this by showing how the text can and has been read in a variety of ways in many different contexts. A history of reception of the text in the EOTC enables the researcher to explore aspects of the Ethiopian context.

This is what the parameters of the conversation should look like, whereby conclusions are drawn from a conversation between two partners in dialogue and meaning could be negotiable.[15] In addition, the conversation could lead to a different conclusion if one of the partners is replaced by another. That implies that a text could have one meaning in one context and another meaning in a context that is changed through the participation of a new partner. As this approach assumes that meaning is a product of a conversation between different partners, it pays serious attention to each partner speaking for him- or herself so that the conclusion will be fully informed by both poles. However, this does not at all imply a diminishing of the place of the biblical text, as sometimes assumed traditionally.

As we are turning to Draper's terminology, there are three major elements in tripolar African contextual approach: *contextualization, distantiation*, and *appropriation*.[16] Draper (2001:155; 2002:16)[17] himself admits that it does not really matter which of the three poles one begins with, "provided that each is given the due weight" with appropriate consideration of the context of the reader. In this study I have chosen to begin with distantiation, followed by contextualization, finally wrapping up with appropriation.[18]

2.2.2 Distantiation

In the conversation process of two partners, distantiation is the stage where the reader of a text is considered as a listener, before he or she responds to the text. Distantiation, therefore, refers

---

Another tradition of reception entered Ethiopia in the form of a Western reception or non-reception of *1 Enoch* and the STL. Draper's model did not focus on the reception issue where the research of the present study introduces it as it is appropriate for this particular subject of study.

[15] Ukpong seems to be at the origin of an ambiguity when he says that the African context is the subject of interpretation. But strictly speaking 'contexts' do not interpret, but the different persons in that context. What he really seems to mean is that African readers must be allowed/ empowered to be the subjects of interpretation. It is Gerald West (2009:247-267) who has clarified the issue by pointing out that we should pay attention to the fact that text and context enter into dialogue by means of the reader: this reader will conduct this dialogue according to his/her own ideo-theological orientation: culture, position in society, values, concerns, commitments…

[16] Applying the tripolar concept to the translation/interpretation process of the Septuagint, Owan (1997:110f.) uses the designations *interpretation, actualization* and *inculturation,* which may be in line with Draper's terminology. Owan uses *interpretation* in the sense of Draper's *distantiation*, while *actualization* stands for *appropriation* and *inculturation* expresses practically the same as *contextualization.*

[17] Before he articulates in a more elaborate way and coining "new" terminologies in these later publications, Draper has already discussed clearly in his earlier publication (1991) the elements involved in text and context interpretive methodology.

[18] Bruce (2003:44-70), for instance, has applied this approach using the three interpretive elements effectively.

to listening to the text rather than talking to it. It aims, as Draper (2002:17) puts it, "to gain 'critical distance' from the text, to suspend what s/he previously understood the text to mean, to open her/himself up to new understanding which may contradict her/ his pre-assumptions." In this stage the process calls for "the reader/ hearer to let the text be other than her/himself, to be strange, unexpected, even alienating" (Draper 2002:17). In other words, the text is given space to challenge and judge the interpreter. It is part of the expectation that the reader is determined to critically engage with the text, giving it a closer reading. It is very important to note that the text is not merely an object of scrutiny; rather it is an independent partner with a power outside the control of the reader. The biblical text is an active partner in the conversation with a point of view that challenges, judges, or persuades the reader. In the meantime however, as this is a conversation, the reader is not a passive recipient of the text. The reader can expose her/his life situation and problems, ask questions, and challenge, even if at this stage of distantiation the text is given more attention than the reader. It is the text's turn to make its point while the reader does more than just listen to it but meets it and engages with it in an attentive and open manner.

In this study, selected texts from *Jude* and *1 Enoch* are critically examined. The three methods of exegesis—*behind the text, in the text,* and *in front of the text*—will be employed to validate the meaning of the text from various perspectives where it is appropriate. This is a method successfully employed by many biblical scholars including Gerald West (1993:26-50), Itumeleng J. Mosala (1989), and Cheryl B. Anderson (2003:23-43).

2.2.3 Contextualization

In the stage of *contextualization*, the present researcher's concern with the African context comes to the fore. As plainly expressed by Draper (2002:17), contextualization "involves spending time analyzing who we are and what our location in society and history is." Two aspects can be discerned here: the context of the reader with its many dimensions and the reader with his own attitudes and views of the issues involved in the context as well as in the text. It is this reader who directs the conversation between the text and the context. At this stage the context of the reader is given due attention in the conversation process. In most traditional approaches to biblical interpretation, it is assumed that an interpretation or

assumption from the western point of view represents the "objective" meaning, or the norm.[19] In a contextual African interpretive approach however, the stage of contextualization legitimizes the contribution made from an African point of view as valid. It is valid because arguments are made and questions asked on the basis of realities, experiences and values that are associated with the African contexts. It is the stage where African realities and experiences are assessed and analyzed independently where it requires some form of distantiation. It creates a space for seeing ourselves, our realities and our situation as Africans.

In fact, even if we share several values and traditions that give us a common African identity, we also have our own diversity and uniqueness differing from one location to the other. In applying this approach, aware of our common African identity and presuppositions, the contextualization stage lets us also reflect on the specific cultural and historical differences between various African peoples. In other words, when we speak of an African interpretive approach, "African" may apply either to the broader assumption of a commonality enjoyed by all Africans or to the specific context of particular African socio-cultural and geo-political entities.

For instance, Draper, in his various writings, focuses on the struggle against Apartheid in South Africa and the colonial liberation struggle in other African countries. Ethiopia, however, has known no Apartheid or colonial oppression but like other Africans, its inhabitants have experienced exclusion from the global agenda because they were perceived as "other". When Ukpong (2000:11; 1995:11) writes about the link between the biblical and the African contexts, he considers that "the main focus of interpretation is on the communities that receive the text rather than on those that produced it or on the text itself, as is the case with western methods" where "both the context of the text and context of the reader play an important role in the production of meaning."

This approach has made us aware of the significant neglect and exclusion of the rich Ethiopian literary and religio-historical culture in global scholarship. This study attempts

---

[19] For some insights on the value of pre-modern interpretation of Scripture for contemporary Biblical studies, see Decock 2005:57-74.

therefore to pay special attention to the various aspects of Ethiopian contexts, including the religious life of ordinary believers, art, stories, literary documents and other social aspects associated with the book of *1 Enoch*. The preservation history of the book that has been kept alive only in Ethiopia, its continuing relevance to both adherents of the EOTC and the Evangelical Churches, the "canon" of the Scriptures from EOTC perspective, and other issues related to the text of *1 Enoch* are presented from the African/Ethiopian viewpoint. This may shed new light on the book leading to a better understanding of Ethiopian Christianity from within, while at the same time due attention will be given to other voices. .

2.2.4 Appropriation

In the process of a conversation between text and context, the third pole, appropriation, is essentially present from the very beginning. It is a significant element in the interpretive process for it brings the results of the previous two elements, the text and the context, in conversation with each other and this in turn may lead to action or, at the least, it will prevent the search for the meaning of the text from ending in a vacuum. This phase of the interpretive process, in Draper's (2002:18) words, "includes the understanding that it results in changed behavior, in action in and through the community of faith in society."

Therefore, the appropriation this study primarily is looking for is that of two different receptions of the texts in the Ethiopian Churches. It means bringing these differing receptions into dialogue, which presupposes that the researcher knows the context, the history of reception of the text, and all that is involved in this. In addition, the study seeks to put the biblical texts in question that brings the Ethiopian context in conversation with it. This may enable the two church groups to appreciate each other's reception and to develop a broader and deeper understanding of the place of the Scriptures in general and of the position of *1 Enoch* and the STL in the Church in particular.

However, it is maintained that the appropriative moment is elusive in the interpretive process. Gerald O. West (2009:266) identifies two instances where it appears: "It is both the construct of the constant engagement between text and context, and a separable component of the interpretive process." Thus, the appropriation element is present at every interpretive step, in questions of relevance at various points and in the final stage of the study, where explicit

suggestions are made. Undoubtedly one of the essential elements in the tripolar African contextual approach is that it is a *conversational* process, a two way communication. Central to it is the conversation between the text and the context and between different church traditions. It is also mindful of being guided by an awareness of common ground, namely the primary axis or thread of Christian faith, who is Jesus (Draper 2002:18).

Affirming Draper's position, Gerald West would want to be more explicit in the role of the reader/interpreter/biblical scholar in the appropriation process. He prefers to designate the third pole as "the appropriative reader" so that it would help us recognize his/her ideo-theological position in the interpretive act. This means, as West (2009:266) helpfully clarifies, "our social locations construct ideological orientations which partially constitute our engagement with the biblical text, and the biblical text constitutes theological orientation which partially constitute our engagements with our community contexts."

Therefore, in the process of the conversation and the reading of both text and context one would obviously be expected to argue from one's chosen perspective. If this perspective is Jesus, the primary axis of Christian teaching, then one is expected "to read from the perspective of the powerless, the outcast, the poor, rather than from the perspective of the powerful, the respectable, the rich" (Draper 2002:18). In addition, Draper (2002:18f.) states: "We also choose to read from our own specific location in Africa, trying to understand in what way the text may contribute to our life and our faith as Africans in the hostile global environment."

This is an approach that is helpful for one who is engaging with a text on the one hand and with differing church groups on the other. As it creates a better space for conversation and dialogue in the African way, it serves as an appropriate framework for dealing with issues related to the Scriptures in Ethiopia. What would serve to develop a mutual understanding between the EOTC and the EEC – thus, ultimately, serving the body of Christ – is willingness to have a respectful conversation with one another. It is this approach that frames the present study which is based on a spirit that is highly regarded in many African contexts as it involves positive dialogue and conversation.

2.3 History of Reception Approach

In the broader framework of the tripolar African contextual approach, the nature of this thesis demands, for some of its parts, other complementary approaches. Of the two complementary approaches, the first one, a *history of reception* approach, is employed as a framework for the historical survey sections of the thesis. These sections are concerned with the background and transmission history of *1 Enoch*, reception of Christianity in Ethiopia, the translation and preservation history of *1 Enoch* in Ethiopia, and some brief notes on the history of Evangelical Christianity in Ethiopia. The history of reception approach frames the historical information in its chronological order with special attention for prominent periods in Christian history.

Important in the reception history approach is its special attention for ways in which the particular perspective of each period and context has shaped the understanding of a text and how the text, in turn, has affected the history into which it is received.[20] Even if the tripolar African contextual approach and the history of reception approach have each their own specific goals and motivations, they share a common focus in trying to unravel how text and context shape one another. While the African contextual model emphasizes the conversation between the biblical text and the current African context and its readers, the history of reception approach concentrates on the text and its interpretation in the specific context of historical periods whose myriad perspectives have played a role in shaping the meaning of the text for today's reader. Put differently, the role played by the reception history model in the interpretation process over time[21] fills gaps that may not be covered by the African contextual approach, but both focus on the same elements - text and context and appropriation. For

---

[20] History of reception approach could be one of the examples where there is an increasing interest in the interpretation of the Fathers. Paul Decock (2008b:329), for instance, connects the reason for this growing interest with a question "Why is the Western approach to the actualization of Scripture so hesitant, so uneasy and so lifeless?" In other words, he indicates that in recent biblical scholarship, we are obliged to question "to what purpose do we read the bible" (Decock 2008b:340). Giving the due attention to the importance of history of reception approach, Decock (2008b:340f.) concludes that "Patristic and Medieval exegesis remind us that interpreting Scripture is ultimately about the lives of the readers, about experiencing, and responding to, God's life giving word about the meaning of the world and of life, about our human responsibility in this world, and about the hope which can sustain us."

[21] As to the importance of time span in shaping a formative meaning or relative consensus, Alister E. McGrath (2011:107), in connection to his definition of reception history, comments that in the history of Christianity "certain ideas came into being under very definite circumstances; and that these ideas require to be tested and validated over time – a process often referred to as 'reception'."

instance, Gowler (2010:191) summarizes: "The meaning of a text does not reside alone in the creative genius of its author; there is a complex correlation between a text and the contexts in which a text has been read and reread, including various dynamic interrelations between creator and contemplators, past and present." In this way, the African tripolar interpretive and the history of reception frameworks mutually inform each other.[22]

Even if it had roots in some earlier works, without their authors actually articulating the concept, the reception history approach, also known as *Wirkungsgeschichte*, is a relatively new approach the development of which is still in progress. Based on philosophical discussions by scholars such as Martin Heidegger (1996) and Paul Ricoeur (1981), Hans-Georg Gadamer (1975; 2004) theorized that throughout history exegesis had occurred in conversation mode between text and reader and this insight became the foundation of his thinking in shaping the *Wirkungsgeschichte* framework.[23]

The major contribution of Ricoeur and Gadamer is their appreciation of the conversational or dialogical way of reading biblical texts, whereby both the text and the reader are listening to and challenging each other.[24] Gadamer, in this respect, proposed an interpretive method using double foci in his theory of "fusion of horizons," an approach that was followed and further developed by others.[25] However, Gadamer (1975:99) goes a step further by concluding that any hermeneutical event is an unfinished task that implies a process involving a continuous time span.[26] Gadamer (2004:581) concludes his most recent work with a remark on the

---

[22] Some scholars employed the history of reception approach together with other approaches such as the socio-rhetorical approach, whereby both inform one another. For a discussion of such an interdisciplinary approach, based on a number of Vernon Robbins's (1992; 1994; 1996; 2002; 2010) studies of the dialogical approach and mainly committed to a socio-rhetorical interpretation, see Gowler 2010:191-206.

[23] For instance, Martin O'Kane (2010:148) argues that "while there has clearly been a burgeoning of publications in relation to the reception history of the Bible in art, the most influential figure associated with *Wirkungsgeschichte* remains Hans-Georg Gadamer, and the seminal work that has provided the theoretical underpinning of the concept is found in his *opus magnum, Truth and Method* (1975), where he presents the role of hermeneutical aesthetics in understanding the function of art.

[24] For instance, Ricoeur (1981:143) argues that "to interpret is not a question of imposing on the text our finite capacity of understanding but of exposing ourselves to the text and receiving from it an enlarged self."

[25] This approach has been widely discussed and elaborated by Anthony Thiselton (1980) in his widely recognized work, *The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description*.

[26] O'Kane (2010:158) correctly notes that the nature of the reception history approach "is not simply about the history of cataloguing responses to a biblical text, but about a vital and multi-faceted human engagement in interpretative situations that are forever changing."

ongoing nature of interpretation: "But I will stop here. The ongoing dialogue permits no final conclusion. It would be a poor hermeneuticist who thought he could have, or had to have, the last word."[27]

Another contribution of Gadamer, related to reception history, lies in his awareness that "transformation" over time of the meaning of terms would have a major impact on the interpretation process and ensuing understanding. Knight (2010:137) correctly opines that "one of the most striking qualities of Gadamer's *magnum opus* [*Truth and Method*] is his view that the history of the language used obstructs any move towards an absolute definition of terms." This is evident in the attempt of this thesis to define a number of key theological terms which are seemingly understandable but notoriously problematic when one is arguing and trying to reach consensus. The same terms may convey different things as the context changes spatially and/or temporally. Gadamer (2004:111) explains this effect and how words or concepts may be transformed: "transformation means that something is suddenly and as a whole something else, that this other transformed thing that it has become is its true being, in comparison with which its earlier being is nil."

Luz applies this framework effectively in his Matthean commentary. Luz (1990:95) argues that *Wirkungsgeschichte* involves looking at "the history, reception, and actualizing of a text in media other than the commentary, e.g., in sermons, canonical law, hymnody, art, and in the actions and sufferings of the church." His discussion of the Magi, for instance, that connects the text with its diverse and rich interpretations in the history of painting acknowledges the contribution of artists and their viewers.

Furthermore, Luz shows the importance of the reception history approach in efforts to promote ecumenism. He argues that the reading of the interpretations of the Church Fathers, for instance, helps to deepen the meaning of any given text on the one hand while, even more significant, deepening ecumenical understanding (Elliott 2010:164).

---

[27] This is how Gowler (2010:203) concludes his article on the interdisciplinary approach of reception history: "we stand on the shoulders of centuries of conversations; our own positions are never independent of the reception history of these texts—ancient and modern—and our own work is woefully incomplete without a dialogic presentation of or response to those other responses."

In fact, *Wirkungsgeschichte* as a relatively new approach in the process of formation is still challenged and confronted with questions, for example how it should be defined. Roberts and Rowland (2010:132) offer a working definition as to what constitutes history of reception:

> *Wirkungsgeschichte* is an attempt to be truly diachronic and to appreciate the history of texts through time as a key to their interpretation. It contests the idea that exegesis should be confined to written explication of texts or to the views of a few academic exegetes. Rather, its openness to other media of exegesis, and to the varieties of effects of biblical texts, puts biblical studies in touch with wider intellectual currents in the humanities and in faith communities. *Wirkungsgeschichte* acknowledges literature, art, music and actualizations of the text as modes of exegesis just as important as the conventional explanatory writings of Judaism and Christian theology. It also entails acknowledging that, alongside the arts, there is a rich tradition of biblical interpretation which lies unstudied and perhaps unread in libraries and archives.

In formulating the concept and definition of reception history in relation to validating what constitutes meaning, Gadamer (2004: 296) writes: "The real meaning of a text, as it speaks to the interpreter, does not depend on the contingencies of the author and his original audience. It certainly is not identical with them, for it is always co-determined also by the historical situation of the interpreter and hence by the totality of the objective course of history."[28]

In conclusion, history of reception, unlike methods such as the traditional historical critical method that treats the text as an object of examination in itself, encourages a conversational approach involving the text and the reader, whereby the reader is located at various periods of history.[29] Like the African contextual approach, *Wirkungsgeschichte* asks for the input of both text and reader in the creation of meaning. The importance of the reception history framework lies in its sensitivity to various voices in the interpretive history of the text and using these to

---

[28] However, Thiselton is one of the scholars who hesitate to fully support the ascription of meaning mainly to historical context. For instance, he argues that "wrestling with *Wirkungsgeschichte* or reception history opens the door to exegesis as explication: an explication that permits us to see dimensions of meaning that *successive contexts of reading bring into sharper focus* for our attention" (Thiselton 2007: 304). On the other hand, some scholars argue that "following Hans-Georg Gadamer, text and interpreter can be seen as co-participants in a conversation that constitutes meaning rather than being secondary to some sort of prior, original meaning" (Rowland 2009: 143). In a sense, Rowland's explanation of *Wirkungsgeschichte* is equivalent to that of Draper's tripolar approach with three corresponding elements: text, interpreter, conversation and they shift the focus from the traditional historical-critical method to a new approach that gives more space to the reader.

[29] For a discussion on the relevance of the reception history approach as compared to the historical-critical method, and the importance of interdisciplinary approaches, see Lyons 2010:207-220. For an argument on "the centrality of this interpretative approach and its deep roots in Protestant exegesis of the Bible" (Roberts and Rowland 2010:135), see Morgan 2010:175-190.

build meaning. The entire process, therefore, is characterized by "an awareness of negotiation taking place" between the text and the reader (Roberts and Rowland 2010:135). In its ecumenical inclusivity as well, the reception history approach maintains openness to various voices in history and an appreciation of plurality of meaning.

2.4 Ecumenical Appreciative Approach

As part of its purpose this study strives to bring the EOTC and EEC in conversation and to effect a better understanding between the two groups through a better understanding of the Scriptures that both believe in as sacred text. This could be achieved by engaging in an ongoing conversation in a spirit of ecumenism and appreciation of the other. Appreciation of the other calls for *openness, mutual respect, a common goal, inclusiveness* and *tolerance*. These would be the main but by no means the only conditions for establishing an appreciative conversation in an ecumenical spirit. However, if the basic requirements are to a significant degree fulfilled, ecumenical discussion in the Ethiopian context will be attainable. What, then, do these requirements mean and how can each of them be applied to promote ecumenical unity among Ethiopian churches? Before we consider this question we have to define what we mean by "ecumenism" in the context of, and for the purpose of, this thesis.

2.4.1 Background and Definition of Ecumenism

Even if the concept of ecumenism has had varying meanings in the history of the church, "at the turn of the twenty-first century, both 'ecumenism' and 'ecumenical movement' refer primarily to the multidimensional movement of churches and Christians whose goal is both the *visible unity of the churches and an integration of mission, service, and renewal*" (Rusch 2001:46).

The word "ecumenism" derives from the Greek οἰκουμενη, a passive participle of οἰκεω, meaning "inhabit." The participle was later used to indicate the inhabited world – living together in one world.

According to the *Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement* the different nuances of the meaning of ecumenism are (a) a search for unity in the truth found in Jesus; (b) a search for the will of God in every area of life and work; (c) a search to discern, proclaim and participate

in the triune God's purpose for humankind; (d) the mission of God to the world.[30] In contemporary literature, ecumenism refers "to a multidimensional movement, including mission, social concerns, and ethical questions, *whose center and goal is the unity of the churches*" (Rusch 2001:47). This is adopted as a working definition by the present study.

The World Missionary Conference held in Edinburgh in 1910 is usually described as the beginning of the modern ecumenical movement. It made different movements focus on *uniting Christians to share the gospel with the world* (Rusch 2001:52). "The conference emphasized enduring ecumenical concerns: the evangelization of the world, where a divided and competing Christianity was a great hindrance; a commitment to peace and social justice; and a specific inner ecclesiastical motive – to seek the unity of the church because, on the basis of a confession of faith, *the church is essentially one*" (Rusch 2001:52). These were also the major concerns that, in the Ethiopian context, motivated Gudina Tumsa, the late General Secretary of the Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus (EECMY), in his selfless attempts to attain ecumenical unity in Ethiopia in particular and in the world in general.[31]

The common basis for all ecumenical thought and action is the fundamental conviction of the message of the NT—that unity is in the nature of the church.

> The unity of the church is a matter of Christian faith and confession, and not mere utility (Eph. 4:15). Thus the church in its unity is indestructible / [unbreakable]. This insight is part of Christian faith and confession. The unity of the church is viewed as God's gift. Every effort for Christian unity presupposes an essential unity of the church that already exists. The task of *ecumenism, then, is to allow this God-given unity to become visible* (Rusch 2001:56).

---

[30] For details, see the Introduction of the *Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement,* edited by Lossky, Nichlas et al, xi-xiv.

[31] Gudina Tumsa gave his life, both in life and death, for ecumenism, Christian solidarity, the cause of the unity of the body of Christ, the cause of the Gospel of the Risen Lord Jesus Christ—an evangelical ecumenical martyr. Gerd Decke is quite right in illustrating Gudina's martyrdom in the context of his ecumenical endeavour to firmly resist the imminent evil in a unified spirit. Gudina was a martyr of the abuse of the Gospel and an ecumenical hero who endangered his life in order to rescue the Christian church in his country, Ethiopia. Decke (2003:128) writes: "No wonder that in the long run the Marxist regime [of Ethiopia] decided to eliminate Gudina Tumsa, when Gudina was not willing to collaborate with them, nor let himself be used for propaganda purposes, and he was instrumental in founding a Council on the Cooperation of the Churches in Ethiopia [CCCE] in 1976, including the Orthodox, Catholic and various Protestant denominations, which was understood as establishing a political base independent from the government."

Gudina perceived a number of ecumenical qualities as connected to the Lutheran definition of the Church as "the communion of saints where the word of God is proclaimed rightly and the Sacraments are administered rightly." This meant, in his view, that "the Church is located where grace is offered, the bitterness of sin is taken away, the blessings of God appropriated, and the joy of the Lord's forgiveness is experienced" (Gudina 2003:16). Whatever structures we might have, either in a church or in ecumenical unity, what matters is the common goal: to promote and experience the grace, blessings and forgiveness of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is in this sense that Gudina embraced the Lutheran vision of unity of saints under God's grace and the ecumenical spirit of unity bringing this grace of Jesus Christ in the proclamation of the Gospel, which is in effect evangelical.

The EOTC in its dogmatic stance strongly empathizes with many aspects of the Ecumenical council and its catholicity. The Church firmly confesses and believes in the "unity of saints" as expressed in the apostolic confessional creeds. Likewise, Lutheran reformers have stressed that their teaching "should not be conceived as the dogma of a new church but simply as the correct teaching of the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church, to which the reformers belonged" (Rusch 2001:50). In other words, like their Orthodox counterparts, in principle the reformers were of an ecumenical mind and spirit when they set out to reform the church. The confessional creeds of the Lutheran Communion have kept this spirit alive.

It is in this broader sense that Malek (1999:19) defines ecumenism as "an examination of conscience, a dialogue for conversion, a radical acknowledgement of our conditions as sinners in need of Christ, attempting to resolve our differences and practical engagement in ways that vividly portray Christ as our chief quality, our Lord. Ecumenism is a means of evangelisation and witness to the wider world."

Thus ecumenical relations can and should be built on global, regional, and local levels. At all these levels it allows divided churches in their own settings to work cooperatively for the cause of the gospel, to stand together against evil that Christians – and all human beings for that matter – face, and to discuss divisive issues. In the Ethiopian context, for instance, Gudina

was able to emphasize the evangelical perspective of ecumenism as integrated in his Lutheran identity. This is a must, a position to be held by every evangelical Lutheran Christian.[32]

Ecumenism is an ideal that the churches of Christ strive for in order to reach complete unity.[33] But, even if many agree with the indispensability of ecumenism for the realization of a true church of Christ, it remains a real challenge when it comes to praxis.[34] For establishing an adequate ecumenical conversation, as is the aim of this study, some practical principles of ecumenism will have to be employed as part of the thesis' overall framework. These principles that would considerably enhance the possibility of a successful ecumenical conversation are discussed below.

2.4.2 Openness

To complement both the tripolar African contextual and the reception history approaches the present thesis employs the ecumenical appreciative approach.

 One of its elements is openness which may introduce a common thread to link the different frameworks. For instance, it is argued that "the goal of reception history is to develop an open-ended dialogic form of hermeneutics that is not alienated from human experience" (Roberts and Rowland 2010:133) which is also a very important element for an ecumenical appreciative approach.

Openness, from an ecumenical appreciative point of view, implies the willingness to learn about and from the other and, thus, establish appreciation of the good qualities of, and

---

[32] Even if there is the will and the need in general terms, it is not yet clear whether this motive still lives among subsequent leaders of the EECMY and the members at large.

[33] "… I in them and you in me, that they may become completely one, so that the world may know that you have sent me and have loved them even as you have loved me" (John 17:23 (NRSV)).

[34] This has been clearly reflected in the qualitative interviews that are part of this research. Almost all interviewees agreed in principle that ecumenism is unquestionably part and parcel of the church body. They however expressed how difficult and challenging the practice of ecumenism is in the Ethiopian context. For a detailed discussion see chapter eight of this thesis.

contributions made by, the other.[35] It entails readiness to be changed and renewed by what one learns from the other.

The nature of openness in ecumenism arises from the nature of the Bible itself. While it serves as a common heritage for the creation of one Christian faith community, it also allows for alternative voices coming from different contexts. As Elliott (2010:162) remarks about the Bible: "What else can the church or churches rely on? But it is also the Bible which allows the church to be a community of openness yet alterity".

We need to underline that openness in ecumenism entails belief in the omnipotence of God and miracle, even in regard to church unity. It is true that many distance themselves from ecumenical unity because they fear it is in practice an impossibility. However, the church should base its principles on the Scriptures' firm teaching that nothing is impossible with God. He is a God of miracles. Therefore, it is our responsibility to move forward and to give ourselves in faith to Him and obey Jesus' prayer (Jn. 17:23) to the effect that we should be completely one. Speaking from the Ethiopian context, Gudina Tumsa was strongly convinced of the need for openness. He argues:

> It seems to be necessary to remind ourselves of the mighty power of the Bible's God, because there are Christians who argue that there cannot be a unity among the churches. *Biblical faith is based on the impossible, on miracles*. … miracles are contrary to the laws of nature. Ours is still the God of miracles, and one of the miracles he may perform today is to bring about unity among His churches. *Let us then talk about His Church rather than our churches* (emphasis mine) (Gudina 2003:19).

From an Orthodox perspective it is also maintained that openness - openness to the Spirit of the Lord and towards one another - is a key to ecumenical understanding. An Orthodox theologian, John Meyendorff, makes a plea to his fellow Orthodox and others for openness if they want a sincere ecumenism to emerge. He writes that all the efforts to bring about ecumenical unity "will bring forth fruit only if they end upon an encounter, not only with each

---

[35] For example, one of the ways to be involved in this learning process about the other and from the other is by participating in the scholarly discussion of ecumenism. It is noted that the *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* … is a venture that is "part and parcel of the new spirit: a spirit of openness in discussion" (from the back page of *Scripture and Ecumenism*, by Leonard J Swindler, 1965).

other, but also with the Lord in the Spirit of Truth. To be truly 'ecumenical' is to be ready [in other words, to be open] at every moment, for this encounter" (Meyendorff 1965:57f.).

In conclusion, openness entails readiness to learn from, and listen to, the other in a manner that may change one's perspectives. It requires a lot of trust in God who is the owner and creator of the church and it asks for obedience to Him, accepting what is right in His sight. It is in this spirit that this study is conducted and it expects the different churches in Ethiopia to embrace the same openness and engage in a vibrant ecumenical conversation. At God's table, *oikoumene*, we cannot limit ourselves. We must be open to accept this new phenomenon based on adequate interpretations of the Scriptures.

2.4.3 Mutual Respect

Ecumenism, dialogue, conversation, all these involve two or more parties who, for their encounter to succeed, have to combine openness with mutual respect. However sincerely one party strives to achieve cooperation and fellowship, the efforts will not bear fruit if there is no reciprocation from the other parties.[36]

Mutual respect is the conscious undertaking of each party to value the very existence of the other parties and to appreciate their qualities. Without such mutual respect there can be no ecumenism. In the Ethiopian context, particularly in EOTC and Evangelical circles, labeling the other negatively has been a common problem. In this divisive environment, fictitious narratives developed, blackening each other. So, the call for mutual respect implies the need for a move against the tendency to demonize the other without justification. It entails the replacing of disregard with respect, thus building a spirit of ecumenism.

2.4.4 Common Goal

The common goal of both church bodies, even if understanding and rituals differ, is a holistic[37] transformation of individuals that, in turn, leads to societal transformation through the good

---

[36] This is evident from Gudina Tumsa's effort in the 1970's to establish an ecumenical council in Ethiopia. He did not succeed as other denominations were not ready.

[37] "Holistic" ministry, in the Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus, has been applied as the central motto of the Church with an understanding of serving human beings in their full personality of spirit, body and soul. It

news of Jesus Christ. If both parties came to realize that the other is involved in the same noble mission, appreciation would of necessity follow and might even result in cooperation. Such synergy would lead to much better achievements than the efforts made separately and competitively. This study suggests that the common denominator should be given more weight, in order to promote a fruitful ecumenism.

It is clear that the EOTC and the Evangelicals have to avoid the pitfalls of a divided society and learn to acknowledge and appreciate the ultimate goal of "the Church". When churches come to a deliberate awareness that they are serving and worshiping one and the same Lord to whom the church belongs, they may humble themselves and be willing to cooperate and develop fellowship with their co-workers in the Kingdom. A consciousness that all are partners in the same mission might serve as a powerful motivation for ecumenical unity and fellowship. The realization that all confess that "there is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called to one hope when you were called, one Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all" (Eph. 4:4-6 (NRSV)) would help believers to value that broad oneness above all that separates them. It calls for the deeper identity of brotherhood in the family of the Lord whose ultimate goal is serving Him and Him alone. It is in this spirit that ecumenical fellowship in Ethiopia would be effective and could be achievable.[38]

Experience teaches that there are a number of things that a single denomination cannot do on its own. In order to be successful these things require cooperation with brothers and sisters in other denominations. Examples are challenging the communist persecution and the denial ideology in Ethiopia in the 70's and 80's, the overthrowing of Apartheid in South Africa, and the struggle against HIV/AIDS.

---

has multifaceted dimensions addressing religious, socio-cultural, and political aspects, as Jesus did and for which he set an example during his earthly ministry.

[38] It is in this spirit that Gudina's (2003:26) urgently called on the EECMY to promote ecumenical unity: "In obedience of the Lord of the Church and in order that the prayers of our Savior may be fulfilled, the ECMY should continue its efforts and strengthen its work in areas of ecumenical cooperation."

2.4.5 Inclusiveness

As Christian churches have a common goal, it is feasible for them to practice inclusiveness as regards their perception of the Scriptures and its interpretations. For instance, Elliott (2010:164) argues that "Canonical reading is good when it is inclusive ('both…and') and bad when it is exclusive (canons within canons: 'either…or')."[39] The element of inclusiveness implies also a strong bond between an ecumenical appreciative approach and a reception history approach as the concern of the latter is for "negotiating a more emancipated, inclusive and dialogical kind of understanding" (Roberts and Rowland 2010:134).

In proclaiming the Gospel the mandate is inclusive which means "that proclaiming Christ to his world is the responsibility of every Christian and every church, regardless of the varying situations in which we find ourselves" (Gudina 2003:63).However, inclusiveness does not mean succumbing to the identity of the other; rather, it is about treating all equally and fairly. Justice must be at the center of this approach so that the process does not get stuck in another kind of animosity or hatred.

Philip Potter (1977:307) points out both the challenge and the extent of inclusiveness in the ecumenical movement. He writes: "The whole burden of the ecumenical movement is to co-operate with God in making the *oikoumene* an *oikos*, a home, a family of men and women, of young and old, of varied gifts, cultures, possibilities, where openness, trust, love and justice reign" (Potter 1977:307). This argument also clarifies how the different requirements listed in this section are interconnected.

2.3.6 Tolerance

To be inclusive means to willingly and intentionally embrace the other in a frame of mind that necessitates another principle of ecumenism, namely tolerance. As an endeavor to create unity and fellowship, ecumenism faces a number of serious challenges, even obstacles. When such obstacles manifest themselves, a sound way to deal with them is to exercise tolerance. Once again, tolerance does not imply the loss of one's identity and becoming another person.

---

[39] For a similar discussion see Luz 2005: 344-48.

Rather, it is appreciating the qualities of the other by exercising leniency, acceptance or understanding towards the differences and seeming weaknesses of the other. Part of an appreciative approach is tolerance shown by both parties for the common good of the society they are serving.

Above all, the bottom line for tolerance to be effective is love and justice. Ecumenical unity should arise from hearts that have surrendered to love as shown by Jesus Christ, practiced on the basis of justice. Ecumenism must always presuppose love and justice as manifested in the life and ministry of Jesus Christ. Tolerance, therefore, is not just agreeing to disagree, which is a good principle in itself, but rather to go further and love, accept, and appreciate the other without any intention of changing one's identity.

Another way to give expression to tolerance is in practicing "unity in diversity." In ecumenism, there is an inherent and ultimate unifying bond between Christians and churches of Christ. However, there are also undeniable differences between Christian traditions. These differences should be tolerated without any tendency of disguising the differences. Instead they should be appreciated and whenever possible enjoyed so as to build unity.

The five requirements mentioned here are some characteristics of the *ecumenical appreciative approach,* applicable to this study. I intend to develop this theoretical framework into a more elaborate one in the main part of the thesis. More precisely, the contribution of this thesis is its integration of three approaches, where it proves that, depending on the topic, integration of approaches is not only adequate but also appropriate for some topics. In this chapter, however, I have described the overarching framework of the approaches and the assumptions by which the writer of this study has been shaped and guided.

 The following joint declaration of the Roman Catholic Church and the Lutheran Communion is a good example of an agreement reached in an ecumenical spirit after an extended process in which   the various ecumenical requirements have become part of the thinking of both churches:

> the Roman Catholic–Lutheran *Joint Declaration on Justification* (1997) was in no way
> an admission that the long quest for the correct justification doctrine was a waste of
> time and that interpretations are merely a matter for aesthetics and sometimes for moral

warnings; rather, it was a confident claim that the truth of this matter is to be found somewhere between the Protestant and Catholic doctrinal positions (Elliott 2010:171).

2.4 Conclusion

This chapter theorizes on the conceptual approach that frames this study. Under the umbrella of the tripolar African contextual broader framework, the thesis uses two more complementary but subordinate theoretical frameworks, closely interwoven with the overarching one. The history of reception approach guides portions of the thesis related to historical dimensions, both ecclesiastical and scriptural, while an ecumenical appreciative approach guides mainly those portions of the thesis that relate to discussions concerning the two church groups in question. In other words, this is an interdisciplinary approach employing three closely connected theoretical frameworks that are mutually inclusive.

Each of the approaches with their distinctive properties promotes a number of principles that all three have in common, but in different forms. These common principles are fundamental to the present study. They include conversation, dialogue, appropriation, self-criticism, and inclusivity. It is the researcher's assumption that they allow space for all parties in the search for ecumenism to be heard and also to be challenged.

CHAPTER THREE

REDEFINING SOME TERMS AND CONCEPTS WHICH CAUSE MISUNDERSTANDING

3.1 Purpose of the Chapter

Terminological and conceptual misunderstandings are very common because of the changes they undergo in their usage by different communities through time and space. The same word can mean different things over time and at different locations. In addition, when a word / concept is imported / translated into another language and used by a different faith community, it may not mean one and the same thing as in its original language or for the other community.

Despite the potential confusion and misunderstandings of such key terms and concepts would create, it is unavoidable to use them for their long standing usage around both the academic and ecclesiastical circles. As a result, it is inevitable to clarify the possible confusions, set a working definition applicable to this context,[1] and engage in the broader debate of the problem to make some proposal as much as possible.

The major research question this thesis is dealing with is "Why do the Ethiopian Churches, Orthodox and Evangelicals, who have been shaped and influenced by *1 Enoch*, hold strongly opposing views towards the STL in general and *1 Enoch* in particular?" Under this broader question, which serves for the entire thesis, another specific question could be raised to be discussed in this chapter—could one of the reasons for differing views between Ethiopian Evangelicals and the EOTC be due to the differences they may have in conceptual understanding and pragmatic usage of such theological and biblical terms?[2] If so, which terms

---

[1] If the broader audience, and not specifically the participant of the colloquium he was originally addressing, is in his mind, Eugene Ulrich's (2003:58) plea to formulate "a fully adequate definition that all can agree on," is unlikely since a key term or a concept should be defined based on a context.

[2] In fact, it is true that there is a different view of the Scriptures because the two churches stand in two very different historical traditions. The history of the Protestant churches in Europe has shaped their understanding and approach to the Scriptures, a history very different from the history and experience of the Ethiopian Church. However, the problem is a terminological one, which does not consider this differences and as a result most

are so disputed and which ones are used in common terms? To what extent do terminological and conceptual differences result in misunderstanding of each other? Are these differences real or superficial? Could there be a common ground that both church groups may come closer in understanding and defining these terms?

The purpose of this chapter, therefore, is to critique the definitions, scope, importance and usage of various biblical and theological key terms, concepts, views, and categories of writings, with special reference to the STL in the NT time and in today's Ethiopian Churches, so as to lay a foundation for the terminological ground of the discussion of the thesis. It also attempts to indicate the differences in concept of some terminologies and makes a choice this thesis would follow, so that the reader would understand what it means when those key terminologies are employed in the thesis.

The chapter is divided into two main parts, where key biblical and theological terms, concepts, and views are defined in the first part, whereas categories of scriptural writings are identified in the second.

3.2 Key Biblical and Theological Terms, Concepts and Views

Some of the key theological and biblical terms and concept, which have been used or misused differently, include Scripture, canon/canonical, Bible/biblical, authority, and inspiration.[3] Some of them were employed anachronistically by some modern scholars, while others underwent a significant change of meaning. It is believed that such confusions contributed to varying positions and misunderstandings of the place of STL in Ethiopian churches in particular and the global church in general.

---

scholarly discussions employ the same key terms in reference to both differing churches with their own peculiar concepts and nuances for these terms.

[3] It is understood that there are plenty of biblical and theological terms of which definitions universal consensus are not reached. Only these — (the) Scripture(s), canon/canonical, Bible/biblical, authoritative, inspiration, Apocrypha, and STL — are treated in this chapter/thesis due to their unique sensitivity in the Ethiopian churches context. I argue that these are the most significant concepts which are highly disputed among Ethiopian churches in particular, even if they are highly debated in the global churches as well.

3.2.1 Scripture (the Scriptures)

"Scripture" is a complex and difficult term to define mainly because of its conceptual differences and development in various contexts and periods, as well as its close connectedness with other related concepts and terms like "authority," "inspiration," and "canon". In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary,* for example, there is not an entry for "Scripture" *per se*, rather an entry under "scriptural authority" with eight separate articles, each focusing on a particular aspect of the subject (Freedman 1992, 5:1017-1056).[4] Some other biblical dictionaries simply avoid defining it; rather they refer to how the word is used in the Bible at different periods and in different believing communities (Bromiley 1996:1069). Another way of presenting it is either by simply relating it or coupling it with other subjects such as canon, inspiration, revelation, interpretation, tradition, and authority.[5] Another way of defining the term is to generalize it as a "name given to the holy writings of any religions group" (Elwell 1986:1915).Thus, the difficulty to define "Scripture" is evident.

Scripture and Bible: To begin with, the problem in conceptual definition of Scripture, in the English language, is simply equating it with another related, but not identical, term Bible. For instance, Alister E. McGrath writes that the English terms "Bible" and "Scripture," together with the derived adjectives "biblical" and "scriptural," "are virtually interchangeable. Both designate a body of texts which are recognized as authoritative for Christian thinking" (McGrath 2007:121).

Likewise, Robert Gnuse equates the two terms—"Bible" and "Scripture"—with the term "canon", which is more technical and formal, for him, than the others. "The words 'Scripture' and 'Bible' are used interchangeably. The word 'canon' is basically synonymous with these two words, but it denotes more properly the official corpus of literature designated by the Church for theological use in the fourth century A.D." (Gnuse 1985:5).

---

[4] The articles include biblical authority in Judaism, Eastern Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism (these three are an overview of three different confessional contexts), Early Church, Middle Ages, (these two represent the formative periods of the church), Reformation and post-Reformation, Enlightenment, post-Enlightenment, and post-critical periods, (dealing with the development of the subject in various periods).
[5] Among others, this includes Ferguson and Wright 1988:627-633; Tenney 1976:302-313.

However, even in English, these two terms are not always designating one and the same thing. At least three major differences can be noted: first, the very names themselves have different origins; while "Scripture", the Greek γραφή, *graphe* refers to (sacred) writings, the word "Bible", the Greek βιβλία, *biblia* refers to a book, or a collection of books.[6] Secondly, while "Scripture" has a long standing history, even though with a widely developing meaning through time, "the Bible" is fairly a recent invention in English language. It is maintained that the word "Bible, the English form of the Greek name_Biblia_, meaning 'books,' the name which in the fifth century began to be given to the entire collection of sacred books, … was adopted by Wickliffe, and came gradually into use in [the] English language" (Bible Works 2003:580). Finally, whereas the word Scripture(s),[7] either in its singular or plural form, refers to any sacred writings, without necessarily indicating the canonicity of the work, the word Bible is mainly attached to the canon of the Scriptures.

Therefore, the assertion of some scholars that the two terms, Scripture and Bible, are used interchangeably, as presented above, is largely misleading. If they are used interchangeably, which is true at times, it is either a recent phenomenon or can be identified from its context. However, James C. VanderKam rightly warns that we should avoid using the term "Bible" or "biblical" for the Second Temple Period, which presupposes a canon, rather, we should use a broader term(s) "(the) Scripture(s)" and "scriptural" for the authoritative writings of the period (VanderKam 2002:109).

Ethiopian Context: When it comes to the Ethiopian context, the Ethiopian Churches, both Orthodox and Evangelicals, designate the Bible in Amharic word መጽሐፍ ቅዱስ *Metsihaf Qidus* (literally means "The Holy Book"), whereas the Scripture(s) is designated by the plural form of it, ቅዱስት መጻሕፍት *qidusat metsahift* (literally means "holy books"). Nevertheless, the concept that constitutes what the Orthodox and the Evangelicals would indicate by "Bible" or "(the) Scripture(s)" may not be one and the same thing. Especially, what the Orthodox

---

[6] It is from these two different Greek terms, γραφή and βιβλία, that the English terms "Scripture" and "Bible" are derived respectively. These two terms have been employed either with the definite articles, ἡ γραφή or τα βιβλία, indicating to a specific writings or books, or without the definite article, indicating to a general and wider collection.

[7] In most cases, it is the singular form of Scripture which is equated to the Bible, even if, at times, the plural is also employed likewise.

Christians think of the Scriptures (holy books) is quite different from what their counterparts, Evangelicals, would think about them, even if the difference of the concept of the word "Bible" መጽሐፍ ቅዱስ is much narrower than before. The word "Bible," for the Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church, refers to the eighty-one books, traditionally called as ሰማኒያ አሃዱ *semaniya ahadu* (the eighty-one), which the Church claims to be their "canon".[8] On the other hand, for the Evangelicals, it refers to the sixty-six books of the Bible accepted by the Protestant churches globally.

In terms of definition, as the Evangelicals would agree, the EOTC mainly connects the notion of the Scriptures with its divine origin and inspiration. The church believes that "all Scriptures are written with the inspiration of the Spirit of God or are the breadth of God. They are also described as Holy Books containing the word of God" (EOTC 1996:45).Therefore, besides the agreement on the definition of the term "Scripture", what unifies both church groups in Ethiopia is that both refer to the collection of the books of the Old and New Testament as the "Bible". However, they differ in what constitutes the Bible on the one hand and the range of the Scriptures in the other hand. The Orthodox tend to embrace a wider collection as the Scriptures while the Evangelicals tend to limit the Scriptures to only "canonical" books.

Despite the difference in what constitutes the canon of the Scriptures, both Orthodox and Evangelical Christians in Ethiopia have a very high regard and reverence for the Scriptures. Now-a-days, it is customary that most of the debate and discussion on the marketplace among the laity of the two churches is mainly based on the Bible. The Bible is a point of reference to most of the arguments, which implies a common understanding of the critical importance of the Scriptures.

Defining the term "Scripture/the Scriptures": The term "Scripture/the Scriptures", in a broader sense, can simply be defined as "a [considered] book holy by the members of a religion" (Stanley 2010:3); a definition, which can be applicable for all religions. Stanley further articulates that "***Scripture is the writing accepted by and used in a religious***

---

[8] Which eighty-one books constitute the EOTC canon and issues related to the "canon" of the EOTC are discussed in depth in chapter six below.

community as especially sacred and authoritative" (2010:4; emphasis original).[9] In its narrower sense, against this definition, the word Scripture is attached to only a "canon" or "the Bible".[10] However, even if the books of the canon are Scriptures, the Scriptures are not limited to it.

The definition of "the Scriptures" by EOTC, as stated above, is very much in line with a well-articulated definition by E. J. Schnabel, who defines the Scriptures as "the written word of God" as understood by Christians, and "an established body of writings of divine origin, possessing authority for the people of God as well as for the individual" as understood by Jews (Schnabel 2000:34). More recently, aware of the confusion and lack of precision, Eugene Ulrich (2002:29) attempts to define it in a more adequate and broader sense: "A book of scripture is a sacred authoritative work believed to have God as its ultimate author, which the community, as a group and individually, recognizes and accepts as determinative for its belief and practice for all time and in all geographical areas."

The definition, which includes the notion of authority, inspiration, revelation, but not of "canon",[11] is adopted in this study. In other words, the term(s) (the) Scripture(s) is employed to designate early Jewish and Christian writings, which are authoritative and inspired, but not necessarily "canonical". This concept seems an inclusive one so as to fit for all churches in Ethiopia.[12]

3.3.2 Authority

The concept and definition of authority is another complex question.[13] Besides the spatial and temporal differences of the concept, the complexity arises from two other problems. On the

---

[9] Stanley lists and discusses four major elements, according to his definition, which constitute "Scripture". These are: (1) the Scriptures are written; (2) the Scriptures are accepted by and used in a religious community; (3) the Scriptures are viewed as especially sacred; and (4) the Scriptures are viewed as especially authoritative. (For the discussion on each of these, see Stanley 2010:4-7.)

[10] This is a notion maintained by the Ethiopian Evangelical Churches.

[11] For a more detailed discussion on different ranges of concepts on "the Scriptures" and "canon", see Kelsey 1975:100-108.

[12] The major difference in position and usage of terminology in relation to the Scriptures among the varying churches in Ethiopia is more connected to "canon", which may come under a sub-topic, "canon", below.

[13] Frederick H. Borsh, (1993:35), for instance, argues that the differing position regarding the role and authority of the Scriptures among Christian churches has been from the earliest days.

one hand, it arises from mixing different concepts of authority: divine authority, authority as understood secularly, scriptural authority, apostolic authority, ecclesiastical authority, etc. On the other hand, the confusion of which authority is given priority over which one remains a point of contention. In other words, the same kind of authority, for example, biblical authority, is considered/defined as a primary authority at some point and that primacy may be replaced by another kind of authority, for example, by divine authority or ecclesiastical authority at another time. So, the problem is whether these authorities are one and the same, or whether they have some kind of hierarchy, or whether they function on entirely different levels or for different purposes, or whether they can be employed interchangeably.

The perception of authority entertained here must be limited to scriptural authority as it was understood by early Judaism or Christianity so that it must not be confused with the current understanding. Some other sources of authority are discussed in conjunction with their relationship with scriptural authority, which apparently has a differing position between the Orthodox and Evangelicals in Ethiopia. Thus, an understanding of authority in the Ethiopian churches context will follow the discussion on the overview and diverging positions of scriptural authority.[14]

Objective Definition: Ulrich (2002:29) tries to give a definition of authority in an objective sense: "An authoritative work is a writing which a group, secular or religious, recognizes and accepts as determinative for its conduct, and as of a higher order than can be overridden by the power or will of the group or any member." This definition makes it clear that the notion of authoritative Scripture by itself, and as understood by early Judaism and Christianity, does not include or presuppose the notion of what is today (or later on) known as "canon" in the west.

Catholics and Protestants on Authority: In clarifying the distinction between Catholics and Protestants on the notion of authority, Clark H. Pinnock (1985:8) offers a lengthy discussion with examples and biblical references and concludes in this manner: [15] "The catholic tradition

---

[14] For instance, Carl F. H. Henry (1986:296) defines biblical authority as something which denotes that "the bible is the word of God and as such should be believed and obeyed". However, this could only reflect the contemporary understanding and not the ancient period, Christian or Jewish.
[15] Unfortunately, Pinnock left out the Orthodox from his discussion entirely. By and large, the Orthodox position on authority is not that far from that of the Catholics.

tends to take the logic of God preserving his Word one step further than Protestants do, to the point of declaring the church magisterium itself infallible"[16] in interpreting the Scriptures.[17] Following Luther, Pinnock (1985:81) urges, as Protestants, "we must give Scripture the focus of our greatest attention and let it have a free ministry and the primary authority." Thus, according to this position, in the Catholic tradition, as in the Orthodox tradition, the Church's authority of interpreting the Scriptures is superior to individual's authority while it is the vice versa among the Protestants—individual freedom and authority to interpret and apply the Scriptures has primacy over ecclesiastical authority to do so.

Biblical Authority and Inspiration: Another point of debate on scriptural authority is whether the Scriptures are authoritative because they are inspired or the other way round; they are inspired because they are authoritative. The view which gives priority to authority gives inspiration only a secondary place by prioritizing authority. In other words, the Scriptures are inspired because they are authoritative. In this line, Gnuse (1985:65) argues that "authority is the prior category. Inspiration is a corollary; it is subordinate. Because the Bible is authoritative, we may speak of it as inspired. Inspiration is a second order doctrine."[18]

---

[16] Clark H. Pinnock sternly, but unwarrantly, criticizes this position, a position which the Orthodox would share with the Catholics. He argues that "though understandable in terms of logic, it seems to be unwarranted scripturally and in view of historical developments. Tying up the package of authority so tightly in this way binds the Word of God more to the creaturely realm than it wants to be and permits the message to come under too greater a degree of human control" (Pinnock 1985:81). But this raises another difficult question that the Protestants' individual based interpretation of the Scriptures makes it worse in giving more control for individuals, rather than a community, to control the usage of the Bible's authority. It is this practice, which Pinnock didn't mention, led to an endless atomization of the church into segments of their own authority. Unable to see countless error his Protestant counterparts commit, Pinnock's criticism towards the Catholics, which would apply also to the Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church, is to protect the Church from erring. "All this seems to be implied in the notion of canon itself, which suggests a unique normativity over the ongoing developing traditions. Otherwise, the Bible would just melt into human traditions and lose its capacity to bring about change and reform. In opting the canon, the church seemed to say that the criteria of truth lay outside herself in a text that stood over her and at times even against her. By accepting the norm of Scripture, the church declared that there was a standard outside herself to which she intended to be subject for all time. Being the Word of God this special sense, the Bible could measure the other authorities and be the foundation of Christian hermeneutic. The church can fall into error and needs the Bible to measure herself by. In turn, the church serves the canon by continuing in the truth and faithfully proclaiming the Word of God" (Pinnock 1985:81-82).
[17] The crucial issue is not the authority of the Scriptures per se, that is beyond question. The divisive issue is whether each believer has the authority to interpret the Scriptures and is therefore free to do so, or whether the authority rest in the community and its leadership. Again, the EOTC was probably not involved in such acrimonious debates in the course of its history.
[18] Gnuse (1985:65) further explains that "Inspiration describes a quality of the text, but the concept of authority seeks to describe why the Scriptures should be used. The reason for authority should also explicate how Scripture

If this is the case, where is the basis for biblical authority? Gnuse responds to this question in functional terms rather than ontological:

> Scripture is authoritative—by that we mean that it provides insight for the Church on how to be Christian in word and deed, and it provides a pattern by which the Church adapts its life style to each new generation. *Scripture is authoritative because of what it does [functionally] for the Church, not because of what it is [ontologically]; it provides us with our Christian identity. The Scriptures are authoritative because the Church has chosen to use them for two thousand years* (Gnuse 1985:123; *italics* mine).

This position is very much in line with a position which argues that inspiration is secondary to canonicity.[19] That means, both positions agree that the Scriptures are inspired because they are considered as authoritative or canonical. But this position falls short because it judges subjective concept as an objective one. Recognizing a limited number of books as authoritative or canonical can objectively be verified; however, inspiration is mainly a spiritual phenomenon as God's action is beyond observation. Opposing to this position, it is believed that scriptural authority arises from its divine inspiration.

Biblical Authority and Tradition: The authority of the Scriptures, according to the Orthodox, is mainly connected to its inspiration, and as a result, equated to divine authority.[20] "The most frequently used model for affirming the unity of Scripture is to stress its inspiration by God. The reason lies in the ultimate authority of God, for if Scripture is seen as something given by God to humanity, then it must partake of his ultimate divine nature" (Bratsiotis 1951:20). However, unlike the Evangelicals, Bratsiotis (1951:20) writes:

> according to Orthodox theology the Church is the guardian of supernatural revelation in its historical development, and the store (of supernatural revelation) is the Bible on the one hand and the apostolic tradition on the other hand; the Bible constitutes the written, and tradition the spoken, Word of God, yet both are authoritative source of Christian

---

ought concretely to be used and understood in the life of the Church and in the doing of theology. Inspiration does not do that. It merely tells us why the Scriptures were effective once we used them under the mandate of biblical authority."

[19] For a discussion on the definition of "inspiration" and its relation to canonicity, see below under subtopics "inspiration" and "canon".

[20] For a detailed discussion of the position of the Eastern Orthodox Churches on the authority of the Scriptures in connection to tradition, see J. Robert Wright 1993:61-65.

teaching… Neither does tradition make the Bible superfluous nor does the Bible make tradition superfluous, but these both mutually supplement and interpret one another.[21]

Among Evangelicals, following their Reformation ancestors, scriptural authority is absolute and, it is said, the only binding one. This is derived from one of Luther's slogans—*sola Scriptura*.[22] That means, "the Scriptures are the sole ultimate authority for faith and life" (Carson 1986:5).[23] However, they also confess that the Reformation tradition and the interpretation of the Church Fathers are well accepted both for dogma and practice.[24] In recent years, Evangelical scholars are increasingly aware of the inseparable usage of the Scriptures and tradition. It is argued that "In the divine economy Scripture and tradition are… inseparably bound together through the work of the Spirit" (Franke 2004:204. For a similar position, see Achtemeier 1980:116). Therefore, the two "must function together, each in its

---

[21] Bratsiotis (1951:20-21), in his presentation on WCC symposium, further elaborates how both tradition and the Scriptures are equally authoritative and important in the Orthodox Church: "If, from the Orthodox point of view, it is not the right way of speaking to assert that 'the Church was the mother of the Bible', it is an even less correct expression to make the opposite claim that the Bible begat the Church. Of both the Bible and tradition the Church is the birthplace, guardian, authoritative witness, and also authoritative interpreter. The Bible as much as tradition was begotten in the womb of the Church. For her sake both were created and both were transmitted to her. She gives evidence about the canon of Holy Scripture that is about the fact that the content of the books constituting it is the Word of God. In the Church these books are preserved unalloyed and in her alone both the Bible and tradition are securely and authoritatively interpreted. It is, however, to be understood that, when we say in Orthodox theology that the authority of the Bible and of her twin sister tradition is testified by the Church, it is implied that they both have their source in the authority of God, whose revelation and word they both contain and from whom the Church also derives her authority." However, Kelsey (1975:96) argues that it is inappropriate to compare the Scriptures and tradition because they are not on the same level. He writes, "Since 'scripture' and 'tradition' are not logically on a par, it is misleading to contrast them as alternative and competing authorities for the church's forms of action and speech. Indeed, it is commonly acknowledged now by Protestant (including Oscar Cullmann, Gerhard Ebeling, K. E. Skydsgaard, Jaroslav Pelikan and Albert Outler) and Roman Catholic (including Yves-Marie Congar, Joseph Geiselmann, George Lindbeck [an American Lutheran, but widely wrote on Catholic theology], and George Tavard) theologians alike that the issue raised by *sola scriptura* is not whether there are two sources for Christian theology ('canonical scripture' and 'tradition') or only one ('canonical scripture' alone). Both sides now agree that 'scripture' is that set of writings whose *proper* use serves as the occasion by God's grace for his presence, as they both agree that it is permissible to call the complex comprised by the dialectic between proper use of scripture and gracious presence of God by the name 'tradition'."

[22] The other two related slogans being *sola gratia,* grace is the sole ground of salvation, and *sola fides,* faith is the sole means of salvation.

[23] However, for a discussion on the insufficiency of the Scriptures as a source of revelation, from the Roman Catholic Church perspective, see Albert C. Outler 1965:9-11.

[24] This can clearly be referred from the Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus constitution, article 2, where the church confesses of accepting the unaltered Augsburg Confession as the Scriptures are correctly and purely interpreted. In this connection, a Presbyterian scholar, Robert McAfee Brown, (1965:42), argues that the renowned Evangelical scholar, Karl Barth, "delivers us from what can be a very perverse notion of *sola scriptura*… and a [narrow] Biblicism… And he [Karl Barth] provides the supreme criterion by which all else, whether Scripture, tradition, church fathers, private insights, church structure, or whatever, must be judged— namely the criterion of the Lordship of Jesus Christ. Whatever witnesses to the Lordship of Jesus Christ we must maintain. Whatever jeopardizes the Lordship of Jesus Christ we must discard."

proper fashion, as coinherent aspects of the ongoing ministry of the Spirit (Achtemeier 1980:204)."

Ontological and functional usage: Another level of complexity, particularly in the Ethiopian context, even if it could be applicable to many other contexts, is the problem in the ambiguity of the ontological/confessional usage of authority and its functional/practical usage. For instance, what is more important for the EOTC is the interpretive authority of the church rather than a fixed list of books. According to the teaching of the church "each Christian should not interpret the Scripture for himself. This is the work of the church, the divinely appointed teacher of truth" (Aymro and Motovu 1970:79). This implies that if a book serves the church's purpose well as interpreted by her, which is also coupled with tradition, it would easily function as the Scriptures whether it is in the "canon" or not (interviewee # 4 personal communication, 16.12.2011).[25] That means this church gives more weight for the functional authority of the Scriptures than its ontological authority.

Unlike the EOTC, among the Ethiopian Evangelicals, following their *sola scriptura* principle, the priority of biblical authority in its ontological sense is taken for granted. In practice, however, the liberty of individuals to interpret the Bible in the way they believe is right, or the suitable interpretation accepted by the believing community, is apparent. This practice, therefore, reverses the primacy of ontological authority of the Scriptures, which they claim, to a functional authority of the Scriptures through the interpretive authority of the individual interpreter or the believing community around them.

Ethiopian context: When it comes to the Ethiopian context, the understanding of the source of authority in spiritual and ecclesiastical matters is one over which there is dissent between Orthodox and Evangelicals. Even if their difference in this matter is undeniable, it tends to be exaggerated. What they have in common, as a source of authority, though to a varied degree, is the Bible. Therefore, biblical authority can serve as a common ground for both churches, even if the functioning of this authority is conceived in different ways.

---

[25] For a discussion and findings from field research on this position, see § 6.4.4.2. Finding 5 below in chapter six of this thesis.

3.2.3 Inspiration

It is necessary to define inspiration because the concept is attached to many other concepts either alien and distinct from them or identical to them. In other words, what inspiration is and what it is not can easily be confused if not adequately articulated. The concept is also employed differently as time goes on and in varying contexts. In addition, the biblical foundation of inspiration is contentious, where some claim for clear and strong textual evidence, while others contend that the Bible has a very loose ground in such a claim in itself. Still another point which needs clarity is the object of inspiration—who or what is inspired, the author, the text, the community, or what else. Even if there are debates around these and other points, the notion of inspiration is mainly connected to the divine origin of the Scriptures.

Translated from a Greek word θεοπνευστος, *theopneustos*, the term *inspiration* has a long heritage in the theological literature, but it is always used with further explanation and disclaimers. This is because *theopneustos* means "God-breathed" (see Henry 1979:1:13). In contemporary usage, as David S. Dockery states, "the term inspiration suggests the idea of 'breathing into.' Secular emphasis is generally synonymous with illumination or human genius. But the New Testament emphasis is that God 'breathed out' what the sacred writers communicated in the biblical writings" (Dockery 1995:41).[26] In short, as Carl F. H. Henry puts it, "the Bible's life-breath as a literary deposit is divine" (Henry 1986:13. Cf. Kelly 1963:203).

Confusion with other concepts: Some scholars could refer to a work as inspired, but not authoritative, or vice versa. For others, inspiration is the same thing as authority and canon. For instance, Paul J. Achtemeier (1980:119), by way of explaining what "inspiration" is, unifies all these elements: inspiration, canon, and authority: "The boundaries of inspiration are precisely the boundaries imposed by the canonical limitation.... only the books included in the canon are inspired, and those outside are not." To him, biblical authority is merely inherent in the inspired Scripture, that is, in its recognition of the "canon" as the inspired word of God,

---

[26] Dockery suggests a better term to define what is commonly defined by the word 'inspiration.' He recommends that "a preferable term might be spiration, rather than inspiration in order to emphasize the divine source and initiative, rather than human genius or creativity" (Dockery 1995:41).

"the Christian community acknowledges the authority of the scriptural witness to the realities upon which that community is based" (Achtemeier 1999:152).[27] In the same line, Pinnock (1985:64) also contends that inspiration presupposes canonization; a book is inspired in the long process of canonization.

However, for Thomas A. Hoffmann, the case is different; a book can be inspired and "normative" without being necessarily canonized even if the three components—inspiration, normativeness, and canonicity—are interrelated. He argues for

> the possibility of the existence of a book presently outside the canon which would possess the other two components [—inspiration and normativeness]. A reading of the history of the canonization of our NT suggests that possibly such books as the Shepherd of Hermas, the First Epistle of Clement, or the Epistle of Barnabas [of which some are canonical in the EOTC] might have the first [inspiration] and second [normativeness] components and simply lack the third [canonicity]. The reasons why they were eventually dropped from the canon are not that clear. The larger OT canon of the Orthodox churches also suggests the same possibility (Hoffmann 1982:463).[28]

To mention but few, Krister Stendahl, F. F. Bruce, and Bruce M. Metzger are among those who articulate clearly that inspiration does not presuppose canonicity.[29] Stendahl (1962:245) explains the role of inspiration in the Early church by saying: "Inspiration, to be sure, is the divine presupposition for the New Testament, but the twenty-seven books were never chosen because they, and only they, were recognized as inspired. Strange as it may sound, inspiration was not enough. Other standards had to be applied." In a similar manner, Bruce (1988:268) also writes: "inspiration is no longer a criterion of canonicity: it is a corollary to canonicity." Metzger (1987:257) agrees with them in saying: "while it is true that the Biblical authors were inspired by God, this does not mean that inspiration is a criterion of canonicity. A writing is not canonical because the author is inspired, but rather an author is considered to be inspired because what he has written is recognized as canonical, that is, recognized as authoritative."

---

[27] Note that Achtemeier's argument is mainly from the present Christian perspective, which may not necessarily reflect that of the early Church.

[28] Hoffmann (1982:457, n.36) argues that inspired works well beyond the limits of the canon of the bible which he notes the position is already held by other scholars including E. Kalin (1971:541-49) and A. C. Sundberg (1975:358, 364-71).

[29] See also Charles C. Price (1993:81) who argues that there are no limits for inspiration or inspired ancient writings while the notion of a canon is that it is closed.

Likewise, J. I. Packer argues that inspiration is not simply another meaning of canon or Scripture, nor is it authoritative power; rather, it is the notion that the faith community's understanding of the Scriptures or any part of it is God-given. "That it is 'God-breathed.' A product of the creator-spirit's work, always to be viewed as the preaching and teaching of God himself through the words of the worshipping human witness through whom the spirit gave it" (Packer 1988:629; for different theories on inspiration see Schnabel 2000:41). It is therefore, both the divine influence on the writers and that which resulted in what they wrote that are actually the word of God (Erickson 1983:199).

Scriptural claim of Inspiration: Many scholars who discuss biblical inspiration argue that the notion that the special status of the Scriptures within Christian theology rests upon its divine origins and can be discerned both in the New Testament itself, and in subsequent reflection on it.[30] Alister McGrath, for instance, writes that "an important element in any discussion of the manner in which Scripture is inspired, and the significance which is to be attached to this, is 2 Timothy 3: 16-17, which speaks of Scripture as "God-breathed" (*theopneustos*). This idea was common in early Christian thought, and was not regarded as controversial" (McGrath 2007:134).

On the other hand, others argue that such a traditional position does not do justice in its interpretation and exegesis to the limited biblical text. William J. Abraham, for instance, contends that "there are relatively few texts which deal explicitly with topic of inspiration" (Abraham 1981:92). Besides the scarcity of the texts, he further argues that those texts do not come from the major accepted books like Romans, Galatians, or the Gospels (Abraham 1981:92f.).[31]

Gnuse (1985:17) argues that "inspiration is directly discussed only in the later New Testament writings. Unfortunately, dogmatic understandings of Scripture too often prevent the exegete from properly evaluating the texts in context." Even though the Old Testament was not yet in a unified canonical form, the two common passages, 2 Timothy 3:16 and 2 Peter 1:20-21, which

---

[30] For an extended discussion on scriptural evidence on the inspiration of itself, see Stewart Custer 1968:31-60.
[31] For the full discussion on exegetical considerations of the text, see Abraham 1981:991-108. The thesis of his entire book is that "Evangelicals need to rethink and revise their ideas on the inspiration of the bible" (ibid, 109).

speak of inspiration refer most evidently to the Old Testament writings as being inspired (ibid). So, this argument is in line with Jude's use of *1 Enoch* as inspired and authoritative, but not necessarily canonical.

Development/Fluidity in the Concept of Inspiration: As many other theological key terms, inspiration also undergoes a constant shift of notion and definition. Dockery, from within the Southern Baptist Convention, examines two lines of fluidity, inconsistency, shifts and changes in the notion of the usage of inspiration in his Church. The first instance is how the confessions of the Southern Baptist Convention defines and re-defines, amends and changes the concept of biblical inspiration from the seventeenth century to the present. He examines more than ten instances of such a change or theological development on the view of the Holy Scriptures, biblical inspiration, and authority (Dockery 1995:178-181).

The second line Dockery examines is the varieties of positions currently held within the Southern Baptist Convention, which could be true for most mainline denominations. He lists four different groups represented in the discussion of the nature of the Scriptures: (1) fundamentalists, (2) conservatives or evangelicals, (3) moderates, and (4) liberals. Within each of these groups, Dockery explains, there is a range of differences and sub-groups which makes it further difficult to precisely define them according to their labels. (See Dockery 1995:182-186 for the discussion on these groups.)

Locus / object of Inspiration: Another contentious area in connection to inspiration is the locus or the object of inspiration. The question is who/what is inspired? Did God inspire the author, the text, the believing community, or all? How did the inspiration happen? Gnuse portrays advocates of inspiration into four groups or models:[32] (1) strict verbal inspiration,[33]

---

[32] Gnuse (1985:22-62) discusses each model in detail devoting a chapter for each one of them.

[33] Advocates of strict verbal inspiration, as Gnuse summarizes, declare "the very words of the text to be inspired by direct divine communication" (Gnuse 1985:21). Strict verbal inspiration, a "stance taken by many conservative Protestants," Gnuse describes, "strongly declares that the Bible has authority for the theology and lifestyle of all Christians because it is inspired by God. The actual biblical words are inspired or even dictated by God through the individuality of each biblical author" (ibid:22). Strict verbal inspirationists zealously connect inspiration with total infallibility and inerrancy of the Bible, as they "have a very high view of the Bible" (ibid:22-25). Gnuse (1985:27-23) strongly criticizes them for their weaknesses hugely overweigh their strengths.

(2) limited verbal inspiration,[34] (3) non-textual inspiration,[35] and (4) social inspiration.[36] After his lengthy discussion on each model, Gnuse is convincingly in favor of the last model, social inspiration, "for it appears to have greater sensitivity to the biblical text. The emphasis upon the group or community of faith reflects the biblical agenda more than previous models of inspiration which emphasized individual inspiration exclusively" (Gnuse 1985:61f.).

Social Inspiration theory, which perceives that the Scriptures are the product of a process rather than individual authors, gains a support from James Barr. He strongly contends that "If there is inspiration at all, then it must extend over the entire process of production that has led to the final text. Inspiration therefore must attach not to a small number of exceptional persons like St. Matthew or St. Paul: it must extend over a larger number of anonymous persons… it must be considered to belong more to the community as a whole" (Barr 1983:27). The argument that "'the inspiration of the Bible' refers to the enhancement which the bible instrumentally causes in persons and not the bible itself as the terminus or locus of the enhancement" (Trembath 1987:103),[37] is in line with this theory.

There are also others who claim that biblical inspiration has ceased during its writing/ early stage. John Scullion (1970:91), for instance, argues that

---

[34] The advocates of limited verbal inspiration, according to Gnuse (1985:21), believe "that the words are communicated by God but are historically conditioned or accommodated." In this group are many Protestant Evangelicals and Roman Catholic theologians of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Even if they are much more flexible and in a better position than the first group, Gnuse (1985:40f.) concludes that they fail to forge an adequate position for the problem at hand, describing and defining inspiration. For a discussion on both the strengths and weaknesses of this group, see Gnuse 1985:38-41.

[35] Those who support the non-textual inspiration believe "that inspiration does not really apply to the biblical text as we have it. Some would posit that only the ideas or message is inspired, while others limit the experience of inspiration to the authors who gave us the text and not the text itself (Gnuse 1985:21). Liberal Protestant theologians from the nineteenth and twentieth century are under this category. Since they completely dissociate inspiration from the text, they "no longer needed to concern themselves with difficulties which arose in the text, nor did they worry about such terms as inerrancy or infallibility" (ibid:42). Gnuse (1985:49) criticizes this position more than the others: "This theory really moves too far away from the biblical text and becomes a separate ideological theory apart from any discussion of biblical authority. It overlooks especially the concept of biblical community, the source of the inspired individual."

[36] The advocates of social inspiration creatively posit "that inspiration is a charism which affected the community of believers as a whole rather than individual authors" (Gnuse 1985:21).

[37] According to Trembath's argument (1987:103), "the inspiration of the bible", in grammatical terms, is a subjective genitive, rather than an objective genitive. He argues, "the uniqueness of the Bible for Christian life and theology is rooted not in its inspiration, but rather in that to which it inspires us."

> Scriptural inspiration ceases with the writings of the last book of the New Testament canon. But the inspiring breath of the Spirit continues in the Church. It is through the Spirit that she recognized the books of the canon and that she continues and will always continue to see yet other facets of God revealing himself as true to himself and have fresh insights into the depths of the mystery that he is.

In responding to the question what kind of divine activity is inspiration, Pinnock replies that many kinds of divine activity seems to have been involved in different literary styles including prophetic utterances, collecting and composing these work, wisdom literature, and the poetic utterances. Therefore, as Pinnock (1985:63) argues, "The obvious lesson to learn about inspiration from seeing what it produced is that inspiration is not one single activity but a broader superintendence over a process of Scripture making that is not simple but complex."[38]

So, I conclude in agreement to Pinnock's (1985:64) well-versed suggestion that

> we think of inspiration in broader terms than is customary—less as a punctilinear enlightenment of a few elect persons[39] and more as a long-term divine activity operating within the whole history of revelation. Inspiration means that God gave us the Scriptures, but it does not dictate how we must think of the individual units being produced. Scriptures exist because of the will of God and is a result of his ultimate causality, but it comes into existence through many gifts of prophecy, insight, imagination, and wisdom that the Spirit gives as he wills. The all-important point is that everything taught in the Scriptures is meant to be heard and heeded, because it is divinely intended. Every segment is inspired by God, though not in the same way, and the result is a richly variegated teacher, richer for all its diversity. The very differences are what enables the bible to speak with power ad relevance to so many different settings, [which could apply to the Ethiopian case,] and to address the many-sidedness of human condition.

Inspiration and Revelation: It is maintained that there is a clear distinction between revelation and inspiration. Whereas "Revelation is the record of God's communication through men", as Clarence H. Benson (1978:7) writes, "Inspiration is God's power enabling man to record perfectly the truth revealed. The word inspiration, used only twice in the Bible

---

[38] Pinnock (1985:64) further explains that "We may speak of the social character of inspiration and of the complexity of its execution, involving the work and gifts of many people, most of them unnamed but doing their part under the care of the spirit to achieve the desired result. Inspiration cannot be reserved for the final redactor but ought to be seen as occurring over a long time as a charism of the people of God. God was at work in the community to produce a normative text for the community to serve as its constitution."

[39] In this line, for instance, scholars including Millard J. Erickson limit inspiration to the original writers. Erickson (1992:61) defines inspiration of the Scriptures as the "supernatural influence of the Holy Spirit upon the Scripture writers which rendered their writings an accurate record of the revelation."

(Job 32:8; II Tim. 3:16), means the 'inbreathing' of God into man so that man speaks or writes God's revelation of truth with authority and accuracy (II Pet. 1:21)."

I conclude using the words of Dockery (1995:41): "recognizing the shortcomings in the term inspiration, we shall continue to use the word, primarily because of its long-term standing in theological literature. The point that must be stressed when using this term is that it points to God as the source of Scripture." It embraces the entire complex process of the composition of the biblical materials, in which case, it "is something that cannot be proved to be present, although various factors may point to its presence" (Marshall 1982:115f.). In this thesis, therefore, *inspiration* denotes the divine element of the Scriptures, in the sense that the Scriptures are "God-breathed" and as a result they acquire divine authority.

3.2.4 Canon

The confusion in using terms and expressions in relation to "canon" has two dimensions. First, terms like "Scripture", "canon/canonical", "authoritative", "inspired/inspiration", etc, are not only understood differently but also are often used without giving proper attention to the purpose for which they were first introduced. Second, in most cases, the terms are used interchangeably and without making clear distinction or delimitation among them. Part of this confusion arises from the paradoxical nature of the terms themselves since some of them denote the same thing at a time and a different thing in another context.[40] Therefore, it is indispensable to define the term so as to make a clear distinction from other related key terms in general and make assertion in which nuance the word is employed in this particular work.

Definition: One of the major problems in canonicity is the problem of definition where no consensus has been reached over what defines it. Hoffman strongly devalues the process of canonization as "nothing if not an immensely complex, confusing, and obscure one" (Hoffmann 1982:463; in fact, he notes a string of literature in support of his contention). In another effort, after discussing nine definitions given in different dictionaries, which includes

---

[40] Recently, in this connection, scholars argued that what complicates the discussion of canonicity and related terms is the scarcity of "any clearly stated and universally accepted definitions of what constitute scripture and canon" (McDonald and Sanders 2002:4).

Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant, Ulrich attempts to make an all-embracing definition, from the analysis of the definitions he refers to. (Unfortunately, he does not include any Orthodox definition of canon.) However, he ends up with two meanings of "canon of Scripture":

> 1. The canon of scripture, i.e., the canon which scripture constitutes, the rule of faith articulated by the scripture (= *norma normans*), the rule that determines faith, the authoritative principles and guiding spirit which govern belief and practice.

> 2. The canon of Scripture, i.e., the canon which constitutes scripture, the list of books accepted as inspired scripture (= *norma normata*) the list that has been determined, the authoritative list of books which have been accepted as scripture (Ulrich 2002:28).[41]

And, based on these two senses of definitions, he concludes that, until the official fixation of the canon, "one can designate the growing collection of authoritative books as 'canonical' in the first sense of rule, but there is not yet a canon in the second sense of an authoritative list" (Ulrich 2002:30).[42] Thus, the concept of "canon" has been used in two different ways: open and closed. It has been open so long as it gives the possibility of including and excluding any scriptural material until its fixation is closed in its second sense. It is maintained that "an essential part of the process toward the canon was the judging and sifting to determine which were supremely authoritative and which not. As long as the list was open, there was a collection of authoritative books, a collection of Scriptures, but there was not yet an authoritative collection of books, a canon" (Ulrich 2002:32).[43] In other words, a scriptural book can be authoritative without necessarily being part of the list, while a book part of a list at some earlier period may not achieve a canonical status at the end.[44] That a book was part of

---

[41] F. F. Bruce (1988:17) defines the term only form the second concept of canon—the canon of the Scriptures as "the list of writings acknowledged by the Church as documents of the divine revelation."

[42] One of the confusions is defining the term only in its second sense and applying it also to the first sense. For instance, Achtemeier, (1980:120) defines the canon as only "finally determined on the bases of the church with a large variety of writings, some of which, in that elective experience, were to be included in the canon, and hence to be regarded as inspired, while others were to be excluded, and hence to be regarded as lacking in inspiration."

[43] VanderKam (2002:91), agrees with the sense of open canon until its official fixation later on. "There was no canon of Scripture in Second Temple Judaism. That is, before 70 CE no authoritative body of which we know drew up a list of books that alone were regarded as supremely authoritative, a list from which none could be subtracted and to which none could be added."

[44] Walter Brueggemann (2003:6), for example, argues that the books included in the list of the canon are not necessarily the worthiest ones in their usage; rather the believing community recognized some and excluded the others. In his words, the canonical "books were recognized to be the most recurring useful, reliable, and 'meaningful,' that is, judged to be true teaching. This does not mean in every case that they are the 'best' books from a religious, moral, or artistic perspective, but that the community of faith was drawn to them."

a circulated list does not guarantee its canonicity at the end[45] as its authoritative status at some point does not do as well.

A year after he made a distinction between two meanings of "canon", as stated above, Ulrich again proposes to establish a clear definition of "canon" in order to enable adequate discussion around the topic. He defines it in the sense of the "canon of Scripture" as

> a "technical term in theology designating the collection of inspired books that composes Holy Scripture and forms the rule of faith."[46] It is the definitive list of inspired, authoritative books which constitute the recognized and accepted body of sacred Scripture, forming the rule of faith of a major religious group, that definitive list being the result of inclusive and exclusive decisions after serious deliberation and wide endorsement by the community (Ulrich 2003:58).

Misunderstandings—anachronism and Jamnia: In this connection, one of the most common misunderstandings among scholars in regard to "canon" is the anachronistic use of the term. It is maintained that "the word 'canon' applied to a set of books is a Christian innovation of the fourth century" (deSilva 2002:27).[47] So the very use of the term "canon/canonical" for a set of books before that period is misleading, although unavoidable.[48] The term "canon," in the sense of accepted list of writings, "appears to have been first used by Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, in a letter circulated in AD 367" (Bruce 1988:17).

Related misunderstanding, derived from the previous one, is that the "canon" of the OT is already closed as early as the first century BC or AD (Nicole 1997:199f.; Soggin 1976:18).[49]

---

[45] For the Lutheran tradition this end was with Luther; for the Roman Catholic Church was with the Council of Trent; with the EOTC this end has not yet come.

[46] This part of his definition, he quotes from Rahner and Vorgrimler 1965:65.

[47] In the same line, Oesterley (1935:3) also maintains that "As a technical term used in reference to Scriptures the word 'Canon' is Christian, appearing in this connexion for the first time … towards the end of the fourth century."

[48] For a similar argument see Bowley 1999:356. He notes that "the term 'canon' is decidedly anachronistic and misleading with respect to discussions concerning Second Temple Judaism." For the history of the term 'canon' see Metzger 1987:289-93.

[49] Beckwith (1985:165) suggests even an earlier date for the closure of the canon. He concludes that the whole of the OT canon was closed by Judas Maccabaeus and his associates around 160 BC, 250 years earlier than AD 90 of Jamnia. (The whole argument of ch. 4 (pp.110-180) of his book attempts to prove this position. He maintains the same position in his later article (1991:395). However, Sundberg, Jr., (1988:78-82) refutes Beckwith's position with plausible evidence. For instance, (1) one of Beckwith's argument (1985:152) for early canonization is based on *2 Macc* 2:14f., where "Judas also gathered together for us all those writings that had been scattered." However, this statement is too general to refer to a canonical concept because, as Sundberg comments, there is no suggestion in the text that Judas Maccabaeus compiled a list of the writings he collected, that he divided these

As Arie van der Kooij (2003:27) maintains, this theory can no longer be retained because of two reasons, which are (1) "the idea of a synod of Jamnia can no longer be defended," and (2) the theory, he continues, "does not do full justice to the early Jewish sources."

From the eighteenth to mid-twentieth centuries, the view that the Hebrew canon was closed at a Council or Synod in Jamnia has been well accepted, especially in the West. However, since the position has been increasingly challenged in the second half of the twentieth century, with a lead of Jack P. Lewis (1964:132) who concluded that the Jamnia hypothesis[50] "appears to be one of those things that has come to be sure due to frequent repetition of the assertion rather than to its being actually supported by the evidence." David G. Dunbar (1986:303; for similar conclusions see his note on 1986:426, n.24) also criticizes the wider acceptance of the hypothesis of Jamnia meeting by rabbinic scholars to close the Hebrew canon was based on minimal grounds. Recently, James A. Sanders (2002:262) declares that as the date of the closure of the canons is increasingly "elusive and difficult to pinpoint, now that we are freed of the Yavneh/Jamnia or conciliar mentality."[51] Lee M. McDonald (1995:49) admits that there is evidence that a council was held at Jamnia on the issues of the Bible; however, he rejects that there is sufficient evidence to argue "that any binding or official decisions were made regarding the scope of the biblical canon at Jamnia."

The problem with an assertion of the closure of the Hebrew canon at Jamnia in 90 AD is that it overlooks that the Judaism of that period was not uniform. There have been various groups

---

writings into separate sections and their order within each, as Beckwith tries to suggest. (2) The prologue of Ecclesiasticus makes mention three times of the Law, the prophets, and, in varying language, "the others that followed them" or "the other books of our fathers" or "the rest of the books," which many scholars agree that these phrases designate a third collection of the Scriptures which had not yet received a name (Beckwith 1985:163ff.). However, there is no such a thing that shows the limit of those books included in the section. Sundberg, therefore, rightly comments that for Beckwith to define the status of this third collection in absolute term as "canonical" or "not canonical" is too simplistic. (3) Philo describes the Scriptures as "the Law, the Prophets, the Psalms, and other books" regarding which Beckwith (1985:117) argues that whereas the first three of these terms designate the tripartite canon, the last phrase most likely refers to "books outside the canon." But however one is to interpret "the Psalms," the fact remains that all four terms are connected by means of the correlative conjunction "and", which Beckwith fails to give a textual explanation. (4) One of the most important texts for Beckwith is that of Luke 24:44, where "the Psalms" is named as third category as in Philo. But it has to be noted that the possibility that "the Psalms" here refers simply to the "book of Psalms" should not be excluded. Sundberg (1988:81) further comments, "what Beckwith does not tell us is that the only book of the Hagiographa found with a commentary at Qumran is precisely that of the Psalms." For more points see Sundberg (1988:81f.).
[50] For an exhaustive discussion on Jamnia hypothesis, see Lewis (2002:146-162).
[51] For a list of scholars who reject the Jamnia hypothesis, see Lewis 2002:162, n.139.

under the umbrella of Judaism, who have their own contribution to the formation of later rabbinic Judaism.[52] It is convincingly argued that the section known as "the writings"

> were probably the last to receive assent: their content as found in the present Hebrew Bible is not known before 100 BC, and it is clear that certain books not in the present list were accepted by some communities; also, some in the present canon were evidently not universally accepted. For example, Esther is not known at Qumran, while *1 Enoch* seems to have been accepted not only at Qumran but also by the writer of the New Testament epistle of Jude and the Ethiopian church (Neusner 1996:112).

Thus, which Community recognized which books varied.[53]

On the other hand, it is argued that the church did not have a fixed OT canon until its fixation by the church in the 4th and 5th centuries parallel to the formation of the NT Canon. For instance, Sundberg (1975:359f.) argues that what is known to us today is that "the church had no Old Testament canon until mid-fourth century in the East and until the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century in the West. When Christian writings came to be used in the Church with the authority like to that of the Scriptures inherited from Judaism, we are able to say that we have Christian Scriptures not Christian Canon."[54] To be sure, the problem of "canon," from the inception of Christianity to the present period, is lasting: "The first Christians already had a Scripture [not a canon], inherited from Judaism, whose origins time has concealed; while still today the edges of the biblical canon are blurred,[55] with old disputes about the 'deuterocanonical' books asleep perhaps, but by no means dead" (Barton 1997:1). The weakness of Sundberg's position is that to say that there was no universally held or "fixed" list is not to prove that there were no lists. In this regard, different Jewish documents, with some variation, witness that there was a body of scriptural literature recognized as authoritative and binding (or "canonical" in a later sense) by all groups at various periods. In

---

[52] For various sects and religious pluralism from Maccabees to Yavneh in the broader circle of Judaism, see Grabbe 1992:463-554.

[53] Beckwith's (1985:154-166) argument for tripartite division cannot prove a fixed canonical list because it does not tell us exactly which books are listed in the three groups. Moreover over the witness of different groups for a fixed number would not represent all Jewish communities of that period.

[54] Grisanti, (2001:598) for instance, suggests that any biblical book before the completion of the "canon" be viewed as a "preliminary canonical" and becomes "canonical" only after the completion of the "canon."

[55] The image is that there is a body of writings but the edges are not clear; some of these writings on the edges are "in" for some communities and are "out" for others. This applies at present to Protestant canon which is very restricted, the Catholic and Greek Orthodox canon which is a bit larger. These two canons are clearly defined. The EOTC has seen no need as yet to define these edges.

the process of the formation of the OT "canon," the major body of the OT was stabilized in different stages beginning from the fourth century BC to the first century AD, indicating that canonization was a long process.

The major argument accepted by many scholars for an earlier dating of the canon, stems from the various lists and the tripartite division of the OT recognized by different groups. These includes (1) the prologue of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) which mentions three times the Law, the Prophets, and the other books; (2) Philo, who mentions the tripartite division; (3) Josephus who mentions 22 sacred books of Judaism (that is, 5 books of the Law, 13 books of the Prophets, and 4 other books); (4) *4 Ezra* 14, which refers to 24 recognized books alongside 70 other books which also were inspired; and (5) the NT witness of tripartite division (Lk 24:44).[56]

The point here, therefore, is two-fold: (1) in the process of canonization, there were varying lists of authoritative scriptural books held by different groups without having a universally[57] accepted list of a canon until the fourth and fifth centuries. This shows a certain degree of fluidity around the core of books regarded as scriptural and authoritative. (2) However, at the same time, most of the books in what is now known as the OT had already been stabilized or enjoyed a "canonical" status by all groups a century before Christ. The fluidity on the outer

---

[56] For a detailed discussion on these and some other evidences, see Müller 1996:25-32; Beckwith 1985:110-180; Dunbar 1986:301-315; Bauckham 1990:229-231; deSilva 2002:30-33. For a contrary view on this list as an evidence for stabilization of the canon at early period, see note 45 above.

[57] It is important to note that the term "universal/universally" is problematic as the issues, questions, concerns, or concepts raised and discussed in the Western tradition are incorrectly assumed as "the" universal. For instance, most of the issues we raised in this study are raised from the perspective of the theological questionings of the Western tradition. The question is that if one would listen to what EOTC scholars raise as issues, would they raise the same issues, and would they deal with them differently? This is just raising a question because we have a tendency to consider our viewpoint as a universal viewpoint, while in fact it is only one of the many viewpoints. For instance, Gene Green (2008:26) in his discussion on Jude's use of "pseudepigraphical" works, referring mainly to *1 Enoch*, raises a question in a very universal way; saying: "The question that **all readers** (emphasis mine) of the epistle must ponder is why he [Jude] makes use of these texts that were not finally received into **the canon of the Scripture** (emphasis mine)." Green's way of generalization and universalization of one's own position or tradition is not at all unique to this work. Like Green, many other western scholars have taken for granted their view point as *the* universal one and in so doing, they either neglect the existence of the EOTC with its own different "canon" of Scriptures or display their ignorance of the existence of another rich tradition as theirs. Paying equal attention to the EOTC would probably need another thesis by its own right and this is only to express that the present thesis raises and formulates its major questions and arguments from the viewpoint of the Western tradition. However, it pays the due attention to the issues and concerns of the EOTC as much as possible and reflects it from that very point of view.

edges of this stable core leaves open the possibility that *1 Enoch* had a special status for Jude, for example.

Canon versus Scripture: At this juncture, it is important to better clarify the difference between "canon / canonical" and "Scripture / scriptural," is appropriate. Since "canon" denotes a fixed list of authoritative document whereas "Scripture" designates writings which are taken to be religiously authoritative without regard to systematic enumeration or limitation (Gamble 1985:18), all canonical books are scriptural, but not vice versa. As Sundberg (1992: 355) first introduces such a clear distinction, he used the term "Scriptures" for authoritative literature, whereas the term "canon" for scriptural collections that are "closed".[58] With such clear distinction, Sundberg (1976:136-40) shifts the period of canonicity for the New Testament canon from the second and third centuries to the fourth century.[59]

It is noted that most definitions of the Scriptures and canon available "can be employed to show that there were more writings acknowledged as Scripture in antiquity than those that were eventually included in the current biblical canon" (McDonald and Sanders 2002:4).[60] In other words, it is possible to have the Scriptures (or canon of the Scriptures in the sense of *norma normans*) without having a canon (in the sense of *norma normata*) which was the situation in early Judaism and Christianity before the fixation of a canon. For instance, Gamble (1985:18) argues likewise: "whereas the concept of canon presupposes the existence of the scriptures, the concept of the scriptures does not necessarily entail the notion of canon."[61]

---

[58] Barton (1997:157f.) argues that such a clear distinction between the concept of "Scripture", ("which results from the growth of writings perceived as holy,") and "Canon", ("which represents official decision to exclude from Scripture"), in the modern study, has been introduced by Sundberg. Miller (2004:136f.) also agrees that such an introduction comes from Sundberg even if he criticizes the position of both Sundberg and Barton.

[59] Based on his discussion on Athanasius's inconsistent use of Sirach and Wisdom as canonical in practice, but not in theory, as a case study, Johan Leemans (2003:276f.) also concludes that "in the second half of the fourth century the process of canonization was still full of uncertainties and far from closed."

[60] Elsewhere, McDonald (1995:13) makes a clear distinction between "(the) Scripture(s)" and "canon", even though it is accepted that there is some kind of overlap. He argues that "Scripture has to do with the divine status of a written document that is authoritative in the life of a community of faith. Canon… denotes a fixed standard or collection of writings that defines the faith and identity of a particular religious community."

[61] In some circles, there is a clear position of connecting canonicity with inspiration. According to Hoffmann (1982:464), as inspiration is a process of acceptance of the Scriptures by the faith community, also the act of canonization by the faith-community makes the text canonical. "This means that there is no mistake made if the

So, it is correct that when Dunbar (1986:356) concludes in recent scholarship there is a general consensus in distinguishing between "(the) Scripture(s)" and "canon" where the former is more general and inclusive while the latter "suggests the ideas of delimitation and selection that are not necessarily included in the term 'Scripture'." It is, therefore, with this understanding of canon, the Scriptures and authority that the study on the scriptural status of *1 Enoch* in general and also in *Jude* will be undertaken in this thesis.[62]

3.3 Categories of Scriptural Writings

Scriptural writings are broadly classified as "canonical" and "extra-canonical" literature, where the "extra-canonical" literature is further divided into "apocryphal" and "pseudepigraphical" writings.[63] Each of these categories is treated under the two Testaments, Old and New, separately since each category has its own unique history, formation, acceptance and limitations.

3.3.1 "Canonical" Books

3.3.1.1 Old Testament[64]

In the discussion of the Old Testament canon, it should be noted that there is more than one OT canon, and the discussion must be on the OT canons, rather than "canon". There are at least two widely known OT canons. The first one is the Hebrew/Palestinian canon, which is a

---

church has happened to fail to recognize and canonize some book or other which is both inspired and normative. The biblical books are canonical because the church has accepted them into the canon; the church has accepted them into the canon because she recognized them as inspired and normative." However, this arguments seems to put inspiration and normativity the only criteria for canonization which is not the case since there are other criteria which the Church has used to determine the canon of the Scriptures, including catholicity, orthodoxy, apostolicity, antiquity, and use. For a detailed discussion on the criteria for canonicity, see McDonald 2002:423-439. In his argument, McDonald convincingly puts inspiration only as an additional feature for the Scriptures and not one of the primary criteria. He writes (2002: 439): "Inspiration was no a *criterion* by which a New Testament book was given the status of scripture and later placed into a fixed canon, but rather a corollary to its recognized status."

[62] A detailed and lengthy discussion on *1 Enoch*'s scriptural authoritative / canonical status and the position of the EOTC on the "canon" are discussed in their appropriate places—chapters five and six respectively.

[63] James C. VanderKam (2005:164) laments on the limitations of such terminological ascription saying, "our terms for some bodies of literature ('Apocryphal,' 'parabiblical,' etc.) do not help us to gain a more disciplined, historically attuned picture."

[64] It is known that the term *Old Testament* is a problematic designation in the interfaith context. The alternative designation, the *Hebrew Bible*, has also its own limitations. The scope of this study would not allow getting into this discussion. However, it is the former usage which is opted in this study.

narrower collection, and known as the Masoretic Text (MT). The other one is the Greek/Alexandrian canon, which is called the *Septuagint* (LXX), and comprises more materials than the former.[65] The latter differs from the former in two major ways: first the LXX contains a larger number of books than the MT.[66] Secondly, the order of the books is different.

It is widely accepted that "[c]ontemporary NT literary criticism has abundantly made it clear that the Septuagint was indeed the Bible of the earliest church" (Manus 2003:659).[67] Until the Reformation of the sixteenth century, the church has been mainly using the LXX as her authoritative Scriptures.[68] Since then, the Protestant Church opted to follow the Hebrew canon whereas the Catholics and the Orthodox continued to use the Greek canon, with still more materials in the Eastern Orthodox canon than the Catholics. Among the Orthodox, there are still minor variations in their Old Testament collection.[69] Therefore, following one canonical tradition does not mean that that one is the only one which exists or which is correct. In the meantime, it should be known that that there are two canons does not mean there are two opposing or rival canons;[70] rather, it means, they have been developed in different contexts by faith communities sharing the same faith.[71]

---

[65] It is unclear and misleading when Walter Brueggemann (2003:6) designates the Hebrew canon as "disciplined canon" whereas the Greek canon as "undisciplined canon." He fails to explain in what terms one is "disciplined" while the other is "undisciplined".

[66] The LXX, as Johan Lust (2003:39) writes, contains three different materials: (a) a translation of the books of the MT, (b) a translation of books written in Hebrew or Aramaic, but not included in MT, and (c) books written in Greek.

[67] This is true for the later church, but the situation of the NT writings is rather mixed. For a detailed discussion on the Septuagint as the bible of the Early Church, see also M. Muller 1993:194-207.

[68] The Greek speaking church continued with the LXX, but the Latin speaking church used mainly the Vulgate, which was meant as a translation from the Hebrew manuscripts available to Jerome in Palestine around the year 400 AD. But they used a wider canon than that of the Jews. The position of Jerome, whatever it was, cannot be taken as defining the canon. For a detailed discussion on Jerome's position on this, see Decock 2008a:205-222.

[69] For the different lists of biblical books in different traditions, see appendices 1.A – 1.C. The EOTC "canon", which has a unique character, will be discussed elsewhere later on.

[70] It should be noted, as Johann Cook (2003:151f.) argues, that "the rabbis did not create a scriptural canon. They inherited a more-or-less agreed set of writings – holy books." And there are textual variances within the same canonical tradition, and none of the traditions are free from this problem.

[71] For a discussion on a similar status of authority and inspiration of the two canons, even when they differ from each other, see Lust 2003:39-55.

Even if there is still disagreement on the content of the Old Testament canon, following these two major traditions, it is believed that "several facts seem to leave open the possibility for agreement on an extended Old Testament canon" (Koperski 2003:255).

3.3.1.2 New Testament

There is not much debate as to which books constitute the canon of the New Testament. All Christian denominations, except the Ethiopian Orthodox Church accept the 27 books of the New Testament. As to the "canon" of the EOTC New Testament, the detailed discussion comes elsewhere later on. What should be noted here is that the EOTC has a broader and a narrower "canon" of the New Testament where the twenty-seven books, recognized by other churches, are the narrower and there are some additional ones to constitute the broader "canon".

3.3.2 Apocrypha[72]

Apocrypha, which literally translated as "hidden books," is a problematic designation for various reasons. First the hiddenness has both negative, for those who neglect them, and positive connotations for those who approve of the books. Thus the term is both an honorable as well as derogatory one (Metzger 1965: ix). Secondly, it could be a designation used to differentiate the Alexandrian canon from the Palestinian. This understanding associates Apocrypha with the LXX (Dentan 1954:11f.; Hinson 1976:172). Thirdly, following these two—Palestinian and Alexandrian—traditions its usage is obscure among the Christian church. It is maintained that what is Apocrypha for the Protestants and Anglicans, who follow the Palestinian canon, is Deutero-canonical for the Catholics, whereas what is Apocrypha for the Catholics is pseudepigrapha for the Protestants and not Pseudepigrapha for the Catholics (Musaph-Andriesse 1981:17f.; Metzger 1957:6).[73] Finally, the number of apocryphal books is also different under different traditions. However, unlike the pseudepigrapha, which is an open literary category, Apocrypha is relatively a closed collection (Charlesworth 1992a:

---

[72] On a more recent discussion on the terms "apocrypha" and "pseudepigrapha", see Stuckenbruck 2010:143-162.
[73] Soggin (1976:11-18) separately discussed the Hebrew Bible as a Palestinian canon and the LXX as an Alexandrian canon which contains all the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical books as authoritative in his book. See Appendices 1.A – 1.C for the different consideration of the Apocryphal books by different churches.

I,292). In what follows, both Old and New Testament apocryphal works are discussed separately.

3.3.2.1 Old Testament

Its meaning and usage of the term: Besides the problems around the meaning and usage of the term Apocrypha, the previous paragraph indicates what Old Testament Apocrypha means. This can be clarified from the evolution and development of the concept and its usage at various periods of the Church's history. Oesterley (1935:4) describes the evolution of the meaning of the term "Apocrypha" in four stages: first, at the early stage, the term was used to designate "books containing hidden teaching not to be disclosed to ordinary people." So, as indicated in 2 Esdras 14:44-47, he comments that in the beginning of the second century A.D., the apocryphal books "were held in higher esteem than canonical books" in certain Jewish circles.

Second, Origen "distinguished between books read during public worship and those which he calls 'apocryphal'; by this word, however, he does not mean the books of what we call[74] the Apocrypha, but those which we designate *Pseudepigrapha.* But Origen is not consistent in his use of the term, because elsewhere he applies it to heretical books" (Oesterley 1935:5).

"A third stage, which we find in the fourth century in the Greek Church, is that in which a distinction is made between canonical books and books read for edification; by the latter are meant the books of our Apocrypha, while the word 'apocryphal' was still applied to those which we call *Pseudepigrapha*" (Oesterley 1935:5).

The fourth stage is Jerome's usage, where he "distinguished between *libri canonici* and *libri ecclesiastici*, the latter referring to the books of our Apocrypha, which were then called 'apocryphal' in a new sense" (Oesterley 1935:5). So, according to Oesterley (1935:5), it is "this use of the term [came] to be generally accepted, and this has continued to the present day."

---

[74] Oesterley is not clear to whom he is referring when he uses the word "we" since the word is understood differently by various bodies or individuals.

According to Martin McNamara (1983:17), the term Apocrypha refers to the writings of the Second Temple Period. "Writings composed during the intertestamental period[75] are often referred to as the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, or by Roman-Catholics writers as deuterocanonical." However, he further notes the reason for the confusion on the usage of the terms:

> The terminology has originated in denominational settings and can at times be confusing. The Roman-Catholic tendency would be to use only two terms: canonical and apocryphal. A writing not part of the canon, whether it be the canon of the Old or of the New Testament, would be designated apocryphal, the Apocrypha being the non-canonical writings. Those writings not part of the Hebrew Scriptures but recognized by the Roman Catholic Church as canonical are called deuterocanonical, because their canonicity was formally declared only after a period of discussion… The Reformers refused to accept any of these [deuterocanonical books] as canonical, and designated them as Apocrypha. The other books relating to the Old Testament period which were neither in the Hebrew Bible nor in the western canon are given the designation Pseudepigrapha" (McNamara 1983:17f.).[76]

Edgar J. Goodspeed (1939:1) defines the Apocrypha in a very simple terms as "the fourteen books that stand in old English Bibles between the Old Testament and the New."[77] Brueggemann (2003:5) on the other hand equates apocryphal books with deuterocanonical books, which seemingly he distinguishes "between the Protestant and Roman Catholic/Orthodox[78] canons in that the latter includes a serious of seven works called deuterocanonical (that is, second canon) books, also known as the Apocrypha."[79]

---

[75] For McNamara (1983:15), intertestamental period constitutes "the period between 200 B.C. and 100 A.D."

[76] McNamara (1983:18) continues to note how the confusion is endless: "since other Christian Churches, such as the Greek, Slavonic or Armenian, have in their bibles writings not found in the western Canon (e.g. 3 and 4 Maccabees), these too tend to be regarded as among the Apocrypha and to feature in later translations, as in the newer editions of the *Revised Standard Version*. Within the Apocrypha there is some confusion in the manner in which the various Books of Ezra are referred to. The first problem concerns the number to be attached to the name. In the Vulgate the canonical books of Ezra and Nehemiah are entitled respectively 1 and 2 Ezra (as already in the Greek Septuagint). Consequent on this the Vulgate designates the two apocryphal books of Ezra as 3and 4 Ezra. These are now generally referred to as 1 and 2 Ezra – although some prefer to use the forms 'Esdras,' the better to distinguish them from the canonical works."

[77] And the fourteen books, as he (Goodspeed 1939:1) lists, are 1 and 2 Esdras, Tobit, Judith, Some additions to Esther, the Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus or the Wisdom of Sirach, Baruch, Susanna, the Song of the Three Children, Bel and the Dragon, the Prayer of Manasseh, and 1 and 2 Maccabees.

[78] Brueggemann is one of a few scholars who dare to include, at least in the margin, the Orthodox in general, not the EOTC, in such a discussion.

[79] Even if Brueggemann (2003:5) declines to include them in his OT introduction work, he admits that the apocryphal books "are widely understood to be of secondary status in terms of their significance to the development of the Christian community's faith."

According to Daniel J. Harrington (2002:146), the church has settled the place of Apocrypha by taking four different positions: namely, (1) Eastern Orthodox churches include them in their Bibles;[80] (2) the Roman Catholic church decreed to include them in the bible as deutero-canonical; (3) most Protestant churches include them in their Bibles in a special section apart from the undisputed canonical books; and (4) Jews and many Evangelical Protestants omit them entirely from their Bibles.[81]

By and large, the Ethiopian Evangelicals designate scriptural books in two dichotomized categories: biblical books (pointing to the canonical books) and additional (heretical) books, in a negative sense, including all the "non-canonical" books as added by the EOTC.[82] This is a view which is neither in line with its historical tradition nor with the most contemporary Protestant view of Old Testament canon and apocryphal books.

3.3.2.2 New Testament

New Testament Apocrypha, also called Christian apocryphal literature, can be defined as "literature that is either attributed to biblical persons as authors or recounts narratives about biblical persons that parallel or supplement the biblical narrative" (Bauckham 1997b:68). Bauckham (1997b:68) further describes a number characteristics which make this corpus. These include: (1) In most of the works the biblical persons are NT characters, but in some cases they are OT characters. (2) The literature continued to be written for many centuries, in many Christian traditions, and so the whole corpus of such literature is vast. (3) Modern collections of such literature in translation are only selections, usually including the earliest such literature, but often also including later works that have been particularly influential in Christian history. (4) Only occasionally do they include Christian works written under OT

---

[80] Evidently, the Orthodox position has not been always consistent and uniform regarding Apocrypha. For instance, the "Larger Catechism drawn up by Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow (1839) expressly omits the Apocrypha in the listing of Old Testament books. This catechism was subsequently translated into Greek and has had a wide influence in the Orthodox world" (Bloesch 1994:163).
[81] For the history of these developments, see the articles in Meurer 1991.
[82] This is more the "popular" view than the "scholarly" one among Ethiopian Evangelicals even if many scholars in the Ethiopian Evangelical tradition would share this "popular" view.

pseudonyms, which can often be found, along with Jewish works of this kind, in collections of the OT Pseudepigrapha.

After discussing the development and history of canonical and apocryphal concepts in the early church and the Apostolic Fathers, E. Hennecke (1963:28) defines the New Testament Apocrypha as constituting of three distinct types of writings—Gospels, Acts and Apocalypses:

> When we speak of 'Apocrypha of the NT', we mean by that Gospels which are distinguished by the fact not merely that they did not come into the NT but also that they were intended to take the place of the four Gospels of the canon (this holds good for the earlier texts) or to stand as enlargement of them side by side with them. … It is further a matter of particular pseudepigraphical Epistles and of elaborately fabricated Acts of Apostles, the writers of which have worked up in novelistic fashion the stories and legends about the apostles and so aimed at supplementing the deficient information which the NT communicates about the destinies of these men. Finally, there are also belong here the Apocalypses in so far as they have further evolved the 'revelation' form taken over from Judaism.

What is very important in the Ethiopian context is that among the New Testament Apocrypha, some of the books are highly regarded in the Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church.[83] Even if this collection is very wide and complex, it needs further study on those which are uniquely important to the Ethiopian church.

3.3.3 OT Pseudepigrapha[84]

Besides the canonical and apocryphal books, "many other Jewish and Jewish-Christian works have survived from the period between about 200 B.C. to about A.D. 200. Since most of these profess to have been written by ancient worthiest of Israel, who lived long before the books were actually composed, they are generally called 'pseudepigrapha" (Metzger 1965:[xi]).

---

[83] The eight bulky books, included in the EOTC New Testament, and known as Books of Church Order, are, *Sinodos* (4 books, namely The Order of Zion, Commandment (*Tizaz*), *Gitzew,* and *Abtils*), the Book of the Covenant (2 books), Clement (1), and Didascalia (1). However, it should be noted that the eight NT books additional to the 27, as another version simply counts, could only be the eight books of Clement. Even if these books are meant for the clergy and not the laity, they are highly regarded by the church.
[84] It should be noted that there is a confusing terminological overlap between "pseudepigrapha," the name of a more or less fixed body of writing and "pseudepigraphy," the literary practice of attributing one's writing to someone else, usually an ancient seer, worthy or other dignitary (Stone 1984:427, n.240).

Metzger (1965:[xi]) clearly describes how Catholics and Protestants categorize what constitutes pseudepigrapha for each of them:

> [F]or a Roman Catholic most of the books which Protestants regard as the Apocrypha (but not the Prayer of Manasseh and 1 and 2 Esdras) are held to be authoritative Scripture and are called deuterocanonical. Other books, which neither Protestants nor Roman Catholics regard as inspired or authoritative, are called apocryphal by Catholics and pseudepigraphical by Protestants.

Comparing three different lists of OT Pseudepigrapha in English by R. H. Charles in 1913, H. F. D. Sparks in 1983, and J. H. Charlesworth in 1985, D. S. Russell (1987:xii) clearly shows the difficulty of the scope of this collection of books which constitute this literature.[85] However, he attempts to provide five criteria to identify and define as to what constitutes this body of diverse writings in Jewish or Jewish-Christian traditions as:

> which (a) are not included in the Old or New Testaments, the Apocrypha and the rabbinic literature, (b) are associated with the biblical books or biblical characters, (c) are more often than not written in the name of some ancient biblical worthy, (d) convey a message from God that is relevant to the time at which the books were written and (e) are written during the period 200 BC – AD 200 or if later than this, preserve Jewish traditions of that same period (Russell 1987:xii-xiii).

When it comes to the Modern classification of "Old Testament pseudepigrapha," according to William Adler (2002:211f.), it "originates in a distinction introduced by the Protestant Reformation. Protestant scholars reserved the term 'apocrypha' for books that were included in the Vulgate and the Septuagint, but were lacking in the Hebrew Bible. Thus, books that early church had designated 'Old Testament apocrypha' came to be known as 'Old Testament pseudepigrapha'."[86] This can be exemplified by R. H. Charles's (1913:II,iv) work of Apocrypha and pseudepigrapha where his volume of "apocrypha" comprises of those books which "constitute the excess of the Vulgate over the Hebrew, and (that) this excess is

---

[85] Though commonly used for lack of a better term, Marinus de Jonge (2003:459) also agrees that the use of the expression "Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament" is not suitable for several reasons. "First, there is by no means consensus on the question which writings should be reckoned to the Old Testament pseudepigrapha and which should not. Second, there is much difference of opinion about the provenance and the transmission history of many documents."

[86] Adler (2002:212, n.4) notes that "Jerome also used the word apocrypha in the modern sense, that is, as a description of works found in the Septuagint but absent from the Hebrew Bible." He further notes that "the word 'pseudepigrapha' to describe religious literature found in neither the Greek nor the Hebrew Bibles first appears in J. Fabricious, *Codex pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti* (Hamburg, Leipzig: 1713)."

borrowed from the Septuagint." What was left over, namely "[a]ll the . . . extant non-Canonical Jewish books written between 200 B.C. and A.D. 100 with possibly one or two exceptions," were assigned to the pseudepigrapha.

OT Pseudepigrapha, according to Charlesworth, in his comprehensive edition (1983), contains 65 documents, which can be classified into six basic genres—apocalyptic, testament, expansion of the Old Testament and legends, wisdom and philosophical literature, prayers and psalms, and fragments of Judeo-Hellenistic works. For the most part, they are as influential for Jews and Christians "as the writings later canonized. Many early Jews and many of the earliest Christians considered these documents infallible and full of divine revelation" (Charlesworth 1992b:V, 538ff.).[87]

3.4 Conclusion

It is evident that multiplicity in usage and meaning around key terms is inescapable for a number of reasons. Besides the temporal, spatial, and conceptual factors, the contextual factor contributes much for the variation. However, some key theological and biblical terminologies have been used without considering the possible variation a word may have because of these factors, which resulted in either misunderstanding or inadequate argument. In order to avoid such confusions, this chapter tries to clarify the concept of four theological / biblical key terms as they will be better used in this thesis in particular, which is mainly related to the Ethiopian context, and the wider reader of the field. In addition, a number of scriptural bodies are identified so as to minimize some misconception around different categories of sacred writings.

The first difficult term to define is "(the) Scripture(s)" mainly because it is inappropriately equated with the term "Bible", which is much narrower than "the Scriptures". Even if it is problematic in English, it is especially inadequate in Ethiopian languages. In its proper usage, the notion of "the Scriptures" is mainly connected to its divine origin and inspiration. What should be clear is that while the biblical books are Scriptures, the Scriptures are not restricted

---

[87] See Appendix 2.B for the full list of these books.

84

to the Western "Bible". Thus, the concept of "the Scriptures" adequate to both this thesis and the Ethiopian context is a definition which includes early Jewish and Christian sacred writings that are inspired, authoritative, but not necessarily canonical in the Western sense.

Even though the complexity of the word "authority" is multifaceted, partly it shares the same problem with the concept of "the Scriptures". The two outstanding confusions around "authority" are mixing various sources of authorities and failure to adhere which authority governs over the others. The first point that this chapter has tried to clarify is that, like "the Scriptures", especially in early Judaism and Christianity, authoritative Scriptures does not necessarily presuppose the present notion of "canon", which is not in the sense of a closed and clearly delineated set of books; rather, maybe be in the sense of a "set of books" not necessarily defined as rigidly as in later Church History. Secondly, Orthodox and Evangelicals, in principle, take an opposing position regarding the hierarchy between scriptural interpretive authority of the church and individual authority, which is very loose in practice, especially in contemporary Ethiopia. Whereas scriptural interpretation in the EOTC, like that of the Roman Catholic Church,[88] is controlled ecclesiastically, Evangelicals give priority to the individual believer's freedom to interpret it. Thirdly, even if the distinction between biblical authority and inspiration is highly contentious and vague, it is believed that scriptural authority arises from its divine inspiration. Fourthly, it should be noted that scriptural authority is inseparable from tradition, a notion which is now-a-days increasingly accepted by Evangelicals. Finally, with a limited degree of variance, Ethiopian churches could have a common ground regarding binding and supporting authority for faith and practice.

---

[88] This position of the RCC is clearly stated in Vatican II, DEI VERBUM 10. "Sacred tradition and Sacred Scripture form one sacred deposit of the word of God, committed to the Church. Holding fast to this deposit the entire holy people united with their shepherds remain always steadfast in the teaching of the Apostles, in the common life, in the breaking of the bread and in prayers (see Acts 2, 42, Greek text), so that holding to, practicing and professing the heritage of the faith, it becomes on the part of the bishops and faithful a single common effort. But the task of authentically interpreting the word of God, whether written or handed on, has been entrusted exclusively to the living teaching office of the Church, whose authority is exercised in the name of Jesus Christ. This teaching office is not above the word of God, but serves it, teaching only what has been handed on, listening to it devoutly, guarding it scrupulously and explaining it faithfully in accord with a divine commission and with the help of the Holy Spirit, it draws from this one deposit of faith everything which it presents for belief as divinely revealed" (*DEI VERBUM* 1965).

In regard to the concept of "inspiration" its attachment to other terms, its variation through time, its level of textual evidence, and the object of inspiration are points of debate. In this debate, limiting inspiration only to canonical Scriptures, once again like "the Scriptures" is inadequate. Moreover, even if there are textual evidences on its self-assertion of "inspiration", they are very much limited. An appropriate way of defining inspiration is that it is the inbreathing of God on the Scriptures at various ways and different levels of the process of Scripture production so that they have divine authority in them.

Besides its complexity to define with more clarity and a meaning with a shared nuance, the fourth term, "canon", shares similar problem of mixing it with other terms. Thus, the inappropriate equation of the term with concepts like "the Scriptures", "inspiration" or "authority" should be avoided. Likewise, more than the other words, it suffers from misusing it anachronistically, even if such usage has been objected to recent studies. Therefore, the concept of canonization formally is a fourth century phenomenon of delimitation and selection of scriptural writings included in the list of authoritative books of a faith community.

Early Jewish and Christian scriptural writings have three broader categories with a significant degree of overlap among themselves—canonical, deutero-canonical / apocryphal, and pseudepigraphical writings. Among the canonical, there is clear consensus as to what constitute the New Testament; while there are two collections of Old Testament—the Masoretic Text (the Hebrew canon) and the Septuagint (the Greek canon). While the Orthodox and the Catholics follow the Greek canon, which is wider, Protestants follow the narrower, the Hebrew Canon.

The designation Old Testament Apocrypha, which is relatively closed collection, is somehow confusing because it is used by Protestants to designate what for Catholics is deutero-canonical books,[89] while it is used by the Catholics to designate what the Protestants use for Old Testament pseudepigrapha.[90] As compared to Old Testament apocrypha, New Testament

---

[89] See the appendices 1A – 1.C for various lists of books by different authors, still with some disagreement as to what belongs to which church.
[90] With this difference in mind, this thesis follows the Protestant way of designation because it is more common way in current scholarly debate.

Apocrypha is much wider and fluid collection. As it can be identified from the name itself, it is typically Christian collection. Like the New Testament apocrypha, Old Testament pseudepigrapha is a wider collection even if it includes earlier and Jewish writings. However the level of their importance may be different, all these categories played a significant role in shaping Christendom through the centuries and continue to do so. It is to one of these pseudepigraphical works, but canonical to the EOTC, *1 Enoch*, that this study gives special attention, as it has been claimed that it influenced Ethiopian spirituality and other aspects of life.

CHAPTER FOUR

JUDE'S USAGE OF JEWISH LITERATURE, "CANONICAL" AND "EXTRA-CANONICAL"

4.1 Introduction

In spite of its unique contribution and importance in the NT, the book of Jude is sadly a neglected book among both scholars and preachers.[1] Richard Bauckham (1990:134) and Cory D. Anderson (2003:47) affirm the appropriateness of the description "The Most Neglected Book in the New Testament"[2] for *Jude* partly due to the widely accepted view of Jude's dependence on 2 Peter.[3] Other reasons for the neglect may include its brevity, its citation of non-canonical Jewish writings, "its burning denunciation of error" (Blum 1981:384), and the apparent absence of main Christian teachings. To be sure, in spite of its obscurities and brevity, not only *Jude*'s extensive use of the traditions of ancient Judaism but also the status it gives to *1 Enoch* and other Second Temple Period literature gives it a unique place in the NT.

On the other hand, in spite of its brevity, *Jude* is permeated by Jewish literature, both "canonical" and "non-canonical". Its intensive and extensive usage of the literature made the short book very compact, overloaded by scriptural citations, references and allusions. This chapter begins with *Jude*'s literary and interpretive strategy as to how the book is designed to defend its argument. This will be followed by a discussion on his usage of Jewish literature,

---

[1] For a discussion of the neglect of the book by scholars see S. Maxwell Coder 1958:4; and especially on a continuous recent neglect see Bauckham 1990:134; or its neglect, with some other Catholic Epistles, both by the church and ordinary readers yet with an improved attention in the recent scholarship, see Bauckham 1997a:153.

[2] This is a title of an article by D. J. Rowston 1974-75:554-563. With some other reasons, according to Rowston, the major reason for its neglect is its use of *1 Enoch* and our lack of knowledge of a particular historical situation. However, since Rowston's critical comment, there has significant attraction to *Jude* among scholars. For recent articles and commentaries on the epistle of Jude see: Richard J. Bauckham 1983; J. Daryl Charles 1990b:109-124; 1991a:130-145; 1991b:106-124; Walter M. Dunnett 1988:287-292; Jarl Fossum 1987:226-243; Michael Green 1987; Douglas J. Moo 1996; Carol D. Osburn 1981:107-115; 1985:296-303; 1977:334-341; Thomas Wolthuis 1987:21-45.

[3] Bauckham (1990:134) uses a very strong expression to signify such a neglect: "The tradition of scholarly contempt [i.e. considering Jude merely as nothing but an excerpt from 2 Peter] has also led to scholarly neglect of Jude hence to ignorance of Jude." For instance, George Eldon Ladd (1993:655) writes, "There is little of theological interest in Jude that is not found in 2 Peter." According to Andrew Chester and Ralph P. Martin (1994:81f.), Luther neglected the book for a similar reason: *Jude*'s dependence on 2 Peter.

where a brief discussion on the OT usage is followed by his usage of "extra-canonical" literature, focusing on *1 Enoch*. Selected texts, both from *Jude* and *1 Enoch,* will be exegeted and compared in line with such usage so as to understand the legitimacy of *Jude*'s "extra-canonical" works, as it is to the "canonical" works.

This raises the problem that a "canonical" book quotes "non-canonical" works as "canonical". Among these works is *1 Enoch* which is quoted and upheld as prophecy in the Early Church and the Apostolic Church. The chapter concludes with a remark, which sets the agenda for a discussion on the status of *1 Enoch* in *Jude* and other STL in the ensuing chapter. This will enable the reader to understand in what way the usage of STL has been legitimate and appropriate. This chapter discusses an issue, which we, Ethiopian Evangelicals, may try to avoid dealing with, but which is ultimately unavoidable. This is a stage of distantiation where the text will be critically examined.

4.2 Preliminary Issues: *Jude*'s Hermeneutics and Literary Style

Besides other Jewish literature in general, the influence of *1 Enoch* on *Jude* is evident not only in the citations and allusions, themes and motifs, and overwhelming vocabulary permeating the book, but can also be seen in the literary style which *Jude* consciously uses in clear contrast with the biblical literature. Both the form and the content reveal *Jude*'s affinity towards and knowledge of the Second Temple Period literature, his awareness of its continuity with the biblical literature, and the authoritative status he grants the source material upon which he is dependent. Hence, a discussion on some literary issues is appropriate.[4]

---

[4] Due to the limit of space, some traditional topics, with indirect effect on this discussion, such as authorship, date, opponents, addressee, occasion, language and theological themes, though highly disputed, are not discussed here. However, some of the issues may be raised here and there in relation to other topics. At the same time, this paper holds Jewish character of the different groups connected to the letter: Palestinian setting, Jewish-Christian author and readers, gnostic oriented antinomian opponents, and an earlier date, about 50s and 60s.

Though generically a letter,[5] it is rightly maintained that the body of the book is "a performed midrash[6] on the theme of judgment" (Ellis 1999:120).[7] Ellis further notes that as an interpretative activity the midrash procedure (1) is oriented to the Scriptures, (2) adapting it to the present (3) for the purpose of instructing or edifying the current reader. Since *Jude* follows this pattern, it justifies Jude's use of the quotation at scriptural level.[8] It is, therefore, possible to regard the literary form of Jude as "an epistolary sermon," that is, a sermon delivered in an epistolary framework, a form which might already have been in use both in Judaism and Christianity before *Jude*'s time (Bauckham 1983:3). This can be easily observed from an examination of the hermeneutical approach of *Jude*, which includes a careful analysis of the structure and a number of literary devices as closely followed by *Jude*, whose "exegetical method is indivisible from his message" (Charles 1990b:119). The careful composition, in the form of a midrash, which argues for the major message of the book, as stated in v. 4, can be readily seen from the methods and techniques he employs, which were also widely accepted in contemporary Judaism and can be paralleled especially from the Qumran community (Bauckham 1992:1098).

4.2.1 Structure and Analysis of *Jude*

The structure and its analysis, which is discussed here, were first observed by Ellis (1993:221-226) and later on adopted and refined by Bauckham.[9]

1-2 **Address and Greeting**

---

[5] The Epistle of Jude has almost all the features of an ancient letter form: the sender, the receivers, greetings, purpose and occasion, the main body, and doxology. For a discussion on epistolary framework of the letter see Carroll D. Osburn 1992:288-294.

[6] "Performed midrash," as Ellis (1988:703) calls it, is a phrase used to designate interpretive renderings of various kinds of "text + exposition" patterns.

[7] Ellis (1999:120) argues that the author has reworked the midrash and given it the covering form of a letter (1-4, 20-25). He notes the performed piece constitutes c.72% of the letter.

[8] For more details see Ellis 1988:703-709; idem 1977:201-208.

[9] Bauckham extensively discusses and elaborates the structure and its significance to an adequate understanding of every aspect of the letter in his various works. This study adopts his latest analysis in Bauckham 1992:1098. His major refinement of Ellis's analysis is that he regards the whole vv. 8-10 as a commentary on vv. 5-7, with the 'citation' in verse 9 introduced as a secondary 'text' to aid the interpretation of vv. 5-7. For a recent discussion on Jude's structural analyses from different perspectives see David. J. Clark 2004:125-137 and Larry Douglas Smith 2004:138-142. Even if both of them propose different structures for *Jude*, they agree with Bauckham and Ellis that the structure of the letter is part of the author's technique of conveying his message.

3-4	**Occasion and Theme**
3	A. The Appeal to Contend for the Faith
4	B. The Background to the Appeal: The False Teachers, Their character and Judgement (forming Introductory Statement Theme for B')
5-23	**Body of the Letter**
5-19	B'. The Background: A Midrash on Four Prophecies of the Doom of the Ungodly
5-7	*"Text" 1: The Old Testament Types*
8-10	+ interpretation
(9)	including secondary "text" : Michael and the Devil
11	*"Text" 2: Three more Old Testament Types*
12-13	+ interpretation
(12-13)	including secondary allusions
14-15	*"Text" 3: A Very Ancient Prophecy*
16	+ interpretation
17-18	*"Text" 4: A Very Modern Prophecy*
19	+ interpretation
20-23	A'. The Appeal
24-25	**Concluding Doxology**

This analysis elucidates the epistolary framework of the letter which contains a "midrash" or a section of formal exegesis (vv. 5-19). The initial statement of the theme of the letter (vv. 3-4) contains two parts (A and B) which correspond, in reverse order, to the two parts of the body of the letter (B' and A').[10]

Bauckham (1992:1098) further contends that the midrashic style used in vv. 5-19 is "a very carefully composed piece of scriptural commentary which argues for the statement made in v. 4." In these verses, scriptural examples and quotations become "texts" which are then interpreted to apply to the situation facing Jude's readers. This midrashic pattern of "text" followed by interpretation is repeated four times. The first two "texts" are actually allusions to

---

[10] For further explanation on how the whole fits together, see Bauckham 1990:179-186.

biblical stories which are then interpreted to apply to Jude's opponents. The latter two are from authoritative sources which are equally applied to the readers' situation (Bauckham 1990:179-234).[11]

Among the texts, text 1 and 2 summarize three groups of people—Israel in the wilderness (Num 14), the watchers or fallen angels (*1 Enoch* 6-19), and the Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 19)—and three individuals—Cain (Gen 4:8), Balaam (Num 22:31:16) and Korah (Num 16)—from the sacred writings.[12]All of these are well-known scriptural examples of judgment, here used as historical types of the false teachers who are similarly doomed to judgment, rather than verbal prophecies.[13] The second pair of texts, 3 and 4, are verbal prophecies of the false teachers, quoted from *1 En* 1:9 and oral tradition of the teaching of the apostles (Bauckham 1992:1098) respectively.[14]

A number of stylistic features mark a distinction between "texts" and interpretation. First, there is a shift in tense from "texts" to interpretation. The tense of the verbs in the "texts" is past or future, referring to types in the past or prophesying the future, whereas the interpretations use present tenses, referring to the fulfilment of the types and prophecies at the present time (Ellis 1993:225. For some exceptions see Bauckham 1992:1089). Secondly, transition from "text" to interpretation is also marked by phrases with οὗτοι used in a formulaic way to introduce each section of interpretation.[15] They serve to identify the false teachers as the people to whom the prophecies refer. In this way, they make the transition from the prophecy to its application to the opponents. Thirdly, the "texts" are introduced by

---

[11] For a discussion on the status of "non-canonical" books in *Jude* see below.

[12] It is noted that this is an acceptable way of citing the text of a midrash, (cf. l Cor 10:1-5; Heb 7:1-3) (Bauckham 1990:182).

[13] But for some verbal allusions to the actual texts of the Scriptures see Bauckham 1990:182f. In another work, Bauckham (1983:79-84) suggests that the references to Cain, Balaam and Korah are not merely to the OT texts as such but to some other Second Temple Period traditions about these figures which had grown up around the OT texts.

[14] As indicated in the analysis, that is "text" 3: (A Very Ancient Prophecy) and "text" 4: (A Very Modern Prophecy), they show that the opponents and their judgement have been prophesied about from the very earliest times up to the most recent times.

[15] This resembles similar formulae used in the Qumran commentaries (4QFlor 1:2, 3, 11, 12, 17; 4QpIsa 3:7, 9, 10, 12; 4QpIsa[b] 2:6-7, 10) and occasionally in the NT (Gal 4:24; 2 Tim 3:8).

the formulae like ὅτι (5, 11) and λέγω (14, 17)[16] distinguishing them from the interpretation. Bauckham notes that besides the four main "texts" there is a secondary "text" (v. 9), which helps the interpretation of "text" 1 (Bauckham 1992:1099).[17]

4.2.2 Typology, Catchwords, and Triplets

Besides his literacy structure, *Jude* uses typology, catchwords and triplets in an interwoven way with each other. One of the methods employed by the NT writers' usage of OT (or other Jewish traditions) is typology, which presupposes continuity between the two testaments as promise (prophecy) and fulfilment[18] or correspondence between type and antitype. For Jude, the OT types apply prophetically to his opponents with historical correspondence between the ungodly of the past and those of the present.

The first instance of *Jude*'s typological triplet cites "three classic examples of sin which incurred divine judgment:" (Bauckham 1990:186) the unbelieving Israel (v. 5), the rebellious angels (v. 6) and Sodom and Gomorrah (v. 7) all of which exhibit "unnatural rebellion" (Green 1968:166-67). The second triplet, Cain, Balaam, and Korah (v. 11), are united by the phrase "are objects of a woe-cry, [that is], a prophetic denunciation, issued by the writer" (Charles 1990b:116).

Besides these typological triplets, the extremely brief book *Jude* is flooded by the abundance of descriptions listed in groups of three. Charles observes twenty sets of triplets which overwhelm the only twenty-five verses (Charles 1990b:124, n.24),[19] beginning from the

---

[16] Ellis (1993:224) notes that these formulae are used elsewhere in the NT to introduce quotations, e.g. 2 Cor 10:17; Gal 3:11; Mk 12:26.
[17] However, for Ellis (1993:22, 224), v. 9 is a citation with equal weight as the others because it fits all the features which the other citations would have.
[18] For a detailed discussion on 'typology' as promise and fulfilment, see Gerhard Von Rad 1986:28-46 and R. T. France 1971:38-80.
[19] Charles (1990:117f.) further relates Jude's usage of triplets with his Jewishness that he tries to find three-fold witnesses to validate his testimony as a tradition in the OT (Deut 17:6; 19:15) and later on affirmed by the NT (Jn 5:31-33; 8:17-18; Mt: 18:16; 2 Cor 13:1; 1 Tim 5:19; Heb 10:28).

writer's self-designation in v. 1 through to the final doxology in v. 25.[20] The many sets of triads indicate the urgency, depth, vividness and strength of the author's argument.[21]

Jude is also marked by strong and consistent use of catchwords in order to connect various elements in his structure.[22] Both the abundant and consistent usage of catchwords shows that the literary device is not accidental on the writer's part, rather, it is "the hall-mark of the midrashic procedure" (Ellis 1993:225). Most of the catchwords, which occur more than four times, as listed by C. Landon, are: (1) ἀσεβήν/ἀσέβεια vv. 4, 15 (3x), 18; (2) ὑμεῖς vv. 3 (3x), 5 (2x) 12, 17, 18, 20 (2x) 24; (3) οὗτοι vv. 4, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 19 (αὐτός) 11; (4) κύριος vv. 4, 5, 9, 14, 17, 21, 25; (5) ἅγιος vv. 3, 14, 20 (2x), 24 (ἄμωμος); (6) σάρξ, ἐπιθυμία vv. 7, 16, 18, 23; (7) ἀγάπη/ἀγαπητοί vv. 1, 2, 3, 12, 17, 20, 21; (8) ἔλεος/ἐλεέω vv. 2, 21, 22, 23; (9) κρίσις, κρίμα vv. 4, 6, 9, 15; (10) πᾶς vv. 3, 15 (4x), 25 (2x) (Landon 1996:52f.). This confirms the general tendency of the writer to structure and enforce his message by repeating certain key words a practice "paralleled at Qumran and elsewhere (e.g. 1 Pet 2:4-10)" (Bauckham 1992:1099).

Jude also employs other minor literary devices and motifs which may not easily be detected but are common to the Second Temple Jewish tradition as continuation and development of

---

[20] These are, as Charles (1991:132, n.5) puts them: v.1: self-designation of the writer ('Ιούδας, δοῦλος, ἀδελφός) and attributes ascribed to the readers (ἠγαπημένοις, τετηρημένοις, κλητός); v. 2: elements in the greeting (ἔλεος, εἰρήνη, ἀγάπη); v. 4: participles modifying the main verb (προγεγραμμένοι, μετατιθέντες, ἀρνούμενοι); vv. 5-7: paradigms of judgement (unbelieving Israel, the rebellious angels, Sodom and Gomorrah); v. 8: actions of the οὗτοι (βλασφημεῖν, ἀθετεῖν, μιαίνειν); v. 9: indicative actions of Michael (διελέγετο, οὐκ εητόλμησεν, εἶπεν); v. 11: examples of woe (Cain, Balaam, Korah); escalation of rebellious action (ἐπορεύθησαν, ἐξεχύθησαν, ἀπώλοντο); v. 12: traits of those at the love-feasts (σπιλάδε·, συνευωχούμενοι, ἀφόβως); characteristics of the waves (ἄγρια, ἐπαφρίζοντα, αἰσχόναι); vv. 14-15: actions of the Lord (ἦλθεν, ποιῆσαι κρίσιν, ἐλέγξαι); v. 16: characteristics of the οὗτοι (γογγυσταί, μεμψίμοιροι, κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας ἑαυτῶν πορευόμενοι); v. 19: further characteristics (ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες); vv. 20-21: presence of the Trinity (Holy Spirit, God, Jesus Christ); participles relating to the writer's imperative (ἐποικοδομοῦντες, προσευχόμενοι, προσδεχόμενοι); vv. 22-23: final imperatives (ἐλεᾶτε, σῴζετε, ἐλεᾶτε); v. 25: divine designations (θεός, σωτήρ, κύριος); and threefold view of time (πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας).

[21] In the same line, Steven J. Kraftchick (2002:19) argues that "The triple formulations underscore the urgency of the letter, attempting to make the readers see and feel the magnitude of the danger in their midst. Their use lends depth and vividness to the author's argument, causing his positive statements about God and the community to stand in direct contrast with the negative portrait of the antagonists."

[22] As Ellis (1993:225) observes, the catchwords join "text" to "text" (e.g. κρίσις 6, 9, 15), "text" to interpretation (e.g. λαλεῖν 15, 16), "text" to introduction (e.g. κύριος 4, 15), "text" to final application (e.g. σῴζω 5, 23), or they may join all four elements (τηρέω 1, 6, 13, 21; κύριος 4, 5, 14, 17, 21).

the OT.[23] Thus *Jude*, in his literary strategy and hermeneutics, proves himself to highly depend on and follow early Jewish traditions, both in form and content.

4.3 *Jude*'s use of Jewish Literature: I—OT

Jude's learned awareness of both the OT and STL is evident from his extensive usage of both traditions in an interwoven and systematic way, as it is clear from his structure and midrashic interpretation. To make the picture full, an overview of OT in *Jude* will first be discussed, followed by his usage of *1 Enoch*, the major resource of *Jude*, representing *Jude*'s use of STL. In order to answer the question on the status of *1 Enoch* in *Jude*, a more detailed discussion will be on *1 Enoch* below, while this part, on *Jude*'s usage of the OT, is only an overview.

Without a single explicit citation, *Jude*'s high usage of and dependence on the OT is evident in at least five major ways. It is full of (1) types and examples of OT figures and traditions, (2) motifs common to OT, (3) theophanic expression in a judgment context, (4) the notion of writing of names in heavenly books, and (5) typological exegesis. A short description is given to each category in what follows.

First, at least ten subjects—unbelieving Israel, the fallen angels, Sodom and Gomorrah, Michael the archangel, Moses, Adam, Cain, Balaam, Korah, and Enoch—are mentioned at different levels.[24] It is hard to see that such a short book would have all these figures mentioned in those few verses unless the author is very well versed in the literature. We do not find this in most of the NT books.

Second, one of the ways Jude uses the OT is his dependence on OT motifs. He uses two sets of triplets in order to make an antithesis of the ungodly and the faithful. Whereas the ungodly are typified by the examples from the OT, the faithful are portrayed by terms common in the OT, such as ἅγιος (holy) (v.14), μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα v.

---

[23] For instance, with a major antithesis of the ungodly, basically represented as οὗτοι (vv. 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 19), and the faithful, who are unidentified as ὑμεῖς (vv. 5, 17, 18, 29). Charles (1990b:120, n.9) lists not less than 19 other contrasts which appear throughout the letter. As Charles notes, juxtaposition is a notable feature of both canonical and non-canonical Jewish wisdom literature. For other dependence on Jewish tradition in general and Enochic motifs in particular, such as theophanic appearance and judgment themes, see below.

[24] For a detailed discussion on Jude's use of the OT, see Charles 1990b:109-124.

23 ("hating even the garment stained from corrupted flesh"), and ἀμώμος v. 24 ("blameless"). Such juxtaposition "is a notable feature of OT wisdom literature" (Charles 1990b:111).[25]

Third, another dependence of Jude on the OT is his theophanic expression in a judgment context. Even if *Jude* 14-15 is explicitly derived from *1 Enoch* (see below), its relation to the Sinai Theophany and blessing of Moses in Deut 33:1ff. is clear. "Behold (for) he comes...,"[26] "with the myriads of his holy ones..." [27] "to execute judgment upon all..."[28] "and he will destroy all the wicked..."[29] "and he will reprove all flesh...,"[30] all are reminiscent of the OT common patterns of theophany-statements, which are taken up by the apocalyptic literature, including *1 Enoch* (Charles 1990b:111f).

Fourth, another aspect in *Jude*'s reminiscence of OT, as well as the apocalyptic literature, is the notion of names written in heavenly books (v. 4), with a motif of the divine foreknowledge.[31]

Finally, Jude's typological exegesis is the major element of his dependence on the OT because typology[32] is related to the question of the use of the OT in the NT. Jude's use of the OT types reflects his awareness of continuity between the two testaments. Nevertheless, Jude's use of the OT in any way is combined and supported by later Jewish thoughts. "Jude combines typological treatment of the OT with conventions and imagery contemporary to sectarian Judaism which would have been readily understood by his readership" (Charles 1990b:115).

---

[25] It is particularly common in the book of Proverbs, where the righteous and the foolish stand as diametrically opposed.

[26] Deut 33:2, Judg 5:4; Ps 18:9; Isa 19:1; 26:21; 31:4, 27; 40:10; Amos 1:2; Mic 1:3; Hab 3:3; Zeph 1:7; Zech 9:14; 14:1, 3; Mal 3:1-3.

[27] Deut 33:2; Ps 68:117; Isa 40:10; 66:15; Dan 7:10.

[28] Deut 10:18; Pss 76:9; 96:13; Isa 33:5; Jer 25:31; Dan 7:10, 13, 16; Joel 3:2, Zeph 3:8; Hab 1:12; Mal 2:17; 3:5

[29] Pss 46:8-9; 76:3-6; Isa 19:3; 27:1; 66:15-16 Jer 25:31; Zeph 3:8-18; Hag 2:22; Zech 14:2-3,12.

[30] Isa 66:15-24; Jer 25:31; Zeph 1:8, 9, 12; Mal 3:3-5.

[31] Ex 32:32-33; Pss 40:4; 56:8; 69:29; 139:16; Isa 4:3; Jer 22:30; Dan 7:10; 12:1; Mal 3:16; *1 En* 81:1-2; 89:62; 90:14, 17, 20, 22; 104:7; 108:3,7; *T. Ass* 7:5; *2 Bar* 24:1; Rev 3:5; 5:1, 7, 8; 10:8-11; 20:12.

[32] For a discussion on the problem arising from the lack of common definition of typology, four different views and three major characteristic features, see W. Edward Glenny 1997:627-638.

4.4 *Jude*'s use of Jewish Literature: II—*1 Enoch*

Besides the explicit quotation in vv. 14-15, some images, expressions, allusions, motifs and theological themes of *1 Enoch* fill up the content of *Jude*. Both in form and content, Jude uses *1 Enoch*, in the same manner as his usage of the OT. In other words, Jude's use of *1 Enoch*,[33] where Jude's letter is crowded by Enochic themes and motifs in line with the other Scriptures he uses, signifies a special validity of *1 Enoch* in Jude. The quotation in vv. 14-15 is given special attention followed by the other themes and allusions from the book.

4.4.1 *Jude*'s Quotation of *1 Enoch*

It has long been recognised that *Jude* 14-15 is a quotation of *1 Enoch* 1.9.[34] Bauckham (1983:93) further contends that it is the only section of Jude's midrash provided with a formal quotation from a written source as his text, as indicated by a standard formula in which τούτοις, "these," identifies the false teachers as those to whom the prophecy applies.[35] Jude makes certain modifications, in accordance with the practice of his period, so that it may reflect his exegesis (Osburn 1976-77:340f.). This can be shown in a comparison of Jude with the Greek and Ethiopic versions of *1 Enoch*.[36]

4.4.1.1 Comparison of Jude 14-15 and 1 Enoch 1:9

1 En 1:9 (Ethiopic)	1 En 1:9 (Black)	Jude 14-15 (UBS)	Jude 14-15 (NRSV)
And behold! he	ὅτι	ἰδοὺ	See
comes with ten	ἔρχεται σὺν	ἦλθεν κύριος ἐν	the Lord is coming
thousands holy ones,	ταῖς μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ	ἁγίαις μυριάσιν	with ten thousands
	καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ,	αὐτοῦ,	of his holy ones,
to execute judgment	μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ	ποιῆσαι κρίσιν	to execute judgment
upon them	κατὰ πάντων,	κατὰ πάντων	on all,

---

[33] See the discussion below on v. 6, how Jude employs the second type in his first triplet, and also how he employs a prophetic formula quoting from *1 En* 1:9 below.

[34] It is maintained that at least as early as Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian that this connection was recognised (Osburn 1976-77:334).

[35] Cf. 4QpIsa[b] 2:7; 4QFlor 1:16; Act 2:16; 4:11.

[36] Here the Greek of *1 Enoch* is from Black's (1970) edition and the Ethiopic is represented by Knibb's (1978) translation. For a comparison that includes Qumran Aramaic and a Latin version, see Bauckham 1983:95.

and to destroy	καὶ ἀπολέσει πάντας τοὺς	καὶ ἐλέγξαι πᾶσαν ψυχὴν[37]	and to convict everyone
the impious	ἀσεβεῖς		of ungodliness
and to contend	καὶ ἐλέγξει		
with all flesh	πᾶσαν σάρκα		
concerning every-	περὶ πάντων	περὶ πάντων τῶν	of all the
thing which the	ἔργων τῆς	ἔργων	deeds that
sinners and the	ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν	ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν	they have committed in
impious have done	ὧν ἠσέβησαν	ὧν ἠσέβησαν	such an ungodly way,
and wrought	καὶ	καὶ περὶ πάντων	and of all the harsh
	σκληρῶν ὧν	τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν	things that
	ἐλάλησαν λόγων,	ἐλάλησαν	have spoken
	καὶ περὶ πάντων		
	ὧν κατελάλησαν		
against him.	κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ	κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ	against him.
	ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς.	ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς	ungodly sinners

Some of *Jude*'s divergences from the Greek need to be considered:

1) ἰδοὺ: against the Greek, *Jude* here agrees with the Ethiopic and some suggest the divergence is because *Jude* follows the Aramaic text (Black 1973:195; VanderKam 1973:129-150, 147f).[38]

2) ἦλθεν: *Jude*'s is aorist where both the Ethiopic and the Greek are present. It is noted that *Jude*'s aorist represents a Semitic "prophetic perfect," and has translated the Aramaic literally, whereas the Greek and the Ethiopic are more idiomatic renderings (VanderKam 1973:148; Osburn 1976:337).

---

[37] Besides this reading, there are some variant textual readings exist among old manuscripts: some read παντας τους ασεβεις, others read παντας τους ασεβεις αυτων, others only παντας ασεβεις, and some others read τους ασεβεις. The UBS (3rd edition, 1983) main text is compatible with the latest Nestle – Aland (28th edition, 2012) except that the variant texts are available only in the Nestle – Aland.

[38] Michael A. Knibb (1978:59) suggests that both the Ethiopic and the Greek derive from an original ארי.

3) κύριος: as a subject is *Jude*'s addition. The subject of the sentence in *1 Enoch* is God.[39] Various suggestions are given for *Jude*'s introduction of κύριος: (a) it is of considerable Christological importance, so that it may be applied to Jesus as the "eschatological Redeemer" (Osburn 1976:341; Black 1973:195). (b) It could also be by analogy with other theophany texts[40] which were applied to the parousia in the primitive Christianity (Bauckham 1981:136, n.5).

4) ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ: Once again Jude agrees with the Ethiopic against the Greek.[41] Whether the expansion of the Greek text is the result of a secondary gloss or scribal error in the Greek version (Osburn 1976:337) Jude's Semitism reflected in using ἐν instead of the Greek's σὺν signifies that he is here not following the Greek (Bauckham 1983:94).[42]

5) καὶ ἐλέγξαι πάντας τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς: As can be seen in the comparison, here *Jude*'s text is abbreviated.[43] Both the Ethiopic and the Greek texts (verbs) indicate three purposes of God's coming: (1) to judge, (2) to destroy, (3) to convict. *Jude* omits the idea of destruction by merging it with convicting, which he might be expected to retain in line with vv. 5, 10. However, the omission of "destroy", which comes rather oddly before "convict" in *1 Enoch,* emphasizes the judicial conviction of the false teachers before their destruction (Bauckham 1983:94, 96).

6) πᾶσαν σάρκα: The original object of the conviction, "all flesh," is omitted from Jude. Here also, the omission may be explained as to apply the effect of the text exclusively to the ἀσεβεῖς, whom Jude identifies as the false teachers (Bauckham 1983:94).

---

[39] Even though the last explicit mention of God in *1 En* 1 is in v.4, according to the context, he continues to be the subject until v. 9.
[40] Isa 40:10; 66:15; Zech 14:5; cf. *1 En* 91:7.
[41] Bauckham attempts to explain the longer reading of the Greek, σὺν ταῖς μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτου ..., as a Christian interpretation of the text. He suggests, the rendering of the Greek must be either "a Christian interpretative gloss on a Greek text which originally rendered the Aramaic more accurately, or possibly an indication that [the Greek] represents an originally Christian translation of *1 Enoch*," who combined two Christian interpretations of Zech 14:5 (Bauckham 1981:138).
[42] Osburn (1976:338) notes that the agreement of the Ethiopic with the Aramaic fragment in *1 Enoch* 1:9 would support Ullendorff's (1968) thesis that parts of the Ethiopic texts were derived directly from the Aramaic.
[43] Note the alternation of ἀπολέσει by ἐλέγξω, later on left out, which reduces Jude's verbs by one.

7) περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ : here the Greek is longer than both Jude and the Ethiopic. Knibb explains that the longer text of the Greek that it may be dittography (Knibb 1978:60). It may also be possible to suggest *Jude* abbreviated the text once again, "as the Ethiopic has certainly done here."[44] It is further suggested that the longer Greek text is "reflecting a conflation of two readings" from the Aramaic originals (Bauckham 1983:96).

8) With all these minor divergences, the closer word for word similarities between the Greek text of *1 Enoch* and *Jude* must be noted: (1) μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ, (2) μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ κατὰ πάντων, (3) πάντας τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς (4) περὶ πάντων (τῶν Jude) ἔργων (τῆς *1 En*) ἀσεβεῖς αὐτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν (5) καὶ περὶ πάντων (6) κατ᾽ αὐτου ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς.

The analysis clearly shows that the quotation is very close, almost verbatim. However, both the minor differences and the close parallels between the texts are explained variously. Two alternatives, both of which are possible but unlikely, are: (1) that Jude was quoting the Greek version from memory (Kelly 1969:276), or (2) that the close coincidence between the Greek text and Jude is merely accidental, assuming in both cases a literal rendering of the Aramaic with Jude's few alterations for his own purposes (Milik in Bauckham 1983:96). The other alternative is that "Jude *knew* the Greek version but made his own translation from the Aramaic" (Bauckham 1983:96).[45]

4.4.1.2 Jude 14-15 in Context

In Jude's literary style, *Jude* 14-15 comprises "text" 3: a very ancient prophecy, of his four scriptural texts, each followed by interpretation. A number of literary devices indicate that this quotation has been given special attention by the author. 1) Προεφήτευσεν, the aorist active of προφητεύω, "prophesied", is understood in different possible ways. (a) Donald Guthrie (1981:978f.) admits that Jude uses this term as a formula to introduce *1 Enoch*, but hesitates to

---

[44] Bauckham 1983:96.
[45] However, the other alternative noted by Bauckham (1983:96) that the Greek of *1 Enoch* is "a corruption of the Greek version which Jude quotes, or that the translator of the Greek version was a Christian who knew Jude's letter" is unlikely because, if so, the Greek text of *1 Enoch* would have included the term κύριος and avoided the duplication mentioned (7).

consider this as denoting Scripture, because Jude is the only one in the NT to quote in such a way.[46] (b) George L. Lawlor (1972:102) argues that Jude is not quoting *1 Enoch,* but offering a prophecy of his own, given to Jude by inspiration. But the text unambiguously states that "Enoch, in the seventh generation from Adam, prophesied, saying,..." (c) Blum (1981:393) denies the claim of the prophecy because it "does not give any startling new information but is simply a general description of the return of the Lord in Judgment." But every prophetic message need not necessarily have brand new information. (d) Reicke (1964:210), on the other hand, suggests that Jude genuinely regards the quotation from Enoch as ancient prophecy of the destruction of these same false teachers.[47] (e) Likewise, Bauckham (1983:96f.) maintains that "prophesied" indicates that Jude regarded the prophecies in *1 Enoch* as inspired by God without regarding the book as canonical Scripture.[48] (f) Finally, Watson (1998:478, 494) equates the prophecy of Enoch with any other OT prophecy, as used in Jude. It is a prophecy by Enoch, Watson argues, prophesied long ago against the false teachers.[49]

2) ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ, "in the seventh generation from Adam": a conventional description of Enoch in *1 Enoch* (60:8; 93:3, Jub. 7:39).[50] Traditionally the number seven signifies perfection as it is applied here to enforce the importance of the prophecy which comes from a perfect Enoch.[51] 3) λέγων, the participial form of λέγω "saying": This is another clear indication for the quotation's scriptural status. One of the major reasons for the objection of the quotation's authoritative status is the lack of traditional quotation formula for Scripture,

---

[46] Ladd (1993:636) likewise argues, since Jude does not include γραφη in his formula, the most common formula used by the NT, he is not considering it as Scripture. However, NT writers are not confined only to this formula.
[47] Reicke (1964:210) further notes that Jude applies the prophecy of Enoch to his opponents in the same way as the Qumranites used Habakkuk to identify the enemies mentioned by the prophet with their contemporary seducers of the elect.
[48] The issue on the discrepancy of using inspiration, authority, canonical Scripture, and other related terms are discussed elsewhere.
[49] Interestingly, Watson does not touch on the issue of canonicity.
[50] That these texts allude to other parts of *1 Enoch*, especially 60:8, suggests that Jude knows more than merely the Book of Watchers and that the Book of Parables had been preserved alongside it in the form Jude received the tradition. The texts alluded in 4.4.2.1 (2) below, also strengthen this suggestion.
[51] Bauckham (1983:96) writes that number seven "indicates Enoch's very special character in the genealogy of the patriarchs, as the man who walked with God and was taken up to heaven (Gen 5:24)—the root of all legends and literature about Enoch in the Second Temple Period Judaism. The description here is probably intended to stress, not so much Enoch's antiquity as his special status which gives authority to his prophecy."

i.e. γραφη (Moo 1996:273; Ladd 1993:655, et. al.). However, it is maintained that scriptural quotations and allusions are introduced in the NT in enormous diversity. For instance D. A. Carson (1988:247) lists more than a dozen various formulae only in the Gospel of John.

Furthermore, in Matthew's use of the OT, there are at least twelve citations introduced without including the word γραφη, but in all these cases he uses either λέγω or προφητεύω, or both, which is exactly what Jude does, to introduce his scriptural text.[52]

Finally, the point argued here is that in using both λέγω and προφητεύω, in giving a special prophetic status to Enoch, in using the text in a strategic way in his midrash, and in its Christological amendment of the quotation, Jude assumes the status of *1 Enoch* as Scripture.

4.4.2 Other Enochic Themes, Motifs and Allusions in *Jude*

Besides the quotation in vv. 14-15 and a citation in v. 6, the enormous amount of material from *1 Enoch* in *Jude* indicates Jude's unique attention to *1 Enoch*. The following discussion reflects on textual reminiscence of *1 Enoch* at different levels and some major themes and motifs of *Enoch* reflected in *Jude*, which once more reinforce the assumption that *Jude* is permeated by *1 Enoch.*

4.4.2.1 Allusions, Reminiscences and Catchwords of 1 Enoch in Jude

That Jude is influenced by *1 Enoch* in a remarkably unique way is evident in the extent to which he uses *1 Enoch*.[53] Jude's use of all sorts of citations towards *1 Enoch*—allusions, reminiscences, catchwords—is part of the evidence that Jude knew *1 Enoch* exceptionally well.[54] All of these are present in Jude as discussed here in the order of their appearance in *Jude*.

---

[52] Mt 1:22; 2:15, 17; 3:3; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:14, 35; 15:7; 21:4; 22:43. See also Heb 2:6; 12; 12:26, where only λέγων is used as an introductory formula of the citation.
[53] Bauckham (1983:10) strongly maintains such a remarkable influence by *1 Enoch*. However, his (and some other scholars) equation of Jude's influence by *1 Enoch* and *Testament of Moses* is questionable. Bauckham's own works on *Jude* are incomparably full of *1 Enoch*. We do not see much of *Testament of Moses* in Jude except a secondary citation in v. 9, which might have a lesser significance for Jude's argument.
[54] "An allusion rewords or repeats an earlier brief statement, a reminiscence implies a casual mention of a previous work.... Catchwords include single words or groups of words placed to catch attention or repeated to become slogan" (Rowston 1974-75:557f.).

1) v. 4, οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι, "who long ago were designated", is related to God's foreknowledge of each one's destiny, a concept which fascinated the imagination of the author of *1 Enoch* (89:62-71; 19; 108:7) as well as some other Jewish apocalyptic writers (Kelly 1969:250). Bauckham (1983:36f.) specifically relates this concept of the heavenly books as reminiscent of Enoch's heavenly tour and his prophecies: "Jude could have taken up this idea of heavenly tablets of destiny from *1 Enoch*.... Jude applied to the false teachers the prophecies of Judgment on the wicked which he found in *1 Enoch*, where they allegedly derived from Enoch's reading of heavenly tablets."

2) v. 4, ἀσεβής, and its cognates, "ungodly", is a catchword, which appears 6 times in this brief letter, which is more than any other NT book. Four of the occurrences are in *1 Enoch's* quotation (vv. 14-15), where the other two serve as catchwords, linking the quotation to the appeal (v. 4) and the apostolic prophecies (v. 18). The term is frequently used in the context of judgment for any evil deed, i.e., ἀσέβεια, "godlessness," (*1 En* 10:20). This is certainly the word which sums up Jude's charge against the false teachers.[55] Bauckham's (1983:40) expression would make the comparison clear: "The ungodly behaviour of the false teachers (ἀσεβεῖς) is (1) in relation to God the Father a perversion of his grace, and (2) in relation to Christ, a denial of his lordship." Likewise, he argues, the idea of denial of God by conduct is attested also in *1 Enoch* (38:2; 41:2; 45:2; 46:7; 48:10; 67:8, 10) (Bauckham 1983:40).

3) v. 4, "[They] deny our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ," has come from its parallel in *1 Enoch* (48:10), "They denied the Lord of spirits and his Messiah." The parallel is both in wording and sense if we consider that Jude is charging the false teachers that they deny both God the father and Christ.[56]

---

[55] It is argued that the word "may be almost said to give the keynote to the Epistle as it does to the *Book of Enoch*" (Mayer in Bauckham 1983:37).

[56] Kelly (1969:252) argues for understanding the denial towards both God and Christ (see the discussion above, #2) based on Jude's acquaintance with *1 Enoch* from which he cites this expression.

4) v. 7, Jude's use of οὖτοι, which introduces each section of interpretation in his commentary, has often been compared to the standard formula ("This is..." "Those are...") used in the interpretation of apocalyptic dreams and visions as in *1 En* 46:3.[57]

5) v. 8, ἐνοπνιαζόμενοι, the present passive participle of ἐνοπνιάζομαι, "on the strength of their dreams" may refer to *1 Enoch* 99:8, where the sinners of the last days "will sink into impiety because of the folly of their hearts, and their eyes will be blinded through the fear of their hearts, and through the visions of their dreams." Not only this verse, but "concern with false teachers is a feature of the Epistle of Enoch" (Nickelsburg 2001:86) as it is with Jude.

6) v. 8, σάρκα μέν μιαίνουσιν, "they defile the flesh": *1 Enoch* repeatedly refers to the sin of the fallen watchers as "defiling themselves" with women (μιαίνεσθαι) "to defile themselves": *1 Enoch* 7:1; 9:8; 10:11; 12:4; 15:3, 4. Jude, therefore, is identifying the sin of the false teachers as corresponding to that of the second and third types in vv. 6 and 7.

7) v. 9, besides Michael, archangel (ἀρχάγγελος) is a common expression for either 4 (*1 En* 40) or 7 (*1 En* 20:7) leading classes of angels in *1 Enoch*. Michael is included in either case, and often taking the leading role (cf. *Asc. Isa.* 3:16: "Michael the chief of the holy angels").[58]

8) v. 11 is a woe-oracle. In later Judaism it "developed an increasingly imprecatory character, becoming a prophetic pronouncement of Judgment on sinners. This is the function of the large number of woes (32, more than in any other ancient Jewish work) in *1 Enoch* 92-105" (Bauckham 1983:77f.).

9) In vv. 12-13, Jude employs four images from nature in a series,[59] which is parallel with either *1 En* 2:1-5:4 or (and) 80:2-8 where in the former text, the four images are positively mentioned in the same sequence as in Jude,[60] and in the latter text, only three of the images are

---

[57] Cf. Dan 5:25-26; Zech 1:10, 19-20; 4:10, 14; Rev 7:14; 11:4; 14:4 (Bauckham 1983:45).
[58] Even if Jude's citation in v. 9 is from *Testament of Moses*, he is much more familiar with Michael from his close acquaintance with *1 Enoch*.
[59] It is noted that the images are from each of the four regions of the physical world: cloud in the air, trees on the earth, waves in the sea, and star in the heaven (Reicke 1964:207).
[60] However, the point emphasised in Enoch is that violating the created order through sin and the symbolism denotes a more proper functioning of creation according to God's order.

mentioned for the disobedient as in Jude.[61] Osburn (1985:297) contends that Jude here has in mind only *1 Enoch* 80:2-8 and 67:5-7 and not 2:1-5:4 for two reasons: (1) the context of 80:2-8 is in a section that treats the impending punishment of the ungodly; and (2) the order of Jude is precisely that of Enoch. However it seems likely that both passages in *1 Enoch* have inspired Jude's series of metaphors since both passages are against lawlessness, which Jude also condemns. Jude, therefore, "represents the lawlessness of nature, prophesied for the last days, by selecting an example from each of the four regions of the world, and sees them as figures of lawless teachers who are also prophesied for the last day" (Bauckham 1983:91).

4.4.2.2 Enochic Themes and Motifs in Jude[62]

1) **Theophany and Judgment**: As examined in the quotation above (vv. 14-15), the theophanic motif in a judgment context is common to both *1 Enoch* and Jude. In both texts, the Lord appears for the purpose of judgment, ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων. By changing the subject in *1 Enoch* 1:9, who is God, into κυριος, who is Jesus, Jude reshapes the tradition to fit "the new historical situation in view of his eschatological purposes and Christological understandings" (Osburn 1976/77:340).

2) **Ungodly and Judgment**: Essentially, the deep crisis depicted in *1 Enoch* is the perversion of the right order in which the conviction of the pious was that this epoch was an apostasy, and as a result eschatological judgment is inevitable among all (Charles 1991a:140). In a similar fashion, Jude passionately exhorts his audience to struggle against the false teachers, who pervert the right teaching. As in Enoch, judgment is inevitable on these ungodly ones. In both texts, the Lord comes for the purpose of dealing with the ungodly.

3) **Eschatological Judgment**: In Jude, just as in *1 Enoch*, judgment is certain, yet, it comes in the future. Jude's examples of judgment from the past point forward to the eschatological judgment that must inevitably follow. It is maintained that "the great judgment that looms in

---

[61] John Peter Oleson (1979:492-503) argues that the missing fourth symbol in Jude comes from a pagan account of the birth of Aphrodite in Hesido's *Theogony*. But this is rejected by Osburn (1985:299) because "the presence of such a disgusting Hellenistic legend in the midst of a section dominated by quotations of and allusions to Second Temple Jewish apocalyptic literature (vv. 5-16) is decidedly strange"

[62] Jude's Angelology, which mainly comes from Jude's acquaintance with *1 Enoch*, is consciously excluded here not to repeat it since it will be given enough space below by its own right.

almost every major section of *1 Enoch* and many of its subsections is the final judgment, which will occur at the end of the old age and before the beginning of the new" (Nickelsburg 2001:55). Likewise, Jude's expression of "great day" for the judgment emphasizes his view of eschatological judgment.

4) ***The Figure of Enoch***: Enoch is the ideal figure in *1 Enoch*,[63] a concept adapted by Jude. Jude clearly appeals to the prophetic authority of Enoch. Only Jude in the NT expresses that Enoch is in the seventh generation from Adam who prophesied from of old to the present. Thus, both works essentially uplift the figure of Enoch.[64]

In summary, *1 Enoch*'s themes in *Jude* are evident for several reasons, among which the theophany-statement, their intention focused on apostasy, their eschatological orientation and all the citations permeating Jude are noteworthy. Besides these technical devices which show Jude's strong bond to Jewish traditions, the frequent mention of angels and the traditions out of which *Jude*'s angelology is developed are also indicative of Jude's strategic usage of Jewish material. Now the discussion turns to texts related to angels in *Jude*.

4.5 Angels in *Jude*: Specific Elements Connected to *1 Enoch*

This section is intended to show that besides the overall dependence of Jude on *1 Enoch*, the close connection of *Jude*'s angelology to that of Enoch discloses not only his dependence, but also the special status of Enochic collection in *Jude*. Even though angelic beings are referred to elsewhere in the NT, *Jude*'s angelology is exceptionally developed and closely connected to the STL angelology. Some comment that Jude is nearly obsessed with angels (Benton 1999:13). This is evident from Jude's (1) ontological and functional usage of angels, (2) categorizing of fallen and unfallen angels, (3) usage of developed imagery for angels like δόξαι (v. 8), ἀστέρες (v. 13), and ἅγία (v. 14) besides ἄγγελοι (v. 6), and (4) a dualistic usage of ὁ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος versus ὁ διάβολος (v. 9), all in line with a developed angelology of the Second Temple period, especially that of *1 Enoch*. The five references

---

[63] The figure of Enoch in *1 Enoch* will be discussed elsewhere.
[64] The expression "the seventh from Adam" occurs twice in *1 Enoch* (60:8, 93:3). Charles (1991:143) maintains that the number seven retains great symbolic importance throughout *1 Enoch*.

above (vv. 6, 8, 9, 13, 14,) and the issues connected to them which will be discussed in detail, show that *Jude* is highly permeated by angelology.

The exegesis of the five angelic related texts is treated under three categories. (1) The fallen angels, as explicitly mentioned in v. 6 and implicitly mentioned in v. 13, are mainly discussed from the ontological point of view and their function in that particular context. In other words, the original position and the final fate of (fallen) angels are treated as understood in Jude. (2) The "ten thousands of his holy ones" (v. 14) and "the glorious ones" (v. 8), representing the unfallen angels, are also discussed in regard to ontology and function. (3) The text related to Michael and the devil (v. 9) discloses the dualistic angelology of *Jude* and Michael's special status in his angelology.

4.5.1 Fallen Angels

There are two texts in *Jude* referring to the fallen angels, both in usage and terminology: one explicit (v. 6) and the other implicit (v. 13). Whereas the first has clear parallels in *1 Enoch*, and other related texts, the latter has only loose parallels. Whereas the first is with longer descriptions about the fallen angels, the latter lacks them. However, in both, the fate of the fallen angels is connected to the "deepest darkness", to varying extents: (1) until the judgment day (v. 6) and (2) forever (v. 13). Unlike in v. 6, where the designation for angels is the most common, ἀγγελος, v. 8 has a less frequent term for angels, δοξαι. Still, both texts have in common a strong dependence on *1 Enoch*, as it is made clear in what follows.

4.5.1.1 The Example of the Fallen Angels (Jude 6)

i) Context

Jude 6, as seen in the structure, is part of "text" 1 (vv. 5-6) in the background: as part of a midrash on four prophecies of the judgment of the false teachers (vv. 5-19). It is one of the "three Old Testament types"[65] sandwiched by the other two scriptural references, with equal status, which all refer to the false teachers and affirm the certitude of the judgment. The fallen

---

[65] Bauckham (1992:1098), in his analysis, refers v. 6 as the second OT type equally with the other two as summaries of the Scriptures.

angels, exactly in the same way as the other two groups of people—unbelieving Israel and Sodomites—serve as types of sin and judgment. For Jude, all of them are scriptural types.

ii) *Jude* 6 and *1 Enoch*

The parallels between texts from *1 Enoch* and *Jude* 6 demonstrate not only Jude's acquaintance with *1 Enoch* (Kistemaker 1987:379), but also his primary dependence upon it (Kelly 1969:257; Watson 1998:488). Here are some of the parallels (The text of *1 Enoch* is from Black 1970):

<div align="center">

Jude 6[66] // *1 Enoch* 12:4; 10:6; 10:4[67]

</div>

ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας   //   . . . τοῖς ἐγρηγόροις

τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας // τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οἵτινες ἀπολιπόντες

τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον   // τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸν ὑψηλόν, τὸ ἁγίασμα τῆς

στάσεως τοῦ αἰῶνος (12:4)

εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας // καὶ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς μεγάλης τῆς κρίσεως... (10:6)

δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν // Δῆσον τὸν ᾿Αζαὴλ ποσὶν και χερσίν, καὶ βάλε

αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σκότος (10:4)

The parallels indicate that Jude's reference is directly dependent on *1 Enoch* 6-19, which is "the earliest [account] of the fall of the Watchers" (Bauckham 1983:51). The conflation of a number of texts from these chapters shows more Jude's close familiarity with the book which he cites freely.[68] As will be discussed in the next chapter, *1 Enoch* elucidates that the judgment

---

[66] The English translation of v. 6 reads: "And the angels who did not keep their own position, but left their proper dwelling, he has kept in eternal chains in deepest darkness for the judgment of the great Day."

[67] Knibb's (1978) translation of these texts is: "…the watchers of heaven who have left the high heaven and the holy eternal place;" (12:4) "and that on the great day of judgment he may be hurled into the fire;" (10:6) "Bind Azazel by his hands and feet, and throw him into the darkness" (10:4).

[68] With several varying forms, the tradition of the fallen angels is well known in other Second Temple Period literature, yet none of them has as close a parallel as *1 Enoch* to *Jude*. Cf. *Jub* 4:15, 22; 5:1; CD 2:17-19:1 QApGen 2:1; *T. Reu.* 5:6-7; *T. Naph* 3:5; *2 bar* 56:10-14. Other related texts in *1 Enoch* are 21; 86-88; 106:13-15, 17.

on the watchers was certain. Jude also, using the watchers as a type of the false teachers, presupposes that certainty of judgment.

iii) Exegetical Notes on *Jude* 6

1) ἡ ἑαυτῆς ἀρχή: The use of ἀρχή here is disputed. Some suggest a meaning of "priesthood," an estate given by God (Green 1968:165). Other suggestions include "beginning" (Manton 1999:112),[69] "dominion" (Kelly 1969:256),[70] or "position of authority" (Kistemaker 1987:377). One thing in common in all these expressions is that the term is used to express the higher place of angels from an ontological point of view. The angels' position is one of "heavenly power or sphere of dominion, which the angels exercised over the world in the service of God" (Bauckham 1983:52). Furthermore the term is employed mainly as it has been understood in the Second Temple Period literature in connection with angels.[71] It is further noted that the use of the definite article in the phrase ἡ ἑαυτῆς ἀρχή and its parallel τό ἴδιον οἰκητήριον signifies the place given by God to the angelic beings, which is superior to human beings (Kistemaker 1987:380). Thus, ἀρχή here points to the exalted position and authority the angels occupied.[72] The two nouns, in synonymous parallel, stress the two aspects of the position of angels: "stipulated responsibilities ([ἀρχή], 'dominion') and a set place [οἰκητήριον] (Blum 1981:390).

2) εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας : The angels were kept "for the judgment of the great day," which is parallel to *1 En* 10:12 where Michael is to bind the fallen angels "for seventy generations in the valley of the earth, until the great day of their judgment." The adjective "great" is uncommon with "judgment" in biblical texts, where, "the great day of the Lord" is more usual (Joel 2:11, 31; (=Act 2:20) Zeph 1:14; Mal 4:5; Rev 16:18). Jude's use of the

---

[69] Manton's (1999:112) argument for "beginning", more literal interpretation, is based on his suggestion that they left their "first position," which is related to the fall of the angels.
[70] Kelly's (1969:256) translation is based on other similar NT titles such as "principalities" and "powers" in Rom 8:38; Col 2:15, or even "world-rulers" as in Eph 4:12.
[71] Cf., *Jub* 2:2; 5:6; *1 En* 82:10-20; 1QM 10:12; 1QH 1:11. Note especially that ἀρχή is employed to denote a rank of angels in *T. Levi* 3:8; *2 En* 20:1 and as cosmic powers in Rom 8:38; Eph 1:21; 3:10; 6:12; Col 1:16; 2:15.
[72] The exaltation is further strengthened by the expression ἀπολιπόντας, a verb taken from the parallel *1 Enoch* 12:4; 15:3, where the angels left the high, holy and eternal heaven. Note also *1 Enoch* 15:7. "The spirits of heaven, in heaven is their dwelling."

phrase is consistent with *1 Enoch*, though both expressions are common in *1 Enoch* (cf. *1 En* 22:11; 54:6; 84:4). Here also Jude's dependence on *1 Enoch* is evident (Kelly 1969:257).[73]

3) δεσμός: the language of chains is one of the remarkable expressions in *1 Enoch*'s tradition of the fall of angels.[74] The extent of the punishment is intensified with an expression ὑπὸ ζόφον,[75] where, besides the chains, the very darkness of the place increases the misery.

4) ἀΐδιος: The chains are called "eternal," synonymous with αἰωνίος (v. 7), but also limited to the day of judgment. This is a difficult expression since both permanence and limit of time are expressed at the same time. The apparent discrepancy comes from Jude's wording of Enoch's different texts together. Jude's basic text here is *1 En* 10:5, where Azazel is bound forever (εἰς τους αἰῶνας) until the judgment. Bauckham (1983:53) notes that "forever" here must mean "for the duration of the world until the Day of judgment," which makes the imprisonment more persistent, that is, there is no way to escape, until that day.[76] The everlasting chains could also indicate the hopeless situation of the fallen angels. The chains are everlasting "because the wicked angels stand guilty forever, without hope of recovery or redemption (Manton 1999:18).

iv) The Purpose of *Jude* 6 in its Context

Besides a direct quotation from *1 Enoch* in verses 14-15,[77] Jude's extensive use *1 Enoch* here in v. 6 signifies not only the author's, but also the readers' high esteem towards *1 Enoch*. The story of the fallen angels is at the center of the first three historical types, preceded and succeeded by two other types from OT texts. The story discloses that the angels who have enjoyed a heavenly status, are not less but more in danger of judgment since they failed to

---

[73] Michael Green (1968:165) further testifies that Jude's dependence on *1 Enoch* here is in both the subject matter and form of expression. He refers to frequent expression of "until the judgement of the great day' in *1 En* 10:6; 14:1; 22:4, 10, 11, 97:5; 103:8.

[74] *1 En* 13:1; 14:5; 54;3-5; 56:1-4; 88:1; cf. *Jub* 5:6; 2 *Bar* 56:13.

[75] For a discussion on ζόφον, see below on the discussion of v. 13.

[76] Similar use of the expression can be attested in 10:12, where the fallen angels are bound to a complete period of time—seventy generations—but, here also, until the eternal judgement. See also 14:5: "imprisoned all the days of eternity;" *Jub* 5:10 (evidently dependent on *1 En* 10): "they were bound in the depths of the earth forever, until the day of great condemnation."

[77] For the discussion on the quotation, see below.

keep that status. Including the other two types, they are "typological prophecies of the eschatological judgment at the Parousia which threatens apostate Christians in these last days" (Bauckham 1983:63).

4.5.1.2 ἀστέρες πλανῆται (v. 13) as Fallen Angels

In his literary plan, Jude portrays the false teachers in two categories of historical types: (1) vv. 5-10 (text + interpretation) groups of people, types signify the false teachers as sinners to be judged, and (2) vv. 11-13 (text + interpretation) individual sinners, types signify the false teachers as false teachers who lead other people to sin. V. 11 is the "text" for the second category, individual types, including Cain, Balaam and Korah, where vv. 12-13 are its interpretation. The ἀστέρες πλανῆται in v. 13 is connected to the second type, τῃ πλανῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ, with a catchword πλάνη, which literally means "wandering" from the right path.[78]

ἀστέρες πλανῆται, which literally means "wandering stars," is an image taken from *1 Enoch*. It is maintained that the noun πλανήτης occurs only in Jude 13 in the sense of a wandering star or planet, indicating their irregular movement as violating "the order of the heavens and which was attributed to the disobedience of the angels controlling them" (Günther 1986:459). [79] Many would agree that Jude is alluding to the passages in *1 Enoch*[80] where the watchers are represented as seven stars "which transgressed the command of the Lord from the beginning of their rising because they did not come out at their proper times" (18:15), and further, the fall of the watchers is represented as the fall of the stars from heaven (86:1-3) (Bauckham 1983:89; Kelly 1969:274; Green 1968:176; Perkins 1995:153; Sidebottom 1967:90; Moffatt 1928:239; Moo 1996:261). If Jude uses the concept of wandering stars in this sense, then he is once again, as in v.6, comparing the fallen angels with false teachers, and indicating that the judgment is inevitable. Green (1968:177) further notes a contrast and peculiarly fitting allusion to Enoch: "for whereas the wicked angels lost their heavenly home by disobeying God, and fell to destruction, Enoch gained heaven by obeying God."

---

[78] For the discussion on the meaning of the word see W. Günther 1986:457.
[79] Cf. *1 En* 82 for the image that the heavenly bodies are controlled by angels.
[80] *1 En* 18:13-16; 21:3-6; 83-90. For the relations with passages see below.

Some more reasons for the assertion that Jude has borrowed this image from *1 Enoch* are (1) in Jewish apocalyptic thought heavenly bodies are controlled by angels (*1 En* 82), (2) in *1 En* 18:13-16; 21:3-6, the fallen angels are represented as seven stars "which transgressed the command of the Lord from the beginning of their rising because they did not come out at their proper times" (18:15) (Kelly 1969:274, cf. 21:16); (3) the imagery is taken up in the later Dreams (*1 En* 83-90), which in its allegory of world history represents the fall of watchers as the fall of stars from heaven (86:1-3); (4) in 88:1, 3, the archangels cast the stars down into the darkness of the abyss and bind them there, and (5) until the judgment of the End, when they will cast into the abyss of fire (90:24) (Bauckham 1983:89). Therefore, this corresponds well to Enochic images, as also noted in the vocabulary.

ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους, as Kelly (1969:274) maintains, is directly related to v. 6 above in both the wording and the idea. To be sure, the darkness in *1 Enoch* (88:1; cf. 10:4-5) and Jude 6 is a temporary fate of the fallen angels, until the last judgment, whereas here, the darkness is the eternal destiny of the wandering stars. Moreover, in *1 Enoch* the place of final damnation is usually represented by fire.[81] Bauckham (1983:90) argues that Jude's preference for the image of darkness here is because it is a more appropriate fate for stars.

Just like the fallen angels in v. 6, here also the wandering stars of v. 13, who are the fallen angels, are kept (τηρέω the same verb as in v. 6) in the deepest darkness forever. Jude concludes this paragraph with the same note that he makes at end of every section and sub-section—judgment (Moo 1996:261).

4.5.2 Unfallen Angels

Jude's doctrine of the fallen angels is mainly related to one of his major themes: judgment. However, this does not limit his inclusion of another group of angels. Moreover, his usage of various terms in all the occurrences indicates his developed angelology in line with his background references—*1 Enoch* and other apocalyptic literature. Besides the archangel

---

[81] In Jewish thought the idea of imprisonment in eternal darkness is also known: Tob 14:10; *1 En* 46:6; 63:6; *Pss. Sol.* 14:9; 15:10; cf. Mt 8:12; 22:13; 25:30. Sometimes the two images were combined*: 1 En* 103:8; 108:14; *Sib. Or.* 4:48; 1QS 2:8; 4:13; *2 En* 10:2.

Michael, Jude refers twice to holy and glorious angels (vv. 8, 14). Both texts signify Jude's ontological usage of the terms even if the functional[82] nuance is not entirely absent in the latter text. Now the discussion is limited to the two terms δόξαι and ἅγιαι, in the two texts.

4.5.2.1 δόξαι as Angelic Beings

i) Terminology

The basic dictionary meaning of δόξα is "glory," "honour," "radiance" or "reputation" (Hegermann 1990:344) where the concept of glory or honour are most common. In the OT, this glory is basically found only in God, though in some texts angelic beings show some of its characteristics (Ezek 8:2; 1:7; 13; Dan 10:5f.). However, in the Second Temple period the concept of glory is further applied to entities in the heavenly realm: God, his throne, and the angels (Aalen 1986:45).[83] In the NT, it is maintained that among other more frequent usages, the term δόξα is used to refer to angelic powers, in continuation with Ezekiel's endowment of glory to heavenly beings, where the visible light or the radiance of the angels is stressed (Aalen (1986:46).[84] Thus, the attribution of Jude's δόξαι as angels is well attested.[85]

ii) δόξαι in its Present Context

---

[82] Angelic or heavenly beings are designated in the Scriptures in various ways which is based on the various usages in different contexts. We can deduce at least two distinct usages in relation to angels in the Scriptures: ontological and functional. That is, the terms designated to refer to angels, as employed in the Scriptures, denote either their being or function. T. H. Gaster (1962:128f.), for instance, clearly maintains that the word "angel" is used in twofold senses: a) a messenger from God, functional usage, and b) a spiritual being, an ontological usage. This is nicely distinguished, according to him, in the earliest portions of the Bible: "while every divine messenger is regarded as a spiritual being, not every spiritual being is a divine messenger." In a broader sense, ontologically, angels are believed to be "heavenly beings, members of Yahweh's court, who serve and praise him" (Bietenhard 1986:101). However, the most frequent usage of the term "angel," as it is used in the OT, is functional rather than ontological. As a matter of fact, many scholars would define and explain the usage of angels in the OT from the functional point of view. For instance, a number of dictionaries and encyclopaedic articles, including *ABD, TDNT, ZPEB, NIDNTT, ISBE, IDB, NBD*, devote themselves for the functional usage of the term "angel". Their functional designation, therefore, is connected to their duty which is "to execute God's universal will in heaven and on earth. They promote divine goodness, and they are mediators of God's love and good will to man" (Founderbruk 1976:163). For a detailed discussion on five categories of functions of angels see Founderbruk 1976:163f.; Gaster 1962:129; von Rad 1964:77.

[83] In the Dead Sea Scrolls, it is used for angels (1QH 10:8), also in other early literature *(2 En* 22:7, 10; *Asc. Isa.* 9:32) (Hillyer 1992:250).

[84] Aalen (1986:46) discusses five other usages of the term in the NT.

[85] See also Hegermann 1990:345, for a similar connotation of the concept which goes back to the selection of δόξα as the word to translate kābôd in the LXX.

Tracing back to attestations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in apocalyptic and Gnostic literature, Bauckham (1983:57) maintains the term δόξαι in *Jude* 8 stands for angels. Not only the attestations, which include the early church Fathers' interpretation that Jude's δόξαι are angels, Bauckham (1983:57) argues, it is rightly used as angels also because "they participate in or embody the glory of God."[86] Other commentators also argue in a similar sense. For instance, Kelly (1969: 263), tracing back to some OT texts[87] contends Jude's use of δόξαι for angels. He further notes that the author of Jude, as a Jewish Christian, "sharing the intense interest in angels which characterized later Judaism, the writer has a properly deferential attitude towards the glorious ones."[88]

If δόξαι refers to angels, then why do the false teachers slander them? This can be understood from Jude's use of the term for angels from his Second Temple Period background, which could be related to the angels' function as givers, guardians, and watchers over the Law of Moses and to uphold the created order.[89] So the opponents of Jude, being antinomians,[90] desiring complete freedom, "slander"[91] angels and refuse to accept their authority connected with the Law. In Bauckham's (1983:59) words, "their 'slandering' of angels was a way of detaching the Law from God and interpreting it simply as an evil."

---

[86] Cf. *T. Jud.* 25:2; *T. Levi* 18:5; Heb 9:5.

[87] LXX Ex. 25:11, Ex 24:16f.; 33:18-23; Ps 19:1, and also the other texts from Second Temple Period literature cited above.

[88] Note also an alternative translation, "the angels" or "the heavenly beings" or "the glorious angels in heaven" given by Robert G. Bratcher 1984:176f. See also Dick Lucas and Christopher Green 1995:189, where they argue for "celestial beings" as angels. However, some interpretations, such as "God's authority" (Wiersbe 1984:164); "godly leaders" or "elders" (Cedar 1984:252f.) lack ground for their suggestion. Others, like Blum (1981:391), who suggests "all spiritual forces—good or evil," and Reicke (1964:201) who interprets as "those in positions of power whether angels or men;" in their interpretation, demonstrate the ambiguity of the term, if not in this context.

[89] For angels as mediators of the Law of Moses, a common Jewish belief, see *Jub* 1:27-29. Cf. Act 7:38; 53; Heb 2:2; Gal 3:19.

[90] For identification of the opponents as antinomians see Bauckham 1992:1100; Watson 1998:475; Barclay 1960:186f.

[91] Note the catchword contrast (βλασφημέω) between the false teachers in v. 8 and 10 and the devil in v. 9 (βλασφημία).

4.5.2.2 ἐν ἁγίαις μυρίασιν αὐτοῦ (v. 14)[92]

As it is already mentioned, the context of *1 Enoch* and the similar text, Deut 33:2-4, where ἅγια μυριας is employed, is that of theophany. That fits with Jude's themes because these passages which link God's giving of the Law at Sinai and his theophany with the presence of "myriads of angels," "the very beings that Jude's opponents 'slander' (v. 8) by their antinomian mindset" (Lucas and Green 1995:207). It is also argued that not only Jude, but also other NT writers, in their eschatological doctrine, are influenced by the language of an angelic company attending Christ's second coming. Thus the "holy ones" are angels, the heavenly army of the Divine warrior, as in Zech 14:5, which was probably the main source of the early Christian expectation that the Lord at his Parousia would be accompanied by a retinue of angels (Bauckham 1983:97).[93] Jude's usage of the "holy ones" as angels, as it is used in *1 Enoch*, therefore, signifies both *Jude*'s highly developed angelology and his intense dependence on and high regard for *1 Enoch*.

4.5.3 Michael versus the Devil (v. 9)

In addition to Jude's implicit classification of his angelology in two clear categories—fallen and unfallen, as categorized in *1 Enoch*—the appearance of the archangel Michael and his opponent, the devil, gives a complete picture of a highly developed angelology in this tiny book. Even if a number of questions arise in relation to *Jude* 9, because of the limit of space, the discussion here focuses only on a few points: its source, its purpose in the present context, and the role of Michael.[94]

4.5.3.1 The Background and Source of Jude 9

The story of Jude's quotation in v. 9 goes back to Moses's death in Deut 34:5-6: "Then Moses, the servant of the Lord, died there in the land of Moab, at the Lord's command. He

---

[92] Here, only the usage of the phrase as it develops Jude's angelology is dealt with. For the discussion on the quotation from *1 Enoch*, see below. And for a discussion on the usage of the term οἱ ἁγιοις as a designation for holy angels in the OT and *1 Enoch,* see in the next chapter, where the term is discussed as it appears in *1 Enoch* 1:9. Since Jude 14 is part of the quotation from *1 En* 1:9, it has the same concept as in its source.

[93] Matt 16:27; 25:31; Mark 8:38; Luke 9:226; 2 Thess 1:7.

[94] On a detailed and thorough discussion on the verse, the status of the source material in *Jude*, and the history of its interpretation, see Tromp 1993:270-285; Bauckham 1992:235-280; idem 1983:65-76; Priest 1992:920-922; Andersen 1967:295-96.

was buried in a valley in the land of Moab, opposite Beth-peor, but no one knows his burial place to this day." Stimulated by this story, a number of legends grew up around the death and burial of Moses, one of which is the story in the *Testament of Moses* (Bauckham 1983:47; Lucas and Green 1995:192f.).[95] However, the part of the book which Jude quotes is missing, although there are a number of other works which refer to it, out of which a possible story is reconstructed. According to Bauckham (1992:238f.), the original story, as told in the *Testament of Moses*, can be reconstructed as follows:

> Joshua accompanied Moses up Mount Nebo, where God showed Moses the land of promise. Moses then sent Joshua back, saying, 'go down to the people and tell them that Moses is dead.' When Joshua had gone down to the people, Moses died. God sent the archangel Michael to remove the body of Moses to another place and to bury it there, but Samma'el, the devil, opposed him, disputing Moses' right to honourable burial. Michael and the devil engaged in a dispute over the body. The devil slandered Moses, charging him with murder, because he slew the Egyptian and hid his body in the sand. But Michael, not tolerating the slander against Moses, said, 'May the Lord rebuke you, Satan!' At that the devil took flight, and Michael removed the body to the place commanded by God. Thus no one saw the burial-place of Moses.[96]

The earliest example of this kind of contest between the devil and an angel is found in Zech 3:1-5, from which Michael's words to the devil, "May the Lord rebuke you!" in Jude's source are derived. Similar disputations are recorded in some Second Temple Period literature (see Jub. 17:15-18:16; 48, CD 5:17-18), a tradition to which Jude 9 alludes.[97] Thus, that Jude here draws upon from the *Testament of Moses* is well supported and evident.[98]

4.5.3.2 Jude 9 in Context.

The purpose behind Jude's use of this quotation here is not an easy question. However, as already indicated in the analysis of *Jude*, it has only a secondary importance, which is to support the interpretation of "text" 1.[99]

---

[95] Since the work under examination is referred to as either *Testament* or *Assumption of Moses*, its identification is problematic. The debate is whether they were two distinct works, a single work consisting of two sections or two designations, or two separate works which were subsequently joined together. For a discussion on the problem see Bauckham 1992:236f.
[96] Bauckham modifies from what he suggests earlier (idem 1983:72f.).
[97] For further discussion see Bauckham 1992:245-249.
[98] For a similar argument see Hillyer 1992:248f; Sidebottom 1967:88; Green 1968:169; et al.
[99] Bauckham (1992:1099) explains that "the use of such a secondary text in the course of the interpretation of another text can be parallel in the Qumran Commentaries, as can the incorporation of implicit allusions to other

In Jude's use, v. 9 is connected to vv. 8, 10 by the catch-word βλασφημέω (8, 10)/βλασφημία (9) ("they slander"/"slander"). Jude's midrashic interpretation involves type from the Scriptures which is applied on the anti-type of his day. Here, the story in v. 9 is introduced simply in the course of the interpretation of the types of vv. 5-7. In the scheme, v. 8 and v. 10 directly related to the slandering of the false teachers, the antitypes for the types in vv. 5-7, whereas the slander on v. 9 is merely a support for the argument in v. 8. This is evident in v. 10 that v. 10 does not simply interpret v. 9, but rather takes up the interpretation begun in v. 8. Thus, with the catchword connection v. 9 relates to the final clause of v. 8. Moreover, v. 10 takes up the application of the types in its first clause, οὗτοι, as in v. 8, and ends the exposition by making it clear that the judgment is indispensable (Bauckham 1983:44).

The interpretation of who slanders in v. 9 divides scholars. Some interpret "Michael did not bring a slanderous accusation against the devil," which is further applied to mean, "If the greatest of the good angels refused to speak evil of the greatest of the angels, surely no human being may speak evil of any angel" (Hillyer 1992:249. See also Moo 1996:245; Barclay 1960:221; Barnet 1957:334; Kelly 1969:264). Even if this interpretation sounds simple, it is odd because the contrast is not between Michael and the false teachers, using the catch word "slander." Therefore, the other suggestion that Michael did not dare to condemn the devil for slander, is more appropriate because the point here is that Michael invokes God's authority as the only one who could judge the slanderous devil (Watson 1998:489f; Bauckham 1983:60). This argument has further support from Jude's original source, as reconstructed above, where it is clear that "the devil slandered Moses." The point here is (1) the false teachers slander (as in v. 8) even the good angelic guardians of the Mosaic Law like the devil does towards Moses and (2) Michael appeals to the Lord's judgment which Jude also applies to the false teachers.

4.5.3.3 Michael in 1 Enoch as Understood in Jude

1 Enoch serves not only as "a highly elaborate paradigm for the development of intertestamental angelology" (Charles 1990a:172) but also maintains the prominence of Michael. In *1 Enoch* Michael appears 18 times as ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ μέγας. It is maintained that

texts in the course of the interpretation of a given text, a practice which Jude adopts in vv. 12-14, where there are allusions to Ezek 34:2; Prov 25:14; Isa 57:20; *1 En.* 80:6."

Michael achieved an incomparable stature in later Judaism so that among the seven (four) archangels, he is considered to be the chief and is said to have "(1) mediated the giving of the Torah (cf. Gal 3:19), (2) stood at the right hand of God's throne, (3) mediated prayers of the saints, (4) offered the souls of the righteous who died, and (5) accompanied them in to paradise" (Charles 1990a:172).[100]

Although it can be argued that both Danielic and Enochic traditions concerning Michael's angelic functions were taken up and expanded in apocalyptic literature, Jude has *1 Enoch* in mind for the role of Michael because Michael's role as the primary opponent of the devil and as an eschatological hero is more developed in *1 Enoch.* Even if Jude here quoted from *Testament of Moses*, it is mainly shaped by *1 Enoch*.[101] Thus Jude's quotation which includes one of Michael's roles, defending God's people from the devil, is not primarily to make an argument to his major theme; rather it comes from Jude's high regard for angelic beings and apocalyptic literature where *1 Enoch* is prominent. In other words, Michael's prominence among the angels, which Jude highly recognizes, and *1 Enoch's* prominence in Jude's scriptural usage, leads him to quote from *Testament of Moses* at a secondary level.

4.6 Conclusion

Central to the purpose of this chapter is the intention to show that Jude, besides being uniquely influenced by *1 Enoch*, uses *1 Enoch* as Scripture. In other words, *Jude* is not only permeated, and as a result shaped by *1 Enoch*, but also gives it scriptural authority in its usage.[102]

---

[100] See also Nicholl (2000:37) for a detailed discussion and a thorough textual referencing on Michael's prominence among the archangels in Jewish Christian thought. He describes Michael as the most important one, charged with the task of defending Israel and of interceding for it. Michael, as Nicholl writes, was often regarded as a military angel and as having a significant eschatological role, the primary opponent of Satan/Belial, whom he defeats at the end. "It is also likely that in Qumran Michael was the Angel of Light, the Prince of Light and the Angel of His Truth, who fought for the sons of light against the sons of darkness, who are led by the Angel of Darkness" (ibid:35).
[101] Michael's role as a primary opponent against Satan and mediator between God and man seems to reach its peak in the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*: *T. Dan* 6:2; *T. Levi* 5:5-6.
[102] Going one step further, Coryl D. Andersen (2003:48) argues that "Jude's belief in the inspiration and authority of the pseudepigraphical book of 1 Enoch played an influential role in the writing of the Epistle of Jude, in that it caused him to read 1 Enoch with an eschatological and christological hermeneutic."

Furthermore, all the evidence indicates that Jude uses *1 Enoch* as inspired Scripture which prophesied about his own time. However, this does not mean Jude gives or does not give "canonical" status to *1 Enoch*. Either would be misleading.[103] Such an assertion requires a re-examination of the difference between "inspired Scripture" and "canonical Scripture."[104] But these scarcely differ for Jude, if indeed Jude had a sharply defined concept of "canon" in today's western way of understanding of the term. Thus Jude uses *1 Enoch* as authoritative Scripture without necessarily considering its "canonical" status in the same way as it came to be understood in the later periods. In other words, what Jude does with *1 Enoch* is much the same for other works in the way that they variously treat "scriptural" traditions.

This status of *1 Enoch* in *Jude* is not unique to *Jude*. It is preceded by at least the Qumran Community and Enochic circle itself.[105] Jude is also followed by some apostolic fathers who regarded *1 Enoch* as scriptural. This leads us to a discussion in the ensuing chapter on the overview of *1 Enoch*'s status in a broader context of the Second Temple Judaism and Early Christian Periods until its disappearance in the West.

---

[103] For instance, Bauckham (1983:96) maintains that while "Jude regarded the prophecies in *1 Enoch* as inspired by God, it need not imply that he regarded the book as canonical scripture." Essentially Bauckham maintains the scriptural status of *1 Enoch* though his expression "canonical" is inadequate since that was not an issue in Jude's use of *1 Enoch*. However, in his later work, it seems that Bauckham has changed his position on this point. He writes (1990:231), "[p]recisely what kind of authority it had by comparison with the canon we cannot tell; nor need he have done." For a similar position see also Rowston 1974-75:557.

[104] For a discussion on such terminological confusion, and a stance of this study, see chapter 3 above.

[105] A closer look at the Dead Sea Scrolls will show the influence of Enoch and also several shifts away from Enoch at the same time. For a discussion on this see chapter 4 of Stuckenbruck's recent publication (2014).

CHAPTER FIVE

1 ENOCH'S ROLE AND STATUS IN JUDE AND OTHER EARLY JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

5.1 Introduction / Purpose of the Chapter

This is one of the central chapters of this thesis in which we will discuss the usage and scriptural position of *1 Enoch* in the early Jewish and Christian literature, especially in *Jude*, in line with the self-assertion of its authority. The popularity of *1 Enoch* both among some groups of Judaism and a wider Christian circle at its early period (in the latter case lasting for a significantly longer period of time), its significant influence on the NT and some other Second Temple Period literature, and paradoxically, the reasons for its decline and disappearance from both the Jewish circle and the global church, will be identified.

In a nutshell, this chapter presents the history of reception and transmission of *1 Enoch* with special emphasis on its influence on other literary works, particularly *Jude*, and various believing communities from its inception to its demise. This will enable us to see that the rise and decline of *1 Enoch* has been a gradual process in an extended period of time. More importantly, its rejection was a later development, only after it remains alive in various NT and other writings, which in turn would help us to understand its unique scriptural place.

The chapter begins with a discussion of the use and influence of *1 Enoch* among two religious communities—early Judaism and Christianity. The so-called Qumran community among the Jewish groups is an outstanding example both in its use of, and influence by, *1 Enoch*. This is followed by a discussion of the vast impact and usage of the book among early Christians and their literature.

Following the discussion on the popularity and usage of *1 Enoch*, its scriptural authority is addressed. This is done in two lines: (1) the book's self-assertion as authoritative Scripture is examined, and (2) its authoritative scriptural status as employed in *Jude* is discussed. Even if *1 Enoch* has been recognized as authoritative Scripture in various literary works, the focus of

this chapter is its assertion of authoritative status in the book of *Jude*, in line with the scope of the thesis.

The third part of the chapter engages with the reasons for the gradual decline and disappearance of the book from the scene. As it first exists and was produced by the Jews, the rejection begins with them; but only to be followed by the Christians, who favoured it for a longer period after its rejection by the Jews. The summary on several Church Fathers' attitude towards the book in about four centuries clarifies the long process of its demise.

Finally, the chapter discusses how the texts of the book have survived in various ancient biblical languages. Even if portions of the book have survived in fragmentary Aramaic and Greek texts, among a few others, it is only in Ge'ez that the book has survived in its entirety, where it enjoys "canonical" status in the EOTC "canon".

5.1 The Use and Influence of *1 Enoch* in the Early Jewish and Christian Literature

The influence and high regard of *1 Enoch* within early Jewish and Christian literature is an area of consensus within the field of study.[1] In this section the common usage of and influence on one of the Jewish religious groups, the Qumran community, and on early Christianity, including *Jude,* is discussed. The connections between Jews and Christians of the Enochic circles can be expressed by their mutual usage of the corpus and its influence on them (VanBeek 2000:93).

5.1.1 On Jews, Especially the Qumran Community

The influence and place of *1 Enoch* within early Judaism can be evaluated in at least two ways: influence on groups and influence on literature. Because of the wide circulation and use

---

[1] It is more than a decade since authoritative scholars on Enochic studies began to gather biennially under an umbrella group called "Enoch Seminar". The Seminar includes, in Charlesworth's (2005:436) words: "a group of scholars highly trained in second temple Judaism and Christian origins, and most experts on the books of Enoch (= 1 Enoch)." It is among such a circle of scholars that the influence of *1 Enoch* on early Judaism, including Christianity, is agreed upon.

of *1 Enoch*, it is maintained that a Jewish group at Qumran[2] not only "considered parts of *1 Enoch* to be authoritative" (VanBeek 2000:95), but also lifted them to scriptural status (Flint 1999:60).[3] The wider usage or circulation of *1 Enoch* among the community is evident in that, to some extent, they were shaped and influenced by it (VanderKam 1994:155f.).[4] It is further argued that "there is surely some continuity between the sect and the movement attested in *Enoch*" (Collins 1998:146). Nickelsburg qualifies the relationship between the community behind the corpus of Enoch and Qumran community as a kind of parent-child status. He summarizes the issue as follows:

> Although there is no evidence that any of the Enochic text was composed at Qumran, the fragments from Cave 1 and Cave 4 indicate that the Enochic texts were favorites to the community. … Furthermore, references to community formation in CD 1 and 1QS 8 parallel some of the details in the Apocalypse of Weeks and suggest that the Qumran Community was a latter-day derivation of or successor to the community or communities that authored and transmitted the Enochic texts (Nickelsburg 2001:65).

The high regard and influence of *1 Enoch* among the Qumran Community is also evident in comparison to their usage of Hebrew Scriptures.[5] In other words, *1 Enoch* is evinced as having an exceedingly exceptional authoritative nature among the Community given its wide circulation (evident from its significant amounts of copies) and it is among rare books translated into the vernacular, Greek. In this connection, Ulrich lists six verifying criteria indicative of the standards to which "canonical" Scriptures would have to adhere among the Qumran community, where *1 Enoch* and Jubilees have gained strong claims for such canonicity next, only, to the Torah and the Prophets (Ulrich 2010:116-117).[6]

---

[2] The identity of the Qumran community is quite debatable. However, the Essenes, as many would agree, are the most-likely other options, along with the Sadducees and Pharisees/zealots. For a discussion on the identity of the group see VanderKam 1999:487-533 and Fitzmyer 2000:249-60.

[3] Flint (1999:62-66) draws this conclusion after discussing a number of criteria which may determine a writing to be viewed as Scripture. These include, formal indications of scriptural status, claims of Divine authority and Davidic superscriptions, the appeal to prophecy, number of manuscripts used (which indicates the popularity), translation into Greek, and quotations, allusions and dependence of the community's work on the literature in question. *1 Enoch* is one of the prominent works which would fit these criteria.

[4] In the same line, Collins (2007:33) also argues that "there is no doubt that the Enochic writings helped shape the worldview of the sect."

[5] In connection to a superior place of *1 Enoch* among the Qumran Community, Harrington (2002:197) argues that this book "had much greater use and influence than any of the apocrypha or Old Testament Writings apart from Psalms."

[6] After examining the level of scriptural or "canonical" status of various corpuses, based on the criteria he set for canonicity of a work among the Qumran Community, Ulrich (2010:117) concludes that the Torah and the

Furthermore, the theology of the Qumran community, which is in clear similarity with that of *1 Enoch*, confirms that the Qumran community was influenced by the literature.[7] (1) The theology of angels and demons at Qumran maintains a clear connection to that of *1 Enoch*. Besides the angel story, reminiscent of Enochic literature, the four archangels, who are also called "angels of the presence," the impotence of human beings towards the power of evil, and as a result, a request towards angels for intercession, are some of the parallels. (2) Other themes such as end time, final judgment, the resurrection of the dead, and time of salvation, which are common to both the community and *1 Enoch*, suggest a shared eschatologically-oriented theology (Stegemann 1998:201-10).[8]

After the landmark discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and a comparatively large number of Enochic manuscripts, it is argued that the number of the fragments in itself can be evidence for "the authority the book enjoyed for a time in Jewish circles, at least amongst the groups that lie behind [them]" (Knibb 2009:19). However, this does not mean the book is purely a sectarian work as it has clearly enjoyed a wider status among other Jewish circles,[9] as this is evident from some Jewish literary works, to which we know turn.

The other influence of the Enochic tradition on the Jews can be measured by its influence on a substantial body of Jewish writings of the Second Temple Period. *1 Enoch* enjoyed authoritative status not only among some Jewish groups but also in some Jewish literature (VanBeek 2000:93). Nickelsburg (2001:71-81) discusses more than a dozen items of Jewish literature which are influenced, directly or indirectly, by *1 Enoch,* though to varied degrees.[10]

Prophets, including Psalms and Daniel, followed by *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, could be part of their "canon", while "Job and possibly Proverbs might qualify". The rest of the OT books might have been known but may or may not have been considered as part the Scriptures.

[7] Here, it has to be noted that the date of at least parts of *1 Enoch* is earlier than the rise of the community. For the discussion on the dates, see Stegemann 1998:142-162. Charlesworth (2005:446) also concludes that "the members of the Enochic Seminar agreed on the probable date of the earliest composition among the books of Enoch. … conceivably [they originated] as early as the end of the fourth century B.C.E."

[8] Nickelsburg (2001:78) proposes three major outcomes that affected the Qumran community as a result of Enochic literature influence: (a) "They informed and undergirded the community's high eschatological consciousness; (b) they informed and supported the community's dualistic cosmology; and (c) they were consonant with Qumranic claims to possess special revelation.

[9] For a similar position and his evidence, see Knibb 2009:19.

[10] These include: the wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira, Pseudo-Eupolemos, *The Book of Jubilees*, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, The Aramaic Levi Document, The Wisdom of Solomon, *2 Baruch, 2* and *3 Enoch*, Philo and Josephus. Of course, Nickelsburg (2001:71-81) discusses to what extent and in what regard, they are influenced.

In most of the literature, the watchers story, the prominent narration of *1 Enoch*, shows up several times, especially in Qumran literature.

Among the literature which indicates influence from and dependence on *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* is outstanding,[11] though with due attention and respect to the conventional Mosaic tradition.[12] It refers to the Book of the Luminaries, the Book of the Watchers, the Animal vision,[13] and the Apocalypse of Weeks, the four parts of *1 Enoch* whose fragments have been discovered at Qumran (VanderKam 1995:110-121; 2001:305:331). Themes such as the figure and call of Enoch, the solar calendar,[14] are some of the areas tied to the literature.[15] As with the *Book of Jubilees'* strong dependence on, or affirmation of the Enochic tradition, the Qumran Community, in turn, gave high regard to *Jubilees*.[16] It is believed that *Jubilees* was not only possibly "the earliest attestation of the Enoch traditions apart from the Enochic corpus itself"

Besides the Qumran literature, including *Jubilees* and *The Genesis Apocryphon*, VanBeek (2000:93-100) adds the *Testaments of Reuben* and *Naphtali* and *Targum pseudo–Jonathan* to his list.

[11] For a variant conclusion that both works belong to a common group and tradition rather than *Jubilees's* dependence on *Enoch*, see Ida Fröhlich 2005:147. According to this position, "[the] authors and readers of both Enochic collection and Jubilees may have belonged to the same religious group. Differences between the two works reflect the particular interests of their authors."

[12] The major "enigma of Jubilees", as Boccaccini (2009:xvi) calls it, is its synthesis or synchronization of both the Enochic tradition and the Mosaic tradition, arguably at the same level of dignity, authority, or inspiration. Boccaccini summarizes the various positions adopted by scholars of the field into four major categories, based on the papers presented on the Fourth Enoch Seminar, at Camaldoli, 8-12 July 2007. These include: (1) those who "claimed that Jubilees was a direct product of Enochic Judaism with some Mosaic influence – Mosaic features were simply subordinated to Enoch ideology. [2] … Jubilees was a conscious synthesis of Enochic and Mosaic tradition, yet remaining autonomous from both. [3] … Jubilees was essentially a Mosaic text with some Enochic influence – in the confrontation it was Moses who prevailed. [4] … [and those who] questioned the very existence of a gulf between Enochic and Mosaic traditions as competing forms of Judaism at the time of Jubilees."

[13] Jacques van Ruiten (2005:93), on the contrary, argues that the assertion by VanderKam that *Jubilees* is dependent almost on all exiting parts of *1 Enoch*, including the *Book of Dream Vision*, is not plausible as both *Jubilees* and the *Book of Dream Vision* might have used "a common tradition, which is probably to be found in the Book of the Watchers." However, VanderKam (2005:164) responds to Ruiten's arguments convincingly stating that it is impossible to "minimize the significance of the fact that Jubilees underscores that Enoch left written works behind," supporting his position with textual evidences.

[14] For instance, Uwe Glessmer (1999:233) maintains that *1 Enoch* is not only "the oldest source material for the 364-D[ay] C[alendar] T[radition], but also generally for Jewish texts with explicit calendrical contents."

[15] For a discussion on *Jubilee's* dependence on *1 Enoch*, see also Erik W. Larson 2005:84-89

[16] Besides the biblical tradition, according to Rietz, (2005:111) "*the most important* [italics mine] traditions inherited by the Qumran Community include 1 Enoch and Jubilees." As literary evidence, he further notes that, "[of] the documents found at Qumran but not composed there, excluding documents later collected into the Tanakh, Jubilees leads the list of extant copies with at least fifteen manuscripts" (ibid, n.2).

(Nickelsburg 2001:72), but also refers to the corpus "as authentic and authoritative divine revelations" (Jackson 2009:411).

Besides the *Book of Jubilees* and the Qumran Community literature, there is other evidence, though minor, that *1 Enoch* has been used or was known among other Jewish communities or their literature. Among those, the *Testament of Reuben* 5 takes up the watcher story.[17] The *Testament of Naphtali* 3.5-4.1,[18] in the same line, mentions the watchers story and clearly indicates that the writer of the Testament[19] has read the writings of Enoch. VanBeek (2000:100) further mentions that *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, a book possibly dated in the early 5th century, has clearly mentioned the story of the watchers from *1 Enoch*, which indicates the continued usage of the book among some circles of the Jews as late as the time of Augustine.

Two points, however, which should be clearly noted in regard to the connection between the Qumran community and *1 Enoch* are that (1) with all the high regard it received, it exists with many other authoritative Scriptures side by side in a pluralistic context; and (2) most probably, from the evidence we have to date, the community at Qumran does not seem to have had a list of books in the sense of a clearly defined body of authoritative Scriptures, or something like "a canon" in its modern concept. After persuasive discussion on this point, Schuller (2012:310) plausibly concluded that the "high theology" developed in the Dead Sea Scrolls, through various books, "could co-exist with considerable textual pluriformity and diversity. For whatever reason, there seems to have been no impetus to make lists, to count books, to define explicitly what is to be included and excluded." The authoritative status and its immense influence, later on, was taken up by Christians, who seemed to be significantly attracted to it and made use of it, until the time of Augustine, who openly denied the possibility of the angel story, the core story of *1 Enoch* (VanBeek 2000:111).

---

[17] Unlike *1 Enoch* and Jubilees, where the watchers are responsible for the sinful acts, Testament of Reuben shifts the responsibility to the women, who allured the watchers.
[18] VanBeek (2000:99) notes that the *Testament of Naphtali* is among those whose copies were discovered at Qumran.
[19] It should be noted that in recent studies many hold the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* to be Christian in their present form.

5.1.2 The Popularity and Influence of *1 Enoch* on the NT, Early Christians and Their Writings

The influence of *1 Enoch* on the NT writers, the Apostolic and Church Fathers, is clear. R. H. Charles (1912:xcv), at the beginning of the last century, wrote that "the influence of *1 Enoch* on the New Testament has been greater than all the other apocrypha put together." E. Isaac (1983:10) also strongly witnesses to this, and says the following:

> There is little doubt that 1 Enoch was influential in moulding New Testament doctrines concerning the nature of the messiah, the son of man, the messianic kingdom, demonology, the future, resurrection, final judgment, the whole eschatological theatre, and symbolism. No wonder, however, that the book was highly regarded by many of the earliest apostolic and Church Fathers.[20]

The status of Enochic literature among early Christians may be seen in two general periods or parts of literature:[21] (1) in the New Testament and early Christian writings, and (2) in the writings of the Church Fathers until the denial of the place it had achieved up until this time. Each of these can also be viewed in terms of two different types of references: (a) explicit allusions, including direct quotations, and (b) indirect allusions to the writings or the figure of Enoch (Adler 1978:271).[22]

1) The two major NT texts which quote from *1 Enoch* are Jude 14, 15 and 2 Pet 2:4. Adler (1978:271) maintains that Jude 14, 15 is one of the two "unambiguous parallels in the preserved books of Enoch."[23] VanBeek (2000:100f.) strongly argues that 2 Peter apparently alludes to *1 Enoch* 2:4 by using Jude 6. He also comments that several modern commentators agree that the author of 2 Peter has followed Jude 6 on this. However, Bauckham (1983:247)

---

[20] However, Richard Bauckham (1999:232f.) criticizes such (uplifting?). To him *1 Enoch* was not widely used at the outset of Christianity, rather, it became more popular amongst Christians only in the second century and after.
[21] James C. VanderKam (1996:33-101) discusses the influence and status of Enoch within early Christian writings at three different levels: the influence of (1) the literature, (2) the motifs, especially the angel story, and (3) the person of Enoch himself.
[22] For the discussion, besides the writings, on the place of the figure of Enoch in early Christian literature, see Adler 1978:273-75 and VanderKam 1996:88-100. Adler (1978:273) lists and discusses at least seven functions or characteristics of the Enochic figure: (a) Enoch's translation (b) Enoch's repentance, (c) Enoch's uncircumcision, (d) Enoch the priest, (e) Enoch the discoverer of astrology, (f) Enoch the scribe of righteousness, and (g) Enoch, the opponent of Antichrist.
[23] The other unambiguous text, according to Adler (1978:271), is Origen's quotation in De Principiis from *1 Enoch* 21:1. For Jude's quotation see the discussion in chapter four above.

proposes the contrary view that the author of 2 Peter was unfamiliar with the text of *1 Enoch*, in view of his contention that the echoes of *1 Enoch* in Jude 6 are lost in 2 Pet 2:4. Nevertheless, VanBeek (2000:101) rightly argues, "2 Peter puts the story of the flood for the destruction of the ancient world and the salvation of Noah directly after the story of the watchers." Moreover, the priority of Jude over 2 Peter is debatable, and if, in any case, 2 Peter is not dependent on Jude that strengthens the argument for 2 Peter independently alluding to the Book of the Watchers.[24]

Besides these two texts, there are a number of allusions to *1 Enoch* in the New Testament. VanBeek (2000:102f.) makes the reasonable argument that, apart from 2:4 the allusions in 2 Peter 1:19, 20, 21, 3:2 indicate the authoritative status of *1 Enoch*.[25] The other allusions are Rev 14:20 to *1 En* 100:3; Rom 8:38, Eph 1:21, Col 1:16, "angels.... principalities...powers," to *1 En* 61:10 "angels of power and ... angels of principalities," and 1 Pet 3:19-20 // *1 En* 19:1.[26] Therefore, it is rightly maintained that "*1 Enoch* played a very important role in New Testament times and deeply influenced some writings of the New Testament" (Dalton 1989:175).

From a theological point of view the influence of *1 Enoch*, among others, on the NT writers, especially those of the Gospels, is evident from their Christological terminology. Some of the usage and the concepts of the epithets "Son of Man", "Son of God", "the Anointed One", "the Chosen One", "the Messiah", and some others related to these, have been highly developed in *1 Enoch* (and some other Second Temple Period Literature). These have been adopted by Gospel writers in a way that suits their purpose suggesting, therefore, that the influence of *1 Enoch* in general and the *Book of Parables* in particular, on the concept and use of Christological terms on the Gospel writers is plausible.[27] In her conclusion, Lucass (2011:187)

---

[24] VanderKam (1996:63), in his part confirms 2 Peter's usage of *1 Enoch*. He writes, "There can be no doubt that the same Enochic section which underlies Jude 6 also inspired this passage although, unlike Jude (one of his sources), the writer never names Enoch as the authority on which his words rest."

[25] VanBeek's (2000:102f.) major point of argument is 2 Peter's usage of the phrase τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον (the prophetic word) in 1:19.

[26] For a strong argument for the prominence of the figure of Enoch among the early Christians, as preserved in Rev. 11, see VanderKam 1996:89-100.

[27] For an extended discussion of such a development from *1 Enoch* (and some other Jewish writings) to the NT writers, and the continuity and innovative usage by the NT writers, see Shirley Lucass 2011:144-187.

rightly writes that "the writers [of the New Testament] sought to portray Jesus as Messiah in the terms they did, and in many instances these were terms which, for them, were derived directly from the Hebrew Scriptures[28] themselves. Therefore, the type of Messiah portrayed in the New Testament, for them, is rooted in antecedent Jewish tradition."

2) The popularity of *1 Enoch* among the Apostolic and Church Fathers, more than in the New Testament, is evident from the many allusions, references, and even direct quotations to *1 Enoch*.[29] Common parallels can be attested in (a) Barnabas 4:3 // *1 En* 89:61-64; 90:17 and Barnabas 16:5 // *1 En* 89:45-77; (b) Justin Martyr's *2 Apologia* 5 // *1 Enoch*'s account of the angels, (c) Clement of Alexandria's *Stromata* 5.1.10,2 // *1 Enoch*'s angelic account. Moreover, among the Church Fathers, Tertullian, Origen, Athenagoras, Irenaeus, Cyprian, and Tatian all figure prominently in their use of *1 Enoch*, particularly with regard to the angel story. The angel story is also widely used in Gnostic circles in relation to evil and its origin.[30]

Besides direct Christian witnesses, there are writings described as Jewish literature but which are believed to have originated, and been preserved, among Christians, also directly influenced by or dependent on *1 Enoch*. For instance, the two other books named after Enoch, *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*[31] and *3 (Jewish) Enoch*,[32] are of this category. These two books named

---

[28] Here, Lucass (2011) is referring to the Second Temple Jewish Literature in her discussion as she has made extensive comparison between the texts of the NT and the text of *1 Enoch* as well as some other biblical and pseudepigraphical works (especially in chapter 7, pp.144-157).

[29] VanBeek, (2000:106) boldly writes, "several of the Apostolic and Church Fathers saw *1 Enoch* as authoritative."

[30] All of these, and even some more literature, and their usage and dependence on *1 Enoch*, are thoroughly discussed in VanderKam 1996:36-88. See also Adler 1978:271- 273 and VanBeek 2000:106-111.

[31] *2 Enoch* or *Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch* is another apocalyptic writing of the Second Temple Period named after the influential antediluvian figure. Whether it has a Jewish or Christian origin is still contested even if its Jewish origin is gaining more ground. Besides the name of Enoch, the theme of the book, where the figure of Enoch is at its centre and his ascent to the celestial bodies are clearly in line with that of *1 Enoch*. However, it is argued that *2 Enoch* does not depict Enoch "simply as a human taken to heaven and transformed into an angel, but as a celestial being exalted above the angelic world. In this attempt, one may find the origins of another image of Enoch, very different from the early Enochic literature, which was developed much later in rabbinic Merkabah and Hekhalot mysticism–the image of the supreme angel Metatron, 'the Prince of the Presence.' The titles of the patriarch found in 2 Enoch appear to be different from those attested in early Enochic writings and demonstrate a close resemblance to the titles of Metatron as they appear in some Hekhalot sources" (Orlov:2014). For a detailed discussion on *2 Enoch*, see Orlov 2014; idem 2010:587-590; for an English translation and its introduction see Andersen 1983:91-221.

[32] *3 Enoch*, also named as "The Third Book of Enoch", "The Book of the Palaces", "The Book of Rabbi Ishmael the High Priest", and "The Revelation of Metatron", is the latest among the three apocalyptic books named after Enoch. Based on the names mentioned in the book and its contents, it is debatable whether the book should be

after Enoch do not only follow the traditions preserved and entertained in *1 Enoch*, rather they further develop the tradition to another stage of religious practices and understandings related to subsequent times after the Second Temple Period.

5.2 Scriptural/Authoritative Status of *1 Enoch*

Central to the purpose of this chapter is the intention to show that Jude, besides being uniquely influenced by *1 Enoch*, uses *1 Enoch* as Scripture. In other words, Jude is not only permeated, and as a result shaped, by *1 Enoch* but also gives it scriptural authority in its usage of *1 Enoch*. This status of *1 Enoch* in Jude is not unique to Jude. It is preceded by at least the Qumran Community and the Enochic circle itself. Jude is also followed by some apostolic fathers who regarded *1 Enoch* as scriptural. The discussion which follows is therefore chronological.

5.2.1 *1 Enoch*'s Self-assertion as Scripture

Enoch's scriptural status arises from the book itself. Nickelsburg (1995:333) argues that "the editor(s) of *1 Enoch* presented their apocalyptic corpus as itself being Scripture—revealed, authoritative, and life-giving in its function." He discerns Enoch's self-assertion as Scripture in two major ways: in the way it uses or considers other scriptural material and the internal evidence of how the Enochic corpus identifies itself.

First, Nickelsburg (1995:334-37) assumes that the Jewish authors of *1 Enoch* knew much of the Hebrew Bible and observes three ways in which they understood their relationship to the Scriptures. (1) *1 Enoch* never *explicitly* refers to any source of the Hebrew Bible; rather biblical tradition is woven into its own wording, phrasing and motifs.[33] (2) The Enochic authors made broad and varied use of the material in the Scriptures, employing a variety of

---

categorized under the ongoing Enochic tradition or the Hekalot/Merkaban lore. However, besides the themes running through *3 Enoch*, such as the ascension of Enoch into Heaven and his transformation into the angel Metatron, (similar to themes in *2 Enoch*,) points such as Enoch's exaltation as an angel and his enthronement in Heaven (10:1-3; 16:1), Enoch's reception of a revelation of cosmological secrets of creation (13:1-2), the story about precious metals and how they will not avail their users and those that make idols from them (5:7-14), A hostile angel named Azaz'el/Aza'el and two others like him are mentioned (4:6; 5:9) ("*3 Enoch*" 2014) are all indicators that the writer(s) of *3 Enoch* has a knowledge of or influenced by *1 Enoch*. For an English translation and introduction of *3 Enoch* see Alexander 1983.

[33] For a detailed discussion of the various parts of the HB as understood by Enochic authors see Nickelsburg 1995:334-337.

techniques, interpreting the tradition "toward a common end: moral exhortation governed by an eschatological perspective" (Nickelsburg 1995:334; see also pp 337-342 for a discussion on particular texts). (3) Because of Enoch's gradual development which embodies traditions over three centuries, it is not always clear whether a particular Enochic text is dependent on a biblical text or a parallel form of a tradition, and whether an Enochic author considers his source to be Scripture. Therefore, Nickelsburg (1995:342) concludes:

> The lack of any explicit appeal to Scriptural authority is counterpoised with the claim that the Enochic books are the deposit of a revelation given long before the birth of the Bible's first author, Moses, and intended for earth's last generation. This diminution of the authority of the Tanakh and celebration of Enochic authority are linked to the function of the Enochic corpus: it is revealed scripture intended to constitute the eschatological community of the chosen who will endure the final Judgment and receive the blessings of eternal life.

Second, Nickelsburg (1995:344) asserts a number of points suggesting that *1 Enoch* considers itself as Scripture. (1) The generic form of *1 Enoch* took the form of a testament ascribed to Enoch, namely that "the corpus ends with a self-conscious reference to itself as the embodiment of heavenly wisdom, gotten by Enoch and revealed to the eschatological community of the righteous as Enoch's testimony." (2) There is an explicit, central and repeated claim in *1 Enoch* to be a revelation from God.[34] (3) The Enochic corpus claims Enoch's revelation is the embodiment of the heavenly wisdom that has the power to give life.[35] (4) Enoch's authority supersedes that of the Torah, for the Enochic authors, because they believed the ancient seer and sage received revelation not found in the Tanakh. For them Enoch "had foreseen their time, its problems, and its critical place at the end of history and he received a pointed and explicit message of judgment and salvation that was directed to the people of the last generation" (Nickelsburg 1977:347), Thus, the corpus and its message were presented by its compilers, and accepted by some others as well, as authoritative revelation.

---

[34] This is especially true in chs 92-105 where "the author claims to be imparting divine revelation" in a way similar to prophetic corpus (Nickelsburg 1977:326).
[35] Here, the relationship is with the notion of wisdom in the book of Sirach where heavenly wisdom has become resident in the Mosaic Law. See Nickelsburg 1977:345

Moreover, its self-conscious references to its written character justifies describing it as Scripture at least in these contexts.[36]

5.2.2 *1 Enoch*'s Scriptural Status: the case in *Jude*

The discussion of *Jude*'s use of *1 Enoch* so far clearly shows that Jude uses *1 Enoch* not only as authoritative, but also as scriptural.[37] Whether Jude includes *1 Enoch* in the "canon" of the Scriptures is an irrelevant question to ask since that was not a question *Jude* would have asked. It is, therefore, anachronistic for us to be asking the same question because Jude predates the close of the Hebrew Bible and the Western preoccupation with reliance on a fixed body of books as the *canon* rather than on a set of basic principles (which enable the church to interpret this conglomerate of differing texts). However, scholars differ on the status *Jude* gives to *1Enoch*. The discussion here, therefore, focuses on the different positions taken by modern scholars and some external evidence relevant to the question.[38]

First, those who reject the authoritative status of *1 Enoch* in Jude point to at least two reasons for their rejection: (1) The Old Testament "Canon" is already "closed" in the first century in which *1 Enoch* is not included (Moo 1996:273).[39] However, this position is not only questioned[40] but also rejected by many who maintain that the canon was "unclosed".[41] Some of

---

[36] Nickelsburg (1977:346) notes that the fact that *1 Enoch* was not accepted as part of the Jewish canon of the Rabbis should not pre-empt the question of its status as canonical Scripture in some circles. Clearly the text itself claims to be definitive revelation constituting the eschatological community, to whom, the text was Scripture.

[37] For a discussion on what constitutes "(the) Scripture(s)" and the take of this study, see above, chapter three. In thesis, the word "Scripture/scriptural" is employed to designate early Jewish and Christian writings, which are authoritative and inspired, but not necessarily "canonical". To be more specific, this study assumes that for Jude, *1 Enoch* is among the inspired Scripture as this concept is understood in the NT (2 Tim 3:16).

[38] Part of the disagreement on *1 Enoch's* status in *Jude* among scholars arises from the extent to which they give attention to Jude's use of *1 Enoch*. Some simply base their arguments on only the quotation in *Jude* 14-15 whereas others make theirs based on a thorough discussion of various ways (as discussed in this chapter) that *Jude*'s embodiment of *1 Enoch* is evident.

[39] Moo (1996:273) further notes "*1 Enoch* has never been given official canonical status by *any* (his emphasis) religious body," an argument some others could also hold. But this is total ignorance of the fact that *1 Enoch* enjoyed a canonical status in the EOTC from its introduction at an early period to date. This will be discussed in the following chapter.

[40] McDonald and Sanders (2002:5) warn that caution is required in discerning what ancient writers concluded about the divine status of earlier literature that they cited. They further questioned "perhaps the notion of an *unclosed* biblical canon is present even though the ancient writers did not yet have a term available to identify it."

[41] For instance, Smith, Jr. (1972:4) argues that because the OT canon was not yet closed by the Jews at the time when many NT books were being written and some fluidity in Christian usage even after the "canon" was closed, it is incorrect that NT writers have a closed canon. McDonald and Sanders (2005:5) further comment that, "more

131

the evidence for the openness of the OT canon at Jude's time is found in (a) the usage of extracanonical literature by the Qumran community, NT authors and early Church Fathers, without making clear distinction between "canonical" and "non-canonical" Scriptures; (b) the difference of opinions among early Fathers on the extent of the OT "canon"; (c) the divergence in LXX codices and (d) the fact that after AD 70, Judaism and Christianity went their separate ways and thus established the bounds of the "canon" relatively independently of one another (Dunbar 1986:309).

(2) The other reason for the rejection of scriptural authority of *1 Enoch* in *Jude* is that he does not use γραφή, the standard formula of scriptural quotation, when he quotes *1 Enoch* (Ladd 1993:656; Moo 1996:273). However, the NT writers used other formulae to refer to the Scriptures, which includes προεφητεύω and λέγω.[42] Moreover, some books of the early church explicitly quote *1 Enoch*, following Jude, using the formula γραφή.[43]

Secondly, the reasons for accepting *1 Enoch*'s authoritative and scriptural status in *Jude* are several (see also Gunther 1984:550). (1) NT authors and Apostolic Fathers who quote from Jewish "pseudepigrapha" do not differentiate between "apocryphal" and "recognized" books of the OT (Adler 2002:213).[44] However, Bauckham (1990:227f.) contends that such treatments by the Fathers, whose existence he admits, are very rare. (2) This entails that the precise boundaries of the "canon" of the Early Church were not yet fixed (Evans 2002:185).[45] On the other hand, Bauckham (1990:231) argues that at the time of NT there was a fairly stabilized "canon" alongside the other books which were given a subordinate status and any of which "might occasionally be quoted as inspired writings by a writer who recognized it as

---

recently, one [Jewish] scholar, [Jacob Neusner,] has questioned whether the rabbinic sages of late antiquity ever discussed the issue of a closed canon." See also the discussion above, chapter three, on "canon."

[42] See the above exegesis in chapter 4 for a more detailed discussion on the contention of Jude's citation as a formula for Scripture. See also VanBeek 2000:104, for more evidences for other introductory formulae for inspired writing in the NT.

[43] For instance, the *Epistle of Barnabas* uses the formula in citing from the B*ook of Enoch*: "Enoch says", "as it is written," and "Scripture says", (4:3; 16:5), which suggests that *Enoch* continued to retain the same esteem extended to it by the epistle of Jude (Adler 2002:213).

[44] Note that Adler (2002:213) is careful in not using the term "canonical," rather he prefers the more general term "recognized," probably thinking that "canonical" could be anachronistic.

[45] Evans (2002:185) further notes that because of the lack of such a boundary it would be impossible to determine the canon of the Scriptures for anyone in the first century AD.

such … or who knew that within the limited circle for which he was writing it was generally valued". This hypothesis Bauckham applies to the case of *1 Enoch* in *Jude*. (3) The way *Jude* introduces his quotation from *1 Enoch* shows that *Jude* considered *1 Enoch* to be scriptural (VanderKam 1996:34-36).[46] (4) In addition to the formula, "Jude's hermeneutic included the principle that inspired Scripture speaks of the last days in which the interpreter is living," as is evident "in the use of the text of *1 Enoch* 1:9" directed against the false teachers of Jude's day (Dunnett 1988:289). (5) *1 Enoch* was considered as Scripture or inspired by the early church and apostolic fathers. It is maintained that "at the time when Barnabas wrote, *Enoch* was held to be an inspired book; it retains this reputation more or less throughout the second century" (Bigg 1902:309).[47] (6) Some Church Fathers held *1 Enoch* as inspired Scripture not only because of the book itself, but, more importantly because Jude considered it to be Scripture.[48]

In conclusion, all the evidence indicates that Jude uses *1 Enoch* as inspired Scripture which prophesied about his own time. However, this does not mean Jude gives or does not give "canonical" status to *1 Enoch*. Either option would be misleading.[49] Such an assertion requires a re-examination of the difference between inspired Scripture and canonical Scripture. But these scarcely differ for Jude, if indeed Jude had a sharply defined concept of "canon". Thus Jude uses *1 Enoch* as authoritative Scripture without necessarily considering its "canonical" status in the same way as it came to be understood in the later periods.[50]

---

[46] VanderKam (1996:34-36) argues that not only the prophecy of Enoch, but also the content of *Enoch* which Jude used and accepted, entails scriptural authority of *Enoch*.

[47] This is also evident in their usage of *1 Enoch*. See VanBeek 2000:106-111; VanderKam 1996:36-60, and Nickelsburg 2001:67-95 for a detailed discussion on the usage of *1 Enoch* by Early Church Fathers.

[48] Tertullian used *1 Enoch* in this sense as maintained by VanBeek 2000:110.

[49] For instance, Bauckham (1983:96) maintains that while "Jude regarded the prophecies in *1 Enoch* as inspired by God, it need not imply that he regarded the book as canonical scripture." Essentially Bauckham maintains the scriptural status of *1 Enoch* though his expression "canonical" is inadequate since that was not an issue in Jude's use of *1 Enoch*. However, in his later work, it seems that Bauckham (1990:231) has changed his position on this point. He writes, "[p]recisely what kind of authority it had by comparison with the canon we cannot tell; nor need he have done." For a similar position see also Rowston 1974-75:557.

[50] This applies, in fact, to other New Testament authors as well.

5.3 The Reasons for Decline and Disappearance of *1 Enoch* from the Scene

Until it was brought back by James Bruce from Ethiopia into the West in 1773, *1 Enoch* had largely disappeared from both Jewish and Christian communities,[51] except the Ethiopian church, which preserved the book in its entirety. It is very strange and difficult to explain why *1 Enoch*, a book with such a widespread usage, scriptural authority, and high regard among some of the early Jewish communities and the early Christians, has not become part of both the Hebrew and Christian canon, in its later development, with the single exception of the Ethiopian Church. As in the case of many other sacred writings, the rejection[52] of Enochic writings from both Jewish and Christian communities was gradual and associated with several reasons in connection to the specific agenda of each period.

There are some commonalities and major differences as to the reasons which gradually led to the rejection of this work among the two religious groups, the Jews and the Christians, among whom it used to enjoy high regard and scriptural authority. Naturally, the book was first rejected by the Jews at the emerging period of Christianity, while it took much longer for the Christians to finally reject the work after having considered it as authoritative. As these developments follow two different lines, it is appropriate to discuss the demise of *1 Enoch* among the two faith communities independently.

5.3.1 From the Jewish Circle

Several factors have been proposed as to why *1 Enoch* was rejected or excluded by Jews, which resulted in its absence in the Hebrew canon. The first main reason could be its association with and strong influence on the then Jewish "sectarian groups". This may have resulted in reluctance towards the book and then finally detachment of what became the

---

[51] Boccaccini, in his lecture at the fifth Enoch Graduate Seminar, held in May 2014 in Montreal, strongly contends that the Book of Enoch has never disappeared from the memories of the West even if its text has been lost for centuries where the West had been searching and longing to it until it was finally found in the eighteenth century.

[52] Here, "rejection" implies a deliberate relegation of the book to the margins from the level of authority it used to have as Scripture, which in turn leads to its final exclusion altogether from recognized Scriptures, which is somehow stronger stance than non-inclusion. It is in this sense that the word "rejection/rejected" is used in the present chapter or elsewhere in the thesis in regard to *1 Enoch*'s status among the Jews or Christians.

mainline group after the destruction of the temple from its teaching and authority, which may naturally have ended up with its rejection or exclusion. Nickelsburg (2001:82), for instance, concludes:

> The exclusion of the Enochic works from the canon of the Hebrew Bible was probably due to complex factors in the sociology and religious thought and practice of late Second Temple Judaism. Among these would have been the rabbis' dissociation from the apocalyptic circles that created and cherished these works and, with the exception of the undisputed Daniel, their disinclination toward apocalyptic speculation and the authority that undergird it.

In other words, *1 Enoch* has never been accepted by the Judaism of the Priestly groups around the temple, at the same level of authority it enjoyed among the sectarian groups, rather, it has been targeting against Priestly Judaism at the centre of the temple. At the outset of the first century AD, the dominant Jewish group was that at the centre of the Temple. So, it would not be surprising if the book would be rejected later on by rabbinical Judaism in the absence of its promoters, a Jewish sect at the Qumran.

Another reason, somehow associated with the first one, could be its marginal theological stance in relation to the Torah. As indicated elsewhere in this study, *1 Enoch* develops its own authoritative scriptural status without any appeal to the Torah, a self-assertion based on independent authority. When the Torah-observant stream of Judaism claimed orthodoxy and authority, the fate of the Enochic corpus and its bearers, against such a dominant force, would have been simply a phasing out as heresy.

Paolo Sacchi, for instance, proposes that both Enochic literature and the Qumranites were rejected among the Jews in the early period because of their incorrect theological teachings. In his own words, "Qumran and Enochism were already rejected by the theologically and politically correct movements. Qumran was condemned because of its predeterminism (see R. Aqiba); Enochism was condemned because of its belief in the existence of 'two powers in heaven' or because of its lack of belief in Moses' torah" (Sacchi 2005:407).

Finally, not only as part of *1 Enoch*, but also as its central component and popularity it received, the shift in the interpretation of the angel story became another reason for the rejection of the entire book. As Bauckham (1985:316) correctly argues, "the story of the fall

of the Watchers remained popular in Judaism,[53] as the standard interpretation of Gen. 6:1-4,15 until the second century A.D., when it was superseded by the view that the 'sons of God' (Gen. 6:2,4) were men, not angels." (On this see especially P. S. Alexander, 1972:60-71.) Therefore, the rejection of *1 Enoch* can been seen as a two stage development—first by the Jerusalem priesthood establishment before 70 AD and secondly by the post-70 AD rabbinical leadership: each for their own reasons.

In summary, one may identify three major categorical differences of *1 Enoch* from the Hebrew Bible, which would be the major reasons for the rejection of the book by the mainstream Jews, pre- and post-70 AD. First and foremost, in its pro-70 AD context, the book has been associated with the sectarian groups. Such would have been a rival group, rejecting the traditional Jewish[54] stream around the Temple and claiming their own way as being orthodox. When the rivalry ended with the dominance of one group of Judaism or rabbinical Judaism in its post-70 AD form, the fate of the prominent books among the sectarian group would have been rejection and nothing more. Second, the content and structure of the book apparently competes with the Torah, which had the upper hand as far as those who had the power to determine the boundaries of the Hebrew Bible were concerned. Finally, the interpretation of the prominent story of the book, the story of the fallen angels, was shifted to a new dimension where it only reflects the Book of Genesis, part of the Torah. That is, the interpretation of the "sons of God" in the Genesis account was shifted from the fallen angels to men, in a way that discredits the place of *1 Enoch* among the Jews. However, this does not mean that these are the only factors which contributed to the gradual demise of the Enochic corpus among the Jews.[55] If not in the same way, these factors partially contributed to the neglect of the writings around the Christian Church, to which we now turn.

---

[53] Bauckham (1985:316) notes the texts on such popularity, which are: *1 En* 86:1-88:3; 106; Jub. 4:15, 22; 5:1; Sir 16:7; Wis 14:6; 4Q180 1:7-8; 1QApGen 2:1; CD 2:17-19; T. Reu 5:6-7; T. Nap 3:5; 2 Bar 56:10-14; 2 En 18:3-8; 7:3; Targum Pseudo-Jonathan Gen. 6:1; Philo, Gig. 6.

[54] Pharisaic Judaism could be more traditional than the Qumranite or Enochic Judaism as it remains around the Temple. In addition, it is this group of Jewish sects which later on continued to be a dominant traditional Judaism as rabbinical Judaism.

[55] For instance, Mahn (2008:92-93) singled out three major reasons for the rejection of the *Book of Watchers*, if not *1 Enoch* in its entirety, from the Hebrew Bible. In his MA thesis, devoted to this topic, he cites in the main, theological reasons (holding contradictory teaching from the Hebrew Bible), structural reasons (an attempt to replace the Torah), and geo-political reasons (that the Hasmonean rulership was against any Hellenistic ideology,

5.3.2. From the Christian Church in the West and East

In spite of all evidence that *1 Enoch* maintains an authoritative scriptural status among a wider provenance of the Church, questions, reluctance, criticism, and condemnation around the book began as early as the second century AD (Bigg 1902:309). Subsequently, *1 Enoch* fades out from wider Christendom gradually. Several reasons have been defended for the rejection of the book among the Christian circle. Bigg (1902:309) argues that the main motive to condemn *1 Enoch* "was its attribution of carnal lust to heavenly beings." In the same line, VanBeek (2000:111) concludes that the main reason for the suppression or condemnation of *1 Enoch* by the Church Fathers is its use of explicit terms regarding the actions of the angels in Genesis 6.1-4.

In spite of their wider usage, there was also reluctance and scepticism among some Church Fathers,[56] and a few who questioned the authority of *1 Enoch*,[57] where it was Augustine who explicitly rejected the authority of *1 Enoch* among Christians. Adler summarizes both the position and the reason for Augustine's rejection of the book:

> Augustine suggests that some things contained in these writings [the Books of Enoch] were written by Enoch himself. This is so, he says, by virtue of the fact that Jude quotes from Enoch. But Augustine rejects the writings of Enoch as a whole, arguing that they were not transmitted properly through successive generations. Specifically, he rejects the idea of the angelic origin of the giants of Gen 6:4, and proposes that the "sons of God" of Gen 6 were Sethites, not angels (Adler 1978:272).

5.3.2.1 Summary of the position of Leading Church Fathers

Following an authoritative quotation of *1 Enoch* in Jude, the gradual decline and final rejection of *1 Enoch* in the Christian Church can be overviewed by giving a brief summary of

---

apparently enshrined in Enoch). Even if there are some truths in his conclusions, some of his arguments are inadequate on the basis that they lack objective evidence and, as a result, appear at some points to be far-fetched.
[56] Tertullian is one of the examples of such reluctant. See VanBeek 2000:109-111, and Adler 1978:272, for the discussion.
[57] Origen, whose position was unstable, may be classified here (Adler 1978:272). Bigg, for instance, discusses how difficult it was for Origen to take a clear stance on *1 Enoch*'s authoritative status. He writes, "Origen doubted the inspiration of the book, but does not absolutely reject it; he was attracted towards it by its promise of mysteries, but he believed that the angels fell through pride" (Bigg 1902:309).

the position of some of the leading Church Fathers from the second to the early fifth centuries AD.

(1) The author of the *Epistle of Barnabas* (ca. 135-38 AD), at least twice refers to *1 Enoch* as authoritative Scripture. These include, *Barn.* 16:5 where he uses the formula λέγει γὰρ ἡ γταφή, "For Scripture says" and at 16:6, the use of another formula, γέγραπται γάρ, "For it is written", referring to a text from *1 Enoch*, where the community of this writer has high regard for the book. Probably, the provenance of the *Epistle of Barnabas* would be Egypt (Nickelsburg 2001:87), where the authoritative status of *1 Enoch* has been more prominent in the Eastern Church than the Western, even from the early stage.

(2) **Justin Martyr** (Rome) and **Athenagoras** (Athens), from the Latin West and the Greek East respectively and the second century AD, used the Watchers story in *1 Enoch* in defense of their theology of ascribing the origins of sin to the watchers,[58] which might have paved the way for one of the main areas of contention in the book's final rejection.

(3) **Irenaeus** from Asia Minor, contemporary with the above two, refers to the "illicit unions" of the angels,[59] but differs from them by not explicitly ascribing the origin of sin to such unions. He further refers to *1 Enoch* in his opposition to a list of teachings, including "roots, herbs, dyeing, cosmetics, sorcery, and hate-production potions" (Nickelsburg 2001:88). However, it is unclear to what extent these explanations or contents would have contributed to or been reasons for *Enoch*'s rejection.

(4) It is in the works of **Tertullian** of Carthage that one can clearly see the authority of *1 Enoch* being questioned.[60] Tertullian, from the early third century AD, strongly defended the scriptural authority of *1 Enoch* by referring to it as "the writing of Enoch" (*scriptura Enoch*) and claiming the "canonical" authority of Jude's quotation.[61] Rather, most important for our

---

[58] For a detailed discussion on Justin's and Athenagoras's usage of *1 Enoch*, see Nickelsburg 2001:87f.
[59] As Reed (2005:152) noted, Irenaeus further describes the Enochic myth of angelic descent as "among the revelations that the Holy Spirit 'proclaimed through the prophets'." It is this kind of bold statement which contributed to the rejection of the book by subsequent Church Fathers.
[60] Nickelsburg (2001:89) considers Tertullian as someone with greatest knowledge of *1 Enoch* among the early church Fathers. He writes, "More than any other early church theologian, Tertullian of Carthage indicates knowledge of 1 Enoch and defends its authenticity and inspiration."
[61] As Reed (2005:152) notes, Enoch is "the oldest prophet" (*Idol*, 15.6).

discussion here is Tertullian's attempt to defend the authority of the book where he acknowledges that some doubt its authority because it is not in the Jewish canon, a position which clearly sheds light on the reasons for *1 Enoch*'s rejection in the third century AD.[62] Tertullian, in his *De Cultum Feminarum*, (1.2.1) says, "I am aware that the Scripture of Enoch, which has assigned this order (of action) to angels, is not received by some, because it is not admitted into the Jewish canon either."[63] Nickelsburg (2001:89) notes that "Like Jude, [Tertullian] considers Enoch to have been a prophet and the author of this text."

(5) At the beginning of the third century AD, **Clement of Alexandria** made significant use of *1 Enoch* in his defense of various Church teachings. To this end, and with reference to *1 Enoch*, he maintained that the watchers had taught human beings various evils, including astronomy, prognostication, and other arts. It could also be that some of his writings, given their Gnostic connection,[64] may have sparked doubts in the later debate of *1 Enoch*.

(6) An immediate successor of Clement in Alexandria, **Origen**, is one of the key figures in understanding the oscillating position towards *1 Enoch* in third century AD in eastern Christianity. Nickelsburg (2001:90) summarizes Origen's position towards *1 Enoch* in three points: (1) Origen considers the writings "to be the authentic products of the patriarch and [(2)] he cites them as Scripture; [(3)] however, he also indicates that others in the church [did] not hold this position." Origen explicitly refers to *1 Enoch* five times, from about 220 to 250 AD, where it is clear that his high regard for the book diminishes gradually, as is evident from his usage of the text. From boldly quoting from the book as authoritative Scripture in the outset to reducing it ultimately to a questionable book in the church,[65] indicating that the book is not accepted by the church universally, summarizes his position. Origen's ambivalence

---

[62] Another Carthagian, Cyprian, probably followed exactly the same position of his predecessor, Tertullian, on the debate of *1 Enoch*. Nickelsburg (2001:89f.) discusses that there are some treatises falsely ascribed to Cyprian, which refer to *1 Enoch* as Scripture, using an introductory formula "as it is written".

[63] Note that Martin Hengel (1992:81), in his translation of *... non recipi a quibusdam, quia nec in armarium Iudaicum admittitur,* deliberately avoids the word "canon" and translates as "…because it is not received into the Jewish Torah shrine."

[64] If not all of his writings, some of Clement's writings have some gnostic connections. For instance, "Clement's *Eclogae propheticae* (ca. 200 C.E.) is a collection of excerpts from gnostic writings with brief commentary in which it is not always possible to separate the excerpts from Clement's commentary" (Nickelsburg 2001:90).

[65] For a detailed discussion on all of Origen's references to *1 Enoch* and their implication, see Nickelsburg 2001:90-92.

towards the book of *1 Enoch* can be drawn from his conflicting witness to it. On the one hand, he refers to the book as authoritative to make his arguments while on the other, he belittles its authority when it does not fit his arguments. At any event, his explicit reasons for diminishing the status of *1 Enoch* are that (1) it is not considered to be authoritative by the Jews and (2) its lack of universality within the Christian Church.

(7) Origen's contemporary, **Julius Africanus**, used *1 Enoch* for chronographic writings where he preferred to interpret "sons of God", referring to the sons of Seth and the daughters of Cain, instead of "angels of heavens", which seems to correspond to the "watchers, the sons of heaven" (Nickelsburg 2001:92). This is a strong indication of a shift in the interpretation of the "sons of God" from the watchers to Sethites, which would later on became one of the main reasons for the rejection of *1 Enoch* in the church at large.

(8) Unlike the other prominent Alexandrians, by the mid-fourth century AD, **Athanasius** had become so clear in his mind to the extent that he never hesitated to label the Enochic corpus with other "non-canonical" books, named after Moses and Isaiah, as "apocryphal". As he argued that these works came from the hands of "heretics" and strongly rejected them in his canonization process. In his thirty-nine *Festal Letters* of 367 AD he declares that the "heretics . . . write these books whenever they want and then grant and bestow upon them dates, so that, by publishing them as if they were ancient, they might have a pretext for deceiving the simple folk" (Athanasius, as quoted by Reed 2005:200). In other words, Athanasius rejected *1 Enoch* as "apocryphal" on the grounds that the book, with other "pseudepigraphical" works, was originated by "heretics". The two major challenges to Origen's position are (1) the popularity of the book among common people and (2) Jude's quotation of *1 Enoch*, Athanasius having included Jude in his canonical list. In regard to the first challenge, Athanasius poses the question "Who has made the simple folk believe that those books belong to Enoch even though no scriptures existed before Moses?" (Athanasius, as quoted by Reed 2005:200) where, in reply, he stipulates that this is simply the *modus operandi* of the "heretics"—they deceive the unlearned. However, in regard to the second challenge Athanasius is silent, as he fails to address the issue of Jude's quotation of Enoch's prophecy (Reed 2005:201).

(9) At the outset of the fifth century, **Jerome** comes out boldly rejecting *1 Enoch* as apocryphal. Jerome makes explicit reference to *1 Enoch* on three occasions, this in connection

with Jude's quotation from an apocryphal book. Nickelsburg (2001:94) argues that the two main reasons for Jerome's strong rejection of *1 Enoch* are (1) his assertion of the book as heretical, especially in its angel story, and (2) its association with "heretical" groups, namely Manicheans, whom Jerome thinks drew their teaching from this book. Jerome further deliberated over the quotation of Enoch in Jude. For Jerome, the quotation serves more to question the legitimacy of Jude than to support the authority of Enoch. Moreover, his stronger argument to delimit the OT canon on the boundaries of the Tanakh played a significant role in his rejection of the Enochic corpus.[66]

(10) Similar to Origen, **Augustine of Hippo** has shown a considerable fluidity in his stance on the Enochic corpus. On the one hand, joining Jerome, he clearly categorizes *1 Enoch* as apocryphal. On the other hand, he believes that some of these writings have been truly penned by Enoch himself. If this book was to be rejected, according to Augustine, this must also have entailed a rejection of *Jude* so consequently, he defends Jude's quotation from *Enoch* as legitimate (Reed 2005:202). He, therefore, accepts the authority of *Jude* even if it quotes from this book, where the content is legitimate. However, as time goes by, even if he does not deny its inspiration, he gradually rejects *1 Enoch*'s "canonical" authority mainly because of its content of the angel story, but also arguing that the book has not been accepted as "canonical" by "the people in antiquity who would have attested [it] as such" (Nickelsburg 2001:95).

At least three major conclusions can be drawn from the overview of the various positions of the Early Church Fathers and some other similar writings. Firstly, the rejection of Enoch among Christians took place within a very gradual process after it had gained a long-standing authoritative position among many believing communities. Furthermore, the rejection was stronger and quicker within the Western church relative to its Eastern counterpart, where it gained wider circulation and reception. It has been widely accepted that the book gained more authority and wider circulation in the East than the West.[67] In fact, this leads naturally to its dissemination in Ethiopia from the East, Alexandria, possibly with other biblical writings at an

---

[66] For a detailed discussion on the rejection of Enoch from the OT canon mainly on the grounds of following the scope of Jewish canon, see Reed 2005:194-205.

[67] For instance, Reed (2005:152) argues that the writings attributed to Enoch continued to circulate in the second and third centuries AD in a various localities, especially "Syro-Palestine, Egypt, and North Africa".

equal status which it enjoyed in this period of transmission. Finally, there has not been any one particular reason singled out for *Enoch* to be rejected, rather diversified reasons at various periods, contexts, locales, and individual theological/ideological motives have been proposed.

As to the reasons for the gradual decline and rejection of the book in the Christian Church, therefore, several points could be deduced from the analysis of these prominent Church Fathers and their writings, among which four are prominent. (1) For some, *Enoch* has been strongly associated with "heretical traditions/sects", the accusation being of both its production and employment by them in refuting "the true" teaching of the Church. Furthermore, some of its contents have been used by pagan anti-Christian polemics to attack Christianity.[68] (2) For others, whether it comes from a genuine source or not, some of *Enoch*'s teaching or content does not comply with other parts of the Church's Scriptures. In other words, the interpretation of the Enochic text contradicts the teachings of certain parts of the Bible or certain aspects of the Church's 'canon' in the sense of the rule of faith.[69] For instance, this argument is mainly connected with the interpretation of the sons of God as the Watchers, where the Genesis text has been reinterpreted as Sethites rather than the Watchers.[70] (3) Still some others rejected the book(s) due to their adherence to the Jewish "canon", where the book is excluded.[71] Some have argued that anything not included in the Jewish tradition should be excluded.[72] (4) Related to all of the above, some question the authority of the Enochic corpus on the ground of the authenticity of the authorship. Here, it was not a matter of whether it

---

[68] For some examples of such attacks or usage, see Reed 2005:199.

[69] This is mainly connected to the theology of ascribing the origins of sin to the watchers against the Pauline teaching and its interpretation of the origins of sins ascribed to human beings. (It should be noted that Paul certainly ascribes the sin to Adam; but, one should not be too absolute in denying that Paul accepts an influence of Satan on humans.) In the EOTC, the origin of sin may be ascribed to both: first to evil spirits and then to human beings.

[70] For a survey of references to the teaching of the fallen angels in early Christian literature, in order to demonstrate the widespread popularity of the idea in second-and third-century Christianity, see Bauckham 1985:319.

[71] Reed (2005:194), for instance, writes that "[a]lready in the third century we find clues that some Christians had begun to question the authority of the Enochic books and that their doubts were largely rooted in the status of the these texts amongst 'the Jews' [where they have been excluded from their canon]."

[72] This was a general principle, later on during the Reformation, followed by the Reformers to fix the boundaries of their Old Testament.

would have been authored by a "heretical" source or not, rather, proponents of such a point were not sure if the works had in fact been penned by Enoch himself.

In addition to these major reasons, *Enoch* enjoyed neither a general consensus on its inspired status, nor a wider usage both in the East and West, where this otherwise must have been at an equal level of usage to receive recognition from all parts of the Church. That it never came to a prominent position in the West, such that it enjoyed in the East, was evident from the lack of Latin translations of the books. Thus, all these factors mutually substantiating each other led to a "progressive marginalization" of the Enochic works "occur[ing] concurrently with a shift in the consensus among learned Jews and Christians about the identity of the 'sons of God' in Gen 6:1-4" (Reed 2005:2006).[73]

With a gradual rejection by prominent and formative Church Fathers like Augustine, including the tradition's popularity and wider usage among the Manicheans (Reed 2005:272),[74] *1 Enoch* lost its influence and status which it had enjoyed for about three to five centuries, that is, until the early fourth century. Until then, in one form or another, it was a source book for Christian writers in explaining questions related to the presence of evil, idolatry, and demons in the world and the certainty of punishment of the wicked at the judgment (VanderKam 1996:100). Had it not been for the Ethiopic translation and the recent discovery of the Aramaic fragments at Qumran, *1 Enoch* would have been lost, bar the citations of it which appear in various literature. Thus, the rejection of the corpus by the Church Fathers in the fourth century and the dominance of the Sethite interpretation of Gen 6:1-4 resulted in the decline and disappearance of *1 Enoch* from the scene, except in the Ethiopian church.[75]

---

[73] For a discussion on the evolution of the tradition of the interpretation of the "sons of God", see Reed 2005:215-226.

[74] This was Jerome's argument to reject *1 Enoch*.

[75] VanBeek (2000:111) also concludes, "After Augustine, there is little mention of *1 Enoch* in Christian literature; and after Qumran, there is little mention of *1 Enoch* in Jewish literature." For a discussion on *1 Enoch*'s status and the history of its transmission and preservation in Ge'ez, the only text preserved in its entirety, see chapter six of this thesis.

5.4 The Survival of the text: at Qumran, among Christian Communities, and the *Ge'ez* text in Ethiopia

The survival of the text of *1 Enoch* can be classified at three stages and mainly in three languages. Along with some fragments in Greek and Aramaic, the text of *1 Enoch,* in its entirety,[76] survived only in *Ge'ez* through its use by the Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church. A brief overview on the Aramaic and Greek manuscripts of *1 Enoch,* and the reasons for its ultimate survival in *Ge'ez* are discussed.

5.4.1 The Qumran Aramaic Texts

Since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the proposition that the *Book of Enoch* originated among a Jewish community of the Second Temple Period, having been originally written in Aramaic, has received consensus among modern-period scholarship (Nickelsburg, 2001:9).[77] The discovery of the Aramaic fragments of *1 Enoch* at Qumran makes unambiguous the earlier date of the book as well as its Jewish origin. The discovered fragments include portions from the four parts of the book—the *Book of Watchers,* the *Book of Dreams,* the *Epistle of Enoch*, and the *Astronomical Book*—with the exception of the *Parables of Enoch*. Nonetheless, most of the fragments contain only limited portions as they are significantly damaged.

Subsequent to the Qumran discovery, Milik has tried to reconstruct the fragments, based on the available Greek and Ethiopic texts. He then concludes that "for the first book of Enoch, the *Book of Watchers*, we can calculate that exactly 50 per cent of the text is covered by the Aramaic fragments; for the third, the *Astronomical Book*, 30 per cent; for the fourth, the *Book of Dreams*, 26 per cent; for the fifth, the *Epistle of Enoch,* 18 per cent" (Milik 1976:5).

But this position has been challenged and strongly criticized as misleading by later studies. Ullendorff and Knibb (1977:601), in their critical review of Milik's book, contend that "the true proportion of genuinely recognizable Aramaic material is thus of the order of about 5% of

---

[76] For a qualification of the expression "in its entirety", see page 4, f.n.7 of this thesis above.
[77] For a summary and his own detailed discussion on the debate before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls whether the original language of *1 Enoch* was Aramaic or Hebrew, see Charles 1912:lvii-lxx.

the total [of the Ethiopic book of Enoch]." According to Knibb's (1978:12) further analysis, there are about 200 verses in Aramaic which correspond to the Ethiopic verses, out of a total of more than 1000. However, he indicates that "we are very far from possessing the equivalent in Aramaic of 196 verses of the Ethiopic version", because of the damaged state of the Qumran fragments.

Irrespective of the size of the fragments, the discovery of the Aramaic text at Qumran has exerted an increasingly massive influence on the study of *1 Enoch* as well as its place and the role it played among, at least, some groups of the early Jews. Besides its evident textual significance,[78] as one of the greatest archaeological discoveries of the modern era,[79] the survived Aramaic texts of *1 Enoch* witness to their Jewish origin and their significance for the preserving community.

5.4.2 The Greek Texts

As the Greek texts of *1 Enoch* are scarce, we are left with a number of questions related to its translation, date, provenance, and transmission. However, besides a large number of Aramaic fragments of *1 Enoch*, some tiny Greek papyrus fragments were also found in Cave 7 at Qumran. This would shed light on the difficult question of the translation period of *1 Enoch* into Greek, which at least goes back to the second century BC and was carried out by the Jews.

Based on his study of the Greek translation of the *Book of Watchers* and the *Epistle* in comparison with the Aramaic texts, James Barr (1979:191) suggests that the Greek translation of *1 Enoch* "belonged to the same general stage and stratum of translation as the Septuagint translation of Daniel", as both of the books contain apocalyptic form and content. Pushing the discussion further, Knibb strongly argues that the formation of a fivefold integrated Pentateuchal structure was introduced at this stage of translation and transmission. He argues:

---

[78] It is not surprising that all prominent scholars involved in major translation and text-criticism of *1 Enoch* have used these Aramaic texts as evidence for their text whenever available. These include Milik 1976, Black 1985, Isaac 1983:5-89.), Nickelsburg 2001, and Knibb 1978.

[79] For a complete edition and translation of the entire Dead Sea Scrolls, see Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997, 1998. For the edition and translation of specific text of Aramaic fragments of *1 Enoch*, see ibid. 1997:398-445.

> In any case, whatever the origin of Greek translation, and whether any part of it was known at Qumran, it is plausible to think that it was at the Greek stage in the transmission of the text that the *Parables* and the *Astronomical Book* were inserted between the *Book of Watchers* at the beginning and the *Book of Dreams* and the *Epistle* at the end to [produce the book familiar from?] the Ethiopic version with its fivefold structure (Knibb 2009:20).

However, Black (1985:11) conjectures that such redaction may have been completed in the beginning of the second century AD, probably by some Jewish-Christian "redactor-translator" for Christian interest. This argument seems plausible as no portion of the *Book of Parables,* the largest component of the five books of *1 Enoch*, appears in the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus. However, the date of this part of the book, given its various implications on other major topics, has been one of the most disputed areas without consensus until recently.[80] Following Michael E. Stone (2007:444-49), in his recent second volume of the comprehensive work on *1 Enoch*, Nickelsburg (and VanderKam 2012:62f.) convincingly concludes that "the Parables [should be dated] between the latter part of Herod's reign and the early decades of the first C.E., with some preference for the earlier part of this time span."

As to the surviving Greek translated manuscripts of *1 Enoch,* about a quarter of the entire corpus has been discovered,[81] and the copies are ascribed as dating from the fourth to ninth centuries AD. Isaac (1983:6) and Nickelsburg (2001:12-14) list the principal Greek manuscripts, where texts from parts of all books of *1 Enoch*, except the *Book of Parables*, are contained. These include: (1) a fifth or sixth century AD manuscript, discovered in 1886/87 in a grave, which contains a complete text of *1 Enoch* 1:1-32:6a (from the *Book of Watchers*);[82] (2) preserved in the Chronographia of George Syncellus are *1 Enoch* 6:1-9:4; 8:4-10:14; 15:8-

---

[80] The debate on the date of the *Book of Parables* spans from as early as 94-79 BC by Charles (1912:72-73) to as late as 270 AD by Milik (1976:91-96). To mention some of the works which gave attention to this particular problem, after Milik's proposal for such a late date, we may include Greenfield and Stone 1977:51-65; Knibb 1978-1979:345-359; Mearns 1978-1979:360-369; Black 1980:19-30; Nickelsburg 2005:2554-256; Bampfylde 1984:9-31; Sacchi 2006:377-395. See also eight articles recently presented on this specific topic on the Third Enochic Seminar (2005) in Camaldoli, Italy, and published in Gabriele Boccaccini 2007. These include Piovanelli 2007:363-379; Suter 2007:415-443; Stone 2007:444-449; Charlesworth 2007:450-468; Hannah 2007:469-477; Arcari 2007:478-486; Eshel 2007:487-491; and Olson 2007:492-296.

[81] Nickelsburg (2001:12) approximates between 28 per cent (p. 12) and 25 per cent (p. 20) of the surviving *1 Enoch*'s Greek translation.

[82] As Nickelsburg (2001:12) demonstrates, this codex, known as Codex Panopolitanus, together with the Enochic text, contains portions from the *Gospel of Peter* and the *Apocalypse of Peter* which he posits on the basis of their shared interest in journeys to the realm of the dead.

16:1 (from the *Book of Watchers*); (3) some fragments which come from the fourth century CE and contain *1 Enoch* 77:7-78:1; 78:8; 85:10-86:2; 87:1-3 (from the *Book of Luminaries* and the *Book of Animal Apocalypse*);[83] (4) manuscripts discovered in the Vatican Library containing *1 Enoch* 89:42-49 (from the *Book of Animal Apocalypse*); and (5) another papyrus codex containing *1 Enoch* 97:6-107:3 (from the *Epistle of Enoch*).

The preservation of all of the discovered Greek manuscripts of *1 Enoch* is associated with Christian communities or individuals.[84] As the manuscripts come from the beginning of the fourth century CE, evidently the book possessed more status among Christians but was relegated to a position of subordination/inferiority by the Jews. Furthermore, in spite of the lesser portion which has survived, the significance of the Greek text, mainly for textual criticism, is notable.

5.4.3 The *Ge'ez* Texts

The transmission and translation history of the Enochic text in Ethiopia is part and parcel of the broader process of translation of scriptural texts,[85] even at the time when it was declining in other parts of the Christian Church. Apart from the preliminary translation work by the first Bishop of the EOTC, Abba Frumentius, *Abuna Selama Kesate Berhan,* (Father of Peace, Revealer of Light), it is believed that the main translation of the Scriptures was carried out in the fifth and sixth centuries by the so-called "the Nine Saints", missionaries who came from Asia Minor.[86] In other words, that *1 Enoch* was translated into Ethiopic, at the latest, in the fifth and sixth centuries, is plausible and received scholarly consensus (Knibb 2009:177).

Even if the translation took place in such an early period, the oldest manuscripts of *1 Enoch,* so far attested, have mainly come from the 14th century onwards, as is true for most of the

---

[83] This partition is not included in Isaac's list.

[84] For instance, Codex Panopolitanus (or the Gizeh fragment, as designated by Matthew Black (1970:8)) was discovered in a Christian grave and bound with other Christian writings, portions of the apocryphal *Gospel of Peter* and the *Apocalypse of Peter*. These Greek fragments of *1 Enoch*, with some quotations and allusions from early Christian writings and Church Fathers, has been published by Matthew Black (1970).

[85] There is strong scholarly consensus that the translation of *Enoch* into Ge'ez is part of the translation and transmission process of the entire biblical corpus between the fourth and sixth centuries AD (cf. Reed 2005:8; Knibb 2001a:403; Nickelsburg 2001:17; Ullendorff 1973:55-56).

[86] For a comprehensive discussion on the translation of the Scriptures into Ethiopic, see Knibb 1999:1-54.

broader scriptural Ethiopic manuscripts.[87] However, significant portions of quotations in other books, from a similar period, suggest that they used earlier translations of *Enoch* than the period in which they themselves were written.[88] Among others, books which preserved large portions of *1 Enoch* include መጽሐፈ ምዕላድ *Metshafe Mi'lad* (the *Book of Nativity*), መጽሐፈ ብርሃን *Matshafe Berhan* (the *Book of Light*), and መጽሐፈ ምስጢር ሰማይ ወምድር *Metshafe Mistira Semay Womeder* (the *Book of the Mysteries of Heaven and Earth*).[89]

For instance, መጽሐፈ ምዕላድ *Metshafe Mi'lad*, in addition to some other portions, quotes the entire text of *1 Enoch* 46:1-51:5 and 62:1-16. As Knibb (2009:180) noted, these are exactly the same passages which "have attracted the interest of modern scholars concerned with messianism." Besides such texts, which are related to Christological themes, መጽሐፈ ምዕላድ *Metshafe Mi'lad* discusses and defends "the authority of Enoch[,] who is presented as the first prophet, the first who announced the coming of Christ" (Knibb 2009:183).

More importantly, the quotations in such books, from these significant periods of the history of the EOTC, strongly explain some of the reasons why *1 Enoch* has been influential, as much as it is authoritative, in the Ethiopian Church, which in turn could be a possible explanation for its survival. The quotations from the *Book of Enoch* "are also of interest because of the light they shed on the doctrinal and ecclesiastical controversies of the time" (Knibb 2009:187).[90]

---

[87] As to the date of the oldest Ge'ez mss of *1 Enoch*, until the turn of this century, see Knibb (2001b:340-354), who concludes that the oldest mss so far come from the fifteenth century or a little earlier. However, Olson (1998:30-32) argues that the oldest Ge'ez Enochic mss date from the twelfth century AD, a claim which Knibb (2001b:347) strongly rejects as "certainly wrong". However, recent studies indicate that the earliest ms. is EMML 8400 from around the year 1400 (Stuckenbruck, personal communication 2015).

[88] For a list of quotations from the *Book of Enoch* in printed texts and some discussions on a number of them, see Milik 1976:85-88. Following Milik, Klaus Berger (1980:100-109) also worked through the list of quotations and concluded that the quotations came from works whose compositions were earlier than the oldest Ethiopic manuscripts of *1 Enoch*.

[89] For brief descriptions about these books, see Edward Ullendorff 1973:141. For a detailed discussion on a number of quotations and their text-critical values, see Knibb 2009:176-187.

[90] The theological debates of the fifteenth century are mainly Christological and ecclesiastical. According to Jacopo Gnisci (2012:31f.), there were two prominent figures, a priest and a king, in the fifteenth century controversies in Ethiopian history, whose writings are still extant. Gnisci explains that whereas the priest, Gyorgis of Sagla, who was prominent in the first half of the century, mainly focuses on Christological controversies, where *1 Enoch* has been influential, the King, Zer'a Yacob, active in the second half of the century was occupied in ecclesiological issues and Mariology.

One of the ways ancient biblical texts have survived is their public usage through various means, including the use of amulets. While the tradition of using amulets among religious people of the ancient period is common for purposes including protection, medicine, and good fortune, this tradition has continued to date among many Ethiopians. T. de Bruyn (2010:147) defines amulet "as an item that [is/was] believed to convey in and of itself, as well as in association with incantation and other actions, supernatural power for protective, beneficial, or antagonistic effect, and that is worn on one's body or fixed, displayed, or deposited at some place." In addition, among many people, amulets are often associated with and inherent to magical power, even if this point itself is debatable.[91]

From the earliest period of Christianity in Ethiopia, as it has been commonplace elsewhere among Christian and other religious communities,[92] to use amulets widely, a practice still exercised today. Among other texts, *1 Enoch*, besides Psalms, is one of the prominent biblical texts used for this purpose.

M. de Jonge (2003b:1f.) strongly argues that pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament "were transmitted because copyists regarded them as important and were of the opinion that they could function meaningfully in the communities for which they copied them. *Transmission clearly presupposes the enduring relevance of what is transmitted*" (italics mine).

5.4.4 Other Texts

In addition to the three versions discussed here—the Aramaic, the Greek, and the Ethiopic—there are three other languages or versions in which some portions of *1 Enoch* have been preserved. (1) In Latin, *1 Enoch* has been preserved by several quotations and references by Church Fathers. Even if the extracts could suggest a possibility of a Latin translation of the book,[93] Nickelsburg (2001:14) rejects such a possibility as "the evidence is slim and far from

---

[91] For a long list of references on an on-going debate on this issue, see de Bruyn 2010:147, no.8.
[92] For instance, de Bruyn (2010:166-183) makes a catalogue of a long list of amulet mss from fourth – eighth centuries AD, which were used by Christians, written in Greek, and found in Egypt. In addition, de Bruyn (2010:159) comments that it is known "from Isidore of Pelusium, John Chrysostom, Augustine, and other patristic sources that Christians wore 'gospels' around their necks, hung them at their bedside, or used them in other ways for apparently protective purposes." He further gives full references for each of the citations from the writings of the Church Fathers (idem 2010:159, n.60).
[93] Knibb (1978:21) has some inclination to that end.

compelling." (2) Two Coptic fragments, containing few verses of *1 Enoch* 93, were also discovered in 1939. (3) A Syriac excerpt from the *Book of the Watchers, 1 Enoch* 6:1-6, serves as further textual evidence for the wider use the Book of Enoch. Evidently, that the Enochic writings have been translated, transmitted, and preserved in all these ancient languages and communities shows that "Enochic texts and traditions circulated across a surprisingly broad geographical range" (Reed 2005:9).

5.5 Conclusion

The role and status of *1 Enoch* among both Jews and Christians, at its early stage, is a matter of scholarly consensus. Given its influence in many aspects of the Qumran Community, the legacy of the book in shaping and influencing the Community is largely convincing. Besides their lifting it up to a level of authoritative status and shaping their theology in accordance with it, they have preserved the text at a significantly wider level.[94] Above and beyond this outstanding preservation of the text by the Community, that *1 Enoch* has been employed in an authoritative scriptural status proves that its usage and influence is wider than that particular Community among the Jews.

In addition to the external evidence of *1 Enoch*'s authoritative scriptural status among some groups, its authority is drawn from within the book itself. The book presents itself as Scripture with divine authority for the final days. Its self-assertion on its authority is evident from its usage of other Scriptures where it presents itself as a divine revelation superseding all others. It is this kind of prophetic authority, maintained in the book of *Jude* that witnesses to an uncompromised superior authority.

The *Book of Enoch* gained influential status at the outset of Christianity, this being evident from its significant usage in early literature, including the New Testament. Even if the influence is exceptionally outstanding in the book of *Jude* and some other early Christian

---

[94] This is to imply the discussion above (5.1.1) that, as compared to other scriptural books discovered at Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls, the number of copies of the Enochic fragments was one of the prominent one, which could show a wider reproduction of the text of *1 Enoch* among the Qumran Community.

writings, its legacy remains clear in many NT books. The louder voice of Apostolic Church Fathers demonstrates an appeal to the authority of the book.

However, this has not been without conflicting views among some Church Fathers, who have taken the trouble of stipulating a clear stance on the scriptural authoritative status of *1 Enoch.* Some of the reasons for such reluctance among Christians arise from the rejection of the book by the Jews mainly for two reasons. Possibly the two major reasons why the Jews rejected *1 Enoch* are its association with "heretical" groups and ironically, its self-assertion as superior to the Torah.

Besides these, the status of the book has been under fire by some Church Fathers, especially since the third century AD until the fifth century AD, when it was finally rejected by the church in the West, on the basis of the authoritative stance of Augustine. Its association with "heresy", proposed theological inconsistency with the Torah, its absence from the Jewish canon, and questions around authenticity are some of the major reasons for the rejection of the corpus among Christians.

In a gradual process, both in the West and in the East, the book has not only been excluded from the list of canonical books which was developing,[95] but the text has all but disappeared. Aramaic fragments of Jewish origin at Qumran, some Christian Greek fragments in Egypt, and some quotations in various literary works preserved portions of the book from those early periods until its full preservation by the Ethiopian Church in Ge'ez became known in the West in the eighteenth century AD.

It is in this Ge'ez text and the EOTC "canon" that it both survived in its entirety[96] and enjoyed an authoritative "canonical" status. The EOTC received it just as they did other Scriptures of equal authoritative status at its emergence as a state religion in the early fourth century AD. It is possible, nevertheless, that other questions may be posed around the survival and preservation of the text as occurring only within the EOTC. Such questions would include

---

[95] The earliest Council which seems to have concerned itself with constructing a list of canon is the Council of Laodicea (?360 AD) where Canon 60 list the books, but does not include *1 Enoch*. However, it does not include Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Sirach, Maccabees and Revelation.
[96] For a qualification of the expression "… survived in its entirety", see p.4, f.n.7 above.

how and why this church preserved the book given its rejection and subsequent disappearance from the church at large. Such question will be engaged with in the following chapters.

CHAPTER SIX

RECEPTION, TRANSLATION AND PRESERVATION HISTORY OF THE SCRIPTURES AND "CANON" FORMATION IN ETHIOPIA

6.1 Purpose of the Chapter

The main focus of this chapter is to survey the history of reception, translation, preservation, and "canon" formation of the Scriptures in the Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church. As part of an attempt to address the central problem of the thesis, "Why do the Ethiopian Churches, Orthodox and Evangelicals . . . hold strongly opposing views towards the STL in general and *1 Enoch* in particular?", this chapter targets the question "Why and how the Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church 'canon of the Scriptures' has come to contain the largest 'canonical' collection? Which points in the church's history were decisive for the concept and formation of its current scriptural collection?" Furthermore, it deals with the extent and concept of "canon" of the Scriptures in the EOTC.

Even if the main object of this history is the EOTC, with more than sixteen hundred years of existence, a brief discussion on the concept and position of "canon" among Ethiopian Evangelicals, is included. This discussion would include the attitude of Evangelicals to both their own "canon" of the Scriptures and that of the EOTC. The discussion further attracts special attention to some of the controversies related to one of the recent translation projects of Amharic Bibles for and by the EOTC.

To respond to these questions the chapter is structured into four major parts, which are related to one another. At the outset, the chapter begins with some major introductory issues and background to the entire chapter. There are some designations which would either be employed uniquely in the Ethiopian context or strange to a non-Ethiopian reader. Without understanding the contextual usage of these designations, some of the terms may appear to be misleading. Such clarification would help the reader to understand the discussion properly and adequately.

The second part of the chapter deals with the reception history of Christianity to Ethiopia so as to understand the reception history of the Scriptures in the EOTC. In connection to the reception history of both Christianity and the Scriptures, the chapter unfolds the translation and transmission history of the Scriptures in EOTC, with special emphasis on *1 Enoch* and other "extra-canonical" writings. It is in this discussion that one would understand the legacy of the EOTC in connection to the preservation of the text of *1 Enoch* in its entirety, where the historical background of the preservation of *1 Enoch* in the EOTC is assessed.

In the third part of the chapter, the translation history, both early and current ones, the notion and concept of "canon" in the EOTC, with brief contrast with the Evangelicals, will be studied. It is in this part that the uniqueness of both the concept and the extent of the EOTC "canon" of the Scriptures are addressed. Some of the misunderstandings between the EOTC and Ethiopian Evangelicals partly arise from misrepresentation of the other's stance on the Scriptures and the concept of "canon". Thus, this part of the chapter aims to assess such lack of clarity.

Finally, the fourth part of the chapter, as a practical example of the problem, engages with a recent controversy between the EOTC and the Ethiopian Evangelicals on the translation of an Amharic Bible, "A Millennium Translation". This is a case study which aims to clarify the extent of the problem discussed in the previous part. The chapter concludes with some informed suggestions to address similar and related problems in the future with mutual understanding and respect to one another.

6.2 Introduction and Background

6.2.1 Introduction

Among the few countries where Christianity was introduced at a very early period, Ethiopia is one of the most ancient. Therefore, the Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church is one of the oldest churches in Africa and known for its ancient collection of the Scriptures. The church claims the introduction of some of the Hebrew Scriptures (i.e. portions of the Old Testament) in Ethiopia before the Christian Era. This claim puts the church and its history of reception, translation, and transmission of Scriptural texts and some of its traditions in a unique place. Furthermore, it has resulted in the Ethiopian church adhering to a collection of Scriptural

books, which are significantly different from collections of other Christian churches, containing both "canonical"[1] and some "pseudepigraphical"[2] works at equally authoritative level.

The fact that the church has since the fourth and fifth centuries been isolated[3] from other churches,[4] where the main translation and transmission was made, made it develop independently and retain some unique traditions, one of which is its openness to contending scriptural writings and interpretations so that it gives to different categories of Scriptures the same status. As maintained by EOTC historical theologians, the EOTC is also essentially different from other churches in the West and the East in that the main debates[5] in its history

---

[1] As there is no distinction between what is called "canonical", "apocryphal", and/or "pseudepigraphical" in the Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church Scriptures, such terms should not have been used in this context. However, I am forced to use them in order to help a non-EOTC reader to understand the discussion. For a detailed discussion on terminological problems within the traditions of both the EOTC and Ethiopian Evangelicals and the provisional stance of this thesis, see chapter three above.

[2] In addition to all the "deutero-canonical" books of the Roman Catholic Church, which are also called "Apocryphal" by Protestants, the prominent "pseudepigraphical" books included in the EOTC "canon", with some others, are *1 Enoch*, Jubilees, Joseph Ben Gurion (or 4 Maccabees?) in the Old Testament. The eight bulky books, included in the EOTC New Testament, and known as Books of Church Order, are, *Sinodos* (4 books, namely The Order of Zion, Commandment (*Tizaz*), *Gitzew,* and *Abtils*), the Book of the Covenant (2 books), Clement (1), and Didascalia (1). (However, it should be noted that the eight NT books additional to the 27, as another version simply counts, could only be the eight books of Clement.)

[3] The reasons for the isolation of the EOTC at various periods vary depending on the religio-political context of the given period. However, the overarching reasons for the isolation include, but not limited to, (1) that it has been under the Coptic Church until recently where almost all communication and engagement with other churches has been through it, if it happened at all. So, it did not have that legitimate authority to be an independent church by itself and to represent in any major ecumenical council. (2) With the rise of Islam, the power of the Coptic Church itself has been significantly diminished, which in turn weakens its relationship to the EOTC. (3) Besides its effect on the Coptic Church, the rise of Islam, more or less, cut off Ethiopia from the rest of the world for centuries, where the country considered itself as a "Christian Island". (4) The short lived Catholic Jesuits' presence and a relationship ended up with bloodshed significantly contributed to the isolation in developing deep-rooted suspicion and animosity towards the western churches. (5) The geographical location that it is a bit distant from Europe may have contribution for the isolation. For details on Ethiopia's isolation from the rest of the Christian world at various centuries and the close relationship between the history of the Church and the nation, see Munro-Hay 2002:15-39. In the same line, Edward Gibbon (1830:234) writes on the geographical isolation of Ethiopia saying: "Encompassed on all sides by the enemies of their religion, Ethiopia slept near a thousand years, forgetful of the world by whom they were forgotten." However, this position has been strongly rejected by Teshale Tibebu (1995:xviii-xix) who concludes that "It is time that the geographical isolation paradigm in explaining Ethiopian history be given a decent burial. Ethiopia was hardly isolated from the outside world."

[4] According to Sven Rubenson (1978:51), the major end of isolation of both the church and the country, particularly with Europe, was marked in the first half of the nineteenth century as "Ethiopia was flooded by a great number of European travelers and missionaries of every kind and description."

[5] For a discussion on a century long debate in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries on the observance of Sabbath (Saturday) instead of Sunday, see ሱሰ 1997፤71-74.

155

focused on issues such as Christology,[6] Mariology,[7] and Sabbath, besides being a government religion and therefore highly involved in and controlled by politics.[8]

Consequently, the church never officially discussed the issue of the "canon" of the Scriptures, although a few vague traditions and other suggestions, made by the emperors, were accepted without any formal discussions. This chapter surveys the major points in the history of the EOTC's Scriptural reception, transmission, translation and collection. This may offer a systematic response to how and why the Ethiopian Church retains a unique scriptural collection which gives equal authoritative status for both the so-called "canonical" and "non-canonical" works.

Finally the study sheds some lights on the concept and debate of the EOTC "canon". This may lead us to hints as to the challenges of the current position of the church—whether the church may be compelled to take actions on the issue of fixation of a "canon" in order to address some of the contemporary demands, which may require her to finalize the closure of her "canon" in an official way.

As the literature on the issues of this chapter is very limited, the main source for the central parts of this chapter originates from qualitative interviews with twenty-eight interviewees from both the EOTC and Evangelicals, which is specifically conducted with an intention to explore new insights into the topic. I furthermore include insights from Ethiopian literature that has been neglected or that was inaccessible for earlier writers.

---

[6] A discussion on a major Christological controversy in the EOTC, how much bloody it was, and on the decisive role of the emperors, see ጎርጎርዮስ 1974:64-73, 86-92.

[7] For a discussion on the 15th century debate on Mariology, the involvement of the Emperor, and the bloodshed in connection to the controversy, see ጎርጎርዮስ 1974:44-45.

[8] It can easily be noted that, for most part, almost every history book on Ethiopia's last two centuries cannot avoid recording the history of EOTC at its centre and the same is true for EOTC history books, where they cannot avoid the history of the monarchy as well, which is an integral part of it, i.e. EOTC. A remarkably good work on a very close attachment between the church and state in Ethiopia, with special reference to the medieval period, where the church underwent a significant reform and development, has been done by Taddesse Tamrat (1972). In this work, Taddesse gives special attention to King Zer'a Yacob, whose "highest ideal" is defined as being "the assimilation of his pagan subjects into the Christian community, and the creation of a religiously homogenous society" (Taddesse 1972:238); however, "his attempt to bring about a radical change in the religious life of his people did not bear substantial fruit" (Taddesse 1972:243).

6.2.2 Background

Included in the background are some insights from an Ethiopian perspective on language, religion, and a few notes on the Ethiopian Calendar. While the language part focuses on some issues related to designation and origin, the religion section introduces briefly the current religious landscape in Ethiopia. The calendar section introduces some technical differences between the Ethiopian Calendar, which will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter, and the Gregorian Calendar. This is to inform the reader on how these subjects have been understood in the Ethiopian context in general and in this thesis in particular.

6.2.2.1 Language

Besides the two major traditional biblical languages, Hebrew and Greek, Ge'ez and Amharic are the two main languages particularly important to this study. These two Ethiopian languages are crucial both for their historical place in regard to the EOTC scriptural transmission and translation for centuries, and it is these two languages, with the two traditional biblical languages, which were involved in the recent Millennium edition, where Ge'ez is used as the base text while Amharic is the text into which it was translated. Thus it is appropriate to give some background discussion of these key Ethiopian languages.

6.2.2.1.1 Ge'ez / Ethiopic

Ge'ez (ግዕዝ), also unfavourably known as Ethiopic, is a Semitic language and assumed to have an ancestry in the old South Arabian Semitic language which was further developed in the northern region of modern Ethiopia. It later became the official language of the Kingdom of Axum and the Ethiopian imperial court. Currently the language is mainly used in the rituals of the Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church (Munro-Hay, 1991).

A precise description of Ge'ez in a dictionary suffices for our purpose from an historical point of view:

> ... the [Ge'ez] language evolved out of Sabean, which had been brought to the highlands
> by immigrants from South Arabia in the first century A.D.[9] It ceased being a spoken

---

[9] It should be earlier than this since arguably the Kingdom of Axum has already been established, Ge'ez as its language, at the first century AD (Munro-Hay 1991).

language in about the 10th century but continues to be a literary and ecclesiastical tongue to the present day. It has 182 phonetic symbols (26 characters with 7 variations each), and is learned by rote by young lads from *debteras* in the churchyard; they can read it but don't understand it and cannot translate it into Amharic, the living language. Those who learn to write it as well as read it are those who became *debteras*. The Bible was translated from Greek into Ge'ez in the 6th century[10] and remained in that inaccessible form until the 19th. ...[the first Amharic manuscripts were written only at] the time of Tewodros II (1855-1868)" (Prouty and Rosenfeld 1981:77).[11]

According to Richard Pankhurst (1998:25), the Ge'ez language underwent two major changes around the early fourth century due to the spread of Christianity, which in turn resulted in the translation of the Scriptures into Ge'ez from the LXX. These changes are the introduction of vowels and the direction of writing from left to right instead of right to left, perhaps influenced by the Greek.

Even if Ge'ez was no longer a living language in the 14th century, it is believed that it was in this period that its literature has largely developed. By this time, "there is ample evidence that [Ge'ez] had been replaced by the Amharic language in the south and by the Tigrigna and Tigre languages in the north, [while it] remained in use as the official written language until the 19th century, [where] its status [is]comparable to that of Medieval Latin in Europe" (Anonymous 2012c).

One significant issue to be mentioned here is the modern period designation of the language, Ge'ez. From an Ethiopian historical perspective, this language has been consistently and unambiguously known as Ge'ez and as Ge'ez alone by the language and its users. It is unclear from where and when the alternative name "Ethiopic" has been introduced to designate this ancient language. One of the possible answers would be that this name was given by western explorers who first introduced it and its writings to their Western world as "Ethiopic" after having come across it in Ethiopia. But one thing for sure we know about this language is that

---

[10] Here also the translation was much earlier than the sixth century, at least as early as the fourth century, the time of Frumentius, the first bishop of the EOTC, who translated the Scriptures (see below).

[11] However, in the same book, it is maintained that "Henry Salt, after trips to Ethiopia in 1805 and 1809 interested the British and Foreign Bible Society in producing an Amharic [B]ible, because most Ethiopians, no matter how Christian, could not read their own [B]ible as it was in Ge'ez. In 1830 [before the time of Tewodros II] the Church Missionary Society (CMS) in the persons of Samuel Gobat and Christian Kugler began distribution of the Gospels and the New Testament, and in 1840 the entire [B]ible was finished and distributed" (Prouty & Rosenfeld 1981:135).

it never refers to itself in this way. In Ethiopia, this language has been known only as Ge'ez. Thus, it would not only be unfair but also misleading and offensive to an Ethiopian reader as there are so many other languages spoken in this country. In other words, Ethiopia's population is not exclusively a Ge'ez speaking such that one could designate this language to be "Ethiopic".

However, the scholarly circle seems to go on using this designation based on an erroneous tradition. As Ge'ez is no more a spoken language and only a literary language, if it loses a closer attention for such seemingly minor issues, we may contribute to the loss of some of its identity and heritage. This thesis, therefore, not only strictly and consistently designates the language with its own original name, Ge'ez, but also strongly and humbly encourages others to give the due attention to do justice to the language.[12] One of the offshoots of this ancient language,[13] Amharic, to which we now turn, on the other hand does not suffer such a problem.

6.2.2.1.2 Amharic

Evolved from the Ge'ez during the medieval period, Amharic is the second most-spoken Semitic language in the world, after Arabic. It became an official language in the Ethiopian government since the thirteenth century AD, by King Yikuno Amlak (1270-85), and currently it is the official working language of the Federal Government and several states within the federal system. As a result it retains its official status and is used nationwide, as it has been the working language of government, the military, and of the Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church throughout medieval and modern times (Anonymous 1012a).

---

[12] There are other examples where scholars erroneously or ignorantly employ wrong designations, and in turn, mislead the general reader, in designating Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church incorrectly. The first instance could be that many scholars and others wrongly equate the EOTC with the Coptic Church and refer to it so. It has been a common personal experience at various instances that I have been asked if I am writing on issues related to the Coptic Church, as if they are referring to the EOTC. The second instance, very offensive to EOTC believers, is to designate them as the Ethiopian Orthodox Church (EOC) rather than EOTC, where the key identity indicative term, *Tewahedo,* is eliminated. These two issues need further scholarly investigation and I strongly recommend them for further study in a way that would address the problem and its solution adequately.
[13] As some studies indicate, besides Amharic, Tigre and Tigrinya are believed to be the descendants of Ge'ez at some point (Amsalu n.d.:42.). However, this has been contested by some others who believed that Ge'ez cannot represent the common ancestral language of these Ethiopian and Eritrean languages (Connell and Killion 2010:508.).

Until some portions of religious tracts were printed in the seventeenth century by the Portuguese Jesuits, Ge'ez continued to be the normal medium for writing (Henze 2000:78). Amharic is written in a slightly modified form of the alphabet used for writing Geʿez. However, in the modern period, from a literary point of view, "Amharic is the most studied and best understood language of Ethiopia" (Yacob 2013). As it is the official working language of the Federal Government of Ethiopia and most of the Federal States; undeniably it is the most spoken and understood language in the country. Amharic has been imposed on all of the subjects of Modern Ethiopia to the south, east, and western part of the nation since the nineteenth century expansion. As it has been the educational language for almost all primary schools in Ethiopia for about a century, until 1991, it gained the status of the lingua franca of the entire nation. All kinds of the national media of the country have also been mainly dominated by Amharic.

As a result, in the last hundred years, it became one of the most important languages around the Christian churches in Ethiopia. Besides the ancient and historic literary works in Ge'ez, currently Amharic became the dominant language in the religious literary works of all Ethiopian Churches. Thus, a literary work or a biblical translation in this language would have an exceptionally influential role in the dynamics of the religio-political landscape of Ethiopian Churches in particular and the overall population in general.

6.2.2.2 Religion

Besides the long existing EOTC, four other religious groups—Islam, Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Indigenous Traditional Religion—are noteworthy in Ethiopian history.[14] The discussion of this thesis is limited only to the EOTC and the Ethiopian Evangelicals or Protestants. Given that one of the central focuses of the thesis is the discussion on the EOTC

---

[14] According to the recent statistical report of the 2007 census of Ethiopia, there are six categories among which citizens could choose their religious identity. These include: Orthodox, 43.5%, Protestant, 18.6%, Catholic, 0.7%, Muslim/Islam, 33.9%, Traditional, 2.6%, & Other, 0.6%. Orthodox Christianity includes the "Tewahedo", "Kibat", & "Tsega", while Seven Day Adventist, Pentecost, Lutheran, Baptist, Anglican, Presbyterian, "Meserete Kristos", "Mulu Wengel", "Kale Hiwot", etc. were put under the Protestant category. Jehovah's, Behais, Jews, Hindus, etc. fall under the other category (FDRE 2008:17).

which is widely covered elsewhere in the thesis the focus of the introduction of this part is limited to the Evangelicals in Ethiopia.

6.2.2.2.1 Ethiopian Evangelicals (Protestants)

As compared with a very ancient history of the EOTC, the introduction of Evangelicalism in Ethiopia is very recent. A couple of the earliest Evangelical Churches celebrated their centenary (or less) of their inception recently.[15] The missionaries who introduced the Evangelical tradition claimed that their main intention was to bring about reformation within the EOTC structure, which they were not successful at doing and thus ended up with separate churches. They blame the EOTC, making the accusation that irrespective of their willingness "to work inside the EOC framework, the EOC was not willing to give this movement the necessary room and freedom. ... [As a result the Evangelicals] developed more or less as a protest against the harassment and persecution by the EOC clergy" (Bakke 1987:124).[16]

Precisely speaking, Protestant missionaries were introduced to Ethiopia from the seventeenth century though it was the nineteenth century which favoured them to root themselves in some parts of the country. The main reason for their arrival was "the political and material aid which the Ethiopians now began to expect from Europe" (Sergew 1970b:37). In other words, all attempts by western missionaries either to reform the EOTC from within or to establish any kind of Protestant church was not successful in "Ethiopia proper", i.e., the Northern Amhara/Tigray dominated Orthodox areas, until Menelik's expansion (r. 1889-1913) to other ethnic groups since the end of the nineteenth century.

During the time of Menelik, missionaries have rooted themselves at least in some remote parts of the new territories. The modernist Emperor Haile Sellassie decreed in 1944 that the country was "divided into what was termed 'Ethiopian Church Areas' and 'Open Areas'," (Forslund,

---

[15] For instance, the two largest Evangelical denominations in Ethiopia celebrated their establishments' anniversaries as national churches recently. The Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus (EECMY), a Lutheran denomination, has celebrated the centenary of its inception and the 50th anniversary of its establishment as a national church in the last decade. The Ethiopian *Kale Hiwot* Church (EKHC), a Baptist denomination, celebrated its 75th anniversary in the same time. These are the two prominent evangelical churches in Ethiopia and others only followed them later.

[16] How this competitive and rival attitude to each other later developed and affected the reaction towards the new LXX based Amharic Bible reception is discussed below.

1993:37) where the 'Open Areas', predominantly non-Christians, refers to areas in which missionaries may preach and teach their own denominational faith. The focus of the missionaries was mainly evangelizing adherents in the areas where traditional religion was practiced. Based on the missionary backgrounds, various denominations were founded during the last Emperor as indigenous churches.

It was largely because of their recent introduction and their attachment to the West that Protestant churches were severely persecuted during the Derg regime, which ironically gave them a unique momentum to firmly establish their foundations and to expand beyond imagination. The extreme persecution and repression of this period prepared them to explode and spread like a wild fire during the new democracy and freedom. With a rapid growth in the last two decades, they proved to be the third largest religious group with increasing recognition as Ethiopians, which is coupled with the dropping of the term *mete,* a derogative name given to them during the Derg regime, meaning: "(new) comers (from outside)", "foreigners/outsiders", or who do not belong here.

Besides all the Evangelical teachings, one of the major changes which came up with the missionaries was a clear-cut determined list of Scriptural books, the "canon". Furthermore, one of the first jobs of the missionaries was to translate the Bible into vernaculars, as was true during the time of Reformation in Europe. This was entirely a new approach, challenging the long standing tradition of the EOTC, where Ge'ez has been considered as the language of the liturgy and all religious practices, and the "canon" includes much more books than the "canon" of sixty-six books introduced by the missionaries.

Even if there are a lot of improvements in recent years, the history of the relationship between the EOTC and the Ethiopian Evangelicals in the last century, in most cases, was that of hatred and animosity. While the EOTC openly condemn the Evangelicals as heretics, Arianists, anti-Mary, etc, the Evangelicals equate the Orthodox members as heathen or Gentiles, to whom the gospel should be preached anew. The relative openness of Emperor Haile Sellassie I towards the Evangelicals after the Italian invasion (esp. since 1941), the inclusive attack of the communist regime on all religions since 1974, and legalization of religious equality in the constitution since 1991 by the current government, has improved the relationship little by little even if it was very slow and fluid. From its inception, the Bible Society of Ethiopia has, for

example, been one of the ventures which has facilitated the relationship between the EOTC and the Ethiopian Evangelicals. This has been instrumental in actively involving and promoting strong and lasting relationships among all churches in Ethiopia.[17] In other words, irrespective of some differences they would have, both in the concept and extent of the "canon" of the Scriptures, the central element which brings all Christian Churches in Ethiopia—Orthodox, (Catholics,) and Protestants—together is the Bible and the institution responsible for it, the Bible Society of Ethiopia, is instrumental in this goal of accommodating the various parties involved.

With all their unique identity reflecting their respective missionary origin, the Ethiopian Evangelicals have largely been influenced by the EOTC to forge an Ethiopian identity. As they have been influenced by and adopted a number of EOTC traditions and practices, Evangelicals in Ethiopia have developed an Ethiopian identity that identifies them as Ethiopian.[18] One such prominent element is the Ethiopian Calendar, where all Ethiopian Evangelicals follow the EOTC calendar year, which is "Ethiopian", and not the calendar of the West. Ethiopian Evangelicals, therefore, celebrate New Year, Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, and other church festivals on different dates from the other global Evangelicals, in unity with the EOTC, adopting the local tradition. Furthermore, unlike other Evangelicals, the Finding of the True Cross is also celebrated by many Ethiopian Evangelicals with the EOTC. This may lead us to note the unique way of counting in the Ethiopian calendar.

6.2.2.3 Some Notes on the Ethiopian Calendar

The Ethiopian Calendar is globally unique, which needs a deeper study and a detailed description, whereas the scope of this chapter does not allow us to do so.[19] Here also, in line with this study, a summary note on the basic elements is given. Besides its uniqueness in its

---

[17] Currently BSE has opened an office devoted to promoting ecumenism and maintaining strong cooperation both at higher and grass-root levels. The result from the efforts in the last couple of years have been highly appreciated as immensely fruitful and encouraging (interviewee # 21, Personal communication, 21.12.2011).
[18] For a discussion on more common elements shared across all denominations and the major influences of the EOTC on other churches in Ethiopia, see chapter seven below.
[19] For a discussion on the influence of *1 Enoch* on the Ethiopian calendar, see the next chapter.

computation, it governs all walks of life in the nation—religious, social, political, and educational life.

The Ethiopian calendar runs seven years behind the Gregorian in the first four months of its year (from September 11 (*Meskerem* 1) to December 11 (*Tahsas* 22)) and is eight years behind in the other nine months (from January 1 (*Tahsas* 23) to September 10 (*Pagumen* 5/6)). The first day of the Ethiopian calendar, 1 *Meskerem* 2006, for example, corresponds to 11 September 2013 and the last day, 5 *Pagumen* 2006, to 10 September 2014. Ethiopia is known as a "thirteen months of sunshine", as there are twelve months of thirty days each and the thirteenth one with only five days (six in a leap year).

As the day begins at sunrise, not midnight, there is a-six-hours difference from the western way of counting. In many parts of the country, especially where EOTC is dominant, "The day that an event has occurred is more often expressed in terms of the holy day, than a calendar date; for example, 'His horse ran away on Mikael.' Each day of the month is dedicated to some holy figure" (Prouty & Rosenfeld 1981:xiv; see also Phillipson 2009:xii).

As these two calendars, Ethiopian and Gregorian, also known as European in Ethiopia, are employed at various levels side by side, it is customary to mention whether one is using the Ethiopian or the European calendar. In most cases, when employed in Ethiopian languages and for local audience, the Ethiopian calendar is predominant. It is for international consumption in foreign language and mainly in academic circles that the Gregorian calendar is commonly used. However, as the two calendars are employed at one's discretion, it is compulsory to indicate whether one is using the Ethiopian or the Gregorian calendar. For instance, as this thesis is a scholarly work intended for an international audience or reader, unless it is otherwise stated, the dates naturally follow the Gregorian calendar. On the other hand, most of the Amharic references referred to in this thesis mainly employ the Ethiopian calendar and they specifically note when they employ the Gregorian one. This unique Ethiopian calendar mainly emerges from its unique history of the reception and preservation of the Scriptures, to which we now turn.

6.3 Reception History of Christianity and the Scriptures in Ethiopia

There are five major periods in the history of reception, transmission and translation of the Scriptures into Ge'ez. These periods are directly connected to the history of the reception of the religion itself and of the church and its reformation. Therefore, this part begins with a short survey of the ancient history of the church and of its reformation at some later periods. The age-old attachment to Judaism is also briefly presented. This is followed by mapping the reception, translation, and transmission history of the Scriptures paying special consideration to those involved in the translation and to the question from which *Vorlage* it was translated in each period. In connection to the reception history of the EOTC Scriptures, special attention is given to *1 Enoch* and other "extra-canonical" writings. This would lead us to the historical background of the preservation of *1 Enoch* in the EOTC.

6.3.1 Introduction of Christianity

There are three traditions describing the reception of Christianity in Ethiopia that historians argue about. These include: (1) the pre-Christian connection of Ethiopia to Jerusalem and the immediate introduction of Christianity through the Ethiopian Eunuch (Act 8:27-40);[20] (2) the apostolic introduction by St Matthew (and some other apostles), who came to preach the good news in Ethiopia and who died and were buried there; and (3) the introduction of Christianity in the fourth century by two brothers which happened by accident.[21] As these three lines of historical argument are discussed, they will also shed some light on the history of the reception, transmission, translation and preservation of Scriptural writings in the EOTC.

Based on oral tradition and significant literary evidence, the EOTC and Ethiopian historians make strong claims for a long standing historical relationship and religious ties between Ethiopia and Jerusalem, dating back to the time of King Solomon.[22] The story begins with the

---

[20] Even if it is far from convincing, some scholars such as Edwin M. Yamauchi (2004:161-181) argue that "the Ethiopian Eunuch was not from Ethiopia."

[21] John Baur, (2009:35) however, adds up another one by taking out the second one here. He writes, "Ethiopian tradition knows three steps in the advent of Christianity: Philip's eunuch brought the faith, Frumentius the priesthood, and the Nine Saints monastic life".

[22] For such strong claim, see the *Kebre Negest,* an Ethiopian Epic from the fourteenth century AD. For an English translation of the text of this document, see Budge 1932.

visitation of the Queen of Sheba to see the fame of King Solomon (1 Kgs 10:1-13), whereby she conceived a child from King Solomon named Menelik I. Born in Ethiopia, Menelik I went back to Jerusalem where he was educated in the Israelite religion and on his return to Ethiopia, he brought along with him the Ark of the Covenant, priests and the Scriptures available to him at that time.[23] This strong connection between Ethiopia and Jerusalem continued until the coming of Christ and was perpetuated afterwards.[24] It is in this context that the visitation of the Ethiopian eunuch to Jerusalem and his baptism by Philip, as told in Acts 8, is seen as the first fruit of Ethiopian Christianity.[25] The EOTC believes that, even if Christianity was introduced at a very early period, both priestly ministry and sacramental services were introduced only in the fourth century with the arrival and ministry of St Frumentius ([EOTC] 1996:7).[26]

The apostolic ministry of St Matthew to Ethiopia, for which the EOTC makes no strong claims, has been mentioned by a number of writings dating to as early as Origen. Aymro and Motovu (1970:1) write that "Origen says that St. Matthew was the apostle to Ethiopians". They further note (here they refer to Cross 1957) that "[t]he Roman Martyrology declares that St. Matthew was martyred in Ethiopia" (Aymro and Motovu 1970:1, n.1). Ephraim Isaac (1976:20) ascribes to traditions which maintain that St. Matthew came to Axum to preach. Ullendorff (1968:12f.), referring to a New Testament "Apocrypha", also states that "Matthew

---

[23] Not only the church, but also the Ethiopian Monarchy traces back its relationship to the Solomonic dynasty until the late Emperor Haile Sellassie I, as stated in the *Kebre Negest*.

[24] This is one of the major explanations made for the origins of the Ethiopian Jews, who call themselves *Beta Israel,* "house of Israel", whereas others, in Ethiopia, call them *Felasha,* derogatively. Even if many of them have been taken back to Israel a couple of decades ago, thousands of them are still waiting for their exodus. For various views on the origin of the Ethiopian Jews and the ties between Ethiopia and Jerusalem in this connection, see Ullendorff 1968:115-18; L. Rapoport 1979; and Prouty & Rosenfeld 1981:66-67.

[25] Eusebius of Caesarea, for instance, wrote, "But as the preaching of the Saviour's Gospel was daily advancing, a certain providence led from the land of the Ethiopians an officer of the queen of that country, for Ethiopia even to the present day is ruled, according to ancestral custom, by a woman. He, first among the Gentiles, received of the mysteries of the divine word from Philip in consequence of a revelation, and having become the first-fruits of believers throughout the world, he is said to have been the first on returning to his country to proclaim the knowledge of the God of the universe and the life-giving sojourn of our Saviour among men; so that through him in truth the prophecy obtained its fulfillment, which declares that 'Ethiopia stretcheth out her hand unto God' [Ps 67.11]" (Book 2, ch. 1 in Eusebius Pamphilius 1890).

[26] However, this argument may raise some questions such as whether there was church structure before this time or whether there were just a few individual Christians. But even so, individual Christians would surely read the Scriptures and celebrate baptism and eucharist. As these are important issues to understand the status of the church in the first couple of centuries, until the commencement of the official priestly ministry by St Frumentius, such questions need further study.

baptized the king of Ethiopia." As described by Ullendorff, the story goes on to explain how Matthew was murdered by a succeeding king.[27]

Pankhurst (1998:34) rightly notes the claim of EOTC that Christianity first reached Ethiopia in the early apostolic period, and "that 'many' at that time 'believed'. The faith did not, however, become the state religion until the early fourth century."[28] Scholars like Taddesse Tamrat (1972:22) and John Baur (2009:35) also agree with an early introduction of Christianity, not through the eunuch or Apostles, but rather through merchants and travellers as Axum, at that early stage, had developed strong communications with the Greco-Roman world.

Whether it was as a consolidation of previously introduced Christian beliefs or as a brand-new introduction to the land that Christianity became the state religion in Ethiopia in the fourth century is well preserved.[29] Among many other indications, the most significant evidence may be the episode written by the contemporary Latin historian, Rufinus, who received first-hand information "from Aedesius of Tyre, who [himself] had been a prisoner and servant in the royal household at Axum with Frumentius, the future bishop" (Munro-Hay 1991).[30] In addition, scholarly consensus maintains that the work of scriptural translation into Ge'ez has been advanced by the Bishop, Frumentius, Abuna Selama.

6.3.2 EOTC as a Judeo-Christian Church

Besides the historical records and a strong traditional belief that Ethiopia has been introduced to the Jewish faith and practice, there is the fact that the EOTC has continued practicing a

---

[27] However, Ullendorff (1968:12f.) further explains how the story is inauthentic. On the other hand, even if the Ethiopian Church believes that St Matthew has preached the Good News in Ethiopia, it does not accept his martyrdom in Ethiopia since the church believes that the introduction of the Gospel to Ethiopia occurred without any bloodshed (ምክረ ሥላሴ 2007a:154). See also Sergew 1970a:3.

[28] There are some scholars who insist that the introduction of Christianity into Ethiopia occurred only in the fourth century, among whom Henze (2000:32-34) and O'Leary (1936:19) are included. However, the discovery of Ge'ez manuscripts from as early as the fourth– sixth century AD reveals that Christianity had been well established before the translation of at least the discovered manuscripts (Anonymous 2012b).

[29] S. Kaplan (1984:15), for instance, writes that even if there are some variations in tracing the arrival of Christianity in Ethiopia to the Apostolic period, "scholars are virtually unanimous in viewing" its introduction in the fourth century by Frumentius and his brother as a turning point in Ethiopian history.

[30] Since Rufinus's account is so important for the history of Christianity in Ethiopia, Jones and Monroe (1955:26-27) give us the English translation in full.

number of Jewish religious traditions to date. These clearly indicate a strong and sustained historical connection to Judaism. Thus, EOTC is rightly considered as a Judeo-Christian Church. There are at least seven deeply embedded practices and traditions of Jewish origin currently observed by the EOTC. These include: (1) the belief in the existence of the Ark of the Covenant, *the Tabot*,[31] whereby no church can function without its replica, (2) the church buildings as copies of the Hebrew Temple,[32] (3) observance of the Sabbath,[33] (4) observance of dietary law in accordance with the Hebrew Bible,[34] (5) ritual cleanness, (6) two regular days of fasting, and (7) circumcision of young boys on the seventh day.[35] After discussing all these practices in detail, Mikre Sellassie (2004:28) rightly concludes that "the existence of such early Jewish influences and deep-rooted Old Testament practices suggests that Judaism was practiced at least by a group of people in Ethiopia before the introduction of Christianity."

Thus, this is a church where different practices and traditions existed side by side. Unlike any other Christian church, the EOTC maintained Jewish and Christian practices, which shows the openness of the church as regards to differing voices. For instance, its key interpretive method, the *Andemta tiriguame* (i.e. alternative interpretation),[36] resembles the Jewish

---

[31] It is believed that it is the *Tabot* that makes the church holy. For a detailed description, see Bakke 1987:49.

[32] The shape of church buildings could be either circular or rectangular. However, whatever the case, they are divided into three parts following the pattern of the threefold division of the Temple in Jerusalem. For more details, see Ullendorff 1968:82-87.

[33] That is, in addition to the Day of the Lord, Sunday, EOTC strictly observes Saturday as a holy day, in the same fashion as the Jews observe the Sabbath.

[34] It was not an exaggeration when M. Parkins (1968:207f.) commented that Ethiopian people are the most meticulous in observing dietary law.

[35] For a detailed discussion of each of these traditions, see Mikre-Sellassie 2008:56-58. For a more extensive discussion of these traditions and related aspects, see Ullendorff 1968:82-115. One of the strongest arguments Ullendorff makes is that these aspects are pre-Christian and unique to the EOTC, which makes it different, even from the other Oriental Churches, as against the opinion of some other scholars, including M. Rodinson (Ullendorff 1968:114f.). Some EOTC scholars maintain that there were practices of animal sacrifices around the Ark at some point in Tana Kirkos Monastery, which were directly linked to the Jewish practice of the Law (ሰሳ 1997:15).

[36] For a detailed discussion on such interpretive theory and practice, see Cowley 1983; Lee 2013:5. For instance, in the *Andemta* commentary of the Book of Revelation, there are thirteen different interpretations for "*white horse*" in Rev. 6:2. These include the "*white horse*" as: (1) "it is the time of the false Messiah" (in relation to the Jews), (2) "it is the time of the false Messiah" (in relation to Christians), (3) "it is the chariot of the sun," (4) "it is the chariot of the throne," (5) "it is the chariot of Adam," (6) "it is the humanity of Adam," (7) "it is the time of Adam," (8) "it is the time of the fathers," (9) "it is the time of Augustus," (10) "it is the time of Tiberius," (11) "it is the time of Constantine," (12) "the interpretation appeared to (Constantine)," (13) "it is the manhood of the son of God." For more details of this interpretation, see Lee 2013:21f.

Midrashim interpretive method, open for alternative or contending meanings.[37] It is in this context and tradition of openness that "canonical" alongside some "pseudepigraphical" writings have been received, transmitted, translated, and collected, and given equal authoritative status in the EOTC.

6.3.3 Translation and Transmission of the Scriptures in Ethiopia[38]

When and from which versions were the Ge'ez translations made? Was it before Christianity, or during the fourth century, where Christianity was an official religion of the government of Axum? Or after that, with the coming of "the Nine Saints"? Or only in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, after the church had gone through a major reformation within itself? Which versions were used at each of these periods if translation was made at each of them? These are the questions to be dealt in this sub-section.

Broadly speaking, there are five major periods in the history of reception, transmission and translation of the Scriptures into Ge'ez: (1) the earliest period before and at the birth of Christianity, when the religion of Israel and Christianity were introduced, (2) the fourth century AD, when Christianity had become a state religion, (3) the fifth - sixth centuries AD, typical for the arrival of "the Nine Saints", when the faith spread widely and the Church was structurally consolidated, (4) the fourteenth - fifteenth centuries AD, when the church underwent a major reform, and (5) the twentieth century with the formal autonomy of the church and a translation shift from Ge'ez to Amharic.[39] These are the five turning points which shape and contribute to the translation and transmission history of the Scriptures in Ethiopia, and to which we turn one by one.

---

[37] The inclusive nature of the EOTC is more apparent in its literary works where the church preserves not only contending literary works within the circle of the Christian Church, but also preserves sacred writings of that of the other / opposing / rival religious groups. For instance, Qura'n has been translated into Ge'ez and preserved in a number of ancient monasteries such as Debre Libanos in Shoa and Debre Newe in Gojam (interviewee # 9, personal communication, 19.12.2011).

[38] A journal article has been developed and published from extracts of this sub-section entitled "Mapping the Reception, Transmission, and Translation of Scriptural Writings in the EOTC: How and Why Some "Pseudepigraphical" Works Receive "Canonical" Status in The Ethiopian Bible" (Bruk 2013b).

[39] At the eve of the 21st century, the church found itself at a crossroads, having to choose between continuing with its strong traditions by resisting the flooding western cultural worldview or compromising some of its longstanding traditions to accommodate modernity hoping to retain the new generation in the church.

(1) If Judaism was introduced to Ethiopia during the visit of the Queen of Sheba to King Solomon—a position strongly held by the EOTC—some portions of the Hebrew Bible, at least the Pentateuch, a text of the Felasha[40], the Beta Israel of Ethiopia, or Ethiopian Jews, must have been introduced at that time. Even if there is a very persistent claim by the EOTC that a scriptural translation from the Hebrew text was made as early as that, this is extremely unlikely as Ge'ez, before the Christian era, was not yet a written language. However, this question is linked to Acts 8, where the Ethiopian eunuch is reading the Scriptures from the Book of Isaiah. If the episode is historical, and though it is not known with certainty what version the eunuch was reading[41], it is evident that some Scriptural texts, in whichever language, existed in Ethiopia as early as the Christian era, or even before.

A generalized description of an Oxford dictionary on the Bible translation into Ge'ez dismisses the entire history in a few lines, and with major shortcomings. It reads:

> Bible translation into Ethiopic (Ge'ez) prob[ably] began in the 4th-5th cent[uries], basically from Greek, but with some influence from Syriac and possibly also Hebrew. From the 14th cent[ury] there were revisions based on the Arabic texts. Almost all Ethiopic biblical MSS date from the 13th/ 14th cent[uries] or later (Cross 1957:566).[42]

The two shortcomings, which need to be closely studied, are limiting the date of the beginning of Ge'ez translation to the fourth - fifth centuries and the date of its mss only to thirteenth / fourteenth centuries. It is correct, however, to note that "there is no satisfactory complete ed[itio]n, [of the Ge'ez version in one volume] though most Books of the OT have been pub[lished separately]..." (Cross 1957:566). But this cannot rule out the possible existence of manuscripts from as early as the fourth and fifth centuries AD.

---

[40] Even if Ethiopian legends strongly claim for a very early date of Felasha's arrival to Ethiopia, during the visitation of Menelik I, the dating of their coming to Ethiopia is much disputed.

[41] Most probably (there is strong consensus among historians) that the eunuch was reading from the LXX version since Greek was widely used in Ethiopia at that time in government circles and among the elite (ምክረ ሥላሴ 2007c:9). However, the Ethiopian scholar, Mikre Sellassie Gebre Amanuel (2007b:159) argues that the eunuch was reading a Ge'ez text, since all the Scriptural writings of the Felashas, the Ethiopian Jews, were not in Hebrew or Greek, but in Ge'ez.

[42] The dictionary further notes on the extent of the canon: "The extent of the canon of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church is unclear in detail, but most lists of books said to comprise the canon include (in addition to the OT, NT, and most of the Deuterocanonical Books) various other items such as Jubilees, 1 Enoch, and the Ethiopic Didascalia" (Cross 1957:566).

Against the long standing position of many scholars that the earliest Ethiopic mss date only from or after the thirteenth century, a very recent archaeological discovery proves that there must have been well-preserved biblical manuscripts in Ge'ez as early as the fourth century.[43] A report of the archaeologists disclosed that:

> What could be the world's earliest Illustrated Christian manuscript has been found in a remote Ethiopian monastery. The Four Gospels were previously assumed to date from about 1100AD, but radiocarbon dating conducted in Oxford suggests they were made between 330 and 650AD. This discovery looks set to transform our knowledge about the development of illuminated manuscripts. It also throws new light on the spread of Christianity into sub-Saharan Africa (Anonymous 2012b).[44]

In other words, the discovery of the manuscripts from as early as the $4^{th} – 6^{th}$ century AD reveals that Christianity has been well established before the translation of at least the discovered manuscripts. This in turn proves that during the time of King Ezana of Axum or the coming of St Frumentius, the first bishop of the Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church, at the early fourth century, Christianity was practiced in Ethiopia, even if it was not fully accepted / practiced by the state. This discovery further rules out the claim or the argument of many scholars who strongly contend that the introduction of Christianity to Ethiopia is only during or after the fourth century.[45]

Not only is the early introduction of Christianity to Ethiopia denied by many scholars, but also some reject Ge'ez's usage as writing language before the time of Ezana, the second quarter of the fourth century. However, it is evident that some of the kings before Ezana used Ge'ez for inscription purposes in their coinages.[46]

(2) As mentioned above, an unambiguous fact in Ethiopian Church history is that Christianity became a state religion in the Axumite Kingdom during the reign of King Ezana in the first half of the fourth century AD with St Frumentius as its bishop. It is in this period that a formal

---

[43] The main reason for such a misleading position, as Mikre Sellassie (2007b:165) strongly argues, is that there have been hardly any sufficient paleontological or archaeological studies done on the field in Ethiopia.

[44] For a detailed report on the entire process of the archaeological discovery and the carbon dating at Oxford see EOTC 2009.

[45] Among the modern scholars or historians who write the introduction of Christianity only in the fourth century Henze (2000:32-34) is included.

[46] For instance, King Wazeba, one of the Axumite kings before Ezana, began to use Ge'ez, instead of Greek, on his coins (Henze 2000:31).

translation of the Scriptures, from versions which were available to the bishop and without any distinction being made between "canonical" and "non-canonical", was produced.

As mentioned above, it is strongly believed that the Ge'ez language underwent two major changes around the early fourth century, due to the spreading of Christianity which in turn resulted in the translation of the Scriptures into Ge'ez from the LXX.[47] The two new developments, possibly as a result of scriptural translation from Greek, were the reversal of the direction of writing, henceforth from left to right instead of from right to left, a reversal perhaps influenced by Greek, and the introduction of vowels (Pankhurst 1998:25).

Besides the development of the Ge'ez language due to scriptural translation works by or under the order of the first bishop, another significant historical turning point is the consecration of the first bishop of the church, St Frumentius. It is based on this first appointment of the bishop by St Athanasius, head of the Alexandrian Patriarchate, since then, that the EOTC has fallen under the apostolic headship of the Coptic Church for sixteen hundred years, until it became an autonomous Patriarchate only in the mid-twentieth century.[48] This bond with the Coptic Church in the later period resulted in scriptural translation being derived from the Arabic main text.

(3) The third turning point in the history of reception, transmission and translation of the Scriptures in Ethiopia is the arrival of "the Nine Saints" from Syria in the fifth and sixth century AD, when they widely propagated the faith and consolidated the church in many aspects. Besides introducing the monastic tradition and a Christian education system in Ethiopia, Pankhurst (1998:37) believes that "the Nine Saints" were involved in "translating, or re-translating the Bible, mainly from the Greek, into Ge'ez". There is a general consensus that the major translation work of the Scriptures into Ge'ez was largely carried out by the Saints

---

[47] It is believed that there was Syriac influence, beginning in this translation, even if the main base text was the LXX (Cross 1957:566).
[48] It is not clear whether St Frumentius followed the "canon" proposed by St Athanasius or he never claimed any other "canon" as the church he presided was an infant one. In fact, not only due to the infancy of his church, but also the question of "canon" has been far from being settled yet for him to take any "canonical" tradition.

who have been very formative for Ethiopian Christianity. It is believed that they have used the LXX as their base text with some reference to the Syriac text as they came from Syria.

However, there is no indication that they have made any attempt to list or designate Scriptural books. Rather, the evidence is indicative of the Saints translating both "canonical" and "pseudepigraphical" books without making any distinction. For instance, the Book of Ethiopic Enoch, with some other pseudepigraphical works, which is in its entirety retained only in Ge'ez, has disappeared in that same period from other parts of the Christian world.[49] Therefore, such books were translated in Ge'ez either during this period, or before, as part of authoritative Scriptural tradition.

(4) Another major period of literary activity in the history of Ethiopia, known as a time of literary renaissance, is the fourteenth century. After the so-called "dark age"[50] in the EOTC history, there was both political and religious reform in Ethiopia. During this period, the Ge'ez version underwent a major revision, this time based on an Arabic translation (Cross 1957:566), which was itself probably based on the Hebrew text. In other words, the LXX based Ge'ez was revised, using the Hebrew based Arabic, which made the Ge'ez version a hybrid of LXX and MT.[51] This became clear during the recent translation process of the LXX into Amharic. Mikre Sellassie (2007b:171), a leading EOTC scholar and translation expert,

---

[49] For a discussion on the rejection, especially by Augustine, and disappearance from the Christian Church in the West since the fourth century AD, see Adler 1978:272 and VanBeek 2000:111.

[50] There are three major features which characterize a period known as "the dark age" in the Ethiopian (Christian) history, a period from the late seventh to the early thirteenth centuries. First, as the kingdom of Axum was weakened, the ports were taken by the Muslim Arabs and the in land roads were blocked by internal rivals, which in turn blocked all the trade routes which resulted in both economic and political crisis. Secondly, with such political crisis and internal rifts, the Coptic Church refused to send Patriarchs for about a century, so that the Ethiopian Church was completely isolated and left without legitimate leadership. As there was no one responsible to ordain priests and an existing generation had been passing away, the church's pastoral and liturgical ministry was endangered. Finally, the invasion of the Queen Judith marked the first persecution of the Ethiopian state and church by somewhat an external body and motivated both politically and religiously took place in this period. With huge destruction of human and material resources of great religious and historical heritage, her assault marked the climax of "the dark age" but did not sustain power after the fall of the Queen, rather left place for another Christian dynasty in a different locality, the Zagwe Dynasty in Lasta. For a detailed discussion on these three incidents and the characteristics of "the dark age", see ሉሌ 1997:47-52; ምክረ ሥላሴ 2010:98-101; ጎርጎርዮስ 1974:30-31.

[51] It is argued that the Syriac also has immense influence on the early Ge'ez translations which makes the Ge'ez version a fusion of all those other texts.

173

notes that, at times, the Ge'ez is much closer to the MT than the LXX because of the Arabic influence in the fourteenth century.

With regard to canonical listing, one important document translated in this period was the *Fetha Negest*, the Law of the Kings. It is believed that it is a legal code compiled around 1240 by an Egyptian Christian writer in Arabic and that it was later translated into Ge'ez in Ethiopia and expanded upon with numerous local laws (Tzadua 1968:xvff). In this legal code it is mentioned that there are eighty-one "divine books which must be accepted by the holy church", though it lists only seventy-three (four). It is on the basis of this tradition, which it considers as being of apostolic origin, that the Ethiopian Church describes the "canon" of the Scriptures as comprising eighty-one books. The problem is that no one knows in which council this list was recognized as such and which these eighty-one books are exactly. There was no debate on the extent and the concept of the canon in this period either, as the major controversy of this period was Mariology, which has, ever since, been given prominence in the church.

(5) From the fifteenth until the twentieth century, the church has faced so many challenges, both from external bodies and within itself. Movements of the Imperial centres,[52] less than friendly ties with the Coptic Church which was pressurised by the Egyptian Muslim governors,[53] attempts to Catholicize the Ethiopian Christians by the Jesuits, bloody controversy on the two natures of Christ,[54] invasion by the Muslim sultanate of Adal,[55] and

---

[52] The major shifts were from Axum to Zagwe/Lalibela, and from there to Gondar, and then finally to Shewa. However, there have been a number of shorter period occasional capitals of the state of Ethiopia. For a detailed discussion on such power shifts, see Munro-Hay 2002:19-36.

[53] For difficult relationships the EOTC experienced with the Coptic Church at times, see ሱሴ 1997:49, 57, 59. For the major complaints and dissatisfaction of the EOTC on the Coptic Church, see ገርገርዮስ 1974:74-83. For similar discussions, see also O'Leary 1936:47-49.

[54] For a lengthy discussion on the coming of the Jesuit missionaries, their attempt to Catholicize the EOTC, and the ensuing bloody controversy on the nature(s) of Christ, see Jones and Monroe 1955:88-96; ገርገርዮስ 1974:50-60; ሱሴ 1997:97-128. Gibbon (1830:234f.) also records some of the details of the events chronologically, including the bloodshed. He concludes by reasoning that that historic event has had an effect of shuttering of the EOTC to the West. After the EOTC won the battle against the Jesuits, Gibbon (1830:235) writes that they "resounded with a slogan of triumph, 'that the sheep of Ethiopia were now delivered from the hyenas of the west;' and the gates of that solitary realm were forever shut against the arts, the science, and the fanaticism of Europe."

[55] Much has been written on the invasion of the Muslim sultanate of Adal, Imam Ahmed ibn Ibrahim, also nicknamed *Gragne Mohamed,* to which the EOTC claims much of the destruction of priceless and countless manuscripts, monasteries and other sacred materials. A book in Amharic by Tekle-Tsadik Mekuria, a renowned

other historical events which seriously shook the church.[56] However, the church proved to be strong enough to cope with the challenges and to preserve its unique traditions. At the same time the church managed to copy, transmit and retain Scriptural books at various monasteries, remote from danger and other challenging circumstances.

The most notable achievement of the church which has long been awaited and which came true in the twentieth century was the formal autonomy of the church, headed by its own patriarchate. Technically the church never had the right to conduct its own major council as it was always a dependent or a subordinate of the Coptic Church, in spite of its isolation from other churches for so many centuries. At the same time, in spite of its dependency and because of its isolation, the church managed to adhere to its own unique collection of Scriptural books and to continue its other unique traditions.

As we can see from these layers of reception, translation, and transmission history of the Scriptures in Ethiopia, the influences are widely diverse. Strong and direct influence from the Jews, the Alexandrian Coptic Church, the Syrian theologians and texts, and later, an Arabic textual and theological legacy are evident. The overview of this history further proves that the EOTC scriptural tradition seems to be a conglomeration of all these influences and as a result remains to be open and wider than them all. It is in such a competing textual tradition that some of the texts, such as *1 Enoch*, gain prominence as they became central for various practical traditions such calendar, angelology, amulets, astrology, dualism, medicine, and many other aspects in the lives of both the laity and the clergy.[57]

In summary, the Ge'ez translation of the Scriptures is one of the ancient translations. Although the translation process has been very complex, it is clear that the main text for the Ge'ez Bible is the LXX with, at times, influences from the MT, the Syriac,[58] and at its later

---

Ethiopian historian and diplomat, entitled Ethiopia and the invasion of Gragne Mohamed, is devoted to this topic. For a discussion on this invasion, see also ተክለ ጻዲቅ 1972:32-56; Pankhurst 1998:84-96; ምክረ ሥላሴ 2010:391-394; ሱሴ 1997:100-107.

[56] These challenges are mainly connected to the external attempts of expansion which resulted in invading both the country and the church. For a detailed discussion on the major wars Ethiopia fought, see Pankhurst 1998.

[57] For a detailed discussion on the influence and place of *1 Enoch* in the Ethiopian Church in particular and the entire populace in general, see the next chapter, Chapter 7.

[58] Whether the Syriac origin is MT or LXX is not known, which needs further study.

age from the Arabic. The earliest translation had been done at least in, or even before, the fourth century, with a major translation work following in the fifth and sixth centuries, and with another major revision taking place as late as the fourteenth and following centuries. As part of authoritative Scriptures, *1 Enoch* has always been part of this reception history as one of the prominent books in the tradition of the EOTC.[59] However, the production of an authoritative list of books to be included remained lacking or unclear or incomplete, with variations. Saying differently, the fixation of the "canon" of the Scriptures has never taken place in the long history of the church, which affords equal authority to both "canonical" and some "pseudepigraphical" works. What then is the "canon" of the EOTC?

6.4 The Concept, Notion, and Extent of the "Canon" of the Scriptures in EOTC and Evangelicals in Ethiopia

6.4.1 Introduction

As with any Christian denomination, it is assumed that the EOTC has its own "canon" of the Scriptures and indeed the church itself traditionally holds 81 books of the Old and the New Testament books as its "canon". With closer and critical investigation, however, this tradition can be challenged and a different conclusion is drawn as it seems that the concept of a "canon" as a strict list of books and the requirement to limit oneself to that list is possibly alien to the EOTC's understanding of the "canon". Thus the fundamental issue at stake is not only the extent and content of the "canon", but also the concept and usage of the term itself.[60] Questions such as "Is the EOTC 'canon' open or closed?" in its strictest sense, may not fit the concept of the "canon" in the EOTC, though the question is becoming more relevant in recent times. Such a question may be very relevant to Western churches, but proves, when imposed on the EOTC, to be inherently alien to it. This section of the chapter, therefore, critically investigates both the concept and extent of the EOTC "canon" of the Scriptures.

---

[59] For a very recent discussion on the reception history of *1 Enoch*, see Stuckenbruck 2013:7-40. Stuckenbruck (2013:21) rejects the authority of the book in the EOTC before the fifteenth century, a position which Nickelsburg (2001:106-108) correctly rejects.

[60] For a detailed discussion on some key theological terminologies, including "canon" and "canonical", as employed in this thesis, see chapter three above.

Furthermore, the conceptual problem on how the Ethiopian Evangelicals understand and articulate the "canon" of the Scriptures, which is usually taken for granted, is critically investigated. The question of whether or not they have a closed or open "canon" is indirectly at stake. In other words, the stance of the different Evangelical Churches in Ethiopia on the notion of a "canon" of the Scriptures is assessed from hermeneutical, theological, practical, and historical points of view. Besides the question on how they understand their "canon" of the Scriptures, we examine whether the Ethiopian Evangelicals across the board would have similar views on it.

6.4.2 Other Preliminary Issues

The specific theoretical framework applicable to this chapter in general, and this section in particular, is a "history of reception approach" as the question of a "canon" of the Scriptures lies behind the history of reception, collection, translation, and transmission of the Scriptures in the Ethiopian church. This approach gives special attention to the way in which a particular perspective of each period and context has shaped the understanding of the text and how the text has had effects on the history into which it is received.[61] In clearer terms, H. Marcuse (2003) defines the "history of reception" as "the history of the meanings that have been imputed to historical events. It traces the different ways in which participants, observers, historians and other retrospective interpreters have attempted to make sense of events both as they unfolded and over time since then, to make those events meaningful for the present in which they lived and live".

It is this approach in perspective which frames the entire discussion of this chapter. As the discussion around the "canon" of the Scriptures has been arguably as old as the history of the Christian church itself, this study has in mind some of the discussions and concepts at various points in history, in accordance with the contemporary debate.

---

[61] For a detailed discussion on this theoretical framework, which is a *history of reception approach*, see chapter two, which is devoted solely to a discussion on this and two other theoretical frameworks.

Methodologically, this study applies both literature and fieldwork.[62] In addition to drawing on the little amount of literature on the topic, the main tool employed in collecting data is qualitative interviews with the leading elites of the EOTC and Ethiopian Evangelicals. The interviewees included for the study were purposely selected among high level scholars, theologians, leaders, clergy and some laity of both the EOTC and Evangelical adherents. The questions the interviewees were asked include: "How do you define 'canon' of the Scriptures?" "What constitutes the Scriptures or the 'canon' of the Scriptures in the EOTC or Ethiopian Evangelical Churches?" "Is the 'canon' of the EOTC or Ethiopian Evangelical Churches closed or open?"[63]

6.4.3 Data Analysis

As the literary data are scarce in the field, the main data for this section come from field study. The literature dealing with the EOTC "canon" is both insufficient and misleading / contradictory. It is insufficient because the participants in the Western scholarly discussion of the topic of the "canon" of the Scriptures, which has been extensively discussed, have neglected the EOTC "canon" in their discussion.[64] In addition, the definition and the extent of the "canon" of the Scriptures in general has been a highly debated issue among scholars of the field in the recent years. A recent monumental work on the subject, published in 2002, edited by McDonald & Sanders, with contributions of more than thirty scholars in the field, and rightly entitled *The Canon Debate: on the Origins and Formation of the Bible*, is evidence of the ongoing debate. The book admits that it intended "to show how diverse and complex the issue and positions on canon formation are" (McDonald & Sanders 2002:17). However, the questions around the EOTC "canon" are entirely ignored in this comprehensive work, as in others before.

---

[62] For a broader and detailed discussion on methodology, literature review, and data analysis, see chapters one and two above. Included here are the key points relevant to understand the discussion of this section.

[63] For the entire open qualitative interview questions used as a frame to make probing questions, see Appendix 3.A. See also chapter one for a discussion on the process of the field research, the number and diversity of interviewees, and all other details in this connection.

[64] For instance, the leading scholars in this debate in the last century, Beckwith (1985 and 1991), Bruce (1988), Gamble (1985), Metzger (1987), and Sundberg (1988 and 1969), all ignored the EOTC "canon" in their discussion.

Amongst a number of books produced by the EOTC, a recent publication on the overall life and beliefs of the church, entitled *The Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church Faith, Order of Worship and Ecumenical Relations* is notable. The book comprises twenty-seven chapters, among which one deals with Holy Scriptures according to the church's "canon". However, the list is only one among several mentioned elsewhere,[65] which complicates the "canon" problem of the EOTC. In fact, the works by Aymro & Motovu (1970:77-79) and by Sergew Hable Selassie (1977), also give different lists, which would mislead the reader.

In connection to the EOTC "canon", Cowley (1974:318-323) is the first ever to contribute directly to the topic.[66] His brief but pioneering article states that there are two ways of classifying the EOTC "canon"—namely as a "narrower" and as a "broader" "canon" (Cowley 1974:318). The "broader" list comprises a list of 46 OT books and 35 NT books while the "narrower" canon lists 54 OT and 27 NT books. The essential difference between these two lists concerns mainly the NT, where eight substantial books are included.[67] The content of the OT list is more or less the same, but there is still fluidity in both lists. However, Cowley's (1974:320) conclusion that the list in the "narrower" canon "can be regarded as undisputed in the Ethiopian Orthodox Church today" is misleading since the variations in different lists have not yet been resolved.[68]

Another recent article by Baynes (2012:799-818) raises the issue of the concept of canon in the EOTC, where she concludes that it is a loose one. However, the article admits that its

---

[65] For instance, the recently published EOTC Bible contains a different list while Cowley (1974:318-319) has two different lists, to compare.

[66] It should be noted that J. M. Harden (1926:37-51) has raised the issue and reflected the extent of the problem in the EOTC "canon" as he surveyed the literary history of the Ethiopian Church.

[67] One of the versions of these eight books, included in the EOTC NT, and known as Books of Church Order, are, *Sinodos* (4 books, namely The Order of Zion, Commandment (*Tizaz*), *Gitzew,* and *Abtils*), the Book of the Covenant (2 books), Clement (1), and Didascalia (1). Another version simply counts eight books of Clement, which are called 1 Clement, 2 Clement, 3 Clement … and 8 Clement. Thus, when we talk about publication, it is about the "narrower" canon since these eight additional NT books are too bulky to be printed in one volume.

[68] To be sure, all the existing Amharic translations, which follow the "narrower" eighty-one list, have variations in the number of their OT list. Referring to the 1918, 1929, 1947, and 1980 publications, Dibekulu Zewde (1995:118) argues that there are uneven lists of books in some of these "canons", where there are more than eighty-one books, even if all of them are counted as eighty-one books of the Scriptures.

study on the concept of the "canon" is not exhaustive as its main concern is the canonical position of two "pseudepigraphical" books in the EOTC "canon".[69]

It is Dibekulu Zewde (1995), an EOTC theologian and a researcher, who has undertaken a study fully devoted to the topic of the EOTC "canon" - a very detailed work, entitled *The 81 Holy Bibles and the Scripture – Canons* (as translated by the author of the book himself). This extensive and exhaustive work is written in Amharic, an Ethiopian national language, which limits its access to the local readers. Thus, this study closely and critically engages with it as its primary source.

The two main questions around the EOTC "canon", namely its concept and extent, are critically analysed for the purpose of this research using a fairly recent book in Amharic by Dibekulu, devoted to this. This book is relevant because it addresses concerns on the issues related to the concept of the "canon" and whether it is a closed or open "canon".

The main qualitative data comes from 28 participants who were deliberately chosen because of their capacity and expertise related to the study. All participants were clearly informed about the nature and purpose of the study, having signed a declaration of such an understanding and consent to participating in the research project explicitly. All the interviews were audio-taped, and at the early stage of the data analysis, all were transcribed verbatim, and codified topically where responses of the same question or topic are grouped for comparing and contrasting. Findings were drawn interpreting them based on the questions raised by this study.[70]

---

[69] Some other general books on the EOTC briefly touch the canon issue, mainly on the list eighty-one books of the "canon" and the belief of the church on the inspiration of those scriptural books.

[70] All the twenty-eight interviews are transcribed in the language they are conducted, Amharic (with two exceptions, which are in English), and are available in the appendix volume to the thesis.

6.4.4 Discussion and Findings on the Concept and Extent of the EOTC "Canon"[71]

6.4.4.1 Part One, Dibekulu Zewde's Book

Dibekulu's book begins with an assumption that the two authoritative sources for the EOTC Scriptures are Ecumenical Synods before 451 and the Church Fathers. He refers to six ecumenical councils from what he calls the eighty-five Apostolical canons to the Council of Laodicea in 360 CE. He also refers to more than fifteen Church Fathers from both the East and the West until St Augustine, where all of these are credible sources for the canonical origin of the EOTC.

His study proves that it is possible to reach a list of eighty-one "canonical" books in a number of different ways and that at times the list of the books may be above or below eighty-one. In this regard, he points out that this has not been a problem in the church's tradition. In other words, the fluidity of the extent of the "canonical" books has not been a major concern in the history of the EOTC.[72] After an extensive discussion of six major "canonical" traditions, which he assumes as the background for the EOTC Scriptures, Dibekulu (1995:296) concludes that the number of "canonical" books of the EOTC is eighty-one and that this is only a tradition without an explicit or official decision or recognition by the church.

A closer look at the book further shows that the entire discussion of the book clarifies not only just the fluidity of the EOTC canon; rather, it proves that the church does not have any officially accepted canon. Besides a comprehensive and a detailed discussion with credible evidence the simple proof for the lack of such a canon in the EOTC he presents is the four published Bibles or canons of the Scriptures in the last century, from 1918 – 1980 (Dibekulu

---

[71] For a discussion on the concept and extent of the EOTC "canon", see also Bruk and Decock 2012:178-188.
[72] However, one may ask why did it become an issue at the Reformation period or in the fourth and fifth centuries in the history of the Church, and why not in the EOTC? Even if this needs further investigation, an initial response would be the historical context of each period and the questions rose during those times required fixation of a canon. However, in the case of the EOTC, the challenges and the questions as a result were different from those in the other parts of the Church. The EOTC has been dealing with other crucial questions of its context.

1995:275),[73] where the four editions have different lists, even if they agree in most of the collections.

As Dibekulu tries to respond to the issue of the concept of a "canon", he explicitly argues that what makes a sacred book binding in a church's authoritative Scriptures is not necessarily the recognition in a certain Ecumenical Council; rather, it is its orthodoxy in line with the teaching of the church[74] (and, that it is interpreted in an orthodox way according to the teaching of the church). The example he gives is the canonical status of the two books of Clement where they were rejected by some Ecumenical Councils in 691 AD of which the EOTC was not part. Thus, the decisions of these Councils regarding the "canonical" status of these books are not binding to the EOTC so long as the books do not contradict its teaching according to their own assessment.[75]

One of the major reasons which contributed to the openness of the EOTC "canon" is the meaning of the adjectives which are used to refer to the Scriptures. There are at least ten terms or adjectives Dibekulu (1995:225f.) lists which are used to express Holy Scriptures as used in the church. These include: (1) books which are "ordered to be accepted" by the church, (2) "honoured", i.e., those books which maintain the highest honour, (3) "holy", i.e., those books which are the holiest ones, (4) books which are "to be read", i.e., obliged to be read, (5) books which would necessarily "be read" in the future, (6) "canonical", i.e., books which are canonized, (7) books which "should be canonized", (8) "recognized" or "known" more than any other books, (9) "divine", i.e., books which speak about God, and (10) "written with the inspiration of the Spirit of God". It is in this context that he discusses the canon of the EOTC, where books qualified with these adjectives may have scriptural status and thus played an important role in the concept of the Scriptures in this church. In other words, the various

---

[73] This list can also include a fifth edition, the so called a Millennium Edition, with another variant list of books, which was published after the publication of Dibekulu's book, in 2007.

[74] In fact, this was the original meaning of 'canon' in the church until the 4th century AD. See John Barton in Coggins and Houlden 1992:104.

[75] What is important to note here is that the EOTC was not part of the Ecumenical Councils and so had to make up their own minds and saw no reason to press for a clear-cut solution.

adjectives used to indicate sacred books forced the church to be more inclusive and open to a larger number of books, without a clear delimitation.

Dibekulu finally argues that the EOTC has an open canon but calls for a closed canon possibly in the near future so that the EOTC follows the traditions of other churches.[76] In this final remark, he proposes three options the church should consider, underlining the necessity of a closure of a canon. The three options he suggests are to determine which 46 OT and 35 NT books constitute the eighty-one books of a canon (option 1), or which 49 OT and 35 NT books constitute 84 books of a canon (option 2), or which 46 (49) OT and 27 NT books constitute 73 (76) books of a canon.

It can be inferred from his final remarks, in particular, and the entire book, in general, that the EOTC canon, on the one hand, has never been a closed canon in a strict sense with a binding list of books, and on the other hand, that there are still only a limited number of books which are debated to be part of the canon or not. In other words, it is not an open canon so long as the options to include whichever books one may want to include is closed and, it is not a closed canon so long as there are still possibilities to include or exclude certain books from its canon.

6.4.4.2 Part Two: Findings from Interviews

There are five major categories on the position of closed or open canon, which emerged from the interviews with the EOTC elites. (1) Some of them strictly argue for a closed canon but fail to objectively prove their position. (2) Some others argue for a progression from an open canon to a closed one. (3) Others express the need for a middle ground to define the canonical position of the church where it is not strictly closed or open. (4) Some preferred to bypass the question or were not comfortable to respond to it. (5) Others tried to defend both a closed and open canon.[77]

---

[76] It is interesting that the scholarly approach is not interested in limiting the attention to the canonical works but wants to study all documents from that same period in order to understand the canonical works. On the other hand, canonical criticism again emphasized the canonical framework.

[77] In his recent article Jackson (2014) has made a very import contribution on our understanding of the concept and practice of "canon" during the Second Temple Period and later. However, his concept of the "dualling

It is appropriate to give some description of each of these:

(1) The first position is that the EOTC canon is strictly closed. For instance, interviewee # 11 (personal communication, 19.12.2011), a university lecturer and an EOTC theologian, strongly argues that the EOTC canon is a closed one. Even though he conceded that one could count the list of the canon in various ways, he insisted that the canon is closed and what apparently seems to be open is a matter for interpretation. Likewise, Interviewee # 12 (personal communication, 19.12.2011), the vice chairperson of the scholars' committee of the EOTC, next to the Patriarch, strictly contends that the church has a closed canon even if he admits the existence of some gaps in the way the books are counted. An instructor in a prominent EOTC theological seminary, interviewee # 16 (personal communication, 19.12.2011), is in agreement with them. He says that strictly speaking, the church has a closed canon of 81 books even if we can come to this 81 in different ways. Moreover, he argues that the issue of determining which 81 books constitute the correct canon is the responsibility of the scholars of the church and it is best left to them. Interviewee # 24 (personal communication, 27.12.2011), an accountant by profession, but an active member of the church, argues that his church has eighty-one books which make it strictly a closed canon. But he admits the enumeration may vary and that this does not matter so long as the books included in any of the lists are not violating the true teaching of the Scriptures and is consistent with them. He further notes that one can even accept other books if their teaching[78]

---

canons" is somehow elusive to the discussion of our present discussion in the EOTC and Ethiopian context. His main point, as exemplified in three STL faith communities—Enochic, Pharisees and Christians, is that they all accept the first (Hebraic) canon and developed a second canon specific to their own tradition and make use of this one to interpret the first. Even if it resembles the scriptural construct of the EOTC, the problem to apply Jackson's dual canon to the EOTC is that the second canon, according to this pattern, is the production of that specific community. Even if the EOTC has a lot of literary production in line with their traditional teaching, it is not this body of literature which is considered as authoritative Scripture. The canonical difference between the EOTC and Evangelicals (or the Western concept for that matter) is not on the books produced by the EOTC themselves, rather, on the other STL writings included in the EOTC canon. Therefore, it would be appropriate to make a distinction between the concept of canon, as mentioned earlier (chapter 3), as a rule of faith and a list of books, where the former is the guiding principle in the EOTC whereas the latter is assumed by the Evangelicals. It is this assumption of the concept of canon in the EOTC that led to embrace "a neither open nor closed" type of canon. But this assertion or evaluation, unfortunately, is made up of the western "closed/open" canon concept and not from the EOTC "rule of faith" concept of canon, which may not necessarily preclude the same assumption.

[78] It should be noted that correct teaching has been a strong 'canonical' norm in the history of the Church. Even Luther was tempted to use it to sideline the Letter of James. This could be an indication that canon as correct doctrine may be a stronger argument than canon as belonging to a list. The question of a canon within a canon is

is edifying, which comes across as indirectly advocating for an open canon. In one way or the other, he shares the same position with some of the above research participants.

(2) In the second category are those who advocate an open canon. One of the leading scholars of the EOTC and a Bible translation consultant, interviewee # 1 (personal communication, 15.12.2011), maintains that there is no distinction between what other Christian churches would distinguish into canonical, Apocryphal and/or non-canonical books in the EOTC; the church holds all as Scriptures.[79] Interviewee # 1 also suggests that there are different schools within the EOTC holding differing positions on the list of the canonical books. Interviewee # 9 (personal communication, 19.12.2011), an EOTC theologian and a researcher in Addis Ababa University (AAU), also has a clear position in suggesting that the canon of the EOTC is open since there is no strict list of books to form a closed canon. There are possibilities for certain books to be in or out of the canon. On the other hand, he argues that, this does not mean any book can have that privilege; a book should be in agreement with the doctrinal criterion over list criterion to be part of the canon in one or the other list, in which case it is a closed canon. Strictly speaking, he expressed the need for a third alternative.

(3) As partially suggested by interviewee # 9 above (#2), in the third category are those who are in search of a middle ground to define the canon of the EOTC where it is not strictly closed or open. For instance, interviewee # 3 (personal communication, 11.12.2011), an EOTC theologian and a researcher in AAU, clearly sees the number 81 as more of a tradition than practice. The books of the canon are less than 81. However, it is very difficult for him to say that the canon of the EOTC is open even if the church is still trying to fix it.

(4) Many interviewees may fall into this category where they fear the issue is yet inconclusive and as a result they opt to either bypass the question or are not comfortable to respond to it conclusively. Interviewee # 14 (personal communication, 21.12.2011), the General Secretary

---

a move in this direction. So, one may ask in this case if correct doctrine determines what in the books should receive priority.

[79] Besides the openness of the canon, the other nuance he indicates in his interview is that the EOTC doesn't make any distinction between the so called "canonical", "Apocryphal", "non-canonical" and/or "pseudepigraphical" books as Western churches do. The books of Genesis, Luke, *1 Enoch*, or Judith are all equally Scriptures in the EOTC, for instance.

of the Bible Society of Ethiopia (BSE), responds that the church has not yet declared officially whether it has an open or closed canon and, as a result, it is difficult to say whether the church owns an open or closed canon. Interviewee # 22 (personal communication, 21.12.2011), a translation consultant at the BSE, is either uncertain or uncomfortable to respond to this question and he comments that the church strongly attached itself to the number 81, which assumes a closed canon, whereas the variation in the inclusion and exclusion of certain books in this strict list is still open.[80]

(5) Finally, interviewee # 4 (personal communication, 16.12.2011), a prominent church leader and scholar, argues that the EOTC "canon" of the Scriptures is both closed and open. He argues that so long as there is a clear principle and guideline that constitutes a book to be among the Scriptures, it is a closed "canon". However, that does not mean that there is a rigid number of books which counts to be a canon; this would make it an open "canon".[81] In other words, he argues, it is not which book is part of the canon that is binding (open?); rather, it is what teaching is derived from it that decides its inclusion in the canon (closed?).

In summary, the entire five categories, in one way or the other, reflect that the EOTC "canon" of the Scriptures is neither closed nor open; or on the other hand, one can rightly argue that it is both closed and open. In other words, the discussion reflects that three broader categories are in dialogue: closed, open, and neither closed nor open.

In the meantime, the concept of the "canon" has not yet been developed or understood as a strict list of sacred books where nothing can be included or excluded in the EOTC. This is very much connected to the ultimate authority of the church where it retains the right to determine what is binding in regard to the Scriptures. This is very clearly reflected in the plea of many of the participants in the church to finalize the closure of the "canon". However, there are others who question this request as unacceptable, since they believe that the church has

---

[80] In the same line, interviewees like interviewee # 13 (personal communication, 20.12.2011), a PhD student and an Instructor in a leading seminary of the EOTC, interviewee # 10 (personal communication, 19.12.2011), scholar and one of the top leaders of the EOTC, and interviewee # 19 (personal communication, 23.12.2011), a lay member of the church, are either unwilling or uncomfortable or unsure to respond to the question.
[81] Interviewee # 4's example to express this is the rule or law of fasting. That one has to fast is an unchangeable and strict law. But in what way to fast, how long to fast, when to fast, and other details are flexible or open to the one who is determined to fast.

always had both the guidelines and the mandate to recognize whether a book is "canonical" or not. In other words, they suggest that the "canon" of the EOTC is basically in line with the rule of faith as the determining factor over a list of books. So, a hard and fast inclusion and exclusion issue of books is not apparent in the church's scriptural tradition.

6.4.4.3 Part Three: Other sources

Besides Dibekulu's analysis and the findings of interviews, that the EOTC "canon" is neither closed nor open, the literature published under the supervision of the church indicates similar findings. For instance, a book entitled *The Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church Faith, Order of Worship and Ecumenical Relations* strongly claims a closed "canon" of 81 books (EOTC 1996:45-47). However, contrary to its closure, it admits that the EOTC "has other books written by Holy Fathers based on the Old and New Testaments expanding the theological education and prayer; books on the hymns and chants of St. Yared and other related books" (EOTC 1996:47). It is in this latter sense that another book entitled *The Church of Ethiopia: Past and Present* (EOTC 1997) generalizes that the holy books at the disposal of the EOTC make it difficult to say exactly how many constitute the "canon". It does not indicate that the "canon" is closed, nor does it mention a traditional number eighty-one; rather it collectively indicates various kinds of ancient books preserved by the church that are over 850 in number. One can readily find more evidence of such variations as an indication of the fluidity or uncertainty of what constitutes the EOTC "canon", which is both confusing and misleading, at least for a non-Orthodox scholar or reader.

There seems to be a consensus among scholars that the EOTC "canon" is fluid (Baynes 2012; Cowley 1974).[82] Such a conclusion remains meaningless and misleading if it does not consider the deeper understanding of the concept of "canon" by the EOTC. It represents no more than an understanding of the external appearance of the "canon" of the EOTC, but it does not include the historical and pragmatic position of the church itself. Historically, the EOTC, as a church, has never participated in any ecumenical council deliberating on the issue of the

---

[82] See also Ullendorff (1968:31-72) where his entire discussion on Bible translation history in Ethiopia has a nuance of non-canonized Scripture in the EOTC. In his long discussion of the Bible in Ethiopia, he rather avoids discussing the issue of the canon of the Scriptures directly.

"canon" of the Scriptures nor did it hold any debate independently so as to make a conclusive decision on its "canon" of the Scriptures. Pragmatically, until the dawn of the twenty-first century, the church did not find itself in a position where the issue of the closure of the "canon" of the Scriptures has been a major challenge and a central issue for its life and faith, since all the Scriptures, regardless of their inclusion in the list of the "canon", are only part of the broader tradition by which the church is governed (interviewee # 9, personal communication, 19.12.2011).

On the other hand, it should be noted that currently there has been an increasing tendency to look for a closed "canon" by the EOTC, perhaps because of certain external influences. These may include (1) the general trend of the Church at large, to have, as almost all churches, a formally closed "canon"; and (2) an informal, but continued, debate with fellow believers from Protestant churches, where in most cases the debates presuppose a closed "canon".[83]

In conclusion, it seems fairly clear that the major reason for the existence of an inconclusive list of the EOTC "canon" is very much connected to a differing understanding of the concept of the "canon" of the Scriptures based on different historical experiences. As to the EOTC, in principle, any ancient scriptural book, which is coherent with the dogma of the church, can be part of the "canon". It is in this sense that the "canonical" concept of the EOTC and that of the early Church is similar. However, in practice, the list of books, which have potential to be part of the "canon" of the Scriptures, is limited to only those which are mentioned in the various traditional lists and the symbolic number eighty-one. As a result, the church has never officially defined what constitutes a "canon" of the Scriptures nor fixed which books comprise this list. It is satisfied with the tradition of eighty-one books of "canon" as binding without

---

[83] Given that the "canon" debate is a dynamic one, it should be noted that we remain with more serious and sensitive questions around the canon, both in the EOTC and the other Christian churches in general, which is beyond the scope of this thesis. Specifically, questions recommended for further study include, among other issues; why it became so important in the sixteenth century in Europe to have absolute clarity on the boundaries of the canon and why was it not so urgent in Ethiopia; why was it not so urgent in the West until the sixteenth century, and that whenever the West discussed it in some way in the past, what was it that led to such a concern; why it is now becoming a concern for some EOTC members, which was not a major concern before; even if it has always been a major concern in the West; and, finally, whether the West always officially agreed that the canon of the Old Testament must follow the Jewish tradition.

interrogating the number or the value of the eighty-one and without worrying whether this number is either unambiguous or definitive.

However, one may conclude that the central concept of the "canon" of the Scriptures for the EOTC may not mainly reflect a list of specific books which would constitute authoritative Scriptures; rather, it denotes "the apostolic criteria" (interviewee # 4, personal communication, 16.12.2011), as claimed by the church, that determines whether a given scriptural book could be part of that authoritative Scriptures. In other words, the concept of the EOTC "canon" of the Scriptures arises more from the ancient concept of "canon" as a rule of faith than its later development of "canon" as a list of fixed books. It is a matter of time that will determine whether the church will finally take a decision to clarify both the concept and extent of the "canon" of the Scriptures in line with this latter development, in response to the current pressures, or whether it will continue to hold either an open or a closed "canon" of the Scriptures, viewed from this latter point of view.

6.4.5 Discussion and Findings on the Concept and Extent of the "Canon" among Ethiopian Evangelicals

6.4.5.1 Introduction

Unlike the EOTC, there is no question on the extent of the "canon" of the Scriptures among Ethiopian Evangelicals; it is generally taken for granted that they all follow the global Evangelical list of sixty-six books. The question rather to be posed should be whether the Evangelicals understand what is meant by a "canon" of the Scriptures—its concept and notion. Do Ethiopian Evangelicals understand the historical background of the "canon" and the entire process of canonization or do they understand their sacred writings in a different way? If assessed from historical, hermeneutical, theological, and practical points of view, is the "canon" of Ethiopian Evangelicals closed or open or neither of them? Is there any level of fluidity of understanding of the concept and extent of the "canon" among Evangelicals in Ethiopia? These are some of the problems this subsection attempts to assess.

As in the case of the EOTC interviewees, fourteen Evangelicals are involved in the field research on the concept and notion of the "canon" of the Scriptures. Among these fourteen interviewees, most of them are elites—leaders, theologians, higher education instructors, and

ordained minsters—while only a couple of them are laity, but volunteer/lay ministers.[84] As is the case with the EOTC interviewees, here also, academically all of them are holders of first degrees or above, including PhD.[85] As the top leaders of three mainline Evangelical Churches and instructors from leading seminaries are involved in the interviews, it is possible that their position adequately reflects that of the collective stances of Evangelicals in Ethiopia. Besides the interviews, faith statements of three institutions—The Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus (EECMY), The Ethiopian Kale Hiwot Church (EKHC), and The Evangelical Churches Fellowship of Ethiopia (ECFE)—on their stance of their Scriptures, are incorporated in the concluding remarks.

The main focus of this subsection is analysing the interviews on their responses on the position of their Evangelical "canon" of the Scriptures. The analysis mainly aims to display the findings on the attitude of the interviewees towards their "canon": its concept, notion, and extent. In addition, their attitude to the EOTC "canon" and the so called "additional books" is assessed. Finally a critique is made of the Evangelicals' notion of "canon" of the Scriptures from a hermeneutical and practical point of view.

6.4.5.2 Analysis and Results from the Evangelical interviewees

The interviewees have a very strong consensus on the majority of the questions, though they expressed this in slightly different ways or wordings. In most cases, the nuance is the same. However, there are issues where they differ from one another, taking various stances. In only a few cases is there a stark contrast between a majority position and a minority opinion strongly articulated. In the meantime, many of them try to be honest and confess their ignorance at a number of issues, while others hold strong convictions on the canon, but when objectively examined, could not substantiate their propositions.

---

[84] In many Ethiopian Evangelical Churches, it is very difficult to demarcate between ordained and lay ministers as many minsters could perform the duties traditionally engaged in by ordained ministers. Furthermore, many lay ministers hold a full time ministry office without being formally ordained with "self-designated" ministry titles such as "Evangelist", "Brother", "Pastor", and so on. In the meantime, in almost all Evangelical denominations in Ethiopia, the pulpit is open for lay preachers, where many congregations are fully dependent on them. Therefore, the line between ordained and lay ministers is technically unclear and practically insignificant.

[85] For detailed information on the composition of the interviewees, see chapter one of the thesis above.

In a broader look, there are three categories where the Evangelical interviewees can be divided on the issues related to their attitude towards their Scriptures and the Scriptures of the EOTC. These categories include (1) issues about which there is more or less full consensus, (2) issues on which the majority defend a common position while a minority differ, and (3) issues either with varied positions or a fluid stance by several interviewees. The analysis begins with what the interviewees have in common and then proceeds to issues on which they hold diverse positions.

One of the most unanimous stances all interviewees hold in common is on the question "How do you define your Evangelical "canon" of the Scriptures?" The response of this question reflects the common passion of all Evangelical interviewees, where they all equate their Bible with "the Word of God" from which nothing can be added nor nothing reduced. So, the two major points on the concept of "canon", according to Ethiopian Evangelicals, are: (1) its fixation to a limited number of books, a closed "canon", and (2) that it is "the" Word of God. In most cases, their definitions are more functional than conceptual; it is more about what it serves, what it accomplishes, rather than what it is. Thus, their emphasis and focus is more on point #2 than #1.[86]

Thus, they all believe it is the source of all authority and the only authoritative document of the Christian faith. God puts it amongst human beings by His Spirit and humans wrote it so that it becomes our law, our instruction (interviewee # 5, personal communication, 17.12.2011; interviewee # 6, personal communication, 17.12.2011). Some argue that the Evangelicals' Bible is highly attached to salvation and they believe that anything outside the 66 books would undermine the doctrine of salvation which comes only through Jesus Christ and His grace. So, this belief leads one to be suspicious towards all other versions, especially

---

[86] The only exception on the concept of the "canon" is that of interviewee # 18 (personal communication, 22.12.2011). The concept of "canon", according to her, is specifically associated with the measuring or weighing criteria. So, what is important is not if the book is in this list or that, rather, it is whether it qualifies based on a given criteria. This concept or principle is exactly the same with the EOTC's concept, as expressed by interviewee # 4, though they differ on what constitutes the criteria. For interviewee # 4 (personal communication, 16.12.2011), for instance, the major criterion is if the book complies with the true teaching of the church, its orthodoxy. For interviewee # 18, however, among others, the criteria include its authoritative power, prophetic background, its authenticity, orthodoxy, and existential power. Thus, both of them, in their own distinct ways, see canon in the meaning of a true doctrine than a list of books.

those of EOTC related translations, as they are thought to be against Christocentric salvation teaching (interviewee # 15, personal communication, 21.12.2011).

However, they all seem to be quite ignorant about the long process of canonicity and whether there are any other historically credible alternative "canons".[87] When asked "What is the historical background of your "canon"? How did we receive it?" none of them, but one (interviewee # 17, personal communication, 21.12.2011), expressed or identified that the final form of the 66 books of the Protestants' / Evangelicals' Bible has its historical connection to the Reformation, which has brought about these churches[88]. As some explain, Ethiopian Evangelicals consider that their Bible is given from above; they do not see it from any historical context; rather it is highly honoured and revered as it is believed to be a-directly-God-given-document (interviewee # 15, personal communication, 21.12.2011). Others think that their Bible, which they think is accepted by the global church, is the word of God (interviewee # 27, personal communication, 30.12.2011).[89]

As a result, they all assume or take for granted that their Bible, the biblical "canon" with sixty-six books, is "the Bible", "the word of God". They just believe their teachers and their predecessors and refer to their traditional teaching, which merely assumes that the Bible which they have is the only true Bible. For instance, one of my interviewees is so clear in her response that she has inherited her Bible, a Bible with the sixty-six books, from her fathers as "the Word of God" and she believes that this is the only one and the true story or "the truth". She said, "We took what our forefathers and our leaders said for granted!" (interviewee # 7, personal communication, 17.12.2011). Another one said, "The missionaries come up with the sixty-six books and we took them for granted. It is not something developed here in Ethiopia; rather, we inherited what the missionaries have brought to us and we received it without questioning at all" (interviewee # 8, personal communication, 18.12.2011). Some consider

---

[87] Only one interviewee (interviewee # 18, personal communication, 22.12.2011) differs from others in that she has a rough clue that there has been a canonization process and our "canon" is not just dropped down from above. She mentioned that the books included in the "canon" have passed some set certain criteria at some point.
[88] She (interviewee # 17, personal communication, 21.12.2011) marginally mentioned that it was Luther who rejected the additional books based on the endless ceremonies conducted in the Catholic Church and came up with the correct "canon".
[89] Interviewee # 27 (personal communication, 30.12.2011) assumes the sixty-six books "canon" is the only one globally accepted.

that their "canon" has already been considered by the early church (interviewee # 15, personal communication, 21.12.2011).

Another area of consensus by the majority of Ethiopian Evangelical interviewees is their prejudice and misconceptions over the so called "additional books", the books which are included in the EOTC "canon" but not found in their "canon" of the 66 books. Almost all of them believe that those books are later additions by the EOTC to legitimize their "erroneous" teaching (interviewee # 5, personal communication, 17.12.2011; interviewee # 17, personal communication, 21.12.2011). Some of them further call them "the excess (*tirif*)" books where they still believe not only "additional" books, but also claim that these are the books which are the main reasons for the differences between the EOTC and the Evangelicals in Ethiopia (interviewee # 6, personal communication, 17.12.2011). They are consciously and lately added by the priests, the clergy, and leaders of the EOTC by their own wish to defend their "erroneous" tradition and teachings (interviewee # 7, personal communication, 17.12.2011). Others incorrectly related the usage of the replica of the Ark of the Covenant with the "additional books," where these books are thought to be the sources for this and other "alien" practices and ceremonies of the EOTC (interviewee # 17, personal communication, 21.12.2011).

Furthermore, interviewee # 15 (personal communication, 21.12.2011) explains that we consider some of the EOTC books are associated with sorcery, others with fictitious myth, and still some others with mere secular tradition and culture. As we are highly encouraged to be spiritual and converted from all worldly things, he continued, the EOTC books are considered as encouraging such worldliness. When some Evangelical interviewees compare their Bible and that of the EOTC, they do not have any justification for their views as they argue that the EOTC "canon" contains additional books purely by the wish of human beings and, in contrast, the sixty-six books of the Evangelicals' "canon" are written by people who are inspired by the Holy Spirit (interviewee # 17, personal communication, 21.12.2011).

However, here also, their arguments prove to be erroneous and mainly based on prejudice,[90] ignorance,[91] and animosity.[92] All their claims about those books are assumptions as none of them read any part of those books seriously even if only a few of them claim they superficially have browsed them.[93] Many of them expressly confess that they have not even heard individual names of any of those books.[94] Some claim to know some of the books while referring to non-existent titles[95] or fail to name any single book among those "additional" books (interviewee # 5, personal communication, 17.12.2011; interviewee # 6, personal communication, 17.12.2011).[96] Others claim that they have read some of the "additional books", but failed to give any example or clue if they read any portion of any of those books (interviewee # 18, personal communication, 22.12.2011).[97] Some mentioned that they were brought up in a context where they had been told that those books outside the sixty-six are not

---

[90] Interviewee # 15 (personal communication, 21.12.2011), for instance, argues that broadly speaking, Ethiopian Evangelicals don't see whatever belongs to Orthodox as positive. So, "all the books outside our canon are seen negatively and they are thought to be added by Orthodox lately. As a result, when we try to read those books, we are already preoccupied by negative attitude and we don't understand what they say. So, we want to avoid reading them." Furthermore, interviewee # 23 (personal communication, 27.12.2011) explains that a number of times, he tried to read those "additional" books, with an objective to find their heresy, which so far he couldn't find any. As he believed they have been lately added by the EOTC, he had a negative attitude towards them, though that attitude is gradually changing.

[91] An instructor in one of the higher level theological studies in one of the Evangelical seminaries has openly admitted that he should have known the historical background to the "canon" of the Scriptures, to which, he confessed, he was ignorant (interviewee # 8, personal communication, 18.12.2011).

[92] For instance, interviewee # 27 (personal communication, 30.12.2011) and interviewee # 7 (personal communication, 17.12.2011) respond to many of the questions related to the EOTC in a very negative and confrontational mood, which is shaped by the severe persecution of the Evangelicals by the EOTC, and based on those maltreatments, they consider them as cruel heathen people.

[93] Once we, Evangelicals, considered the "canon" of our 66 books as the only correct Bible, interviewee # 15 (personal communication, 21.12.2011) critically discloses, we consider the EOTC "canon" as a taboo, with which we should avoid all contact. (That is how the writer of this thesis has been considered when he brought the "EOTC Bible" of the 1988 Amharic version to some sessions.)

[94] Among those who boldly confessed that they did not read those books which are considered as "additional" by the EOTC, and as a result, they have a very limited knowledge of them, include interviewee # 21 (personal communication, 27.12.2011), interviewee # 8 (personal communication, 18.12.2011), interviewee # 6 (personal communication, 17.12.2011), interviewee # 7 (personal communication, 17.12.2011).

[95] For instance, interviewee # 7 (personal communication, 17.12.2011) tried to give an example from a book which never existed, which she calls *Tofiq,* as any one of the books among those "additional books".

[96] Interviewee # 17 (personal communication, 21.12.2011), for instance, mentioned the name of only one book, Judith, among the books she thinks "additional" by Orthodox and said that she does not know if the Book of Enoch is part of these.

[97] Interviewee # 28 (personal communication, 03.01.2012), for instance, claims he has read those "additional books" but could not remember any portion of them. He does mention the book of Enoch, but he confessed that he has not read it, and as a result, does not know about it.

only useless, but also misleading to our doctrine of salvation—only by faith in Christ alone—and considered as heretical (interviewee # 23, personal communication, 27.12.2011).

Some try to trace back the reasons why such a negative attitude has been developed. Interviewee # 15 (personal communication, 21.12.2011) reasons that this attitude was developed when the missionaries taught us to distance ourselves from any kind of attachment to the EOTC or the Catholic Church. Following them (the missionaries), he continues, we distanced ourselves from the EOTC as far as we could and we developed a negative attitude to those "additional" books of the EOTC canon. Gradually, those books were considered as heretical and the source of all heresy in the EOTC.

As some of the interviewees boldly admitted (interviewee # 8, personal communication, 18.12.2011; interviewee # 17, personal communication, 21.12.2011), this clearly shows that they are expressly ignorant about the historical background and the long canonization process of their (and others, for that matter) biblical "canon".[98] For instance, interviewee # 24 (personal communication, 29.12.2011) openly confessed that he does not know the historical background and the reasons for having three various "canons" in Ethiopia: Orthodox, Catholic, and Evangelicals. On the other hand, interviewee # 21 (personal communication, 27.12.2011) erroneously thinks/believes that the "canon" of the sixty-six books, which is now the Evangelicals' "canon", was fixed around the fourth century by the Church Fathers, and the Catholics and the Orthodox added some books later on. Interviewee # 28 (personal communication, 03.01.2012) also believes that the sixty-six books are the ones accepted by the early church and currently his church follows that tradition.

In connection to the historical background of their "canon", many interviewees boldly confess one important point, namely admitting a level of uncriticality within Ethiopian culture, though some pretend to this cover up. They agree that critical questioning is an alien culture among many Ethiopians, where it leads Evangelical leaders simply to follow their missionary

---

[98] When asked about the origin of the sixty-six books canon, her canon, interviewee # 7 (personal communication, 17.12.2011), for instance, strangely mixed up the tradition of the Septuagint with the Evangelicals' "canon". She believes that the sixty-six books of the Evangelicals' "canon" have been written by "the seventy elders of the early Church leaders", led by the Holy Spirit. She confessed that that is what she was taught in her Seminary theological education.

teachers, while in turn, the laity just trusted the leaders and ministers of their churches without questioning, which resulted in accepting the sixty-six books of the "canon" as the Word of God.

Therefore, as any critical approach is highly discouraged and condemned in the church, interviewee # 15 (personal communication, 21.12.2011) argues, no one would dare to go further and ask objective questions about the historical context and origin of the Bible. In this line, for instance, interviewee # 7 (personal communication, 17.12.2011) confesses that she has never been critical, a trend she shares with most Ethiopians, to such historical and objective questions around the "canon". Interviewee # 23 (personal communication, 17.12.2011) also admits that what we lack is a critical approach and we are told just to hate and avoid such books without being told what is included in them and why should we do so. This prejudice developed and has gradually governed our attitude towards those books.

In order to assess the current attitude of Ethiopian Evangelicals towards the "apocryphal and pseudepigraphical" books included in the EOTC "canon", four projected categories were posed to be chosen by the interviewees. The four categories posed to be chosen included: (1) these books are heretical or unnecessary for Christians and they should be avoided; (2) they should be read as any ordinary books so that it may be known if there is anything in them from which one would benefit; (3) they should be read as some kind of Scripture, but not as authoritative as the "canonical" books; and (4) they should be read as the Scriptures so long as they do not contradict the teaching of the "canonical" books.

Among the fourteen interviewees, the large majority opted to be categorized under option #2, where this majority has subsequently been split into two other groups. Even if both groups of the majority strongly agree that these books should be read, they differ at what level they should be read. The first group claims the books should be read as any other ordinary book without any scriptural value, while the other group argue that they first be read and closely examined before giving them any category.

Category 1. Only two fall under this category, where one of them strongly develops a negative attitude towards those books. As she believes that the Bible with 66 books is complete and sufficient for our salvation and spiritual life, anything outside it should be avoided. Suggesting

reading those books would amount to compromising the completeness and sufficiency of "the Bible" (interviewee # 5, personal communication, 17.12.2011). Nearly with the same position, the second interviewee seems moderate, holding simply that the sixty-six books are sufficient and that is "our identity that we do not need anymore" (interviewee # 6, personal communication, 17.12.2011).

Category 2.1. The first group of this category contend that these books should be read as any ordinary books so that it may be known if there is any benefit from reading them. They should be read and known as any other book, not as authoritative Scriptures (interviewee # 18, personal communication, 17.12.2011). We can read them as we read other commentaries or important books and they would help us as historical documents (interviewee # 2, personal communication, 11.12.2011). Interviewee # 17 (personal communication, 21.12.2011) believes that they should be read only to know what their contents are, not to accept them as the Scriptures. We can read them as any other book, she argues, but not as the Scriptures; reading is not bad. They should be read for historical accounts and reference books, but not for our spiritual consumption as we use the other "canonical" books. For interviewee # 25 (personal communication, 29.12.2011), these books should be read as any other ordinary books if one has the time to do so. Otherwise, for him, the sixty-six books are enough for his spiritual life and salvation. According to interviewee # 21 (personal communication, 27.12.2011), they should be read for historical accounts and employed as reference books, but not for our spiritual consumption as we use the other "canonical" books. Interviewee # 23 (personal communication, 17.12.2011) partially agrees with interviewee # 21 and in the meantime puts himself in the second category. He argues that they should be read as historical books which would give some accounts of biblical history. However, he contends that they are not worthy for our salvation (salvation in terms of eternal life after death, as many Ethiopian Evangelicals understand); rather, they may have some ethical benefits (which may help for our relationship with others and not necessarily related to our eternal conversion) and therefore we should read them. For him, the most important thing is we need to do a closer study on them and decide what content they have, what their benefit might be, what negative aspect they might have, if any. So, before taking any position, we need to first do a critical research on them, he concludes.

Category 2.2. In the second group, interviewee # 26 (personal communication, 29.12.2011), for instance, argues they should be read and their content should be known. It should be based on that knowledge, one should determine whether they should be read for spiritual life or not. So, commenting without first reading them and knowing about them would not be fair. He, therefore, strongly recommends that those books should first be read before categorizing them anywhere. They should be read so that it may be known if there is something worthwhile in them (interviewee # 7, personal communication, 17.12.2011). Likewise, it is agreed that they should first be read critically without taking any stance and only after that one could decide in which category they should be classified (interviewee # 8, personal communication, 18.12.2011).[99] Interviewee # 27 (personal communication, 30.12.2011) thinks "we need to study them and find out [what they say and], there is a lot which we can learn from these books."

Category 3. Among those who reluctantly would agree to some kind secondary level scriptural position of the "apocryphal and pseudepigraphical" books, some believe that in principle they should be read at a lower level, but are still not fully comfortable reading them as any kind of Scripture in practice (interviewee # 15, personal communication, 21.12.2011). Another one, in this category, supports reading them as secondary level Scriptures, but does not encourage them to be read by the laity; rather, he suggests these books should be employed by the elites at higher level education and research for a better result (interviewee # 28, personal communication, 03.01.2012).

Category 4. Only two interviewees, interviewee # 2 (personal communication, 11.12.2011) and interviewee # 18 (personal communication, 22.12.2011), support the fourth position in principle, not in practice, with unclear position on closed and open canon concept. For instance, interviewee # 18 (personal communication, 22.12.2011) mentioned it is still possible if a given book from the "additional books" from the Orthodox "canon" fulfils the criteria,

---

[99] As interviewee # 8 (personal communication, 18.12.2011) didn't read the "additional" books in the EOTC "canon", and not included in his "canon", he does not know if they have any heretical teaching or if they have any significance in being read. Traditionally, he knows that these books are considered as heretical, unworthy, unrecognized among Evangelicals; but, he does not know why they have been considered so and he couldn't see any justification for them being considered in this way except the tradition.

that it be included in the [Evangelicals'] "canon". So, theoretically she has an open "canon" in mind though not practically as she assumes none of those books would fit the criteria.

The main reasons for strong denial of scriptural authority for those "apocryphal" and "pseudepigraphical" books include: the potential contradiction and inconsistency with the "canon" of 66 books (interviewee # 2, personal communication, 11.12.2011);[100] the sufficiency of the 66 books "canon" for all spiritual matters (interviewee # 5, personal communication, 17.12.2011);[101] and mainly being suspicious on the trustworthiness of the books as they are related to the EOTC, a historical rival and infamous church viewed from the perspective of many Ethiopian Evangelicals.

6.4.5.3 Critique on the Evangelical Notion of the "Canon"

The overall assessment of this analysis proves that the focus of the responses of Evangelical interviewees on what constitutes their "canon" is more existential and pragmatic than objective and historical. Their focus is on what it means for them now and not on how it came to be historically. When they define the Scriptures of the EOTC, their responses are mainly biased and based on prejudice and not on facts. The two main sources of their stances on their Scriptures are missionaries and their forefathers. Even if most of the interviewees admit that they have been uncritical to what they have been told, their tendency to stand firm in their uncritical position seems still very strong. One of the main contradictions in the view of many Evangelical interviewees about the EOTC "canon" is that on the one hand, most of them had read hardly any part of what they call "the additional books" by the Orthodox Church lately, and on the other hand, they assume those books contain much faulty teaching and would lead them to so many endless things.[102] So, given that most of them have never read these books or

---

[100] However, this position conceptually and potentially acknowledges the concept of an open "canon", as it argues that so long as the teachings of a given "apocryphal" book are consistent with the rest of the sixty-six books, then it should be accepted as an authoritative Scripture. interviewee # 2 (personal communication, 11.12.2011), without reading all the "apocryphal" books in the EOTC "canon", assumes that none of those books can fit with their Christian teachings with the "canonical" books.

[101] Interviewee # 5 (personal communication, 17.12.2011) strongly claims that nothing should be added and reduced from the 66 books, "the canon", which is adequate for all our spiritual needs. If it is sufficient alone, which she believes it is, why do then we need more, she questions.

[102] Interviewee # 6 (personal communication, 17.12.2011), for instance, (wrongly) believes that all the EOTC different traditions, such as the Ark of the Covenant (tabot), dietary and fasting, intercession [of Mary and/or angels], gedil, etc, all are derived from these books. However, when she is asked to give any single example of

only some portions of them, the question they fail to respond to is, how can they know whether those books have those massive negative effects.

Even if almost all Evangelicals have faith statements on what constitutes their "canon", surprisingly none of the interviewees refer to those documents at all. However, the three faith statements of two oldest Evangelical denominations, EECMY and EKHC, and an umbrella institution for the Ethiopian Evangelicals, ECFE, only briefly refer to what constitutes their Scriptures. Like the responses of the interviewees, three of the statements assume that the Old and the New Testament, with 66 books of the "canon" of the Scriptures, constitute their Bible, which is "the Word of God".

The statements commonly and clearly reflect "a closed canon", with thirty-nine OT and twenty-seven NT books, with nothing to be added and nothing to be reduced. In addition, one strong voice they have in common is that all authority arises from these sixty-six books and nothing else. However, none of these statements explain or give any clue as to the historical background of their Scriptures. Neither do they mention anything explicitly about the "apocryphal" books.

However, one can challenge the "closed canon" notion of the Evangelicals from their practical hermeneutical point of view. As the Scriptures are open to any believer to be read and interpreted as they perceive and there is no objective way of adjudication[103] of the adequacy of certain interpretations, the Scriptures are open to any kind of interpretation. Unlike the strong unitary church owned interpretation of the EOTC, one of the reasons for ever increasing numbers of denominations and unstopped dissections of Evangelical Churches in Ethiopia

---

such teaching or texts, she confessed that she never read them and does not know any of the content of the books. Likewise, interviewee # 7 (personal communication, 17.12.2011) firmly believes that it is those "additional books" which lead the EOTC to endless stories of various beliefs, practices, and traditions. However, she does not have a single example of such stories from the texts of those books. As she confessed, she had never read any of them to the extent that she does not know any of the names of these books.

[103] One way of achieving this objectivity was the "literal" meaning and later on "the historical" meaning, so that historians are expected to objectively explain the "original historical" meaning. Some interviewees are aware of the literal meaning in a sense that the Scriptures interpret Scriptures way, but not the modern "historical" method.

could be the hermeneutical openness of the Scriptures.[104] Thus, the whole notion of the "closed canon" of Evangelicals would be problematic from a hermeneutical perspective.

Another area of hermeneutical challenge Evangelicals would possibly face is the notion of "canon in the canon". From the time of Luther, Evangelicals tend to view few books as foundational for their core faith statements, which would give more theological authority to a few "canonical" books, a notion called a "canon in the canon". In addition, it is customary that preaching of most pulpits in Evangelical churches focus on certain "favourite" texts and books and practically exclude some other unfavourable ones. Even if this needs further objective study by its own right, its potential for an open "canon" is undeniable.

From a practical point of view, both the extent and authority of the "canon" is at stake in light of the fast-growing tendency of the charismatic movement in the mainline churches and the expansion of Pentecostalism. On the one hand the centre of gravity of authority tends to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit from the Scriptures. It is the guidance and illumination of the Holy Spirit to ministers, believers, and churches that counts more than anything else, even if it is claimed this practice is based on the Scriptures. As a result, among many others, the "prophetic voices" from "the prophets"[105] are practically receiving more weight than the text of the Scriptures. "Thus says the Lord" has been becoming a common trend in many pulpits of Charismatic and Pentecostal Congregations, which again suggests the authority and emphasis of the "canon" of the Scriptures is more open than closed.

Another practical example that shows the inconsistency of the closed "canon" concept of Evangelicals is their adoption of the EOTC calendar for all their ceremonial practices. As the EOTC calendar is mainly computed based on the book of Enoch, the Ethiopian Evangelicals, following this calendar as legitimate, indirectly consider the legitimacy of this book on this

---

[104] What is called "the hermeneutical openness", here, merely signifies the liberty an individual Evangelical believer, both as a minster and/or laity, would have to interpret the biblical texts both on the pulpit and personal readings. It is to reflect the dissonance very common now a days in many Evangelical pulpits, without any authoritative adjudicating body or means; rather, opens up for unlimited possibilities of readings.

[105] The prophetic office and the title called "the Prophet" in currant usage and its implication for the authority and place of the Scriptures among Ethiopian Evangelicals is a wider problem to be assessed independently as it lies far beyond the scope of this study. The conclusion taken in this thesis is provisional and based on a preliminary personal observation as a member of one of the Charismatic Churches in Ethiopia.

point.[106] Some of the Evangelical Churches with lectionaries follow that of the EOTC, and not that of the Evangelicals of their missionary origins. In accepting the Enochic calendar as a legitimate one, one may question whether this "pseudepigraphical / apocryphal" book has authority on Evangelicals even if they may not consciously recognize it.

Finally, even if the de jure position of Evangelicals in Ethiopia claims a clear concept of a closed "canon" and a fixed number of books in the "canon", the de facto position does not fully reflect this position. Moreover, the major problem with their concept of the "canon" is mainly the lack of objective explanation for their stance, which puts the credibility of the position in a serious problem. As many interviewees admitted, their ignorance of the historical background of the "canon" of the Scriptures of both their own and that of the EOTC puts them in an uncomfortable place to fully defend their position. It is from such misconception and prejudice that they have been prevented from taking a closer look at wider scriptural books in Ethiopia. Like the EOTC, Ethiopian Evangelicals too may need to re-address adequately their stance towards the "canon" of the Scriptures.

6.5 A Case Study on a Recent Amharic Millennium Translation[107]

6.5.1 Introduction

It is appropriate to wrap up the two major discussions of this chapter, the reception history of the Scriptures and "canon" formation of the Scriptures in the EOTC, with a case study of a controversial Millennium translation of an Amharic Bible. It is appropriate because it assesses and clarifies the magnitude of the problem, which persists to this day and the unresolved[108] nature of the EOTC "canon" of the Scriptures, at least for some time. In addition, in the last couple of centuries, translation of the Scriptures shifted from Ge'ez to Amharic, and other

---

[106] For a number of influences of the EOTC on Ethiopian Evangelicals, and an indirect authority of *1 Enoch* on them, see below chapter seven of this thesis.

[107] The controversy around the translation and publication of the Amharic "Millennium" Bible in Ethiopia has been discussed elsewhere (Bruk 2014) independently even if portions of it are mainly extracted from this subsection.

[108] The term "unresolved" here is employed to indicate the unclarities expressed by the EOTC interviewees around the extent and concept of their canon. However, such "unresolved" status by no means is unique to this tradition; it is common in other traditions as well, when the Scriptures are published.

Ethiopian languages. The case study will further demonstrate the conceptual and empirical differences of the EOTC and most Ethiopian Evangelicals.

Some of the key questions arising in connection with the new Millennium translation include: have the Amharic translations followed the same trend of the Ge'ez translation and reception of the Scriptures, or have they followed their own line? What necessitates a new Amharic version and why was the Millennium Amharic version intended to be mainly based on the Ge'ez and the LXX?[109] Is there a shift from MT to LXX? What were the reactions to the translation from different groups, and the reasons behind the reactions? Are there any outcomes resulting from these reactions?

Bearing in mind the discussion so far in the chapter as its background, the focuses of this section, therefore, are: (1) a brief overview of translation history of Amharic Bibles in Ethiopia and (2) the notion, process, and publication of the Amharic Millennium translation of the Bible and the reaction to it.

6.5.2 An Overview of Translation of the Scriptures into Amharic

Even if Amharic became the language of common people and an official language of the court of Ethiopia as early as the thirteenth century AD, it had to wait for centuries until the Scriptures had been translated into it. This is mainly because of the long existing tradition of the sacredness of the Ge'ez language as the language of the Church. Until the last century, any attempt to translate the Scriptures into Amharic was mainly initiated by foreigners or western missionaries.[110]

The first portions of the New Testament were translated into Amharic in the seventeenth century by a German missionary, Peter Heiling. However, the first full Amharic Bible was

---

[109] Another interesting question, which this study does not examine, is whether the translation has really made the Ge'ez its main base text or just it simply claims to be so. Some question if it is a brand new translation or an adaptation/revision from the previous translations with some targeted textual revisions? As this needs an extensive textual analysis and exegetical work, which is beyond the scope of this study, would be an area for critical examination to be taken up by researchers or literary exegetes.

[110] It should be noted that there have been some Amharic commentaries of biblical texts that include verse by verse translations from Ge'ez into Amharic. However, these are basically meant as interpretation of the Ge'ez text and not technically biblical translation as they are not compiled as translations of a biblical book or books.

translated by an Orthodox priest and monk, with a name Abba Abraham,[111] and with the close assistance, collaboration, and sponsorship of Asselin, a French diplomat in Cairo, who finally preserved the handwritten copy of the translation. Abba Abraham used both the Greek and Ge'ez versions as base texts for his translation while referring to the Hebrew and the Syriac at some points. Buying the book from Asselin, the British Bible Society published the four gospels in 1824, the full New Testament in 1829, and finally the entire Bible in 1840.[112] As the translation work has been intended, sponsored, and led, and later, the publication made by non-Orthodox, western, foreign figures, it contains only the 66 books of the Old and New Testaments, the conventional Protestant Bible.

The first major translation work of an Amharic Bible in the twentieth century was initiated by the late Emperor Haile Sellassie I. Even if the translation project was initiated within Ethiopia, it was interrupted by the Italian invasion and completed abroad. This translation came in 1923,[113] with the order of the late Emperor Haile Sellassie I, fully from the Ge'ez version, which was published in photo offset in London between 1928 and 1934 E.C. The Bible contains both the Ge'ez and Amharic translation in two columns side by side, which made it too bulky (ሰይፈ ሥላሴ ዮሐንስ 2007:12-18፤ 17).

It is the 1962 version, which was translated and published by the Bible Society of Ethiopia (BSE) / the United Bible Societies (UBS), which has gained a reputation of being "the standard" Amharic Bible by most Ethiopian Evangelical Christians. The translation was conducted by the BSE, with a permission of the Emperor,[114] and by local and foreign

---

[111] For a detailed record on this translation, see Gustav Arén 1978:42-44.

[112] The original handwritten copy of the entire translation of this work has 9539 pages altogether, which took ten years for Abba Abraham to translate (Arén 1978:43).

[113] For an unsuccessful attempt to translate and publish an Amharic New Testament by the Swedish Evangelical Mission and others using both local and foreign experts at the first quarter of the twentieth century, see Gustav Arén 1999:122-128, 141-143, 215-217.

[114] In the earlier publications of this translation, the speech of the Emperor was published as the preface of the Bible where he claims he made an order and made recruitment of scholars to conduct the translation. However, this must have been mistaken with his previous order or initiative, which was published in photo offset while he was in exile. The version is copyrighted by the BSE/UBS which is a clear indication of the responsibility and ownership of the translation, but not the Emperor. Either he must have ordered that his inaugural speech be published at the front page of the Bible or the then BSE officials were convinced it would be good if it would be published as the preface of the translation. For a full English translation of his speech or the preface, see Haile Sellassie 1961.

translation professionals, inclusive of all denominations, Orthodox, Catholics, and Protestants. The translators used the MT and the Abba Abraham Amharic version as base text while the LXX was used only on a secondary base as a reference (Mikre Sellassie, personal communication, 15.12.2011). It is generally viewed as a MT based translation and contains only the sixty-six books accepted by all denominations.

This version of the Amharic Bible gradually dissatisfied the EOTC for a number reasons, namely, (1) it does not contain the wider list of eighty-one books of the Scriptures, rather only the sixty-six books accepted by the Protestants, (2) some key wording of the translation fails to reflect the EOTC teaching and tradition, (3) at points, it does not agree with Ge'ez text of the Bible, and (4) the original translation was not specifically intended for the EOTC, (5) which further indicates that the members of the translation group were not exclusively or predominantly from the EOTC.[115] As a result, it was negotiated between the EOTC and the BSE/UBS that a revised and amended version of the 1962 be published exclusively intended for the EOTC.

The revision has been made and published in 1988 with a clear notification that it was published exclusively to the EOTC. The revision mainly includes two aspects—(1) inclusion of the "deutero-canonical / apocryphal / pseudepigraphical" books, which takes the number of the books to eighty-one, and (2) revision of some key theological terms in the New Testament so as to satisfy the nuance of the EOTC ecclesiological tradition.[116] The major compromise from the EOTC side, once the BSE/UBS agreed to include the books relevant to the EOTC, was to accept that these "deuterocanonical" (as it is designated in Bible itself) books be put between the Old Testament books and the New Testament as a third category, and not mixed with the other Old Testament books, as according to the tradition of the Church.

---

[115] These elements were directly and indirectly indicated in the preface of the 1988 version of the Amharic Bible as reasons which necessitated the publication of this revised and abridged version. In fact, the other two reasons expressed in the preface were: (1) the 1962 version was out of print and (2) the need to address the spiritual demand of the new generation, (where the implication is the new generation strived to read the Scriptures).
[116] These verses include Mt 1:18, 24-25; 22:40; Lk 1:32, 48, 53-55; 19:48; Jn 5:27-29; 6:53-59; 20:15-18; 21:6; Act 15:2, 6, 22; 16:4; 20:17; 1Cor 9:5; 13:4-6; 2Cor 6:16; Eph 1:3; Phil 1:1; 2:7; 1Tim 5:17; Tit 1:5; 1Pet 1:3-5; 1Jn 5:6; 2Jn 1:1; 3Jn 1:1; Jes 5:14; Rev 3:14; 5:6, 8, 11; 14:1-5; 15:3-4; 20:4; and they are in bold face so that the readers could easily identify the amendments. With few other topics, the two main amendments focus on stronger Christological emphasis and the preference of "priest(s)" to "elder(s)".

However, this translation/revised version of the 1988 Amharic Bible was not much known among most general Evangelical believers at the beginning. As it gradually became known to some, it was viewed negatively. If an Evangelical believer carries this Bible, a version with "Apocryphal / Deutero-canonical" books, it is customary that they may be mocked, belittled or seen in suspicion about their spiritual status, as has in fact happened to myself on a number of occasions. Moreover, this was followed by further critical and negative reaction from the EOTC, which led the EOTC to initiate another Amharic Bible translation project, namely that of "the Millennium edition, to which we will turn after a while.

The first new Amharic translation of the new (Gregorian) Millennium was the one translated by the International Bible Society (IBS). This translation, heavily dependent on the English New International Version (NIV), was published in 2001 as አዲሱ መደበኛ ትርጉም, literally: *The New Standard Translation*. As it was mainly intended for Evangelicals, or as typically an Evangelical translation, following the tradition of its English version, it contains the 66 books of the Old and New Testament, accepted by Evangelicals.

At the outset, the reaction to this translation was a mixed one. For many Evangelicals, who know but one Amharic Bible in their entire Christian life, short or long, it was not easy to accept any alternative as if it devalues the credibility of their one and only Bible. Many questioned, given a close acquaintance with the language and an inherent attachment to the text of the previous version,[117] whether it would be easy for any to welcome a new version. Furthermore, many began to question if they have more than one Bible. However, with its implicit Evangelical identity, the simplicity of the language for the new generation, and its inclusion of study guides (in some of its published Bibles), it attracts the attention of many, though, mainly Evangelicals. Most importantly, it became an alternative text for many who would only read and understand Amharic, but engage critically with the text.

Before the turn of the Ethiopian 3rd millennium and after a brief history of nearly two hundred years of Amharic Bible translation, a new Amharic Bible was translated and appears as a gift

---

[117] It should not be overemphasized that more often than not, the 1962 version of the Amharic translation has been considered as "the" Amharic Bible or "the Bible" among many Evangelicals.

of the millennium. Using the UBS terminology, this Bible is categorized as a confessional Amharic Bible for the EOTC. As the EOTC has been dissatisfied with both the 1962 or 1988 versions, the Church took the initiative to produce a new Amharic Bible translation in collaboration with the BSE/UBS. Besides the number of the books in the "canon", these translations had never been satisfactory for the EOTC as the majority of the translators have been non-Orthodox and the MT has been the dominant Vorlage in these cases. This necessitated another Amharic translation exclusively by and for EOTC. Moreover a canon of 66 books is apparently connected to the MT while any other more than that, particularly in the Ethiopian context, both by EOTC and Evangelicals, is considered as LXX related. Thus, even if the Vorlage for the Ge'ez version comprises both the LXX and MT, including others to a varied degree, the fact that the LXX contains "additional books", as called by the Evangelicals, results in it being the father text of the Ge'ez version. Thus a closer study of this new Millennium translation and the dynamics around it would help us understand the major discourse and narrative of how the Ethiopian Orthodox and Evangelicals view the "canon" of the Scriptures or "the Bible"

6.5.3 The Publication of the Millennium Amharic Edition

Even if the EOTC claims a long history of Christianity and Amharic has long been a dominant language over Ge'ez among the common people, it is only about six years ago, the Ethiopian Millennium (September 2007 G.C.), that the first Amharic Bible, fully recognized by the church, as she took the initiative of the translation work and carried it out as its owner, was published by the Bible Society of Ethiopia as a Millennium edition. Unlike the existing Amharic Bibles, this translation claims to be mainly based on the Ge'ez and the LXX, which provokes negative reactions by many Evangelicals. As a result, a number of questions have been raised, some of which are discussed in this chapter. The questions included the issue of *Vorlage*, a shift to another base text, the nature and reasons for the reactions by the Evangelicals, the outcomes and the contributions of the translation (and the controversy for that matter).

6.5.3.1 The Need for a New Amharic Translation

The translation project of the new Amharic Bible has been initiated by the late Patriarch of the EOTC, His Holiness Abba/Abuna Paulos.[118] As it is clearly stated in the introductory message of the edition (BSE 2007:v-vi), there are two major reasons for the initiative.[119] First, none of the existing Amharic translations were based on the LXX and the ancient Ge'ez versions, which clearly display textual differences to a significant degree. Even the 1988 version,[120] which includes "deuterocanonical" books and was intended for the EOTC, did not satisfy the needs of the church.[121] Secondly, the translation philosophy of the previous versions is entirely alien to EOTC's longstanding traditional interpretative methods. As a result of these two main grounds, it has been difficult for the church to accept those versions as her own Bible for a long time (interviewee # 22, personal communication, 21.12.2011). In other words, the need for a representative *Vorlage* and an adequate interpretive method for the church, and, as a result, a lack of identifying with the previous translations of the Church, necessitated a brand new translation, in a way that could address those demands.

Therefore, it was inappropriate to make this edition as a mere adaptation of the previous Amharic versions, by simply changing a few verses and expressions to satisfy the interest of the EOTC.[122] The translation work has taken fourteen years of hard work, with three major phases and revised and reshuffled translators. The work has been one of the priorities of the Patriarch himself and carried out by close follow up of his and other top leaders and scholars

---

[118] It is customary in Ethiopia to mention several titles entailing his name in formal occasions. He is formally called as "His Holiness Abba/Abuna Paulos, Patriarch and Catholicos of Ethiopia, High Priest / Bishop of Axum, *Echegue* of the See of St. Tekle Haimanot, President of the World Council of Churches, and An Honorary President of World Religions for Peace." His Holiness Abba/Abuna Paulos has passed away recently, on 16 August 2012 G.C. He was succeeded by His Holiness Abba/Abuna Mathias I, who was enthroned at Holy Trinity Cathedral on 03 March 2013 G.C.

[119] The reasons are also explained in the special edition of the inaugural bulletin of the New LXX based Amharic Bible, by other scholars of the Church who participated in the translation (EOTC 2007:6, 7, 18).

[120] For a list of reasons necessitated the revision of the 1962 Amharic version and ended up as the 1988 Amharic version, as the first acknowledged confessional translation for the EOTC by the BSE, see above sub-section 6.5.2. As indicated in the preface of the Millennium edition, even that confessional translation didn't meet the needs of the EOTC.

[121] Interviewee # 22 (personal communication, 21.12.2011.) explains that that translation created resentment around EOTC, as the order of the books doesn't follow that of the church's and there is no such thing as "proto-" or "deutero-canonical" in EOTC biblical tradition since all books have equal status.

[122] This is how some Evangelical believers consider the new edition (interviewee # 2, personal communication, 11.12.2011.) as was done before in the 1980 E.C. Amharic edition.

of the EOTC. High level translation consultants and linguists with ample skills of Ge'ez, Greek, Hebrew, and Amharic took part in the translation. Before it was finally accepted, two draft translations were rejected and ordered to be reworked according to a more adequate standard.[123]

6.5.3.2 The need for Ge'ez and the LXX as the base texts

The need for a trustworthy translation that can be fully trusted by a faith community which is able to confess it as "our Bible" is one thing. But to achieve that goal, whose components address the need, is another matter. In a critical era, where seemingly consensus[124] is achieved by many leading global translation agencies to use the MT[125] as base text for OT translation, one may be at odds to see why a church shifts to another version as a base text, other than on the grounds of textual variants. However, surprisingly enough, the UBS has revised its translation policy to publish confessional Scriptures in 2003,[126] almost a decade after EOTC had begun its project, the latter coinciding with that of the UBS.

Before responding to the question of the base texts, it should be first noted that the Ge'ez mss are recognized as one of the ancient biblical traditions and are used for standard textual criticism.[127] The main reason in choosing the Ge'ez and the LXX as the base texts for this brand new Amharic translation, as unambiguously reasoned out both by the Patriarch and the translation committee, is that it is the Ge'ez version which the church has preserved and used in the last two millennia. As mentioned above, the *Vorlage* for the Ge'ez translation is mainly the LXX, and EOTC identifies herself with these two versions. For a number of reasons,

---

[123] For a detailed report on the entire process of the translation see the preface of the version itself, BSE 2007:v-vi; and a special bulletin during its inauguration, EOTC 2007:2-7.

[124] If we need to be more critical of the decision to follow the MT at all times, we can raise several significant questions to it, namely: what would be the reason to prioritise the MT; given that the MT may not always be the oldest, why MT; why should we go for the oldest; did the NT writers always use the text now in the MT, it seems not; so, why today. Therefore, it should be noted that the MT is one of the venerable texts, maybe just as the EOTC "canon" is one of the venerable "canons".

[125] Of course, the Dead Sea Scrolls "biblical" manuscripts have corrected the MT base for the Old Testament/Hebrew Bible translation in a number of places. So, that is a further complication to the production of a translation based on the Hebrew.

[126] For the revised guidelines of UBS on translation of confessional Bibles for particular churches, see EOTC 2007:35.

[127] It is evident that both the Hebrew Bible and Greek NT standard texts used the Ge'ez as evidence for variant texts.

which are not mentioned here, EOTC's scriptural books were never published in a single volume but were fragmented and preserved mainly in small groups and/or individually for centuries.[128] This is the first time an initiative has been taken by the Church itself, without any other external imposition, invitation, or influence, as confirmed by the translation committee:

> Even if it can be seen that our church [EOTC] has been using these translations [i.e. the Amharic translations published until the publication of this one], for reasons mentioned above[129] the church has been longing for a conducive period [καιρος] to translate the Holy Scriptures [into Amharic], with Ge'ez as the base text and the Hebrew and the LXX as references (*translation from the Amharic is mine*.) (BSE 2007:v).

Therefore, the need for the Ge'ez and the LXX to be the base text arises from a search for self-identity, in response to the assumed imposition of the West, and as a result, in order to validate the biblical text to the believing community by internalizing it in a contextually relevant manner. It is in line with and a continuation of a longstanding indigenizing tradition of EOTC, which has been mainly attained by rejecting the domination of western conceptualizations of the issues.[130]

6.5.3.3 Is it a shift from MT to LXX?

The question whether the Amharic Septuagint translation is a shift from MT is an elusive question and the answer could be "yes" and "no". It is "Yes," because the Amharic versions so far published through the BSE, following the UBS policy, used the MT as their base text

---

[128] For Instance, among the twelve scriptural Ge'ez manuscripts, which I investigated at the British Library, the number of books ranges from one to thirty books in a codex. Some manuscripts contain just only one book, while others have two, five, seven, eight, fifteen, sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, twenty-one, or thirty books in a single codex. In all these twelve manuscripts, there is no overarching pattern of order books or a kind of major consensus in putting them in any given order. Rather, it would probably reflect the need and capability of the sponsor for the manuscript. Given that the copying and owning a scriptural manuscript was expensive in the old days of Ethiopia, it would be only the upper class who were able to own these manuscripts. Thus, one of the reasons for the number of the books included in a given codex would be affordability. In fact, the other explicit reason for a limited number of books to be bound together would be the sheer size of the manuscripts. It is only to a manageable size and weight that one can produce a manuscript.

[129] See above sub-section 6.5.3.1 for the reasons referred in the quotation.

[130] Both as a church and a major component of the socio-political player of the country, the entire history of EOTC (and Ethiopia for that matter) demonstrates that it has strongly resisted any kind of external imposition. That is, of course, why the church has retained so many unique and only its own traditions in many aspects— theology, liturgy, music, literature, art, interpretive method, education, etc., which all need deeper and closer studies. In the meantime, it should be noted that one of the main reasons why the Orthodox believers see Evangelicals as adherents of the latter to the Western tradition, and call them መጤ "intruders" or "new comers" in its negative sense.

and the current translation differs from that tradition in its main text. However, it cannot be considered as a shift *per se* for two reasons. First, the aforementioned Amharic versions have never been fully identified as Bibles of EOTC. The church has been using it without fully recognizing it as her own. If the MT based translations have not been fully recognized by the church as her own, how can it be a shift from the MT? Secondly, from a practical point of view, the church has been using the Ge'ez version as her official text, and any preacher of the church quotes from the Ge'ez to validate his position—preaching is usually not validated without a quote in Ge'ez. Thus, this translation can be the Church's first official Amharic translation and the only recognized one in its entirety. Therefore, even if it seems there is a shift from MT to LXX from a general Amharic Bible translation historical assessment, this cannot be asserted if one views it in relation to the specific EOTC scriptural transmission, translation, and usage historical background.

6.5.3.4 Reactions to the Translation

Besides so many informal discussions with angry fellow Evangelical believers, who were passionate about the truth of the Bible, there were two major formal incidents which I came across with strong (some were emotional) negative reaction to the publication of the new translation. The first encounter came from some of my theological students in graduate and undergraduate Evangelical theological schools, where I was teaching in both schools.[131] The other incident came from a workshop prepared by the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) Ethiopia, where many church leaders from different denominations, leaders from various Bible translation agents, and other stakeholders took part, a few months after the printing and distribution of the Bible.[132] Many participants in the workshop openly and emotionally expressed their anger and negative reaction to the newly published translation as divisive, erroneous, and above all, it was stressed that it would open doors wide for the Muslim's criticism that Christians do not have one Bible.[133] An objective explanation of a translation

---

[131] Some students went to the extent of passionately asking why we, Evangelical leaders, failed to stop the entire process of the publication from the very beginning.

[132] I participated in the workshop representing the EECMY, as I was coordinating the translation ministry of the Church on part-time bases.

[133] A group of concerned individuals from the workshop agreed to form a committee to come up with objective cases for the shortcomings of the translation to appeal to the BSE and church leaders. Their main strategy was to do textual criticism based on the Greek text and prove the proposed "shallowness" or "bias to the Orthodox

consultant from the BSE to respond to all the questions, comments and reactions in the workshop were in vain, as he was an Orthodox himself.[134] Among the Orthodox, it has been received with special gratitude and appreciation even if some have questioned the credibility of the translation within the church.

6.5.3.5 The Reasons behind the Reactions

There are various reasons for the negative reactions articulated differently, even if they became united in their reaction. These may include zeal, ignorance, animosity, etc.,[135] with theological, dogmatic, and textual issues underlying these emotions.[136] To begin with the positive reason, even if it is not objective, the reaction came "out of a genuine zeal and passion for the word of God. It came from a strong stance that the word of God is only one" (interviewee # 22, personal communication, 21.12.2011) and anything that differs from it should be rejected.[137] Interviewee # 2's (personal communication, 11.12.2011) major argument for his negative reaction was that he assumes the translation was done by the EOTC alone without any involvement of any others. This, interviewee # 2 continued, would erode the unity of the churches and diminish the spirit of Ecumenism.[138] However, interviewee # 2 admitted

---

teaching", which never came out, as far as I know. I personally advised them to ask if the translation process has any procedural or technical inadequacy, if measured up with the UBS policy or guidelines.

[134] One of my interviewees, who opted to be anonymous, told me that there was an Evangelical passionate minister from the diaspora, who had come back to Ethiopia and warned the BSE not to publish it, formed a movement which could react strongly against that translation as a heretical and divisive one, and challenged BSE and some Evangelical leaders for about two years, both in person and through electronic media. This was later on weakened as time went on and some people intervened in the matter.

[135] It should be noted that this thesis aims to tackle these issues, in particular by focussing on *1 Enoch*, and in this way contribute to a sounder ecumenical climate. This position is discussed in chapter eight below in greater detail and clarity.

[136] It should be noted that some critics have come up with a few objective textual variants to criticize the weakness of the translation. In this regard, the translation committee has made it clear in its introductory notes of the Bible that they are ready to receive any such critical argument and have promised to make appropriate revisions in the near future.

[137] This position assumes the previously used sixty-six books Amharic Bible as the only true word of God, as it is not aware of the existence of any other biblical tradition or believes that any other than that is heretical (interviewee # 15, personal communication, 21.12.2011; interviewee # 17, personal communication, 21.12.2011).

[138] The term ecumenism, in its general Ethiopian context, and as it is employed by the concerned interviewee here, may be defined as a fellowship of churches coming together in a spirit of cooperation and harmony for one cause and mission of Jesus Christ they are called. For more detailed discussion on ecumenism in general, as it is understood in Ethiopian context, and ecumenism as a theoretical framework as employed in this thesis, see chapter two above.

that he is entirely ignorant if there was any involvement of the BSE, an Ecumenical body which strongly promotes ecumenism, in the translation and publication process as a whole.

Most of my Evangelical interviewees, for instance, expressed their negative reaction to the translation openly and passionately, but without hiding the fact that they had not read it or without having any sufficient knowledge about its content.[139] For instance, one of my respondents reacted negatively because she assumes the Orthodox must have changed a number of key words to their favour, which she couldn't substantiate with evidence from the text, as she he had not read it (interviewee # 6, personal communication, 17.12.2011).[140] This clearly shows how the Evangelicals' ignorance about the background of various canonical traditions, at almost all levels, both theologians and lay ministers, is rampant.

From a broader point of view, one of the main misconceptions among the Ethiopian Evangelical Christians, which made them react so passionately against the Millennium translation, arises from their naive assumption that all Christian denominations hold similar, if not identical, stances on what constitutes the Word of God. To be more specific, most Evangelical believers are unaware of EOTC's position that the word of God is found in two major components, the Scriptures and tradition,[141] on equal ground. EOTC maintains its position clearly:

> The Holy Scriptures are one of the two great foundations of the faith and here is what our church holds and teaches concerning it. The word of God is not contained in the Bible alone, it is to be found in tradition as well. The Sacred Scriptures are the written word of God who is the author of the Old and New Testaments containing nothing but perfect truth in faith and morals. But God's word is not contained only in them, there is

---

[139] Among the fourteen Evangelical interviewees who took part in the study, only one tried to argue his point based on textual evidence, which he promised to provide after the interview, but he failed to do so on the basis of a number of excuses.

[140] The example, interviewee # 6 (personal communication, 17.12.2011) tried to give was the story of Jesus' first sign at the Cana wedding (Jn 2:1-11), where she thought EOTC must have added the word "intercessor" to Mary; which is incorrect. That is what she assumed from her experience of Orthodox friends, using that story as an evidence for Mary's identification as an intercessor. Even if they could have argued that way, they never changed any word in that story to justify Mary's "intercessory" role/function.

[141] In fact this corresponds very well with the Roman Catholic position, and it must be remembered that the issue of the relationship between the two has been very much discussed in the West in an ecumenical spirit for the last 50 years.

an unwritten word of God also, which we call apostolic tradition. We receive the one
and other with equal veneration (EOTC 2003).[142]

One of the apparent arguments some Evangelical leaders posed against the publication of the Millennium translation was its potential to open the door wider for the Muslim criticism of the Bible being more than one.[143] However, this argument fails to understand the background of the formation of the "canon" of the Scriptures and that we, Christians, have more than one "canonical" tradition, where the Protestant Bible is only one such tradition. Conversely, the misconception could be a result of an incorrect comparison of the tradition of how the Muslims receive their Quran, where they believe they receive it directly from heaven at once, and the tradition of how we get our Bible. Many Evangelical believers incorrectly think that we receive it similarly. If this belief is challenged in some way by the Muslims, which the publication of this translation could support, the Evangelicals are afraid of losing the debate with their Muslim friends or neighbours. In addition to such ignorance, what the Evangelicals have (knowingly or unknowingly) bypassed is the already existing different Amharic versions published by the BSE for EOTC, which have eighty-one books instead of the sixty-six of the Evangelicals. That means, we already have two different biblical versions as far as the number of the books is concerned.

Another criticism of the Evangelicals is that the translation was made by the Orthodox alone,[144] and BSE should not have published it unless it embraces all churches in Ethiopia. However, this argument also fails to make a point for a number of reasons. For one, BSE is governed by its own policies, in accordance with the policies of the UBS, where they have amended their principle to publish Biblical translations affiliated to a particular denomination. For another thing, the translation was technically supervised, assisted and partially financed

---

[142] This could be understood in various ways; a common way, as it is maintained in the present context, is that there are two bodies of teaching: written Scriptures and tradition as an additional body of writings. It can also be understood as if the tradition is the 'spirit' within which the Scriptures should be read. There is much scope here for further reflection. There are various 'spirits' of reading: a Lutheran reading; an EOTC reading; a Latin reading; a Greek orthodox reading: all different traditions of reading the same Scriptures.

[143] This was one of the strongest arguments against the Millennium edition raised by a number of Evangelical leaders on the workshop mentioned above.

[144] Many of my Evangelical interviewees did not know at all any involvement of the BSE in the process of the translation and publication of the Millennium translation; they just took it for granted that everything was done by EOTC and them alone (interviewee # 6, personal communication, 17.12.2011; interviewee # 2, personal communication, 11.12.2011; interviewee # 23, personal communication, 27.12.2011).

by the BSE. Since BSE, in support with UBS, is closely involved in the translation process, it is again a misunderstanding to consider that the work has been done exclusively by EOTC.[145]

Some of my interviewees from the Evangelical circle explicitly mentioned that one of the reasons for negatively reacting without a closer investigation of the translation is a longstanding spirit of hatred and animosity between the two churches (interviewee # 2, personal communication, 11.12.2011; interviewee # 21, personal communication, 27.12.2011.). There has been a strong tendency by both sides to react negatively against or reject that which is associated with the other party. For instance, as Mary, angels, and saints are highly regarded and venerated by the Orthodox, the Evangelicals are strongly resistant to such connections and these figures are down played on the pulpit. Likewise, the "jargons" of Evangelicals—"Jesus is Lord!" "The Lord bless you!" "In the name of Jesus..."—are strictly avoided by the Orthodox believers, as a way of keeping oneself from falling into heresy (interviewee # 2, personal communication, 11.12.2011).[146] Likewise, many Evangelical interviewees, especially those whose background was Orthodox, have confessed that they were taught that all additional books other than the 66 are heretical and added locally by EOTC to support their wrong teaching (interviewee # 23, personal communication, 27.12.2011; interviewee # 2, personal communication, 11.12.2011; interviewee # 21, personal communication, 27.12.2011; interviewee # 17, personal communication, 21.12.2011).

6.5.3.6 The Outcomes and contributions of the Translation

Within the controversy around the Millennium translation, it can be noted that there are quite significant outcomes and contributions as a result. First, it is very important that an open debate is developed around biblical translation within Ethiopian Churches. Whichever the motive would be, the debate brings different views to the table, which have been hidden,

---

[145] In the workshop which is mentioned above, that was what the BSE tried to explain to the participants where they could not accept the explanation. On the other hand, it should be noted that a few years back the Evangelicals welcomed the publication of the NIV Amharic translation by the IBS wholeheartedly even if it was translated exclusively by the Evangelicals. So, this attitude denies the right of the other churches to exercise their own confessions.

[146] However, as it is discussed in chapter seven of this thesis, the situation currently is increasingly changing and the relationship between believers of the two churches is becoming highly appreciative. If this initiative is nurtured by church leaders, the effect would be tremendous. However, it should also be noted that there are extremist groups in both sides, who are strongly working on the separation and hatred of the other.

unvoiced, or silenced. As the debate goes on, awareness of the other would gradually be developed. As people come together to discuss the issue, they come closer to each other and develop a better understanding of each other, as well as the subject matter at hand.

Second, arguably one of the major contributions of this Amharic version is that it gives variant readings in the footnote. This is an entirely new phenomenon in the Ethiopian Biblical translation tradition.[147] The presence of the variant readings in the footnotes implies that there are more than one tradition or version, where it gives the liberty to the reader to choose whichever reading he/she believes is adequate or closer to the original. This may be a new exercise to the wider Ethiopian biblical reader, especially among the Evangelicals.[148]

Third, the translation provokes curiosity among many Evangelicals to read the so-called "additional books" by EOTC, which could provide some benefit. Some have pledged that they would read them differently than before—they will read it positively (interviewee # 15, personal communication, 21.12.2011; interviewee # 23, personal communication, 27.12.2011). In addition, it invites and necessitates a much closer and sensitive study of the Scriptures in general.

Fourth, the strong reaction and some meticulous criticism on the text of the translation calls for genuine revision immediately, even though the translation committee has indeed made promises in this regard already where it has been promised by BSE to carry on the translation in the near future.

Fifth, it also encourages new initiatives among some of EOTC scholars and leaders in the form of revisiting its canonical list and calling for the church to fix it once and for all. The controversy as to which books belong in EOTC canon is still debatable among scholars within the church. So, it seems that, as some EOTC scholars believe (interviewee # 22, personal

---

[147] In the 1980 E.C. Amharic version, which was amended a little bit for EOTC, footnoting is introduced in a very few verses of the NT variant readings (as noted above), but not as a principle and policy of that translation. It was only an amendment or correctional addition.

[148] As to the Orthodox, this may not be of huge impact for two reasons—first, the laity are generally listeners and not readers of the Bible and it is the priests who read and interpret to the public. Secondly, it is a common Orthodox interpretive method, in their *Andemta* interpretation, to give a number of alternative interpretations to any text or verse. So, it may not be a new experience to them as such.

communication, 21.12.2011; interviewee # 12, personal communication, 19.12.2011), there is a degree of urgency that the church may settle the matter conclusively.

6.5.4 Conclusion

The Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church is one of the ancient churches which received the faith at its earliest period. The church claims the introduction of the Old Testament before Christianity, with its old-age contact with Jerusalem, which paved the way to it. The church obtained a Ge'ez translation of the Scriptures as early as the fourth century AD, mainly from the LXX with some influence from the Syriac and the MT, even if it came across with various revisions and recensions from other texts, including Arabic and MT. As the church has been isolated from Western Christendom for centuries, the concept of the "canon" of the Scriptures, in the western way of expression, remains different[149] and as a result holds a larger number of books in its "canon", where this is loosely listed in various sources. Furthermore, the conglomeration of all these traditions gave way for books such as *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* be included in the authoritative Scriptures of the church.

Given that Ge'ez is its official text, EOTC has never recognized Amharic translations of the Scriptures published in one volume until the beginning of the 3rd millennium, when the church has published the first of its kind. This Amharic Bible, designated as "The Amharic Septuagint", or "The Millennium Edition", based its translation on the Ge'ez and the LXX texts. Since the existing Amharic translations, in favour among the Evangelicals, were based on the MT, and considered as the standard Amharic Bible, the publication of the new one sparked hot debate as to its need, credibility, and authenticity, mainly by the Evangelicals.

Even if the main reasons for the furious reaction could be passionate devotion to the Scriptures, ignorance about the other, and historical rivalry between various denominations,

---

[149] It should be noted, however, that the EOTC has a "canon", but they saw no need to decide clearly about the 'edges' as there was no unanimity in the church, which seems to be the ultimate criterion. In the West, the issue of the 'edges' was resolved in a polemical context, which is not always the best context; however, polemics lead to argument and argument provides in the end deeper insight. Even if there are some clear indicators are emerging, it is not as to yet clear if this will be the case in the Ethiopian context as well. In addition, as they have maintained the older understanding of canon as church tradition more clearly than the evangelical tradition has done; for them the emphasis has shifted almost one-sidedly to the list (although the idea of church teaching and tradition is always there even if somewhat hidden).

the publication of the new translation introduced a new era in the history of Ethiopian Christianity. Besides providing another variant textual tradition to the Ethiopian Christian Community, it is a priceless achievement of the EOTC in making available the good news in the mother tongue of most of its adherents, in the tradition with which they identify themselves. However, it also poses more assignments both to the Orthodox and Evangelicals to know and accept each other, work together, assess objectively the weaknesses of such works, and be partners in the same mission to which they are called.

6.6 Final Remarks

As part of its long and rich history of Christianity, the EOTC has developed its own unique "canon" of the Scriptures, which is part of its rich tradition. The history of reception, transmission, and translation of the Scriptures has always been part and parcel of the history of Christianity itself. In this extended history of the church, both have been shaping one another mutually even if the influence of the history of Christianity has been more dominant than that of the Scriptures.[150]

In the same way as the EOTC is the only church which retains several unique Judeo-Christian traditions, it would not be a surprise that it retains a number of other exclusive elements as well. This church has been isolated from the global Church which enabled a development of its own traditions, its own "canon" of the Scriptures, its own calendar, and its own unique scripts.[151]

With regard to the Scriptures, the church has included many ancient texts among its Scriptures, which were received equally at the outset of its official establishment in the early 4th century AD. With such openness,[152] its long isolation from the global Church, the relevance

---

[150] The dominance of history over the Scriptures is evident from the church's occupation more with issues related to politics, nationalism, power, its relationship to the Coptic Church, and preventing the nation and the church from external invasions. That is in line with how historical contexts are the glasses through which the Scriptures are read. In other words in every reading the text is read from a particular context, where sometimes the context "overpowered" or even "distorted" the text. For a detailed discussion on this, see Bruk 2013a.

[151] Besides the western churches, mainly the Catholics and Protestants, the Coptic Church and the Greek Orthodox churches have equally held their own liturgical calendar and their own "canon".

[152] The openness of the EOTC has been described in two different ways. First, interviewee # 9 (personal communication, 19.12.2011) strongly claims that the strong literary character of the church made her preserve all

of the text to its context, the EOTC ended up with the longest list of books in its "canon", including books rejected by the West and East. These could be the reasons for the survival of the entire text of *1 Enoch* only in Ge'ez, as part of the authoritative scriptural "canon", for which the EOTC should be fully credited.

However, not only the extent of the "canon", but also its concept remains unique. As the EOTC has never officially debated the issue, it is difficult to exactly define what it means by the "canon" of the Scriptures. But this does not mean it does not have a "canon". With all the irregularities of the inclusion and exclusion of certain books, the EOTC has a "canon" of 81 books. It is impossible, therefore, to say for sure if the "canon" of the EOTC is open, closed, or in between. Put differently, the "edges" are not quite defined while the core texts are firmly within the "canon" while other books are firmly outside the "canon". This is because either it is insignificant for the church so far, as the church was able to function sufficiently with these vague edges[153] and as it is an alien concept to it; or it is an issue that the church still would want to address, as it has become an issue in the church only recently.

On the other hand, the Ethiopian Evangelicals inherited their "canon" of the Scriptures from the missionaries who brought the faith to them. As they trusted the missionaries and their successors, Ethiopian Evangelicals have taken for granted that their Bible with the 66 books is "the Word of God", come from above. They believe, without any hesitation, that it is the source of all authority, which nothing should be added or subtracted. Based on this belief and historical animosity, they strongly reject the books in the EOTC "canon" which are not in theirs. Unfortunately, their rejection of and hatred for those books is not based on objective

---

kinds of literature, including the Qur'an in Ge'ez, even if Islam is considered as a heretical religion. In other words, the church has been open to various kinds of literary works to be preserved in their literary forms in the monasteries of the church. Secondly, Ralph Lee (3023:2f.) relates the openness of the church in accommodating views and works of people who tend towards a heretical position. Lee gives us an example of which he describes as of "great interest" that "such a staunchly miaphysite church should use" a material produced by a person "clearly identifying him as a 'Nestorian'", which "reflects an open outlook of Ethiopian scholars. My contemporary experience of these scholars is that they are so, and will happily devour works from any Christian tradition, although they may warn the laity against reading such things."

[153] Why was the church able to function sufficiently with these vague edges? Probably because they had a sufficiently effective means of discerning God's will in the traditional teaching of the church. So, there may have been less anxiety about these fringe books as they knew how to interpret them according to the canon of common church teaching.

assessment or fair judgment, as they do not read those books, and as a result, are unfamiliar with the content in them. In addition, their belief that those books are recent production and later addition by the EOTC is historically incorrect and based on subjective assumptions.

These conceptual and practical differences have been openly reflected during the publication of a recently translated Amharic Bible at the Ethiopian Millennium celebration. The publication of this Bible, which was carried out by the EOTC, under the sponsorship and supervision of the BSE, became an immediate cause to expose the positions of the two church bodies in Ethiopia, the Orthodox and the Evangelicals. On the one hand, the Orthodox have been challenged to determine clearly which books are to be included and which ones are to be excluded, which would be "a closed canon". As the church has never officially made a list of a "closed canon", it remains a challenge until a clearer position has been taken. On the other, because of the ignorance of the historical background of biblical canons and the uncritical nature of their argument for the possibility of a number of canons, Evangelicals remain challenged objectively on their position.

As the young twenty-first century generation of the two church groups would challenge each other objectively, both churches would want to address these challenges in a more objective way than before. Retaining their uniqueness and identity, it seems that the time has come for all parties to rethink such pressing issues and come up with solutions with mutual benefits. The first step for this would be openness to know and appreciate the other without losing one's own identity. As this will be discussed in the final chapter of this thesis, most of the interviewees involved in this study, both Orthodox and Evangelicals, are very optimistic that better relationships between the two church bodies in Ethiopia is inevitable, a position this study argues for.

Finally, as the Scriptures have been shaped and influenced by the history of the church, the EOTC has significantly been influenced and shaped by its Scriptures in general and some texts in particular. One of the reasons why biblical books like *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* have retained their "canonical" place in the EOTC "canon" is the unique influence and legacy they have had in shaping some key traditions and practices of the church. The influence of the books like *1 Enoch* is not limited to deeply rooted and embedded traditions in this church; rather, it is extended to other dimensions of the Ethiopian society, including social, religious,

cultural and political aspects, to varying degrees. The effect of the influence and legacy of the book further extends to the Evangelicals' sphere in Ethiopia, at least indirectly. It is this unique influence of *1 Enoch*, with other related traditions and sources, in the Ethiopian context in general and the EOTC in particular which we assess in the ensuing chapter and to which we now turn.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE INFLUENCE AND LEGACY OF *1 ENOCH* IN THE MAKING OF ETHIOPIA

7.1 Introduction and Purpose of the Chapter

As one of the major contributions of this thesis, this chapter explores the influence of *1 Enoch* on Ethiopian Christianity over the centuries and its impact on shaping contemporary Ethiopian Christianity. Besides the religious legacy, mainly on the EOTC and/or indirectly on Ethiopian Evangelicals, the main purpose of the chapter is to highlight the level of the impact *1Enoch* has on various aspects of Ethiopian society.

The chapter, therefore, tries to show how diverse the influence of *1 Enoch* is on the Ethiopian Church in particular and on the wider society in general. The chapter gives samples and evidences based on some case studies from various perspectives where the influence of *1 Enoch* may be identified. This is, however, not an exhaustive study of the different aspects of influence the book may have. Even in the subsections of this chapter, only some samples are included, as each subsection may need a wider and deeper study on their own right. We may leave and recommend such deeper and exhaustive studies on topics raised on each subsection, for further studies. I wish therefore to emphasize from the outset that this chapter constitutes only a preliminary investigation of a much under-researched topic.

1 Enoch has disappeared from where it originally emerged, developed, spread widely and once gained authoritative status. Unlike the original milieu from which it arose and faded away, it gained "canonical" authority, maintained its momentum, and survives in its entirety in Ethiopia to date. Besides the Aramaic and the Greek fragments with some portions, it is this surviving text in Ethiopia in Ge'ez which became the text of *1 Enoch*. For at least more than a millennium, (sixth/seventh – seventeenth/eighteenth centuries) it has been alive only in Ethiopia. Not only did it survive, *1 Enoch* has also been one of the prominent biblical texts in the long history of the EOTC.

As it survived only in Ethiopia and gained prominence in the life and traditions of the EOTC, one would expect a certain influence and legacy of this book on the church which retains it as part of its authoritative Scriptures. Even if the book has widely attracted scholarly attention in the last hundred years, its legacy and influence on the community, credited for its survival by retaining it for such a long period of time with its original authority, has largely been ignored in the scholarly discussion.

There are, however, a few exceptions where scholars have shown some interest in taking on the study of the influence of the book in Ethiopia. Some have boldly acclaimed *1 Enoch* as a book that shaped not only religious aspects of the EOTC but that influenced a wide variety of aspects of the Ethiopian worldview which itself is closely tied up with religion. Such a bold claim was made firstly and unsurprisingly by one of the leading Ethiopian scholars, Isaac (1983:10), who states: "it is hardly possible to understand any aspect of the religious tradition and thought of Ethiopia, the country in which it survived, without an understanding of it [i.e. *1 Enoch*]." He further argues, "What distinguishes Ethiopian Christian theology from that of either the Western or Eastern Christendom may well be the Ethiopian emphases on Enochic thought." Even if there are some elements of truth in this proposition, it has weaknesses and is overstated.

Some others acknowledge the scholarly neglect of the book's role in Ethiopian society and they attempt to fill the gap. For instance, one of the leading scholars of Enochic studies, George Nickelsburg (2001:104), admits to the irony of the neglect of the book's influence and legacy in the Ethiopian Church and breaks the silence in this regard.[1] He notes that it is strange to see that "scholars of 1 Enoch have paid little systematic attention to the historical matrix of the Ethiopic version and to the book's ongoing role in the life and thought of Ethiopian Christianity."[2]

---

[1] Nickelsburg (2001:104-108) devotes about five pages in the first volume of his massive commentary on the book to its influence in the Ethiopian church. He contributed further to the discussion in an article (Nickelsburg 2006:611-19). He also states that Milik has remarked at an earlier date on the neglect by scholars of the book's influence on the EOTC.

[2] Nickelsburg (2001:104) further lists a few scholars and points out specific small contributions they made, including Ullendorff, Milik, Berger, Fuhs and Isaac. He is critical of the fact that *1 Enoch*'s influence has been studied "only in relation to early Jewish texts and the literature of Western Christianity."

Therefore, the central question of this chapter is what the various legacies and influences of *1 Enoch* in Ethiopia are, in a country where it survived in its entirety. This broader question entails other specific ones, namely: are all aspects of the religious traditions and worldviews of Ethiopia heavily influenced by this book, as boldly claimed? To what extent is the Ethiopian Christian identity tied up with *1 Enoch*? In which specific areas are *1 Enoch*'s influence and legacy in the EOTC explicit? Does the book have further influence on other dimensions, other than religious and spiritual, in Ethiopia? To put it differently, does the book influence the social, cultural, political, intellectual and/or other aspects and life in broader Ethiopian society? Does it directly or indirectly influence Ethiopian Evangelicals—a community which rejects it?

In an attempt to respond to these questions, this chapter focuses on the Ethiopian context in general, with special emphasis on the legacy of *1 Enoch* in the EOTC. Focusing particularly on the spiritual and theological influences, the discussion further goes on to other aspects where the book may have contributed in the making of Ethiopia at large.

Methodologically, this is a stage where the text of *1 Enoch* is in dialogue with the Ethiopian context. As mentioned elsewhere, the tripolar contextual method, with its three elements— distantiation, contextualization, and appropriation—is the over-arching methodology of the thesis. This is, therefore, the second stage of the method—contextualization, where context is focused upon. It is at this stage that the text is contextually examined in the community in which it is employed.

In addition to the available literary sources, both local and international, the discussion includes field research and interviews. As the chapter focuses on the Ethiopian context, the available local material, both primary and secondary literatures, are the appropriate ones for the purpose of the chapter. In addition to these limited literary works, personal observation and some empirical assessments are employed. For assessment of manuscripts on *1 Enoch*, the

concerned manuscripts in the British Library, EMML in Addis Ababa and some others from Berlin and Hamburg state libraries are examined.[3]

The chapter begins with a discussion on ancient manuscript evidence of *1 Enoch*'s prominence in the transmission history of the Scriptures in Ethiopia. Related to that prominence is its usage by other literary works. Thus, a discussion on evidence from ancient Ge'ez manuscripts of *1 Enoch* and its later usage by other major literary works in Ethiopia constitutes the first part of the chapter.

In the second part, the influence and legacy of *1 Enoch* in the EOTC, particularly from the theological perspective, is explored. The concept of sin and salvation, a highly developed angelology and demonology, and Christology are areas in focus. At this point, we may evaluate the level of *1 Enoch*'s influence on the EOTC's theological stance and thought. In other words, we assess if the claim that credits this book as the main underlying element to understand Ethiopian Christian theological worldview, is plausible.

The third part of the chapter engages with the influence and legacy of *1 Enoch* in the spiritual realm and spiritual practices in Ethiopia. This includes the unique computation of the Ethiopian Calendar, a number of other social aspects, especially the practice of using amulets, and the place of *1 Enoch* in Ethiopian iconography. The level of both the presence and absence of artistic works relating to this book, would be indicative of the degree to which the book is influential.

The fourth part briefly suggests other broader aspects where *1 Enoch*'s influence in Ethiopia could be detected. This is intended to identify and recommend some other areas of *1 Enoch*'s influence Ethiopia for further examination. This may include geography, cosmology, hymnology, science, medicine, and so forth.

The fifth part attempts to explore if the Ethiopian Evangelicals, as part and parcel of the Ethiopian Christian community, have been influenced directly or indirectly by the Enochic

---

corpus. *1 Enoch* is one of the rejected scriptural works by Ethiopian Evangelicals, considering it a later addition by the EOTC. This section critically examines if there is any legacy of such a rejected book among the Evangelicals.

Finally, the chapter closes with a critique on Ephraim Isaac's bold proposition on the influence of *1 Enoch* on the Ethiopian Christian worldview. After a general survey of *1 Enoch*'s possible influence on Ethiopian Church and society, we would have a better position to evaluate Isaac's argument. This would lead us to some concluding remarks on the chapter.

7.2 *1 Enoch*'s Ge'ez Manuscripts and its Literary Usage as Evidence for its Prominence in the EOTC

Besides the wider influence 1 Enoch would have on the EOTC in particular and Ethiopia in general, its literary prominence and scriptural significance can be detected from two literary perspectives. On the one hand, manuscript evidence depicts 1 Enoch as being among the most prominent biblical books in the transmission history of the Scriptures in the EOTC. On the other, 1 Enoch has been employed as source material for other significant literary works produced in the latter period of Ethiopian literary history. After discussing the manuscript evidence, we will turn to other Ethiopian literary works, which heavily depend on, or used 1 Enoch as their source.

7.2.1 Evidence from Biblical Manuscripts

It is believed that hundreds of thousands of manuscripts (mss) have been produced in Ethiopia since the Christianization of the nation in the early fourth century AD to date.[4] The production of the mss has been centered through the church and its institutions, mainly the monasteries. The court, both on institutional and individual levels, has also been extensively involved. Besides natural disaster and being worn out by poor handling, it is unfortunate that an inconceivable amount of ancient mss have been destroyed during the wars in the country.

---

[4] For a discussion on the manuscript history of *1 Enoch* in Ge'ez, see Ted M. Erho and Loren T. Stuckenbruck 2013:87-133.

Most notably devastating in their record of deliberate mss destructions are the wars and invasions of the ninth[5] and the sixteenth[6] centuries.

Against all destructive forces targeted against the mss, however, their production has carried on at each and every period of the history of the EOTC in particular and Ethiopia in general. Producing mss has continued to date, even after the invention of the printing machine centuries ago.

The subject matter of Ethiopian mss comprises a wider range of subjects. Even if scriptural and religious writings are among the more prominent, the mss include topics on history, philosophy, law, mathematics, and medicine (Pankhurst [2013a]).

Besides both natural and manmade destruction of Ethiopian mss, thousands of these ancient mss have been looted, stolen and sold and as a result, spread all around the world. According to R. Pankhurst's "conservative" estimation, as "they do not include privately owned MSS, or recent library acquisitions", there are about 5000 Ethiopian mss currently owned outside Ethiopia (Pankhurst [2013a]).

---

[5] The first major attack on the Christian Empire of Abyssinia came from a discontented minority group of the so-called Felasha (in recent days, designated also as Bete-Israel, i.e., house of Israel), led by a lady called Queen Judith, also called *Yodit Gudit* in Amharic, Esato in Tigrigna, or Ga'wa in Arabic), in the ninth century. Once she defeated the throne, her attack was mainly targeting the church: burning to ash its buildings, literature, arts, monasteries, and everything connected to the church. Her cruelty was memorable and legendary as she massacred thousands of clergy, princes and nobilities all around the country. It is recorded that her reign extends for forty years destroying what has been built in four centuries. For some historical details on her invasion, see ጎርጎርዮስ 1974:30; ምክረ ሥላሴ 2010:98-101; Ullendorff 1960:60f. For English translations of two manuscripts from the Ge'ez on her offensives she made and the motives behind it, see Sergew 1972:226-230.

[6] The second and most devastating to the Ethiopian literary treasure was the sixteenth century invasion by a remarkable general of the Adal army, Ahmed ibn Ibrahim el Ghazi, surnamed Gragne-the-left-handed, who subdued the entire country. According to Taddesse (1993:42), unfortunately, this was the most destructive period in the whole history of the Ethiopian Christian Kingdom, where only small portion of the glorious cultural and religious heritage from the ancient and medieval period survived "the destructive force of human history." Ullendorff (1960:73) further designates the event as the "holocaust". To use his words: "The holocaust enveloped most parts of Ethiopia and brought in its train misery and murder, ruin and devastation. Much of the literary and intellectual heritage of Abyssinia was irretrievably lost, and the barbarism and brutality had an effect far transcending that age. To Ethiopians a good deal of their hard-won civilization was destroyed, while to the historian and *éthiopisant* precious documentation and irreplaceable evidence perished for ever."

The enormous task of cataloguing tens of thousands of these Ethiopian mss[7] started in the 1970's, by a project known as the Ethiopian Manuscripts Microfilm Library (EMML), partnered by three institutions, namely – the Hill Museum & Manuscript Library (HMML), the Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church, and Vanderbilt University.[8] Even if the EMML project correctly and proudly claims that it "is the world's richest resource for the study of Ethiopian manuscripts, with complete copies of more than 11,000 Ge'ez manuscripts in microfilm and digital formats" (HMML [2013]), Pankhurst, who praises the achievements of the EMML project, rightly warns that the task is far from completion.[9]

It is a couple of hundred selected "biblical" mss from this highly regarded catalogue of EMML[10] and a dozen of other biblical mss from the British Library, which are examined in the following section.

7.2.1.1 Analysis of Selected "Biblical" Manuscripts from EMML

The manuscript analysis includes about 220 mss from EMML described by Stuckenbruck who computed the list, as a provisional "sampling of manuscripts that obviously were attempting to collect a number of texts together, including some that many would call 'biblical'."[11] The time

---

[7] Loren Stuckenbruck (personal communication) argues that the numbers of manuscripts are of course much, much higher. We are dealing with 750,000, but this is all a notional number based on educated guesses about churches and monasteries. The EMML photographs were made of only 30-50% of the manuscripts from locations where photographs were taken or from which photographs were brought to central locations for photographing. The manuscripts were not always carefully chosen (e.g. at Lake Tana); therefore, there are many more manuscripts there and other places were never included in the collections.

[8] These are the three institutions own the project as mentioned by HMML ([2013]). However, Pankhurst ([2013b]) has slightly a different list of the partner institutions. He writes, "The EMML project … was based on a partnership between three institutions: the Ethiopian Ministry of Culture, the Ethiopian Orthodox Church, and St John's Abbey and University in Collegeville, Minnesota." He later on mentions a key involvement of another institution, the Institute of Ethiopian Studies, in the EMML project (ibid).

[9] Pankhurst ([2013b]) comments that "Though microfilming of manuscripts was carried on fairly exhaustively for almost two decades in much of the country, manuscripts in many other areas, including Tegray, let alone Eritrea, have still not been touched by the project at all." Despite the fact that much has been done after Pankhurst's comment, more than a decade ago, cataloguing Ethiopian mss exhaustively is still a huge task to be carried on.

[10] Pankhurst ([2013b]) points out that "The EMML project … won the admiration of virtually all scholars in the field (Leslau, Ullendorff, Strelcyn, Hammerchmidt, Chojnacki, Tubiana, et al.) and is widely quoted in works of scholarship."

[11] The list of the mss and the biblical books each ms contains in a table form has been computed by Loren Stuckenbruck and graciously given to me during our meeting in Munich in June 2013. I am deeply grateful for his willingness to share this information with me. See Appendix 4.A for the list of the mss and the books each ms contains, as listed by Stuckenbruck, and analyzed in this chapter.

frame of the mss spans from the twelfth to twentieth centuries, with fifteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries mss predominating.[12]

To point out some of the broader trends of the mss in question, there is not any dominant pattern in the order of the books, as is common either in the Jewish or Christian "canons". For instance, James A. Sanders (2003:249) remarks that "no matter how the content differs among the several Christian canons, the structure and message of the Christian canons, as a group, contrast significantly with those of the Jewish canon. The Tanakh provides a way to move on to Mishnah and Talmud, while the First or Christian Old Testament provides a way to move on to the New Testament." We do not, however, see such broad structure in these EOTC mss, which would have reflected a sequential theologically nuanced shape, or composition of parts, of biblical books arising from the order.

There is no pattern or rule regarding how many books a ms may have, since any given ms may include a single book,[13] two books, three, four or almost the entire Old Testament. In some cases, a ms may include some biblical books, commentaries, some portions of other books, without any regular order. Potentially, any book may appear alone or with any other book, or it may appear as a first, a middle or a last book of any given ms. For example, among the analyzed 220 mss, 43 of them are single books,[14] while only one twentieth century mss (EMML# Cer75) contains almost all of the OT books including the NT.[15]

One may therefore conclude that there has not been any well-recognized and established order or tradition of biblical books in Ethiopian scriptural mss, at least until the beginning of the twentieth century, when printing started. Rather, the manuscript evidence boldly speaks to

---

[12] Even if the dates for the mss are not conclusive, as they appear on the catalogue, 1 ms is from the twelfth century, 3 mss from fourteenth, 32 from fifteenth, 12 from sixteenth, 31 from seventeenth, 77 from eighteenth, 13 from nineteenth, another 13 from twentieth centuries, where about 38 mss do not have dates on the catalogue.

[13] In most cases, Octateuch or Pentateuch, Kings, and the Twelve, are considered as single books. In the meantime, as they may appear as single books or merged together, the connection between Daniel and its associates (Susana and Bel), and Proverbs and *Tegsas*, is unclear.

[14] Among the books which appear as a single book of a given ms are: *Enoch,* Jubilees, Kings, Octateuch, Sirach, Ezekiel, Song of Songs, and Isaiah.

[15] The order of books in this ms may draw some attention as it tries to follow the traditional order of the Pentateuch / Octateuch, historical books, wisdom or poetic books, and prophets. However, there are a number of variations if one closely looks at the place of each books; for instance, Sirach is the last book of the OT in one mss, EMML # Cer75, where almost all the OT books are included.

itself that the EOTC, at this stage, has not followed the conventional tripartite or quadripartite structures for its biblical Scriptures.[16]

This does not mean, however, that there are no other conclusions, explicitly or implicitly, which can be drawn from the order or structure of the mss examined. Among a number of conclusions one may trace, those connected to *1 Enoch* appear to be more explicit than any others. Based on (1) the frequency of appearances, (2) precedence in the order, and (3) appearing as an independent ms, we can see the unique place this book has and its significance in the transmission history of the Scriptures in the EOTC, especially from the fifteenth to the twentieth centuries.

Out of the 220 mss analyzed, *1 Enoch* appears sixty-seven times, which makes it the most frequent book in the list followed, in fact, by the entire Octateuch/Pentateuch, which appears sixty-six times. As it is a significantly costly business, it may be argued that copying and producing a manuscript is primarily based on the contemporary usage and importance of the text by the believing community, as a group or individual, mainly among the nobility or the royal families.[17] It would seem that the prominence of the book may have called for such significant investment in copying it throughout the centuries.

If the order of precedence in any given mss is taken into account, in this criterion as well *1 Enoch* stands first as the most frequent first book in the mss examined. On fifty-one of its sixty-seven appearances, *1 Enoch* is the first book of those mss; followed by the Octateuch/Pentateuch where only forty of the sixty-six of its appearances are as the first book.

---

[16] Sanders (2003:245-249) shows that even if the Protestant OT and the Jewish Hebrew Bible have the same content, their structure conveys different messages serving the theology of each group. He writes (p.245) "A careful look at the Tanak as we have inherited from the Masoretes shows that its tripartite structure makes a very different statement from that of the Christian quadripartite First (Old) Testament. In the case of comparison of the Jewish and Christian Protestant canons …, the two structures (*norma normata*) are quite different, although the texts of the two are essentially the same." For a comparison of the structures and contents of the two canons, see a table in Alan J. Hauser & Duane F. Watson 2003:34-35.

[17] For a detailed discussion on the entire process of bookmaking or manuscript writing in Ethiopia from ancient to modern period, see Sergew Hable Selassie 1981.

In other words, against the traditional precedence of the Pentateuch, *1 Enoch*'s precedence in the EOTC scriptural mss outnumbers that of the Octateuch/Pentateuch.[18]

In addition, if it is compared to the Octateuch/Pentateuch, there are fifteen mss where both *1 Enoch* and the Octateuch/Pentateuch appear, where *1 Enoch* comes first in ten of them, whereas the Octateuch/Pentateuch comes first only in two, and in the other three, *1 Enoch* comes in between the books of Pentateuch. This may further be indicative of the prominence of *1 Enoch* in the EOTC over the traditionally recognized Pentateuch, which is recognized as the first set of books of any Christian Scriptures.

With a closer look at the order of books in this list of mss, one striking pattern is that in twenty-three mss, the Book of Job immediately follows *1 Enoch*. This could be an indicator of the long held belief of the EOTC that *1 Enoch* is the first book of the Scriptures, as he, Enoch, precedes Moses (interviewee # 10, personal communication, 19 12 2011), and Job is understood to be among those from the most ancient (see Ezek 14:14). According to this point, *1 Enoch*'s prominence is not only that of functional, but also chronological or historical prominence.

With regard to mss devoted to single books, there are ten mss entirely devoted to *1 Enoch*, where it is only preceded by the Octateuch/Pentateuch, as this set of books has the advantage of standing as a single book both individually and collectively.[19] That means, except Octateuch/Pentateuch, *Enoch* as a single book is more frequent than other biblical books.

Therefore, if all these points are taken into account collectively, *1 Enoch*'s prominence in the mss of EOTC "biblical" Scriptures, particularly from the fourteenth to twentieth centuries, is fairly strong. This trend can also be traced from the Ethiopian manuscripts collected in the British Library.

---

[18] If one may want to see a manuscript with one of the largest collections from the fifteenth century, EMML #1768, nearly the entire OT, *1 Enoch* appears as the first book of that large collection.

[19] For example, a ms can be either only the book of Genesis, or a couple of books among the Pentateuch/Octateuch, or only the Pentateuch, or the entire Octateuch. So, the comparison is between just one book, *1 Enoch,* and eight books.

7.2.1.2 Analysis of Twelve Biblical Manuscripts from the British Library

These mss[20] are biblical Ge'ez mss collected in the British Library and selected from a couple of Ethiopian mss for their inclusion of *1 Enoch*.[21] Nine of the twelve mss come from the eighteenth century, where the remaining three come from the sixteenth, seventeenth, and nineteenth centuries.[22] While the conclusions drawn from this set of manuscripts could be indicative for the period from the sixteenth to the seventeenth period, they certainly allow us to draw conclusions for the eighteenth century.

When we come to detail, *1 Enoch* appears in all the twelve mss, as these are exclusively selected as Enochic mss. Among the twelve mss, *1 Enoch* appears nine times as the first book of the ms, where one ms contains only Enoch. On one ms where both *1 Enoch* and the Octateuch are found, *1 Enoch* is the first book followed by the Octateuch. The Book of Job appears on four mss and always immediately follows *1 Enoch*. Except for these patterns, we do not find any recognized order of books in these mss, as any given ms can include an unspecified number of books.[23] If we compare the two mss with the largest number of books, MSS# Orient. 484 and MSS# Orient. 492, each containing sixteen books, they have eleven books in common, but with an entirely different order.[24]

These descriptions strengthen our previous conclusions drawn from the EMML mss above. We may conclude here (1) that the number of appearances as the first book of nine out of twelve mss and that it precedes the Octateuch in the only ms in which the Octateuch is found, could be strong evidence that *1 Enoch*, in the last five hundred years has been one of the most

---

[20] For the list of these manuscripts and their specific reference numbers, see Appendix 4.B.

[21] For the purpose of this study I have limited my research to these twelve mss which contain *1 Enoch*.

[22] Almost all the dates of the mss, as assigned by W. Wright, (1877:7-19, 209) and S. Strelcyn, (1978:4-5), are debatable since there has not been yet done any carbon test so that they may have relatively reliable dates. Based on a recent findings on the dates of some ancient Ethiopian illuminated gospel mss, which are carbon tested and dated as much earlier than it was originally assumed, I assume the dates of these mss would be earlier than they appear in the catalogues of Write (dates of ten mss) and Strelcyn (dates of two mss). But until such scientific conclusion is made and some kind of consensus is reached on the dates of the mss, I tentatively adopt the dates as assigned in these catalogues.

[23] For example, the number of books in each ms is 1, 2, 4 (3 mss), 5 (2 mss), 6, 8, 11, and 16 (2 mss) books.

[24] For example, both mss contain Sirach, Judith, Esther, and Tobit, where one of the mss has this order, while the other with almost a reverse order—Tobit, Judith, Esther, and Sirach. Whereas one of these mss includes Octateuch, various portions of Jeremiah, Daniel, and Ezekiel, the other ms instead has Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom, Isaiah, and Song of songs.

influential "canonical" books of the EOTC. (2) That *1 Enoch* appears as the first book so frequently, and in many cases immediately followed by Job, is indicative of the belief in the EOTC that it is the first book of the EOTC Scriptures followed by Job. And (3) that there has not been any finalized order of Scriptural books in the EOTC in its long history of scriptural reception and transmission.[25]

7.2.2 Evidence from Usage by Other Ethiopian Literary Works

Some modern scholars studied the usage of *1 Enoch* by other Ge'ez literary works mainly in search for older textual evidence of the book. The works of three scholars in this connection are selected and briefly discussed as evidence that *1 Enoch* has significant influence on ancient ecclesiastical literary works in Ethiopia.

Milik is the first scholar to recognize Ge'ez quotations of *1 Enoch* in Ethiopian literary works for the purpose of text-criticism and dating of existent Enochic Ge'ez mss. As part of his Aramaic fragments discussion, he made a provisional list of quotations in some Ge'ez literary works and made use of them in his notations of the Aramaic texts.[26]

Following Milik, Berger has taken up the same line, underlining the significance of the Ge'ez quotations in other Ethiopian literary works for *1 Enoch*'s textual history. Based on the work of Milik, Berger (1980:100-109) made three significant contributions. He: (1) added some commentaries on the list provided by Milik, (2) added further quotations not included in Milik's list, and (3) identified which literary works, among those which quote from *1 Enoch*, are more significant evidences for dating the oldest mss.

About three decades after Berger's work, in 2009 Knibb further discusses the quotations based on the works of both Milik and Berger. Knibb's critical analysis of the works of these two scholars engages with their contributions and limitations, mainly from the text-critical point of

---

[25] One of the mss (Orient. 743), for instance, includes all the following items together: (1) Hymns and Prayers, including the Athanasian Creed; (2) "The Song of Songs, concerning the Son, and the Christian Church, and His Mother," an exposition of words and phrases in the Song of Songs; (3) Expositions of some passages of the Old and New Testaments; and (4) a long series of exposition, commencing with *Enoch*, where *the Book of Enoch* is also cited.

[26] For Milik's detailed discussion and the list of quotations, see Milik 1976:85-88.

view and dating the oldest mss. He also, however, affirms that there are a significant amount of quotations of *1 Enoch* in the Ge'ez writings of mainly the fifteenth century.[27]

Now we can mention some of the quotations of *1 Enoch* as discussed by these three scholars, so as to ratify our point, that the influence of *1 Enoch* in other Ge'ez wrings in the EOTC is evident. As the extant manuscripts of *1 Enoch* flourished mainly from the fifteenth century onwards (Knibb 2009:177), the prominent books which used and are influenced by it, are primarily from the same period, a period labeled as "the Golden Age of the [Ge'ez] literature" (Harden 1926:22). Knibb (2009:179) classifies three categories of Ge'ez writings from the fifteenth century which used *1 Enoch* in their writings, which are "doctrinal writings, hagiographical texts, and prayers".

Among these three categories, three significant doctrinal books—*Metshafe Berhan (the Book of Light)*, *Metshafe Mi'lad (the Book of Nativity)*,[28] and *Metshafe Mistire Semay Womeder (the Book of the Mysteries of Heaven and Earth)*[29]—are exceptionally important both for the magnitude of their quotations and the theological influence they have on the church. For instance, besides other passages, *Metshafe Mi'lad* quotes "the complete text of *1 Enoch* 46:1-51:5 and 62:1-16—exactly the passages that have attracted the interest of modern scholars concerned with messianism" (Knibb 2009:180). Other texts quoted by *Metshafe Mi'lad*, also reflecting contemporary Christological debates,[30] include *1 Enoch* 61:6-8; 63:11-12; 69:26-70:3; and 71:12-17 (Knibb 2009:181).

---

[27] Knibb devotes one full chapter on this issue (chapter 10: entitled 'The Text-Critical Value of the Quotations from *1 Enoch* in Ethiopic writings'), in his book *Essays in the Book of Enoch,* 176-187. In his analysis of quotations of *1 Enoch* in Ge'ez writings, Knibb includes the works of some other scholars in languages other than English.

[28] According to Knibb (2009:180), these two books, *Metshafe Berhan and Metshafe Mi'lad* are attributed to the famous Emperor Zer'a Yacob (1434-68), "during whose reign there was a flowering of Ethiopian literature. However, it is more likely that they were composed by high-ranking clergy under the auspices of the king in order to give expressions to his views. They reflect the Christological and ecclesiastical controversies of the day."

[29] Knibb (2009:180) maintains that *Metshafe Mistire Semay Womeder*, a book with apocalyptic character, is also from the time of Zer'a Yacob, the fifteenth century AD. For an English translation of this book, see Budge 1935.

[30] For a detailed discussion on Christological debate in the fifteenth and sixteenth century Ethiopia, see Jacopo Gnisci 2012:31f.

Besides these Christological texts, *Metshafe Mi'lad* quotes *1 Enoch* 89: 19-30 in another context. Furthermore, texts including *1 Enoch* 91:12-13 and 15-17 are quoted in this book in connection with the incarnation and the last judgment. *Metshafe Mi'lad* further quotes *1 Enoch* 72:33-34 and 78:15-17 in relation to the authority of Enoch as the first prophet who announced the coming of Christ (Knibb 2009:183).[31]

In its fourth part, the *Book of Mysteries of Heaven and Earth* rephrases portions from the Apocalypse of Weeks, where it aims to show that the sixth to the tenth weeks are connected to the coming of Christ and the last one, with the Antichrist (Isaac 1983:10; Nickelsburg 2001:105). In connection with the end of the world, *Metshafe Mistire Semay Womeder* also quotes *1 Enoch* 93:8. The book further refers to *1 Enoch* 3:1; 18:22, the Parables, the Book of the Luminaries, and the Animal Apocalypse.[32]

Besides the quotations, the depth of dependence of *Metshafe Mistire Semay Womeder* on the book of Enoch, and the presence of *1 Enoch* behind this work, deceived some European explorers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries who mistakenly assumed their finding as being the text of *1 Enoch*—only to be later disappointed.[33]

---

[31] An important question discussed in *Metshafe Mi'lad*, as presented by Knibb (2009:180) is that these texts are targeting opponents who questioned the authority of *1 Enoch*. The argument assumes that the opponents accept the astronomical and calendrical computations based on the book, and asks, why then they fail to accept Enoch's prophetic authority. This question recurs a number of times among some Ethiopian Christians, which needs further study so as to address the contemporary issue around this and other books in a similar status.

[32] For the literature discussing on the usage of these various texts in *Metshafe Mistire Semay Womeder*, see Nickelsburg 2001:105, nn.173-176.

[33] E. Isaac (1983:8) describes that a Capuchin monk brought a text of the book of *Metshafe Mistire Semay Womeder*, assuming that he brought a manuscript of *1 Enoch* from Ethiopia to Europe. Isaac continues, "[t]his manuscript, which aroused great excitement in Europe, drew the attention of the first great European Ethiopian scholar, Ludelfus Hiob, who traced it to the Bibliotheca Regia in Paris in 1683. He was disappointed to learn that the manuscript was not of 1 Enoch but that of an unknown Ethiopian work called the Book of the Mysteries of Heaven and Earth."

One of the monumental literary works of thirteenth and fourteenth century Ethiopia,[34] is *the Kebre Negest*,[35] *the Glory of Kings*,[36] an epic possibly expanded and produced from earlier works in order to legitimize the Solomonic Dynasty, also uses *1 Enoch*.[37] This influential book has incorporated the story of the fallen angels in its account of primeval history[38] and cosmological explanations.

The Ethiopian hagiographical works[39] prefer free rendering of, or allusions to, *1 Enoch* rather than direct quotations. For instance, "*the Acts of Ezra of Gunda Gunde*, in a passage about the cross, give a free rendering of [*1 Enoch*] 25:5 and, in a passage about the death of Ezra, use the phrase "the first ram" from [*1 Enoch*] 89:46-47 to refer to Ezra (Knibb 2009:180)."

Another important literary work which used portions of *1 Enoch* is *Metshafe Senksar*, the Ethiopian Synaxarium,[40] a liturgical book with a compilation of readings for each day of the entire year's saints' days. The ascension of Enoch into heaven is commemorated on the 27th of *Tir* (Feb. 04)[41] and for the reading of that day, the book "summarizes the first four books of 1

---

[34] Even if the majority of modern scholars tend to agree with the thirteenth century dating of *Kebre Negest*, there is strong argument from some that the work has its origin from the sixth and seventh century AD. For instance, Irfan Shahid (1976:133-178) argue for the dating of the sixth century. For a discussion on the date of *Kebre Negest*, see Munro-Hay 2001.

[35] The high regard *Kebre Negest* has in Ethiopia rightly expressed by Ullendorff (1960:144) as follows: "The *Kebre Negest* is not merely a literary work, but—as the Old Testament to the Hebrews of the Koran to the Arabs—it is the repository of Ethiopian national and religious feelings, perhaps the truest and most genuine expression of Abyssinian Christianity."

[36] For an earlier English translation of *Kebre Negest,* see Budge1922, though criticized by Piovanelli (2013:7) as a translation with "notorious flaws." For a latest English translation of the *Kebre Negest*, see Brooks 1996. For a discussion on the influence of *Kebre Negest* on the Rastafarian movement, see Hausman 2005. Piovanelli (2013:7), helpfully notes that *Kebre Negest,* besides its critical Ge'ez edition by Bezold 1905, is now translated into six languages: (1) French, Colin 2002; Mahler 2007; Beylot 2008; (2) Amharic, Sergew Gelaw 2007/8; (3) Italian, Raineri 2008; (4) Hebrew, HaCohen 2009; (5) Portuguese, Pedro Paez's translation of chapters 12-86 and now translated to English, Boavida, Pennec, and Ramos 2011:80-91; and (6) English, Budge 1922. For an up-to-date bibliography, see Bausi 2012:lvi-lix.

[37] According to Ullendorff (1960:143), besides quotations and paraphrases from the Old and New Testaments, *Kebre Negest* uses the Book of Enoch and many other writings including the *Book of Pearl,* the Christological and patristic writings in Coptic, Syriac, Arabic, and Greek, the *Testament of Adami*, Rabbinical literature and the Qur'an.

[38] As Nickelsburg (2001:104) maintains, besides reflecting the angel story, as told in *1 Enoch* 6-11, *Kebre Negest* uses sources like *Pseudo-Clementine Homily 8*, which in turn is influenced by *1 Enoch*.

[39] These texts from the same period are concerned with local saints of contemporary period or a little before. For a discussion on a broader context of Ethiopian hagiology, see Harden 1926:73-91.

[40] For the English translation of the text of *Metshafe Synksar*, see Budge [2014]. There are some differences on pagination between this electronic version and the hard copy Nickelsburg (2001:105, n.177) refers to.

[41] Nickelsburg (2001:105) mistakenly refers to Feb 1, instead of 4 as an equivalent to *Tir* 27.

Enoch, quoting from the Introduction (1:3-5), the Book of the Watchers (13:7-8; 14:10-18 briefly; 18:7-8), the Parables (40:2; 46:1; 48:3-4),[42] the Book of the Luminaries (72:1), and the Animal Vision (85:3; 90:28-29, 32-33)" (Nickelsburg 2001:105).[43]

To highlight an example from quotations in prayer texts, *1 Enoch* 46:1-6 and the entire chapter 62 are quoted in a manuscript in the British Library (Add. 11,678), where various prayers are assembled.

Besides these quotations and allusions by such prominent literary works, another study discloses the influence of *1 Enoch* as a hermeneutical key in some ancient biblical commentaries, in this case, the Book of Revelation. In his study of Ethiopian commentaries on the Book of Revelation, Ralph Lee (2013:6) describes how three hermeneutical approaches, among others, are employed in interpreting Revelation in these traditional commentaries, of which *1 Enoch* is the first one.[44]

According to Lee (2013:7), the fifteenth century writer of the *Terguame Qalamsis* (Interpretation of the Apocalypse), who is familiar with the *Book of Ethiopic Enoch*, has frequently quoted from and alluded to it.[45] As to the importance and usage of *1 Enoch* for the interpretation of the commentary, Lee (2013:7) writes, "Enoch is used primarily as a source to explain references to angels in Revelation in a manner that sees the two books almost as a single unit." In his analysis of *Enoch*'s influence on the interpretation of the *Terguame Qalamsis*, Lee (2013:7-9) discusses more than half a dozen quotations and allusions, where he concludes the person of Enoch, as presented in the Book of Enoch as its reference, is one of the prominent figures and to be considered as one of the witnesses in it.

---

[42] Nickelsburg (2001:105) further notes that "[t]he material from the Parables is identified as a prophecy of Christ, and the description of the New Jerusalem in the Animal Vision is interpreted to refer to the church."
[43] For more references from *1 Enoch* in other days of commemoration see Nickelsburg 2001:105.
[44] The other two are "Mohammed and Muslims, and the historical framework".
[45] For a brief, but notable, background and description of *Terguame Qalamsis* see Lee 2013:3-5.

Likewise, the *andemta*[46] commentary writers also employed *1 Enoch*, even if they prefer allusion to quotations (Lee 2013:11).[47] The influence and place *1 Enoch* has in these works would better be summarized in Lee's (2013:11) words:

> Enoch is regarded, along with St John and others, as a special kind of prophet, who conversed with God, and gives special information about the roles of angels, with the Enoch angel passages being regarded as complementary to those in Revelation. Enoch's important role, at least in later Ethiopian thought, is demonstrated by his association with one of the enigmatic witnesses, although this idea is not consistent in Ethiopian interpretation.

In conclusion, first, the manuscript analysis gives some kind of prominence to *1 Enoch* among the Scriptures. Secondly, *1 Enoch* functioned as a guide to the interpretation of the Scriptures in the later literary works and commentaries of the EOTC. Even if the level of such influence of the book before the fifteenth century is yet to be assessed (and remains unclear), its prominent place since then is evident from its presence in various literary productions, during which time the literary renaissance of the church has occurred. There does, however, remain much research to be done on various Ethiopian literary works regarding the extent, which text, from which period, and why they have been influenced by, and used, *1 Enoch*.[48]

7.3 *1 Enoch*'s Influence on the Theology of the EOTC

Among the many theological themes which would have been influenced by *1 Enoch*, hamartiology and soteriology, angelology and demonology, and Christology and eschatology could be good examples to display the level of influence the book has had in most theological stances of the EOTC. As these three areas are briefly assessed, by no means is this an exhaustive study of *1 Enoch*'s influence on EOTC theology. This section, however, would

---

[46] For a clear and precise discussion on the background of *andəmta* commentary, see Lee 2013:5.

[47] The two main reasons, according to Lee (2013:11), for such preference could be "a greater familiarity of the book [i.e., *1 Enoch*] by the time the *andəmta* was written, or it may simply reflect the fact that the *andəmta* is a corpus of works, and so detailed quotations are not felt necessary."

[48] In an informal discussion of concerned Enochic scholars, where the large majority are Ethiopians, and facilitated by Loren Stuckenbruck, a concern was raised on a number of possible research areas on the field where quotations and allusions in various Ethiopian literary works was underlined. Among these works, which are believed to use *1 Enoch*, and as a result singled out to be closely studied are: Metshafe Mister, Metshafe Mistire Semay Womeder, Metshafe Mi'lad, Lideta Henok, Metshafe Kidan, Mashafa Berhan, Kebre Negest, Fetha Negest, Hexameron, Felasha use of Henok in versions of the Book, Hagiographical Writings (Woletta Petros, a Re'ya Maryam), Degwa, Borrowed motifs in homilies (e.g. on heaven, on the angels), gedle (e.g. Gedle Haimanot, Gedle Menfes Qidus), Names of angels (good and bad) in magic books (Stuckenbruck 2013).

also share its contribution in adding up to the evidence of the unique place and importance of the book in Ethiopia.

7.3.1 The Concept of Sin and Salvation in the EOTC

Even if the concept of sin and soteriology is not one among the well-articulated theological notions in the EOTC (as compared to other theological issues like Christology, Mariology, Trinity, Angelology, and ecclesiology) the position of the church in this regard would not be difficult to articulate.[49] From a theological point of view, the church believes that sin originated both from the dominion of Satan[50] and original sin from the Fall. Confessionally, people are responsible for their sins as they inherit a sinful nature from Adam, original sin (Aymro & Motovu 1970:94f.). Thus, in the EOTC, both human beings and the evil spirits are responsible for the origin of sin.[51]

In the meantime, it is common place in EOTC thought (and, of course, other Evangelical churches in Ethiopia) that sin and affliction are largely attributed to demons or evil spirits. In fact, this is in line with the belief by the early church as reflected by some Church Fathers.[52] According to Schultz (1978:190), for instance, Irenaeus has mainly been dependent on some "pseudepigraphical" works for his doctrine of the origin of sin, where he finally concludes that "it should be proposed, since Irenaeus was so dependent upon speculations outside the Old and New Testaments in formulating his arguments against the gnostics and developing his ideas on sin, which possibly other early Church Fathers were likewise dependent upon sources outside the Old and New Testaments in formulating their ideas on sin". An important point of Schultz's (1978:169, 172) conclusion, in connection to the EOTC and *1 Enoch*, is that Irenaeus's attribution of "the origin of sin directly to Satan and his forces in terms strongly

---

[49] For instance, in three significant books published in the second half of the last century on and/or by the EOTC, where most of the theological and historical aspects of the church are discussed, sin and salvation has not even been given a sub-topic, let alone a chapter (EOTC 1996, Sergew 1970c, Aymro & Motovu 1970).

[50] As Richard Bauckham (1985:314) correctly maintains, "the Book of Watchers uses the story of the fall of the Watchers as a myth of the origin of evil (cf. especially [*1 En*] 10:8)."

[51] In fact, from a practical point of view, the difference between the Evangelical theology of sin and the EOTC theology is more a matter of emphasis.

[52] For a detailed discussion on Irenaeus's attribution of origin of sin to demons and fallen angels, based on "non-biblical" or "pseudepigraphical" works, which was a trend among many Church Fathers, see Schultz 1978:161-190.

reminiscent of 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and other late Jewish pseudepigraphical writings," is a position similar to the EOTC.

Schultz (1978:172) further argues that according to Irenaeus, "[s]in is directly related to angelic powers and principally to the leader of these powers, Satan. He is the first to sin against God and later lead others to that sin or apostasy." As this notion of the origin of sin from Satan or other evil spirits is vague in the NT, Schultz (1978:178) argues that the source for Irenaeus' "notions [on the origin of sin from evil spirits] must come from a familiarity with a tradition similar to that found mainly in the first book of Enoch." I found this strongly in line with the belief of the EOTC, mainly influenced by the teaching of *1 Enoch*, one of the formative books of the church (see Ephraim Isaac 1983:10).[53]

For instance, besides a direct reference to such attribution in *1 Enoch*, where it reads: "the whole earth has been corrupted through the works that were taught by Azazel (Satan); to him ascribe all sin" (1 En 10:8), there are plenty of texts in this book which affirm this notion, including the angels "took unto themselves wives ... (1 En 7:1) "from among the children of men" (1 En 6:2) ... "and began to go in unto them and to defile themselves with them" (1 En 7:1) so that "they (wives) became pregnant and they bore great giants," (1 En 7:1) "they taught them (wives) charms and enchantments, and the cutting of roots, and made them acquainted with plants" (1 En 8:3). Other texts in *1 Enoch* describing man's defilement through the evil teachings of angels include 8:1-2, 3-4; 9:4; 16:3; 69:4-12.

In order to rescue or liberate those who are under the power of these evil spirits or who are possessed by the demons, exorcism is performed. As maintained by the EOTC [2013], "Unusual or especially perverse deeds, particularly when performed in public, are symptomatic of a demoniac," and as a result, exorcism is performed in various ways.

Even if the conventional concepts of original sin and salvation by grace are confessional positions of the EOTC, open practice proves that there are other levels of sin and salvation. At

---

[53] As the scope of this study does not allow to go deeper, one issue which would need further exploration is the extent to which Ethiopian Christianity's understanding of sin was influenced by *1 Enoch* and the ways in which this differs from other biblical and patristic traditions that are common to the ancient churches.

times, human beings are helpless as more powerful beings than them can perverse their realm and defile them or force them to commit sin, in which case the origin of sin is ascribed to evil spirits.[54] Likewise, human beings are strongly required to fulfil as much as they can of relevant requirements to attain their salvation. Believers are strongly encouraged to involve themselves in a number of practices "to secure the 'salvation' of the soul" (Langmuir, Chojnacki, and Fetchko 1978:1).[55]

7.3.2 A Developed Angelology and Demonology in the EOTC

Currently, one of the distinguishing elements of the EOTC, as a unique church, besides various traditions developed through time, is its highly developed and elaborated angelology. The high regard and veneration of angels is one of the teachings and practices articulated lucidly and without any ambiguity.

Ontologically, according to EOTC teaching, angels share some of the attributes of God, specifically holiness, which would lead them to be venerated and honored at the same 'higher level'. In other words, that they possess divine holiness, where they share likeness of God ontologically, would result in their functional identity and honorific status.[56] However, this is not to overlook the more basic ontological difference between uncreated and created, God and angels.

Due to their veneration and honor in the EOTC, "there exists a Holy Book known as The Homilies of the Angels which shows how angels are sent by God and come down from Heaven to help and guard the faithful and destroy the wicked by divine punishment" (Aymro & Motovu 1970:84). It is from this book that the main teaching of the EOTC about the angels

---

[54] As Paul B. Decock (2013:204-205) noted, the situation is complicated by the fact that writers like Origen taught that the fact that evil powers take over a person's life is the result of their own sinfulness; the more we become a slave of sin the more the demon gets a chance to get in and eventually take over. Satan himself became alienated from God because of his own choice.

[55] For instance, according to Langmuir, Chojnacki, and Fetchko (1978:1), "A person would order an icon from an artist-priest and then offer it to a church to ensure the 'salvation' of his soul."

[56] For a detailed discussion on the ontological and functional identity of angels from the EOTC's point of view, see EOTC 1996:56-58.

is incorporated. Aymro and Motovu (1970:84) recap the main teaching of the church about angels as follows:

> God in His goodness sends His angels and saves from evil the faithful who fear Him and believe in His name, and guards and helps them in the time of affliction. We pray to God that he will send His holy angels to save us from all evil, and that in the time of trouble His angels will help us. They repel the demons from the church and guard the priest lest the devils snatch away the Flesh and Blood of our Master. So, also when the priests depart, one or more angels remain to guard the church and the tabot.

According to the teaching of the EOTC, angels, as descending and ascending beings between humans and God, serve both. On the one hand, they are close aides and fast ministers of God, as they are at His disposal always ready to execute His orders. On the other hand, they intercede and help human beings by bringing their prayers and offerings to God, a status given to them as a favour (EOTC 1996:57). It is because of their place and status given by God, by His mercy and favour, as messengers of both mercy and wrath and intercessors of human beings before God by bringing their prayers, offerings and alms to Him, that they are venerated and honored.

Besides personal honor and prayers to angels as protectors and intercessors, churches and tabots are named after them in order to accommodate the honor to be bestowed upon them and to provide space for the believers to bring their intercessory prayers, alms, and offerings directly to the angels. All angels, especially the seven acclaimed ones—Michael, Gabriel, Rufael, Uriel, Ragel, Remiel, and Phanuel—have all their own feast day to be devoutly kept and celebrated in their honor.[57]

As the major reformation period of various theological concepts and spiritual practices, the fifteenth century reform of Emperor Zer'a Yacob, which has had lasting effects in shaping the church to date, includes a developed angelology and demonology of the church. For instance, a homily developed in honor of the angel Gabriel in the fifteenth century, shows this development (Getachew Haile 1992:15-60). In addition to the angel's appearance to Mary, as

---

[57] To mention the major ones, while the feast of Michael is celebrated on *Tir* 12 (Jan 20), follows right the clourful celebration of *Timket*, Epiphany, the feasts of Gabriel are celebrated on *Tahsas* 19 (Jan 28), *Megabit* 30 (April 8), and *Sene* 12 (June 19) (The alternative Gregorian calendar dates for these celebration given by Aymro and Motovu (1970:85) are incorrect.).

told in *Luke,* the homily details other missions of the angel from various parts of *1 Enoch*, including 10:97, where the angel is involved in the destruction of the giants. The references to *1 Enoch* in this connection include 20:7; 40:2, 3, 6, and 9.

It is further maintained that in the readings for saints' days, the interest of the church in angels is highly reflected in all the works related to the liturgy, where the names of the archangels, especially Michael, are often interpolated into stories from the Bible and the lives of Christian Saints, which is a common trend (Nickelsburg 2001:105). Furthermore, in EOTC tradition, "[e]ach family has its own patron saint or angel whose feast it celebrates every year both in the church and at home when friends and neighbours are invited" (Aymro & Motovu 1970:82). That means that there are protective angels, with their various orders and ranks, who play an important part in both the religious and social life of the people. Angels, especially Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, and Uriel, play a special role in the individual's life as personal guardians of those especially dedicated to them and to those who celebrate with meticulous observance the dates of their special festivals.

All these expressions and functions of angels are mainly developed on the basis of *1 Enoch*'s highly developed angelology, even if it is not exclusively from it alone. As angelology is a biblical phenomenon, the EOTC has also drawn its teaching of angels from the entire Bible, even if the influence of *1 Enoch* seems exceptionally outstanding.

7.3.3 The Christology of the EOTC and the place of *1 Enoch*

The Christological teaching of the EOTC has a unique place in the history of the church as it was one of the main theological topics debated throughout the centuries until it was officially resolved recently.[58] Furthermore, the importance of this topic is strongly emphasized by putting the name of the winning party, *Tewahedo*, among the three positions of the

---

[58] The prolonged Christological controversy lingering for several centuries in the EOTC, among three schools, ጸጎች *Tsegoch* (three birth or grace), ቅባቶች *Qibatoch* (unction or anointment), ተዋሕዶዎች *Tewahedo* (unionists), finally settled in the so-called Boru Meda Council or Debate in 1885, adopting the position of the ተዋሕዶዎች *Tewahedo* (unionists) as the official position of the church. For a detailed discussion on the debate of this Council, see አድማሱ ጀምበሬ 1970:279-283.

Christological debates of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, on the official designation of the church; therefore, the Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church.[59]

As it is widely accepted, New Testament Christology is largely influenced by the Book of the Parables, the second book of *1Enoch*—a position generally held by NT Christological scholars. It is atop of this major influence that one may see some special influence of *1 Enoch* on the Christology of the EOTC. Nickelsburg (and VanderKam 2012:78) emphasizes this distinctive influence of *1 Enoch* on the EOTC Christology, saying, "even at points where the Western Churches have relied on texts from the New Testament," the EOTC uses *1 Enoch* as its recourse for its Christological formulation.

One of the major Ethiopian works on Christology of the EOTC from the fifteenth century is *Metshafe Mi'lad*, "Book of the Nativity",[60] which is highly influenced by *1 Enoch*. "Enoch is frequently cited as a prophet, probably as the preeminent prophet, sometimes as the first prophet, and often in conjunction with Daniel (in the order, Enoch and Daniel)" (Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2012:78). As the Book of the Parables is extensively used with citation of large texts, which includes *1En* 46, 48, 50-51, 60-63, 69, and 70-71, they are mainly used as proof texts of the glorified Son of Man for "Jesus' divine status as a member of the Holy Trinity" (Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2012:78f).[61]

In conclusion, in the EOTC Christological concept, where the divinity is given more emphasis than is traditionally given in other churches, the role of *1 Enoch* to formulate and articulate such a high Christology is significant. It should also be noted, however, that *1 Enoch* is not the

---

[59] For a discussion on Christological debate in the EOTC, see ጎርጎርዮስ 1974፥50-72፤ ሉሊ መልአኩ 1997፥137-138. For a systematic discussion on the Christological position of the EOTC, see Strauss 1997. More recently, an EOTC theologian and deacon, Mebratu Kiros Gebru (2005), for his MTh thesis, has done a thorough study on the topic and argues that categorizing the EOTC Christology as Monophysite is a distortion of the church's self-understanding and it should be understood as a Miaphysite Christology. Girma Bekele (2011:157) further explains that such misunderstandings has had a negative impact on the EOTC-EEC relationships: "Sadly, misreadings of the EOTC's Christological position have distorted the understanding of the theological position of the EOTC arrived at by the later indigenous Protestant Churches."

[60] This is a book with "a collection of homilies for the monthly observances of the nativity of Jesus, whose origins are attributed to the Emperor Zar'a Ya'qob Konstantin (1434-1468)" (Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2012:78).

[61] As indicated by Nickelsburg (and VanderKam 2012:78, n.178), the most frequently cited text is *1 Enoch* 46:1(-4). For more references, see Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2012:78.

only source from whence the EOTC Christological stance is formulated; rather, it is only one among others of those that shaped this theology.

7.4 *1 Enoch*'s Influence on Spiritual and Socio-cultural Practices

As one of the major sources of the Ethiopian Calendar, *1 Enoch*'s influence cuts across all dimensions of Ethiopian life in spite of its greater influence in religious and spiritual practices. In the socio-cultural and popular religious aspect, *1 Enoch*'s significance in a popular usage of amulets and other practices related to it could be singled out as an outstanding example. On the other hand, in a religious society like Ethiopia, where iconography is part of the piety and popular religious practice, the marginal appearance of the figure of Enoch in this dimension would be a surprise. These are some of the samples chosen to be discussed in this section.

7.4.1 *1 Enoch* and the Ethiopian Calendar[62]

Beckwith (2005:1) widely elaborates on both the connection between calendar and worship and the significance of their relationship. According to him, the fact that "holy days and holy weeks or seasons [i.e. calendar] always have liturgical provision made for them [i.e. worship], whether they are occasions of feasting or of fasting", has been maintained from long ago. In the meantime, one of the prominent influences of *1 Enoch* on its believing communities of all ages, would be its calendar as the basis of spiritual practices and theological beliefs. For instance, Beckwith (2005:4) concludes that "[t]he closest link between Calendar and Chronology … is to be found in the calendar followed at Qumran, and based upon the teaching of 1 Enoch and Jubilees. Here, all the holy days of the Jewish year, even the natural ones concerned with the crops and the harvest, tend to take on a commemorative significance."

It could be argued, therefore, that the calendar of the EOTC, which is mainly derived from *1 Enoch*, would have immense impact on the day to day spiritual life of the church and its adherents. Thus, two points need special attention given in this section: (1) *1 Enoch* is one of

---

[62] For a discussion on the computation of the Ethiopian Calendar and its variation from other calendars, see above chapter six.

the major sources of the computation of the EOTC calendar[63] and (2) the calendar has possibly more lively effect on the EOTC and its adherents than in any other Christian church.

In connection to the first point, the ecclesiastical calendar of the EOTC, which is the basis for the current civil calendar in official use in Ethiopia, is very primitive and strictly observed and must have arrived very early in Ethiopia with the book of *1 Enoch* (Kropp 1999:184). In fact, as it would be expected, *1 Enoch* is not the only source material for the formation of the Ethiopian calendar. It is maintained that there are three main time-counting systems or source materials used in the Ethiopian calendar. These are: (1) "The "*hassab* ['era'] model" used for the calculation of movable festivals.[64] [2] Another system is that based on the *Abusakər* treaties and Islamic astronomy.[65] [3] The third originates from *Mäshafä Henok* and gives the arithmetical patterns of daylight and lunar phases" (Uhlig 2003:733).

The actual usage of these materials for the three various purposes mentioned above, is not clearly classified, as any of the three materials can be used for any of the calendrical computations of the others as well. This is as a result of either the complicated nature of the Ethiopian chronography, or because of the fact that only a few writers are competent enough to accurately apply each for the intended purpose.[66] In connection to the prominence of *1*

---

[63] For a comprehensive discussion on the calendar of *1 Enoch* and its relation to other calendars, see Beckwith, *Calendar*, especially the third chapter entitled "The Earliest Enoch Literature and Its Calendar: Marks of Their Origin, Date and Motivation", pp 16-53.

[64] For a precise description of *hassab*, an Ethiopian Ge'ez calendrical procedures or "computes", and its fundamental difference with *Abu Shaker*, see Neugebauer 1983:55-58. Neugebauer (1983) clarifies that while "the hasāb in Ethiopia still agrees exactly with the Easter computus of Alexandria in the fourth century", (p.56) Abū-Shāker, a work of a thirteenth century Arab-influenced writer, "represents medieval Islamic astronomy without having the slightest influence on the Ethiopic computus" (p.55). He further notes that "[w]hile the hasāb lies completely outside the realm of astronomy, it is evident that Abū-Shāker worked under the influence of serious Arabic theoretical astronomy" (p.57). Neugebauer's conclusion finally is: "the Ge'ez computus is the best preserved monument of early Alexandrian Christian usage in calendric matters and an impressive witness to its total isolation from scientific astronomy, an attitude not surprising for early Christianity. Abū-Shāker, however, no longer belongs to this early age but is part of a new civilization far removed from Alexandrian Christianity" (p.58). This conclusion dismisses the long standing traditional view that hasāb's computus is mainly based on Abū-Shāker.

[65] For the English translation of *Abu Shaker*, see Neugebauer 1988. Even if many believe *Abushaker* has a prominent place in Ethiopian calendar, Neugebauer concludes otherwise. He writes, "Abu Shaker's work was obviously based exclusively on Islamic astronomy and had nothing at all to do with the Ethiopian computes. But it told much about Coptic, Syrian, Jacobite, and Melkite disputes on calendrical maters, shedding light on an interesting phase of Arabic-Christian civilization of the Middle Ages" (Neugebauer 1988:3).

[66] For a detailed discussion on Ethiopian chronology and computation of calendar for various purposes, see Uhlig 2003:733-737.

Enoch in the Ethiopian calendar, it is further noted that the synaxarium's reference to the Astronomical Book shows the major role that *1 Enoch* played as the basis for the Ethiopian religious calendar (Nickelsburg 2001:106).

Above all, the witness from the fifteenth century reformer of the church, Emperor Zer'a Yacob (1434-68), whose impact on all aspects of the church is lasting to date, is vital on the place of *1 Enoch*'s influence as the main source material on the Ethiopian calendar. He loudly said, "No man, may he come from East or West, from North or South, from all the four corners of the world, can compute the time of Fast, of Easter and its feasts, or of the stars, without Enoch" (as quoted in Nickelsburg 2001:106).[67] This conclusion, therefore, is in line with the conviction of almost all of my interviewees that *1 Enoch* is the prominent source of the Ethiopian calendar.[68]

This point leads us to our second point, the effect of the calendar on the Ethiopian Church and its adherents. It is true that calendar and worship have been integral parts of the religion of Israel and all the religious movements which emerged from it.[69] As a Judeo-Christian church, the influence of calendar on worship, liturgy, spirituality and all practical aspects is deep-rooted.

To the best of my knowledge, the Ethiopian Church has the biggest number of religious holidays over the year and every single day throughout the year is associated to certain

---

[67] Even if the claim that the *Ethiopic Enoch*'s influence on the Ethiopian calendar is widely accepted in Ethiopian tradition, basically from the oral witness, as this is strongly stressed by most of my interviewees, some of the recent local works on the topic, Ethiopian calendar and its computes, hardly mention any of such Enochic influence. For instance, one of the reputed Ethiopian scholar, Meseret Sebhat Leab (1988), entirely ignores any place of *1 Enoch* in his major work on the Ethiopian Church's position of the tradition of Ethiopian calendar. Another recent book on the same topic by Be'emnet Mitiku (2002) also ignores *1 Enoch* in his discussion. As attractive saying as this on the cover of his book, "A calendar as ancient as Enoch, a Christianity dating from the birth of Christ, a computes as great as Demetrius, a land of refuge to the lord – all this is here!", Hiruy Sime's (2000) book fails to connect his book on Ethiopian calendar to *1 Enoch*. However, he admits that even if the Ethiopian calendar is mainly originated from *1 Enoch*, he failed to incorporate it in his book as *1 Enoch* needs special expertise obtained only by few special scholars (ኍሩይ ስሜ 2000:36, 40-44, 55-56, n.2).

[68] One of my interviewees, interviewee # 13 (personal communication, 20-12-2911), for instance, strongly commented that even if the influence of *1 Enoch* in the Ethiopian Church is multi-dimensional, its influence on the calendar is paramount. More than other traditional sources, the learned chronographers highly rely on it as its calendar is highly developed, interviewee # 13 concludes.

[69] It may be argued that the connection between calendar and worship is a natural reality of all religion. This may need a closer study to make specific and concrete conclusions.

religious holidays. In other words, every day of the year would have a number of items attached to it as festival, feast, commemoration, and/or fasting. As it is instituted in the *Senksar*, the Ethiopian Synaxarium, the church commemorates hundreds of saints, angels, martyrs, church buildings, festivals, etc. For instance, there are thirty three feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary[70] in one year and nine major and nine minor feasts of our Lord (Aymro and Motovu 1970:58-60).[71]

In addition to these feasts and festivals, there are about 250 days of fasting in a year, of which about 180 are obligatory for all (Ullendorff 1960:106), while the rest are only for priests, monks, nuns and other special groups within the church (EOTC [2014]).[72] As every fasting day should be observed on the basis of various times of the day, hours are counted meticulously in a traditional way. It is evident that in many parts of the country, especially where the EOTC is dominant, "the day that an event has occurred is more often expressed in terms of the holy day, than a calendar date; for example, 'His horse ran away on Mikael.' Each day of the month is dedicated to some holy figure" (Prouty and Rosenfeld 1981:xiv; see also Phillipson 2009:xii).

---

[70] Among the thirty-three feasts of the Virgin Mary, some of the prominent ones are Conception, Nativity, Presentation, Conceived of the Lord, Flight into Egypt, Death of our Lady, Assumption, Appearance.

[71] As mentioned by Aymro and Motovu (1970:58-60), the major feasts of the Lord are: 1. His conception, 2. Christmas, 3. Epiphany, 4. Transfiguration, 5. Palm Sunday or hosanna, 6. Good Friday, 7. Easter, 8. Ascension, 9. Pentecost, while the minor ones are: 1. Sibket, the feast to commemorate the preaching of the prophets that Messiah will come to redeem His people from bondage, 2. Brahan, the feast to commemorate the fact of our Lord having come into the world for its enlightenment, 3. Nolwae, the feast of our Lord as "Good shepherd", 4. Gena, the feast to commemorate the reality that our Lord was actually born, not a mythical phenomenon, 5. Gizret, circumcision, 6. Kana ze Galilee, (feast of Kana of Galilee) when the Lord turned water into wine, 7. Debra zeit, it is held that the Second Advent will take place on the Mount of Olives. A day is kept on which the faithful offer special prayers that they may be righteous on that solemn event and on the right side of the Supreme Judge, 8. Megabit Meskel, 9. Ledete Simon, this is the feast to commemorate the event when a woman sinner (Mary Magdalene) washed the feet of the Lord with her tears and anointed them with ointment. Simon who had invited Jesus complained but the Lord made things clear to him.

[72] According to the EOTC [2014], "Every Wednesday and Friday are days of fasting because on Wednesday the Jews held a council in which they rejected and condemned our Lord and on Friday they crucified him. The fasts [which] are ordained in the Fetha Negest are: 1. Fast for Hudadi or Abiye Tsome (Lent), 56 days. 2. Fast of the Apostles, 10-40 days, which the Apostles kept after they had received the Holy Spirit. It begins after Pentecost. 3. The fast of Assumption, 16 days. 4. The gahad of Christmas (on the eve of Christmas). 5. The fast preceding Christmas, 40 days. It begins with Sibket on 15th Hedar and ends on Christmas Eve with the feast of Gena and the 28th of Tahsas. 6. The fast of Nineveh, commemorating the preaching of Jonah. It comes on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of the third week before Lent. 7. The gahad of Epiphany, fast on the eve of Epiphany."

In what has been described so far, the connection between calendar, angels and saints, the Lord and the Virgin Mary, holidays and feasts, are all intertwined, both for the church life and individual practices. Without mentioning the significance of the calendar for the liturgy, rites for the dead, fertility and agricultural practices, and some other religious and spiritual aspects of both the individual and the community, what has been mentioned above could be a clear indication of the importance of calendar in every aspect of the Ethiopian church and its adherents on an everyday basis. This in turn demonstrates a significant influence of the book of *1 Enoch*, through its calendar, on various aspects of the EOTC in particular and Ethiopians in general.

7.4.2 *1 Enoch* and Popular Religion in Ethiopia

Some of the most common popular religious beliefs and practices in Ethiopian society in general are the tradition of magic, possession by evil spirits, and some other traditional beliefs, including amulets.[73] These practices are by no means unique to the EOTC or its adherents; rather, they are widely shared customs in every part of the nation and among almost all religious communities.[74] The major difference would be on how various communities perform the practices in different ways and with different elements with some varying effects and focus.[75]

As exorcism is practiced with a belief that angels and demons fight against each other on behalf of individuals, and even if this exorcism is very clear in the NT, the way it is practiced is very much at home with the spiritual realm in *1 Enoch*, as the practitioner calls on the

---

[73] Besides belief in witchdoctors, magic, evil possession and exorcism, some of the other superstitious beliefs widely common in Ethiopia include belief in the power of evil-eye, use of grass for ritual purposes, dispensation of rain, food taboos, the concept of genii loci in trees, water-places, mountain-tops, etc. For a detailed discussion on these and others, see Levine 1974:46-64.

[74] According to Levine (1974:48), "Throughout Greater Ethiopia there are beliefs that certain physical symptoms are caused by named spirits which take possession of a victim. … The term *zar*, [which refers to a kind of spirit believed to possess persons until placated by physical offerings], is the most widely used name for this intrusive spirit: belief in *zar* possession appears among the Amhara, Tigreans, Felasha, Kimant…", people groups predominately EOTC adherents.

[75] For some examples of various kinds of practices of exorcism and alleviating the problem, see Levine 1974:48f.

names of various angels in belief that they would protect the victim by fighting against the evil spirits.

Our focus here, however, is on the most common practices among the public, the forms of magical practices, as they are performed by many EOTC adherents and mainly run by one of the enigmatic offices of the church, the *debteras*, even if they do not perform the official position of the church.[76] One of these very common magical practices is the usage of amulets for various purposes, which seems widely practiced until today.

The usage of amulets is by no means exclusive practice in Ethiopia or by EOTC adherents;[77] rather it is important to isolate two distinctive features relevant to our present discussion. First, it is effectively performed by a learned group of people, who occupy an office in the EOTC. Second, in addition to other biblical and extra-biblical texts, *1 Enoch* is one of the main texts employed in amulets in Ethiopia, as some of the illustrations are also somehow connected to it.

To begin with the first feature, amulets in Ethiopia are basically prepared and dispensed by experts called *debteras*, an office unique to the EOTC. So, who they are, what their place is in the hierarchy of the EOTC, and what role they play, are questions to be dealt with in order to better understand how amulets function as "unlawful" practice under the EOTC umbrella. David Appleyard (2007:130) correctly describes this office and its role:

> A peculiar office in the church hierarchy is that of the däbtära, an unordained officiant whose role in performing the liturgy is not unlike that to the Greek psaltēs. However, the däbtära also has the role of administrator, scribe and scholar, who may also use his

---

[76] Even if such magical practices are not part of the official stance of the EOTC, many perceive that the church has a syncretistic nature, as these practices are conducted with the knowledge of the church. For instance, Finneran (2003:427–433) argues that "[t]he more you look beneath the veneer of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church, the more apparent it becomes that Ethiopia is rich in folk belief and superstition … " (p.427). "Ethiopian Orthodox Christianity embraces a number of idiosyncratic beliefs" (p.429), where he gives examples of evil eye, magic, amulets, and some other aspects related to these practices. On the other hand, Gorgorios (1974:122) admits that some of his EOTC members practice sacrifices for ancestral spirits (ወቃቢ) during various Christian festivals, he condemns that such practices are non-Christian and as a result the church denounces them.
[77] For example, a book entitled *Runic Amulets and Magic Objects*, and devoted to study text of amulets at several periods and localities in various parts of Europe, discusses the wide variety of usage of amulets in European history (MacLeod and Mees 2006). The book concludes that it is "evident that the different traditions share a common inheritance in terms of some fundamental aspects of amuletic practice, but notable regional developments clearly occur too" (p.254).

skills *in preparing amulets and in traditional medicine and divination* (italics mine), which sometimes imbues him with an ambiguous reputation, serving what have been called the 'licit' and the 'illicit' aspects of religion.

Furthermore, Getnet Tamene describes two categories of function they hold at one and the same time, activities which are within the realm of the church and activities outside the realm of the church. In his words:

> The däbtära occupy in the Ethiopian Church an intermediate position between the clergy and layman. They study spiritual subjects longer than priests, devoting about 20-30 years of their life time to acquiring religious knowledge. Ritual dances that are conducted by the däbtära at times of important religious ceremonies are accompanied with cultural musical instruments such as the drums of different sizes (käbäro, nägarit), which are made of a hollowed-out tree-trunk, good to indicate rhythm, and sistram (sänasel). … Out of churches, the däbtära also perform magical rituals, astrological activities, and provide amulets and medicines prepared from various herbs to scatter demons and to avert disease. … This attitude of superstitious and magical practices which is common among the däbtära puts them somewhere on the margin of Christianity in the hierarchy of the Ethiopian churches (Getnet 1998:98f.).

In as much as it is performed among many people, the practice of amulets for various purposes is public and very open. In as much as the practice is not part of the official liturgical or mystical act of the church and is rather performed by only people who occupy a position in the church but not by laity, the *debteras*, it is however apparently secretive. In addition, the fact that the *debtera*s are fearfully respected as they are believed to obtain magical power enhances the secretive nature of the practice.[78]

The *debtera*s, therefore, occupy two major positions; on the one hand, they are experts in chanting and dancing during the liturgical singings around the church's liturgical and other festival ceremonies, well known among the EOTC folks, and on the other hand and at the same time, they are practitioners of various magical activities outside the church. Niall Finneran (2003:430) correctly describes these two roles as follows: The *debtera*s "are not merely neophytes of the church with special responsibility for leading chants at services, but are viewed as quasi-magicians in their own right. *Dabtaras* are itinerant figures, often

---

[78] According to some of my interviewees, who prefer to be anonymous, the *debteras* are believed to bring any kind of harm to anybody whether with their magical power or their association with the spirit world.

misconceived as being strange or mad, who make a living—apart from ecclesiastical activities—by providing charms and white magic."

The *debtera*s are approached to prepare amulets for quite a number of problems to be solved. This may include healing from any kind of illness; love, fidelity and desire; fertility charms; protection from enemies and curses, bad luck, or defeat of the enemy; etc. Thus, such people, who are very crucial in the liturgical and worshiping realm of the EOTC, are at the same time experts of such popular practices to which the church never gave its blessing.

The second distinctive feature of this popular practice in the Ethiopian context, is that the content of the amulets are largely associated with the text and stories of *1 Enoch*.[79] As much as the amulets would be used for many various things, the content of *1Enoch* is also diverse and furthermore, due to its apocalyptic nature, the book has received prominence to be used for this purpose. Some of the more prominent elements from *1 Enoch* to be used for the amulets are the angels and the watchers, especially the seven archangels and Shemihaza and Azazel/Azaz'el/Asael. While the archangels are used as protective elements and guardians, Shemihaza and Azazel/Azaz'el/Asael are used to attack the enemy and bring bad luck.[80]

Furthermore, in the fashion of *1 Enoch*'s dualistic theology between evil spirits and good spirits or the watchers and angels, these traditional practices have clear dualistic character. For instance, Finneran (2003:429) describes that "[t]raditional dualistic notions of good and evil are also a vital component of the daily Christian belief [in Ethiopia]; the *Zar*, for instance, are spiteful malevolent spirits allied to the harmful and evil *Saytan* (ghouls), whilst the *Abdar* are

---

[79] What an amulet should contain would vary from one context to another, or from one period to another, or from one purpose to another, or one belief to another, etc. For a discussion on these variations see MacLeod and Mees 2006:254-256. For instance, in the recent conflict in Central African Republic, the anti-Balaka militant put on amulets contained flesh of their enemies. A BBC reporter writes; "Many of the Christian fighters we met - the anti-Balaka - believe in magic. They go into battle wearing a variety of amulets. A group of fighters at a checkpoint told me some of the amulets contained the flesh of men they had killed. 'We are bullet-proof,' their commander told me, chuckling" (BBC 2014).

[80] At a workshop and exhibition on Ethiopian Church's paintings of "yesterday and today", held at Addis Ababa University, Institute of Ethiopian Studies on 13th Dec. 2011, a few paintings and texts of amulets have been displayed and reflected that both the paintings and the text have clear resemblance to the book of Enoch even if they are more of paraphrases and stories blended with other biblical texts.

generally benign protective nature spirits. It is in this realm of superstition, beneath a Christian veneer, that the belief of the evil eye still flourishes."

Therefore, as long as these practices are alive in the Ethiopian public, the influence of *1 Enoch* in this connection remains strong. In fact, not only the practice of amulets, but also texts of magic prayers are among some of the manuscript collections of the EOTC literary legacy, where in many cases *1 Enoch* is attached to these kinds of texts.[81] Even if the boundaries of these practices are vague between popular religion and church practice, the influence of *1 Enoch* is clearly evident.

This does not mean, however, that *1 Enoch* is the only text used for amulets in Ethiopian tradition; rather, it is only one of the texts. Texts from the Psalms and other local writings, including *Tea'mere Mariam* (the Miracle of Mary) are especially common. Thus, as the issue of the practice of amulets in Ethiopia is semi-illicit and relatively mysterious, but with much wider usage for diverse objectives, and as a practice preformed in conjunction with magic prayers,[82] it needs a comprehensive study in its own right.

7.4.3 *1 Enoch* and Iconography in Ethiopia

Like the flourishing literary history of the Ethiopian church, as an integral part of the country, the art of painting and iconography is a widely flourishing cultural aspect. Even if the Christian art in Ethiopia "continued to be reproduced there for a much longer period than any other center of Christianity in Africa," it has not been well known in the outside world as the country remains remote and isolated from the Western world (Langmuir, Chojnacki and Fetchko 1978:1). That one of the recent archaeological discoveries of the most ancient Gospel manuscripts of Ethiopia from the fourth to sixth centuries are illuminated ones[83] shows that art in the Ethiopian church is as old as its history.

---

[81] For a discussion on a manuscript on magic prayer of Enoch, see Gragg 1975:61-71.
[82] For a discussion on extensive use of magical practices and prayers among the wider Ethiopian populous, see Edward Ullendorff 1956:229-31.
[83] For a detailed report on the entire process of the archaeological discovery and the carbon dating at Oxford see EOTC 2009.

As iconography is roughly a reflection of the popular culture of a given society,[84] the Virgin Mary is at the center of Ethiopian Christian painting tradition since the ascendency of her centrality around the life of the church in the fifteenth century, "thus epitomizing Ethiopia's devotion to the Mother of Christ" (Langmuir, Chojnacki and Fetchko 1978:3).[85] The subject of "the Covenant of Mercy", where a "composition represents an alleged promise given by Christ to His mother that 'whatever she asks will be granted'," as maintained by scholars, shows a "belief in Mary's extensive power of intercession, [which is] important in Ethiopian religious thinking" (Langmuir, Chojnacki and Fetchko 1978:5).

Following the Virgin's icons, Christ's images are depicted in connection to His Birth (closely connected to Mary), Crucifixion, His Resurrection, Baptism, his second coming, and some others from the Gospel stories. Some of the scenes important to Ethiopian iconography related to Christ, are those depicting the Flight into Egypt, Christ's Entry into Jerusalem, or His teaching to the disciples.

Angels, especially the archangels Michael and Gabriel, Apostles, saints, and martyrs enjoyed great popularity in Ethiopian iconography. Popular stories such as the visitation of the Queen Sheba to King Solomon and the mysterious and miraculous Menelik I's bringing of the Ark of the Covenant are amongst the prominent icons.

Besides myriads of crosses, by and large, the overwhelming majority of the theme of Ethiopian Christian iconography is around the Virgin Mary and the Gospel stories around Jesus. It is surprising to note that in a church like the EOTC, where more than half a dozen Jewish practices are well alive, Old Testament figures and stories from this part of the Bible are only peripheral in the church's iconography.[86]

---

[84] Spiritual iconography is not restricted to the sphere of the church in Ethiopia, rather the devotion of the people to various spiritual figures is depicted in that they preserve icons or paintings on the walls of their homes, restaurants, graveyards, tattoos (mainly a cross on forehead, check, or hand), clothes, furniture, and ornaments.
[85] For a detailed discussion on the iconography of Mary in Ethiopia that the iconographers adopted both the Eastern and Western traditions, and the distinction between the two with examples form illustrations, see Langmuir, Chojnacki and Fetchko 1978:3.
[86] For a detailed catalog of icons collected by the Institute of Ethiopian Studies (IES), see IES 2000.

It is in this context that we need to understand the place of *1 Enoch* in the flourishing of Ethiopian Christian iconography. As an Old Testament figure himself, Enoch is no different from other prominent OT figures, where his images are only marginal in the mainline painting of the church. In other words, Enoch is not one of the main figures in Ethiopian iconography, possibly because OT figures are not at the center of the iconography as compared to the NT figures and stories from it, the favorite of Ethiopian Christian iconography.

This does not mean, however, that Enoch is entirely absent from the scene of painting. To mention only a few, Enoch appears once among more than 300 icons in the IES collection, where he is only a tiny figure hardly seen on a major painting of the second coming of Christ (IES 2000:136).

Even if the figure of Enoch himself is a very rare case in Ethiopian iconography, as compared with the other prominent figures in the field and *1 Enoch*'s prominent place in other spheres of the church, the wider range of angels in the tradition of iconography could still be indicative of *1 Enoch*'s influence in its developed angelology. Besides the archangels, whose icons could possibly be surpassed only by those of the Virgin Mary and Christ, myriads of angels are among the common wall paintings in the church, especially on ceilings. For instance, the ceiling of the Church of Debre Berhan Selassie at Gondar is decorated with row upon row of winged cherubs. According to Richard Marsh (1998:37), these "may well have been inspired by words from the Book of Enoch."[87]

In the rich tradition of Ethiopian Christian iconography, therefore, the influence of the figure of Enoch seems only minimal, a place it shares with other OT figures and stories. The prominent place for the angels in this tradition, however, still also proves *1 Enoch*'s indirect influence on this arena.

---

[87] Marsh (1998:34-36) argues that the painting is a direct reflection of the text of *1 Enoch* 71, where he quotes the entire chapter in conjunction with the painting.

7.5 *1 Enoch*'s Bond in Other Broader Areas in Ethiopia

Beyond the spiritual and religious realm, in fact inherently connected to them, the deep-rootedness of *1 Enoch* in Ethiopia can also be seen in other seemingly marginal areas, where further study is recommended. These fields may include geography and cosmology, philosophy and imagination, hymnology and music, astrology and mythology, science and medicine, and so on. Even if all these wider subjects require further study by their own right, to provide a few examples here would be appropriate.

One vivid scenario evidently common to the Ethiopian spatial context in *1 Enoch* is its geography, which is very much linked to travel and cosmology. The geography of *1 Enoch* especially that of the Book of the Watchers, is highly elaborated.[88] In this section, Enoch travels from one mountain to another mountain peak, and again to other mountains, from east to west, from south to north, led by creatures like angels.[89] Nickelsburg (2006:617) rightly observes the spatial connection between the book of Enoch and the Ethiopian context in this way:[90]

> 1 Enoch's focus on the created material world, its sacred cosmology and geography and its flora and fauna, may have helped the book to exude a sense of familiarity. In a country of deep ravines and high mountain peaks[91]— some of them sacred [Ullendorff 1960:94]—the story of the watchers' descent onto Mount Hermon (ch. 6) and the accounts of Enoch's journeys to the great mountain ranges of the West and East[92] and the valleys of punishment would have led the reader's imagination through familiar terrain. Enoch's journeys through the spice orchards to the great tree of paradise would have resonated in a world where groves of trees were sacred [Heldman1973:43-60; see

---

[88] For a detailed discussion on the geography of *1 Enoch*, with special attention to chapters 17-19, see a monograph by Bautch 2003.

[89] According to Bautch (2003:29), the genre of this section, i.e., 1 Enoch 17-19, is both apocalyptic and *nekyia*, "a Hellenistic genre featuring accounts of journeys to the land of the dead". Even if this is accepted by some (Brooke 2006:266-270), on the contrary, some others reject it in its strongest terms and suggest another genre. Contrary to Bautch's position, for instance, Scott (2004:755) suggests, "seen as a whole, 1 En. 17-19 is an example of the well-established *periodos ges* or 'around-the-earth journey' literature. … the *periodos ges* offered ancient audiences a pleasingly synoptic view of the earth's circuit, embellished with curious details of its most exotic phenomena", a phenomenon friendly to the Ethiopian context. For a discussion on this genre, see Romm 2002:26-31.

[90] Most of the notes in this quotation are taken from Nickelsburg's (2006) notes in the original article.

[91] As Nickelsburg (2006:617, n.54) notes, for summary descriptions of Ethiopian geography, see Mountjoy and Embleton 1967:326-29; Kaplan et al. 1975:347-50. For some visual depictions of the terrain in Ethiopia, see Veitch 1868; Pankhurst and Ingram 1988.

[92] For Enoch's travels to various mountains, including the seven mountains in the south, see Bautch 2003; esp., section 2 "Description of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17-19," 33-156.

also Levine 1974:42-67]. Many of the wild animals that preyed on the Israelite sheep that populate Enoch's second dream vision were part of the everyday experience of many Ethiopians.[93]

As has been the long preserved tradition in the EOTC, churches are mainly built at the highest places from their respective vicinity and peaks of mountains. This in turn has been accompanied by unlimited travels of the clergy and other "pious" people from one church to another for several reasons and pilgrimage of short and long distance throughout the country. As Enoch travels various directions for various purposes, where the purposes of the journeys are duly revealed, accompanied with an angel, the wide range of religious travels in Ethiopia highly correspond to *1 Enoch*'s perspective.

In regard to hymnology and music, it is claimed that St Yared, the famous indigenous writer, and the father of Ethiopian unique hymnology who composed the five hymnological books: ድጓ፣ *Dəggua,* ምዕራፍ፣ *Məräf,* ዝማሬ፣ *Zəmāre,* መዋሥእት፣ *Mäwāset,* እና ቅዳሴ፣ *Qidase,* used the Book of Enoch for his music.[94] When he prepared his compositions addressing the feasts of angels, martyrs and saints, he used *1 Enoch* as his source (interviewee # 13, personal communication, 20.12.2011).

7.6 *1 Enoch*'s Legacy among Evangelicals in Ethiopia

The place of *1 Enoch* among Ethiopian Evangelicals, at a traditional level, is no different from the place of other "pseudepigraphical" writings, which are part of the authoritative Scriptures of the EOTC.[95] As part of this literary body, *1 Enoch*, among others, is not only rejected, but also very little known as it is not read by Evangelicals. An intriguing question to ask, would be how could such a book, which is hardly known about and abandoned by the faith community, possibly have influence on them?

This can be responded to from two perspectives—ecclesiastical and socio-cultural. First, from the ecclesiastical point of view, the influence of the centuries old EOTC on the newly

---

[93] On Ethiopian wildlife, see Kaplan, *Handbook,* 23f.; Pankhurst & Ingram 1988:155-76.
[94] For a discussion on the originality of Ethiopian Church music and the legacy of St Yared's creativity in the production of music from the 5th and 6th centuries onwards, see ረዳ አስረስ 2000:95-128.
[95] For a discussion on the place of various scriptural books and the concept of "canon" around both the EOTC and the Ethiopian Evangelicals see above, chapter six.

established Ethiopian Evangelical churches is multi-dimensional by itself. Even if it is an undeniable fact that there has been some conflict and animosity between the two church communities during the emergence of the Evangelical churches in the western and southern part of Ethiopia about a century ago,[96] the legacy of the EOTC within the Evangelicals has been significant.

First and foremost, some of the first influential leaders who crafted both the confessional and ministerial stances of the then Evangelical movements in the western part of Ethiopia, who have later on obtained a major influence on the movement at national level, were originally EOTC ordained priests.[97] Even if they were keen to accept the core Evangelical concepts brought by the missionaries, where reading of the Scriptures and conformity to it are at the center of their teaching, the national ordained clergy were strongly convinced to retain a number of EOTC traditions and practices.[98]

Among all other practices and concepts adopted from the EOTC at the very earliest stage of the Evangelicals' establishment, the most obvious and which would have direct relation to *1 Enoch*, is the calendar. Without exception, Ethiopian Evangelical churches never followed the calendar of their missionary ancestors; rather, they comfortably and possibly uncritically followed the EOTC calendar, which is largely influenced by *1 Enoch*, for all their liturgical, lectionary, ecclesiastical, and other purposes.[99] It is true, however, that they adopt such a calendar without any knowledge about its origin and meaning behind it. In other words, they are unaware that the origin of their calendar, which they employ for all their spiritual activities, is largely based on one of the books they have considered as "heretical".

---

[96] The intensity of Evangelical expansion at a sizable level, which involves nationals at various levels and localities, was from the beginning of the twentieth century onwards. For a discussion on these expansions in the western and southern parts of Ethiopia and both the positive and negative relationships between the EOTC and Evangelicals, including a debate on the extent of the EOTC influence among Evangelicals, see Bakke 1987:107-124.

[97] Among those influential leaders, *Qes* Gebre-Ewostateos and *Qes* Badima Yalew are notable (Bakke 1987:107-124).

[98] For instance, the traditional name for an ordained priest, *Qes*, is adopted by some Evangelical churches with all its traditional high position, which gave them recognition for their ministry (see Bakke 1987:107-123).

[99] According to Forslund (1993:62), Evangelicals did not find any reason, and in fact no other substantial choice, than following the EOTC calendar for their liturgical year and other purposes.

Following the teaching of the "reformed" / "converted" / "evangelically minded" EOTC priests, many of the first members or converts of the evangelical movement came from the EOTC, where tradition and spirituality are strongly associated with the converts. As there are some socio-political factors other than theological and spiritual ones,[100] which underlie the conversion, several theological concepts and practices have been retained by converts.[101] Among these, the ones connected to *1 Enoch* include a strong belief in the concept of dualism between the two spiritual realms, the angels and the watchers, and strong emphasis on spiritual warfare between the evil spirits and the good spirits. In addition, even if the concept of sin at the confessional level is extracted from the missionary background, the concept of the origin of sin from the evil spirits imposed on human beings is a shared concept between Orthodox and Evangelicals in Ethiopia. For instance, Forslund (1993:217), in his critical study of the preaching in one of the largest Evangelical churches in Ethiopia, the Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus (EECMY), describes how a preacher employs a fable to show that sin originated from various evil spirits.[102]

Secondly, from a socio-cultural point of view, most of the spiritual or cultural practices mentioned above under the subtopic "popular religion", i.e., tradition of magic, possession by evil spirits and hence exorcism, and some other traditional beliefs, are in one way or the other common among the Evangelicals in Ethiopia, as a shared cultural mind-set of Ethiopians. For instance, unlike the missionary background, a strong belief in evil spirit possession and exorcism are widely practiced spiritual cultures both among Orthodox and Evangelicals in Ethiopia.

---

[100] In many western and southern parts of Ethiopia, many people have been converted to Evangelical Christianity not only for its salvific factor, rather it has been seen as refugee from political and social oppression and aggression. In a sense, Evangelical Christianity has been considered as a liberating power or instrument form various kinds of yokes. For a detailed discussion on this, see Eide 2000.

[101] For a discussion on the general influence of the EOTC on Ethiopian Evangelicals or a common traits they share, see chapter eight of this thesis.

[102] The fable goes like this: "The first spirit is a lion which causes people to be proud (ኩራት). The second one is a male goat which leads people to (commit) adultery (አመነዘረ). The third one is a swine which leads people to stealing (ሰረቀ). The fourth one is a tortoise which makes people lazy (ሰነፍ). The fifth one is a beetle (ጥንዚዛ) which makes people greedy (ንፉግ). The sixth one is a snake which makes people cunning (ተንኮለኛ). The seventh and the last one is a leopard which makes people angry and quarrelsome (ተጣላ) (Forslund 1993:217).

It is important to note two significant points around this practice of evil spirit possession and exorcism among Evangelicals. On the one hand, these practices are possibly blended from three different sources—(1) traditional EOTC background, (2) Ethiopian traditional religious practices, and (3) conglomerated to some related biblical texts.[103] On the other hand, even if both faith communities have similar concepts and objectives, they do it in different forms or procedures, in a way that would give them their own unique identity.[104] In other words, even if they gave a flavor of their own with some distinctive forms, the practice and nomenclature of evil possession and exorcism is fairly the same and partly in line with *1 Enoch*'s angelology and demonology.[105]

Like the other sub-topics in this chapter, the question of the extent of both the EOTC's and *1 Enoch*'s influence on Ethiopian Evangelicals is a broader topic, which needs a broader assessment in its own right, which is beyond the scope of this study. What has been attempted here, however, is to provide some concrete cases where the influence of *1 Enoch* on Ethiopian Evangelicals is vivid and undeniable.[106]

---

[103] Some elementary studies made by some of my undergraduate students at the Mekane Yesus Seminary indicate that the main sources for those overwhelming practices and high reception among many Evangelical audiences could be traced back from three different backgrounds. These three possible sources are the EOTC tradition, divination in indigenous traditional religions, and experiences from Charismatic churches from other parts of the world. In order to come up with a more concrete conclusion on the question, the topic needs further intensive and extensive study.

[104] For instance, among the EOTC, there is special place and church known by its effectiveness in exorcism and healing where the so-called possessed individuals would be taken to, so that special prayers would be performed with special procedures where sprinkling of water and washing or cleansing with a "holy" water, *tebel*, is at the center of the process. On the other hand, even if there are some well-known congregations somehow connected to the practice of exorcism, it is part and parcel of any charismatic or Pentecostal evangelical church worship practice. There are possibly some identified ministers who are specifically associated with the practice for their effectiveness. The major differences between the two, however, is that the Orthodox priest would pray in the name of Jesus, Mary, angels, or saints, while the Evangelical minister would pray in the name of Jesus alone. The third practitioners, the traditional religious ones, would have their own procedures for exorcism and never pray in the name of Jesus, which makes it substantially different from that of the Orthodox and Evangelicals.

[105] For instance, one of my seminary classmates, who has been famous practitioner of exorcism repeatedly witnessed that a number of women come to him and confessed that they had sex with an evil spirit, and only after he prayed for them would they be liberated. This is one of the stories commonly heard among charismatic ministers as much as we can hear from EOTC exorcism stories.

[106] For some discussion with concrete examples on the continuity and discontinuity of traditions in some Evangelical churches and the EOTC, see Forslund 1993:62-73.

7.7 A Critique of Ephraim Isaac's proposition

To my knowledge, Ephraim Isaac is the first scholar to boldly comment on the influence and legacy of *1 Enoch* on the Ethiopian church and its worldview even if some others before him indirectly and to a minimal degree indicate such an influence.[107] Even after Isaac's brief comments in 1983, more than three decades ago now, only Nickelsburg took a step forward to be involved in the discussion of Enoch's influence on the community in which it survived.[108]

In a sense, Isaac's comment on the importance of *1 Enoch* to understand Ethiopian Christianity and its worldview, could be considered as a landmark observation in taking the study forward. It has been one of the main sources of motivation for this study.

Isaac's bold propositions, however, spark a number of questions as much as the propositions try to respond to others. So, what are the bold statements from Isaac in this connection? Could his position be objectively proven? Are his arguments supported by evidence? What has been left out as much as what has been said? Why is Isaac so bold on the one hand and so brief on the other? What are the strengths and shortfalls of his major argument?

To begin with, Isaac (1983:10) makes two major statements in connection with *1 Enoch*'s role in the Ethiopian Church. First, he concludes that "it is hardly possible to understand *any aspect* of religious tradition and thought of Ethiopia, the country in which it survived, without an understanding of it [i.e. *1 Enoch*]." This conclusion comes in comparison to his assessment of *1 Enoch*'s influence on the Western ideology. In his evaluation, he dismisses any contribution of *1 Enoch* to "the development of the intellectual history of modern Western culture" (Isaac 1993:10). Furthermore, the only examples he provides for the book's all-

---

[107] For a summary on this, see Nickelsburg 2006:611f. After summarizing the few instances Enoch's use in Ethiopia is mentioned, Nickelsburg (2006:612) agrees that, "[a]mong the editions of 1 Enoch published since 1821, only the 1983 translation by Ephraim Isaac has addressed the issue of the Ethiopian use of 1 Enoch - but then only briefly."

[108] Nickelsburg (2001:104-108) first devoted a subsection of five pages in his monumental commentary of *1 Enoch* (2001). Five years later, he published that same portion in a journal article with a very light revision (Nickelsburg 2006:611-619).

rounded influence on the Ethiopian church is limited to its literary usage by some other Ethiopian literature.[109]

In this case, the major weakness of Isaac's statements is that they are too general and too absolute. He attributes the understanding of "all aspects" of Ethiopian religious thought with all its traditions to *1 Enoch*, as if that is the *only* book which shaped the Ethiopian Christian worldview as much as it has *nothing* to do with shaping any aspect of the Western worldview. Isaac does not even try to convince his readers why he has made such a bold and general statement. In other words, he fails to briefly indicate the various aspects, other than literary, where the influence of *1 Enoch* is prominent, such as calendar, Christology, angelology, etc., which would have been possible; on the other hand, he dismisses entirely the possible influence of *1 Enoch* on the Western world, where the Jewish and Hellenistic worldviews have visible legacy.

Similar to his first, Isaac's (1983:10) second bold argument reads: "What distinguishes Ethiopian Christian theology from that of either Western or Eastern Christendom may well be the Ethiopian emphases on Enochic thought." The example he gives for this conclusion is the distinguishing factor of the EOTC theology from the rest of Christendom, where its unique belief is on the origin of sin. He says, in Ethiopian tradition, "[s]in does not originate from Adam's transgression alone; Satan, the demons, and evil spirits (the fallen angels) are equally responsible for its origin; they continue to lead man astray, causing moral ruin on the earth" (Isaac 1983:10).

It is surprising to see how he, being an Ethiopian himself, overlooks the major distinguishing factors of the EOTC, which are mainly Jewish practices, including the *tabot* (the Ark of the covenant), male circumcision, observance of two Sabbaths, dietary laws, fasting of two days, church buildings (replica of the Temple), and ritual cleanliness.[110] According to the official position of the EOTC, besides the external influence of the evil spirits, the church believes in

---

[109] Isaac (1983:10) briefly mentions how the Book of Mysteries of Heaven and Earth has been misunderstood to *1 Enoch* in the seventeenth century Europe and how other books like *Kebre Negest* and others are influenced by it.

[110] For a brief discussion and references for each of these elements, see above chapter six.

the fallen nature of human beings (Aymro and Motovu 1970:94f.). So, it would be misleading to conclude that the concept of the origin of sin, derived from the book of Enoch, is the element which makes Ethiopian Christianity different from the others, both in the West and the East.

Isaac's conclusion, therefore, fails to explain the point in explaining the distinctive factors which make the Ethiopian Church distinctive from others and further cites an example which does not fit the argument. Even if one agrees with him that the Ethiopian Church concept of the origin of sin is highly influenced by the teaching of *1 Enoch*, it would not be acceptable to use that as a factor which differentiates it from other churches. Rather, there are other major elements and factors that put the EOTC in a unique place in Christendom.

Besides the abovementioned Jewish practices in the EOTC, which would be the reasons for some to consider the church as a Judeo-Christian church, other elements such as its Christology, traditions such as the Finding of the True Cross, some hierarchical positions of the church which includes the *debtera*s, the Yaredic hymnology and music, and the Ge'ez literature and its liturgy, can be listed as factors distinctive to the church. Even if some of these may have been influenced by *1 Enoch*, directly or indirectly, they have their own tradition and development without being linked exclusively to *1 Enoch*.[111]

If critically assessed, therefore, I have strong reservation on Isaac's exclusivist argument on the influence of *1 Enoch* on the EOTC. Besides its exclusivist nature, the examples he employed for his arguments are either shallow or misleading. This is not to criticize the brevity of the argument, which is acceptable as the scope of his work may not allow him to go further; rather, it is the weakness of choice between what should be included and what would have been excluded. Even if one may highly appreciate his leading step beginning such an important discussion, regrettably the propositions look very simplistic. With all the

---

[111] For an alternative view on the sources and traditions of unique Ethiopian practices, see Ullendorff 1960:82-115. One of the strongest arguments Ullendorff (see pp.114-15) makes is that these facets are pre-Christian and unique to the EOTC, making it different even from the other Eastern churches, against the argument of some scholars, including M. Rodinson.

shortcomings, it may remain one of the major stimulants for further study in the area of *1 Enoch*'s influence on its Ethiopian context.

7.8 Concluding Remarks

What this chapter attempts to show is that the influence of *1 Enoch* is evidently spread in wider areas both spatially and thematically in Ethiopia. It is also however an indication that studies on the influence and legacy of *1 Enoch*, in a country where its text has survived in its entirety, are far from making any conclusive arguments on the level of its influence, which is indicative of a wide open door for extensive research.

As one would strongly agree with Harden (1926:20), who concludes that Ethiopian Christian thoughts or nuances have permeated all literature[112] produced in the ancient Ethiopian Christian Empire, it would be difficult to agree at a similar level with E. Isaac's conclusion that *Enoch*'s influence is found in every aspect of the Ethiopian worldview. Rather, to argue that literary works such as *Kebre Negest* have more influence on the entire spectrum of Ethiopian life by directing them to the entire Scriptures, a collective influence,[113] would be more convincing than restricted to only one literary work, *1 Enoch*.

This does not mean that Isaac's claim is pointless; rather, he has a very strong point to make— *Enoch*'s legacy and influence is huge even if it is not the only book that shaped every aspect of the nation or the Ethiopian Christian worldview. As described in this chapter, although no one single expression or idea which has been examined gives a complete picture concerning the extent of EOTC's dependence upon *1 Enoch* and other "pseudepigraphical" literature, all of those points and ideas examined do offer a basis from which two conclusions can be drawn

---

[112] Harden (1926:20f.) writes that "Nearly every Ethiopic manuscript, whether it be biblical, or liturgical, or theological, or historical, or philosophical, or even but a magic scroll, begins with 'In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, One God,' or some similar words. This is no doubt to be accounted for by the fact that these manuscripts come to us ultimately from the priests and monks of the Church, in whose hands was all the learning of the country, and who alone were able to read and write."

[113] For instance, Piovanelli (2013:12) convincingly argues that "the *Kebrä Nägäst* played a major role in the shaping of the special Christian identity of Ethiopian society, in the creation of the biblical flavour that permeates every aspect of Ethiopian daily life and culture." This argument tries to uplift the role of *Kebra Nagast* instead of limiting every influence on it, a misrepresentation Isaac has done to *1 Enoch*.

in connection to *1 Enoch*'s influence in the EOTC in particular an Ethiopian society in general.

First, *1 Enoch* significantly influenced and shaped the theology, spirituality, and practice of the EOTC at its deeper level. This influence in turn widely contributed to the making of Ethiopian worldview and thought in various aspects. Secondly, even if the level of influence *1 Enoch* has is broader and wider, it would be naïve and misleading to assume that that is the book which shaped the uniqueness of the Ethiopian church in particular and the nation in general. *1 Enoch* is only one of those which took part and share their legacy in making this complex church and its rich history.

In conclusion, the role of *1 Enoch* is not limited to theology, piety, worship, and magical practices of Ethiopian Christianity, but *1 Enoch* has also influenced Ethiopian science, chronography, and historiography over the course of many centuries.[114] The magnificent angelological traditions of the church are also indebted to Enoch. What is most important in this study, as Nickelsburg (2001:106) concludes, is that besides being cited as sacred Scriptures to make a theological point, in most of these aspects, "*1 Enoch* functions for the Ethiopians as it had earlier, in one place or another, in Mediterranean Christianity," among which Jude's circle is notable. Thus, *1 Enoch* as it was highly esteemed and influential at least in some early Jewish and Christian circles, is honored, highly recognized and influential at least in one of the Christian churches of today, the EOTC, which preserved it in its entirety.

---

[114] The scope of this study sets a limitation in a discussion of all of these aspects in detail. For a number of references see Nickelsburg 2001:104-106.

CHAPTER EIGHT

APPROPRIATING THE SCRIPTURES IN ETHIOPIAN CHURCHES AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR COOPERATION AND ECUMENISM

8.1 Purpose of the Chapter

The Scriptures could play a uniting as well as a dividing role in the Ethiopian churches. In their canonical form, the sixty-six books that constitute the canon of the Evangelicals are also the largest part of the EOTC canon with some additional books that by the Evangelicals are regarded as apocryphal and "pseudepigraphical". Although the symbolic value of this canonical aspect has a significant impact on the kind and the level of relationships between different churches, basically it is the way in which churches interpret and appropriate the Scriptures that, depending on its open-mindedness and informed insights, defines whether the Scriptures will be dividing or uniting the churches.

The central question that this chapter tries to address is to what extent the Scriptures and the "canon" have been a dividing or uniting factor among Ethiopian churches and whether, in this respect, other factors play a significant role besides the Scriptures. The discussion of this matter will be followed by other questions related to the current ecumenical situation, such as: are ecumenical unity and cooperation possible and, if so, what could the future potentially look like. Finally, the researcher considers what would be the role and place of the scriptural books that are part of the EOTC canon as well as of a larger group of literature referred to as the Second Temple Literature, but that are not part of the Evangelicals' canon in Ethiopian Christianity. Included is a discussion of the role that *1 Enoch*, already an influential book in Ethiopia, could play in promoting cooperation and a better understanding between adherents of the different churches instead of being a stumbling block.

As this chapter is the culmination of the dissertation, findings in earlier chapters as well as first-hand information obtained from the qualitative interviews are employed to build the chapter's argument. It covers one of the areas about which all interviewees spoke out unreservedly and clearly, showing some imagination as regards the possible future of a fellowship of Ethiopian churches cooperating with each other.

This is a chapter where the dialogue and the conversation comes to its climax where I, the researcher, determine and construct this dialogue from my own position as: 1) an Ethiopian realizing the crucial importance for my country at this stage of its history to work towards a harmony between a variety of groups; 2) an Evangelical intellectual and Church man concerned about harmonious or constructive relations between Christians (i.e., from my ecumenical theoretical framework); 3) as a scholar discovering the importance of *1 Enoch* and the STL for the understanding of the early church . This is in line with Gerald West's (2009:267) argument where he stressed the importance of the scholar or the reader/interpreter who constructs the dialogue between text and context, which he called the ideo-theological framework. It is in this dialogue, the "to-and-fro movement" (West 2009:261), that appropriation is happening.

It is commonplace in historical Christian tradition globally and therefore to be expected in the Ethiopian context as well, that there is a number of factors that may be considered as separating the various church bodies while other factors can be regarded as unifying them. Because the central line of this study is scriptural, the first part of chapter eight deals with the role of the Scriptures as a unifying and as a dividing force at one and the same time. In the second part the chapter highlights other aspects of the same problem. Finally, the future of ecumenism in Ethiopian Christianity will be assessed.

8.2 The Role of the Scriptures as a Uniting and Divisive Factor in Ethiopian Christianity

All Ethiopian churches strongly claim that a basic foundation of their faith is the Scriptures. They all believe in the Bible as the source of their faith and religious practice. This is nowadays a common denominator and the basis for discussions and arguments on issues related to faith, even among the ordinary members of different churches. In the meantime, however, the Scriptures remain one of the main reasons why the Orthodox and the Evangelicals in Ethiopia identify each other as different or alien. As we are talking here about one and the same Bible, how can it both unite and divide the faithful? Is it because of something in the nature of the Scriptures themselves, or is it the manner in which it is perceived and appropriated by the various denominations that makes it into a divisive element that apparently simultaneously unites? Are there perhaps other potentially divisive elements

that are employed to emphasize differences rather than build unity? These are some of the points this subsection considers.

8.2.1 The Scriptures as a Uniting Factor

There are a number of reasons why Ethiopian Christians consider their Christianity as unique and deeply rooted in the Bible. Firstly, the name "Ethiopia" is mentioned about forty times in the Bible[1] on the basis of which many Ethiopians, irrespective of their denominational background, proudly refer to a strong historical connection to the Bible.[2] They see this as an indication that God has given a special place and made an everlasting promise to Ethiopia and to the Ethiopians.[3] According to this belief, Ethiopia's unique place before God is grounded in the Scriptures. It is common, for instance, both among Orthodox and Evangelicals, to quote Psalm 68:31, "… Ethiopia will be stretching out her hands to God", (BBE) as an indication that Ethiopia is specially connected to God.[4] Whether it is justifiable or not, many Ethiopians perceive of their special place before God as a scriptural truth. Possibly this is where the Bible is experienced equally and in the same way by most Ethiopian Christians: as proof of their unique Ethiopian Christian identity.

Secondly, the Ethiopian eunuch in the New Testament (Act 8:27) is believed to be the basis for the first ever introduction of Christianity to Ethiopia. This text is often directly associated with the Scriptures. Philip asked the eunuch if he understood what he was reading, namely a biblical text from Isaiah.

---

[1] In the NRSV, there are forty-six verses where the words "Ethiopia," "Ethiopian," or "Ethiopians" appear. These include: Ethiopia: 2 Kgs 19:9; Est 1:1; 8:9; Job 28:19; Pss 68:31; 87:4; Isa 11:11; 18:1; 20:3, 5; 37:9; 43:3; 45:14; Jer 46:9; Ezek 29:10; 30:4f; 38:5; Nah 3:9; Zeph 3:10; Jdt 1:10; Esg 1:1; 3:12; 8:9; 13:1; 16:1; 1 Es 3:2; Ethiopian: 2 Chr 14:9; Jer 38:7, 10, 12; 39:16; Act 8:27; Ethiopians: 2 Chr 12:3; 14:12f; 16:8; 21:16; Isa 20:4; Je. 13:23; Ezek 30:9; Dan 11:43; Amos 9:7; Zeph 2:12; Act 8:27.

[2] For a detailed discussion on the belief that Ethiopia has a unique place before God, see Bekele Woldekidan 2002.

[3] In fact, the claim that the promise of God's chosen people is transferred from Israel as God's covenant people to Ethiopia as His new Israel or His new covenant people is elaborated on in *Kebre Negest*, Glory of the Kings. This myth has been widely used among both Orthodox and Evangelicals, either in the context of the *Kebre Negest,* or without any direct reference to it (even without any apparent knowledge of its literary background).

[4] Some Evangelical preachers go so far as to a claim that the entire world will be blessed through Ethiopia. In other words, they believe that for blessing to come to the rest of the world, Ethiopia has to be blessed first, as God's chosen people or the new Israel. Ethiopia will thus cause the blessing of the rest of the world.

Thirdly, the first common venture in which all Ethiopian churches have been working together is the Bible Society of Ethiopia (BSE) whose main purpose is to make the Bible accessible to all Ethiopian Christians. The BSE has long been a platform where Ethiopian churches did meet and concentrate together on the task of acquainting all Ethiopians with the Scriptures. The BSE [2014] was deliberately structured in such a way that it could contribute "to be a platform of unity for the Christian churches in Ethiopia," partnering the EOTC, the Ethiopian Catholic Church, and the ECFE.

Building further on this partnership, the BSE has recently launched an office in the Society for the Promotion of Ecumenism. This project will be deliberately and systematically developed in order "to facilitate [an] ecumenism forum" that will stimulate "the major churches of the country to stand and work together for the development and transformation of the country" (BSE [2014]). This office is led by Pastor Dr. Seleshi Kebede and it has already achieved some of its goals in various parts of the country by bringing believers of different churches together and by, at local level, creating awareness of ecumenism and inspiring a broad range of church members to embrace the spirit of the ecumenism.

In the fourth place, the Ethiopian church has made a unique contribution to the study of the Bible by its preservation of biblical texts in one of the ancient languages into which the Scriptures have been translated. On the one hand, the EOTC has translated the Bible in Ge'ez and preserved it for centuries to come, including some books that were in other parts of the world considered as lost. On the other hand, the Evangelicals are deeply involved in translating the Bible into different vernaculars whereby we must take into account that the Evangelicals have only a short period of history whereas the EOTC builds on a very long history. But, irrespective of their age, both churches are keen to preserve and disseminate the Scriptures, each in its own way.

Finally, the current appropriation of the Bible by all churches in Ethiopia is becoming more and more central to the faith and lives of their members. Indications of this appropriation are the following. First, all churches preach nowadays to their congregations from the Scriptures in a much more intensive way than before. Second, the hunger for the Bible is evident among both Orthodox and Evangelicals. And third, all churches are increasingly and more purposefully engaged with the translation and dissemination of the Bible.

Therefore, the central position of the Scriptures, which was to a degree always a fact, is currently much strengthened among all churches in Ethiopia. That the name "Ethiopia" is frequently mentioned in the Bible creates a strong sense of a unified national identity embedded in the Scriptures among Ethiopians. In addition, Ethiopians interpret the strong presence of Ethiopia in the Bible as spiritually meaningful in a more existential way. Though all biblical texts related to Ethiopia are important in unifying Ethiopian Christians, some texts such as Psalm 68:31 and Acts 8:27 have been especially prominent in this regard. Besides the sixty-six books canon, Ethiopia has been mentioned in some "deutero-canonical" books as well which may contribute to their renewed interest for Evangelicals as well. So, why is the Scriptures with its strongly uniting elements, simultaneously a dividing Ethiopian factor between churches? Or could this be based on a misunderstanding?

8.2.2 The Scriptures as a Dividing Factor

As much as it is one of the leading factors in uniting various churches in Ethiopia, the Scriptures are also a battleground where they draw boundaries, claiming how unique they are and much purer in faith according to the Bible than others. As each church strives to prove its close adherence to the Scriptures and, hence, the superiority of its doctrine and religious practice, not only do they attempt to validate their teachings, but they go as far as invalidating the teachings of others.

One may observe four basic levels at which in Ethiopian churches the Scriptures are used and represented – or misused and misrepresented – for dividing. Most obvious is the canonical distinction whereby the Orthodox include eighty-one[5] books in their canon whereas the Evangelicals accept only sixty-six of those. On another level, variations in translation philosophy and key theological terms in the sixty-six books have resulted in different Orthodox and Evangelical perceptions. These include disagreements on the base text used for translation into the different vernacular languages as well as the translation of some key Hebrew and Greek terms of which the nuances in Orthodox and Evangelical versions differ.

---

[5] For a detailed discussion on the extent and concept of mainly the EOTC canon and the Evangelicals, see chapter six of this thesis.

At a third level Orthodox and Evangelicals use different methods of interpreting texts and thus reach, naturally, different conclusions. Such varied perceptions of the meaning of identical texts is not limited to the two main church groups, but is common among Evangelicals themselves and at times among members of the same denomination. Finally, Orthodox and Evangelicals don't give the same central position to the Scriptures and differ in the level of authority they attribute to the Bible. The authoritative status of the Scriptures in the two church groups varies at least on the technical level. Thus, it is appropriate to consider these purportedly divisive elements in greater detail in order to assess if they indeed are inherently divisive.

(1) Canonical Distinction. In the previous chapter we have seen that the EOTC and the Ethiopian Evangelicals have different canonical traditions as well as some conceptual differences in defining and understanding what constitutes the "canon" of the Scriptures. On the one hand the EOTC holds a "canon" of the Scriptures with eighty-one books which, I argue, constitutes a "canon" that is neither open nor closed. What defines the EOTC "canon" of the Scriptures is that it is not necessarily a final list of books to which nothing can be added and from which nothing can be taken away. Rather, it presents the "canonical" criteria in line with the teaching of Orthodoxy according to which a variety of ancient and sacred book may be adjudicated to be part of the "canon". The Ethiopian Evangelicals, on the other hand, strongly and strictly hold on to the sixty-six books of "canon" as constituting the only and binding Scriptures.

Even if this distinction is apparent, the issue is not so much which books as what teaching one draws from these books. In other words, the Evangelicals think that the most important safeguard for hearing the word of God is to know exactly which books to rely on and which cannot be relied on. Of course, the problem of interpretation is in the Evangelicals' context overlooked as if a literal interpretation solves all problems. So, the question is what other guidance Evangelicals have for a correct interpretation of the Scriptures. Do we know which guidance of the Holy Spirit is the correct one? (Already in the OT there was the problem of discerning between true and false prophets.) In other words, when people become more aware of the challenge of *how* to find a correct interpretation of the Scriptures *for now*, they will

become more humble and more accepting of the diversity of traditions with the hard truth to this challenge.

Not only do they strongly hold on to the canon of sixty-six books, but many Evangelicals consider the existence of other books as heretical and as added later by the EOTC. As a result these books are the main source of difference between the two church groups. In other words, many Evangelicals assume that the EOTC uses the extra books to develop "unbiblical" teaching and practices and they consider this the main reason for the divide. One could however list a number of arguments to support the view that this is a rather superficial difference and that, on the basis of other differences which are not inherently scriptural, it has been considerably exaggerated. Firstly, the books that Orthodox and Evangelicals have in common, by far outnumber the very few that are not included in the Evangelical canon. Of eighty-one books, sixty-six are accepted by both church groups which leaves fifteen books on which they differ. One might say that they have 81.5% in common and only a difference of 18.5%. It seems more reasonable to emphasize this communality rather than the small difference.

Secondly, the assumption of some Evangelicals that, as those fifteen books are heretical and must therefore be the main source of "unbiblical" teaching of the EOTC, is not only misguided but results from ignorance and animosity. As argued in chapter six of this thesis, almost all of my Evangelical interviewees had never read any of those fifteen books and some of them did not even know their titles. Everyone failed to identify any of the "heretical" teaching that supposedly is based on those "additional books". Almost all of the respondents knew nothing about the contents or teachings of these books. Therefore, the Evangelicals' argument that these books cause the divide between the two churches must be considered unfounded. This false perception is probably based on fabricated stories from unknown sources and may be based on animosity and ignorance.[6]

---

[6] For instance, one of my interviewees, interviewee # 7 (personal communication, 17.12.2011), told me about a fabricated story supposedly from the book of Enoch, or another "apocryphal" book, however, which is totally unrelated to the story. The story claims that a place where the three lads in the book of Daniel were put into the blazing fire is found in one of the Southern Ethiopian districts, namely Durame.

In fact, a similar tendency is very common among Orthodox where many followers speak of the "*pente*" Bible which is a derogatory way of referring to the Scriptures of the Evangelicals as entirely different and as the source of their "heresy". In this case also, the reason is ignorance and animosity, as they are not aware that the Evangelical canon is no more than the very largest part of their own. It should be noted that this ignorance mostly characterizes the ordinary EOTC members while most of the clergy and the elites clearly understand the similarity and the distinction between the two canons.

In the third place, the complete rejection by many Evangelicals of certain books that belong to the Orthodox "canon", makes no sense in the context of history. Ethiopian Evangelicals boldly associate their foundation and the dogmatic basis for accepting only sixty-six Bible books as representing the *sola scriptura,* with the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century. Following Jerome, one of the prominent Reformers, Martin Luther, proposes the Hebrew canon as a legitimate one. This position practically led later on to printing/publishing only the sixty-six books as an official canon. However, Luther strongly approved of using the other books – also called "apocryphal"[7] – for edification and for spiritual purposes, although they rank in importance below the books of the canon. Thus, especially in the case of some Evangelical churches that strongly connect their historical development to the Reformation and its teaching, the rejection of "apocryphal" books contradicts their links to Luther.

Furthermore, a close look at recent EOTC historical and theological publications shows that scriptural references for almost all of their teachings point to the sixty-six books shared by both canons.[8] This is largely due to the search of Orthodoxy for clearer and stronger arguments in relation to the scriptural teachings of other Christian denominations and it emphasizes that Orthodox and other Christian teachings are obviously grounded in the same Bible. This is also in line with the Orthodox Church's distinguishing between "proto-

---

[7] It should be noted that the number of additional books in the EOTC canon still exceeds the number of books considered as "apocryphal" in Luther's canon which correspond to the Catholic "deutero-canonical" books.
[8] For instance, a number of recent publications that discuss the theological, pastoral and dogmatic issues of the EOTC, almost exclusively refer to the sixty-six books in their discussion on topics such as angelology, Christology, Mariology, spirituality, and other ecclesiological and practical matters. These publications, among others, include: EOTC 2009; ibid 2007a; ibid 2007b; ibid 1996; Aymro and Motovu 1974; ስሳ 1997; Sergew 1977.

canonical" books, namely the sixty-six books, and "deuterocanonical" books for remaining titles in their canon. We may therefore conclude that the use of their canons by Orthodox and Evangelicals offer more factors to unify than to divide them.

That the two church groups have different books in their canon is often referred to as a major dividing factor. However, this assumption seems superficial and largely a result of the historical animosity between the followers of the Orthodox and Evangelical churches that turned into hatred and that also paved the way for an uncritical assessment that the Bible is divisive. However, if both church groups look critically and in a more informed manner at this argument, they may realize that the canonical lists of books are not inherently divisive. Rather, the Scriptures, as a source of all fundamental Christian teaching, remain a monumental unifying element for all churches in Ethiopia. It deserves to be praised for inviting fellowship and unity, instead of being blamed for groundless differences.

(2) Translational Variation. Another point of difference between the Scriptures as accepted by the Orthodox and the Evangelicals concerns variations of some key theological terms, due to translation of either the same original text or from two different source texts. This has been clearly demonstrated in two translations of the Bible into the Amharic language. Firstly, as discussed in chapter six above, there is the revision of the 1988 Amharic Bible in a way that may have suited the needs of the EOTC. Of the two major revisions[9] that are relevant to our present discussion, one involves the revision of key biblical terms in a number of verses in some NT books (all of them part of the common sixty-six books canon).[10] The revision has been made in order to facilitate the appropriation of the Bible for EOTC readers. The original biblical text however is not affected. In other words, the differences in the translation by the two church groups are not of an inherently textual or scriptural nature but, rather, they represent an external translation in order to satisfy the theological or ecclesiastical traditional assumptions of each church group.[11]

---

[9] While revising key terms is one major change, the other one is inclusion of fifteen additional books as "deutero-canonical" books between the Old and the New Testaments.
[10] For a list of texts and the key words in question, see chapter six, f.n.102 above.
[11] For instance, one of the major changes in the adaptation of the 1988 Amharic Bible revision for the Orthodox Church was a revision of some terms in a way they may suit the ecclesiological tradition terminology of the

The second difference related to translation is where the two church groups somehow differ on the authoritative status of the base texts of their Bibles. For instance, while the EOTC follows largely the LXX tradition of the Old Testament,[12] Evangelicals adhere strongly to the Masoretic or Hebrew Bible tradition. While the EOTC go along with their historical connection to the global Orthodox churches, Evangelicals hold on to their Western missionary background. However, these differences on the *Vorlage* have been detected only recently when both church groups were engaged in the translating and printing of Bibles in the Amharic language. The controversy surrounding the Amharic Millennium translation that we discussed at length in chapter six, is mainly founded on this distinction. For instance, one major variation that may have significant theological implications is the text of Romans 8:34 where the role of Jesus is either that of a judge (as stated in the EOTC translation) or of an intercessor (as maintained by the Evangelicals).[13] However, both roles are referred to in other biblical texts and a few verses cannot be determining factors concerning key theological matters.[14]

But even in this case, whichever canonical perspective is employed, the central Christian teachings are one and the same. Minor textual differences do not have the potential to function as the basis for major doctrinal differences. Such differences would consist in mere interpretations arising from the same canonical tradition. There exist much stronger theological differences arising from one and the same text among the Evangelicals whereas

church. One clear example of this nature is the term πρεσβύτεροι or its declensions (Act 15:2, 6, 22; 16:4; 20:17; 1Tim 5:17; Tit 1:5; 2Jn 1:1; 3Jn 1:1; Jes 5:14) are revised as ካህናት "priests" instead of ሽማግሌዎች "elders" in the previously "Protestant" oriented translation.

[12] Even if the EOTC has from its very beginnings been largely inclined to the LXX tradition, the Masoretic influence has always been there since the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries' reformation in the church. However, the strongest claim that the church has made its adaptation of the LXX tradition was articulated when the Millennium translation of the Amharic Bible was initiated by the EOTC some ten years ago.

[13] See also texts like Heb. 7:25 and Isa. 53:12 with similar nuances of interpretation. One of key theological or Christological differences between the EOTC and Ethiopian Evangelicals in connection to Jesus Christ is on his role as Judge and Intercessor. Whereas the Orthodox emphasize His role as a Judge, as intercession is mainly attributed to Mary, saints and angels, the Evangelicals (without denying His role as a judge) believe that the interceding role is exclusively that of Jesus as they deny any such role of other figures. As a result, the Orthodox label the Evangelicals as ጸረ-ማሪያም (i.e. anti-Mary), while the Evangelicals consider the Orthodox as syncretistic or worshipers of other gods than Jesus. It was this existing tendency which was later on reflected openly and became an issue of controversy during the publication of the Amharic Millennium Bible in 2007.

[14] As this chapter is not intended for exegetical work, it would be commendable if this issue was taken up for further study.

such differences in the EOTC are accommodated by its *andemta* interpretive philosophy. Therefore, the difference regarding the *Vorlage* is not necessarily a reason for inherent scriptural division between the two church groups in Ethiopia. After all, the underlying factor is that churches interpret texts in ways which suit their traditional teachings.

(3) Interpretive Presuppositions. In relation to translation variation, discussed under the second point above, division between Orthodox and Evangelicals is created by their different histories and traditions as they interpret the same texts in different ways. This is by no means unique to these two Ethiopian church groups. Interpretive presuppositions are common in large Christian communities as well as small Bible study groups and often within the same denominations. It is this factor rather that has had a strongly divisive effect in the history of the wider Protestant communities, who have confessionally the same canonical books. This phenomenon can easily be capitalized on by the Orthodox and the Evangelicals by interpreting the same texts differently in such a way that it affirms their existing traditions.

For instance, the story of Jesus' first sign at the wedding in Cana of Galilee in John's Gospel (2:1-12) is interpreted in diametrically opposed ways. EOTC interpreters, on the one hand, employ the story as evidence of the intercessory role of Mary in an emphatic and respected position. Evangelical preachers on the other hand use the text to show that there is no such role for Mary and that, according to the text, Mary is as ordinary a person as anybody else. In the eyes of Evangelicals Mary clearly indicates that she is of no importance and only Jesus has a central position.[15]

Again, the Scriptures are not an inherently divisive factor but, in this case, what separates the two church groups in Ethiopia is their interpretive presuppositions. Their interpretive presuppositions and differences notwithstanding, most Ethiopian Evangelicals promote and cultivate fellowship and unity among themselves by tolerating the differences. More importantly, these differences are not perceived as the result of actual biblical distinctions but

---

[15] For a discussion on the interpretation divergence on this text, as seen from the EOTC perspective, see ይቅርባይ እንዳለ 2014. As an EOTC clergy, ይቅርባይ እንዳለ strongly claims that the EOTC interpretation of this text is as clear and bold in its presentation of Mary's role as an intercessor. On the other hand, his presentation of "the Evangelicals' interpretation" is derogatory even if the main position on the issue of intercession is acceptable. He incorrectly presents that Protestants intentionally use the text to insult and degrade Mary.

are correctly understood as doctrinal presuppositions. It would be unfair and unreasonable to look upon this kind of interpretive differences between the Orthodox and Evangelicals in a different light and to define them as scriptural differences.

By way of conclusion, two elements in the above reasoning are crucial. Firstly, if all scriptural interpretations are to some extent different due to point of view, tradition, personal experience of the readers… this is not due to the biblical text in itself. Therefore it is not so much the biblical texts which cause the division but the ways of reading. Secondly, interpretive presuppositions by their very nature are tolerable because they are open for discussion and change from time to time. If from both sides there is a willingness and a positive attitude towards the promotion of unity and cooperation, such presuppositions should not pose obstacles for fellowship and ecumenism.

(4) Scriptural Authority. A crucial difference in view between the EOTC and the Ethiopian Evangelicals is represented by their positions as regards the authority of the Scriptures. The EOTC considers the Bible as only one of the authoritative traditions of the church, as only one of several sources for Orthodox teaching and practice. The Ethiopian Evangelicals however, embraces the Bible as the one and only source of all its teaching and practice.[16] Hence, people who put this point forward as the main barrier between the two church groups, maintain that, even if the churches would agree on all of the above points, the different position given to the authority of the Scriptures, would invalidate any possible agreement between them.

However, as discussed in chapter three of this thesis, the gap between these two stances has been narrowing in recent decades, both in global scholarly debate and in the current Ethiopian context. On the one hand, Evangelicals are becoming more and more aware of the importance of church tradition and express this in their confessional statements or constitutions.[17] On the other hand, the increasing centrality of the Scriptures in the life and practice of the EOTC has been demonstrated in various ways in recent decades. As the two church groups are growing

---

[16] For a detailed discussion on the stances of the EOTC and the Ethiopian Evangelicals on biblical authority, see chapter three of this thesis.

[17] For instance, one may see this connection in the Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus constitution, article 2, where the church confesses to accepting the unaltered Augsburg Confession as the Scriptures are correctly and purely interpreted

much closer to each other, the place of authority ascribed to the Scriptures seems to become a less of an insurmountable problem.

Moreover, at whatever level one reasons out, the most important point as regards the authority of the Scriptures is that both groups believe and accept the Bible as authoritative. The difference in the Orthodox and Evangelical views on the authority of the Scriptures is, of course, is how the two churches discern what the authoritative divine message in the Scriptures really is in their particular contexts, where the gap has recently been diminished with a potential for further reduction. Once again the Scriptures, in connection with the positions maintained by different church groups on its authority, have a power that ultimately is more unifying than divisive. In conclusion, as a result of ignorance and historical animosity, the apparent differences in the approaches to the Scriptures of the EOTC and the Ethiopian Evangelicals have been unduly emphasized, resulting in a perception of the Scriptures as divisive. However, a closer look at each seemingly divisive element indicates that the Bible not only inherently promotes unity and fellowship but that, in the context of the EOTC and the Evangelicals in Ethiopia, it is the key and the necessary condition for sound and genuine unity, fellowship, cooperation and ecumenism.

8.2.3 The Place of "Deuterocanonical/extracanonical" Books in Ethiopian Churches

As has been discussed in detail in chapter three, some terminologies, employed in different contexts, designate different bodies of literature. For instance, the word "deuterocanonical" is used by both the Roman Catholics and the Orthodox to designate those books in their respective canons that are additional to the sixty-six "proto-canonical" books. Although the term "deuterocanonical" in both churches refers to the secondary canonical status of the books in this category, the number of books included in each church's canon is not identical.

When it comes to the Protestants, there are in their canon no books with a secondary canonical status and, thus, no "deuterocanonical" books. The books designated as "deuterocanonical" by the Roman Catholics are called "apocryphal" by the Protestants while there are other categories of books which are called "apocryphal" by the Roman Catholics. The "deuterocanonical" books in the "canon" of the EOTC are in the Protestant tradition divided

into two categories: some are "apocryphal" while others are referred to as "pseudepigraphical" books.

As a common designation for the fifteen or more books that are part of the EOTC but not of the Evangelicals' canon, I choose to use two words that are applicable as designations by both church groups, namely, "deuterocanonical/extracanonical" books. "Deuterocanonical" represents the EOTC designation, whereas "extracanonical" represents the Evangelical designation, which at the same time includes both the "apocryphal" and some of the "pseudepigraphical" books among the number of fifteen. Thus, whether we call the books "deuterocanonical" or "extracanonical", the terms point exclusively to the fifteen, eighteen or more books under examination in this section.[18]

The question is what the place of these "deuterocanonical/extracanonical" books in the various Ethiopian churches is in fact. As mentioned above, (§8.2.2 (1)), in EOTC scholarship and church literature,[19] there seems recently to have been a deliberate emphasis on this distinction between "proto-" and "deutero-canonical" books by giving them a primary and a secondary level of authority (Mikre-Sellassie, personal communication, 15.12.2011). As this tendency to prioritize "proto-canonical" books gains momentum in the EOTC, it will positively affect the search for unity and cooperation among the various churches in Ethiopia.

The question, therefore, mainly focuses on the stance of the Ethiopian Evangelicals on these "extracanonical" Jewish books that belong to the Second Temple Period Literature (STL). We have seen in chapter six above that the underlying reason for the strongly negative attitude of Ethiopian Evangelicals to these books is mainly based on prejudice, ignorance, and animosity. We have also seen that the respondents to the researcher's questions on the possible positions

---

[18] Another problem which may arise from the designation "deutero-canonical" referring to the fifteen books of the EOTC "canon" is the question whether these books include the "broader" or the "narrower canon", as designated by Cowley. For a detailed discussion on this variation, see chapter six of this thesis. In the present section, we limit ourselves to the books in the "narrower canon" as these are published and printed out as the EOTC Bible for the public.

[19] One of the clearest recent literary works by the EOTC is a special edition of the Ethiopian Millennium celebration for which leading scholars of the church produced a number of articles on various historical, biblical, doctrinal, and theological aspects of the church in her long history as well as in the contemporary situation. Of hundreds of biblical references in this book, almost all come from the proto-canonical books. For detailed biblical references, see, EOTC 2007b.

of Evangelicals in respect of the "extra-canonical" books fall into three categories. But the question here is how this important literature could be appropriated in a way that would benefit the readers while promoting ecumenism and mutual cooperation of churches in Ethiopia. With that aim in mind, it is appropriate to provide a brief survey of the problem posed by the "extra-canonical" books and the history of their reception in the wider Evangelical or Protestant community.

The problem is reflected in the following questions most of which have been raised by various groups and individuals by way of challenges to the writer of this study. Among these were Evangelical colleagues, fellow students and others who challenged the researcher as to the relevance of his study to Evangelical Christianity in Ethiopia. Some questions are rhetorical, usually inviting a straight 'yes' or 'no'. Examples of these are the following. What is the relevance of Second Temple Literature and were these books not excluded from the canon long ago? Weren't they rejected from the canon that was promoted by the Protestant Reformers, who held *sola scriptura*? Is our Bible not enough for our salvation and do we need more books? If our Bible contains the revelation of God's way of salvation why use more books? Are the obscurities we encounter in the Bible not enough and do we want to add more? Are these works not heretical? Our Bible itself is too much to cover, why add more so that we can't give enough attention to the accepted biblical books? However, our Catholic and Orthodox friends would pose entirely different questions such as: Are these books not, after all, part of our Scriptures? Have they not been read, used, and valued by the church for two millennia? And a last one: Have they not been part of the Bible of early Christians and NT writers? (For similar challenges and questions see deSilva 2002:15.)

One of the misunderstandings that may result in a negative view of these "extra-canonical" books among Ethiopian Evangelicals is a lack of knowledge of the history of the Bible. Many think that their Bible is a book, given by God exactly as it now stands. Many Evangelicals in Ethiopia do not know how those "extra-canonical" books fit into the history of the church. We now turn to this aspect. In the following paragraphs an overview is provided of the canonical question through four major periods of Christian church history, namely the era of the NT writers, the fourth and fifth century of canon fixation, the Reformation, and the present situation. It has to be noted that this is a very broad topic that requires careful study in its own

right. What is included here is a bare minimum, aimed at showing the relevance and the "non-heretical" character of the "extracanonical" books, especially for the benefit of those who think otherwise.

Although it is to some extent arguable, the Bible of the early church and the NT writers is the LXX[20] which includes books that for Evangelicals are "apocryphal", even if the Hebrew Bible is not unknown in the early church. Bruce (1988:48f.) argues that "the scriptures known to Jesus and his disciples were no doubt the scrolls of the Hebrew Bible. [However as] soon as the gospel was carried into the Greek-speaking world, the Septuagint came into its own as the sacred text to which the preachers appealed." Likewise it is noted that, besides the preachers of the early church, "it was the Greek Septuagint, not the Hebrew Bible in the original, that was the Bible of most of the New Testament writers, including the apostle Paul. They have based their arguments on its translation—and even its mistranslation" (Pelikan 1996:19). The fact that the LXX which includes several apocryphal books was the Bible of the NT period is well attested.[21]

The major figures in the formative stages of the canonization of the Old and New Testament books of the early church are from the fourth and fifth centuries. The witness of three church Fathers is prominent. Athanasius was very important because he was the first to use the term "canon" in the sense of "canon of the Scriptures," and he made persistent attempts to fix both the OT and NT canon of the church (Bruce 1988:77). Two points are important for our purpose here. The first point is that Athanasius' list of books to be canonized included some apocryphal books and excluded some canonical ones. However, he recommended the books he excluded from the canon "to be read to those who are recent converts to our company and wish to be instructed in the word of true religion" (Athanasius as quoted in Bruce 1988:79).[22]

---

[20] Even if one can establish that the text of the NT quotations in many cases is close to or identical with what we now know as the LXX texts, it should be noted, however, that the LXX was not a book like our present day bibles which contains all the "deutero-canonical/extra-canonical" works. What we have are different Codices with slightly different lists of books.

[21] This shows that different Jewish groups have not been using a uniform group of books. For early Jewish diversity and various Jewish scriptural approaches see James Sanders 1999:1-23.

[22] For a similar addition and omission on some other early church lists of the Scriptures, see Beckwith 1985:189. Because of Athanasius's exclusion of some and inclusion *of other Apocryphal books*, Beckwith (1985:187) disqualifies Athanasius's list.

A second church Father, Jerome, who had translated the Bible from Hebrew into the Vulgate, the Latin Bible eventually used by the Latin Church, denied the equal status of apocryphal books even if he accepted that they were used in the church for edification. He called those books included in the Hebrew Bible the "Hebrew truth" and suggested to use only these books for church dogma.[23] As Bruce (1988:93) notes, Jerome did not consider apocryphal books to be part of the "canon proper". They should "not be used for the establishment of doctrine, but they retain great ethical value which makes them suitable for reading in the course of Christian worship." But sometimes Jerome quoted from the apocryphal books using the same introductory formulae as he did when quoting from the "Hebrew truth" or the NT books (Bruce 1988:93) which indicates that the canon was, at least functionally, rather loosely circumscribed.

The third church Father who was influential in this context is Augustine who very clearly avoided making a distinction between the status of apocryphal and other Hebrew books. This position was held by the major body of the church until the Reformation.[24] As opposed to Jerome's list, it was Augustine's position that was accepted by the church. Dunbar (1986:310) concludes likewise: "In the fifth century, Augustine's advocacy of the Apocrypha prevailed over Jerome's endorsement of the Jewish Canon." Another point of note is that Augustine's acceptance of the LXX as the authoritative canon emerged from his acknowledgement of the church's decision, "acknowledging that [the books] were 'regarded as canonical, not by the

---

[23] Jerome gives the Hebrew text of the OT priority over the LXX on theological and not philological reasons. Paul Decock (2008:205-222) convincingly argues that Jerome's translation from the Hebrew texts is more acceptable to Christian readers than the LXX which was a translation done by Jews. The critical point is that they did not have the light of Christ by which they could understand and translate the Scriptures 'correctly'. The issue is not so much textual or philological but a matter of the light of Christ. In his argument why the LXX translation has a subordinate place in the history of salvation, from Jerome's point of view, Decock (2008:216f.) writes that "Christian interpreters like Jerome, having faith in Christ as their key, are able to understand much better and can therefore translate more accurately. Jerome's pre-understanding is that translation is not a mechanical exercise (mere philology) but that the knowledge and faith of the person of the translator will determine the level of understanding of the text, according to the well known principle in Greek and Roman Antiquity that only like understands like. Applied to the Scriptures, only a person with Christian faith can understand God's revelation about Christ in the Scriptures. That is also why for Jerome the same Spirit who inspired the writers should also inspire the interpreters to touch the readers."

[24] For his list of 44 canonical books of the OT, see Bruce, *Canon,* 95. Beckwith misrepresents Augustine and contradicts himself by saying that Augustine claims that Jesus endorsed the Jewish canon (p.2) and Augustine's claim for the LXX canon is "his ignorance of Hebrew and his exaggerated respect for the Christian MSS of the LXX" (Beckwith 1985:14, n.8). For Augustine's respect for the original biblical languages, see Bruce 1988:94f.

Jews, but by the church'" (Pelikan 1996:21). Augustine's influence is evident in a number of church councils held at the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century where the inclusion of the apocryphal books in the biblical canon of the church was endorsed.[25] This position was held by the church for more than a millennium, until the Reformation when a major challenge to the preserved canon of the church arose.

The Reformation of the sixteenth century called not only for reformation of the church but also for a "re-formation" (as Pelikan (1996:21) calls it) of the Bible. The Reformers' slogan, *sola scriptura*, even if it focused on the sole authority of the Scriptures and, in consequence, a lesser say for the church and the pope, raised a question regarding the canon: Which books form the Scriptures? Luther's protest against the abuse of the indulgence system, which was bound up with the belief in purgatory and the practice of prayers for the dead, had some basis in 2 Macc 12:45f, until that time a canonical book. Luther, for the sake of defending his position, found a ready reply in Jerome's exclusion of 2 Maccabees from his list of the OT canon. However, Luther wished to exclude not only apocryphal books from the biblical canon, but also some books of the Hebrew Bible and New Testament that Jerome had accepted.[26] Besides, what Luther rejected was only the authoritative status of those apocryphal books in relation to church doctrine, but he considered them as "useful and good to read" (Pelikan 1996:21), thus following Jerome. In other words, he accepted apocryphal works as long as they did not contradict doctrine.

After Luther, the Lutheran Reformers did not list canonical books, either in the Augsburg Confession of 1530 or in the Formula of Concord of 1577, but they included a separate section of Apocrypha in their printed Bibles, a tradition that was followed by later Christians.[27] It was the Westminster Confession (1646) that was the first to clearly list the canonical books, excluding all apocryphal books, equating these with any other writing. Yet, even the

---

[25] For a detailed discussion on the councils including their names and dates see Bruce 1988:97.
[26] Luther once said: "I hate Esther and 2 Maccabees so much that I wish they did not exist" (as quoted in Bruce 1988:101).
[27] For a number of different ways of listing biblical books in the post-Reformation era, which was not consistent, see Bruce 1988:102-104.

Westminster Confession does not claim that the apocryphal books are heretical.[28] The printing and the usage of apocryphal books in the Protestant traditions right after the Reformers mainly follow two lines. Whereas Lutherans and Anglicans[29] continued to print the Apocrypha as a third part in their Bibles, drawing on them for lectionaries and special services, others radicalized the Reformers' views and went so far as to formalize an opinion against the Apocrypha (deSilva 2002:39). This stance is still reflected in the current inconsistent status of apocryphal books among Protestant churches.[30] Two major conclusions can be drawn: Some books have been disputed in the history of the church and the dispute was basically not concerned with their possible heretical nature, but rather with their status as secondary to the Scriptures and their relevance was not questioned.

Coming back to the current Ethiopian Evangelical churches, their attitude towards "extra-canonical" books is unique in that – unlike the wider Evangelical circle – they have a unanimously negative view of these books. This position is not typical for the larger circle of Protestants where different churches adopt varied stances as regards the status of apocryphal books. Except for the EOTC's printed Amharic Bible which includes eighteen "deuterocanonical" books as part of the two testaments and that has by Protestants been rejected or received with suspicion, there is no printed Bible in any of the Ethiopian languages that contains "extra-canonical" books. As maintained in chapter six above, any scriptural books apart from the sixty-six of the Protestant Bible are not only rejected but considered heretical or at least regarded negatively by many Evangelicals. We have seen that this is the outcome of prejudice, animosity and ignorance. This misconception has led many Evangelicals to subscribe to the saying that "anything related to the Orthodox should be rejected."

The challenge faced by Ethiopian Evangelicals is to shed prejudices and to get better informed in order to handle the matter fairly and adequately. Even before thinking about rejecting or

---

[28] deSilva (2002:38) notes that "Indeed, the Westminster Confession's statement might be seen to agree with Jerome's, Wyclif's, and Luther's judgement that these texts may be used as edifying literature, just as one would use any devotional classic."

[29] Among all Protestants, the Anglican Church is a good example of bodies who use the "apocryphal books" positively, including in their liturgy.

[30] For a discussion on variation of printed Bibles in the West in the last three centuries see Bruce 1988:111-114.

accepting "extra-canonical" books, serious questions need to be asked one of which concerns their relevance.   If we consider the books to any extent relevant, we need to question what their specific relevance is for the Evangelicals and for promoting fellowship and cooperation among Ethiopian churches. In the view of the present researcher, whatever position one takes as regards their canonicity,   the "extra-canonical" books can be regarded as relevant for several reasons.

Looking at the earliest tradition, the authors of the NT themselves show signs of a high degree of familiarity with the Second Temple Literature. The degree to which NT writers used STL can be understated[31] as well as overstated,[32] but not overlooked. In short, this body of literature constitutes a treasury of primary texts "for deepening our appreciation of the intellectual, theological, rhetorical, and social milieu of early Christianity" (deSilva 2002:25).

Second Temple Literature gives a fuller and more reliable picture of early Judaism. Moreover, the knowledge of the life of Jews in the diaspora - something of great importance for an understanding of the early Christian mission, yet something of which the Hebrew Bible says very little - is mediated to us through this valuable body of literature. It is stated that Second Temple Literature offers windows of understanding onto "the prayers and liturgies of [Diaspora] Jews, into the ethos of the pious life embraced by them, and into the ways in which they used the literary, conceptual, and rhetorical forms of the Greek world, something that continued in Christian literature" (deSilva 2002:21) It is this body of literature that served as a vehicle for translating the 'Gospel' from a Jewish culture into a Greek culture with its own rhetorical forms.

Another compelling reason to use the "deuterocanonical/extra-canonical" books lies in their unique function during the formative period of the Christian church theology. The writings were "formative for early Christian theology, a heritage shared by Protestant, Catholic, and Orthodox Christians" (deSilva 2002:25). It is awkward to confess the theology of apostolic

---

[31] For instance Beckwith (1985:388) claims that *4 Maccabees* is never even referred to by any NT or second or third century writers, but "he is overlooking or suppressing many correspondences, especially between *4 Maccabees*, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and Origen" (deSilva 2002:22).
[32] For instance, Elias Oikonomos, as quoted in deSilva (2002:21), claims "Jesus himself, the apostles Peter, Paul, and James, and the book of Revelation, use the deuterocanonical writings in a way similar to Jewish practice."

fathers who are partly influenced and shaped by these "deuterocanonical/extra-canonical" works, and yet to reject such formative material.

Whether it is known to them or not, the Ethiopian Evangelicals are profoundly influenced by the practice, theology, devotion and ethics of the EOTC, both in a positive and a negative sense.[33] The EOTC in its turn is significantly influenced and shaped in various aspects of church life by the body of "deuterocanonical/extra-canonical" books and, thus, the knowledge of this literature is indispensable for an understanding of the EOTC. Some of the criticism by Evangelicals, directed against the EOTC, results partly from ignorance of this background.

As this thesis specifically singles out the all-encompassing influence of *1 Enoch,* mainly on the EOTC and to some degree also on the Ethiopian Evangelicals, a closer study of this book within the broader body of "deuterocanonical/extra-canonical" books and in relation to the Ethiopian context is crucial. If all churches in Ethiopia would get together in order to study such an influential book and to consider its meanings for Ethiopian Christianity, it might open doors for cooperation to mutual benefit. It could at the same time be a good exercise and pave the way for other joint ventures. In that way the positive influence of studying *1 Enoch* and similar works could promote ecumenism and cooperation.

By way of winding up the first section of this chapter, we need to draw some pertinent conclusions. Firstly, even if apparently the fact that the EOTC and the Ethiopian Evangelicals hold different canonical traditions is seen as a major controversy, the Bible tends to unite rather than divide. Whoever wants to use the Bible as an instrument of division can easily pinpoint a number of elements to superficially support their efforts. However, a closer look at each of these suggests that they are subjective or external to the texts themselves and have been superimposed on canonical issues. These subjective factors are the real cause of animosity between the churches. If there are any elements related to the Scriptures that are potentially divisive, these play not only in the Ethiopian context but may be related to the wider Christendom. As such they need to be considered and challenged, mainly in relation to

---

[33] For a brief discussion on the influence of the EOTC on Ethiopian Evangelicals in various aspects, see chapter six of this thesis.

issues of interpretation that are in turn connected to the presuppositions characterizing the teachings of each denomination. Such practical differences or diversity in the appropriation of the Scriptures – determined by widely differing contexts where their effect may be negative or enriching – should not be labelled as inherently divisive elements of the Scriptures.

Secondly, even if the relevance of the Second Temple Literature in general, and *1 Enoch* as its representative, is evident for a number of reasons, including its importance for the study of NT origins, textual comparison, devotional value and historical records, it is especially relevant to the Ethiopian context. As we have seen in the previous chapters, Jude's usage of *1 Enoch* does not necessarily validate or refute the canon of either the EOTC or the Evangelicals. Rather, it implies a positive attitude towards *1 Enoch* and necessitates making use of it, irrespective of its canonical status. However, – and this is a failure that the Ethiopian Evangelicals are ignorant of – they have also rejected the "extra-canonical" writings outright in spite of their value. Therefore it is highly recommended that Evangelicals in Ethiopia re-evaluate their attitude towards this invaluable body of literature so that they may appropriate the text and receive its benefits. In the words of D. A. Carson, "However strongly evangelicals, as part of the larger Protestant tradition, reject the Apocrypha as Scripture, they can no more dismiss this corpus from all consideration than they can write off the world and culture into which the Christ was born, and in which the New Testament was written" (D. A. Carson as quoted in deSilva 2002:40).

8.3 Other Factors that Potentially Affect Unity and/or Divisions between Ethiopian Churches

Arguing that the Scriptures are not inherently divisive, in spite of the fact that the EOTC and the Evangelicals in Ethiopia follow two differing canonical traditions, leads to another problem, namely, if the Scriptures do not cause the division, then what does? Which are the underlying factors that create animosity to the extent that Christians have severely persecuted their fellow brothers and sisters on many occasions?[34]

---

[34] Literature on persecution on Evangelicals in Ethiopia is plenty, which includes Eide 2001, Bascom 2001, ፈቃዱ 1999, ወንድዬ 2000, 1998, Jetto 1999, Anonymous 1973, 1972. For an extensive discussion on a number of

However, we also wonder whether there are scriptural elements that have in the past been divisive   and that now may be used for promoting and nurturing cooperation and ecumenism? What can both church groups learn from their past dark relationship in order to build together a brighter future relationship?

This is no doubt a very broad issue that requires further study on a large scale, which I strongly recommend. However, for the purpose of the present chapter we have to limit ourselves to a few aspects of the problem.

Points that have played an important role in dividing the churches in Ethiopia are the following: historical occurrences, variations in doctrinal and theological issues, political and ethnic elements, administrative, structural and practical issues, and the missionary factor. Each of these points may have contributed to the aggravation of differences and animosity.   We will attempt to assess whether they could be used conversely for promoting and cultivating ecumenism and unity.

8.3.1 Historical Facts

In some of the previous chapters of this study, it has been argued that the EOTC has shown a significant level of literary flexibility and inclusivist tendencies. Sacred writings from various backgrounds, including other faiths, in this case the Qur'an, have been translated into Ge'ez, copied, transmitted, and preserved in various monasteries of the EOTC. The origins of the Ge'ez version of the EOTC Bible, from a historical point of view, can be traced back to Hebrew, Greek, Syriac, and Coptic versions at various periods of times. The "neither closed

incidents of sever persecution of Evangelicals by the EOTC members in both "mob-attacks" and systematic ways coordinated with the state officials, see Tibebe Eshete 2009, especially pp.175-188, For instance, Tibebe (2009:178) narrates two incidents of mob-persecution, mainly by EOTC adherents, in central Addis Ababa and a nearby city, Debre Zeit. In the Debre Zeit incident, which took place in August 1967, "the large crowd stormed the assembly, disrupted the procession, and attacked the men indiscriminately. They destroyed their musical instruments and then burned the Bible." Similarly, in the Addis Ababa incident, in 1969, government officials and clergy and believers of the EOTC involved in the attack of a congregation which involved elements of violence and mob justice. Tibebe (2009:179) further writes about a letter released on November 9, 1971 from the chief of public security of the Ministry of Interior, accusing Evangelicals and planning to conduct a nation-wide crackdown on them. "The letter sent out to all government officials, military officers, parishes of the Orthodox churches, and school directors throughout the empire … The memorandum set the tone for the ensuing persecution that swept through the country."

nor open" nature of the EOTC's canon and the larger number of canonical books in its Bible could also be indicative of this inclusivity and flexibility.

However, when it comes to loyalty to the church's faith and traditions, EOTC adherents have always shown the utmost allegiance to the protection of the church from any external influence. In its centuries' long history, the EOTC has faced a number of different external influences and it has substantially resisted almost all of these. This long and proud history encouraged in its adherents a strong mentality of pride in "the faith of our fathers" which is very much associated with an assumption that church and nation are one and the same.

In fact, as the EOTC has officially been the state religion for about sixteen centuries, church and nation were indeed like two sides of the same coin until the downfall of the late Emperor Haile Sellassie I in 1974. During all that time, adherents of the church would give their lives for their country, but above all for the cause of the love of their church and in protection of the "faith of our fathers". In the course of history Jewish,[35] Islamic,[36] Catholic,[37] and Protestant[38] movements have attempted to change the Ethiopian religious landscape monopolized by the EOTC.[39] These historical incidents have caused the EOTC to become more suspicious of, and closed to, others. The Orthodox hardened their attitude from time to time, growing more exclusive, more ardently faithful to the church and increasingly nationalistic. Based on a deep-rooted belief that Ethiopia is "a Christian island" defined by EOTC faith and tradition, some have gone so far as to proclaim "one nation (Ethiopia), one faith/religion (*Tewahedo* Orthodox) and one flag (green, yellow, and red)".[40]

---

[35] The Jewish attempt to destroy the Orthodox faith refers mainly to an attack by the ninth-century Queen Judith who ruled the country for forty years causing much destruction.

[36] The Islamic invasion is especially that of the sixteenth century conquest by the infamous Ahmed Gragne.

[37] The early seventeenth century attempt by the Jesuits to convert the nation to Catholicism was both bloody and unsuccessful and the effect was that the Orthodox kept the doors even firmer closed against any attempts to form ecumenical relationships.

[38] From the seventeenth to twentieth centuries, various attempts have been made by Protestant missionaries to reform the EOTC from within the church which never succeeded, but increased Orthodox suspicion of outsiders.

[39] For a detailed discussion of all these conflicts, see Bruk 2013a.

[40] Even if it became an obsolete ambition, some have gone as far as to claim "one language (Amharic) and one monarch (the Lion of Judah)", which was a failed agenda of the late Ethiopian imperial throne. This has been reflected in the 1931 and 1955 constitutions of Ethiopia. The 1931 constitution is basically nothing more than a declaration of the formation of "the Ethiopian Empire" under the perpetual line of the Solomonic dynasty. It was an articulation of the tradition and myth of Ethiopianism predominated by Ethiopian/Abyssinian Emperors at

However, the Evangelicals also have a history, albeit a much shorter one. Many missionaries from the West as well as a number of early local pioneers of the Evangelical movement in different parts of Ethiopia have given their lives for their faith. The EOTC may count martyrs in their thousands, but in their relatively short history in Ethiopia the Evangelicals have seen hundreds of their followers die in martyrdom. As time passes, new generations of Evangelicals in Ethiopia are "born Evangelicals" and they proclaim their love for "their fathers' faith" as the Orthodox do.

I respect, appreciate, and accept the fact that millions of Christians are born Orthodox. It is not necessarily their choice or their fault. They have been brought up in the Orthodox tradition and identify themselves with its long history. I understand their patriotic and nationalistic stance, in line with their tradition. History is in their favor as Ethiopia was exclusively Orthodox for an exceedingly long period. At the same time, however, it is not necessarily my choice and my fault that I am born Ethiopian Evangelical. I grew up in a church with a century old history in the Evangelical tradition that was, of course, presented as the only "correct" way of being a Christian. I would say that I am not less proud of my Ethiopian Evangelical identity than my fellow Orthodox Christians are proud of their identity. In other words, Orthodox and Evangelicals have both their own story to tell and to be proud of. Today, history brings us together. We share the same nation and we are adherents of the same religion be it in different denominations. Even if we can each, from our own denominational background, point to some unique historical occurrences, at the same time we share historical accounts,

least from the fourteenth century onwards, as the tradition is elaborated in the *Fetha Negest* and *Kebre Negest*. The 1955 revised constitution further stipulates three consecutive articles (124-126) where the flag, the Amharic language, and the EOTC as the State Church are declared as unitary to the nation. All these stipulations have been abolished with the down fall of the monarch in 1974. For a discussion on how the Amhara rulers imposed this "myth" of one nation, one language, and one religion practically on other Ethiopian people in general and the Oromo people in particular, see Malbaa 1988:34-61. In his parliamentary speeches of 17 April 2012, when he addressed an emerging Muslim extremism in Ethiopia, the late Prime Minister of Ethiopia, Meles Zenawi, publicly mentioned that there are a few extremists in the EOTC as well. He said: "At the recent *Timket* (epiphany) celebrations, there was a slogan which declared, 'One country, one religion'." (Larger portion of the speech on the religious extremism and its criticism is found in Alemayehu 2012.) For his full speech and responses to the questions in the parliament on that day on YouTube, see Meles 2012. Likewise, the researcher of this study has observed, in his 2012 field research visit to Ethiopia, some Ethiopians wore a T-shirt with this slogan in Amharic: አንድ ሀገር፣ አንድ ሃይማኖት፣ አንድ ባንዲራ (one nation/country, one religion, one flag).

stemming not only from the overall Christian perspective but also from our shared experience as citizens of one Ethiopian nation.

From these few crucial historical considerations one may draw a number of conclusions. Repeated attempts by various faith groups to coerce Ethiopians to change the Orthodox faith in the long history of Ethiopia resulted only in strengthening its attitude of exclusivism, defensiveness and suspicion towards the other. In addition, the sheer length of time that the EOTC has been the only Christian church in Ethiopia, created among its adherents a strong sense of loyalty to the church and the expression, "the faith of our fathers", is rooted in the bones and blood of every believer. This may have led to the assumption that Ethiopia belongs to the Orthodox and to them alone. Also, many of the Evangelical interviewees in this study, whose background was Orthodox, have emphasized that one of the main legacies they have retained from the EOTC is a strong loyalty to their faith and an exclusivist tendency. Some expressly noted that they had been stubborn and did not want to allow any changes in regard to their faith to the extent of being prepared to sacrifice their lives for it. They believe that it was this kind of uncompromising, non-negotiable standing up for their faith that helped them to survive and resist the severe persecution of the seventeen years lasting military regime.

In conclusion, two points are worth nothing. Firstly, if there is today animosity between Orthodox and Evangelicals in Ethiopia, it is closely linked to the historical reality of the country. From a historical point of view, it is not surprising that the EOTC tends to an exclusive and monopolistic position. History may, to a degree, justify that an Orthodox believer, from a religious point of view, might refer to Evangelicals as *mete* (new comer). Given attempts to "attack" the EOTC faith and tradition at various periods of history, it is not surprising that they cultivated a stubborn approach to safeguarding their faith.[41] Rather, it is thanks to this stubborn resistance to any externally imposed change of their historic legacy that the Ethiopian Orthodoxy stands out in the whole world as a unique church with many

---

[41] Even if there is a tendency among the other church elites that the EOTC is looked down upon as "backward", the EOTC members always kept their sense of superiority over all the other religious members. Rather, the Orthodox boast of their extraordinary cultural and religious identity as unique. According to Dejene (1977:10), "While others struggled under the colonial yoke, Ethiopia preserved her independence and a unique and pure African culture, ህገ ልቦና 'the unwritten fear of God in the heart'. [Meanwhile] መናፍቃን 'heretics' [i.e. non-Orthodox] cultivate a sense of being European, leading the people astray from their ancient faith."

distinctive qualities. Even if this position has contributed considerably to the severe hostility between the EOTC and other churches in Ethiopia, it should also be appreciated as helping the church to keep such a unique identity. The Orthodox have stood firm in the face of external and internal pressures. Its strong tendency to exclusivity was aimed at preserving its faith and its tradition, rather than at creating divisions with other Christian churches.

New eras come up with new realities. Political rifts and changes dictate the direction and reality of history. A number of politically connected historical incidents that are discussed below may give us a glimpse of that continuously shifting reality. As the socio-political landscape today is entirely different from what it was just a century ago,[42] it would be wise to shape and reshape oneself in a way that suits the current realities on the ground. We, Ethiopians, could gain a lot from such a move and it would help us to go forward as a nation together. Churches could contribute to this process through promoting unity, mutual respect and reconciliation as the time requires. Churches ought to build bridges and heal wounds so that history can be turned from being a divisive element into a uniting factor for the betterment of all.

8.3.2 Doctrinal and Theological Factors

That there are doctrinal and theological differences between Orthodox and Evangelicals in Ethiopia is unquestionable. There are however also theological and doctrinal controversies among Evangelicals themselves and, similarly, among the five Oriental Orthodox churches of which the EOTC is one.[43] In fact, what gives a denomination its unique identity consists possibly in the unique aspects of its theology and doctrine. Besides certain other traditions it is the substance of their teaching that defines who they are.[44]

If the above statement is correct, then, in any ecumenical dialogue and discussion, the basic identity and the doctrine of the participating churches have to be respected and are non-

---

[42] For a discussion on political and ethnic dynamics as dividing and uniting factors, see below §8.3.4.

[43] For a detailed discussion on dialogue between the EOTC and some sister Orthodox churches as regards the forming of   closer ecumenical ties, and EOTC's overall ecumenical relations, see EOTC 1996:109-146; Chaillot 2002:8-16.

[44] As it is beyond the scope of this study and no specific strong point to be made on the subject, no attempt will be made to discuss the theological and doctrinal differences between the EOTC and the Ethiopian Evangelicals.

negotiable. In other words, ecumenical dialogue does not require churches of any denomination to make compromises as regards their key theological foundations and central doctrine. If this is a condition, one might ask then how is ecumenism possible? What could dialogue achieve if no church is willing to shift its position? And again, was this perhaps the main divisive factor between the EOTC and the Ethiopian Evangelicals?

Before a response to these questions is possible, four points need to be understood. Firstly, doctrinal and theological issues and related differences have not been officially debated as the context itself is not conducive to such a debate. It is, therefore, difficult to argue that the need to respect each other's doctrines and traditions has caused a divide between the two church groups in Ethiopia. Given the animosity between them, any such debate could at the moment only be confrontational and diminish the possibility of future ecumenical harmony. Such a debate can be fruitful only if it is preceded by the building of a good relationship in a context of listening to one another. Instead, EOTC and Evangelicals have thus far been misrepresenting each other in their own circles by creating a wrong image of the other. The divisive factor is therefore not the other's theological or doctrinal outlook, but the tendency to blacken each other's name. In addition, it is customary that, in an ecumenical discussion between the churches, their fundamental theological teachings are not for discussion. However, for the sake of getting a better understanding of each other it is indispensable that Orthodox and Evangelicals meet and talk. As long as the two church groups are not adequately informed about each other, animosity will continue to widen the gap between them. Only dialogue could counter ignorance and narrow the gap caused by unfamiliarity and hostility. Only once we know the other better, can we be open and cultivate mutual respect. It is on the basis of understanding that one can make reasonable decisions as regards cooperation and the limits and types of interrelationships that are possible.

Once the identity of each group is clearly understood by the others, the time comes to identify and promote that which they have in common. As in the case of the canonical discussion above, also as regards their fundamental theological teachings, there is no doubt that there is more that unites than that separates them. The three prominent church groups in Ethiopia – the EOTC, the Evangelicals and the Roman Catholics - are known as the "Trinitarian Churches". They share most of the Apostolic traditions and confessions on the teachings of

the Trinity. All believe in the lordship and salvific power of the Lord Jesus Christ. That the Incarnate Christ has died, is risen from the dead, ascended to heaven, and will be coming to judge is central to the teaching of all the Trinitarian churches. These are only a few among many basic Christian teachings that all three churches could uphold together. Each church may have something unique in the way it expresses its teachings, but in the content these teachings largely intersect. Part of the problematic relationship between the churches is no doubt caused by unawareness of all that they have theologically and doctrinally in common, as well as by a lack of readiness to promote and nurture those shared values for the sake of mutual understanding and better relationships.

On the basis of an adequate knowledge of those factors that the EOTC and the Evangelicals have in common and those that separate them would undoubtedly help them to avoid misunderstandings. Some in the community have used these misunderstandings to widen the gap and to aggravate enmity between the church groups. For example, the EOTC and the Evangelicals are closer in their perceptions of some major theological issues like Christology than is generally believed. In actual fact there are detailed studies that suggest Evangelicals in Ethiopia should develop and articulate a Christological position that would fit the Ethiopian context as the difference between the EOTC and them mainly lies on their articulations.[45] It is a matter of saying the same thing in different ways. Such examples need to be discussed so that misconceptions can be corrected, promoting unity and cooperation.

Generally, even if theological and doctrinal issues are the key to the identity of each denomination, they cannot be an excuse for the rejection of discussions. When they are conducted in a disciplined way, based on mutual respect, dialogue can be instrumental in creating a perception of the true identity of the other. However, as theological and doctrinal issues tend to be technical and academic in character, such discussions should preferably be

---

[45] For a detailed discussion on the EOTC Christology and its implications and connection to the Ethiopian Evangelicals, see a PhD thesis by Stephen J. Strauss 1997, a study devoted to this topic. The findings of Strauss's (1997:iv) study "suggest that in speaking of Christ, evangelicals in Ethiopia should avoid referring to 'two natures' while affirming his full deity and, especially, his full humanity. They should develop a fresh Christological creed for the Ethiopian context."

held between parties with some relevant specialized knowledge. In addition they need to be preceded by preliminaries in order to create an atmosphere conducive to such discussions.

8.3.3 Administrative/ Structural Issues

The administration and structure of the two church groups are based on different principles. The EOTC is strongly centralized. It is led by a synod that is presided over by the Patriarch. The Evangelicals on the other hand, have a largely decentralized administrative structure so that decision making and authority are strongly fragmented. While the EOTC has typically a hierarchical priestly system, the Evangelicals significantly follow a system of leadership by the laity. The EOTC still maintains large-scale traditional and local educational, liturgical, administrative, and networking systems whereas the Evangelicals are inclined to follow their western counterparts in this respect. This aspect requires a deeper and detailed study leading to clear conclusions - something that is beyond the scope of the present thesis. It is however evident that the administrative and structural systems of the EOTC and the Ethiopian Evangelicals differ substantially. While some EOTC interviewees question whether any kind of dialogue would be possible with such a fragmented church body, Evangelical interviewees worry that the highly traditional and centralized EOTC system would be an obstacle.

Administrative and structural systems, although not without impact, mainly govern internal issues rather than external relationships. Moreover, such systems change from time to time in order to improve their functioning. It is for example evident that the systems of both church groups are in the process of undergoing change. While many Evangelicals are gradually becoming more centralized as they grow, both numerically and spatially, in the EOTC a more liberal system has become accepted at various levels of administration under influence of western education and the new political system of the country.[46] The result of these tendencies is that, as regards church administration and structure, the Evangelicals and the EOTC are getting closer to each other. Therefore church administration and structure, being

---

[46] For instance, the recent election of the new Patriarch has been more democratic: both clergy and laity were involved whereas traditionally only the clergy or the monarch played a role in this process.

mainly internal issues and changing from time to time, should not be an obstacle for ecumenical unity and fellowship between the church groups.

8.3.4 Political and Ethnic/Linguistic Reasons[47]

As history proves, politics and religion are closely linked with, at times, the one shaping and reshaping the other. In the political history of Ethiopia religion has influenced politics and, in turn, been influenced by the political philosophy of a given period. As the political landscape shifts from one ideology or system to another, especially in the last hundred years, the religious landscape in Ethiopia has shifted as well in various ways. The present researcher does not attempt to analyse how religion and politics impact on each other in Ethiopia as this would go far beyond the scope of this study, but a few points are briefly highlighted to help us see how a shift in political perspective has led to a new religious perspective that significantly impacts on the ecumenical relationships among various church groups in Ethiopia. As the political dynamics in Ethiopia are highly sensitive to ethnicity and language, this also plays a role in the changing perceptions of ecumenical relationships in Ethiopia as discussed below.

We limit ourselves to the last 130 years, from the 1880s to date. In this period six layers of political development set the tone for changes in the religious landscape as well. As we outline these six layers of political change and adjustments, we will also determine how fast religion reacted to the changes. Change in the religious landscape plays obviously a major role in the ecumenical relations among churches in Ethiopia. Crucial periods in Ethiopia since 1885 are: the time before Emperor Menelik II, Menelik's period of expansion and forging the modern Ethiopian nation, the five years of the Italian invasion, Emperor Haile Sellassie I's reform and greater openness to the west, the demise of the Solomonic dynasty and the rise of the communist military regime, and the new constitutional democracy with the rule of EPRDF.

---

[47] I have discussed portions of this sub-section, 8.3.4, in some more details elsewhere (see Bruk 2013a).

Until the time of Menelik II the political geography of Ethiopia has been consistently fluid and it was difficult to pinpoint the country's boundaries.[48] The Abyssinian Empire has at times stretched across the entire width of eastern Africa, including parts of Arabia across the Red Sea. However, in other periods, it consisted of no more than a few regions in today's northern Ethiopia. But, whatever the size of its territory, the EOTC has, since its inception in the early fourth century, been the state religion to which the rulers had to adhere. Not only did they have to pledge allegiance to the faith, but political rulers were also key players in shaping and determining the fate of the church.[49] Therefore, it is true to say that the nation was loyal to the EOTC, but the church was equally loyal to the court. It is this close connection between state and church that created among citizens a strong sense of identifying being an Ethiopian national with being an Orthodox Church member. This was not just a construct characteristic of a couple of centuries but it endured from one generation to the next over many centuries. It is this historical background that in the minds of Orthodox believers legitimizes the perception of Ethiopian and Orthodox as practically synonymous. This assumption did have a strong negative impact on ecumenical relationship based on the equality of all and on mutual respect.

In shaping the ethno-religious complex of contemporary Ethiopia an important role was played by Menelik's territorial expansion. "Menelik II from the central province of Shoa incorporated the lands and peoples of the south, east and west into an empire which became the modern state of Ethiopia" (Young 1998:192). The reign of Menelik II was marked by two major stages in the creation of modern Ethiopia. Firstly, branching out from the old core of Ethiopia, he invaded the territories to the south, east, and west.   In other words, the modern Ethiopia, from the geo-political point of view, is Menelik's Ethiopia of the early twentieth century. Secondly, he moved the power center from the old core of Ethiopia (the current

---

[48] For a closer study and various views on the making of "Modern Ethiopia" by Emperor Menelik II and what has been Ethiopia before his time, see a PhD dissertation by Getahun Dilebo 1974. See also a well-articulated *Layers of Time* of Paul Henze 2000.

[49] In the West, the Church – State relations model is an inheritance from the Constantinian period; it lasted right throughout the Byzantine period; in this context there were many contestations between the power of the Church (Pope) and that of the Emperor and political leaders where, at times, the power of the Emperor was weak. However, in the Ethiopian contexts, the Church – State relation lasted for about sixteen centuries, from the introduction of Christianity as state religion in the fourth century AD to its abolishment in 1974, where in most cases, unlike the West, the Church has been subservient of the political leadership as some of the Emperors have been influential theologians themselves. For a discussion on this relationship in the Ethiopian context, see Bruk 2013a.

northern Ethiopia) to, what was then the periphery of the territory: the heartland of Menelik's expansion, Shoa. Thus, the old Axumite and Gondarian centers of imperial rulers found themselves in the semi-periphery of the new Ethiopia and became history.

In the context of our discussion two other ethno-religious occurrences in this period are of importance. The first one is the inclusion of a huge number of ethnic groups, which is about fifty or more out of the current total eighty-five plus ethnic groups, with their own religious, cultural, linguistic, social, and historical identities.[50] Especially important is the religious aspect: Emperor Menelik II with his territorial expansion towards the east, south and west, had added very large numbers of Muslims and followers of traditional religions to the population. In other words, Ethiopia was no longer a semi-homogeneous ethnic entity consisting of mainly Amharas and Tigrians who were associated with a Semitic group, but now many other groups were included from Cushitic, Omotic, and Nilotic backgrounds. This in turn led to ethnic groups developing links based on their religious background. For instance, the eastern and southeastern parts of the country became predominantly associated with Islam, whereas most southern ethnic groups are typically traditionalists. The larger ethnic group of the Oromo that was forcefully included in the empire is partially associated with Islam and partially with traditionalism including the way of life that characterizes their traditional beliefs and that is very evident in their socio-political system.[51]

---

[50] As compared to the traditional Abyssinia proper, mainly the current northern part of Ethiopia, the largest ethnic group (the Oromo) and the majority of about the eighty-five ethnic groups in today's Ethiopia have been included in the nation mainly by Menelik II's invasion. For instance, besides the Oromos, the largest ethnic group, more than half of the ethnic groups of the country are situated in the current Southern Ethiopia region, only one of the nine federal states. In other words, in today's Ethiopia, the largest portion of the land, the majority of the ethnic groups and the population, have been eventually included in "the Greater Ethiopian Empire" by Emperor Menelik II only a century ago, (i.e. 1889-1913).

[51] Many Oromo elites and nationalist historians, for instance, openly deny today that they are Ethiopians claiming that the designation "Ethiopia" is "an embodiment of a foreign 'colonial' imposition which subverted the canons of Oromo civilization and cuts short its national history" (Alessandro Triulzi 2002:284). Asafa Jalata (1993:6), for instance, writes that "the terms Abyssinia and Ethiopia are used interchangeably to indicate the homeland of the Amharas and the Tigrayans [minorities], and the terms Abyssinians or Habashas or Ethiopians refer to these two peoples. Although the historical meaning of Ethiopia is applicable to all black peoples, its current meaning applies mainly to the Amharas and the Tigrayans. That is why Oromo nationalists say 'We are Oromiyans, not Ethiopians', recognizing the current meaning of Ethiopia." In the same line, Baissa Lemmu (1998:90) laments that "Millions of Oromos believe that their nation [i.e. Oromia] is unfairly treated , misgoverned, robbed, exploited, and oppressed first by the Amhara and currently by the Tigrayans."

In the context of this background another important point emerges from the history of Menelik's expansion. There are strong historical indications that, wherever Menelik's troops annexed new territory, they would force the defeated inhabitants to undergo Orthodox baptism. Thus, the expansion of the Orthodox Church followed the expansion of the nation, even though there was considerable resistance against the forced baptisms and many people retained their religion, even if this meant that they were seen as second class citizens.[52]

One outcome of Menelik's expansionist drive is that the inclusion of new territory and of many new ethnic groups laid the basis for the modern Ethiopia with its serious demographical imbalance, resulting in a struggle for the formation of a new identity. Menelik's "New Ethiopia" is no longer a nation of one religion, one language, and one people.[53] The Christian empire had been hugely victorious by increasing its population with millions of additional subjects but, on the flip side, from this time onward Ethiopia was a pluralistic society, characterized by a wide variety of ethnic, religious, cultural, social, and historical perspectives. With the expansion of the empire and its population, a struggle ensued between the invaders trying to impose a new identity on the new subjects, and those subjects fighting to retain their original identity. Religion was one aspect of this struggle with the Orthodox faith being forced on the invaded people often giving rise to bitter resentment. In view of the long history of close connections between the monolithic Orthodox Church and the political rulers, it has been difficult for the church to accept the diverse and pluralistic society that resulted

---

[52] For instance, Tolo (1998:87, 266, 124), who studied the religio-political dynamic between the Orthodox Amhara and one of the Southern indigenous people in Ethiopia, noted that the Sidama people had "the impression that their masters did not consider them worthy of becoming members of the EOC" when they occupied them. Rather, "they were humiliated and considered lower than other people." However, after all this, they "were ordered to be baptized. Soldiers were involved in the implementation of the order that came from the government." However, in many cases, the forceful conversion and the association of the EOTC with the "invading" rulers resulted in a negative reaction. Malbaa (1988:22) writes: "the Islamic religion spread in Oromia as a reaction to the Ethiopian colonization. The Oromo accepted Islam and non-Orthodox Christianity [i.e. Evangelical Christianity] en-masse because they identified Abyssinian Orthodox Christianity with the oppressor and also to assert their identity visa-a-vis Abyssinians."
[53] Even if Menelik II followed the principle of forcing the new subjects in the entire territory by the sword to convert to Orthodox Christianity, he showed more diplomacy and tolerance for other religions in some parts of the country. Both the forced conversions and his moments of tolerance were strongly politically motivated with the aim to keep his power and the unity of his "Greater Ethiopia". For a discussion on the dynamics of centre and periphery in the newly extended Ethiopia of Emperor Menelik II, see Eide 2000:15-22.

from Menelik's conquests.[54] It has been equally difficult for the invaded people to be entirely subjected to a new identity bringing with it a very different way of life. The political and ethno-religious aspects of daily life during this period would later have a negative influence on the ecumenical dialogue.[55] In fact, they served as breeding grounds of conflict and animosity among various peoples and religious groups in Ethiopia.[56]

The five years of the Italian invasion and occupation of Ethiopia from 1936-1941, albeit of limited length, had a lasting impact on the already volatile ethno-religious problems in modern Ethiopia. On the one hand, the Italian Roman Catholic Church supported - and blessed on occasion - the invasion of the Fascists as a way of expanding a Catholicism of the Roman kind.[57] From a religious point of view, this period was used as an intensive attempt to catholicize the EOTC, but the result was that the gap between the two churches was further widened. This contributed to the very negative reaction of the EOTC when confronted with demands for ecumenical tolerance.[58]

---

[54] To be affirmed by Haile Mariam Larebo (1988:379) later on, for instance, Markakis (1974:32) shows that documents of the EOTC regularly portraying "the wars of national conquest as a struggle between good and evil, light and darkness, attributing its victories to the might of God, while describing the enemy as being guided by Satan."

[55] The dynamics of centre and periphery since the time of Menelik II between the ruling Amhara elites at the centre and the other ethnic groups located in the western and southern part of the country at the periphery, and the tension and the struggle between these two groups, is critically discussed in Eide's PhD study. He discussed it in three categories where all of them have clear political implications and hence he categorized them as socio-political, ethno-political, and religio-political dynamics (Eide 2000:15-22).

[56] For a detailed discussion on the history and its multi-dimensional and lasting effect of Menelik II's expansion to the western, southern and eastern parts of today's Ethiopia and its making, see Teshale Tibebu 1995, esp. pp. 37-52. In the summary of his discussion on the expansion and victories of Menelik, Teshale (1995:48f.) writes: "With the triple victory over Muslim Egypt, Catholic Italy, and the 'pagan' and Muslim South in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, a new era began in Ethiopian history, that of modern Ethiopia. The 'Conquering Lion of the Tribe of Judah' had triumphed!" For further discussion on Menelik's expansion and invasion to the many people around him, see also Marcus 1975; Prouty 1976; Darkwah 1975.

[57] Referring to the book *The Vatican in the Age of the Dictators* by Anthony Rhodes, for instance, it is reported that: "In his Pastoral Letter of the 19th October [1935], the Bishop of Udine [Italy] wrote, 'It is neither timely nor fitting for us to pronounce on the rights and wrongs of the case. Our duty as Italians, and still more as Christians is to contribute to the success of our arms.' The Bishop of Padua wrote on the 21st October, 'In the difficult hours through which we are passing, we ask you to have faith in our statesmen and armed forces.' On the 24th October, the Bishop of Cremona consecrated a number of regimental flags and said: 'The blessing of God be upon these soldiers who, on African soil, will conquer new and fertile lands for the Italian genius, thereby bringing to them Roman and Christian culture. May Italy stand once again as the Christian mentor to the whole world'" (*New World Encyclopedia* [2014]).

[58] An Ethiopian Catholic theologian and researcher, Petros S. Berga, expressed the historical animosity between the EOTC and the Catholic Church as one of the major factors to hinder ecumenical relationship between the two churches. Petros (2006:108) clearly summarizes the problem: "Ethiopian Orthodox sources mentioned the blood

The Italians however did not only attempt to Catholicize the new "colony", but also encouraged ethnic groups that did not adhere to Christian religions to try and flourish in their own right and to resist the Orthodox and Amhara influence. It is maintained that

> … the Italians showed favouritism to non-Christian ethnicities such as the Oromos, the Somalis, and other Muslims (many of whom had supported the Italian invasion). In an attempt to isolate the dominant Amhara rulers of Ethiopia, who supported Haile Selassie I, the Italians granted the Oromos, the Somalis, and other Muslims, autonomy and rights (Anonymous [2014]).[59]

This strengthened the tendency in Ethiopia to equate religious identity with ethnic identity.

As concerns the Evangelicals, their very isolated missionary endeavours were halted by the invaders. The results of this Italian interference were twofold. Firstly, the relatively few emerging Evangelical believers were persecuted, although to a lesser degree than Orthodox followers, and they were encouraged to give up their faith. Secondly however, this very persecution strengthened their faith and gave them the courage to resist in the absence of their missionary leaders. Therefore the Italian occupation was for the Evangelicals a historic period when many of them established their identity as indigenous Ethiopian Evangelicals.[60]

---

shed by the Portuguese attempt at imposing Catholicism, and the alleged cooperation of Catholic missionaries (Massaja) with the Italian forces combating the Emperor Menelik. The murder of two Orthodox archbishops and numerous monks and faithful by Mussolini's guns which had reportedly been 'blessed by the Vatican Pope' reopened old wounds." Petros further refers to a claim by an Orthodox writer, Dejene Sheferaw (1997:10), saying that "a Catholic invasion aimed at destroying the Ethiopian identity", as a threat for any ecumenical engagement.

[59] That the Italians used a divide and rule system during their five years of Ethiopian occupation towards the Amharas, the Oromos and the Muslims is well-documented. For a discussion on this, see Alberto Sbacchi 1985:157-166. See also Marcus (1994:149f.) where he summarized both the figures of the casualties and magnitude of the severity. "Altogether as many as ten thousand people died, not a large figure by World War II standards but enough to reveal the Italians as murderous racists. When, a few months later, European-officered Muslim Somali troops went to the Debre Libanos and massacred monks and deacons …, Christian Ethiopia recoiled in horror."

[60] That the Evangelicals in Ethiopia have revived and grew significantly during the Italian occupation is discussed in detailed by Staffan Grenstedt (2000) in his PhD studies. Grenstedt (2000:64-67) identifies at least three factors for such growth. These include (1) what he calls the "African Factor" where "Africans were the real missionaries of Africa" (p.64). (For a discussion in support of this theory see also Sundkler 1987:75ff.; 2000:2f.; Walls and Bediako 1995:204f.; Balisky 1997.) (2) "The indigenous dynamics" which includes both in leadership style (p.65) and ways of worship (p.66). (3) Reaction to the forceful approach of the EOTC and the Italians where "the EOC was regarded as primarily the church of the Amhara occupants and the Catholic Church as the church of the Italian occupiers" (p.65).

After the defeat of Italy, Ethiopia presented it with a bill for damages inflicted in the course of the invasion and occupation including the loss of 2,000 churches (ገጉርጊዮስ 1974:77; Barker 1971:129). Furthermore the brutal murder of many Orthodox clergy and laity by the Italians as the EOTC in its position as state church had been at the center of the war. The result was that both the defeat of Ethiopia at the beginning of the war and the final victory were considered as the defeat and victory of not only the nation but also the church.[61]

Thus, also in this brief period, religious institutions found themselves once again in antagonistic positions, as losers or winners. After independence was restored, the EOTC reclaimed its powerful position as state church. Since their missionaries had been chased away by the Italian forces, Evangelicals were seen, at least, as neutral or non-enemies in the new religious status quo. This may have had some impact on the shift that took place under the Emperor, Haile Sellassie I who showed greater openness to the west and introduced various reforms. As a twentieth century state, Haile Sellassie's Ethiopia was torn apart by two worldviews, the one traditional/indigenous and the other modern/western. Haile Selassie was a capable leader who took account of both worldviews and who consolidated the traditional way of using the church for political purposes while at the same time introducing modern institutions in a fashion that reinforced his power.[62] He tried to show himself as a pious traditional emperor *par excellence* as well as a modern liberator of his people by initiating a new era and a modernized Ethiopia.

As a modern head of state, Haile Sellassie introduced the first ever constitution in Ethiopia whereby the perpetuation of the Solomonic dynasty was constitutionally secured. The tradition of church and state functioning as two sides of the same coin was also confirmed in the constitution, but only superficially so. In actual fact, the Emperor used the constitution to

---

[61] An EOTC bishop and historian, አባ ገጉርጊዮስ (1974:76-79) explains the level of the atrocities on the EOTC by the Italian fascists; the cooperation, support and blessing of the Vatican, including the Pope, the clergy, and the laity, to the occupation; and the intention of the Catholic Church to systematically destroy the EOTC by supporting and strengthening the Muslims. He further explains the brevity of the EOTC clergy and the laity who gave their lives both for religion and the nation.
[62] Some scholars, including Paul B. Henze (2000), argue that it was this short-sighted approach, intending to keep all power to himself that finally caused his total collapse without any possibility for the continuation of his extremely hailed and sacred lineage.

guarantee absolute monarchical[63] rule by significantly reducing the Church's power, bringing the relative power balance between church and state effectively to an end (Gebru 1991:46).

It is, in fact, not only the imperial constitution that put the Empire in an overall superior position, both in court and in church, but the EOTC's own hierarchical system confirms the superiority of the Emperor. On the one hand, the 1955 constitution requires of the Emperor to be the defender of the faith. On the other hand, the EOTC itself considers Orthodoxy as the only official Church of Ethiopia and the Emperor as defender of its faith.[64] As a result, it is strongly held that the EOTC "has always been the official Church of Ethiopia, and has been supported and protected by the Emperors of Ethiopia. All important nominations within the Church are subject to the approval of the Emperor, who is acknowledged as the 'Defender of Faith'" (Matthew 1970:59).

In addition, Haile Sellassie I strengthened the existing situation of grounding the power of both institutions, church and state, on what was the economic basis of Ethiopia, namely land.[65] Traditionally, the Church owned one third of the country's territory, providing it   with a significant amount of wealth. As a result, the Church's attitude as regards the state was on the whole static and supportive of the status quo (Gilkes 1975:19). By many non-Orthodox ethno-religious groups in Ethiopia this church-state relationship was considered as an alliance maintained to oppress and exploit others. This view contributed to a negative perception of the Orthodox and a significant amount of resistance against the EOTC.

However, once the Emperor had secured his supremacy over all Ethiopian institutions, he took over some of the powers of decision of the church and this marked the beginning of the removal of the church's influence on major government affairs, significantly changing the

---

[63] For a strong argument on Haile Sellassie's unique attempt to build an absolute monarchy, very different from his predecessors, see Gebru Tarreke 1991:42-54.

[64] For some extracts of the Emperor's speeches, when formally accepting the title "Defender of the Faith", strongly emphasizing the divine origin of his throne, see Forslund 1993:29, 30, 34.

[65] Gilkes (1975:20) comments that the imperial system of Haile Sellassie was mainly grounded on the economic base of the country, its land, rather than on his Solomonic lineage and the Church's support. He says: "The real practical strength of the system lay not in the mystique of the House of Solomon nor in the religious sanctions of the Church, important though they were. It lay in control of the economic base of the Empire—land."

place of the church. Mulatu and Yohannis (1988:18) describe the emperor's programmatic

concentration of power in his own person as follows:

> The emperor enjoyed supreme authority under the constitution, which formalized his position vis-à-vis the church and the traditional nobilities. But to further his policy of centralization and modernization, he had to cultivate the support of both these groups. The church, as the custodian of Ethiopian Christian tradition and as one of the prominent landowners, constituted a formidable power. The emperor was fully aware of the traditional powers of the church; it had previously brought down emperors who were inimical to its interest or who professed religions other than Orthodox Christianity. He successfully curbed its power by introducing administrative reforms that limited the church's authority to tax church lands; he abolished the temporal jurisdiction of the church courts and placed the operation of the church under government supervision.[66]

While he reduced the authority of the EOTC little by little and drew its power to himself as

the "real Father of the Church", the emperor also allowed relative freedom and a degree of

inclusiveness for other religions in moves that were politically motivated. As a result it was

during his era more than at any other time in the history of modern Ethiopia that Protestant

missions became rooted and flourished in the southern and western parts of the country.[67] In

contrast however, his official position was still defined by the promotion and imposition of the

EOTC faith and of Amhara superiority in order to unify the country under the principle of one

religion and one language.[68] In a sense, therefore, his reign was an era of contradictions and a

foretaste of what the future would bring, namely increasing religious plurality and freedom on

the one hand, and still extreme suppression of religious and cultural identity, on the other. The

Emperor's policy would further aggravate the conflict and animosity between the established

EOTC and the emerging Evangelicals.

---

[66] However, writers including Mikael Doulos (1986:136) argue that the Emperor was a genuine reformer and the blame should go to the church and the nobilities. He witnessed that "Emperor Haile Selassie was a reformer, but his reforms were resisted by feudal landlords and a suspicious church, as well as being retarded by corrupt government officials. His long term reign from 1917 to 1974 (including years a regent) was characterised by a genuine desire to bring modern education and development to the country."

[67] For instance, one of his prominent cabinet ministers, Emmanuel Abraham, who was also appointed as ambassador to various countries, was a President of one of the Protestant churches, the Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus in Ethiopia, as it was called then. For a detailed discussion on both a relative freedom and a significant persecution of Evangelicals during Haile Sellassie's period, see Emmanuel Abraham 1995.

[68] In this connection, it is argued that "The emperor attempted to centralise authority and create a modern nation state through the promotion of Amharic as the sole language of instruction and public discourse and by placing the Ethiopian Orthodox Church at the heart of the cultural life of the multi-confessional nation" (Think Africa Press [2012]).

However, the long reign of this most powerful monarch who, much more than any of his predecessors, by using various instruments of manipulation managed to monopolize the power of both state and church, came overnight to an abrupt end, marking the collapse of power accumulated over centuries. With the Emperor's departure a new era began in which tendencies to pluralism and unison collided. But innovative ideas and new worldviews, opposed to the historical unitary and exclusivist concepts, led to greater diversity and inclusivity.

As we have seen, until the Ethiopian revolution in 1974, church and state controlled the country as two faces of the same coin, benefitting and influencing each other so that it was, to an extent, difficult to differentiate between the two. The 1974 revolution was a landmark. It changed the church-state relationship mainly for ideological reasons, and democracy would arrive only about twenty years later when it sealed the divorce of church and state with the provision of constitutional guarantees.

The new military junta, also called "the Derg", took power unexpectedly at a moment when a massive popular revolution had shaken the last Emperor of the Solomonic dynasty. Military forces took power, overthrowing the Christian Empire once and for all. After the military had taken power, they declared the popular revolt to be a socialist revolution and subsequently associated themselves with communist countries, subscribing to the communist ideology of suppressing religion altogether. Under the cover of socialist ideology, the early rule of the Derg was characterized by extensive bloodshed and by persecution, mainly of young people and including religious persecution mostly targeting Protestants.

Although most top leaders of the Derg regime came from an Orthodox background, they confessed themselves to be Marxist-Leninists in order to consolidate their power. Like all other religious groups, the Orthodox Church suffered severe persecution by the regime or, in other words, by people who came from the very same Orthodox background. Its Patriarch, Abuna Theophilus, was murdered in July 1979, together with the Rev. Gudina Tumsa, the General Secretary of the Ethiopian Evangelical (Lutheran) Church Mekane Yesus, by the military dictator, Mengistu Haile Mariam (Eide 2000:33, 178).

It was a period of unprecedented developments. Church and state went their own way. The EOTC lost its dominant position as a state religion and could no longer impose its will on other and emerging religious groups as it had done in earlier periods of the country's history. The huge shift in the relations of church and state did not fail to impact on the country. For example, as all churches were persecuted by the communist regime, there was for the first time a kind of empathy and a sense of unity among them. The government, in order to protect its power base, nominated puppet leaders at various levels of the Church, even if church and state were officially divorced. The sense of being equal in the face of severe communist persecution encouraged religious groups, other than Orthodox, to expand to some degree and claim a national identity for themselves. Paradoxically, although this was a period when religious groups were, at best, under strict state control (EOTC and Islam) or, at worst, severely persecuted (especially Protestants), many denominations and religious groups managed to grow and develop profoundly in reaction to the situation. Even the EOTC, despite the strong reduction of its political power and the loss of other benefits, acknowledges the significance of its relative separation from the state, especially because it stimulated the revitalization of its prophetic identity as a church.

In broader terms, two major aspects of religion in Ethiopia stood out during the era of the Derg. Firstly, it was in this period that for the first time it was decreed that, at least theoretically, religion and state were separate entities and that all religions were equal. The practical separation of the state and the EOTC however remained superficial. Socialism's purported philosophy of the equality of all human beings conscientized the followers of various religious groups as regards their equal rights. Secondly, never before in Ethiopian history had religious persecution been this severe and especially targeted were the Evangelicals.[69] Thousands of their members were kept under arrest for years. Many of them were tortured, many were murdered and hundreds of churches were closed. A massive amount of properties of various denominations was confiscated. Evangelical believers were treated as less than second-class citizens. The extreme brutality of the persecution created however a

---

[69] Øyvind Eide (2000:200-206) discussed in detail two major categories of the allegations as why to the religious persecution during the Derg regime (1974-1991) was particularly severe against the Evangelicals. While the first allegation is the purported alien-ness of the faith, the second is its political content.

sense of immense spiritual strength and the faithful persevered in fighting back with spiritual means. While trauma caused by the government and the resulting hatred of the regime were continuously on the increase, believers organized themselves systematically in cells and the growth of Evangelical churches, both in number and depth, was tremendous. Honesty, integrity, perseverance, diligence, and good morale were values that were generally associated with the Evangelicals of this period and these qualities were perceived both externally and internally. Even if the EOTC itself suffered a lot under the military regime, it supported the persecution of the Evangelicals, so that the two church groups continued to see each other as enemies.[70] The result was that an official attempt to organize an Ecumenical Council among all churches in Ethiopia during the first years of socialism, in response to its atheistic ideology, failed.[71]

After the Derg regime was overthrown in 1991, a new constitution was drafted and endorsed in a referendum held in 1995 by a transitional government (*Ethiopian Constitution* 1995). With the replacement of the communist dictatorial rule by a constitutional democracy, a new

---

[70] Tibebe Eshete (2009) discussed in detail the cooperation of the EOTC with the communist regime in persecuting the Evangelicals. In addition to the existing culturally and theologically oriented persecution by the EOTC and the Imperial regimes, the Derg added a political implication for the severe persecution against the Evangelicals. Tibebe (2009:217) writes, "Unlike other references to evangelicals, such as *tsere Mariam* [anti-Mary] and *Pente* ['Pentecostal in a derogatory sense'], which mainly signified cultural or theological orientation, the term *Mete* [new-comer or alien] was politically loaded concept, purposely chosen. *Mete* was used deliberately as an exclusionary tool targeting the evangelicals for the perpetration of isolated attacks." In regard to the initiation and collaboration of the EOTC with the Derg regime in persecuting the Evangelicals, Tibebe (2009:222) further narrates some historical events: "In 1978, a high-level delegation consisting of members of the Orthodox clergy and professionals from different sectors of the society made a plea to Mengistu [the then leader of the regime] that the government should take serious action towards the *Pentes* because they represented a dangerous threat to the nation and the revolution. A high-level committee was set up to inquire about the *Pentes* and present a report. The committee led by Fikre Sellassie, a Derg member and close ally of Mengistu, concluded that the *Pentes* had no economic and cultural significance to the nation, and stressed the fact that the *Pentes* were devoid of national patriotism, as they pursued religious beliefs inspired by foreigners. Their purported connection with the Western world was an issue that the report brought up as something dangerous. In the end, the committee recommended that ways had to be sought to eradicate the religion from Ethiopia. Accordingly, the Derg took the committee's report seriously and adopted a position of systematically rooting out the evangelical faith."

[71] A prayer meeting by a few concerned church leaders and individuals in 1974 ended up becoming an official ecumenical council in Ethiopia on October 2, 1976, under a name the Council for the Cooperation of Churches in Ethiopia (CCCE). Not far long, however, as the EOTC, followed by the Catholic Church, withdrew from the CCCE, so that those early attempts to establish an all-inclusive ecumenical movement became a failure. As it was only Evangelicals remained, it paved the way for different Evangelical churches to come together and form a fellowship, an umbrella institution (Evangelical Churches' Fellowship in Ethiopia (ECFE)) that played an important role in creating an atmosphere of unity among them. For a discussion on the earlier attempt to form an ecumenical council in Ethiopia, see Tibebe 2009:223-230; Debela Birri 2003:132-146; Eide 2000:127-128.

and brighter era dawned for Ethiopia. The constitution, from the very beginning of its Preamble, strongly emphasizes the equality of all inhabitants by stating: "Firmly convinced …, to live together on the basis of equality and without any sexual, religious or cultural discrimination" (*Ethiopian Constitution* 1995). In addition, the constitution clearly states the separation between state and religion. Article 11 of the constitution decrees three issues: "1. State and religion are separate. 2. There shall be no state religion. 3. The state shall not interfere in religious matters and religion shall not interfere in state affairs" (*Ethiopian Constitution* 1995: article 11).

Naturally, one would expect that such weighty changes, introduced within a short period of time, would pose challenges and would be difficult to bring into practice. It demands the commitment and full awareness of all parties. With some limitations in the implementation of laws, the principled commitment of the government has been impressive. The new Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia is federated on the basis of ethnic identity where the regional states are formed based on ethnic lines.[72] Religious identity plays only a secondary role and this has, at least in the first decade of the current dispensation, lessened religious tensions. In the meantime, given the constitutional right of religious equality, competition among different religions has caused several major and minor conflicts, claiming some lives and leading to the destruction of churches and mosques in various parts of the country.[73]

From the practical point of view, the constitutional changes affect mainly the status of the EOTC. Considering the many challenges, it is highly commendable that the Church has reshaped its structure and survived the turbulence of the last two decades. In this period the

---

[72] For instance, seven of the nine regional states are named after the ethnic group of the region: Tigray, Afar, Amhara, Oromia, Somale, Harari, Benshangul and Gumuz. Among the remaining two, Southern People Nations and Nationalities Region is further divided in to zones based on different ethnic groups. As clearly stated in the preamble of the constitution of the Ethiopian Federal Democratic Republic, the federation is that of the ethnic groups in the nation.

[73] Among many, one of the severest and deadliest incidents which won wide media coverage was the 2011 incident in the south-western part of the country, where Muslims burned down many churches and murdered a number of Christians. One of the media outlets recorded the incident as follows: "Muslims in Ethiopia have torched 69 Christian churches, a Bible school and an orphanage –in less than one month. Not content with this alone, at least two Christians have been murdered simply because they were Christian. As the 'machete-wielding' Muslims warned that more killings would be coming, thousands of Christians have fled in fear. Ethiopian Christians, who have been dominant in their country since the 4th century, are in a state of crisis due to the 'religious hatred and violence' of their Muslim neighbours" (Lisa Graas 2011).

Church grew in many respects. It especially was successful in its efforts to inspire the youth to be self-assertive and to strongly identify with the faith, as opposed to the former tendency of nominal membership.[74] Striving in a deeply Christian, humble way of an exemplary life, in a broader context, the EOTC witnessed its readiness to live in this country side by side with other religious groups in harmony and mutual respect. With its rich history and immeasurably rich legacy, the contribution of the Church to the building of the nation remains prominent.

In conclusion, political shifts and rifts have played a major role in the way Orthodox and Evangelicals relate to one another. As compared to the stable and static connection of Church and state in Ethiopia over a period of sixteen hundred years, the rapid changes in geo-politics and in the ethno-religious landscape in the last hundred years have been very dramatic and far-reaching. Among the changes are two major shifts that affected the ecumenical discourse among Ethiopian churches. Firstly, there has been a struggle between two forces. There are those – with the EOTC at its centre – who want a unitary nationalistic Ethiopia based on the century-old Abyssinian Empire. And there is a second movement of those who have more recently been included in the new empire bringing their own identity and who have fought hard to preserve and revitalize their values in the face of persecution. The last movement led to a shift from a unitary socio-religious and ethno-political identity to a broader based pluralistic social structure. In the process, the EOTC changed from being the single and exclusive state religion and from being the national symbol of that unity, to become only one of many religions in a country where more than half of the population is non-Orthodox. These are the realities that younger generations need to take into account when it comes to creating a future of ecumenical fellowship in Ethiopia.

The political ferment of the last century led to increased antagonism between various religious groups. The different sides have their own story to tell to justify the claim that they were victims of others. Politicians abused their power and added to the animosity between religious groups for political gain. The last hundred years of Ethiopian politics have not been free from such occurrences. It is such external factors, much more than the internal causes we discussed

---

[74] For a discussion on the increasing self-assertion of the youth in the EOTC and its key players, see Chaillot 2002:64-70.

earlier, that played a negative role by provoking hostility between churches. However, as time goes by, and all parties develop a clearer view of past and present, it becomes more and more appropriate to build bridges for reconciliation and ecumenical fellowship. But before we come to a final conclusion there is one more factor to be dealt with to which we now turn.

8.3.5 Missionary Factors

Unlike the factors we have touched on above, the missionary aspect has already been the subject of discussions at a credible scholarly level. In 1996 a symposium has taken place at Lund University in Sweden on the impact of European missions in Ethiopian society where Orthodox, Catholic, and Evangelical scholars from Ethiopia took part in a dialogue with scholars from the west.[75] Even if the overall discussion of the symposium focused mainly on the general mission impact, its specific effect on ecumenism was at the heart of the dialogue.

The symposium provided two points of importance for the purpose of this study. From the Orthodox perspective, it was frankly stated that western missionary work in Ethiopia had been detrimental to the unity of the church and, as such, was not accepted. For instance, Getachew Haile (1998:1), one of the presenters from the Orthodox Church, began his paper by quoting a missionary dream: "*I dream that I destroyed the previous Church and I saw a new Church being built.*" In a broad sense, the entire activity of evangelizing the evangelized, which is considered as proselytizing, means that missionaries created rifts in existing churches, breaking up faith communities and causing brothers and sisters in faith to leave one church for another. The process of course also affected the power of the EOTC. Getachew (1998:6) stated that it amounted to provoking the EOTC into declaring war on the missionaries and their followers. Taddesse Tamrat (1998:30) added that mistrust had been a lasting effect of the missionary activities and that "[e]ssentially the sore feelings inflicted in those early days do not seem to have healed."

---

[75] Among thirteen speakers at the symposium, seven were European scholars and missionaries, while five were Ethiopian nationals (two from the Orthodox, two Catholics and one Evangelical) and there was an Eritrean Catholic. The papers were later published in 1998 in book form, edited by Getachew Haile, Ausulve Lande, and Samuel Rubenson, under the title *The Missionary Factor in Ethiopia: Papers from a Symposium on the Impact of European Missions on Ethiopian society, Lund University, August 1996*.

310

Another point emerging from the frank discussions between Orthodox, Catholics and Evangelicals during the Lund symposium was the Evangelicals' complaint that they have been constantly misunderstood and mistreated by the Orthodox, because at the earliest stages of the Evangelical movement there had been no intention to establish new denominations. Instead their vision had been to continue working within the EOTC and to bring the good news to non-Christians living on the periphery of Ethiopia, including the groups added to the new empire by Menelik II. The Evangelicals also described their contributions to the making of modern Ethiopia, for example in the fields of modern education, health care and economic development.

The most important point to come out of this conference, in my view is the fact that both sides related cases and stories from their own perspective and that they agreed to listen to each other. Both sides presented arguments that were valid. More than that, the discussion led to crucial new questions such as how to go about the relationship between EOTC and Evangelicals in the future. In response to the discussion some Evangelicals for example asked: "Should the EOTC continue to be 'a mission field' for the Evangelicals?" As this was a major reason for the rift between the two church groups, the Evangelicals should consider this question seriously and speedily.[76] In the meantime, the EOTC ought to openly question itself whether it can finally acknowledge Evangelicals as fully and equally Ethiopian. The most important point to come out of the Lund meeting is that both sides can learn from mistakes made in history and be open and willing to correct these for the cause of Christ and the common good.

In conclusion, under sub section §8.3, we have been dealing with factors that are perceived as having played a role in dividing the EOTC and Ethiopian Evangelicals in particular, and all

---

[76] One of the major reasons for Evangelicals to consider the EOTC as "a mission field" is their assumption that the saving Gospel of Jesus Christ is not adequately preached which would result in a failure of appropriate faith in Jesus Christ. However, one of the major changes both structural and functional within the EOTC in recent years has been its revitalization of mission and Gospel preaching. The introduction of the eleventh hour Gospel preaching and opening Gospel and Apostolic Mission as a Department at a higher level of the Church's structure, which has been further introduced to lowest levels of its structure are clear measures the Church has taken to address the question at stake. This has been strengthened from time to time in so many different ways. For a discussion on these developments and changes in the Church, especially in the last couple of decades, see በላይ ተገኝ 2007:30-34.

church groups in Ethiopia in general. As a result we may conclude that, on the whole, it is political and practical issues that have provoked and aggravated conflict and enmity by exaggerating relatively small doctrinal and biblical differences. With openness and willingness from both sides to understand the root causes of the divide, these causes will be recognized as external ones that can be overcome. If all sides give due attention to their own central teachings and values, based on biblical standards such as reconciliation, forgiveness, ecumenism, fellowship and unity for the sake of the body of Christ, the differences will become less weighty and, ultimately, turn out to be negligible. It is against this background that we make some comments as regards the future of ecumenism among Ethiopian churches.

8.4 The Future of Ecumenism in Ethiopian Churches

As a culmination of the chapter and the entire thesis, conclusions and recommendations are presented here, concerning the future of ecumenical relations between all churches in Ethiopia in general and between the Orthodox and Evangelicals in particular. The discussion in this section is based on conclusions we have reached in the course of this study while we also take a closer critical look at the opinions of the twenty-eight interviewees who have all actively responded to concerns raised by the present researcher.

8.4.1 Findings and Conclusions Related to Ecumenism

A clearer insight into the fluidity and plurality of meanings in key theological and biblical terminologies and the way in which they are employed in different traditions and contexts, could have an immense effect on the prevention of misunderstandings between different church groups.[77] In addition, there are always common denominators in the churches' diverse frameworks that offer hope for conducting a fruitful dialogue and finding common ground. Therefore, an awareness of such terminological diversity that in the past may have created divides and even been misused in order to purposely separate churches could open new opportunities for discussions that can lead to a better understanding of one another.

---

[77] This is the main focus of chapter three of this study.

This study argues that both the Letter of Jude and the EOTC recognize the scriptural authority of *1 Enoch*. This puts the Ethiopian Evangelicals in a very challenging position as they too accept Jude as canonical Scripture while in the general Ethiopian context the influence of *1 Enoch* is evident. In other words, both Jude and the Ethiopian context could function as bridges between the two church groups and might be a reason for the Ethiopian Evangelicals to re-evaluate their attitude to *1 Enoch* and other STL. As these differences have caused division in the past, they may now be reconsidered and lead to a new appreciation of one another for mutual benefit. If closely studied, both *1 Enoch* and other related literary works could be highly relevant to the Ethiopian Evangelicals both for promoting a closer relationship with the EOTC and for the sake of the intrinsic worth of the books. When it comes to issues of "canon" of the Scriptures, which is one of the central points of this study, there are undeniable differences between Orthodox and Evangelicals as regards both the concept and the size of the "canon". The positions have generally been perceived as irreconcilable and, consequently, as the main obstacle for any kind of relationship and ecumenism. The present researcher however argues that, from a biblical point of view, what they have in common outweighs their differences. Moreover, in most cases, the differences are very superficial. They seem more important than they are because of external factors. Therefore the Scriptures in the Ethiopian context could play a uniting rather than a divisive role.

Politics and missionaries were the main forces that aggravated the enmity between the EOTC and the Ethiopian Evangelicals. In spite of their many contributions to the forging of a new Ethiopian identity, the role of both politics and the missionaries in provoking and widening the gap between the two church groups is apparent and undeniable. We have seen that each political episode in the last hundred years played its own significant role in the shaping of what Ethiopia is today, a country of plurality and diversity, while the centuries long Church-state relationship that decisively hindered any kind of ecumenical association between Ethiopian churches, has been modified. All these are today becoming facts from history and the realities on the ground are changing.

Therefore, if there is greater awareness and understanding that the main causes for conflict and animosity between Orthodox and Evangelicals in Ethiopia were of non-essential and, by now, historical nature, the creation of an ecumenical relationship entailing cooperation for

mutual benefit is not only achievable but timely and indispensable. Ecumenism is achievable because both church groups will realize how much they have in common. It is timely because the need to serve the nation together, moving it forward is a responsibility shared by all. And finally ecumenism is indispensable because all churches sincerely confess and preach that they belong to Christ and live for the cause of the Gospel. The ultimate Head of the Church, Christ, is calling for unity of spirit and fellowship of the body.

8.4.2 Orthodox and Evangelical Interviewees on Ecumenism

The qualitative analysis of interviews with twenty-eight interviewees, fourteen from each church group, is that by and large they were categorically of the same opinion, albeit based on different lines of arguments. As ecumenism came up in the final part of the interview, the interviewees were in a sense wrapping up earlier statements and offering conclusions based on what they know, believe and have experienced. While all interviewees were asked to comment on the future of ecumenism in Ethiopia, supporting their statement with concrete reasons, Evangelicals were invited to add their thoughts on the legacy of the EOTC and to reflect on what they retained from the EOTC background in relation to the question of ecumenism. Before final conclusions are drawn, responses are categorized in three groups: EOTC interviewees speaking on the future of ecumenism in Ethiopia, Evangelical interviewees giving their view on the same subject, and the opinion of Evangelical interviewees on the EOTC legacy.

8.4.2.1 EOTC Interviewees on the Future of Ecumenism in Ethiopia

All EOTC interviewees agreed that ecumenism among Ethiopian churches in the future is important even if they differ among themselves on its possibility. Some argued that it is both crucial and possible as what they have in common exceeds that what keeps them apart. Some argued the two church groups need to work on defining a common goal and finding a common language to help them establish cooperation and love and to set aside the enmity (Mikre-Sellassie, personal communication, 15.12.2011).[78] Some commented that there are clear

---

[78] For instance, he suggests that if we respect each other and cooperate with one another, we can do anything together. We have to develop and promote a new language of cooperation and tolerance. We need to appreciate and respect the traditions of the other, which does not mean to accept it. In the meantime, we need to stop those

indications of nascent fellowship and tolerance at different levels that should be further cultivated.[79] Interviewee # 11 (personal communication, 19.12.2011) said that the times are inviting, even pressing for, ecumenism. Ethiopian churches need to move into that direction.

Interviewee # 14 (personal communication, 21.12.2011) mentioned the negative effects of periods in which conflicts were destructive and generations were destroyed.[80] However, he was optimistic about the future of Ethiopian ecumenism. There are promising signs and its coming about seems inevitable. In his opinion, cooperation between churches in Ethiopia is a matter of saving the present generation from secularism, atheism, ignorance and unbelief and an act of confession for all the evil things that have been done. Interviewee # 19 (personal communication, 23.12.2011) was convinced that the ecumenical relationship is already developing and becoming more and more visible at various levels and in different contexts. She did not doubt that unity and fellowship among the churches will be strengthened as the time demands.

Even if he did not question the need for ecumenism, interviewee # 9 was a bit worried by the practicalities of bringing it about in the near future unless both sides work with the deliberate intention to bring about attitudinal change enabling both parties to see the good in the other at

---

actions that create conflict. Things such as sheep stealing should be stopped from the Evangelicals' side and the Orthodox should cut out derogatory and hate speech, for example labeling the other as "anti-Mary". There are many unbelievers in Ethiopia and it is our mutual responsibility to reach out to them. We can do better if we cooperate in this regard. Evangelicals should help Orthodox in self renewal rather than stealing their sheep. If we cooperate and develop the spirit of love, we can do a lot in this country. We need to remember that we both are members of the WCC. This should be promoted locally as well.

[79] In this regard, interviewee # 3 (personal communication, 11.12.2011) argues that overall the last three to four decades were characterized by better relationships, at least at grassroots level. For instance, many Orthodox Christians listen to Evangelical songs and preaching on CD's and VCD's, which indicates a more positive attitude of believers towards others. At macro-level, we have the Bible and Christ in common even if there are micro-level differences between us that are easily tolerable in view of the bigger cause we have in common. Initiatives by some schools and ecumenical organizations such as the Bible Society of Ethiopia are noble and they offer good opportunities for the cooperation of different churches.

[80] Interviewee # 14 (personal communication, 21.12.2011) recalls our recent history of the 60's to 80's as decades of shameful history in Ethiopian Christianity. We developed a culture of animosity instead of love; cruelty and revenge instead of mercy and forgiveness. Families, neighbours, friends, and societies were divided among themselves and became enemies. People were stigmatized to the extent that people might refuse to bury the bodies of loved ones because of their denominational affiliation. This animosity and hatred resulted in extreme poverty and misery, backwardness in thinking and condemnation of one another in what was a totally chaotic situation. We ended up raising a generation that does not fear the Lord nor love its neighbour. This generation knows no compromise and tolerance.

the midst of a still deep rivalry. If the willingness is there on both sides, they could see much to appreciate in each other and suggest practical changes (interviewee # 9, personal communication, 19.12.2011).[81] Then, according to interviewee # 9, it will be possible to build on what the churches have in common and to focus on those common points rather than on what divides them (interviewee # 9, personal communication, 19.12.2011). Interviewee # 10 (personal communication, 19.12.2011) had some concerns as regards the sincerity of the eventual implementation of ecumenical cooperation, even if ecumenism is needed. Interviewee # 13 (personal communication, 20.12.2011) and interviewee # 16 (personal communication, 21.12.2011) mentioned that differences are very common, even within one and the same denomination, and that the problem is lack of understanding. Thus, they concluded, we can have fellowship based on what unites us instead of remaining separated on the basis of disagreements.

Interviewee # 12 (personal communication, 19.12.2011) strongly emphasized the need for ecumenism. He noted that denominational division is not ideal Christianity whereas ecumenical cooperation is. However, he thought that the divide between the two church groups is very deep and should not be taken lightly. Bridging the divide requires a lot of work, commitment and tolerance.[82] Furthermore, he felt that the fragmented nature of the Evangelicals may frustrate dialogue between the churches. He feared that it would be difficult for the Evangelicals to speak with one voice (interviewee # 11, personal communication, 19.12.2011). Also interviewee # 4 (personal communication, 16.12.2011) commented that

---

[81] Interviewee # 9 (personal communication, 19.12.2011) further suggests that the deeper problem from the EOTC's perspective is sheep stealing by Evangelicals that should be stopped. Instead, he argues, Evangelicals should be grateful to the EOTC for the long tradition and preservation of Christianity in Ethiopia, while the EOTC should acknowledge the positive impact of the Evangelicals in revitalizing the preaching of the Word in the church. It is only since the coming of the Evangelicals that the tradition of daily preaching from the Scriptures or assembly ጉባኤ (guba'e) at 17hr in every church of the EOTC was established. This has led to a greater awareness of the Scriptures among Orthodox believers, interviewee # 9 commented.

[82] Interviewee # 12 Ashebir (personal communication, 19.12.2011) further suggested that to achieve a better ecumenical atmosphere, we need to recognize the deeper levels of our differences as a simplistic approach won't take us anywhere. This would create more tolerance and openness for learning. A lot of work and tolerance was demanded from both sides including objective study. Common workshops would be a good beginning. Even if we may not agree in everything, we can narrow the gap separating us and be more tolerant of our differences.

there still exists considerable animosity between the EOTC and the Evangelicals. In spite of this he also emphasized the absolute need to establish ecumenism in Ethiopia.[83]

Interviewee # 24 (personal communication, 27.12.2011) on the other hand argued that the differences between the two church groups are created by our sinful human nature while our unity in Christ is absolute and as Christians we cannot deny it. In his view all faithful Ethiopians should take the blame for damaging Christian unity in many ways because all are children of God and Jesus died for all. Therefore, he proposed that primarily leaders should accept the responsibility for restoring unity and taking it seriously. The public will then follow. The present approach to religion should be reversed in order to promote love, unity, and peace instead of hatred, fighting, and animosity.

It was interviewee # 22 (personal communication, 21.12.2011) however who, convincingly and based on solid reasoning, proclaimed the inevitability of ecumenism in the current Ethiopian context. He argued:

> As we all believe in Jesus Christ, I cannot see anything else that would have the power to unite us. We all are branches on the same tree, Jesus Christ. So, how can we afford not to be united? In the present Ethiopian context, unity of churches is indispensable for the continued existence of each church. We live in a very dangerous era. If we don't unite, we will perish as the external challenges are increasingly threatening. So, we must avoid emphasizing our minor differences and strengthen our unity. That is the only choice if we want to overcome the challenges of the day. The challenges faced by the present generation are the tendency to unbelief as a result of modern thinking and worldviews, and the attraction of other religions. The fighting of churches among themselves and their failure to maintain a robust fellowship with each other paves the way and encourages those who are on the verge of leaving the church.

 The EOTC interviewees, therefore, boldly argued for the establishment of ecumenism in Ethiopia. Small reservations were related to doubt about practicalities, given the deep rooted animosity between the EOTC and the Evangelicals. Some were of the opinion that ecumenical

---

[83] Interviewee # 4, (personal communication, 16.12.2011), in addition, argued that we need each other. We should not fail seeing the truth in each other. We need to learn about each other without feelings of superiority or inferiority and without being judgmental, but keeping in mind that we are called for one and the same mission—expanding the kingdom of God.

cooperation had already begun and that it only needed to be cultivated in order to become a solid principle and reach maturity.

8.4.2.2 Evangelical Interviewees on the Legacy of the EOTC

Before we discuss the Evangelical interviewees' arguments concerning ecumenism, we want to consider their views on what they think they have, directly or indirectly, inherited from the EOTC. They mentioned various elements but there was a very strong consensus on specific things which they claimed that Evangelicals could honestly attribute to their Orthodox background.

For good or for bad, what Evangelicals inherited from Orthodoxy was, according to interviewee # 2 (personal communication, 11.12.2011), the severely dogmatic nature of their faith and a tendency to be suspicious of any kind of change.[84] Interviewee # 7 (personal communication, 17.12.2011) subtly affirmed this statement by stressing its negative implication. She argued that Evangelicals have inherited the Orthodox inflexibility concerning whatever they have received from their predecessors, accepting their words as the only, total and unchangeable truth. That is how closed the Evangelicals are and how averse to change. The tendency to an extremely exclusivist stance among Evangelicals would be another direct influence of the EOTC, while also the "Ethiopianness" of the Evangelicals is largely shaped by Orthodoxy.

Interviewee # 6 (personal communication, 17.12.2011) believed, on a more positive note, that also the social and theological values of the Evangelicals are to a large extent extracted from the Orthodox. Interviewee # 8 (personal communication, 18.12.2011) added ceremonial elements such as the festival of the Finding of the True Cross and the calendar as examples of the legacy for which the Evangelicals are indebted to the EOTC. Interviewee # 15 (personal communication, 21.12.2011) added that the Evangelicals are very much obsessed with the physical symbol of the cross. They put a cross on top of huts, houses, church buildings, walls,

---

[84] interviewee # 2 (personal communication, 11.12.2011) further explained that the legacy has a positive and negative impact in our broader Christian life and in terms of ecumenism. It helped us to maintain our faith in times of severe persecution. On the other hand it closes doors to discussion and change.

on exercise books, rings, and so on. This is purely the result of our Orthodox background,[85] he claimed. Furthermore, interviewee # 15 (personal communication, 21.12.2011) listed the Evangelicals' dietary tradition,[86] their musical tradition, and the Ge'ez alphabet as part of the Orthodox legacy.

Interviewee # 18 (personal communication, 22.12.2011) provided a number of examples to prove that the concepts of ceremonial holiness and dietary laws of the EOTC are in many ways still alive among Evangelicals. She could not see any difference between Christmas or Easter celebrations in her former Orthodox family and in her present Evangelical family. The Evangelical group of respondents further noted the deep reverence and solemn mood during worship, the dietary culture (including the avoidance of pork and other meat purchased from a Muslim), the fact that some Evangelicals regularly fast on Wednesdays and Fridays, the manner in which Evangelicals go to Holy communion,[87] assuming that any church space is sacred or holy, the use of the Bible, the physical material, as a tool for healing and to provide security from dangers[88] - all these are remains of their Orthodox background and they have become part of the Evangelical sub-conscious. Most interviewees agreed that these are elements of Orthodox origin that survive among Evangelicals.[89]

---

[85] For the Orthodox's special attention to the cross in Ethiopia and its spiritual symbolism, Chaillot (2002:129) correctly witnessed that "one proclaims the faith with the symbol of the Cross which is omnipresent: around the neck, tattooed on forehead, neck, hands and arms, embroidered on clothes and other materials and objects. The Cross is profoundly venerated. The priest always holds a Cross in his hand, ready to bless people coming to kiss it and to be blessed. Large Crosses are used during liturgies and processions."

[86] For instance, interviewee # 15 (personal communication, 21.12.2011) shared that Evangelicals give much attention to holiness in their dietary rules. They avoid pork and meat from Muslims' butcheries or homes. He gave example from his missionary career in India where the cross-cultural courses couldn't change his dietary prejudice stemming from his Orthodox background.

[87] Interviewee # 18 (personal communication, 22.12.2011) noted that, based on their Orthodox background, many Evangelicals still believe the Lord's Supper should be taken with fasting. Many women refrain from the Table if they have their period while some of them won't even come to church.

[88] According to interviewee # 18 (personal communication, 22.12.2011), many Evangelicals put the Bible under their pillows, in their pockets (for the entire day), around children's beds or anywhere they feel it may prevent evil things or ward off spirits. As concerns reverence for the Bible, there is the example of a Western missionary instructor in an Ethiopian Bible school, who threw the Bible on the ground to teach his students that it was just paper and that only its contents were important. The Seminar promptly sent him away.

[89] Interviewee # 26 (personal communication, 29.12.2011), interviewee # 21 (personal communication, 27.12.2011), interviewee # 25 (personal communication, 29.12.2011), interviewee # 15 (personal communication, 21.12.2011), and interviewee # 28 (personal communication, 03.01.2012) among others stressed the sanctity of the Bible, including its physical material. Interviewee # 28 shared that he, when doing graduate and post graduate studies in the West, always felt uncomfortable when preachers on the pulpit would folded their

Interviewee # 21 (personal communication, 27.12.2011) supported what interviewee # 18 said above and added some historical and spiritual elements inherited from the EOTC.[90] Seen from a historical perspective, the EOTC is the church that preserved the nation as a Christian nation. This is the unique legacy of this church. That Ethiopians feel they belong to a Christian nation is due to Orthodoxy. In addition, interviewee # 21 commented that the Evangelical spirituality is more like the spirituality of the EOTC than like that of western Evangelicals.[91]

Interviewee # 23 (personal communication, 27.12.2011) contributed some observations on the socio-cultural heritage of the EOTC. He stated that, even if people are trying to circumvent certain customs nowadays, most of the mourning and funeral traditions resemble those of the EOTC, such as memorials on the third day, fortieth day, and after a year.

Interviewee # 25 (personal communication, 29.12.2011) opined that the EOTC legacy is of a theological and doctrinal nature because many of the first national pioneers of Evangelical churches were Orthodox clergy themselves. He mentioned, for instance, infant baptism, priests and their naming (*qes*), the liturgy setup (*qidase*), the altar as a sacrificial space (*mesewiya*), the three apostolic confessions and the basic theological terminologies.[92]

Interviewee # 26 (personal communication, 29.12.2011), listing similar inherited elements related to doctrine, spirituality and of a historical character, included practical factors that are still recognizable in the day to day lives of Evangelical Christians. For instance, he believes in the protection of the angels, a belief that must be a result of his EOTC background because no one taught him this belief in his Evangelical church. He argued that it is a very common thing

Bible while preaching. He ascribed his unease to the influence of the EOTC tradition. He concluded that special respect and honor is given to the physical Bible, because from it a supernatural force seems to penetrate one's innermost being.

[90] Besides the high regard for church buildings, interviewee # 21 (personal communication, 27.12.2011) added, there is a very high regard for church leaders and churches themselves as well.

[91] The Evangelical practice of exorcism and the strong belief in the spiritual realm as close to daily life provide, in interviewee # 21's opinion (personal communication, 27.12.2011), other examples for the fact that in their experience of spirituality the Evangelicals are closer to the Orthodox than to the missionaries.

[92] Interviewee # 25 (personal communication, 29.12.2011) spoke mainly from the EECMY's experience. Other Evangelicals however may have different views on these heritage elements. They could well take a reactionary stance and deliberately avoid anything that hints at Orthodoxy.

among many Evangelicals that they hold certain beliefs that do not originate from their present Evangelical church and that they continue to live in ways inherited from the EOTC. For example, the offering of extended and fervent prayers, prostration before God, special solemn attention during the liturgy, etc., are all embedded in an Orthodox background.

Interviewee # 27 (personal communication, 30.12.2011) stated that, naturally, every aspect of Ethiopian existence is influenced by the EOTC as it has been at the center of power (politically and theologically) for a long period. He considers Ethiopian culture as to a significant degree shaped by the EOTC. The EOTC defined in a way the core values, worldviews, and assumptions of Ethiopian society in general, and thus, logically, also of Evangelicals who are part of Ethiopian society.

The Evangelical interviewees argued persuasively that the legacy of the EOTC is deeply rooted in their spiritual, theological, cultural, social, liturgical, and practical lives. They pointed out the many, multi-faceted aspects of their natural bond with the EOTC, but this strong association was also evident in the way they expressed themselves and the emotions they showed when reflecting on their roots. Next, fully aware of this close connection with Orthodoxy, the Evangelical respondents in this study considered the future of ecumenism in Ethiopia to which we now turn.

8.4.2.3 Evangelical Interviewees on the Future of Ecumenism in Ethiopia

The Evangelical interviewees in general expressed optimism about the future of ecumenism in Ethiopia and declared ecumenism to be indispensable for the Ethiopian churches. However, some raised concern as regards its implementation. They proposed slightly different strategies for the implementation of ecumenism but agreed on the need for urgency and on the ultimate goal. They unambiguously stressed the need for Christian fellowship and for the promotion of ecumenical unity without any further delay.

 Many of the interviewees based their arguments in favour of ecumenism on the fact that, what Evangelicals and the EOTC have in common, by far outstrips their differences (interviewee # 21, personal communication, 27.12.2011). Even if there are traditional differences as regards biblical books, the books that both church groups accept outnumber the disputed ones by far. "We can focus on our common ground and on our mission which is the same" (interviewee #

2, personal communication, 11.12.2011).[93] "There is a lot we have in common. We have a common country. We believe in the same God and Jesus Christ. If we go further and deeper in our spiritual and eternal values such as eternal life, the death and resurrection of Christ, and that this world is only temporary, we can work together" (interviewee # 23, personal communication, 27.12.2011). "There are a lot of ways in which we can work together including all national issues and some missional issues as long as we all are Trinitarian churches. We have the same mission, we have the same major issues and social problems in our country where all of us are concerned and want to be involve[d]. So, why don't we work together on these many areas where we will be more productive, effective, and successful if we do it together" (interviewee # 21, personal communication, 27.12.2011).

The Evangelical interviewees also looked at the question of historical truth. On both sides, among Evangelicals as well as in the EOTC, incorrect information about the other has been spread and led to animosity, conflict, and a big divide. Most of the stories told about the other party were incorrect and both sides were guilty of spreading them. The most regrettable part of the history of these two church groups is that their differences were blown up and exaggerated. "And all we have in common has been entirely shattered" (interviewee # 26, personal communication, 29.12.2011). Such exaggeration was sometimes a deliberate act that succeeded in creating enmity because of the ignorance of church members. Therefore, both parties need to learn about the other closely before whatever action is taken (interviewee # 2, personal communication, 11.12.2011; interviewee # 8, personal communication, 18.12.2011).[94] "The more we are willing to listen to one another and sit down to listen to the other's story, the better we begin to understand that we are saying the same thing in different ways or different languages"(interviewee # 21, personal communication, 27.12.2011).[95] "The

---

[93] All quotations in this chapter from the interviews are my translation from the Amharic as the interviews were conducted in Amharic.

[94] Interviewee # 8 (personal communication, 18.12.2011) commented that we need to know each other better in order to cooperate. We need to learn first what really makes us different from each other and what unites us so that we may make informed decisions.

[95] Interviewee # 21 (personal communication, 27.12.2011) believed that if we come and talk together, we may find that we are not as different as we think. We need to respect each other and learn from one another. He pointed to the precedence of the Evangelicals' Fellowship - a good example of such a relationship. Even there, there have been lots of differences among various Evangelical denominations. However, they deliberately celebrate what they have in common without focusing on differences.

most important thing is we need to be willing and ready to learn about the other and with that understanding we can build a solid relationship. If we don't cooperate, we all are losers" (interviewee # 25, personal communication, 29.12.2011).

Many interviewees suggested that, in order to achieve a robust fellowship among all Christians in Ethiopia, a tradition of considering each other more positively should be promoted. Evangelicals need to stop using derogatory terms and blackmailing the other for the sake of achieving our common goal, the mission of God (interviewee # 18, personal communication, 22.12.2011; interviewee # 2, personal communication, 11.12.2011). "A positive attitude towards the other, openness to learn, and a humble approach are expected from both sides. Pride, self-righteousness, and judgmentalism should be avoided" (interviewee # 7, personal communication, 17.12.2011). Interviewee # 21 (personal communication, 27.12.2011) added that "we need to put off our own glasses and consider differences from the other's point of view. In that way we can learn from one another and appreciate one another." Furthermore, interviewee # 23 (personal communication, 27.12.2011) argued: "We have to change the attitude of exaggerating our differences our common elements are much stronger. It is not about bringing institutions together, it is about working and walking together."

Many interviewees described the current atmosphere in Ethiopia as promising and pointed out that in several ways ecumenism has already taken off. Interviewee # 7 (personal communication, 17.12.2011) admitted that her attitude towards the Orthodox had changed tremendously and become more positive for two reasons. Firstly, a number of Evangelical leaders had at various sessions presented the EOTC in a positive light, especially from the historical point of view and taking into account the heavy price Orthodoxy paid for sustaining Christianity in Ethiopia. Secondly, in recent decades there has been a new development among Orthodox churches to focus more on biblical preaching. Therefore, interviewee # 15 (personal communication, 21.12.2011) concluded that the future of the relationship between the two church groups looks bright: "We have already begun to work together in a number of areas and the sense of animosity is significantly decreasing."[96] Interviewee # 18 (personal

---

[96] Interviewee # 15 (personal communication, 21.12.2011) gave two examples of developing positive attitudes towards others. On the one hand, Evangelicals are consciously adopting the dancing and music traditions of the

communication, 22.12.2011) affirmed that there are noticeably many improvements in the relationship and the situation is today totally different compared to a few years back. "We begin to see what we have in common, which is much more than what divides us. It is true that we have some differences; but we are now beginning to appreciate our similarities and that should give us a lot of hope for this country".[97] For interviewee # 25 (personal communication, 29.12.2011) the recent developments in the EOTC where, among both clergy and laity, there is an increasing concentration on the Bible, could contribute to unity and fellowship.[98] In addition, Christians learned how to work together during the famine and the communist regime. Interviewee # 26 (personal communication, 29.12.2011) added that the church groups' negative labelling of each other has diminished in the last couple of decades while cooperation, fellowship, and attempts to understand one another are significantly growing: "The future is very promising in that we will work to nurture and strengthen our unity and fellowship for our common good. At the moment, the relationship is getting more and more accepted at the higher level of leadership and educated church members and this tendency should filter down to grass-root level, to the public." Finally, interviewee # 27 (personal communication, 30.12.2011) brought up that previously the relationship between the Orthodox and Evangelicals was predominantly shaped by what has happened in the past whereas at present, with a constitution that offers the right of worship to, and equity for, all Ethiopians, the environment is more conducive to the building of relationships.[99]

EOTC that are becoming more and more popular. On the other hand, The Orthodox focus more and more focused on the Bible so that it becomes common ground for discussions. Furthermore, they are considering Evangelicals as their brothers and Evangelicals are gradually accepting them as Christians. They began working together in areas affecting both, concerning reconciliation, security, HIV/AIDS, and other national issues. All these are not only indicators of a nascent ecumenical relationship, rather they are evidence of the inevitability of ecumenism in Ethiopia.

[97] Interviewee # 5 (personal communication, 17.12.2011) gave an example from her own family: her father, mother, and she attend different churches, namely Orthodox, Evangelical and Pentecostal and they live harmoniously together. Such ecumenism could be the future of Ethiopia.

[98] This argument is in line with the argument of some EOTC interviewees, interviewee # 1 and interviewee # 9, that the daily gospel preaching of the eleventh hour is a new phenomenon and has a tremendous effect on the biblical devotion and knowledge of their members. This may demarcate a shift on the side of the Evangelicals not to consider the EOTC as a mission field.

[99] Interviewee # 27 (personal communication, 30.12.2011) gave practical examples of Ethiopian churches working together where cooperation is officially practised at different levels. All churches—Evangelicals, Catholics, and Orthodox—work in partnership in the Ethiopian Bible Society; again in development work, for instance, in umbrella institutions like a Christian Relief and Development. These positive aspects are indicators

Many interviewees expressed the opinion that leaders carry a great responsibility in the process of step by step realizing the intended fellowship and ecumenical unity (interviewee # 5, personal communication, 17.12.2011; interviewee # 2, personal communication, 11.12.2011).[100] Interviewee # 25 (personal communication, 29.12.2011) underlined that appropriate discussion and dialogue by leaders and experts at a high level and characterized by due respect for one another, would create an atmosphere that is conducive for the development of fellowship and unity among the wider public. Although the leaders of both church groups carry this responsibility, some interviewees stressed that the greater responsibility rests with the Evangelicals as, historically, they are the ones who, at the time, emerged from the existing Orthodox Church (interviewee # 6, personal communication, 17.12.2011; interviewee # 5, personal communication, 17.12.2011). According to interviewee # 21 (personal communication, 27.12.2011), Evangelicals (and Catholics for that matter) ought to consider the EOTC as a mother church, a historic church of the nation that preserved the Christian heritage for all Ethiopians. That fact, interviewee # 21 accentuated, needs to be respected and appreciated.

Another point stressed by many interviewees was the urgency and the mandatory nature of establishing ecumenical fellowship among Ethiopian churches. "We have to build on our common ground and this should come now" (interviewee # 6, personal communication, 17.12.2011). "It is for the good of all sides to have cooperation and unity" (interviewee # 8, personal communication, 18.12.2011). "Only if we have a united spirit do we have the potential to overcome the threats of the day and accomplish our mission in this nation. Therefore, the spirit of unity and ecumenical cooperation is mandatory" (interviewee # 7, personal communication, 17.12.2011). "Once the leadership and the elites are convinced, cooperation between various churches in Ethiopia seems obligatory for the existence and expansion of every church" (interviewee # 26, personal communication, 29.12.2011).

---

of the future where further cooperation will be initiated in terms of sharing books, resources, theological education in different institutions.

[100] interviewee # 2 (personal communication, 11.12.2011) agrees and comments that as the general populace merely follow their religious leaders, the issue of fellowship and ecumenism should be mainly worked out around the leaders and higher educational families. Leaders and teachers should advocate it strongly and the mass will just follow them.

In tandem with their optimism and their awareness of the urgent need for ecumenical unity, some interviewees mentioned concerns that have to be considered if ecumenism is pursued. Interviewee # 17 (personal communication, 21.12.2011) expressed her reluctance as regards working together with the Orthodox in mission or evangelism. "That would be very difficult. Possibly, we can peacefully live together with a good relationship. Even if it is very difficult to have fellowship with EOTC members, we need to cooperate with those who are positive about it." Interviewee # 28 (personal communication, 03.01.2012) warned:

> As we have a history of animosity and conflict, the kind of fellowship we want to create, will not come as easily as we sometimes think. We have to do a lot to come out of that history of conflict and animosity and gradually build up the envisioned kind of fellowship and unity. There are still some fanatic movements working against any kind of fellowship. But the level of relationship we have already attained and the cooperation we have developed to date is encouraging and promising. We would be able to cooperate on lots of common issues and build up our fellowship gradually.

Interviewee # 27 (personal communication, 30.12.2011) admitted that the process may be very difficult and challenging, but believed that gradually cooperation would be promoted. Interviewee # 26 (personal communication, 29.12.2011) concluded that, even if it needs hard work, sincerity, and commitment, the goal of ecumenical fellowship in Ethiopia is attainable.

8.4.2.4 Summary of Opinions

The opinions of Orthodox and Evangelical interviewees concerning the possibility of ecumenism in Ethiopia, particularly in view of the fraught relationship between the EOTC and the Evangelicals, converged to the extent of, in some respect, being similar. Both sides agreed on the urgency and the compulsory nature of ecumenism for the good of all. Both sides singled out the fact that lies, fabricated in order to demonize a particular church, should be corrected and that genuine learning about others would be a good start to creating a better future. Both sides believed that ecumenism has already begun in various ways and that it should be promoted and further cultivated. Given the problematic history, both sides stressed the need for attitudinal change to achieve unity and effective fellowship. Both sides raised concerns about the implementation of ecumenism; the task will be demanding and requires commitment from the EOTC as well as the Evangelicals. Both sides defined the role of leaders and elites as crucial in leading the population towards the unity and cooperation that are extremely important in the Ethiopian context.

If, indeed, both sides are hungry for ecumenical fellowship, then what is delaying the speedy realization of a better relationship? Are the interviewees perhaps just expressing some ideal without wanting to commit to its realization? Is it perhaps difficult to openly commit to fellowship with other churches because the interviewees want to appear loyal to their own denomination? Would they express the same eagerness for cooperation if they were put on a platform to publicly argue for ecumenism with others? Is it, on the other hand, possible that what they have been saying is a sound reflection of the general opinion of most members of all churches or the leadership only so far so that an immediate beginning can be made with realizing cooperation and fellowship in unity?

8.5 Conclusion

Chapter eight of this study outlines the role of the Scriptures as a uniting and/or dividing factor among Ethiopian churches. Even if it has obviously been (mis)used as an instrument for division which has been done frequently, the Scriptures have inherently the potential to unite rather than to divide. It is not that the Scriptures per se are the real dividing factors, rather, it is the different ways in which the Scriptures are seen and interpreted in the different traditions which became the dividing forces of the different church groups. It has been appropriated to serve the interest of various churches by manipulating the followers of other churches. An appropriation that would be done sincerely and in all fairness to others would be to understand and value the other's understanding of the Scriptures and its function as a criterion for right doctrine.

In addition to an inadequate appropriation of the Scriptures, other external factors have caused and aggravated differences among Ethiopian churches, usually in the name of the Scriptures. In the course of history these differences grew extremely severe. Both Orthodox and Evangelicals spread stories blaming each other for the deep enmity separating them. From the scriptural point of view none of these stories carried any weight. Today, all of this is history and Ethiopians are left with its legacy, some of it negative, some positive. In the meantime the realities on the ground have changed and demand to be accepted as they unfold.

The good news emerging from the present study is that both sides, when approached independently, do not only understand the need for unity and fellowship but also believe in the

urgent need for ecumenism in Ethiopia. One way forward to this effect is that the Ethiopian Evangelicals take serious action and appropriate the STL, both as participants in the global Christian heritage in general and as recipients of various influential legacies from the EOTC in particular. This would complement the current deliberate move of the EOTC to focus on the preaching of "the Word", intentionally focusing on the "proto-canonical" books.

Recent trends in Ethiopia are promising for the establishment of a vibrant ecumenical relationship among the churches. Even if some old evil remains, the new understanding and willingness to work together in many common areas foretell a bright future for ecumenism. The role of leaders and prominent citizens in the process is underlined by many interviewees as important to attain greater effectiveness and efficiency. As ignorance was one of the root causes for the spread of enmity, learning about one another and attitudinal change are essential and highly recommended.[101]

Finally, ecumenism does not imply that one gives up one's own identity and subscribes to another. Rather, it involves appreciating the identity of the other while celebrating one's own identity in a more comfortable and realistic manner. Trinitarian churches in Ethiopia, however, will have to define a common identity embracing the mission and ultimate goal of all churches as one and the same. It asks for a "unity in diversity", whereby the unique identity

---

[101] Seleshi (2008:120-123), in his dissertation proposes seventeen points important for effective ecumenism among Trinitarian Churches in Ethiopia. In our personal communication (27.12.2011), he particularly emphasizes the first four points: "To promote love, acceptance, tolerance, and cooperation in mission and transformation [among Ethiopian Trinitarian Churches], I recommend the following: 1. As Trinitarian Churches we have to take action in the area of tolerance, cooperation, mission and transformation. 2. The Trinitarian Churches need to recognize the different modes of baptism. We should not condemn others because they are using a mode of baptism which is different from ours. 3. Churches should determine to go to unreached people, rather than proselytizing the others' members. Proselytizing should be stopped, because it will bring animosity and misunderstanding among Trinitarians. Members of different churches should be respected for who they are. 4. We should respect the freedom of every Trinitarian church member to be served in a church of his/her choice. If this is the case how do we understand proselytization? Proselytizing involves pressuring people. We need to keep a balance between respecting human freedom and pressuring people to follow our way. We should not condemn them for leaving our church and joining another Trinitarian church."

of each party is respected and appreciated while simultaneously the common identity in a wider context is accepted and promoted for mutual benefit and the glory of the Lord.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aalen, S. 1986, "δόξα" in *NIDNTT*, vol. 2, Carlisle: Paternoster, 44-48.

Abijole, Bayo 1988, "St. Paul's Concept of Principalities and Powers in African Context," *Africa Theological Journal*, 17/2:118-129.

Abraham, William J. 1981, *The Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Achtemeier, Paul. J. 1999, *Inspiration and Authority: Nature and function of Christian Scripture*, Peabody: Hendrickson.

_____ 1980, *The Inspiration of Scripture: Problems and Proposals*, Philadelphia: Westminster.

Adamo, David T. 1993, "The Table of Nations Reconsidered in African Perspective (Gen 10)," *Journal of African Religion and Philosophy*, 2:138-143.

_____ 1992, "Ethiopia in the Bible," *African Christian Studies*, 8:51-64.

Adler, William 2002, "The Pseudepigrapha in the Early Church," in Lee Martin McDonalds and James A. Sanders (eds.), *The Canon Debate: on the Origins and Formation of the Bible*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 211-228.

_____ 1978, "Enoch in Early Christian Literature," in Paul J Achtemeier, (ed.), *Society of Biblical Literature, 1978 Seminar Papers*, vol. I, Missoula: Scholars Press, 271-275.

አድማሱ ጀምበሬ (መልአከ ብርሃን) 1970፤ *ዝከረ ሊቃውንት፣* አዲስ አበባ፤ ትንሣኤ ዘጉባኤ ማተሚያ ቤት፣ 1963 ዓ/ም፡፡

Aland, Kurt et al. (eds.) 1983, *The Greek New Testament*, 3rd rvd. ed., Stuttgart: United Bible Societies.

Alemayehu G. Mariam 2012, "Ethiopia: Unity in Divinity!" *ECADF: Ethiopian News and Opinions*, online newsletter, accessed on 05/10/2014 from: <http://ecadforum.com/2012/06/19/ethiopia-unity-in-divinity/>.

Alexander, Patrick H. et al (eds.) 1999, *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical and Early Christian Studies*, Peabody: Hendrickson.

Alexander, P. S. 1983, "3 Enoch," in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, *Volume 1, Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, New York: Doubleday, 222ff.

_____ 1972, "The Targumim and Early Exegesis of 'Sons of God' in Genesis 6," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 23:60-71.

Allison, Jr., Dale C. et al. (eds.) 2010, *Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception*, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, accessed on 24/07/2014 from: <http://www.degruyter.com/view/db/ebr>.

Amsalu Aklilu n.d., *ጥሩ የአማርኛ ድርሰት እንዴት ያለ ነው!*, Addis Ababa: Kuraz Publishing Agency.

Andersen, F.I. 1983, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, *Volume 1, Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, New York: Doubleday, 91-221.

Andersen, H.G. 1976, "Moses, Assumption of," in Merrill C. Tenney (ed.), *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible,* vol. 4, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 295-96.

Anderson, Cheryl Barbara 2003, "Lessons on Healing from Naaman (2 Kings 5:1-27): An African-American Perspective," in Phiri, Isabel Apawo, Haddad, Beverley, and Masenya (ngwana' Mphahlele), Madipoane (eds.), *African Women, HIV/AIDS, and Communities*, Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Publication, 23-43.

Anderson, Cory B. 2003, "Jude's Use of the Pseudepigraphal Book of 1 Enoch," *Dialogue*, 36/2:47-64.

Anonymous [2014], "Second Italo-Ethiopian War", accessed on 11/05/2014 from: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Italian_invasion_of_Ethiopia>.

_____ 2012a, "Amharic Language," accessed on 15/05/2012 from: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Amharic_language>.

_____ 2012b, "Discovery of earliest Illuminated Gospel Manuscripts Found in Ethiopian Monastery", accessed on 21/05/2012 from: <http://www.ninesaintsethiopianorthodoxmonastery.org/Sacred_Archaeological_of_Ethiopia.html/>.

_____ 2012c, "Ge'ez Language" (2012), accessed on 04/05/2012 from: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ge%27ez_language#cite_ref-MAT_9-0/>.

_____ 2007, *መጽሐፍ ቅዱስ፤ የብሉይ እና ሐዲስ ኪዳን መጻሕፍት፤ በግዕዝ ላይ ተመሥርቶ የተተረጎመ* አዲስ አበባ፡ የኢትዮጵያ መጽሐፍ ቅዱስ ማሕበር፡፡

_____ 1973, "Persecution in Ethiopian," *Logos Journal*, 12:16.

_____ 1972, "Persecution in Ethiopian," *Target*, 2/25:12-14.

Appleyard, David 2007, "Ethiopian Christianity" in Ken Parry (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Eastern Christianity*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub, 115-136.

Arcari, Luca 2007, "A Symbolic Transfiguration of a Historical Event: The Parthian Invasion in Josephus and the Parables of Enoch," in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 478-486.

Arén, Gustav 1999, *Envoys of the Gospel in Ethiopia: In the Steps of the Evangelical Pioneers 1898-1936*, Studia Missionalia Upsaliensia LXXV, Stockholm: EFS förlaget.

_____ 1978, *Evangelical Pioneers in Ethiopia: Origins of the Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus*, Studia Missionalia Upsaliensia XXXII, Stockholm: EFS förlaget.

Asafa Jalata 1993, *Oromia and Ethiopia: State Formation and Ethnonational Conflict, 1868-1992*, Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner.

Aymro Wondmagegnehu and Joachim Motovu 1970, *The Ethiopian Orthodox Church,* Addis Ababa: The Ethiopian Orthodox Mission.

Bacote, Vincent, Miguélez, Laura C., and Okholm, Dennis L. (eds.) 2004, *Evangelicals Scripture: Tradition, Authority and Hermeneutics*, Downers Grove: IVP.

Baissa Lemmu 1998, "Contending Nationalism in the Ethiopian Empire State and the Oromo Struggle for Self-determination," in Asafa Jalata (ed.), *Oromo Nationalism and the Ethiopian Discourse: The Search for Freedom and Democracy*, Lawrenceville, NJ.: The Red Sea Press, 83-95.

Bakke, Johnny 1987, *Christian Ministry: Patterns and Functions within the Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus*, Studia Missionalia Upsalinsia xliv, Oslo: Solum Forlag A.S.

Balisky, E. Paul 1997, *Wolaitta Evangelists: A Study of Religious Innovation in Southern Ethiopia 1937-1975*, Aberdeen: University of Aberdeen (Doctoral Dissertation).

Bampfylde, Gillian 1984, "The Similitudes of Enoch: Historical Allusions," *JSJ* 15:9-31.

Barclay, William 1960, *The Letters of John and Jude*, Edinburgh: The Saints Andrew Press.

Barker, A. J. 1971, *Rape of Ethiopia, 1936*, New York: Ballantine Books.

Barnet, Albert E. 1957, "The Epistle of Jude: Introduction and Exegesis," in George Arthur Buttrick (ed.), *The Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 12, New York: Abingdon Press, 317-343.

Barr, James 1983, *Holy Scripture: Canon, Authority, Criticism: The Sprunt Lectures delivered at Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia February 1982*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

_____ 1978, 1979, "Aramaic-Greek Notes on the Book of Enoch," *JSS* 23:184-98; 24:179-92.

Barton, John 1997, *Holy Scripture, Sacred Text: The Canon in the Early* Christianity, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Bascom, Kay 2001, *Hidden Triumph in Ethiopia*, Pasadena, Calif.: William Carey Library.

Bauckham, Richard 1997a, "Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal Writings," in Ralph P. Martin and Peter H. Davids (eds.), *Dictionary of the Later New Testament and Its Development,* Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP, 68-73.

_____ 1997b, "James, 1 Peter, Jude and 2 Peter," in Markus Bockmuehl and Michael B. Thompson (eds.), *A Vision of the Church: Studies in Early Christian Ecclesiology in Honour of J. P. M. Sweet,* Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 153-166.

_____ 1992, "Jude, Epistle of," in Freedman, David Noel (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 3, New York: Doubleday, 1098-1103.

_____ 1990, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*, Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

_____ 1985, "The Fall of the Angels as the Source of Philosophy in Hermias and Clement of Alexandria," *Vigiliae Christianae*, 39:313-330.

_____ 1983, *Jude, 2 Peter*, Word Biblical Commentary, Waco: Word Books.

_____ 1981, "A Note on a Problem in the Greek Version of *1 Enoch* 1:9," *JTS* 32:136-138.

Baur, John 2009, *2000 Years of Christianity in Africa: An African Church History*, 2nd ed., Nairobi: Paulines Pub.

Bausi, A. (ed.) 2012, *Languages and Cultures of Eastern Christianity: Ethiopian*, Variorum, The Worlds of Eastern Christianity (300-1500) 4, Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate.

Bautch, Kelley Coblentz 2003, *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17-19: "No One Has Seen What I Have Seen"*, Leiden: Brill.

Baynes, Leslie 2012, "Enoch and Jubilees in the Canon of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church," in Eric F. Mason (ed.), *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*, Leiden: Brill, 799-818.

BBC (online Report) 2014, "CAR act of cannibalism dark sign of things to come?", accessed on 13/01/14 from: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-25708024>.

Beckwith, Roger 2005, *Calendar, Chronology and Worship: Studies in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity, v. 61, Leiden: Brill.

_____ 1991, "A Modern Theory of the Old Testament Canon," *VT* 41:385-395.

_____ 1985, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and Its Background in Early Judaism*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Bediako, Kwame 1995, *Christianity in Africa: The Renewal of a Non-Western Religion*, Edinburgh/New York: Edinburgh University Press/Orbis.

በእምነት ምትኩ (መጋቢ ጥበብ) 2002፤ *የኢትዮጵያ ታላቁ ሀብት ባሕረ ሀሳብ (የዘመን አቆጣጠር)*፤ አዲስ አበባ።

Bekele Woldekidan 2002, ሪቫይቫል ኢትዮጵያ እና የመጨረሻ መጨረሻ. (*Revival in Ethiopia and the Final End*), Addis Ababa: Mulu Wongel Church.

በላይ ተገኝ 2007, "የስብከተ ወንጌል አገልግሎት በሃኛው ክፍለ ዘመን በኢትዮጵያ ኦርቶዶክስ ቤተ ክርስቲያን፣" in EOTC, *መጽሐፍ ቅዱስና የኢትዮጵያ ኦርቶዶክስ ተዋሕዶ ቤተ ክርስቲያን፣ ልዩ አትም፡፡* ([2000 E.C.]) ፤ [አዲስ አበባ፣ ኢኦተቤክ]፣ special edition:30-34.

Benson, Clarence H. 1978, *Biblical Beliefs: the Doctrine of inspiration, Salvation, the Church, Angels, Last Things*, 3rd ed., Wheaton: Evangelical Teacher Training Association.

Benton, John 1999, *Slandering the Angels: The Message of Jude*, Grange Close, England: Evangelical Press.

Berger, Klaus 1980, "review of Michael Knibb," *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch,* in *JSJ* 11:100-109.

Beylot, R. 2008, *La Glorie des Rois, ou l'Histoire de Salomon et de la reine de Saba* (with a foreword by P. Piovanelli), Apocryphes 12, Turnhout: Brepols.

Bezold, C. 1905, *Kebra Nagast. Die Herrlichkeit der Könige. Nach den Handschriften in Berlin, London, Oxford und Paris zum ersten Mal im äthiopischen Urtext herausgegeben und mit deutscher Übertsetzung versehen*, Abhandlungen der philosophisch-philologischen Klasse der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 23.1, München: Verlag der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Bietenhard, H. 1986, "ἀγγελος," in Colin Brown (ed.), *NIDNTT*, vol. 1, Carlisle: Paternoster, 101-103.

Bigg, Charles 1902, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, The International Critical Commentary [43], 2nd ed., Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Bible Works 2003, "Bible," in *Easton's Bible Dictionary*, (electronic material, CD, version 6.0.005y), article 580.

Black, Matthew 1985, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: a New English Edition,* Leiden: Brill.

_____ 1980, "The Composition, Character, and Date of the 'Second Vision of Enoch'," in Martin Brecht (ed.), *Text-Wort-Glaube: Studien zur Überlieferung, Interpretation und Autorisierung Biblischer Texte, Kurt Aland Gewidmet,* Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 50, Berlin: de Gruyter, 19-30.

_____ 1973, "The Maranatha Invocation and Jude 14, 15 (*1 Enoch* 1:9)," in B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley (ed.)*, Christ and Spirit in the New Testament: in Honour of Charles Fransis, Digby Moule*, Cambridge: CUP.

_____ 1970, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece,* Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece, Leiden: Brill.

Bloesch, Donald G. 1994, *Holy Scripture: Revelation, Inspiration and Interpretation,* Christian Foundation, Downers Grove: IVP.

Blum, Edwin A 1981, "Jude," in Frank E. Gaebelein and J.D. Douglas (eds.), *Expositor's Bible Commentary*, vol. 12, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 379-396.

Boavida, I., Pennec, H., and Ramos, M. J. (eds.) 2011, *Pedro Paez's History of Ethiopia, 1662*, I, transl. by C. J. Tribe, Works Issued by the Hakluyt Society, Third Series 23, London: Ashgate.

Boccaccini, Gabriele (ed.) [2014], *4 Enoch: The Online Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, accessed on 24/07/2014 from: <http://www.4enoch.org/wiki3/index.php?title=Main_Page>.

_____ 2009, "Preface: The Enigma of Jubilees and the Lesson of the Enoch Seminar," in idem and Giovanni Ibba (eds.), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: the Evidence of Jubilees*, Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, xiv-xxi.

_____ (ed.) 2007, *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 492-296.

_____ (ed.) 2005, *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Lights on a Forgotten Connection*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

_____ (ed.) 2002, *The Origins of Enochic Judaism: Proceedings of the First Enoch Seminar: University of Michigan, Sesto Fiorentiono, Italy, June 19-23, 2001*, Turin: Silvio Zamorani Editore.

Boccaccini, Gabriele and Ibba, Giovanni (eds.) 2009, *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: the Evidence of Jubilees*, Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans.

Borsh, Frederick H. 1993, "Introduction," in Frederick Houk Borsh (ed.), *The Bible's Authority in Today's Church,* Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 35-42.

Bowley, James E. 1999, "Prophets and Prophecy at Qumran," in Peter Flint and James C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 2, Brill: Leiden, 334-378.

Brakke, David 1994, "Canon Formation and Social Conflict in Fourth-Century Egypt: Athanasius of Alexandria's Thirty-Ninth Festal Letter," *Harvard Theological Review*, 87/4:395-419.

Bratsiotis, Panayotis I. 1951, "An Orthodox Contribution," in Alan Richardson and W. Schweitzer (eds.), E. Every (trans.), *Biblical Authority for Today: A World Council of Churches Symposium on 'The Biblical Authority for the Churches' Social and Political Message Today'*, London: SCM, 17-29.

Bratcher, Robert G. 1984, *A Translator's Guide to the Letters from James, Peter, and Jude,* Help for Translators series, London: UBS.

Bromiley, Geofferey W. (ed.) 1988, *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (in four volumes), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Brooke, George J. 2006, book review of Kelley Coblentz Bautch, *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17-19: "No One Has Seen What I Have Seen"* (Leiden: Brill, 2003) in *Dead Sea Discoveries*, 13/2:266-270.

Brooks, F. 1996, *A Modern Translation of the Kebre Nagast (The Glory of the Kings)*, Lawrenceville, N.J.: Red Sea Press.

Brown, Robert McAfee 1965, "Scripture and Tradition in the Theology of Karl Barth," in Leonard J. Swidler (ed.), *Scripture and Ecumenism: Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox and Jewish,* Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1965, 23-42.

Bruce, F.F. 1988, *The Canon of Scripture,* Downers Grove: IVP.

Bruce, Patricia Frances 2003, "'The Mother's Cow': A Study of Old Testament References to Virginity in the Context of HIV/AIDS in South Africa," in Phiri, Isabel Apawo, Haddad, Beverley, and Masenya (ngwana' Mphahlele), Madipoane (eds.), *African Women, HIV/AIDS, and Communities*, Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Publication, 44-70.

Brueggemann, Walter 2003, *An Introduction to the Old Testament: the Canon and Christian Imagination,* Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Bruk A. Asale 2014, "A Millennium Translation based on the Geʿez and LXX: a New Bible Translation in the Ethiopian Church and its Controversy," *The Bible Translator: Technical Paper*, 65/1:49–73.

_____ 2013a, "Church and State in Ethiopia", unpublished paper presented to the UKZN-HUiB Summer Institute, Pietermaritzburg.

_____ 2013b, "Mapping the Reception, Transmission, and Translation of Scriptural Writings in the EOTC: How and Why Some "Pseudepigraphical" Works Receive "Canonical" Status in The Ethiopian Bible," *Journal for Semitics*, 22/2:358-375.

Bruk A. Asale and Decock, Paul B. 2012, "The Ethiopian Orthodox *Tewahedo* Church (EOTC) Canon of Scripture: Neither Open, nor Closed nor in-between," in J. Wassermann and S. Reddy (eds.), *Surveying Student Research in the Humanities: Proceedings of the 2012 Postgraduate Conference of the University of KwaZulu Natal College of Humanities, Howard College, Durban, 3-4 October 2012*, Durban: Prontaprint, 178-188.

BSE [2014], Bible Society of Ethiopia, accessed on 15/04/2014 from: <http://biblesociety-ethiopia.org/?page_id=220>.

_____ 2007, *Amharic Bible, The: with the Old Testament Based on Septuagint*, Addis Ababa: The Bible Society of Ethiopia.

Budge, E.A. Willis 1935, *The Book of the Mysteries of the Heavens and the Earth and Other Works of Bahayla Mika'el (Zosimas): The Ethiopic Texts Edited from the Unique Manuscript (Éth 37 Peiresc) in the Bibliotheque Nationale with English Translations*, London: Oxford University Press.

_____ 1932, *The Kebra Nagast*, accessed on 26/09/2013 from: <http://www.sacred-texts.com/chr/kn/>.

_____ 1922, *The Queen of Sheba and Her Only Son Menyelek: Being the History of the Departure of God and His Ark of the Covenant from Jerusalem to Ethiopia, and the Establishment of the Religion of Hebrews and the Solomonic Line of Kings in that Country. A Complete translation of the Kebra Negast with Introduction*, London: Martin Hopkinson.

Bui, Yvonne N. 2009, *How to Write a Master's Thesis*, Los Angeles: SAGE Pub.

Carson, D. A. 1988, "John and the Johannine Epistles," in D. A. Carson and W. G. M. Williamson (eds.), *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*, Cambridge: CUP.

_____ 1986, "Recent Developments in the Doctrine of Scripture," in D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge (eds.), *Hermeneutics, Authority and Canon*, Leicester; IVP, 1-48.

Cedar, Paul A. 1984, *James, 1, 2 Peter, Jude*, The Communicator's Commentary, Waco: Word Books.

Chaillot, Christine 2002, *The Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church Tradition: a Brief Introduction to its Life and Spirituality*, Paris: Inter-Orthodox Dialogue.

Charles, J. Daryl 1991a, "Jude's Use of Pseudepigraphical Source-Material as Part of His Literary Strategy," *NTS*, 37:130-145.

_____ 1991b, "Literary Artifice in the Epistle of Jude," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 82/1-2:106-124.

_____ 1990a, "The Angels, Sonship and Birthright in the Letter of the Hebrews," *JETS* 33:171-178.

_____ 1990b, "'Those' and 'These': The Use of the Old Testament in the Epistle of Jude," *JSNT*, 38:109-124.

Charles, R. H. (ed.) 1913, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament,* 2 vols., Oxford: Clarendon.

_____ 1912, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch,* Oxford: OUP.

_____ 1906, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Charlesworth, James H. 2007, "Can We Discern the Composition Date of the Parables of Enoch?" in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 450-468.

_____ 2005, "Summary and Conclusions: The Books of Enoch or 1 Enoch Matters: New Paradigms for understanding Pre-70 Judaism," in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Lights on a Forgotten Connection*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 436-454.

_____ 1992a, "Apocrypha: Old Testament Apocrypha," in D.N. Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. I, New York: Doubleday, 292-294.

_____ 1992b, "Pseudepigrapha, OT," in D.N. Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 1, New York: Doubleday, 537-540.

_____ (ed.) 1983, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols., Garden city, N.Y.: Doubleday.

_____ 1979, "The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tubingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch," *NTS* 25:315–23.

Chester, Andrew and Martin, Ralph P. 1994, *The Theology of the Letters of James, Peter, and Jude,* NTT, Cambridge: CUP.

Clark, David. J. 2004, "Discourse Structure in Jude," *The Bible Translator*, 55:125-137.

Coder, S. Maxwell 1958, *Jude: The Acts of the Apostates*, Chicago: Moody.

Coggins, Richard James and Houlden, James Leslie (eds.) 1992, *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, London: SCM.

Colin, G. 2002, *La Gloire des Rois (Kebra Nagast), épopée nationale de l'Éthiopie*, Cahiers d'Orientalisme 23, Genève: Cramer.

Collins, John J. 2007, "How Distinctive was Enochic Judaism?" in M. Bar-Asher and E. Tov (eds.), *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls V-VI; A Festschrift for Devorah Dimant*, Haifa: University of Haifa; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 17-34.

_____ 1998, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd ed., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Connell, Dan and Killion Tom 2010, *Historical Dictionary of Eritrea*, 2nd ill. ed., USA: Scarecrow Press.

Cook, Johann 2003, "Textual Diversity and Canonical Unity," in Jean-Marie Auwers and Henk Jan de Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons,* Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium clxii, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 135-152.

Cowley, Roger, W. 1983, *The Traditional Interpretation of the Apocalypse of St John in the Ethiopian Orthodox Church,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____ 1974, "The Biblical Canon of The Ethiopian Orthodox Church Today," *Ostkirchliche Studien*, 23:318-323.

Croatto, J. Severino 1987, *Biblical Hermeneutics: Toward a Theory of Reading as the Production of Meaning*, translated by Robert R. Barr, Maryknoll: Orbis.

Cross, F.L. 1957, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd ed., Oxford/ New York: Oxford University Press.

Custer, Stewart 1968, *Does Inspiration Demand Inerrancy?: A Study of the Biblical Doctrine of Inspiration in the Light of Inerrancy,* Nutley, N.J.: Craig Press.

Dalton, William Joseph 1989, *Christ's Proclamation to the Saints: A Study of 1 Peter 3:18-4:1*, Analecta Biblica 23, Rome: Editrica Portificio Instituto Biblico.

Darkwah, R. H. Kofi 1975, *Shewa, Menelik and the Ethiopian Empire 1813-1889*, London: Heinemann.

Debela Birri 2003, "Rev. Gudina Tumsa and the Ecumenical Movement of the 1970s: the Ethiopian Case", in *Life and Ministry of Rev. Gudina Tumsa, General Secretary of the EECMY, The: Report Volume & Lectures of the[First] Missiological Seminar sponsored by the Gudina Tumsa Foundation at Mekane Yesus Theological Seminary Mekanissa, April 18-21, 2001*, [Addis Ababa]: GTF, 132-146.

de Bruyn, Theodore 2010, "Papyri, Parchments, Ostraca, and Tablets Written with Biblical Texts in Greek and Used as Amulets: a Preliminary List," in *Early Christian Manuscripts: Examples of Applied Method and Approach*, Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas (eds.), Texts and Editions for New Testament Study, vol. 5, Leiden/Boston: Brill, 145-189.

Decke, Gerd 2003, "The Role of Gudina Tumsa in a Critique Dialogue between Marxism/Socialism and Christianity," in Paul Hoffmann (ed.), *Life and Ministry of Rev. Gudina Tumsa, General Secretary of the EECMY, The: Report Volume & Lectures of the [First] Missiological Seminar Sponsored by the Gudina Tumsa Foundation at Mekane Yesus Theological Seminary Mekanissa, April 18-21, 2001*, [Addis Ababa]: GTF, 98-128.

Decock, Paul B. 2013, "Discernment in Origen of Alexandria," *Acta Theologica 2013 Supplementum* 17:189-208.

_____ 2008a, "Jerome's Turn to the Hebraica Veritas and His Rejection of the Traditional View of the Septuagint" in *Neotestamentica* 42:205-222.

_____ 2008b, "Can the Church Fathers Help us to Develop a Better Approach to the Actualization of Scripture?", in Hans de Wit and Gerald West (eds.), *African and European Readers of the Bible in Dialogue: In Quest of a Shared Meaning*, Studies of Religion in Africa: Supplements to the Journal of Religion in Africa, vol. 32, Leiden/Boston: Brill, 329-342.

_____ 2005, "On the value of Pre-Modern Interpretation of Scripture for Contemporary Biblical Studies, *Neotestamentica*, 39:57-74

DEI VERBUM 1965, "Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, *DEI VERBUM,* Solemnly Promulgated by His Holiness Pope Paul VI On November 18, 1965," accessed on 11/10/2014 from: <http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651118_dei-verbum_en.html>.

ደጀኔ ሽፈራው 1997፤ «ኦርቶዶክሳዊ ማንነት፣» ሐመር፡ ዘኦርቶዶክስ ተዋሕዶ፣ 24፡10፡፡

de Jonge, Marinus 2003a, "The authority of the 'Old Testament' in the Early Church: the Witness of the 'Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament'," in Jean-Marie Auwers and Henk Jan de Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons,* Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium clxii, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 459-486.

_____ 2003b, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as part of Christian Literature: the Case of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve,* Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha, Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Dentan, Robert C. 1954, *The Apocrypha, Bridge of Testaments,* Connecticut: The Seabury Press.

deSilva, David A. 2002, *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Dibekulu Zewde 1995, *The 81 Holy Bibles and the Scripture – Canons*, Addis Ababa: Tinsae Printing Press.

Dimant, Devorah 1983, "The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch," *VT* 33:16–19.

Dingman, Terry William 2002, "The influence of the angelology of 1 Enoch on Judaism in the Second Temple Period," unpublished PhD Dissertation (South Africa, [Pretoria]: University of South Africa.

Diop, Cheikh Anta 1974, *The African Origin of Civilization: Myth or Reality?*, Westport, Conn.: Lawrence Hill.

Dockery, David S. 1995, *Christian Scripture: An Evangelical Perspective on Inspiration, Authority and Interpretation,* Nashville: Broadman and Holman Pub.

Douglas, J.D. (ed.) 1996, *The New Bible Dictionary*, 3rd ed., Leicester: IVP.

Doulos, Mikael 1986, "Christians in Marxist Ethiopia", *Religion in Communist Lands* 14:134-145.

Draper, Jonathan A. 2002, "Reading the Bible as Conversation: A Theory and Methodology for Contextual Interpretation of the Bible in Africa," *Grace and Truth: Orality and Textuality: An African Perspective*, 19/2:12-24.

_____ 2001, "Old Scores and New Notes: Where and What is Contextual Exegesis in the New South Africa?" in McGlory T. Speckman and Larry T. Kaufmann (eds.), *Towards an Agenda for Contextual Theology: Essays in Honour of Albert Nolan*, Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Publications, 148-168.

_____ 1991, "'For the Kingdom Is Inside You and It Is Outside of You': Contextual Exegesis in South Africa", in Patrick J. Hartin and Jacobus H. Petzer (eds.), *Text and Interpretation: New Approaches in the Criticism of the New Testament*, Leiden: Brill, 235-258.

Dunbar, David G. 1986, "The Biblical Canon," in D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge (eds.), *Hermeneutics, Authority and Canon*, Leicester: IVP, 293-360.

Dunnett, Walter M. 1988, "The Hermeneutics of Jude and 2 Peter: the Use of Ancient Jewish Traditions," *JETS* 31:287-292.

Eide, Øyvind M. 2000, *Revolution and Religion in Ethiopia: The Growth and Persecution of the Mekane Yesus Church 1974-85*, East African Studies, Oxford: James Currey; Athens: Ohio University Press; Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Press.

Elwell, Walter A. (ed.) 1986, *Baker Encyclopædia of the Bible*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Elliott, Mark W. 2010, "Effective-History and the Hermeneutics of Ulrich Luz," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 33/2:161-173.

Ellis, E. Earle 1999, *The Making of the New Testament Documents*, Biblical Interpretation Series, Leiden: Brill.

_____ 1993, *Prophecy and Hermeneutics in Christianity*, Grand Rapids: Baker Books.

_____ 1988, "Biblical Interpretation in the New Testament Church," in Martin Jan Mulder, (ed.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, CRIANT, Assen: Van Gorcum, 691-725.

_____ 1977, "How the New Testament Uses the Old," in I. Howard Marshall, (ed.), *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 199-219.

Emerald Group [2010a], "How to... Conduct Interviews," accessed on 05/03/2010 from: <http://info.emeraldinsight.com/research/guides/interviews.htm>.

_____ [2010b], "How to... Analyse Qualitative Data", accessed on 05/03/10 from: <http://info.emeraldinsight.com/research/guides/qualitative.htm>.

Emmanuel Abraham 1995, *Reminiscences of My Life*, Oslo: Lunde forlag.

EOTC [2014], "Religious Holidays and Calendar", accessed on 22/01/2014 from: <http://www.ethiopianorthodox.org/english/calendar.html>.

_____ [2013], "Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church", accessed on 25/10/2013 from: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethiopian_Orthodox_Tewahedo_Church>.

_____ 2009, *Ethiopian Church Treasures and Faith*, [Paris], France: Archange Minotaure.

_____ 2007a, *መጽሐፍ ቅዱስና የኢትዮጵያ ኦርቶዶክስ ተዋሂዶ ቤተ ክርስቲያን፤ ልዩ እትም፡፡* ([2000 E.C.]) ፤ [አዲስ አበባ፤ ኢአተቤክ]፡፡

_____ 2007b, *የኢትዮጵያ ኦርቶዶክስ ተዋሕዶ ቤተ ክርስቲያን ታሪክ ከልደተ ክርስቶስ እስከ ዓ.ም (2000)* ፤ [አዲስ አበባ፤ ኢአተቤክ]፡፡

_____ 2003, "The Bible", retrieved on 21 May 2012 from: <http://ethiopianorthodox.org/english/canonical/books.html/>.

_____ 1997, *The Church of Ethiopia: Past and present*, Addis Ababa: Commercial Printing Enterprise.

_____ 1996, *The Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church Faith, Order of Worship and Ecumenical Relations*, 2nd ed., Addis Ababa: Tinsae Publishing House.

Erho, Ted M. & Stuckenbruck, Loren T. 2013, "A Manuscript History of *Ethiopic Enoch*", *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*, 23/2/87-133.

Erickson, Millard 1992, *Introducing Christian Doctrine*, 2nd ed., edited by L. Arnold Hustad, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

_____ 1983, *Christian Theology*, vol. 1, Grand Rapids: Baker.

Eshel, Hanan 2007, "An Allusion in the Parables of Enoch to the Act of Matthias Antigonus in 40 B.C.E.," in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 487-491.

Ethiopian Constitution of 1955, accessed on 05/10/2014 from: <http://www.himchurch.org/images/Constitution/Ethiopia/The_Revised_Constitution_of_The_Empire_of_Ethiopia-Proclama.html>.

Ethiopian Constitution of 1931, accessed on 05/10/2014 from: <http://www.ras-tafari.com/documents/EN_Ethiopian_Constitution_1931.pdf>.

Eusebius Pamphilius 1890, *Church History, Life of Constantine, Oration in Praise of Constantine*, Series II, vol. 1 in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, edited by Philip Schaff, http://www.ccel.org/schaff/npnf201.iii.vii.ii.html, accessed November 26, 2013.

Evans, Craig A. 2002, "The Scriptures of Jesus and His Earliest Followers," in Lee Martin McDonalds and James A. Sanders (eds.), *The Canon Debate: on the Origins and Formation of the Bible*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 185-189.

FDRE 2008, *Summary and Statistical Report of the 2007 Population and Housing Census*, Addis Ababa: Population Census Commission and UNFPA.

ፈቃዱ ጉርሜሳ 1999፣ የወንጌል እምነት እንቅስቃሴ በኢትዮጵያ፣ አዲስ አበባ፡የምሥራች ድምጽ ሥነ-ጽሑፍ አገልግሎት፡፡

Ferguson, Sinclair B. and Wright, David F. (eds.) 1988, *New Dictionary of Theology,* Leicester: IVP. G. B.

Founderbruk, G.B. 1976, "Angel," in Merrill C. Tenney, ed., *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, vol. I, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 163-166.

France, R. T. 1971, *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission*, London: The Tyndale Press.

Franke, John R. 2004, "Scripture, Tradition and Authority: Reconstructing the Evangelical Conception of *Sola Scriptura*," in Vincent Bacote, Laura C. Miguélez, and Dennis L. Okholm (eds.), *Evangelicals and Scriptures: Tradition, Authority and Hermeneutics,* Downers Grove; IVP, 192-210.

Freedman, David Noel (ed.) 1992, *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (in six volumes), New York: Doubleday.

Finneran, Niall 2003, "Ethiopian Evil Eye Belief and the Magical Symbolism of Iron Working," *Folklore* 114:427–433.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 2000, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins,* Grand Rapid: Eerdmans.

Flint, Peter 1999, " 'Apocrypha,' other Previously Unknown Writings, 'Pseudepigrapha,' in the Dead Sea Scrolls" in idem and James C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 2, Brill: Leiden, 24-66.

Forslund, Eskil 1993, *The Word of God in Ethiopian Tongues: Rhetorical Features in the Preaching of the Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus*, Studia Missionalia Upsaliensia LVIII, Uppsala: International Tryck AB.

Fossum, Jarl 1987, "Kurios Jesus as the Angel of the Lord in Jude 5-7," *New Testament Studies* 33/2:226-243

Fröhlich, Ida 2005, "Enoch and Jubilees," in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 141-147.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg 2004, *Truth and Method*, 2nd rev. ed., trans. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald Marshall, London: Continuum.

_____ 1975, *Truth and Method*, London: Sheed & Ward.

Gamble, Harry Y. 1985, *The New Testament Canon: Its Making and Meaning,* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Gaster, T. H. 1962, "Angel," in George Arthur Buttrick (ed.), *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible,* vol. 1, New York: Abingdon Press, 128-134.

Gebru Tarreke 1991, *Ethiopia: Power and Protest: Peasant revolts in the twentieth century* African Studies Series 71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Getachew Haile, Lande, Ausulve and Rubenson, Samuel (eds.) 1998, *The Missionary Factor in Ethiopia: Papers from a Symposium on the Impact of European Missions on Ethiopian society, Lund University, August 1996,* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH.

Getachew Haile 1998, "The Missionary's Dream: An Ethiopian Perspective on Western Missions in Ethiopia", in Getachew Haile, Ausulve Lande, and Samuel Rubenson (eds.), *The Missionary Factor in Ethiopia: Papers from a Symposium on the Impact of European Missions on Ethiopian society, Lund University, August 1996,* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH, 1998, 1-8.

_____ 1992, *The Mariology of Emperor Zär'a Yaqob of Ethiopia: Texts and Translations*, Orientalia Christiana analecta 242, Rome: Pontificum Institutum Studiorum Orientalium.

Getahun Dilebo 1974, "Emperor Menelik's Ethiopia, 1865-1916: National Unification or Amhara Communal Domination," PhD diss., Howard University.

Getnet Tamene 1998, "Features of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church and the Clergy," *Asian and African Studies*, 7/1:87-104.

Gibbon, Edward 1830, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, complete in four volumes*, vol. 3, Philadelphia: B.F. French.

Gilkes, Patrick 1975, *The Dying Lion: Feudalism and Modernization in Ethiopia.* London: Julian Friedmann Pub.

Girma Bekele 2011, *The In-Between People: A Reading of David Bosch through the Lens of Mission History and Contemporary Challenges in Ethiopia*, Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Pub.

Glenny, W. Edward 1997, "Typology: A Summary of the Present Evangelical Discussion," *JETS*, 40:627-638.

Glessmer, Uwe 1999, "Calendars in the Qumran Scrolls," in Peter Flint and James C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 2, Brill: Leiden, 213-278.

Gnisci, Jacopo 2012, "Continuity and Tradition: The Prominent role of Cyrillian Christology in Fifteenth and Sixteenth Century Ethiopia," in *Polyvocia SOAS Journal of Graduate Research* 4:20-38, accessed on 03/11/2013 from: <http://www.soas.ac.uk/research/rsa/journalofgraduateresearch/edition-4/file75708.pdf>.

Gnuse, Robert, *The Authority of the Bible: Theories of Inspiration, Revelation and the Canon of Scripture,* New York: Paulist Press, 1985.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. 1939, *The Story of the Apocrypha,* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

ጎርጎርዮስ፥ አባ (የሸዋ ሊቀ ጳጳስ) 1974፣ *የኢትዮጵያ ኦርቶዶክስ ቤተ ክርስቲያን ታሪክ፣* አዲስ አበባ:

Gowler, David B. 2010, "Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation: Textures of a Text and its Reception," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 33:191-206.

Grabbe, Lester L. 1992, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian: vol. Two, The Roman Period*, Minneapolis: Fortress.

Gragg, Gene B. 1975, "A Magic Prayer of Henoch from a Manuscript of the Goodspeed Collection of the University of Chicago" in Harold G. Marcus (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fifth United States Conference on Ethiopian Studies*, East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University Press, 61-71.

Graas, Lisa 2011, "Muslims Burned 69 Churches in Ethiopia: Thousands of Christians Flee," *News Real*, online eNews Letter, posted on 25/03/2011, accessed on 08/10/2014 from: < http://www.newsrealblog.com/2011/03/25/muslims-burned-69-churches-in-ethiopia-thousands-of-christians-flee/>.

Greenfield, Jonas C. and Stone, Michael E. 1977, "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes," *HTR* 70:51-65.

Green, Gene L. 2008, *Jude and 2 Peter*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, Grand Rapids, MI.: Baker.

Green, Michael 1987, *2 Peter and Jude*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

_____ 1968, *The Second Epistle General of Peter and the General Epistle of Jude: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC, Leicester: IVP.

Grenholm, Christina and Patte, Daniel 2000, "Receptions, Critical Interpretations, and Scriptural Criticism," in idem (eds.), *Reading Israel in Romans Legitimacy and Plausibility of Divergent Interpretations*, Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1-54.

Grisanti, Michael A. 2001, "Inspiration, Inerrancy, and the OT Canon: The Place of Textual Updating in an Inerrant View of Scripture," *JETS* 44:577-598.

Gudina Tumsa 2003, *Witness and Discipleship: Leadership of the Church in Multi-Ethnic Ethiopia in a Time of Revolution: The Essential Writings of Gudina Tumsa, General Secretary of the EECMY (1929-1979)*, edited by Paul Hoffman, Addis Ababa: GTF.

Gunther, John J. 1984, "The Alexandrian Epistle of Jude," *NTS*, 30:549-562.

Günther, W. 1986, "πλανάω, Lead Astray, Deceive," in *NIDNTT*, vol. 2, Carlisle: Paternoster, 457-461.

Guthrie, Donald 1981, *New Testament Theology*, Leicester: IVP.

HaCohen, R. 2009, כבוד המלכים האפוס הלאומי האתיופי *(The Glory of the Kings: The Ethiopian National Epic)*, Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press.

Haile Mariam Larebo 1988, "The Ethiopian Orthodox Church," in Pedro Ramet (ed.), *Eastern Christianity and Politics in the Twentieth Century*, Durham: Duke University Press, 379.

Haile Sellassie I, Emperor 1961, "Speech Delivered by H.I.M. Haile Selassie I on July 23, 1961," posted by Lion of Judah Society (LOJS), accessed on 12/09/2013 from: <http://www.lojsociety.org/haile_selassie_bible_speech1961.html>.

Hannah, Darrell 2007, "The Book of Noah, the Death of Herod the Great, and the Date of the Parables of Enoch," in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 469-477.

Hannold, Boyd A. 2010, Jude *in the Middle: How the Epistle of Jude Illustrates Gnostic Ties with Jewish Apocalypticism through Early Christianity*, Saarbrücken, Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing.

Harden, J.M. 1926, *An Introduction to Ethiopic Christian Literature*, London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Harrington, Daniel J. 2002, "The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Early Church and Today," in Lee Martin McDonalds and James A. Sanders (eds.), *The Canon Debate: on the Origins and Formation of the Bible*, Peabody: Hendrickson Pub., 196-210.

Hart, Chris 2005, *Doing Your Masters Dissertation*, London: SAGE Pub.

Hauser, Alan J. & Watson, Duane F. 2003, "Introduction and Overview" in idem, (eds), *A History of Biblical Interpretation: Vol. 1: The Ancient Period*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1-54.

Hausman, Gerald 2005, "From the *Kebre Nagast*: The Lost Bible of Rastafarian Wisdom and Faith from Ethiopia and Jamaica," in Dereck Daschke and W. Michael Ashcraft (eds.), *New Religious Movements*, New York: New York University Press, 205-206.

Hegermann, H. 1990, "δόξα, ης, ἡ," in *EDNT*, vol. 1, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 344-348.

Heidegger, Martin 1996, *Being and Time*, 7th ed., trans. Joan Stambaugh, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Heldman, Marilyne E. 1973, "Christ's Entry into Jerusalem in Ethiopia", in: Harold G. Marcus and John Hinnant (eds.), *Proceedings of the First United States Conference on Ethiopian Studies*, East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University, 43-60.

Helmer, Christine and Landmesser, Christof (eds.) 2004, *One Scripture or Many?: Canon from Biblical, Theological, and Philosophical Perspectives*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hengel, Martin 2002, *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon,* Translated by Mark E. Biddle, Old Testament Studies, Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

_____ 1992, "The Septuagint as a Collection of Writings Claimed by Christians: Justin and the Church Fathers before Origen", in James D. G. Dunn (ed.), *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, A.D. 70 to 135: the Second Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium on Earliest Christianity and Judaism (Durham, September 1989)*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 39-83.

Hennecke, E[dgar] 1963, *New Testament Apocrypha: volume one, Gospels and Related Writings,* W. Schneemelcher (ed.), English translation edited by R. McL. Wilson, London: SCM.

Henning, Elizabeth 2004, *Finding your way in qualitative research*, Pretoria: Van Schaik Pub.

Henry, Carl F. H. 1986, "Bible, Authority of the," in Walter A. Elwell (ed.), *Baker Encyclopædia of the Bible*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 296-300.

_____ 1979, "The Authority and Inspiration of the Bible," in F. E. Gaebelein (ed.), *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, in 12 vols., Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1:13.

Henze, Paul B. 2000, *Layers of Time: A History of Ethiopia*, London: Hurst & Co.

Hillyer, Norman 1992, *1 and 2 Peter, Jude,* NIBC, Peabody: Hendrickson.

ጎሩይ ስሜ 2000፤ *ትክክለኛው የኢትዮጵያ ዘመን አቆጣጠር፣ አለሙ ተሳሳተውን የጎርጎርዮስ ዘመን አቆጣጠር መከተል ፤ዛሬ ከጌታችን ልደት በኋላ 2000 ዓ.ም መሆኑ፣* አዲስ አበባ።

HMML [2013], "Ethiopia Study Center", accessed on 19/11/2013 from: <http://www.hmml.org/ethiopia-study-center.html>.

Hoffmann, Thomas A. 1982, "Inspiration, Normativeness, Canonicity, and the unique Sacred Character of the Bible," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 44: 3: 447-469.

Holter, Knut (ed.) 2007, *Interpreting Classical Religious Texts in Contemporary Africa*, Nairobi: Acton Pub.

_____ 2002, *Old Testament Research for Africa: A Critical Analysis and Annotated Bibliography of African Old Testament Dissertations, 1967-2000*, New York: Peter Lang.

IES 2000, *Ethiopian Icons: Catalogue of the Collection of the Institute of the Ethiopian Studies [IES], Addis Ababa University*, Milan: Skira Editore.

Igenoza, Andrew O. 1988, "Medicine and Healing in African Christianity: A Biblical Critique," *African Ecclesial Review*, 30:12-25.

Isaac, Ephraim 1983, "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch: A New Translation and Introduction," in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Volume 1, Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, New York: Doubleday, 5-89.

_____ 1980, "Genesis, Judaism and the 'Sons of Ham'," *Slavery and Abolition: A Journal of Comparative Studies*, 1/1:4-5.

_____ 1976, *The Ethiopian Church*, Boston: H. N. Sawyer Co.

Jackson, David R. 2014, "Dualling Canons," in Georg Steins, Philip Sumpter, Johannes Taschner (eds.), *Relationships Between the Two Parts of the Christian Bible: Historical, Literary, and Theological Studies*, Osnabrücker Studien zur Jüdischen und Christlichen Bibel, Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht unipress, forthcoming.

2009, "Jubilees and Enochic Judaism," in Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba (eds.), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: the Evidence of Jubilees*, Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 411-425.

Jetto Hordoffa 1999, "Troubled but not Destroyed: the Effects of Persecution of 1978-1991 on the Congregation of the Western Wellega Bethel Synod," BTh Paper, Mekane Yesus Seminary.

Jones, A.H.M. and Monroe, Elizabeth 1955, *A History of Ethiopia*, Oxford: Clarendon.

Kalilombe, Patrick-Augustine 1980, "The Salvific Value of African Religions: A Contextualized Bible Reading for Africa," in Atal sa Agang et al. (eds.), *Christianisme et Identité Africaine: Point de vue exegetique – Actes de lur Congres des biblistes africains, Kinshasa, 26-30 Decembre 1978*, Kinshasa: Facultes Catholiques, 205-220.

Kalin, E. 1974, "The Inspired Community: A Glance at Canon History," *CTM*, 42:541-49.

Kaplan, Irving et al. 1971, *Area Handbook for Ethiopia*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Kaplan, Steven 1984, *The Monastic Holy Man and the Christianization of Early Solomonic Ethiopia*, Studien zur Kulturkunde 73, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Kelly, J. N. D. 1969, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, BNTC, London: Adam and Charles Black.

_____ 1963, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*. New York: Harper and Raw.

Kelsey, David H. 1975, *The Uses of Scripture in Recent Theology*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Keteyi, Xolile 1998, *Inculturation as a Strategy for Liberation: A Challenge for South Africa*, with an Epilogue by Tinyiko Sam Maluleke, Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Pub.

Kistemaker, Simon J. 1987, *Exposition of the Epistles of Peter and of the Epistle of Jude*, NTC, Grand Rapids: Backer Book House.

Knibb, Michael A. 2009, *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions,* Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha, vol 22, Leiden/Boston: Brill.

_____ 2001a, "Christian Adoption and Transmission of Jewish Pseudepigrapha: The Case of 1 Enoch," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 32:396-415.

_____ 2001b, "The Translation of *1 Enoch* 70.1: Some Methodological Issues" in Ada Rapoport-Albert and Gillian Greenberg (eds.) *Biblical Hebrew, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Michael P. Weitzmann*, London: Sheffield Academic Press, 340-354.

_____ 1999, *Translating the Bible: the Ethiopic Version of the Old Testament,* The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1995, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____ 1978-79, "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review," *NTS* 25:345-359.

_____ 1978, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments, vol. 2 Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Knight, Mark 2010, "*Wirkungsgeschichte*, Reception History, Reception Theory," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 33/2:137-146.

Koperski, Veronica 2003, "Sirach and Wisdom: A Plea for Canonicity," in Jean-Marie Auwers and Henk Jan de Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons,* Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium clxii, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 255-264.

Kraftchick, Steven J. 2002, *Jude, 2 Peter,* Abingdon New Testament Commentaries, Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Kropp, Manfred 1999, "Ethiopian Orthodox Church" in Ken Parry, et. al., (eds), *The Blackwell Dictionary of Eastern Christianity,* Oxford: Blackwell Pub., 184-190.

Ladd, George Eldon 1993, *A Theology of the New Testament,* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Landon, Charles 1996, *A Text-critical Study of the Epistle of Jude*, JSNTSS, Sheffield; Sheffield Academic Press.

Langmuir, Elizabeth Cross, Chojnacki, Stanislaw and Fetchko, Peter 1978, *Ethiopia: The Christina Art of an African Nation*, Salem, Massachusetts: the Peabody Museum of Salem.

Larson, Erik W. 2005, "The LXX and Enoch: Influence and Interpretation in Early Jewish Literature," in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, Grand Rapids; Eerdmans, 84-89.

Lawlor, George L. 1972, *The Epistle of Jude*, Nately, N.J.: Presbyterian and Reformed.

Leemans, Johan 2003, "Canon and Quotation: Athanasius' Use of Jesus Sirach," in Jean-Marie Auwers and Henk Jan de Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons,* Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium clxii, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 265-277.

Lee, Ralph 2013, "The Ethiopic Commentary on Revelation – Interpretative Highlights", Addis Ababa: Holy Trinity Theological College, unpublished paper presented at the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting 2013, Joint Session of Ethiopic Bible and Literature and St John's Apocalypse.

Levine, Donald 1974, *Greater Ethiopia: The Evolution of a Multiethnic Society*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lewis, Jack P. 2002, "Jemnia Revisited," in Lee Martin McDonalds and James A. Sanders (eds.), *The Canon Debate: on the Origins and Formation of the Bible*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 146-162.

_____ 1964, "What Do We Mean by Jabneh?," *JBR*, 32:132.

Lossky, Nichlas et al. (eds.) 1991, *Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement*, Geneva: WCC Publications; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Lucas, Dick and Green, Christopher 1995, *The Message of 2 Peter and Jude: The promise of His Coming,* BST, Leicester: IVP.

Lucass, Shirley 2011, *The Concept of the Messiah in the Scriptures of Judaism and Christianity*, Library of Second Temple Studies 78, New York: T & T Clark.

ሉሌ መልአኩ 1997 ዓ.ም., *የኢትዮጵያ አርቶዶክስ ተዋሕዶ ቤተ ክርስቲያን ታሪክ፤* አዲስ አበባ፤ ትንሣኤ ዘጉባኤ ማተሚያ ቤት::

Lust, John 2003, "Septuagint and Canon," in Jean-Marie Auwers and Henk Jan de Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons,* Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium clxii, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 39-55.

Luz, Ulrich 2005, "Canonical Exegesis and Hermeneutics of 'Effective History'," in idem (ed.), *Studies in Matthew*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 333-48.

_____ 1990, *Matthew 1–7: A Commentary*, trans. Wilhelm C. Linss, Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Lyons, William John 2010, "Hope for a Troubled Discipline? Contributions to New Testament Studies from Reception History," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 33/2:207-220.

MacFall, Ernest A. 1970, *Approaching the Nuer through the Old Testament*, Pasadena: William Carey Library.

MacLeod, Mindy and Mees, Bernard 2006, *Runic Amulets and Magic Objects*, Woodbridge: The Boydell.

Mahler, S. 2007, *Kebra Negast, la Gloire des Rois d'Éthiopie*, Paris: La Boutique des Artistes.

Mahn, Stephen 2008, "The Popularity and Rejection of the Story of the Watchers (l Enoch 6-11)," unpublished MA thesis; Montreal, Quebec: Concordia University.

Malek, George 1999, "Towards Defining Ecumenism: The Bible and Ecumenism," in Lombaard Christo (ed.), *Essays and Exercises in Ecumenism*, Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Publication, 7-25.

Manton, Thomas 1999, *Jude*, CCC. Wheaten, Crossway Books.

Manus, Chris Ukachukwu 2003, "Scriptures and Canon: Interpretations of the bible in contemporary African Christianity," in Jean-Marie Auwers and Henk Jan de Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons,* Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium clxii, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 659-669.

Marcuse, H. 2003, "Reception history: Definitions and quotations," Retrieved 09 November, 2012 from: <http://www.history.ucsb.edu/faculty/marcuse/receptionhist.htm>.

Marcus, Harold Golden 1994, *A History of Ethiopia*, Berkeley / Los Angeles / London: University of California Press.

_____ 1975, *The Life and Times of Menelik II: Ethiopia 1844-1913*, Oxford: Oxford Studies in African Affairs.

Markakis, J. 1974, *Ethiopia: Anatomy of a Traditional Polity*, Oxford: OUP.

Martínez, Florentino Gracía and Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. 1997 (vol.1), 1998 (vol.2), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition,* 2 vols., Leiden: Brill.

Marshall, I. Howard 1982, *Biblical Inspiration*, London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Marsh, Richard 1998, *Black Angels: The Art and Spirituality of Ethiopia*, Oxford: Lion Pub.

Matthew, P.K. 1970, "The Hierarchy" in Sergew Hable Sellassie (ed.), *The Church of Ethiopia: A Panorama of History and Spiritual Life*. Addis Ababa: B.S.P.E., 55-61.

Mbiti, John 1971, *New Testament Eschatology in an African Background: A Study of the Encounter between New Testament Theology and African Traditional Concepts*, SNTSMS, London: London University Press.

McDonald, Lee Martin 2002, "Identifying Scripture and Canon In the Early Church: The Criteria Question," in Lee Martin and McDonald and James A. Sanders (eds.), *The Canon Debate: on the Origins and Formation of the Bible*, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 416-439.

_____ 1995, *The formation of the Christian Biblical Canon: Revised and Expanded Edition,* Peabody: Hendrickson.

_____ 1988, *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon*, Nashville: Abingdon Press.

McDonald, Lee Martin and Sanders, James A. (eds.), 2002a, *The Canon Debate: on the Origins and Formation of the Bible*, Peabody: Hendrickson.

_____ 2002b, "Introduction," in idem, *The Canon Debate: on the Origins and Formation of the Bible*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 3-17.

McGrath, Alister E. 2011, *Christian Theology: An Introduction*, 5th ed., Chichester; West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Pub.

_____ 2007, *Christian Theology: An Introduction,* 4th ed., Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

McNamara, Martin 1983, *Intertestamental Literature,* Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier.

Meade, David G. 1986, *Pseudonymity and Canon: An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Earliest Christian Tradition*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Mearns, Christopher L. 1978-79, "Dating the Similitudes of Enoch," *NTS* 25:360-369.

Mebratu Kiros Gebru 2005, "Miaphysite Christology: A Study of the Ethiopian Tewahedo Christological Tradition on the Nature of Christ", an MTh Thesis, Toronto: Theological Faculty of the University of St Michael's College in the University of Toronto.

Malbaa Gadaa 1988, *Oromia: An Introduction*, Khartoum.

Meles Zenawi 2012, "PM Meles Zenawi Answers Parliament Members' Questions April 17, 2012" online on YouTube, accessed on 06/10/2014 from: <http://www.ethiotube.net/video/19271/PM-Meles-Zenawi-answers-parliament-members-questions-April-17-2012--Part-3>.

Metzger, Bruce M. 1987, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

_____ 1965, "Introduction to the Apocrypha," in Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger (eds.), *The Oxford Annotated Bible with Apocrypha: Revised Standard Version,* New York: Oxford University Press, [ix-xx].

Meurer, S. (ed.) 1991, *The Apocrypha in Ecumenical Perspective*, Readings, U.K./New York: United Bible Societies.

መሥረተ ስብሐት ለአብ 1988፤ *ትውፊታዊ ጕሳብ ዘመንና ታሪኩ በኢትዮጵያ ቤተ ክርስቲያን አዳም*፥ አዲስ አበባ፤ መካነ የሱስ ሴሚናሪዮም።

Meyendorff, John 1965, "The Meaning of Tradition," in Leonard J. Swidler (ed.), *Scripture and Ecumenism: Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox and Jewish*, Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 43-58.

Mikre-Sellassie Gebre-Amanuel 2010, *የእግዚአብሔር መንግሥት ታሪክ በምድር ላይ፣ ጠቅላላ የቤተ ክርስቲያን ታሪክ፣ ሁለተኛ መጽሐፍ፣* አዲስ አበባ፤ ብርሃንና ሰላም ማተሚያ ድርጅት፣ 2002 ዓ.ም.።

_____ 2008, *The Early Translation of the Bible into Ethiopic/Geez*, Addis Ababa: Berhanina Selam Printing Enterprise.

_____ 2004, "Early Translation of the Bible into Ethiopic-Geez," in Gosnell L.O.R. York and Peter M. Renju (eds.), *Bible Translation and African Languages*, Nairobi: Acton Pub., 25-39.

_____ 2007a, *የእግዚአብሔር መንግሥት ታሪክ በምድር ላይ፤ ጠቅላላ የቤተ ክርስቲያን ታሪክ፤ አንደኛ መጽሐፍ፤* አዲስ አበባ፤ አርቲስቲክ ማተሚያ ድርጅት፤ 2000 ዓ.ም.።

_____ [2007b], ‹‹የቅዱሳት መጻሕፍት ታሪክ በኢትዮጵያ፤›› በየኢትዮጵያ ኦርቶዶክስ ተዋሕዶ ቤተ ክርስቲያን ታሪክ ከሊደተ ክርስቶስ አስከ *!*, [አዲስ አበባ፤ ኢኦተቤክ]፤ 156-173።

_____ [2007c], ‹‹በኢትዮጵያ ኦርቶዶክስ ተዋሕዶ ቤተ ክርስቲያን ሊቃውንት ተተርጉሞ በሁለት ሺህ ዓ.ም. የታተመው መጽሐፍ ቅዱስ፤›› በኢኦተቤክ፤ *መጽሐፍ ቅዱስና የኢትዮጵያ ኦርቶዶክስ ተዋሕዶ ቤተ ክርስቲያን፤ ልዩ እትም*፤ [አዲስ አበባ፤ ኢኦተቤክ]፤ 8-11።

Milik, Jozéf T. 1978, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments, vol. 2 Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

_____ 1976, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4*, Oxford: Clarendon.

Miller, John W. 2004, *How the Bible Came to Be: Exploring the Narrative and Message,* New York: Paulist Press.

Moffatt, James 1928, *The General Epistles: James, Peter, and Judas*, London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Moo, Douglas J. 1996, *2 Peter and Jude*, The NIV Application Commentary, Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Morgan, Robers 2010, "*Sachkritik* in Reception History," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 33/2:175-190.

Mosala, Itumeleng J. 1989, *Biblical Hermeneutics and Black Theology in South Africa*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Mountjoy, Alan B. & Embleton, Clifford 1967, *Africa: A New Geographical Survey* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger.

Mulatu Wubneh and Yohannis Abate 1988, *Ethiopia: Transition and Development in the Horn of Africa* Profiles: Nations of Contemporary Africa. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press; London: Avebury.

Müller, Mogens 1996, *The First Bible of the Church: A Plea for the Septuagint,* JSOTSS 206, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

_____ 1993, "The Septuagint as the Bible of the New Testament Church," *SJOT*, 194-207.

Munro-Hay, Stuart C. 2002, *Ethiopia, the Unknown Land: A Cultural and Historical Guide*, London, I.B. Tauris Pub.

_____ 2001, "A Sixth Century Kebra Nagast ?" *Annales d'Ethiopie* 17 (2001) 43-58, accessed on 15/01/2014 from: <http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/ethio_0066-2127_2001_num_17_1_990>.

_____ 1991, *Aksum: an African civilization of late antiquity*, [e-book] retrieved on 21 May 2012 from: <http://www.dskmariam.org/artsandlitreature/litreature/pdf/aksum.pdf/>.

Munro-Hay, Stuart and Pankhurst, Richard 1995, *Ethiopia*, World Bibliographical Series, vol. 15, Oxford: CLIO Press.

Musaph-Andriesse, R.C. 1981, *From Torah to Kabbalaha; A Basic Introduction to the Writings of Judaism,* London: SCM Press.

Nestle and Aland 2012, *Novum Testametnum Graece: based on the work of Eberhard and Erwin Nestle*, edited by Barbara and Kurt Aland and others, 28th rev. ed., Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibel Gesellschaft.

Neugebauer, Otto 1988, *Abu Shaker's "Chronography": A Treatise of the 13th Century on Chronological, Calendrical, and Astronomical Matters, written by a Christian Arab, preserved in Ethiopic*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Sitzungsberichte, 498, Wien: Der Österreichische Akademie Der Wissenschaften, 1988.

_____ 1983, "Abū-Shāker and the Ethiopic Hasāb", *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 42/1:55-58.

Neusner, Jacob and Avery-Park, Alen J. 2003, *George W. W. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning, Vol. 1 & 2,* SJSJ, Leiden: Brill.

Neusner, Jacob (ed.) 1996, *Dictionary of Judaism in the Biblical Period: 450 B.C.E. to 600 C.E.*, Peabody: Hendrickson.

New World Encyclopedia [2014], "Second Italo–Ethiopian War," in online Encyclopedia, accessed on 07/10/2014 from : <http://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Second_Italo-Ethiopian_War>.

Nicholl, Colin 2000, "Michael, The Restrainer Removed," *JTS*, 5:27-53.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. and VanderKam, James C. 2012, edited by Klaus Baltzer, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 37-81,* Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

_____ 2004, *1 Enoch: A New Translation Based on the Hermeneia Commentary*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. 2006, "The Book of Enoch in the Theology and Practice of the Ethiopian Church", in Siegbert Uhlig (ed.), *Proceedings of the 15th International*

Conference of Ethiopian Studies, Hamburg July 20-25, 2003, Wiesbaden : Harrassowitz, 611-19

_____ 2005, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction,* 2nd ed., Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

_____ 2001, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1-36; 81-108*, Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

_____ 1995, "Scripture in *1 Enoch* and *1 Enoch* as Scripture," in Tord Fornberg and David Hellholm (eds.), *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts: Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*, Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 335-354.

_____ 1978, review of *The Books of Enoch*, by J. T. Milik, *CBQ* 40:411–19.

_____ 1977, "The Apocalyptic Message of 1 Enoch 92-105," *CBQ*, 39:309-328.

Nicole, Roger 1997, "The Canon of the New Testament," *JETS*, 40:199f.

Njoku, Uzochukwu J. 2008, "Religion and the Socio-Political Order: Developing a Theological Framework for Public Discourse in Nigeria," *Journal of Inculturation Theology*, 10/1:90-104.

Oesterley, W.O.E. 1935, *An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha,* London: SPCK.

O'Kane, Martin 2010, "*Wirkungsgeschichte* and Visual Exegesis: The Contribution of Hans-Georg Gadamer," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 33/2:147-159.

O'Leary, De Lacy 1936, *The Ethiopian Church: Historical Notes on the church of Abyssinia*, London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Oleson, John Peter 1979, "An Echo of Hesido's *Theogony* vv. 190-2 in Jude 13," *NTS*, 25:492-503.

Olson, Daniel C. 2007, "An Overlooked Patristic Allusion to the Parables of Enoch?" in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 492-296.

_____ 1998, "Enoch and the Son of Man in the Epilogue of the Parables," *Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha*, 18:27-38.

Onwu, Nlenanya 1988, "The Parable of the Unmerciful Servant (Matt 18:21-35)," in Justin S. Ukpong (ed.), *Gospel Parables in African Context*, Port Harcourt: CIWA Pub., 43-51.

Orlov, Andrei A. 2014, "2 Enoch," in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *4 Enoch: The Online Encyclopedia of Second Temple Judaism*, accessed on 26/06/2014 from: <http://www.4enoch.org/wiki3/index.php?title=2_Enoch>.

_____ 2010, "Enoch, Slavonic Apocalypse of (2 Enoch)," in John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow (eds.), *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 587-590.

Osburn, Carroll D. 1992, "Discourse Analysis and Jewish Apocalyptic in the Epistle of Jude," in David Alan Black (ed.), *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis*, Nashville: Broadman, 287-319.

_____ 1985, "*1 Enoch* 80:2-8 (67:5-7) and Jude 12-13," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 47:296-303.

_____ 1981, "The Text of Jude 5," *Biblica*, 62/1:107-115.

_____ 1976-77, "The Christological use of *1 Enoch* 1:9 in Jude 14, 15," *NTS*, 23:334-341.

Osie-Bonsu, Joseph 1990, "The Contextualization of Christianity: Some New Testament Antecedents," *Irish Biblical Studies*, 12/3:129-148.

Outler, Albert C. 1965, "Scripture, Tradition an Ecumenism," in Leonard J. Swidler (ed.), *Scripture and Ecumenism: Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox and Jewish,* Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 9-22.

Owan, Kris J. N. 1997, "The Word of God in Human Language: Towards a Culturally Pluralistic Interpretation of the Bible," *Journal of Inculturation Theology*, 4/2:97-119.

Packer, J.I. 1988, "Scripture," in Ferguson, Sinclair B., and Wright, David F. (eds.), *New Dictionary of Theology*, Leicester/Downers Grove: IVP, 627-631.

Pankhurst, Richard [20013a], "Historical Feature: A Serious Question of Ethiopian Studies; Five Thousand Ethiopian Manuscripts Abroad, and the International Community", accessed on 03/11/2013 from: <http://www.ethiopianorthodoxchurch.org/edu_articles/histirical_feature.html>.

_____ [2013b]. "The Microfilming of Ethiopian Manuscripts: A Nostalgic View", accessed on 19/11/2013 from: <http://www.linkethiopia.org/guide-to-ethiopia/the-pankhurst-history-library/the-microfilming-of-ethiopian-manuscripts-a-nostalgic-view/>.

_____ 1998, *The Ethiopians*, The Peoples of Africa, Oxford: Blackwell Pub.

_____ 1961, *An Introduction to the Economic History of Ethiopia from the Early Times to 1900*, London: Oxford University Press.

Pankhurst, Richard & Ingram, Leila 1988, *Ethiopia Engraved: An Illustrated Catalogue of Engraving by Foreign Travellers from 1681 to* 1900, London - New York: Kegan Paul.

Parkins, Mansfield 1868, *Life in Abyssinia: Being Notes Collected During Three Years' Residence and Travels in that Country*, London: Murray.

Pelikan, Jaroslav 1996, *The Reformation of the Bible: the Bible of the Reformation*, New Heaven: Yale University Press.

Perkins, Pheme 1995, *First and Second Peter, James, and Jude*, Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox Press.

Peterson, T. 1978, *Ham and Japhet: The Mythic World of Whites in the Antebellum South*, Metuche, NJ and London: Scarecrow Press.

Petros S. Berga 2006, *What Happened to the Original Christian Unity in Ethiopia?: Towards the Restoration of our Original Unity in Christ*, St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag Erzabtei St. Ottilien.

Phillipson, David W. 2009, *Ancient Churches of Ethiopia: fourth to Fourteenth Centuries*, New Heaven: Yale University Press.

Pinnock, Clark H. 1985, *The Scripture Principle*, London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Piovanelli, Pierluigi 2013, "The Apocryphal Legitimization of a "Solomonic" Dynasty in the *Kebra Nagast*: A Reappraisal," *AEthiopica: International Journal of Ethiopian and Eritrean Studies*, 16:7-44.

_____ 2007, "A Testimony for the Kings and the Mighty Who Possess the Earth: The Thirst for Justice and Peace in the Parables of Enoch," in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 363-379.

Potter, Philip 1977, "One Obedience to the Whole Gospel," *The Ecumenical Review*, 24/4:303.

Price, Charles C. 1993, "Holy Book, Holy People: A Study of the Authority and Use of the Bible," in Frederick Houk Borsh (ed.), *The Bible's Authority in Today's Church,* Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 71-100.

Priest, John F. 1992, "Moses, Testament of," in David Noel Freedman (ed.), *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 4, New York: Doubleday, 920-922.

Prior, Michael 1997, *The Bible and Colonialism*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Prouty, Chris and Rosenfeld, Eugene 1981, *Historical Dictionary of Ethiopia*, African Historical Dictionaries, no. 32, Metuchen, NJ.: The Scarecrow Press.

Prouty, Chris 1976, *A Chronology of Menelik II of Ethiopia 1844-1913*, East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University.

Rahner, Karl and Vorgrimler, Herbert 1965, *Theological Dictionary,* Cornelius Ermst (ed.), Richard Strachan (trans.), New York: Herder and Herder.

Raineri, O. 2008, *La Gloria dei Re. Salomone e la regina di Saba nell'epopea etiopica tra testo e pittura*, with illuminations by Yohannes Tesemma and an introduction by R. Riva, Roma: Fondazione Benedetta Riva.

Range, William A. 1975, *The Geography of Modern* Africa, New York: Columbia University Press.

Rapoport, L. 1979, *The Lost Jews: Last of the Ethiopian Falashas*, New York, Stein and Day pub.

ረዳ አስረስ (ሊቀ ሥዩማን) 2000፣ ‹‹የኢትዮጵያ ኦርቶዶክስ ተዋሕዶ ቤተ ክርስቲያንና ጽዋትወ ዜማ››፣ በየኢትዮጵያ ኦርቶዶክስ ተዋሂዶ ቤተ ክርስቲያን ታሪክ ከልደተ ክርስቶስ እስከ 2000 ዓ.ም፣ [አዲስ አበባ፣ ኢኦተቤክ]፣ 95-128።

Reed, Annotte Yoshiko 2005, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reicke, Bo 1964 , *The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude: Introduction, Translation and Notes*, The Anchor Bible, Garden City: Doubleday.

Repphun, Eric et al. (eds.) 2011, "Beyond Christianity, the Bible, and the Text: Urgent Tasks and New Orientations for Reception History," *Relegere: Studies in Religion and Reception*, 1/1:1-11, an online journal, accessed on 24-07-2014 from <https://relegere.org/relegere/article/view/391/494>.

Ricoeur, Paul 1981, *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rietz, Henry W. Morisada 2005, "Synchronizing Worship: Jubilees as a Tradition for the Qumran Community," in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 111-118.

Roberts, Jonathan and Rowland, Christopher 2011, "Review Essay: Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception," *Relegere: Studies in Religion and Reception*, 1/2:351-58.

_____ 2010, "Introduction," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 33/2:131-136.

Robbins, Vernon K. 2010, "Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation," in David E. Aune (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to the New Testament*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 192-219.

_____ 2002, "Argumentative Textures in Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation," in A. Eriksson, T.H. Olbricht and W. Übelacker (eds.), *Argumentation in Biblical Texts: Essays from the 2000 Lund Conference*, Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 27-65.

_____ 1996, *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*, Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International.

_____ 1994, "Socio-Rhetorical Criticism: Mary, Elizabeth, and the Magnificat as a Test Case," in Elizabeth Struthers Malbon and Edgar V. McKnight (eds.), *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 164-209.

_____ 1992, *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark*, repr. paperback with new introduction and additional indexes, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Romm, James S. 2002, *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought: Geography, Exploration, and Fiction*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rowland, Christopher 2009, "Re-imagining Biblical Exegesis," in Mark Knight and Louise Lee (eds.), *Religion, Literature and the Imagination: Sacred Worlds*, London: Continuum, 140-49.

Rowston, D. J. 1974-75, "The Most Neglected Book in the New Testament," *NTS* 21:554-563.

Rubenson, Sven 1978, *The Survival of Ethiopian Independence*, Lund Studies in International History, 7, reprinted with corrections, London: Heinemann.

Ruiten, Jacques van 2005, "A Literary dependency of Jubilees on 1 Enoch?" in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 90-93.

Rusch, William G. 2001, "Ecumenism, Ecumenical Movement," in *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol. 2, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 46-60.

Russell, D. S. 1987, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Patriarchs and Prophets in early Judaism,* London: SCM Press.

Sacchi, Paolo 2006, "Qumran and the Dating of the Parables of Enoch," in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Waco: Baylor University Press, 377-395.

_____ 2005, "History of the Earliest Enochic Texts," in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Lights on a Forgotten Connection*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 401-407.

Sanders, James A. 2003, "The Stabilization of the Tanak" in Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson (eds.), *A History of Biblical Interpretation: Vol. 1: The Ancient Period*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 224-252.

_____ 2002, "The Issues of Closure in the Canonical Process," in Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (eds.), *The Canon Debate: on the Origins and Formation of the Bible*, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 252-263.

_____ 1999, "The Scrolls and the Canonical Process" in Peter Flint and James C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 2, Brill: Leiden, 1-23.

Sawyer, Harry 1968, *Creative Evangelism: Towards A New Encounter with Africa*, London: Lutherworth.

Sbacchi, Alberto 1985, *Ethiopia Under Mussolini; Fascism and the Colonial Experience*, London: Zed Books.

Schnabel, E. J. 2000, "Scripture," in *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, Leicester: IVP, 34.

Schreurs, Nico and Plastow, Thomas (eds.) 2003, *Jaxtaposing Contexts: Doing Contextual Theology in South Africa and in the Netherlands*, with a foreword by Albert Nolan, Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Pub.

Schuller, Eileen 2012, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Canon and Canonization," in Eve-Marie Becker and Stefan Scholz, *Kanon in Konstruktion und Dekonstruktion: Kanonisierungsprozesse religiöser Texte von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart: Ein Handbuch,* Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co., 293-314.

Schultz, D.R. 1978, "The Origin of Sin in Irenaeus and Jewish Pseudepi-Graphical Literature," *Vigiliae Christianae*, 32/3:161-190.

Scott, James M. 2004, book review of Kelley Coblentz Bautch, *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17-19: "No One Has Seen What I Have Seen"* (Leiden: Brill, 2003) in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 123/4:752-756.

Scullion, John 1970, *The Theology of Inspiration,* Theology Today, no. 10, Cork: Mercier Press.

Seleshi Kebede 2008, "The Cooperation of Trinitarian Churches in the Mission and Transformation of Ethiopia," D.Min. diss., Seattle, Washington: Bakke Graduate University.

ሰይፈ ሥላሴ ዮሐንስ፤ (መጋቤ ብሉይ) [2007], ‹‹የመጽሐፍ ቅዱስ ትርጉም አመጣጥ ከመጀመሪያ እስከ ዘመናችን፡፡›› በኢአተቤክ፣ *መጽሐፍ ቅዱስና የኢትዮጵያ አርቶዶክስ ተዋሂዶ ቤተ ክርስቲያን*፣ *ልዩ እትም* [አዲስ አበባ፤ ኢአተቤክ፤ 2000 E.C.]፣ 12-18፡፡

Sergew Gelaw 2007/8, *The Kebra Nagast in Ge'ez and Amharic*, Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

Sergew Hable Sellassie 1981, *Bookmaking in Ethiopia*, Leiden: Karstens Drukkers B.V.

_____ 1972, *Ancient and Medieval Ethiopian History to 1270*, Addis Ababa: United Printers.

_____ 1970a, "The Establishment of the Ethiopian Church," in idem (ed.), *The Church of Ethiopia: A Panorama of History and Spiritual Life*, Addis Ababa: B.S.P.E., 1-6.

_____ 1970b, "The Period of Reorganization," in idem (ed.), *The Church of Ethiopia: A Panorama of History and Spiritual Life,* Addis Ababa: B.S.P.E., 31-42.

_____ (ed.) 1970c, *The Church of Ethiopia: A panorama of history and spiritual life,* Addis Ababa: B.S.P.E.

Shahid, Irfan 1976, "The *Kebra Negast* in Light of Recent Research," *Le Muséon*, 89:133-178.

Sidebottom, E. M. 1967, *James, Jude and 2 Peter*, NCB. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons.

Smith, D. Moody, Jr. 1972, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New," in J.M. Efird (ed.), *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring*, Duke: Duke University press, 3-65.

Smith, Larry Douglas 2004, "Unlocking the Structure of Jude," *The Bible Translator*, 55:138-142.

Soggin, J. Alberto 1976, *Introduction to the Old Testament: From Its Origins to the Closing of the Alexandrian Canon*, OTL, London: SCM.

Stanley, Christopher D. 2010, *The Hebrew Bible: A Comparative Approach*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Stegemann, Hartmut 1998, *The Library of Qumran: on the Essences, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus,* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Stendahl, Krister 1962, "The Apocalypse of John and the Epistle of Paul in the Muratorian Fragment," in W. Klassen and G. T. Snyder (eds.), *Current Issues in the New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper,* New York: Harper & Row, 239-245.

Stone, Michael E. 2007, "Enoch's Date in Limbo; or, Some Considerations on David Suter's Analysis of the Book of Parables," in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 444-449.

_____ 1984, *Jewish writing of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus,* Assen: Van Gorcum.

Strauss, Stephen J. 1997, "Perspectives on the Nature of Christ in the Ethiopian Orthodox Church: A Case Study in Contextualized Theology," PhD dissertation, Deerfield, Illinois: Trinity International University.

Strelcyn, S. 1978, *Catalogue of Ethiopian Manuscripts in the British Library Acquired Since the year 1877*, London: British Museum Publications Ltd.

Stückenbruck, Loren 2014, *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 335, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

_____ 2013a, Minutes of the First Meeting on *Mashafa Henok* in Ethiopian Scholarship: Informal Discussion, Addis Ababa, Addis Ababa University, Room NCR 361, March 22, 2013.

_____ 2013b, "The Book of Enoch: Its Reception in Second Temple Jewish and in Christian Tradition," *Early Christianity*, 4:7-40.

_____ 2010, "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha," in John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow (eds.), *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 143-162.

_____ 2007, "The Early Traditions Related to 1 Enoch from the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Overview and Assessment," in Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins (eds.), *The Early Enoch Literature*, JSJSup 121, Leiden/Boston: Brill, 41-63.

_____ 2000, "The 'Angels' and 'Giants' of Genesis 6:1-4 in Second and Third Century BCE Jewish Interpretation: Reflections on the Posture of Early Apocalyptic Traditions in Relation to Emerging Demonology," *Dead Sea Discoveries*, 7:354-73.

_____ 1997, *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum, 63, Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck.

_____ 1990, "Revision of the Aramaic-Greek and Greek-Aramaic Glossaries of the Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4 by J. T. Milik," *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 41/1:13-49.

_____ 1978, review of *The Books of Enoch*, by J. T. Milik, *CBQ* 40:411–19.

Sundberg, Albert C., Jr. 1992, review of Bruce Metzger's *The Canon of the New Testament,* in *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 60, no. 2:355

_____ 1988, "Re-examining the Formation of the Old Testament Canon," *Interpretation* 42:78-82.

_____ 1976, "Canon of the NT," in *The Interpreter's Bible Dictionary of the Bible,* Supplementary Volume, Nashville: Abingdon, 136-40.

_____ 1975, "The Bible Canon and the Christian Doctrine of Inspiration," *Interpretation* 29:352-71.

_____ 1973, "Canon Muratori: A Fourth-Century List Author(s)," *The Harvard Theological Review*, 66/1:1-41.

_____ 1969, *The Old Testament of the Early Church*, New York: Kraus Reprint.

Sundkler, B. 1987, "African Church History in a New Key," in Petersen, K.H. (ed.), *Religion, Development and African Identity*, Uppsala: Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, 73-88.

Sundkler, B. and Steed, C. 2000, *A History of the Church in Africa*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Suter, David W. 2007, "Enoch in the Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Book of Parables," in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 415-443.

Swidler, Leonard J. (ed.) 1965, *Scripture and Ecumenism: Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox and Jewish*, Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Taddesse Tamrat 1998, "Evangelizing the Evangelized: The Root problem between Missions and the Ethiopian Orthodox Church", in Getachew Haile, Ausulve Lande, and Samuel Rubenson (eds.), *The Missionary Factor in Ethiopia: Papers from a Symposium on the Impact of European Missions on Ethiopian society, Lund University, August 1996,* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH, 17-30.

_____ 1993, "Church and State in Ethiopia: The Early Centuries," in Greirson, Roderick (ed.), *African Zion: the Sacred Art of Ethiopia*, Fort Worth, Texas: InterCultura Inc., 33-42.

_____ 1972, *Church and State in Ethiopia: 1270-1527*, Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

ተክለ ጻዲቅ መኩሪያ 1972, *የኢትዮጵያ ታሪክ ከዐፄ ልብነ ድንግል እስከ ዐፄ ቴዎድሮስ፡* 5ኛ እትም፣ አዲስ አበባ፡ ብርሃንና ሰላም ማተሚያ ቤት፣ 1965.

Teshale Tibebu 1995, *The Making of Modern Ethiopia 1896-1974*, Lawrenceville, NJ: The Red Sea Press.

Tenney, Merrill C. (ed.) 1976, *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible* (in five volumes) Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Terre Blanche, Martin, Durrheim, Kevin and Painter, Desmond (eds.) 2006, *Research in Practice: Applied Methods for the Social Sciences,* 2nd ed., Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Tertullian, *De Cultum Feminarum*, Tertullian Project, last modified 2003, accessed on 12/10/2014 from: <http://www.tertullian.org/anf/anf04/anf04-06.htm>.

Think Africa Press [2012], "Ethiopia: First Signs of A New Dawn for Ethnic Relations?", accessed on 27/09/2012 from: <http://thinkafricapress.com/ethiopia/negotiating-enemy-onlf-tpfl-eprdf-desalegn-meles#.UGQZt9KQGtY.email> .

Thiselton, Anthony 2007, *Thiselton on Hermeneutics: The Collected Works and New Essays of Anthony Thiselton*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

_____ 1980, *The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description*, Exeter: Paternoster Press.

Tibebe Eshete 2009, *The Evangelical Movement in Ethiopia: Resistance and Resilience*, Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press.

Tolo, Arne 1998, *Sidama and Ethiopia: The Emergence of the Mekane Yesus Church in Sidama*, Studia Missionalia Upsaliensia, LXIX, Uppsala: Studia Missionalia Upsaliensia.

Trembath, Kern Robert 1987, *Evangelical Theories of Biblical Inspiration: A Review and Proposal,* New York: Oxford University Press.

Triulzi, Alessandro 2002, "Battling with the Past: New Frameworks for Ethiopian Historiography," in Wendy James et al. (eds.), *Remapping Ethiopia: Socialism and After*, Oxford: James Currey; Addis Ababa: AAU Press, 276-288.

Tromp, Johannes 1993, *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition With Commentary*, Leiden: Brill.

Tzadua, Paulos 1968, *The Fetha Nagast: the Law of the Kings*, Addis Ababa, Haile Sellassie I University.

Uhlig, Siegbert 2003, "Chronography," in ibid (ed.) *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica*, vol 1, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 733-737.

_____ 1984, *Das äthiopische Henochbuch*, Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit. Band 5, Apokalypsen, Lfg. 6, Gütersloher Verlagshaus.

Ukpong, Justin S. 2003, "Biblical Interpretation in Africa: Transcending the Boundaries of Inculturation and Liberation," *Journal of Inculturation Theology*, 5/2:105-122.

_____ 2000, "Developments in Biblical Interpretation in Africa: Historical and Hermeneutical Directions" in West, Gerald. O and Dube, Musa W. (eds.), *The Bible in Africa: Transactions, Trajectories, and Trends*, Leiden: Brill, 11-28.

_____ 1997, "Models and Methods of Biblical Interpretation in Africa," *Journal of Inculturation Theology*, 4/1:3-31.

_____ 1996, "The Parable of the Shrewd Manager (Luke 16:1-13): An Essay in Inculturation Biblical Hermeneutic," *Semeia 73: "Reading With": An Exploration*

of the Interface between Critical and Ordinary Readings of the Bible; African Overtures, 73:189-210.

_____ 1995, "Re-reading the Bible with African Eyes: Inculturation and Hermeneutics," *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa*, 91:3-14.

_____ 1994a, review article of J. Severino Croatto *Biblical Hermeneutics: Toward a Theory of Reading as the Production of Meaning*, in *Journal of Inculturation Theology*, 1/2:179-191.

_____ 1994b, "Towards a Renewed Approach to Inculturation Theology," *Journal of Inculturation Theology*, 1/1:8-24.

_____ 1994c, "Christology and Inculturation," in Rosino Gibellini (ed.), *Paths of African Theology*, Maryknoll: Orbis, 40-61.

_____ 1978, *Sacrifice: African and Biblical – A Comparative Study of Ibibio and Levitical Sacrifices*, Rome: Urbaniana University Press.

Ullendorff, Edward 1968, *Ethiopia and the Bible: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1967*, London: Oxford University Press.

_____ 1965, *The Ethiopians: An Introduction to Country and People,* 2nd ed., London: Oxford University Press.

_____ 1960, *The Ethiopians: an Introduction to Country and People*, London: Oxford University Press.

_____ 1956, "Hebraic-Jewish Elements in Abyssinian (Monophysite) Christianity," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 1:216-256.

Ullendorff, Edward and Knibb, Michael 1977, book review of J. T. Milik (ed.): *The books of Enoch: Aramaic fragments of Qumran Cave 4, with the collaboration of Matthew Black,* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976, in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,* 40:601 – 602.

Ulrich, Eugene 2010, "The Jewish Scriptures: Texts, Versions, Canons," in John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow (eds.), *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 116-117.

_____ 2003, "Qumran and the Canon of the Old Testament," in Jean-Marie Auwers and Henk Jan de Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons,* Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium clxii, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 57-80.

_____ 2002, "The Notion and Definition of Canon" in Lee Martin McDonalds and James A. Sanders (eds.), *The Canon Debate: on the Origins and Formation of the Bible*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 21-35.

VanBeek, Lawrence 2000, "1 Enoch Among Jews and Christians: A Fringe Connection?," in Stanley E. Porter and Brock W. R. Pearson (eds.), *Christian-Jewish Relations through the Centuries*, JSNTS 192, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 93-115.

VanderKam, James C. 2005, "Response: Jubilees and Enoch," in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, Grand Rapids; Eerdmans, 162-170.

_____ 2002, "Questions of Canon Viewed Through the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Lee Martin McDonald, and James A. Sanders (eds.), *The Canon Debate*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 91-109.

_____ 2001, *The Book of Jubilees*, Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

_____ 1999, "Identity and History of the community," in Peter Flint and idem (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 2, Brill: Leiden, 487-533.

_____ 1996, "1 Enoch, Enochic Motifs, and Enoch in Early Christian Literature," in idem and William Adler (eds.), *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*, Assen: Van Gorcum/Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 33-101.

_____ 1995, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament, Colombia: University of South Carolina Press.

_____ 1994, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

_____ 1982, "Some Major Issues in the Contemporary Study of 1 Enoch: Reflections on J. T. Milik's *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*," *Maarav* 385–97.

_____ 1973, "The Theophany of Enoch 1:3b-7, 9," *VT*, 23:129-150.

van der Kooij, Arie 2003, "Canonization of Ancient Hebrew Books and Hasmonaean Politics," in Jean-Marie Auwers and Henk Jan de Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons,* Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium clxii, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 27-38.

Veitch, Sophie F. F. 1868, *Views in Central Abyssinia*, London: John Camden Hotten.

von Rad, Gerhard 1986, "Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament," in Donald K. McKim (ed.), *A Guide to contemporary Hermeneutics: Major Trends in Biblical Interpretation*, Grad Rapids: Eerdmans, 28-46.

_____ 1964, "מַלְאָךְ לְגֹנְחֹא in OT" in Gerhard Kittel (ed.), *TDNT*, vol. 1, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 76-80.

Wambutda, Daniel N. 1987, "Hebrewisms of West Africa: An Ongoing Search in the Correlation Between Old Testament and African Weltanschauung," *Ogbomosho Journal of Theology*, 2/33-41.Ullendorff, Edward 1973, *The Ethiopians: an Introduction to Country and People,* 3rd ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press.

West, Gerald O. 2009, "Interpreting 'The Exile' in African Biblical Scholarship: an Ideo-theological Dilemma in Post-colonial South Africa," in Becking, B. And Human, D. (eds.), *Exile and Suffering: A Selection of Papers Read at the 50th Anniversary Meeting of the Old Testament Society of South Africa OTWSA/OTSSA, Pretoria August 2007*, Leiden: Brill, 247-267.

_____ 2006, "Contextuality," in John F. A. Sawyer (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to the Bible and Culture*, Oxford: Blackwell publishing, 399-413.

_____ 2003, *The Academy of the Poor: Towards a Dialogical Reading of the Bible*, Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Pub.

_____ 2001, "Contextual Bible Study in South Africa: A Resource for Reclaiming and Regaining Land, Dignity and Identity," in McGlory T. Speckman and Larry T. Kaufmann (eds.), *Towards an Agenda for Contextual Theology: Essays in Honour of Albert Nolan*, Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Pub, 169-184.

_____ 1993, *Contextual Bible Study*, Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Pub.

ወንድዬ አሊ. 2000፤ *የእኩለ ቀን ወጋግታ*፣ አዲስ አበባ፡ የኢትዮጵያ ቃለ ሕይወት ቤተ ክርስቲያን ሥነ-ጽሕፍ ክፍል፣ 1992 ዓ.ም፡፡

_____ 1998፤ *በመከራ ውስጥ ያበቡ ቤተ ክርስቲያኖ*፣ አዲስ አበባ፡ የኢትዮጵያ ቃለ ሕይወት ቤተ ክርስቲያን ሥነ-ጽሕፍ ክፍል፣ 1990 ዓ.ም፡፡

Wiersbe, Warren W. 1984, *Be Alert: 2 Peter 2 and 3 John and Jude,* England: Scripture Press Foundation.

Williams, Chancelor 1976, *The Destruction of Black Civilization: Great Issues of Race from 5400BC to 2000AD*, Chicago: Third World Press.

Williams, Joseph John 1930, *Hebrewisms of West Africa: From Nile to Niger with the Jews*, London: George Allen and Unwin; New York: Lincoln MacVeach/The Dial Press.

Wolthuis, Thomas1987, "Jude and Jewish Traditions," *Calvin Theological Journal*, 22:21-45.

Wright, J. Robert 1993, "The 'Official Position' of the Episcopal Church on the Authority of Scripture: Historical Development and Ecumenical Comparison," in Frederick Houk Borsh (ed.), *The Bible's Authority in Today's Church,* Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 43-70.

Wright, W. 1877, *Catalogue of the Ethiopic Manuscripts in the British Museum Acquired since the Year 1847*, London: Gilbert and Rivington.

Yamauchi, Edwin M. 2004, *Africa and the Bible*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.

Young, John 1998, "Regionalism and Democracy in Ethiopia," *Third World Quarterly*, 19/2:191-204.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Comparison of List of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Books

Appendix 1.A. Comparison of List of the Old Testament Books by Dockery (1995:84)

COMPARISON OF LIST OF THE OLD TESTAMENT BOOKS		
RABBINIC CANON 24 BOOKS	SEPTUAGINT 53 BOOKS	ROMAN CHATOLIC OLD TESTAMENT 46 BOOKS
The Law	*Law*	*Law*
Genesis	Genesis	Genesis
Exodus	Exodus	Exodus
Leviticus	Leviticus	Leviticus
Numbers	Numbers	Numbers
Deuteronomy	Deuteronomy	Deuteronomy
The Prophets	*History*	*History*
The Former Prophets		
Joshua	Joshua	Joshua
Judges	Judges	Judges
1-2 Samuel	Ruth	Ruth
1-2 Kings	1 Kingdoms (1 Samuel)	1 Samuel (1 Kingdoms)
The Latter Prophets	2 Kingdoms (2 Samuel)	2 Samuel (2 Kingdoms)
Isaiah	3 Kingdoms (1 Kings)	1 Kings (3 Kingdoms)
Jeremiah	4 Kingdoms (2 Kings)	2 Kings (4 Kingdoms)
Ezekiel	1 Paralipomena (1 Chronicles)	1 Chronicles (1 Paralipomena)
The Twelve	2 Paralipomena (2 Chronicles)	2 Chronicles (2 Paralipomena)
Hosea	1 Esdras (Apocryphal Ezra)	Ezra (1 Esdras)
Joel	2 Esdras (Ezra-Nehemiah)	Nehemiah (2 Esdras)

Amos	Esther (with Apocryphal addition)	Judith
Obadiah	Judith	Tobit
Jonah	Tobit	Esther
Micah	1 Maccabees	1 Maccabees
Nahum	2 Maccabees	2 Maccabees
Habakkuk	3 Maccabees	
Zephaniah	4 Maccabees	
Haggai		*Poetry*
Zechariah		Job
Malachi	*Poetry*	Psalms
	Psalms	Proverbs
	Odes (including the prayer of Manasseh)	Ecclesiastes
The Writings	Proverbs	Song of Songs
Poetry	Ecclesiastes	Wisdom of Solomon
Psalms	Song of Songs	Ecclesiasticus (The Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach
Proverbs	Job	
Job	Wisdom (of Solomon)	
Rolls—"the Festival Scrolls"	Sirach (Ecclesiasticus or The Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach	*Prophecy*
Song of Songs	Psalms of Solomon	Isaiah
Ruth		Jeremiah
Lamentations		Lamentations
Ecclesiastes	*Prophecy*	Baruch (including the Letter of Jeremiah)
Esther	The Twelve Prophets	Ezekiel
Others (History)	Hosea	Hosea
Daniel	Joel	Joel
Ezra-Nehemiah	Amos	Amos
1-2 Chronicles	Obadiah	Obadiah
	Jonah	Jonah
	Micah	Micah

	Nahum	Nahum
	Habakkuk	Habakkuk
	Zephaniah	Zephaniah
	Haggai	Haggai
	Zechariah	Zechariah
	Malachi	Malachi
	Isaiah	
	Jeremiah	
	Baruch	
	Lamentations	
	Letter of Jeremiah	
	Ezekiel	
	Daniel (with apocryphal additions, including the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children, Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon)	

Appendix 1.B. Comparison of List of the Old Testament Books by Stanley (2010:28-29) [1]

This chart shows that to what extent different religious groups differ from each other in the contents of their respective canons and, in the meantime, it shows the level of unity they have in their collection against the diversity. Note that some Orthodox churches may have a slightly different list than what we have in this list under the "Orthodox Bible" column.

JUDAISM	CHRISTIANITY		
Hebrew Bible	Catholic Bible	Orthodox Bible	Protestant Bible
Torah	*Law/Pentateuch*	*Law/Pentateuch*	*Law/Pentateuch*
Genesis	Genesis	Genesis	Genesis
Exodus	Exodus	Exodus	Exodus
Leviticus	Leviticus	Leviticus	Leviticus
Numbers	Numbers	Numbers	Numbers
Deuteronomy	Deuteronomy	Deuteronomy	Deuteronomy
Former Prophets	*Historical Books*	*Historical Books*	*Historical Books*
Joshua	Joshua	Joshua	Joshua
	Judges	Judges	Judges
Judges	Ruth	Ruth	Ruth
	1 Samuel	1 Kingdoms (=1 Samuel)	1 Samuel
Samuel (1& 2)	2 Samuel	2 Kingdoms (=2 Samuel)	2 Samuel
	1 Kings	3 Kingdoms (=1 Kings)	1 Kings
Kings (1 & 2)	2 Kings	4 Kingdoms (2 Kings)	2 Kings
	1 Chronicles	1 Chronicles	1 Chronicles

---

[1] As Stanley (2010:28) writes, "Titles in *italic* type appear in Orthodox and Catholic Bibles but not in Jewish or Protestant Bibles; titles marked [*italics*] appear only in Orthodox Bibles. Orthodox churches vary in the contents and order of their canons."

Latter Prophets	2 Chronicles	2 Chronicles	2 Chronicles
Isaiah		[1 Esdras]	
Jeremiah	Ezra	2 Esdras [Ezra + Nehemiah]	Ezra
Ezekiel	Nehemiah	Esther (longer)	Nehemiah
The Twelve (Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum,	Tobit	Judith	Esther
	Judith	Tobit	
Habakkuk, Zephaniah,	Esther (longer)	1 Maccabees	
Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi)	1 Maccabees	2 Maccabees	
	2 Maccabees	[3 Maccabees]	
		[4 Maccabees]	

374

Hebrew Bible	Catholic Bible	Orthodox Bible	Protestant Bible
Writings	*Poetic Books*	*Poetic Books*	*Poetic Books*
Psalms (150)	Job	Psalms [151]	Job
Proverbs	Psalms (150)	[Odes of Solomon (w/ prayer of Manasseh)	Psalms (150)
Job		Proverbs	
Song of Solomon		Ecclesiastes	
Ruth	Proverbs	Song of Solomon	Proverbs
Lamentations	Ecclesiastes	Job	Ecclesiastes
Ecclesiastes	Song of Solomon	*Wisdom of Solomon*	Song of Solomon
Esther	*Wisdom of Solomon*	*Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)*	
Daniel	*Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)*	[*Psalms of Solomon*]	
Ezra-Nehemiah			
Chronicles (1 & 2)			
(listed above under "Latter Prophets" or "Writings")	*Prophets*	*Prophets*	*Prophets*
	Isaiah	Hosea	Isaiah
	Jeremiah	Joel	Jeremiah
	Lamentations	Amos	Lamentations
	Baruch (including Letter of Jeremiah)	Obadiah	
	Ezekiel	Jonah	
	Daniel *(longer)*	Micah	Ezekiel
	Hosea	Nahum	Daniel
	Joel	Habakkuk	Hosea
	Amos	Zephaniah	Joel
	Obadiah	Haggai	Amos
	Jonah	Zechariah	Obadiah
	Micah	Malachi	Jonah

	Nahum	Isaiah	Micah
	Habakkuk	Jeremiah	Nahum
	Zephaniah	*Baruch*	Habakkuk
	Haggai	Lamentations	Zephaniah
	Zechariah	*Letter of Jeremiah*	Haggai
	Malachi	Ezekiel	Zechariah
		Daniel *(longer)*	Malachi

Appendix 1.C. Comparison of List of the Old Testament Books by Bruce C. Birch et al. (2005:25-28)

The Jewish Canon[2]	The Protestant Old Testament Canon	The Roman Catholic Old Testament Canon[3]	The Orthodox Old Testament Canon[4]
Torah	Genesis	Genesis	*Law/Pentateuch*
Genesis	Exodus	Exodus	Genesis
Exodus	Leviticus	Leviticus	Exodus
Leviticus	Numbers	Numbers	Leviticus
Numbers	Deuteronomy	Deuteronomy	Numbers
Deuteronomy	Joshua	Joshua	Deuteronomy
	Judges	Judges	Joshua
Prophets	Ruth	Ruth	Judges
	1 Samuel	1 Samuel	Ruth
Former Prophets	2 Samuel	2 Samuel	1 Kingdoms (=1 Samuel)
Joshua	1 Kings	1 Kings	2 Kingdoms (=2 Samuel)
Judges	2 Kings	2 Kings	3 Kingdoms (=1 Kings)
1—2 Samuel	1 Chronicles	1 Chronicles	4 Kingdoms (2 Kings)
1—2 Kings	2 Chronicles	2 Chronicles	1 Chronicles
Lamentations[5]	Ezra	Ezra	2 Chronicles

[2] Birch (2010:25) notes that "1—2 Samuel, 1—2 Kings, 1—2 Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, and the Twelve Prophets are each considered a single book because each set of writing forms one complete scroll."

[3] The Roman Catholic Canon includes all thirty-nine books found in the Protestant OT Canon, plus eleven additional books. These books are arranged variously in different Roman Catholic Bibles. The order in this table reflects that of the New Jerusalem Bible and the New American Bible. The names of the books in italics are those not found in the Protestant canon.

[4] The Orthodox tradition includes all the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament found in the Protestant OT Canon, plus fourteen additional books. In the Greek Orthodox Church, the traditional text for the Old Testament is the Greek Septuagint (LXX). The Slavonic translation of the Septuagint is the traditionally used Old Testament text for the Russian Orthodox Church. The names of the books in italics are those not found in the Protestant canon. [Note that Birch and et al, left out the Ethiopian Orthodox Church tradition from the discussion.]

[5] Note that in this list, Lamentations is under "Prophets", and not under "the Writings" as the case in the previous lists,

	Nehemiah	Nehemiah	*1 Esdras* (= Esdras in the SRSV Apocrypha = 2 Esdras in Slavonic Bibles)
Latter Prophets	Esther	*Tobit*	
Isaiah	Job	*Judith*	*2 Esdras* (= Ezra in some Orthodox Bibles 2 Esdras also includes Nehemiah)
Jeremiah	Psalms	Esther *(with six additions)*	
Ezekiel	Proverbs	*1 Maccabees*	Nehemiah
	Ecclesiastes	*2 Maccabees*	*Judith*
The Twelve	Song of Solomon	Job	*Tobit*
Hosea	Isaiah	Psalms	Esther *(with six addition)*
Joel	Jeremiah	Proverbs	*1 Maccabees*
Amos	Lamentations	Ecclesiastes	*2 Maccabees*
Obadiah	Ezekiel	Song of Songs	*3 Maccabees*
Jonah	Daniel	*Wisdom of Solomon*	Psalms (*with Psalm 151*)
Micah	Hosea	*Sirach*	Job
Nahum	Joel	Isaiah	Proverbs
Habakkuk	Amos	Jeremiah	Ecclesiastes
Zephaniah	Obadiah	Lamentations	Song of Solomon
Haggai	Jonah	*Baruch (Baruch6 = The Letter of Jeremiah)*	*Wisdom of Solomon*
Zechariah	Micah	Ezekiel	*Wisdom of Sirach (= Ecclesiasticus)*
Malachi	Nahum	Daniel *(with three additions: the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Young Men, Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon)*	Hosea
	Habakkuk		Amos
	Zephaniah		Joel
	Haggai	Hosea	Micah
	Zechariah	Joel	Obadiah
	Malachi	Amos	Jonah
		Obadiah	Nahum
		Jonah	Habakkuk
		Micah	Zephaniah

		Nahum	Haggai
		Habakkuk	Zechariah
		Zephaniah	Malachi
		Haggai	Isaiah
		Zechariah	Jeremiah
		Malachi	*Baruch*
			Lamentations
		(The Vulgate, or Latin, translation of the Roman Catholic Bible contains *3 Esdras, 4 Esdras,* and the *Prayer of Manasseh in an appendix.*)	*Epistle of Jeremiah*
			Ezekiel
			Daniel *(with three additions: the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Youth, Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon)*
			(Greek Orthodox Bibles contain 4 Maccabees and the Prayer of Manasseh in an appendix. Slavonic Bibles add 3 Esdras to this appendix.)

Appendix 2: List of Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

Appendix 2.A. Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Different Churches (Musaph-Andriesse, 1981:17f.)

a) Apocrypha in the Protestant churches = Deutero-canonical books in the Roman Catholic Church

- Tobit (Tobias) (originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic in the second century BCE)
- Judith (originally written in Hebrew, presumably in the second century BCE)
- The Wisdom of Solomon (Composed in Hellenistic circles about the first century BCE)
- Baruch (presumably from the first Century BCE)
- The Letter of Jeremiah
- I and II Maccabees (the first written in Hebrew, the second in Greek, both during the second century BCE)
- Additions to the Book of Daniel (date uncertain)
- Additions to the Book of Esther (presumably from the first century BCE)
- The Wisdom of Jesus Sirach (written in Hebrew in the second century BCE)

b) Apocrypha in both the Protestant churches and the Roman Catholic Church

- III and IV Maccabees (first century BCE)
- III and IV Ezra (Esdras) (second century BCE)
- The Prayer of Manasseh (date uncertain)

c) Apocrypha in the Roman Catholic Church = Pseudepigrapha in the Protestant churches

These books were written predominantly in a Jewish milieu at the end of the Old Testament period.

They comprise:

- The Letter of Aristeas (end of the second century BCE)
- Jubilees (originally written in Hebrew; end of the second century BCE)
- The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic; second or first century BCE)
- I Enoch (about 165 BCE)
- The Psalms of Solomon (originally in Hebrew; about 50 BCE)

- The Assumption of Moses (the beginning of the Christian Era)

- The Ascension of Isaiah (the beginning of the Christian Era)

- The Apocalypse of Baruch (II Baruch, 50—100 CE)

- The Sibylline Books (round about the beginning of the Christian Era)

- The Damascus Document (originally written in Hebrew; second or first century BCE)

This is how Musaph-Andriesse listed them but with some differences from other scholars and books. However, his comparison is appreciated.

Appendix 2.B. Books of OT Pseudepigrapha (Charlesworth 1983)

Apocalyptic Literature and Related Works

1 Enoch	Questions of Ezra
2 Enoch	Revelation of Ezra
3 Enoch	Apocalypse of Sedrach
Sibylline Oracles	2 Baruch
Treaties of Shem	3 Baruch
Apocalypse of Ezekiel	Apocalypse of Abraham
Apocalypse of Zephaniah	Apocalypse of Adam
4 Ezra	Apocalypse of Elijah
Greek Apocalypse of Ezra	Apocalypse of Daniel
Vision of Ezra	

Testaments (Often with Apocalyptic Sections)

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs	Testament of Moses
Testament of Job	Testament of Solomon
Testaments of the Three Patriarchs	Testament of Adam

Expansions of the OT and Legends

Letter of Aristeas	Ladder of Jacob
Jubilees	4 Baruch
Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah	Jannes and Jambers
Joseph and Aseneth	History of the Rechabites
Life of Adam and Eve	Eldad and Modad
Pseudo-Philo	History of Joseph
Lives of the Prophets	

Wisdom and Philosophical Literature

Ahiqar	Pseudo-Phocylides

3 Maccabees   Syriac-Menander

4 Maccabees

Prayers, Psalms, and Odes

More Psalms of David   Prayer of Joseph

Prayer of Manasseh   Prayer of Jacob

Psalms of Solomon   Odes of Solomon

Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers

Fragments of Judeo-Hellenistic Works

Philo the Epic Poet   Theodotus

Orphica   Ezekiel the Tragedian

Fragments of Pseudo-Greek Poets Aristobulus

Demetrius the Chronographer   Aristeas the Exegete

Eupolemus   Pseudo-Eupolemus

Cleodemus Malchus   Artapanus

Pseudo-Hecataeus

Appendix 3: Qualitative Interview

Appendix 3.A. Leading Interview Questions

A) The first category of interviewees is EOTC leadership and scholars. The questions for this category focus on information about the historical background of the traditions of the EOTC, its canonical position, and the traditions of the making of the church throughout the centuries.

This includes how and why the Book of Enoch has been preserved only in Ethiopic and other related issues around this book.

- How do you define the canon of the EOTC?

- Its reception and translation,

- Its extent and whether it's closed or not,

- Its authority and place in the tradition of the Church,

- Its relation to the canon of other traditions,

- Its originality and antiquary.

What makes the EOTC canon unique and does it have any effect on the unique place of EOTC?

Which is the official position of EOTC on the canon of the Scriptures?

How and why do you think the Book of Enoch has been preserved only in Ethiopic?

How much has the Book of Enoch permeated the life, practice, theology, and tradition of EOTC? Which are the impacts of Enoch in the history of this church?

Do you think Enoch is known, used, and understood by the laity or is it a book only for the elites? Would you explain your position with examples and evidences?

As it is not among the books of the Septuagint in other traditions, why is Enoch included in the Amharic translation of the Septuagint, which was translated recently?

B) The second category is monks and congregants from the same church. Here also the questions focus on related issues, but with a different perspective.

How much do you know about the Book of Enoch?

Do you think the Book of Enoch has any unique impact in shaping Ethiopian Christianity and other aspects of Ethiopian people?

If yes, which are the unique impacts of the Book of Enoch in shaping Ethiopian Christianity and spirituality? Does and did it have further impact, directly or indirectly, on political, cultural, social, literary, and artistic dimensions in Ethiopian society?

Some claim that Ethiopian identity cannot be understood without understanding the book of *1 Enoch*. Do you agree with this position? Why?

C) The third category includes instructors, lecturers, tutors and writers in various theological institutions in both church bodies. Selected questions from the above two categories will be raised for this group besides the following ones:

Have you ever heard, read, or used the Book of Enoch or other pseudepigraphical books incorporated in the EOTC canon?

Which is your attitude or opinion towards this (these) book(s)?

D) The final group includes congregants and ministers from Evangelical churches. Selected questions from the above three categories will be raised for this group.

Appendix 3.B. An Informed Consent Document

UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU-NATAL

AN INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

The Informed Consent document could either be

in the form of a letter to the participant, containing information on the items listed below and concluding with a declaration allowing for the name of the participant, signature and date, or

drawn up as a declaration with a separate information sheet containing information on the items listed below

Note: in the case of 1 above, a copy of the signed consent has to be given to the participant.

INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED IN THE INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

The Project Title:

1 Enoch in Jude and in EOTC Canon: Developing a Proper Understanding of Second Temple Period Literature (STL) in Ethiopian Churches for a better understanding of each other and mutual cooperation

The objectives of this study are:

To show how the negligence towards a closer and deeper reading of the brief book, but exceptionally important in bridging our contemporary understandings to Christian Origins, the book of Jude, contributed to holding extremely divergent positions in Ethiopian Churches in particular and globally in general.

To survey and review *1 Enoch*'s preservation history in the EOTC and its lasting legacy in the Ethiopian context.

To explore the canonical status of Scripture in the EOTC in comparison to the EEC canonical position with special attention to the STL included in the EOTC canon.

To critique the definitions, scope, importance and usage of various theological key terms around Scripture, authority, canon, and inspiration with special reference to the STL in the NT time and in today's Ethiopian Churches.

To suggest and articulate a better approach for scriptural understanding within the Ethiopian churches to come closer to each other fostering ecumenical unity and work together for a common mission of the Church rather than being rivals.

DECLARATION

I…………………………………………………………………… hereby confirm that I understand the contents of this document and the nature of the research project, and I consent to participating in the research project.

I understand that I am at liberty to withdraw from the project at any time, should I so desire.

Full information of the interviewee

Title _____   Full Name _____

Sex   _____   Date of Birth _____

Educational Status _____

Position _____

Church Affiliation _____

SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT   DATE

_____

Place _____

Appendix 3.C. Interview Analysis

I have interviewed 28 people nearly around the same type of questions, but with some variation based on individual differences in terms of Church affiliation, educational level, position in the church, gender, age, and their personal acquaintance with the subject matter. As it can be seen from the table below, among the 28 interviewees, 14 are Orthodox while 14 are Evangelicals; 21 are male and 7 are female; 8 are PhD or equivalent holders, 10 have 2nd degree, and another 10 have 1st degree or less; 15 of them are theologians while 13 are non-theologians; 12 serving at a leadership capacity in the churches they belong to, while 10 are serving in the church as full time or part time ministers with a clear sense of ministry, and another 6 are just laity, or not currently actively involved in ministry; 6 are below or equal to 30 years of age, 15 are between 30-50, and 7 are above or equal to 50 years old. The total time the interview conducted was 1,412 minutes or about 24 hours (23:53"), which means spending an average of 51" minutes with each interviewee even if it ranges between 13" with the shortest one while about 2 and half hours with the longest (of course, at two different sessions).

Table 1. General statistics of the composition of the interviewees

1	Church Affiliation	Orthodox		Evangelicals
		14		14
2	Gender	Male		female
		21		7
3.1	Educational level (General)	1st degree	2nd degree	PhD (or equivalent)
		10	10	8
3.2	Educational Level (specific to Theological Education)	Theologian		non-theologian
		15		13
4.1	Ministry in the Church (based on ordination)	Ordained		non-ordained
		9		19

4.2	Ministry in the Church (based on leadership and ministry status)	leaders	ministers	laity
		12	10	6
5	Age	≤ 30	30 - 50	≥ 50
		5	15	7

Appendix 4: Ethiopian Manuscripts

Appendix 4.A. Some of the "Biblical" manuscripts in Ge'ez, as listed by Loren Stuckenbruck

EMML#	Date	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
3	16th (150-)	Jub																												
25	16th	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	Ba[1]	Ek																							
26	15th/16th	Is[2]	Ek	1M	2M	3M																								
36	18th/19th	En	Job	Pr	Tg	Wi	Ec	SS	12	Si	To	D	1E	2E	3E															
38	18th	Kgs	Job	Is	Pr	Tg	Wi	Ec	1E	Sus	D																			
57	15th/16th	Jud	To	Et	1M	2M	3M																							
101	18th	Jub																												
179	20th (195-)	En	1E																											
201	20th (192-)	En	Is	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	PBa[3]																						
207	20th (191-)	Jub	En																											
259	18th	Kgs	12																											
510	18th	8																												
629	20th (196-)	En	Is	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	PrJ[4]	PBa[3]	[5]																				
673[6]		MODERN PRINTED BIBLE																												

[1] Apocryphal as opposed to canonical one
[2] Frag. Is. 48:7-49:6
[3] Paralipomena of Baruch
[4] Prophecy of Jeremiah to Pashur
[5] Physiologus
[6] Not MS but printed Bible

819	18th	Kgs	1C	2C	Sus	D	Bel	Et																						
1011	18th/19th	Is																												
1163	18th	8	Jub																											
1200	20th	V	2E	V	Jub	V[7]																								
1279	20th	Job	Jud	Et	En	1E	Ec[8]	To	Ec																					
1402	18th	Kgs																												
1481	17th	Kgs	Pr	Tg	Ec	Wi	Si	Jud	Et	Sus	D	Bel	Is	12	1M	2M	3M	1C	2C	To										
1531	19th/20th	En																												
1768	15th	En	1M	2M	3M	Is	AsI	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	PBa[3]	Job	3E	2E	1E	Ek	Sus	D	Bel	12	Pr	Tg	Ec	Wi	SS	Si	Jud	To	Et
1839	17th/18th	8	Kgs	Job	12	Is	Ek	Pr	Tg	Ec	Wi																			
1842	17th (166-)	8	12	D	Si																									
1929	15th	8	Jug[10]	Ru																										
1945	18th (w20)	V	Jub																											
1950	17th/18th	En	V																											
2080	15th	En	Jud	Et	Is	Ek	Je	Ba	Lm	PrJ[4]	LeJ	PBa[3]	12	Pr	Tg	Wi	Ec													
2082	16th/17th	Je	Ba	PBa[3]	Lm	LeJ	Ek	V																						
2098	15th	8																												
2112	18th	Is	V	Sus	D	Bel																								
2148	17th (160-)	Pr	Tg	Ec	Wi	Kgs																								
2388	18th (176-)	8																												

[7] Inc. Amh. commentary on Enoch
[8] Incomplete beginning of Ecc.
[9] Inc. Neh.
[10] Frag. Judg 20:15-21:25

2436	17th	En	8	Is	D	En[11]								
2440	17th (166-)	En	Job	Pr	Tg	Wi	Ec	SS	Is	12	D	D[12]	1E	
2532	18th	8	Jub											
3018	18th	Kgs												
3067	15th	Is	AsI											
3322	18th	Pr	Ec	Wi										
3407	19th	Job	En	12	Is	Pr	Wi	Ec	SS					
3439	18th	Pr	Tg	Ec	Wi	SS	Si	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	PrJ[4]		
4437	17th	En	Job	8	Jub	Is								
4460	18th	Pr	Tg	Ec	Wi	1E	Sus	D	Bel	SS	D[13]			
4648	20th	En	V	Is										
4750	18th	En	8	Jub										
4756	18th	Pr	Tg	Wi	Ec	SS	Job	Is	12	Sus	D	D[14]	1K[15]	D[16]
4767	17th/18th	Kgs												
4778	18th	Pr	Tg	Wi	Ec	V	SS							
5003	18th	En	Pr	Tg	Wi	Ec	Job	SS	12	Is	Sus	D		
5229	18th	Is												
5507	18th	Kgs												
5589	18th	Ek	Je	Ba	LeJ	Lm	PrJ[4]	PBa[3]	2E	3E	En	Si		

---

[11] 1En. 1:1-30:2
[12] Variant version of 11:1-45
[13] Dan ch. 11
[14] Dan 11:1-13
[15] 1 Sam 1:1-17:6
[16] Dan 11:13-45

ID	Date	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
5591	20th (191-)	En	Je	Ba	LeJ	Lm	PBa³	Si												
Zion[17]	15th/16th	12	Is	En	To	Jud	1E	2E	3E	Sus	D	Bel	Pr	Tg	Ec	Wi	Ek	Job		
Zion3	17th (166-)	Ps[18]	Pr	Tg	Wi	Ec	Si	Kgs	Job											
Bizan1	16th (153-)	8	Jub	Kgs	2C															
Bizan2	15th (141-)	Kgs	1C	2C																
Gunde31	15th	Is[19]	Ek	1M																
GundeA	15th (147-)	Kgs	Je[20]																	
Gunde96	14th	Sus	D	Bel	Si[21]	1E	V													
Gunde94	15th/16th	Ex[22]	Nu[22]																	
Gunde95	15th	D	Bel	To	Jud	Et														
Gunde65	12th	Si																		
Kebran	15th (141-)	8																		
Maqale1	15th (141-)	8																		
Maqale2	15th	8																		
Zeway	15th	8																		
Ca1007	16th/17th	Pr	Tg	Ec	Wi															
Ca1570	16th (158-)	En	8	Kgs	Pr	Tg	Ec	Wi	Job	Is	12	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	1E	Sus	D	Bel	Ek
B11601	18th	12	V																	

[17] Rebound in disorder and fragmentary, and consequently ordering cannot be considered canonical after B12

[18] Psalter in full form, inc. canticles, etc…

[19] Frag. Is. 49:1-6

[20] Frag. Jer 51:10-30

[21] Frag. 2:1-4:3

[22] Frag

Label	Century														
B8822	18th	En	Job	D[23]	1E	Si									
B8823	18th	En	Kgs	M[24]	V										
Bod At3	17th	Job	Pr	Tg	Wi	Ec	Is	12	Sus	D	Bel	SS			
Ber 1	16th	En													
Ber 2	15th?	Is	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	PBa[3]	Ek							
Ber 3	16th/17th	Pr	Tg	Ec	Wi	Is	D[23]	1E	D[25]						
Ber 4	16th/17th	Si	1E	D[23]											
Ber 5	15th/16th	Si	V												
Ta3	18th?	V	To	En	V										
Ta9	15th	Jub	En	Ek	D[23]										
Ta26	17th?	Pr[26]	Ec	Wi	Job										
Ta51	18th?	Ec	Wi	Job	Pr[26]	Ec	Wi	SS	Is	12	1E	Sus	D	Bel	D[27]
Ta54	15th?	Pr[26]	Ec	Wi	SS										
Ta55	18th?	Kgs													
Ta58	18th?	Kgs													
AH20-4[28]															
AH 26	17th/18th	12	Is												
AH30	17th/18th	En													
AH63	18th/19th	Job	Pr[26]	Wi	Ec	SS	Is	AsI							

[23] May include Sus and Bel

[24] Catalogue does not define which book

[25] Frag Dan 11:8-45

[26] May include Tagsas

[27] Frag Dan 11:1-45

[28] See further catalogue

AH70	18th?	2C	2E	3E	To	Jud	Et	1E	V			
Man23	18th	En	Job	Kgs								
Man25	17th (168-)	8										
BS169	15th	8										
BS187	19th	En	Job	Is	1E	Pr	Tg	Wi	Ec			
BS200	20th	Jub	1M	2M	3M							
Bod1		Ge	Ex									
Bod2		Le	Nu	De								
Bod3		Jos	Jug	Ru	1C	2C	Kgs					
Bod4		En										
Bod5		En	Job	Is	12	Pr	Tg	Wi	Ec	SS	D[23]	
Bod6		Je	Lm	Ek	1E	3E	Et					
Bod7		Is	AsI	1E								
Bod8		Am	Mi	Joe	Ob	Jon	Nah	Ha	Zep	Hag	Zec	Mal
Vat 263	14th-15th	Is	AsI	D[23]								
Vat 279	15th	T3P										
Hm271	17th (168-)	Ge										
Hm271a	18th	En										
St4368	18th	Pr[26]	Wi	Ec	1E	12	Is	Job	Sus	D[29]		
St4371	19th	En	NOT ETHIOPIC MS, BUT MODERN COPY THEREOF									
Griaule3	18th-19th	1E	Job	Pr	Tg	Wi	Ec	Is	12			
B480	15th	8										

---

[29] May include Bel

B481	17th	8	V													
B482	17th	8														
B483	18th (172-)	8	Kgs													
B24185	19th	En														
B485	16th	Jub	En													
B484	18th	En	8	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	PrJ[4]	D[30]	Ek	1E	2E	3E	To	Jud	Et	Si
B486	18th	En	Kgs	Si	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	PrJ[4]								
B488	18th (172-)	Kgs	1C	2C	12												
B487	18th	Kgs	Si	M[24]	Et	Jud	To										
B489	18th (173-)	1C	2C	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	PrJ[4]	D[23]	Si	1E	2E	3E	To	Jud	Et	M[24]
B490	18th	En	Job	D[23]	1E	Is											
B24990	18th	En	Job	Pr[26]	Wi	Ec	SS	Is	12	D[23]	1E						
B24991	17th	Is[31]	12	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	PrJ[4]	Ek	D[23]	1E	Ne[32]	Si	To	Jud	Et	
B491	18th	En	Job	12	To	Jud	Et	M[24]	1M	2M							
B492	18th	En	Pr[26]	Ec	Wi	Is	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	PrJ[4]	1E	SS	Si	Jud	Et	To[33]
B493	18th	Ps	Pr[26]	Ec	Wi	SS	Kgs	1C	2C	12	D[23]						
B494	18th	Pr[26]	Wi	Ec	SS	Si	D[23]	D[34]									
B495	18th	SS	Pr[35]	Ec	Wi												
B496	17th	Job	Pr[26]	Ec	Wi	Is	Ba	LeJ	Je	Lm	PrJ[4]	D[23]	12	V			

[30] Inc. apocryphal sections

[31] Small portion of the end of the book; uncertain if was present in its entirety

[32] Frag Neh 3:27-4:22

[33] Only beginning bit of book

[34] Dam ch. 11

[35] "Rubrics are omitted towards the end" – missing Tagsas???

B497	18th	Job	Pr[26]	Wi	Ec	Is	12																							
B498	17th	D^{23}	Job	Si	Ho	Mi	Joe	Jon	Ha[36]	To	Nah	Ha[37]	Zep	Hag	Zec	Mal													
B499	18th	Si	D^{23}	En	Is	Ho	Am	Mi	Joe	Ob	Jon	Nah																	
B500	18th	Si																											
B501	15th	Is	AsI	12	Ek	D^{23}																							
B502	18th	Is	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	PBa^4	Ek	D^{23}	12	1E	2E	3E	To	Jud	Et	M^{24}	D^{38}											
B503	18th	Is	D^{23}	1E	AsI	AB^{39}	AE^{40}																						
B504	18th (175-)	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	Ek	1E	2E	3E	1M	2M	M^{24}	To	Et	Jud	Si													
B829 f.7	17th	Mi	Joe																										
B505	18th (172-)	1M	2M	M^{24}	To	Et	Jud	Si	D^{23}																				
B506	18th	M^{24}	Ek	1E																									
Griale26	18th-19th	1E	Job	Pr	Tg	Wi	Ec	Is	12																				
Griale91	19th-20th	V	Ba	V	En^{41}	V																							
Cer28	18th	12	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	PrJ^4	1C	2C	1E	$3E^{42}$	M^{24}																	
Cer35	17th	Kgs																											
Cer51	20th	Jub	1C	2C																									
Cer75	20th	8	Jub	En	Kgs	1C	2C	1E	2E	3E	Jud	Et	To	M	Job	Ps	Pr	Tg	Mb	Wi	SS	Is	Je	Ba	Lm	Ek	D^{23}	12	Si	[43]

[36] fragment

[37] less preceding fragment

[38] Frag. Da 11:13-45

[39] Apocalypse of Baruch

[40] Apocalypse of Ezra regarding the Day of Judgment (=section of 1Ez??)

[41] Fragments

[42] ??

[43] NT books

Cer110	20th	En	Job																	
Cer131	19th	Je[44]	Job	D[23]	Je	Ba	Lm	Et	En	Is	1C	2C	To							
Cer199	19th	8	Jub																	
Cer259	15th	Job	Pr	Tg	Wi	Mb	SS	Si												
Fait5	18th-19th	En	Job	D[23]																
HebU37[45]	18th	Jub	M	Si	1E	2E	3E	To	Jud	Et	D[23]									
JArch5	20th	En	12																	
6686	17th	En	Job	?	Wi	?	?	Is	12	D[23]	Si	Je[46]	Ek							
6706	18th	Is	En	Si	Je	Ba	?													
6930	18th	En	Job	Pr	?	Wi	?	SS	12	D[23]	Is									
6974	18th?	En	Job	Pr	Tg	Ec	Wi	SS	Is	D[23]	1E	12	Jub							
7103	18th?	En	Job	?	Wi	Tg	Ec	SS?	Is	Ez[47]										
7584		En	Job	SS?	To	Pr[26]	Ec	Et	Jud	Is	Sus	D[29]	Je	Ba[46]	Ek	12	1E	2E	Si	V
Tüb 19		Si																		
Wein 16		V	D	12[48]	V															
Ta 132	17th/18th?	Kgs																		
Ta 168	16th/18th?	Kgs	Ne[49]																	
Jena		En	Job	NOT ETHIOPIC MS; LATER COPY OF PROBABLY BERLIN MS																
Ber 6	17th	V	Pr	Tg	Wi	Ec	SS													

[44] fragments
[45] **order not certain**
[46] May also include other works commonly grouped with Jer
[47] "Ezra the prophet"
[48] Unlikely that all books are present, but insufficient information
[49] Frag Neh. 7:51-69

Makelle	18th	En	Job	[50]																		
Abb 16	19th	En	12	Is	Pr	Tg	Wi	Ec	D[23]	Si	Job	SS										
Abb 22	15th	8																				
Abb 30	18th	En	Pr	Tg	Wi	Ec	Job	12	D[23]	Is												
Abb 35	17th	En	Job	Kgs	1C	2C	Pr[26]	Ec	Wi	Is	Je	Ba[46]	Ek	D[23]	12	Si	1E	2E	3E	To	Jud	Et
Abb 55	15th/16th	En	Job	Pr	Tg	Ec	Wi	Si	Is	Je	Ba	LeJ	Ek	D[51]	1E	2E	Et	12	1M	2M	M	
Abb 99	19th	En																				
Abb 107		V	En	Is	V	Ex	De	Esd	V[52]													
Abb 117	19th	8	Jub																			
Abb 122	18th	Si	V																			
Abb 148	18th/19th	8																				
Abb 195	18th	V	Is	12	Je	Lm	LeJ	Ba														
Abb 197	19th	Kgs	En	Job	D[23]																	
Jer1	18th (177-)	SS	Pr	Tg	Ec	Wi	Job	Et	Si	To												
B16185		1K	2K	3K																		
B16187		SS																				
B16188		Si	1E	2E	3E	Sib[53]																
B16186		Pr	Tg	Ec	Wi	Job																
B16189		Pr	Tg	Ec	Wi	Job	12															
B16223		AB[39]	V																			

---

[50] Non-catalogue entry; may include other works
[51] Includes Bel; may inc. Susanna
[52] All books in this MS are only extracts thereof
[53] "Prophetia Sibyllae" 5pp

B11678		V	1E[54]	En[55]									
B16241		TSo[56]	V										
Abb 21	18th	Ex	V										
Abb 57	15th	Kgs[57]											
Vat 71	18th	En											
Vat Bo2	15th (144-)	V	Jub[58]	V									
Vat Bo3	14th	Kgs											
Vat 249	18th	Job	Sus	D	Bel								
PBI A		Jub											
PBI B		En											
PBI C[59]	18th	Jub	1C	2C	M								
VaCo127	17th/18th	AB?	V										
Fran1		En	Job	8									
Fran2		Kgs	1C	2C	2E	3E[9]	To	Jud	Et	1E	[60]		
Fran4		Kgs	12	Job	Pr	Tg	Ec	Wi	Is	1E	Sus	D	Bel
Fran5		Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	Ba[1]	V						
Fran6		Ek											
Fran7		V	1E	2E	3E	To	Jud	Et	Si	1M	2M	V	

[54] fragments

[55] Only 46:1-4 and 61:1-18 (manuscript is theological treatise on the Trinity)

[56] "Wisdom of Solomon against demons" – possibly a version or extract of T. Sol.

[57] Do not appear in exactly the conventional order; 1K is proceeded by 1p. of 2K, whose remainder is located after the entirety of 3K

[58] fragments on 2pp.

[59] Ordering uncertain

[60] Josippon

SPK988		AB															
SPK985		Kgs	D[23]														
SPK986		Ps	Pr[26]	Ec	Wi	SS	Is	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	PBa	1E	3E	12	V	
SPK3067		Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	PBa	Job	1E	2E	3E							
SPK3068		Jub	M[24]														
Fran12		Ek															
Hm405	18th/19th	Pr	Tg	Wi	Ec	SS											
Griau307		1E	Job	Pr	Tg	Ec	Is	12									
Haver23		8															
Bizan6	1491/2	61															
JArch1	1775/6	SS	Pr[26]	Ec	Wi	Job	Es	Si	Tob								
JArch4	19th	Jub	E[62]	Ek													
KBBer2	17th/18th	Kgs	D[23]														
KBBer3	17th/18th	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	PBa	Job	1E	2E	3E							
KBBer4	16th	Ps	Pr[26]	Ec	Wi	SS	Is	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	PBa	1E	2E	12	V	
KBBer11	15th	Jub	M														
KBBer12	17th/18th	ABa															

Note also the cursory listing by Mordini on Gunda Gundi, though the fragmentary nature of this work precludes its incorporation into the above listing

---

[61] 81 canonical books of OT and NT, Enoch, Ascension of Isaiah, etc.
[62] 1&2 Ezra = canonical books of Ezra?

Appendix 4.B. Ge'ez Manuscripts, with the Book of Enoch, in the British Library

No.	MSS #	Date	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	Add. 24,185	19th	En															
2	Orient. 485	16th	Jub	En														
3	Orient. 484	18th	En	8	Je[1]	Je[2]	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	PrJ[3]	D[4]	Ek	1-4E[5]	To	Jud	Et	Si
4	Orient. 486	18th	En	Kgs	Si	Je[6]												
5	Orient. 490	18th	En	Job	D	1E	Is	12										
6	Add. 24,990	18th	En	Job	Pr	Wi	Ec	SS	Mis[7]	Is	12	D	1E					
7	Orient. 491	18th	En	Job	12	To	Jud	Et	M	M[8]								
8	Orient. 492	18th	En	Pr	Ec	Wi	Is	Je	Ba	Lm	LeJ	PrJ	1E	SS	Si	Jud	Et	To
9	Orient. 499	18th	Si	D	En	Is	12											
10	Orient. 743	17th	Mis[9]	SS[10]	Mis[11]	En[12]												
11	Or. 8822	18th	En	Job	D	1E	Si											
12	Or. 8823	18th	En	Kgs	3M	Mis[13]												

[1] Only portions from Jer. 46:2-51:64.

[2] Another book of Jeremiah.

[3] The Prophecy of Jeremiah to Pashur.

[4] Daniel with all the "apocryphal" books – Susanna, the Song of the Three Holy Children, Bel, and the Dragon.

[5] These are the four books of Ezra or Esdras.

[6] With other books related to him.

[7] Comparisons of various biblical persons and symbols.

[8] The first and second Books of Maccabees, translated from the Vulgate.

[9] Hymns and Prayers, including the Athanasian Creed.

[10] "The Song of Songs, concerning the Son, and the Christian Church, and His Mother," an exposition of words and phrases in the Song of Songs.

[11] Expositions of some passages of the Old and New Testaments.

[12] A long series of exposition, commencing with *Enoch*. The Book of Enoch is also cited.

[13] Three Compositions for Moral Edification.