

**THE ANGEL STORY:  
A STUDY OF THE INTERPRETATION OF GENESIS 6:1-4 IN  
THE JEWISH LITERATURE OF THE SECOND TEMPLE  
PERIOD.**

**Shem Miller**

**MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL  
FACULTY OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES**

**A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements of the degree of M.A. in Religious Studies  
August, 2005**

**Under the supervision of  
Dr. G. Oegema**

**© Shem Miller 2005**



Library and  
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et  
Archives Canada

Published Heritage  
Branch

Direction du  
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

*Your file    Votre référence*

*ISBN: 978-0-494-22611-7*

*Our file    Notre référence*

*ISBN: 978-0-494-22611-7*

#### NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

#### AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

---

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

  
**Canada**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>  | iv |
| <b>ABSTRACT</b>  | v  |
| <b>I. INTRODUCTION</b>   | 1  |
| 1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF GENESIS 6:1-4  | 2  |
| 2. EXEGESIS OF GENESIS 6:1-4   | 5  |
| 3. GENESIS 6:1-4 IN THE CONTEXT OF GENESIS   | 12 |
| <b>II. 1 ENOCH (3<sup>RD</sup> CENTURY B.C.E.)</b>                                 | 13 |
| 1. 1 ENOCH AT QUMRAN   | 13 |
| 2. TRANSMISSION OF ENOCHIC CORPUS  | 14 |
| 3. TEXTUAL IDENTITY OF THE BOOK OF THE WATCHERS                                    | 15 |
| 4. TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE BOOK OF THE WATCHERS                                    | 17 |
| <b>III. JUBILEES (2<sup>ND</sup> CENTURY B.C.E.)</b>                               | 23 |
| 1. JUBILEES 5:1-10 AND GENESIS 6:1-4   | 23 |
| 2. JUBILEES AND 1 ENOCH  | 30 |
| <b>IV. THE SEPTUAGINT (3<sup>RD</sup> CENTURY – 2<sup>ND</sup> CENTURY B.C.E.)</b> | 35 |
| <b>V. OTHER 2<sup>ND</sup>-CENTURY TEXTS WHICH ALLUDE TO THE ANGEL STORY</b>       | 41 |
| 1. JESUS BEN SIRACH (200-170 B.C.E.)   | 41 |
| 2. PSEUDO-EUPOLEMUS (CIRCA 150 B.C.E.)   | 45 |
| 3. BARUCH (2 <sup>ND</sup> CENTURY B.C.E.)   | 50 |
| <b>VI. THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS</b>  | 54 |
| 1. THE BOOK OF GIANTS FROM QUMRAN (1 <sup>ST</sup> CENTURY B.C.E.)                 | 54 |
| 2. THE GENESIS APOCRYPHON (50 BC.E.- 50 C.E.)                                      | 58 |
| 3. THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT (100-75 BC.E.)  | 62 |
| 4. 4Q180 (100-50 B.C.E.)   | 66 |
| 5. 4Q370 (50 B.C.E. – 0 C.E.)  | 68 |
| <b>VII. OTHER FIRST-CENTURY TEXTS C.E. WHICH ALLUDE TO THE ANGEL STORY</b>         | 68 |
| 1. WISDOM OF SOLOMON (50 B.C.E. – 0 C.E.)  | 68 |
| 2. 3 MACCABEES (1 <sup>ST</sup> CENTURY B.C.E.)                                    | 72 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 3. SIBYLLINE ORACLES (TURN OF THE ERAS)                                   | 74  |
| 4. PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA (20 B.C. – 40 C.E.)                                | 78  |
| 5. FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS (37C.E.-100 C.E.)                                     | 80  |
| VIII. THE EPISTLES OF 2 PETER AND JUDE (CIRCA 80 C.E.)                    | 81  |
| IX. FIRST TO SECOND-CENTURY C.E. TEXTS WHICH ALLUDE TO THE ANGEL STORY    | 87  |
| 1. THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS (2 <sup>ND</sup> CENTURY C.E.) | 87  |
| 2. 2 <sup>ND</sup> (SYRIAC APOCALYPSE OF) BARUCH (90-120 C.E.)            | 93  |
| 3. 3 <sup>RD</sup> (GREEK APOCALYPSE OF) BARUCH                           | 96  |
| X. MAJOR TRENDS IN INTERPRETATION   | 97  |
| 1. THEODICY, DEMONS, AND THE FLOOD  | 97  |
| 2. DEFILEMENT AND JUDGMENT  | 100 |
| 3. THE GIANT STORY  | 101 |
| 4. NEGATIVE EXEMPLARS   | 102 |
| 5. NAMES  | 103 |
| XI. CONCLUSION  | 106 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY  |     |



To Noni, whose loving encouragement and support has helped to sustain me, and to the memory of my grandfathers John Kerr and Jim Mankins who passed away during the writing of this thesis. May they be in the company of angels.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to all those who have helped me throughout the arduous process of writing this thesis. Firstly, I would like to thank my advisor Dr. Gerbern Oegema, who has helped me tremendously not only by the sharpness of his thoughts, but also by his kindness and generosity. I would like to thank Dr. Ian Henderson, who graciously agreed to purview the section which treated the N.T., for his suggestions for improvement. I wish to express my appreciation to Dr. Manuel Jinbachian who offered valuable suggestions on the section treating the Septuagint, which have improved that section in no small way. Furthermore, he graciously made available to me the unpublished manuscript of his forthcoming book concerning the Septuagint's translation and interpretation of Genesis. Lastly, my cordial thanks are also offered to Dr. Patricia Kirkpatrick, who has carefully read through the proofs of this thesis, called my attention to some doubtful areas, and offered valuable comments on the section treating Genesis 6:1-4: she must not be held responsible for the errors which survive.

### **ABSTRACT**

The story of the “sons of God” in Genesis 6:1-4 has attracted the attention of Jewish texts from its inception, on account of its obscure character and positioning before the story of the Flood. Particularly, throughout the Second Temple period this story was expanded into a mythological tale of the fallen angels’ exploits and their disastrous consequences. Each work interpreted and employed the mythology in a unique manner, which was often influenced by its specific literary concerns. Generally speaking, the angel story became a theodicy, explanation for the Flood, and an infamous example from the sacred history of Israel of God’s immanent judgment of the unrighteous. Through an exegetical analysis of each text which employs the angel story, this study will describe its variegated interpretation and literary development throughout the Jewish literature from the 4<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E. to the early 2<sup>nd</sup> century C.E.

### **RÉSUMÉ**

L’histoire des « fils de Dieu » dans Genèse 6 :1-4 a attiré l’attention des écrits juifs dès le commencement à cause de son style obscur et sa position avant l’histoire du déluge. Particulièrement, au cours de la période du Deuxième Temple, elle est devenue le récit mythologique des exploits des anges déchus et de leurs conséquences désastreuses. Chaque œuvre a interprété et utilisé cette mythologie à sa manière unique, souvent dictée par des soucis littéraires spécifiques. En somme, l’histoire des anges est devenue une théodicée, une explication du déluge, et un épisode infâme de l’histoire sacrée d’Israël du jugement immanent sur les personnes injustes par Dieu. Par une analyse exégétique de chaque œuvre utilisant l’histoire des anges, cette étude décrira les différentes interprétations et les développements littéraires de cette histoire dans les écrits juifs datant du 4<sup>ème</sup> siècle av. J.-C. au début du 2<sup>ème</sup> siècle ap. J.-C.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The story of בני האלהים and the “daughters of men” in Gen 6:1-4 is one of the most bizarre passages in the Hebrew Bible. One of the most troublesome aspects of this pericope is its truncated form, which appears to have been interpolated into the text of Genesis.<sup>1</sup> Its obscure and elliptical character, classically characterized by H. Gunkel as a “piece of a torso,”<sup>2</sup> has led to a cornucopia of interpretations throughout the history of biblical interpretation. It has also received much attention by modern scholarship on account of its wide spread attestation in ancient Jewish and Christian literature, and its prominence in *1 Enoch* 1-36 (i.e., the Book of the Watchers).<sup>3</sup> The central aspect of the Genesis passage addressed during the Second Temple period is the activities of the בני האלהים and הנפילים, and their disastrous consequences. An elaborate mythology concerning the Watchers as exemplified in the Book of the Watchers (hereafter abbreviated BW), as well as several ancillary motifs and interpretations, bloomed during this period. Generally speaking, many works during the Second Temple period interpret that the sons of God were actually fallen angels, which cohabitated with women and

<sup>1</sup> G. Von Rad, *Genesis* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975), 113; C. Westermann, *Genesis 1-11* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984), 499-500.

<sup>2</sup> H. Gunkel, *Genesis* (Marcon: Mercer University, 1997), 59.

<sup>3</sup> To my knowledge the most exhaustive study done of the angel story in the Jewish literature of the Second Temple period is D. Dimmant's PhD dissertation submitted in 1974 [D. Dimmant, “The Fallen Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical Books Relating to Them [Hebrew],” (Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University, 1974)]. L. Stuckenbruck is currently writing a book concerning “the influence of ‘fallen angels’ tradition in ancient Judaism and the New Testament” (Eerdmans). Unfortunately, this book was not published before the submission of this study. M. Delcor's article also provides an excellent overview of the tradition of the fallen angels and the giants in this period. See; M. Delcor, “Le mythe de la chute des anges et de l'origine des géants comme explication du mal dans le monde dans l'apocalyptique juive,” *RHR* 190 (1976): 3-53. More recently, J. VanderKam's overview of Enoch and Enochic motifs also provides a very excellent and broad overview of the Enochic watchers mythology during the Second Temple period, and his chapter in *Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* on “Enochic Motifs” continues his analysis of the angel story into early Christian literature. See; J. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995); J. VanderKam and W. Alder, *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (CRINT 3.4; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 33-100. Most recently, A. Reeds dissertation on the illicit teaching of the fallen angels provides a cogent and exhaustive analysis on the Aseal tradition from the *1 En.* 1-36 as well. See; A. Reed, “What the Fallen Angels Taught: The Reception-History of the ‘Book of Watchers’ in Judaism and Christianity,” (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 2002). See also; J. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 178-211; L. Stuckenbruck, “The Origins of Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Interpretation of Genesis 6:1-4 in the Second and Third Centuries B.C.E.,” in *The Fall of the Angels* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 93-115; idem, “Genesis 6:1-4 as the Basis of Divergent Readings during the Second Temple Period,” *Hencoh* 2002 (24): 9-106; Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 365; 371-372; R. Zuurmond, “The Flood According to Enoch in Early Christian Literature,” *SBL Seminar Papers*, 1991 (2 vols.; SBLSP 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 2:768-72.

produced giants who corrupted the earth. In short, the angel story became a theodicy, explanation for the Flood,<sup>4</sup> and an infamous example from the sacred history of Israel of God's immanent judgment of the unrighteous. Through an exegetical analysis of each text which employs the angel story, this study will describe the angel story's variegated interpretation and literary development throughout the Jewish literature from the 4<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E. to the early 2<sup>nd</sup> century C.E.

## 1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF GENESIS 6:1-4

In order to fully understand the development of the angel story and trace its trajectory of interpretation throughout the Second Temple period one must first identify and analyze its base text. For many reasons, it is legitimate to question whether Gen 6:1-4 as preserved in MT should be used as the springboard for an analysis of the theme in the Second Temple period. For example, it is difficult to know whether the text as we have it preserved in the Leningrad codex (c.1008 C.E.) was the biblical text used by Hebrew speaking Jews from this period. Even if one is willing to grant that the biblical texts copied by the Qumran scribes presented the standardized biblical texts, Gen 6:1-4 is not extant in preserved Qumran MSS. Furthermore, the MSS of the BW from Qumran, which is our oldest witness to the text (3<sup>rd</sup> cent. B.C.E.), is a radically expanded form compared to the MT. Some scholars have come to the conclusion that the HB was actually based upon the BW, rather than visa versa.<sup>5</sup> Thus, P. Sacchi has characterized Genesis as a demythicizing reaction to the revolutionary ideas found in the BW.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, this hypothesis is bolstered by J. Milik's theory of an Enochic Pentateuch at Qumran.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, is it legitimate to assume the priority of Gen 6:1-4 in the MT when analyzing texts from the Second Temple period?

The answer which emerged from this study is that the textual basis for expanded interpretation in the Second Temple period is most likely Gen 6:1-4 rather than *1 Enoch*.

---

<sup>4</sup> Originally in Genesis this passage may have been placed before the flood to explain God's severe punishment of the earth. However, later literature, and particularly the BW of *1 Enoch*, adapted this into a theodicy to explain the pervasiveness of sin in the world and justify God's punitive measures. See, M. Elliot, "Origins and Functions of the Watchers Theodicy," *Henoch* 24 (2002): 63-75.

<sup>5</sup> P. Sacchi, *The History of the Second Temple Period* (JSOTSup 285; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 174-181; J. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 31; M. Black and J. VanderKam, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 140-41; M. Barker, *The Older Testament* (London: SPCK, 1987), 12-32.

<sup>6</sup> Sacchi, *History*, 178.

<sup>7</sup> Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 30-33.

The majority of the references to the angel story lack key components of the Enochic watchers mythology, and therefore appear to use the biblical text as their point of departure rather than the BW. Although this assertion cannot be proved, there are several additional reasons to doubt the priority of the BW over the MT of Genesis 6:1-4.

Firstly, the Pentateuch of the Septuagint, which is from the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.E. contains a translation of Gen 6:1-4, which is 1) either based upon a *Vorlage* very similar to the MT, or 2) based upon another textual tradition very similar to the MT.<sup>8</sup> This demonstrates an antiquity of the biblical story which at least dates back as far as the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.E. Furthermore, the theory of an Enochic Pentateuch has been widely criticized by scholars as an untenable hypothesis. For example J. Greenfield and M. Stone have remarked concerning the Enochic Pentateuch that it is, “unsupported by any solid evidence except for the following: three Enochic works are copied together in one Qumran manuscript and two of these in two more; fragments of five or more Enochic works have been discovered at Qumran; and, finally, a differing selection of five works are combined in the [much later] Ethiopic version.”<sup>9</sup>

Secondly, an examination of the sources used in Gen 6:1-4 supports a date which precedes the BW. Much work has been done in analyzing the ancient Near Eastern and Greek background of Genesis 6:1-4 in an attempt to identify the sources used by the J document, which in its present state is thought of as a truncated demythologized etiology.<sup>10</sup> On the one hand, parallels to the sons of God have been drawn to Canaanite

---

<sup>8</sup> This assertion will be argued for in the forthcoming sections on the LXX and the BW. According to E. Tov, “the text presupposed by the LXX [i.e., the Hebrew *Vorlage*] basically represents a tradition which is either close to that of the MT, or can easily be explained as a descendent or source of it [E. Tov, *Text Critical Use of the Septuagint* (Jerusalem: Yuval Press., 1981), 261].” The differences between the MT and the LXX will be discussed in the section dealing with the LXX. For an overview of these differences and similarities see; J. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (SBLSCS 35; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 52-79. For a survey of the critical issues involved see; Tov, *Text Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 260-275; 293-295.

<sup>9</sup> J. Greenfield and M. Stone, “The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes,” *HTR* 70 (1977): 52-53; see also, J. VanderKam, “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*,” in *From Revelation to Canon* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 360-62; G. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 22-23.

<sup>10</sup> R. Hendel, “The Nephilim Were on the Earth: Genesis 6:1-4 and Its Ancient Near Eastern Context,” in *The Fall of the Angels* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 11-34; idem, “Of Demigods and the Deluge: Toward and Interpretation of Genesis 6:1-4,” *JBL* 106 (1987): 13-36; E. Speiser, *Genesis* (AB 1; Garden City: Doubleday, 1964), 45-46.; E. Kraeling, “The Significance and Origin of Gen 6:1-4,” *JNES* 6 (1947): 193-208; Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 368-69; 379-80; P. Hanson, “Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and the Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6-11,” *JBL* 96 (1977): 202-218.

traditions, which have led many scholars to the conclusion that the sons of God are an archaism derived from the older Canaanite phrase “Sons/Children of El.”<sup>11</sup> It has been pointed out that, “in Ugaritic texts the sons of El are members of El’s divine assembly and they are described as the offspring of El and . . . Asherah.”<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, Ammonite and Phoenician inscriptions from Iron Age II which mention the “Children of El” have also been found.<sup>13</sup> For example, a Phoenician inscription from Arslan Tash (7<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E.) mentions the “sons of El, and the great council of all the holy ones.”<sup>14</sup> This indicates that the “Children of God” continued to be used throughout the first half the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium B.C.E. with relatively the same denotation. *1 Enoch*, on the other hand, does not use the “children of El” nor the “sons of God” to describe the fallen angels. Rather *1 Enoch* uses the term watchers, which is only found in the literature of the second half of the Second Temple period (3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.E.-1<sup>st</sup> century C.E.). Some scholars have also drawn parallels to the writings of Hesoid (6<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E.).<sup>15</sup> Particularly, one passage from the *Catalogues of Women* bears a striking resemblance to the narrative of Gen 6:1-4:<sup>16</sup>

Now all the gods were divided through strife; for at that very time Zeus . . . was hastening to make an utter end of the race of mortal men, declaring that he would destroy the lives of demi-gods, that the children of the gods should not mate with wretched mortal, seeing their fate with their own eyes; but that the blessed gods henceforth even as aforementioned should have living and their habitations apart from men. But on those who were born of immortals and of mankind verily Zeus laid toil and sorrow upon

<sup>11</sup> For examples in Ugaritic see; M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartin, *The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani, and Other Places* (ALASP 8; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1995), 1.4.III12-14; 1.17.VI.26-29; 1.10.I.3-5. Several examples in Ugaritic are given and discussed in detail by; Hendel, “The Nephilim Were on the Earth,” 18-27; see also, U. Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961), 292-3; Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 369.

<sup>12</sup> Hendel, “The Nephilim Were on the Earth,” 23-25.

<sup>13</sup> For an Ammonite inscription see; S. Ahituv, *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Inscriptions* [Hebrew] (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1992), 220-223.

<sup>14</sup> F. Cross and R. Saley, “Phoenician Incantations on a Plaque of the Seventh century B.C. from Arslan Tash in Upper Syria,” *BASOR* 197 (1970): 45; see also (*KAI* 27.11-12) = H. Donner and Wöllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften* (Band II; Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1973), 43-45. For another example see, W. Albright, “An Aramaean Magical Text in Hebrew from the Seventh Century B.C.,” *BASOR* 76 (1936): 5-11.

<sup>15</sup> J. Van Seters, *Prologue to History* (Louisville: Westminster, 1992), 155-58; G. Nickelsburg, “Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6-11,” *JBL* 96 (1997):395-397; 399-404; Hendel, “Of Demigods and the Deluge,” 18-23; idem, “The Nephilim were on the Earth,” 30-32.

<sup>16</sup> Nickelsburg has also drawn a parallel between the Asael material in the BW 6-11 and the Prometheus myth in Hesoid’s *Theogony*. See; Nickelsburg, “Apocalyptic and Myth,” 399-404.

sorrow.<sup>17</sup>

Overall, although there are many differences between these examples, the similarities between these different Canaanite and Greek myths and the certain aspects of the biblical text attests to an antiquity (Late Bronze to Iron Age) of the terminology and material incorporated into the Gen 6 which is antecedent to the BW.

Lastly, a look at the transmission history of Genesis points to an earlier date for Gen 6. It should not be overlooked that Gen 6:1-4, with the exclusion of v.3 which is sometimes regarded as a later gloss<sup>18</sup> or pre-Israelite mythical fragment which was incorporated into the J document,<sup>19</sup> is widely identified as part of the J document.<sup>20</sup> Scholars traditionally identify the *Sitz im Leben* of J in the 9<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C.E.<sup>21</sup> On the other end of the spectrum, even if scholars such as J. Van Seters are correct in an exilic date of J (6<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E.),<sup>22</sup> and the incorporation of Greek (Hesoid 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E.) rather than older Mesopotamian material into the J document,<sup>23</sup> this would still antecede the BW. Therefore, a later exilic date for the J document has few implications for this study because the majority of the passage, and the material incorporated into this passage of the J document, stills precedes the oldest extant source which refers to the angel story, i.e., the BW of *1 Enoch*. This evidence points to an antiquity of the mythology of the בני אלוהים and הנפלים which predates the BW by at least two centuries.

## 2. EXEGESIS OF GENESIS 6:1-4

Now that an argument for the priority of the biblical text over that of *1 Enoch* has been made through a brief overview of the historical background of Gen 6:1-4, an

---

<sup>17</sup> Translation from H. G. Evelyn-White, *Hesoid* (LCL; Cambridge: Harvard, 1936), 199-200. The observation that Genesis 6:1-4 resembles Greek mythology is not exclusive to modern scholarship. For example, Josephus writes in *Ant.* (1:73) concerning Genesis 6:1-4 that, "many angels of God now consorted with women and begat sons who were overbearing and disdainful of every virtue, such confidence had they in their strength; in fact the deeds that tradition ascribes to them resemble the audacious exploits told by the Greeks of the giants [trans., H. Thackeray, *Josephus IV: Jewish Antiquities* (LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University, 1930)]."

<sup>18</sup> Van Seters, *Prologue to History*, 152-54.

<sup>19</sup> B. Childs, *Myth and Reality in the Old Testament* (SBT 27; London: SCM Press, 1962), 56.

<sup>20</sup> R. Friedman, *The Bible with Sources Revealed* (San Francisco: Harper, 2003), 42; G. Von Rad, *Genesis*, 109; G. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15* (WBC 1; Waco: Word Books, 1987), 137-8; Speiser, *Genesis*, 46; Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 368-69; Van Seters, *Prologue to History*, 149-158.

<sup>21</sup> R. Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible* (San Francisco: Harper, 1987), 33-69; 246.

<sup>22</sup> Van Seters, *Abraham in history and Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), 148-153; 309-312; *ibid.*, *Life of Moses: The Yawist as Historian in Exodus-Numbers* (Louisville: Westminster, 1994), 457-464.

<sup>23</sup> Van Seters, *Prologue to History*, 38-42; 155-58.



exegesis of Gen 6:1-4 and an overview of its placement within the context of Genesis will follow.

| <u>Genesis 6:1</u>                               | <u>Translation</u> <sup>24</sup>  |
|--|---|
| ויהי כי החל האדם לרב על פני האדמה ובנות ילדו להם | And when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them. |

The introductory phrase ויהי כי, “and when,” can be found elsewhere in Genesis (26:8, 27:1, 43:23) and is used to introduce a temporal clause. More precisely, it describes continual action, and sets the stage for the narrative in verse 2.<sup>25</sup> The background for the story is that mankind is populating the earth. The noun האדם is a common noun in the collective sense of the word man, i.e., “mankind.”<sup>26</sup> Likewise, פני האדמה is idiomatic for “ground.”<sup>27</sup>

| <u>Genesis 6:2</u>   | <u>Translation</u>   |
|--|--|
| ויראו בני האלהים את בנות האדם כי טבת הנה ויקחו להם נשים מכל אשר בחרו | The sons of God saw that the daughters of men were fair; and they took for themselves wives from all whom they chose |

The term בני האלהים is here in parallel to בנות האדם. The juxtaposition of these two terms semantically (son vs. daughter and man vs. God), and literarily through the parallelism within the sentence may shed some light on the meaning of the בני האלהים. The meaning of בנות האדם is similar to בני האדם, i.e. “Mankind” in general, but in the female sex, i.e., “Womankind” in general.<sup>28</sup> The simplest meaning of בני האלהים is “gods,”<sup>29</sup> just as daughters of men (בנות האדם), or sons of men (בני האדם) in Hebrew is idiomatic for men or women. However, the original meaning of the phrase as gods, which is seen through parallels in similar terminology in Canaanite, Ugaritic, and Phoenician, was demythologized in its biblical usage.<sup>30</sup>

In Gen 6 בני האלהים probably means angelic beings, in contrast to human beings,

<sup>24</sup> Translation of Genesis 6:1-5 are mine.

<sup>25</sup> Westermann has noted this exposé to verse 2 is originally part of the pericope of Genesis 6:1-4 because verse 2 presupposes verse 1 as a part of the narrative [Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 340,370]. See also; Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 139.

<sup>26</sup> Cassuto, *Genesis*, 291.

<sup>27</sup> F. Brown, S. Driver, and C. Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), 9.

<sup>28</sup> Cassuto, *Genesis*, 291.

<sup>29</sup> Westermann, 372.

<sup>30</sup> S. Parker, “Sons of God,” *DDD*, 1499-1502.

as the use of בני האלהים elsewhere in the HB demonstrates (Ps 29:1,82:6-7,89:6-7; Job 1:6, 2:1, 38:7).<sup>31</sup> For example, the interpretation that the בני אלהים were angels can be seen in Job 38:25 where the Lord describes the “morning stars,” which is probably a reference to the heavenly host present with him at creation, as בני אלהים. In total, the phrase בני אלהים occurs 3 times in Job referring to angelic beings (Job1:6, 2:1, 38:7). Lastly, בני אלהים, and another cognate בני אלים, are used elsewhere in the Psalms to denote the Lord’s angelic host (Ps 29:1; 82:6-7; 89:6-7).<sup>32</sup>

This verse also describes the motivating cause of the angels’ actions, when it describes the women as טבת, “fair, or beautiful.”<sup>33</sup> This word literally means good, but here it takes the connotation of “good in appearance, or beautiful.”<sup>34</sup> The action that the angels take upon seeing the beautiful woman is to take wives. The phrase here (Heb. ויקחו להם נשים) does not imply rape, polygamy, or any negative evaluation on the part of the author.<sup>35</sup> Rather, the general import of this verse would be that angels saw beautiful women and literally took them (for wives).

| <u>Genesis 6:3</u>   | <u>Translation</u>   |
|--|--|
| ויאמר יהוה לא ידון רוחי באדם לעלם בשגם<br>הוא בשר והיו ימיו מאה ועשרים שנה | Then the Lord said, “My spirit shall not remain in man for ever, for he is flesh, but his days shall be a hundred and twenty years.” |

This is the first indication in the story of God’s estimation of the event. Furthermore, this interjection of God’s appraisal and reaction to the occurrences stops the narration of the story. On account of this abrupt break in the narration of the story, and its continuation after this verse, some scholars understand this phrase to be an editorial interjection, which originally was not related to the mythology.<sup>36</sup>

God replies that his spirit 1) “shall not abide in” or 2) “shall not judge, or strive with” man forever. The meaning of לא ידון in the Hebrew text is unclear and, further complicating the matter, it is a *hapex legomena*. If the root of this verb is ד"ן, as in *BDB*,

<sup>31</sup> Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 371-72; Cassuto, *Genesis*, 292-94; Speiser, *Genesis*, 44-45; Von Rad, *Genesis*, 110.

<sup>32</sup> Cassuto, *Genesis*, 292; S. Parker, “Sons of God,” *DDD*, 1504; Hendel, “The Nephilim Were on the Earth,” 18.

<sup>33</sup> *BDB*, 373.

<sup>34</sup> Cassuto, *Genesis*, 294.

<sup>35</sup> Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 141; Cassuto, *Genesis*, 294.

<sup>36</sup> Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 366.

then the meaning would be “will [not] execute judgment for, or strive for.”<sup>37</sup> This is how many modern English translations have understood this verb. For instance the NAS translates it as “my spirit shall not strive with man forever.” However, one encounters a problem with the vocalization of the *holem* if one follows the vocalization of the MT.<sup>38</sup> Therefore, other translations (RSV), and commentators, understand the root to be from *דנ*, which is found in Talmudic Aramaic and possibly in Hebrew, which means “to abide permanently.”<sup>39</sup> This, of course, is anachronistic because Talmudic Aramaic is later than Standard Biblical Hebrew.

Therefore, it is probable that the MT has been corrupted here and the original reading may have been *ידור*, “remain” instead of *ידון*. A variant reading was found at Qumran (4Q252) which verifies this.<sup>40</sup> Furthermore, other expanded versions of the angel story, which were originally based upon Hebrew or Aramaic originals such as *I Enoch* and *Jubilees*, seem to verify an original Hebrew reading of “shall not abide.” For example, J. VanderKam has pointed out that Ethiopic texts “suggest strongly that *Jubilees*’ Hebrew original read *ידור*, as in 4Q252, not *ידון*, or at the very least the author understood *ידון* to mean *ידור*.”<sup>41</sup> Therefore, it appears as if the most ancient interpretation of this problematic verb equated it with “remaining” rather than “judging.” This meaning is apparently how it was understood from 3<sup>rd</sup> century onwards as its translation as “remain” in many ancient texts shows (LXX, Vulgate, Peshitta, *Targum Onkelos*, and Ethiopic Genesis).

The phrase, “for he is flesh” is also problematic. The meaning of *בשגם*, “for” is composed from the combination of the preposition *ב*, with the relative particle *ש*, and the conjunction *גם*<sup>42</sup> and is literally translated as “because that he.”<sup>43</sup> This apparently explains the reason for God’s judgment to be the “state” (of being made of flesh) of mankind. How this relates to the story of the angels is not explained in the text. The

<sup>37</sup> BDB, 189; cf., 192; Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 375.

<sup>38</sup> Cassuto, *Genesis*, 295.

<sup>39</sup> Cassuto, *Genesis*, 295-96.

<sup>40</sup> M. Bernstein, “לא ידור רוחו באדם לעולם” 4Q252 i 2: Biblical Text or Biblical Interpretation?” *RevQ* 16 (1993): 421-27.

<sup>41</sup> J. VanderKam, “The Angel Story in the Book of *Jubilees*,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 160.

<sup>42</sup> Westermann, *Genesis*, 375-76.

<sup>43</sup> BDB, 980.

implication that the editor may be trying to create with this interpolation here may be that, “My spirit shall not abide in man for ever, for he is flesh [and has had sexual relations with angels].” On account of this difficulty some prefer to read בשגם as an infinitive construct from the root ש"גג, with a prepositional prefix of ב, which means to “err or sin” (Lev 5:18, Num 15:28; Ps 119:67).<sup>44</sup> This reading is based upon a variant pointing in some editions, which have a *q'ames* under the last syllable. Thus, the meaning would be “by reason of their going astray” they are now flesh, i.e., they will not live forever. The meaning of בשר, which is “flesh,” is contrasted with God’s spirit (רוח). The distinction is between all animals and men which are flesh, and God who is spirit.<sup>45</sup> Lastly, God declares his judgment of the situation that mankind will live 120 years. Apparently, this means from this moment forward. However, this is problematic in the context of Genesis as a whole, on account of the longevity of life enjoyed by some of the postdiluvian patriarchs (eg., Abraham, 175 yrs.).<sup>46</sup>

#### Genesis 6:4

הנפלים היו בארץ בימים ההם וגם אחרי כן  
אשר יבאו בני האלהים אל בנות האדם וילדו  
להם הם הגברים אשר מעלום אנשי השם

#### Translation

The *nephilim* were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came to the daughters of men and they bore children to them. These were the *gibborim* that were of old, the men of name.

The relationship between this verse and verse 3 is problematic on account of ambiguity in the relationship between: אשר, בימים ההם, and וגם אחרי כן. This verse clearly continues the narrative from the verse 2, but the question is how these conjunctions relate the clauses of sentence to one another. A solution to this problem may begin with the relationship between “in those days,” and אשר.<sup>47</sup> As Cassuto has pointed out “in those days” probably refers to the period before the flood.<sup>48</sup> Furthermore, he posits that the meaning of אשר here is כאשר or “when.” Therefore, according to this interpretation “the נפלים were on the earth in those days (i.e., before the flood), when the sons of God came

<sup>44</sup> BDB, 993.

<sup>45</sup> Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 142.

<sup>46</sup> Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 142. See also, Cassuto who has an ingenious solution to this contradiction. Mankind’s life span is “destined gradually to reach the stage where those who live the longest will live 120 years” (*Genesis*, 297).

<sup>47</sup> Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 377.

<sup>48</sup> Cassuto, *Genesis*, 291; 298-301.

into the daughters of men, and also afterward (i.e., after the flood).” Therefore, the sons of God came into the daughters of men “in those days” before the flood. As a result of this their offspring, the גברים, were on the earth the same time as the נפילים.<sup>49</sup> In this manner, according to this interpretation, the גברים and the נפילים are identified as being contemporaneous.

The origin of both the נפילים and גברים is obscure.<sup>50</sup> Some scholars have sought to find their origin in Akkadian and Canaanite mythology. For example, some have suggested the origin of הנפילים is *apkallu*, which are the creatures of the Akkadian god Ea.<sup>51</sup> Parallels to the Canaanite phrase “Sons/Children of El” have also been drawn.<sup>52</sup> Furthermore, “in Ugaritic texts the sons of El are members of El’s divine assembly and they are described as the offspring of El and . . . Asherah.”<sup>53</sup> On the other hand, scholars have also drawn parallels to the writings of Hesoid (7<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E.).<sup>54</sup> Particularly, one passage from the *Catalogues of Women* bears a striking resemblance to narrative of Gen 6:1-4.<sup>55</sup> However, there is one salient difference between the biblical נפילים and גברים and these parallels. The offspring of the gods are not associated with giants in Greek or in Ancient Near Eastern mythology. Therefore, the meaning and function of the נפילים and גברים as giants, which is the most prevalent interpretation during the Second Temple period, most likely finds its origin in inter-biblical interpretation which was undoubtedly influenced by Canaanite and Greek mythology

<sup>49</sup> This interpretation is a good explanation of the difficult text, but is by no means the only one. For instance, there is nothing in the grammar or syntax of the text that prohibits one from understanding, “and after that when the sons of God went into the daughters of men” as relating to וגם אחרי כן instead of בימים. This interpretation would disassociate the נפילים from גברים because the נפילים would have been on the earth before the flood and the גברים afterwards: “the נפילים were on the earth in those days (i.e., before the flood), and also afterward (i.e., after the flood), when the sons of God came into the daughters of men.”

<sup>50</sup> Cf., P. Coxen, “Gibborim,” *DDD*, 654-655; “Nephilim,” *DDD*, 1163-1168; J. Collins, “Sons of (the) God(s),” *DDD*, 1499-1510.

<sup>51</sup> A. Kilmer, “The Mesopotamian Counterparts of the Biblical Nephilim,” in *Perspectives on Language and Text* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 39-43.

<sup>52</sup> For examples in Ugaritic see; Dietrich, Loretz, and Sanmartin, *The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani, and Other Places*, 1.4.III.12-14; 1.17.VI.26-29; 1.10.I.3-5. Several examples in Ugaritic are given and discussed in detail by; Hendel, “The Nephilim Were on the Earth,” 18-27.

<sup>53</sup> Hendel, “The Nephilim Were on the Earth,” 23-25.

<sup>54</sup> Van Seters, *Prologue to History*, 155-58; Nickelsburg, “Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6-11,” 395-397; 399-404; Hendel, “Of Demigods and the Deluge,” 18-23; idem, “The Nephilim Were on the Earth,” 30-32.

<sup>55</sup> See; H. G. Evelyn-White, *Hesoid*, 199-200. Nickelsburg has also drawn a parallel between the Asael material in the BW 6-11 and the Prometheus myth in Hesoid’s *Theogony*. See, Nickelsburg, “Apocalyptic and Myth,” 399-404.

(Num 13:33, 21:33-22:2; Amos 2:9-10; Deut 3:11).

Contrary to the majority of literature of the Second Temple period, the Bible contains the remnants of a tradition that some of the נפלים and גברים survived the flood.<sup>56</sup> For instance, in Num 13:33 in the spy's report of Canaan there is a reference to a people of great stature called the נפלים, who were clarified by the narrator as being descendents of the נפלים. This reference must surely be to the story of the נפלים in Gen 6:1-4. They are called נפלים in Genesis because, as the story of Genesis assumes, they fell (נפל) from the sky to the earth. Later, they fell by the sword and descended into the torment of Sheol to await final judgment. This is probably the connotation of the reference to the גברים in Sheol in Ezekiel 32:27, where the verb נפל occurs several times in a similar context (Ezek 32:20,22,23,24,27).<sup>57</sup> Lastly, in Amos 2:9-10 the Amorites in the land before the Israelites are described as giants, and the giant Og in Deut 3:11 is also described as an Amorite (Num 21:33-22:2).

The גברים are a special class of humans distinct from David's champions in 2 Sam 23:8-39 (= 2 Chr 11:10-47). Through comparative Semitics the etymological origin of the Hebrew word has been traced to Akk. *gabbaru*, which means "strong."<sup>58</sup> In the HB, the first *gibor* was Nimrod (Gen 11) who was a mythological hunter. Another reference to the גברים, with its mythological connotations, appears in Ezekiel 32:27 where they are mighty warriors in lying in Sheol still equipped with their weapons of war:

And they [Meshech and Tubal] do not lie with the fallen mighty men of old who went down to Sheol (ולא ישכבו את גברים נפלים מערלים), whose swords were laid under their heads, and whose shields are upon their bones; for the terror of the mighty men (גברים) was in the land." (NRSV, Ezek 32:27)

Furthermore, in the present narrative of Gen 6:1-4 the גברים are associated with the נפלים as the progeny of the union between בני האלהים and the daughters of men by their

---

<sup>56</sup> This seems to be exclusively an inter-biblical interpretation because it is almost completely absent from subsequent literature. Pseudo-Eupolemus may be the only extant reference to this tradition when he quotes Eupolemus, in his work 'On the Jews,' which states that the Assyrian city of Babylon was first founded by those who escaped the Flood. See, Stuckenbruck, "Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition," 93-98. This may also be the interpretation of- Josephus in *Ant.* 1.173. See, L. Feldman, *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary: Judean Antiquities 1-4* (vol. 3; ed. S. Mason; Brill: Leiden, 2000), 66 n.553.

<sup>57</sup> Cassuto, *Genesis*, 298-99.

<sup>58</sup> Coxen, "Gibborim," *DDD*, 654; *BDB*, 149-150; "גבר" in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum alten Testament* (vol. 1; ed. G. Johannes and H. Ringgren; Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1973), 902.

juxtaposition in the text. In summary, from these biblical references we can deduce that later biblical authors interpreted that there was a remnant of נפלים that survived and that they were interpreted to be giants or גברים.

The phrase יבוא בני האלוהים אל בנות האדם clearly contains a sexual denotation. Thus, the text elaborates that the women gave birth to the גבורים, who are further described as being 1) from old and 2) men of name. The additional appellation “men of name” is often thought of as the conclusion of the etiological source used by J. However, as our investigation into *1 Enoch* will reveal, this is not the only possible explanation of the double-appellation. Could this be a reference to the progeny of the נפלים?

### 3. GENESIS 6:1-4 IN THE CONTEXT OF GENESIS.

In order to fully understand how this pericope fits into Genesis as a whole, and understand its full import, one must consider this pericope in the overall context of Genesis, and more specifically its juxtaposition with the flood narrative. Westermann has hypothesized that this pericope is a conflation of two sources: an etiological tale which explains the origin of the men of name, or the גברים, and a mythological tale about the union of the gods with mankind.<sup>59</sup> Furthermore, the overall story created by the J document is primarily about a transgression of divinely ordained bounds.<sup>60</sup> However, from this perspective of the text one may then ask how this story about the “dissolution of proper bounds of heaven and earth”<sup>61</sup> fits into the primeval history of Genesis, and particularly the flood narrative?

Speiser’s characterization of this pericope as a “prelude to disaster” is a very keen insight into the essential function of this story within the J document and Genesis as a whole. Speiser understands that, “the present position of the fragment immediately before the account of the flood can scarcely be independent of that universal catastrophe.”<sup>62</sup> Seen in this light the angel story is an introduction to the flood, and an explanation of why the flood took place.<sup>63</sup> Overall, in the narrative of Genesis, the original etiological concerns of the ancient myth, which were used as sources for the J

<sup>59</sup> Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 379; Von Rad, *Genesis*, 110-112. Cf., Cassuto, *Genesis*, 300.

<sup>60</sup> Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 379, VonRad, *Genesis*, 112.

<sup>61</sup> Von Rad, *Genesis 1-11*, 112.

<sup>62</sup> Speiser, *Genesis*, 46.

<sup>63</sup> J. Sogin, “Sons of God, Heroes, and Nephilim: Remarks on Genesis 6:1-4,” in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions* (ed. Michael Fox et al.; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 135-36; Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 146-7; Speiser, *Genesis*, 46; Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 368-9; Von Rad, *Genesis*, 112-13.

document, are of little consequence to the meaning of the present form of the flood narrative. This pericope in its present form and placement points to man's general corruption as the reason for the flood. Thus, in verse five when the hidden narrator speaks completely on his own for the first time, one finds the true purpose of the entire story: "The Lord saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually" (Gen 6:5). The reaction of God is that he declares that he will blot out man and beast from the face of the earth (Gen 6:5-7). This, indeed, is what happens: "and all flesh died that moved upon the earth, birds, cattle, beasts, all swimming creatures . . . and everything which breathed the breath of life in its nostrils died (Gen 7:21-22)."

However, there are also problems created through this understanding of this passages' relation to the flood because of its laconic form. The narrator does not explain why this event was such a gross transgression, nor does he elaborate on any of the details of the transgression. Thus, the reader is left with the impression that something horribly evil has occurred but the details of "why" are not explained. This lacuna in the story is precisely what served as the springboard for interpretation in the literature of the Second Temple period. The zenith of this interpretation is *1 Enoch*.

## II. 1 ENOCH (3<sup>RD</sup> CENTURY B.C.E.)

### 1. 1 ENOCH AT QUMRAN

Following the work of R. H. Charles scholars typically identified in 5 separate writings which compose *1 Enoch*.<sup>64</sup> Charles' hypothesis of five separate writings was further bolstered with the publication of the Aramaic fragments from Qumran by J. Milik. According to Milik, "for the first book of Enoch, the Book of Watchers, we can calculate that exactly 50 percent of the text is covered by the Aramaic fragments; for the third, the Astronomical Book, 30 percent; for the fourth, the Book of Dreams, 26 percent; for the fifth, the Epistle of Enoch, 18 percent."<sup>65</sup> Five separate MSS were unearthed which contain fragments of an Aramaic original of the BW (4QEn<sup>a-c</sup>), which Milik dated on

---

<sup>64</sup> R. Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, xlii-liv. Charles' division of the separate books is as follows: Book of Watchers (1-36); Similitudes of Enoch (37-71), also known as the Book of Parables; Astronomical Book (72-82); Book of Dreams (83-90); and Epistle of Enoch (91-107).

<sup>65</sup> Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 5.



paleographical grounds from mid-second century to the first century C.E.<sup>66</sup> Furthermore, Milik concluded that some of the earliest MSS of the BW and the AB were copies, which would then place their provenance in third century B.C.E or earlier.<sup>67</sup> Therefore, the BW is a very important piece of literature for our study because it is the most ancient source, written sometime in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.E., which paraphrases and expands Gen 6:1-4.<sup>68</sup>

## 2. TRANSMISSION OF THE ENOCHIC CORPUS

On account of the antiquity of the BW and the complex transmission of *1 Enoch*, it is necessary to analyze the textual identity of the BW, as well as its relation to the other books of the Enochic corpus, before we proceed into an analysis of the interpretation of the BW. The two earliest MSS dating from the second century B.C.E. of BW found at Qumran (4QEn<sup>a-b</sup>) contained only the BW.<sup>69</sup> Furthermore, three MSS at Qumran show that the BW was copied together with at least two other Enochic writings from the 1<sup>st</sup> century B.C.E.<sup>70</sup> This is significant because it suggests an earlier composition (3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.E.) of the separate parts of the BW into a coherent whole, and a later accretion of the some of the other books associated with Enoch from the first century B.C.E. onwards.

This evidence from Qumran has been interpreted in a variety of ways from Milik's theory of an Enochic Pentateuch to the G. Nickelsburg's theory of an Enochic testament. Nickelsburg has argued in his recent Hermenia commentary on *1 Enoch* 1-36; 81-108 that the BW forms the core of what was originally an Enochic testament.<sup>71</sup> Although he does not bar the possibility of an earlier independent 3<sup>rd</sup> century transmission of the BW, he argues for an early addition of parts of the AB and the Epistle of Enoch.<sup>72</sup> However, other scholars are more cautious about assigning an early date for a compilation of the Enochic corpus because of the highly complex transmission of *1*

<sup>66</sup> Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 139-243; M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 6-15; J. Greenfield and M. Stone, "The Enochic Pentateuch," 51-57.

<sup>67</sup> Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 160-65; 270-75; J. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 111-113.

<sup>68</sup> J. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 25-26.

<sup>69</sup> Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 25; Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 8-11.

<sup>70</sup> 4QEn<sup>c,d,e</sup> contain parts of the BW along with the Book of Dreams (*1 Enoch* 83-90) and Epistle of Enoch (*1 En.* 91-107).

<sup>71</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 22-26; 165-173; idem, "Scripture in *1 Enoch* and *1 Enoch* as Scripture," in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts and Their Textual and Situational Contexts* (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995), 343-346; A. Reed, "What the Fallen Angels Taught," 25-32.

<sup>72</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 169-70.

*Enoch*.<sup>73</sup> As is well known, no MSS were found at Qumran from the Parables of Enoch (37-71). Even more problematic is the fact that the earliest collection of all five books of *1 Enoch* is the Ethiopic compilation, which dates to the 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> Centuries C.E., and furthermore, the earliest MS of the Ethiopic (*1 Enoch*) dates from the 15<sup>th</sup> century. Furthermore, evidence from other MSS, such as Codex Panopolitanus (6<sup>th</sup> century C.E.)<sup>74</sup> and the Chester-Beatty Michigan Papyrus XII (4<sup>th</sup> century),<sup>75</sup> suggests that the BW was transmitted in diverse manners. Therefore, it is probable based upon the MSS evidence that diverse Enochic corpora were current in the first century C.E. Palestine.<sup>76</sup> In conclusion, any hypothesis of the development of Enochic corpus connecting the Enoch writings found at Qumran with the much later Ethiopic collection of *1 Enoch* should be done tentatively because it is possible that the BW was associated with the Ethiopic corpus of *1 Enoch* at a much later stage.

### 3. TEXTUAL IDENTITY OF THE BW

Inquiry into the text of the BW has shown that it is highly complex on account of the multiple stages of redaction, accretion, and integration of material which discuss different topics surrounding the Watchers.<sup>77</sup> Five discrete sections of the BW have been identified based upon form critical analysis (1-5; 6-11; 12-16; 17-19, and 20-36), which integrate different traditions concerning the Watchers.<sup>78</sup> The assimilation and juxtaposition of these separate traditions poses a great challenge to the interpretation of the text and has led to various theories of how to understand the various traditions within the text. For example, much work has been done to identify the traditions which underlie the polyvalent text by isolating the different traditions surrounding the Watchers in *1 En.* 6-11 such as: 1) their sexual immorality or corrupting teaching; and 2) the different

<sup>73</sup> E. Larson, "The Relation between the Greek and Aramaic Texts of Enoch," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 435-444; M. Knibb, "Christian Adoption and Transmission of Jewish Pseudepigrapha: The Case of 1 Enoch," *JTS* 32 (2001): 396-415.

<sup>74</sup> This MS is also known as the Gizeh Codex. It contains two incomplete MSS of the BW bound together with the apocryphal Petrine writings of the *Gospel of Peter* and *Apocalypse of Peter*.

<sup>75</sup> This MS contains the BW bound together with the Epistle of Enoch, Pseudo-Ezekiel writings, and passages from Melito of Sardis' *Homily on the Passion*.

<sup>76</sup> Greenfield and Stone, "The Enochic Pentateuch," 63.

<sup>77</sup> VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 26-45; Black and VanderKam, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*, 8-18; D. Dimmant, "Fallen Angels," 99-100.

<sup>78</sup> VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 195-233; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 7, 165-72, 191-93.

angelic leaders Shemeziah or Aseal.<sup>79</sup> For instance, it is generally accepted that the original core of BW 6-11 is the Shemiziah narrative, then at a later point Azael material (*1 Enoch* 7:1, 8:1-3; 9:6,8; 10:4-10) was added.<sup>80</sup> Other scholars have attempted to understand the text in the context of the apocalyptic genre. For example J. Collins sees the, “breaks in continuity, [and] inconsistency in the explanation of evil” in the BW as both byproducts of its text history as well as an intentional literary technique common to the genre of apocalyptic literature.<sup>81</sup>

Central to an analysis of BW which strives to uncover the different traditions, is the hypothesis that there are two distinct approaches to the origin of sin in the BW 6-11 presented in the Shemeziah and Asael material.<sup>82</sup> The Shemeziah material focus on the Watchers sexual sin and the malevolent effects caused by their progeny; and the Aseal material focuses on the revelations of illicit knowledge, the following corruption of humanity, and the origin of sin and suffering. Therefore, in the Shemaziah tradition the sin is introduced into the world by giants, the progeny of the illicit union of angels and women, and in the Azael tradition sin is introduced through the corrupting knowledge.<sup>83</sup> However, as has been cogently demonstrated in A. Reed’s recent dissertation on “what the fallen angels taught,” this approach has is limitations because there are also several verses in the BW which link Shemaziah to illicit pedagogy.<sup>84</sup> Furthermore, and more importantly, the Asael and Shemeziah traditions “are not simply conflated, harmonized, nor resolved into a single story, [rather] one can discern an attempt to interweave the various strands into a meaningful whole through the imposition of a loose literary structure.”<sup>85</sup> For instance, key themes are highlighted throughout the BW 6-11 such as: the dangers of sexual immorality, the corrupting potential of knowledge, and the

---

<sup>79</sup> Nickelsburg, “Apocalyptic and Myth,” 384-91; *ibid*, *1 Enoch*, 165-72; Dimmant, “Fallen Angels,” 23-72; Hanson, “Rebellion in Heaven,” 197-202; 220-225.

<sup>80</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 165-172; 190-193.

<sup>81</sup> J. Collins, “The Apocalyptic Technique: Setting and Function in the Book of the Watchers,” *CBQ* 44 (1982): 91-101.

<sup>82</sup> C. Newsom, “The Development of *1 Enoch* 6-19: Cosmology and Judgment,” *CBQ* 42 (1980): 315-323; 328-329. Nickelsburg, “Apocalyptic and Myth,” 397-404; Hanson, “Rebellion in Heaven,” 195-233.

<sup>83</sup> M. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1-36, 72-108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran* (JSPSup 11; Worchester: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 293-97. Davidson points out that this is almost exclusively an Enochic concept of the origin of sin in the Qumran library.

<sup>84</sup> Reed, “What Fallen Angels Taught,” 44-54. Nickelsburg understands this as a secondary stage in the formation of the text [Nickelsburg, “Apocalyptic and Myth,” 384-386; 397-398].

<sup>85</sup> Reed, “What the Fallen Angels Taught,” 44.

antediluvian proliferation of violence.<sup>86</sup> Overall, one can identify an earlier stratum in which there were separate traditions concerning the origin of sin, and the exploits of the Watchers and giants, which were skillfully intertwined.

#### 4. TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE BW

The scope of this study prevents a thorough analysis of all of the BW. However, through a survey of selected texts one can gain an overall understanding of how the BW explicated Genesis. This brief survey will attempt to demonstrate how, on the one hand, many of these differences are exegetically based interpretations, and on the other hand, many others are due to the unique Enochic mythology of the sons of God.<sup>87</sup> Let us now turn to an analysis of the BW's interpretation of Genesis:

##### Genesis<sup>88</sup>

And when men began to multiply on the face of the earth and daughters were born to them. The sons of God saw that the daughters of men were fair; and they took for themselves wives from all whom they chose. (Gen 1-2)

The *nephilim* were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came to the daughters of men and they bore children to them. These were the *gibborim* that were of old, the men of name. (Gen 4-5)

##### The Book of the Watchers<sup>89</sup>

And when the sons of men had multiplied, in those days, beautiful and comely daughters were born to them. And the Watchers, the sons of heaven, saw them and desired them. And they said to one another, come let us choose for ourselves wives from the daughters of men and let us beget for ourselves children . . . then they all swore together and bound one another with a curse. (*1 En.* 6:1-3,5)

And they began to go in to them, and to defile themselves through them, and to teach them sorcery and charms . . . and they conceived from them and bore to them great giants. And the giants begat Nephilim, and to the Nephilim were born Elioud. . . And the giants began to kill men and to devour them. And they began to sin against the birds and beasts and creeping things and the fish, and to devour one

<sup>86</sup> Reed, "What the Fallen Angels Taught," 44-50.

<sup>87</sup> J. VanderKam, "Biblical Interpretation in 1 Enoch and *Jubilees*," in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSup 14; ed. James Charlesworth and C Evans; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 105-107; J. VanderKam, "The Interpretation of Genesis in 1 Enoch," in *The Bible at Qumran*, 132-146; K. Pomykala, "A Scripture Profile of the Book of the Watchers," in *A Quest for Context and Meaning* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 267-71; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 167-77; Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 178-212.

<sup>88</sup> Translations of Hebrew are mine.

<sup>89</sup> All English translations of Ethiopic from *1 Enoch* are taken from; G. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001).

another's flesh. And they drank the blood.  
Then the earth brought accusation against  
the lawless ones (*1 En.* 7:1-6).

When one compares the tradition preserved in *1 Enoch* 6 to Gen 6:1-4 one can immediately note several differences. Firstly, the בני האלהים are called “watchers, sons of heaven.” J. VanderKam has noted that this is probably based upon a more literal translation of בני האלהים as, “the gods, or angels,” verses the anarthrous בני אלהים as God.<sup>90</sup> Therefore, it is probable that the Enochic authors understood בני האלהים as angels but used their own terminology: i.e., watchers, sons of heaven. Watchers (Aram., עירין; Grk. ἐγγενηγόροι), from the root עור “to be awake,” is a term for angelic beings found in *1 Enoch*, and in apocalyptic literature, to denote angels in general.<sup>91</sup> None of the fragments from Qumran of *1 Enoch* attest an Aram. מלאכא, the typical Aramaic word for angel, even where the LXX and Ethiopic have angels (Grk. ἄγγελοι; Eth., *mala'kt*). Nickelsburg has pointed out that the use of the double appellation, “watchers, sons of heaven,” may be due to the peculiar terminology of Aramaic *1 Enoch*, which has been obscured by the Greek and Ethiopic translations.<sup>92</sup> Nickelsburg has deduced that in the original Aramaic the “watchers and holy ones” (Aram. עירין וקדישין) was typically used for (non-fallen) angels, and “watchers of heaven” (Aram. עירין די דשמא) as a neutral term designating both good and evil angels.<sup>93</sup> Furthermore, he suggests that the Greek translations of *1 Enoch* adopt the terminology “watchers” (ἐγγενηγόροι) for the rebel angels and the word angels (ἄγγελοι) for good angels. Overall, according to Nickelsburg’s analysis, the term “watchers” in Greek, and “watchers, sons of heaven” in Aramaic, came to be associated with fallen angels.

Another glaring difference between Gen 6:1-4 and the BW is the interpretation of both הגברים and הנפלים as giants. Whereas in Gen 6:1-4 their meaning (and relationship between one another) is ambiguous, in *1 Enoch* they are clearly defined. In fact, it may be this ambiguity which led to such a rich interpretation in the BW and later literature of

---

<sup>90</sup> J. VanderKam, *Enoch and Apocalyptic Tradition*, 30-31; J. VanderKam, “The Interpretation of Genesis in *1 Enoch*,” in *The Bible at Qumran* (ed. Peter W. Flint; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 134.

<sup>91</sup> M. Black and J. VanderKam, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*, 106-07; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 140-41.

<sup>92</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 140-41.

<sup>93</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 140.

this period.<sup>94</sup> Essentially the BW, and many other subsequent pieces of literature, interpret that both הגפלים and הגברים were the offspring of the union, and furthermore, are giants. As has been already shown, there is an exegetical basis for the interpretation of הגפלים as giants through inter-biblical interpretation. It is probable that this served as the impetus for the BW's interpretation that הגפלים were giants. However, the question remains as to how both הגברים and הגפלים were associated together as the offspring of the illicit union. It is possible that the identification of the גפלים with the גברים is an interpretation based upon the arrangement of the narrative, which identifies both the גפלים and the גברים as the offspring of בני האלוהים because they existed contemporaneously (before the flood) and are referred to sequentially in the text.

It should also be pointed out that the BW takes this interpretation one step further. Not only are both הגפלים and הגברים the giant offspring of the illicit union, but the BW also introduces a genealogical progression from הגברים (giants) → הגפלים → *elioud* (men of name).<sup>95</sup> This progression is also implicit in the sequence of the biblical narrative in which all three are related to one another in a temporal manner through the conjunction אשר. Thus, it is probable that the author(s) of the BW further defined the manner in which they were all related by adding a genealogical progression based upon the sequence of the text.

Another addition of the Enochic text is that the angels plot together because they lusted after the extraordinary beauty of the women (*1 En.* 6:4).<sup>96</sup> This seems to be an addition by the Enochic authors motivated by the plot of the overall story developed in the BW concerning the fall of the angels and their culpability (*1 En.* 6:3-4). However, it is also an expansion based upon the text of Gen 6:1-4. For example the biblical text merely says they “saw them,” in contrast to the BW states that the Watchers “saw and desired them.” Secondly, Gen 6:2 states that, “the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were beautiful (Heb. ויראו בני האלהים את בנות האדם כי טובת הנה). The Enochic authors accentuate the beauty of women by describing them as “fair and beautiful,” to explain the

<sup>94</sup> Stuckenbruck, “Genesis 6:1-4 as the Basis for Divergent Readings,” 99-106; idem, “Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition,” 99-106.

<sup>95</sup> Nickelsburg has pointed out that *elioud* corresponds to the Heb, “men of name,” and is probably derived from an orthographic error in the original Aramaic. He proposes an original reading of על ירהוה or עלי. See; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 185.

<sup>96</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 176.

lustful motives of the angels (*1 En.* 6:2; 7:1, 2). The BW also adds a tone of condemnation by adding material that characterizes their actions as premeditated sin (6:3-8).<sup>97</sup>

One central element of the watchers mythology in the BW, which must be discussed separately, is the Asael tradition. According to the Asael tradition the Watchers taught women and their progeny all sorts of forbidden knowledge about art craft, magical spells and war craft, which caused an increase of evil on the earth (*1 En.* 10:8; 8:1-4; 16:3). The following selection epitomizes the Enochic authors' use of both the Azael and Shemeziah stories. It appears that the Asael tradition is an interpretation of Gen 6:5 and 11-12:

Genesis 6:5; 11-12

The Lord saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thought of his heart was only evil continually (Gen 6:5) . . . Now the earth was corrupt in God's sight, and behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted their way upon the earth. (Gen 6:11-12).

*1 Enoch* 9:6-9

You see what Aseal has done, who has taught all iniquity upon the earth, and has revealed the eternal mysteries that are in heaven, which the sons of men were striving to learn. And (what) Shemihazah (has done) to whom you gave authority to rule over them who are with him. They have gone into the daughters of the men of earth, and they have lain with them, and have defiled themselves with the women. And they have revealed to them all sins . . . and now behold the daughters of men have born sons from them, giants, half-breeds. And the blood of men is shed upon the earth and the whole earth is filled with iniquity (*1 En.* 9:6-9).

The Asael tradition in the BW has elaborate upon the content of man's evil thought, and how such knowledge could be so defiling as to corrupt all flesh on the earth. According to this tradition the cause of the flood was the evil corrupting knowledge taught to mankind by the fallen angels (*1 En.* 9:8-10). The flood, therefore, was God's final solution to the rampant iniquity that filled the earth on account of this knowledge (*1 En.* 10:2).

The last selected text summarizes the fate of the Watchers, in a pericope where the four archangels are commissioned to do various tasks: Sariel is instructed to warn

---

<sup>97</sup> Pomykala, "A Scriptural Profile," 267.

Noah of the impending doom of the earth by the great deluge, Raphael is instructed to imprison Asael for his illicit pedagogy, Gabriel is commissioned to destroy the giants, and Michael is instructed to imprison Shemihazah and the other fallen angels who made a pact with him. This section describes the fate of the giants and the fallen angels:

And to Gabriel he said, 'Go Gabriel . . . and destroy the sons of the Watchers . . . and send them against one another in a war of destruction' . . . And to Michael he said, 'Go, Michael, bind Shemihazah and the others with him . . . And when their sons perish and they see the destruction of their beloved ones, bind them for seventy generations . . . until the day of their judgment. . . Then they will be led away to the fiery abyss, and to torture, and to the prison where they will be confined forever . . . Destroy the spirits of the half breeds because they have wronged men.' (*1 En.* 10:4-13).

Therefore, the giants, in their hunger for violence (*1 En.* 7:5), eventually turn on one another and kill each other through internecine conflict (*1 En.* 10:9; 14:1-7).

Furthermore, both Gabriel and Michael are commissioned to "destroy the sons of the Watchers" (*1 En.* 10:9;15). In both cases the fate of the giants is not sealed by the flood according to the BW, but rather by the direct decree of God and the direct intervention of his angels.<sup>98</sup> Here the Enochic authors may have expanded on the bellicose connotations of the mythological גבירים. Thus in Ezekiel 32:27 they lie in Sheol with weapons in hand and the BW they are doomed to die in internecine warfare. In the BW their fathers, the Watchers, are doomed to watch as they destroy themselves and are eventually bound in the netherworld to await their eschatological judgment in a fiery abyss. Lastly it appears that the spirits of the giant "half-breeds," half spirit and half flesh, also need to be eradicated because the spirits of the disembodied giants still roam the earth (*1 En.* 10:15; 15:8-11). Overall in the BW, there appears to be two traditions concerning the fate of the

---

<sup>98</sup> However, in Enoch's dream visions in *1 En.* 83-90, whose present form dates to ca. 165 B.C.E. [Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 361], there is evidence that the motif of the giants death through the Flood supplemented their death through internecine warfare. According to *1 En.* 89:6 the elephants, camels, and asses (which represent the progeny of the Watchers in the Animal Apocalypse), "sank to the bottom together with every animal, so that I [Enoch] could not see them. And they were unable to escape but perished and sank in the deep." However, in the same vision the elephants, camels, and asses attack one another in internecine warfare (*1 En.* 88:1-2). I disagree with L. Stuckenbruck's hypothesis in his recent article, "Origin of Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition," that the flood in the BW was designed as a punishment for the giants (*1 En.* 111-118). There is no evidence in the BW, to my knowledge, that the giants were destroyed through the flood except the fact that the flood is announced (*1 En.* 10:1-3) following a description of the teachings of the Watchers and atrocities of the giants (*1 En.* 7:1-8:3). However, this is precisely the same literary progression of *Jubilees* where Stuckenbruck maintains that the giants died through internecine warfare.



souls of the giants. The first is in *1 En.* 10:15 where God commands Michael to “destroy the spirits of the half-breeds and the sons of the Watchers” (*1 En.* 10:15). However, in *1 En.* 15:8-11 it is described that the spirits of the giants still live and persecute mankind, and furthermore, they “will make desolate [the sons of men] until the day of consummation of the great judgment” (*1 En.* 16:1). Therefore, in this manner the spirits of the giants became associated with demons during the Second Temple period and early Christianity.<sup>99</sup>

In conclusion, the Enochic version of Gen 6:1-4 answers two questions which arise from the laconic story told in Gen 6:1-4.<sup>100</sup> Firstly, “Why did God send the Flood?” The text of Genesis through the juxtaposition of Gen 6:1-4 and the flood narrative may imply a causal relationship. However, *1 Enoch* explicitly connects this, and expounds on reasons for which God sent the flood: the corrupting pedagogy of the Watchers, and the violence caused by the wicked giants. Secondly, “How did the earth get so corrupted that God would be justified in destroying all life?” The BW accounts for the pervasiveness of antediluvian evil and proposes a theodicy for God’s punitive measures.<sup>101</sup>

This overview has strived to show that the mythology of *בן האלהים* in the BW was not only conversant with scripture but, moreover, was exegetically based upon Gen 6. Generally speaking, Enochic authors employed in their interpretation of scripture other scriptural material and Israelite myth.<sup>102</sup> The manner in which Enochic authors employed and interpreted scripture was often elusive and creative because of several factors. Firstly, *1 Enoch* represents the use of scripture when scripture was still emerging.<sup>103</sup> Secondly, although not discussed in this paper, it must also be pointed out that the stylistic features of the apocalyptic genre often affected the manner in which the BW employed and interpreted scripture.<sup>104</sup> Lastly, the Enochic authors’ unique theological and thematic concerns, as well as the traditional material concerning the Watchers available to them, often affected the BW’s interpretation of *Scripture*.

<sup>99</sup> Stuckenbruck, “Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition,” 103; VanderKam and Alder, *Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage*, 76-79. For examples see, *Test. Sol.* 5:3, 17:1-5; *Jub.* 10:1-14.

<sup>100</sup> VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 41.

<sup>101</sup> M. Delcor, “Le mythe de la chute des anges,” 22-24; Elliot, *Origins and Functions*, 63-67.

<sup>102</sup> G. Nickelsburg, “Scripture in *1 Enoch* and *1 Enoch* as Scripture,” in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts and Their Textual and Situational Contexts* (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995), 342-43.

<sup>103</sup> Pomykala, “A Scriptural Profile,” 264-84.

<sup>104</sup> J. Collins, “Apocalyptic Technique,” 96-100; 107-111.

### III. JUBILEES (2<sup>ND</sup> CENTURY B.C.E.)

*Jubilees* is perhaps the most important source for a study of the development of the angel story because it is the earliest amalgamation of the biblical and the Enochic account of the angel story. The book of *Jubilees*, which was written in Hebrew in the middle of the second century B.C.E., is a rewritten account of Genesis – Exodus 14 purportedly dictated to Moses on Mount Sinai by angels (*Jub.* 1:29; 2:1; 30:17-21). *Jubilees* interpreted the HB when its text, and the bounds of its canon, were not firmly set, and therefore, great liberties were taken with the biblical text in its interpretation of the angel story. As has been noted by those attempting to define its genre, “it is easier to describe the literary character of *Jubilees* than to name its genre.”<sup>105</sup> This is primary on account of the presence of several different genres in *Jubilees*.<sup>106</sup> This led M. Testuz to the conclusion that, “le livre des Jubilés est un ouvrage de genre composite, qui tient à la fois du livre historique, de l’ouvrage de législation, du livre chronologique, de l’apocalypse et du genre des testaments.”<sup>107</sup> However, although it is clear that there are several elements of different genres in *Jubilees*, Charles’s overall description of the book as, “[a] narrative based upon the historical narratives in Genesis and Exodus, interspersed with legends, and emphasizing certain legal practices” is a suitable definition for the purposes of this study.<sup>108</sup> In other words *Jubilees* can be essentially defined as a rewritten account of Gen 1- Exodus 14, with several *halakhic* and some *aggadic* additions. Therefore, it seems most reasonable, for the purposes of this analysis, to understand the genre of *Jubilees* as “Bible Rewritten and Expanded.”<sup>109</sup>

Over the past century scholars have posited a wide range of dates for *Jubilees*

---

<sup>105</sup> O.S. Wintermute, “Jubilees” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed J. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985), 2.36. M. Testuz noted in his study of *Jubilees* concerning its genre that, “il est difficile de répondre de façon brève et précise” on account of its highly complex character. See, M. Testuz, *Les idées religieuses du livre des Jubilés* (Geneva: E. Dorz, 1960), 11.

<sup>106</sup> Testuz, *Les idées religieuses du livre des Jubilés*, 11-12. Testuz has identified elements of historiography, testament, apocalyptic, law, and chronology in *Jubilees*. O. Wintermute identifies elements of all the above genres in *Jubilees*, but also adds that “in terms of overall structure, *Jubilees* is similar to narrative Midrashim.” See, Wintermute, “Jubilees,” *OTP*, 2.37-40.

<sup>107</sup> Testuz, *Les idées religieuses du livre des Jubilés*, 12.

<sup>108</sup> R. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees: or The Little Genesis* (New York: Macmillan, 1917), vii-viii.

<sup>109</sup> G. Nickelsburg, “The Bible Rewritten and Expanded,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2.2; ed. M. Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 97-100.

ranging from the 4<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E. to the 1<sup>st</sup> century C.E.<sup>110</sup> However, within the past 25 years scholarship has come to a general consensus, mainly through comparison of internal information with historical events, that *Jubilees* was written between 170-150 B.C.E.<sup>111</sup> Furthermore, it is generally agreed upon, following the discovery the Hebrew fragments of 13 MSS of *Jubilees* found at Qumran, that it was originally written in Hebrew. It was subsequently translated into Greek (and possibly Syriac) from the Hebrew, and then translated into both Latin and Ethiopic from the Greek translation.<sup>112</sup> The full text is extant only in Ethiopic, only fragments have survived in Greek, and about ¼ has been preserved in Latin. Therefore, Ethiopic will be the primary used and this will be augmented by the Greek and Hebrew which have survived.

### 1. JUBILEES 5:1-10 AND GENESIS 6:1-4

On account of the particular genre of *Jubilees* it is closely related to the biblical text and often reproduces the Bible verbatim.<sup>113</sup> Works which rewrite the Bible offer unique difficulties for interpretation because they do not explain the biblical text separate from its exposition.<sup>114</sup> On account of this method of exposition this analysis will treat a *Jubilees*' rewriting, and its use of Enochic material separately. In fact, a close reading and comparison of Genesis 6:1-4 and *Jubilees* reveals that there are several omissions, additions, and rearrangements of the text.<sup>115</sup>

#### Jubilees 5:1<sup>116</sup>

When mankind began to multiply on the surface of the entire earth and daughters

#### Genesis<sup>117</sup>

And when men began to multiply on the face of the earth and daughters were born

<sup>110</sup> J. Goldstein, "The Date of the Book of Jubilees," *PAAJR* 50 (1983): 63-86; J. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 207-85.

<sup>111</sup> Wintemute, "Jubilees," *OTP*, 2.43-4; VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 214-85; Charles, *The Little Genesis*, xxix-xxxiii; G. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 78-9; J. Goldstein, "The Date of the Book of Jubilees," 63-74.

<sup>112</sup> VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, vi-xxiv; K. Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen* (JSHRZ 2.3; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1981), 285-298. Although, Berger disagrees that the Syriac was translated from Hebrew.

<sup>113</sup> Nickelsburg, "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded," 97-98.

<sup>114</sup> VanderKam, "Biblical Interpretation," 117-125.

<sup>115</sup> I have chosen to place the biblical text in the order that it is treated in *Jubilees*, in order to highlight *Jubilees*' rearrangement of the text. Examples of the various types of differences include: 1) omissions, which include parts of Gen 6:4; 2) additions, which include parts of *Jub.* 5:2-3; 6-7; and 3) rearrangements, which include Gen 6:3 and *Jub.* 5:8. For a detailed analysis see, J. van Ruiten, *Primaeval History Interpreted* (StPB 66; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 188-89; VanderKam, "Angel Story," 157-158.

<sup>116</sup> All English translations of Ethiopic from *Jubilees* are taken from; J. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (CSCO 511; Lovanii: Peeters, 1989).

<sup>117</sup> Translations of Hebrew are mine.

were born to them, the angels of the Lord – in a certain (year) of this jubilee – saw that they were beautiful to look at. So they married of them whomever they chose.

They gave birth to children for them and they were giants.

to them. The sons of God saw that the daughters of men were fair; and they took for themselves wives from all whom they chose. (Gen 6:1-2)

The *nephilim* were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came to the daughters of men and they bore children to them. These were the *gibborim* that were of old, the men of name. (Gen 6:4)

*Jubilees* begins the angel story by citing from Genesis 6, but then moves into its own exposition of the text in the following verses.<sup>118</sup> Overall, this verse is a very close rewriting of parts of Gen 6:1-2;4, with several additions and omissions due to different reasons typical to this genre of literature. Some of these differences are due to the *Vorlage* of *Jubilees*, which may have differed from the MT in certain areas. For example, whereas the MT has “when *man* began to increase on the face of the earth,” *Jubilees* has “when the *children of man* began to increase on the surface of the entire earth.” The discrepancy between men and children of men may be due to a different Hebrew *Vorlage* that had בני אדם instead of אדם as in the MT. The additional note about the date “in a certain year of that jubilee” was made in order to conform the story “with the larger pattern in the book in which events are tied to a timeline that begins with creation.”<sup>119</sup> In *Jubilees*, therefore, the “addition of dates within the story of the flood is a justification of the calendar of the author.”<sup>120</sup>

Another difference between *Jubilees* and Genesis in this verse is the edition of “entire,” which heightens the pervasiveness of man’s presence upon the earth and, hence, the later corrupting effects on the entire earth.<sup>121</sup> The effect of this is an added emphasis in *Jubilees* on the pervasiveness of sin compared to the Genesis. This emphasis justifies God’s complete destruction of the *entire* earth, since the earth was *entirely* corrupted (e.g., *Jub.* 5:2). Another difference may arise from *Jubilees* different interpretation of the

<sup>118</sup> J. VanderKam has pointed out that this is similar to *1 En.* 6:1-2 as well, which uses the biblical text as a springboard for its own expansion and exposition [VanderKam, “Angel Story,” 157].

<sup>119</sup> VanderKam, “Angel Story,” 158.

<sup>120</sup> J. van Ruiten, “The Interpretation of the Flood Story in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Interpretations of the Flood* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 78.

<sup>121</sup> VanderKam, “Angel Story,” 159.

text, which is often influenced by Enochic traditions. For example, *Jubilees* translates בני האלוהים as “angels of the Lord.” As pointed out in the analysis of Gen 6:1-4 this translation is consistent with its use elsewhere in the HB. However, this translation was most likely influenced by their identification in *1 Enoch* and the LXX as angelic beings (Job 1:6, 2:1, 38:7).

One glaring difference between Genesis and *Jubilees* in this verse is the truncation of most of Gen 6:4 into, “And they bore children to them; and they were the giants.” *Jubilees* does not mention the men of renown, the גברים, and the נפלים, and furthermore, interprets them to all be giants. However, it should be underscored that this interpretation has a solid basis in the biblical text in: 1) Num 13:33, which identifies the נפלים as giants; and in 2) Gen 6:4, where the exact relationship between the גברים and נפלים is not clearly defined. This ambiguity was ingeniously interpreted in Enochic literature as a genealogical progression. However, in *Jubilees* they are interpreted to be one and the same: giants. The reason for this interpretation may have been an effort to make the story more coherent,<sup>122</sup> or it may have been influenced by the LXX which identified both the גברים and the נפלים as giants as well.

#### *Jubilees* 5:2

Wickedness increased on the earth. All animate beings corrupted their way – (every one of them) from people to cattle, animals, birds, and everything that moves about on the ground. All of them corrupted their way and their prescribed course. They began to devour one another, and wickedness increased on the earth. Every thought of all mankind’s knowledge was evil like this all the time.

#### Genesis 6:5

And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.

This verse is roughly parallel to Gen 6:5, but expands it in order to explain the pervasive corruption of the earth, and the effects of the marriage between the angels and mankind. This overall intention is revealed in *Jub.* 5:2 through a clever omission of *man* in “the wickedness of *man* was great on the earth (Gen 6:5).” Thus, it was not just the wickedness of man that corrupted the earth but also “all flesh.” This omission implies that the giants were also culpable. Thus, the verse continues, “and they all corrupted their

<sup>122</sup> van Ruiten, *Primaeval History Interpreted*, 189-90.

way and their ordinances, and they began to eat one another, and injustice grew upon the earth.” This addition to devouring one another is an allusion to the Enochic account, where the giants devoured one another, and it is here clearly tied to one of the causes of the earth’s corruption.

The displacement of verse 3 in the biblical text and the juxtaposition of “and injustice increased upon the earth” immediately after “and they bore children for them; and they were the giants” in *Jubilees* seals the causal relationship implied in the biblical text. Thus, *Jubilees* displaces Gen 6:3 and directly connects the giants to the spread of violence. The author further highlights the violence and corruption by describing its prevalence, which is found elsewhere in the context of the Genesis flood story: “and all flesh corrupted its way; man and cattle and beasts and birds and everything which walks on the earth. And they all corrupted their way and their ordinances (Gen 6:7;12).” The effect of this brings one to *Jubilees*’ paraphrase of Genesis: “and injustice grew upon the earth and every imagination of the thoughts of all mankind was thus continually evil.” Thus, the giants had a malevolent influence upon humanity and caused a widespread degradation and corruption of mankind.

*Jubilees* 5:8

He said: ‘My spirit will not remain on people forever for they are flesh. Their lifespan is to be 120 years’.

Genesis 6:3

Then the Lord said, “My spirit shall not abide in man for ever, for he is flesh, but his days shall be a hundred and twenty years.”

This verse in *Jubilees* has three interesting interpretations of Genesis 6: 1) the interpretation of יָדוֹן as “will not dwell,” 2) the translation of בָּאָדָם as *sab*’, and 3) its rearrangement into material describing the punishment of the angels. The main difference formed by the accumulation of these differences between *Jubilees* and Genesis, is that the proclamation of limited longevity is related to the giants rather than to mankind. *Jubilees* has moved the proclamation from its context in Genesis 6, where it is apparently speaking of not dwelling with *man* (בָּאָדָם) forever, and changed its context to judgment of the giants by interpolating it into the middle of a passage speaking about God’s judgment of the angels (*Jub.* 5:6) and the giants (*Jub.* 5:7-9).<sup>123</sup>

Firstly, this is done through the interpretation of יָדוֹן as “will not dwell,” rather

<sup>123</sup> van Ruiten, “Interpretation of the Flood in *Jubilees*,” 79-80.

than “judge.” As mentioned in the analysis of the biblical text this reading is supported by many ancient witnesses and by one writing at Qumran (4Q252). However, it must also be stressed that, “it can hardly be doubted that the writer of *Jubilees* also knew about the [alternative] reading of דין [meaning “to judge”] because in the immediate sequel he begins talking about the *judgment* at considerable length.”<sup>124</sup>

Secondly, this interpretation is evinced in the Ethiopic translation of באדם as *sab*’, which means “people.” Accordingly, VanderKam translates this clause as, “My spirit will not remain on *people* (*sab*’) forever for they are flesh.”<sup>125</sup> As VanderKam has noted, “in this context, with the verse surrounded by references to the children of the angels, the term translated people (*sab*’) obviously refers to the giants who were identified as the children of the angels in *Jub.* 5:1.”<sup>126</sup> Therefore the following proclamation of limited longevity is also related to the giants.<sup>127</sup>

Lastly, these two interpretive differences are couched in the middle of an extensive expansion of the biblical text in which the punishment of the angels and the giants is outlined:

Against his angels whom he had sent to the earth he was angry enough to uproot them from all their (positions of) authority. He told us to tie them up in the depths of the earth; now they are tied within them and are alone. Regarding their children there went out from his presence an order to strike them with the sword and to remove them from beneath the sky. He said: ‘My spirit will not remain on people forever for they are flesh. Their lifespan is to be 120 years’. He sent his sword among them so that they would kill one another. They began to kill each other until all of them fell by the sword and were obliterated from the earth. Now their fathers were watching, but afterwards they were tied up in the depths of the earth until the great day of judgment when there will be condemnation on all who have corrupted their ways and their actions before the Lord. He obliterated all from their places; there remained no one of them whom he did not judge for all their wickedness. (*Jub.* 5:6-11)

<sup>124</sup> VanderKam, “Angel Story,” 160.

<sup>125</sup> Dimmant, “Fallen Angels,” 96; VanderKam, “Angel Story,” 159.

<sup>126</sup> VanderKam, “Angel Story,” 159.

<sup>127</sup> VanderKam also proposes that this is supported through the chronology of the story, in which the giants died before the flood (i.e., the giants would have perished by 1297 *Anno Mundi* and the flood came in 1308 *Anno Mundi*). See, VanderKam, “Angel Story,” 160-61. This is also the interpretation of K. Berger, who associates the internecine destruction of the giants with the proclamation of limited longevity in *Jub.* 7-9: “Die Riesen sollen sich – abgesehen davon, daß Gott ihre Lebenszeit verkürzt – gegenseitig mit Schwertern töten (K. Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, 349).”

Thus, the overall import of *Jub.* 5:6-11 clearly concentrates on the judgment of the angels and giants, which are not punished through the flood but rather through God's direct punitive action. In *Jubilees* the flood is God's judgment upon mankind, which came as a result of the illicit union of the Watchers and the destruction caused by their evil progeny the giants (*Jub.* 7:21-22).

Generally speaking the account in *Jubilees* is concerned with the notion that the angels corrupted the natural order of things. The meaning of this order, something also of concern to *1 Enoch*, is that the angels left their prescribed way and defiled themselves in sexual relations with women.<sup>128</sup> This corrupted the natural order of things, which in turn corrupted the thoughts and inclinations of mankind:

Wickedness increased on the earth. All animate beings corrupted their way – (everyone of them) from people to cattle, animals, birds, and everything that moves about on the ground. All of them corrupted their way and their prescribed course. They began to devour one another, and wickedness increased on the earth. Every thought of all mankind's knowledge was evil like this all the time. The Lord saw that the earth was corrupt, (that) all animate beings and corrupted their prescribed course, and (that) all of them – everyone that was on the earth – had acted wickedly before his eyes. He said that he would obliterate people and all animate beings that were on the surface of the earth which he had created. (*Jub.* 5:2-4)

Later on *Jub.* 7:21 gives a summary of this overall portrayal of the events, which confirms *Jubilees* interest in the violation of God's prescribed sexual order as the principal evil:

For it was on account of these three things that the flood was on the earth, since (it was ) due to fornication that the Watchers had illicit intercourse – apart from the mandate of their authority – with women. When they married of them whomever they chose they committed the first (acts) of uncleanness. (*Jub.* 7:21)

Furthermore, as B. Halperin-Amaru has pointed out in her analysis of *Jubilees*, the author of *Jubilees* also uses this motif of the violation of God's ordained sexual order in a polemic against intermarriage.<sup>129</sup> Thus the Watchers also become negative exemplars of

---

<sup>128</sup> *Jub.* 4:21-22 || *1 En.* 12:4. In *1 Enoch* departure of God's order is related to both descending to earth and sexual immorality. However, in *Jubilees* it is related almost exclusively to sexual immorality. See, D. Dimmant, "Fallen Angels," 92-103.

<sup>129</sup> B. Halperin-Amaru, *The Empowerment of Women in The Book of Jubilees* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 147-59.



those who marry “whomever they choose” with no thought of purity (*Jub.* 5:1;7:21). Overall it must be stressed that the primary difference between Genesis 6:1-4 and the angel story in *Jubilees* is the combination of the flood with elements of the watchers mythology. Thus, generally speaking, the text of Genesis “is altered and rewritten as a story of the imprisonment of the Watchers and the destruction of their children, combined with elements of the flood narrative to portray the consequences of lawlessness.”<sup>130</sup>

## 2. JUBILEES AND 1 ENOCH

Although there has been debate concerning the date of the BW and *Jubilees*, it is certain that the BW (3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.E.) was written before *Jubilees* (2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.E.). It is clear that *Jubilees* employed and transformed Enochic tradition in its own interpretation of the angel story. What is not entirely clear, however, is whether or not *Jubilees* was directly dependent upon the BW. Therefore, was *Jubilees* employing traditional interpretation of the בני אלוהים in Genesis 6, as transmitted in the synagogues and other religious institutions, or was *Jubilees* directly dependent upon the BW?<sup>131</sup> This question can not be answered with a great amount of certainty; however, a tentative conclusion concerning their relationship can be deduced through comparison of their treatment of the angel story.

### *Jubilees*<sup>132</sup>

#### **1. The deed -**

When mankind began to multiply on the surface of the entire earth and daughters were born to them, the angels of the Lord – in a certain (year) of this jubilee – saw that they were beautiful to look at. So they married of them whomever they chose. (*Jub.*5:1a)

### *1 Enoch*<sup>133</sup>

#### **1. The deed -**

And when the sons of men had multiplied, in those days, beautiful and comely daughters were born to them. And the Watchers, the sons of heaven, saw them and desired them. And they said to one another, come let us choose for ourselves wives from the daughters of men and let us beget for ourselves children . . . then they all swore together (כלחן כחדה) and bound one another with a curse. (*1 En.* 6:1-3,5)

<sup>130</sup> van Ruiten, “Interpretation of the Flood in *Jubilees*,” 79.

<sup>131</sup> Concerning the synagogue and other religious institutions in Second Temple Judaism see; I. Gafni, “Historical Background” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2.2; ed. M. Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 22-24; S. Safrai, “The Temple,” in *Jewish People in the 1<sup>st</sup> Century* (2 vols.; CRINT 1.2; ed. S. Safrai and M. Stern; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974-1976), 908-44; *ibid.*, *World History of the Jewish People: Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period* (vol. 8; ed. B. Netanyahu, M. Avi-Yona and Z. Baras; Jerusalem: Jewish History Publications Ltd., 1977), 65-98.

<sup>132</sup> Translation from; J. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (CSCO 511; Lovanii: Peeters, 1989).

<sup>133</sup> Translation from; G. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001).

**2. The offspring -**

They gave birth to children for them and they were giants. (*Jub. 5:1b*)

**3. The disastrous result -**

Wickedness increased on the earth. All animate beings corrupted their way – (everyone of them) from people to cattle, animals, birds, and everything that moves about on the ground. All of them corrupted their way and their prescribed course. They began to devour one another, and wickedness increased on the earth. Every thought of all mankind's knowledge was evil like this all the time. (*Jub. 5:2*)

**4. The corruption of all flesh -**

The Lord saw that the earth was corrupt, (that) all animate beings and corrupted their prescribed course, and (that) all of them – everyone that was on the earth – had acted wickedly before his eyes. (*Jub. 5:3*)

**5. The judgment -**

Against his angels whom he had sent to the earth he was angry enough to uproot them from all their (positions of) authority. He told us to tie them up in the depths of the earth; now they are tied within them and

**2. The offspring -**

And they began to go in to them, and to defile themselves through them, and to teach them sorcery and charms . . . and they conceived from them and bore to them great giants. And the giants begat Nephilim, and to the Nephilim were born Elioud (*1 En. 7:1-6*)

**3. The disastrous result -**

And the giants began to kill men and to devour them. And they began to sin against the birds and beasts and creeping things and the fish, and to devour one another's flesh. And they drank the blood. Then the earth brought accusation against the lawless ones (*1 En. 7:1-6*).

**4. The corruption of all flesh -**

You see what Aseal has done, who has taught all iniquity upon the earth, and has revealed the eternal mysteries that are in heaven, which the sons of men were striving to learn. And (what) Shemihazah (has done) to whom you gave authority to rule over them who are with him. They have gone in to the daughters of the men of earth, and they have lain with them, and have defiled themselves with the women. And they have revealed to them all sins . . . and now behold the daughters of men have born sons from them, giants, half-breeds. And the blood of men is shed upon the earth and the whole earth is filled with iniquity (*1 En. 9:6-9*).

**5. The judgment -**

And to Gabriel he said, 'Go Gabriel . . . and destroy the sons of the Watchers . . . and send them against one another in a war of destruction' . . . And to Michael he said, 'Go, Michael, bind Shemihazah and

are alone. Regarding their children there went out from his presence an order to strike them with the sword and to remove them from beneath the sky. He sent his sword among them so that they would kill one another. They began to kill each other until all of them fell by the sword and were obliterated from the earth. Now their fathers were watching, but afterwards they were tied up in the depths of the earth until the great day of judgment when there will be condemnation on all who have corrupted their ways and their actions before the Lord. (*Jub.* 5:6-7;9-10)

the others with him . . . And when their sons perish and they see the destruction of their beloved ones, bind them for seventy generations . . . until the day of their judgment. . . Then they will be led away to the fiery abyss, and to torture, and to the prison where they will be confined forever . . . Destroy the spirits of the half breeds because they have wronged men.' (*1 En.* 10:4-13).

There are many similarities between the angel story in *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch*. Firstly, *Jubilees* is aware of the Shemeziah tradition in the BW, i.e., fornication between the angels and mankind, as one of the causes of man's corruption and God's impending judgment (*Jub.* 4:21-22 || *1 En.* 9:6-8).<sup>134</sup> Furthermore, *Jubilees* refers to the Asael tradition of illicit teaching in a story about Cainan's inscription in *Jub.* 8:1-4: "And he [Cainan] found a writing which the ancestors engraved on stone. And he read what was in it. And he sinned because of what was in it, since there was the teaching of the Watchers (*Jub.* 8:3)." Therefore, it appears that *Jubilees* was aware of the Asael tradition in the BW 6-16, but chose not to focus on it as the cause of the corruption of the earth.<sup>135</sup>

Secondly, the results of the illicit union between angels and mankind are similar in the BW and *Jubilees*: the total corruption of mankind (*Jub.* 5:3 || *1 En.* 9:9). The judgment is also similar: the angels are bound in the netherworld (*Jub.* 5:6-10 || *1 En.* 10:4), and are doomed to watch the destruction of their progeny (*Jub.* 5:7-9 || *1 En.* 10:4-15). Furthermore, they are doomed to be destroyed before the flood through the direct

<sup>134</sup> VanderKam, "Angel Story," 156; 169-70.

<sup>135</sup> My opinion differs from D. Dimmant who regards the Asael tradition in the book of *Jubilees* as a secondary insertion. Thus she believes that the *Jub.* 8:1-4 was probably not part of the original composition. Furthermore, she believes that *Jubilees* is not directly dependent upon the BW, but rather makes use of common aggadic tradition. See, Dimmant, "Fallen Angels," 99-103. However, J. VanderKam has convincingly shown in two articles that these two hypotheses are incorrect. He asserts that 1) *Jubilees* was directly dependent upon the BW, and 2) was aware of the Asael tradition. See; VanderKam, "Angel Story," 154-56;169-70; J. VanderKam, "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second Century Sources," in *From Revelation to Canon* (StPB 62; Leiden :Brill, 2000), 328-29. See also A. Reed's recent dissertation on the topic which concurs with VanderKam's conclusions, and offers additional literary analysis of the BW and *Jubilees* which supports these two conclusions [Reed, "What Fallen Angels Taught," 127-139].

intervention of God (*Jub.* 5:6-10 || *1 En.* 10:9-15). Lastly, in both there are demonic spirits who emanate from the corpses of the giants which instigate evil in the postdiluvian age (*Jub.* 10:5 || *1 En.* 15:8-11). Overall it may be concluded that material from *Jub.* 5:1-10 and other Enochic sections of *Jubilees* (4:15-26; 7:20-39; 10:1-17) demonstrates that the author of *Jubilees* knew the *1 Enoch*.<sup>136</sup>

These many similarities notwithstanding, there is also a considerable number of differences between *Jubilees* and the BW. For instance, in *1 Enoch* the original sin of the angels is in heaven, where they conspire and bound one another in an oath (*1 En.* 6:5).<sup>137</sup> On account of this they are called “watchers” because they watch, and lust, and then come down to the earth. Their progeny are appropriately called נפלים, because their wicked parents fell (Heb. נפל) from heaven. However, in *Jubilees* the Watchers are originally sent for good purposes, and hence, they are also called angels of God who come down (Heb. ירד) from heaven (*Jub.* 4:15).

Another glaring difference between *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* is *Jubilees*’ focus on the Shemeziah myth of the Watchers and its diminishing of the Asael myth. This emphasis was not due to a lack of the Asael tradition at *Jubilees* disposal, but rather a purposeful adaptation of the angel story. There are 2 significant implications for this alteration: 1) varying views on the origin and escalation of sin that preceded the flood, and 2) a literary technique which *Jubilees* uses to establish the authority of the message delivered to Enoch as being divinely inspired. As VanderKam has noted, “the facts that *1 En.* 6:2 attributes the Watchers departure from heaven to sexual desire and that *Jub.* 4:15 and 5:6 explain it as due to a divine commission to teach and encourage justice reveal varied views on the origin of the sinfulness that produced the flood.”<sup>138</sup> Whereas Enochic theology downplays the central role of the fall of Gen 3 as a corrupting agent of mankind, *Jubilees* keeps the adamic fall as the central explanation of the origin of sin (*Jub.* 3:17-29). Therefore, in contrast to Enochic theology, which places sin’s origin in heaven, the theology of *Jubilees* maintains that sin is of earthly origin. In *Jubilees* the Watchers are not responsible for the origin of sin, because “Adam fell long before they came on to the

<sup>136</sup> Reed, “What Fallen Angels Taught,” 127-139; VanderKam, “Enoch Traditions,” 305-448. Both Reed and VanderKam assert that *Jubilees* knew and employed in its interpretation the BW, BD, AB as well as parts of the Epistle of Enoch.

<sup>137</sup> VanderKam, “Enoch Traditions,” 328-329; *ibid.*, *A Man for All Generations*, 120.

<sup>138</sup> VanderKam, “Enoch Traditions,” 329.

scene.”<sup>139</sup> Furthermore, the Watchers do not sin in heaven, but come down to earth and then later enter into inordinate sexual relationships. Thus, the tale in Enochic literature serves more as an account for the origin of sin, whereas in *Jubilees* it accounts for the pervasiveness and escalation of antediluvian sin.<sup>140</sup>

One of the fundamental purposes of *Jubilees* is to establish the 364 solar day calendar as the authoritative calendar. This calendar was purportedly taught to Enoch (*Jub.* 4:15-18) by the angels who descended, and therefore, it gained its authority as being divinely revealed and inspired knowledge. Thus the good teaching of the angels served to substantiate the calendar, as well as the figure of Enoch as an authority figure equal to Moses.<sup>141</sup> Therefore, *Jubilees* interpreted that the angels came down in order to teach, and after revealing this knowledge to Enoch, succumbed to their desire to marry women and left their proper place to cohabit with women.<sup>142</sup>

Another major difference between them is the treatment of the evil spirits of the giants, which apparently persecute mankind after the flood (*Jub.* 5:8-9, 10:4-5 || *1En.* 15:5-11). In *Jubilees* 9/10 of them are restrained after Noah prays to God to restrain the demons (*Jub.* 10:1-14). At the request of Mastema (Satan) God allows 1/10 to remain so that he may mislead mankind (*Jub.* 10:8). Thus, a malevolent force is left in the world as an explanation for sin, as in the BW, but it has been severely restrained in *Jubilees* so that “they will not have power over the children of the righteous henceforth and forever” (*Jub.* 10:6).<sup>143</sup> Later on in *Jubilees* in the time of Seroh the effect of this is seen when people began making graven images with the help of the cruel spirits who lead them astray (*Jub.* 11:4-5). Thus, the disembodied spirits become an extension of Mastema’s evil spiritual activity on earth. This is re-conceptualization of the angel story asserts more human responsibility for sin and suffering, than the angel story in the BW, and is congruent with the biblical concept of Satan as a divinely appointed accuser of mankind

<sup>139</sup> J. Collins, “The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature,” in *Seers, Sibyls, and Sages in Hellenistic Roman Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 291.

<sup>140</sup> VanderKam, “Enoch Traditions,” 328-30; *ibid.*, “Angel Story,” 153-54.

<sup>141</sup> Concerning *Jubilees*’ estimation of Enoch as being equal to Moses see; G. Nickelsburg, “The Books of Enoch at Qumran: What We Know and What We Need to Think about,” in *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum* (BZNW 97; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999), 104-6.

<sup>142</sup> Delcor, “Le mythe de la chute,” 23-24; Collins, “The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature,” 290.

<sup>143</sup> VanderKam, “Enoch Traditions,” 330-31.

(Job 1:6-2:7; 1 Chron 21:1; Zech 3:1-2).<sup>144</sup> Thus, this story in *Jubilees* serves as an etiology of the origin of Mastema's demons, and a theodicy of postdiluvian suffering with a just omnipotent God.<sup>145</sup>

In conclusion, this analysis of *Jubilees*' use of the angel story has demonstrated that *Jubilees* employed Enochic traditions, which were at times very similar to the BW. Furthermore, on account of 1) the tremendous similarity between them and 2) the historical antiquity of the BW compared to the *Jubilees*, it is probable that *Jubilees* knew the BW and used it as the basis for its interpretation of the angel story. Overall, one can say that *Jubilees* was more greatly influenced by the Shemeziah tradition in the BW, and intentionally diminished the illicit teaching motif (Asael tradition) for its own purposes. At the same time, however, it must also be stressed that *Jubilees* used the Genesis account as its base text, and on account of this is closer to Genesis than *1 Enoch*.<sup>146</sup>

#### IV. THE SEPTUAGINT (3<sup>RD</sup> CENTURY – 2<sup>ND</sup> CENTURY B.C.E.)

The Septuagint, which is the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures made from the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.E. to the 1<sup>st</sup> century C.E., is another invaluable source for the study of the progression of the angel story during the Second Temple period for two reasons. Firstly, it is an early translation of the Pentateuch which, at times, employs traditional interpretation of the passage in its translation. Secondly, it is the version upon which Philo and Josephus comment.<sup>147</sup> The legendary *Letter of Aristeas*, which dates from the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century to the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.E., refers to the completion of the Pentateuch in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.E.<sup>148</sup> Therefore, the standard dating of the LXX's translation of the Pentateuch is mid-second century B.C.E., if not earlier.<sup>149</sup> On the basis of this dating it should be added that the chronological relationship between the LXX and *Jubilees*, and their use of the angel story, must be approached with caution.

---

<sup>144</sup> Reed, "What Fallen Angels Taught," 138.

<sup>145</sup> Reed, "What Fallen Angels Taught," 139.

<sup>146</sup> VanderKam, "Angel Story," 154.

<sup>147</sup> J. Lewis, *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 82.

<sup>148</sup> N. Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (trans. W. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 36-51; R. Shutt, "Letter of Aristeas," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985), 2.8-9.

<sup>149</sup> H. Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902), 21; S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 47-52; Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 50-51.

Although it is fairly safe to assume the chronological precedence of the BW, compared to *Jubilees* and the LXX, present scholarship does not allow any firm conclusions about the chronological relationship between *Jubilees* and the Pentateuch of the LXX on account of the difficulties of dating these works.

Analyzing the differences between the LXX and the MT is a complex endeavor because the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX is no longer extant. It is possible that the LXX preserved other textual traditions that diverge from the MT, as well as textual variants to the MT, because one cannot assume the priority of the MT over the LXX when analyzing variant readings.<sup>150</sup> Furthermore, differences between the MT and the LXX arise for a variety of reasons aside from differences in textual traditions, which include: translation techniques, limitations of language, and corrupted readings.<sup>151</sup> Lastly, working in tandem with these causes of discrepancies, is the translator's interpretation of the passage. The translators were undoubtedly familiar with traditional interpretation of the passages taught and transmitted along side of the Bible in the synagogue.<sup>152</sup>

| <u>LXX Gen 6:1</u>  | <u>LXX Translation</u> <sup>153</sup>  | <u>MT Translation</u>  |
|---|--|--|
| καὶ ἐγένετο ἡνίκα ἤρξαντο οἱ ἄνθρωποι πολλοὶ γίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ θυγατέρες ἐγενήθησαν αὐτοῖς | And it came to pass that men began to be numerous upon the earth and daughters were born to them,. | And when men began to multiply on the face of the earth and daughters were born to them. |

Overall in Gen 6 the LXX is very sensitive to the syntax and vocabulary of its Hebrew *Vorlage*. For instance here it is clear that the LXX understood כִּי וַיְהִי as a temporal clause by its translation of כִּי as ἡνίκα.<sup>154</sup> The phrase καὶ ἐγένετο ἡνίκα occurs three more times in Genesis and introduces a temporal clause in all three of these occurrences.<sup>155</sup> Clearly, as the authors of the LXX discerned, the usage of כִּי in Gen 6:1 is closely related to כאשר i.e., to denote time.<sup>156</sup>

<sup>150</sup> Tov, *The Text Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 293-306; Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 77.

<sup>151</sup> Tov, *The Text Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 40-46; 50-69; Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 78-79.

<sup>152</sup> Concerning the synagogue and other religious institutions in Second Temple Judaism see; Gafni, "Historical Background," 22-24; Safrai, "The Temple," 908-44; *ibid.*, *World History of the Jewish People: Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period*, 65-98.

<sup>153</sup> All translations of Greek from the LXX and Hebrew from the MT are mine.

<sup>154</sup> Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, 52.

<sup>155</sup> Gen 19:17; 24:30; 31:10.

<sup>156</sup> BDB, 473. This can be seen in translation of Tg. Onq. as well, which translates it as כִּד, which is the usual manner to translate כאשר.

The LXX's translation of Gen 6:1 is similar to the MT and consistent with the LXX's overall translation techniques in Genesis. For instance, the translation of וַיְהִי כ as καὶ ἐγένετο is typical in Genesis.<sup>157</sup> Out of the 155 occurrences of וַיְהִי in Genesis, the standard translation in the LXX is either καὶ ἐγένετο or ἐγένετο δὲ, which are used to some degree interchangeably.<sup>158</sup> Another example of the LXX's consistent translation technique at work in this verse can be found in the translation of על פני with the preposition ἐπὶ. A very literal rendering would be ἐπὶ προσώπου. However, after one looks at the various manners in which the LXX translates this idiomatic phrase one discovers that the usage of a preposition is a common manner of translation (cf., Gen 1:2, 1:20, 7:3), although the latter more literal rendering also occurs (cf., Gen 7:23, 8:9, 11:12).

| <u>LXX Gen 6:2</u>   | <u>LXX Translation</u>  | <u>MT Translation</u>   |
|--|---|---|
| ιδόντες δὲ οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ<br>τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν<br>ἀνθρώπων ὅτι καλαὶ εἰσιν<br>ἔλαβον ἑαυτοῖς γυναῖκας<br>ἀπὸ πασῶν ὧν ἐξελέξαντο | And, when the sons of God<br>saw that the daughters of<br>men were beautiful they<br>took for themselves wives<br>of all whom they chose. | The sons of God saw that<br>the daughters of men were<br>fair; and they took for<br>themselves wives from all<br>whom they chose. |

The translation of Gen 6:2 highlights the sensitivity of the LXX to the textual difficulties of the text. The LXX translates בני אלהים literally as οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ. As is apparent in this translation Hellenistic Judaism did not have as much of a problem as Rabbinic Judaism would later have with the anthropomorphic connotations of this passage.<sup>159</sup> As mentioned earlier, the interpretation that the בני אלהים were angels probably found its origin in other passages in the HB, which associate them with angels.

<sup>157</sup> J. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (SBLSCS 35; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 52-53;75.

<sup>158</sup> However, there is a difference in the translation of וַיְהִי in the latter part of Genesis as compared to the beginning. In chs.1-12 וַיְהִי is usually translated as καὶ ἐγένετο, because 40/45 occurrences translate it in this manner. Genesis 4:17, 5:32, 9:26, 9:27, 11:1 are the only exceptions. Three of these exceptions translate it as καὶ ἦν, which is another manner popular in Genesis of translating וַיְהִי occurring eight additional times in Genesis. In another occurrence in Gen 1:7 the translator(s) omitted the וַיְהִי due to harmonizing tendencies and added it to the following verse to make a consistent translation of the occurrences of וַיְהִי—יָאמר in the MT. In chs.12-19 roughly half are translated by καὶ ἐγένετο, and half by ἐγένετο δὲ. There are two exceptions that translate it as δὲ. However, in the last portion of Genesis, ἐγένετο δὲ occurs the majority of the time. 39 occurrences are ἐγένετο δὲ and only 15 are καὶ ἐγένετο. An additional 17 occurrences are translated in various other manners because of their differing usages.

<sup>159</sup> P. Alexander, "The Targumim and Early Exegesis of 'Sons of God' in Genesis 6," *JJS* 23 (1972): 60-71. For instance *Tg. Onq.* translates בני אלהים as בני ברביא in an effort to avoid the possibility that angels may have had intercourse with women.



In total the phrase בני אלהים occurs 3 times in Job (1:6, 2:1, 38:7), and its Aram. equivalent (בר אלהין) once in Dan 3:25. Significant to our study, however, is the fact that in three of the cases the LXX translates the passage as “angels of God”: either as οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ, or as ἀγγέλου θεοῦ (Dan 3:25). In one case it is translated even more freely as ἄγγελοι (Job 38:7). Lastly, a variant reading of Gen 6:2 in LXX (Alexandrian) reads ἄγγελοι for υἱοὶ. Therefore, as these other passages show, the translators surely understood the meaning of sons of God as angels but chose a literal rendering of the Hebrew in Gen 6:2. In fact this interpretation of this cryptic passage came to be a traditional understanding of the passage, and is quoted by Josephus and Philo in their interpretation of the passage as well.<sup>160</sup> With this in mind one cannot help but wonder which role Enochic traditions, which were undoubtedly firmly ensconced in traditional interpretation of this passage by the middle of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.E., played in the identification of בני אלהים in the LXX as angels.

It is clear from later Greek versions of this passage that Gen 6:1-4 continued to be problematic in translation throughout the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> centuries C.E. Aquilla (130 C.E.) translates this passage literally as οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν θεῶν, “the sons of gods,” but Symmachus (193 C.E.) renders it as οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν δυναστευόντων, “the sons who exercise lordship.”<sup>161</sup> One can note that Symmachus’ translation is a step in the direction of interpretation that avoids anthropomorphism, and which is characteristic of later rabbinic literature and Targumim as well.<sup>162</sup>

The translation of טוב as καλὰ in this verse is an example of the LXX’s textual sensitivity. In general טוב is rendered well by κάλος because their semantic range is fairly equivalent. Therefore, the majority of occurrences of טוב are translated by κάλος.<sup>163</sup> Furthermore, the meaning of κάλος in the LXX highlights the beauty of the women,

<sup>160</sup> Philo, *Gig.* 6-18; 58-59, *Deus* 1-3; *Jos. Ant.* 1:73.

<sup>161</sup> F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive Veterum Interpretetum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), 22-28.

<sup>162</sup> Alexander, “The Targumim and Early Exegesis,” 59-63. For instance, *Tg. Onq.* translates this phrase as רבירים “nobles.” An example of later rabbinic interpretation, which rejects the notion that the בני אלהים were angels, can be seen in *Gen. Rab.* 26:5.

<sup>163</sup> 20/25 occurrences in Gen, the LXX translates טוב as καλὰ. However, the translation as κάλος is not exclusive because the LXX also translates טוב as ἀγαθός (Gen 24:10, 45:18; 45:20), amongst other various meanings (Gen 29:19, 40:16).

possibly, in order to identify the motive of the angels.<sup>164</sup> This nuance of καλός and טוב can be seen in Genesis 24:16, in which both are clearly referring to physical beauty.<sup>165</sup> Thus, the LXX also uses κάλος to render יפה elsewhere in Genesis (Gen 12:14; 29:17).

| <u>LXX Gen 6:3</u>  | <u>LXX Translation</u>  | <u>MT Translation</u>   |
|---|---|---|
| καὶ εἶπεν κύριος ὁ θεός οὐ μὴ καταμείνῃ τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς σάρκας ἔσονται δὲ αἱ ἡμέραι αὐτῶν ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ἔτη | And the Lord God said, My Spirit shall certainly not stay among these men for ever, for they are flesh, but their days shall be a hundred and twenty years. | Then God said, “My spirit shall not remain in man for ever, for he is flesh, but his days shall be a hundred and twenty years.” |

The translators of the LXX apparently understood the verb ידון to mean “remain” as its translation as καταμείνῃ, “to remain” demonstrates.<sup>166</sup> It is perplexing that the only possible root of ידון with this meaning is דנ"נ, which is found solely in later Talmudic Aramaic. Therefore, the LXX is probably following another Hebrew *Vorlage* here which contained a different reading, or it is likewise possible that the MT has been corrupted here. The LXX’s translation is probably based upon ידיר “remain” instead of ידון, which is also witnessed by 4Q252.<sup>167</sup> Other expanded versions of the angel story, which were originally based upon Hebrew or Aramaic originals such as *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, seem to verify an original Hebrew reading of “shall not remain.”<sup>168</sup> Therefore, it appears as if the most ancient interpretation of this problematic verb equated it with “remaining” rather than “judging.” This meaning is apparently how it was understood by many ancient translations (LXX, Vulgate, Peshitta, *Targum Onkelos*, and Ethiopic Genesis).<sup>169</sup>

The LXX translates the problematic phrase בשגם הוא בשר as διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς σάρκας ἔσονται “because they are flesh.” Thus, the LXX also further specifies the object of verb from “mankind” in the MT to “these men” (τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις). This was probably done to clarify that the offspring of the illicit union, as well as mankind, would

<sup>164</sup> *Tg. Onk.*, as well, in Gen 6:2 (and 24:16) translates טוב as שפיר, or “beautiful,” which is the usual way that *Tg. Onk.* translates יפה rather than טוב. H. Kasovsky, *Ozar Leshon Targum Onkelos Concordance* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1986), 530, 199-201.

<sup>165</sup> *Tg. Onq.*, as well, in Gen 24:16 and 6:2 translates טוב as שפיר, or “beautiful,” which is the usual way that *Tg. Onq.* translates יפה rather than טוב. See; Kasovsky, *Ozar Leshon Targum Onkelos*, 530, 199-201.

<sup>166</sup> H. Liddell and R. Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon: Abridged Edition* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 357.

<sup>167</sup> M. Bernstein, “לא ידור רוחי באדם לעולם,” 421-27.

<sup>168</sup> J. VanderKam, “The Angel Story in the Book of *Jubilees*,” 160.

<sup>169</sup> *Tg. Onq.* translates this verb as לא יתקיים, “will not endure.” Other texts continue to translate this from the root ד"ן. For example, Symmachus’ Greek translation had κρίνουν “judge.”

suffer from God's judgment of a limited lifespan.<sup>170</sup> This verse anticipates the next verse, which further labels these offspring as the giants. This small clarification is important because, again, it points to the notion that the LXX was sensitive to the surrounding interpretation of the passage. Through this ingenious translation one can definitely hear echoes of Enochic tradition of the angel story.

| <u>LXX Gen 6:4</u>  | <u>LXX Translation</u>   | <u>MT Translation</u>  |
|---|--|--|
| οἱ δὲ γίγαντες ἦσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις καὶ μετ' ἐκείνο ὡς ἂν εἰσεπορεύοντο οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐγεννώσαν ἐαυτοῖς ἐκεῖνοι ἦσαν οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ἄπ' αἰῶνος οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ὀνομαστοί | Now the giants were upon the earth in those days; and after that when the sons of God went into the daughters of men, they bore [children] to them, those were the giants of old, the men of renown. | The <i>nephilim</i> were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came to the daughters of men and they bore children to them. These were the <i>gibborim</i> that were of old, the men of name. |

The major difference between the LXX and the MT is the translation of both הגפלים and הגבורים as γίγαντες. The origin of this difference could be due to the interpretation of the passage or a different text which lies before the translators. This underlying text, could account for differences between the LXX and the MT. However, it should be recalled at this point that the *Vorlage* of the LXX is not extant. Therefore, caution must be used when comparing the MT to the LXX. For example, it is interesting that *Jubilees*, which is also translated from a Hebrew original text from this same period, also associated the mighty men, the גפלים, and גבורים with the giants. This could be interpreted as a witness for a different Hebrew underlying text which was extant during this period which conflated the גפלים, and גבורים into giants. On the other hand, if the LXX is based upon a *Vorlage* similar to the MT, which does not make it clear that the גפלים were the result of the marriage, then the translation of the LXX clarifies this through its translation of both the גפלים and the גבורים as giants. Thus, LXX Num 13:33 consistently translates the גפלים as giants. Overall, in either case the LXX's translation affirms an interpretation or textual tradition in which the mighty men, the גפלים, and גבורים were the giant progeny of the marriage between angels and mankind.

<sup>170</sup> Tg. Onq.'s translation is likewise fascinating. It describes the effects of God's judgment not upon all mankind, but rather upon דרא בישא הדין, "this wicked generation."

| <u>LXX Gen 6:5</u>   | <u>LXX Translation</u>   | <u>MT Translation</u>  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>ιδὼν δὲ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἐπληθύνθησαν αἱ κακίαι τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ πᾶς τις διανοεῖται ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἐπιμελῶς ἐπὶ τὰ πονηρὰ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας</p> | <p>And the Lord God saw that the wickedness of mankind upon the earth was becoming great, and that every one was continually thinking only about evil in his heart all day long.</p> | <p>And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.</p> |

The first difference between the LXX and MT one notices is the replacement of the first nominal clause with a verbal clause. The MT has וַיֵּרָא יְהוָה כִּי רַבָּה רַעַת הָאָדָם בָּאָרֶץ, “and the Lord saw *the great wickedness of man upon the earth*.” However, the LXX translates this as, ἰδὼν δὲ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἐπληθύνθησαν αἱ κακίαι τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, “and the Lord saw that *the wickedness of mankind upon the earth was becoming great*.” Therefore, the LXX is translating רַבָּה as if it was from the root רָב"ב, as in Gen 18:20 (cf., also Exod 23:29). Indeed the only difference between the verbal form and adjectival form is the *games* under the first radical, i.e., רָבָה (adjective) in contrast to רָבָה (verb). The syntax of the sentence would be equally understandable with a verbal clause. There are several explanations for this difference. It could be understood as evidence that the *Vorlage* of the LXX was not vocalized. However, it could equally be assigned to scribal error, or a different *Vorlage* altogether. These possibilities notwithstanding, this difference is probably due to translation technique because the LXX also changes the second clause in the sentence from nominal to verbal. The Heb. text has וְכָל יִצָּר מִחֲשַׁבַּת לִבּוֹ, which could be translated as “every device of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.” However, in a very clever translation the LXX has, “καὶ πᾶς τις διανοεῖται ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἐπιμελῶς ἐπὶ τὰ πονηρὰ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας,” which could be translated as, “and each one was thinking about only evil in his heart all day long.” The key difference is the translation of וְכָל יִצָּר מִחֲשַׁבַּת לִבּוֹ, “every device of the thoughts of his heart,” as a verbal clause διανοεῖται ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, “*he thought about it in his heart*.” Therefore, it seems that the LXX is changing the nominal clauses to verbal clauses, which is a translation technique in order to make the Hebrew syntax more understandable in the Greek language.

## V. OTHER 2<sup>ND</sup> CENTURY B.C.E. TEXTS WHICH ALLUDE TO THE ANGEL STORY.

### 1. THE WISDOM OF JESUS BEN SIRACH (200-170 B.C.E.)

Ben Sirach is the earliest example of a Jewish writing which *alludes* to the angel story as a negative illustration. Joshua ben Eleazar ben Sirach was “a professional scribe or sage who studied in Jerusalem during the first quarter of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.E.”<sup>171</sup> His book is a collection of his teaching originally published under his name (Sir 50:27) around 180 B.C.E. Sirach is related in genre to the wisdom literature of the HB, such as Proverbs and Ecclesiastes.<sup>172</sup> It was originally written in Hebrew and subsequently translated into Greek by the author’s grandson. This Greek translation was only the beginning of Sirach’s complex transmission history, which has multiple textual traditions of varying length.<sup>173</sup>

Extensive portions of the book in Hebrew were discovered in the Cairo Genizah,<sup>174</sup> as well as fragments from Qumran (2Q18; 11QPs<sup>a</sup>)<sup>175</sup> and Masada.<sup>176</sup> Unfortunately, none of the Qumran or Masada fragments contain the pericope in Ben Sirach which alludes to the angel story. Much scholarly research has been done analyzing the proposed authenticity of the Cairo Hebrew MSS, compared to the Greek and later Syriac and Latin copies, and a consensus has been reached that they, “contain the original text or something very near to the original text of Ben Sirach.”<sup>177</sup> Therefore, the Hebrew MSS of the Cairo Genizah (MS A and B) will be compared to the Greek in our analysis of the text.

A look at Sir 16:7 within the context of the book of Sirach will help one gain an understanding of how he used the angel story as a negative example in his book. The

<sup>171</sup> Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 55.

<sup>172</sup> D. DeSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 153-197; M. Gilbert, “Wisdom Literature,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2.2; ed. M. Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 292-93; J. VanderKam, *Introduction to Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 115-119.

<sup>173</sup> M. Nelson, *The Syriac Version of the Wisdom of Ben Sira Compared to the Greek and Hebrew Materials* (SBLDS 107; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 3-16; P. Skehan and A. DiLella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 51-61; DeSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha*, 156.

<sup>174</sup> 2 MSS from the Cairo Genizah (MS A and B) have been discovered dating from the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries C.E. See; I. Lévi, *The Hebrew Texts of the Book of Ecclesiasticus* (SSS 3; Leiden: Brill, 1951), V-VIII; P. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 13-16.

<sup>175</sup> 2Q18 = Sir 6:14,15; 6:20-31; 11QPs<sup>a</sup> = Sir 51:13-20:30.

<sup>176</sup> The MSS found at Masada include Sir 39:27-43:30. See; Y. Yadin, *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1965), 1-2. See also; P. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*, 23-125. Beentjes has the most comprehensive and convenient collection of the Hebrew fragments from the DSS, Cairo Genizah and Masada.

<sup>177</sup> A. DiLella, *The Hebrew Text of Sirach: A Text Critical and Historical Study* (London: Mouton & Co., 1966), 148. For an overview of the various scholarly opinions see: *ibid*, *The Hebrew Text*, 20-45.

verse is couched in between two sections, which highlight 1) the divine government of the universe and 2) the free will and responsibility of mankind for sin (Sir 15:11-20; 17:1-12).<sup>178</sup> The larger context of Sir 16:7 is discussing the certainty of divine retribution for sin through a series of examples from the sacred history of Ancient Israel (Sir 16:6-23).<sup>179</sup> This pericope proceeds a small section speaking about the misfortune of having ungodly children (Sir 16:1-5). In order to properly understand Sirach's use of the angel story one must keep these thematic concerns in mind.

| Cairo Genizah MS A & B <sup>180</sup>  | LXX Sir 16:7 <sup>181</sup>  |
|--|--|
| אשר לא נשא לנסכי קדם המורים עולם בגבורתם   | οὐκ ἐξιλάσατο περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων<br>γιγάντων οἱ ἀπέστησαν τῇ ἰσχύϊ αὐτῶν       |
| He did not forgive the princes of old, who<br>revolted in times past in all their might. | He was not propitiated for the ancient<br>giants who revolted in their might |

An analysis of the Greek version and the Hebrew MSS from Cairo reveals that there are a few variations between them. Firstly, there is a difference between “giants” in the LXX and “princes of old” in the Hebrew. Here one can see similarity between the Greek version and the LXX's identification of the נפלים as giants. Concerning the Hebrew version, the Hebrew MSS found in the Cairo Genizah (specifically MS B) are very close to the original Hebrew *Vorlage* of Sirach. Therefore, this reading may be more original than the Greek translation. In any case this verse in Heb. is definitely an allusion to the נפלים and גבורים of Gen 6:1-4. In fact, one cannot help but notice the similarities between Sirach and the MT:

| MS A  | MT   |
|---|--|
| אשר לא נשא לנסכי קדם המורים <sup>182</sup> עולם בגבורתם                                 | המה הגבורים אשר מעולם אנשי השם   |
| He did not forgive the princes of old, who<br>revolted in times past in all their might | These were the mighty men (הגברים) that<br>were of old, the men of name. |

<sup>178</sup> R. MacKenzie, *Sirach* (OTM 19; Wilmington: Michael Glazier Inc., 1983), 72-78; J. Snaith, *Ecclesiasticus or The Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 78-87.

<sup>179</sup> Snaith, *Ecclesiasticus*, 81; MacKenzie, *Sirach*, 75; Skehan and DiLella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 273-4.

<sup>180</sup> All of this verse is not preserved in MS B. However, one orthographical difference notwithstanding, MS B is identical to MS A. See; Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira*, 45; 53.

<sup>181</sup> Translations of Greek and Hebrew texts of Sirach are mine.

<sup>182</sup> This is המורדים in MS B. This variant reading was probably caused by the confusion of the verbal root between מ"רד and מ"רה. This differing root would effect the orthography of the present participle, however, on account of the fact that the semantic range of these two roots are very similar it does not affect the meaning (*BDB*, 597-98).

When looking at these texts side by side it becomes apparent that the “princes of old” לנסכי קדם are related to the “men of name” אנשי השם in the MT. Furthermore, the MT says that these “men of name” were “of old” מעולם, which is mirrored by “in times past” עולם in the Hebrew version of Sirach. Lastly, it is highly probable that בגבורתם is a reference to הגבורים in the MT. In fact the Hebrew of Sirach does not prevent one from understanding the passage to read “by their גבורים” (= giant progeny of the angel marriage) as well as “in their גבור” (= strength). The meaning of the former would change the sentence to, “He did not forgive the princes of old, who revolted in times past in (by means of) their giants.”<sup>183</sup> Overall it is clear that the Heb. text of Sirach is very similar to the MT. However, when one turns to the Greek translation one can definitely see the influence of the LXX upon the rendering of the גבורים and the נפלים to mean giants in the Genesis passage.

One thing is definitely clear: the Greek version of Sirach stands in the tradition of *Jubilees*, BW, and the LXX, which identify the נפלים and the גבורים as giants who were judged by God for their unrighteousness. This background of the angel story supported his argumentation in this section, that “everyone will receive in accordance with his deeds” (Sirach 16:14). Furthermore, Sirach was aware of some of the broader Enochic mythology, which is elaborated upon in *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch*, because he states that the giants “revolted in their might.” Sirach also says that God was “not propitiated” for the ancient giants. However, the biblical text does not speak of anyone propitiating on behalf of the giants, rather this bears a striking resemblance to Enochic mythology in the BW where Enoch is pleaded to intercede for the fallen angels (*1 En.* 12).

Overall, it is clear that Sirach was aware of the Enochic tradition concerning the Watchers but does not elaborate upon it. The lack of an expounded reference to the angel story could be due to several reasons and it must be approached with caution. For

---

<sup>183</sup> Some evidence for the authenticity of this translation can be found in the Syriac, which translated the phrase המורים עולם “revolted in times past” as “filled the world.” The Syriac was translated from a Hebrew *Vorlage*, which appears to have had affinities with Cairo Genizah MSB, and Masada [Nelson, *Syriac Version of Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 17-27; 131-32]. The Syriac in this verse understands עולם to be a noun, “world,” as the direct object of the verb “filled.” The total import of this verse in the Syriac is that the “kings of old” filled the earth by their גבורים = (giants). For the Syriac text see; F. Vattioni, *Ecclesiastico: Testo ebraico con apparato critico e versioni greca e siriana* (Rome: Napoli Institute, 1968), 79.

example, on the one hand, it could be an *intentional* restraint for theological reasons.<sup>184</sup> On the other hand, Sirach's abbreviated reference to the angel story could simply be part of the literary strategy in this section of briefly citing examples from Israel's history.<sup>185</sup> Overall, as we shall see in the forthcoming analysis, Sir 16:7 is a typical example of the use of the giants as a negative example of wickedness and God's imminent judgment.

## 2. PSEUDO-EUPOLEMUS (CIRCA 150 B.C.E.)

Two fragments attributed to Eupolemus concerning the life of Abraham were preserved by Eusebius in *Praeparatio Evangelica*, who excerpted them from Alexander Polyhistor's *On the Jews*. Traditionally they have both been ascribed to an unknown Samaritan "Pseudo-Eupolemus" writing in the mid-second century B.C.E.<sup>186</sup> In contrast to Eupolemus, the fragments of Pseudo-Eupolemus were thought to be too syncretistic with "a high degree of openness" to the Hellenistic environment to be Eupolemus.<sup>187</sup> They freely incorporated Greek and Babylonian mythology into the life of Abraham.<sup>188</sup> For example, names are drawn from pagan mythology, and Enoch is identified with Atlas.

R. Doran has subsequently mounted a cogent argument for authorship of these fragments by multiple authors, one being Eupolemus himself the other being an anonymous author.<sup>189</sup> This later view, however, would not affect the date of the

<sup>184</sup> VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 107; DeSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha*, 187-193.

<sup>185</sup> There are three references to Israel's history, which serve as negative examples in this pericope: 1) v. 7 refers to Gen 6:1-4, 2) v. 8 refers to Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 18-19), and 3) v. 10 refers to the story of Israel's "eating of quails" during their sojourn (Num 11). See, Skehan and DiLella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 273-4.

<sup>186</sup> C. Holladay, *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors* (SBLTT 20; 4 vols.; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), 1.157-160; J. Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistory und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke* (Hellenistische Studien 1-2; Breslau: Verlag von H. Skutsch, 1875), 82-103; H. Attridge, "Historiography," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2.2; ed. M. Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 165-66; B. Wacholder, "Pseudo-Eupolemus' Two Greek Fragments of the Life of Abraham," *HUCA* 34 (1963): 83-85; M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (2 vols.; London: SCM Press, 1974), 1.88-89.

<sup>187</sup> Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistory*, 96; Wacholder, "Pseudo-Eupolemus," 84-87; Attridge, "Historiography," 165.

<sup>188</sup> Specifically, elements of Berossus and Hesoid have been found in Pseudo-Eupolemus. Berossus authored a history of Babylon at the beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.E. Fragments of his work were preserved by Josephus (cf., *Ant*, 1.158). Influence from Hesoid, amongst other Greek authors who linked Atlas with astrology, has also been found. See; R. Doran, "Pseudo-Eupolemus," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985), 2.877-78; Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistory*, 90-97; Wacholder, "Pseudo-Eupolemus," 92-93.

<sup>189</sup> R. Doran, "Pseudo-Eupolemus," *OTP*, 2.873-8.



fragments because Eupolemus is also considered to have written in middle of the second century B.C.E.<sup>190</sup> Thus, regardless of the question of authorship, the fragments can safely be dated to ca. 150 B.C.E.

The first fragment uses the background of Gen 6-14 in its account of Abraham's life. The basic contents of the fragment are: the postdiluvian settlement of Babylon by giants (Praep. ev. 9.17.2), their building of the tower of Babel (Praep. ev. 9.17.3), Abraham's founding of Astrology (Praep. ev. 9.17. 3), his teaching of Astrology to the Phoenicians (Praep. ev. 9.17. 4-6), his sojourn to Egypt (Praep. ev. 9.17. 6-7), his teaching of astrology to the Egyptians (Praep. ev. 9.17. 8-9), and the origin of Astrology with Enoch (who learned it from the angels of God). The second fragment speaks of Abraham's ancestry to the giants who lived in Babylon, and who were destroyed by the gods because of their impiety. However, one of the giants escaped and built a tower and lived in it (Praep. ev. 9.18.2).

Ps.-Eup. Frag. 1 "Eupolemus"<sup>191</sup>

Eupolemus in his work concerning the Jews of Assyria says that the city of Babylon was first founded by those who were saved (διασωθέντων) from the flood. He also says that they were giants (γίγαντες) and built a well-known tower. When it fell as the result of the action of God, the giants were scattered throughout the whole earth. (Praep. ev. 9.17.2-3)

While Abraham was living in Heliopolis with Egyptian priests, he taught them many new things. But the original discovery he traced back to Enoch, saying that this man Enoch, not to the Egyptians, had discovered astrology first. (Praep. ev. 9.17.8)

The Greeks say that Atlas discovered astrology. (Atlas and Enoch are the same.) To Enoch was born a son, Methuselah, who

Ps.-Eup. Frag. 2. "Anonymous"

In some anonymous writings we found that Abraham traced his family to the giants. While these giants were living in Babylonia, they were destroyed by the gods (ὑπο τῶν θεῶν) because of their wickedness. One of them, Belus, escaped death and came to dwell in Babylon. There he built a tower and lived in it. It was named Belus after Belus who built it. After Abraham had been instructed in the science of astrology . . . (Praep. ev. 8.18.2)

<sup>190</sup> Attridge, "Historiography," 163; F. Fallon, "Eupolemus," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985), 2.863.

<sup>191</sup> Greek text and English translation from; Holliday, *Jewish Hellenistic Authors*, 1.170-77.

learned all things through the help of the angels of God, and thus we gained our knowledge. (Praep. ev. 9.17.9)

There are several notable characteristics of these two fragments which can be both compared and contrasted to the angel story in *Jubilees*, *1 Enoch*, and the LXX. Firstly, Ps.-Eup. Frag. 1 “Eupolemus” preserves a story that presupposed that the giants perished in the flood. Thus, it uses the language that some of them “saved themselves” from the Flood.<sup>192</sup> In Ps.-Eup. Frag. 2 “Anonymous” the giants suffer from the god’s (τῶν θεῶν) direct judgment and are destroyed “for their wickedness.” The text does not elaborate in what manner (through the Flood?) or for what reason. It is significant that in both fragments the giants are portrayed in the context of judgment from God for unnamed reasons.

Secondly, the surviving giants built a tower, which God knocked over, and were subsequently dispersed throughout the earth. This is obviously an allusion to the biblical story of Nimrod’s tower (Gen 10).<sup>193</sup> This interpretation is based upon the LXX, which translates Nimrod’s description in Gen 10:8 as a גִּבּוֹר as γίγας (LXX). Therefore, in the LXX Nimrod was a “giant” who built the foundation for his empire in the land of Babylonia (Gen 10:10). In this manner, Nimrod was associated with the giants who survived the Flood and built a tower in Babylon. The fact that some giants escaped the Flood likewise comes from the LXX, which translates the נְפִלִים in Num 13:33 as γίγαντες.<sup>194</sup> Lastly, in Ps.-Eup. Frag. 1 “Eupolemus” the tower “fell as a result of the action of God” and the giants were scattered throughout the whole earth. This is also based upon the biblical account in Gen 11:4-9. Although the destruction of the tower is only implied in Genesis, the ensuing scattering of the people clearly described in the biblical text.<sup>195</sup>

<sup>192</sup> The opposite of this is also implied by this verb., i.e., some died in the flood as well. This is the literal translation of the verb διασώζω in the middle voice as it is here [Lidell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon: Abridged Edition*, 167].

<sup>193</sup> J. Kugel, *The Bible as It Was* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 127-28; Holladay, *Jewish Hellenistic Authors*, 178.

<sup>194</sup> The HB has a story about how the spies of the land “saw the נְפִלִים (the sons of Anak, who come from the נְפִלִים); and we seemed to ourselves like grasshoppers (Num 13:33),” which the LXX translated as “giants.”

<sup>195</sup> However, in Gen 11:1-9 the Lord scatters the people through the confusion of their language, not the collapse of the tower. Gen 11:6 states that יָדָה הָחֵלם לַעֲשׂוֹת “and this is what they have begun to make [verbal root חָלַל in Hiphil means “to begin” (BDB, 320)]. Thus, the text implies that the tower had only

Perhaps the most bizarre element in Pseudo-Eupolemus concerning the description of Abraham's life is the genealogical note about Abraham's ancestry from the giants in Ps.-Eup. Frag. 2 "Anonymous." The laconic nature of the statement, as well as the lack of commentary concerning it, makes this phrase very difficult to interpret. All that can be unequivocally said is that Abraham's ancestors were giants, and furthermore, giants lived in (or "founded" in Ps.-Eup. Frag. 1 "Eupolemus") Babylon. The interpretation of this statement is bound with the next departure from the biblical account.

Abraham is said to have founded<sup>196</sup>, or more exactly *re-discovered*, astrology in Babylonia (Praep. ev. 9.17.3) because later in the text it is also added that the *first discovery* was Enoch (ἐυκέναι πρῶτον την ἀστρολογίαν). Both of these ideas are common in Hellenistic Jewish literature of the Second Temple period.<sup>197</sup> For instance, Artapanus, who was a Greek speaking Jewish historian living in the second century B.C.E., also states that Abraham "came to Egypt with all his household to the Egyptian king Pharethothes and taught him astrology (Praep. ev. 9.18.1)."<sup>198</sup> Furthermore, the notion that Enoch was the first to receive astrological secrets is the basis of the entire AB (*1 En.* 72-82), as well as the divinely inspired calendar of *Jubilees* (*Jub.* 4:17-25).<sup>199</sup> Thus, this may be the background in Pseudo-Eupolemus of the statement that Enoch discovered astrology, and his son also learned "all things [pertaining to astrology] through the help of the angels of God (Praep. ev. 9.17.9)."

How does Abraham's astrological knowledge relate to his giant ancestry in Pseudo-Eupolemus? Is the text here implying that "the astrological knowledge which eventually passed on to the Phoenicians and Egyptians had itself been *inherited by*

---

been started. Interpreters thus concluded that the tower was left as an unfinished monument. This may be also implied in Gen 11:8, "they left off building the city." Perhaps it was abandoned because it was destroyed. See; Kugel, *The Bible as it Was*, 129.

<sup>196</sup> The Greek text has here εὐγενείᾳ καὶ σοφίᾳ πάντας ὑπερβέβηκοῦντα ὃν δὴ καὶ τὴν ἀστρολογίαν, "He excelled all men in nobility of birth and wisdom. In fact he discovered both astrology . . ." The same verb is used in the later example when the story says that Enoch "first discovered" astrology. Therefore, it seems appropriate here to translate as "re-discover." Cf., Doran, "Pseudo-Eupolemus," *OTP*, 2.880-881 (note f) who translates this as "he sought and obtained knowledge about astronomy" for the same reason.

<sup>197</sup> *Jub.* 12:16, *Ant.* 1:67-168, *LAB* 18:5, Pseudo-Orphica (Recension B) 21, 27-31 (cited in Clement of Alexandria, *Miscellanies*, 124). See; Kugel, *The Bible as it Was*, 139-40.

<sup>198</sup> J. Collins, "Artapanus," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985), 2:897-903.

<sup>199</sup> VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 112-13.

*Abraham*,” as L. Stuckenbruck has persuasively argued in his recent article?<sup>200</sup>

Furthermore, Stuckenbruck has argued that there was a genealogical progression of astrological knowledge from the angels → Enoch → giants (Noah himself also being one) → Abraham.<sup>201</sup> This seems unlikely for several reasons, not the least of which is the sheer number of hypothetical leaps in interpretation one must take in these two fragments,<sup>202</sup> which, in addition to this, are not supported by *Jubilees* or *1 Enoch*.<sup>203</sup> It seems more likely that this is the unique interpretation of the anonymous author of Ps.-Eup. Frag. 2.

Overall, one can identify in Pseudo-Eupolemus novel elements of the angel story mixed together with elements from the LXX, the Enochic angel story, and *Jubilees*. The LXX was almost surely the basis of the biblical background of the story as the analysis of Nimrod’s tower has endeavored to show. Furthermore, there is also evidence of influence of the LXX in the proper names used in the two fragments.<sup>204</sup> The story also interweaves haggadic material known from *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* about the Watchers. For example the notion that the giants perish in the Flood is also in the Dream Visions of *1 Enoch* (*1 En.* 83-90). Furthermore, the role of Enoch’s acquisition of astrological knowledge during his heavenly sojourn is essential to both *Jubilees* and the AB of *1*

---

<sup>200</sup> Stuckenbruck, “Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition,” 93-99.

<sup>201</sup> Stuckenbruck claims that, “if the section 9.17.3-4 on Abraham is coordinated with 9.17.8-9 on Enoch, it is implied that Abraham’s learning is being derived from Enoch whose knowledge in turn, came through instructions revealed to him ‘by angels of God’ [Stuckenbruck, “Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition,” 97].” Furthermore, he asserts that “Belos thus seems at this point [in frag. 2] to correspond to the figure of Noah in the biblical tradition” [Stuckenbruck, “Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition,” 96]. Thus, the fragments both suggest that the “spread of [astrological] knowledge took place through several links in an unbroken line of transmission: from (a) angels to (b) Enoch to (c) a giant (Belos? [i.e., Noah]) or giants, who then escaped the Flood, to (d) their descendants all the way down to the time of Abraham.”

<sup>202</sup> There is meager evidence for this hypothesis in the two fragments. First the text says that Abraham founded astrology in Babylon, not *inherited* as Stuckenbruck has interpreted. Furthermore, the connection that Stuckenbruck makes between the giants and astrological lore is circumstantial: 1) astrological lore was founded in Babylon, when Abraham was there, and 2) the giants dwelled in Babylon. The text does not in any way state that the giants possessed astrological knowledge. The only relationship between the giants and astrological lore is Abraham because he is said to descend from a giant in the Ps.-Eup. Frag. 2 “anonymous.”

<sup>203</sup> Firstly, in the BW the angels teach the illicit astrological knowledge rather than the giants. Thus, Pseudo-Eupolemus states that “Methuselah learned all things through the help of the angels of God.” Secondly, this knowledge is taught to the people not Enoch. Enoch is taught astrological knowledge in the AB by the angels; however, this serves as a practical basis for the calendar and his dream visions. Furthermore, there is no evidence in the text, nor in any literature of this period to my knowledge, that Enoch’s secret astrological knowledge was passed on in a genealogical progression to his great grandson Noah. Thirdly, it is explicitly defined in *1 En.* 106 and 1QapGen 2 that Noah is not a giant.

<sup>204</sup> Hollander, *Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, 161; Wacholder, “Pseudo-Eupolemus,” 87-88.

*Enoch* (1 En. 72-82). The idea that the tower was knocked down by God, as well as Abraham's astrological knowledge is also in *Jubilees* (*Jub.* 10:26; 12:16). However, there are also unique interpretations in these two fragments such as Abraham's ancestry from the giants who survived the Flood. The notion that some of the giants may have survived the Flood is also found in *Pseudo-Eupolemus*.<sup>205</sup>

### 3. BARUCH (2<sup>ND</sup> CENTURY B.C.E.)

The book of Baruch was purportedly written by Baruch, the secretary of Jeremiah (*Jer* 36:4; 32:12), in the fifth year of the Babylonian exile (*Bar* 1:1-2). It may have been on account of Baruch's affinity with Jeremiah, that Baruch was preserved in four uncial LXX manuscripts following Jeremiah<sup>206</sup> and once may have been bound in the same Hebrew scroll as Jeremiah.<sup>207</sup> Baruch was originally written in Hebrew (and possibly Greek for certain sections) and subsequently translated into Greek, and then from Greek into other languages such as Latin and Syriac.<sup>208</sup> There has been much debate concerning the original language of Baruch, and the lack of any Aramaic or Hebrew MSS of Baruch has made the discussion more difficult. However, since the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century it has been generally accepted that, at least the first portion of the book was originally written in Hebrew (*Bar* 1:1-3:8).<sup>209</sup> This hypothesis is based upon internal literary evidence, such as Hebraisms, mistranslations from the underlying Hebrew text, as well as a Hebraic poetic meter identifiable when retro-translating the Greek into Hebrew.<sup>210</sup> However, concerning the last portion of Baruch (*Bar* 3:9-5:9) the debate is more divided. For instance, E. Tov maintains that it is not sufficiently clear from the Greek that *Bar* 3:9ff

<sup>205</sup> This may also be the interpretation on Josephus in *Ant.* 1.173. See, L. Feldman, *Flavious Josephus: Translation and Commentary: Judean Antiquities 1-4* (vol. 3; ed. S. Mason; Brill: Leiden, 2000), 66 n.553.

<sup>206</sup> Those four uncials are Codex: 1) Alexandrius, 2) Vaticanus, 3) Marchalianus, and 4) Venetus. For a more detailed explanation see; D. Burke, *The Poetry of Baruch* (SBLSCS 11; Scholars Press: Chico, 1982), 9-11.

<sup>207</sup> E. Tov, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch* (HSM 8; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976), 168-70.

<sup>208</sup> O. Whitehouse, "I Baruch," in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (ed. R. Charles; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 577-80; C. Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions* (AB 44; Garden City: Doubleday, 1977), 259; R. Harwell, "The Principal Versions of Baruch," (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1915), 5-62; Burke, *Poetry of Baruch*, 11-16.

<sup>209</sup> Whitehouse, "I Baruch," *APOT*, 1.571-72; E. Tov, *The Book of Baruch* (SBLTT 8; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975), 1-6; DeSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha*, 201; Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah*, 257-58; R. Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha* (New York: Harper, 1949), 416-17.

<sup>210</sup> Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah*, 260; Harwell, "The Principal Versions of Baruch," 52-60; Whitehouse, "I Baruch," *APOT*, 1.571-72.

was translated from Hebrew.<sup>211</sup> However, there are others who have mounted impressive arguments for a Hebrew original for parts of this section<sup>212</sup> or the section as a whole.<sup>213</sup>

The date and providence is likewise a complex issue, which is complicated by the composite composition of Baruch.<sup>214</sup> The date of the entire work cannot be positively ascertained, and furthermore, each section of the book most likely has different dates.<sup>215</sup> It is generally accepted that the poem in praise of wisdom (Bar 3:9-4:4) was compiled in Palestine in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.E.<sup>216</sup> However, this dating is tenuous because it is based upon very minimal internal evidence.<sup>217</sup> As has been already noted by Whitehouse nearly a century ago, it can hardly be said that the poem section reveals a distinct historical period.<sup>218</sup> On account of the total lack of any external evidence for both dating and original language, the relationship between Baruch and the development of the angel tradition must be approached with caution. Fortunately, however, this poses only a minor methodological problem because Baruch's use of the angel tradition is brief and fairly inconsequential in the larger framework of the entire myth.

As mentioned Baruch is a composite work and consists of several different genres of literature such as poems (Bar 3:9-4:4), prayers (Bar 2:6-3:8), and psalms (Bar 4:5-5:9).<sup>219</sup> Generally speaking there are five major sections of Baruch, which are divided by the differing genres and topics within Baruch: 1) an introduction (Bar 1:1-14), 2) a confession for the Palestinian remnant (Bar 1:15-2:5), 3) prayers of the exiled community

---

<sup>211</sup> Tov, *Book of Baruch*, 7.

<sup>212</sup> Whitehouse, "I Baruch," *APOT*, 1.572. Whitehouse identified the poem section (Bar 3:9-4:4) as being based upon a Hebrew underlying text, and the psalm section (Bar 4:5-5:9) as being originally composed in Greek. The first to expound an entire Hebrew *Vorlage* of Baruch was J. Kneucker in late 19<sup>th</sup> century in his commentary on Baruch [J. Kneucker, *Das Buch Baruch* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1879)]. For a concise summary of the development of scholarly opinion of this issue see; Burke, *Poetry of Baruch*, 23-26.

<sup>213</sup> Harwell, "The Principal Versions of Baruch," 63-64; Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah*, 303; Burke, *Poetry of Baruch*, 7-8; 23-26; C. Torrey, *The Apocryphal Literature: A Brief Introduction* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945), 62-64; Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times*, 419.

<sup>214</sup> J. Goldstein, "The Apocryphal Book of I Baruch" *PAAJR* 46/47 (1980): 179-199; DeSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha*, 202-205; Torrey, *Apocryphal Literature*, 59-62.

<sup>215</sup> Whitehouse, "I Baruch," in *APOT*, 574-75; Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times*, 415-22.

<sup>216</sup> Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah*, 304; Harwell, "The Principal Versions of Baruch," 66; DeSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha*, 204; Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times*, 419.

<sup>217</sup> Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah*, 260.

<sup>218</sup> Whitehouse, "I Baruch," *APOT*, 1.575

<sup>219</sup> Whitehouse, "I Baruch," *APOT*, 1.570; Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah*, 259; Burke, *Poetry of Baruch*, 5-6.

(Bar 2:6-3:8) , 4) a poem in praise of wisdom (Bar 3:9-4:4), and 5) a psalm of encouragement (Bar 4:5-5:9).<sup>220</sup> The section that Bar 3:26 lies in, a poem in praise of wisdom (Bar 3:9-4:4), is a distinct section because it is incongruous with the preceding section.<sup>221</sup> For example, it is poetry rather than prose, and it is didactic rather than prophetic. There are also differences in vocabulary, such as the consistent use of a different name of God (θεός rather than κύριος).<sup>222</sup> Overall, Bar 3:26 can be studied in the context of the poem in praise of wisdom (Bar 3:9-4:4) because it is a distinct literary unit within Baruch.

The immediate context of Bar 3:26 (the poem in praise of wisdom [Bar 3:9-4:4]), is giving examples of how no one has found wisdom through unaided power - even the giants of old (Bar 3:29-31). In order to understand how Baruch is using the angel tradition it will be necessary to consider Bar 3:26 in context.

O, Israel, how great is the house of God! And how vast the territory that he possesses! It is great and has no bounds; it is high and immeasurable. The giants were born there, who were famous of old, great in stature, expert in war. God did not choose them, nor give them the way to knowledge; so they perished because they had no wisdom, they perished through their folly. (Bar 3:24-28, RSV)

| <u>Bar 3:26 LXX</u>  | <u>LXX Gen 6:4</u>   | <u>Bar 3:26<sup>223</sup></u>   |
|--|--|---|
| ἐκεῖ ἐγεννήθησαν οἱ γίγαντες<br>οἱ ὀνομαστοὶ οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς<br>γενόμενοι εὐμεγέθεις<br>ἐπιστάμενοι πόλεμον | οἱ δὲ γίγαντες ἦσαν ἐπὶ<br>τῆς γῆς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις<br>ἐκείναις . . . ἐγεννώσαν<br>ἑαυτοῖς ἐκεῖνοι ἦσαν οἱ<br>γίγαντες οἱ ἀπ' αἰῶνος<br>οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ<br>ὀνομαστοί | The giants were born there,<br>the men of name of old,<br>great in stature, expert in<br>war. |

Most commentators agree that this verse is dependent upon Gen 6:4.<sup>224</sup> However, the author of the poem in praise of wisdom (Bar 3:9-4:4) did not draw upon Genesis in a rigid verbatim manner, but rather reproduces the central ideas of the verse.<sup>225</sup> A

<sup>220</sup> Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah*, 257-58. Titles of sections are taken from Moore, however, this division is generally accepted; cf., Burke, *Poetry of Baruch*, 1-3; Whitehouse, "I Baruch," *APOT*, 1.569-573.

<sup>221</sup> Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah*, 259.

<sup>222</sup> Burke, *Poetry of Baruch*, 33.

<sup>223</sup> Translations of Baruch mine unless otherwise specified.

<sup>224</sup> Burke, *Poetry of Baruch*, 98; Whitehouse, "I Baruch," *APOT*, 1.589.

<sup>225</sup> Burke, *Poetry of Baruch*, 98-99.

comparison of the LXX Gen 6:4 and Bar 3:26 shows that there are many similarities between LXX Gen 6:4 and Bar 3:26: 1) “giants” or οἱ γίγαντες is used in both to denote the גפלים, 2) the same verbal root is used to describe their birth (Baruch ἐγεννήθησαν / LXX Genesis ἐγεννώσαν), and 3) the men of name in the LXX is shortened in Bar by eliminating οἱ ἄνθρωποι (Baruch οἱ ὀνομαστοί / LXX Genesis οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ὀνομαστοί). The phrase “of old” is also semantically identical between them, however, a slightly different prepositional phrase is used to denote this (Baruch οἱ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς / LXX Genesis οἱ ἀπ’ αἰῶνος). Therefore, it is clear from these similarities that Bar. 3:26 is based upon the Gen 6:4.

When one looks at the surrounding context of Bar 3:26 one can see that in this passage the example of the giants is used as both a positive and a negative example. Positively speaking, they are an example of Israel’s greatness and vastness. However, negatively speaking, they are an example of those who perish in their own foolishness. The text does not elaborate on the nature of their foolishness nor on the manner of their demise. However, it does state that they were 1) great in stature, and 2) expert in war. The latter characterization of the giants as experts in warfare is particularly interesting because is not mentioned in Genesis 6:1-4. Essentially, Bar 3:26 is an example of an assimilation of the connotations of both גפלים and גבורים into warrior-giants. As has been discussed in the previous analysis of Gen 6:1-4, and its subsequent translation into the LXX, the גפלים became associated with giants through inter-biblical interpretation. In addition to this, גבורים became associated with warriors through inter-biblical interpretation. Nimrod was described as a mythical hunter, גבר ציד, in Gen 10:8-9 and later in 2 Sam David’s champions were described as גבורים. Ezekiel 32:27, which may have been aware of these mythological connotations, also combined both גפלים and the גבורים as warriors, “ולא ישכבו גבורים גפלים מערלים.” Therefore, it appears that in Bar 3:26 the inter-biblical connotations of these two words (גפלים and גבורים) are combined into “giants who are expert at war.” This assimilation may also have been influenced from the Asael traditions in the BW, where Asael taught men “to make swords of iron and weapons and shields and breastplates and every instrument of war (*1 En. 8:1*).” The wicked progeny of the Watchers – the giants – are also condemned to die in bloody warfare (*1 En 10:9*). Overall, it appears that Bar 3:26 has filled in the lacunae of Gen



6:1-4 and deduced why the progeny of the בני האלוהים are “famous men of old,” either through inter-biblical connotations or/and through traditional interpretation of the passage. They were famous because, similar to Goliath, they were great warriors, as well as being giant in stature.

## VI. THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

### 1. THE BOOK OF GIANTS FROM QUMRAN (1<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY B.C.E.)

The theory of the Qumran Book of the Giants (hereafter BG) was first proposed by J. Milik, who identified amongst the fragments of *1 Enoch* some which contained details not present in the Ethiopic *1 Enoch* (4Q203, 4Q530, 4Q531 [4QEnGiants<sup>a,b,c</sup>]).<sup>226</sup> According to Milik, *1 Enoch* speaks only in generic terms of the giants and the נפלים. However, these Enochic fragments gave personal names to the sons of the Watchers and related their exploits with “a profusion of detail”.<sup>227</sup> Milik hypothesized that these fragments represented a lost work, which he called the Book of the Giants from Qumran. His hypothesis was bolstered by the parallel occurrence of some of the details mentioned in these fragments in two later sources: the Manichaean Book of Giants,<sup>228</sup> and the Jewish writing *Midrash of Shemiziah and Asael*.<sup>229</sup> In the grand scheme of Milik’s analysis of the Aramaic fragments of *1 Enoch*, his theory of the BG was only one aspect of his overall theory of an Enochic Pentateuch at Qumran, in which the BG replaced the Similitudes of *1 Enoch* (*1 En.* 37-71).<sup>230</sup> Although Milik’s hypothesis of an Enochic Pentateuch and his subsequent dating of the Similitudes of *1 Enoch* (*1 En.* 37-71) has come under criticism,<sup>231</sup> one of his more lasting contributions was his theory of BG which has found some broad acceptance.

It must be stressed at the outset that all that can be unequivocally said about the

<sup>226</sup> Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 298-339.

<sup>227</sup> Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 299.

<sup>228</sup> W. Henning, “The Book of Giants,” *BSOAS* 11 (1943-46): 52-74; J. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (HUCM 14; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union Press, 1992), 9-50.

<sup>229</sup> Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 321-31. Milik’s text is based upon four rabbinic sources.

<sup>230</sup> Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 76-79; 91-106.

<sup>231</sup> For a summary critical objections to the theory of an Enochic Pentateuch and dating of the Similitudes see; M. Stone, “Apocalyptic Literature,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2.2; ed. M. Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 396-402; VanderKam, “Some Major Issues,” 360-62; D. Dimmant, “The Bibliography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch,” *VT* 33 (1983): 14-19, 24-29; M. Knibb, “The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review,” *NTS* 25 (1979): 345-59; G. Nickelsburg, review of J. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, *CBQ* 40 (1978): 417-418.

BG is that 1) it was closely related to *1 Enoch* and 2) contained some details not extant in *1 Enoch*. However, any other conclusions about the content, date, and its relationship to *1 Enoch* must be approached with caution. First, the fragmentary nature of the BG severely limits the ability to determine its date.<sup>232</sup> Secondly, the conjectured sequence of the fragments is not agreed upon.<sup>233</sup> Thirdly, the identification of the fragments that belong to the BG corpus is also debated although there are certainly MSS which are generally accepted as being part of the BG.<sup>234</sup> Lastly, the codicological relationship between the BG and *1 Enoch* cannot be determined with certainty.<sup>235</sup> Milik identified on paleographical grounds the inclusion of certain fragments of the BG within the same MS containing portions of *1 Enoch* (4Q203 together with 4Q204 [4QEnGiants<sup>a</sup> together with 4QEn<sup>c</sup>]).<sup>236</sup> These difficulties notwithstanding, some general conclusions can be drawn from the variegated studies done on the BG.

Originally Milik identified 13 fragments and 6 copies of the BG at Qumran.<sup>237</sup> However, the most exhaustive study done on the fragments by L. Stuckenbruck has identified many more than this.<sup>238</sup> Milik's dates the BG to 125-100 B.C.E.<sup>239</sup> although the basis for this dating has been criticized.<sup>240</sup> The only objective evidence for establishing the date of a MS is the paleography and no exhaustive paleographical analysis (of all the extant fragments of BG) has been done to date. Most of the various MSS, which have been paleographically analyzed, date sometime within the 1<sup>st</sup> century B.C.E. For example, F. Cross identified 6Q8 (6QGiants) as coming from the last half of the century B.C.E., and 4Q530 (4QEnGiants<sup>b</sup>) from the first half of the 1<sup>st</sup> century B.C.E.<sup>241</sup>

On account of the problems associated with the narrative order, it is very difficult

<sup>232</sup> L. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran* (TSAJ 63; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 28-31.

<sup>233</sup> Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants*, 13-20; F. Martinez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (STDJ 9; New York: E. J. Brill, 1992), 110-113; Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 67-128.

<sup>234</sup> Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants*, 41-42; 214-42.

<sup>235</sup> Martinez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 113-114.

<sup>236</sup> Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 178-82; 310-17.

<sup>237</sup> Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 309.

<sup>238</sup> Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants*, 41-213; 225-242.

<sup>239</sup> Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 58.

<sup>240</sup> Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 53-56; Martinez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 115; Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants*, 29.

<sup>241</sup> F. Cross, "The Development of the Jewish Scripts," in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* (ed. G. Wright; New York: Doubleday, 1965), 190 - figure 4 line 3 & 6; Milik dated 4Q203 (4QEnGiants<sup>a</sup>) to the last third of the 1<sup>st</sup> century B.C.E. [Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 178].

to ascertain the specific characteristics of the original account of the BG. However, some general themes have been gleaned from the surviving fragments.<sup>242</sup> Most generally the BG was a story about the giant's exploits, dreams, and plights in a more detailed fashion than *1 Enoch*. For example, the giants are given names and specific roles, such as Mayaway acting as an intermediary (4Q203 [4QEnGiants<sup>a</sup>]). The BG also highlights how they come to learn about their fate through dream visions (6Q8; 2Q26; 4Q530 [6QGiants; 2QEnGiants; 4QEnGiants<sup>b</sup>]). However, contrary to Stuckenbruck's opinion, it cannot be ascertained whether or not the giants died in the Flood in the BG on account of the fragmentary state of the MSS.<sup>243</sup>

The scope of this study does not allow an exhaustive analysis of the various fragments of the BG. However, an analysis of one pertinent fragment which directly discusses the giants will follow. 4Q531 (4QEnGiants<sup>c</sup>) is usually placed at the beginning of the BG in a section recounting the fall of the Watchers and birth of the giants.<sup>244</sup> L. Stuckenbruck dates the paleography of MS from middle to late Hasmonean script (ca. 100-63 BC.E.).<sup>245</sup>

#### 4Q531 (4QEnGiants<sup>c</sup>)<sup>246</sup>

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| ] אטמיו [ 1                | 1 ] they defiled themselves [              |
| ] גברין ונפלין [ 2         | 2 ] giants and nephilim [                  |
| ] אולדו אלו כ [ 3          | 3 ] they begat. Behold k [                 |
| ] במדה ועל יד מה [ 4       | 4 ] in its blood, and by means of mn [     |
| ] ין די לא שפק להון ול [ 5 | 5 ] yn for it wasn't enough for them and   |
| ] ובעין למאכל שגיא מל [ 6  | 6 ] and they were wanting to eat much ml [ |
| vacat 7                    | 7 vacat                                    |
| ] מחורה נפיליא [ 8         | 8 ] the nephilim smote it (the earth?) [   |

As one can readily notice 4Q531 is very fragmentary and difficult to understand without the aid of a larger context, which is provided by the Enochic watcher mythology. As Stuckenbruck has pointed out, "without the BW the mythical context of the BG would be

<sup>242</sup> For an excellent summary of the general characteristics of the BG see; Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants*, 25-8.

<sup>243</sup> Stuckenbruck interprets that the giants died in the Flood in the BG based upon very fragmentary texts (4Q530, 6Q8). Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants*, 38-39; *ibid*, "Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition," 105-06.

<sup>244</sup> Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 67; Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants*, 149-53; Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 308. However, cf., Martinez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 104-5; 112-13.

<sup>245</sup> Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants*, 142.

<sup>246</sup> Text and translation of 4Q531 from; Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants*, 150.

incomprehensible.”<sup>247</sup> Thus, 4Q531 may be recalling the origin and evil exploits of the giants.

| 4Q531 (4QEnGiants <sup>c</sup> )   | <i>1 En. 7:1-6</i>   |
|--|--|
| ... they defiled themselves ...  | And they began to go in to them, and to defile themselves through them, and to teach them sorcery and charms ... and they conceived from them and bore to them great giants. And the giants begat Nephilim, and to the Nephilim were born Elioud <sup>248</sup> ... And the giants began to kill men and to devour them. And they began to sin against the birds and beasts and creeping things and the fish, and to devour one another's flesh. And they drank the blood. Then the earth brought accusation against the lawless ones. |
| ... giants and nephilim ...  |  |
| ... they begat. Behold ...   |  |
| ... for it wasn't enough for them and for ...<br>... and they were wanting to eat much ... |  |
| ... in its blood, and by means of ...  |  |
| ... the nephilim smote it (the earth?) ...   |  |

Although the exact order of the events of 4Q531 (4QEnGiants<sup>c</sup>) compared to *1 En. 7:1-6* cannot be determined because of the fragmentary nature of 4Q531, it closely resembles the narrative recounted in *1 En. 7:1-6*. For example, both texts mention the גבורים and the נפלים. However, the identification of (and relationship between) the גברין and נפלין is problematic in 4Q531.<sup>249</sup> They could have been conflated in 4Q531, similar to the LXX, as the offspring of the Watchers. In this case they would be standing in apposition to one another in 4Q531.<sup>250</sup> On the other hand, both the גברין and the נפלין could be interpreted like Syncellus' Greek version of *1 Enoch 7:2*, i.e., a paternal progression from the גברין to the נפלין. The remaining fragments of the BG are of little help because the נפלין are mentioned only one more time.<sup>251</sup> Overall it is not possible to determine the exact relationship or nature of both the גברין and the נפלין in 4Q531.<sup>252</sup>

The fragmentary nature of 4Q531, and the difficult textual history of *1 En. 1-2* prevents any firm conclusions about 4Q531's relationship to *1 Enoch* and especially to *1 Enoch 7:1-2*. *1 Enoch 7:1-2* is a difficult text because it is very poorly attested in the

<sup>247</sup> Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants*, 27.

<sup>248</sup> Nickelsburg suggests that this is a corrupted reading. See; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 182-82.

<sup>249</sup> Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 70; Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants*, 111-12.

<sup>250</sup> M. Black and J. VanderKam, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*, 154. The Watcher's progeny are identified elsewhere as נפלים in the DSS (cf., 4Q531; 1QapGen 2:1).

<sup>251</sup> נפלין occurs in 4Q530. For discussion see; Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants*, 111; Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 71.

<sup>252</sup> Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants*, 111-2; 149-50.

Aramaic MSS from Qumran 4Q202 (4En<sup>b</sup>), and furthermore, its textual history in Greek and Ethiopic is convoluted.<sup>253</sup> This passage also resembles many other parts of *1 Enoch*. For example the notion of the Watchers defiling themselves is also prominent in *1 En.* 15:3-4 and *Jub.* 7:21. This is apparently the denotation of the verb אטמיו or “they defiled themselves” in 4Q531.<sup>254</sup> Furthermore, the motif of blood as part of the damages of the giant’s activities figures elsewhere in *1 Enoch* (*1 En.* 9:1,9;15:9). This is the general import of בדמה “in blood” in 4Q531, although the exact meaning of the pronominal suffix in בדמה is difficult to determine because of the fragmented text.<sup>255</sup> There are also differences between 4Q531 and *1 Enoch*, such as the third person narrative of 4Q531. On account of this difference D. Dimmant has proposed - contra Milik - that the BG “was not included in an Enochic corpus such as the Ethiopic one.”<sup>256</sup>

In conclusion, it should be reiterated that all that be unequivocally said about the BG is that 1) it was closely related to *1 Enoch* and 2) contained some details not extant in *1 Enoch*. On account of the notion that it is fairly safe to assume the chronological priority of the BW (*1 Enoch* 1-36), it can also be added that these similarities are also evidence of 4Q531’s literary dependence upon the BW. It must also be added that the BG elaborated upon the mythology of the Watchers in *1 Enoch*. Unfortunately, not enough of the work has survived to give one an objective view of the BG’s angel story.

## 2. THE GENESIS APOCYPHON (50 B.C.E. – 50 C.E.)

The Genesis Apocryphon (1QapGen) is “an Aramaic version of several chapters of the Book of Genesis, interwoven with legends around the lives of the Patriarchs.”<sup>257</sup> Most of the columns are in a very poor state of preservation, and its precise length and

<sup>253</sup> Virtually every extant version has a different reading of *1 En.* 7:1-2. The text is usually taken from the Greek version of *1 Enoch* attested in Syncellus, which also has its difficulties as the corrupted reading of *Elioud* reveals. Furthermore, the Ethiopic and Akhmim papyrus of Greek Enoch both omit, “and the giants begat *Nephilim*, and to the *Nephilim* were born *Elioud*,” compared to Syncellus’ Greek version. Milik’s reconstruction of 4Q202 (4En<sup>b</sup>) through retroversion partially from the Akhmim papyrus of Greek Enoch and Ethiopic *1 Enoch*, and partially from Syncellus Greek version, “is highly questionable.” See; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 182-83; Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 165-7.

<sup>254</sup> This is an Ithpaël verb 3 per. pl., from the root יטמ, with the n assimilated into the consonant of the first syllable. See; M. Sokoloff, “Notes on the Aramaic Fragments of Enoch from Cave 4,” *Maarav* 1 (1978-79): 209-13; Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants*, 149; Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 308-09; Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 67-68.

<sup>255</sup> Milik proposes “in his blood” בדמה as the translation. See; Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 308. The pronominal suffix could be either masc. or fem. Another possible meaning, referring to a feminine noun, relates to the bloodshed of the earth. See; Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants*, 150; Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 308.

<sup>256</sup> D. Dimmant, “The Biography of Enoch,” 16.

<sup>257</sup> N. Avigad, “Last of the Dead Sea Scrolls Unrolled,” *BA* 19 (1956): 23.

complete contents are uncertain.<sup>258</sup> In the second column a story about the birth of Noah is preserved. Lamech, after seeing his new born wonders whether he has been fathered by one of the Watchers. After some heated words with his wife, he then seeks his father's (Methuselah) advice and opinion. Lamech is eventually reassured that his son is not the progeny of the Watchers.

The date of the Genesis Apocryphon is unknown and, as usual, paleography can only offer the *terminus ad quem*. N. Avigad judged the paleography of the scroll to date from the Herodian period (ca. 50 B.C.E.-50 C.E.).<sup>259</sup> E. Kutscher likewise dated the language of the scroll to first century B.C. or C.E.<sup>260</sup> The composition of the scroll could be earlier, but it is also possible that this scroll is an autograph.<sup>261</sup>

The genre of the Genesis Apocryphon is debated.<sup>262</sup> It has many similarities to midrash, and has been characterized thus by several authors.<sup>263</sup> It could also be defined as the "bible rewritten and expanded"<sup>264</sup> or a "free reworking of the Genesis stories."<sup>265</sup> In any case, the Genesis Apocryphon rapidly departs from the biblical story of Noah's birth (Gen 5:28-29) and adds haggadic material from other sources such as the lost Book of Noah, *Jubilees*, and *1 Enoch*.<sup>266</sup> Columns VI-XII may have been directly dependent

<sup>258</sup> N. Avigan and Y. Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judea* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1956), 8,12-14.

<sup>259</sup> N. Avigad, "The Paleography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents," in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ScrHier 4; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1958), 71-72.

<sup>260</sup> E. Kutscher, "The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon: a Preliminary Study," in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ScrHier 4; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1958), 22.

<sup>261</sup> J. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1* (Rome: Pontifical Institute Press, 1971), 16-19.

<sup>262</sup> Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 6-14.

<sup>263</sup> G. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Aggadic Studies* (StPB 4; Leiden: Brill, 1961), 124; M. Lehmann, "1Q Genesis Apocryphon in the Light of the Targumim and Midrashim," *RevQ* 1 (1958-59): 249-63.

<sup>264</sup> Nickelsburg, "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded," 104-107; M. Bernstein, "Re-Arrangement, Anticipation, and Harmonization as Exegetical Features in the Genesis Apocryphon," *DSD* 3 (1996): 37-39; 55-57. M. Bernstien identifies the literary techniques used in the Genesis Apocryphon in its interpretation of Genesis, i.e., arrangement, anticipation and constructive harmonization.

<sup>265</sup> This is Fitzmyer's characterization of the genre of the Genesis Apocryphon. See; Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 6-7; 10-11.

<sup>266</sup> The assertion that the Genesis Apocryphon knew both *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch* will be shown in the following analysis. See; Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 16-17. In addition to these two books Milik proposed that the 1QapGen 1-15, as well as *1 Enoch* 106, was a summary of the Book of Noah [Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 55-56]. See also; Martinez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 27-8; 40-3. This view has been subsequently criticized for several reasons by G. Nickelsburg. See; G. Nickelsburg, "Patriarchs Who Worry About Their Wives: A Haggadic Tendency in the Genesis Apocryphon," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed M. Stone and E. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 137-58; *ibid*, *1 Enoch*, 541. The lost Book of Noah is known to exist from

upon the lost book of Noah, whose title is referred to in 1QapGen 5:29.<sup>267</sup> It is almost certain that the Genesis Apocryphon was aware of the mythology of the Watchers in *1 Enoch* 6-11, which is the background of 1QapGen 2. The most cogent evidence that the Genesis Apocryphon used the Enochic angel story is 1QapGen 2:1-15's striking resemblance to *1 Enoch* 106.<sup>268</sup> Indeed, the story of the Watchers descent, although not preserved in extant fragments, may have been included in the two proceeding columns of the Genesis Apocryphon.<sup>269</sup>

There are also similarities between the Genesis Apocryphon and *Jubilees* (cf., *Jub.* 4:15-27; 5:1-12; 7:21-24). However, the relationship between the Genesis Apocryphon and *Jubilees* is more complex. Firstly, it appears that the Genesis Apocryphon also knew *Jubilees* directly, and supplemented its story at least in two places with *Jubilees*. For instance, the Genesis Apocryphon uses the same chronology of Abraham's life as *Jubilees* does.<sup>270</sup> Furthermore, the Genesis Apocryphon calls Lamech's wife Bitenosh, which also occurs solely in *Jubilees* 4:28.<sup>271</sup> It is significant that these two details which the Genesis Apocryphon has in common with *Jubilees* are not found in *1 Enoch*. This supports the view that the Genesis Apocryphon knew both *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* individually, and furthermore, it is not necessary to deduce that Enochic influence on the Genesis Apocryphon was mediated through *Jubilees*.<sup>272</sup> In conclusion, it appears that *Jubilees* and the Genesis Apocryphon are two separate examples of the influence of Enochic traditions.

|  |                                   |                        |
|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| <u>1QapGen 2:1-2;15-16</u> <sup>273</sup>      | <u>Translation</u> <sup>274</sup> | <u>1 Enoch 106:1-6</u> |
| הָא בָּאדִין חֲשַׁבְתָּ בְּלִבִּי דִּי מִן (1) | (1) Behold, then, I thought       | And when Lamech had    |

references elsewhere in *Jub.* 10:13, 21:10 and *T. Levi.* 2:3, 17:2. For an overall survey of the Book of Noah see; Martinez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 24-44.

<sup>267</sup> R. Steiner, "The Heading of the Book of the Words of Noah on a Fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon: New Light on a 'Lost' Work," *DSD* 2 (1995): 66-71; F. Martinez, "Interpretations of the Flood in the DSS," in *Interpretations of the Flood* (TBN 1; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 88-89.

<sup>268</sup> For a detailed comparison of *1 Enoch* and the Genesis Apocryphon, see; Nickelsburg, "Patriarchs Who Worry," 137-43, 154-58; *ibid.*, *1 Enoch*, 541-42.

<sup>269</sup> Nickelsburg, "Patriarchs Who Worry," 142. For the text of the all extant fragments of the Genesis Apocryphon Col. 1, 3-17 see; M. Morgenstern, E. Qimron, and D. Savan, "The Hitherto Unpublished Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon," *AbrN* 33 (1995): 30-54.

<sup>270</sup> The chronology of Abraham's life is identical to *Jub.* 22:27, which is a midrashic interpretation of Gen 16:3 in *Jubilees*. Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 116-17;180.

<sup>271</sup> Avigan and Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon*, 18.

<sup>272</sup> Nickelsburg, "Patriarchs Who Worry," 155; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 541-2.

<sup>273</sup> Aramaic text from; Avigan and Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon*, Column II.

<sup>274</sup> English translation is mine.

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| עירין הריאתא ומן קדישין . . . ולנפיל[ין].              | in my heart that the conception was from the Watchers, or from the holy ones, . . . (belonging to?) the nephilim. | come to age, he took for himself a wife, she conceived from him and bore a child . . . And              |
| (2) ולבי עלי משתני על עולימא דנא                       | (2) And my heart within me wavered because of this child.   | Lamech was afraid of him, and he fled and came to Methuselah his father. And he said to him, "a strange |
| (3) באדין אנה למך אתבהלת ועלת על בתאנוש אנ[תחי] . . .  | (3) Then, I, Lamech became frightened and came to Bitenosh.   | child is born to me. He is not like us but (like) the sons of the angels of                             |
| (15) די מנך זרעא דן ומנך הרינוא דן ומנך נצבת פריא      | (15) that this seed is from you, and this conception is from you, and from you the planting of [this]fruit.       | heaven. His form is strange, not like us. His eyes are like rays of the sun,                            |
| (16) ולא מן כול זר ולא כול עירין ולא מן כול בני שמ[ין] | (16) and not from any stranger, not from any of the Watchers, and not from any of the son's of hea[ven].          | and glorious is his face. I think that he is not from me, but from the angels."                         |

Although the story line closely resembles *1 Enoch* 106, there are also significant differences between them as well.<sup>275</sup> However, on account of the fragmentary state of the Genesis Apocryphon it is difficult to determine whether or not these differences were due to a different story, or lacunas in the MS.<sup>276</sup> One literary difference between them is that the Genesis Apocryphon is told in the first person and *1 Enoch* 106 is in the third person. There are also differences in the details of the story. For example, the confrontation between Lamech and his wife Bintenosh in QapGen 2:1-18 is not in the Enochic version. The physical description of the baby's radiant complexion, and his postpartum praise of God is not in the Genesis Apocryphon (cf., *1 Enoch* 106:2-3). Lastly, the designation of the angels is different. In *1 Enoch* they are called "angels of heaven," or simply "angels." However, in the Genesis Apocryphon two double-appellations are used to describe the angels: 1) "watchers, and holy ones"; and 2) watchers, and sons of heaven.<sup>277</sup>

The first double-appellation עירין . . . קדישין "watchers, and holy ones" can also be found in *1 En.* 12:2-3, where it is referring to the fallen angels of the watcher mythology. Both of the terms, "watcher" and "holy ones," are used individually throughout Enoch

<sup>275</sup> Nickelsburg, "Patriarchs who Worry," 137-43, 154-58; *ibid.*, *1 Enoch*, 541-42.

<sup>276</sup> For a facsimile and transcription of the scroll, see Avigan and Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon*, Column II.

<sup>277</sup> Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 80-81, 84.



and other literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls to designate angels.<sup>278</sup> Daniel also uses this same formula to describe angelic beings (cf., Dan 4:13, 17, 23[English versification]).<sup>279</sup> The end of the sentence after the introduction of the “Watchers and holy ones” cannot be understood because the text is poorly preserved: *הא באדין חשבת בלבי די מן עירין הריאתא ומן קדישין . . . ולנפיל[ין]*. Only one word can be reconstructed at the end: the *nephil[im]*. It is unclear if the author considers the *nephilim* to be the progeny of the angels or the angels themselves. The second double appellation *“Watchers, and sons of heaven”* can also be found in *1 En.* 6:2,14:3 and it is, similar to the previous example, apparently referring to the fallen angels of the watcher mythology. The two terms “holy ones” and “sons of heaven” are also used in tandem elsewhere in the DSS to denote angelic beings.<sup>280</sup>

In summary, although the Genesis Apocryphon differs from *1 En.* 106 in the name of the angels, it need not be surprising that the Genesis Apocryphon employed common Enochic terminology to name the Watchers. Although the exact relationship between the Genesis Apocryphon and *1 Enoch* cannot be ascertained, it is highly probable on account of the similar terminology, and plot, that its version of the angel story was directly influenced by *1 Enoch*. However, as previously mentioned, the Genesis Apocryphon also knew *Jubilees*’ version of the angel story on account of certain details in common between the Genesis Apocryphon and *Jubilees* not present in *1 Enoch*. Unfortunately, the poor state of Col. I/II prevents any definite conclusions.

### 3. THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT (100-75 B.C.E.)

The Cairo Damascus Document (hereafter CD) was found in the Cairo Genizah nearly half a century before the discovery of Qumran. The two MSS which were found of CD, subsequently labeled A and B, are dated to the 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries

<sup>278</sup> Examples of “holy ones” in *1 Enoch* and other literature include: *1 En.* 12:2, 14:25, 39:4-5, 47:2-4; 1QS 11:7; 1QH 6:13; 1QM 12:4, CD 20:8. Some examples of “Watchers” in *1 Enoch* and other literature include: *1 En.* 1:5, 10:9,15, 12:4, 13:10, 14:1-3, 15:2, 16:1-2; CD 2:18; *Jub.* 4:15.

<sup>279</sup> Although “angels” may not have been the original meaning of “watcher and holy one” in Daniel [S. Bhayro, “Daniel’s ‘Watchers’ in Enochic Exegesis of Genesis 6:1-4,” in *Jewish Ways of Reading the Bible* (JSSSup 11; Manchester: Oxford University Press, 2000), 58-66], the singular form of this appellation, “watcher and holy one” is used in two places to designate angelic beings in Daniel (Dan 4:13, 4:23 [4:10,20 in Aram.]). Furthermore, in Daniel this singular form is semantically equivalent with the plural form because it is also used with the same meaning (Dan 4:17 [14 in Aram.]).

<sup>280</sup> The Hebrew equivalent of “sons of heaven” is used in coordination with “holy ones” in other texts from Qumran. See; 1QS 4:2,11:8; 1QH 3:22.

respectively.<sup>281</sup> Following the discovery of fragments from CD in Qumran it became apparent that the CD was originally a Qumran sectarian text. Furthermore, CD MS A was a fairly reliable text compared to the ancient fragments of it found at Qumran.<sup>282</sup> Paleographical analysis of the fragments discovered at Qumran points to date between 100 and 75 B.C.E. for the composition of the CD.<sup>283</sup> However, the complexities of the literary structure make the interpretation of the paleographical evidence complex.

Overall the CD is divided into two parts: 1) a parenetic review of Israelite history focusing upon its past and future punishment (1-8), and 2) a legal section which contains elaborations on biblical law (9-16).<sup>284</sup> On account of this clear distinction, as well as a considerable divergence between the MS A and B in their overlapping passages (7-8 [A] parallels 19-20 [B]), C. Rabin proposed that the two MSS originated from one archetype.<sup>285</sup> The literary structure of CD as a whole is complex because it contains a wide variety of literary units, and therefore, no wide consensus has yet emerged from literary analysis concerning whether or not the text is a composite arising from different periods, or a textual unity with different literary subsections.<sup>286</sup> However, despite these complexities, an overall unity of the Damascus Document in the Genizah text and the 4Qfragments has been argued for by some.<sup>287</sup>

The MSS of CD from Qumran cave 4, 5, and 6 pertain predominantly to laws and

---

<sup>281</sup> J. Baumgarten and D. Schwartz, "Damascus Document (CD)," in *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents: The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* (PTSDSSP 1; ed. James Charlesworth; Tubingen: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992), 4.

<sup>282</sup> H. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 116-117; Baumgarten and Schwartz, "Damascus Document," 6-7.

<sup>283</sup> F. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 71-73; J. Milik, *Ten years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (SBT 26; London: SCM Press, 1959), 58-59. See also, D. Dimmant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2.2; ed. M. Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 490-91; Stegemann, *Library of Qumran*, 117; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 124.

<sup>284</sup> Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 123-4; Baumgarten and Schwartz, "Damascus Document," 4.

<sup>285</sup> C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954), viii.

<sup>286</sup> J. Murphey-O'Conner, "An Essene Missionary Document CD II, 14-VI, 1," *RB* 77 (1970): 201-04; 225-29; *ibid*, "A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI, 2-VIII, 3," *RB* 78 (1971): 210-11; 216-17; 231-32.

<sup>287</sup> Dimmant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," 496-97; See also, J. Fitzmyer, Prolegomena to *Fragments of a Zadokite Work: Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, by S. Schechter (New York: KTAV, 1970), 18-19. Specifically, in the 4Q fragments the two sections of CD are combined into one running text [Milik, *Ten Years*, 39].

communal rules.<sup>288</sup> One MS from cave four preserves portions of CD 1:21-2:21, but it is very fragmentary (4Q266 Frag. 2). What is remaining of the 4Q266 attests to the essential accuracy of CD MS A in 2:14-21. In this section, which mentions the Watchers, the author admonishes his readers to “choose that which he [God] wants and despise that which he hates,” and goes on to give examples of mighty warriors who have “walked in the wantonness of their hearts.”

Cairo Damascus Document (MS A) Col. 2:14-21<sup>289</sup>

|   |   |
|---|---|
| (14) ועתה בנים שמעו לי ואגלה עיניכם לראות<br>ילהבין במעשי               | (14) And now, O sons, hearken to me and I<br>will uncover your eyes so you may see and<br>understand the works of   |
| (15) אל ולבחר את אשר רצה ולמאוס כאשר שנא<br>להתהלך תמים                 | (15) God and choose that which he wants<br>and despise that which he hates: to walk<br>perfectly  |
| (16) בכל דרכיו ולא לתור במחשבות יצר אשמה ועני<br>זנות כי רבים           | (16) in all his ways and not to stray in the<br>thoughts of a guilty inclination and<br>licentious eyes. For many   |
| (17) תעו במ וגבורי חיל נכשלו במ מלפנים ועד הנה<br>בלכתם בשרירות         | (17) have failed due to them; mighty<br>warriors have stumbled due to them, from<br>the earliest times and until today. (For<br>example,) walking after the wantonness of |
| (18) לבם נפלו עידי <sup>290</sup> השמים בה נאחזו אשר לא<br>שמרו מצות אל | (18) their heart(s), the Watchers of heaven<br>fell. They were held by it (the wantonness<br>of heart), for they did not keep God's<br>ordinances                         |
| (19) ובניהם אשר כרום ארזים גבהם וכהרים<br>גיוותיהם כי נפלו              | (19) and so too their sons, who were as<br>high as the lofty cedars and whose corpses<br>were as mountains. For   |
| (20) כל בשר אשר היה בחרבה כי גוע ויהיו כלא היו<br>בעשותם את             | (20) all flesh which was on dry land fell,<br>for they died and were as if they had not<br>been, for they had done  |
| (21) רצונם ולא שמרו את מצות עשיהם עד אשר<br>חרב אפו במ                  | (21) their (own) will and had not kept the<br>ordinances of their maker, until his wrath<br>was kindled against them.   |

Overall, this text outlines through historical examples from Israel the disastrous consequences of not doing the will of God and following ones own will instead (CD

<sup>288</sup> Baumgarten and Schwartz, “Damascus Document,” 59-63; C. Hempel, *The Damascus Document*, (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 26-42.

<sup>289</sup> Text and translation taken from; Baumgarten and Schwartz, “Damascus Document,” 14-15.

<sup>290</sup> This is a corrupted reading. One should read עירי as in 4Q266 Frag. 2 Col. 2.18 (4QD\*). E. Qimron has noted that, “in fact this dalet is not typical for our MS [CD] since it only has a tiny upper stroke.” See; M. Broshi, et al., eds., *Damascus Document Reconsidered* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992), 13.

2:18-3:12). More specifically, this passage is giving an example of those who “stray in the thoughts of a guilty inclination and licentious eyes.” The connotation of עני זנות (CD 2:16) in this passage is not only sexual, but it is also clearly a reference to the sexual intercourse between the בני אלוהים and the daughters of men in Gen 6:1-4. It is interesting that CD is adding an element of lust to the story, which is not included in the biblical account.

The fact that this story is referring to the בני אלוהים of Gen 6:1-4 can be ascertained from their description in the story as both “warriors” גבורי חיל and “Watchers” עירי השמים which “fell” נפל from heaven. One can note the background of both Gen 6 and Enochic mythology through these words. The phrase גבורי חיל is taken directly from the הגבורים of Gen 6:4, who are identified in Genesis as the giant offspring of the union. The notion that these offspring were warrior-giants is an idea which developed in the literature of the 1<sup>st</sup> century C.E. or earlier.<sup>291</sup> Furthermore, it is probably not a coincidence that the verb נפל (cf., הנפלים in Gen 6:4) was used to describe the Watchers descent, and the fate of the giants to perish (נפל) in the Flood (cf., CD 2:18-19). The term עירי is found in other places in the literature of Qumran and finds its providence in the previous Enochic literature, and literature influenced by Enochic mythology, in the second and third centuries B.C.E.<sup>292</sup> Furthermore, עירי השמים is an Enochic appellation of the Watchers.<sup>293</sup>

However, there are also some salient differences between CD and the Enochic watchers mythology. For example, in CD the angel story is used as a negative illustration for moral persuasion.<sup>294</sup> However, CD does not blame the Flood solely upon the Watchers as in Enochic theology, nor does it imply that this incident was the origin of sin.<sup>295</sup> The author dedicates equal space to the sin of the Watchers (CD 2:16-19) and the sin of humanity (CD 2:20-21).<sup>296</sup> Rather, CD mentions the Watchers to provide an

<sup>291</sup> See discussion of Bar 3:26.

<sup>292</sup> Some examples of “Watchers” in *1 Enoch* and other literature include: *1 En.* 1:5, 10:9,15, 12:4, 13:10, 14:1-3, 15:2, 16:1-2; CD 2:18; *Jub.* 4:15; 1QapGen 2:1,16.

<sup>293</sup> Aram. עירין די שמיא / Heb. עירי השמים (*1 En.* 12:4, 13:10, 15:2) or עירי בני שמים (*1 En.* 6:2, 14:3) are both also found in *1 Enoch* [Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 140]. Cf., also 1QapGen 2:16.

<sup>294</sup> VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 122.

<sup>295</sup> Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 180, 294-300; Collins, “The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature,” 290-93.

<sup>296</sup> Nickelsburg, “Books of Enoch at Qumran,” 107.

example of the “consequences of sinful desire [and] he does not use the myth to explain the presence of sin in the world, for his point is that sin is of humanity’s own doing.”<sup>297</sup> However, the narrative states explicitly that the giants died in flood, which is in sharp contrast to the BW in which they perish through internecine warfare. As we shall see in the forthcoming analysis these two characteristics, i.e., 1) the giants died in the flood and 2) are used as a negative illustration, are the defining characteristics of how the angel story is used in the literature of the later part of the Second Temple period (170 B.C.E.-).

In conclusion, although the CD shows influence from certain Enochic motifs of the angel story, it also shows some marked dissimilarities which distinguish it from *1 Enoch*. In fact CD shows influence from a variety of sources. For instance, the calendar of *Jubilees* is cited as being authoritative in CD (CD 16:3-4).<sup>298</sup> Furthermore, the CD is thoroughly informed by the HB in language and content, and explicitly quotes it at times.<sup>299</sup> Lastly, as will become evident in the following sections, CD’s angel story evinces more similarities in content and function to majority of literature from the later part of the Second Temple period than to *1 Enoch*.

#### 4. 4Q180 (100-50 B.C.E.)

4Q180 and 4Q181 appear to be parts of a commentary on the biblical history.<sup>300</sup> J. Milik argued that they were copies of a hypothetical “Book of Periods,” which provided the apocalyptic 70 week time schemes found in other works such as *1 Enoch* 10:11-12 (cf., 4Q202).<sup>301</sup> This hypothesis has come under criticism by some who find his interpretation of the fragments problematic, as well as a lack of evidence that a “Book of Periods” ever existed.<sup>302</sup> However, these objections notwithstanding, both 4Q180 and 4Q181 appear to refer to the same work of biblical interpretation. There is a mention of Abraham’s begetting of Isaac and then the text mentions Azael and the angels who had intercourse with human women giving birth to giants. It is quite fortuitous for this study that - at this very point - the two highly fragmentary MSS of 4Q180 and 4Q181 overlap,

<sup>297</sup> Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 295.

<sup>298</sup> S. Talmon, “The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judean Desert,” in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ScrHier 4; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1958), 177-187.

<sup>299</sup> Baumgarten and Schwartz, “Damascus Document,” 7.

<sup>300</sup> J. Milik, “*Milki-sedeq et Milki-resa* dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens,” *JJS* 23 (1972): 110.

<sup>301</sup> Milik, “*Milki-sedeq et Milki-resa*,” 110-124; *ibid*, *Books of Enoch*, 248-58.

<sup>302</sup> R. Huggins, “A Canonical Book of Periods at Qumran?” *RevQ* 59 (1992): 421-24; 433-36; D. Dimmant, “The ‘Peshier on the Periods’ (4Q180) and 4Q181,” *Israel Oriental Studies* 9 (1979): 91-102.

which aides in the restoration of 4Q180.

J. Strugnell has dated the paleography of 4Q180 to “l’époque hérodiennne tardive” and 4Q181 to “hérodienne ancienne ou moyenne.”<sup>303</sup> Furthermore, if 4Q180 is a copy, this dates the original text of 4Q180 to at least the same period of the original text 4Q181. However, whether or not 4Q181 is an autograph cannot be ascertained. Therefore, the original date of 4Q180 probably lies somewhere in the first half of the 1<sup>st</sup> century B.C.E.

| Frg. 1   | Frg. 1 4Q180 <sup>304</sup>  |
|--|--|
| <p>7. [ו]ן פשר על עזזאל והמלאכים אש[ר באו אל בנות אדם]</p> <p>8. [וי] לדו להם גברים ועל עזזאל]</p> | <p>7. [And] commentary concerning Azael and the angels wh[o went into the daughters of humankind]</p> <p>8. [and] they [b]ore to them mighty ones. And concerning Azael [. . . ]</p> |
| Frg. 2   | Frg. 2 4Q180   |
| <p>2. [בנות] האדם וילד[ו]ן להם גבור[ים]</p>  | <p>2. the [daughters of] humankind, and [they] bore to them mighty one[s. . . ]</p>  |

On account of the very fragmentary state of 4Q180 it is difficult to judge the complete context of this fragment. What is clear, however, is that this is an illusion to the biblical story in Genesis 6:1-4 with one prominent addition: the name of Azael. This name, which is most probably included in this story under influence of the BW, manifests an awareness of the Enochic watcher story. However, one need not assume a slavish dependence upon Enochic watcher mythology. For instance, the Watchers are not referred to as מלאכים “angels” once in *1 Enoch*.<sup>305</sup> However, the Watchers are called “angels” in *Jub. 5:6*. In fact, D. Dimmant has pointed out that there are overall similarities in content between 4Q180 and 4Q181 and *Jubilees*, CD, *1 Enoch*, and the HB.<sup>306</sup> For instance, the chronology is similar to *Jubilees* where the angels are

<sup>303</sup> J. Strugnell, “Notes en marge du volume V des ‘Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jorden’,” *RQ* 7 (1969-71): 252, 54.

<sup>304</sup> Critical text and translation from J. Roberts, “Wicked and Holy (4Q180-181),” in *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents: The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* (PTSDSSP 1; ed. James Charlesworth; Tubingen: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992), 206-213. For detailed discussion of the rational and sources of his restoration of any part of the forthcoming text of 4Q180 refer to his critical apparatus.

<sup>305</sup> The Watchers may have also been called בני [שמים] “sons of [heaven]” in 4Q181 Frg.2.2. However, the ink has been obliterated and the reading is not certain. See, Roberts, “Wicked and Holy,” 212-13.

<sup>306</sup> Dimmant, “Peshet on the Periods,” 95-98.

introduced after the birth of Noah's son (*Jub.* 4:33-35; 5:1ff).<sup>307</sup> Lastly, the interpretation of 4Q180 is very similar to 4Q370, which also interprets that the progeny of the angels were Mighty Men (גבורים).

#### 5. 4Q370 (50 B.C.E. – 0 C.E.)

An "Admonition Based upon the Flood" (4Q370) is of particular interest because it mentions that the גבורים died in the flood. The script of 4Q370 dates to the late Hasmonean period.<sup>308</sup> Although the story of the Watchers is not preserved in the MS, it certainly appeared in the original. However, in its present state of preservation very little can be said about 4Q370's version of the angel story. The first column of the MS gives an account of the flood which draws on *Genesis* 6-9.<sup>309</sup> Line 6 of the MS details the results of the deluge by giving a summary of all who perished including the mighty men והג[בור]ים לא נמל, "And the Gib[or]im did not escape." Therefore, this MS is in the same tradition as CD in which the giants suffer their ill fate in the flood rather than through internecine warfare as in the BW.

### VII. OTHER 1<sup>ST</sup>-CENTURY B.C.E. TEXTS WHICH ALLUDE TO THE ANGEL STORY.

#### 1. WISDOM OF SOLOMON (50 B.C.E.-0 C.E.)

Most scholars divide Wisdom into three main sections: (1) Wis 1-6:11, called the "book of eschatology"; (2) Wis 6:12-9, called the "book of wisdom"; and (3) Wis 10-19, called the "book of history."<sup>310</sup> The book of eschatology is a discourse on righteousness, wickedness, sin, immorality, death and their interrelationship culminating in God's just eschatological judgment.<sup>311</sup> The general topic is the moral demands and corresponding gifts of wisdom.<sup>312</sup> In the book of wisdom (Wis 6:12-9) the discourse turns to wisdom herself and the speaker is implicitly Solomon.<sup>313</sup> Solomon exhorts the rulers of the earth

<sup>307</sup> Dimmant, "Peshar on the Periods," 95.

<sup>308</sup> C. Newsom, "4Q370: An Admonition Based Upon the Flood," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 23.

<sup>309</sup> Martinez, "Interpretations of the Flood in DSS," 96-97; Newsom, "4Q370," 38-9.

<sup>310</sup> Holmes, "Wisdom of Solomon," *APOT*, 1.518; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 175; M. Gilbert, "Wisdom Literature," 301-304.

<sup>311</sup> L. Grabbe, *Wisdom of Solomon* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 13; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 175.

<sup>312</sup> J. Reider, *The Book of Wisdom* (JAL; New York: Harper, 1957), 2; The Book of Eschatology (1:1-6:11) begins and ends by addressing to the pagan rulers of the earth an exhortation to justice, and with a warning that those who pursue immoral ends will ultimately be exposed and convicted by Divine Wisdom [D. Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 43; Garden City: Doubleday, 1979), 4].

<sup>313</sup> Wis 7:1-6; 9:8.

to seek wisdom and asserts that wisdom is easy to gain for those who seek her. He then launches into an explanation of the characteristics of wisdom. The book of history (Wis 10-19) is “a midrash from wisdom’s and God’s activities in history, from Adam to the conquest of Canaan, with major excursions into the question of idolatry and pagan worship.”<sup>314</sup> It is in this latter section that there is a reference to the giants who perished in the Flood (Wis 14:6). Although the literary structure of Wisdom is complex, a consensus has been reached that there is a unity throughout the different sections of Wisdom on the basis of: (1) the structure of Wisdom, (2) the style of Wisdom, and (3) and the themes that run throughout Wisdom.<sup>315</sup>

Wisdom was probably originally composed in Gk. in a Jewish Hellenistic community in Alexandria. Nearly all of the textual recensions appear to have been translated from Greek version, which was transmitted in LXX.<sup>316</sup> The only significant variant text of Wisdom in the Vetus Latina, because some of its variants appear to be more original than the principal Greek versions (LXX Alexandrian and Sinaiticus).<sup>317</sup> Some have proposed that part of the original version of Wisdom was composed in a Semitic language, based upon Hebraic modes of thoughts and expression, and above all undeniable Hebraisms.<sup>318</sup> However, the arguments for a Gk. original far outweigh and, at

<sup>314</sup> Grabbe, *Wisdom*, 14.

<sup>315</sup> A concentric chiasmic structure has been found throughout Wisdom in its different thematic sections [Gilbert, “Wisdom Literature,” 301-08; A. Wright, “The Structure of the Book of Wisdom,” *Bib* 48 (1967): 165-184]. There is also unity in the style of Wisdom which can be seen in: (1) the distinctively Greek language and style used throughout Wisdom in a consistent manner [Winston, *Wisdom*, 14-18.]; (2) the use of literary techniques throughout the work such as, “flashbacks,” “diptychus,” and “synchysis;” [Gilbert, “Wisdom Literature,” 306-08; J. Reese, *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and Its Consequences* (AnBib 41; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1970), 140]; and (3) the repetition of themes and thematic words that span the different sections of Wisdom such as “the religious knowledge of God and the theological concept of ‘seeing’” [Winston, *Wisdom*, 16; Grabbe, *Wisdom*, 25; Reese, *Hellenistic Influence*, 140-45]. See also; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 181.

<sup>316</sup> MSS of Wisdom are preserved in Gk., Lat., Syr., Old Eth., Aram., Arabic, and Armenian. In Gk. Wisdom is preserved in entirety in several uncials of the LXX. The Syr. has come to us in three recensions: the Peshitta, the Syro-Hexaplaric, and the fragment of a Palestinian version from the Bodleian MS. As for the other versions: (1) the Armenian version generally follows LXX S and A, (2) the Old Ethiopic conscientiously follows the word order and sentence structure of Gk., and (3) the Aramaic and Arabic are late (13<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries respectively). There are no extant ancient Hebrew versions. See; Reider, *Wisdom*, 7; Winston, *Wisdom*, 66.

<sup>317</sup> Wis 1:15, 2:8, 2:17, 5:14, 6:1, 8:11, 9:19, 10:1, 11:5, 17:1. According to Winston this is significant because the VL’s translation of Wisdom may be based upon an earlier recension of Wisdom than the LXX [Winston, *Wisdom*, 65].

<sup>318</sup> F. Zimmermann, “The Book of Wisdom: Its Language and Character,” *JQR* 57 (1966): 1-27; E. Speiser, “The Hebrew Original of the First Part of the Book of Wisdom,” *JQR* 14 (1923/24): 455-482; C. Purinton,



times, invalidate these arguments.<sup>319</sup> Most scholars now agree that these Hebraisms couched in Gk. language are due the influence of the LXX.

There is no consensus about the date of Wisdom and proposals date from 220 B.C.E. to 50 C.E. It is generally agreed that the *terminus a quo* is the LXX because of Wisdom's quotation of LXX Isaiah. There is no consensus for the *terminus ante quem* because Wisdom shows similarities to several other works including: Philo (ca 13 B.C.E.- 50 C.E.),<sup>320</sup> the NT,<sup>321</sup> and Clement of Rome (writing about 110 C.E.).<sup>322</sup> However, caution should be taken when considering these parallels for dating purposes because it is difficult to determine priority, and furthermore, it cannot be ruled out that they both are drawing upon common sources.<sup>323</sup> Arguments for specific dates based upon historical allusions are based upon: (1) identifying the persecution in Wis 14:16-20 with the persecution of the Jews during the time of various ptolemaic leaders, [Ptolemy IV Philopator (221-204 B.C.E.), VI Philopater (180-145 B.C.E.), VIII Physcon (145-116 B.C.E.)],<sup>324</sup> and (2) identifying the apocalyptic vision in Wis 5:16-23 with the persecutions under the reign of Caligula (37-41 C.E.).<sup>325</sup> However, these arguments are also not conclusive because Wisdom gives no clear indications of its historical context.<sup>326</sup> In the light of all the conflicting opinions a general date of Wisdom is sometime in

---

"Translation Greek in the Wisdom of Solomon," *JBL* 47 (1928): 276-304; Reider, *Wisdom*, 23-24. For a list of Hebraisms see, Winston, *Wisdom*, 15.

<sup>319</sup> Reider, *Wisdom*, 24-29; Winston, *Wisdom*, 14-18; Grabbe, *Wisdom*, 24-47; Gilbert, "Wisdom Literature," 301. The few authors who have tried to reconstruct an original Hebrew or Aramaic behind the Greek text could only do so at the cost of modifications which affected the very meaning of the text because Wisdom contains technical Greek terms which are difficult to express in the Hebrew of that period. According to Reider, "the rhetorical and idiomatic style of the Greek precludes the possibility of its being a translation [Reider, *Wisdom*, 27]." Also significant is Wisdom's quotation of LXX Isa 3:10, 44:20, Job 9:12, 19, which is radically different from the MT (Wis 2:12; 15:10; 12:12). Lastly, several scholars have demonstrated that there is an overall unity in the thought and structure of Wisdom which appears to be the product of a Hellenistic Jewish author [Reese, *Hellenistic Influence*, 1-25; 122-161].

<sup>320</sup> Reider, *Wisdom*, 17-18.

<sup>321</sup> Similarities between Wisdom and the NT include: Matt 27:43, 54 and Wis 2:13, 18; Rom 1:18-23 and Wis 13:1-9; Rom 5:12 and Wis 2:24; Col 1:15-17 and Wis 7:24-26; 1 Pet 1:6-7 and Wis 3:5-6.

<sup>322</sup> Grabbe, *Wisdom*, 29; Winston, *Wisdom*, 67. It appears that Clement of Rome quotes Wis 11:21 and 12:12 in his commentary on the Epistle to the Corinthians.

<sup>323</sup> Winston, *Wisdom*, 58-62; Grabbe, *Wisdom*, 28; Gilbert, "Wisdom Literature," 313.

<sup>324</sup> C. Larcher, *Le Livre de la Sagesse ou la Sagesse de Salomon (EBib, nouvelle série 1; 3 vols.; Paris: Gabalda, 1983-85)*, 1:141-146.

<sup>325</sup> Winston, *Wisdom*, 22-25; Graabe, *Wisdom*, 88-89.

<sup>326</sup> Grabbe, *Wisdom*, 87.

between the Roman conquest of Egypt in 47 B.C.E. and the conclusion of the first century C.E.<sup>327</sup>

In a study analyzing the historical development of the angel story, it is particularly important to note that Wisdom has many connections with biblical and apocalyptic literature.<sup>328</sup> These parallels reflect, amongst other things, Wisdom's awareness of the traditional biblical interpretation. Most significantly, it explains how Wisdom's use of the angel story could completely presuppose the background of the watchers mythology. To some degree Wisdom's interpretation must have also been common knowledge to his audience, otherwise, Wisdom would have spelled out the details of his example.

Wisdom 14:6

καὶ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ἀπολλυμένων ὑπερηφάνων  
γιγάντων ἡ ἐλπίς τοῦ κόσμου ἐπὶ σχεδίας  
καταφυγοῦσα ἀπέλιπεν αἰῶνι σπέρμα  
γενέσεως τῇ σῇ κυβερνηθεῖσα χειρί

Translation<sup>329</sup>

For even in the beginning, when arrogant  
giants were dying, the hope of the world  
took refuge on an ark, and steered by your  
[God] hand left a seed of a [new]  
generation to the world.

The theme of this section of Wisdom (Wis 14:1-7) is the folly of a seafarer who trusts in a wooden figure on a ship's prow. Essentially Wisdom is arguing that although men planned and made the vessel, nevertheless, a safe voyage is directed by God. Thus, it mentions Noah's ark, and how God saved Noah and his family from the Flood as one example. However, in so doing it also mentions the giants who perished in a negative light as being ὑπερήφανος, "arrogant, or proud." Thus, it can be deduced that Wisdom was at least aware of the tradition that the wayward giants perished in the Flood. This mythological background in Gen 6 of the בני אלֹהִים, and their giant progeny the נפִלִים, is implied by the context Wisdom in which the giants are mentioned in connection with the Flood.

<sup>327</sup> Winston has hypothesized that the language of Wisdom belongs to the first part of the first century C.E. because he has found at least 35 words that occur in Wisdom and are not attested as occurring in literature before the first century.

<sup>328</sup> Nickelsburg has pointed out striking parallels between Wis 5:1-8 and the servant poem in Isaiah 52:13-53:12 [Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 179]. Wisdom also employs biblical arguments in its repudiation of idols in 12:24-13:19, which are parallel in imagery and logic Jer 10:1-16 and Isa 44:9-20. In addition, there are also striking parallels between the book of eschatology and apocalyptic literature. For instance, the ultimate reality of the heavenly world (as described in Wisdom) is an important constituent of such texts as Dan 7:1-12; *1 En.* 37-71, 92-105; *2 Bar.* 51. Lastly, there are also many contacts with NT literature. Significant examples of similarities in interpretation can be found in: the story of the righteous persecuted one (Wis 2:13, 18 and Matt 27:43), and Paul's argument against paganism (Rom 1:18-27 and Wis 13-15).

<sup>329</sup> English translation is mine.

It should be recalled at this point that this idea – that the giants perished in the Flood – is not part of the earliest forms of the traditions in the LXX, BW, Ben Sira, and *Jubilees*. It could, however, be deduced from the narrative in Genesis 6 in which the judgment of God immediately follows the pericope containing the account of the angels' descent and their cohabitation with mankind. Therefore, this interpretation appears to be at its core dependent upon traditional interpretation of the Flood story in Genesis 6, rather than on the mythology of the בני אלהים. According to the sources available to study from this period this interpretation emerged in the middle of the second century B.C.E. as is reflected in the Book of Dreams (*1 Enoch*), Pseudo-Eupolemus, and the Damascus Document. Furthermore, it persisted in the literature of the following period as 4Q370, Wisdom 14:6, *3 Macc.* 2:4, *Sib. Or.* 1:88-103, 2:232, and *3 Bar.* 4:10 demonstrate.

## 2. 3 MACCABEES (1<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY B.C.E. – 1<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY C.E.).

*3 Maccabees* is a model example of the interpretation that the giants died in the Flood as result of the direct judgment of God. It is also an illustration of the angel story transformed into the "giant story," which occurs within many sources during the Second Temple period. The giant's ill fate is mentioned in passing as a negative example of those who commit injustice, and the Watchers' exploits are completely neglected. Overall in *3 Maccabees* this example from Israel's sacred history fits well into *3 Maccabees'* genre which is historical romance,<sup>330</sup> or pathetic history.<sup>331</sup>

The topic of *3 Maccabees* is the struggle of the Egyptian Jewry under the persecution of Ptolemy IV Philopater (221-203 B.C.E.). It was originally written in Greek and has been transmitted in the LXX, Peshitta, and Armenian Bible.<sup>332</sup> *3 Maccabees'* interest in Egyptian Jewry, and its similarity with the *Letter of Aristeas* and *2 Maccabees*, suggests the book was written in Egypt.<sup>333</sup> It was associated with *2 Maccabees* in the LXX on account of their common themes of religious oppression and divine deliverance. However, an alternative title of *3 Maccabees* is found in some

<sup>330</sup> DeSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha*, 310-11; H. Anderson, "3 Maccabees," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985), 2.510; M. Hadas, *The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees* (New York: Harper, 1953), 13-15.

<sup>331</sup> Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 118, 169.

<sup>332</sup> C. Emmet, "The Third Book of Maccabees," in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (ed. R. Charles; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 1.155; Anderson, "3 Maccabees," *OTP*, 2.510. *3 Macc.* is in codices Alexandria and Venetus, but is not in the earlier codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus (4<sup>th</sup> century).

<sup>333</sup> DeSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha*, 307; Anderson, "3 Maccabees," *OTP*, 2.512.

ancient book lists of πτολεμαϊκά “things pertaining to Ptolemy.”<sup>334</sup>

The date of the book cannot be determined with great accuracy because there is no internal evidence which suggests a specific date.<sup>335</sup> Therefore, many scholars have attempted to identify its date through comparison to other literature such as (the additions to) Daniel,<sup>336</sup> 2 Maccabees, the *Letter of Aristeas*,<sup>337</sup> and Esther.<sup>338</sup> The similarities between 3 Maccabees, and 2 Maccabees, and the *Letter of Aristeas*, would put the *terminus a quo* in the conclusion of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.E. The vocabulary of the work has also been used as a basis for dating. For example, it is argued that the technical language of the book also suggests a date of the Ptolemaic period (160-60 B.C.E.).<sup>339</sup> However, others posit that the term λαογραφία “registration” (2:28) reflects the census taken by Augustus in 24/23 B.C.E.,<sup>340</sup> although this term is also found in the Greek from the Ptolemaic period as well.<sup>341</sup> In summary there is no internal evidence which identifies 3 Maccabees to a specific date and a very broad dating is preferable from 1<sup>st</sup> century B.C.E.<sup>342</sup>

Maccabees begins by describing the attempt of Ptolemy IV to enter the holy of holies in the temple in Jerusalem (1:1-2:24) and his failure on account of the miraculous intervention of God (2:21-24) on account of a prayer by the high priest Simon (2:1-20). In this fervent prayer Simon makes reference to the giants as an example of God’s just judgment of those “who have done anything in insolence and arrogance” (2:3).

3 Macc. 2:4

σὺ τοὺς ἔμπροσθεν ἀδικίαν ποιήσαντας ἐν  
οἷς καὶ γίγαντες ἦσαν ῥώμῃ καὶ θράσει  
πεποιθότες διέφθειρας ἐπαγαγὼν αὐτοῖς

Translation<sup>343</sup>

You destroyed those who in the past  
committed injustice, among whom were  
even giants who trusted in their strength

<sup>334</sup> Emmet, “Third Book of Maccabees,” *APOT*, 1.162.

<sup>335</sup> DeSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha*, 307-08.

<sup>336</sup> DeSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha*, 307

<sup>337</sup> Anderson, “3 Maccabees,” *OTP*, 2.515-16; Emmet, “Third Book of Maccabees,” *APOT*, 1.156-7; S. Tracy, “III Maccabees and Pseudo-Aristeas: A Study,” *YCS* 1 (1928): 244-47; Hadas, *Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees*, 8-10; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 172.

<sup>338</sup> Moore, *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah*, 195-99; Hadas, *Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees*, 6-8.

<sup>339</sup> DeSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha*, 308; Emmet, “Third Book of Maccabees,” *APOT*, 1.157-8; D. Williams, “3 Maccabees: A Defense of Diaspora Judaism?” *JSP* 13 (1995): 20-21.

<sup>340</sup> V. Tcherikover, “The Third Book of Maccabees as a Historical Source,” in *Studies in History* (ScrHier 7; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961), 11-18; J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 124-5.

<sup>341</sup> Emmet, “Third Book of Maccabees,” *APOT*, 1.158,165; Anderson, “3 Maccabees,” *OTP*, 2.512.

<sup>342</sup> VanderKam, *Introduction to Early Judaism*, 80-81.

<sup>343</sup> English translation is from the RSV.

One notable characteristic of *3 Maccabees*' reference to the giants is the lack of any mention of the Watchers in the context of the Flood story. This is particularly surprising since, the origin of the Watchers, i.e., the בני אלוהים are the center piece of Gen 6:1-4 which is the prelude to the Flood in Genesis. Furthermore, the Watchers are the centerpiece of the later Enochic watchers mythology. However, in *3 Maccabees* the story is focused on the giants, which, it should be recalled, would not have existed without the בני אלוהים.

As we have seen this version of the angel story, which turned into a story about the giants, can be found in other earlier works from this period as well. As early as the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.E. the giants are mentioned without the Watchers (Sir 16:7; Bar 3:26; 4Q531; Ps.-Eup.; Wis 14:6). In addition to this, frequently in these works the giants also serve as a negative example (Sir 16:7; Bar 3:26; CD 2.14-21; Wis 14:6). Thus, in *3 Maccabees* the giants are one of the many negative examples Simon brings from the sacred history of Israel (2:5-6).

Overall *3 Maccabees* bears a striking resemblance to Sirach's use of the giant story which dates from the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.E. (Sir 16:6-23). For instance, both mention only the giants. Furthermore, both make reference to giants as one in a series of negative examples from Israel's sacred history as part of the literary strategy of the author. Literarily speaking the reference to the giants in both of these texts is part of the literary strategy of briefly citing examples from Israel's history to illustrate a point. For example, negative examples in Sirach include: 1) Sir 16:7 refers to Gen 6:1-4, 2) Sir 16:8 refers to Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 18-19), and 3) Sir 16: 10 refers to the story of Israel's "eating of quails" during their sojourn (Num 11). In *3 Maccabees* other negative examples include Sodom and Gomorrah and Pharaoh (2:5-6). Therefore, as these two texts demonstrate, the usage of the angel story which emphasizes the giants as a negative example from Israel's sacred history dates back to early 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.E. and continued into the 1<sup>st</sup> century C.E.

### 3. SIBYLLINE ORACLES (TURN OF ERAS)

The phenomenon of Sibylline oracles is widely attested in the ancient world,<sup>344</sup> and in the Jewish literary tradition the Sibyl is identified as the daughter of Noah (*Sib. Or.* 1:289;3:827).<sup>345</sup> The most characteristic feature of the Judeo-Christian *Sibylline Oracles* is the prediction of ill fate for mankind, which was often directed at one particular group. The standard collection of Judeo-Christian *Sibylline Oracles* numbers books one through twelve, although the MSS tradition is convoluted.<sup>346</sup> They were written in Greek over a span of more than 700 years and are, in their final state, a product of both Jewish and Christian literary activity.<sup>347</sup>

Books 1 and 2, which make reference to the Watchers and the giants, are generally recognized as originally being a Jewish work written around the turn of the era in Asia Minor.<sup>348</sup> Books 1 and 2 are not separated in the MSS and were originally a single Jewish work to which extensive Christian additions were made.<sup>349</sup> The original Jewish *Sibylline Oracles* was built after the pattern of 10 generations, the first 7 of which are preserved without interpolations (1:1-323).<sup>350</sup> In this section the first reference to the angel story is made (1:88-108). Book 2 has many Christian and Jewish elements intertwined and it is difficult to ascertain the original Jewish stratum from the later Christian adaptations.<sup>351</sup> The second reference to the angel story falls within this

<sup>344</sup> H. Lanchester, "The Sybilline Oracles," in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (ed. R. Charles; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 2.386-371; J. Collins, "The Sibylline Oracles," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2.2; ed. M. Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 358-362.

<sup>345</sup> J. Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 1. 317.

<sup>346</sup> The MS tradition of the *Sibylline Oracles* consists of twelve books in two distinct collections numbered 1-8 and 9-14. Books 9 and 10, which are found in the second collection, are omitted in the critical editions because they repeat information found in the first collection of 1-8 (eg., *Sib. Or.* 10 = *Sib. Or.* 4). See, Collins, "The Sibylline Oracles," 357.

<sup>347</sup> VanderKam, *Introduction to Early Judaism*, 107.

<sup>348</sup> A. Kurfess, "Christian Sibyllines," in *New Testament Apocrypha* (ed. E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher; trans. R. Wilson; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), 708; *ibid.*, "Oracula Sibyllina I-II," *ZNW* 40 (1941): 160-165; Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," 358, 377-78; *ibid.*, "Sibylline Oracles," *OTP*, 1.331. Concerning the Sibylline Oracles' provenance see; Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," *OTP*, 1.332.

<sup>349</sup> A. Rzach, "Sibyllinische Orakel," in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Zweiter Band 2A; ed. G. Wissowa; Stuttgart: J.B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1923), 2146-2151; J. Geffcken, *Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracula Sibyllina* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs Buchhandlung, 1902), 47-53; Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," 376-77; *ibid.*, "Sibylline Oracles," *OTP*, 1.331; Kurfess, "Christian Sibyllines," 707.

<sup>350</sup> Geffcken, *Komposition und Entstehungszeit*, 47; Rzach, "Sibyllinische Orakel," in *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, 2146; Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," *OTP*, 1.331.

<sup>351</sup> Kurfess, "Christian Sibyllines," 707.

category (2:232) and therefore could possibly be Jewish or Christian.<sup>352</sup>

The story of the Flood is the most prominent parallel between the *Sibylline Oracles* and the Bible. It is based upon the LXX version of the Flood, but also accounts for details not included in the biblical narrative but which are part of the watcher mythology. For instance, the punishment meted out to the angels and the giants corresponds to the mythology of the Watchers prevalent during this period, which has its roots in the Enochic watchers story. The Watchers are chained in a fiery hell (*1 En.* 90:23; 10: 6, 12-13), and the giants suffer their demise through the Flood (*1 En.* 89:9).

Sib. Or. 1:98-103<sup>353</sup>

Ἄλλοι δ' ἄλλα ἕκαστα μεμηλότα  
τεχνῶντο, γρήγοροι<sup>354</sup> ἀλφειστήρες  
ἐπωνυμίας μετέχοντες ταύτης, ὅτι μετὰ  
θρέσ' ἀκοίμητον νόον εἶχιν ἄπλητόν τε  
δέμας· στιβαροὶ μεγάλῳ ἐπὶ εἶδει ἦσαν·  
ὅμως δ' ἔμολον ὑπὸ ταρτάριον δόμον  
αἰνὸν δεσμοῖς ἀρρήκτοις πεφυλαγμένοι  
ἐξαποτίσαι ἐς γέεναν μελεροῦ λάβρου  
πυρὸς ἀκαμάτιο.

Translation<sup>355</sup>

Others (i.e., angels) each devised that which they took interest in, [these were the] enterprising Watchers, who received this appellation because they had a sleepless mind in their hearts and were immense in body. They were mighty, of great form, but nevertheless they went under the dread house of Tartarus guarded by unbreakable bonds, to make retribution, to Gehenna of terrible, raging, undying fire.

The section in which that above excerpt is found within the *Sibylline Oracles* is contrasting the righteous exploits of the second generation of mankind, such as carpentry, astronomy, and medicine (*Sib. Or.* 1. 90-98), with the wicked deeds of the Watchers who made μεμηλότα or “that which they took interest” or more literally “that which they cared about.”<sup>356</sup> This could very well be an allusion to the illicit pedagogy of Watchers in the Asael myth of the BW, where the angels make instruments of war, metallurgy, sorcery, and astrology (*1 En.* 7:1; 8:1-3).

The *Sibylline Oracles* describes the Watchers as having a “sleepless mind in their hearts,” and being “mighty, great in form.” The former descriptive phrase is most

<sup>352</sup> Collins, “Sibylline Oracles,” 377; 378-79; Kurfess, “Christian Sibyllines,” 707; Rzach, “Sibyllinische Orakel,” in *PW*, 2150.

<sup>353</sup> Greek text from; A. Rzach, *Oracula Sibyllina* (Vienna: F. Tempsey, 1891), 12-14; 41-2.

<sup>354</sup> Γρήγοροι is surely referring οἱ ἐγρήγοροι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ “the Watchers of heaven” as in Enochic mythology. See; Rzach, *Oracula Sibyllina*, 13; *ibid*, Rzach, “Sibyllinische Orakel,” in *PW*, 2147.

<sup>355</sup> English translation is mine.

<sup>356</sup> The Greek root μέλω has both connotations. See, Lidell and Scott, *Greek-English Dictionary*, 438.

probably a reference to lusting of Watchers which is also paralleled in the BW (*1 En.* 6:1). The prepositional phrase μετὰ θρέσ “in their hearts” further defines the nature of their sleepless minds by describing where<sup>357</sup> they had a sleepless mind. The meaning of root θρέν as “heart, or seat of the passions” makes this denotation clear.<sup>358</sup> The later descriptive phrase is more problematic. As has been shown in this paper other literature of the Second Temple period attributes the giants as being mighty and tall in stature, rather than their parents. The use of the two descriptive phrases ἄπλητόν . . . δέμας “immense in body,” and στιβαροὶ μεγάλῳ ἐπὶ εἵδει ἦσαν, “they were mighty, of great form” assures the reader that this a physical attribute. Apparently, in the *Sibylline Oracles* this additional note is explaining a lacuna in the biblical account by positing that the giants inherited their tall stature from their parents. Thus in *Sib. Or.* 2 there is an amalgamation of the giants and the angels into one being. The sons of God were giant angels and their progeny were the giants. This explains the later reference to the angels as giants (γίγαντες) in *Sib Or.* 1:123 as well as their description as being great in form. In this next passage the *Sibylline Oracles* describes the fate of the giants:

| <u>Sib. Or. 2.231-3</u>  | <u>Translation</u>   |
|--|--|
| καὶ πάσας μορφὰς πολυπενθέας ἐς κρίσιν<br>ἄξει εἰδῶλων ῥα μάλστα παλαιγενέων<br>Τιτῆνων ἠδὲ τε Γιγάντων καὶ ὅσας εἶλεν<br>κατακυσμός | And will lead all the mournful forms to<br>judgment, especially those of ancient<br>phantoms, Titans and the Giants which the<br>Flood killed. |

In a section describing the resurrection of the dead and eschatological judgment of souls, the *Sibylline Oracles* makes reference to the ancient phantoms. Furthermore, it equates these ancient phantoms with the giants. The word used for phantom is εἰδῶλον, which is a word that describes in Greek the “spectre of a dead person.”<sup>359</sup> Thus, it appears that these phantoms are the disembodied spirits of the giants. The idea that the souls of the giants will be free to reap havoc until the final day of judgment is also found in BW: “From the day of the slaughter and destruction and death of the giants, from the soul of whose flesh the spirits are proceeding, . . . they will make desolate until the day of

<sup>357</sup> This is an unusual dative locative with the preposition μετὰ. See, H. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), §1692.

<sup>358</sup> Lidell and Scott, *Greek-English Dictionary*, 768.

<sup>359</sup> Lidell and Scott, *An Abridged Lexicon*, 196.



the consummation of the great judgment" (1 En. 16:1).<sup>360</sup>

In conclusion, as this analysis has shown there are many similarities between the BW and the *Sibylline Oracles*. However, these similarities should not obscure the differences in the *Sibylline Oracles* which are just as significant. In the BW the giants do not perish in the Flood but rather in internecine warfare. However, here as in the majority of Jewish literature that makes reference to the angel story from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.E. through the 1<sup>st</sup> century C.E., the giants perished in the flood (cf., 1 En. 89:6; CD 2:19-21; 4Q370; Ps. Eup. Frag. 1; Wis 15:6; 3 Macc. 2:4).

#### 4. PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA (20 B.C.E. – 40 C.E.)

Philo was an Hellenistic Jew from a wealthy and prominent family in Alexandria who composed many expository studies on the Pentateuch.<sup>361</sup> Philo's hermeneutic is essentially an amalgam of Greek philosophical thought and theological interpretation of Jewish scriptures. On the one hand, his writings are infused with many Greek philosophical notions, and on the other, Philo was doubtlessly following Jewish exegetical principles when commenting on the Pentateuch. Therefore, he surely would have been familiar with the traditional interpretation of the Genesis 6:1-4 which was taught and transmitted in the Jewish synagogues in Alexandria.<sup>362</sup> Furthermore, he was influenced by the Greek translation of the HB and most likely used it as his base text for the angel story. On account of this, his interpretation of the passage assumes הגנפלים are giants as the LXX translates. Ironically, although Philo was a devout Jew, his writings became very influential in the Christian church and were transmitted solely by Christian authors throughout the centuries.<sup>363</sup>

In Philo's interpretation of Gen 6:1-4, which he discusses in his work called *On Giants* the angel story fits into the larger context of the Flood story. Throughout his interpretation of the Flood in *On Giants* three levels of interpretation are evident: 1) the historical event, which in the case of the angels story he simply asserts that it occurred; 2)

<sup>360</sup> Cf., *Jub.* 10:1-4; 1 *En.* 10:15; 15:8-11; *Test. Sol.* 5:3, 17:1-5.

<sup>361</sup> P. Borgen, "Philo of Alexandria," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2.2; ed. M. Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 252; R. Williamson, *Jews in the Hellenistic World: Philo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 1-2; VanderKam, *Introduction to Early Judaism*, 138.

<sup>362</sup> Concerning the synagogue and other religious institutions in Second Temple Judaism see; Gafni, "Historical Background," 22-24; Safrai, "The Temple," 908-44; *ibid.*, *World History of the Jewish People: Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period*, 65-98.

<sup>363</sup> D. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature* (CRINT 3; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1993), 16-30.

the lessons to be drawn from it; and 3) the allegorical interpretation, which is the focus of his exposition on Gen 6:1-4.<sup>364</sup> In the case of the angel story it is difficult to glean elucidation of the literal meaning of the biblical text from Philo's allegorical interpretation in *On Giants*.<sup>365</sup> On an allegorical level he interprets that the "angels of God" can describe good angels and wicked angels, i.e, demons (*Gig.* 6, 16). The implication is that in Gen. 6:1-4 they represent demons, however, he does not clarify this thought. Furthermore, the angels of God represent those who seek solely the daughters of men or the sensual pleasures of life (*Gig.* 17-18; *Deus* 3). He also asserts that the giants represent one of the three classes of souls (*Gig.* 58-59). The giants are the earth born class (γίγας being associated with γηγενής).<sup>366</sup> This class is opposed to the heavenly born who cultivate the mind and the virtues.

Overall, Philo's interpretation does not elaborate much on the literal meaning of the text, however, it appears from references elsewhere in Philo that he presupposes on a literal level that the angels of God are incorporeal demons that descended into the bodies of men in order to fulfill their lustful sexual desires with women (*Gig.* 12-13,17; *QG* 1:92; *Deus* 1-3).<sup>367</sup> In his commentary on Genesis, called *Questions and Answers on Genesis*,<sup>368</sup> he states in comment to the question, "why were the giants born from angels and women?" that although, "the substance of the angels is spiritual, it often happens that they imitate the forms of men and for immediate purposes, as in respect of knowing women for the sake of begetting Giants" (*QG* 1:92). Thus it appears that underlying Philo's allegorical interpretation is an understanding that the angels of God *took form* (μεταμορφόομαι) in human bodies and had sexual intercourse which produced giants.<sup>369</sup> However, he does not elaborate because for him this historical event is of little importance in comparison to its symbolic meaning.

<sup>364</sup> Lewis, *Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature*, 42-3.

<sup>365</sup> Concerning Philo's allegorical hermeneutic see; Borgen, "Philo of Alexandria," 242-243; 262-264; Williamson, *Philo*, 144-48.

<sup>366</sup> Philo, *On Giants*, 445.

<sup>367</sup> Lewis, *Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature*, 44-45. His interpretation shows similarity to the phantom forms of *T. Reuben* 5:1-7 and explains why it was necessary for them to change form.

<sup>368</sup> Most of the Greek original of this work has been lost and our present text is largely dependent upon the Armenian version.

<sup>369</sup> Philo in *QG* 1:92 uses the verb μεταμορφόομαι which means "to be transformed, or imitate form." Therefore, the angels "imitate the forms of men and for immediate purposes, as in respect of knowing women and for the sake of begetting giants."

In summary, Philo's main influence was the LXX and he shows no influence from the Enochic watchers mythology. Philo also includes novel features in his interpretation of Gen 6:1-4, which appear to be based upon difficulties of the biblical story. For example, he answers the question concerning the difficulty of angelic beings having sexual relationships with mankind by interpreting that the angelic beings took human forms.

## 5. FLAVIOUS JOSEPHUS (37C.E.-100 C.E.)

Josephus is the most important source for Jewish history of the first century C.E. According to his autobiography (*Life* 2,5) Josephus was a member of a prominent priestly Jewish family in Jerusalem and was born the first year of the reign of Gaius Caligula (37 C.E.). He relates that he finished his monolithic history of the Jewish people (20 Books), called *Jewish Antiquities*, in the thirteenth year of Domitian 93 C.E. In it he covers the history of the Jewish people from Genesis to before the war with Rome (ca. 66 C.E.).<sup>370</sup> Essentially the first ten books of *Jewish Antiquities* are a lengthy paraphrase of the Bible, which contain additions and omissions with the aim of explication and dramatization of the text, and resolution of theological difficulties.<sup>371</sup> Furthermore, Josephus draws upon a wide variety of sources for his embellishments of the biblical narrative.<sup>372</sup> One of these biblical stories which contain embellishments is his re-telling Genesis 6:1-4.

Josephus records how mankind had become wicked in the time before the flood: "[Mankind] abandoned the customs of their fathers for a life of depravity . . . they no longer took account justice towards men, but displayed by their actions a zeal for vice" (*Ant.* 1:72). It is in this background of the depravity of mankind that Josephus recounts how the angels of God consorted with women and begat wicked sons.

<sup>370</sup> P. Bilde, *Flavious Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome* (JSPSup 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), 80-92.

<sup>371</sup> S. Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome* (Boston: Leiden, 2002), 35-41; H. Attridge, "Josephus and His Works," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2.2; ed. M. Stone; Fortress: Philadelphia, 1984), 211; L. Feldman, *Josephus' Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 14-30.

<sup>372</sup> Feldman, *Josephus' Interpretation*, 14-18; Bilde, *Flavious Josephus*, 92-99; Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee*, 24-47; Attridge, "Josephus and His Works," 211-216.

Ant. 1:73

πολλοὶ γὰρ ἄγγελοι θεοῦ γυναιξὶ  
συνιόντες ὑβριστὰς ἐγέννησαν παῖδας καὶ  
παντὸς ὑπερόπτας καλοῦ διὰ τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ  
δυνάμει πεποίθησιν ὅμοια τοῖς ὑπὸ  
γιγάντων τετολμῆσθαι λεγομένοις ὅφ'  
Ἑλλήνων καὶ οὗτοι δράσαι παραδίδονται

Translation<sup>373</sup>

For many angels of God had intercourse  
with women, and gave birth to sons who  
were insolent and disdainfully haughty of  
all that was good, because of the  
confidence they had in their own strength.  
For, according to tradition, they dared to do  
that which is said by the Greeks to have  
been done by the giants.

The most glaring difference between Josephus and previous literature of the Second Temple period is that the offspring of the union between the angels of God and the daughters of men were not giants but rather overbearing and wicked men. In actuality, this interpretation conforms more to later rabbinic interpretation than to Jewish literature of the Second Temple period.<sup>374</sup> Josephus states that their great strength enabled them to do feats which resembled the acts of the giants in Greek literature.<sup>375</sup> Thus, they are giant in strength rather than stature.<sup>376</sup>

Overall Josephus' portrayal is similar to *Jubilees* in the sense that the biblical text<sup>377</sup> is the point of departure and, hence, the main purpose for the story is to explain why the flood took place rather than elaborate on the story of the Watchers. Thus, the angel story serves as an explanation for the increase of antediluvian sin. Firstly, he accounts for the increase of sin through the degeneration of Seth's descendants. Secondly, he uses the story in Gen 6:1-4 as an example of the further moral degradation of mankind. Thus, Josephus places the culpability upon mankind, rather than the giants, for the state of affairs upon the earth (*Ant.* 1:70-72). In this sense his interpretation is remarkably different from the Enochic watchers mythology.

### VIII. THE EPISTLES OF 2 PETER AND JUDE (CIRCA 80 C.E.)

<sup>373</sup> English translation is mine.

<sup>374</sup> This interpretation is similar to later rabbinic interpretation in which the sons of God were interpreted to be nobles and their sons overbearing princes. The tradition that the sons of God were angels, and their sons giants, almost completely disappeared in rabbinic literature and continued only in sparse occurrences, such as marginal glosses in the tagummim (*Tg. Neof.* Gen 6:1-6; *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 6:4; *Gen. Rab.* 26.5). See also; Lewis, *Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature*, 92-101.

<sup>375</sup> Hesoid (*Theogony*, 185) describes the giants that came up from the earth to reap havoc when it was impregnated with the blood of heaven. They are also described by Homer (*Odessey* 7:59;10:120).

<sup>376</sup> Lewis, *Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature*, 77.

<sup>377</sup> The biblical text most likely used by Josephus was the LXX. See; Lewis, *Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature*, 82.

The epistles of 2 Peter and Jude are admonitions warning against false teachers who had made their way into the church.<sup>378</sup> Jude is ascribed to the brother of James and Jesus, and was written around the year 80 C.E. (Jude 1:1). However, pseudepigraphical authorship of the epistle can not be ruled out.<sup>379</sup> Likewise, the epistle of 2 Peter is ascribed to Simeon Peter (2 Pet 1:1), but this is scarcely accepted in the current trends in scholarship on account of internal evidence.<sup>380</sup> There are many similarities between 2 Peter and Jude (cf., Jude 4-13. 16-18 || 2 Pet 2:1-18; 3:1-3), and most modern commentary has assumed the priority of Jude over 2 Peter, and hence, 2 Peter's literary dependence upon Jude.<sup>381</sup> However, dependence upon a common source cannot be ruled out.<sup>382</sup> Based upon 2 Peter's literary relationship to Jude, the author's attitude to a collection of Pauline letters (2 Pet 3:15), and the lack of any direct quotation to *1 Enoch*, a conservative dating for 2 Peter is late 1<sup>st</sup> century (80-100 C.E.), although on this evidence an early 2<sup>nd</sup> century date cannot be excluded.<sup>383</sup>

Both 2 Peter and Jude make strategic use of the tradition of the fallen Watchers and their antediluvian sins in order to illustrate their denunciation against false teachers.<sup>384</sup> In order to understand why they used the angel story it is critical to understand where their use of the tradition falls within their polemic against false teaching. As has been stressed in J. Neyrey's commentary on 2 Peter and Jude, two areas that both 2 Peter and Jude focus on in their denunciation of false teachers are their sexual impurity and insubordination.<sup>385</sup>

<sup>378</sup> R. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC 50; Waco: Word Books, 1983). 11-13; 154-156; C. Osburn, "2 Peter"; "Jude," in *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 2000), 750, 1039.

<sup>379</sup> See Bauckman for a cogent argument for Jude's authorship [Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 14-15]. Pseudepigraphical authorship is largely argued for on the basis of the high level of Greek used in Jude. See, J. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude* (BNTC; Adam and Charles: London, 1969), 231-34; E. Sidebottom, *James, Jude, and 2 Peter* (Thomas Nelson: London, 1967), 78-79; B. Reicke, *The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude* (AB 37; Doubleday: New York, 1964), 190-91.

<sup>380</sup> Bauckman, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 158-162; Sidebottom, *James, Jude, and 2 Peter*, 99-100; Reicke, *James, Peter, and Jude*, 143-45; Kelly, *Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 235-237.

<sup>381</sup> J. Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude* (AB 37C; Doubleday, New York, 1993), 120-22; Bauckman, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 141-43; Kelly, *Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 225-230.

<sup>382</sup> Bauckman, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 141; Reicke, *James, Peter, and Jude*, 189-90.

<sup>383</sup> Reicke, *James, Peter, and Jude*, 144; Bauckman, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 157-58; Kelly, *Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 237. Furthermore, the scoffer's objection in 2 Pet 3: 4 corresponds well with this period which was marked by disillusionment regarding the second coming [Osburn, "2 Peter," 1040].

<sup>384</sup> J. Charles, "Jude's Use of Pseudepigraphical Source-Material as a Part of a Literary Strategy," *NTS* 37 (1991): 130-145; VanderKam and Alder, *Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage*, 63.

<sup>385</sup> Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, 10-13, 21-32, 52-3, 64-69, 87-88, 136-38, 153-54, 160, 192, 200, 220.

Purity in the ancient Jewish mind pertained to a variety of areas including the way the body is regulated.<sup>386</sup> Specifically in Jude and 2 Peter, the false teachers are accused of sexual impurity. Purity was not solely a cultic matter, but it also served as a metaphor for moral and religious behavior, primarily in regard to sexual activity.<sup>387</sup> In this manner sexual purity was associated with holiness. Therefore, Jude accuses the false teachers of being stains (Jude 12,13) who practice debauchery (Jude 4) and defilement of the flesh (Jude 8) in contrast to his audience who should be without blemish (Jude 24). Peter, as well, focuses on the sexual impurity of the false teachers (2 Pet 2:13-20). For example, he characterizes them as blots and blemishes (2 Pet 2:13) who follow the polluting desires of the flesh (2 Pet 2:10). Secondly, Jude characterizes the false teachers as those who “flout authority” (v. 8), and “insult and revile figures of status within the hierarchical world of the church (v.15).<sup>388</sup> Likewise, 2 Peter characterizes his opponents as false teachers who deny the Master (2 Pet 2:1) and despise of authority (2 Pet 2:10).

Peter and Jude also assure their audience that these sexually immoral false teachers will be judged. Thus, Peter brings examples from God’s past judgments in the Bible in order to indicate what the future holds for these heretics. Likewise Jude makes use of well known examples from God’s past judgments in Bible in order to describe and denounce the heretics. For example, Jude 5-7 uses the examples of the generation of the sojourn, the fallen angels in Gen 6:1-4, and Sodom and Gomorrah; and in vv. 10-13 he brings the examples of Cain, Balaam, and Korah.<sup>389</sup> Peter, on the other hand, brings the examples of the fallen angels, Noah’s flood, Sodom and Gomorrah, and Balaam (2 Pet 2:10-16). In both of these writings one of these negative examples is the story of the fallen angels in Gen 6:1-4.

| <u>Jude 6</u>  | <u>Translation</u> <sup>390</sup>  | <u>2 Pet 2:4</u>  | <u>Translation</u>  |
|--|--|---|---|
| ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ<br>τηρήσαντας τὴν<br>ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ<br>ἀπολιπόντας τὸ | And the angels that<br>did not keep their<br>own position but left<br>their proper | Εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς<br>ἀγγέλων<br>ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ<br>ἐφείσατο ἀλλὰ | For if God did not<br>spare the angels<br>when they sinned,<br>but cast them into |

<sup>386</sup> Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, 10-13, 31-32, 52-53, 136-38, 153-4; J. Neusner, *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 108-119; *ibid.*, “History and Purity in First-Century Judaism,” *HR* 18 (1978): 1-17.

<sup>387</sup> Neusner, *The Idea of Purity*, 108.

<sup>388</sup> Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, 32.

<sup>389</sup> Neyrey, *2 Peter, Jude*, 59-60, 72-73.

<sup>390</sup> English translations of Jude and 2 Peter follow the RSV unless otherwise noted.

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| ἴδιον οἰκητήριον<br>εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης<br>ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς<br>ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον<br>τετήρηκεν, | dwelling have been<br>kept by him in<br>eternal chains in the<br>nether gloom until<br>the judgment of the<br>great day. | σειραῖς ζόφου<br>ταρταρώσας<br>παρέδωκεν εἰς<br>κρίσιν τηρουμένους, | hell and committed<br>them to pits of<br>nether gloom to be<br>kept until the<br>judgment. |
|---|--|---|--|

Jude 6 characterizes the sin of the angels as not “keeping” their position. However, 2 Peter 2:4 does not specify which sin the angels committed and only states that they sinned. The verb used in Jude 6 is τηρέω, which means “to keep.” However, this verb is used at times with the meaning of keeping back or guarding one’s sexual state.<sup>391</sup> In this manner it is also related in the NT to keeping from marrying or keeping ones virginity (eg., 1 Cor 7:37). The text does not explicitly define what the angels should have guarded and only adds that they did not guard “their own position” ἐαυτῶν ἀρχὴν. However, what position is Jude referring to? Jude could be referring to the sexual state of the angels, which they did not keep or guard when they had sexual intercourse. Secondly, Jude further describes the sin of the angels as leaving behind their proper dwelling.<sup>392</sup> The noun translated as “dwelling” οἰκητήριον means most basically home, and Jude is here referring to is their heavenly abode. Thus, overall in this verse, Jude is accusing the angels for leaving their proper heavenly estate for the purpose of engaging in marriage here on earth.

It is clear that the sin of the angels in both Jude and 2 Peter is associated with sexual immorality not only because of the angel story’s association with Sodom, but also because of the accusations made by Jude and Peter against their adversaries of sexual immorality (Jude 8; 2 Pet 2:10). Jude 7 compares the sins of the fallen angels to Sodom and Gomorrah by the use of ὡς “as” and the τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον “in a similar manner.” Jude 1:7 characterizes those sins as “unnatural lust” σαρκὸς ἐτέρας, which the KJV ingeniously translates as “strange flesh.” However, why did Jude choose to describe the sexual immorality of the Sodomites and the fallen angels with going after strange flesh? Could it be because the men of Sodom desired to have sexual relationships with not only

<sup>391</sup> “τηρέω” in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (vol. 8; ed. G. Friedrich; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1969), 141; “τηρέω” in *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (ed. J. Thayer; Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977), 622.

<sup>392</sup> The verb “leave” ἀπολείπω means here “leaving behind, or abandoning.” See; *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, 64.

Abraham, but also with his traveling companions who were angels (Gen 19:1-12)? Thus, the story of the angels who had sexual intercourse with strange flesh, i.e., mankind, in Gen 6:1-4 is associated with the sexual immorality of Sodom. In order to understand where this story fits in the overall literary scheme of 2 Peter and Jude a general comparison will follow.

### **The Opponents**

But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will be false teachers among you, who will secretly bring in destructive heresies, even denying the Master who bought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction. And many will follow their licentiousness, and because of them the way of truth will be reviled. (2 Pet 2:1-2)

### **Historical Examples**

**1. Fallen Angels** - For if God did not spare the angels when they sinned, but cast them into hell and committed them to pits of nether gloom to be kept until the judgment. (2 Pet 2:4)

**2. Noah's Flood** - If he did not spare the ancient world, but preserved Noah, a herald of righteousness, with seven other persons, when he brought a flood upon the world of the ungodly;  
(2 Pet 2:5)

**3. Sodom and Gomorrah** - If by turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah to ashes

### **The Opponents**

For certain men have crept in, who ages ago were marked out for judgment. Godless men, who turned away from God's favor to sexual immorality and deny our only Master and Lord Jesus Christ. (Jude 4)<sup>393</sup>

### **Historical Examples**

**1. Generation of the Sojourn** - Now I desire to remind you, though you were once for all fully informed, that he who saved a people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed those who did not believe. (Jude 5)

**2. Fallen Angels** - And the angels that did not keep their own position but left their proper dwelling have been kept by him in eternal chains in the nether gloom until the judgment of the great day. (Jude 6)

**3. Sodom and Gomorrah** - Just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding cities,

---

<sup>393</sup> English translation is mine.



he condemned them to extinction and made them an example to those who were to be ungodly; (2 Pet 2:6)

### *Sin and Judgment*

Then the Lord knows how to rescue the godly from trial, and to keep the unrighteous under punishment until the day of judgment, and especially those who indulge in the lust of defiling passion and despise authority. (2 Pet 2:9-10)

which likewise acted immorally and indulged in unnatural lust, serve as an example by undergoing a punishment of eternal fire. (Jude 7)

### *Sin and Judgment*

Yet in like manner these men in their dreamings defile the flesh, reject authority, and revile the glorious ones. (Jude 8)

As can be seen in the above comparison Peter and Jude bring various examples as evidence that God's judgment is sure to come to their adversaries, and they have two examples in common: the fallen angels and Sodom. In fact, both are referring to a traditional list of examples from Israel's sacred history in which divine judgment is dispatched which includes the Watchers, Sodom and Gomorrah, the Flood, Pharoah, and the sojourn amongst others.<sup>394</sup> Furthermore, Jude's three examples form the core of the traditional list. The traditional lists of negative examples were often referred to in order to illustrate a denunciation of sexual impurity (*Jub.* 20:5; *CD* 2:16-17; *3 Macc.* 2:3-7) or insubordination (*T. Naph.* 3; *Jude* 5-7; *2 Pet* 2:4-6; *Sir* 16:7). These two themes were related to one another at an early stage of the angel story.

The BW relates that the angels defiled themselves when they *forsook their proper place in heaven* (cf., *1 En.* 12:4, 15:3-4). Thus, the theme of sexual defilement and insubordination became closely associated in the myths development. For example, *Jubilees* 7:21 states that "it was on account of the fornication of the Watchers, apart from the mandate of their authority" that the flood came to the earth. The idea that the angels' sin was leaving their heavenly abode is a prominent motif in *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch* (cf., *Jub.* 4:21-22, 5:2-4, 7:21; *1 En.* 12:4). Similar to *Jubilees* Jude 6 focuses on the notion

<sup>394</sup> Several texts bring a number of these examples together (e.g., *Sir* 16:6-14; *CD* 2:14-17; *3 Macc.* 2:3-7; *Jub.* 20:5; *Jude* 5-7; *2 Pet* 2:4-6; *T. Naph.* 3:4-5). See; K. Berger, "Hartherzigkeit und Gottes Gesetz, die Vorgeschichte des anti-jüdischen Vorwurfs in *Mc* 10.5," *ZNW* 61 (1970): 27-36; J. Schlosser, "Les jours de Noé et de Lot: A propos de *Luc*, XVII, 26-30," *RB* 80 (1973): 25-36; Bauckman, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 46.

that the angels left their dominion and have been reserved for judgment.<sup>395</sup> Thus, the contextual link between the Watchers and the heretics is their departure from the prescribed way and resulting loss of privilege. It is no wonder that Jude declares that false teachers are like, “wandering stars [a biblical euphemism for angels] for whom the nether gloom of darkness has been reserved forever (v. 13).” This is an appropriate metaphor and pun about stars/angels wandering from the heavenly course ordained by God. This is also the interpretation in *T. Naph.* 3:1-5 that also compares the Watchers to “stars,” which “left their established path.”

It is reasonable to deduce that Jude was aware of these thematic issues surrounding the Watchers in Enochic literature because Jude was surely familiar with *1 Enoch* as is evinced by his quotation of *1 Enoch* (*1 En.* 1.9 in Jude 14). Furthermore, there are too many similarities between the angel story in Jude and *1 Enoch* to be coincidental. For example, the punishment of the Watchers is similar to the Enochic watchers mythology: they were bound in chains in a fiery Hell to await their final judgment (cf., *1 En.* 10:12, 13:1-2, 21:6).

This background is very elucidating when one turns to Jude’s and 2 Peter’s use of the angel story as an example of God’s judgment. Jude and 2 Peter are most likely using the example of the fallen angels because it is an appropriate illustration of what their opponents have done. Firstly, one can deduce that Jude and Peter refer to the fallen angels as examples of imminent judgment of the insubordinate because the angels left their proper place and were judged. Thus, the insubordination of the false teachers will receive judgment. Secondly, just as the fallen angels were sexually immoral and will be judged by God, thus, the sexually immoral activity of their opponents will also be judged. Thirdly, it should not be overlooked that the angels are associated with false teachers. This is possibly on account of fallen angels’ connotation with illicit pedagogy from the Asael myth in the BW.<sup>396</sup> 2 Peter and Jude are denouncing false teachers who are leading people astray, which corresponds to the angels’ revealing of illicit and corrupting knowledge to mankind. Overall, the background of the angel story makes the use of the

---

<sup>395</sup> J. Charles, “Jude’s Use of Pseudepigraphical Source-Material,” 135; J. Wicker, “An Analysis of the Use of Noncanonical Literature in Jude and 2 Peter” (Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1985), 156-57.

<sup>396</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 191-193.

fallen angels as negative exemplars poignant, and highlights the author's incriminations against the false teachers.

## IX. 1<sup>ST</sup> TO 2<sup>ND</sup>-CENTURY C.E. TEXTS WHICH ALLUDE TO THE ANGEL STORY

### 1. TESTAMENT OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS (2<sup>ND</sup> CENTURY C.E.)

The *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs* is alleged by its authors to be the last will and testament of the twelve patriarchs of Israel.<sup>397</sup> The main goal of the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs* was both ethical exhortation and encouragement to the Jewish communities to live righteously and to have hope for the future of Israel.<sup>398</sup> The testament genre originated in the HB but did not fully emerge as a genre until the Hellenistic age.<sup>399</sup> The paradigmatic biblical example is Jacob's last words to his sons in Gen 49.

The MS tradition of the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs* is very complex and on account of this it is preserved in several languages.<sup>400</sup> The Greek MSS, which far outnumber the others, date from 10<sup>th</sup> to the 17<sup>th</sup> centuries C.E. They have been arranged in two manners by Charles and De Jonge's critical editions, each according to their hypothesized textual history and original language.<sup>401</sup> A limited number of MSS have been preserved in Hebrew or Aramaic, which seems to indicate that at least some of the *Testaments* in the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs* had a Hebrew original and were

---

<sup>397</sup> The critical Greek text of the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs* will be taken from; M. De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), which is based upon the MS *b*. This text is preferable over R. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1908), which is based upon the MSS *c h i*. For a critique of Charles' edition see; M. De Jonge, *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum* (Leiden: Brill, 1970), i-xvii. For a description of the various MSS and the critical text used by De Jonge see; De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition*, xi-xli.

<sup>398</sup> R. Charles, "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), 2.282.

<sup>399</sup> J. Collins, "Testaments," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2.2; ed. M. Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 325.

<sup>400</sup> It is persevered in part or in whole in Greek, Armenian, Slavonic, Hebrew, and Aramaic. See, De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition*, xi-xxx.

<sup>401</sup> R. Charles hypothesized that two Greek recensions were made from the Hebrew original, which he labeled  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  [Charles, "Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs," *APOT*, 2.288-89;95]. However, M. de Jonge rejects the  $\alpha/\beta$  classification and concludes that *b* and *k* preserve the oldest stage of a Greek *Vorlage*. He bases his critical Greek text on the full MS *b* and posits that there is not sufficient evidence to prove that the Greek *Testaments* are a translation of a Hebrew original. Overall, De Jonge has made a strong case for the originally Christian nature of the Testaments [M. De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of Their Text, Composition, and Origin* (2d ed.; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1975), 31-128].

subsequently modified by Christian authors throughout their transmission.<sup>402</sup>

The question of date and composition is no less thorny than the complex MS and transmission history. The classical position proposed by R. Charles is that the *Testaments* were originally written ca. 137-107 B.C.E. in Hebrew as Jewish documents and were later interpolated under Christian influence.<sup>403</sup> Charles posited that there are internal literary characteristics in the Gk. MSS such as imbedded Heb. idiom and etymologies that betray signs of having been copied from Heb. MSS.<sup>404</sup> Supporting this idea was the discovery of some Aramaic fragments and the existence of both Heb. (although late), and Aramaic Testaments. Following Charles, M. de Jonge proposed that the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs* were Christian documents that drew on Jewish sources written ca. 150-225 C.E.<sup>405</sup> He mounts an impressive argument against the identification of Christian interpolations, and posits that because much Jewish material (which was originally written in Greek, Aramaic, and Hebrew) was incorporated into the present Greek *Testaments* both Semitisms and 'Septuagintisms' may be found in the Greek text.<sup>406</sup> Lastly, H. Kee has posited that the Testaments were composed in Gk. by a Hellenized Jew using extant Jewish traditions sometime in the early 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.E.<sup>407</sup> In conclusion we can say that this quagmire of interpretations demonstrates that there is no overwhelming evidence for any one view and that "much of the material in the Greek *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs* is compatible with either Jewish or Christian

---

<sup>402</sup> Semitic fragments include: 1) Hebrew fragments of a *T. Jud.*, a complete *T. Naph.*, and parallel fragments to *T. Naph.* 1:6-12 from Qumran Cave 4; and 2) Aram. fragments of the *T. Levi* found in the Cairo Geniza (*T. Levi* 6:8-13), which have since then been supplemented by parallel fragments found at Qumran. These fragments include: (1) an Aram. *T. Levi*, (2) a hitherto unknown Aram. *Testament of Amram*, the father of Aaron, Moses and Miriam, and (3) an Aram. *Testament of Kohath*, the son of Levi [H. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 1:776].

<sup>403</sup> Charles, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *APOT*, 2:289. However, this view is weakened by the commonly accepted fact among current scholarship that the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs* were originally written in Greek, and "cannot be easily retroverted into a Semitic language" [Collins, "Testaments," 342]. For a thorough treatment of this view see, H. Slingerland, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research* (SBLMS 21; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 44-47; 60-74.

<sup>404</sup> Charles, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *APOT*, 2:287-89. See also J. Bickerman who posits a original Hebrew version dating to the "first quarter of the second century" B.C.E. [J. Bickerman, "The Date of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *JBL* 69 (1950): 245-60].

<sup>405</sup> De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study*, 121-8; M. De Jonge, *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), 183-4.

<sup>406</sup> De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study*, 31-36, 177-128.

<sup>407</sup> Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *OTP*, 1:777-78.

authorship.”<sup>408</sup>

I will now turn to an examination of the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs*’ contacts with Second Temple Judaism and particularly the angel story. There can hardly be any doubt that the author of the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs* was directly dependent on popular Jewish traditions.<sup>409</sup> There are many striking parallels between them and *Jubilees*, which show that the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs* knew *Jubilees*.<sup>410</sup> There are also clear indications that the *Testaments* used the LXX as its version of the Bible.<sup>411</sup> Most important to our study, is the *Testament of the 12 Patriarchs*’ striking reference to the angel story which is both in continuity and incongruous with the traditional interpretations of the angel story.

The *Testament of Reuben* includes a story about the Watchers cohabitation with women that is modeled on the biblical angel story, and influenced by the Enochic watchers mythology, but which contains many drastic differences:

Women are evil (πονηραί), my children . . . they use wiles to and try to ensnare men by their forms (σχήμασι). . . by the way they adorn themselves they first lead their minds astray . . . and then by the act itself [of sex] they take them captive. . . So shun [or flee from] sexual impurity [fornication] (πορνείαν), my children, and command your wives and daughters not to adorn their heads and faces . . . It was thus [physical adornment] that they allured the Watchers (Ἐγγρηγόρουσιν) before the flood; for, as a result of seeing them continually, the Watchers lusted after one another, and they conceived the act in their minds and changed themselves into the shape (μετασχηματίζοντο) men and appeared to the women when they were having intercourse with their husbands. And the women, lusting in their minds after their phantom forms, gave birth to giants (γίγαντες) for the Watchers (ἐγγρηγόρους) seemed to them tall enough to touch the sky. (*T. Reu.* 5:1-7)

As in much of the literature from this period the sons of God are interpreted to be angels who cohabit with women. However, one striking difference is that the Watchers actually changed form into the shape of men in order to fulfill their lustful

---

<sup>408</sup> Collins, “Testaments,” 343.

<sup>409</sup> H. Sparks, ed., *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 510; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 231.

<sup>410</sup> For example, the description of “Judah’s exploits in battle, which is recounted in *T. Jud.* 3-6, fits naturally into the context of the wars of Jacob and his sons against the Canaanites described in *Jub.* 34:1-9. Also, the *T. Naph.* 1:9-12 and *Jub.* 28:9 both represent Bilhah and Zilpah as sisters.

<sup>411</sup> For example, the *T. Jos.* 2:3 mentions that there was a hippodrome by Rachael’s tomb, which is clearly a translation from LXX Gen 48:7.

desires. This interpretation is very similar to Philo's explanation of how the angels who posses incorporeal bodies were able to have sexual relations with women (cf. Philo, *QG*, 1.92). If the Watchers changed form (μετασχηματίζοντο) from בני האלהים into anthropomorphic phantoms then sexual intercourse would be physically possible.<sup>412</sup> This addition serves the overall literary theme of sexual immorality in the *Testament of Reuben* by highlighting the physically sexual nature of the sin on both the angels' and the woman's behalf.

Another striking addition is that the women are blamed for the incident because they both seduced the Watchers and lusted after their phantom forms. This interpretation is unique to *T. Reuben* and is primarily due to the author's agenda. The only possible basis in Genesis for this interpretation is the description of the daughters of men as beautiful in LXX Gen 6:2. It is possible that the author of the *Testament of Reuben* interpreted that they were beautiful טוב because they adorned themselves in a seductive manner.<sup>413</sup>

Lastly, it should also be pointed out that in *Testament of Reuben* the giants are explicitly stated to be the offspring of this sexual union, and the נפלים and the גברים of the Hebrew text are not mentioned. This is in harmony with the interpretation of the LXX. In order to enforce this identification an explanatory note is added that the Watchers were of tall stature.

As with many of the authors of this period the specific thematic concerns of the work also affected the interpretation of Gen 6:1-4, and the angel story. Thus, the *Testaments* interpretation stems not only from the text and tradition, but from his particular agenda. For instance, as Hollander and De Jonge have observed each of the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs* is centered around a specific vice or virtue that the patriarch discusses and the main theme of *Testament of Reuben* is a warning against the

<sup>412</sup> Philo in *QG* 1:92 uses the word μεταμορφωσις; "they imitate the forms of men for the purpose of having sex with women and for the sake of begetting giants." For discussion see; R. Zuurmond, "The Flood According to Enoch in Early Christian Literature," 768-69.

<sup>413</sup> This tradition is virtually absent from other literature of this period, but a few examples can be found in a later Rabbinic literature such as *Pirke R. El.* 22 and *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 6:1-2, which states that, "the sons of the great ones saw that the daughters of men were beautiful, that they painted their eyes and put on rouge, and walked about with naked flesh." See also; J. Kugel, "Reuben's Sin with Bilhah in the Testament of Reuben," in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells* (ed. David Freedman et al.; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 548; 550; *ibid.*, *Traditions of the Bible*, 211.

follies of sexual impurity or πορνεία.<sup>414</sup> In order to fully understand the author's use of the Watcher tradition it is essential to note that in the context of *T. Reu. 5* the author is describing the evil nature of women as an example in his warning against πορνεία and he brings the angel story as a specific illustration to demonstrate this point (*T. Reu. 5:1-5*). Essentially, he accuses the women of alluring the Watchers into having sexual relations with them as an example of the seductive and wicked nature of women (*T. Reu. 5:6*).

Overall, similar to Jude and 2 Peter, this unique interpretation of the angel story finds its impetus in the desire of the *Testament of Reuben* to illustrate his warning against sexual impurity or πορνεία.<sup>415</sup> Thus, the theme of sexual impurity is mentioned in the context of the angel story as a negative example. In *T. Reu. 5:5* immediately before the story of the Watchers is mentioned the author declares, "Therefore, flee πορνεία," and immediately after the story in *T. Reu. 6:1* the author again reinforces the notion by reiterating, "Therefore, beware of impurity." Therefore, the story serves as a negative hortatory example to avoid sexual impurity as the Watchers did.

The notion that the angel story was associated with being a negative example of sexual impurity from Israel's sacred history is also reinforced in the *Testaments of Naphtali's* allusion to it as well. In *T. Naph. 3:4-5* the author declares that "[Israel] shall not become as Sodom, which changed the order of its nature. In a similar manner, the Watchers also changed the order of their nature, who the Lord also cursed at the Flood making the earth desolate because of them." The meaning of the phrase "changed the order of their nature," which both Sodom and the fallen angels have in common, is surely a reference to the illicit sexual activity of the angels with mankind.<sup>416</sup> Thus, by straying from this prescribed path they have corrupted the natural order of the universe. This behavior is contrasted in *T. Naph. 3:2* with the stars of the heaven which do not change their order, or literally leave their prescribed path. In summary, one notices that the *T. Naph. 3:4-5* employs the two most popular examples from the traditional list of negative

<sup>414</sup> H. Hollander and M. De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (SVTP 8; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 29-33; 87.

<sup>415</sup> It should be underscored that, contrary to what has been suggested by S. Greiner, the seductive nature of women is not the main point of the *T. Reu. 5* [cf., S. Greiner, "Did Eve Fall Or Was She Pushed?" *BR 15* (1999):16-23]. Otherwise, the *Testament of Reuben* would have surely taken the opportunity to interpret such in his retelling of the "Reuben and Bilhah" story in *T. Reu. 1:6-10; 3:10-15*, in which he places the culpability squarely on Reuben.

<sup>416</sup> Hollander and De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*, 307-08.

exemplars (Sodom and the fallen angels) in the most common manner (i.e., as a negative example of sexual impurity).

Lastly, one should note three important subtleties about the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarch's* use of the angel story. Firstly, the *T. Naph.* 3:5 declares that the Lord judged them in the Flood. This is, apparently, referring to the idea the Watchers or the giants were judged, and died, in the Flood. Secondly, the *T. Naph.* 3.5 portrays the overall cause of the Flood as being the result of the Watchers, "Lord cursed *on their account* (δι' αὐτοὺς) the earth with the Flood." Thirdly, at the conclusion of the *T. Reu.* 5:7 it is mentioned that the Watchers "appeared to them as reaching unto heaven" as an explanation of the fact that the women gave birth to giants. Thus, the great stature of the giants is explained by the appearance of the Watchers to the women. As has been previously shown this is the interpretation of *Sib. Or.* 2 as well, where there is an amalgamation of the Watchers and the giants.

## 2. 2<sup>ND</sup> (SYRIAC APOCALYPSE OF) BARUCH (90-120 C.E.)

The setting of 2 *Baruch* is the destruction of the First Temple in Jerusalem in 587 B.C.E., although it was written following the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 C.E. It contains many different literary types including prayers, lamentations, apocalypses, and a letter to the Diaspora. Most scholars divide the book into seven sections, with some disagreement regarding borderline verses: 1) an account of the destruction of Jerusalem and lamentation (1-12); 2) the impending judgment (13-20); 3) the time of retribution and the subsequent messianic era (21-34); 4) Baruch's lament and an allegory of the vine and the cedar (35-46); 5) terrors of the last time, nature of the resurrected body, and the features of Paradise and Sheol (47-52); 6) Baruch's vision of a cloud (53-76); and 7) Baruch's letters to the nine and a half tribes and to the two and a half tribes (77-87).<sup>417</sup> Relevant to this study is the reference to the fall of the angels, which is presumably an allusion to Gen 6:1-4, in Baruch's vision in a cloud (53-76).

---

<sup>417</sup> F. Murphy, *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch* (SBLDS 78; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 12-29; J. Charlesworth, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research* (SBLSCS 7; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976), 84; R. Surburg, *Introduction to the Intertestamental Period* (St. Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1975), 140-141; M. Stone, "Apocalyptic Literature," 409; P. Bogaert, *L'Apocalypse Syriacque de Baruch* (SC 144-145; 2 vols.; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1969), 1.57-78; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 281-286; A. Klijn, "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch" in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed J. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985), 1.615. Although Klijn, amongst other scholars, prefers to further subdivide these sections the division remains essentially the same.



According to J. Klijn, the textual tradition regarding chapters 1-77, which is the apocalypse proper, must be dealt with separately from those of chapters 78-87, which is the attached letter.<sup>418</sup> Although, it should be underscored that this textual tradition does not completely undermine the literary unity of the apocalypse and the letter.<sup>419</sup> Until the turn of the century the apocalypse proper (1-77) was only known from one Syriac manuscript dating from the sixth or seventh century C.E.<sup>420</sup> Subsequently, two fragments have come to light in Greek from the fourth or fifth century (12:1-13:2 and 13:11-14:3).<sup>421</sup> Furthermore, small fragments of the text in Syriac have also been discovered in lectionaries of the Jacobite Church. However, concerning the attached letter (78-87), 36 MSS are known because it once belonged to the Syriac canon.<sup>422</sup> Finally, a translation of the entire *2 Baruch* into Arabic was discovered, however, the Arabic translation appears to be a free rendering of the Syriac and therefore is of little help in evaluating the original Syriac text.<sup>423</sup> The Syriac text now extant was a translation from a Greek text, which may have been the original language of the apocalypse.<sup>424</sup>

This book is important for numerous theological concepts, such as the problem of evil and God's sovereignty. For example the fall of Jerusalem is attributed to angelic activity rather than man's (7:1-8:5), and there are many discussions concerning the origin of sin (15:5f., 23:4f., 48:42, 54:15, 19; cf. *4 Ezra* 7:116-31).<sup>425</sup> *2 Baruch* also had a certain pessimism for the present (85:10) and preoccupation for the end of time, which will not come until the number of those to be born is fulfilled (23:4-7; cf. *4 Ezra* 4:35-37).<sup>426</sup>

There is a consensus among scholars that the book was written in Palestine in 90-

<sup>418</sup> Klijn, "2 Baruch," *OTP*, 1.615; Bogaert, *L'Apocalypse Syriaque de Baruch*, 33-34.

<sup>419</sup> M. Whitters, *The Epistle of Second Baruch: A Study in Form and Message* (JSPSup 42; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 35-65.

<sup>420</sup> Bogaert, *L'Apocalypse Syriaque de Baruch*, 34-38; Klijn, "2 Baruch," *OTP*, 1.615-616.

<sup>421</sup> Bogaert, *L'Apocalypse Syriaque de Baruch*, 40-43.

<sup>422</sup> Bogaert, *L'Apocalypse Syriaque de Baruch*, 43-45.

<sup>423</sup> P. Van Koningsveldt, "An Arabic Manuscript of the Apocalypse of Baruch" *JSJ* 6 (1975): 205-7; Klijn, "2 Baruch," *OTP*, 1.616.

<sup>424</sup> Bogaert, *L'Apocalypse Syriaque de Baruch*, 353-355; Stone, "Apocalyptic Literature," 409; Klijn, "2 Baruch," *OTP*, 1.616.

<sup>425</sup> Charlesworth, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research*, 84.

<sup>426</sup> Charlesworth, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research*, 84

120 C.E.<sup>427</sup> Thus, *2 Baruch* is preoccupied with giving an answer to the question why God allowed his temple to be destroyed.<sup>428</sup> Overall, the dating of *2 Baruch* is done on the basis of: 1) the identification of the historical reference “to the disaster that befalls Zion now” (67:1) as the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E.<sup>429</sup>; 2) *2 Baruch*’s literary relationship to 4 Ezra;<sup>430</sup> and 3) its possible citation of the *Epistle of Barnabas*.<sup>431</sup> It still remains a matter of debate in view of the many points of contact between *2 Baruch* and *4 Ezra*, whether the former or the latter is earlier. At present, the scales are tipped for a chronological priority of *4 Ezra*, which would favour a date of *2 Baruch* of ca.100 C.E., although dependence upon a common source cannot be ruled out.<sup>432</sup>

The section of the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch which refers to the angel story is Baruch’s vision of a cloud (53-76). In this vision Baruch sees a cloud from which bright and dark waters alternatively pour forth, and their significance is explained. The reference to the angel story is made in the interpretation of the first black waters (2 Baruch 56).

2 Baruch 56: 10-16<sup>433</sup>

ܐܪ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ (10)  
 ܐܪ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ (11)  
 ܐܪ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ (12)  
 ܐܪ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ (13)  
 ܐܪ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ (14)  
 ܐܪ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ (15)  
 ܐܪ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܡܐ (16)

Translation<sup>434</sup>

For he who was a danger to himself was also a danger to the angels. For they possessed freedom in that time in which they were created. And some of them came down and mingled themselves with women. At that time those who acted like this were tormented in chains. But the rest of the multitude of angels, who have no number, restrained themselves. And those people who were living on the earth perished together through the waters of the flood. Those are the first black waters.

<sup>427</sup> Bogaert, *L'Apocalypse Syriaque de Baruch*, 270-1; 294-5; L. Rost, *Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976), 128-129; Klijn, “2 Baruch,” *OTP*, 1.616-17, Stone, “Apocalyptic Literature,” 410.

<sup>428</sup> Murphy, *Structure and Meaning*, 71-2.

<sup>429</sup> Klijn, “2 Baruch,” *OTP*, 1.661-17; Rost, *Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon*, 128-129.

<sup>430</sup> Klijn, “2 Baruch,” *OTP*, 1.617.

<sup>431</sup> Bogaert, *L'Apocalypse Syriaque de Baruch*, 272-280.

<sup>432</sup> Stone, “Apocalyptic Literature,” 409; Klijn, “2 Baruch,” *OTP*, 1.617; Rost, *Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon*, 128-129. However, cf., E. Schürer who posits a priority of *2 Baruch* [E. Schürer, *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus* (ed. M. Galtzer; New York: Schocken Books, 1961), 90-91].

<sup>433</sup> Critical Syriac text is from; S. Dederling, *Apocalypse of Baruch* (Vetus Testamentum Syriace iv.3; Leiden: Brill, 1973), 32-33.

<sup>434</sup> English translation is mine.

The first aspect one notices is that the sons of God are here simply called angels which came down. The verb “descend” ܕܢܠܐ is the Aramaic form of the Hebrew root “to fall” ١. ܢܠ. Thus, the angels referred to are the fallen angels, or the *nephilim* of Genesis 6:1-4. *2 Baruch* goes on to describe their activity by saying that they “mingled together” with women. The verb ܕܡܝܬܠܟܐ means “mixing together,” and it is also used in the sense of “mixing blood with other people groups.”<sup>435</sup> Thus, the sexual activity resulted in the mixing of blood between the angels and mankind. On account of their activity the text describes their judgment as being tormented in chains. This judgment is similar to Enochic watchers mythology, and is also repeated in Jude and 2 Peter (cf., *1 En.* 10:12, 13:1-2, 21:6). Lastly, the text describes the ill fate of mankind immediately after the story of the fallen angels, as perishing through the flood. Although the noun used here (ܕܡܝܬܠܟܐ) means any “flood,” this is obviously a reference to the Flood in Genesis which proceeds the story of the sons of God. Overall, as this analysis has shown, *2 Baruch* chooses not to elaborate on the angel story. Essentially it records how the angels descended, commingled with women, and were punished. However, there is one novel subtle element that is introduced into its version of the angel story. The text mentions that only some of angels came down and the majority of the angels restrained themselves. This embellishment adds an element of the free will to their decision to come down and mingle with women, as well as added responsibility for those who did.<sup>436</sup>

### 3. 3<sup>RD</sup> (GREEK APOCALYPSE OF) BARUCH

The Greek apocalypse of Baruch has been preserved in Greek and Slavionic, and the Slavonic is a translation based upon a lost Greek original.<sup>437</sup> The MSS of the Greek and Slavonic texts date mostly from the 15<sup>th</sup> century C.E. The date of the book is unknown and theories date from the 1<sup>st</sup> through the 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries C.E. It was first attested by Origen (*De principiis*, 2:37), which sets the latest possible dating of *3 Baruch* to 230

<sup>435</sup> R. Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (ed. J. Smith; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903), 143.

<sup>436</sup> VanderKam, *Enoch*, 155; Delcor, *Le Mythe de La Chute des Anges*, 51.

<sup>437</sup> H. Gaylord, “3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 1.653-655; Stone, “Apocalyptic Literature,” 410-412.

C.E.<sup>438</sup> In its present state there are many Christian elements in the work, which have been interpreted as being interpolations into an earlier Jewish work.<sup>439</sup> On the other hand, the work could also be an originally Christian with Jewish elements. Others have claimed that the work is the product of Jewish Gnosticism<sup>440</sup> or mysticism<sup>441</sup> from the beginning of the second century C.E. Overall no consensus concerning the date of 3 *Baruch* has emerged and a broad dating is preferable.

In this book the Lord sends an angel to comfort Baruch, who is lamenting over the destruction of the temple. This angel guides Baruch through the five heavens and explains their mysteries. The third heaven consist of a reenactment of primordial history, including a description of the Garden of Eden and the Flood. There is also a brief reference to the giants who perished in the Flood in Baruch's vision of the third heaven.

3 Baruch 4:10<sup>442</sup>

Καὶ εἶπον ὁ ἄγγελος· Ὁρθῶς ἐρωτᾷς ὅτε ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κατακλυσμὸν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἀπώλεσε πᾶσαν σάρκα καὶ τὰς τετρακοσίας ἐννέα χιλιάδας τῶν γιγάντων

Translation<sup>443</sup>

And the angel said, rightly you ask when God made the Flood over the earth and destroyed all flesh and 409,000 giants.

The main contribution of this text to the angel story is the notion that the giants perished together with humanity in the Flood. Furthermore, the text adds a specific number of the giants who died. It is interesting that the entire angel story is not elaborated upon, and only the ill fate of the giants is mentioned. Thus, the entire angel story is now the background of this small passage in 3 *Baruch*.

## X. MAJOR TRENDS IN INTERPRETATION

### 1. THEODICY, DEMONS, AND THE FLOOD

One of the first adaptations of the angel story was the Enochic watchers story. In

<sup>438</sup> To my knowledge M. James was the first to make this observation [M. James, *Apocrypha Anecdota* 2 (TS 5; ed. J. Robinson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1893), li]. It has also been followed by others [cf., Stone, "Apocalyptic Literature," 410].

<sup>439</sup> H. Hughes, "The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch," in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), 2.529-30.

<sup>440</sup> L. Ginsburg, "Greek Apocalypse of Baruch," in *The Jewish Encyclopedia* (12 vols.; New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1901-1910), 2.551.

<sup>441</sup> J. Picard, "Observations sur l'Apocalypse grecque de Baruch," *Semitica* 20 (1970) : 100-103.

<sup>442</sup> Critical Greek text from; J. Picard, *Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece* (PVTG 2; ed. A. Denis and M. De Jonge; Leiden: Brill, 1967), 84-85.

<sup>443</sup> English translation is mine.

the BW it is possible<sup>444</sup> that this story of the Watcher's illicit activities and their disastrous consequences became an explanation for the origin of sin.<sup>445</sup> More importantly, however, the story of the Watchers in the BW serves as a theodicy, which both explains why God sent the Flood and justifies his extreme punitive measures (*1 En.* 10:1-4). Therefore, the Aseal tradition attributes the cause of the Flood to the vast pervasiveness of sin caused by to the illicit pedagogy of the Watchers (*1 En.* 10:2-8), while the Sehemiziah tradition traces its root to sexual misconduct of the fallen angels (*1 En.* 10:10-20). A ramification of this view of the cause of the Flood, which is intricately tied to a theodicy, is the creation of the demonic spirits of the disembodied giants that reap havoc and tempt mankind in the postdiluvian world (*1 En.* 15:8-9). Thus, the demons serve as an explanation of the presence of sin in the postdiluvian world which allows for an omnipotent and just God (*1 En.* 15:10-12). This Enochic watchers story is especially important because of the prevalence of Enochic motifs in other treatments of the angel story throughout the following period.

One should be cautious not to overstate the prevalence of the Enochic watchers story in the Jewish literature of the Second Temple period. Although the Enochic watchers story had a tremendous influence over the other literature from the period, *1 Enoch* is essentially unique in its presentation of the angel story. Furthermore, there are several lines of development of the angel story, which existed and developed independently of one another, which show no signs of influence from the BW. It would be misleading and an oversimplification to suggest that the BW was the base text of, or even exercised influence over, all subsequent interpretation of the angel story. There are several works that contain wholly novel elements of interpretation not found in *1 Enoch* (eg., Pseudo-Eupolemus and CD), and additionally those which show little to no influence from the Enochic watchers mythology (eg., Josephus, Philo, and the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs*).

A comparison of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* shows that even *Jubilees*, which was directly influenced by *1 Enoch*, shows many drastic differences. For example, in *1*

---

<sup>444</sup> Please see note 151.

<sup>445</sup> Elliot, "Origins and Functions of the Watchers Theodicy," 63-75; J. Barr, *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality* (Fortress Press: Minneapolis, 1992), 78-84; Collins, "The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature," 290-95.

*Enoch* the first sin of the angels was in heaven, where they conspire and bound one another in an oath (*1 En.* 6:5).<sup>446</sup> However, in *Jubilees* the Watchers are originally sent to the earth for good purposes (*Jub.* 4:15). Secondly, whereas the BW only comments in passing about the story of Adam, Eve, and their expulsion from the Garden of Eden (*1 En.* 32:6); *Jubilees* retells the story in whole (*Jub.* 3:17-29) as an explanation of why the Jews should not be uncovered as the gentiles do (*Jub.* 3:31).<sup>447</sup> Thus, the angel story in Enochic literature may serve in some capacity as an account for the origin of sin,<sup>448</sup> whereas in *Jubilees* it accounts for the pervasiveness and escalation of antediluvian sin.<sup>449</sup> Lastly, the portrayal of the evil spirits of the giants is also radically different in *Jubilees* (*Jub.* 5:8-9, 10:4-5 || *1 En.* 15:5-11). A malevolent force is left in the world as an explanation for sin, as in the BW, but it has been severely restrained in *Jubilees* (*Jub.* 10:6).<sup>450</sup> This re-conceptualization of the demonology in *Jubilees* asserts more human responsibility for sin and suffering than the BW. Generally speaking, this view of the origin of demons must have found some adherents because it can also be seen in later works in the first through third centuries C.E., and was often connected with the final eschatological judgment of the giants (*T. Sol.* 17:1-5; *Sib. Or.* 230:1-3; cf., *Jub.* 10:1-14; *1 En.* 16:1).

In conclusion, diverse currents of interpretation of the angel story are discernable as early as the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.E. Subsequent Jewish literature does not use the angel story as an explanation for the origin of sin,<sup>451</sup> but rather focuses on the story as a theodicy, explanation of the Flood, and a negative historical example used for hortatory purposes. Thus, although Sirach (early 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.E.) refers the angel story (Sir

<sup>446</sup> VanderKam, "Enoch Traditions," 328-329; *ibid.*, *A Man for All Generations*, 120.

<sup>447</sup> Possibly also as an explanation for the origin of sin [cf., Collins, "The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature," 291].

<sup>448</sup> Please see note 451.

<sup>449</sup> VanderKam, "Enoch Traditions," 328-30; *ibid.*, "Angel Story," 153-54.

<sup>450</sup> VanderKam, "Enoch Traditions," 330-31.

<sup>451</sup> I would add that it is debatable whether or not the Watchers mythology serves as an explanation for the origin of sin in *1 Enoch* as well. Nowhere in *1 Enoch* does it state that the origin of sin was with the Watchers. This is a deduction from the emphasis placed upon the malignant effects of the fallen Watchers activities, in combination with the notion the story of the Garden of Eden is mentioned only in passing in one of Enoch's heavenly journeys: "this very thing is the tree of wisdom from which your old father and aged mother, they who were your precursors, ate and came to know wisdom; and consequently their eyes were opened and they realized that they were naked and they were expelled from the garden" (*1 En.* 32:6). Cf., J. Barr, *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality* (Fortress Press: Minneapolis, 1992), 78-84; Collins, "The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature," 290-95.

16:7), he maintains the adamic fall as the primary explanation for the origin of sin (Sir 25:24). Furthermore, the adamic fall continues to be an explanation for the origin of sin later on in the Second Temple period (cf., 1 Tim 2:12-14; Philo, *QG*, 1.46). In these works one can detect another interpretation of the fall removed from the angel story, which places the blame not upon the shoulders of the Watchers but rather upon women. Eventually this current in Judaism re-entered the angel story in a novel manner in the *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs* where the women are held responsible for the fall of the angels as well (*T. Reu.* 5:1-7).

## 2. DEFILEMENT AND JUDGMENT

Another prominent motif in the use of the angel story in the Jewish literature of the Second Temple period is defilement. This is the major concern of *Jubilees* and also figures prominently in the Shemiziah myth of the BW as well (*Jub.* 7:21, 20:5; *1 En.* 9:6-9, 10:11, 15:3-4). Subsequently, influences of the motif of defilement the angel story can be seen in several works in this period (*Sir* 16:8; *3 Macc.* 2:5-6; *2 Pet* 2:6; *Jude* 7; *T. Reu.* 5:1-7; *T. Naph.* 3:4-5; 4Q531; CD 2:16-17). Particularly, the angel story became associated with sexual immorality and was often used as a paradigmatic negative example along side of Sodom and Gomorrah of the disastrous consequences of sexual immorality (*Sir* 16:8; *3 Macc.* 2:5-6; *2 Pet* 2:6; *Jude* 7; *T. Reu.* 5:1-7; *T. Naph.* 3:4-5).

This motif finds its origin in the BW and is first fully developed in *Jubilees*. The BW relates that the angels defiled themselves in sexual relationships with women when they *forsook their proper place in heaven* (cf., *1 En.* 9:6-9; 12:4, 15:3-4; *Jub.* 4:21-22, 5:2-4, 7:21). In *Jubilees*, this insubordination corrupted the natural order of things, which in turn corrupted the thoughts and inclinations of mankind (*Jub.* 5:2-4).<sup>452</sup> Thus, the theme of sexual defilement and insubordination became closely associated in the myths development. Furthermore, in *Jubilees* as well as later literature the Flood came to the earth principally as a result of God's judgment of the illicit sexual misconduct of the fallen angels (*Jude* 7; *2 Pet* 2:6; CD 2; *T. Naph.* 3:4-5):

For it was on account of these three things that the flood was on the earth, since it was due to fornication that the Watchers had illicit intercourse –

---

<sup>452</sup> *Jub.* 4:21-22 || *1 En.* 12:4. In *1 Enoch* departure of God's order is related to both descending to earth and sexual immorality. However, in *Jubilees* it is related almost exclusively to sexual immorality. See, D. Dimmant, "Fallen Angels," 92-103.

apart from the mandate of their authority – with women. When they married of them whomever they chose they committed the first acts of uncleanness. (*Jub.* 7:21)

Another theme in the angel story is the closely associated with their sexual immorality is the ensuing judgment of God. This theme finds its origin likewise in the BW where the fallen angels are bound in a fiery Hell to await final judgment (*1 En.* 10:6, 12-13; 13:1-2; 21:6). This motif is also used by *Jubilees*, although without the fire (*Jub.* 5:6). Furthermore, other subsequent works particularly in the end of the Second Temple period also described that this was the judgment enacted by God upon the fallen angels for their sexual immorality (*Sib. Or.* 1:98-103; 2:285-95; *T. Sol.* 5:3, 17:1-5; 2 *Pet* 2:9-10; *Jude* 8; 2 *Bar.* 56:10-16).

### 3. THE GIANT STORY

Another trend in the interpretation of the angel story is the creation of the giant story. As early as the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.E. the giants are mentioned without the fallen angels (*Sir* 16:7; *Bar* 3:26; 4Q531; *Ps.-Eup.*; *Wis* 14:6, 3 *Macc.* 2:4). In addition to this, frequently in these works the giants also serve as a negative example (*Sir* 16:7; *Bar* 3:26; CD 2.14-21; *Wis* 14:6, 3 *Macc.* 2:4). Secondly, in this giant story the giants often perished in the Flood, rather than through internecine warfare as in the BW and *Jubilees* (*1 En.* 10:9-12; 14:1-6; *Jub.* 5:6-11). This idea as well, is not part of the earliest forms of the traditions in the LXX, BW, Ben Sirach, and *Jubilees*. It is probably based upon the sequence of the biblical narrative in Genesis where Gen 6:1-4 is a prelude to the Flood. According to the sources available to study from this period this interpretation emerged in the middle of the second century B.C.E. as is reflected in the Book of Dreams (*1 En.* 89:6), and Pseudo-Eupolemus. Furthermore, it persisted in the literature of the latter half of the Second Temple period (and later) as well (CD 2:19-21; 4Q370; *Wis* 14:6; 3 *Macc.* 2:4; *Sib. Or.* 1:88-103, 2:232; 3 *Bar.* 4:10).

Thirdly, there was an assimilation of both נפלים and גבורים into warrior-giants. The first step in the direction of this interpretation was translation of both of these words as “giants” by the LXX. The interpretation of the LXX combined with inter-biblical interpretation is most likely what gave rise to the first example of a warrior-giant. Nimrod was described as a mythical hunter, גבר ציד, in Gen 10:8-9 and later in 2 Sam



David's champions were described as גבורים. Ezekiel 32:27 also combined both נפלים and the גבורים into warriors. However, Bar 3:26 was the first source who combined the biblical connotations of these two words (נפלים and גבורים) are into "giants who are expert at war." This assimilation may also have been influenced from the Asael traditions in the BW, where Asael taught men "to make swords of iron and weapons and shields and breastplates and every instrument of war (*1 En.* 8:1)." The wicked progeny of the Watchers – the giants – are also condemned to die in bloody warfare (*1 En.* 10:9). Overall, it appears that Bar 3:26 has filled in the lacunae of Gen 6:1-4 and deduced why the progeny of the בני האלוהים are "famous men of old," either through inter-biblical connotations or/and through traditional interpretation of the passage. They were famous because, similar to Goliath, they were great warriors, as well as being giant in stature. This interpretation is also seen in CD 2:17 where the fallen angels are compared with "mighty warriors."

Lastly, there is the interpretation that the giants were men. The first reference to this is in the Hebrew portions of Ben Sirach preserved in the Cairo Geniza. The Hebrew text of Sirach related the men of name, and the הגבורים with "princes of old" לנסכי קדם. However, when one turns to the LXX one finds "ancient giants" ἀρχαίων γιγάντων. Therefore, there is evidence that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Sirach considered the giants to be nobles rather than giants. The only other reference to this is Josephus' clever interpretation that rationalizes that they were called giants by way of their association with the giants in Greek mythology (*Ant.* 1:73). However, according to Josephus, they are actually men. This interpretation is important because it dominates later rabbinic interpretation of this passage. Therefore, it is possible that the much later rabbinic interpretation finds its first attestation as far back as the second century B.C.E.

#### 4. NEGATIVE EXEMPLARS

The most prevalent manner in which the angel story is used in the Jewish Literature of the Second Temple period is as a negative example. The angel story, or the giant story, is often mentioned as a negative parenthetic illustration warning against arrogance, overconfidence in one's own power, and sexual immorality (Sir 16:7; Bar 3:26; CD 2:14-21; Wis 14:6; 3 *Macc.* 2:4). The angel story became an infamous example from the history of Israel of God's judgment upon the unrighteous, and by the second

century B.C.E. it was associated with other infamous examples from the sacred history of Israel such as Sodom and Gomorrah, the desert sojourn (Num 11), Pharaoh, and Noah's Flood. These examples were often referred to together and became a traditional list of negative examples from Israel's sacred history in which divine judgment is dispatched (Sir 16:6-14; CD 2:14-17; 3 *Macc.* 2:3-7; *Jub.* 20:5; Jude 5-7; 2 Pet 2:4-6; *T. Naph.* 3:4-5).<sup>453</sup>

|                       | <u><i>Giants</i></u> | <u><i>Watchers</i></u> | <u><i>S. &amp; G.</i></u> | <u><i>Flood</i></u> | <u><i>Sojourn</i></u> |
|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Sirach 16:6-14        | YES                  | NO                     | YES                       | NO                  | YES                   |
| CD 2:14-17            | YES                  | YES                    | NO                        | YES                 | NO                    |
| <i>T. Naph.</i> 3:4-5 | NO                   | YES                    | YES                       | YES                 | NO                    |
| 3 <i>Macc.</i> 2:3-7* | YES                  | NO                     | YES                       | NO                  | NO                    |
| <i>Jubilees</i> 20:5  | YES                  | NO                     | YES                       | NO                  | NO                    |
| Jude 5-7*             | NO                   | YES                    | YES                       | NO                  | YES                   |
| 2 Peter 2:4-6*        | NO                   | YES                    | YES                       | YES                 | NO                    |

The above graph indicates which of the examples each of the sources use which employ the historical lists. One can readily note that in the various historical lists the stories of the fallen angels and Sodom and Gomorrah are prominent. Almost every source (the exception being CD) which refers to the giants/Watchers also uses Sodom and Gomorrah as a negative example. It goes without saying that the deviations of the list are due to the unique agenda of the author which changes from book to book. However, there are two key themes that are prominent in the use of these lists as examples of God's judgment. Firstly, the theme of sexual impurity and defilement stands out as the most common manner in which the lists of historical examples are used (*Jub.* 20:5; CD 2:16-17; 3 *Macc.* 2:3-7). Secondly, the theme of defilement is closely associated with the theme of insubordination (*T. Naph.* 3; Jude 5-7; 2 Pet 2:4-6; Sir 16:7). The prominence of these two themes within the use of the angel story as a negative

<sup>453</sup> Berger, "Hartherzigkeit ung Gottes Gesetz," 27-36; Schlosser, "Les jours de Noé et de Lot," 25-36; Bauckman, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 46.

\* References marked with an asterisk bring other historical examples in addition to those noted in the graph.

example is most likely on account of the angel story's early association with defilement in the Enochic watchers mythology. In summary, the angel story became part of a traditional list of historical examples from Israel's sacred history which were used as negative examples for parenetic purposes.

## 5. NAMES

The table below is a summary of the various names used throughout the various works that refer to the angel story for both the fallen angels and their progeny the giants. On account of the fact that the various sources are written in different languages the chart contains their English equivalents. Thus, for example, the word "watchers" refers to ἐγγήγοροι in any source written in Greek, and עירין for any source written in Aramaic. Furthermore, for the sake of clarity every variant of the primary name used is not shown in the graph. Therefore, for example, although the Watchers may have many variations in the BW such as, "watchers, and holy ones," עירין וקדישין and "watchers of heaven" עירין די דשמא, only "watchers" is found in the graph because these are variations of the same name. These variations are addressed in the in sections of this study dealing with each source. Lastly, it has also occurred (for example in CD) that a source will clearly refer to the offspring as being tall, great, strong, mighty, ect. . . , but will never actually name the creature. In this case, although the name giant is implied by the context, the graph has not added "giants."

|              | <u>Fallen Angels</u> | <u>Giants</u>                     |
|--------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Genesis      | Sons of God          | Nephilim, Gibborim, Men of Renoun |
| 1 Enoch 1-36 | Watchers             | Giants, Nephilim, Eliod           |
| Jubilees     | Watchers, Angels     | Giants                            |
| 4Q531        | None                 | Gibborim, Nephilim                |
| LXX          | Sons of God          | Giants, Men of Renoun             |
| T. 12 Patr.  | Watchers             | Giants                            |
| Sirach       | —                    | Giants, Princes                   |
| Baruch       | —                    | Giants, Men of Renoun             |
| 2 Baruch     | —                    | Giants                            |
| 3 Baruch     | Angels               | —                                 |
| Jude         | Angels               | —                                 |
| 2 Peter      | Angels               | —                                 |
| CD           | Watchers             | —                                 |
| 1QapGen      | Watchers             | Nephilim                          |
| 4Q180        | Angels               | Gibborim                          |

|               |          |                       |
|---------------|----------|-----------------------|
| 4Q370         | —        | Gibborim              |
| Ps.-Eupolemus | —        | Giants                |
| Wisdom        | —        | Giants                |
| 3 Maccabees   | —        | Giants                |
| Sib. Or.      | Watchers | Giants                |
| Philo         | Angels   | Giants                |
| Josephus      | Angels   | Giants, Men of Renoun |

Out of the 23 sources which this study has discussed 16 name the fallen angels. The vast minority is the term sons of God. Every source except the Bible and the LXX has used another term to describe the בני אליהם. The sources are essentially equally divided concerning the appellation of the fallen angels as either watchers or angels. There does not seem to be any correspondence according to the language used in the original sources in Greek, and the preferred name. However, the sources written in a Semitic language prefer the term watchers over angel. The only two exceptions are 3 *Baruch* and 4Q180. Lastly, there does not seem to be any solid correlation with time periods and preferred names for the fallen angels as well. For example, the oldest appellation outside of the Bible was most likely “watchers,” but this cannot be known for sure because 1 *Enoch* is transmitted in entirety only in Ethiopic translations which obscured the original Aramaic.<sup>454</sup> For instance, the Ethiopic and Greek in certain cases translated “watchers” as “angels.” Furthermore, the next oldest source originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic (*Jubilees*) is also preserved in translation in Ethiopic and it refers to the fallen angels as both angels and watchers. Ben Sirach is of little help for the Hebrew original because it does not refer to the angels. Therefore, at this point one can not be sure whether or not the fallen angels were first called watchers in Hebrew, and only subsequently called angels under the influence of the Pentateuch of the LXX. However, it is a tempting suggestion.

Concerning the names of the progeny of the fallen angels the majority of literature refers to them as giants. The consistent exception is literature written in Hebrew or Aramaic, which retained the biblical expression of גברים or נפלים. This is most likely on

<sup>454</sup> Nickelsburg has shown that “the terminology that various Enochic authors used to designate the members of the heavenly entourage is obscured by the Greek and Ethiopic translations [Nickelsburg, 1 *Enoch*, 140-41].

account of the idea that these terms came to mean “giants” in Hebrew and Aramaic. Thus, in CD although they are not called גברים or נפלים the progeny of the Watchers are described as being physically tall. However, throughout the Book of the Giants, which is only preserved in very fragmentary form, the giants are called both גברים or נפלים. Therefore, one can say that every source that refers to the progeny of the fallen angels considered them to be giants. This is most likely on account of the biblical association of the נפלים with people of tall stature, and the subsequent translation of the גברים or נפלים as giants in the Pentateuch of the LXX.

## **XI. CONCLUSION**

This study has endeavored to show how the angel story was interpreted throughout the Jewish literature of the Second Temple period. Generally speaking, the angel story became a theodicy, explanation for the Flood, and an infamous example from the sacred history of Israel of God’s immanent judgment of the unrighteous. On account of the various ways in which the angel story was interpreted, as well as the tenuous dating of many of the works which refer to it, it is very difficult to trace any literary progression. This study has endeavored to show that the base text for the angel story is in Genesis 6:1-4. This story was then radically embellished by the BW, which in turn had a tremendous influence upon several subsequent works which used the angel story. Furthermore, there were multiple lines of development of the angel story, which existed and developed independently of the Enochic watchers mythology. Lastly, there are several works which contain wholly novel elements of interpretation not found in *1 Enoch*. However, can any other general observations be made concerning the development of the angel story?

Although the BW was the base text of the expanded version of the angel story, it was unique in its presentation. Subsequent literature does not wholly adopt any part of the vast Enochic watchers myth, nor was all subsequent literature influenced by Enochic motifs. Most likely, the influence that the Enochic watchers story had over most subsequent literature was indirect. In other words, on account of the vast number of similarities between several subsequent versions of the angel story and certain elements of the Enochic version, it is possible that the Enochic watchers mythology became the traditional interpretation of the passage. However, if this is true, one can only speak of a

traditional Enochic interpretation in broad terms such as the general themes and development of the story. The broad themes are the identification of the sons of God, their progeny, and their activities. Thus, when a subsequent work, for example Sirach, mentions the giants in a negative manner with no elaboration of the background of the story, it is probably this Enochic version in broad terms that he is referring to.

The closest chronologically and literarily to the Enochic version is *Jubilees*, which was most likely directly influenced by the BW. This, perhaps, took place in the early second century B.C.E. Concurrently, the LXX also made its translation and interpretation of the passage. Subsequently, in the middle of the second century B.C.E., there appeared to be a new trend in the interpretation of the angel story which focused upon the giants while using them as negative examples. The earliest example of this is Ben Sirach. This version of the angel story continued to be used throughout the Second Temple period (Sir 16:7; Bar 3:26; CD 2:14-21; Wis 14:6; 3 *Macc.* 2:4). Furthermore, sometime in the middle of the second century B.C.E. there emerged an interpretation that the giants died in the Flood, which was initially an addition to the angel story of the judgment of God upon the giants (*1 En.* 89:6; CD 2:19-21). CD 2:19-21 is an interesting example in the beginning of the first century B.C.E., which recounts that both the angels and the giants perished in the Flood. However, subsequently in the first century B.C.E. it became a part of the interpretation of the angel story which focused upon the giants rather than the angels (4Q370; Wis 14:6; 3 *Macc.* 2:4; *Sib. Or.* 1:88-103, 2:232; 3 *Bar.* 4:10). Lastly, as far back as the second century B.C.E., there also developed an interpretation of the angel story which made it part of a traditional list of negative examples from the history of Israel (Sirach 16:6-14 and *Jubilees* 20:5). Furthermore, it is likely that the angel story and Sodom formed the core of these lists. This literary development of the use of the angel story also persisted into the latter half of the Second Temple period (CD 2:16-17; 3 *Macc.* 2:3-7; *T. Naph.* 3; Jude 5-7; 2 Pet 2:4-6).

Beyond these general developments any observations concerning a literary progression cannot be made without a great deal of speculation. However, one thing is certain. The angel story did not cease with the closing of the Second Temple period. Although Rabbinic literature, which tended to deny that the Sons of God were angels, interpreted the angel story in a radically different manner than the preceding Jewish

literature, the angel story continued in subsequent Christian works (eg., Justin Martyr; Irenaeus; Clement of Alexandria), as well as works containing both Christian and Jewish elements (eg., *LAB* 3:1-3; *T. Sol.* 6:1-3).<sup>455</sup> Even in modern interpretation there exist a number of interpretations of Gen 6:1-4 that strive to identify the sons of God, some of which find their roots in the angel story of the Second Temple period.<sup>456</sup>

---

<sup>455</sup> For a detailed analysis of early Christian uses of the angel story see; VanderKam, "1 Enoch, Enochic Motifs, and Enoch in Early Christian Literature," 33-101; W. Wagner, "Interpretations of Genesis 6:1-4 in Second-Century Christianity," *JRH* 20 (1996): 137-155.

<sup>456</sup> W. Kaiser, *Hard Sayings of the Bible* (Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1996), 104-109.

### Bibliography-

- Ahituv, S. *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Inscriptions* [Hebrew]. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1992.
- Albright, W. "An Aramaean Magical Text in Hebrew from the Seventh Century B.C." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 76 (1936): 5-11.
- Alexander, P. "Targumim and Early Exegesis of 'Sons of God' in Genesis 6." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 23 (1972): 60-71.
- Amaru, B. H. *The Empowerment of Women in The Book of Jubilees*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 60. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Anderson, H. "3 Maccabees." *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- Attridge, H. "Historiography." *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Compendium Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2.2. Edited by M. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- . "Josephus and His Works." *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Compendium Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2.2. Edited by M. Stone. Fortress: Philadelphia, 1984.
- Avigad, N. and Y. Yadin. *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judea*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1956.
- Avigad, N. "Last of the Dead Sea Scrolls Unrolled." *Biblical Archaeologist* 19 (1956): 22-24.
- . "The Paleography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents." Pages 56-87 in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Scripta hierosolymitana 4. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1958.
- Bauckham, R. *Jude, 2 Peter*. Word Biblical Commentary 50. Waco: Word Books, 1992.
- Baumgarten, J. and D. Schwartz. "Damascus Document (CD)." Pages 4-57 in *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents: The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Seas Scrolls Project 1. Edited by J. Charlesworth. Tübingen: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992.
- Barker, M. *The Older Testament: The Survival of themes from The Ancient Royal Cult in Sectarian Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1987.



- Barr, J. *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality*. Fortress Press: Minneapolis, 1992.
- Beentjes, P. *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Berger, K. *Das Buch der Jubiläen*. Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 2.3. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1981.
- . “Hartherzigkeit und Gottes Gesetz, die Vorgeschichte des anti-jüdischen Vorwurfs in Mc 10.5.” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 61 (1970): 1-47.
- Bernstein, M. “Re-Arrangement, Anticipation and Harmonization as Exegetical Features in the Genesis Apocryphon.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 3 (1996): 37-57.
- . “4Q252 i 2: Biblical Text or Biblical Interpretation?” *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1993): 421-27.
- Bhayro, S. “Daniel’s ‘Watchers’ in Enochic Exegesis of Genesis 6:1-4.” Pages 58-66 in *Jewish Ways of Reading the Bible*. Journal of Semitic Studies Supplement 11. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Bickerman, J. “The Date of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 69 (1950): 245-260.
- Bilde, P. *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.
- Black, M., and J. VanderKam. *The Book of Enoch: or, 1 Enoch: A New English edition/ with Commentary and Textual Notes*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985.
- Boccaccini, G. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Bogaert, P. *L’Apocalypse Syriaque de Baruch*. Sources chrétiennes 144-145. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1969.
- Borgen, P. “Philo of Alexandria.” *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Compendium Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2.2. Edited by M. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Broshi, M., E. Qimron, J. Baumgarten, and F. Martinez, eds. *Damascus Document Reconsidered* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992), 13.
- Burke, D. *The Poetry of Baruch*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 11. Scholars Press, Chico, 1982.

- Cassuto, U. *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*. Translated by Israel Abrahams. 2 vols. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1984.
- Charles, J. "Jude's Use of Pseudepigraphical Source-Material as a Part of a Literary Strategy." *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991): 130-145.
- Charles, R. *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1908.
- . "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.
- . *The Book of Jubilees: or The Little Genesis*. New York: Macmillan, 1917.
- Charlesworth, J. "In the Crucible: The Pseudepigrapha as Biblical Interpretation." Pages 20-43 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 14. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth and C. A. Evans. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- . *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Series 7. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Childs, B. *Myth and Reality in the Old Testament*. Studies in Biblical Theology 27. London: SCM Press, 1962.
- Cohen, S. *Josephus in Galilee and Rome*. Boston: Leiden, 2002.
- Collins, J. "Watcher." Pages 1681-1685 in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Edited by Karel vander Toorn et al. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . "Testaments." *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Compendium Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2.2. Edited by M. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- . "The Apocalyptic Technique: Setting and Function in the Book of the Watchers." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982): 91-111.
- . "The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 287-299 in *Seers, Sibyls, and Sages in Hellenistic Roman Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . "Artapanus." *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- . *Between Athens and Jerusalem*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

- . “The Sibylline Oracles.” *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period. Compendium Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2.2.* Edited by M. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- . “Sibylline Oracles.” *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* Edited by J. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Coxon, P. “Gibborim; Nephilim” Pages 654-655; 1163-1168 in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible.* Edited by Karel vander Toorn et al. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Cross, F. and R. Saley. “Phoenician Incantations on a Plaque of the Seventh Century B.C. from Arslan Tash in Upper Syria.” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 197 (1970): 42-49.
- Cross, F. “The Development of the Jewish Scripts.” *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright.* Edited by G. Wright. New York: Doubleday, 1965.
- . *The Ancient Library of Qumran.* New York: Doubleday, 1961.
- Dalton, W. *Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits: A Study of 1 Peter 3:18-4:6.* Analecta Biblica 23. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965.
- Davidson, M. *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1-36, 72-108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran.* Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 11. Worchester: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Dederling, S. *Apocalypse of Baruch.* Vetus Testamentum Syriace iv.3. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- Dehandschutter, B. “Pseudo-Cyprian, Jude and Enoch.” Pages 114-120 in *Tradition and Re-Interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature.* Leiden: Brill, 1986.
- De Jonge, M. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text.* Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- . *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum.* Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- . *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of Their Text, Composition, and Origin.* 2d ed. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1975.
- . *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975.
- Delcor, M. “Le mythe de la chute des anges et de l'origine des géants comme explication du mal dans le monde dans l'apocalyptique juive.” *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 190 (1976): 22-24.

- DeSilva, D. *Introducing the Apocrypha*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002.
- Dietrich, M. O Loretz, and J. Sanmartin. *The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani, and Other Places*. Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palastinas und Mesopotamiens 8. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1995.
- DiLella, A. *The Hebrew Text of Sirach: A Text Critical and Historical Study*. London: Mouton & Co., 1966.
- Dimant, D. "The Fallen Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical Books Relating to Them." Dissertation: The Hebrew University, 1974.
- . "Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha." *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Compendium Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. Edited by Martin Jan Mulder, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- . "The Bibliography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch." *Vetus Testamentum* 33 (1983): 14-29.
- . "Qumran Sectarian Literature." *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Novum Testamentum 2.2. Edited by M. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- . "The 'Pesher on the Periods' (4Q180) and 4Q181." *Israel Oriental Studies* 9 (1979): 77-102.
- Donner, H. and W. Wöllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1973.
- Doran, R. "Pseudo-Eupolemus." *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. Charlesworth. 2 Volumes. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- Elliot, M. "Origins and Functions of the Watchers Theodicy." *Henoch* 24 (2002): 63-75.
- Emmet, C. "The Third Book of Maccabees." *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. Edited by R. Charles. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Fallon, F. "Eupolemus." *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. Charlesworth. 2 Volumes. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- Feldman, L. *Josephus' Interpretation of the Bible*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

- Fitzmyer, J. *The Genesis Apocryphon of Cave 1: A Commentary*. Biblica Et Orientalia 18A. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971.
- . *Prolegomena to Fragments of a Zadokite Work: Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, by S. Schechter. New York: KTAV, 1970.
- Field, F. *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive Veterum Interpretetum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.
- Friedman, R. *Who Wrote the Bible?* San Francisco: Harper, 1987.
- . *The Bible with Sources Revealed*. San Francisco: Harper, 2003.
- Freudenthal, J. *Alexander Polyhistory und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste judäischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke*. Hellenistische Studien 1-2. Breslau: Verlag von H. Skutsch, 1875.
- Gafni, I. "Historical Background." *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2.2. Edited by M. E. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Gaylord, H. "3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch." *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Geffcken, J. *Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracula Sibyllina*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs Buchhandlung, 1902.
- Gilbert, M. "Wisdom Literature." *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2.2. Edited by M. E. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Ginsburg, L. "Greek Apocalypse of Baruch." *The Jewish Encyclopedia*. 12 volumes. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1901-1910.
- Goldstein, J. "The Apocryphal Book of I Baruch." *Proceeding of the American Academy of Jewish Research* 46/47 (1980): 179-199.
- . "The Date of the Book of Jubilees." *Proceeding of the American Academy of Jewish Research* 50 (1983): 63-86.
- Grabbe, L. *Wisdom of Solomon*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Greiner, S. "Did Eve Fall or Was She Pushed?" *Bible Review* 15 (1999): 16-23.

- Greenfield, J. and E. Qimron. "The Genesis Apocryphon Col.XII." *Abr-Nahrain: Supplement Series 3* (1992): 70-77.
- Greenfield, J. and M. Stone. "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes." *Harvard Theological Review* 70 (1977): 51-65.
- Hadas, M. *The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees*. New York: Harper, 1953.
- Hanson, P. "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and the Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6-11." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96 (1977): 195-233.
- Harwell, R. "The Principal Versions of Baruch." Dissertation: Yale University, 1915.
- Hendel, R. "The Nephilim Were on the Earth: Genesis 6:1-4 and Its Ancient Near Eastern Context." Pages 11-33 in *The Fall of the Angels* Edited by C. Auffarth and L. Struckenbruck. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . "Of Demigods and the Deluge: Toward an Interpretation of Genesis 6:1-4." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987): 13-36.
- Hengel, M. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. 2 Volumes. London: SCM Press, 1974.
- Henning, W. "The Book of Giants." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11 (1943-46): 52-74.
- Holladay, C. *Fragments From Hellenistic Jewish Authors*. Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations 20. 4 Volumes. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Hollander, H., and M. De Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. *Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigraphica* 8. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Huggins, R. "A Canonical Book of Periods at Qumran?" *Revue de Qumran* 59 (1992): 421-36.
- Hughes, H. "The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch." *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.
- James, M. *Apocrypha Anecdota 2*. Texts and Studies 5. Ed. by J. Robinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1893.
- Jellicoe, S. *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Kaiser, W. *Hard Sayings of the Bible*. Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1996.

- Kasovsky, H. *Ozar Leshon Targum Onkelos Concordance*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1986.
- Kee, H. "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Kelly, J. *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. Adam and Charles: London, 1969.
- Kilmer, A. "The Mesopotamian Counterparts of the Biblical Nephilim." Pages 39-43 in *Perspectives on Language and Text*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987.
- Klijn, A. "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch." *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- Knibb, M. "Christian Adoption and Transmission of Jewish Pseudepigrapha: The Case of 1 Enoch." *Journal for the Study of Religion* 32 (2001): 396-415.
- . *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.
- . "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review." *New Testament Studies* 25 (1979): 345-59.
- Kugel, J. *The Bible As It Was*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- . "Reuben's Sin with Bilhah in the Testament of Reuben." Pages 525-545 in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells*. Edited by David Freedman et al. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- . *Traditions of the Bible*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Kutscher, E. "The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon: a Preliminary Study." Pages 1-35 in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Scripta hierosolymitana 4. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1958.
- Kurfess, A. "Christian Sibyllines." *New Testament Apocrypha*. Edited by E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher. Translated by R. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.
- . "Oracula Sibyllina I/II." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 40 (1941): 151-165.
- Kraeling, E. "The Significance and Origin of Gen 6:1-4." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 6 (1947): 193-208.

- Kvanig, H. "Enoch und der Menschensohn: Das Verhältnis von Hen 14 zu Dan 7." *Studia Theologica* 38 (1984):101-133.
- Lanchester, H. "The Sybilline Oracles." *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. Edited by R. Charles. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Larcher, C. *Le Livre de la Sagesse ou la Sagesse de Salomon*. Etudes bibliques nouvelle série 1; 3 volumes. Paris: Gabalda, 1983-85.
- Larson, E. "The Relation between the Greek and Aramaic Texts of Enoch." Pages 434-444 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery*. Edited by L. Schiffmann et al. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.
- Lehmann, M. "1Q Genesis Apocryphon in the Light of the Targumim and Midrashim." *Revue de Qumran* 1 (1958-59): 249-63.
- Lewis, J. *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Lévi, I. *The Hebrew Texts of the Book of Ecclesiasticus*. Semitic Studies Series 3. Leiden: Brill, 1951.
- MacKenzie, R. *Sirach*. Old Testament Message 19. Willmington: Michael Glazier Inc., 1983.
- Marcos, N. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*. Translated by W. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Martinez, F. *Qumran and Apocalyptic*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 9. New York: E. J. Brill, 1992.
- . "Interpretations of the Flood in the DSS." Pages 86-108 in *Interpretations of the Flood*. Themes in Biblical Narrative 1. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Milik, J. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- . *Ten years of Discoveries in the Wilderness of Judaea*. Studies in Biblical Theology 26. London: SCM Press, 1959.
- . "Milki-sedeq et Milki-resa dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 23 (1972): 95-144.
- Moore, C. *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions*. Anchor Bible 44. Garden City: Doubleday, 1977.



- Morgenstern, M., E. Qimron, and D. Savan. "The Hitherto Unpublished Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon." *Abr-Nahrain* 33 (1995): 30-45.
- Murphey-O'Conner, J. "An Essene Missionary Document CD II, 14-VI, 1." *Revue Biblique* 77 (1970): 201-29.
- . "A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI, 2-VIII, 3." *Revue biblique* 78 (1971): 210-32.
- Murphy, F. *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 78. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Nelson, M. *The Syriac Version of the Wisdom of Ben Sira Compared to the Greek and Hebrew Materials*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 107. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Neusner, J. *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- . "History and Purity in First-Century Judaism." *History of Religions* 18 (1978): 1-17.
- Neyrey, J. *2 Peter, Jude*. Anchor Bible 37C. Doubleday, New York, 1993.
- Newsom, C. "4Q370: An Admonition Based Upon the Flood." *Revue de Qumran* 13 (1988): 23-43.
- Nielsburg, G. *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- . "Patriarchs Who Worry About Their Wives: A Haggadic Tendency in the Genesis Apocryphon." Pages 137-158 in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by M. Stone and E. Chazon. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 28. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . "The Books of Enoch at Qumran: What We Know and What We Need to Think about." Pages 99-113 in *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum*. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 97. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999.
- . "Scripture in 1 Enoch and 1 Enoch as Scripture." Pages 333-354 in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts and Their Textual and Situational Contexts*. Edited by T. Fornberg et al. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995.
- . "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6-11." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96 (1997): 383-405.

- . “The Bible Rewritten and Expanded.” *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2.2. Edited by M. E. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- . Review of J. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (1978): 411-419.
- Newsom, C. “4Q370: An Admonition based on the Flood.” *Revue de Qumran* 13 (1988): 23-43.
- . “The Development of 1 Enoch 6-19: Cosmology and Judgment.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 42 (1980): 310-329.
- Osburn, C. “2 Peter,” and “Jude.” *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 2000.
- Parker, S. “Sons of God” Pages 1500-1510 in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Edited by Karel vander Toorn et al. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Pearson, B. “1 Enoch in the Apocryphon of John.” Pages 355-367 in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts and Their Textual and Situational Contexts*. Edited by T. Fornberg et al. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995.
- Pfeiffer, R. *History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha*. New York: Harper, 1949.
- Picard, J. *Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece*. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 2. Edited by A. Denis and M. De Jonge. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- . “Observations sur l’Apocalypse grecque de Baruch.” *Semitica* 20 (1970): 77-103.
- Pomykala, K. “A Scripture Profile of the Book of the Watchers.” Pages 263-284 in *A Quest for Context and Meaning*. Biblical Interpretation Series 28. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Purinton, C. “Translation Greek in the Wisdom of Solomon.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 47 (1928): 276-304.
- Rabin, C. *The Zadokite Documents*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1954.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Genesis*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975.
- Reed, A. “What the Fallen Angels Taught: The Reception-History of the ‘Book of Watchers’ in Judaism and Christianity.” Dissertation: Princeton University, 2002.

- Reese, J. *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and Its Consequences*. Analecta biblica 41. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1970.
- Reeves, J. *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions*. Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 14. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union Press, 1992.
- Reicke, B. *The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude*. Anchor Bible 37. Doubleday: New York, 1964.
- Reider, J. *The Book of Wisdom*. Jewish Apocryphal Literature Series. New York: Harper, 1957.
- Roberts, J. "Wicked and Holy (4Q180-181)." Pages 204-213 in *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents: The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 1. Edited by J. Charlesworth. Tübingen: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992.
- Rogerson, J. *Genesis 1-11*. Wiltshire: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Rost, L. *Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976.
- Runia, D. *Philo in Early Christian Literature*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 3. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1993.
- Rzach, A. "Sibyllinische Orakel." *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Zweiter Band 2A. Edited by G. Wissowa. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1923.
- Sacchi, P. *The History of the Second Temple Period*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 285. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Safrai, S. "The Temple." *Jewish People in the 1<sup>st</sup> Century*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 1.1-2. Edited by S. Safrai and M. Stern. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974-1976.
- . *World History of the Jewish People: Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period*. Volume 8. Edited by B. Netanyahu, M. Avi-Yona and Z. Baras. Jerusalem: Jewish History Publications Ltd., 1977.
- Schlosser, J. "Les jours de Noé et de Lot: A propos de Luc, XVII, 26-30," *Revue biblique* 80 (1973): 13-36.
- Schürer, E. *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus*. Edited by M. Galtzer. New York: Schocken Books, 1961.

- Shutt, R. "Letter of Aristeas." *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. Charlesworth. Doubleday: New York, 1985.
- Sidebottom, E. *James, Jude, and 2 Peter*. Thomas Nelson: London, 1967.
- Slingerland, H. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 21. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Skehan, P. and A. DiLella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. Anchor Bible 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- Smyth, H. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Snaith, J. *Ecclesiasticus or The Wisdom of Jesus Son of Sirach*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Sokoloff, M. "Notes on the Aramaic Fragments of Enoch from Cave 4." *Maarav* 1 (1978-79): 197-224.
- Sogin, J. "Sons of God, Heroes, and Nephilim: Remarks on Genesis 6:1-4," Pages 135-36 in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions*. Edited by Michael Fox et al. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996.
- Sparks, H. ed. *The Apocryphal Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.
- Speiser, E. *Genesis*. Anchor Bible 1. Garden City: Doubleday, 1964.
- . "The Hebrew Original of the First Part of the Book of Wisdom." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 14 (1923/24): 455-482.
- Stegemann, H. *The Library of Qumran*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Steiner, R. "The Heading of the Book of the Words of Noah on a Fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon: New Light on a 'Lost' Work." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 66-71.
- Stone, M. "The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century B.C.E." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (1978): 479-492.
- . "Apocalyptic Literature." *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* 2.2. Edited by M. E. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

- Strugnell, J. "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan'." *Revue de Qumran* 7 (1969-71): 252-259.
- Stuckenbruck, L. "Genesis 6:1-4 as the Basis for Divergent Readings During the Second Temple Period." *Henoch* 24 (2002): 99-106.
- . "The Origins of Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Interpretation of Genesis 6:1-4 in the Second and Third Centuries B.C.E." Pages 87-118 in *The Fall of the Angels*. Edited by C. Auffarth and L. Struckenbruck. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . *The Book of Giants from Qumran*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 63. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- Surburg, R. *Introduction to the Intertestamental Period*. St. Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1975.
- Swete, H. *Intro to the O.T. in Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902.
- Talmon, S. "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judean Desert." Pages 162-199 in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Scripta hierosolymitana 4. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1958.
- Tcherikover, V. "The Third Book of Maccabees as a Historical Source." Pages 1-26 in *Studies in History*. Scripta hierosolmitana 7. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1961.
- Torrey, C. *The Apocryphal Literature: A Brief Introduction*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945.
- Tov, E. *The Text Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. Jerusalem: Simor Ltd., 1981.
- . *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 8. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976.
- . *The Book of Baruch*. Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations 8. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975.
- Tracy, S. "III Maccabees and Pseudo-Aristeas: A Study." *Yale Classical Studies* 1 (1928): 241-52.
- VanderKam, J. and W. Alder. *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 4.3. Edited by J. VanderKam and W. Alder. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- VanderKam, J. *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.

- . “Biblical Interpretation in 1 Enoch and *Jubilees*.” Pages 103-107 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 14. Edited by J. Charlesworth and C Evans. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- . “The Angel Story in the Book of *Jubilees*.” Pages 151-170 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . “The Interpretation of Genesis in 1 Enoch.” Pages 129-148 in *The Bible at Qumran*. Edited Peter W. Flint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- . *Enoch and the Growth of Apocalyptic Tradition*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 16. Washington DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.
- . “Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second Century Sources.” Pages 305-331 in *From Revelation to Canon*. Studia post-biblica 62. Leiden :Brill, 2000.
- . “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*.” Pages 354-365 in *From Revelation to Canon*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . *Introduction to Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Van Koningsveldt, P. “An Arabic Manuscript of the Apocalypse of Baruch.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 6 (1975): 205-7.
- Van Seters, J. *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis*. Louisville: Westminster Press, 1992.
- . *Abraham in history and Tradition*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.
- . *Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus-Numbers*. Louisville: Westminster, 1994.
- Vattioni, F. *Eslesiastico: Testo ebraico con apparato critico e versioni greca, latina, e siriana*. Rome: Istituto Orientale di Napoli, 1968.
- Vermes, G. *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity. Edited by J. Neusner. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975.
- . *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Aggadic Studies*. Studia post-biblica 4. Leiden: Brill, 1961.

- Wacholder, B. "Pseudo-Eupolemus' Two Greek Fragments of the Life of Abraham." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 34 (1963): 83-113.
- Wagner, W. "Interpretations of Genesis 6:1-4 in Second-Century Christianity." *Journal of Religious History* 20 (1996): 137-155.
- Wenham, G. *Genesis 1-15*. Word Biblical Commentary 1. Waco: Word Books, 1987.
- Westermann, C. *Genesis 1-11*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984.
- Waldstein M. and F. Wisse. *The Apocryphon of John*. Nag Hammadi and Manichaen Studies 33. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Wagner, W. "Interpretations of Genesis 6.1-4 in Second Century Christianity." *The Journal of Religious History* 20 (1996): 137-155.
- Wevers, J. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 35. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Whitehouse, O. "I Baruch." *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. Edited by R. Charles. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Whitters, M. *The Epistle of Second Baruch: A Study in Form and Message*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 42. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.
- Wicker, J. "An Analysis of the Use of Non-Canonical Literature in Jude and 2 Peter." Dissertation: Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1985.
- Wickham, L. "The Sons of God and the Daughters of Men: Genesis VI 2 in Early Christian Exegesis." Pages 135-147 in *Language and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Hebrew and Biblical Exegesis*. Oudtestamentische Studien 19. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- Williams, D. "3 Maccabees: A Defense of Diaspora Judaism?" *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 13 (1995): 17-29.
- Williamson, R. *Jews in the Hellenistic World: Philo*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Winston, D. *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 43. Garden City: Doubleday, 1979.
- Wright, A. "The Structure of the Book of Wisdom." *Biblica* 48 (1967): 165-184.

Yadin, Y. *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1965.

Zimmermann, F. "The Book of Wisdom: Its Language and Character." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 57 (1966): 1-27; 101-35.

Zuurmond, R. "The Flood according to Enoch in Early Christian Literature." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 30 (1991): 766-772.