



BRILL

---

The "Angels" and "Giants" of Genesis 6:1-4 in Second and Third Century BCE Jewish Interpretation: Reflections on the Posture of Early Apocalyptic Traditions

Author(s): Loren T. Stuckenbruck

Source: *Dead Sea Discoveries*, Vol. 7, No. 3, Angels and Demons (2000), pp. 354-377

Published by: [BRILL](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4193170>

Accessed: 03/10/2010 23:17

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=bap>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



BRILL is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Dead Sea Discoveries*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE "ANGELS" AND "GIANTS" OF GENESIS 6:1-4  
IN SECOND AND THIRD CENTURY BCE JEWISH  
INTERPRETATION: REFLECTIONS ON THE POSTURE  
OF EARLY APOCALYPTIC TRADITIONS

LOREN T. STUCKENBRUCK

University of Durham, UK

During the last twenty-five years an increasing number of publications have focussed on the "watchers" (often called "fallen angels") and their "giant" offspring (sometimes associated with "demons") in Jewish literature of the second temple period. It has been recognised that a number of early Jewish traditions regarded these beings as essentially evil, representative of forces that are inimical to God's original purpose for creation.<sup>1</sup> This picture is, of course, most well known through apocalyptic and wisdom literature composed prior to the Common Era, remains of some being attested among the Dead Sea Scrolls: the early Enoch traditions—so especially the Book of Watchers and Animal Apocalypse in 1 Enoch, and the Book of

---

<sup>1</sup> The literature is considerable, but see especially D. Dimant, e.g., in *"The Fallen Angels" in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic Books Related to Them* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University Ph.D. Thesis, 1974; in Hebrew) and "The 'Peshar' on the Periods' (4Q180) and 4Q181," *Israel Oriental Studies* 9 (1979) 77-102; M. Delcor, "Le myth de la chute des anges et de l'origine des géants comme explication du mal dans le monde dans l'apocalyptique juive. histoire des traditions," *RHR* 190 (1976) 3-53; J.T. Milik, "Turfan et Qumran: Livre des géants juif et manichéen," *Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt* (eds G. Jeremias, H.-W. Kuhn and H. Stegemann; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971) 117-27 and *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); P. Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6-11," *JBL* 96 (1977) 195-233; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6-11," *JBL* 96 (1977) 383-405; D.W. Suter, "Fallen Angels, Fallen Priests," *HUCA* 50 (1979) 115-35; I. Fröhlich, "Les enseignements des veilleurs dans la tradition de Qumran," *RevQ* 13 (1988) 177-87; P. Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (JSPSup 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990); J.C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony. Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (HUCM 14; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992); L.T. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran. Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (TSAJ 63; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1997).

Giants—Ben Sira, the Book of Jubilees, Damascus Document, Wisdom of Solomon, 3 Maccabees, 3 Baruch, and several fragmentary texts from previously unknown works (e.g., 4QSongs of the Sage [4Q510-11]; 4QAges of Creation [4Q180-81]; 4QExhortation Based on the Floor [4Q370]; and 11QApocryphal Psalms (11Q11) col. 5). However, unless these materials are considered in relation to a broader context of post-biblical interpretation and early Jewish adaptations of classical traditions from antiquity, it is impossible to appreciate their position within what appears to have been a debate among Jews during the third through first centuries BCE concerning the origins of culture and the origin of pre-diluvian evil.<sup>2</sup> Clearly, the notion of irreversibly rebellious watchers and giants was not taken for granted by Jewish apocalyptic authors. Rather, it was hammered out as Jewish interpreters writing in Greek as well as Aramaic and Hebrew were variously attempting to provide an account of the beginning and nature of the universe by coming to terms with a colourful palette of received traditions. The purpose of this article is, with reference to Gen. 6:1-4, to describe this diversity among the early Jewish apocalyptic writings and to consider what was at stake among those who read the biblical tradition as an account relating to the introduction of evil into the world. In order to achieve this aim, I shall first briefly discuss the biblical texts, and then proceed to describe the role of "giants" in some of the euhemeristic sources, followed by a discussion of apocalyptic traditions which may in some measure be understood as a response to these sources.

### A. *The Biblical Traditions*

The most significant biblical passage for the "fallen angels" tradition is the notoriously difficult Gen. 6:1-4. Here, during the time before the great flood, at least two, perhaps three, categories beyond that of human beings are distinguished in the Masoretic tradition: (1) "the sons of God" (בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים in vv. 2, 4a—LXX οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ) who consort with "the daughters of humanity," on the one hand, and (2) their offspring "the mighty men . . . men of renown" (הַנְּבִירִים . . . אֲנָשֵׁי הַשֵּׁם in v. 4b—οἱ γίγαντες . . . οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ὀνομαστοί), on the other. In addition, (3) there is a somewhat vague reference to "the Neph[i]lim"

<sup>2</sup> Two important attempts in this direction, albeit with contrastive views, may be found in Reeves, "Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?" *JBL* 112 (1993) 110-15 and R.V. Huggins, "Noah and the Giants: A Response to John C. Reeves," *JBL* 114 (1995) 103-10.

(הנפילים) who are said to have been “on earth in those days” (v. 4a); the Greek tradition, by using the designation οἱ γίγαντες again, identifies the Nephilim with “the mighty men.”<sup>3</sup> Given the ambiguous shape of the text as it stands, just how these groups relate or contribute to the story of the great flood is left unclear. A series of questions for interpreters could emerge: How are any of these groups involved in God’s decision to punish evil by sending a flood (cf. 6:3, 5-7, 13)? Are “the sons of God” or their progeny somehow involved with the “great evil,” “violence,” and “corruption” upon the earth (vv. 5, 11-13), or is the deluge simply God’s response to the escalation of human wickedness alone? Further, does the flood’s destruction of “all flesh” include the offspring of “the sons of God” and “the daughters of humanity,” or is it reserved for the other contemporaries of Noah and his family?

Although the biblical tradition emphasizes the completeness of the destruction brought about by the flood (Gen. 6:13, 17), it contains enough traces that would have provided Jewish readers during the second temple period ample reason to suspect that “the mighty men”—“Neph[i]lim”—“the giants” actually survived the cataclysm. This is either because they could be thought to have belonged to Noah’s family who escaped on the ark or because they survived the flood in a manner left unnarrated in the biblical text. Whereas the brief account about Nimrod in Gen. 10:8-12 might reflect the former possibility,<sup>4</sup> a later passage in the Hebrew Bible referring to “the Nephilim” (Num. 13:33)<sup>5</sup> opens up the way to consider the latter. These alternatives within biblical tradition bear further comment.

In Gen. 10:8-11 Nimrod, a post-diluvian descendant of Noah through the line of Ham, is described as “a mighty man in the land” (נבר בארץ, v. 8) and as “a mighty hunter before the Lord” (נבר ציד, v. 9a, b). Moreover, he is credited with having built several cities (v. 11). Finally, his rule was established in Babel, Erech, and Accad which were in the land of Shinar, the very location in which

<sup>3</sup> The same assimilation of both Hebrew terms into one group is made in this verse by the Aramaic targumic traditions of Onqelos and Neofiti (ניבריא and ניבריה, respectively).

<sup>4</sup> That is, Nimrod is represented as the son of Cush, the son of Ham, the son of Noah (Gen. 10:6-8).

<sup>5</sup> Although an allusion to Gen. 6:4 is not impossible, the reference in Ezek. 32:27 to the נפילים נבריים, which is translated as οἱ γίγαντες τῶν πεπρωκότων in the Greek tradition, neither refers to the flood nor specifies when this group “descended to Sheol with their weapons of war.”

the tower of Babel is built according to the following narrative (11:1-9). Significantly, the Greek translator, perhaps noting the use of נִבְרַר in 6:4, likewise rendered that term with γίγας in all three instances referring to Nimrod in vv. 8-9. Whatever one may have made of Nimrod's relationship to Noah, his identification as a "mighty man" or "giant" may have given readers cause to infer that the group(s) referred to as the offspring of "the sons of God" in 6:4 may, at least in part, have survived the flood,<sup>6</sup> whether this was supposed to be through the lineage of Noah (who in this case would have been a "giant") or by some independent and unnarrated means.

The second passage, from Numbers 13, contains a curious double-reference to "the Nephilim" (הַנְּפִילִים, v. 33), who as in Gen. 6:4 are rendered as οἱ γίγαντες (though only once; so also Targums Onqelos and Neofiti). Here the designation denotes inhabitants of Canaan whose great size made the Israelites spying out the land look like grasshoppers in comparison. In the Hebrew text, these Nephilim are identified as "the sons of Anak" who, in turn, are descendants from the Nephilim. Within the literary context of the Pentateuch, these ominous dwellers of Canaan could have been readily interpreted as descendants of the Nephilim of Gen. 6:4. Such a connection would again presuppose that somehow they escaped the great flood unless, again, Noah was to be considered one of their number.

The specific correlation of the Nephilim in Num. 13:33 with "the sons of Anak" (cf. vv. 22, 28) opens up a wider horizon for linking groups within the biblical tradition, in both the Masoretic Text<sup>7</sup> and the Greek translation traditions. In Deut. 2:10-11, an apparent gloss explains that a people called "the Emim" among the Moabites "like the Anakim are also thought to be the Rephaim." The correspondence of Gibborim ("mighty men") = Nephilim = Anakim = Rephaim, which may be inferred from a synthetic reading of Genesis 6, Numbers 13, and Deuteronomy 2, results in a translation strategy in which the common term γίγας is often applied by the translators.<sup>8</sup> By implication, Og

<sup>6</sup> This seems to be the shape of the tradition behind Philo's discussion of Nimrod in *de Gig.* 63-66; see n. 58 below.

<sup>7</sup> Unfortunately, none of the biblical manuscript fragments from the Dead Sea preserves anything corresponding to the passages relevant to the present discussion.

<sup>8</sup> For instances of נַבְרָרִים, and רַפְאִים, and עַנְקִים (only once: Deut. 1:28) rendered as γίγαντες throughout the Septuagint tradition, see the listing with discussion by B. Pearson, "Resurrection and the Judgment of the Titans: ἡ γὰρ τῶν ἀσεβείων in LXX Isaiah 26.19," S.E. Porter, M.A. Hayes, and D. Tombs, *Resurrection* (JSNTSup, 186; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1999) 36-37 and nn. 6-7.

king of Bashan belongs to this circle, as suggested by the unusually large size of his bed and the comment that he "alone was left remaining from the remnant of the Rephaim" (Deut. 3:11; cf. v. 13). According to Josh. 12:4, the same phrase מִיִּחַר הַרְפָּאִים as found in Deut. 3:11 is rendered ἐκ τῶν γιγάντων thus perhaps establishing him as a descendant of the pre-diluvian giants. This interpretive possibility was later recognised in several traditions preserved in rabbinic and targumic literature.<sup>9</sup>

The foregoing brief look at biblical tradition allows for the following inferences about the giant offspring of "the sons of God." (a) There is no coherent picture that clarifies their status in relation to the flood. Although in Numbers 13 and Deuteronomy 2-3 they are regarded as enemies of the Israelites in the wilderness, the first reference in Genesis 6 does not single them out as those against whom the flood was sent. (b) Despite the annihilation of "all flesh" (except for Noah, his family, and the selected animals on the ark), traditions persisted that regarded the "giants" as having survived the flood. The possibility for later interpretation emerges, therefore, that the giants, or at least some of them, survived the flood with their flesh intact and that they were not necessarily regarded as the embodiment of an evil introduced into the world through the fallen "sons of God."

### *The "Pseudo-Eupolemus" Fragments*

The story about the "giants" occurs in two sources cited by the historiographer Alexander Polyhistor (112-30 BCE) whose work, in turn, is quoted by Eusebius in his *Praeparatio Evangelica* 9.17.1-9 (frag. 1) and 9.18.2 (frag. 2).<sup>10</sup> Despite the likelihood that both fragments stem

<sup>9</sup> See b. Nid. 61a and Tg. Ps.-Jon. Deut. 2:2 and 3:11 in which both Sihon and Og are identified as giants insofar they are the "sons of Ahijah the son of Shemhazai," the latter of course being the chief of the "fallen" angels in the Enoch tradition. In b. Nid. 61a Og is in addition, said to have reported the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah to Abraham, and is singled out as one "who escaped from the generation of the flood" (זה עוב שפלים מדור מכול). Another passage in b. Zev. 113 refers only to "Og king of Bashan", its brief account suggests that Og escaped the scalding waters of the flood by (presumably) holding onto the ark which was miraculously protected by cooled water. Indeed, Milik has speculated whether these texts presuppose a knowledge of giants traditions which ultimately derive from the Book of Giants (Og being a derivable equivalent for the giant 'Ohyah).

<sup>10</sup> The Greek text was published thirty years ago by A.-M. Denis, *Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum Quae Supersunt Graeca. Una Cum Historicum et Auctorum Iudaeorum Hellenistarum Fragmentis* (PVTG 3; Leiden: Brill, 1970) 197-98. For English translations,

from different sources,<sup>11</sup> they share an anti-Egyptian perspective on the dissemination of culture and learning,<sup>12</sup> favouring the view that such knowledge originated instead from Babylonia. If Alexander Polyhistor's first century BCE citation of the fragments may be taken as a broad *terminus ad quem*, then these passages are likely to derive from works composed sometime during the second century BCE, while the traditions they contain may possibly be even earlier. As we shall see below, the references in these fragments to giants are of particular importance in providing a plausible background for the way early Jewish apocalyptic traditions developed the biblical interpretation of Gen. 6:1-4.

Although the fragments vary in length, frag. 2 being preserved in more abbreviated form than the more detailed account of frag. 1, they share some important features with respect to the γίγαντες. First, the giants in both fragments are linked with Babylonia (9.17.2; 9.18.2).

---

see R. Doran, "Pseudo-Eupolemus: A New Translation and Introduction," *OTP* 2.873-79 (with discussion); C.H. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors. I. Historians* (SBLTT 20; Pseudepigrapha 10; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1983) 157-87 (with commentary and Greek text), and B.-Z. Wacholder, *Eupolemus. A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College and Jewish Institute of Religion, 1974) 104-6 (discussion) and 313-14. See further H.W. Attridge, "Historiography," M.E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2.2: Philadelphia: Fortress Press; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984) 165-66; Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 32-40 (esp. 33-34 and nn. 126-27); and Pearson, "Resurrection and the Judgment of the Titans," 42-44.

<sup>11</sup> Those tracing both passages to the same author include J. Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke. Hellenistische Studien* (Breslau: Skutsch, 1875) 90-92; B.-Z. Wacholder, "Pseudo-Eupolemus' Two Greek Fragments on the Life of Abraham," *HUCA* 34 (1963) 83-113; see also M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1974) 1.88-89; H.W. Attridge, "Historiography," 165-66; Reeves, "Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?" 112; and Holladay, *Fragments*, 159 and 163 n. 18. Due to slightly different emphases, however, the fragments attributed to (Eupolemus" and to "anonymous sources" respectively, stem from a circle of similar traditions. Doran, "Pseudo-Eupolemus," 874-76, followed by Pearson, argues that the Samaritan traits of the first fragment stem from Eupolemus himself (though see Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 34-35, esp. n. 128), while the second fragment derives from a different tradition, whether oral or written. See further Wacholder's change of mind in *Eupolemus*, 287 n. 112; N. Walter, "Pseudo-Eupolemos (Samaritanischer Anonymus)," *JSHRZ* 1/2 (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1976) 137-43; and Huggins, "Noah and the Giants," 104-7 (see n. 2).

<sup>12</sup> This is especially clear in frag. 1 (9.17.8b—"Enoch first discovered astrology, not the Egyptians"; 9.17.8a—only after Abraham taught the Phoenicians is he said to have taught among the Egyptian priests), while it is implied in frag. 2 (whereas Abraham passes his knowledge on to the Phoenicians, nothing is said about such activity when he went to Egypt).

Second, they are correlated with the biblical traditions about the great flood (9.17.2; 9.18.2)<sup>13</sup> and the building of a tower (9.17.2; 9.18.2). Third, after identifying the founders of Babylonia as giants “who were delivered from the flood” (οἱ διασωθέντοι ἐκ τοῦ κατακλύσμου) and built the famous tower (9.17.2), frag. 1 goes on to derive the knowledge of astrology from Enoch (9.17.8)<sup>14</sup> and to attribute the same knowledge to Abraham (9.17.3) who taught it to the Phoenicians (9.17.4). The more cursory note in frag. 2 (9.18.2) likewise singles out the extraordinary astrological knowledge of Abraham who passed it on to the Phoenicians. Of special interest in frag. 2 is that Abraham’s ancestry is explicitly traced back to the giants “who lived in the land of Babylonia.”

Fourth, both fragments share a series of details relating to giants traditions which, however, are preserved in a somewhat different form. In particular, each refers to a certain “Belos” who is linked in some way with Babylon.<sup>15</sup> In frag. 2, Belos is unambiguously identified as a giant who, unlike other giants “destroyed by the gods because of their impiety,” escaped destruction to dwell in Babylon where he built a tower. Although the episode in which giants were destroyed is not specified, it is likely an allusion to the flood, and thus the giant Belos seems to correspond to the figure of Noah in the biblical tradition.<sup>16</sup> In frag. 1, Belos “son of Kronos” is mentioned as part of the writer’s explanation for the origin and development of culture, a tradition which is attributed to the Babylonians. Unlike frag. 2, however, the

<sup>13</sup> The reference in this fragment to “destruction” is a likely allusion to the deluge.

<sup>14</sup> Enoch is equated with the Greek Atlas in 9.17.9.

<sup>15</sup> This association of Belos stands much in contrast with the works of Herodotus (2.82) and Diodorus Siculus (1.81.6), in which the origin of astrology is traced to Egypt; cf. Doran, “Pseudo-Eupolemus,” 877.

<sup>16</sup> See Reeves, “Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?” 115 which discusses the possibility of Noah as a giant on the basis of his interpretation of the name “Atambish” in two fragmentary Manichaean texts preserved in Middle Persian published by W. Sundermann: “M5900 Recto?” and Frag. “L” page 1, Verso, line 5; see, respectively, Sundermann, *Mittelpersische und partische kosmogonische und parabeltexte der Manichäer* (Berliner Turfantexte, 4; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1973) 78 and idem, “Ein weiteres Fragment aus Manis Gigantenbuch,” *Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata* (Acta Iranica 23 and Second Series 9; Leiden: Brill, 1984) 491-505, esp. 495 n. 19 and 497. Reeves and Sundermann both argue that Atambish refers to one of the giants who serves as an anti-Noah figure in the story. The name is, unfortunately, not preserved among the Dead Sea Book of Giants fragments. Huggins’ contention that, instead, the Manichaean Atambish is to be identified with Enoch is less convincing; cf. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 73 n. 43. Grounds for considering Noah as a γίγας might already have been seen as implicit in the biblical story itself, if the notion of the giants’ or Nephilim’s survival of the deluge is coupled with the view that only Noah and his family (along with the animals) escaped destruction.

precise relationship between this Belos and the γίγαντες is not delineated; it remains unclear whether Belos is assumed to have been the first of the giants<sup>17</sup> or simply the first human being (πρῶτον γενέσθαι βῆλον).<sup>18</sup> Moreover, unlike frag. 1, the motif of destruction is associated with the tower, and the "escape" is made not by one person alone, but by "the giants" as a group. Furthermore, the fragments each associate the giants, whether directly (frag. 2) or indirectly (frag. 1), with the introduction of culture, and in neither are they *as a whole* consigned to punishment. A distinction is thus drawn between "good" and "bad" giants. In frag. 1, it is the giants responsible for having built the tower who were culpable and therefore scattered from Babylon throughout the earth, while at the same time it was Abraham, born in Babylonia generations later, who "pleased God because he eagerly strove to be pious." If a reading of 9.17.3-4 on Abraham is synthesized with 9.17.8-9 concerning Enoch, it is possible to infer that Abraham's learning was thought to have derived ultimately from that of Enoch whose knowledge, in turn, came through instructions given him by "the angels of God." The text does not identify either Abraham or Enoch as a giant; nevertheless, the mention of Abraham's place of birth in Babylonia following the brief account about the tower built by the giants certainly allows for such a connection.<sup>19</sup> Just *how* the continuity of learning between the pre-diluvian Enoch and the post-diluvian Abraham occurred is not explained; but the escape of giants from the flood suggests that they themselves are the implied tradents of the knowledge given to Enoch. The portrait painted in frag. 2 distinguishes between the calumniable giants "destroyed by the gods because of their impiety" (διὰ τὴν ἀσέβειαν ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν ἀναιρεσθῆναι) and one of their offspring, Abraham, who brought astrology to the Phoenicians.

<sup>17</sup> As argued by Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 314.

<sup>18</sup> In my opinion, Doran has been too quick, through an emendation which designates Belos as the son of Kronos rather than as Kronos himself (choosing to read a genitive κρόνου in place of the accusative κρόνον), to differentiate between the traditions in frags 1 and 2; cf. Pearson, "Resurrection and the Judgment of the Titans," 43-44 n. 23. In the end, the possibility that Belos is thought to be one of the Titans of Greek mythology or even a giant cannot be discounted; on the merging of the Titan and giants' mythologies into one story during the Hellenistic period, see e.g., T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth. A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore/London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993) 44-56 and 445-54.

<sup>19</sup> The likelihood that frag. 1 assumes Enoch was a giant is strengthened by his identification with Atlas, who was a second generation Titan in Greek mythology and was associated with the discovery of astrology; cf. the references cited in B.-Z. Wacholder, "Pseudo-Eupolemus' Two Greek Fragments," 96 nn. 82-83.

In addition, Belos' building and inhabiting the tower is not characterised as anything "bad."

The identification in frag. 1 of the tower builders as "giants" can be explained, of course, on the basis of a reading or interpretation of Gen. 10:8-11 (about Nimrod) and 11:1-9 (about the tower of Babel). Likewise, the account of Gen. 11:1-9 may lie in the background of frag. 2, in which the giants' post-diluvian existence is taken for granted. Both fragments may thus reflect an inference that if the deluge destroyed "all flesh" and giants survived the catastrophe, then the only survivors (i.e., Noah and his family) may have been "giants" as well. In this way, the biblical giants have become an important link in the introduction and spread of culture.

Significantly, the fragments do not distinguish between reprehensible and commendable learning; in fact, there is little question that the knowledge attributed, for example, to Enoch and Abraham is being referred to with approval. Moreover, the fragments suggest that the spread of such knowledge occurred along one line of continuity: (a) angels to (b) Enoch to (c) a giant (Belos?) or giants who escaped the flood to (d) their descendants and, therefore, to Abraham. It is nevertheless important to note that the link between the "giants" and culture is nowhere explicit.

Finally, the events of destruction, whether through the flood (frag. 2) or on account of the tower (frag. 1), do not have an enduring cosmic significance associated with them. This configuration of tradition functioned in order to situate Jewish origins in the biblical story within the context of propaganda concerning the provenance of culture. Abraham is thus assigned a prominent role in substantiating the chronological preeminence of Babylonian learning over Phoenician, in the first instance, and over Egyptian, in the second.

### *The Early Enoch Traditions*

Much in contrast to the euhemeristic fragments recorded by Alexander Polyhistor, the early apocalyptic Enoch traditions (Book of Watchers = 1 Enoch 1-36, Book of Giants, and Animal Apocalypse = 1 Enoch 85-90) contain narratives which proclaim a divine punishment against the evil carried out by the watchers and their giant offspring. Therein the great flood, or at least imagery thereof, is given an important role as the authors' descriptions of divine acts of judgment.

Book of Watchers (1 Enoch 1-36). The paleographical dating of 4Q201 (4QEnoch\*) to "the first half of the second century" BCE and the man-

uscript's conservative orthography along with possible copying confusions have suggested, according to J.T. Milik, that its *Vorlage* goes at least as far back as the third century.<sup>20</sup> In this earliest extant form of the Book of Watchers, various strands of tradition had already been combined in chaps 6-11 and 12-16 to form a running narrative<sup>21</sup> that painted a picture attributing the pre-diluvian spread of reprehensible forms of culture and learning to the "fallen angels" (1 Enoch 7:1; 8:3; 9:6-8a; 13:2b; cf. 16:3) and explaining the increase of oppression and violence suffered on earth at this time through the activities of their offspring, the giants (7:3-6; 9:1, 9-10; cf. 10:15).<sup>22</sup> Whereas the "Pseudo-Eupolemus" fragments do not make any effort to distinguish between the angels who instructed Enoch in the sciences and giants who apparently learned this from Enoch, this early Enochic tradition distinguishes clearly between the *rebellious* angels who fathered the giants and introduced humans to rejected forms of knowledge, on the one hand, and those angels who have instructed Enoch about the nature of the universe, on the other. The fallen angels' teachings are listed in the Book of Watchers at 1 Enoch 8:1-3 and are more cursorily referred to in 1 Enoch 7:1b; 9:8, and 10:7.<sup>23</sup> In 1 Enoch 8:1-3, a tradition originally associated with the angel 'Asa'el,<sup>24</sup> the teachings include: (a) the making of weapons which led to violence (8:1a); (b) how to fashion jewelry and cosmetics which led to acts of fornication (8:1b-2); and (c) activities associated with magic and astrological forms of divination (8:3; cf. 7:1b). This contrasts with the learning mediated in the visions to Enoch by good angels. In the Book of Watchers Enoch's two journeys through the cosmos to observe the

<sup>20</sup> See Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 140-41.

<sup>21</sup> Although different strands of tradition within 1 Enoch 1-16 can be distinguished (so C.A. Newsom, "The Development of 1 Enoch 6-19. Cosmology and Judgment," *CBQ* 42 [1980] 310-29), the oldest manuscript to include any portion of Book of Watchers, i.e., 4Q201 (= 4QEnoch<sup>a</sup>, dated ca. first half of the 2nd cent. BCE), shows that these once separate strands have already been interwoven. Fragments of 4Q201 correspond to chaps 1-5 (in 4Q201 1 i-ii), 6-11 (in 1 iii-vi, in which the 'Asa'el and Shemihazah traditions are combined), and chap. 12 (in 1 vi). Similarly the early Hasmonean 4Q202 (= 4QEnoch<sup>b</sup>): from chaps 1-5 (1 ii 1), chaps 6-11 (1 ii-iv), and chap. 14 (1 vi). On 4Q201-2, see Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 139-63 and 164-78 respectively.

<sup>22</sup> 1 Enoch 10:15 seems to refer, however, not strictly to the giants but to the post-diluvian "souls" which survive them, as in chaps 15-16; cf. D. Dimant, "1 Enoch 6-11: A Methodological Perspective," *SBLSP* 13 (1978) 323-39, esp. 333 n. 8.

<sup>23</sup> This list is adapted and expanded, respectively, in the later Similitudes (1 Enoch 65:6-11 and 69:1, 6-15).

<sup>24</sup> As has been shown e.g., by Newsom, "The Development of 1 Enoch 6-19," 313.

positions of stars and luminaries, places of punishment and reward, and the contours of the earth with Jerusalem at its centre are mediated by a variety of angels (1 Enoch 17:1-36:4), with Uriel playing a prominent role as an *angelus interpretes* during Enoch's second journey (1 Enoch 17:1-20:7).<sup>25</sup>

Neither the "Pseudo-Eupolemus" fragments nor the Book of Watchers explicitly associates the giants with the spread of culture. Nevertheless, such a role is strongly implied in the former,<sup>26</sup> while in the latter the watchers' offspring are merely included among the recipients of the fallen angels' teaching (1 Enoch 10:7-8). This difference, however, does not ultimately explain why the author(s) of the Book of Watchers placed such an emphasis on the giants' culpability. The Shemihazah strand of the narrative underscores the giants as the product of the angels' sin which consisted of the sexual union between themselves as heavenly beings with women on earth (1 Enoch 6:1-4; 7:1a, 2; 9:7-8; 10:9a, 11; 15:3-7, 12). The reason for singling out this pre-diluvian activity as loathsome is most clearly expressed in 15:3-7: the union between essentially spiritual, heavenly beings and earthly humans of flesh and blood by definition violates the order of nature (15:4, 9-10).<sup>27</sup> The giants, who are the progeny of such an illegitimate union and neither fully angelic nor fully human, are called "bastards" (10:9—τοὺς μαζήπείους in Codex Panopolitanus, likely transliterated from the Heb./Aram. ממזרים).<sup>28</sup> As products of a created order gone awry, the giants engage in activities which both oppress and threaten the existence of creation itself, including both animals and human beings (7:3-5; 9:1, 9b; cf. 10:15).<sup>29</sup> It is ultimately their destructive deeds that result in God's response to human petitions for divine intervention (9:2-3, 10).

<sup>25</sup> In the Astronomical Book (1 Enoch 72-82), which was likely known to the writer of 1 Enoch 17-36, the instructions to Enoch concerning the calendrical movements and positions of the sun and moon are likewise mediated by Uriel. See further, e.g., 1 Enoch 71:3-4.

<sup>26</sup> See the discussion of the "Pseudo-Eupolemus" fragments above.

<sup>27</sup> This transgression is in analogy with explanation offered in the Astronomical Book for the existence of wrong calendars: disobedient stars have veered off the paths designed for them from the beginning; cf. 1 Enoch 80:6-8. The Book of Watchers prefaces the story of the Watchers with calls to consider the obedience of the created order, implying that any digression is in breach of the divine order.

<sup>28</sup> No doubt, therefore, the phrase רוחות ממזרים ("spirits of the bastards") in 4Q510 1 5 (among a list of demonic forces) and 4Q511 35 7 (singled out as needing to be subjugated by God) refers to the giants who have existed beyond the flood only as spirits. See further 4Q444 2 i 4.

<sup>29</sup> See n. 22 above.

Another difference between the "Pseudo-Eupolemus" fragments and the Book of Watchers lies in the fate of the giants. Whereas in the former, a giant or giants escaped the flood, the latter uses flood imagery to underscore their eradication. To be sure, the Book of Watchers does refer to an escape from the flood (10:3), but this is restricted to the righteous Noah and his offspring. There is no possibility of identifying Noah as one of the giants (*contra* the tradition about Belos in Pseudo-Eupolemus frag. 2), just as Enoch "the scribe of truth/righteousness" is dissociated from any link with a tradition of learning that includes the giants (*contra* the impression left by Pseudo-Eupolemus frag. 1).

However, despite an emphasis on the singularity of Noah's escape, the Book of Watchers does allow a post-diluvian existence for the giants. Rather than escaping the deluge, as in the "Pseudo-Eupolemus" fragments, the giants are merely able to survive in a radically altered form, that is, as "evil spirits" (15:8-9). The available textual witnesses are not explicit about how this change has come about, although a narratological explanation may be inferred from a reading of 15:3-16:3 as an elaboration on parts of 10:1-22. As a mixture of heavenly and earthly beings, the giants were composed of flesh and spirit. When they came under divine judgment, the fleshly part of their nature was destroyed, whether through fratricidal conflict (7:5; 10:12) or through the flood. Spirits or souls emerged from their dead bodies, and it is in this form that the giants are allowed an existence until the final judgment (16:1). Since these spirits were the products of a reprehensible union, they are innately evil. The giants live on as disembodied spirits after the biblical flood, continuing to engage in the sorts of activities that had so characterised them before. In particular, one may infer that they wished to bring affliction to human beings (15:12), the offspring of Noah, being jealous that humans had escaped the deluge with their bodies intact. This reconstructed aetiology explains how it is that giants could come to be openly identified as demons at a later stage<sup>30</sup> and, in turn, why it is that demons were thought to be especially desirous of entering the bodies of human beings. As the

<sup>30</sup> In particular see the Christian Testament of Solomon 5:3; 17:1. In the former text (within the section 5:1-11), the demon Asmodeus from the Book of Tobit (the longer recension known through Codex Sinaiticus) is reinterpreted as one born from a human mother and an angel, while in the latter (in the section 17:1-5) the demonic power thwarted by Jesus (in an allusion to Mark 5:3) is identified as one of the giants who died in the internecine conflicts. The implications of the giants traditions for concepts of demonology at the turn of the Common Era have until now been insufficiently recognised.

giants are allowed to survive into the post-diluvian period (albeit only as spirits), neither their internecine battles nor the deluge represent God's final triumph over evil. While the flood is a clear sign of divine punishment in the past, it remains but a proleptic one. Hence the flood motif in chap. 10 refers back to the biblical event (10:2), but also adapts imagery thereof when alluding to the eschatological judgment at which time evil will once and for all be eradicated (10:20, 22). In the meantime—that is, between the time of the deluge and God's final destruction of evil—the giants' evil spirits can only operate as defeated powers whose time is limited.

Book of Giants. This writing, which is preserved only through Manichaean fragments in several languages<sup>31</sup> and among a number of manuscript fragments from the Dead Sea,<sup>32</sup> has been subjected to increased scholarly attention during the last ten years.<sup>33</sup> Since this work clearly reflects the influence of the Book of Watchers,<sup>34</sup> the composition of the latter may serve as a *terminus a quo* for its date, while it is more difficult with regard to the Book of Giants to determine a *terminus ad quem*. As I have argued elsewhere, a date between the time of the Book of Watchers and Daniel 7 is possible, though this must remain uncertain.<sup>35</sup> The Book of Giants may be said to have adapted and rein-

<sup>31</sup> The three most significant treatments and publications of these materials are by (1) W.B. Henning, "The Book of Giants," *BSOAS* 11 (1943-46) 52-74; (2) Sundermann, *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer*, 76-78 and (3) idem, "Ein weiteres Fragment," 491-505 and Reeves' monograph treatment, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony*.

<sup>32</sup> Attention was early on drawn to Book of Giants among the Dead Sea materials by Milik.

<sup>33</sup> See F. García Martínez, "The Book of Giants," *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 97-115; Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony*; R. Eisenman and M.O. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Shaftsbury, ME: Element, 1992) 94-96; K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994) 119-24; Huggins, "Noah and the Giants"; M.E. Stone, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pseudepigrapha," *DSD* 3 (1996) 279-95, esp. 282-84; and Stuckenbruck, e.g., *The Book of Giants*.

<sup>34</sup> See Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 24-25.

<sup>35</sup> Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 31, 119-23; idem, "The Throne Theophany of the Book of Giants: Some New Light on the Background of Daniel 7," *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (eds S.E. Porter and C.A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Roehampton Institute London Papers, 3; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1997) 211-20. Although the vision of judgment contained in 4Q530 2:16b-20 is more developed than the parallel phrases in its counterpart in Dan. 7:9-10, this does not necessarily mean that the Book of Giants was composed before Daniel 7. What has been shown, nevertheless, is that one can no longer assume that the parallels between these passages suggest a dependence of the Book of Giants on the Daniel text.

forced the view known in the Book of Watchers that the giants were destroyed through intramural conflict (see below). Unfortunately, the limited material evidence requires that any arguments concerning what the work originally did or did not contain be made with caution.<sup>36</sup> Nevertheless, the extant fragments do preserve enough of the work for one to offer a few observations about its distinctive view of the watchers and the giants.

As in the Book of Watchers the giants (designated both נכרִיָא and נפִילִיָא)<sup>37</sup> and their angelic progenitors are unequivocally regarded in the Book of Giants as evil, deserving of irrevocable punishment.<sup>38</sup> Similarly, the Book of Giants retains the dual motif of internecine fighting (1Q23 9+14+15?; 4Q531 4)<sup>39</sup> with their destruction through the flood (2Q26; 4Q530 2:4-7; 6Q8 frag. 2). Finally, the Book of Giants also retells the story about the fall of angels (see esp. 4Q531 frag. 5). However, the communication between Enoch and the watchers that so characterizes 1 Enoch 12-16, in which Enoch mediates between their petitions and God's declaration of judgment, has given way to a story which centres more on communication between the patriarch and the giants themselves.<sup>40</sup> Whereas the Book of Watchers emphasizes how it is that the watchers learn of their judgment, the Book of Giants throws the spotlight on the pre-diluvian chaos from the perspective of the giants. The work thus contains what must have been an elaborate account describing the giants' pre-diluvian exploits (4Q531 frag. 1; 1Q23 9+14+15?; 4Q532 frag. 2), recounts perhaps two series of

<sup>36</sup> For a detailed reconstruction of the document, including a critical analysis of other attempts to infer an original structure, see my article, "The Sequencing of Fragments Belonging to the Qumran *Book of Giants*: An Inquiry into the Structure and Purpose of an Early Jewish Composition," *JSP* 16 (1997) 3-24.

<sup>37</sup> Thus the "mighty ones" and "Nephilim" of Gen. 6:3 are, as in Greek tradition, identified with one another; so in 4Q531 5 2 and see further 4Q530 2:6, 13, 15.

<sup>38</sup> This view does not mitigate the fact that the sinful watchers are originally thought to have been "gardeners" whose task it was before their rebellion to act as angelic protectors of the earth (4Q530 2:7 and perhaps 3:11; see Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 113-16).

<sup>39</sup> For the intramural violence, see also the Book of Giants fragments published by Henning, "Book of Giants," 60 (Middle Persian frag. j, lines 23-32) and 65-66 (Sogdian frag. pp. 1-2, lines 1-18). Significantly, as in 1 Enoch 10:12, the internecine conflicts may involve the watchers, who in 4Q531 4 are included among the list of those killed "by the sword" (line 5). The motif of infighting among the giants is further attested in Jub. 5:9 and 7:22-24a (see below) and Sib. Or 1:104-8.

<sup>40</sup> The mediator between Enoch and the giants is none other than one of the giants, Maḥaway; see 4Q530 2:21-3:11 and the Manichaean Uyğur fragment, in which Maḥaway's equivalent is called "Virogdad" (see the English translation by Henning, "The Book of Giants," 65).

dreams which herald judgment (2Q26; 6Q8 frag. 2; 4Q530 2:4-20), and describes the nature of their plight more fully and with far more detail than either the Book of Watchers or Jubilees (e.g., 4Q203 frag. 8; 4Q530 frag. 6 i 5-7; 4Q531 frag. 17 4-7, 11-12).<sup>41</sup> Conspicuous is, of course, the fact that, in contrast with other known contemporary Jewish apocalyptic writings, the Book of Giants assigns proper names to the giants: for example, 'Ohyah, Hahyah, Mahaway, Gilgamesh, Hobabish, and Aḥiram.<sup>42</sup>

If read against the background of the "Pseudo-Eupolemus" fragments' special interest in the giants, the Book of Giants becomes more than just an elaboration of the interpretation of Genesis 5-6 as found in the earlier Enochic tradition. It may well be that, in fact, the Book of Giants was attempting to refute just the sort of tradition that the "Pseudo-Eupolemus" fragments contain. Similar to the materials cited by Alexander Polyhistor and preserved through Eusebius, the Book of Giants relates the story about the giants to Babylonian tradition.<sup>43</sup> In addition, the motif of escape from punishment for at least some of the giants, though with a negative result, may also be preserved in the Book of Giants fragments.<sup>44</sup> However, unlike the euhemeristic sources, the Book of Giants goes to great lengths to draw an unambiguous distinction (a) between the hopeless position of the rebellious angels and giants, on the one hand, and the knowledge revealed to Enoch, on the other, and (b) between the culpable giants who did not escape punishment and the human beings (Noah and sons) who escaped the flood. A reconstruction of the book suggests a relatively elaborate narrative which revolves around how it is that the giants become cognisant that they would not be exonerated for their heinous crimes.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>41</sup> The miserable state of the giants is not only represented by their dread of the coming judgment, but also manifests itself in restless sleep (despite weariness) and inability to eat (despite hunger); so in particular 4Q530 6 6-7; 4Q531 17 11-12; and the Manichaean fragment "L" Verso, lines 1-4 published by Sundermann, "Ein weiteres Fragment," 497.

<sup>42</sup> See Stuckenbruck, "The Sequencing of Fragments," 4 n. 4.

<sup>43</sup> This is *inter alia* suggested by the preservation of names for giants in the work that derive from Babylonian tradition (though there is no overlap in the names themselves), such as the Gilgamesh Epic; so esp. Hobabish (4Q203 3 3) from Humbaba (in the Neo-Assyrian version of the Epic) or Huwawa (Old Babylonian version) and Gilgamesh (4Q530 2 2; 4Q531 17 12). See Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony*, 119-20 and 158 n. 365.

<sup>44</sup> Significantly the illusionary hope of such an escape may in the narrative have been attributed to Gilgamesh (4Q531 17 11-12; 4Q530 1:1-6 and 2:1-3); cf. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 23, 103-9, and 161-67.

<sup>45</sup> The plot is not straightforward, in the sense that the giants are merely informed

Inspired by the earlier Enoch tradition, then, the Book of Giants insists that the biblical נפילים = נברים of Gen. 6:4 met with a decisive form of punishment in the great flood, a destruction which Noah and his sons escaped.

This is, nevertheless, not the end of the matter. The aetiology for evil spirits described in 1 Enoch 15:8-16:1 is presupposed among some of the Book of Giants fragments; although divine punishment in the deluge is decisive, it remains incomplete, and the giants seem to be allowed some sort of post-diluvian existence. Of particular interest in this respect may be the fragmentary text in 4Q531 14 2-3:

- 2 ]we (are) [neither] bones nor flesh
- 3 f]lesh, and we will be blotted out from our form

This fragment assumes a distinction between an existence in the form of flesh (בשר) and bones (גרמין) as opposed to one which, after a "form" has been "blotted out," is no longer lived out in the body (נחמחה מן צורתה).<sup>46</sup> If the first person plural of both lines refers to the same subject, then these lines more likely have to do with the giants than with the watchers. The passage suggests that instead of being completely wiped out, the nature of the giants' existence will continue in an altered state; after the death of these giants through the flood,<sup>47</sup> they can only continue to exist in a disembodied state once the bodies they have inhabited have been destroyed.

The Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85-90). The composition of this allegorical retelling of biblical history until the initial victories of Judas during the Maccabean crisis is likely to have occurred sometime between 165 and 160 BCE.<sup>48</sup> As in the Book of Watchers the rebellion of angels (called "stars"; cf. 86:3-4; 87:4; 88:3) begins in heaven. The event takes place in two stages: initially, a single star falls from heaven (86:1) before "many stars" descend after him to

---

of their fate through a series of communications (a "letter" [4Q203 frag. 8] and dreams). Along the way, the giants somehow (perhaps through the giant Gilgamesh; cf. 4Q531 17 11-12; 4Q530 2:2) find reason to think that at least some of them will escape destruction; see 4Q530 2:1-3 (the giants "rejoice" on account of what 'Ohyah had told them Gilgamesh had said). The story shows how such optimism on the part of the giants is misconceived.

<sup>46</sup> I assume that in line 3 the phrase נחמחה מן צורתה ("we will be blotted out from our form") refers to the body only, and not the entire being.

<sup>47</sup> If 2Q26, 6Q8 frag. 2 and 4Q530 2:4-7 represent dreams of the giants about their punishment, the allusions to the flood of these texts may imply that their destruction would occur during the deluge.

<sup>48</sup> See esp. the discussion in P.A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse* 1 Enoch (SBLEJL 4; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993) 61-79.

impregnate the human women ("cows").<sup>49</sup> The Animal Apocalypse, as both the Book of Watchers and Book of Giants, also preserves the tradition about the giants (designated as "elephants, camels, and asses"—cf. 86:4; 87:4; 88:2, 6) who kill one another before the deluge. Similarly, the binding by hand and foot of the first star that fell (88:1) into the abyss is reminiscent of the binding of 'Asa'el hand and foot in 1 Enoch 10:4. The binding of the angels as a whole into the earthly depths (88:3) likewise makes use of the Shemihazah tradition in 1 Enoch 10:11. This binding of culpable angels, as in Jub. 5:6 (cf. 10:5), derives from the widespread images associated with the binding and incarceration of the Titans in Tartarus in Greek mythology, as told in Hesiod's *Theogony* (718) and later adapted in Sibylline Oracles 3:110-58, esp. 150-51).<sup>50</sup>

However, in contrast with the Book of Watchers and even more clearly than in the Book of Giants, there is an emphasis in the Animal Apocalypse on the flood as a conclusive punishment of the giants. In 89:6, this becomes explicit:<sup>51</sup>

And that vessel floated on the water, but all the bulls and elephants and camels and asses sank to the bottom, together with all the animals, so that I could not see them. And they were unable to get out, but were destroyed and sank into the depths.

The last statement reflects a shift in emphasis from those apocalyptic traditions which concede some form of post-diluvian existence for the giants; the author offers no qualification for the giants' destruction, whether it occurred through their intramural violence or the flood. The allegorical narrative of the Animal Apocalypse leaves no trace of their survival, even if in another form. And so, along with the giants, the pre-diluvian watchers are not accorded a continuing function in the post-diluvian part of the story. This contrasts even more with the "Pseudo-Eupolemus" sources than do either the Book of Watchers or the Book of Giants.

---

<sup>49</sup> If the Book of Watchers (at 1 Enoch 8:1) is presupposed, then 'Asa'el may have descended first to teach the women the art of beautification through jewelry and cosmetics. Once the women have made themselves attractive, the other angels are seduced and descend as well (cf. T. Reu. 5:6). The two-stage descent ('Asa'el—the other angels) to earth may be reflected in 4QAgnes of Creation (4Q180) 1 7 which represents an early stage of designating the leader of the fallen angels as 'Azaz'el; cf. Dimant, "The 'Peshar on the Periods,'" 77-102.

<sup>50</sup> See Pearson, "Resurrection and the Judgment of the Titans," 38-41.

<sup>51</sup> The following translation is taken from M.A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*. Volume 2: *Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978) 200.

*The Book of Jubilees*

As in the early Enoch traditions, there is no question about the culpability of the watchers and the giants in Jubilees. Nevertheless, the presentation of the watchers shifts somewhat in several areas: (a) the role of the flood, (b) the origin of demons, (c) the watchers' teaching, and (d) the locus and timing of their rebellion against God.

(a) *The Flood*. Whereas in Genesis 6 the flood is regarded as God's response to the sins of humankind (Gen. 6:3, 13, 17), the early Enoch traditions in the Book of Watchers and Book of Giants consider it one component of the divine judgment against the sons of God (watchers) and the giants. The author(s) of Jubilees attempted to fuse these biblical and apocalyptic traditions, so that the deluge occurs as a response to the sins of humanity in the aftermath of the activities of the wayward angels. However, it remains unclear to what extent in Jubilees the flood itself functions as a direct punishment of the watchers and their children. Whereas the announcement of the flood in 1 Enoch 10:1-3 occurs in a literary context in which the teachings of the watchers and the atrocities of the giants have just been described and is an answer to petitions of the oppressed humanity, Jubilees 5 makes more clear that human beings, whatever the role of the fallen angels and their children has been, are targeted by the deluge itself (5:3-5; cf. 7:20-25).<sup>52</sup> There is thus a more one-sided emphasis in Jubilees that the angels as a whole are bound and sent to the nether regions of the earth (5:6, 10; cf. 'Azazel = 'Asa'el in 1 Enoch 10:4-6, 8) while, on the other hand, the motif of intramural violence, which in 1 Enoch 10:12a includes the fallen angels, is restricted to the giants themselves (5:7, 9; 7:22-24a). This reflects a dual interpretation of the ambiguous Hebrew text of Gen. 6:3. In the first instance, the difficult verb יָדָם is understood to mean "dwell" (5:8; so LXX tradition): "My spirit will not dwell on humanity forever, and their days will be one hundred and ten years." Interestingly, Jubilees does not interpret Gen. 6:3 in relation to human beings, but to a certain sort, that is, the giants, whose lives in the flesh are expected to be cut off in advance of the flood. In this way, it is made clear that the giants are not expected to outlast the flood and, moreover, that the flood itself does not constitute their punishment.

<sup>52</sup> The mention of the watchers' fornication with the women of the earth and the violence of their progeny (7:21b-24a) contributes to conditions which make divine judgment through the flood necessary, but these activities are not themselves punished through the flood.

(b) *The Origin of Demons.* The aetiology in Jubilees concerning the origin of (evil) spirits and demons likewise reflects a shift from that of the Book of Watchers and Book of Giants. Although the demons are similarly identified as the souls or spirits of the dead giants (10:5), there is no hint that any of the giants were killed through the flood. As in the early Enochic traditions, the giants' existence beyond the time of the deluge was in the form of spirits, though in Jubilees it seems more apparent that their disembodied state already obtained prior to the flood (5:8-9).<sup>53</sup> However, the giants' evil character is not explicitly articulated, unlike 1 Enoch 15:4, 6-8, in anthropological terms, that is, as an impure mingling of *flesh and spirit* on the part of their progenitors. Though it is possible that the aetiology of 1 Enoch 15 is presupposed, Jubilees is only clear in assuming that the giants' spirits are a logical consequence of the union of the watchers and human daughters (4:22; 7:21).

The demonic spirits which continue to afflict humanity after the flood represent but a tenth of the original number. Their ongoing activity is the result of a petition by Mastema their chief that God, despite having commanded the angels to bind all the spirits for judgment, nevertheless allow a small proportion of them to corrupt and lead humans astray (10:8, 12), as well as to cause illnesses (10:12). The giants' spirits on earth operate under divine permission and, therefore, exist as contained powers (10:3) whose defeat is assured (10:8).

(c) *The Watchers' Teaching.* A vestige of the sort of learning attributed to the giants and angels in the Pseudo-Eupolemus fragments (see above) may be observed in the sort of knowledge attributed to and taught by the watchers in Jubilees. Similar to "the angels" in the Pseudo-Eupolemus frag. 1 (9.17.9), their teaching has astrological content which, however, in Jubilees is rejected as divination (11:8; cf. 8:3).<sup>54</sup> Furthermore, as in the euhemeristic sources, a line of continuity in the knowledge of astrology is drawn from the watchers to the post-diluvian, *Chaldean* descendants of Noah (Cainan, Noah's great grandson through Shem; cf. 8:1-4)<sup>55</sup> all the way to Nahor, Abraham's

<sup>53</sup> Noah's prayer in 7:5 implies that the giants' disembodied spirits, alongside the watchers, were active before the flood.

<sup>54</sup> See A. Lange, "The Essene Position on Magic and Divination," *Legal Texts and Legal Issues. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (eds M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 377-435, esp. 401-3.

<sup>55</sup> Cainan's knowledge occurs through the discovery of an inscribed stone which

grandfather (11:8). The watchers were originally good and were initially commissioned by God to descend to earth and give instructions to humanity (4:16; cf. 5:6). Their knowledge is, however, skewed after their sexual union with the women, and the content of their teaching about the understanding of heavenly bodies is thus to be rejected. Whereas the Pseudo-Eupolemus frag. 1 forges a link in knowledge between the angels and Enoch without specifying what sort of angels they were (9.17.9), Jubilees, beginning with the watchers' disobedient activities on earth, distinguishes sharply between two tracks of learning: on the one hand, the astrological knowledge taught by the watchers before the flood and eventually transmitted to Nahor and, on the other hand, knowledge of movements of heavenly bodies from which agricultural cycles and calendrical reckonings are derived. The latter, non-divinatory use of knowledge about the sun, moon, and stars is bound up with the 364-day calendrical system which the author(s) advocate. The legitimate knowledge of luminaries in heaven is first taught to Enoch by the (good) angels (4:18, 21) and, subsequently, is presumably transmitted through Noah and his family who escaped from flood, finally reappearing as a pious component in the case of Abraham (12:16).

In addition to instructing Enoch concerning the luminaries and their movements, the angels teach Noah the knowledge of herbal medicine (10:10, 13). This instruction is part of a divine answer to Noah's prayer that God deliver his descendants from the evil spirits who have been corrupting them after the great flood (10:1-6). The use of herbs to combat the afflictions brought about by malevolent spirits is in direct contrast to the Enoch tradition, in which the cutting of roots is unequivocally ascribed to the fallen angels (8:3a). Just as the Enoch traditions, in Jubilees good and bad knowledge is made, respectively, to derive from good and bad angels; however, just what distinguishes the one from the other is different. Whereas the Book of Watchers categorically attributes medicines to the fallen angels who beget a gargantuan progeny that would become afflicting evil spirits (1 Enoch

---

contained the watchers' teaching concerning divination through observations of heavenly bodies (8:3; cf. 11:8). This learning is kept secret from Noah in order not to incur the latter's anger (8:4). In this way, the two tracks of knowledge, both good and bad, are kept distinct from one another so that they do not overlap in their respective lines of transmission. Concerning the later possible confusion between the tradition about Cainan's discovery and the existence of the Book of Giants, see Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony*, 44-45 and nn. 100-1 and Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, VII.

8:3; 15:8-11), in Jubilees such knowledge is revealed by good angels in order to combat the attacks of these evil spirits which originated from the giants.<sup>56</sup>

(d) *Locus and Timing of the Watchers' Rebellion*. Instead of retelling the fall of angels as a rebellion in heaven, Jubilees locates the watchers' disobedience on earth. In this way, the origin of evil becomes a further step removed from the God of Israel. Moreover, the heavenly and earthly spheres continue to be kept separate, that is, they have not been violated in the same way as in 1 Enoch 15:8-11. Finally, what the angels have done and the teaching they represent serve, by way of negative example, as a warning for anyone who would behave in the same way. Thus Noah exhorts his children to "preserve themselves from fornication and pollution and from all injustice" (7:20), three activities of the watchers and the giants which then spread to humankind (7:22-24). It is for this reason, the sins incurred among humanity, that the "flood was sent upon the earth (7:21a,25). This emphasis on human responsibility reflects the culpability of the angels in their decision to disregard God's original mandate to them (cf. 7:21).

### *Conclusion*

The biblical tradition of Gen. 6:1-4 is sufficiently ambiguous to have allowed for a wide range of interpretations concerning the character of the "sons of God," the "Nephilim," and "the mighty men." As has been observed above, however much of the euhemeristic adaptations of early biblical history thought that the giants were destroyed or punished for their activities (whether for "impiety" or building a tower), these did not become a caricature for the giants as a whole. One or more of them were thought to have escaped the deluge and, in so doing, to have played an important role in disseminating culture from the pre-diluvian period down to Abraham. The apocalyptic traditions retold the story in a variety of ways, each of which denied the giants and their progenitors any role in the spread of learning that the authors regarded as divinely sanctioned. The infighting among the giants and the destruction through the flood were important events in which divine action against the increase of evil on

---

<sup>56</sup> Concerning this contrast, see B. Kollmann, "Göttliche Offenbarung magisch-pharmakologischer Heilkunst im Buch Tobit," ZAW 106 (1994) 289-99, esp. 298-99.

the earth was believed to have been tangibly demonstrated. After the Book of Watchers, the flood took on increasing significance as an event which signified the eradication of the giants. The Book of Giants interpreted the flood as a past, yet proleptic, sign of divine judgment, and in Jubilees the deluge operated as an interruption to the increase of evil among humankind and put into effect a partial judgment that anticipates completion at the end of time. For the Animal Apocalypse the flood simply spelled the end of the giants, who are not given any further role to play in the remainder of the subsequent retelling of history.

This diversity of traditions left a legacy that lasted well into the first two centuries of the Common Era.<sup>57</sup> A number of traditions maintain, with the Animal Apocalypse, that the giants were destroyed by the flood. Thus the writer of 4QExhortation Based on the Flood (= 4Q370) affirms the view that, along with evil humankind and other creatures, "the gi[ant]s did not escape (לוא נמלטו) [הגנ]בים" the flood (col. 1:6).<sup>58</sup> In Sibylline Oracles Book 2, the giants and Titans from Greek mythology, who are identified with each other,<sup>59</sup> are said to have been destroyed by the flood. An analogous emphasis is preserved by the writer of 3 Macc. 2:4, whose prayer attributed to the high priest Simon addresses God as the one who "destroyed (δέφθειρας) those who perpetrated wickedness in the past, among whom were the giants who were convinced by (their own) strength and confidence, bringing upon them immeasurable water." According to Wis. 14:6 the escape

<sup>57</sup> With apocalyptic tradition, Philo regarded the "giants" of Gen. 6:4 as evil. However, his views, preserved through his work *De gigantibus*, acquire a much different basis. Without concern for eschatology or biblical chronology, Philo used Gen. 6:4 ("And there were giants on the earth [γίγαντες ἦσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς] in those days," from the LXX) in order claim that the author (Moses) was wishing to distinguish between people who are (a) earth-born (οἱ μὲν γῆς), (b) heaven-born, and (c) God-born (58-67). While he regards the learned Abraham as an example of categories b and c (62-64), it is Nimrod who exemplifies the one who is "earth-born" (63-66). Nimrod's name (given as Νεβρώδ) is interpreted as "desertion" (leaving a better for a worse place), a meaning which corresponds to his willingness to take up arms in war against his own friends. Such activity of "desertion" is, so claims Philo, actually inaugurated by Nimrod since "he began to be a giant *on the earth*" (LXX to Gen. 10:8). Philo, therefore, dissociates Abraham from any identification with giants (*contra* the "Pseudo-Eupolemus" fragments), while adapting for his own purposes an exegetical tradition which at least associated Nimrod with the pre-diluvian "giants."

<sup>58</sup> See C.A. Newsom, "4Q370: An Admonition Based on the Flood," *RevQ* 13 (1988) 23-43 and in M. Broshi et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995) 85-97 (esp. 90-91, 95).

<sup>59</sup> Cf. n. 18 above.

of Noah ("the hope of the world") through divine help was taking place "while arrogant giants were perishing (ἀπολλυμένων ὑπερηφάνων γιγάντων)." In the Greek and Slavic recensions of the later 3 Baruch at 4:10, a large number of giants was destroyed by the flood along with "all flesh" (Greek) or "every firstborn" (Slavic).<sup>60</sup> More veiled allusions to punishment through the deluge may be reflected by the language of Sir. 16:7 ("he [God] did not forgive the giants of old," οὐκ ἐξιλάσατο περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων γιγάντων) and the Damascus Document in CD 2:19-20 ("... and their sons whose height was as the height of cedars and whose bodies were as mountains [were caught] because they fell. All flesh which was on dry land decayed and became as if they never were").

Other traditions allowed, with the Book of Watchers, Book of Giants, and Jubilees, for the giants to persist beyond death in a disembodied form of existence as spirits.<sup>61</sup> This is presupposed in the sapiential songs document in 4Q510 1 5 and 4Q511 35 7, where the "spirits of the bastards" (see above) are reckoned as powers with which the righteous still have to contend. In the later *Christian Testament of Solomon* (5:3; 17:1), the link between the post-diluvian demons and the giant offspring of the fallen angels is made explicit (see n. 22). This raises a possibility that would require more analysis than is possible here, namely, that giants traditions may already be adapted in passages of the gospels in which the desire of spirits to enter into human bodies is presupposed (so e.g., Mark 5:1-20; Matt. 12:43-45//Luke 11:24-26).

Whereas the later early Jewish and Christian traditions are clear-cut in associating the "sons of God" and their progeny in Gen. 6:1-4 with evil, whether destroyed in the past or persistent in the present, the

<sup>60</sup> Cf. the parallel recensions translated by H.E. Gaylord, "3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch. A New Translation and Introduction," *OTP* 1.666-67. While the Slavic version numbers the giants killed at 104,000, the Greek version has 409,000.

<sup>61</sup> As Pearson has shown ("Resurrection and the Judgment of the Titans," 37), several texts among the Greek translations of Jewish scriptures adopt the term "Tartarus" from Greek mythology (the place where the Titans are bound and imprisoned following their conflict with Zeus, according to Hesiod, *Theogony* 718); although these passages (LXX Prov. 30:16; Job 40:15; 41:23) do not specifically refer to the giants, the terminology may reflect a belief in a holding place for the dead. See also 2 Pet. 2:4 in which the Greek verb ταπεινῶ denotes the casting of the sinful angels into a temporary location in the netherworld in anticipation of the final judgment. The imprisonment of the giants/fallen angels in a place beyond the time of the flood may also underlie 1 Pet. 3:19 in which, however, the "spirits in prison" probably refer to human beings who were disobedient before the flood.

earlier authors of apocalyptic traditions found it necessary to delineate a position that dissociated Noah, Enoch, and divinely revealed knowledge from other traditions that they thought were illegitimately aligning these righteous patriarchs with reprehensible figures and questionable areas of learning. Against the backdrop of an eschatological horizon, the allowance for ambiguity in the biblical tradition and the debates surrounding the history and superiority of one culture or another disappeared into a more decidedly dualistic framework in which good and bad angels and the learning attributed to them were kept distinct.