



How the Devil Got His Hooves and Horns: The Origin of the Motif and the Implied Demonology of *ꜜ Baruch*¹

Alexander Kulik

*Department of German, Russian and East European Studies
Faculty of Humanities
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Mt. Scopus, Jerusalem 91905, Israel
akulik@mscc.huji.ac.il*

Abstract

This paper reexamines the problem of the origins of a popular medieval and modern image of the devil as an anthropomorphic creature with hooves and horns and seeks to reconstruct the analogous ancient image of a satyr-like devil as it could be witnessed in diverse sources, including Hellenistic mythology, rabbinic legends, and early Christian texts. It seems that, not belonging completely to any of these worlds, this therianthrope motif emerges from a complicated literary history wherein Greco-Roman Pan, Jewish *seirim*, and other mythological figures graft themselves and their imagery around the forces of the demonic. The main argument of the paper as a whole centers around the place of *ꜜ Baruch* in this complicated history. This composition may contain the only physical description and detailed treatment of demonic *seirim*-satyrs in early Jewish literature and the earliest notion of satyr-like demons available to us.

Keywords

devil, demon, theriomorphic, therianthrope, zoomorphic, zoanthropic, chimerical, image, iconography

Les uns aucunefois se transforment en Fées,
En Dryades des bois, en Nymphes et Napées,
En Faunes, en Sylvains, en Satyres et Pans,

¹ This paper has been prepared in the framework of the research project supported by the Israel Science Foundation grant no. 450/07. I thank Michael Stone, Michael Schneider, and Sergey Minov, who read the manuscript and gave valuable notes.

Qui ont le corps pelu marqueté comme fans;
 Ils ont l'orteil de bouc et d'un chevreuil l'oreille,
 La corne d'un chamois, et la face vermeille
 Comme un rouge croissant, et dansent toute nuit
 Dedans un carrefour ou près d'une eau qui bruit . . .

Ronsard, *Hymne des Daimons*, 331–338

Introduction

The so called *therianthropic* or *zoanthropic* imagery, i.e., images combining zoo- and anthropomorphic elements, are among the most basic and universal components of any mythological or symbolic tradition. Different disciplines and different schools within these disciplines suggest diverse explanations for the origins and development of this phenomenon.² The very diversity of these explanations indicates that we still lack a satisfying integrative solution for this problem. It seems that, at present, no real progress can be achieved in anthropology, social psychology, or other more general disciplines before the etiology of many specific images becomes the object of meticulous historico-traditional study so that new data on the patterns of their development can be accumulated.

The story of some of these images is not limited to ancient and medieval iconographies. Some of the images not only continued their cultural functioning in modern times, but, having penetrated popular Western culture, made their way into the truly universal modern canon. The pandemonium of modern mass culture makes use of Egyptian sphinxes, Greek centaurs, as well as cynocephali, mermaids, and werewolves of diverse descents, satyr-like, bird-legged or winged devils from

² Thus Lang and Frazer take them to be representatives of a shift from an archaic conception of theriomorphic deities to a more advanced anthropomorphic conception (Lang 1968:118; Frazer 1922:466–497). Jungians tend to explain them as part of the universal symbolarium of the collective unconscious (for criticism see Kirk 1974:76–79; Rice 1998:262). Lévi-Strauss suggests seeing animalistic features as accessible and universal elements of meta-language. Therianthropic motifs, binary by definition, can also be regarded in light of his general theory of myths as dualistic structures functioning to mediate contradictions (Lévi-Strauss 1963:89; see also Kirk 1974:38–91; Midgley 1995; Rupp 2007:17–21).

Christian iconography, and more. Modern creativity even enriched the catalogue of therianthropy with new items, such as gilled humanoids, batmen, catwomen, spidermen, and the like in comic books, fantasy novels, “dungeons and dragons” games, and Hollywood features.

Two of the traditional figures surviving in modern usage, the satyr and the devil, are in fact doubles, at least in the most popular variants of their appearance. This is probably not a coincidence. A popular image of the devil as an anthropomorphic creature with hooves and horns (reminiscent of the Greek Pan, sileni, satyrs or Roman fauns) is well attested in medieval Latin Europe since the eleventh century (Link 1996). Yet it is common neither to the early Christian *imaginaire*, nor to the medieval Eastern Christian traditions.³ Does this necessarily mean that the West European devil is a medieval invention or can it be a remnant of ancient traditions? If this motif does have early roots, are they Greco-Roman or Jewish? This paper seeks to reconstruct the ancient image of a satyr-like devil as it is found in diverse sources, including Hellenistic mythology, rabbinic legends, and early Christian texts. It seems that, not belonging completely to any of these worlds, this image emerges from a complicated literary history wherein Greco-Roman Pan, Jewish *seirim*, and other mythological figures graft themselves and their imagery around the forces of the demonic. The main argument of the paper as a whole centers around the place of *3 Baruch* in this reconstruction.⁴

³ Except for the relatively late sources most probably influenced by Western models (see Mango 1992:221). Another exception may be the modern Greek and other Balkan demons Callicantzari (καλλικάντζαροι), who, along with other chimeric forms, may have a satyr-like appearance, and thus probably attest to the survival of satyrs and centaurs as demons in the beliefs of Christianized Greece (Lawson 1910:190–255). The Byzantine *Vita Basilii* 22 (mid 10th century) depicts “satyr-like impersonators” as figures singing and playing “in the manner of god Pan and his satyrs,” mocking church processions, but without any explicitly demonic connotations (see Corrigan 1998:357–58).

⁴ The goal of the paper is to trace the appearance of one particular morphology, even though other images of the demonic were certainly being developed and constructed in the periods under discussion. I do not discuss here alternative morphologies of the devil, however relevant they may be. This task would demand at least a book-length study, and there were several attempts to create such wider surveys (see below), which only proved that they should be preceded by detailed investigation of textual and iconographic evidence on separate traditions, like the one put forth here.

This study utilizes as method the history of motifs. It is based on the assumption that Jewish Hellenistic, Rabbinic, Christian, and Gnostic texts created in late Antiquity may reflect common traditions and may preserve more or less rudimentary evidence of Second Temple Judaism. In this framework it is legitimate and, moreover, necessary to attempt to trace parallels between heterogeneous texts with unclear mutual relations, when this tracing contributes to solving most basic problems, including problems of text interpretation, origin of imagery, etc. This methodology involves assuming that diverse texts preserved in different sources may conserve aspects of a tradition or a tradition complex which is not preserved completely in any of one of the sources. Moreover, it also assumes that, within reasonable temporal and geographic boundaries, later documents or documents from different traditions, may preserve complementary elements of the tradition.⁵

Pagan Image?

Attempts have been made to trace the origin of the motif to the rich Hellenistic imagery connected with the image of the goat-legged and horned deity Pan (see, e.g., Merivale 1969:1–19). This god's powers of possession (panolepsy) in Greek beliefs (see, e.g., Euripides, *Medea* 1167–1174; *Hippolytus* 141–144; Iamblichus, *Orphica* 11), along with his possible associations with the “gates of Hades” allegedly located in the Palestinian Paneas,⁶ could have justified such identification in a Jewish Hellenistic context.⁷ Of some influence for the popularization of

⁵ I would like to thank Michael Stone with whom I had the privilege to discuss methodological issues behind this paper.

⁶ The Baniyas or Paneas/Pamias of the Hebrew sources, known also as Caesarea Philippi — a city and region at the mouth of the Jordan River, named after Pan and with a well attested cult of this deity (see, e.g., Berlin 1999; Wilson 2004:56–69).

⁷ This connection is not very convincing and would demand a rather complicated argumentation. It can be based on one of several possible interpretations of Matt 16:13–18 linking Paneas (Caesarea Philippi) of v. 13 to the “gates of Hades” of v. 18 (e.g., Immisch 1916; on the reception of this idea see Burgess 1996). This interpretation may find some corroboration in the fact that rabbinic tradition considers Paneas as the ultimate source of “lower waters” (*b. B. Bat.* 74b), and the latter could be associated with Sheol-Hades: “Have you entered into the springs of the sea? Or have you walked in the recesses of the depth? Have the gates of death been opened to you? Or have you seen the doors of

the image in medieval Europe may also have been similar-looking Celtic and Scandinavian horned deities, such as, for instance, Cernunnos, the Celtic deity of fertility and hunt (see Davidson 1982:94–96; cf. eadem 1993:30, 46.).

In fact, although the appearance of Pan and his satyric retinue is identical to the Western devil, it is not easy to connect these figures to the demonic more than other pagan deities. Pan is referred to as “demon” by early Christian authors, but only as one of a group of pagan deities-“demons/daemons” (Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus* 1 and 4; Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 5.5.189d; 5.18.208a; for more on this see below).

Jewish Image?

At the same time, similar figures may be identifiable independently as early as the Hebrew Bible itself. The demon Azazel (Lev 16:10 and 26) had goat associations through one of the possible etymologies of the name, as well as through the ritual of scapegoats. Azazel/Asael appears as a principal evil spirit as far back as 1 *Enoch* (8:1; 9:6; 10:4–8; 13:1–2; 54:5; 55:4; 69:2), as well as in many later Jewish sources. Demonic associations

deepest darkness” (Job 38:16–17). Cf. “How many dwellings are in the heart of the sea, or how many springs [“streams,” *venae* in Latin] are at the source of the deep [*principio abyssi*], or how many ways [“streams” in Latin] are above the firmament, or which are the exits of Hell, or which are the entrances of Paradise?” (4 *Ezra* 4:7). The same term — Heb תהום/ ἄβυσσος — may designate either a “water abyss,” or “Hell,” cf. “mouths of the abyss” in the water system of 1 *Enoch* 17:8 and “abyss” as Hell there (1 *Enoch* 54:5; 90:26). For Gk ἄβυσσος as Hell, see Rev 9:1; *Acts of Philip* 3; 24; *Acts of Thomas* 32; *Acts of Andrew and Matthew* 12; 24; and *passim*. “Lower waters” are located “opposite the gates of the Death Shadow [Heb צלִמוֹת] and the gates of Gehenna” (*Seder Rab. deBereshit* 17 in Wertheimer and Wertheimer 1989:I, 27–28). Related to this may be an idea that the “Prince of the Sea” (cf. *b. Bava Bathra* 74b) is in charge of Gehenna (*b. Shabbath* 104a). The insatiability of the sea and of Hades are connected (or at least comparable): “‘All the rivers run into the sea, [but the sea never overflows]; Eccl 1:7]. All the dead go only to Sheol, but Sheol is never full, as it is said, ‘Sheol and Abaddon are insatiable’ [Prov 27:20]” (*Ecclesiastes Rabba* 1.7). If the gate of Hades is in Paneas, then the enigmatic saying pronounced near the Cave of Paneas by R. Yose b. Kisma may be clarified. He said that the Messiah would come, “when the gate [of Hades?] falls down, is rebuilt, falls again, and again rebuilt, and then falls a third time, before it can be rebuilt the son of David will come” (*b. Sanhedrin* 98a).

of the Goat of Dan 7–8 are less transparent but possible (cf. the development of the motif in Rev 12–13 and, e.g., Ps.-Hippolytos, *On the End of the World* 21).

Even more relevant seem biblical *seirim* (Hebrew שְׂעִירִים), “hairy beings” or “goats,” or at least their reception in post-biblical Judaism. They were worshipped by the Israelites according to Lev 17:7 and 2 Chr 11:15, and danced at the site of Babylon’s destruction in Isa 13:21 and 34:14. Whatever the meaning of the original *seirim* in the biblical text might be (cf., e.g., Snaith 1975), in early Jewish and Christian renditions these creatures were often taken to be “demons”:

- (1) In LXX Isa (2nd cent. BCE?)⁸ 13:21 *seirim* is translated as δαιμόνια. The translator of Isa 34:14 renders “*seirim* will greet each other” as “demons [δαιμόνια] will meet ass-centaurs [ὄνοσκένταυροι; on this term see below],” thus either considering *seirim* as a general name for two kinds of monstrous creatures, or using the term for the latter to refer to the appearance of the former type of creature. Note that demons with specifically asses’ legs appear also in *Testament of Solomon* (1st–5th cents.?) 4:2–3 (so-called Onoskelis), as well as that the ass-like Gnostic archon Onoel was known to Origen (185–254; *Contra Celsum* 6.30).
- (2) In the Peshitta (2nd cent.) and different Targums (3rd–7th cents.), *seirim* is regularly rendered as שְׂעִירִים, שִׂדִּי, שְׂדִיָּה, שִׂדִּי, and שְׂדִיָּה “demons” (Lev 17:7; Isa 13:21; 34:14; 2 Chr 11:15); the same goes for the Vulgata (early 5th cent.) in Lev 17:7 and 2 Chr 11:15 (*daemones*). In his commentary on *seirim* of Isa 13:21 (translated there as *pilosi*, “hairy”), Jerome adds that they are “either incubi or satyrs or a certain kind of wild men” and “belong to the race of demons” (*Commentary on Isaiah* 5; see also below).
- (3) The Tannaim also identified the biblical *seirim* with demons. *Sifra* to Leviticus (3rd cent.) 17:7 (Ahare Mot 6) states on the basis of Isa 13:21 that “by *seirim* demons are meant” (וְאֵין שְׂעִירִים אֶלָּא שְׂדִים).

⁸) Many dates adduced hereafter are tentative and without scholarly consensus. General patterns of the relations between different corpuses and traditions may be more relevant for the history of motifs than dating of specific authors or compositions.

- (4) *Leviticus Rabba* (5–6 cents.) 22.7 repeats the same statement with reference not only to Isa 13:21, but also to Deut 32:17 (“they sacrificed to demons”). *Lev. R.* 5.1 interprets the dancing children (וילדיהן ירקדון) of Job 22:11 as demons, with a cross reference to the dancing *seirim* of Isa 13:21. *Genesis Rabba* (5th cent.) bases its identification of *seirim* with demons on Isa 13:21 as well: “Jacob said to Rebecca his mother: Behold, Esau my brother is a hairy man [איש שעיר]’ [Gen 27:11]: he is demonic [גבר שידין], as in the verse, ‘and *seirim* will dance there’ [Isa 13:21]” (*Gen. Rab.* 65.11/15).
- (5) *Seirim* is a designation for demons in Babylonian Amoraic sources in contexts not necessarily connected to the biblical verses cited above. *Seirim* can harm a person in the privy in the Babylonian Talmud (6th–7th cents.) and are able to fly very fast, like a storm wind, through the world:

The tradition for [avoiding harm in] the privy is modesty and silence; the tradition relating to sufferings is silence and prayer. The mother of Abaye trained for him a lamb to go with him into the privy [as a protection against demons?]. She should rather have trained for him a goat? [Is it reasonable] to exchange a *sair* [demon] for *sair* [= goat]? [שעיר בשעיר מיהלף] ⁹ <...> R. Safra entered a privy. R. Abba came and cleared his throat at the entrance. He said to him, “Let the master enter.” When he came out, he [R. Abba] said to him, “You have not yet been turned into a *sair*, but you have learned the manners of a *sair*.” (*b. Berakhot* 62a–b; cf. *b. Tamid* 27b)

Rabbi said to Levi: “Show me the Persians.” — “They are like the armies of the House of David,” he replied. “Show me the Guebers.” — “They are like the destroying angels.” “Show me the Ismaelites” — “They are like the demons of the privy [שעירים של בית הכסא].” (*b. Kiddushin* 72a)

‘As the storm rain [homonymic *seirim*] upon the tender grass’ (Deut 32:2), this is the east wind which rages through the world like a demon [*sair*]. (*b. Bava Bathra* 25a)

⁹ Not fully clear. Possibly also “a goat comes for *sair*.” Magic substitution of a man with a goat (probably connected to the biblical scapegoats tradition) is attested in another Amoraic text: “Rabina said, ‘We learn from this that if a man is seized with fright though he sees nothing, [the reason is that] his star sees. What is his remedy? <...> If he cannot do this, he should say this formula: ‘The goat at the butcher’s is fatter than I am’ [עיזא דבי טבחי שמינא מינאי].”

- (6) *Seirim* in several fragments from Qumran, do not provide a clear picture, except probably [יות מלאה שעירים] of 2QApocryphal Prophecy, which may be understood as “the nether regions full of *seirim*” (2Q 23 1.7).¹⁰

Seirim have no iconographic representation and their appearance is not described. Thus we have no clue how the appearance of these creatures was imagined. The incantation against the night demon in 11QApocryphal Psalms (early 1st cent. CE) mentions only that this bastard of men and angles has horns:

[When] he comes to you in the nig[ht,] you shall [s]ay to him: Who are you, [the offspring of] man and of the seed of the ho[ly] ones? Your face is a face of [delusion,] and your horns are horns of illu[si]on

[כי] יבוא אליך בלי[לה] ווא[מרתה] אליו מי אתה[הילוד מ] אדם ומזרע הקד[ושי]ם פניך [פניך] [ש]ו וקרניך קרני חל[ו]ם [11Q11 5.4–7] ¹¹

The only exception giving a more detailed description may be the parody testimony of the new moon in the *Tosefta* (2nd–3rd cents.): the frightening chimerical creature was reported to be seen in the Judean desert not far from Jerusalem (and thus possibly connected to Azazel):

When I was going up to Ma'ale Adumim, I saw *him* lying between two rocks, and his head was like that of cattle, his ears were like those of a goat, his horns were like those of a deer, and his tail was between his legs. When I saw him, I was frightened and fell backwards (עולה הייתי במעלה אדומים וראיתיו רבוץ בין שני סלעים ראשו) דומה לעגל אזניו דומות לגדי קרניו דומות לצבי זנבו מונחת לו בין יריכותיו ראיתיו [נבעתתי ונפלתי לאחורי]; *t. Rosh ha-Shanah* 1.15).¹²

¹⁰ Michael Schneider suggests understanding the fragment in the light of Isa 14:9 understood as “Hell below was astir to greet your coming rousing for you the [evil] spirits [רפאים] [and] all the [demonic] goats of earth [עתודי ארץ].”

¹¹ A very similar Medieval description is found in Cairo Genizah (T-S K 1.123; unpublished; see Bohak 2008:303.

¹² I thank Michael Schneider for this and following references. There is a striking similarity in the appearance of the frightening creature as well as in the reaction to it, in the much earlier Ugaritic text (italics are mine):

El sat [in] [his place.
 El sat in his *mrzh*.
 He drank wine to satiety,
 Must to inebriation.

Not only the appearance of the creature but also the sudden awe of terror caused by the meeting (including falling backwards) is similar to the descriptions of Pan:

Her color changed, and with legs trembling she staggered back sidelong, and by falling on the chair barely escaped collapsing on the floor. And one old woman among the servants, thinking, I suppose, that a frenzy from Pan or one of the other gods had come upon her began to scream all sorts of prayers . . . (Euripides, *Medea* 1167–1174; cf. *Rhesus* 36; *Hippolytus* 141–144; etc.).

In Jewish iconography, the figure of a satyr holding a lyre has been identified as part of a very obscure composition in a graffito decorating a burial cave at Bet Lei; this image probably dates from the Persian period (see Smith 1996:I, 232, n. 21). Even if this identification should prove correct, the satyr in the graffito appears to have human feet and does not show any indication of being a demon.

Thus, the problem of *seirim* as a possible source for the image under discussion is a reverse from that of Pan — in post-biblical sources they are obviously demonic, but their appearance is not well attested.

Early Christian Image?

We might expect that as in many other cases Jewish and Greek traditions could have been fused on Hellenistic Jewish or early Christian soil. However, also here the evidence is rather ambiguous.

As for satyrs or Pan(s) of early Christian iconography, the attested images have nothing to do with demons; they are part of a quite different visual set based, most probably, on general and neutral decorative traditions of Hellenistic art.¹³

In written sources, as mentioned above, demons with the legs of asses (probably dependant on ὄνοκένταυροι of LXX Isa 13:22 and 34:11,14)

<...>

An apparition accosted him,
With horns and a tail.

¹³ See, e.g., the images of satyr and centaur in the so-called “Orpheus mosaic” from the late Roman or early Byzantine chapel excavated to the North of the Damascus gate in Jerusalem (Ovadia and Mucznik 1981:153, fig. 3).

are known to the presumably Christian *Testament of Solomon* (4:2–3) and to the Ophite Gnostics (Origen, *Cels.* 6.30). When we consider the identification of demons with satyrs in early Christian texts, we have to take into account that the term “demon”/“daemon” — especially in the intercrossing of Hellenistic and Jewish beliefs and word usages — has a wide semantic field ranging from any kind of deity, spiritual or even just legendary beings of Greek or Roman origin, to the evil spirits of Jewish lore (also often associated with pagan deities). Some early Christian authors do define satyrs or Pan as kinds of “demons,” but only along with other pagan deities. Clement of Alexandria (c. 150–215), even though he mentions satyrs among the “demonic crew,” does not distinguish them in this respect from other Greco-Roman deities, the use of the imagery of which he disapproves (*Protr.* 1). For Clement “the unnatural passions of the demons” include not only “diminutive Pans, and naked girls, and drunken satyrs, and phallic tokens,” but also other pagan imagery like “Aphrodite locked in the embrace of her paramour,” “the amorous bird that fluttered round Leda,” “the licentiousness of Zeus,” “the postures of Philaenis and the labors of Heracles” (*Protr.* 4). The same may be said about Eusebius of Caesarea (c. 263–c. 339) referring to Pan (from the famous account of Plutarch on the death of Pan during the reign of Tiberius in *De Defectu Oraculorum* 17) as “demon,” who, as one of the “demons of every kind,” was expelled from this world by Jesus (*Praep. Ev.* 5.18.207d–208a).¹⁴ However, elsewhere, while arguing against Porphyry’s opinion that Pan is a “good demon,” Eusebius states that Pan is a particularly “evil demon,” because he frightens people to death when he appears to them (*Praep. Ev.* 5.5.189d).

The only author explicitly identifying the biblical *seirim* with “demons,” on the one hand, and with satyrs, on the other, is Jerome (c. 347–420), who translates the Hebrew term literally as *pilosi*, “hairy ones,” in Isa 13:21, but as *daemonēs* in Lev 17:7 and 2 Chr 11:15. He adds this explanation in his commentary on Isa 13:21:

When in the following it is said that “the hairy ones will dance there” we must understand this to mean either incubi or satyrs or a certain kind of wild men

¹⁴ The Valentinian Gnostics, by contrast, identified Jesus and Pan, “because he [Jesus] possessed the names of all [Greek *pan*] those who had produced him” (Irenaeus, *Haer.* 16.1.2b–3a).

[*silvestres quosdam homines*] whom some call *fatui ficarii* and understand to belong to the race of demons. (*Comm. in Isa.* 5)

Note that here satyrs, though they belong to “the race of demons,” are not explicitly associated with evil forces. Jerome’s conception of satyrs becomes clearer from his *Life of Paul the Hermit* (italics are mine):

He [Antony] came to a rocky valley¹⁵ and saw a little man [*homunculus*], whose nostrils were joined together, *with horns growing out of his forehead, and with the legs and feet of a goat . . .* The creature I have just described offered to Antony, as pledges of peace, dates to sustain him on his journey. Antony perceived the creature’s intent, stepped forward, and, after asking it what it was, he received this reply: “I am a mortal being, one of the inhabitants of the desert, whom the pagan race, confused by various errors, worship and call *fauns, satyrs, and incubi*. I come as the ambassador from my herd. We beseech that you pray for us to our common Lord, whom we acknowledge came for the salvation of the world, and his sound has spread among the lands.” (*Vita Pauli* 8; cf. Miller 1996)

According to Jerome, even though satyrs belong to the group worshiped by pagans, this is only because the latter are “confused by various errors.” Only erroneously taken for deities (*δαίμονες* in the primary sense of the original Greek word, as in Clement and Eusebius above), satyrs here even offer humans an example of Christian piety. Thus, the *seirim*-satyrs of Jerome must be just a kind of anthropomorphic creature having nothing to do with the diabolic crew, quite in line with a “naturalist” conception of satyrs as a kind of wild humanoid, rather than supernatural beings (like *silvestres quosdam homines* above; cf., e.g., Pliny, *Naturalis Historia*, 6.197; Pausanias, *Periegeta* 1.23.5–6; Aelianus, *De Natura Animalium*, 16.21; the Hebrew אַדְנֵי הַשָּׂדֵה, “wild men” or humanoid animals of *m. Kilayim* 8.5 may belong to the same phenomenon; cf. also, e.g., Mobley 1997). In *Vita* the terms “fauns, satyrs, and incubi” most probably all refer to the same creature. So, analogously, the “incubi or satyrs or a certain kind of wild men” of the *Commentary* may also be different names for the same kind of creature, thus indicating that “satyrs” and “wild men” are the same.

¹⁵ Note that the satyr-like creature of the Tosefta (cited above) is also seen in the desert, “between the rocks.”

The question, thus, becomes, whether Jerome was innovative in his identification of *seirim* with satyrs or whether he followed an unreserved tradition, some *fabula judaica*, as he often did?¹⁶ In the latter case his naturalist rationalization of *seirim* as a kind of “wild humanoids” rather than “evil forces” is not very relevant for the general history of the motif.

Problems of Identification and Continuity

Upon comparing the main traditions examined above, we are left with a rather heterogeneous picture:

	<i>LXX</i>	<i>Tosefta</i>	<i>Targums, Sifra, Talmud</i>	<i>Clement and Eusebius</i>	<i>Jerome</i>
1) definition	<i>seirim</i> = demons	?	<i>seirim</i> = demons	satyrs = demons	<i>seirim</i> = demons
2) denotation	?	demon or “wild man”?	demons = evil spirits	demons = pagan deities	demons = “wild men”
3) appearance	ass-centaurs	satyr	?	satyrs	“incubi or satyrs or a certain kind of wild men”

The text of *LXX* is not very helpful here, since we do not know exactly what the *ὄνοκένταυροι* (known also from Aelianus’ *De Natura Animalium* 17.9 as a kind of tailless ape) are. The patristic references to satyrs as “demons” (pagan deities) are not really relevant. What is left are the rabbinic traditions and Jerome. Jerome’s *seirim* are satyrs and “demons,” even though also not necessarily in the sense of “evil spirits.” His interpretation, however, may be dependent on the Jewish tradition, well attested in rabbinic sources, which does identify *seirim* as demons-evil spirits, without, however, confirming their identification as satyrs. What is missing, in fact, from this equation is any kind of identification of evil spirits with satyrs. This missing link is what we want to introduce below.

In light of the considerations above, we face the following problems:

¹⁶ For Jerome’s indebtedness to Jewish tradition see, e.g., Brown 1992; Kamesar 1993:176–194; Kinzig 2003; Weingarten 2005:17–80.

- (1) There is no description (and certainly no iconography) of the early Jewish *sair* (possibly except the ambiguous notion of the Tosefta). All we know is that the term is homonymic to (and most probably derived from) “goat.” Even for the early post-biblical reception, it is not clear whether the creature was imagined as a goat or satyr-like, i.e., a goat-legged and sometimes horned but still anthropomorphic figure. A certain anthropomorphism may be deduced from LXX Isa 13:21 and 34:14, where *seirim* is rendered by the rare and obscure term ὄνοκένταυροι.
- (2) This does not mean that *sair* could not be imagined as satyr-like (in the light of LXX Isa 13:21 and 34:14; *t. Rosh ha-Shanah* 1.15; and especially Jerome’s commentary to Isa 13:21). However, if it were to be so imaged, an enormous gap would result between the ancient traditions of a goat- or satyr-like demonic *sair* on the one hand, and the medieval Western European satyr-like devil, on the other.

Hence, the West European devil was either (a) a new invention entirely based on the pagan — Hellenistic and/or Germanic and Celtic — legacy, (b) a remnant of early Judeo-Christian traditions (transferred possibly through Jerome’s commentary to Isaiah), or (c) a the result of the conflation of early Judeo-Christian and pagan legacies.

I will demonstrate that the latter two options are at least tenable by introducing into the discussion a source which can (1) illuminate the nature of the ancient goat-like demonic imagery, and thus also (2) provide at least one missing link between the early Jewish and the late Christian traditions.

Demonic Satyrs of *3 Baruch*¹⁷

In *3 Baruch*,¹⁸ the protagonist ascends the “first heaven,” where he finds a plain inhabited by strangely shaped creatures with the appearance of

¹⁷ This section is based *mutatis mutandis* on my commentary to the Greek-Slavonic *Apocalypse of Baruch* (*3 Baruch*) — Kulik 2010.

¹⁸ Known also as the Greek or Greek-Slavonic *Apocalypse of Baruch*, one of the major early Jewish apocalypses, presumably dated from the late first to the second century CE. For monographic research on *3 Baruch*, see Harlow 1996; Kulik 2010.

satyrs or fauns. In the “second heaven,” he finds almost the same creatures, only dog-faced.¹⁹ Both groups are identified as the builders of the Tower of Babel:

3 *Bar* 2:2–3, 7a and 3:1–5a

Greek

² And having taken me he brought me to the first heaven, and showed me a very large door. And he told me, “Let us enter through it.” And we entered as if [borne] on wings, a distance of about a 30 days’ journey. ³ And he showed me within heaven a plain. And there were men living thereon, with the faces of cattle, and the horns of deer, and the feet of goats, and the loins of sheep. <...> ⁷ But, I said, “I pray you, show me what are these men.” And he told me, “These are those who built the Tower of War against God...” <...>

¹ And having taken me the angel of the Lord brought me to the second heaven, and showed me there also a door like the previous and he said, “Let us enter through it.” ² And we entered, being borne on wings, a distance of about a 60 days’ journey. ³ And he showed me there a plain, and it was full of men, whose appearance was like that of dogs, and whose feet were like those of deer. ⁴ And I asked the angel, “I pray you, Lord, say to me who are these?” ⁵ And he said, “These are those who conspired to make the Tower.”

Slavonic

² And there was the first heaven and in that heaven he showed me very large doors. And the angel told me, “Let us enter through these doors,” And we entered about a 30 days’ journey. He showed me salvation. ³ And I saw a plain, where men were living whose faces were those of cattle, with the horns of deer, the feet of goats, and the loins of sheep. <...> ⁷ I said to the angel, “Lord, who are these strangely shaped creatures?” And the angel told me, “These are those who built the Tower of the War against God...” <...>

¹ And the angel took me and brought me to the second heaven and showed me large open doors, and the angel told me, “Let us enter through them.” ² And we entered flying about a 7 days’ journey. ³ And he showed me a great chamber, and there were strangely shaped creatures living in it, with the faces of dogs, the feet of deer, and the horns of goats. ⁴ And I asked the angel of the Lord, “Who are these?” ⁵ And he told me, “These are those who planned to build the Tower.”

In continuation Baruch also learns how the Builders afflicted a deliver- ing woman and wanted to bore through heaven, in order to study its

¹⁹ Notice that the iconography of Roman fauni could include also lupine features (Rupp 2007:75).

composition, and how they were punished with blindness and confusion of languages (3:5b-8).

It is noticeable that in both lower heavens Baruch finds very similar hybrid creatures. A division of the Tower builders into several groups is attested in rabbinic tradition as well. Usually there are not two but three groups:

They [the builders of the Tower] split into three groups. One said, “Let us ascend and live there,” and the second said, “Let us ascend and worship idols,” and the third said, “Let us ascend and fight.” Those who said, “Let us ascend and live there,” the Lord scattered them; and those who said, “Let us ascend and fight,” turned to apes, spirits, demons, and night-demons; and those who said, “Let us ascend and worship idols,” — for there the Lord confused the language of all the earth. (*b. Sanhedrin* 109a)

See also *Tanhuma* Noah 28; *Midrash Psalms* 1.13; *Midrash Aggada* Gen 11:8; *Sefer ha-Yashar* 9.26. On the basis of this text, rich with many close parallels to 3 *Baruch*, James and Uehlinger suggested that 3 *Baruch* contains traces of the original division into three classes, too (James 1897:lix).²⁰ The two groups of Builders in 3 *Baruch* may also resemble two groups of Watchers in the second and fifth heavens of 2 *Enoch* (7 and 18). The first group is “imprisoned” and “tormented,” while the second is only banished from the heavenly liturgy.²¹

However, in 3 *Baruch* the appearances of the two groups are almost identical (and both are compatible with different depictions of Greco-Roman satyrs-silens-fauns), and their identifications differ only in that a delicate distinction is made between “those who built the Tower” and “those who conspired” to build it. There is a good reason to believe that this is not an apocalyptic *déjà vu*, but rather the result of an editorial elaboration. These texts look like two slightly edited variants of the same account, in the first case interpolated by the treatment of celestial measures (2:4–6; it is rather an interpolation than an excursus, since it clumsily cuts the verse 2:7 from the first account). The duplication

²⁰ They may be classified either according to the type of their punishment (banishing of 2:7; confusion of languages of 3:6 and 3:8G; and blindness of 3:8G; thus Uehlinger 1990:150), or of their function in the building process (builders of 2:7; “planners” of 3:5a; and forced builders of 3:5b; thus Harlow 1996:112–113).

²¹ On the connections between Builders and Watchers see below.

of the vision of Builders must be a result of compilation. Two versions of the same description could have been placed successively, according to the model well known in biblical criticism and attested in other pseudepigrapha.²²

Whether 3 *Baruch* presupposes two groups of Builders or one, the cosmology of the book appears unbalanced and unprecedented in that it reserves one, or even two, of the total of five²³ heavens exclusively for the Builders. This can hardly be justified by the role of the Tower account in early Jewish or Christian theology or sacral history.²⁴ A possible solution for this problem is proposed below.

Identifying the satyr-like Builders

Who were the Builders in 3 *Baruch*? Several creative suggestions have been proposed in order to find connections to later realities in the image of the Builders. Thus, Jean-Claude Picard maintains that the account of the Builders in 3 *Baruch* is an allegorical representation of Hellenistic sophists, concerned with the physical nature of heaven (because the Builders wanted to learn “whether heaven is [made] of clay, or of copper, or of iron;” 3:7), and opposed to Philo’s position of the incomprehensibility of heaven (*Somn.* 1.4 [21–24]).²⁵ As noted by Daniel Harlow, this is hardly convincing in light of Baruch’s own consistent interest in

²²) There are also two similar descriptions of Phoenix in 3 *Baruch*, where 7:3–5 is an abridged version that duplicates 6:1–5. The same phenomenon, most probably, lies behind the two different versions of Enoch’s tour in the *Book of Watchers* (ch. 17–19 and ch. 21–36, also separated only by an excursus — the list of the archangels in ch. 20); see Black 1985:15–16. In 3 *Baruch* the duplication theory reducing one heaven from the total calculation, concords with the numbering of heavens in 7:2S and 10:1G and may solve numerous problems of inconsistency in the ouranological picture in the book.

²³) Or whatever their number, from three to seven, would be.

²⁴) The only other vision, where the building of a tower is a central image, is *Hermas*, *Sim.* 9, where the tower symbolizes the Church. The tower of Hermas is built by angels, while in 3 *Baruch*, according to the interpretation below, it is erected by the fallen angels’ progeny. The understanding of Pentecost as the reversal of the tower of Babel is explicit in Gregory Nazianzen, *Oration* 41.15–16 and must be implied in the miracle of tongues on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2:1–11. Cf. also קריה מתבניה “a city to be built” in the vision of Michael (4Q 529 1.9).

²⁵) Picard 1991:14, 33–39; idem 1970:79.

the physical dimensions and mechanisms of heaven throughout the book.²⁶ We deal here not with the problem of forbidden knowledge, but rather with the esoteric limitation of access to this knowledge: celestial mysteries are forbidden for the wicked but revealed to the chosen pious. This position is well articulated in *1 Enoch* 65:11; *4 Ezra* 12:36–38; 14:26; Philo, *Sacr.* 15.60; *Cher.* 14.48; *m. Hagigah* 2.1. Alternatively, George Nickelsburg identified the Builders of *3 Baruch* as Babylonian or Roman destroyers of the Temple.²⁷ However, all these suggestions do not help to explain their satyr-like appearance and their (exclusive) occupation of the lower heaven.

Identification of the satyrs that exclusively occupy the lower heavens as the builders of the Tower satisfies “Baruch” and thus probably the originally intended audience of the work. However, for a reader from another epoch it is difficult to see the connection between such remote images. This implies that an authentic audience might have known something else — some self-evident connotations of both images that helped to reconcile the seemingly disconnected features of the image of “satyr-like Builders in heaven” and integrate this unique invention into an allegedly logical and coherent context of the common knowledge of that time and milieu. This kind of reconstruction based only on fragmentary preserved evidence is not a simple process, but it is possible and may be even convincing, especially when it provides solutions for several problems of textual interpretation, as well as of the history of motifs. Identifying the Builders of *3 Baruch* we should take into consideration the following traditions which are well attested in early Jewish literature and which may justify the identification of the Builders with demonic/archontic figures including (1.1) transformation of the Builders to demonic beings, (1.2) identification of the Builders with demons, (1.3) theriomorphic (possibly including satyr-like) appearance of demons, (1.4–5) heaven as an abode of demons and location of hell, (1.6) theriomorphism of celestial demons in connection to their function in heaven, (1.7) blindness, one of the punishments of the Builders, known

²⁶ Cf. also Harlow’s criticism of Picard based on a mystic-realistic rather than an allegorical and emblematic understanding of *3 Baruch* (Harlow 1996:115).

²⁷ See Nickelsburg 1981:302–303 based on the contamination of Gen 11 and Dan 3 in *Bib. Ant.* 6. Cf. also Nebuchadnezzar, who in a similar manner was punished with lycanthropy (Dan 4:33).

also as a demonic feature; (2.1) identification of the Builders with giants, on the one hand, and (2.2) the giants with demons, on the other. We also have to take into account that 3 *Baruch* must present a model of the harmonization of traditions quite typical for the genre as well as for this specific composition.

1. *Builders as Demons*

Demons appear explicitly in 3 *Baruch* only in 16:3.²⁸ However, we may posit the presence of a developed implied demonology behind the narrative on the basis of the references to “alien spirit” (1:1),²⁹ demolished

²⁸ The concluding plague will strike the children of the wicked, who will be hurt “with demons.” Children suffer for their fathers’ sins in many sources. “Who despises wisdom . . . their offspring are accursed” (Wis 3:11–13; cf. Ezek 16:44; Sir 41:5; 4 *Ezra* 9:17). In the last days “the destitute will go forth and carry off their children, and they will abandon them, so that their children will perish through them” (1 *En.* 99:5). “How dreadful it will be in those days for pregnant women and nursing mothers!” (Mark 13:17). Mass massacre of children forms part of the eschatological scenario of the *Apocalypse of Daniel* (1:10; 2:1). As for the demons’ role in this plague, the demonic Builders hurt a woman in childbirth in 3 *Bar.* 3:5. Jewish traditions on Lilith and other demons hurting newborns and women in labor go back to universal beliefs. Akkadian Lamashtu attacks mothers and newborn infants. Hellenistic demons Gello, Lamia, Mormo can cause child death (Pseudo-Herodotus, *Vit. Hom.* 32; *Hom. Epigr.* 14). The sinful generations of Israel “will sacrifice their children to demons” (*Jub.* 1:11). Demons struck human children also in the past: “the unclean demons began to lead astray the children of the sons of Noah, and to make to err and destroy them. And the sons of Noah came to Noah their father, and they told him concerning the demons which were leading astray and blinding and slaying his sons’ sons” (*Jub.* 10:1–2). In the *Testament of Solomon* demons torture boys, strangle newborn children, “blind children in women’s wombs, and twirl their ears round,” and “make them deaf and mute” (*Test. Sol.* 2; 13). In the time of the Antichrist “the unclean spirits and the demons will . . . kill the babies of the women and they themselves will suckle from them” (*Apoc. Dan.* 12:1–2). See also Rev 12ff; Justin Martyr, 1 *Apology* 5.2, and especially *Acts Thom.* 12: “the more part of children become useless oppressed of devils, some openly and some invisibly, for they become either lunatic or half withered or blind or deaf or dumb or paralytic or foolish; and if they be sound, again they will be vain, doing useless or abominable acts, for they will be caught either in adultery or murder or theft or fornication.”

²⁹ Just before meeting the Builders, Baruch crosses “a river which no one can cross, nor any *alien spirit* of all those that God created.” Different interpretations are possible for “alien spirit” (ξένη πνοή, lit., “alien breath”). Among them are also “anyone alien” or “alien wind.” The meanings “wind” and “spirit” can be expressed by the same word in

giants (4:10; see below), and probably demonic locusts (16:3),³⁰ as well as multiple features ascribed to the Builders and especially of their direct identification with demons in some parallels (*Paraphrase of Shem* [NHC VII,1] 24:30–25:34; *b. Sanhedrin* 109a).³¹

Semitic languages and in Greek (Heb רוּח; Gk πνεῦμα). Gk πνεύματα lit. “spirits” could designate even specifically “angels” or “demons.” Note also “the east wind which rages through the world like a demon [שַׁעִיר]” in *b. B. Bat.* 25a. Although in 3 *Baruch* we have πνοή instead of πνεῦμα, its use in the Semitized Greek of Jews and early Christians could be influenced by the wider semantic field of Heb רוּח (see, e.g., Irenaeus, *Haer.*, 1.6.1 and *PLG* 1106). If wind-spirit may mean an angelic force, especially one moving between heaven and earth, what does this indicate about the nature of our “alien wind-spirit” which does not have access to heaven (or less probably from heaven to earth)? Heb זר “alien” may refer to demons, as in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, to distinguish between the “Aliens” and the “Watchers” and the “Sons of Heaven.” Here Bitenosh tells her husband Lamech: “. . . this seed comes from you, this conception was by you, the planting of [this] fruit is yours. [It was] not by any Alien, neither by any of the Watchers, nor yet by any of the Sons of Heav[en] [[ז] בני שמ[ן]] ולא מן בול עירין ולא מן בול בני שמ[ן]]” (1QapGen ar 2.1). The collocation “alien spirit” as ἀλλότριος πνεῦμα occurs in Iamblichus’ *Egyptian Mysteries* 11.5, speaking about “souls infected with extraordinary defilements and alien spirits” (ψυχαι δὲ περισσῶν μολυσμῶν καὶ ἀλλοτρίων πνευμάτων ἀναπιμπλανται). Alternatively, in the plural form the combination “alien spirits” or “spirits of aliens” might have gone back to Heb רוּחוֹת (ה) זָרִים as a variant or distortion of רוּחוֹת מִמְזָרִים “spirits of bastards,” which designates the demonic offspring of the fallen angels in *Shirot* (4Q510 1.5 and 4Q511 35:7; cf. 1 *En.* 10:9 Cod. Pan.). The very term מְמוֹזָר “bastard” in Zech 9:6 is rendered as “alien” in ancient translations (ἀλλογενεῖς in LXX and נְכַרְאִין in *Tg.*). Not only the name, but also the role of the “alien spirit” in 3 *Baruch*—the fact that it cannot ascend to heaven is appropriate for terrestrial demonic forces. In the *Apocalypse of Abraham* “the earth . . . and its spiritual ones” (CS ΔΨΗΜΑΙΑ probably rendering Gk πνεύματα; 21:3) are opposed to celestial “spiritual angels” (ΔΑΧΒΗΖΙΕ ΔΗΓΛΖΙ; 19:6–7). This confirms the fundamental statement repeated twice in 1 *Enoch*: “The spirits of heaven, in heaven is their dwelling; but the spirits begotten on earth, on earth is their dwelling” (15:10; cf. 15:7–8).

³⁰⁾ “Send forth the caterpillar and the [kind of] locust, and the rust, and [another kind of] locust, [and] hail with lightnings and wrath, and cut them in twain with the sword and with death, and their children with demons.” The locusts are one of the eschatological woes of Revelation 9:3–11, where they are described as hybrid demonic creatures identified as the army of Abaddon-Apollyon. The “fiery locusts” coming out of the mouth of “a mighty Beast like a whale” (*Herm., Vis.* 4.1.6) must be of the same demonic nature.

³¹⁾ Demonic creatures are part of a very similar mourning setting in 2 *Baruch*, which also takes place in the Temple gate: “But as for us who live, woe unto us, because we see the afflictions of Zion, and what has befallen Jerusalem. I will call the Sirens from the

1.1. *Builders became demons.* The Tower builders turned to “apes, spirits, demons, and night-demons” in *b. Sanhedrin* 109a and parallels (see above).³² Thus, the Builders of 3 *Baruch* could also be either struck by lycanthropy (a transformation to animals) or changed into demonic beings. Both kinds of transformation of the wicked are well attested in early Jewish literature.³³

1.2. *Builders were demons.* Whereas according to a developed rabbinic tradition the Builders or the whole “generation of the Separation” were transformed into demons (see above), an alternative Gnostic tradition

sea, and you Lilin, come you from the desert, and you Shedim and Dragons from the forests: awake and gird up your loins unto mourning, and take up with me the dirges, and make lamentation with me” (2 *Baruch* 10:7–8).

³²⁾ This motif reappears in medieval midrash identifying werewolves and woodmen of German folklore as descendants of the Tower builders (*Sefer Ziyoni*, end of Noah; Ginzberg 1909–1938:V, 204).

³³⁾ Cf. Pseudo-Philo mentioning not only that the Builders will live in cliffs “like beasts of the field” (*Bib. Ant.* 7:3) but also that “God divided their speech, and changed their likeness” (*Bib. Ant.* 7:5). An ironic reference to the motif of a transformation of a human to a demonic goat-like *sair* may be recognized in the words of R. Abba: “You have not yet been turned into a *sair*, but you have learned the manners of a *sair*” (*b. Berakhot* 62b; see a wider citation above). According to 2 *Baruch* in the last judgment “the shape of those who now act wickedly will be made more evil than it is now” (2 *Baruch* 51:2) and “those will be changed . . . into startling visions and horrible shapes” (2 *Baruch* 51:5), and “they will depart to be tormented” (2 *Baruch* 51:5; cf. 3 *Baruch* 2:7: “the Lord banished them”). Sinful generations since Enosh in general have lost the Divine likeness and resembled centaurs and apes (*Genesis Rabba* 23,6–7). Nebuchadnezzar was also punished by a transformation to an animal (Dan 4:33); cf. Schlossberg 1993; Henze 1999. Cf. also *b. Bava Qamma* 16a: “The spine of a man after seven years turns into a snake, should he not bow while reciting the benediction ‘We give thanks unto Thee.’” On zoomorphic creatures in Jewish and Christian iconography see Ameisenowa 1949. Men with animal heads are well known in medieval Jewish and Christian iconography; see Ameisenowa 1935. Similar ideas were developed by Plato, assuming reincarnation of men to beasts: “if he does not still refrain from wickedness he will be changed every time, according to the nature of his wickedness, into some bestial form after the similitude of his own nature” (*Tim.* 42b–c; cf. 91e), “a human soul may pass into the life of a beast, and a soul which was once human, may pass again from a beast into a man” (*Phaedr.* 249b); cf. *Phaedo* 81e–82a (the translations are based on the Loeb edition). Origen taught that “one who is now a man may in another world become a demon” (so Jerome, *Ep. Avitum* 3). For more on ancient *metempsychosis*, a human–animal afterlife transformation, see Gilhus 2006:86–90.

considers the Tower building as a demonic plot, i.e., states that the Builders were demons in the first place (*italics are mine*):

And in order that the sin of Nature might be filled, I made the womb, which was disturbed, pleasant — blind wisdom — that I might be able to bring (it) to naught. And at my wish, he plotted with the water of Darkness and also the Darkness, that they might wound every form of your (pl.) heart. For by the will of the light of the Spirit they surrounded you; they bound you in Faith. And in order that his plan might become idle, he sent a demon that the plan of her wickedness might be proclaimed. And he caused the Flood, and he destroyed your (pl.) race, in order to take the light and to take from Faith. But I proclaimed quickly by the mouth of the demon that a Tower come to be up to the particle of the light, which was left in the demons and their race — which was water — that the demon might be protected from the turbulent chaos. And *the womb planned these things according to my will in order that she might pour forth completely. A Tower came to be through the demons.* The Darkness was disturbed by his loss. He loosened the muscles of the womb. And the demon who was going to enter the tower was protected in order that the races might continue and might acquire coherence through him. For he possesses power from every form. (*Paraphrase of Shem* [NHC VII,1] 24.30–25.34; *italics are mine*)³⁴

This tradition not only states that the Tower “came to be through the demons,” but further states that demonic powers “plotted” and “planned” the events, similarly to the second account of the Builders in 3 *Baruch* (3:5). Note also “blind wisdom” and the blindness of the Builders in 3 *Baruch* (3:8G; see *Blindness as demonic feature* below).

1.3. *Demonic theriomorphism.* In different Jewish traditions theriomorphic and especially hybrid therianthropic motifs (combining therio- and anthropomorphic elements) are widely known as demonic features. Evil spirits look like frogs (Rev 16:13) or like locusts with human faces (Rev 9:7). Different kinds of chimeric demons are known to *Testament of Solomon* 18:1–2. Theriomorphic feet betray demonic impostors (*b. Berakhot* 6a; *b. Gittin* 68b). Cf. also the list of three features in which demons are likened to animals: “they eat and drink like animals, multiply like animals, and excrete like animals” (*b. Hagigah* 16a). The seven evil archons of the Ophite Gnostics are also theriomorphic: “the first is Atoth, he has a sheep’s face; the second is Eloaiou, he has a donkey’s

³⁴ The translation is based on Robinson 1990.

face; the third is Astaphaios, he has a hyena's face; the fourth is Yao, he has a serpent's face with seven heads; the fifth is Sabaoth, he has a dragon's face; the sixth is Adonin, he had a monkey's face; the seventh is Sabbede, he has a shining fire-face" (*Apocryphon of John* [NHC II.11] 15–35). Celsus describes the "seven ruling demons" of the Ophite Gnostics as lion-like Michael, bull-like Suriel, serpent-like Raphael, eagle-like Gabriel, bear-like Thauthabaoth, dog-like Erathoel, and ass-like Onoel (Origen, *Cels.* 6.30). Celsus adds that "certain persons return to the shapes of the archons, so that some are called lions, others bulls, others dragons, or eagles, or bears, or dogs" (*ibid.*, 6.33). Cynocephali, dog-faced creatures (as in the description of the second group in 3:3), were met in heaven also by Isaac (*Testament of Isaac* 5:8; see below). Dog-headed demons appear in Egyptian iconography (Keel 1977:80–81).

While rabbinic demons usually have rooster feet (e.g., *b. Berakhot* 6a), the Builders have feet of goats (2:3) or deer (3:3). This gives the creatures of the first heaven (at least the first group) the appearance of silenes, satyrs, and especially Roman satyrs (fauns) described as goat-like from the haunches to the hooves, and often with horns. These images, universally known in the Hellenistic world, might have their counterparts in Jewish and other Near Eastern traditions as well. On the biblical *seirim*-*ὄνοκένταυροι*, rabbinic *seirim*-demons, satyr-like demons of *Testament of Solomon* and Jerome, and the satyr-like creature described in the Tosefta, see the beginning of this article.

1.4. *Heaven as abode of demons.* Heaven is not the most common abode for the demons. However, this notion is far from being unique to 3 *Baruch*. In the *Testament of Solomon* demons reside in heaven, and particularly in "stars," constellations, and the moon (2:2; 4:6, 9) or are even identified with heavenly bodies. In 8:2 they are seven (in 18:2 — thirty six), as seven bound stars of 1 *Enoch* 21:3, seven archons of Gnostics (Origen, *Cels.* 6.30), and seven planets as malevolent demonic powers in Mandaean mythology (cf. Toepel 2005). Some of them are theriomorphic at the same time (18:1–2; see citation above). "Sammael and his hosts," "angels of Satan" dwell below the first heaven (in the "firmament") according to *Ascension of Isaiah* 7:9. "The spirits of the retributions for vengeance on men" are found in the lower heaven in *Testament of Levi* 3:2. They are probably identical to "the spirits of deceit and of Beliar" of the next verse

(*T. Levi* 3:3). Eph 6:12 speaks of the “spiritual force of evil in the heavenly realms” (πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις), and some Church Fathers explain this as referring to demons dwelling in heaven (see Lash 1976). Some demonic creatures reside in heaven in *Testament of Isaac* 5 (see below). Cf. also David Halperin’s (1988:151–154) attempt to reconstruct a lost Jewish tradition of the identification of the celestial Living Creatures/Beasts (לִיִּוִּת) with demons.

Demons can also occupy the lower heaven, being perceived as pagan gods (cf. Deut 32:8; Sir 17:17; *Test. Sol.* 5:5; 1 Cor 10:20; *Acts of John* 41; 43; Justin, *1 Apol.* 5; 41; *Tryph.* 58; 73; Tatian, *Ad Graecos* 8; 29; Origen, *Cels.* 7.69; Theophilus, *Ad Autolyicum* 1.10; Tertullian, *Ad Scapula* 2; *De Idolatria* 1; 15; etc.).³⁵

The idea that “on earth is [or “shall be”] their dwelling” is repeated thrice in three successive verses in the account of the evil spirits begotten from the dead giants (*1 Enoch* 15:8–10; see below). The same impenetrability of the border between the two realms must be meant in *3 Baruch* 2:1, which states that the River Ocean separating the celestial realm cannot be crossed by “any alien spirit of all those that God created.” Thus, the trespassing of this border could have been a motive for the building of the Tower (on demons causing the building of the Tower, see *Paraphrase of Shem* 24–25, cited above). By introducing demons into the Tower story, *3 Baruch* uniquely proposes a harmonization between two traditions: demons limited to the terrestrial realm, on the one hand, and demons as celestial inhabitants, on the other.

The punishment for this attempt comes as an ironic fulfillment of their wish. The Builders here “wanted to get to the firmament” (thus in *Tanhuma Buber*, Noah 22), and that is what they got. The heaven may be not only an abode of demons, but also a place of punishment both for the Watchers (their fathers according to *1 Enoch* 18–19; *2 Enoch* 7 and 18) and for other wicked souls (see below).

1.5. *Hell in Heaven.* In *3 Baruch* not only demons, but also Hades is located in heaven (ch. 4–5). An abode of souls, whether Greek Hades or Jewish Sheol, is normally located “below.” Plato, however, considered

³⁵ Cf. the gods ascending to heaven in order to escape the Flood in *Gilgamesh* 11.11–14. For a survey of evil heavenly powers in pagan, apocalyptic, and Gnostic sources, see Scott 1994:83–103.

heaven to be a post-mortem abode of all kinds of souls (*Phaedr.* 246d; 247c). Stoics believed that souls go eventually to the sun and stay for an interim period of purification close to the sun and the moon. This cosmology, “new” for the Hellenistic world, is probably of Oriental origin, having coexisted with the traditional conception of the afterlife realm in the underworld. It is attested in Plutarch, *Fac.* 27–29; *Sera* 563d; *Gen. Socr.* 590b (see Dean-Otting 1984:122–124; Harlow 1996:125, n. 50; Collins 1996:45). In the former dialogue souls are punished or purified in the sphere of the moon exactly as in *3 Baruch*, where Hades is located in the same heaven with the sun and the moon.³⁶ See a description of the Egyptian astrologist Teukros (1st cent. CE), where the heavenly serpent is standing over the Zodiac sign Scorpio, in whose claws Hades lies (Dean-Otting 1984:124).

In Jewish Hellenistic as well as rabbinic and early Christian traditions normally only the righteous deserve to be placed in heaven (Philo, *Sacr.* 2.5; *b. Ketubot* 104a; *b. Hagigah* 12b; *Midrash ha-Gadol* on Gen 50:26; and *passim*). The boundary between heaven (or more precisely, extra-terrestrial spheres) and Hell is much less clear in Gnostic literature,³⁷ but also in some apocalyptic sources the place of “eternal recompense” for the wicked is located in heaven. This is most probably the case of the “prison house” for heavenly powers in *1 Enoch* 18–19. In *2 Enoch* 10 it is even the same third heaven as in the extant redaction of *3 Baruch*. Two lowest heavens of a total of three, or seven in different versions of the *Testament of Levi*, are also connected with punishment: “In it [the lowest heaven] are all the spirits of those dispatched to achieve the punishment of mankind” (*T. Levi* 3:3). According to one of the opinions presented in *b. Tamid* 32b, Hell may be found above the firmament (גיהנם למעלה מן הרקיע).

In *3 Baruch* both Hell and Paradise are probably located in the same heaven, since the story of the Tree of Knowledge is adjacent to (and even intervenes in) the Hades account. Hell and Paradise are situated

³⁶ Rabbis also connected Hell and the sun: the sun on its setting passes through Hell in order to receive there its fire (*b. Bava Bathra* 84a; cf. “fire of the west” in *1 En.* 17:4–6).

³⁷ Cf. also the accounts about souls which are tortured in the fourth and fifth heavens in the Gnostic *Apocalypse of Paul* (NHC V,2) 20.5–22.30 or inside the Great Dragon surrounding the world (*Pistis Sophia* 3.126).

side by side in 2 *Enoch* 8–10; *Pesiqta de-Rav Kahana* 30.191b; *Ecclesiastes Rabba* 7.14; *Midrash Tannaim* 224. Paradise of the third heaven in 2 *Enoch* 8:5 lies between “the corruptible” and “the incorruptible.” In *T. Levi* 3 heavens are probably divided into two realms: two lower and the higher heaven of “holy ones.” This recalls ancient cosmologies distinguishing between irregular *ouranos* and higher *kosmos* (Andersen 1983–1985:116, n. 81). Likewise, also in 3 *Baruch* the low heavens serve as an abode of the demonic Builders and even of the “impure” Hades.

The presence of demons and Hell in the very beginning of the celestial journey may also have a structural explanation. Martha Himmelfarb (1993:91) has noticed that the central concern of 3 *Baruch* must be reward and punishment brought into relation with the created world. It seems that the composition of the vision may also indicate its focus on retribution and its central element, the afterlife:

<i>Structure</i>	<i>Dominant Topics</i>
Builders <i>Scientific Excursus: Dimensions of Heaven</i>	Abode of Punitive Demons
Serpent-Hades <i>Scientific Excurses:</i> <i>Cosmic Hydrosystem I</i> <i>Tree of Knowledge</i> <i>Sun and Moon</i>	Abode of Wicked Souls
Lake of Birds <i>Scientific Excursus: Cosmic Hydrosystem II</i>	Temporary Abode of Just Souls
Gate to the Kingdom of Heaven	Gate to the Permanent Abode of the Just Souls
Angelic Service	Retribution Mechanism

The chart reflects a reading according to which post-mortem retribution, although scarcely mentioned explicitly, is a structurally dominant topic. In this case, 3 *Baruch* is to be read as follows: (1) The visionary proceeds through the lower heaven, with the abode of demons in it, first to the heaven of the final destination of the wicked (Hades; chapters 4–5), (2) then to the heaven where the transition station of the pious souls is

located (lake of birds; chapter 10), (3) and finally he arrives at the gates of the Kingdom of Heaven, their destined permanent abode, where, due to being alive, he is not admitted (chapter 11). (4) There, at the completion of the ascent, he observes the mechanism of such selection to the seen abodes. All other materials are excursuses which provide information about additional contents of the heavens, where the stations of the soul's ascent are found. This interpretation will relate 3 *Baruch* to many Jewish (and non-Jewish) compositions which are concerned primarily with the fate of the dead and which contain tours of the world of the dead. Thus, also the tour of Baruch may be such *nekylia*, though relocated to heaven.

1.6. *Theriomorphism and celestial demonic functions.* Why would theriomorphic creatures, probably demons, be situated in heaven? Their theriomorphic appearance may be connected with the function of the celestial afterworld doorkeepers and probably “angels of punishment” (1 *Enoch* 53:3; cf. “spirits of retribution” of *Testament of Levi* 3:2, etc.). This understanding would better correspond to the second account of the Builders, where they have the “appearance of dogs” (3:3). The guarding of the Gates of the afterworld by beasts is a common motif; cf., e.g., in Greek and Roman traditions: Cerberus, Eurynomos of Pausanias (10.28.7), beasts and snakes (Aristophanes, *Ran.* 143; 278), Hydra (Virgil, *Aeneid* 6.560; cf. Ovid, *Met.* 4.451–52 and *passim*). See also the serpent-like gate keepers of Hades in 2 *Enoch* 42:1; etc. Although normally the netherworld is meant, in 3 *Baruch* Hades is located in heaven (see above). According to *Testament of Isaac* 5:8 in the beginning of his heavenly tour the patriarch sees creatures whose “faces were like faces of camels and some were like the faces of dogs; others were like the faces of lions and hyenas and tigers.” Their function is to torment the sinners who pass there (to higher heavens?): “They tore him apart, dismembered, and chewed, and swallowed him. After that they ejected him from their mouths and he returned to his original state” (5:12–16). Very similar appearance and function are attributed to the angels of *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*: near the gate of heaven (3:9) Zephaniah finds a “myriad of myriads of angels” with “faces like a leopard, their tusks being outside their mouth like wild boars” (4:3). They are defined as “the servants of all creation who come to ungodly men and bring them and

leave them in this place,” where they wait three days before being cast into their eternal punishment (4:6).³⁸ Also the theriomorphic evil planetary demons of the Gnostics obstruct the soul’s post-mortem ascent to the fixed sphere (see Anz 1897:58, n. 2).³⁹ Note also that Baruch proceeds to heaven accompanied (and defended?) by the “angel of powers/hosts” (cf. 3 *Baruch* 1:8G; 2:1S; 2:6G; 10:1S; 11:1S), whose angelic order according to *Testament of Adam* 4:5 is supposed “to keep demons from destroying the creation of God.”

1.7. *Blindness as demonic feature.* The Builders were “smitten with blindness” (3:8G). “Blindness” is a common characteristic of archons and evil powers in Gnostic literature (*Hypostasis of the Archons* [NHC II,4] 86.28; 87.3–4; 89.25–26; and *passim*; *Gospel of Philip* [NHC II,3] 59.19–23). The name of the chief demon Sammael (appearing in 4:8G below) is derived from Aram סממל “blind” in *Acts of Andrew and Matthew* 24 and *Hypostasis of the Archons* 87.3–4 (“Sammael, that is blind god”).⁴⁰

2. Builders as Giants vs. Giants as Demons

2.1. *Builders as giants.* According to Richard Bauckham (1990:372), the builders of 3 *Baruch* “perhaps substituted for the two groups of angelic Watchers which Enoch saw in the second and fifth heavens” (2 *Enoch* 7; 18). It is remarkable that 3 *Baruch*, which throughout chapters 2–5 is preoccupied with the stories of Gen. 2–11, makes no reference to the Watchers. The author is perhaps engaged in a polemical rejection of the Enoch tradition so that in addition to substituting Baruch for Enoch he also substitutes the human builders for the angelic Watchers.”⁴¹ Harlow (1996:59) develops this idea, stating that we deal here with

³⁸ Cf. the Ozhayah Fragment from Geniza, which compares heavenly dangers with the attack of wild animals (Schäfer 1984:IIa, 27–32). “Angels of destruction” guarding celestial gateways is a commonplace in the Hekhalot literature; see, e.g., *Hekhalot Rabbati* 15.8–16.2 (213–215).

³⁹ Cf. *Pistis Sophia*, where the soul has to give the defense before the evil planetary archons (3.113).

⁴⁰ For the analysis of this name see Bullard 1970:51–54.

⁴¹ For more on “Enochic materials” in 3 *Baruch* see also comm. to ch. 4 in Kulik 2010; Himmelfarb 1993:3; Orlov 2003.

“human invasion of the divine realm as a paradigmatic sin of humanity. The message that emerges is quite the obverse of that conveyed by the myth of the Watchers (of which only 4:10 retains a vestige). This myth depicts the origin of evil in the world as an *invasion of the earthly realm by divine beings*. The archetypal sin according to 3 *Baruch* is the *invasion of the divine realm by human beings*.”

In fact, the demonic creatures of the lower heaven, introduced as the Tower builders, are not a substitution for the Watchers or their opposite. On the contrary, our text most probably implicitly identifies them with the Watchers’ offspring, the giants (4:10).⁴² The Builders are identified with the surviving giants according to a tradition known to Pseudo-Eupolemus cited by Alexander Polyhistor:

⁴² Giants (Nephilim, Refaim, Anakim) were born as a result of the intercourse of the “sons of God” (Watchers, the fallen angels of pseudepigraphic and rabbinic traditions) with the daughters of men (Gen 6:4; developed in 1 *Enoch* 15; *Jubilees* 5:1–2; Philo, *Gig.*; *Genesis Rabba* 26.7; *Deuteronomy Rabba* 1.24; *Tanhuma Buber* 5.6; *Pirqe de-Rabbi Eliezer* 22; and *passim*). They were compared to the Greek “giants” by Josephus (*Ant.* 1.3.1–2). Giants (“bulls and elephants and camels and asses”) perished in the Flood according to the *Animal Apocalypse* (1 *Enoch* 89:6); *Qumranic Book of Giants* [so Stuckenbruck 2000:367 — “the Book of Giants retains the dual motif of internecine fighting (1Q23 9+14+15?; 4Q531 4) with their destruction through the flood (2Q26; 4Q530 2:4–7; 6Q8 frag. 2)”; “If 2Q26, 6Q8 frag. 2 and 4Q530 2:4–7 represent dreams of the giants about their punishment, the allusions to the flood in these texts may imply that their destruction would occur during the deluge” (ibid., 369)]; 4QExhortation (4Q370 1.6), *Sib. Or.* 2:283; 3 *Macc* 2:4; *Wis* 14:6; *CD* 2:19–20. Many other sources refer to the mass destruction of giants, without referring to the Flood explicitly (e.g., *Jubilees* 20:5; 1 *Baruch* 3:26–28; *Sibylline Oracles* 1:145). Cf. also *Testament of Reuben* 5:6; *Apocalypse of Peter* 230; *Acts of Andrew and Matthew* 18; *Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan* to Deut 3:11; *b. Niddah* 61a; *Tanhuma Buber* 4.130; *Tanhuma Hukat* 25; *Numbers Rabba* 19.32. According to some Rabbinic traditions, the whole antediluvian generation was gigantic, so that they had no fear of the Flood (*Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan* to Gen 7:10; *y. Sanhedrin* 10.29b; *b. Sanhedrin* 108b; *b. Rosh ha-Shanah*. 12a; *b. Zevachim* 113b; *Leviticus Rabba* 7.6; *Ecclesiastes Rabba* 9.4; *Tanhuma Buber* 3.13; *Tanhuma Zav* 2; *Pirqe de-Rabbi Eliezer* 22; *Midrash Psalms* 11.100; *Aggadat Bereshit* 4.10). Predeluvian giants who “did not want to glorify God” and laughed at Noah are mentioned in the fragment *On Enoch Tablets of Palaea Historica* (Vassiliev 1893:196–198). For a detailed analysis of the identification of the builders of the Tower of Babel and the giants see Stuckenbruck, “Angels and Giants;” see also Reeves 1993; Huggins 1995; Wright 2005.

Babylon was first founded by those who escaped the Flood. They were giants, and they built the Tower well known in history [ἐῖναι δὲ αὐτοὺς γίγαντας οἰκοδομεῖν δὲ τὸν ἱστορούμενον πύργον]. When it was destroyed by God's power, these giants were scattered over the whole earth. (Eusebius, *Pr. Ev.* 9.17.2–3)

Another fragment of the same origin speaks about Belos, a survivor of the destroyed giants, who built for himself a tower in Babel (Eusebius, *Pr. Ev.* 9.18.2). The concise evidence of these two fragments allows us to bring together and identify both enigmatic images of 3 *Baruch*, the Builders and the Giants, of which, as we learn below, 409,000 were destroyed by the Flood (4:10). Nimrod, who was known as an instigator of the building of the Tower (Josephus, *Ant.* 1.4.2–3; *Genesis Rabba* 23.7; 26.4; 42.4; *b. Hullin* 89a; *Avodah Zarah* 53b; *Pesahim* 94b; *Eruvin* 53a; *Pirque de-Rabbi Eliezer* 24), is called “giant” (γίγας) in LXX Gen 10:8 and 9 (cf. Stuckenbruck 2000:356). Giants Otus and Ephialtes of *Odyssey* 11.305–20 were involved in a similar attempt to build a mountain in order to ascend to heaven. Philo refers to this story and compares it to the biblical account (*Conf.* 2). The motif of the identification of the Tower builders with Nephilim has survived till the ninth century in the work of Hiwi al-Balkhi (Saadia Gaon, *Polemic against Hiwi al-Balkhi* 31–34).

See also the mention of the giants in the context of an assertion about the inaccessibility of celestial Wisdom:

In it [God's house] were born the giants, renowned at the first, stalwarts, skilled in war. Not these did God choose, nor did he give them the way of understanding. They perished for lack of prudence, perished through their folly. Who has gone up to the heavens and taken her [Wisdom], or brought her down from the clouds? Who has crossed the sea and found her. . . . (1 *Baruch* 3:26–30)

2.2. *Giants as demons.* The two identifications of the Builders proposed above — with demons and with giants — do not necessarily contradict each other. As it has been noticed by Loren Stuckenbruck (2000: 365), “the implications of the giants traditions for concepts of demonology at the turn of the Common Era have until now been insufficiently recognized.” In fact, according to Enochic etiology of demons they may be the dead giants, i.e., the demonic spirits released from the bodies of the giants:

You [Watchers] have defiled yourselves with the daughters of men and taken to yourselves wives and acted like the sons of earth, and begotten giants . . . But now the giants, who were begotten of spirit and of flesh, shall be called evil spirits upon earth, and on earth shall be their dwelling. The spirits that have gone forth from the body of their flesh are evil spirits, because they came into being from men, and from the holy Watchers is the origin of their creation. They shall be evil spirits on earth, and evil spirits shall they be called. As for the spirits of heaven, in heaven shall be their dwelling, but as for the spirits of the earth begotten upon earth, on earth shall be their dwelling. (1 *Enoch* 15:3–10)

The identification of demons and giants must have been widely known. Very similar conceptions appear in *Jubilees* (chs. 5 and 10); the *Testament of Solomon* (5:3; 17:1); *Shirot* (4Q510 1.5 and 4Q511 35.7; Stuckenbruck 2000:371–374). Many early Christian writers also identified the antediluvian giants with demons (Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 2.2–6; Athenagoras, *Leg.* 24–25; Tertullian, *Apol.* 22.3–4; Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* 2.14; Ps.-Clementine *Hom.* 7.18–20).

Both of these conceptions of the origins of demons combined in Jewish lore — as inter-worldly bastards, and as spirits of the deceased ancient and mighty men — were known to Greeks, although separately and without negative connotations: Greek daemons are either the bastards of gods and nymphs (Plato, *Apol.* 15 [27b–e] or they are the spirits of the deceased heroes and the first generations of men (Hesiod, *Op.* 110–139; Plutarch, *Def. Or.* 38 [341b] and *Gen. Socr.* 24 [593d]).

Summarizing the data discussed in the last two sections above, we can state that 3 *Baruch* tries to combine two contradictory traditions:

- (1) on the giants that perished in the Flood (as in 4:10 and 1 *Enoch* 89:6; 4QExhortation (4Q370 1.6), *Sibylline Oracles* 2:283; 3 *Macc* 2:4; *Wis* 14:6; *CD* 2:19–20; this tradition explains why these legendary creatures no longer exist), and
- (2) on the giants that survived the Flood (see above and *Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan* on *Deut* 3:11; *b. Niddah* 61a; *b. Zevahim* 113a–b; *Pirque de-Rabbi Eliezer* 23; etc.). The latter tradition explains why some giants still existed alongside Noah's posterity (*Num* 13:33; *Deut* 3:11; LXX *Gen* 10:8, 9) as well as the legends about their involvement in the Tower building (Pseudo-Eupolemus and par.; see above).

The harmonizing narrative of 3 *Baruch* reconciles the two myths assuming that *although the giants perished, they have survived but in a different quality and location* — not in the flesh, but as spiritualized beings inhabiting the lower heaven. Thus 3 *Baruch* also conflates the two motifs — of the imprisonment of the fallen Watchers *in heaven* (1 *Enoch* 18–19; 2 *Enoch* 7; 18) and of their *demonic offspring* in the underworld (*Jubilees* 10:7–11), postulating the imprisonment of the *demonic offspring in heaven*.

Conclusion

The most plausible way to interpret the blind satyr-like creatures of 3 *Baruch* is to understand them as the demonic forces of the lower heaven. If this interpretation is convincing, 3 *Baruch* can attest the missing element which may enable us to reconstruct the *ancient motif of a satyr-like demon*. To be clear, I do not suggest that 3 *Baruch* was necessarily a link in the actual transmission of this motif, but it provides the earliest evidence of its existence. All other sources attest only partial data: the Septuagint defines biblical *seirim*-goats as “demons” with a hybrid appearance of “ass-centaurs” — the image close to satyrs, but not specifically satyr-like; the description of the enigmatic creature in the *Tosefta* perfectly fits a satyr’s appearance, but its demonic nature is not mentioned; other rabbinic sources are very explicit about *seirim* as demons, but add nothing about their appearance; only Jerome defines *seirim* as demons and satyrs at the same time, but it turns out that by “demons” he means a kind of wild humanoid rather than supernatural creatures.

This makes the text in 3 *Baruch*, interpreted in a new way, the most explicit of all these sources and enables us to put together different elements of the puzzle of a common iconographic tradition behind these parallels, or at least some of them. The following system of equations can illustrate this reconstruction:

<i>seirim</i>	= “demons”	= ass-centaurs	(LXX)
x	= x	= satyr	(<i>Tosefta</i>)
<i>seirim</i>	= demons	= x	(<i>Targums, Sifra, Talmud</i>)
<i>seirim</i>	= “demons”	= satyrs	(Jerome)
x	= demons	= satyrs	(3 <i>Baruch</i>)

The motif of a satyr-like demon must be a modification of a more general tradition of presenting demons and archons in various theriomorphic and hybrid forms. This motif may be either originally Jewish — even though not attested in this particular form in ancient Near Eastern sources — or rather a conflation of ancient biblical traditions of goat-like demons with the Hellenistic anthropomorphic but goat-legged and horned Pan and/or satyrs.

The range of sources may indicate the wide integration of the motif into the Jewish lore of late antiquity. This, however, does not necessarily mean that it survived in the Middle Ages, when we find exactly the same image. Nevertheless, the similarity between the ancient and the medieval motifs is striking; it is hardly a coincidence. Such similarity must be either *typological* or *genetic*. It is *typological* if medieval Christians independently reinvented the motif, i.e., resorted to the classical heritage in order to imagine their devil, just as their Jewish predecessors appealed to the same iconography in order to depict the appearance of their demonic *sair*. The problem with this interpretation is that while Hellenistic Jews' choice can be easily explained — both images are goat-like, and the Jews borrowed from the dominant contemporary iconography of their civilization — the reasons for a sudden shift from the earlier winged, serpentine, bird-legged devils to the satyr-like figure in Latin Europe is not clear at all. Alternatively, we can take the ties between the two images to be *genetic*, if the later image hails from the earlier. This interpretation would explain the reappearance of the motif by assuming its unattested transmission; the route of transmission would then still need to be traced, or else one might suggest Jerome as a possible mediator between the ancient Jewish and the medieval Western Christian traditions. In either case, the circumstances of the rebirth of the motif should now be reexamined through the prism of medieval iconography, taking into account the reconstruction suggested above.

References

- Ameisenowa, Zofia. 1935. "Das messianische Gastmahl der Gerechten in einer hebräischen Bibel aus dem 13. Jahrhundert. Ein Beitrag zur eschatologischen Ikonographie bei den Juden." *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 79:409–422.

- . 1949. “Animal-Headed Gods, Evangelists, Saints and Righteous Men.” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 12:21–45.
- Andersen, Francis I. 1983–1985. “2 Enoch.” In James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Vol. 1*, New York: Doubleday, 91–221.
- Anz, Wilhelm. 1897. *Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnostizismus*. Leipzig: August Pries.
- Bauckham, Richard. 1990. “Early Jewish Visions of Hell.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 41:355–385.
- Berlin, Andrea M. 1999. “The Archaeology of Ritual: The Sanctuary of Pan at Baniyas/Caesarea Philippi.” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 315:27–45.
- Black, Matthew. 1985. *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Bohak, Gideon. 2008. *Ancient Jewish Magic: A History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Dennis. 1992. *Vir trilinguis: A Study in the Biblical Exegesis of Saint Jerome*. Kampen: Kok Pharos.
- Bullard, Roger Aubrey. 1970. *The Hypostasis of the Archons: The Coptic Text with Translation and Commentary*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Burgess, Joseph A. 1976. *A History of the Exegesis of Matthew 16.17–19 from 1781 to 1965*. Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers Inc.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. 1996. *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Corrigan, Kathleen. 1998. “The ‘Jewish Satyr’ in the 9th Century Byzantine Psalters.” In Asher Ovadiah (ed.), *Hellenic and Jewish Arts: Interaction, Tradition and Renewal*, Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 351–368.
- Davidson, H.R. Ellis. 1982. *Scandinavian Mythology*. London: Hamlyn.
- . 1993. *The Lost Beliefs of Northern Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Dean-Otting, Mary. 1984. *Heavenly Journeys: A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Frazer, James George. 1922. *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion*. Abridged Edition. London: Macmillan and Co.
- Gilhus, Ingvild Sælid. 2006. *Animals, Gods and Humans: Changing Attitudes to Animals in Greek, Roman and Early Christian Ideas*. London: Routledge.
- Ginzberg, Louis. 1909–1938. *The Legends of the Jews*. 7 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America.
- Halperin, David J. 1988. *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck.
- Harlow, Daniel C. 1996. *The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch) in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Henze, Matthias. 1999. *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar: The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4*. Leiden: Brill.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. 1993. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Huggins, Ronald V. 1995. "Noah and the Giants: A Response to John C. Reeves." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 114:103–110.
- Immisch, Johann Heinrich Otto. 1916. "Matthäus 16.18." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 17:18–26.
- James, Montague Rhodes. 1897. *Apocrypha Anecdota: Second Series*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kamesar, Adam. 1993. *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Keel, Othmar. 1977. *The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Kinzig, Wolfram. 2003. "Jewish and 'Judaizing' Eschatologies in Jerome." In Richard Kalmin and Seth Schwartz (eds.), *Jewish Culture and Society under the Christian Roman Empire*, Leuven: Peeters, 409–429.
- Kirk, Geoffrey Stephen. 1974. *The Nature of Greek Myths*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Kulik, Alexander. 2010. *3 Baruch: Greek-Slavonic Apocalypse of Baruch*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Lang, Andrew. 1968. *Custom and Myth*. New York: AMS Press.
- Lash, Christopher J.A. 1976. "Where Do Devils Live? A Problem in the Textual Criticism of Ephesians 6, 12." *Vigiliae Christianae* 30: 161–174.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1963. *Totemism*. trans. by R. Needham. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Lawson, John Cuthbert. 1910. *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion: A Study in Survivals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Link, Luther. 1996. *The Devil: The Archfiend in Art from the Sixth to the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Harry N. Abrams.
- Mango, Cyril. 1992. "Diabolus Byzantinus." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 46:215–223.
- Merivale, Patricia. 1969. *Pan, the Goat-God: His Myth in Modern Times*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Midgley, Mary. 1995. *Beast and Man: The Roots of Human Nature*. 2nd rev. ed. London: Routledge.
- Miller, Patricia Cox. 1996. "Jerome's Centaur: A Hyper-Icon of the Desert." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4:209–233.
- Mobley, Gregory. 1997. "The Wild Man in the Bible and the Ancient Near East." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116:217–233.
- Nickelsburg, George W.E. 1981. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishna: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Orlov, Andrei A. 2003. "The Flooded Arboretums: The Garden Traditions in the Slavonic Version of 3 Baruch and in the Book of Giants." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 65:184–201.
- Ovadia, Asher and Sonia Mucznik. 1981. "Orpheus from Jerusalem — Pagan or Christian Image?" *Jerusalem Cathedra* 1:152–166.
- Picard, Jean-Claude. 1970. "Observations sur l'Apocalypse grecque de Baruch I: cadre historique fictif et efficacité symbolique," *Semitica* 20:77–103.
- . 1991. "Je te montrerai d'autres mystères, plus grands que ceux-ci . . ." Notes sur 3 Bar et quelques écrits apparentés." In *Histoire et anthropologie des communau-*

- tés juives et chrétiennes dans les sociétés anciennes*. Paris: Centre d'analyse pour l'histoire du judaïsme hellénistique et des origines chrétiennes. École Pratique des Hautes Études, section des Sciences Religieuses, 17–40.
- Reeves, John C. 1993. "Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112:110–115.
- Rice, Michael. 1998. *The Power of the Bull*. New York: Routledge.
- Robinson, James M. (ed.). 1990. *The Nag Hammadi Library*. San Francisco: Harper Collins.
- Rupp, Wayne L., Jr. 2007. *Shape of the Beast: The Theriomorphic and Therianthrope Deities and Demons of Ancient Italy*. Ph.D. dissertation, The Florida State University.
- Schäfer, Peter (ed.). 1984. *Geniza-Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur*. 2 vols. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Scott, Alan. 1994. *Origen and the Life of the Stars: A History of an Idea*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Smith, Morton. 1996. *Studies in the Cult of Yahweh: New Testament, Early Christianity, and Magic*. 2 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Snaith, Norman Henry. 1975. "The Meaning of *Se'irim*." *Vetus Testamentum* 25:115–118.
- Schlossberg, Eliezer. 1993. "Did Nebuchadnezzar Become a Beast? (Dan 4:30) A Study in Medieval Exegesis," *Beit Mikra* 38:343–353.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. 2000. "The 'Angels' and 'Giants' of Genesis 6:1–4 in Second and Third Century BCE Jewish Interpretation: Reflections on the Posture of Early Apocalyptic Traditions." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 7:354–377.
- Toepel, Alexander. 2005. "Planetary Demons in Early Jewish Literature." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 14:231–238.
- Uehlinger, Christoph. 1990. *Weltreich und "eine Rede". Eine neue Deutung der sogenannten Turmbauerzählung (Gen 11, 1–9)*. Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag.
- Vassiliev, Athanasius. 1893. *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina: Pars Prior*. Mosquae: Universitatis Caesariae.
- Weingarten, Susan. 2005. *The Saint's Saints: Hagiography and Geography in Jerome*. Leiden: Brill.
- Wertheimer, Shlomo Aharon and Abraham Joseph Wertheimer. 1989. *Batei Midrashot: Twenty Five Midrashim Published for the First time from Manuscripts Discovered in the Genizoth of Jerusalem and Egypt, with Introductions and Annotations*. 2 vols. Jerusalem: Ktav Yad Wasepher.
- Wilson, John Francis. 2004. *Caesarea Philippi: Baniyas, the Lost City of Pan*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Wright, Archie T. 2005. *The Origin of the Evil Spirits: The Reception of Genesis 6.1–4 in Early Jewish Literature*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.