

ARCHIE T. WRIGHT

The Origin of Evil Spirits

2nd edition

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*
198

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford)

James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)

Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL)

Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg)

198



Archie T. Wright

The Origin of Evil Spirits

The Reception of Genesis 6:1–4
in Early Jewish Literature

Second, revised edition

Mohr Siebeck

ARCHIE T. WRIGHT, born 1958; PhD, University of Durham; Associate Professor of Biblical Studies at Regent University, Virginia, USA.

ISBN 978-3-16-151031-1 / eISBN 978-3-16-157496-2 unveränderte eBook-Ausgabe 2019
ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2013 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen. www.mohr.de

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Nehren on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nägele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

Table of Contents

Preface to the Second, Revised Edition	IX
Preface to the First Edition	XI
Abbreviations.....	XVI
Chapter 1	
Introduction	1
1.1 The Problem	1
1.2 The Approach	3
1.2.1 Structure of the Thesis	3
1.2 Argument and Scope of the Present Study	5
1.4 Summary	9
Chapter 2	
1 Enoch 1–36: The Book of Watchers: A Review of Recent Research.....	11
2.1 Introduction	11
2.2 History of the Texts	12
2.3 Structure of the <i>Book of Watchers</i>	13
2.4 Summary of the Content of the <i>Book of Watchers</i>	16
2.5 Focus of the Research	19
Excursus: Notable terms in the Book of Watchers	20
Watchers.....	20
Shemihazah	21
Azazel/Asa’el	21
Giants	22
Nephilim.....	22
2.6 Date, Place, and Authorship of the <i>Book of Watchers</i>	23
Excursus: Job 4 and the Dating of Job and the Watcher Tradition ...	29
2.7 Source Critical Approach to the <i>Book of Watchers</i>	33
2.7.1 Milik	29
2.7.2 Kvanvig.....	30
2.7.3 Collins.....	31
2.7.4 Hanson	32
2.7.5 Nickelsburg	33
2.7.6 Newsom	34

2.7.8 Dimant	35
2.8 The Function of the <i>Book of Watchers</i>	37
2.8.1 Nickelsburg	38
2.8.2 Hanson	41
2.8.3 Newsom	42
2.8.4 Collins.....	44
2.8.5 Suter.....	46
2.9 Conclusion.....	47
Chapter 3	
Strategies of Interpreting Genesis 6:1–4.....	51
3.1 Introduction	51
3.2 Interpreting the Passage – Genesis 6.1–4	54
3.2.1 Verse 1	55
3.2.2 Verse 2	61
Excursus: The Greek “Sons of the Gods”.....	73
3.2.3 Verse 3	76
3.2.4 Verse 4	80
3.2.4.1 Nephilim	81
3.2.4.2 Gibborim.....	84
3.3 Conclusion.....	90
3.3.1 Verse 6.1	93
3.3.2 Verse 6.2	93
3.3.3 Verse 6.3	94
3.3.4 Verse 6.4	94
3.3.5 Summary	95
Chapter 4	
Reception of the “Sons of God” in the Book of Watchers.....	97
4.1 Introduction	97
4.2 Tradition of the <i>Bene Elohim</i>	98
4.2.1 Bene Elohim as the Watchers	100
4.2.2 Bene Elohim as the Angels of the Nations	102
4.2.3 Bene Elohim as the Host of Heaven.....	103
4.3 The Asa’el/Instruction tradition	105
4.3.1 Asa’el versus Azazel	108
4.3.1.1 Origin of the Name of Asa’el	108
4.3.2 Asa’el and the Atonement Motif.....	111
4.3.3 Asa’el and the Prometheus Myth	116
4.3.4 Summary of the Instruction/Asa’el Tradition	119
4.4 The Shemihazah Tradition	120
4.4.1 Who is Shemihazah?	121

4.4.1.1 Origin of the Name of Shemihazah.....	122
4.4.2 Shemihazah's Role in the Instruction tradition.....	125
4.4.3 Shemihazah Tradition and the "Origin of Evil".....	130
Excursus: Marriage in Genesis 6.2	135
4.5 Conclusion.....	139

Chapter 5

The Rebellion Motif in the Book of Watchers	141
5.1 Introduction	141
5.2 Rebellion of the Angels	141
5.3 Interpreting the Consequences	146
5.3.1 The Corruption of the Earth.....	147
5.3.2 The Judgment of the Watchers.....	148
5.4 The Nature of the Gibborim	149
5.5 Aetiology of Evil Spirits	154
Excursus: Mastema and Belial.....	160
5.6 A Developing Anthropology	163
5.6.1 Spirit in the Biblical Tradition	164
5.7 Giantology Versus Anthropology.....	166
5.8 Conclusion.....	168

Chapter 6

Reception of the Watcher Tradition in the Dead Sea Scrolls.....	169
6.1 Introduction	169
Excursus: Dualism in Relevant Qumran Fragments	170
1QS–Rule of the Community	171
1QH ^a – Thanksgiving Hymns	173
4QAmram–Visions of Amram	173
11Q11(Apocryphal Psalms)	174
4Q510 and 511 – Songs of the Maskil.....	174
CD – Damascus Document	175
11Q5 Column 19 – Plea for Deliverance.....	175
Summary	176
6.2 Incorporation of a Dualistic Worldview	177
6.3 Demonic Possession in the <i>DSS</i>	181
6.4 Prayer at Qumran.....	183
6.4.1 11Q11 (11QPsAp ^a): Invoking the Divine Name.....	184
6.4.2 11Q5 (11QPsa) Column XIX: Plea for Deliverance	188
6.4.3 4Q510 and 4Q511: Songs of the Maskil.....	190
6.5 Conclusion.....	193

Chapter 7	
Philo of Alexandria: Interpreting Genesis 6:1–4.....	194
7.1 Introduction	194
7.2 Philo of Alexandria: Exegete or Philosopher?	195
7.2.1 Philo’s Audience	198
7.2.2 Problems of Interpretation	200
7.3 Philo’s View of the Soul	202
7.3.1 The Immortality of the Soul.....	205
7.4 <i>De Gigantibus</i> : Philo’s Giantology and Anthropology	209
7.4.1 Angels and Daemons	213
7.4.2 Philo’s “Giantology”	216
7.5 Conclusion.....	218
Chapter 8	
Results and Conclusions	223
Bibliography	227
Biblical Material.....	227
Texts and Translations of Primary Texts	227
Other Reference Material Consulted	230
Secondary Sources.....	231
Index.....	245

Preface to the Second Edition

This monograph is a second revised edition to the revision of my doctoral thesis, “Breaching the Cosmic Order: The Biblical Tradition of Genesis 6:1–4 and its Reception in Early Enochic and Philonic Judaism.” The thesis was submitted to the Faculty of Theology at the University of Durham in February 2004. I am very grateful to Dr. Jörg Frey and Dr. Henning Ziebritzki for their initial interest in my topic and the subsequent approval for the WUNT 2 series. What follows in the volume is a minor revision of the initial publication by Mohr Siebeck.

While undertaking the revision of the manuscript I took seriously the reviews/critiques prepared in various journals by the following individuals (in alphabetical order): Paul J. Brown, Philip R. Davies, David Instone-Brewer, T. Klutz, Grant Macaskill, Mark D. Owens, Finny Philip, Paolo Sacchi, and Sean Winter. Each of these scholars offered very helpful comments that I am certain would improve the content and argument presented in the volume. However, due to time limitations, I was unable to address all of the issues in the revision, but I do plan to address those deemed significant in future essays or a complete rewrite of the present volume. Nevertheless, one or two comments should be made concerning the interpretation of the Watcher Tradition that seemed to be a concern of nearly all the reviewers. First, it was not my intention to suggest that the so-called “origin of evil spirits” was the only interpretation one could come up with when reading the Book of Watchers. There are certainly others including George Nickelsburg’s connection to the Wars of the Diadochi or to the corruption of the Temple priesthood. Second, I must also affirm the comments of Paulo Sacchi and Philip Davies that I may have overemphasized the role of Genesis 6:1–4 in the development of the Book of Watchers (i.e. underemphasized the role of other possible sources); however, if Genesis 6:1–4 is not the source for the author of the Book of Watchers, then both authors must have had access to the same tradition if one considers the parallels between Genesis chapter 6 and *I Enoch* chapter 6.

I would like to thank each of the reviewers for their very helpful comments and I look forward to further interaction with them.

Archie T. Wright
Norfolk, Virginia, 2013

Preface

This monograph is a revision of my doctoral thesis, “Breaching the Cosmic Order: The Biblical Tradition of Genesis 6:1-4 and its Reception in Early Enochic and Philonic Judaism.” The thesis was submitted to the Faculty of Theology at the University of Durham in February 2004. I am very grateful to Dr. Jörg Frey and Dr. Henning Ziebritzki for their initial interest in my topic and the subsequent approval for the WUNT 2 series. I appreciate their editorial suggestions, which have no doubt improved the quality of the work. I would especially like to thank Tanja Mix for her patience and tremendous assistance in bringing the manuscript to completion.

Most who have attempted to complete a Ph.D. will say that it is one of the loneliest tasks that a person can experience. In part, this is true. However, a Ph.D. is never the work of a single individual, but it involves the efforts a special group of people in the student’s life. Thus, a grateful acknowledgement for the academic, spiritual, financial, and emotional support must be given, although one cannot express enough gratitude in these few lines. For me, this list of people could produce many pages, so I must limit my heartfelt thanks to a special group of individuals.

I offer a great many thanks to Ken and Lenore Mullican who have been a source of inspiration and encouragement during the process and in the years prior to moving to Durham. They have shown their loving friendship through prayer and financial support. Many thanks go to Kenny and Stephanie Mullican whose friendship, prayer, and financial support have been invaluable. The same must be said of Chad and Debbie Cox, Felipe Ornelas, and Dr. John Swails. I must also give special thanks to long-time friends Scott and Kathy Rex and Janet Koons for their support and prayers. I also must single out my brother Tom for his encouragement and financial support. All my family deserves especial merit for their encouragement and support throughout the process.

Of course, there are many in Durham who have been especially helpful. Thanks to all at St. John’s College, college officers, staff, and students who have made Durham a home away from home. Special thanks must be given to Brad and Kori Embry. They have been true friends. The same must be said for Ron and Kathy Herms and their four beautiful children (Annaliese, Jaeden, Adrienne, and Avrielle). Finally, I must thank Mark Bonnington for being a good friend and always an encourager.

Prior to taking up a place at Durham, I had heard many nightmarish stories about Ph.D. supervisors and all the difficulties that come with that

relationship. However, I can give only praise to my two supervisors, Professor Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Professor C.T. Robert Hayward. Both have shown why they are experts in their field. The knowledge they have given, the direction they have offered, and the patience they have shown, made working with them a memorable experience. Most of all they have offered a hand of friendship that I hope will continue in the years ahead. Special thanks must also be given to the faculty of the Abbey House for their valuable insight and to the staff for their administrative support.

I am grateful to all who have assisted in reading and offering suggestions to the drafts of the thesis and eventually the book. However, I take full responsibility for the content of this work.

Finally, I must thank the Lord for the calling and ministry that he has placed on my life. Without His wisdom and spiritual guidance, none of this would have been possible. I pray this work will bring light and knowledge to the Kingdom.

Archie T. Wright
Durham, England 2005

Abbreviations

<i>AB</i>	<i>Anchor Bible</i>
<i>ABD</i>	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i>
<i>ANET</i>	<i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament</i>
<i>ANRW</i>	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i>
<i>Ant.</i>	Josephus, <i>Jewish Antiquities</i>
<i>b.</i>	Babylonian Talmud
<i>1 Bar</i>	<i>1 Baruch</i>
<i>B.C.E.</i>	Before Common Era
<i>BDB</i>	Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, <i>The New Brown – Driver – Briggs – Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic</i> . Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson, 1979
<i>Ber.</i>	<i>Berakot</i>
<i>Bere.</i>	<i>Bereshith</i>
<i>BibOr</i>	<i>Biblica et Orientalia</i>
<i>BJS</i>	Brown Judaica Studies
<i>BN</i>	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
<i>BSOAS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies</i>
<i>BW</i>	<i>Book of Watchers</i>
<i>c.</i>	century
<i>ca.</i>	circa, about
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Bible Quarterly</i>
<i>CBQMS</i>	Catholic Bible Quarterly Monograph Series
<i>CD</i>	Cairo Genizah Damascus Document
<i>C.E.</i>	Common Era
<i>cf.</i>	compare
<i>ch(s).</i>	chapter(s)
<i>1, 2 Chr</i>	1. 2 Chronicles
<i>col(s).</i>	column(s)
<i>ConBNT</i>	Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament
<i>1, 2 Cor</i>	1, 2 Corinthians
<i>CRINT</i>	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
<i>CSCO</i>	Corpus scriptorium Christianorum orientalium
<i>Dan</i>	Daniel
<i>Deut</i>	Deuteronomy
<i>Did.</i>	<i>Didache</i>
<i>diss.</i>	dissertation
<i>DJD</i>	Discoveries in the Judean Desert
<i>DNTB</i>	<i>Dictionary of New Testament Background: A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship</i>
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
<i>DSS</i>	<i>Dead Sea Scrolls</i>
<i>Eccl</i>	Ecclesiastes

ed(s).	editor(s), edition
<i>1 En</i>	<i>1 Enoch</i>
Eth.	Ethiopic
Exod	Exodus
<i>Exp Tim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
Ezek	Ezekiel
f.	following
fasc.	fascicle
frag(s)	fragment(s)
Gal	Galatians
Gen	Genesis
Hab	Habakkuk
Hag	Haggai
HB	Hebrew Bible
<i>Il.</i>	Homer, <i>Iliad</i>
<i>Od.</i>	Homer, <i>Odyssey</i>
Hos	Hosea
<i>HSCP</i>	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
ibid.	in the same place as the previous citation(s)
idem	the same author
<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
Isa	Isaiah
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
Jdt	Judith
Jer	Jeremiah
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>Jos. As.</i>	<i>Joseph and Aseneth</i>
Josh	Joshua
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods</i>
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplements
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplements
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal of the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
JSPSup	Journal of the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplemental Series
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>Jub</i>	<i>Jubilees</i>
Judg	Judges
<i>J.W.</i>	Josephus, <i>Jewish War</i>
1, 2 Kgs	1, 2 Kings
<i>LAB</i>	<i>Liber antiquitatum biblicarum</i> (Pseudo-Philo)
<i>LAE</i>	<i>Life of Adam and Eve</i>
Lam	Lamentations
LCL	Loeb Classical Library

Lev	Leviticus
Lk	Luke
LXX	Septuagint (Greek O.T.)
<i>m.</i>	Mishnah
1, 2, 3 Macc	1, 2, 3 Maccabees
Mal	Malachi
Matt	Matthew
Mk	Mark
MSS	Manuscripts
MT	Masoretic Text of the O.T.
<i>n.</i>	note
Nah	Nahum
<i>Nid.</i>	<i>Niddah</i>
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
N.T.	New Testament
<i>NTT</i>	<i>Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift</i>
Num	Numbers
O.T.	Old Testament
<i>OTP</i>	<i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> , Charlesworth Edition
<i>OTS</i>	<i>Oudtestamentische Studiën</i>
<i>Pesah</i>	<i>Pesahim</i>
PG	Patrologia Graeca
Philo of Alexandria	
<i>Abr.</i>	<i>De Abrahamo</i>
<i>Agr.</i>	<i>De Agricultura</i>
<i>Cher.</i>	<i>De Cherubim</i>
<i>Conf.</i>	<i>De Confusione Linguarum</i>
<i>Congr.</i>	<i>De Congressu</i>
<i>Contempl.</i>	<i>De vita contemplativa</i>
<i>Decal.</i>	<i>De Decalogo</i>
<i>Det.</i>	<i>Quod Deterius</i>
<i>Deus.</i>	<i>Quod Deus immutabilis sit</i>
<i>Ebr.</i>	<i>De Ebrietate</i>
<i>Fug.</i>	<i>De Fuga et Inventione</i>
<i>Gig.</i>	<i>De Gigantibus</i>
<i>Her.</i>	<i>Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres</i>
<i>Hypoth.</i>	<i>Hypothetica</i>
<i>Ios.</i>	<i>De Iosepho</i>
<i>Leg. 1, 2, 3</i>	<i>Legum allegoriae I, II, III</i>
<i>Legat.</i>	<i>De Legatione ad Gaium</i>
<i>Migr.</i>	<i>De Migratione Abrahami</i>
<i>Mos. 1, 2</i>	<i>De vita Mosis I, II</i>
<i>Mut.</i>	<i>De Mutatione Nominum</i>
<i>Opif.</i>	<i>De Opificio Mundi</i>
<i>Plant.</i>	<i>De Plantatione</i>
<i>Post.</i>	<i>De Posteritate Caini</i>
<i>Praem.</i>	<i>De Praemiis et Poenis</i>
<i>QE</i>	<i>Quaestiones et Solutiones in Exodum</i>
<i>QG</i>	<i>Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin</i>
<i>Sacr.</i>	<i>De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini</i>

<i>Sobr.</i>	<i>De Sobrietate</i>
<i>Somn.</i>	<i>De Somniis</i>
<i>Spec.</i>	<i>De Specialibus Legibus</i>
<i>Virt.</i>	<i>De Virtutibus</i>
PRE	Pirke Rabbi Eliezer
Prov	Proverbs
Ps(s)	Psalms(s)
<i>Ps. Sol.</i>	<i>Psalms of Solomon</i>
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece
<i>Rab.</i>	<i>Rabbah</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
repr.	reprinted
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
1, 2 Sam	1, 2 Samuel
<i>Sanh.</i>	<i>Sanhedrin</i>
2TP	Second Temple Period
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
<i>SBLSP</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers</i>
<i>Sib. Or.</i>	<i>Sibylline Oracles</i>
Sir	Sirach
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
Sus	Susanna
<i>T. Sol</i>	<i>Testament of Solomon</i>
<i>T12P</i>	<i>Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs</i>
<i>T. Asher</i>	<i>Testament of Asher</i>
<i>T. Benjamin</i>	<i>Testament of Benjamin</i>
<i>T. Dan</i>	<i>Testament of Dan</i>
<i>T. Gad</i>	<i>Testament of Gad</i>
<i>T. Issachar</i>	<i>Testament of Issachar</i>
<i>T. Joseph</i>	<i>Testament of Joseph</i>
<i>T. Judah</i>	<i>Testament of Judah</i>
<i>T. Levi</i>	<i>Testament of Levi</i>
<i>T. Naphtali</i>	<i>Testament of Naphtali</i>
<i>T. Reuben</i>	<i>Testament of Rueben</i>
<i>T. Simeon</i>	<i>Testament of Simeon</i>
<i>T. Zebulun</i>	<i>Testament of Zebulun</i>
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
Tg(s).	Targum(s)
1, 2 Thess	1, 2 Thessalonians
Tob	Tobit
<i>TS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
vol(s).	volume(s)
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
Wis	Wisdom of Solomon
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
Zech	Zechariah
Zeph	Zephaniah

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 The Problem

The research presented here is concerned with the reception history of Genesis 6.1–4 in early Enochic and Philonic Judaism during the Second Temple Period (hereafter, 2TP). I suggest that the non-specificity inherent in the biblical text of Genesis 6.1–4 opened the basis for the later emergence of an aetiology of evil spirits as Jewish authors engaged with the text. As a result, Genesis 6.1–4, particularly its interpretation in *1 Enoch* 6–16, played an important part in the development of demonology during the 2TP.

Accordingly, by the turn of the Common Era there was in place a worldview within Judaism in which the activity of autonomous or semi-autonomous evil spirits was regarded as a reality. This view is exemplified in the ministry of Jesus as described in the Synoptic Gospels of the New Testament. By contrast, there is little evidence in Jewish literature during the earlier biblical period for such evil spirits. The understanding of demonic affliction found in the Jewish Scriptures (both Hebrew and Greek traditions) does not contain any references to autonomous or semi-autonomous evil spirits that are able to afflict humanity at will. When they are mentioned in the Hebrew Bible (hereafter HB), evil spirits are seen as beings sent by God to accomplish God's plan in the lives of individuals and the nation of Israel (see e.g. Num 5.14–15, 30 – spirit of jealousy; 1 Kgs 19.7, Isa 37.7 – lying spirits; Hos 5.4 – spirit of whoredom; Judg 9.23, Job 4.12–16 – spirits in the service of God; 1 Sam 16.14–23; 18.10–12; 19.9–10 – evil spirit upon Saul). The LXX translates various Hebrew terms¹ related to some type of wild beast that lurks about in the night or in the wilderness as a demonic creature.²

¹ There are just twenty-one occurrences in the LXX of the term δαιμόνιον (δαίμων), with all but one outside the Pentateuch (Deut. 32:17). The Hebrew term translated demon in the LXX varies: שָׂדֵי (δαίμόνια, Isa 34.14; 13.21 – desert creature); שָׂדֵי (δαίμόνια [Isa 13.21 – hairy goat], also ὄνοκενταύριος [Isa 34.14, 13.21], ματαίους [Lev 17.7 – goat demon], and εἰδώλοις [2 Chr 11.15 – satyrs]); ὄν (δαίμονις, Deut 32.17, Ps 106 (105).37, 38 – demon). All English translations are from NASV.

² See Edwin Yamauchi, “Magic or Miracle? Diseases, Demons and Exorcism,” in *Gospel Review: The Miracles of Jesus* (ed. David Wenham and Craig Blomberg;

This raises the question of how the presence of categorically evil spirits could have emerged in the writings of the first century C.E. Since no material comparable to an episode such as, for example, Mark 5.1–20 exists in the HB, we must look elsewhere.³ It is in this search that we encounter the *Book of Watchers* (1 En 1–36 = *BW*). This third-century B.C.E. pseudepigraphic composite work offers the oldest extant record of the origin of evil spirits in Judaism (see ch. 2 for question of the date of the document). As suggested above, the non-specificity inherent in Genesis 6.1–4 provided the authors of *BW* the opportunity and the biblical authority, to further develop a demonology in the 2TP. Such a view is substantiated through an examination of the continued development of the tradition around the turn of the era. In what follows, this study will attempt to reveal how the reception of Genesis 6.1–4 encouraged the development of the demonology and anthropology in the 2TP. I will endeavour to ascertain what Jews of the 2TP understood with regard to the origin and activity of evil spirits by examining the development of the concept of evil spirits alongside a developing understanding of human nature (anthropology) in early Jewish literature. Along with *BW*, I will address the interpretation of Genesis 6.1–4 in the *Book of Jubilees*, the treatises of Philo of Alexandria, and other Pseudepigrapha for any insights they might offer. In addition, I will discuss the taking up of the concept of evil spirits from the Watcher tradition by the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Each of these texts sheds a particular light on the investigation and reflects significant developments of demonology and anthropology in this period.

The enigmatic nature of these sources requires an introductory caveat. One must resist approaching these sources in an attempt to find clear paths through the traditions. Clarity of this type is obfuscated by inherent complexities. Rather, it is fitting to offer plausible stages of development in the various documents. The historical disparity between the various sources only serves to validate this approach, which may offer a better view of the developing Jewish understanding of the origin of evil. These stages of growth may have merged to make possible the diversity of the

Sheffield: JSOT, 1986), 89–183. Yamauchi argues that the demonology in Israel is restrained in comparison to Mesopotamia. See Edward Langton, *Essentials of Demonology: A Study of Jewish and Christian Doctrine, Its Origin and Development* (London: Epworth, 1949). Langton contends that restraint in respect of the Babylonian and Assyrian influences was due to the desire “to affirm the belief in Yahweh as the one true God.” This restraint, he argues, is the reason for the lack of references to demonology among the early Hebrews.

³ For the most recent examination of demonic activity in the New Testament, see Eric Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity* (WUNT 157; Leiden: Mohr Siebeck, 2002).

tradition of demonic affliction encountered in the New Testament. Andy Reimer maintains:

In this task of reconstructing demonologies, one must seek to hold a tension between an integrated and consistent reading of a text or body of texts and an awareness of the sociology of knowledge ‘gaps’ in any religious sect’s worldview. The history of demonology has certainly shown that attempts by texts such as 1 Enoch to rationalize entities that are by definition chaotic, irrational and typically open to all out speculation are bound to fail. Scholarly attempts to reconstruct any sort of ancient demonology will always have to work in the midst of chaos.⁴

Reimer is correct in his assertion that the demonology of *1 Enoch* is indeed chaotic. However, it may be possible that we can ease the sense of chaos by examining the matter of demons and evil spirits alongside a rather less chaotic anthropology, which was emerging in the 2TP at the same time as an interest in demons, was becoming apparent.

1.2 The Approach

I will attempt to unpack what can only be described as a very complicated collection of traditions that serve as the background of the “Watcher tradition” in *BW*. In an effort to trace the development of this tradition, I will subject two specific texts to close analysis. The first is Genesis 6.1–4 which, given its many peculiarities, has presented considerable difficulty for modern interpreters. The great variety of interpretations of this passage in early Jewish literature reveals that it presented similar difficulty for scripture exegetes and commentators in the post-biblical and later rabbinic periods.⁵ As this thesis will attempt to demonstrate, Genesis 6.1–4 served as the source for the story of the origin of evil spirits in our second key text, *1 Enoch* 1–36.

1.2.1 Structure of the Thesis

The present study is divided into five main sections. The first section consists of the introduction and a chapter that reviews recent research of *BW* which followed the publication of J. T. Milik’s *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* in 1976. It is necessary to present a detailed history of the research of *BW* in light of the questions raised (and

⁴ Andy M. Reimer, “Rescuing the Fallen Angels: The Case of the Disappearing Angels at Qumran,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 353.

⁵ I shall draw on exegetical traditions in the Targumim and Midrashim which, though late, may provide some insight into ways Jewish readers were attempting to understand Gen 6 during the 2TP.

not raised) in the past concerning the structure, date, interpretation, and function of the Watcher tradition.

The second section offers a detailed discussion of Genesis 6.1–4, which includes the various biblical traditions (e.g., “divine council of God”) that may lie behind the passage in its present form, and interpretations of the passage by later Jewish writers in the rabbinic period (see ch. 3). This is not an exhaustive examination of every relevant biblical text or non-Jewish works, but rather a presentation of the themes that the author of Genesis 6.1–4 may have been familiar with when he wrote the passage. I shall attempt to identify what aspects of the biblical tradition allowed the author(s) of *BW*⁶ to interpret the Genesis passage with the negative elements that are present in *I Enoch*’s version of the story.

In the third section, we shall examine the primary text that will serve as the starting point of the tradition of the affliction of humanity by evil spirits in the 2TP, *BW*. This will include three chapters that deal specifically with relevant portions of *BW* (*I En* 6–16), i.e., the author’s use of the biblical tradition of the *bene elohim*. The author’s interpretation of the *bene elohim* is subdivided into the Asa’el tradition (Instruction motif) and the Shemihazah tradition (see *I En* 4). A chapter will follow that focuses on the crux of *BW*, the rebellion motif (see ch. 5). This chapter will consider the effects of the actions of the angels on themselves, their offspring, and humanity. Following this discussion, I shall examine the reception of the Watcher tradition, and its “giantology”⁷ and anthropology in other Early Jewish literature, in particular, the *DSS* (see ch. 6).

The fourth section will examine the treatises of Philo of Alexandria of which *De Gigantibus* is the primary focus (see ch. 7). Within *BW* and the writings of Philo, I shall highlight anthropological themes that weigh heavily in the discussion of affliction by evil spirits in the 2TP. In the final section, I shall conclude with a summary of the points of the thesis and its contribution to future research of the demonology and anthropology of Early Judaism.

⁶ It is the consensus of Enochic scholars that there were likely multiple authors involved in the writing of the various sections of *BW*, however for the sake of reading ease I will use only the singular “author.”

⁷ This is a term coined in discussion with Loren Stuckenbruck about categorizing this section of the Watcher tradition. It is difficult to call it “demonology” if we consider that nowhere in chs. 6–16 are the angels, giants, or their spirits explicitly identified as demons.

1.2 Argument and Scope of the Present Study

Much of recent research on *1 Enoch*, in particular on *BW*, has focused on source and text-critical aspects of the third century B.C.E. material.⁸ Previous research has centred on the traditions that are alluded to in *BW*, i.e. Greek, Near Eastern, and Israelite. This approach has added tremendous insight into the method by which the Jewish community in the

⁸ This material will be discussed in detail in ch. 2: “*1 Enoch* 1–36 *The Book of Watchers*: History of the Documents and a Review of Recent Research.” See e.g. William Adler, “Berossus, Manetho, and 1 Enoch in the World Chronicle of Panodorus,” *HTR* 76 (1983): 419–42; John J. Collins, “The Apocalyptic Technique: Setting and Function in the Book of Watchers,” *CBQ* 44 (1982): 91–111, idem, “Methodological Issues in the Study of 1 Enoch: Reflections on the Articles of P.D. Hanson and G.W. Nickelsburg,” in *SBL Seminar Papers*, 1978 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 315–22; Maxwell J. Davidson, *Angels At Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108, and Sectarian Writings From Qumran* (JSPSup 11 Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992); Deborah Dimant, “The Fallen Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic Books Related to Them” (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University 1974 [Hebrew]); idem, “The ‘Peshet of the Periods’ 4Q180 and 4Q181,” *Israel Oriental Studies* 9 (1979): 71–102; idem, “1 Enoch 6–11: A Methodological Perspective,” in *SBL Seminar Papers*, 1978 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 323–39; Jonas C. Greenfield and Michael E. Stone, “The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes,” *HTR* 70 (1977): 51–65; Paul Hanson, “Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6–11,” *JBL* 96 (1977): 195–223; Ronald S. Hendel, “Of Demigods and the Deluge: Toward an Interpretation of Genesis 6.1–4,” *JBL* 106 (1987): 13–26; J.T. Milik, *Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); idem, “Problèmes De La Litterature Henochique a La Lumiere Des Fragments Arameens De Qumran,” *HTR* 64 (1971): 333–78; Carol Newsom, “The Development of 1 Enoch 6–19: Cosmology and Judgment,” *CBQ* 42 (1980): 310–329; George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch I: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*, (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2001); idem, “Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6–11,” *JBL* 96 (1977): 383–405; idem, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee,” *SBL* 100 (1981): 575–600; idem, “The Books of Enoch in Recent Research,” *RelSRev* 7 (1981): 210–17; Brook W.R. Pearson, “Resurrection and the Judgment of the Titans: in LXX Isaiah 26:19,” *JSNTSup* 186 (1999): 33–51; Andy M. Reimer, “Rescuing the Fallen Angels”; James H. Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992); Michael E. Stone, “The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century B.C.E.,” *CBQ* 40 (1978): 479–492; Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “The ‘Angels’ and ‘Giants’ of Genesis 6:1–4 in Second and Third Century B.C.E. Jewish Interpretation: Reflections on the Posture of Early Apocalyptic Traditions,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 354–77; idem, *The Book of Giants From Qumran, Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (TSAJ 63; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1997; David W. Suter, “Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest”; James C. VanderKam, “Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources,” *SBL Seminar Papers*, 1978 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 229–51; idem, *1 Enoch, Enochic Motifs, and Enoch in Early Christian Literature* (CRINT 4; Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1996); and M.L. West, *The East Face of Helicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

Second Temple Period formulated its theology and traditions, the sources for its theology and traditions (both oral and written), and the manner in which these sources were collected. This has established a firm foundation for future research of the theological message of these documents, which until now has been inadequately addressed.

A further portion of previous research was undertaken in an effort to determine the function of *BW* (see section 2.8.0). Arguments concerning the function of *BW* have centred on why was there such a need for an explanation of the origin of evil during this period of Israelite history? I will present three main theories of interpretation that include 1) the oppression of Israel by the Hellenistic rulers, 2) the origin of evil through the rebellion of angels, and 3) the story as a polemic against the priesthood in Jerusalem.

In summary, these scholarly works have shown that the *I Enoch* 1-36 is made up of complex layers of traditions that, in general, find their origins in Genesis 6. It is no surprise that *BW* is such a complex literary construction, considering its origins lie in this enigmatic passage that invited so much speculation!

Genesis 6.1-4 tells the story of the *bene elohim* and their encounter with the daughters of humanity which resulted in the birth of the *gibborim*. The passage is positioned in the biblical narrative as a prelude to the judgment of the Flood. However, on the surface nothing in the biblical text of Genesis 6.1-4 demands that the reader understand those verses in a negative light, that is, as depicting some action or event that is considered inappropriate or dubious. It is necessary to evaluate the traditions (e.g., the negative aspects of the “angels of the nations”) that underlie Genesis 6.1-4 in order to assess properly why the text is commendable as the starting point of the Watcher tradition.⁹ This is to say, the Watcher tradition represents a type of biblical synthesis and exposition; it is the “superimposition” of negative traditions on to the relatively neutral position of Genesis 6.1-4 (i.e., it is rewritten Bible). In doing so, I shall attempt to identify possible sources that the author of Genesis 6.1-4 may have had in mind while writing the narrative, sources which may have left the text open to a negative interpretation by the author of *BW*.

The vocabulary of Genesis 6.1-4 in both the Hebrew and Greek traditions, i.e. בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים (*bene haElomim*) נַפְלִיִּים (*Nephilim*), גִּבּוֹרִים (*Gibborim*) and γίγαντες, (*gigantes*) invited various interpretations in the early post-biblical and the later rabbinic periods. These interpretations include those which contain detrimental nuances about the characters in the story that could lead to a negative understanding of the text, or portray the characters in a positive or neutral light.

⁹ These traditions will be discussed in detail in ch. 3 below.

The Hebrew expression *bene elohim* evokes images of the heavenly court of God where the “sons of God” ruled over the nations or acted as intermediaries between the God of Israel and his people (see ch. 3, section 3.2.2). Within this tradition, we find possibilities for Genesis 6.2 to take on negative imagery sanctioning the introduction of rebellious angels in *BW*. The term *gibborim* evokes images of the great heroes of Israel in the biblical period, and at the same time is used as a description of the most imposing גִּבּוֹרִים in the HB, Nimrod (see ch. 3, section 3.2.4.2). Nimrod is identified in the LXX tradition as a γίγας; and it is implied that he played an active role in the rebellion of the people at the Tower of Babel. This datum alone leaves sufficient room for a negative interpretation of the Genesis 6 text. The LXX translates גִּבּוֹרִים with the Greek term γίγαντες, which calls to mind the characters of the Greek myths of Hesiod (*Theogony* and *Works and Days*) and Homer (*Iliad*). As will be shown below, it is also possible that this translation also contributed to *BW*’s negative portrayal of the offspring of Genesis 6.4. I shall argue that the biblical tradition of Genesis 6.1–4, perhaps not immediately apparent, served as a starting point for the author of *BW* as he presented his story of the origin of evil spirits.

The negative interpretation of the biblical tradition of Genesis 6.1–4 in *BW* is centred on the *bene elohim*. It is difficult to imagine that the author of *BW* arbitrarily chose this story to present the origin of evil spirits; therefore, it is likely that this tradition had been developing long before it was unveiled as the Watcher tradition (although no direct proof, other than the biblical data listed above and in the following discussion, can be mustered). It is in this tradition that the author discloses the rebellious nature of the angels, which results in the devastation of the earth and humanity (see ch. 4, section 4.2.0).

Within this story of rebellion, scholars of *BW* have argued for at least two streams of tradition identifying a leadership group amongst the angels on which the blame of the rebellion is placed, the Asa’el (Instruction) motif and the Shemihazah motif. Each of these streams adds a particular dimension to the rebellious action of the angels, resulting in the blame for devastation of the earth being placed on the angels in one account, (Shemihazah) and being partially shifted to humanity for its part in the other (Asa’el/Instruction).

I shall discuss the author’s introduction of the Instruction/Asa’el motif and possible motivation for this expansion of the Genesis story (see ch. 4, sections 4.3.0–4.3.4). Much debate has been devoted to the identity of Asa’el and his role in *BW*. He is originally one of the leaders of the angels in the opening verses of *I Enoch* 6, but is later identified as the angel responsible for teaching humanity the art of war and beautification of

women (i.e. the use of cosmetics), which brings about the corruption of the earth. Several scholars have proposed that he is connected to the character Azazel in Leviticus 16, but as will be seen, this theory has no proper foundation at the time *BW* was written. It seems likely that the author's purpose in using the Instruction motif (although this is difficult to determine with any certainty) was to connect the action of the *bene elohim* in Genesis 6 with the judgment of the Flood, placing blame for the disaster on both the angels and humanity.

The primary strand of the story is undoubtedly the Shemihazah tradition (see ch. 4, sections 4.4.0–4.4.3). The author blames the angels for the corruption of creation. Shemihazah and the angels have rebelled against God by crossing into the realm of physical contact with humanity: they have breached the cosmos. The rebellion of the angels and in particular the consequences of their actions, are the focus of the narrative (see ch. 5, section 5.2.0–5.4.0). It is within this tradition that we find motifs of impurity and corruption of the earth and humanity. Each of these is dealt with by the cleansing of the Flood. Alongside these motifs, we are told of the birth of the offspring, who, although characterized as relatively neutral in Genesis 6.4, are portrayed as categorically evil in *BW*. It is here that the synthetic nature of *BW* comes to full view—the punishment of the Flood is a result of the *negative* activity recorded in Genesis 6.1–4. The activity of these figures becomes the central point of the author's story as the rebellious angels are removed from the scene and the interaction of the evil spirits with humanity becomes the focus (*I En* 15–16). At this point, we can identify the author's giantology, which describes the spiritual nature of the giants as evil, their actions as merciless, and their future as irredeemable (see ch. 5, section 5.4.1–5.6.0). Within the author's introduction of evil spirits, he reveals a glimpse of an anthropology that portrays humanity as defenceless against the attack of these creatures.

It will be shown that other Jewish writers will take up this giantology and anthropology in the 2TP (see ch. 6). These authors pressed the motifs of the Watcher tradition into a more dualistic framework in which good and evil spirits attempt to influence human souls. At the same time, an ethical dualism is developed, which posits an internal struggle in the human spirit to live righteously (follow God) or do evil (abandon the Law and service of God). This is an overriding theme in several of the Qumran documents, as is demonstrated in several of the “incantation” prayers (see ch. 6, 6.6.2).

It seems, however, that this explanation of the problem of human suffering was not easily accepted in every Jewish community. The writings of Philo of Alexandria reveal an interpretation of Genesis 6.1–4 that differs markedly from that found in *BW* (see ch. 7). In *De Gigantibus*, Philo

rejects the notion that the giants are evil spirits; rather, they function as personifying metaphors for pleasures and vices of the human flesh (see ch. 7, section 7.4.0–7.4.2). In this manner, Philo is formulating an anthropology that assigns the responsibility of evil to human choice. Philo's anthropology corresponds with the internal struggle of the human soul that is found in some of the *DSS*.¹⁰ His demonology begins with a person's decision whether or not to pursue the desires of the flesh. This internal struggle can be affected by external forces, which are not spirits *per se*, but vices. These vices combine with the fleshly desire of the person, which leads him or her to corruption. Despite Philo's apparent rejection of the demonic interpretation of Genesis 6 found in *BW*, his anthropology has clear affinities with some of the thinking preserved in the Dead Sea documents. Philo's interpretation of the giants reflects diversity within Judaism with respect to the problem of human suffering, a diversity that is also reflected in the New Testament.

1.4 Summary

This thesis discusses the reception of Genesis 6.1–4 (Greek and Hebrew traditions) in Early Jewish literature, in particular, *1 Enoch* 6–16 and the writings of Philo of Alexandria. It will be shown that a primary interpretation of the Genesis passage by these authors involved the understanding of human suffering, that is by demonic affliction in the Watcher tradition and human choice in Philo. While other scholars argue that the story presented in *BW* is simply the author's explanation of an oppressive political situation that Israel is facing, I contend that *BW* can be identified as the author's account of the origin of evil spirits based on his interpretation of Genesis 6.1–4. It should be recognized that this understanding is primarily expressed in *1 Enoch* 15–16. It is clear that the giantology and anthropology, which are presented in *BW*, serve as a backdrop for what would follow in the developing anthropology and demonology in the *DSS*, the Pseudepigrapha, and the Gospels.

The developing anthropology and demonology in these documents reveal a diverse theological community within Judaism in the centuries around the turn of the era. They suggest the likelihood that the author of *BW* indeed intended the message of the book to offer some explanation for the existence and function of evil spirits in the world of third-century B.C.E. Jews. In arguing along these lines, I part company from the views of Suter, Dimant, and others. This thesis advocates that the message of *BW* may be read aetiologically rather than strictly paradigmatically. Although a

¹⁰ See ch. 6, section 6.3.0.

reading which suggests the story is a metaphor for the political situation in Israel at the time is not ruled out, the evidence presented here suggests that *BW* represented the worldview of at least a significant group of Jews in the 2TP, which believed that evil spirits were a reality that they faced on a daily basis.

Before examining the primary source materials themselves, I shall present a thorough evaluative overview of the history of research of *BW* in chapter 2. I include the history of the texts, an outline of the structure of the book, a brief summary of the book, a short excursus on notable terms in *BW*, the foci of the research, i.e., the date, place, and author; theories of source criticism; and the theories of interpretation and function of the book. This evaluation reveals that although this research is invaluable to understanding *BW*, more investigation needs to be done relating to theological issues of the document. This attention to recent research is of particular importance since the major developments in this area of study have transpired during the last three decades. It is in relation to these developments that the focus of this thesis is best delineated.

Index of References

1. Hebrew Bible and LXX

<i>Genesis</i>		6.3	23, 39, 58, 70, 74,
1.26	68, 200, 202		77, 132, 150,
1.27	202		212
2.7	161, 202	6.4	7, 8, 17, 22, 33, 47,
2.24	72		62, 70, 86, 88, 101,
3.22	59, 77, 200		140, 144, 147
4	16, 30, 39, 48, 136,	6.4–7.24	154
	139	6.5	40, 42, 47, 61, 74,
4.10	39		84, 120, 128, 143,
4.12	72		145, 175, 185
4.14	72	6.11	84, 104, 144
4.19	72, 135	6.12	104, 132, 140, 145
4.22	72, 106, 115	6.13	132, 140, 156
4.26	58	6.26	65, 68
5.5	59	7.3–5	22
5.24	144	7.6	143
5.32	206	8.1	143
6	6, 8, 9, 120, 136,	8.2	42, 140
	138, 142	8.17	22
6–9	22, 33, 220	8.21	143, 175
6–16	17	8.22	140
6.1	58, 61, 206	9.1	140
6.1–4	1–4, 6–9, 15, 16,	9.2	143
	19, 20, 22, 30, 32,	9.3	143
	48, 50–55, 63, 65,	9.4–6	36
	67, 69, 71–74, 81,	9.8–17	140
	82, 88–92, 95, 96,	9.10	143
	104, 127, 132, 138,	10.2	22
	139, 141, 146, 151,	10.8–12	87
	166, 190–192, 205,	10.9–10	150
	206, 213, 216–219,	11.6–7	200
	220–222	14.5	86
6.1–2	16, 33, 47	15.15	202
6.2	7, 21, 62, 68, 70,	16.1	22
	72, 97, 101, 121,	18.20	200
	133–135, 139, 143,	41.8	162
	144, 212, 206, 207,	46.13	109
	221		

<i>Exodus</i>		13.6–8	67
4.24	158		
21.6	63	<i>1 Samuel</i>	
22.7	64	1.16	159
22.8	63	1.20	121
25.9–27.9	202	2.12	159
35.21	162	10.27	159
		16	152
<i>Leviticus</i>		16.14–23	1
3.17	147	18	152
7.26	147	18.10–12	1
12.14	147	19.9–10	1
16	8, 22, 96, 106, 107, 109, 111, 112, 114, 117	25.17	159
16.8	112, 113	25.25	159
16.26	113	28.3	126
17.10	147	28.8	126
17.11	162, 178	31.8	
17.14	162, 178	<i>2 Samuel</i>	
19.26	147	2.19–23	108
		2.32	108
<i>Numbers</i>		3.30	108
5.14	162	5.18	84, 120
5.14–15	1	16.7	159
5.30	1	22.5	159
11.25	162	<i>1 Kings (3 Kings)</i>	
13.33	23, 80–82, 84–86, 89, 92	5.1	109
		5.3	109
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		5.5	109
1.27	85	5.7	109
2.10–11	85	5.18	158
2.20–21	85	10.4–5	43
4.19	19	11.14	158
18.10–12	126	11.23	158
23.3	150	11.25	158
32.8	65, 101, 103, 220	14.9	63
32.9	101	16.34	109
32.17	155	19.7	1
		21.10	159
<i>Joshua</i>		21.13	159
5.14–15	66	22.9	103
17.2	121	22.19	69, 103
		22.19–23	103
		22.21	68
<i>Judges</i>		<i>2 Kings</i>	
3.31	87	17.15	103
5.6	87	17.30	121
5.20	103	20.13–15	43
9.23	1		

21.3	103	82.5	68
21.5	103	82.6	101, 183
21.6	126	82.7	183
23.4	103	88.11	84
23.5	103	89.7	101
		105.37	156
<i>1 Chronicles</i>		148.2	103, 220
10.8	82		
14.13	83	<i>Isaiah</i>	
16.33	68	14.12	67
21.1	86	24.19	68
28.9	175	24.21–24	31
		26.9	161
<i>2 Chronicles</i>		26.14	84
16.12	84	26.19	84
18.18	103	37.19	63
20.24	82	47	126
29.13	109		
33.3	103	<i>Jeremiah</i>	
33.5	103	8.2	103
33.6	126	19.13	103
		26.21	84
<i>Ezra</i>		27.9	126
9.11	130		
10.15	108, 109	<i>Ezekiel</i>	
		1	99
<i>Nehemiah</i>		7.24	56
4.1	109	20.9	56, 58
9.32	84	20.14	58
10.13	109	20.22	56, 58
13.17	58	20.24	56
13.23	109	20.39	58
		20.44	58
<i>Job</i>		22.10	130
1.6	62, 67, 136, 158, 185	22.16	56
		22.26	56
1.6–12	68	24.21	58
2.1	62, 67, 101, 136, 158, 185	25.3	56
		26.19	85
2.1–6	68	28.1–19	32
3.16	82	32	85
4.18–19	67	32.2–8	32
38.7	62, 103	32.22–24	82
		32.27	67, 82, 85, 106
<i>Psalms</i>		36.17	130
18.5	159	36.21–23	58
29.1	62, 101	37.5–10	162
58.9	82	39.7	58
77.49	211		
82	66, 69, 101		

<i>Daniel</i>		8.14	121
3.25	62, 71, 101		
3.26	71	<i>Obadiah</i>	
3.27	71	1.4	103
3.28	71		
3.92 (LXX)	101	<i>Nahum</i>	
4.10	99, 220	1.11	159
4.14	99, 220	1.15	159
4.20	99, 220	2.1	159
<i>Hosea</i>		<i>Malachi</i>	
5.4	1	1.12	58
9.7–8	157		

Amos

2. New Testament

<i>Matthew</i>		11.24–26	149
12.26	190	11.26	152
12.43	152		
22.30	133	<i>Romans</i>	
		1.20	202
<i>Mark</i>		<i>1 Corinthians</i>	
1.23	164	6.9–10	105
1.26	164		
5.1–20	2	<i>Galatians</i>	
5.2–8	164	5.19–22	105
5.3–4	221		
5.4–5	164	<i>1 Thessalonians</i>	
5.12	222	4.4–6	128
5.15	179		
9.20–25	164	<i>Hebrews</i>	
11.30	98	8.5	202
12.25	133	9.23	202
<i>Luke</i>		<i>2 Peter</i>	
4.33–35	164	2.4	120
7.21	152		
8.2	152	<i>Jude</i>	
8.29	164	6	120
8.35	179		
11.18	190		

3. Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

<i>1 Enoch</i>		1–32	107
1–5	8, 12, 16, 31	2.1	129, 131

4	4	10.4–6	45, 158
6	212	10.4–15	145
6.1–2	16	10.5	111, 146
6.1–4	104	10.6	21, 116
6.2	97, 98, 139, 142, 221	10.7	155
6.2–8	139, 143	10.8	107, 110, 111
6.3	119	10.9	132, 149
6.3–6	98, 138, 140	10.11	124
6.3–8	21	10.12	21, 146, 158
6.4–5	129	10.12–13	45
6.9	21	10.13	183
6–7	36, 104, 106, 107, 120	10.13–14	146
6–11	26, 27, 30, 32, 34, 35, 39, 42, 44, 45, 127, 128, 132, 141	10.15	148
6–16	1, 4, 9, 16, 19, 33, 35, 46, 98, 104, 142	10.16–11.2	140, 152
6–19	29, 30, 43	10.22	40, 131
7.1	124, 125, 129, 134, 135	12.3	20, 99, 103
7.1–6	140	12.4–6	48
7.2	139, 146, 184	12.6	48
7.3–5	214	12–16	26, 35, 42, 44, 118, 128
7.4	147	13.1	107, 116
7.4–6	131	13.5	146
7.5	39, 145, 148	13.8	48
7.6	147	14.1	99
8	118, 136	14.23	99
8.1	21, 106, 107	15.2	100
8.1–2	65	15.3	99
8.1–3	115	15.4–7	129, 131
8.2	104, 116, 143	15.5	161
8.3	120, 121, 123–126	15.6	146
8.4	140	15.6–9	153
9.1	101, 120, 144	15.7	161
9.3	101	15.7–12	164
9.1–3	39	15.8	114, 148, 163
9.1–10.15	140	15.8–9	184
9.4–5	26	15.9–10	161
9.5	39, 120	15.10	146, 163
9.6	21, 107, 125, 127	15.10–12	154
9.7	125	15.12	166
9.9	144	15–16	8, 9, 47, 152, 160
9.10	161	15.11–12	45, 149, 157, 214
9.10–11	39	16.1	154, 156, 160, 189
9.11	120	16.3	21, 127
10.4	107, 111, 116, 146	17–19	26, 34, 43
10.4–5	113	17–36	31, 35, 45, 118
		19.1	155, 214
		20	121
		20–36	26
		20.1	99
		22.3	161, 163

22.5	161	4.15	21, 73, 101, 105, 116, 117
39.12	99	4.21	25
54.5	107	4.22	25
55.4	107	5.2–10	105, 132
61.12	99	7.2–7	45
69.2	107	7.25	154
71.7	99	10	155, 157, 222
85–90	38	10.1–14	35, 43, 127, 151, 157, 158, 160
86.1	98, 102, 142	10.22–23	200
86.3	98	23.12–31	33
86.4	102		
89.6	154	<i>Life of Adam and Eve</i>	
90.21	102	12–16	142
91.11–17	33	13.1–16.1	82
93.1–10	33		
<i>2 Enoch</i>		<i>Judith</i>	
18.1–6	142	16.6	119
<i>3 Enoch</i>		<i>2 Maccabees</i>	
4.6	113	4.19	61
<i>1 Esdras</i>		5.16	61
9.14	109	7.34	61
<i>2 Esdras</i>		9.13	61
23.13	109	15.32	61
<i>Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah</i>		<i>3 Maccabees</i>	
1.7	159	2.4	84, 150
<i>Baruch</i>		<i>Psalms of Solomon</i>	
3.26	83, 84	8.12	130
4.35	113	18.10–12	128
<i>2 Baruch</i>		<i>Pseudo-Philo</i>	
21.6	74	<i>Liberantiquitatum Biblicarum</i>	
56.10–15	63, 97, 206		83, 88
56.11–14	97	1.20	57
86.10–16	35	2.2	56, 62, 70
<i>Ben Sira</i>	52	3.3	143
<i>4 Ezra</i>	199, 207	13.6	20
3.21–22	42	<i>Sibylline Oracles</i>	
5.43	60	1	45
6.41	74	1.75–80	61, 93
<i>Jubilees</i>		1.105	216
3.15	20	2.228	120
		<i>Sirach</i>	58
		16.1–10	58

16.7	35		
16.26–28	74		
<i>Testament of Asher</i>			
1	159		
1.3	58		
<i>Testament of Benjamin</i>			
3.3	159		
<i>Testament of Gad</i>			
4.7	159		
<i>Testament of Issachar</i>			
6.1	159		
<i>Testament of Judah</i>			
1–3	160		
16.1	153		
<i>Testament of Levi</i>		24, 26, 29, 184	
5.6	153		
14.3–4	24, 28		
18.12	153		
19.1	160		
<i>Testament of Moses</i>			
5–10	33		
		<i>Testament of Naphtali</i>	
		2.5	164
		3.5	36, 100, 132
		8.3	69
		8.6	159
		<i>Testament of Reuben</i>	
		2.3	159
		5.6	125, 130, 149
		5.6–7	35, 63, 100
		<i>Testament of Simeon</i>	
		2.7	159
		3.5	152
		4.9	152
		<i>Testament of Solomon</i>	
			181
		7.7	112
		<i>Tobit</i>	
		6.8	189
		<i>Wisdom of Solomon</i>	52
		2.18	66
		7	181
		14.6–7	35

4. Dead Sea Scrolls

<i>1Q3</i>	111	5.20	166, 176
		5.21	178
<i>1Q19</i>		8.19–20	167, 174
26.13	111		
2	101	11.19	178, 186
		14.16	151
<i>1Q20 (1QapGen)</i>		15.3	178
ii	154	15.14–15	170
ii.1	83, 100, 153	15.17–19	170
ii.16	100		
v.3–4	98	<i>1QM</i>	
		13.10	169, 176
<i>1Q23(1QGiant^a)</i>	110	13.10–12	176
		<i>1QpHab</i>	
<i>1QH^a</i>		7.13–14	140
1.7–9	170		
4.16	174		

<i>IQS</i>	168, 170, 174	2.4	111
1.1–4.26	168		
1.8	185	<i>4Q186</i>	168, 180
2.4–10	184, 189	1.2.7–9	168
3	209	1.3.5–6	168
3–4	173, 185, 201, 209	2.2.6–9	168
3.8–9	178		
3.13–4.26	168	<i>4Q196</i>	210
3.15	201		
3.18	174	<i>4Q201(4QEn^a)</i>	15, 24–26, 48
3.20	175, 210	1.3.6	120, 122
3.20–23	176, 177, 188	1.3.9	105, 108, 121
3.24	167, 182	1.3.13	134
3.25–26	176	1.3.15	125
4.2–8	173, 175, 209	1.3.16	146
4.3–6	209	1.3.18–19	147
4.9–11	209, 214	1.3.23	108, 121
4.9–14	176, 209	1.4	108
4.20–21	178	1.4.1	120, 122, 123
4.23, 26	169	1.4.1–5	123, 127
5.1	182	1.4.7	144
10.21	178	1.4.21	122
		1.5	108
<i>2Q5</i>	111		
<i>4Q23</i>	111	<i>4Q202(4QEn^b)</i>	24
<i>4Q24</i>	111	1.1.5	122
<i>4Q25</i>	111	1.2	97, 100
<i>4Q26</i>	111	1.2.18	134
<i>4Q44</i>	101	1.2.22–23	147
<i>4Q174 (4QFlorilegium)</i>		1.2.26	108
1–3	188	1.3.1	122
1.7–9	188	1.3.1–5	123
3.4	151	1.3.8	144
<i>4Q175</i>		1.4	100, 130, 135, 148
23	185	1.4–9	122, 131, 154
<i>4Q180</i>	110	1.6.8–10	145
1.2	100		
1.7–10	110, 111	<i>4Q203(4QEnGiants^a)</i>	
<i>4Q181</i>		1.5	154
1.2	98	1.7	111
1.5	169	1.7.6	109, 110
		1.8.7–8	89, 149
		<i>4Q204(4QEn^c)</i>	15, 48
		1.2.7	122
		1.2.26	105, 108
		1.5.2	131, 154
		1.5.2.18–19	148
		1.6	100
		1.6.1	162

1.6.15–16	154		
<i>4Q205(4QEn^d)</i>	15, 48	<i>4Q417</i>	175, 186, 200
<i>4Q206(4QEn^e)</i>	144, 48	1.1.16	175
		1.2.12	172, 176, 177
<i>4Q213</i>		2.1.16	167, 210
1.1	184	2.2.12	166
<i>4Q242</i>	210	<i>4Q418</i>	
<i>4Q266</i>		2.4–5	176
6.1.5	167, 189	2.12–13	176
<i>4Q280</i>		12.3.1	177
1.2	176	43	175, 210
<i>4Q286</i>	166	44	175, 210
7	189	45.1.13	175, 210
7.2.1–3	158, 178	55.9	175, 210
<i>4Q290</i>	186	<i>4Q422</i>	185
<i>4Q298</i>		<i>4Q429</i>	152
1.1	172	<i>4Q435</i>	185
<i>4Q318</i>	180	<i>4Q444</i>	124, 152, 180, 186
<i>4Q370</i>	185	1.1.8	178
1.3	166, 176	<i>4Q458</i>	
1.6	154	2.1.5	178
<i>4Q386</i>		<i>4Q473</i>	
1.2.3	159, 178	frag. 2	174
<i>4Q387a</i>		<i>4Q510</i>	52, 152, 171, 179,
3.3.3	167, 177		180, 186, 187
3.3.4	158	1.1.7	187
<i>4Q388a</i>		1.4–5	124, 186
1.2.6	177	1.5–6	188, 172
<i>4Q390</i>		1.6	179, 188
1.11	158, 177	1.8	171, 172
2.1.4	159	<i>4Q511</i>	152, 180, 186, 188
2.1.6	177	2.1.5	187
2.1.7	158	2.1.8	171
<i>4Q395</i>		2.3	131
39	151	3.5	167
		frag. 8	210
		10.11	68, 167
		35.3.5	167
		35.6–8	124
		35.7	131
		35.8–9	188

frag. 48, 49	124, 188	<i>6Q2</i>	112
51.2–3	188		
63.3.5	171	<i>6Q8</i>	35, 110
frags. 63, 64	187		
<i>4Q530(4QEnGi^b)</i>	110	<i>11Q1</i>	111
1.2.1	162, 216		
1.2.3–6	99	<i>11Q2</i>	111
1.2.5–6	80		
1.2.7	129	<i>11Q5</i>	172, 180
1.2.16–20	110	18.9–11	180
1.2.20–21	80	19	184, 185
1.2.20–24	183	19.13	178
1.3.8	23	19.14	173, 180, 181
		19.15	173, 180, 181, 185, 189
<i>4Q531</i>		19.16	173, 180, 181, 189
4.5	154	27	181
5.2	80	27.9	124
frag. 14	154	frag. E iii	185
17.1	99		
17.10	99	<i>11Q11</i>	152, 181
<i>4Q533(4Q556)</i>		2	124, 171, 180, 181
6.1–3	144	3	181, 183
		4	181, 183
<i>4Q534</i>		4.1.12	159
2.18	100, 220	5	167
		5.5–8	188
<i>4Q543</i>	170	5.6–10	184
		<i>11Q19</i>	
<i>4Q544</i>	152	18	113
2.3.12	170	26.11–13	113
2.3.13	171	26.13	112
<i>4Q547</i>		<i>11QPs^a</i>	184
3.9	170	19.15	158, 178, 188
<i>4Q560</i>	124, 152, 180, 189	<i>11QPsAp^a</i>	181
1.1	167, 178, 189		
1.2	181, 189	<i>CD</i>	52, 171, 172
<i>4Q561</i>	180	2.7–10	140
		2.17–21	35
<i>4QAmram</i>	170, 171	2.18	21, 100
		4.12–15	159, 177
<i>4QS</i>	168, 172	4.17	36, 172
		5.8	159, 177
<i>4QTestLevi^a</i>	28	6.14	182
8.3.6–7	24, 28	6.17	182
		11.18–19	110

16.2–4	25	16.14	177
16.4	177, 186	20.8	184
16.5	158	21.9	22, 23

5. Ancient Authors

Josephus		17	212
<i>Jewish Antiquities</i>		18	212
1.72	90	19	76, 199, 205
1.72–76	70, 71, 134	20	204
1.73.2	98, 134	31	212, 213
1.114	87	34–38	209, 214
8.45	181	40	215
11.300	132	42	56
18.259	192	43	215
		47	215
<i>Jewish Wars</i>		58	81, 206, 215
4.25	132	63–66	87
4.201	132		
Philo of Alexandria		<i>De Opificio Mundi</i>	
<i>De Cherubim</i>		19	201
13	102	25	201
		69	201
		72	200
<i>De Confusione Linguarum</i>		73–74	209
81	201	77	201, 215
176	202	79	209
		81	214
<i>De Deterius Potiori insidiari</i>		134–135	199, 202
84	199	135	200
99	201	143	199, 200
		152	209, 215
<i>Quod Deus immutabilis sit</i>		154	202, 205
3	212	155	210
4	209, 213	160	214
10	196		
61–64	195	<i>De Posteritate caini</i>	
		89	69
<i>De Gigantibus</i>	4, 8–9, 196	91–92	69
3	211		
6	62, 63, 69, 70, 97	<i>De Plantatione</i>	196
7	199	12	207
11	207	14	42, 204, 207, 208
12	102, 207	19	200
12–17	209	36	195
13–14	208		
16	75, 114, 210, 211, 213	<i>De Praemiis te Poenis</i>	
		79	196

- | | | | |
|---|---------------|---|--|
| <i>De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini</i> | | <i>Phaedrus</i> | |
| 132 | 211 | 248–250 | 204 |
| <i>De Specialibus Legibus</i> | | <i>Politicus</i> | |
| I.307 | 211 | 274C | 69, 115 |
| <i>De Vita Contemplativa</i> | | <i>Protagoras</i> | |
| | 196, 197, 208 | 321 | 115 |
| <i>Legum Allegoria</i> | 196 | <i>Timaeus</i> | |
| II.6 | 208 | 90a | 213 |
| II.70 | 209 | Plutarch | |
| II.107 | | <i>De E apud Delphos</i> | |
| <i>Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin</i> | | 390E | 213 |
| 2 | 203 | Poem of Empedocles | |
| 11 | 202 | frag. 115 | 203 |
| 51 | 208 | Appolodorus | |
| 89 | 206 | <i>Library</i> | 131 |
| 92 | 70 | Aristotle | |
| <i>Quaestiones et Solutiones in Exodum</i> | | <i>Hist. An.</i> | |
| 13 | 210 | 5.552b | 207 |
| <i>De Somniis</i> | | Augustine | |
| I.102 | 195 | <i>De Civ. Dei</i> | |
| I.134 | 103 | 15.23 | 71 |
| I.134–136 | 199 | Chrysostom | |
| I.135 | 199, 204 | <i>Homil. In Genesin</i> | |
| I.138 | 208 | 12.2 | 71 |
| I.139 | 208 | Herodotus | |
| I.140 | 215 | <i>Histories</i> | |
| I.140–141 | 210 | 1.163 | 77 |
| I.143 | 215 | 3.23 | 77 |
| I.181 | 202 | Hesiod | 60, 70, 73–75, 79,
80, 87, 88, 91, 93 |
| <i>De Vita Mosis</i> | | <i>The Catalogue of Women and Eoiae</i> | |
| 1.1 | 196 | II 2–50 | 73 |
| <i>Patrologia Graeca(PG)</i> | | <i>Theogony</i> | |
| 10.65 | 71 | 118 | 75 |
| Pindar | | 120 | 75 |
| <i>Pythian Odes</i> | | 507–543 | 116 |
| 11 | 75 | 507–616 | 115 |
| Plato | | 561–584 | 116 |
| <i>Phaedo</i> | 204 | | |
| 113D–114C | 34 | | |

<i>Works and Days</i>		<i>De Mysteriis</i>	
42–105	115	10	76
109–174	60		
110–125	73	<i>De Noe</i>	
120–130	70	8	76
 Hilarius		 Eusebius	
<i>Psalm 65.5</i>	76	<i>Praeparatio Evangelica</i>	
		1.9.35c	125
Homer	74, 79, 91, 213, 215	9.17.2–3	154
<i>Iliad</i>		9.17.2–9	87
1.205–207	74	9.18.2	85
1.222	213		
3.420	213	Euripides	
14.279	22	Frag. 943	207
 <i>Odyssey</i>		 Strabo Geographica	
7.55	131	13.4.11	207
7.59	120		
7.205	131	Yasna	
7.206	120	30	175
Book 11	24		
 Ambrosius		 <i>Ahare</i>	
		2.8	113

6. Rabbinic and Other Jewish Literature

<i>b. Niddah</i>		<i>Berakhoth</i>	
11a–b	130	60b	185
61a	86		
 <i>b. Pesahim</i>		 <i>Exodus Rabbah</i>	
54a	199	30.9	36
		43	158
 <i>b. Sanhedrin</i>		 <i>Genesis Rabbah</i>	57
38b	200	1.1	202
56b	36	4.26	57
59a	36	8.4	200
108a	76	10.8	57
		11.6b	57
 <i>m. Sanhedrin</i>		16.6	36
10.3	76	26.5	64, 119, 133
 <i>b. Yomah</i>		 <i>Pirke de Rabbi Natan</i>	
67b	113	3.11	90
		32	77

Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer(PRE)

3	60
22	65, 72, 83
46	113

*Tanah. b.**Targum Isaiah*

24.19–23	69
----------	----

Targum Job

1.21	67
------	----

Targum Neofiti

Genesis	64, 76, 119
Genesis 3.24	199
Genesis 6.1	56
Genesis 6.2	66, 119, 133, 135
Genesis 6.4	82, 88
Genesis 7.4	78
Exodus 22.7	64

Targum Onkelos

Deut. 2.10–11	86
Genesis	119, 133
Genesis 6.2	65, 119
Genesis 6.3	76
Genesis 6.4	82
Leviticus 21.7	90
Numbers 13.3	82

Targum Psalm

29.1	65
82	66

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan

Deut. 2.2	86
Deut. 3.11	86
Genesis 2.8	199
Genesis 6.2	64
Genesis 6.4	79, 83
Genesis 7.4	78, 113, 200

Yerahmeel

24.10–12	72
----------	----