

purpose of this study is to explore possible confluences between the myth of the Watchers and early Christian demonology. Specifically, the evidence presented here suggests that three major aspects of early Christian portraits of the demons, namely their specialization, interiorization, and hierarchical organization, developed in contact with previous Jewish speculations about the Watchers.

I. To Each Sin Its Demon

Among researchers of ancient Christian mystical and ascetical literature, Origen has the reputation of being the first to have developed the concept of the evil thoughts. According to Origen there is a demon behind every kind of evil thoughts and the holy fight against them takes place in one's inner being. Origen has also been credited to have developed for the first time the concept that perfection lies in the spiritual and inner fight against demons.³ Origen's spiritualization and hierarchization of the demons and interiorization of the struggle with evil stand at the foundation of Evagrius' systematization and categorization of the evil "thoughts" (λογισμοί) in his *On the Eight Evil Thoughts*,⁴

3. For the demonology of Origen and prior Christian literature, see Jean Daniélou, "Démon II. Dans la littérature ecclésiastique jusqu'à Origène," in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1932-1995) 3:151-89. For the development of this concept in subsequent Christian literature (particularly monastic), see A. Guillaumont, "Démon III. Dans la plus ancienne littérature monastique," in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1932-1995) 3:189-212.

4. The Greek text, traditionally attributed to Nilus of Ancyra, is extant in two versions, a short one, published in PG. 79:1145-64, and a longer one, which appears in Joseph Muyl-dermans, "Une nouvelle recension du *De octo spiritibus malitiae* de S. Nil," *Le Muséon* 52 (1939) 235-74, here 249-54. The Ethiopian versions were published in Johannes Bachmann, *Aethiopische Lesestücke: Inedita Aethiopia für den Gebrauch in Universitäts-Vorlesungen* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1893) 26-33; Sylvain Grébaud, "La mauvaise passion de la colère selon Evagrius," *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 18 (1913) 213-25; Otto Spies, "Die äthiopische Überlieferung der Abhandlung des Evagrius *Peri okto logismou*," *Oriens Christianus* 29 (1932) 203-28; Victor Arras, *Collectio monastica* (2 vols.; CSCO 238-39; Louvain: Peeters, 1963). The Syriac version is published in Joseph Muyl-dermans, *Evagriana Syriaca. Textes inédits du British Museum et de la Vaticane* (Bibliothèque du Muséon 31; Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1952) 53-59. The Georgian fragments appear in G. Garitte, *Catalogue des manuscrits géorgiens littéraires du Mont Siméi* (CSCO 165; Louvain: Durbeck, 1956) 102 n.8, and Ivane Lološvili, *Zveli k'art'uli mcerfobis matiane* (Annales de la littérature géorgienne ancienne; 2 vols.; Tbilisi: Mec'niereba, 1984), 1:36-38. The Latin version of recension A is published in E. Bigot, *Palladii episcopi Helenopolitani de vita S. Iohannis*

Dreamy Angels and Demonic Giants: Watcher Traditions and the Origin of Evil in Early Christian Demonology

SILVIU N. BUNTA

During the last three decades the fascination of scholars with the myth of the Watchers has been amply documented in the increasing number of studies on the topic.¹ This literature has analyzed the myth in its various expressions, particularly in its earliest forms, namely in the *Book of the Watchers* (1 *Enoch* 1-36), the *Animal Apocalypse* (1 *Enoch* 85-90), *Jubilees*, the *Book of Giants*, and several Qumran documents.² However, the implications of the Watchers traditions for the development of demonology in early Christian literature have been largely overlooked. The primary

1. On this topic see especially L. T. Stuckenbruck, "The Origins of Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: The Interpretation of Genesis 6:1-4 in the Second and Third Centuries B.C.E.," in *The Fall of the Angels* (ed. C. Auffarth and L. Stuckenbruck; Leiden: Brill, 2004) 87-118; idem, "The 'Angels' and the '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 [an earlier and shorter version of the previous article]; idem, *The Book of Giants from Qumran. Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (TSAJ 63; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1997); J.C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony. Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (HUCM 14; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992); D.W. Suter, "Fallen Angels, Fallen Priests," *HUCA* 50 (1979) 115-35; P. Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6-11," *JBL* 96 (1977) 195-233; M. Delcor, "Le mythe de la chute des anges et de l'origine des géants comme explication du mal dans le monde dans l'apocryphe juive," *RHR* 190 (1976) 3-53; D. Dimant, "The 'Fallen Angels' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic Books Related to Them" (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1974 [Hebrew]).

2. 1Q20, 4Q180-181, 4Q370, 4Q444, 4Q310-311, 11Q11, and the *Damascus Document*.

Praktikos (especially 6–33),⁵ and *Antirrhētikos*,⁶ an unprecedented effort that generated the famous lists of evil thoughts in late ancient Christianity.⁷

Now in one instance Origen confesses that he cannot claim originality for his entire understanding of demons. In *Homilies on Joshua* (15:6), which is extant only in a Latin translation by Rufinus,⁸ he gives credit to the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*:

But also in a certain other little book that is called the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, although it is not considered part of the

Chrysostomi dialogus: Accedunt homilia Sancti Iohannis chrysostomi in laudem Diodori, Tarsensis episcopi, Acta Tarachi, Probi et andronici, Passio Banifatii Romani, Evagrius de octo cogitationibus, Nilus de octo vitis (Paris: apud viduam Edmundi Martini, 1680) 356–82. Coptic fragments have been published in H.-M. Schenke, “Ein koptischer Evagrius,” in *Graeco-Coptica. Griechen und Kopten im byzantinischen Agypten* (ed. P. Nagel, Halle: Martin-Luther-Universität, 1984) 219–30. Armenian translations have appeared in Muylde-mans, “Une nouvelle recension du *De octo spiritibus malitiae* de S. Nil,” 235–74. The most recent English translation is available in Robert E. Sinkewicz, *Evagrius of Pontus: The Greek Ascetic Corpus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

5. The Greek has been published in A. and C. Guillaumont, *Évagre le Pontique. Traité Pratique ou le Moine* (2 vols.; SC 170-171; Paris: Cerf, 1971). The Georgian fragments have appeared in Lolašvili, *Zveli k'art'uli mcerlobis matiane*, 1:24–29. An English translation is available in John Eudes Bamberger, *Evagrius: The Praktikos and Chapters on Prayer* (Cistercian Studies Series 4; Spencer, Mass: Cistercian Publications, 1970).

6. The *Antirrhētikos* is not extant in Greek. The Syriac version and a Greek retroversion have been published in W. Frankenberg, *Evagrius Ponticus* (Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen and Philologisch-Historische Klasse, n.s. 13-2; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1912) 472–545. The Armenian version appeared in E. Teza, *Le opere di Evagrio Pontico nell'antica versione armena* (Venice: Ghazat, 1909) 217–223. The Georgian fragments have appeared in Lolašvili, *Zveli k'art'uli mcerlobis matiane*, 1:21–24.

7. Not much has been written on Evagrius' eight evil thoughts. See particularly Diongenes Allen, “Ascetic Theology and the Eight Deadly Thoughts,” *Evangelical Journal* 13 (1995) 15–23, L. Mistrzyk, *Osiem logismoi w pismach Evagriusza z Pontu* [Eight Logismoi in the Writings of Evagrius Ponticus] (Krakow-Tyniec: Wydawnictwo Tyniec, 2007). For Evagrius' dependence on Origen, see A. and C. Guillaumont, *Évagre le Pontique. Traité Pratique ou le Moine*, 1:63–84, 90–93; F. X. Murphy, “Evagrius Ponticus and Origenism,” in *Origeniana Tertia* (ed. R. P. C. Hanson and F. Crouzel; Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1985) 253–69; M. O'Laughlin, “Elements of Fourth Century Origenism: The Anthropology of Evagrius Ponticus and Its Sources,” in *Origen of Alexandria* (ed. C. Kannengieser and W. L. Petersen; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988) 357–73; M. Pesthy, “Logismoi origénienus—logismoi evagriens,” in *Origeniana Octava* (Leuven: Peeters, 2003) 1017–22.

8. Rufinus' translation is published in A. Jaubert, *Origène. Homélie sur Josué* (SC 71; Paris: Cerf, 1960). The only English translation appeared in B. J. Bruce (trans.) and C. White (ed.), *Origen. Homilies on Joshua* (The Fathers of the Church; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2002).

canon, we nevertheless discover the same such meaning—that individual Satans ought to be understood in individual sinners (*quod per singulos peccantes singuli satanae intelligi debeat*).⁹

Rufinus' translations are well known for being more paraphrastic than literal.¹⁰ His rendition of the *Homilies of Joshua* seems to be equally an adaptation rather than a translation.¹¹ A. Jaubert concludes her study of the matter thus:

La traduction de Rufin pour les *Homélie sur Josué* se présente ainsi avec de sérieuses garanties, à condition de ne pas lui demander ce qu'elle ne peut donner. Il faut plutôt la considérer comme une libre adaptation, non comme une traduction. Dans l'ensemble, elle donne l'impression d'une longue paraphrase, mais non d'une paraphrase inexacte. Nous ne serons jamais sûrs d'avoir l'expression d'Origène; nous saurons que Rufin peut atténuer prudemment la pensée; il ne faudra pas tirer argument d'une phrase ou d'un court texte qui ne soient confirmés par ailleurs. Mais pour un développement un peu long, ou qui tout simplement engage la structure des idées, nous avons de fortes chances de tenir fidèlement la pensée d'Origène.¹²

The passage quoted above (from homily 15:6) illustrates the problems that mar Rufinus' translations. Rufinus' rendition of this particular passage can hardly reflect Origen's thought accurately. Only the larger context of the entire homily can expose the thought of the Alexandrian from underneath the flawed Latin translation.

Given the use of *singulos* and *singuli*, in Rufinus' translation the passage in homily 15:6 can only mean that there is one satan in each sinner. Granted that earlier in the homily (15:4) Origen explains the singular *ἀμαρτία* of Rom 6:12 (*βασιδευέτω ἡ ἀμαρτία; regnavit peccatum* in Rufinus' translation) in the sense that each human is commonly dominated by a particular sin,¹³ nowhere else (even in Rufinus' translation) does Origen suggest that

9. Translation from Bruce and White, *Origen. Homilies on Joshua*, 149. The Latin text is from Jaubert, *Origène. Homélie sur Josué*, 352.

10. M. Wagner, *Rufinus, the Translator: A Study of His Theory and Practice as Illustrated in His Version of the Apologetica of St. Gregory of Nazianzen* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1945).

11. See the research in Jaubert, *Origène. Homélie sur Josué*, 68–82.

12. Jaubert, *Origène. Homélie sur Josué*, 82.

13. “Sin has reigned” (Rom 6:12) in every one of us, and in every one of us vices have

each person only battles one demon. Contrary to Rufinus' translation of the above reference to the *Twelve Patriarchs*, Origen is quite emphatic (in Rufinus' rendition) that,

There seems to me to be, so to speak, an endless number of opposing powers (*infinitus . . . numerus contrarium virtutum*), because for almost every human there are several spirits (*spiritus aliqui*) stirring up diverse kinds of sins (*diversa . . . peccatorum genera*) in them. For example, there is one spirit of fornication, and there is another of wrath; there is a spirit of avarice, but another of arrogance. And if there happens to be some person who is driven by all these spirits, or even by more, we should realize that he has all these spirits, or even more, within. From this, we should accept that there are several (*plures*) spirits for each person (*per singulos*), because each human being (*singuli homines*) does not have a single vice (*singula vitia*) or commit a single sin (*singula peccata*), but very many (*plura*) seem to be admitted by every person (*ab unoquoque*). (*Homilies on Joshua* 15:4)¹⁴

There are several demons in each person and they are behind different kinds of sins (*diversa . . . peccatorum genera*). Jean Daniélou explains that Origen's concept of several sins that skirmish with each human is related to his hierarchical vision of the demonic world: "En réalité, il y a un prince de chacun de ces vices qui délègue ses satellites auprès de chaque homme."¹⁵ Indeed, Origen continues in Rufinus' voice,

We should not think that one single (*unus*) spirit of fornication seduces a person (*eum*) who, for example, commits fornication in Brittany, and another person (*illum*) who lives in India or in other

reigned, and in every one of us was a general kingdom of sin (*regnum generale peccati*), just as the Apostle says, 'For all have sinned and are devoid of the glory of God' (Rom 3:23). Yet everyone also had some particular 'king' (*aliquem specialem regem*) in him who reigned in him and ruled over him." (Bruce and White, *Origen. Homilies on Joshua*, 144-45; Jaubert, *Origène. Homélie sur Josué*, 344).

14. Translation from Bruce and White, *Origen. Homilies on Joshua*, 146-47; Latin from Jaubert, *Origène. Homélie sur Josué*, 348.

15. Daniélou, "Démon II," col. 188. For this concept, see *Homilies on Joshua* 15:5 (Jaubert, *Origène. Homélie sur Josué*, 348-49; Bruce and White, *Origen. Homilies on Joshua*, 147).

places; or, again,¹⁶ that there is one spirit of wrath who prompts different persons in different places (*diversis in locis diversos homines agit*). Rather, I think there is indeed one spirit (*unum spiritum*), prince of fornication (*princeps fornicationis*), but there are innumerable ones who submit to it in this capacity (*innumeros vero esse, qui in hoc ei officio pareant*). In each individual person, different spirits (*diversi spiritus*) fighting under this chief stir him up to sins of this type. . . . In like manner, there is one prince of avarice, and so of pride, and of other evils. . . . Nevertheless, I believe that there is a prince of all these, more extreme, so to speak, in wickedness and more haughty in impiety, who, as sole leader of all the princes and as master of the whole abominable army, harasses the entire world. (*Homilies on Joshua* 15:4)¹⁷

Within this context, the argument that Origen seems to make in reference to the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is that there are individual demons for each kind of sin in each sinner. It is this idea, that demons are specialized in certain sins, that Origen credits to the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.¹⁸

16. I corrected up to this point the translation in Bruce and White, *Origen. Homilies on Joshua*, 147, which reads: "We should not think that there is one spirit (*unus*) of fornication that seduces a person who, for example, commits fornication in Brittany, and another [this is a misreading of *illum* as corresponding to *unus*, instead of *eum*] for the person who does so in India or in other places; nor that. . ." The point that Origen makes, as the following sentence clarifies, is just the contrary, that, indeed, there are different spirits of the same sin working in different people.

17. Translation (with corrections) from Bruce and White, *Origen. Homilies on Joshua*, 147; Latin from Jaubert, *Origène. Homélie sur Josué*, 348-50.

18. The critical editions of the Greek text are M. de Jonge et al., eds., *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (Leiden: Brill, 1978) and R. H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (London: Oxford University Press, 1908). There are available the following English translations: H. C. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. James H. Charlesworth, Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983) 1:775-828; H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 1985); R. H. Charles, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1908); idem, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and Fragments of the Second and Third Centuries* (Ante-Nicene Christian Library 22; trans. R. Sinkler; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1871). The main studies on the writing are: Robert Kugler, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001); H. Dixon Slingerland, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research* (Missoula, Mont: Scholars Press, 1977); M. de Jonge, *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Inter-*

However, the *Testaments*' understanding of the evil "spirits" (πνεύματα) is not without ambiguities. According to the *Testament of Reuben* 2:1–3:8, each human receives seven good spirits (of life, seeing, hearing, smelling, speech, taste, and procreation) and seven corresponding spirits of deceit or error (πνεύματα τῆς πλάνης), which govern promiscuity, insatiability, strife, flattery, arrogance, lying, and injustice.¹⁹ It is probably this list of sins that Origen refers to in the above passage.²⁰ However, given that in this passage the good spirits are qualities inherent in the human nature, by which "all human deeds are performed" (2:4), the error spirits listed here do not seem to be individual demons as much as innate psycho-somatic capacities. These capacities are seated in the senses or inside specific organs.

Nevertheless, other passages in the *Testaments* do seem to understand the spirits as independent personified forces battling humans both from outside or from within. *T. Simeon* 2:7 implies that the evil spirits can be sent to humans from outside: "I [i.e., Simeon] determined inwardly to destroy him [i.e., Joseph], because the prince of deceit (ὁ ἄρχων τῆς πλάνης), sending forth the spirit of jealousy (ἀπαστεῖλαις τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ζήλου), blinded my mind."²¹ Probably being "overcome" (ἡττάσθαι) by a spirit in *Testament of Reuben* 5:3 ("women are more easily overcome by the spirit of promiscuity than are men") is also best understood as a defeat by an independent evil force.²² Moreover, spirits are described as running away from the persons they battle (cf. *T. Simeon* 3:5; 4:7; *T. Issachar* 7:7). Also, while the evil spirits can attack a person from outside (cf. *T. Judah* 13:3–4), more often than not they are depicted as inhabiting or affecting one's mind (cf. *T. Simeon* 3:2; *T. Judah* 14:1–3, 8; *T. Dan* 2:4–5; *T. Gad* 6:2) and as working from

pretation (Leiden: Brill, 1975); idem, *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Collected Essays* (Leiden: Brill, 1991); idem, "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Central Problems and Essential Viewpoints," ANRW II 20 (1987) 359–420; idem, "The Main Issues in the Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," NTS 26 (1980) 308–24.

19. M. de Jonge et al., *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 3–5. The partition between the two categories of spirits and, more specifically, the reference in *T. Judah* 20 to two general spirits, of truth and of deceit, recall the "two ways" imagery of late ancient Jewish and Christian literature.

20. This was already the conclusion of E. Bettencourt, *Doctrina ascetica Origenis* (Rome: Libreria Vaticana, 1945) 133–43.

21. This is my adaptation of the translation in Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," 785, in conformity with the Greek text in M. de Jonge et al., *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 15.

22. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," 784; M. de Jonge et al., *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 9.

within the person (cf. *T. Gad* 1:9). In all these cases, the spirits seem to function not as innate human capacities, but as evil beings.

Moreover, the *Testaments* seem to organize the spirits in a hierarchy. Thus, in several passages the spirits of deceit seem to be the subordinates of Beliar/Satan.²³ As seen above, in *T. Simeon* 2:7, the prince of deceit (ὁ ἄρχων τῆς πλάνης) delegates the spirit of jealousy (τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ζήλου). A prince of deceit (ὁ ἄρχων τῆς πλάνης) is mentioned again in *T. Judah* 19:4. Therefore, the *Testaments* contain more than Origen gives them credit for. In a less developed and systematic manner, they seem to refer to the specialization, the interiorization, and the hierarchical organization of the demons.

These aspects of the *Testaments*' view of the spirits correspond to elements in the myth of the Watchers and the *Testaments* betray dependence on the myth in more than one way. The *Testaments* contain two explicit references to the Watcher story (*T. Naphthali* 3:5 and *T. Reu* 5:6–7) and the demonology of the *Testaments* corresponds at several points with developments in the Watchers traditions:

1. The hierarchical organization of the demonic realm is a widespread feature of the thought of the *Testaments* (as it is in Origen's demonology). The early forms the Watchers traditions, known particularly through the *Book of the Watchers* (*1 Enoch* 1–36), the *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 Enoch* 85–90), *Jubilees*, and several Qumran documents,²⁴ contain some of the earliest hierarchical depictions of the wayward angels. *1 Enoch* 6:5 states that the fallen angels numbered two hundred.²⁵ The text mentions the chief (ἄρχων) of the Watchers, Shemihazah (*1 Enoch* 6:3, 7),²⁶ and twenty leaders in charge of groups of ten (*1 Enoch* 6:8).²⁷ In the later *1 Enoch* 69, most

23. See *T. Levi* 3:3; *T. Issachar* 7:7 (πᾶν πνεῦμα τοῦ βελιάρ); *T. Zebulon* 9:8; *T. Dan* 1:7–8 (ἐ τῶν πνευμάτων τοῦ βελιάρ); 6:1–2 (ἀπὸ τοῦ σατανᾶ καὶ τῶν πνευμάτων αὐτοῦ). A Beliar is mentioned in *1 Sam* 2:12. Beliar, as a demonic power or the leader of the fallen angels, appears in *Jub.* 1:20; 15:33; *Ascension of Isaiah* 1:8–9; 2:4; 3:11, 13; 4:2, 4, 14, 16, 18; 5:3, 15; *1QS* 11:17, 23–24; CD 4:13, 15; 5:8; 2 Cor 6:5.

24. See n. 2 above.

25. The Ethiopic versions of *1 Enoch* were edited and translated in M. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978). The Greek versions have been critically edited in M. Black, *Apocalypse of the Watchers* (Leiden: Brill, 1970). A commentary on the *Book of the Watchers* has been published in Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1. A new English translation of the text was republished in G. W. E. Nickelsburg and J. C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: The Hermeneia Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012).

26. The identification of Shemihazah as the chief (ἄρχων) of the Watchers is attested in most versions of *1 Enoch* 6:3 (the exception noted in Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 174, is the Akhmim Greek papyrus), and in all versions of *1 Enoch* 6:7.

27. The reading of this line is not clear. Some Ethiopic manuscripts read: "These are the leaders of the two hundred angels, and of all the others with them" (Knibb, *The Ethi-*

probably dating from the turn of the era, Shemihazah leads a much larger army, with leaders of hundreds, of fifties, and of tens.²⁸ 2 *Enoch* 18:3 also attests to a later development of the Watchers myths, most probably from the first century C.E.²⁹ In this development, the leader of the fallen Watchers is identified as Satanail (and not Shemihazah, as in 1 *Enoch*). He descends to earth with 200 myriads Watchers, according to some manuscripts, or, according to other versions, with 200 princes.³⁰

optic Book of Enoch, 2:74), implying that there were more than two hundred angels. Other Ethiopic MSS read this passage as "These are their leaders of tens, and of all the others with them" (Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2:76n). Most Greek sources preserve a reference to "leaders of ten" (cf. Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*, 21n).

28. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, 1 *Enoch*, 88–89.

29. The following translations of the text are available: Andersen, "2 Enoch," *OTP* 1:191–221; R. H. Charles and W. R. Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896); R. H. Charles, ed., *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913); A. Pennington, "2 Enoch," in Sparks, *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, 321–62; G. N. Bonwetsch, *Die Bücher der Geheimmisse Henochs* (TU 44; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1922); A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Henoch: Texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1952). A Jewish origin of the writing is the majority opinion: Andersen, "2 Enoch," 95–97; Bonwetsch, *Die Bücher der Geheimmisse Henochs*; Charles, *APOT*; Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic*; Odeberg, 3 *Enoch*; S. Pines, "Enoch," *Slavonic Book of Enoch*, 6:797–99; M. Philonenko et al., eds., *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (JSPSS, 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); A. De Santos Otero, "Libro de los secretos de Henoc (Henoc eslavo)," in *Apócrifos del AT IV* (ed. A. Diez Macho; Madrid, 1984) 147–202; Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism*. For a probable Egyptian origin, see Charles, *APOT* 2:426; M. Philonenko, "La cosmologie du 'Livre des secrets d'Henoch'," in *Religions en Égypte hellénistique et romaine* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1969) 109–16; U. Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitswartung im Hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (BZNW 44; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978) 40. For lists of manuscripts see Andersen, "2 Enoch," 92. Unhelpfully, the argument for a Greek source relies mainly on this text and the historical fact that most medieval Slavonic texts are translations from Greek: A. Rubinstein, "Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *JJS* 15 (1962) 1–21; Pennington, "2 Enoch," 324. This is not to say that the Greek is the language of the original. It could very well be itself a translation of a Hebrew or Aramaic text (Andersen, "2 Enoch," 94). Modern scholarship still disputes whether the known versions come from a unique original translation or several sources. A date in the first century C.E. has been proposed by Charles and Morfill, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*; R. H. Charles, "The Date and Place of Writing of the Slavonic Enoch," *JTS* 22 (1921) 161–63; Rubinstein, "Observations on the Slavonic Book of Enoch," 1–21; Pines, "Enoch," *Slavonic Book of Enoch*, 797–99; M. Scopello, "The Apocalypse of Zostrianos (Nag Hammadi VIII. 1) and the Book of the Secrets of Enoch," *VC* 34 (1980) 367–85; De Santos Otero, "Libro de los secretos de Henoc," 147–202; Andersen, "2 Enoch," 94–95; idem, "The Second Book of Enoch," in *ABD* 516–22; C. Bötttrich, *Das slavische Henochbuch* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1995); J. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1995); Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic*. Andrei Orlov ("Noah's Younger Brother Revisited: Anti-Noahic Polemics and the Date of 2. (Slavonic) Enoch," *Henoch* 26 [2004] 172–187) argues for a pre-70 C.E. date of the pseudepigraphon.

30. Andersen, "2 Enoch," 130–31.

Testament of Dan 5:6 suggests that the author of the pseudepigraphon has taken the hierarchical model of the demonic world from a 'Book of Enoch' (βιβλος Ἐνὸχ):

I [that is, Dan] read in the Book of Enoch the Righteous that your prince (ἀρχὼν) is Satan and that all the spirits (πνεύματα) of sexual promiscuity and of arrogance devote attention to the sons of Levi. . . . (1 *Dan* 5:6)³¹

The *Testaments* refer to a book or books of Enoch eight times.³² Most of these references attribute to the Enochic book(s) traditions that are not found in any extant Enochic texts.³³ The tradition mentioned in 1 *Dan* 5:6, that the spirits battle in particular the sons of Levi, is also unattested in known Enochic writings and it is improbable that 1 *Dan* 5:6 is a direct reference to an extant Enochic text. However, the reference to a book of Enoch in 1 *Naphhtali* 4:1 is immediately preceded by an allusion to the story of the Watchers. Therefore, most probably 1 *Dan* 5:6 should be taken as a broad (and quite imprecise) reference to the Watcher traditions that circulated mostly within Enochic texts. Indeed, as 2 *Enoch* 18:3 suggests, by the first century C.E. the leader of the fallen angels was identified in some Enochic lore as Satan.

2. As seen above, in the *Testaments* the spirits perpetrate specific kinds of sins. This idea bears a striking similarity to the tradition according to which the Watchers taught humans diverse forms of divine knowledge. Thus, in 1 *Enoch* 8:1–3 each of the fallen angels, whose leader is now called Asael, teaches people a different form of forbidden knowledge. Moreover, in the later *Similitudes* (most probably dating from the turn of the era), among the angels that taught illegitimate knowledge, now called "satans" (1 *Enoch* 65:6), are mentioned "those who practice sorcery and the power of enchantments" and "those who cast molten images" (1 *Enoch* 65:6).³⁴ Also, in 1 *Enoch* 69, which adds considerably to the list of revealed secrets, the fallen angels are equally specialized in certain heavenly secrets. Just like

31. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," 809; M. de Jonge et al., *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 108.

32. 1 *Simon* 5:4; 1 *Levi* 10:5; 14:1; 16:1 (in some MSS); 1 *Judah* 18:1; 1 *Zebulon* 3:4 (some MSS mention Moses instead of Enoch); 1 *Naphhtali* 4:1; and 1 *Benjamin* 9:1.

33. See George W. E. Nickelsburg, 1 *Enoch*. A Commentary on the Book of 1 *Enoch*, Chapters 1–36, 81–108 (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001) 96.

34. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, 1 *Enoch*, 84.

in 1 *Enoch* 8:1–3, each kind of knowledge is assigned to a particular leader of the Watchers.³⁵

3. Finally, *T. Reu.* 5:6–7 suggests that the interiorization of the work of the demons, so prominent throughout the *Testaments*, corresponds to a development in the Watchers traditions:

For it was thus that they charmed the Watchers, who were before the Flood. As they continued looking at the women, they were filled with desire (ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ) for them and perpetrated the act in their minds (τῆ δianoία). Then they were transformed (μετεσχηματίζοντο) into human males, and while the women were cohabiting with their husbands (ἐν τῆ συνουσίᾳ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀπ'αὐτῶν) they appeared (συνεφάνοντο) to them. Since the women's minds (τῆ δianoία) were filled with lust (ἐπιθυμοῦσθαι) for these apparitions (τὰς φαντάστας), they gave birth to giants. For the Watchers were disclosed (ἐφάνοντο) to them as being as high as the heavens. (*T. Reu.* 5:6–7)³⁶

This reinterpretation of the union between the Watchers and women departs from the primary Watchers traditions (such as Gen 6:1–4, 1 *Enoch*, *Jubilees*, and the Qumran texts) in two major aspects. First, in the primary Watchers texts the relations between the Watchers and the women do not seem to be extramarital. The texts do not suggest that the women whom the Watchers take for themselves are married. On the contrary, the angels appear to enter into marriages with them. *Testament of Reuben* 5:6–7 contains a clear retelling of the Watchers myth. According to this retelling, the women are married prior to their union with the Watchers. Thus the sin of the Watchers not only violates the pre-established order of nature, but it is also adulterous. Secondly, in all primary versions of the Watchers traditions the Watchers perpetrate their sin through direct physical contact with the women. *Testament of Reuben* 5:6–7 suggests a more complex union.³⁷

35. *Ibid.*, 88–89.

36. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," 785. Greek text from M. de Jonge et al., *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 10.

37. On this passage and on sexuality in the *Testament of Reuben* in general see William R. G. Loader, "Sexuality in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and the New Testament," in *Transcending Boundaries: Contemporary Readings of the New Testament; Essays in Honor of Francis J. Moloney* (Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 187; Rome: LAS, 2005) 293–309; Ishay Rosen-Zvi, "Bilhah the Temptress: The *Testament of Reuben* and 'the Birth of Sexuality,'" *Jewish Quarterly Review* 96 (2006) 65–94; James L. Kugel, "Reuben's Sin with

The women perpetrate the illegitimate act, as Ishay Rosen-Zvi notes, "in the course of engaging in the sexual act with their legitimate partners."³⁸ However, even though the sexual act happens in the mind or through the mind (τῆ δianoία), it is no less real. Rosen-Zvi's proposal that "the women did no more than lust after the Watchers 'in their mind'" and that "mental desire alone" gave rise to the giants misses a more plausible reading of the text.³⁹ The women's union with their human husbands merely supplies physicality to the illegitimate act that is rooted in the mind; the mind takes over the body. In other words, the Watchers impregnate the women through the bodies of their husbands.

In conclusions, an explicit confession by Origen and several parallels between Origen's conception of evil and the demonology of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* suggest that the demonology of the Alexandrian theologian is indebted to the speculations of the *Testaments*. Three central elements of the demonology of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* are particularly reflected in the thought of Origen: the specialization, the interiorization, and the hierarchical organization of the demons. In their turn, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* seem to have developed these elements out of Watchers traditions. A further investigation of early Christian sources will supply evidence that emerging Christian demonologies inherited and developed elements of the Jewish Watchers traditions and that, even prior to Origen, the Christian appropriation and retelling of the Watchers myth generated the central elements of Origen's demonology: the specialization, the interiorization, and the hierarchical organization of the demons.

II. Like Fathers, Like Sons

The Watchers traditions provided for early Christianity one of its aetiologies of evil. Several testimonies suggest that, at least as early as the middle of the second century, certain Christian circles identified the origin of the

Bilhah in the *Testament of Reuben*," in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells* (ed. David Noel Freedman; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995) 525–54.

38. Rosen-Zvi, "Bilhah the Temptress," 76.

39. *Ibid.*, 76. Rosen-Zvi's reading of the text coincides with the one in Bernard J. Berger, *Fallen Angels: Soldiers of Satan's Realm* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1952) 31.

demons in the Watchers story.⁴⁰ The identification of the demons with the giants, the offspring of the Watchers and their human partners, has a central role in this Christian development. The Christian appropriation and retelling of the Watchers myth both preserved elements of the earlier forms of the myth and generated new developments.

The early Christian identification of the demons with the giants is rooted in previous Jewish speculations about the offspring of the Watchers and women. As Loren Stuckenbruck has shown recently, early Jewish sources about the myth of the Watchers do not offer an exclusively negative picture of the pre-diluvian giants.⁴¹ The biblical text is not clear in regard to the status and fate of the giants. There is no explicit condemnation of the giants. Their annihilation is only implied in the tradition that only Noah, his family, and the selected animals survived the flood.⁴² Two of the earliest texts to incriminate the giants in unambiguous terms are the *Book of the Watchers* and *Jubilees*. In contrast to this position, the euhemeristic fragments preserved by Alexander Polyhistor draw a distinction between good and bad giants.⁴³ The *Book of the Watchers* and *Jubilees* also depart from other early Watchers traditions in asserting that the giants survived the flood as evil spirits. In contrast to this tradition, in the *Animal Apocalypse* the giants seem to meet their conclusive punishment in the flood (cf. *1 Enoch* 89:6). There is no trace of the giants in any form, spirit or body, after the flood.

The *Book of the Watchers* suggests that the giants, products of the illegitimate union between angels and women, are ontologically flawed and innately evil (cf. *1 Enoch* 15:3–10). They violate in their very existence and constitution the borders between spiritual and earthly beings.

The giants, who are the progeny of such an illegitimate union and neither fully angelic nor fully human, are called “bastards” (10:9—

τους μάζγρους in Codex Panopolitanus, likely transliterated from the Heb./Aram. ܡܘܙܪܝܢ).⁴⁴

As a mixture of heaven and earth, they are both bodily and mortal, on the one hand, and spiritual and immortal, on the other (cf. *1 Enoch* 15:9). Thus, the deluge only destroys their mortal side, that is, their bodies. Their souls survive the deluge as “evil spirits” (*1 Enoch* 15:8–11—πνεύματα πονηρά) and δαίμονες (*1 Enoch* 19:1).⁴⁵ As opposed to the “spirits of heaven” (πνεύματα ὁράων), who dwell in heaven, these “spirits on earth” (τὰ πνεύματα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) are condemned to an earthly life (*1 Enoch* 15:10).⁴⁶ In their post-diluvian existence they engage somehow naturally, expectedly in activities that violate the preordained order of nature: “The spirits of the giants lead astray, do violence, make desolate, and attack and wrestle and hurl upon the earth and cause illness” (*1 Enoch* 15:11).⁴⁷ Nevertheless, *1 Enoch* 15:12 suggests that, beyond their innate evilness, the spirits perpetrate all these evils against humans intentionally and persistently: “These spirits will rise up against the sons of men and against the women, for they have come forth from them.”⁴⁸

In contrast to the *Book of the Watchers*, in *Jubilees* the giants are wiped out in a war, in advance of the flood (cf. *Jub.* 5:6–11). Nevertheless, just like in the *Book of the Watchers*, the souls or spirits of the giants survive the flood (*Jub.* 10:5). *Jubilees* identifies these disembodied spirits as the demons (*Jub.* 10:1–14). The text suggests that the demons function under divine supervision only to encounter and conform to the evil of the humans and that their power over humans is contained (cf. *Jub.* 10:8–13).

The identification of the demons with the giants resurfaces in early Christian texts. In Justin Martyr’s *Second Apology*, composed around 165, the story of the Watchers is specifically associated with the beginning of lustful passions and sins. Justin stops short of attributing each kind of sin to a particular class of demons, as Origen would do later on:

But the angels transgressed this appointment, and were captivated by love of women (γενεαῶν μίξασιν ἡττηθήσαν), and begat children who are those that are called demons (δαίμονες); and they afterwards sub-

44. *Ibid.*, 364.

45. Black, *Apocalypse Henochoi Graece*, 29–30.

46. For the Greek version, see Black, *Apocalypse Henochoi Graece*, 30.

47. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 37.

48. *Ibid.*, 37.

40. This, however, is not the only early Christian explanation for the origin of the demons. Another theory attributed the fall of the angels to the rivalry between angels and humans (see especially Irenaeus, *Demonstratio* 11–16). This alternative actiology of evil should most probably be viewed as part of the ongoing Jewish tradition about the rivalry between angels and humanity, which is attested in *Life of Adam and Eve*. On this tradition, see particularly P. Schäfer, *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelnvorstellung* (SJ 8; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1973).

41. Stuckenbruck, “The Origins of Evil,” 87–118; *idem*, “The ‘Angels’ and the ‘Giants,’” 354–77.

42. See Stuckenbruck, “The ‘Angels’ and the ‘Giants,’” 355–58.

43. *Ibid.*, 358–62.

duced the human race to themselves (καὶ προσέτι λοιπὸν τὸ ἀνθρώπειον γένος ἑαυτοῖς ἐδούλωσαν), partly by magical writings, and partly by fears and the punishments they occasioned, and partly by teaching them to offer sacrifices, and incense, and libations, of which things they stood in need after they were enslaved by lustful passions (μετὰ τὸ πάθεισιν ἐπιθυμιῶν δουλωθῆναι); and among men they sowed murders, wars, adulteries, intemperate deeds, and all wickedness (φόνους, πολέμους, μοιχείας, ἀκολασίας καὶ πᾶσαν κακίαν) (2 *Apol* 5,3–6).⁴⁹

Προσέτι and the mention of enslavement by passions imply that ones who subdue the human race are the Watchers, although the immediate precedent to the phrase is *δαίμονες*. A peculiar feature of this portrait of the Watchers is the fallen angels' need for sacrifices, and incense, and libations, after being "enslaved by lustful passions."⁵⁰ Similar texts in other early Christian authors will elucidate this obscure phrase farther in this study.

The demons are strictly identified with the giants in this passage. However, a segment of Justin's *First Apology*, produced approximately ten years before the *Second Apology*, suggests that Justin may have included the Watchers among *δαίμονες* at an earlier stage of his theology or may have used the term *δαίμονες* more loosely, to apply to all evil forces. The text reads:

For the truth shall be spoken; since of old (ἐπεὶ τὸ παλαιόν) these evil demons (*δαίμονες*), effecting apparitions of themselves (*ἐπιφανεῖας ποιησάμενοι*), both defiled women (*γυναικίας ἐμοίχευσαν*) and corrupted boys, and showed such fearful sights to men (*φόβητρα ἀνθρώποις εἰδείξαν*), that those who did not use their reason in judging of the actions that were done, were struck with terror; and being carried away by fear (*συνηρπασμένοι*), and not knowing that these were demons, they called them gods, and gave to each the name which each of the demons chose for himself (1 *Apol*. 5,2).⁵¹

This passage does not specifically refer to the Watcher myth. On the contrary, as the use of *ἐπεὶ τὸ παλαιόν* implies, the text seems to refer to the

49. Translation from ANF. Greek from E. J. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1915) 26–77.

50. However, the feature echoes Uriel's warning to Enoch in 1 *Enoch* 19:1 that the spirits of the Watchers will lead people to sacrifices to demons.

51. Translation from ANF. Greek from Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten*, 78–89.

activities of demons in general. Nevertheless, several aspects of the narrative imply that an allusion to the Watcher story has at least informed Justin's understanding here of the activity of the demons in general and that, therefore, Justin includes the Watchers with the giants into the category of demons. First, *μοιχεύω* has a much more specific meaning than the above translation ("to defile") would suggest. It means to commit adultery. The meaning is strictly sexual and the implication is that the subject is married. Justin's use of this verb in relation to a union between angels and women recalls the version of the Watcher myth attested in *T. Rev.* 5:6–7.

Second, as noted above, in all early forms of the Watcher traditions the Watchers perpetrate their sins physically. The fact that the demons produce apparitions of themselves (*ἐπιφανεῖας ποιησάμενοι*) in committing adultery with women further recalls the version of the Watchers myth attested in *T. Rev.* 5:6–7, in which the Watchers appear (*συνεφάνηοντο*) to women in their intimate unions with their husbands.

Third, the depiction of the activity of the demons in this passage contains three major parallels to Justin's reference to the Watcher myth in *Second Apology* 5,3–6. First, in both passages the evil angels subdue the people. This subjugation parallels the evil angels' own enslavement to passions. The angels enact in people their own subjugating experience. Second, in both instances this enslavement is accomplished through fear. Finally, both passages mention a cult of the Watchers. *Second Apology* 5,3–6 explains that the Watchers taught the people to offer them sacrifices. In *First Apology* 5,2 people, ignorant of their true nature, call demons gods and give each demon the name he chose for himself. It appears then that, while in *Second Apology* 5,3–6 the demons are specifically identified with the giants, *First Apology* 5,2 includes the wayward Watchers among demons.

The identification of the giants with *δαίμονες* also appears in the *Testament of Solomon*, a Christian composition that is notoriously difficult to date, although it was most probably composed before the end of the third century.⁵² In 5:1–3 the "evil demon" (*πονηρὸς δαίμων*) Asmodeus is depicted as one born of a woman and an angel. In 17:1 another demon introduces himself as the "lecherous spirit of a giant man who died in a

52. See the discussion in D. C. Duling, "Testament of Solomon," in *OTP* 1:935–87, here 940–43. The testament survives in several Greek MSS, a single Syriac manuscript, and a single Arabic manuscript. The non-Greek sources have yet to be published. The Greek text used here is the one in C. C. McCown, *The Testament of Solomon* (UNT 9; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1922) 5–75. The translation used is Duling, "Testament of Solomon."

massacre in the age of giants" (ὄχεικόν πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπου γίγαντος ἐν σφραγῇ τετελευτηκότος ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῶν γιγάντων).⁵³ Notably, this text identifies the demon with the spirit (πνεῦμα) of a giant, as does *Jubilees* (*Jub.* 10:1–14). Moreover, the death of the giant in a conflagration recalls the giants tradition attested in *Jub.* 5:6–11, according to which the giants are wiped out in a war, in advance of the flood.

Yet, in the *Testament of Solomon* the "prince of the demons" (ἀρχὸν τῶν δαιμόνων), Beelzeboul, is not a giant. According to 6:2, he is an angel (ἀγγέλως). He is the only prince (μόνος ἀρχὸν) of the demons because he is the "only one left" (τὸ μόνον με ὑπολειφθῆναι) of the fallen angels (6:1–2). The only other surviving angel is imprisoned in the Red Sea. The text does not specifically identify Beelzeboul and his companion as Watchers. Nevertheless, the list of Beelzeboul's wayward activity resembles the exploits of the Watchers in Justin's *Second Apology*. Beelzeboul is responsible for the worship of demons, for desire (ἐπιθυμία) in holy men and priests, jealousies (φθόνοι), murders (φόνου), and wars (πόλεμοι) (6:4). Moreover, the demon-giant Asmodeus mentions the position and the throne of his angelic father in heaven (5:4), but does not mention his father, who seems to have perished. If Beelzeboul is a Watcher, the implication of the *Testament of Solomon* 6:1–3 is that most Watchers, with two exceptions, died in the flood or in a conflagration before the flood. Had more Watchers survived this downfall, the demons would have had more princes.

Just like Justin and the *Testament of Solomon*, Athenagoras relates the origins of the demons to the Watcher myth.⁵⁴ Athenagoras refers to the Watchers story in his *Embassy for the Christians* 2:4–2:6, dated to the late seventies of the second century.⁵⁵ Unlike Justin, Athenagoras knows a version of the Watchers myth according to which the wayward angels enter illegitimate relations (no mention of marriage) with human virgins (παρθένοι)—*Embassy for the Christians* 2:4, 5–6). Like for Justin, the act is a permanent subjugation (both use ἡττάομαι for this idea); for Justin this is

53. Duling, "Testament of Solomon," 977.

54. One recent study that analyzes Athenagoras' thought on angels with reference to the Watchers traditions (although it places more emphasis on Athenagoras' use of Greek philosophical concepts) is Dragos-Andrei Giulea, "The Watchers' Whispers: Athenagoras's *Legatio* 2:5, 1–3 and the *Book of the Watchers*," VC 61 (2007) 258–81.

55. For the dating of Athenagoras' *Embassy for the Christians*, see L. W. Barnard, *Athenagoras: A Study in Second Century Christian Apologetics* (Théologie Historique 18; Paris: Beauchesne, 1972) 19; B. Pouderon, *Athénagore: Supplique au sujet des chrétiens et sur la résurrection des morts* (Sources chrétiennes 379; Paris: Cerf, 1992) 23.

a subjugation to the love for women (γονατῶν μίξασιν ἡττήθησαν—2 *Apol.* 5:3), while for Athenagoras the Watchers are subjugated to the flesh (ἡττούς σαρκῶς εὐρέθεντες—*Embassy for the Christians* 2:4, 5). Like in Justin's *Second Apology* 5:3–6, for Athenagoras the demons are the giants:

These angels, then, who have fallen from heaven, and haunt the air and the earth, and are no longer able to rise to heavenly things, and the souls of the giants (αἱ τῶν γιγάντων ψυχαί), which are the demons (δαίμονες) who wander (πλανώμενοι) about the world, perform actions similar, the one (that is, the demons) to the natures they have received (αἷς ἔλαβον συστάσασιν), the other (that is, the angels) to the appetites they have indulged (αἷς ἔσχον ἐπιθυμίας). (*Embassy for the Christians* 2:5, 1)⁵⁶

In contrast to Justin, Athenagoras is careful to distinguish clearly between δαίμονες, who are the souls of the giants, and the fallen angels, although both groups perform similar actions. Furthermore, unlike Justin and like the *Testament of Solomon*, Athenagoras specifically identifies the demons with the souls (ψυχαί) of the giants. This recalls the identification of the souls of the giants with "evil spirits" in the *Book of the Watchers* (1 *Enoch* 15:8–11) and with demons in *Jubilees* (*Jub.* 10:1–14). Another difference between Justin and Athenagoras lies in the emphasis the latter places on the fact that the demons perform their destructive actions because of an innate or natural evilness. This development is further reminiscent of the portrait of the giants in the *Book of the Watchers* and *Jubilees* as ontologically evil. However, Athenagoras' understanding of the Watchers merges with Justin's in one significant aspect. According to Justin's *Second Apology* 5:3–6, the Watchers instituted the worship of idols because they needed sacrifices, incense, and libations, after being "enslaved by lustful passions." According to *First Apology* 5:2 this worship is a cult of the demons as gods. Also, in the *Testament of Solomon* the worship of idols is ultimately a cult of the demonic giants and is instituted by the angel (Watcher?) Beelzeboul (6:4). According to Athenagoras, the cult of the idols is also established by the demonic giants:

56. Translation from ANF. Greek from W. R. Schoedel, *Athenagoras. Legatio and De resurrectione* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).

They who draw men to idols, then, are the aforesaid demons (*δαίμονες*), who are eager (*προσσητηρότεες*) for the blood of the sacrifices, and lick them; but the gods that please the multitude, and whose names are given to the images, were men, as may be learned from their history. (*Embassy for the Christians* 26,1)⁵⁷

Just like in Justin, the worship of idols is associated with a desire for sacrifices. Athenagoras is more specific than Justin and the *Testament of Solomon* and provides in explicit terms the reason for the demons' institution of the worship: the demons consume the sacrifices. Most probably the Watchers' use of sacrifices in Justin's *Second Apology* 5,3–6 should also be interpreted as an act of nourishment. The difference between Justin and Athenagoras is that the latter attributes the idol cult and the need to the demons, whom he identifies as the post-diluvian souls of the giants, while Justin associates both the worship and the need for sacrifices with the Watchers. Athenagoras' retelling of the Watchers myth seems to better reflect earlier traditions in which the giants are portrayed as having insatiable (and illegitimate) appetites (e.g., 1 *Enoch* 7:3–5; 86:5–6).⁵⁸ Among their desires 1 *Enoch* 7:5 specifically mentions the illegitimate consumption of blood. Similarly, in Athenagoras the demonic giants are particularly hungry (*προσσητηρότεες*) for the blood of the sacrifices (*Embassy for the Christians* 26,1) and are “greedy of sacrificial odours and the blood of victims” (*λίχνοι περὶ τὰς κνίστας καὶ τὸ τῶν λεπέων αἶμα*—*Embassy for the Christians* 27,2). In attributing the giants' traditional behavior to their progenitors, Justin seems to conflate further the behavior of the offspring with the actions of their angelic parents.

As Origen would emphasize later on, according to Athenagoras the demons have their own distinct functions or operations (*ἐνέργεια*). He makes this point in reference to the demonic nature of the gods/idols. While all of them incite people generally to evil, their actions are distinct:

And that it is the demons who act under their names [that is, of gods/idols], is proved by the operation of each one of them (*ἢ ἐκάστου αὐτῶν ἐνέργεια*).⁵⁹ For some castrate, as Rhea; others wound and

57. Translation from ANF. Greek from Schoedel, *Athenagoras*.

58. This tradition contrasts with the inability of the giants to eat, despite having the desire (see 4Q330 6.6–7 and 4Q331 17.11–12).

59. I have amended the ANF translation (“the nature of their operations”) at this point.

slaughter, as Artemis; the Tauric goddess puts all strangers to death. I pass over those who lacerate with knives and scourges of bones, and shall not attempt to describe all the kinds of demons (*ὅσα εἶδη δαιμόνων*); for it is not the part of a god to incite to things against nature. (*Embassy for the Christians* 26,2)⁶⁰

For Athenagoras a human,

according to the character peculiar to himself and the operation (*ἐνέργεια*) of the ruling prince and of the demons his followers, he is impelled and moved in this direction or in that (*ἀλλος ἄλλως φέρεται καὶ κινεῖται*), notwithstanding that all possess in common the same original constitution of mind. (*Embassy for the Christians* 25,4)⁶¹

Also, like for Origen, the impelling and moving of humans in one way or another (also in *Embassy for the Christians* 25,3; τὸς ἀθρόπους ἄλλον ἄλλως . . . κινεῖσθαι) takes place both “from within and from without” (*ἐνδοθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν—Embassy for the Christians* 25,3).

In the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*, commonly dated 300–320 CE, the fall of the humans predates the birth of the demons.⁶² Humans sinned by

60. Translation from ANF. Greek from Schoedel, *Athenagoras*.

61. Translation from ANF. Greek from Schoedel, *Athenagoras*.

62. The *Homilies* have a parallel text in the *Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions*. They both recount the life of Clement of Rome, show a similar narrative structure, and share some material. The *Recognitions* are generally dated 360–380 CE. For the relation between the two texts and their possible dependence on the same source, see P. Geoltrain, “Le Roman Pseudo-Clémentin depuis les recherches d’Oscar Cullman,” in *Le Judéo-christianisme dans tous ses états: actes du Colloque de Jérusalem, 6–10 juillet 1998* (ed. S. C. Mimouni and F. S. Jones; Paris: Cerf, 2001) 31–38; J. Neville Birdsall, “Problems of the Clementine Literature,” in *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135* (ed. James D. G. Dunn, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 66; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1992) 347–61; J. Wehnert, “Abriss der Entstehungsgeschichte des pseudoklementinischen Romans,” *Apocrypha* 3 (1992) 211–35; Georg Strecker, *Das Judentum in den Pseudoklementinen* (Texte und Untersuchungen 70; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1981); J. Rius-Camps, “Las pseudo-Clementinas. Bases filológicas para una nueva interpretación,” *Revista catalana de teologia* 1 (1976) 79–158. All translations of the *Homilies* are from ANF. The Greek texts are from J. Irmscher, F. Paschke, and B. Rehm, *Die Pseudoklementinen I. Homilien* (2nd ed.; GCS 42; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1969). On Jewish traditions in the *Homilies* see E. J. Tighehlar, “Manna-Eaters and Man-Eaters: Food of Giants and Men in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies 8,” in *The Pseudo-Clementines* (ed. Jan N. Bremmer; Studies on Early Christian Apocrypha 10; Leuven: Peeters, 2010) 92–114; A. Y. Reed, “Jewish Christianity’ after the ‘Parting of the Ways’: Approaches to Historiography and Self-

being “turned to ingratitude by abundance of food and luxuries” (*Ps.-Clem. Hom.* 8.11). The Watchers originally descended and transformed themselves into humans in order to admonish people of their mistake and punish them (*Ps.-Clem. Hom.* 8.12–13).⁶³ Yet, having become human in all regards, they also subjected themselves to lust (*ἐπιθυμῖα*) and, their fiery substance being extinguished under the weight of lust, turned into flesh (*σάρξ*) and thus had intercourse with women (*Ps.-Clem. Hom.* 8.13). These illegitimate unions generated giants. The author’s high regard for dietary laws is the most probable reason for the following retelling of the myth of the giants:

Therefore God, knowing that they [that is, the giants] were barbarized to brutality; and that the world was not sufficient to satisfy them (for it was created according to the proportion of men and human use), that they might not through want of food turn, contrary to nature (*παρά φύσιν*), to the eating of animals, and yet seem to be blameless, as having ventured upon this through necessity, the Almighty God rained manna upon them, suited to their various tastes; and they enjoyed all that they would. But they, on account of their bastard nature (*ὑπὸ νόθου φύσεως*), not being pleased with purity of food (*τῶ καθαρῶ τῆς τροφῆς*), longed only after the taste of blood (*μόνης τῆς τῶν αἱμάτων γεύσεως ἐγλήγοντο*). Wherefore they first tasted flesh. (*Ps.-Clem. Hom.* 8.15)

For the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*, the flood destroyed the flesh or bodies of the giants, but not their souls (*Ps.-Clem. Hom.* 8.18). The “souls of the deceased giants” (*αἱ τῶν τεθνεώτων γυγάντων ψυχαί*) are allowed to live on under a new name (*Ps.-Clem. Hom.* 8.18), which *Ps.-Clem. Hom.* 9.9–10 identifies as *δαίμονες*. This retelling of the Watchers myth corresponds to previous traditions at three significant points.

First, like the *Testament of Solomon* and Athenagoras and most probably on the basis of the tradition attested in *1 Enoch* 15:8–11 and *Jub.*

10:1–14, the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* specifically identify the demons with the souls (*ψυχαί*) of the giants.

Second, as noted above, for Athenagoras, as for the *Book of the Watchers*, the giants are innately evil. According to *Ps.-Clem. Hom.* 8.15, even though the giants were provided food from heaven in order to avoid dietary and spiritual impurity (for the author these two aspects of impurity are intimately related), they unavoidably long after blood because of their “bastard nature” (*ὑπὸ νόθου φύσεως*). The phrase recalls *1 Enoch* 10:9.

Third, Athenagoras’ retelling of the Watchers myth already developed on the earlier traditions according to which the giants had insatiable and illegitimate appetites and concluded that the souls of the giants, the demons, fulfill this desire by partaking of sacrifices. Together with Athenagoras (*Embassy for the Christians* 26.1; 27:2) and the *Book of the Watchers* (*1 Enoch* 7:5), *Ps.-Clem. Hom.* 8.15 finds the epitome of this depravity in the consumption of blood.

According to *Ps.-Clem. Hom.* 8.18–19, the souls of the deceased giants were subjected to a divine law immediately after the flood. Under this divine law, the demons have no power over humans unless, as an angel explains to the demons, “any one of his own accord subject himself to you [i.e., demons], worshipping you, and sacrificing and pouring libations, and partaking of your table” (*Ps.-Clem. Hom.* 8.19). The containment of the power of the demons recalls *Jub.* 10:1–14, in which the demons function under divine supervision and limitations. Also, like for Justin and Athenagoras, and the *Testament of Solomon*, the worship of idols is a cult of the demons, a submission to the demons. Just like in Justin and Athenagoras, the demonic giants feed on the sacrifices. They need the sacrifices for “power” (*ἐξουσία*—*Ps.-Clem. Hom.* 9.9), a term commonly denoting both authority and resources. *Ps.-Clem. Hom.* 9.9–10 further explains that, by offering sacrifices to demons, people open up their bodies for the indwelling of the demons. A passage that recalls the depiction of the union between Watchers and women in *T. Ren.* 5:6–7 explains how demons use the physicality of the human bodies they inhabit for the fulfillment of their own carnal desires:

Being spirits, and having desires after meats and drinks, and sexual pleasures, but not being able to partake of these by reason of their being spirits, and wanting organs fitted for their enjoyment, they enter into the bodies of men, in order that, getting organs to minister

Definition in the *Pseudo-Clementines*,” in *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (ed. A. H. Becker and A. Y. Reed; Tübingen, 2003) 188–231, esp. 197–201.

63. This role of the Watchers as guardians of the people recalls 4Q330 2.7 and 3.11 (part of the *Book of Giants*), in which the Watchers’ original task was to act as protectors of the earth. On this tradition see Struckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 113–16.

to them, they may obtain the things that they wish, whether it be meat, by means of men's teeth, or sexual pleasure, by means of men's members. (*Ps.-Clem. Hom.* 9.10)

In a way reminiscent of *T. Reu.* 5:6-7, the human bodies function as the substitutes of the demons' own bodies, which were destroyed in the flood. The demons continue to experience the passions they indulged in before the flood through human bodies, in a flesh that is now their own.

The evidence provided here suggests that some early Christian speculations identified the origin of evil in the event of Gen 6:1-4 in awareness of earlier Jewish traditions (particularly the traditions extant in the *Book of the Watchers* and *Jubilees*). Even before Origen constructed his influential demonology, the Watchers traditions provided for some Christian authors an aetiology of evil. The demons, for these sources, were the spirits or souls of the giants.

Moreover, the events of Genesis 6 were transferred from a mythic realm into the domain of the universal human psyche. In this transference, the union between Watchers and women is the beginning of human passions perpetuated in the ongoing battles of the human mind. That initial sin is continuously perpetrated between the disembodied and immortal demons and the human psyche. Now demons torment humans from the inside, to the point of taking over the human body.

Furthermore, also prior to Origen, the Christian appropriation and retelling of the Jewish Watchers myth generated the themes that will take center place in Origen's demonology: the specialization, the interiorization, and the hierarchical organization of the demons.

The Watchers Traditions in the *Apocryphon of John*: Fallen Angels and the Arrogant Creator in Gnostic Mythology

PHEME PERKINS

Gnostic exegetes regularly transform the creator god of Genesis 1-9 into the misshapen, ignorant and boastful offspring of Wisdom's disordered passion to emulate the self-generating activity of the "Unknown Father," the highest spiritual being.¹ In some cases, the "Yahweh Sabaoth" figure, one of the seven offspring of the Chief Ruler (creator), rejects his father's arrogance and is enthroned over his own set of heavens alongside a daughter of Wisdom, Wisdom-Life, between the lower realms created out of chaos and the boundary of the heavenly Pleroma.² The existence of such mediating figures and categories in Gnostic mythologizing has made earlier descriptions of Gnostic exegesis as an anti-Jewish inversion of figures and values in Jewish (or orthodox Christian) readings of scripture implausible. The relationships between Gnostic interpretations of Genesis and their

1. For an introductory summary, see Birger A. Pearson, *Ancient Gnosticism. Traditions and Literature* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007) 101-33; idem, "Jewish Sources in Gnostic Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. Michael E. Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984) 443-81; Nils A. Dahl's description of the arrogant Deminge has been the departure point for subsequent treatments of the classic gnostic treatment ("The Arrogant Archon and Lewd Sophia," in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism. Vol. 2 Sethian Gnosticism* [ed. Bentley Layton; Supplements to Numen 41; Leiden: Brill, 1981] 689-712).

2. *Hypostasis of the Archons*, CG II 95.13-96.3; *On the Origin of the World*, CG II 103.32-106.11; see the study by Francis T. Fallon, *The Enthronement of Sabaoth. Jewish Elements in Gnostic Christian Myths* (NHS 10; Leiden: Brill, 1978).