

**Deuterocanonical and Cognate
Literature Studies**

Edited by
Friedrich V. Reiterer, Beate Ego, Tobias Nicklas,
and Kristin de Troyer

Volume 38

**Wisdom Poured
Out Like Water**

Studies on Jewish and Christian
Antiquity in Honor of Gabriele Boccacini

Edited by
J. Harold Ellens, Isaac W. Oliver, Jason von Ehrenkrook,
James Waddell, and Jason M. Zurawski

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-059588-8
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-059671-7
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-059379-2
ISSN 1865-1666

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
CIP catalog record needed.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2018 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston
Typesetting: Integra Software Services, Pvt. Ltd.
Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

www.degruyter.com

Luca Arcari

1 Giants or Titans? Remarks on the Greek Versions of 1 Enoch 7.2 and 9.9

Introduction

As is well known, from the sexual union between the Watchers and human women the so-called Giants came into the world. In both 4Q201 (4QEn^a) 1 III 16–22 // 4Q202 (4QEn^b) 1 II 20–25b (= 1 En. 7:3ff.), the texts are somewhat mutilated, and the reconstruction of the Aramaic term for the sons of the Watchers is purely hypothetical, based exclusively on a retroversion from the Greek and the Ethiopic texts. In the Aramaic version reconstructed by Milik, the term by which the sons of the Watchers are identified is *gbryn*,¹ more or less corresponding to the locution γίγας μέγας attested in the Greek texts (according to the Codex Panopolitanus [henceforth, G] and Syncellus's version transmitted in his *Chronographia universalis* [henceforth, S]).²

According to Nickelsburg, "Greek mythology appears also to have left its imprint at a number of points of 1 Enoch." Although none of the examples reported by scholars definitively demonstrates this influence, if considered together, they seem to suggest different forms of "contact with material at home in the Greek world."³ A very instructive case for this analysis, according to Nickelsburg, is the narrative of 1 En. 6–11. Following (and, simultaneously, countering) suggestions by other scholars, Nickelsburg argues for a problematic dependence on Greek tales about Prometheus:

1 Josef T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 166. A further development in the story of the fallen angels is found in fragments from the Book of Giants hailing from Qumran, where the Aramaic term for the sons of the Watchers is clearly attested: in 4Q530 15–16 is mentioned a dream of 'Obyah who speaks "in front of the Giants" (cf. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 230, 304–07). In 4Q531 11–8, a kind of summary of the events recounted in 1 En. 6–16, the text emphasizes the idea of contamination mentioning the Giants and the Nephilim as if they were two distinct entities (L. 2: *gbryn wuyyryn*). On the Book of Giants found at Qumran, see also Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translations, and Commentary*, TSAJ 63 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), where some of the restorations proposed by Milik are discussed.

2 For the Greek texts of 1 Enoch, see Matthew Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*, PVTG 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1970).

3 George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch I. A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch. Chapters 1–36; 81–108*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 62.

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110594717-002>

The precise relationship between the Enochic Asael material and the Greek Prometheus myth remains problematic. Is it likely that the Jewish author of the Asael myth read and used mythic material from pagan Greek writings or popular oral versions of this material? Could the Greek material itself reflect Semitic versions no longer available to us? This last option has the weakness of positing a stage in the development of the tradition for which we have no definitive evidence. The first and second options have the advantage of using available evidence. Moreover, the Hebrew Scriptures supply many analogies for the Israelite use and transformation of the common Semitic myth. If one dates the creation of the Asael myth to the fourth century B.C.E., before the reforms that led to the revolt and the persecution by Antiochos, there are no clear reasons why Jews would be reticent to use pagan sources from their Greek environment.⁴

In an essay published some years ago, I have analyzed the account of the fall of the Watchers contained in 1 En. 8:1, as well as the differences between the versions of this narrative contained in both G and S.⁵ In observing how S generally tries to "normalize" the tale of the primordial fall in light of the Genesis account, I have also underlined that the insertion of the detail about the women who "corrupt" the angels attested in S may imply that his source belongs to an Enochic tradition, written in Greek, that is different from the one attested in G. In my analysis, such an Enochic tradition certainly dates to a later, but nevertheless ancient period, and it doubtlessly precedes S and the chronographers that it refers to. In the analysis published in 2012, I claim that the Greek materials preserved in both S and G derive from two different social and cultural contexts. Such a position implies that every analysis of the so-called Greek parallels in the Enochic accounts should be evaluated as a result of cultural operations connected to the different phases of transmission of the texts in different languages. Although in many cases a choice from among the different texts can be necessary as a critical operation for the reconstruction of an "original" text of the Enochic account, in other cases their transmissions should be judged as ideologically oriented. This is the point that I wish to stress in this chapter.

Giants or Titans?

The tale of the union between the angels and the women, in its different versions, is the symbol of the union of two incompatible realities. This is the origin of a hybrid, the so-called Giant, the symbol of a reality that is contaminated

4 Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch I*, 193.

5 Luca Arcari, "Are Women the *aiton* for the Evil in the World? George Syncellus' Version of 1 Enoch 8:1 in Light of Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Works and Days*," *Hen* 34 (2012): 5–20.

and impure.⁶ The imagery of sexual union between two incompatible realities recalls a state of social chaos which subverts the established order. It is not an accident that—beside the angels teaching the women magic techniques and herbal cures—the Giants eat “all the toil of men until men were unable to sustain them” (1 En. 7:3). A further consequence of the subversion of the order of creation is the fact that Asa’el teaches men “to make swords and daggers, and shields and breastplates,” and shows them the way to manufacture “[...] bracelets and ornaments. Then the art of making up the eyes and beautifying the eyelids, and the most precious and choice stones, and all kinds of colored dyes” (8:1).

The protology underlying the account of the angelic fall presented in the Book of Watchers certainly does not represent something unique in the circle of ancient protological traditions. The theme of the influences of Near Eastern traditions in Jewish culture was already dear to the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, as evinced for example, in the work of Hermann Gunkel.⁷ Starting out from a new research perspective which adopts some of the presuppositions which stand behind the aforementioned *religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, rethinking and reformulating them, recent scholars have devoted their attention to the traditions hailing from the Mesopotamian and Babylonian worlds.⁸ Yet, what also undoubtedly emerges at a first glance, in my opinion, is the close similarity between the different Greek versions of the account and some elements that have survived in the Greek theogony.⁹ This emerges especially from the usage of terminology and phraseology well attested in Greek accounts concerning the origins of the status quo.

As others have underlined, in many cases the Greek versions of 1 Enoch have not hesitated to make use of terms drawn from Greek protological narratives,

⁶ On the ideological scheme of the Book of the Watchers, see Paolo Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*, JSJSup 20 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 72–87; Gabriele Boccardini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998). On the giants see also Matthew J. Goff, “Monstrous Appetites: Giants, Cannibalism, and Insatiable Eating in Enochic Literature,” *JAJ* 1 (2010): 19–42.

⁷ Cf. Hermann Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895), esp. 63–64 (the figure of Behemot in 1 En. 60:7–9), 286–93.

⁸ Cf. Helge S. Kvanvig, *Primeval History: Babylonian, Biblical, and Enochic*, JSJSup 149 (Leiden: Brill, 2011); Siam Bhatra, *The Shemihazah and Asael Narrative. Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary, with Reference to Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical Antecedents*, AOAT 322 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2005).

⁹ Cf. the study of T. Francis Glasson, *Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology, With Special Reference to the Apocalypses and Pseudepigraphs* (London: SPCK, 1961); and further discussion in Kelley Coblenz Bauch, *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17–19. ‘No One Has Seen What I Have Seen’*, JSJSup 81 (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

perhaps making use of the same techniques of mediation applied in the LXX. The term for Watchers, *γγρν* (4Q201 i i 3¹⁰) or *γγρ* (4Q202 i ii 3¹¹) in Aramaic, becomes in Greek οἱ ἄγγελοι οὐρανοῦ in G and οἱ ἐγγήγοροι in S.¹² Whereas in this case G appears closer to Gen 6:1–4 LXX (where, however, the Watchers are described as οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ), S employs a term less frequently used in classical Greek,¹³ which succeeds in rendering more faithfully the sense of *γγρν*, a substantive connected with waking/watching (cf. the Hebrew *ר* and the use of the Aramaic in Dan 4:10, 14, 20, 28). The Greek term seems to reinterpret the idea of the regional gods active in the time of Cronus, i.e., beings who have the functions of true divine shepherds, each of which appears so self-sufficient in providing for the needs of his own group that nothing violent can happen: no devouring of each other, no war, no strife (cf. Plato, *Pol.* 271d5; 271e1–2).

As we have seen, the Giants, according to Milik, are presumably identified with the Aramaic *gbryn* (cf. 4Q202 i ii 20¹⁴), a term that refers to the extraordinary strength with which these beings are endowed. G reports a variation between *γγαντες* and *τιτάνες*; S, by contrast, is more uniform in its constant use of *γγαντες*:

1 En. 7:2 G: Αἱ δὲ ἐν γαστρὶ λαβοῦσαι ἐτέκοσαν γίγαντας μεγάλους ἐκ πηχῶν τρισχιλίων.¹⁵
They conceived and bore great Giants of 3000 cubits.

1 En. 9:9 G: Καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες ἐγέννησαν τιτάνες, ὅρ’ ὠν’ ἄλη ἢ γῆ ἐπλήσθη αἱματος καὶ ἀδικίας.¹⁶
And the women generated Titans, and the whole earth was filled with blood and iniquity.

1 En. 7:1 S: Καὶ ἔτεκον αὐτοῖς γένη τρία· πρῶτον γίγαντας μεγάλους.¹⁷
And they bore for them three races. First, the great Giants.

1 En. 9:9 S: Καὶ νῦν ἴδου αἱ θυγατέρες τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἔτεκον ἐξ αὐτῶν υἱούς γίγαντας.¹⁸
And now look, the daughters of men bore sons from them, Giants.

Syncellus uses the term *γγας* also in his introductory summary of the *excerptum* from 1 Enoch reported in his work:

10 Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 150.

11 Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 165.

12 Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*, 21.

13 But attested in Hellenistic Greek, see Manetho of Alexandria, fig. 2 (Waddell, LCL), Eusebius of Caesarea, *Comm. Hom. Il.* 3.238.10 (van der Valk) and, consequently, also in the Greek of LXX: e.g., see Lam 4:14.

14 Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 166.

15 Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*, 22.

16 Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*, 24.

17 Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*, 22.

18 Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*, 24.

Σὴθ ἠγερότατος μετὰ τὸν Ἀδάμ τῶν τηρικαῖτα ἀνθρώπων· οἱ δὲ ἐκ γένους αὐτοῦ διακόσιοι ἑρμῆραι τῷ α τῆς κοσμογονίας ἔπει, τοσαυτακοσίου ὄντος τοῦ Ἰφρεθ, αὐτοῦ δὲ τοῦ Σὴθ φοῖ, πλησθέντες κατέβησαν, καὶ ἔλαβον ἑαυτοῖς γυναῖκας ἐκ τῶν θυγατέρων τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἐγέννησαν τοὺς γίγαντας τοὺς ὀνόμαστούς, ὡς φησιν ἡ γραφή. (*Chron. iust.* 11.7–11 [Mosshammer])

After Adam, Seth ruled over the people of that time. In AM 1000, in Jared's 40th year, the 770th year of Set himself, 200 Watchers of his line went astray and went down and took for themselves wives from the daughters of men, and begot Giants, "men of renown," as scripture states.¹⁹

Among other terms, classical Greek includes precisely the words γίγαντες and τιτάνες (or τιτήνες) to indicate some of the actors of the primordial happenings.²⁰ The first alludes to those beings born from the drops of blood trickling out of the wound of Uranus who had been wounded by Cronus (cf. *Theog.* 185–186), represented by Hesiod as "powerful and great Giants, splendid in arms, with long spears in their hands" (κρατερός μεγάλους τε Γιγαντας, / τεύχεσι λαμπομένους, δολίχ' ἔγχεα χερσὶν ἔχοντας). The second refers, more generally, to ancestral gods, those of the second generation (cf. *Theog.* 424, Τιτῆσι μετὰ προτέροισι θεοῖσιν, 648 [and 668]: Τιτήνες τε θεοὶ καὶ δσοὶ Κρόνου ἐκγεγόμεσθα). Hesiod also provides us with a kind of etymology of the term τιτήνες/τιτάνες. On the basis of its assonance with the verb "to stretch," the poet specifies that Uranus called his sons "Titans" because, stretching out their arms with arrogance, they committed huge wrongs, for which they had paid the penalty (cf. *Theog.* 207–210). While, at least in the *Theogony*, the Giants are a relatively clear and well-defined category, the Titans appear several times in the poem as those who are contrary to the order that Zeus is trying laboriously to establish (cf. *Theog.* 393, 630–631, 648, 650, 663, 668). Moreover, one of the descendants of the titans is Prometheus, son of Iapetus (cf. *Theog.* 507–512), who was enchained, like the Titans, as a punishment for not having acknowledged the power of Zeus (cf. *Theog.* 559–560).

The Greek version of the Book of Watchers contained in G, therefore, employs the terms γίγαντες and τιτάνες without distinction to indicate the sons of the Watchers. This is in contrast with the greater uniformity attested in S. Whereas in Hesiod a distinction between the Giants and the Titans is attested, the alternating

¹⁹ Translation is from *The Chronography of George Synkellos. A Byzantine Chronicle of Universal History from the Creation*, translated with Introduction and Notes by William Adler, Paul Tuffin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 15.

²⁰ On the titans see also the analysis by Jan Bremner, "Greek Fallen Angels: Kronos and the Titans," in idem, *Greek Religion and Culture, the Bible and the Ancient Near East*, JSRC 8 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 73–99.

terminology of G seems to presuppose an association between these groups of divinities, which was well known in the Hellenistic-Roman period in virtue of their belonging to the sphere of cosmogonic divine deeds (cf. Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 360e7²¹). S, by contrast, is more adherent to the account in Gen 6:1–4 as attested in LXX,²² the influence of which has not failed to leave traces also in the terminological uniformity with which Philo—who is usually prone to employ Greek philosophical and cultic terminology—has treated the protological events of Gen 6:1–4 (cf. Philo, *Gig.* 58 and his uniformity in using the term γίγαντες).²³

Variations as mirrors of specific ideological and social horizons

As many scholars have observed in the last decades, G and S are not merely products of scribes and/or authors who engaged in the task of providing word-to-word correspondences from Aramaic and/or previous Enochic traditions. Greek versions preserved in both G and S often show omissions and corruptions, as well as stylistic modifications and cultural adaptations. Hence, tendencies of these

²¹ It is well known that the term "Titans," already in the fifth century B.C.E., was also applied to the "Giants" (see the references to the iconography of the Panathenaic *peplos* in Euripides, *Hec.* 472 and *Iph. taur.* 224), and from this overlap a well-consolidated association attested in Hellenistic-Roman period stems, i.e., Γιγαντικά καὶ Τίτανικά, as it emerges from Plutarch's *De Iside et Osiride*. Despite Plutarch's intention of comparing the Egyptian myths with the Greek ones, setting out a true *interpretatio graeca* of the Egyptian religion, the association Γιγαντικά καὶ Τίτανικά indicates that the tradition on which the philosopher leans upon for his analysis coincides with a particular *relecture* of the ancient Greek theogonies, which he shared, at least in part, with his period. On the myth recounted by Plutarch in *De Iside et Osiride*, cf. Philippe Borgeaud and Youri Volokhine, "La formation de la légende de Serapis: un approche transculturelle," *AR* 2.1 (2000): 37–76. For the association Γιγαντικά καὶ Τίτανικά, see also Philo of Byblos, *FGH* 790 F 2, Epicharmus, frg. 135 PCG, Xenocrates, 21 B1 21–22 DK, and Eusebius of Caesarea, *Præp. ev.* 5.1.9. ²² Cf. Gen 6:4 LXX, where the Greek γίγαντες seems to translate the Hebrew *nēpīlm*. S preserves a portion of 1 Enoch in Greek, not attested in Aramaic or in Ethiopic, in which vaguely identified "sons of the giants" seem to be indicated by the transliterated Hebrew term *nēpīlm* (1 En. 7.2 S = Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*, 22, οἱ δὲ γίγαντες ἰ ἐτέκνωσαν Ναρηλεῖμ καὶ τοὺς Ναρηλεῖμ ἰ ἐγεννήθησαν Ἐλιούδ, "and the giants ἰ begat Nafeleim and to the Nafeleim were ἰ born the Elioud").

²³ Cf. Peder Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time*, NovTSup 86 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 105–12. The term γίγαντες is quite often used in other texts of the LXX: cf. 1 Chr 20:8, Jdt 16:6, Job 26:5, Isa 13:3, 14:9, Bar 3:26, Ezek 32:21, 3 Macc. 2:4.

testimonies must also be considered in any discussion of textual criticism, as, among others, Larson, Nickelsburg, and Coblenz Bautch seem to do.²⁴

My approach, though, is quite different. The variations attested in the multi-form Enochic traditions bring to the fore the varied and multiform nature of the transmission of Enochic material in Greek. If G seems to be a typical product of a late-antique Egyptian private or domestic context,²⁵ S represents an elitist attempt to normalize the tale of the fall of the Watchers through eliminating—or perfecting under a theological profile—the most difficult passages perceived as too invasive. Some examples recalled by Adler appear as indicative: for the passage more or less coinciding with 1 En. 10:7 G, S uses the term ἐγγήγοροι to define the Watchers, a less compromising term than the one used in G, ἀγγελοι.²⁶ For 1 En. 15:9, when the evil spirits that can come out of Giants are described, S gives the following explanation διότι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐγένοντο, which differs from G, διότι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνωτέρων ἐγένοντο.²⁷ The reading attested in S is liable to be interpreted in naturalistic terms. However, the most prominent example is in 1 En. 7:5,²⁸ where S refers to the three races (Giants, Nephilim, and Elioud) that are derived from the union between the Watchers and the women. While the other evidence reports a more “mythicized” tale, which describes the impiety of the giants and their enormous stature, the fact that S contains some grammatical ambiguities suggests that it may represent an

emended or normalized text. Concerning 1 En. 7:2 and 9:9, the variations attested in both Greek versions evoke two different ideological and social horizons: if the alternating interplay (γίγαντες or τιτάνες) attested in G can be explained on the basis of the stratified and multifaceted social and religious context of late-antique Egyptian private and/or household environments, the “normalized” version of S (γίγαντες vs. τιτάνες), clearly based on the terminology attested in LXX as well as on the differentiation remarked in Hesiod’s protological tale, seems to refer to a book-centered elitist context, i.e., the same Byzantine context in which George assumes the role of *synkellos* (Syncellus, lit. “cell-mate”) of the Patriarch Tarasius (730–806).

The overlapping terminology of G appears strictly connected to the late antique idea that stories about the Giants and the Titans, as well as Greek narratives on the Gods as a whole, are stories about the demons. In his *Praeparatio evangelica*, Eusebius of Caesarea, starting from some passages contained in Plutarch’s *De defectu oraculorum* (10, 12, and 16 [414, 416c–417b]), recalls the philosopher’s interpretation of the prophetic and oracular shrines among heathens as the abodes of evil demons:

ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον τοῦτον πιστοῦται τὸν λόγον ὁ Πλούταρχος ἐν αἷς φησι τὰς μυθικὰς ὡς περὶ θεῶν διηγήσεις λόγους εἶναι τινὰς περὶ δαιμόνων τὰ τε παρ’ Ἑλλήσιν ῥηόμενα γιγαντικὰ τινὰ καὶ Τιτανικὰ δαιμονικὰ εἶναι διηγήματα, ὡς καινότεραν ὑποβάλλειν δεινόταν. (Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praep. ev.* 5.4.8.4 [Mras, GCS])

And this argument is still further confirmed by Plutarch, in the passage where he says that the mythical narratives told concerning gods are certain tales about daemons, and the deeds of Giants and Titans celebrated in songs among the Greeks are also stories about daemons, intended to suggest a new phase of thought.

Eusebius also quotes a passage from Plutarch’s *De Iside et Osiride* (25 [360d]) in which the philosopher interprets the events concerning the Giants and the Titans as sufferings of certain mighty demons whom the Greek theologians and philosophers considered to be stronger than men, and far superior in power to human nature:

τὰ γὰρ γιγαντικὰ καὶ Τιτανικὰ παρ’ Ἑλλήσιν ῥηόμενα καὶ πολλὰ τινες θεῶν πράξεις καὶ Προθῶνος ἀντιτάξεις πρὸς Ἀπόλλωνα φυγαὶ τε Διονύσου καὶ Πλάνα Διμήτρου οὐδὲν ἀπολήπουσι τῶν Ὀσριακῶν καὶ Τιτανικῶν, ὧν παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνέδην ἔξεστι μυθολογούμενων ἀκούειν· ὅσα τε μυστικοῖς ἱεροῖς παρακαλυπόμενα τελετταῖς ἄρητα διασφίεται καὶ ἀέετα πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς ὅμοιον ἔχει λόγον. (*Praep. ev.* 5.5.1.9 [Mras, GCS])

Thus the deeds of the Giants and Titans celebrated in songs among the Greeks, and many unholy practices of Cronus, and the contests of Python with Apollo, and the banishments of Dionysos, and the wanderings of Demeter, fall nothing short of the acts of Osiris and Typhon, which one may hear everywhere, made the subject of licentious fables. Also the things which, being veiled in mystic rites and initiations, are kept secret and out of sight, have a similar relation to the gods.

24 Cf. Erik W. Larson, *The Translation of Enoch from Aramaic into Greek* (PhD diss., New York University, 1995); idem, “The Relation between the Greek and Aramaic Texts of Enoch,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery, Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress (July 20–25, 1997)*, eds. L. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 434–44; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 18–20; Coblenz Bautch, *The Geography*, 34–40; eadem, “What Becomes of the Angels’ Wives? A Text-Critical Study of 1 Enoch 19:2,” *JBL* 125.4 (2006): 766–80; and eadem, “Decoraton, Destruction and Debauchery: Reflections on 1 Enoch 8 in Light of 4QEn,” *DSD* 15 (2008): 79–95.

25 Some scholars have argued that G was found in the grave of a Coptic monk. Larson favors a fourth- or fifth-century date, especially on the basis of palaeographical comparison. See Larson, “The Relation between the Greek and Aramaic Texts,” 437. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 70 and Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 12, date G at the end of the fifth or sixth century. The widely accepted view is that the Greek version of 1 Enoch is a translation from Aramaic (cf. Larson, “Relation between the Greek and Aramaic Texts of Enoch,” 439). This does not preclude, however, the hypothesis that G may be a copy of a previously translated Greek text (see Nickelsburg, *1 En. 1*, 18). The monastic provenance of G is countered by Peter Van Minnen, “The Greek Apocalypse of Peter,” in *The Apocalypse of Peter*, eds. J. Bremner, and I. Czachesz, *SECA 7* (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), esp. 17–19. An intriguing approach is that carried out by Daniel C. Olson, “From the Alchemist’s Library? Zosimos of Panopolis and Codex Panopolitanus,” *Hen* 35 (2015): 135–53; the author underlines that glosses in G may plausibly be traced to the alchemist Zosimos of Panopolis or to his students.

26 Cf. Black, *Apokalypsis Henochi Graece*, 25.

27 Cf. Black, *Apokalypsis Henochi Graece*, 30.

28 Cf. Black, *Apokalypsis Henochi Graece*, 22.

In order to explain the normalization based on the Greek narrative of Genesis attested in S, it is possible that such a uniformity aimed at taking sides in the ideological debates inevitably connected with the association between the sons of the Watchers and the *τιτῶνες*. In many interpretative traditions concerning the protological Greek tales, the Hesiodic *τιτῶνες* were the object of a Euhemeristic interpretation: Thallus, the author of the chronographic work titled *Ἰστορίαι*, applied a Euhemeristic interpretation to the struggles of Belus, Cronus, and the Titans against Zeus, considering them all to be humans, and this author was consciously cited by Christian authors, most probably on account of their propensity toward Euhemerism.²⁹ In this regard, as noticed by Lactantius,³⁰ Euhemerus's account of the conflict between the Titans and Cronus, as well as his Titanomachy, was similar to the accounts found in the *Sibylline Oracles* (3.110-154), where the Sibyl states that Cronus, Titan, and Japetus lived in the tenth generation after the deluge and only after the death of Uranus did the conflict between Cronus and Titan, as well as the first war between humans, grow upon the earth. S starts from a "key lexeme"³¹ that is attested in the Greek version of Gen 6:1-4 in order to describe one of the various characters in the Enochic drama, the "Nephilim," the offspring of the angels' union with women, who possess extraordinary powers and are called Giants, trying to define, in a distinctive way, traits and actions that characterize the Giants and the theme of the moral decline of humanity. This is a very seminal aspect of the tales concerning "fallen" Watchers which eventually develop in characteristic ways in Christian demonology.³²

²⁹ FGH II D 835. Latin apologists referred to Thallus when they wished to state that Saturn was a human being: FGH 256 F 4a - c ap. Tertullian, *Apol.* 10; Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* 1.13.8; Minucius Felix, *Oct.* 23.9 (= 21.4). In Tertullian, *Ad nat.* 2.12, he is called "Tactius" but Peter L. Schmidt, "Zu den Quellen der römischen Mythistorie," *StPatr* 19 (1989): 100, n. 3, assumes that "der Name Thallos in der Überlieferung ausgefallen ist." For a complete assessment on Thallus and Euhemeristic traditions in antiquity, see Marek Winiarczyk, *The "Sacred History" of Euhemerus of Messene*, *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde* 312 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013).

³⁰ *Div. Inst.* 1.14.8.

³¹ On the "key lexemes" in the narratives about the fallen angels, see Chris Seeman, "The Watchers Traditions and Gen 6:1-4 (MT and LXX)," in *The Watchers in Jewish and Christian Traditions*, eds. A. Kim Harkins, K. Coblenz Baugh, and J. C. Endres (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014), 25-38.

³² On this aspect, see Kevin Sullivan, "The Watchers Traditions in 1 Enoch 6-16: The Fall of Angels and the Rise of Daemons," in *The Watchers in Jewish and Christian Traditions*, 91-105.