

SIN AND HUMAN ACCOUNTABILITY IN SECOND
TEMPLE JUDAISM

by
Young Namgung

Submitted in fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree

Philosophiae Doctor (Ph.D)

in the Faculty of Theology
Department of Old Testament Studies
University of Pretoria

Promoter: Dr. Ananda Geysler-Fouché

August 2017

DECLARATION

I, Young Namgung, hereby declare that the thesis, “Sin and Human Accountability in Second Temple Judaism,” submitted to the University of Pretoria has not previously been submitted by me for a degree at this or other university and I declare further that this is my own work in design and execution and that all material contained herein has been duly acknowledged.

Full name: Young Namgung

Date: 06, Mar, 2018

Signature:

SUMMARY

Sanders (1977:114) contends that “[s]in comes only when man actually disobeys; if he were not to disobey he would not be a sinner.” This thesis was thus motivated to critique Sanders’s contention in relation to sin and human accountability in Second Temple Judaism. Before delving into various understandings of sin and human accountability of Second Temple Judaism, in Chapter 2, I deal with the *Weltanschauung* of Second Temple Judaism. It was observed that Israel’s covenantal history is far from discontinuous with creation at a time of severe theological, sociological, and political plights in spite of the presence of sin and evil. In Chapters 3, I deal with how the authors of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* understood the presence of sin and evil. Even though the Watcher story in these Enochic traditions serves to attribute the origin of sin to the fallen angels, it was observed the Watcher story cannot quench Second Temple Jews’ uneasiness in relation to the presence of sin and evil. In Chapter 4, I deal with Qumran literature. By focusing on the term *yetzer ra* both in pre-Qumran and in Qumran writings, it is worth noting that Qumran literature shows a tendency to realize the severity of the sinfulness of humanity in a complicated and radicalized manner. When looking at first century Jewish (*4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*) and early Christian (Romans and James) literature in Chapter 5, it was observed that the authors of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* came to develop further pessimistic anthropologies distinct from their predecessors in the Second Temple period. However, for them, a possibility is open for the few righteous remnants to obey divine commandments. It can be said that their understandings of sin and human accountability appear to be synergistic. For Paul and James, however, the paradigm of the relationship between divine agency and human agency is shifted from synergism to monergism in terms of the Jesus Christ event.

KEY TERMS

Second Temple Judaism

Sin

Human accountability

Divine agency

Human agency

Evil inclination

The Song of Moses

History

Time

Creation

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Ph.D thesis cannot complete without the support of others who have guided me academically, encouraged spiritually, and motivated emotionally. I am deeply indebted some people during my journey of a Ph.D study in University of Pretoria, South Africa.

— First of all, I give thanks to God for everything He has done for me during this journey of a Ph.D study.

— Dr. Ananda Geysler-Fouché for her warm hospitality and academic integrity as my promoter.

— My families in South Korea – Jang-Bu Namgung, Jung-Yeon Hwang, Yoon Namgung in Incheon and Yong-Yoon Choi, Young-Ju Lee in Gyeongju – for their persistent prayers and financial supports. Without their support, I could not have begun this journey of a Ph.D study.

— Last but not least, my wife and my son – Eun-Jung Choi and Jin Namgung – for being with me during this arduous journey of a P.D study. It is to them that this Ph.D thesis is dedicated.

ABBREVIATIONS

ANTZ	Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte
AYBC	The Anchor Yale Bible Commentary
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium
BibOr	Biblica et orientalia
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche
CBQ	The Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CCT	Challenges in Contemporary Theology
CEJL	Commentaries on early Jewish literature
CPNIV	The College Press NIV Commentary Series
DCLS	Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
IEJ	Israel Exploration Journal
JAJS	Journal of Ancient Judaism. Supplements
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies
JPSTC	The JPS Torah commentary
JQR	The Jewish Quarterly Review
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSPSup	Journal for the study of the pseudepigrapha: Supplement series
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
LNTS	The Library of New Testament Studies
LSTS	The Library of Second Temple Studies
NCBC	New Century Bible Commentary
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament

NTC	New Testament in context
NTS	New Testament Studies
NTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
OTS	Oudtestamentische Studiën/Old Testament Studies
RevQ	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature
SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBLSS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SJSJ	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SPOT	Studies in Personalities of the Old Testament
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
SUNYJ	SUNY series in Judaica
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha
TBN	Themes in Biblical Narrative
TG	Tesi Gregoriana
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	The Word Bible Commentary
WLAW	Wisdom Literature from the Ancient World
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
YJS	Yale Judaica series

CONTENT

Summary	i
Key Terms	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Abbreviations	iv
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
1. <i>Loci</i> of this study: universality of sin over humanity <i>in toto</i>	1
2. <i>Status Quaestionis</i>	3
3. Sanders and the universality of sin over humanity <i>in toto</i>	4
3.1. Sanders’s approach to Rabbinic religion.....	4
3.2. <i>Yetzer Hara</i> in <i>Sifre</i>	5
3.3. Sanders’s approach to 1QH ^a and 1QS.....	7
3.4. Universality of sin over humanity <i>in toto</i> in 1QH ^a and 1QS.....	9
3.5. <i>Yetzer</i> in 1QH ^a	20
3.6. Concluding remarks	23
4. Outline of this study.....	24
Chapter 2. The <i>Weltanschauung</i> of Second Temple Judaism.....	25
1. Preliminary remarks.....	25
2. Deuteronomy 31—32 as a framework of history	26
3. Song of Moses in Second Temple Judaism.....	33
3.1. Qumran literature	33
3.2. Tobit.....	36
3.3. <i>Testament of Moses</i>	38
3.4. Philo	39
3.5. Josephus	41
3.6. <i>Sifre</i> Deuteronomy	42
4. Genesis 1—3 as a framework of theological anthropology.....	44
4.1. Genesis 1—3 in Ben Sira	45
4.2. Genesis 1—3 in 4QInstruction.....	53
5. Time in Second Temple Judaism	66
5.1. Ben Sira	67
5.2. <i>Jubilees</i>	75

5.3. The <i>Animal Apocalypse</i>	86
6. Concluding remarks	93
Chapter 3. Sin and human accountability in <i>1 Enoch</i> and <i>Jubilees</i>	95
1. Preliminary remarks	95
2. The <i>Book of the Watchers</i> in <i>1 Enoch</i>	96
2.1. <i>1 Enoch</i> 1—5	97
2.2. <i>1 Enoch</i> 6—11	103
2.3. <i>1 Enoch</i> 12—16	113
2.4. <i>1 Enoch</i> 17—36	120
3. The <i>Dream Visions</i> and the <i>Epistle of Enoch</i>	126
4. <i>Jubilees</i>	132
5. Concluding remarks	148
Chapter 4. Sin and human accountability in Qumran literature	150
1. Preliminary remarks	150
2. The Watcher story at Qumran	151
2.1. 1QapGen ar	151
2.2. 4Q180	154
2.3. 4Q510—511	155
2.4. 4Q444	157
2.5. 11Q11	158
3. <i>Yetzer Ra</i> in pre-sectarian poetic texts	159
3.1. 11Q5	160
3.2. 4Q213a	164
3.3. 4Q436	165
3.4. 4Q504—506	168
3.5. 4Q393	171
4. <i>Yetzer Ra</i> in sectarian poetic and covenantal texts	173
4.1. The <i>Hodayot</i>	173
4.2. The <i>Rule of the Community</i>	185
4.3. The <i>Damascus Document</i>	192
5. Belial at Qumran	197
6. Concluding remarks	205

Chapter 5. Sin and human accountability in <i>4 Ezra</i> , <i>2 Baruch</i> , Romans, and James...	208
1. Preliminary remarks.....	208
2. <i>4 Ezra</i>	209
3. <i>2 Baruch</i>	216
4. Romans	221
5. James.....	228
6. Concluding remarks	231
Chapter 6. Conclusion	233
1. Summary.....	233
2. Sin and human accountability in Second Temple Judaism.....	238
Works consulted	240
1. Primary sources.....	240
2. Secondary sources.....	240

Chapter 1. Introduction

1. *Loci* of this study: universality of sin over humanity *in toto*

“What then? Are we better than they? Not at all; for I have already charged that both Jews and Greeks are all under sin...(Τί οὖν; προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως· προητιασάμεθα γὰρ Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας πάντας ὑφ’ ἁμαρτίαν εἶναι...)”¹ Paul the Apostle made a declarative claim in Rom 3:9 before he employed the catena of quotations from the Jewish Scriptures in Rom 3:10-18. In doing so, Paul set the stage for making sense of his famous theologoumenon, that is, “the Justification of the ungodly” in Romans 4.² Briefly put, it stands to reason that a notion of the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* goes hand in hand with God’s salvific economy in the course of salvation history. Hence Carson (2013:22, italics original) is correct in saying that “[t]here can be no agreement as to what salvation *is* unless there is agreement as to that from which salvation rescues us.” Unfortunately, however, there has been no scholarly agreement as to what God’s salvific economy in the course of salvation history is about, especially in relation to sin.

For instance, by probing Tannaitic literature that seemingly conforms to the covenantal nomism, Sanders (1977:114) contends that “[y]et it is important to note that the Rabbis did not have a doctrine of original sin or of the essential sinfulness of each man in the Christian sense. It is a matter of observation that all men sin.” For Sanders (1983:125), therefore, it is logically appropriate that Paul’s claim of the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* should be understood as “exaggerated statement” having rhetorical force. According to Paul’s rhetorical strategy of emphasizing the universality of sin over humanity *in toto*, says Sanders (1983:125), Christ should be introduced as “the universal savior.” In other words, despite the fact that Judaism in the Second Temple period cannot be wrong in their conception of sin and atonement in that “[s]in comes only when man actually disobeys; if he were not to disobey he would not be a sinner” (Sanders 1977:114),

¹ If not noted otherwise, English version is from NASB.

² For more details on Paul’s claims in Romans 3—4, see Namgung (2016), especially chapters 3 and 6.

Paul was at pains to find fault with Judaism in that “*it is not Christianity*” (Sanders 1977:552, italics original). Sanders proposes,

The “pattern” or “structure” of covenantal nomism is this: (1) God has chosen Israel and (2) given the law. The law implies both (3) God’s promise to maintain the election and (4) the requirement to obey. (5) God rewards obedience and punishes transgression. (6) The law provides for means of atonement, and atonement results in (7) maintenance or re-establishment of the covenantal relationship. (8) All those who are maintained in the covenant by obedience, atonement and God’s mercy belong to the group which will be saved.

(1977:422)

The covenantal nomism illustrates that the original sin understood in the Christian sense or the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* proclaimed in Paul’s letters fails to do justice to reflecting Judaism in the Second Temple period.

Accordingly, the aforementioned statement that “[s]in comes only when man actually disobey; if he were not to disobey he would not be a sinner” (Sanders 1977:114) gives rise to our *Leitfrage* of this study: “How would Jewish authors of the Second Temple period answer the question as to whether one becomes a sinner because he/she sins or one sins because he/she is a sinner born with a sinful nature?”

2. *Status Quaestionis*

Since Moo's (1987:306) observation almost four decades ago that "[m]any of us *Neutestamentler* feel that Sanders's proposal fails to do justice to some important elements in both Paul and Judaism, yet feel incompetent to explore the mass of Jewish material. We eagerly await the work of the next generation of scholarship on Judaism,"³ we are now better poised to approach Second Temple Judaism and assess whether or not it is correct that "[it] is a matter of observation that all men sin" other than of the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* (Sanders 1977:125).

In an attempt to prepare for the answer to our *Leitfrage* that how Jewish authors of the Second Temple period would answer the question as to whether one becomes a sinner because he/she sins or one sins because he/she is a sinner born with a sinful nature, it is necessary to pose the three research questions that follow: 1) What is the rationale of Sanders's covenantal nomism in rejecting the universality of sin over humanity *in toto*?; 2) what is the *Weltanschauung* of Second Temple Judaism?; and 3) to what sense and to what extent would Jewish authors of the Second Temple period develop the universality of sin over humanity *in toto*? The first question will be handled in the following section as an initial dialogue partner of this researcher. Both the second and third questions will be dealt respectively with in the following chapters.

The rationale of this study is that both the reconceptualization of the *Weltanschauung*, into which creation, history, and covenant are incorporated, and the intensification of identity,⁴ which is centered on purity⁵, in the context of the Exile, can serve to unveil the heightened awareness of the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* in the Second

³ The motivation of pursuing this study is also from dealing with Paul's theological perspectives, especially in relation to his use of quotations from the Jewish Scriptures in the letter to the Romans, as a *Neutestamentler* in my first doctoral thesis. However, as an *Alttestamentler*, it is acknowledged that Second Temple Judaism should be dealt with on its own right.

⁴ Cf. Nickelsburg (2011a). By dealing with *1 Enoch* and Qumran literature, he comes to the conclusion that "Jewish authors of the Second Temple period saw and described their world in terms of an interaction, or at least a contrast, between polar opposites. Over against the We was the Other" (Nickelsburg 2011a:278).

⁵ See Klawans (2000:199), who states that the Qumran covenanters "sought to maintain their own ritual purity, viewing outsiders as sinners and believing sinners to be ritually defiling. Thus physical separation from outsiders was something to be desired."

Temple period. The objective of this study is, therefore, to look into the ways in which Jewish authors of the Second Temple period dealt with sin and human accountability according to their respective contexts. In doing so, this study is aimed at making sense that the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* comes to play a crucial role, in varying degrees, in establishing important theologoumena of Second Temple Judaism. As a result, this study will serve to bridge the gaps between the Old Testament era and the New Testament era in relation to sin and human accountability. More than that, it is hoped that this study will contribute to better understand Second Temple Judaism.

3. Sanders and the universality of sin over humanity *in toto*

3.1. Sanders's approach to Rabbinic religion

According to Sanders (1977), the Rabbis regarded disobedience as sin and guilt. The fact that Israel was chosen by God's election according to his divine will (i.e., getting in) means that they become obliged to obey the commandments (i.e., staying in). It is in this sense that "sin must be the failure to do so" (Sanders 1977:112). Taking a *qal wahomer* argument of R. Jose's homily in *Sifre* Hobah parasha 12:10 as an example, he insists that "[w]hat was considered important was to obey the commandments, and the cure for non-obedience is repentance" (Sanders 1977:112). All the more "all commandments are equally to be obeyed" (Sanders 1977:112). For instance, *b. Mak.* 23b-24a indicates that the whole Torah can be epitomized to one commandment (e.g., Hab 2:4b) or small amounts of commandments (cf. Str-B 3:542-543). That is to say, at least for the Rabbis, divine commandments are manageable. However, he goes on to say that "the attempt to draw out a governing principle or a few main principles shows that the Rabbis did not relegate the 'weightier matters of the law' to a subsidiary place by their emphasis on the requirement to fulfil all the commandments given by God" (Sanders 1977:114). From the vantage point of regarding disobedience as sin and guilt, Sanders contends that "[i]t is not necessary to discuss here Rabbinic speculation on the origin of sinful disobedience. This sort of theological speculation...lies outside the scope of the Rabbinic pattern of religion"

(1977:114). Contrary to the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* proclaimed in Paul's letters, Rabbinic religion remains open to the possibility that, despite "the inborn drive toward rebellion and disobedience," one might not sin (Sanders 1977:114-115). It is for this reason that he is led to contend that one is not born "in a state of sinfulness from which liberation is necessary" (Sanders 1977:114). Moreover, says Sanders, one is not burdened by "the neurotic feeling of guilt" in that "[i]f he is guilty he can do what is necessary and be forgiven" (1977:115). Sanders goes so far as to pose a question as the following: "Was there a real feeling of uncleanness, of contagion or miasma?" (1977:116). Giving a negative answer to this question, he contends that although "sin was very often characterized by terms indicating impurity and defilement," it is a matter of moral impurity other than of ritual one (Sanders 1977:116). This is because "[t]he vocabulary of defilement and pollution was employed to show the heinousness of transgression" (Sanders 1977:116). Sanders attempts to show that the original sin in the Christian sense or the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* does not fit nicely into the pattern of Rabbinic religion.

3.2. *Yetzer Hara* in *Sifre*

In order to assess whether or not the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* does not fit nicely into the pattern of Rabbinic religion as Sanders insists, it is necessary to look into how the homilists employed the evil *yetzer* in their homilies in *Sifre*. Rosen-Zvi's (2011) study on the evil *yetzer* is instructive hereof. The evil *yetzer* occurs in R. Ishmael's homily in *Sifre* Numbers 88, in which the biblical story of Boaz and Ruth in Ruth 3:6-15 is narrated in terms of the conflict between Boaz and his *yetzer*. According to Rosen-Zvi, despite the fact that "[t]he *yetzer* importunes Boaz 'the entire night' to sleep with Ruth" in a cogent manner, Boaz comes to overcome it competently with the help of a vow in the name of the Lord: "As the Lord lives! – I shall not touch her" (2011:19). R. Ishmael's understanding of evil *yetzer* illustrates that "[h]uman beings are threatened from within" by means of the evil *yetzer*, which does not act as an agent of an "unbridled passion" but as "a sophisticated enticer" (Rosen-Zvi 2011:19). That is to say, the evil *yetzer* is introduced as "an independent entity" in R. Ishmael's homily, which should be distinct from Boaz's thoughts (Rosen-Zvi 2011:19-20). R. Josiah's homily in *Sifre* Deuteronomy

33 also exemplifies Boaz's vow in the name of the Lord in the context of the conflict between Boaz and his evil *yetzer*, along with the other two cases of Abraham and David. According to Rosen-Zvi, R. Josiah's homily illustrates that "[g]ood will is not enough; different strategies must be employed to extricate oneself from the *yetzer*'s wiles and exhortations, such as taking an oath in God's name" (2011:20). Notwithstanding Boaz's vow in the name of the Lord in the context of his conflict with the evil *yetzer*, *Sifre* Deuteronomy 45 indicates that Torah study is more efficient in dealing with the evil *yetzer* than a vow in the name of the Lord. By way of the catena of quotations from Deut 11:18, Gen 4:7, Prov 25:21, and Gen 8:21, says Rosen-Zvi, *Sifre* Deuteronomy 45 "ends with a picturesque description of the evil nature of the *yetzer*..." (2011:21). In several homilies in *Sifre*, the evil *yetzer* acts as "the force that fights specifically against Torah and its study" (Rosen-Zvi 2011:24). For instance, in *Sifre* Deuteronomy 43, in which the second part of the *Shema* in Deut 11:13-21 is narrated, it is made clear that the evil *yetzer* acts as an active enticer leading people astray from Torah study to idolatry and finally to death (Rosen-Zvi 2011:24-25). Rosen-Zvi's observation is suggestive of our dialogue with Sanders's approach to Rabbinic religion: "The rules have changed: the heart is not to blame, for the *yetzer* seduces it from within" (2011:25). When it comes to such a seduction of the evil *yetzer*, he proposes that the homilists in *Sifre*, namely the school of R. Ishmael, approach it in terms of demonology other than in "purely psychological terms" in that "there is an entity in the heart that constantly incites its host to sin" (Rosen-Zvi 2011:26). Taken as a whole, Rosen-Zvi's (2011) study on the evil *yetzer* in several homilies in *Sifre* demonstrates that Sanders's (1977:114-115) contention that despite "the inborn drive toward rebellion and disobedience," one might not sin appears to be untenable.

3.3. Sanders's approach to 1QH^a and 1QS⁶

According to Sanders, 1QH^a 12:33-37 [Sukenik 4:33-37; DJD 40.⁷ 12:34-38]⁸ indicates that “[t]he plight from which one is saved by forgiveness and cleansing is not that one is ‘in sin’ in the Pauline sense, but that one has transgressed the covenant” (1977:279). This is because the conception of sin and repentance in the *Hodayot* should be understood as referring to “wrong deeds” due to “the constant proclivity to sin” other than to spatial transference between the diametrically opposed two states (i.e., “from the condemned state to the covenantal state; Sanders 1977:276-277). Based on both 1QH^a 7:15-17 [Suk. 15:15-17; DJD 40. 7:25-27]⁹ and 1QS 4:19-22¹⁰, he goes on to say that fleshly weakness stained by such a constant proclivity to sin will be remedied only at the eschaton (Sanders 1977:279-280). In doing so, Sanders opines,

(1) Being in the community is the decisive factor in salvation, and the members were conscious of being saved (*gegenwärtiges Heil*) and of being members of the community which lived in the presence of God; (2) this salvation did not remove them from being fleshly; they have no righteousness *vis à vis* God and remain in this sense in human weakness and iniquity (*gegenwärtige Schwachheit*); (3) human weakness does not constitute ‘lostness’ or damnation (*keine gegenwärtige Verlorenheit*); it will be overcome at the eschaton.

⁶ If not noted otherwise, I consult the Qumran texts and its respective translations with García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997-1998).

⁷ The numbering system of the *Hodayot* is not straightforward among scholarly works. Sukenik refers to the old system; DJD to the reconstructed one (Stegemann-Puech). DSSSE, with which this study consults, belongs to the interim one: While it follows the column numbering of DJD, it follows the line numbering of Sukenik's.

⁸ 1QH^a 12:33-37 reads: (33) his approval. And I, dread and dismay have gripped me, all /my bones/ have fractured, my heart has melted like wax in front of the fire, my knees give way (34) like water which flows down a slope, for I have remembered my guilty deeds with the unfaithfulness of my ancestors, when the wicked rose up against your covenant (35) and the scoundrels against your word - I thought « For my offences I have been barred from your covenant ». But when I remembered the strength of your hand and (36) the abundance of your compassion I remained resolute and stood up; my spirit kept firmly in place in the face of affliction. For I leaned (37) on your kindnesses and the abundance of your compassion. For you atone iniquity and cleanse man of his guilt through your justice.

⁹ 1QH^a 7:15-17 reads: (15) to desert all your precepts. *Blank* But I, I know, thanks to your intellect, that [...] is not by the hand of flesh, and that a man [can not choose] (16) his way, nor can a human being establish his steps. I know that the impulse of every spirit is in your hand, [and all] its [task] (17) you have established even before creating him. How can anyone change your words? You, you alone, have [created]

¹⁰ 1QS 4:19-22 reads: (19) of the visitation he will obliterate it for ever. Then truth shall rise up forever (in) the world, for it has been defiled in paths of wickedness during the dominion of injustice until (20) the time appointed for the judgment decided. Then God will refine, with his truth, all man's deeds, and will purify for himself the structure of man, ripping out all spirit of injustice from the innermost part (21) of his flesh, and cleansing him with the spirit of holiness from every wicked deeds. He will sprinkle over him the spirit of truth like lustral water (in order to cleanse him) from all the abhorrences of deceit and (from) the defilement (22) of the unclean spirit, in order to instruct the upright ones with knowledge of the Most High, and to make understand the wisdom of the sons of heaven to those of perfect behaviour. For those God has chosen for an everlasting covenant

(1977:281)

For Sanders, it seems that the Qumran covenanters regarded the awareness of their inadequacy *vis à vis* God as the sinfulness of man *qua* man (1977:281). Given that “the confessions of the sinfulness and nothingness of humanity” comes out from the mouth of the members who belonged to the Qumran community, it cannot be a matter of spatial transference between the diametrically opposed two states (Sanders 1977:281). Thus he comes to the conclusion that “in Qumran man’s ‘fleshly’ nature *does not damn*...One who is in the sect remains in human flesh and participates in the ‘sinfulness’ of humanity, but he is still among the saved” (Sanders 1977:281, italics original). The reason why those who are among the saved continue to sin forms part of the mysteries of God (e.g., 1QS 3:21-23¹¹). However, what is clear to Sanders is that “*these profound views of human sinfulness do not touch soteriology*” (1977:283, italics original). Moreover, taking 1QS 8:13—9:2¹² as an example, Sanders attempts to make sense that the conception of the sin of the Qumran covenanters is concerned with transgression within the covenant (1977:282-283). He goes so far as to say that “[s]in *in which damns* is refusal to accept God’s commandments in the sectarian covenant or transgressing one for which there is no repentance...For practical purpose of the sect’s life, sin remains *avoidable*” (Sanders 1977:284, italics original). Likewise, for Sanders, the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* proclaimed in Paul’s letters fails to do justice to in the conception of sin and repentance in 1QH^a and 1QS. For the Qumran covenanters, their awareness of sinfulness only refers to “the heightened sense of man’s inadequacy” *vis à vis* “the heightened perception of grace” (Sanders 1977:297). Taken as a whole, although both the Rabbis and the Qumran covenanters are different in emphasis from each other, “the basic situation appears to be much the same” according to the covenantal nomism (Sanders 1977:298).

¹¹ 1QS 3:21-23 reads: (21) Darkness is total dominion over the sons of deceit; they walk on paths of darkness. From the Angel of Darkness stems the corruption of (22) all the sons of justice, and all their sins, their iniquities, their guilts and their offensive deeds are under his dominion (23) in compliance with the mysteries of God, until his moment; and all their afflictions and their periods of grief are caused by the dominion of his enmity;

¹² 1QS 8:16-18 reads: (16) and according to what the prophets have revealed through his holy spirit. *Blank* And anyone of the men of the Community, the covenant of (17) the Community, who insolently shuns anything at all commanded, cannot approach the pure food of the men of holiness, [18] and cannot know anything of their counsels until his deeds have been cleansed from every depravity, walking in perfect behaviour. Then they can include him

1QS 9:1-2 reads: (1) Because for {...} one sin of oversight he will be punished two years; but whoever acts impertinently shall not return again. Only someone who sins through oversight (2) shall be tested for two full years with respect to the perfectness of his behaviour and of his counsel according to the authority of the Many, and shall then be enrolled according to his rank in the Community of holiness.

This is because, in most cases, “*means of atonement were available*” to transgressions within the covenant, except for some unforgivable transgressions “(at least according to 1QS)” (Sanders 1977:320, italics original).

3.4. Universality of sin over humanity *in toto* in 1QH^a and 1QS

In order to assess Sanders’s contention that “*these profound views of human sinfulness do not touch soteriology*” by which to dismiss a notion of the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* (1977:283, italics original), it is necessary to look into how the Qumran covenanters employed a notion of the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* in 1QH^a and 1QS. First of all, Bockmuehl’s (2001:399) observation is suggestive hereof: Both the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* and the awareness of God’s initiative in atonement are intertwined with each other in Qumran literature (e.g., 1QH^a 15:30 [Suk. 7:30; DJD 40. 15:33]¹³ and 1QH^a 12:37 [Suk. 4:37; DJD 40. 12:38]¹⁴). According to Bockmuehl (2001:398), the Qumranic notion of justification can be found in 1QS 10—11 (e.g., 4QS^j). Although voluntarism should be counterbalanced with determinism (p.396), it is clear to some extent that 1QS 10—11 is paradigmatic, individual, and forensic in that “the individual offers a forthright confession of his own sinfulness and inadequacy” *vis à vis* God (Bockmuehl 2001:398; e.g., 1QS 9:8-10¹⁵; 1QH^a 7:16 [Suk. 15:16; DJD 40. 7:27]¹⁶ and 1QH^a 17:14 [Suk. 9:14; DJD 40. 17:14]¹⁷). Such a confession of one’s sinfulness, which is an “appeal to the human condition,” gives rise to “the exclusively divine constitution of righteousness and forgiveness” (Bockmuehl 2001:398). While agreed with Sanders that the Qumran covenanters referred sin to human actions,

¹³ 1QH^a 7:30 reads: (30) your truth /you bring/ to forgiveness in your presence, you pu[ri]fy them from their offences by the greatness of your goodness, and by the abundance of your com[pas]sion,

¹⁴ 1QH^a 12:37 reads: (37) on your kindnesses and the abundance of your compassion. For you atone iniquity and cle[anse] man of his guilt through your justice.

¹⁵ 1QS 9:8-10 reads: (8) and the goods of the men of holiness who walk in perfection. Their goods must not be mixed with the goods of the men of deceit who (9) have not cleansed their path to separate from injustice and walk in a perfect behaviour. They should not depart from any counsel of the law in order to walk (10) in complete stubbornness of their heart, but instead shall be ruled by the first directives which the men of the Community began to be taught: Bockmuehl’s translation of 1QS 9:10 is like this: “[m]an cannot establish his own steps, for to God belong judgment (משפט) and perfection of way” (10) בכל שרירות לבם ונשפטו במשפטים הרשונים אשר החלו אנשי היחד לחיטר בהם)

¹⁶ 1QH^a 7:16 reads: (16) his way, nor can a human being establish his steps. I know that the impulse of every spirit is in your hand, [and all] its [task]

¹⁷ 1QH^a 17:14 reads: (14) I know th[at] there is hope, thanks to your [ki]ndness, and trust, thanks to the abundance of your strength, for no-one is pronounced just

he views sinfulness as referring to “part of the universal condition of human frailty” (Bockmuehl 2001:400). In other words, while Sanders contends that one becomes a sinner because he sins, it is more likely that one sins because he is a sinner born with a sinful nature. It becomes clear in that the Qumran covenanters attempted to link ritual purity with the atonement of sin (e.g., 1QS 3:3-9¹⁸). Magness (2002:137-138) is of the opinion that the Qumran covenanters would understand purity/ impurity as “manifestations of the moral state of the individual” with the result that the confession of one’s sinfulness plays a pivotal role in performing ritual washing (cf. Collins 2012:78-81). Dealing with purity metaphors employed in 1QH^a and 1QS, Haber (2008:96-98) attempts to make sense that (1) ritual impurity is coupled with sin; (2) that ritual purity goes along with righteousness; and (3) that purification refers to atonement. Thus it comes as no surprise that God’s salvific righteousness unveils the universality of sin over humanity *in toto*.

Hultgren’s (2007) study on the concept of the righteousness of God in 1QH^a and 1QS is instructive hereof. Moreover, for this researcher, such a concept of the righteousness of God in Qumran literature will play a crucial role in substantiating the thesis of this study in the subsequent chapters so that we will linger on this issue longer herein. By probing the ways in which various pre-Qumranic traditions become intertwined in the present context of the Qumran community, he points to the fact that the Qumran covenanters held “a deepened awareness of the problem of sin” (Hultgren 2007:444). According to Hultgren, the concept of God’s righteousness in the *Hodayot* shows explicit influences from three biblical traditions that follow: “the psalms, the wisdom tradition, and the *Gerichtsdoxologie*, especially the form of confession of sins in the Deuteronomistic tradition” (2007:431).

First, the canonical psalmists’ understanding of God’s righteousness is also found in the

¹⁸ 1QS 3:3-9 reads: (3) on his conversion. He shall not be justified while he maintains the stubbornness of his heart, since he regards darkness as paths of light. In the source of the perfect (4) he shall not be counted. He will not become clean by the acts of atonement, nor shall he be purified by the cleansing waters, nor shall he be made holy by seas (5) or rivers, nor shall he be purified by all the water of ablution. Defiled, defiled shall he be all the days he spurns the decrees (6) of God, without allowing himself to be taught by the Community of his counsel. For it is by the spirit of the true counsel of God that are atoned the paths of man, all (7) his iniquities, so that he can look at the light of life. And it is by the holy spirit of the community, in its truth, that he is cleansed of all (8) his iniquities. And by the spirit of uprightness and of humility his sin is atoned. And by the compliance of his soul with all the laws of God (9) his flesh is cleansed by being sprinkled with cleansing waters and being made holy with the waters of repentance. May he, then, steady his steps in order to walk with perfection

Hodayot:¹⁹ (1) God's righteousness connotes that God acts as a just judge in 1QH^a 17:33 [Suk. 9:33; DJD 40. 17:33] (Hultgren 2007:432).

(33) Your just rebuke (תוכחת צדקכה) is with my ..., your wholesome watch has saved my soul, with my steps (1QH^a 17:33)

The similar expression of תוכחת צדקכה also occurs in 1QH^a 10:4 [Suk. 2:4; DJD 40. 10:6] and 1QH^a 14:4 [Suk. 6:4; DJD 40. 14:7].²⁰ In other words, God's righteousness as a just judge reverberates divine justice in judging in the canonical psalms. (2) In 1QS 11:12, one's judgment becomes paralleled with one's salvation just as divine mercy goes along with divine righteousness.

(12) I stumble, the mercies of God (חסדי אל) shall be my salvation (ישועתי) always; and if I fall in the sin of the flesh, in the justice of God (צדקת אל), which endures eternally, shall my judgment be (משפטי); (1QS 11:12)

Thus God's righteousness is, says Hultgren, "God's acting (in power) to save" (2007:432). Besides, in 1QS 10:11-12, God's righteousness refers to the divine gift proffered to the *Maskil* (Hultgren 2007:433).

(11) my limit without turning away. I acknowledge his judgment to be right according to my pervertedness; my sins are before my eyes, like an engraved decree. To God I shall say: « My justice (צדקי) », (12) and to the Most High: « Establisher of my well-being », « source of knowing », « spring of holiness », « peak of glory », « all-powerful one of eternal majesty »... (1QS 10:11-12)

Given that God as my justice/ righteousness (צדקי) is accompanied with the three epithets referring God to the source of well-being, knowing, and holiness, Hultgren is of the opinion that "we may take the epithet 'my righteousness' for God also as pointing to God

¹⁹ I.e., (1) God's justice in judging in Pss 9:5, 9; 72:2; 96:13; 98:9; (2) God's faithfulness in Ps 143:1; (3) God's covenantal faithfulness in Pss 7:17; 31:2; 35:24, 28; 51:16; 71:2, 15, 24; 143:11; (4) God's salvation in Pss 40:11; 65:6; (5) God's victory in Ps 98:2; and (6) "the gift of righteousness that God gives to people" in Pss 24:5; 72:1 (pp. 431-432).

²⁰ 1QH^a 10:4 reads: (4) [... and] you place [truth before my eyes and the reprove]rs {of truth} /of justice/ in all [...]
1QH^a 14:4 reads: (4) [... and] you place [truth before my eyes and the reprove]rs {of truth} /of justice/ in all [...]

as the source of righteousness” (2007:433). That is to say, God’s righteousness as a just judge in 1QH^a appears to be conceptually congenial to God’s righteousness as divine salvation and the divine gift in 1QS. (3) In 1QH^a 6:15-16 [Suk. 14:15-16; DJD 40. 6:26-27], God’s righteousness goes hand in hand with God’s victory (Hultgren 2007:433-434).

(15) and all who know you do not change your words. For you are just, and all your chosen ones are truth. All injustice (16) [and wick]edness you obliterate for ever, and your justice is revealed (וּנְגַלְתָּה צְדָקָתְךָ) to the eyes of all your creatures. *Blank*” (1QH^a 6:15-16)

The hymnist in the *Hodayot* would allude to Ps 98:2 in 1QH^a 6:16: “The LORD has made known his victory, he has revealed his vindication (גִּלְתָּה צְדָקָתוֹ) in the sight of the nations (לְעֵינֵי הַגּוֹיִם)” (Hultgren 2007:433). The hymnist attempted to transpire such a praise of divine victory as God’s righteousness into the eschatological plane – from the eyes of the nations to the eyes of all creatures. Thus he comes to the conclusion that “this eschatological victory will constitute the vindication of God as creator of the world” (Hultgren 2007:434).

Second, the influence of the wisdom tradition on the Qumran community is well pointed. Dualism or dualistic ways of thinking of the Qumran community can be traced back to the wisdom tradition.²¹ Such dualism of the Qumran community makes sense that, in CD 2:1-13²² and 1QS 3:15²³, divine sovereignty in election comes to the forefront as the

²¹ Hultgren (2007:320) concedes that “[r]ecent scholarship has made clear that the origins of Qumran dualism are multiple and complex, not single or unilinear.” He goes on to say that “[a]lthough the influence of Persian dualism cannot be completely ruled out,” Zoroastrianism comes to be less favored (*pace* García Martínez 2007a:227-241). It is more appropriate that the origin of Qumran dualism should be found in Palestinian Jewish tradition. According to Hultgren (2007:320), the probable Palestinian Jewish tradition is as the following: “(1) dualism from priestly circles, probably related to the Enoch tradition...(2) dualism from the sapiential tradition; and (3) dualism from the eschatological war tradition...”; see also Xeravits (ed) (2010).

²² CD 2:1-9 reads: (1) God against their congregation, laying waste all its great number, for their deeds were unclean in front of him. (2) *Blank* And now, listen to me, all who enter the covenant, and I will open your ears to the paths of (3) the wicked. *Blank* God loves knowledge; he has established wisdom and counsel before him; (4) prudence and knowledge are at his service; patience is his and abundance of pardon, (5) to atone for those who repent from sin; however, strength and power and a great anger with flames of fire (6) by the «hand» of all the angels of destruction against those turning aside from the path and abominating the precept, without there being for them either a remnant (7) or survivor. For God did not choose them at the beginning of the world, and before they were established he knew (8) their deeds, and abominated the generations on account of blood and hid his face from the land, (9) from «Israel», until their extinction...

²³ 1QS 3:15 reads: (15) the times of their reward. From the God of knowledge stems all there is and all there shall be. Before they existed he established their entire design.

means by which the Qumran covenanters could substantiate the divine predestination of the righteous and the wicked (Hultgren 2007:434; cf. e.g., Collins 1999, 2003). The wisdom tradition encompasses two distinct strands of theological anthropology: (1) The choosing of walking in the way of righteousness appears to remain within the purview of the human capacity to some extent (Hultgren 2007:434). For instance, Prov 8:20 reads: “I walk in the way of righteousness (בְּאֶרְחֵי צְדָקָה), In the midst of the paths of justice (בְּתוֹךְ נְתִיבוֹת מִשְׁפָּט)” (e.g., Ps 1). Moreover, in Sir 15:11-20, both the human capacity and his ensuing responsibility in choosing what is just are stressed in the context of defending theodicy.

(14) It was he who created man in the beginning, and he left him in the power of his own inclination. (15) If you will, you can keep the commandments, and to act faithfully is a matter of your own choice... (18) For great is the wisdom of the Lord; he is mighty in power and sees everything;. (19) his eyes are on those who fear him, and he knows every deed of man. (20) He has not commanded any one to be ungodly, he has not given any one permission to sin. (Sir 15:14-15, 18-20 RSV)

Thus it is made clear in Prov 12:28 that a way to life is contingent on walking in the way of righteousness: “In the way of righteousness is life, And in its pathway there is no death.” The similar expression of walking in perfection also repeatedly occurs in the Proverbs (e.g., Prov 10:9; 11:20; 20:7; 28:18). The explicit influence of this sort of the wisdom tradition can be found in 1QS 1:8; 2:2; 3:9-10; 4:22 (Hultgren 2007:434).

(8) into the covenant of kindness; in order to be united in the counsel of God and walk in perfection in his sight, complying with all (ולדהתהלך לפניו תמים כול) (1QS 1:8)

(2) the men of God’s lot who walk unblemished in all his paths (ההולכים תמים בכול) (1QS 2:2) and they shall say: « May he bless you with everything... (1QS 2:2)

(9) his flesh is cleansed by being sprinkled with cleansing waters and being made holy with the waters of repentance. May he, then, steady his steps in order to walk with perfection (10) on all the paths of God, as he has decreed concerning the appointed times of his assemblies and not turn aside, either right or left, nor (1QS

3:9-10)

(22) of the unclean spirit, in order to instruct the upright ones with knowledge of the Most High, and to make understand the wisdom of the sons of heaven to those of perfect behaviour. For those God has chosen for an everlasting covenant (1QS 4:22)

These passages from the *Rule of the Community* indicate that the dualism of the Qumran community hinges on God's sovereignty in election according to which both the righteous and the wicked are predestinated. Then, God's dealings with both the righteous, who walks in the way of righteousness and rejects the way of sin, and the wicked, who stands in contrast to the righteous, appears to comport with God's righteousness. Moreover, voluntarism cannot be dissolved into determinism in that the Qumran covenanters repeatedly resorted to the human capacity of walking in the way of righteousness with perfection in these passages. Hence Hultgren is correct in saying that "[i]t is no surprise, then, that the wisdom tradition's understanding of God's righteousness also entered into the community's thought" (2007:434).

However, that is not to say that theological anthropology in the Qumran community appears to be always affirmative (i.e., the human capacity in choosing what is just). (2) According to Hultgren, "there is also in the wisdom tradition a profound sense of the unworthiness of humanity before God" (2007:434). For instance, Job 25:4-6 reads: "How then can a man be just with God? (מִהָיִצְדִּיק אֲנִי וְעַם-אֱלֹהִים) Or how can he be clean who is born of woman? If even the moon has no brightness And the stars are not pure in His sight, How much less man, that maggot, And the son of man, that worm (בְּרִי-אִתָּם תוֹלְעָה)!" Thus such profound awareness of one's inability to be righteous with God would also have influenced substantiating theological anthropology in the Qumran community. This sort of the wisdom tradition can be found both in 1QS 10—11 and in the *Hodayot* (Hultgren 2007:434). First of all, the *Rule of the Community* appears to be explicit in this regard.

(9) future ages. However, I belong to evil humankind (אֲנִי מִן-הַרְשָׁעִים), to the assembly

of unfaithful flesh (סוד בשר עיל); my failings, my iniquities, my sins, { ... } with the depravities of my heart, (10) belong to the assembly of worms (מגדל מלך) and of those who walk in darkness. For to man (does not belong) his path, nor can a human being steady his step; since the judgment belongs to God, and from his hand (11) is the perfection of the path. By his knowledge everything shall come into being, and all that does exist he establishes with his calculations and nothing is done outside of him. *Blank* As for me, if (1QS 11:9-11)

(20) your might. Who can endure your glory? What, indeed, is the son of man (בן האדם), among all your marvellous deeds? (21) As what shall one born of woman (ילוד אשה) be considered in your presence? Shaped from dust (הואה מעפר) has he been, maggots' food shall be his dwelling; he is spat saliva, (1QS 11:20-21)

Then it is made clear that there is a thematic coherence between Job and the *Hodayot* in that the hymnist employed similar expressions of confessing “the unworthiness of humans before God” (Hultgren 2007:435).²⁴

(19) work of iniquity. I know that no-one besides you is just (לא יצדק איש מבלעדך). I have appeased your face by the spirit which you have placed [in me,] to lavish (1QH^a 8:19 [Suk. 16:11; DJD 40. 8:29])

Such profound awareness of one's inability to be righteous with God goes hand in hand with one's confession of sinfulness. Hence Hultgren is correct in saying that the wisdom tradition of confessing the unworthiness of humanity before God in the Qumran community would have a tendency to be easily “combined with other expressions for the frailty, sinfulness, and impurity of humanity as created beings” (2007:435). Hultgren goes on to say that both a “foundation of shame” (סוד הערובה) and a “source of impurity” (מקור הנדה) in 1QH^a 9:22 [Suk.1:22; DJD 40. 9:24], for instance, serve to refer “created human nature” to “nothing more than the human's low state” (2007:436). The phrase, a “foundation of shame” (סוד הערובה) shows a thematic coherence of a similar expression in Job 10:15, “sated with disgrace” (שבע קלון), which is alluded to in 1QH^a 5:21 [Suk.13:15;

²⁴ For a thematic coherence between Job and the *Hodayot*, see Hultgren (2007:435-436).

DJD 40. 5:32], “his counsel is...shame of dishonor...” (סודו ערות קלן). In Job 10:15, the phrase שָׂבַע קָלוֹן, “sated with disgrace,” is used to “speak of his humble origin and his future” (Hultgren 2007:436). Then, the phrase מִקּוֹר הַנְּדָה, a “source of impurity”, is more likely used to assess “the state of the human being apart from God’s justification” than it is used to connote sexual impurity to some extent (Hultgren 2007:436). This is because, for the Qumran covenanters, “purity was possible only within the *yahad*” (Hultgren 2007:436; cf. 1QS 3:3-9).²⁵

Taken as a whole, it comes as no surprise that these two distinct strands of theological anthropology in the wisdom tradition in the Qumran community can help us to understand how the Qumran covenanters would interpret scriptural traditions in an attempt to substantiate a concept of the righteousness of God according to their present contexts. Hultgren’s observation is worth citing in full.

The result is that in their understanding of things, unrighteousness and righteousness are two possibilities for human existence. It does not lie in human’s own power, however, to make himself righteous; it can only come as a gift from God. In and of himself the human is not and cannot be righteous, but God in his mercy enables the human to be righteous.

(2007:437-438)

Third, Kuhn’s (1966:27) observation on the genre of the *Hodayot* is instructive hereof: “Als nächstes ist ein Gattungselement zu nennen, das in zwei verschiedenen Ausprägungen vorkommt, entweder als *Niedrigkeitsdoxologie* oder als *Elendsbetrachtung*.” Then it is more likely that the *Hodayot* belongs to the category of

²⁵ It is of interest to note that Hultgren (2007:436-437) points out that there may be a possible influence of the Enoch tradition (1 *En.* 15:8-16:3 and *Jub.* 7:20-33; 11:4). The Enoch tradition will be dealt with in detail in the subsequent chapters.

1QS 3:3-9 reads: (3) on his conversion. He shall not be justified while he maintains the stubbornness of his heart, since he regards darkness as paths of light. In the source of the perfect (4) he shall not be counted. He will not become clean by the acts of atonement, nor shall he be purified by the cleansing waters, nor shall he be made holy by seas (5) or rivers, nor shall he be purified by all the water of ablution. Defiled, defiled shall he be all the days he spurns the decrees (6) of God, without allowing himself to be taught by the Community of his counsel. For it is by the spirit of the true counsel of God that are atoned the paths of man, all (7) his iniquities, so that he can look at the light of life. And it is by the holy spirit of the community, in its truth, that he is cleansed of all (8) his iniquities. And by the spirit of uprightness and of humility his sin is atoned. And by the compliance of his soul with all the laws of God (9) his flesh is cleansed by being sprinkled with cleansing waters and being made holy with the waters of repentance. May he, then, steady his steps in order to walk with perfection

the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologie* in that it entails a doxology unlike the *Elendsbetrachtung*. Kuhn goes on to say that the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologie* not only corresponds to the *Gerichtsdoxologie* in Daniel, but also refers to “das betreffende Gattungselement der Lieder” in scriptural traditions (e.g., Exod 9:27-28; Lam 1:18-22; Job 4—5; Ezra 9; Neh 9; Dan 3:31—4:34; 9; p.27). Along with the canonical psalms and the wisdom tradition, the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologie* serves to make sense of a concept of the righteousness of God in the Qumran community in that, says Kuhn, “[i]m AT handelt es sich um ein Schuldbekenntnis, das mit einer Doxologie, die im besonderen Jahwes “Gerechtigkeit” ausspricht, verbunden ist” (1966:27). Thus the confession of the nothingness of humanity (i.e., “die kreatürliche Nichtigkeit des Menschen”), “along with reflection on the problem of sin from other traditions,” can arouse the hymnist’s awareness of sinfulness in the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien* (Hultgren 2007:439). As a result, Hultgren (2007:439) is of the opinion that “existence in the flesh (בשר) comes to be closely connected with sin” (cf. 1QS 11:9, 12). For instance,

(30) for ever and ever. *Blank* In the mysteries of your insight [you] have apportioned all these things, to make your glory known. [However, what is] the spirit of flesh (רוח בשר) to understand (31) all these matters and to have insight in [your wondrous] and great counsel? What is someone born of a woman (ליל אשה) among all your awesome works? He is (31) a structure of dust fashioned with water (מבנה עפר ומגבל מים), his counsel is the [iniquity] of sin, shame of dishonor (ערות קלן) and so[urce of] impurity (מקור נדר), and a depraved spirit rules (33) over him. *Blank* If he acts wickedly, he will be an eternal [sign,] a portent for generations, shame [for all] flesh. Only by your goodness (1QH^a 5:19-22 [Suk. 13:13-16; DJD 40. 5:30-33])

Then it is made clear that, for the hymnist in the *Hodayot*, the notion of the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* can play an important role in substantiating a concept of the righteousness of God according to their present contexts. This is because the hymnist would follow the trails of the confession of sin in the Deuteronomistic tradition that “in his righteousness God first punishes sins and then brings restoration” as is clearly seen both in Solomon’s prayer in 1 Kgs 8:46-53 and in Daniel’s prayer in Dan 9:4-19 (Hultgren 2007:442).

In summary, Hultgren’s (2007) study on a concept of the righteousness of God in the Qumran community demonstrates that the Qumran covenanters’ awareness of sinfulness cannot be regarded as rhetorical with reference to the sublimity of God (*pace* Sanders 1977). Theological anthropology in the Qumran community should be understood as being influenced by the three traditions: the canonical psalms, the wisdom tradition, and the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologie*.²⁶ The *Niedrigkeitsdoxologie* points to the notion of the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* according to which the hymnist could make sense of the righteousness of God. The wisdom tradition gives a glimpse of “an anthropological basis (human frailty) for understanding that sinfulness” (Hultgren 2007:443). These two traditions should be in line with the Deuteronomistic tradition, which is covenantal and holds “absolute confidence in God’s righteousness in upholding his promise to restore repentant Israel” (Hultgren 2007:443).

The same tendency in dealing with the righteousness of God and the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* can be found in 1QS 9:26—11:22. Briefly put, 1QS 9:26—11:22 can be divided into the three subsections according to their respective literary styles. Only QS 10:6—11:2b appears to be “marked by repeated first-person singular declarations in the imperfect tense” (Hultgren 2007:427). Although Morawe (1963:330), dealing with the structure of the *Danklieder* and the *Bekennetnislieder* in the *Hodayot*, attempts to assign 1QS 10:9—11:1 as the *Gelübde*, Hultgren’s observation is more appropriate for the structure of the 1QS 9:26—11:22. Of such declarations of the the *Gelübde* (1QS 10:6—11:2b), the *Maskil* made an explicit declaration concerning the righteousness of God and the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* in 1QS 10:23-24 as the hymnist did in the *Hodayot*.

(23) shall not be found on it. With hymns (תְּהִלָּה) shall I open my mouth and my tongue will continually recount both the just acts of God (צְדָקוֹת אֱלֹהִים) and the unfaithfulness of men (מַעַל אֲנָשִׁים) until their iniquity (פְּשָׁעָם) is complete. (24) I shall remove from my lips worthless words, unclean things and plotting from the

²⁶ It should be borne in mind that the Qumran covenanters would transpire these three influences into the apocalyptic plane.

knowledge of my heart. With prudent counsel {I shall hide} /I shall recount/
knowledge, (1QS 10:23-24)

The *Maskil*'s declaration in 1QS 10:23-24 becomes clearer in 1QS 11:2-15a, which belongs to the *Danklieder* and the *Bekennnislieder* in Morawe's study. According to Morawe (1963:330), 1QS 11:2-15a can be divided into the three subsections: 11:2-8 ("*Reflexion*"), 11:9-11 ("*Elendsmotiv*"), 11:12-13a (a similar element of the *Not-Rettungsberichten*"), and 11:13b-15a ("*Reflexion*"). The two sections of the *Reflexion* are concerned with "die Rechtfertigung, die allein durch Gottes Erbarmen und Huld eintreten kann" (Morawe 1963:331). This is because the *Maskil* did beware of his belonging to the "Rest der Gemeinde Gottes" [= the Qumran community], it comes as no surprise that "so muss er auch seine Errettung von der Unreinheit und Sündenschuld lobend verkünden und für die geschenkte Erkenntnis danken" (Morawe 1963:331). Contrary to this *Reflexion* of the righteousness of God, the *Elendsmotiv* in 1QS 11:9-11 serves to highlight one's awareness of sinfulness and unworthiness of humanity, which appears to be in line with the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologie* in the *Hodayot*.

(9) future ages. However, I belong to evil humankind (אדם רשע), to the assembly of unfaithful flesh (ל'סוד בשר עול); my failings, my iniquities, my sins, { ... } with the depravities of my heart, (10) belong to the assembly of worms (סוד גמול) and of those who walk in darkness. For to man (does not belong) his path, nor can a human being steady his step; since the judgment belongs to God (לאל המשפט), and from his hand (11) is the perfection of the path (תום הדרך). By his knowledge everything shall come into being, and all that does exist he establishes with his calculations and nothing is done outside of him. *Blank* As for me, if (1QS 11:9-11)

Hence Hultgren (2007:427) is correct in saying that "the focus of this section is reflection on the faithfulness of God in delivering from sin (*Reflexion*) and on the sinfulness and lowliness of humanity (*Elendsmotiv*).” For both the *Maskil* in 1QS and the hymnist in 1QH^a, the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* plays an important role in substantiating the righteousness of God according to their respective contexts.

3.5. *Yetzer* in 1QH^a

According to Rosen-Zvi (2011:45), both rabbinic *yetzer* and Qumranic *yetzer* are concerned with “the source of sin and evil in this world.”²⁷ While this sort of a discussion concerning the source of sin and evil in the Second Temple period tends to be centered on that which both rabbinic *yetzer* and Qumranic *yetzer* have in common with each other, the evil *yetzer* in Qumran literature should be understood in terms of dualism or dualistic ways of thinking of the Qumran community. Granted that, “even if *yetzer* is not a completely defined term at Qumran, It plays there a rather fixed role and appears in limited contexts” (Rosen-Zvi 2011:48). While the term *yetzer* (יצר) in scriptural traditions refers to the thought, Qumranic *yetzer* is oftentimes interchangeable with the heart. But rabbinic *yetzer* appears to be equal with the heart itself (Rosen-Zvi 2011:48).

In the *Hodayot*, the term *yetzer* is less frequently used neutrally or positively (e.g., 1QH^a 15:13, 16 [Suk. 7:13, 16; DJD 40. 15:13, 19]).²⁸ In most of its appearances, the term *yetzer* has a pessimistic bearing on theological anthropology. For instance,

(19) As for me, a source of bitter sorrow has opened for me, [...] grief has not been hidden from my eyes, (20) when I knew man's inclinations (בְּלִעְתֵּי יִצְרֵי גִבְרִי). [I considered] the response of mankind [and paid attention] to sin and the anguish (21) of guilt. These things have entered my heart, they have penetrated my bones, to [...] and to ponder in meditation (22) of anguish. /I have sighed on the harp of lament for every sorrow of anguish,/ with bitter wailing, until iniquity be destroyed, and [...], and there be no more ravaging diseases. Then (1QH^a 19:19-22 [Suk. 11:16-19; DJD 40. 19:22-25])

Hence Rosen-Zvi is correct in saying that the term *yetzer* in the *Hodayot* “is thus not essentially evil, but an expression of the basis shameful state of humans, creatures of clay”

²⁷ Rosen-Zvi (2011:45) states that “rabbinic *yetzer* is much closer to the Qumranic one than previously believed.” See also Collins (2002: esp. chapter 3).

²⁸ 1QH^a 15:13 reads: (13) For you know the inclination of every creature (כֹּל יִצְרֵי מֵעֶשֶׂה), and scrutinise every reply of the tongue. You establish my heart
1QH^a 15:16 reads: (16) And you, you know the inclination of your servant (יִצְרֵי עַבְדְּכֶם), that I [...] do not [re]ly [...] uplifting the he[art]

(2011:49). It is worth noting that Rosen-Zvi's observation on the term *yetzer* in the *Hodayot* can corroborate with Hultgren's study on a concept of the righteousness of God and the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* in 1QH^a and 1QS. Moreover, Rosen-Zvi's observation on the term *yetzer* can pave the way for understanding the Qumran covenanter's uneasiness in relation to the presence of sin and evil. This is because the term *yetzer* in the Qumran community occurs "in two different contexts: the anthropological and the demonological" (Rosen-Zvi 2011:50). In the *Damascus Document*, for instance, it becomes clear.

(14) *Blank* And now, sons, listen to me and I shall open your eyes so that you can see and understand the deeds of (15) God, so that you can choose what he is pleased with and repudiate what he hates, so that you can walk perfectly (להתהלך תמים) (16) on all his paths and not allow yourselves to be attracted by the thoughts of a guilty inclination (יצר אשמה) and lascivious eyes. For many (17) have gone astray due to these; brave heroes stumbled on account of them, from ancient times until now. For having walked in the stubbornness (18) of their hearts the Watchers of the heavens fell (נפלו עירי השמים); on account of it they were caught, for they did not heed the precepts of God (אשר לא שמרו מצות אל). (CD 2:14-18)

The phrase *יצר אשמה*, "a guilty inclination," indicates not only the influence of the wisdom tradition, but also that of the Enoch tradition of the Watcher story. In the *Rule of the Community*, these two different contexts – anthropological and demonological – becomes complicated and intertwined with each other, especially in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* (1QS 3:13-4:26). There are two diametrically opposed dominions in the world: The sons of light are led by the prince of light; the sons of darkness by the angel of darkness. Notwithstanding such dominions, Rosen-Zvi points out that "by the end, the spirits are transformed from cosmic to psychological beings, contained within *all* people" (2011:50; italics original).

(20) the time appointed for the judgment (בועד משפט) decided. Then God will refine, with his truth, all man's deeds, and will purify for himself the structure of man, ripping out all spirit of injustice from the innermost part (21) of his flesh, and cleansing him with the spirit of holiness from every wicked deeds [*sic*]. He will

sprinkle over him the spirit of truth like lustral water (in order to cleanse him) from all the abhorrences of deceit and (from) the defilement (22) of the unclean spirit, in order to instruct the upright ones with knowledge of the Most High, and to make understand the wisdom of the sons of heaven to those of perfect behavior (וחכמת בני שמים להשכיל תמימי דרך). For those God has chosen for an everlasting covenant (23) and to them shall belong all the glory of Adam. There will be no more injustice and all the deeds of trickery will be a dishonour. Until now the spirits of truth and injustice feud in the heart of man (עד הנה יריבו רוחי אמת ועול בלבב גבר): (1QS 4:20-23)

This is because, even for the sons of righteousness, who are under the dominion of the prince of light, the angel of darkness acts as “a stumbling block” (Rosen-Zvi 2011:51).

(20) And in the hand of the Prince of Lights is dominion over all the sons of justice; they walk on paths of light. And in the hand of the Angel of (21) Darkness is total dominion over the sons of deceit; they walk on paths of darkness. From the Angel of Darkness stems the corruption of (22) all the sons of justice, and all their sins, their iniquities, their guilts and their offensive deeds are under his dominion (בממשלתו) (23) in compliance with the mysteries of God (רזי אל), until his moment; and all their afflictions and their periods of grief are caused by the dominion of his enmity (בממשלת משטמתו); (1QS 3:20-23)

Even the sons of righteousness led by the prince of light cannot avoid the awareness of one's sinfulness and his unworthiness before God. Although they belong to the elect, namely the *Yahad*, they paradoxically remain in a sinful condition due to the dominion of the angel of darkness. Rosen-Zvi's observation is instructive hereof: “The double move...– transferring cosmic dualism into the hearts of people, and identifying human shameful *yetzer* with Belial's demonic plots – is meant to explain the temptation of the sons of light toward sin, and their feelings of depravity” (2011:51). In other words, this double move between cosmic dualism and psychological one in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* makes sense of the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* to some extent. As a result, it is made clear why the hymnist employed the term *yetzer* by giving his thanks to God for his salvific acts in the *Hodayot*.

(7) I give you thanks, Lord (יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ), because you did not desert me when I stayed among a for[eign] people [... and not] according to my guilt (8) did you judge me, nor did you abandon me to the plottings of my inclination (בְּזַמְתֵּי יִצְרָיִם) but you saved (וַתַּצִּילֵנִי) my life from the pit (מִשְׁחַת חַיִּים). You gave [...] among (1QH^a 13:5-6 [Suk. 5:5-6; DJD 40. 13:7-8])

It is for this reason that Rosen-Zvi comes to the conclusion that “*yetzer ra* functioned at Qumran first and foremost as an explanation to the attraction of the members of the *yahad* to sin, despite their election” (2011:53). Briefly put, along with a concept of the righteousness of God in the Qumran community, the term *yetzer* in Qumran literature also makes sense of the universality of sin over humanity *in toto*.

3.6. Concluding remarks

Both Hultgren’s (2007) and Rosen-Zvi’s (2011) studies demonstrate that the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* should not be easily dismissed as a rhetorical expression compared to the sublimity of God when one attempts to establish the pattern of religion of Second Temple Judaism (*pace* Sanders 1977). Although one’s awareness of sinfulness and unworthiness before God may not come to the forefront in their dealings with various communal issues, its significance lies in the fact that the Qumran covenanters should take it into account when they attempted to substantiate a concept of the righteousness of God or make sense of dualism/ dualistic ways of thinking of the Qumran community. This dialogue between Sanders and both Hultgren and Rosen-Zvi (albeit arranged according to this researcher) can set a further stage for this study. This is because this study is aimed at delving into various stances of Jewish authors of the Second Temple period concerning the universality of sin over humanity *in toto*. As a result, we can be better poised to deal with our *Leitfrage* that how Jewish authors of the Second Temple period²⁹ would answer the question as to whether one becomes a sinner because he/she sins or one sins because he/she is a sinner born with a sinful nature.

²⁹ In this study, this phrase “Jewish authors of the Second Temple period” should be understood as referring to selected authors with whom we will be concerned in what follows.

4. Outline of this study

In **Chapter 1**, we have set the stage for the subsequent investigations. It was observed that the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* hold its position, in varying degrees, in Second Temple Judaism. In **Chapter 2**, we will sketch out the *Weltanschauung* of Second Temple Judaism. In this chapter, covenant and history will be dealt with. In **Chapter 3**, we will deal with the extrinsic source of sin and evil attested in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*. In **Chapter 4**, we will look into the internal source of sin and evil attested in Qumran literature. In **Chapter 5**, from the vantage point of the universality of sin over humanity *in toto*, we will compare the theological positions of Second Temple Judaism with those of both early Christian literature (e.g, Pauline letters and James) and other Jewish literature (e.g., *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*). In **Chapter 6**, we will provide a synthesis and conclusion.

Chapter 2. The *Weltanschauung* of Second Temple Judaism

1. Preliminary remarks

The Second Temple period can be regarded as a time period of severe theological, sociological, and political plights, which owes its existence to the Babylonian Exile in 587/586 BCE (cf. Mermelstein 2014). Since the Babylonian Exile, as shall be seen clearly in the sections that follow³⁰, Jewish authors of the Second Temple period attempted to make sense of their present situations in the course of history according to – or against – such various predicaments from which they suffered in an unprecedented manner. The most fundamental uneasiness of Second Temple Jews is the fact that it seems that God disregards his people due to their breaking of the covenant. In other words, they would experience the feeling of despondency in their present situations resulting from the absence of the covenant God. Of most importance in this sense is, therefore, their reconceptualization of the *Weltanschauung*, into which creation, history, and covenant are incorporated and by which to vouchsafe the ongoing relationship with God to their present situations. In doing so, Jewish authors of the Second Temple period could manage to militate against such despondency in relation to severe theological, sociological, and political plights.

In the subsequent sections, we will look into the *Weltanschauung* of Second Temple Judaism. The Song of Moses in Deuteronomy 32 will be dealt with as the history component of the *Weltanschauung*; theological anthropology based on the interpretations of Genesis 1—3 as its creation component; and the hermeneutics of time as its covenant component.

³⁰ E.g., Qumran literature, including 4QInstruction, Tobit, Testament of Moses, Philo's and Josephus's works, Sifre Deuteronomy, Ben Sira, Jubilees, and 1 Enoch, including the Animal Apocalypse.

2. Deuteronomy 31—32 as a framework of history

As Crawford (2005:127) observes, “[t]he book of Deuteronomy was one of the most popular religious texts in the Second Temple period.” Of most importance in this sense is the fact that, as shall be seen clearly in the sections that follow, Jesus Ben Sira and the author of Jubilee appear to have recourse to Deuteronomy 31—32 when establishing the *Weltanschauung* according to which they could make sense of their respective present situations. It is for this reason that it is necessary to deal succinctly with the theology of Deuteronomy 31—32 in its canonical context and then continue to sketch out how Jewish authors of the Second Temple period, in varying degrees, adapted and adopted the theology of Deuteronomy 31—32 in their writings – albeit in a cursory manner.

The Song of Moses (hereafter the Song) in Deuteronomy 32, along with the narrative section in Deuteronomy 31 as an introduction to the Song, “constitutes a poetic summary of Israel’s history of apostasy, punishment and grace” (Braulik 1994:100). Nonetheless, the theology of Deuteronomy 31—32 is more than that in that Israel’s history of apostasy, punishment, and grace serves to shed more light on the faithfulness of God attested in his dealings with Israel in the course of history. It becomes clear when we deal with the genre of Deuteronomy 31—32. When it comes to the genre of the Song, there are two scholarly strands: One group views the Song as the “covenant lawsuit” or *rîb*; the other views it as wisdom literature (cf. Thiessen 2004). In an attempt to resolve such tension, Thiessen insists that the Song may owe its existence to a liturgy. Granted that, he goes on to say that “the Song was meant to prescribe the people’s reaction, both to guard them from acting like the sinful generation of the Song and to lead them in responding to any evil that was brought upon it” (Thiessen 2004:424). Weitzman (1994) attempts to interpret the Song in terms of its narrative setting, which appears to be in tandem with that of *Word of Ahiqar*.³¹ He insists that “[t]he combination of didactic and legal elements within the proverbs of *Ahiqar* thus serves the logic of the surrounding narrative, which calls for the sage to issue a final teaching that is at once instructional and incriminatory” (Weitzman

³¹ Weitzman (1994:389) also points out significant differences between the two narratives: “[t]he literary evidence offers no easy way to overcome these differences, and they seriously complicate the relationship of *Ahiqar* to Deuteronomy 31.”

1994:391). Granted that, Weitzman (1994:393) comes to the conclusion that the Song should be understood as “Moses’ final teaching to the thankless children of Israel.” By focusing on the term \aleph , “witness,” and its cognate, Britt (2004) considers the Song as “a textual witness.” He goes on to say that “[t]he notion of Deuteronomy 31—32 as a textual witness or memorial helps resolve the paradox that the general meaning of the narrative is clear but that the details of narration, chronology, and focus are confusing” (Britt 2004:141). In other words, the Song should be understood as didactic and timeless. Despite the fact that there are various scholarly approaches to the genre of the Song, it stands to reason that they have in common with one another the fact that the theology of the Song is didactic and timeless.

The Song is concerned with the relationship between God and his elect people, Israel. By dealing with “a meditation on divine justice in history” in a didactic and timeless manner, therefore, the Song serves to make sense of “a character portrait of YHWH” (Britt 2004:148). Britt’s observation is instructive hereof: “Within its canonical context it represents a canonical *mise en abyme*, or a condensed statement of the covenant relationship between YHWH and Israel rendered...not historically but rather in developmental and structural terms” (2004:158). It becomes clear when we look into the content of the Song in terms of the faithfulness of God to his elect people, Israel. First of all, the Song appears to best represent “the Deuteronomic view of Israel’s history,” which is known as “the sin-judgment-restoration pattern” running through the Deuteronomistic tradition (e.g., the book of the Twelve is also the case³²) and adapted and adopted by Jewish authors of the Second Temple period (Abasciano 2005:143; cf. Hays 1989:163-164).³³ Such a pattern of sin-judgment-restoration can also be found in Deuteronomy 27—30. The narrative of Deuteronomy 27—30 is centered on “*the deuteronomistic scheme of history*” or “*the SER pattern (Sin-Exile-Return)*” (Morland 1995:33, italics original).

The structure of the Song is demarcated as the following:

³² For the sin-judgment-restoration pattern in the book of the Twelve, see House (1990).

³³ However, Abasciano (2005) attempts to weigh more Exodus 32—34 than Deuteronomy 32 with regard to the Deuteronomic view of Israel’s history reflected on Romans 9—11. For such a pattern in Exodus 32—34, see Nwachukwu (2002:148-151).

Paranetic introduction (vv. 1-3)
 Condensed contrast (vv. 4-6)
 YHWH's faithfulness (vv. 7-14)
 Israel's transgression (vv. 15-18)
 Punishment (vv. 19-25)
 Restraint, nations (vv. 26-33)
 Reconciliation; YHWH reasserts dominion (vv. 34-42)
 Hymn-like conclusion (v. 43)

(Britt 2004:149)

In Deut 32:1, Moses in the Song began with summoning heaven and earth to witness: "Give ear, O heavens, and let me speak; And let the earth hear the words of my mouth." The invocation of heaven and earth as witness forms part of the "covenant lawsuit" or of *rîb* (cf. Wright 1962). Such a "covenant lawsuit" is didactic and timeless in that Moses made an expectant statement in Deut 32:2, which is resonant with wisdom tradition: "Let my teaching drop as the rain, My speech distill as the dew, As the droplets on the fresh grass And as the showers on the herb." Hence Craigie (1976:376-377) is correct in saying that "[i]f all the teaching of the song were to penetrate and saturate the hearts and minds of the Israelites, then it could make them grow in the fear and strength of the Lord." Deuteronomy 32:3 indicates that the purpose of the Song is to proclaim the name of YHWH, which denotes "a character portrait of YHWH."

In Deut 32:4, YHWH is predicated of הַצִּוֵּר, "the Rock." According to Braulik (1994: 127), it acts as "a key motif for the whole song." While הַצִּוֵּר is translated as θεός in the LXX, it is rendered as תְּקִיפָא, "the Mighty One," in the Targum Onkelos. Briefly put, the term הַצִּוֵּר denotes "a character portrait of YHWH" in the Song. This term הַצִּוֵּר refers YHWH to the God of faithfulness and the God of justice. Hall (2000:469) points out that "the image was used to emphasize that he was faithful in contrast to faithless Israel." He goes on to say that this term הַצִּוֵּר serve to "portray his absolute reliability and trustworthiness" (Hall 2000:469; i.e., "perfect," "just," "faithfulness," "without iniquity," "righteous," and "upright"). This character portrait of YHWH comes to stand in contrast to the faithlessness of his elect people, Israel in Deut 32:5: "They have acted corruptly toward

Him, *They are* not His children, because of their defect; *But are* a perverse and crooked generation.” Then Moses made an accusation in a form of the “covenant lawsuit” in Deut 32:6: “Do you thus repay the LORD, O foolish and unwise people? Is not He your father who has brought you? He has made you and established you.” Although Israel was called upon to be faithful and obedient to their Father and Creator, they failed to meet that expectation (cf. Hall 2000:470; e.g., Isa 1:2; 30:9; Jer 3:4, 19; Mal 1:6).

In Deut 32:7-14, the contrast between God’s faithfulness and Israel’s faithlessness is explicitly made. In Deut 32:7, Moses made a call to remember the past: “Remember the days of old, Consider the years of all generations. Ask your father, and he will inform you, Your elders, and they will tell you.” According to Craigie (1976:379), this call to remember the past introduces Israel’s past event as “a map, on which the movements of God in the plane of human events could be traced...and that his acts in the past were of continuing significance for the present and future.” At the center of God’s dealings with Israel in the past is his election of Israel as is clearly seen in Deut 32:8-9: “When the Most High gave the nations their inheritance, When He separated the sons of man, He set the boundaries of the peoples According to the number of the sons of Israel. For the LORD’s portion is His people; Jacob is the allotment of His inheritance.” Since the distribution of the nations and the election of Israel, God’s provision for Israel was given from the period of the wilderness wanderings to the entrance into the Promised Land and God alone took care of them: “The LORD alone guided him, And there was no foreign god with him” (Deut 32:12). It is of interesting to note that Moses regards Israel’s experience during the wilderness wanderings as somewhat positive in Deut 32:10-14, whereas Israel is described as continually sinning and provoking God in Exod 15:22—18:27 (e.g., Deut 1:6-3:29; 9:23-24; Isa 63:7-64:11; Jer 7:25-26; Ezek 20; Pss 78; 106; Neh 9).

Deuteronomy 32:15-18 corresponds to sin component of “the sin-judgment-restoration pattern” according to which Israel’s history can be reviewed. In Deut 32:15, Moses made an accusation of Israel: “But Jeshurun grew fat and kicked—You are grown fat, thick, and sleek—Then he forsook God who made him, And scorned the Rock of his salvation.” It is clear that “[e]ach characteristic and blessing from God was countered by an opposing action from Israel” (Hall 2000:474). In other words, the contrast between God’s

faithfulness and Israel's faithlessness is explicitly made in Deut 32:15-18 than in the foregoing verses. It is made clear that the relationship between YHWH and Israel becomes complicated: "You neglected the Rock who begot you, And forgot the God who gave you birth" (Deut 32:18). This is because Israel committed idolatry as in Deut 32:16-17 with the result that "Israel's idolatry made God jealous" (Hall 2000:474). Israel's idolatry is foolish and incomprehensible: "They sacrificed to demons who were not God, to gods whom they have not known, New gods who came lately, Whom your fathers did not dread" (Deut 32:17). In other words, "these are deities-come-lately. Unlike the Lord, who has acted on behalf of Israel since its beginning, these beings have no record of achievement or reliability" (Tigay 1996:306).

Deuteronomy 32:19-25 corresponds to the punishment or sentence of the "covenantal lawsuit." This is because God came to despise (אָנְדָּן) his elect people, Israel, due to their disobedience and faithlessness: "And the LORD saw *this*, and spurned (אָנְדָּן) *them* Because of the provocation of His sons and daughters" (Deut 32:19). As a result, God came to hide his face from Israel, namely his presence among them, due to Israel's sin and faithlessness: "Then He said, 'I will hide My face from them, I will see what their end *shall* be; For they are a perverse generation, Sons in whom is no faithfulness" (Deut 32:20). Hence Hall (2000:476) is correct in saying that "[t]o hide the face' meant that God would abandon the covenant with Israel." As aforementioned above, Second Temple Jews' uneasiness lies in the fact that God seems to abandon the covenant with Israel. Briefly put, it can give a glimpse of why Jewish authors of the Second Temple period attempted to have recourse to Deuteronomy 31—32 when establishing the *Weltanschauung* as the means by which they could resolve such uneasiness according to their respective present situations. As in Deut 32:16-17, the cause of God's jealousy and anger is Israel's idolatry in Deut 32:21. Then God's punishment continues through Deut 32:22-25. The lists of God's punishment in Deut 32:22-25 resonate with the curses of Deut 28:15-67 (i.e., famine, plague, military invasion). However, the exile as a result of military invasion is not envisioned in the Song. It can also give a glimpse of why Jewish authors of the Second Temple period disregarded the effect of the exile in their attempts to establish the *Weltanschauung*. It is thus well pointed in the observation that "the Song of Moses was widely understood as itself predicting Israel's restoration after exile"

(Bauckham 2008:436).

In Deut 32:26-33, there is an unexpected reversal of the scheme of Israel's sin and God's punishment: "Had I not feared the provocation by the enemy, Lest their adversaries should misjudge, Lest they should say, 'Our hand is triumphant, And the LORD has not done all this'" (Deut 32:27). Due to the enemy's misjudgment of taking credit for Israel's destruction, the Song introduces YHWH's self-vindication and his dealings with Israel's enemy at this juncture, "which will have a positive result in bringing deliverance to Israel (Deut 32:34-43)" (Lundbom 2013:38). The similar God's self-vindication can be found in Ezek 36:22: "Therefore, say to the house of Israel, Thus says the Lord God 'It is not for your sake, O house of Israel, that I am about to act, but for My holy name, which you have profaned among the nations where you went.'" Israel's enemy appears to be foolish and unwise in that they could not understand how their part in God's dealings with Israel came to be accomplished: "'How could one chase a thousand, And two put ten thousand to flight, Unless their Rock had sold them, And the LORD had given them up?'" (Deut 32:30). Both Israel and their enemy fell short of God's respective expectations, with the result that they both ended up visiting God's punishment. Thus the contrast between God's faithfulness and righteousness and humanity's faithlessness and unrighteousness comes to the forefront.

In Deut 32:34-42, Moses made a declaration of God's vindication of his elect people, Israel: "For the LORD will vindicate His people, And will have compassion on His servants; When He sees that *their* strength is gone, And there is none *remaining*, bond or free" (Deut 32:36). However, God's vindication of his elect people, Israel, began with his retribution of Israel's enemy according to his righteousness: "'Vengeance is Mine, and retribution, In due time their foot will slip; For the day of their calamity is near, And the impending things are hastening upon them'" (Deut 32:35). This is because "[v]engeance is the just retribution of God who is the sovereign King of the universe and faithful to his covenant" (Hall 2000:480). By way of God's vindication of his elect people, Israel and his retribution of Israel's enemy, it is made clear that "[j]ustice is restored. God's holiness and sovereignty are acknowledged. He is vindicated" (Hall 2000:480): "'See now that I, I am He, And there is no god besides Me; It is I who put to death and give life. I have

wounded, and it is I who heal; And there is no one who can deliver from My hand” (Deut 32:39). Both God’s vindication and his retribution should be understood as didactic in that, although Israel was warned that their faithlessness and disobedience cannot avoid God’s punishment, such punishment will give rise to the hope of restoration. It becomes clear in Deut 32:43 where “[t]he nations are to join the people in honoring God for his justice and holiness” (Hall 2000:481). Even Israel’s enemy was given a chance to turning from their sin to God: “Rejoice, O nations, *with* His people; For He will avenge the blood of His servants, And will render vengeance on His adversaries, And will atone for His land *and* His people” (Deut 32:43).³⁴

In summary, it is made clear that the Song is centered on God’s faithfulness and righteousness in his dealings with Israel, without losing sight of the faithlessness and sin of Israel and their enemy. God’s faithfulness and righteousness attested in the course of Israel’s past history can be introduced in a didactic and timeless manner as “a textual witness” for Israel’s subsequent generations.

³⁴ For the text-critical issue between the LXX and the MT, See Mclay (2006:44-50). According to Deut 32:43 LXX, there is an inclusio with v. 1 in that the LXX contains the phrases that “Praise, O heavens, together with him, and worship him, all sons of God.” It seem that 4QDeut⁹ is a similar case.

3. Song of Moses in Second Temple Judaism

The survey that follows cannot be exhaustive, but representative. It is fair to say that it will be conducive to show to what extent and to what manner Jewish authors of the Second Temple period would adapt and adopt the Song in their theologizing when managing their respective present situations. In this section, we will look into some of Second Temple literature other than Ben Sira and Jubilee, with which we will deal in the subsequent chapters.

3.1. Qumran literature

The Song is given “special attention within the Qumran community” (Waters 2006:48). The Song, which contains “its denunciation of Israel’s apostasy,” has an influence on the Qumran community (Bell 1994:217). First, Deut 32:28 is alluded to in CD 5:17.

Deut 32:28: *כִּי־גֵי אֲבָד עֲצוֹת הַמָּדָה וְאֵין בָּהֶם תְּבוּנָה:*

CD 5:17: *הֵם גֵּי אֲבָד עֲצוֹת מֵאֲשֶׁר אֵין בָּהֶם בִּינָה כִּי מִלְּפָנִים עֲמַד*

Deut 32:28: “For they are a nation lacking in counsel, And there is no understanding in them.”

CD 5:17: they are folk bereft of advice, in that there is no intelligence in them. For in ancient times there arose

In the original context of Deuteronomy 32, it appears to be ambiguous whether the referent in Deut 32:28 is Israel’s enemy or apostate Israel (cf. Mayes 1981:389-390). While he views Israel’s enemy, namely the no-nation, as the primary referent, Nelson (2004:375) does not dismiss a possibility for apostate Israel. Craigie (1976:36) prefers to view Israel as its referent in that Israel’s lack of discernment acts as a cause of God’s punishment in its foregoing verses. What is clear in CD 5:17, however, is the fact that the referent appears to be “an apostate group within Israel” (Bell 1994:218; e.g., Jannes and Jambres in CD 5:17-19). Nonetheless, CD 5:17-19 goes beyond identifying such an apostate group to be foolish and unintelligent. Lange (1997:417-418) points to the fact

that “CD 5:17-19 does not simply use Jannes and Jambres as a paradigm for Israelite apostasy but as an example of how Belial leads Israel astray.”

(17) they are folk bereft of advice, in that there is no intelligence in them. For in ancient times there arose (18) Moses and Aaron, by the hand of the prince of lights and Belial, with his cunning, raised up Jannes and (19) his brother during the first deliverance of Israel. *Blank* (CD 5:17-19)

Briefly put, the immediate context of CD 5:17-19, in which Deut 32:28 is alluded to in the beginning, illustrates that it is tinged by the influence of the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* (1QS 3:13—4:26). Hence Lange (1997:419) is correct in saying that “apostasy is viewed as being caused by an attack of the servants of the spirit of darkness (see 1QS 3:21-24).”

Second, it is possible that Deut 32:33 may be alluded to twice in 1QH^a 13:10 and 13:27 [Suk. 5:10 and 5:27; DJD 40. 13:10 and 13:27] (cf. Bell 1994).

Deut 32:22: “Their wine is the venom of serpents, And the deadly poison of cobras.”

(10) teeth are like a sword, whose fangs are like a sharpened spear. Vipers’ venom is all their scheming to snatch away. They lay in wait, but did not (1QH^a 13:10)

(27) a lying tongue, like vipers’ venom that spreads to the extremities, like crawlers in the dust they shoot to gra[b,] serpents’ [poison], (1QH^a 13:27)

The immediate context of 1QH^a 13 is also similar to CD 5:17-19 in that “[t]he Hodayot mentions Belial’s torrents (1QH^a 3:31) and contains a thanksgiving to God, who had protected from such, venom included (1QH^a 5:10, 27)” (Uusimäki 2016:130).³⁵ Moreover, the referent of 1QH^a 13 is also “the Jewish enemies of the writer” (Bell 1994:219). However, it is more probable that Jer 16:16 is alluded to in 1QH^a 13:10 and 13:27 (cf. Lange 2012).³⁶ Notwithstanding this, it is fair to say that the phrases of Deuteronomy 32 can be used to deal with the scheme of Belial in the Qumran community.

³⁵ N.b. Uusimäki follows a Sukenik numbering.

³⁶ The textual relationship between Deuteronomy 32 and Jeremiah goes beyond the scope of this study. See Lundbom (2013:38).

Third, Deut 32:22 is alluded to twice in 1QH^a 11:31 [Suk. 3:31; DJD 40. 11:32] and 4:13 [Suk. 17:13; DJD 40. 4:25].

Deut 32:22 “For a fire is kindled in My anger, And burns to the lowest part of Sheol, And consumes the earth with its yield, And sets on fire the foundations of the mountains.”

(31) and the tract of dry land; the bases of the mountains does he burn and converts the roots of flint rock into streams of lava. It consumes right to the great deep. (1QH^a 11:31)

(13) [Even though you burn] the foundations of mountains and fire [sears] the base of Sheol, those who ... [...] in your regulations. (1QH^a 4:13)

As with Deut 32 in 1QH^a 13, 1QH^a 11, in which Deut 32:22 is alluded to in 1QH^a 13:31, revolves around the scheme of Belial. Sheol imagery in 1QH^a 4:13 illustrates that Jewish theologian in the Second Temple period would make use of Deut 32:22 in their attempts to make sense of “an eschatological destruction.” (Uusimäki 2016:182).³⁷ The phrases of Deut 32:22 is used to refer to “God judging the wicked of Israel and yet saving a remnant” in the Qumran community (Bell 1994:220).

Fourth, Deut 32:42 is alluded to twice in 1QM 12:11-12 and 19:4.

Deut 32:42: “I will make My arrows drunk with blood, And my sword shall devour flesh, With the blood of the slain and the captives, From the long-haired leaders of the enemy.”

(11) collect your spoil, Performer of Valiance! Place your hand on the neck of your enemies and your foot on the piles of slain! Strike the peoples, your foes, and may your sword (12) consume guilty flesh! Fill your land with glory and your inheritance with blessing: may herds of flocks be in your fields, /silver,/ gold, and precious

³⁷ E.g., “the Sheol of Abaddon” in 1QH^a 11:19. 1QH^a 11 is also concerned with eschatological destruction.

stones (1QM 12:11-12)

(4) [of the dead! Strike the peoples, your foes,] and may your sword consume flesh!
Fill your land with glory and your inheritance with blessing: [may herds] (1QM
19:4)

Most scholars view Israel's enemy as the referent of God's vengeance in Deut 32:42. However, the possibility for apostate Israel still remains. Notwithstanding this, the referent in 1QM 12:11-12 and 19:4 includes apostate Israel among the enemies of the writer who will visit God's complete vengeance (cf. Bell 1994; Uusimäki 2016; e.g., "the violators of the covenant" in 1QM 1:2).

In summary, it is made clear that the Song, albeit some phrases of it, plays a pivotal role in substantiating their theologoumena in the Qumran community (cf. Bell 1994:221). From the vantage point of the *Yahad* as the elect community, the Qumran covenanters would attempt to translate the theology of the Song into the plane of dualism or dualistic ways of thinking of the Qumran community.

3.2. Tobit

Weitzman (1997:67) points out that "Tobit's 'prayer of rejoicing' in Tobit 13 alludes to the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy 32." According to him, "Raphael's farewell exhortation to Tobit and his son Tobias" in Tobit 12:6-15 appears to resonate with an "instruction given to Moses and Joshua by God" in Deut 31:14-30 (Weitzman 1997:67). When it comes to the songs in Tobit 13 and Deuteronomy 32, these two songs have in common with each other the fact that (1) the songs are performed by sages before their death; (2) an address from sage to the survivors ensues after the song (e.g., Deuteronomy 33 and Tobit 14); and (3) similar language is employed in these two songs (Weitzman 1997:67). Thus Tobit in Tobit 12—13 can be regarded as the second Moses who follows the trails of the Mosaic tradition in Deuteronomy 31—32. Regarding such similarities, linguistic or conceptual, between Tobit 12—13 and Deuteronomy 31—32, Bauckham's observation is worth citing in full.

[I]t is not because the latter [= the Song of Moses] ends with Moses' prediction of Israel's original settlement in the land, whereas Tobit's foresees the corresponding re-settlement of exiled Israel in the land, but because the Song of Moses was widely understood as itself predicting Israel's restoration after exile.

(2006:142-142)

Of most interest to note is that Tobit's pilgrimage during his exile acts as a beacon for Israel's future destiny (cf. Bauckham 2006). Tobit's pilgrimage during his exile reaches its climax in Tobit 13. Tobit 13 can be divided into two subsections: *Tob.* 13:1-8 and 13:9-18 (cf. Fitzmyer 2003:304). The exhortation/invocation of Tobit in *Tob.* 13:1-8 revolves around the praise of god, a call to repentance and the hope of restoration. The description of Israel's future in *Tob.* 13:9-18 corresponds to the pattern of the Mosaic tradition in the Song (i.e., settlement in the Promised Land-Israel's apostasy-God's punishment-ultimate restoration). Hence Moore (1996:284, italics original) is correct in saying that "[i]f God had done *all that* for Tobit and his family, how much more, concludes Tobit, will God do for his people and his Holy City?" God's faithfulness and sovereignty demonstrated in Tobit's pilgrimage during his exile give rise to the hope of Israel's future. It is envisioned in Tobit's motivation of the song in *Tob.* 13:1-2, which is a paraphrasing of Deut 32:39.

"See now that I, I am He, And there is no god besides Me; It is I who put to death and give life. I have wounded, and it is I who heal; And there is no one who can deliver from My hand" (Deut 32:39)

(1) Then Tobit wrote a prayer of rejoicing, and said: "Blessed is God who lives for ever, and blessed is his kingdom. (2) For he afflicts, and he shows mercy; he leads down to Hades, and brings up again, and there is no one who can escape his hand. (*Tob.* 13:1-2 RSV)

Then, Tobit's lamentation in *Tob.* 3:4, which bears the curses of Deuteronomy 28, will be finally revoked.³⁸ Tobit lamented,

³⁸ For the allusion of Deut 30:1-10 in *Tob.* 13:5-6, which is concerned with restoration in terms of the covenantal blessings and curses, see Henderson (2014:151-153).

For they disobeyed thy commandments, and thou gavest us over to plunder, captivity, and death; thou madest us a byword of reproach in all the nations among which we have been dispersed. (*Tob.* 3:4 RSV)

In summary, by way of evoking the Song linguistically and conceptually, Tobit would attempt to bring out the hope of Israel's future convincingly in that "the divinely woven patterns of Israel's past continue into Israel's exilic present" (Weitzman 1997:70).

3.3. *Testament of Moses*

The *Testament of Moses* (circa the first century CE; hereafter *T. Moses*) can be regarded as a retelling of Deuteronomy 31—34 (cf. Harrington 1973). Priest (1983:923) points out that *T. Moses* appears to be "framed around the end of the book of Deuteronomy" 31—34. *T. Moses* is the "the farewell exhortation" of Moses to Joshua in which to predict Israel's future destiny from their entrance into the Promised Land to the end of days (Priest 1983:919). The Deuteronomic view of Israel's history, namely "the sin-judgment-restoration pattern," can be found in *T. Moses* (cf. Harrington 1973:65; Tromp 1993:124). In other words, *T. Moses* reflects such a Deuteronomic view of Israel's history in a linguistic and conceptual manner (cf. Harrington 1973:61; Crowe 2012:66). Of most interest to note is that, in *T. Moses* 9—10, Taxo the Levite plays an exemplary role as the righteous martyred in provoking God's vengeance (cf. Licht 1961:98). The narrative flow of *T. Moses* 9—10 can be demarcated as the following:

An episode that appears to be the culmination of this historical survey tells of the resolve of a Levite and his seven sons to die rather than betray their ancestral faith (9:1-7). There follows an eschatological hymn that portrays the destruction of the evil one at the hands of Israel's guardian angel (10:1-2), cataclysmic cosmic events (10:3-6), and the exaltation of Israel in the end of days (10:7-10).

(OTP 1:919)³⁹

³⁹ N.b. the acronym "OTP" stands for the 2 volume set of "The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha" edited by Charlesworth. Each text will be referenced to according to its respective translator.

Tromp (1993:231) points out that “Taxo will subsequently take revenge on Israel’s enemies, a reward which is often expected to be given to the righteous in the eschatological time.” The role of the martyred righteous in provoking God’s vengeance is “a unique teaching” in *T. Moses* (Priest 1983:923). However, Priest (1983:923) concedes that, despite such a role of Taxo in provoking God’s vengeance, “God alone is the worker of his predetermined will.” When it comes to the perspective of martyrdom in *T. Moses*, which is different from 1 Maccabees and 2 Maccabees, Gathercole’s (2002:58) observation is instructive hereof: “[T]he *Assumption of Moses* [= *Testament of Moses*] is predicated on a very strong theology of election” (cf. Priest 1983:923). Granted that, Harrington’s (1973:66) *status quaestionis* is well in pointed when he poses a question: “Was the *Testament of Moses* written in the way that it was because testaments tend to be predictions of the future, or because Deuteronomy 31—34 leaves itself open to interpretation as a prediction of the future?” Then, he answers that the latter may be the case.

In summary, *T. Moses* gives a glimpse of why and how Jewish authors of the Second Temple period would adapt and adopt the Song, albeit not isolated from Deuteronomy 31—34, in a form of “future expansion”⁴⁰ according to which they could approach their respective present situations.

3.4. Philo

Philo designated the Song as either “the Great Song” (e.g., *Det.* 114) or “the Greater Song” (e.g., *Leg.* 3.105).⁴¹ He distinguished it from the Song of the Sea in Exodus 15. The Song is alluded to in *De virtutibus* 72—75.

Having discoursed thus suitably to his subjects and the heir of his headship, he proceeded to hymn God in a song in which he rendered the final thanksgiving of his bodily life for the rare and extraordinary gifts with which he had been blest from his

⁴⁰ Cf. Harrington’s (1973) terminology.

⁴¹ E.g., *Post.* 121, 167; *Plant.* 59; *Sobr.* 10; *Mut.* 182 and *Somm.* 2:191.

birth to his old age. He convoked a divine assemblage of the elements of all existence and the chiefest parts of the universe, earth and heaven, one the home of the mortals, the other the house of immortals. With these around him he sang his canticles with every kind of harmony and sweet music in the ears of both mankind and ministering angels. (*Virt.* 72-73, LCL)

It seems that *Virt.* 73 is an allusion of Deut 32:1: “Give ear, O heavens, and let me speak; And let the earth hear the words of my mouth” (cf. Weitzman 1997). The manner in which Deut 32:1 is alluded to in *Virt.* 73 sheds more positive light on the Mosaic tradition in Deuteronomy 32 (cf. Bell 1994:225; e.g., “every kind of harmony and sweet music” is added up to Deut 32:1). This is because, in *De virtutibus*, Philo dealt with the virtues prescribed in the Law by Moses and introduced the life of Moses as a supreme exemplar of φιλανθρωπία, “philanthropy.” (cf. Lierman 1976:202; e.g., *Virt.* 51).

Then, in *Virt.* 75, Philo would introduce Israel’s past history as God’s admonitions for the present occasion.

Thus is his post amid the ethereal choristers the great Revealer blended with the strains of thankfulness to God his own true feelings of affection to the nation, therein joining with his arraignment of them for past sins his admonitions for the present occasion and calls to a sounder mind, and his exhortations for the future expressed in hopeful words of comfort which needs must be followed by their happy fulfillment. (*Virt.* 75, LCL).

The Song in *Virt.* 72-75 bears “its hortatory character,” by which to make sense of “a judgment about the future” (Lincicum 2010:106). Briefly put, the Song is not used to denote “future expansion” by Philo as the author of *T. Moses* did. Philo would not view “the events of Deut 32 as transpiring in his own day” (Waters 2006:70). It becomes clear when Philo alluded the Blessing of Moses in Deuteronomy 33 in *De vita Mosis*.

Then indeed, we find him possessed by the spirit, no longer uttering general truths to the whole nation but prophesying to each tribe in particular the things which were to be and hereafter must come to pass. Some of these have already taken place,

others are still looked for, since confidence in the future is assured by fulfilment in the past. (*Mos.* 2.288, LCL)

Lierman (1976:106) points out that “the final chapters of Deuteronomy offer both a characterization of Moses and a prophetic foretelling of Israel’s history.” Although the focus of Philo is on the philanthropy of Moses other than God’s faithfulness attested in the course of Israel’s past history, it is fair to say that he would stand square with the *Tendenz* of Second Temple Judaism in approaching their respective present situations—at least because Philo regarded the Song as “a prophetic text” (Waters 2006:70).

In summary, *De virtutibus*, along with *De vita Mosis*, helps us to understand how Jewish authors of the Second Temple period managed to map their present situations into the topographical terrain of the Mosaic tradition in Deuteronomy 32.

3.5. Josephus

Although Harrington (1973:63) views *Antiquities* 4:312-314 as a retelling of the Song, it is more likely that Deuteronomy 28 comports with *Ant.* 4:312-314 (cf. Waters 2006:64-65). In *Ant.* 4:305-308, Josephus dealt with the covenantal blessings and curses of Deuteronomy 27—28. However, Josephus did not employ the term διαθήκη, “covenant,” by leaving the covenant renewal episode in Deuteronomy 29 untold when he dealt with Deuteronomy 29 in *Ant.* 4:309-310. It is because the aim of Josephus in *Antiquities* lies in his discussion of Moses’s πολιτεία, “constitution” (e.g., *Ant.* 4:310). As with Philo’s allusion of the Song in *Virt.* 72-75 promoting philanthropy, Josephus also understood Deut 28:58-68 not in terms of (covenantal) history, but as a “prediction of future events” with a view to promoting the priestly-aristocratic constitution (Waters 2006:65).

In summary, despite the fact that the “pattern of history of Deuteronomy 32” can be found (Harrington 1973:63), it is fair to say that the Song may not be alluded to *Ant.* 4:312-314.

3.6. *Sifre* Deuteronomy

Although *Sifre* Deuteronomy dates no earlier than the third century CE, it would show the *Tendenz* of Second Temple Judaism in approaching their present situations in terms of Israel's past history epitomized in the Song. For example, *Pisḳa* 58, in which Deut 32:11 is alluded to, indicates how the rabbis regarded their *Devarim* as “both a continuation of and a participation in that originary event” (Fraade 1991:125).

And ye shall observe—this refers to study—*to do*—this refers to performance—*all the statutes*—these are the interpretations—*and the ordinances*—these are the regulations—*which I set before you this day* (11:32)—let them be as precious to you as if you had received them from Mount Sinai today, let them be part of your discourse as frequently as if you had heard them today. (*Pisḳa* 58)⁴²

When it comes to such a “dynamic interplay of prospection and retrospection” taken place in the engagement of the rabbis, Fraade (1991:126) attempts to make it sense by saying that “our experience of and actions in the present are determined to a large extent by our memories and retellings of the past and our anticipations, whether in hope or in fear, of the future.” According to Fraade, the rabbis' dealings with *Ha'azinu* (the Song) in *Pisḳa* 306 is the case. *Pisḳa* 306 begins with alluding to Deut 32:1: “*Give ear, ye heavens, and I will speak* (32:1).” However, it seems that it has a negative bearing on such an invocation of heaven and earth.

R. Meir says: When Israel was meritorious, they gave witness against themselves, as it is said, *And Joshua said unto the people, Ye are witnesses against yourselves* (Josh. 24:22)...After they had corrupted the heavens, as it is said...God called the earth to witness against them, as it is said, *Hear, O earth, behold, I will bring evil (upon this people)* (Jer. 6:19). (*Pisḳa* 306)

Pisḳa 306 brings Israel's guilt to the fore by way of Israel's witnessing against themselves. It is led to God's witnessing against Israel. In *Pisḳa* 306, God summons his witnesses from the earth to the ant: “R. Simeon be Eleazar says: What a humiliation for this fellow

⁴² The translation of *Sifre* Deuteronomy is from Hammer (1986).

to have to learn from the ant!” Then, *Pisḳa* 306 epitomizes Israel’s past history and provides various rabbinic interpretations of *Ha’azinu*. Briefly put, *Pisḳa* 306 begins with “Israel’s unworthiness” and ends with “Israel’s superiority” over the angels (Bell 1994:232; e.g., *Pisḳa* 306 mentions the resurrection of the dead⁴³).

From the verses, *Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One* (6:4), and, *When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy* (Job 38:7)—*the morning stars* are Israel, who are symbolized by the stars, as it is said, *I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven* (Gen. 22:17); and *all the sons of God shouted for joy* refers to the ministering angels, as it is said, *The sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord* (Job 1:6). (*Pisḳa* 306)

While *Sifre* Deuteronomy leaves the curses of Deuteronomy 27—28 untold, *Pisḳa* 306 serves to heighten “the element of comfort” (Hammer 1986:17). Fraade’s observation is instructive hereof.

Scripture’s notice of Moses’ call to heaven and earth to hear his song is placed by the *Sifre*’s commentary within a new, broader temporal framework; that is, within a larger historical progression of witnesses. This chain of witness is emblematic of the history of Israel’s covenantal condition, beginning with her original innocence, continuing with her corruption and sense of abandonment by God, and ending with her future reconciliation with God.

(1991:132)

In summary, *Sifre* Deuteronomy *Ha’azinu* can give us a useful hint at the rationale of how and why Jewish authors of the Second Temple period managed to pattern their respective present situations after the unfolding of Israel’s past history. Hence Fraade (1991:148, italics original) is correct in saying that “[t]he contrast between God’s seeming historical absence and the presence of the song *within* Israel...reflects well the biblical rationale for the establishing of the song as witness in Deut. 31:16-21.” *Pisḳa* 320, in which Deut 32:21 is alluded to, and *Pisḳaot* 342-343, in which Deut 32:43 is alluded to, also point to the

⁴³ E.g., the resurrection is also mentioned both in *2 Mac.* 7:6, in which Deut 32:36 is alluded to, and in *4 Mac.* 18:18-19, in which Deut 32:39 is alluded to.

fact that *Sifre* Deuteronomy may adapt and adopt the Song in a form of “future expansion.”

4. Genesis 1—3 as a framework of theological anthropology

Ben Sira and 4QInstruction are representative of the theological anthropology of Second Temple Judaism. Although they stand for the two strands of wisdom literature in the Second Temple period,⁴⁴ they also have in common with each other the fact that “4QInstruction et Ben Sira comportent à la fois des particularités linguistiques propres à l'hébreu tardif, voire mishnique, et des éléments qui les rattachent fondamentalement à la langue classique” (Rey 2009:17).⁴⁵ Besides, both 4QInstruction and Ben Sira are concerned with the creation stories in Genesis 1—3 in their attempts to make sense of the human condition in relation to sin and human accountability. After looking into such linguistic commonalities between 4QInstruction and Ben Sira, Rey comes to the conclusion as the following.

En dépit des ressemblances, 4QInstruction et le Siracide présentent de sérieuses différences...Il est donc impossible d'attribuer les deux textes à un même auteur...Nous avons vu que les deux auteurs étaient plus ou moins contemporains et qu'ils se situaient dans une même zone géographique.

(2009:20-21)⁴⁶

Despite the fact that both 4QInstruction and Ben Sira could not be produced by the hands of the same author, such linguistic commonalities show explicit closeness in terms of time and place. It is for this reason that we will look into how Genesis 1—3 is interpreted by both 4QInstruction and Ben Sira in an attempt to understand the theological anthropology of Second Temple Judaism.

⁴⁴ See Adams (2010:555), who states that “the differences between the two works on eschatology, the search for knowledge, and such mundane matters as surety are significant.” Moreover, Jesus Ben Sira is ranked higher among Jewish societies, but the author of 4QInstruction is not.

⁴⁵ E.g. linguistic commonalities between 4QInstruction and both 1QS and 1QH are also worth noting.

⁴⁶ “In spite of some resemblances, 4QInstruction and Ben Sira present some serious differences...It is thus impossible to attribute these two texts to the same author...We have seen that these two authors were, more or less, contemporaneous and that they were geographically situated in the same region” (own translation).

When it comes to the theological anthropology of the Jewish Scriptures, Kaiser's observation is worth citing in full hereof:

Blicken wir zurück, so zeichnet sich uns die Gebrochenheit des alttestamentlichen Menschenbildes ab: Einerseits ist der mensch als Ebenbild Gottes in seinem Verhältnis zur Welt ein kleiner König, der in Gottes Stellvertretung die Erde und alles Getier beherrscht (Ps 8,5 ff; vgl. Gen 1,26ff). Dem entspricht die Selbstverständlichkeit, mit der die Deuteronomiker und Deuteronomisten mit der Verantwortlichkeit des Menschen für sein Schicksal rechnen: Die Entscheidung über Leben und Tod, über Heil und Unheil Israels liegt bei ihm und damit zugleich bei jedem einzelnen selbst (Dtn 30,15-20). Andererseits ist das Leben des Menschen flüchtig und nichtig (Ps 144,2f). Sein Herkunft aus der Erde bestimmt seine Zukunft (Gen 3,19). Zugleich aber haftet ihm dank ihrer eine kreatürliche Unreinheit und Schwäche an, die seine Sündlosigkeit verhindert.

(1998:5)

Kaiser's observation is well pointed concerning the rationale and scriptural resources of the theological anthropology of Second Temple Judaism in general.

4.1. Genesis 1—3 in Ben Sira

Ben Sira contains the longest extant wisdom materials among wisdom literature in the Second Temple period. As with the wisdom tradition such as Proverbs, after which Ben Sira is modeled, the sage's instruction is didactic or pedagogical rather than theological, the primary goal of which is "to instill specific mindsets and behavioral patterns into a youthful addressee(s), and to promote a consistent principle of earthly justice" (Adams 2008:155).

The narrative of Genesis 1—3 appears to be employed in Sir 15:9—18:14; 33:7-15; 40:1-11, 27; 49:16; 24:28 (cf. Levison 1988). Of these passages, Sir 15:9—18:14 merits more attention in that it can give a glimpse of how the sage – Jesus Ben Sira and his translator, grandson – would understand and interpret the biblical Adam in an attempt to establish

the basic nature of humanity, by which to explain theodicy in relation to sin and human accountability. Sir 16:24—18:14 is not extant in Hebrew so that we will look at this passage in Sirach (Greek translation) rather than Ben Sira (original Hebrew). Sir 15:9—18:14 can fall into the following four sections:

1. an initial objection plus Ben Sira's response (15.11-20);
2. An implicit objection that God blesses those without faith plus the response that God requites the disobedient (16.1-16);
3. A second explicit objection plus response (16.17—17.24);
4. A recapitulation (17.25—28.24).

(Levison 1988:34)

While the first three sections are apologetic in that it deals with theodicy, the last one is deliberative in that it is centered on an exhortation to repentance (Levison 1988:34). Of these four sections, the third one in Sir 16:17-17:24 sheds more light on the sage's interpretation of the biblical Adam. From the vantage point of the *Tun-Ergehen-Zusammenhang*⁴⁷ (e.g., Sir 16:14), the sage had recourse to creation (e.g., Sir 16:26-17:10) and the Sinaitic theophany (e.g., Sir 17:11-14) as the means by which he could refute the objector accusing that "I shall be hidden from the Lord, and who from on high will remember me? Among so many people I shall not be known, for what is my soul in the boundless creation?" (Sir 16:17 RSV). In so doing, both divine sovereignty and theodicy are questioned and explained.

In Sir 16:26-28, the sage began to account for God's creation of the celestial bodies. However, the emphasis of his description of God's creation is placed on their activity other than on their nature: καὶ ἀπὸ ποιήσεως αὐτῶν διέστειλεν μερίδας αὐτῶν ἐκόσμησεν εἰς αἰῶνα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ (Sir 16:26b-27a).⁴⁸ God determined their divisions and arranged his work in an eternal order. Levison (1988:36, italics original) is of the opinion that "Ben Sira chooses these activities to contrast what the celestial bodies *do* with what people *do not* do." In doing so, the basic nature of humanity comes to the forefront. Levison (1988:36) goes on to say that "the celestial bodies are depicted as eternal and obedient

⁴⁷ For the *Tun-Ergehen-Zusammenhang* in Ben Sira, see Adams (2008:153-213).

⁴⁸ Sir 16:26b-27a RSV reads: (26b) and when he made them, he determined their divisions. (27a) He arranged his works in an eternal order,"

creations; in contrast, people are ephemeral and sinful.” Next, in Sir 16:29-30, the sage dealt with the earthly living beings. The sage added the phrase *καὶ εἰς αὐτὴν ἢ ἀποστροφή αὐτῶν*, “and to it they return (Sir 16:30b RSV), which cannot be found in Genesis 1 but in Gen 3:19,⁴⁹ to his description of God’s creation of the earthly living beings: “with all kinds of living beings he covered its surface, and to it they return” (Sir 16:30 RSV). It serves to make a contrast between the celestial bodies and the earthly living beings. It also acts as a prelude to the sage’s description of God’s creation of humanity in the subsequent verses.

In Sir 17:1-10, the sage dealt with the creation of the first human. When it comes to the basic nature of humanity, the biblical Adam sides with the earthly living beings other than with the celestial bodies. It becomes clear in the first four verses as the following:

(1) κύριος ἔκτισεν ἐκ γῆς ἄνθρωπον καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστρεψεν αὐτὸν εἰς αὐτήν (2) ἡμέρας ἀριθμοῦ καὶ καιρὸν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τῶν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς (3) καθ’ ἑαυτὸν ἐνέδυσεν αὐτοὺς ἰσχὺν καὶ κατ’ εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς (4) ἔθηκεν τὸν φόβον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πάσης σαρκὸς καὶ κατακυριεύειν θηρίων καὶ πετεινῶν (Sir 17:1-4 LXX)

(1) The Lord created man out of earth, and turned him back to it again. (2) He gave to men few days, a limited time, but granted them authority over the things upon the earth. (3) He endowed them with strength like his own, and made them in his own image. (4) He placed the fear of them in all living beings, and granted them dominion over beasts and birds. (Sir 17:1-4 RSV)

The portrayal of the first man in Genesis 1—2 is alluded to in Sir 17:1-4. However, the sage did not employ the term *ἄνθρωπος*, “human being,” in the singular as referring to the biblical Adam. He referred it to humanity in general (cf. Mack 1985:114). Aside from adding the expression that God makes humanity return to the earth in Sir 17:1, the sage also added the expression, which cannot be found in Genesis 1—2, that God gives a limited time to humanity in Sir 17:2.⁵⁰ The former is taken out of the context of Gen 3:19,

⁴⁹ The same motif can be found in Job 34:15; Qoh 3:20; 12:7.

⁵⁰ The same motif can be found in Gen 6:3; Ps 146:4; Wis 15:8; 4 Ezra 7:116, 139; 8:7; 10:14; 2 Bar. 48:46.

which is about God’s judgment against Adam and Eve in relation to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The latter is taken out of the context of Gen 6:3, which is about God’s judgment against humanity in relation to the Flood. However, the ways in which the sage located extraneous components in the narrative of Genesis 1—2 are gnomic. In other words, the sage would disregard the original context when conflating two episodes. Instead, the sage was at pains to make sense of the mortality of humanity “by stressing how brief human existence is” (Levison 1988:36). Chazon (1997:19-20) is of the opinion that “Ben Sira places the allusion to Adam’s return to dust in antithetical parallelism with and as a counterpoint to the creation of human beings from the earth (cf. Gen 2:7). The return to dust is thus presented as inherent in creation and morally neutral.” The mortality of humanity in Sir 17:2 is resonant with Sir 41:10a: πάντα ὅσα ἐκ γῆς εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσεται, “Whatever is from the dust returns to dust (RSV).” In Sir 41:10, the mortality of humanity is introduced when dealing with the destiny of the ungodly: οὕτως ἀσεβεῖς ἀπὸ κατάρας εἰς ἀπόλειαν, “so the ungodly go from curse to destruction” (Sir 41:10b RSV). Nonetheless, the mortality of humanity is universal and axiomatic: “Do not fear the sentence of death; remember your former days and the end of life; this is the decree from the Lord for all flesh” (Sir 41:3 RSV). Thus death cannot be the consequence of Adam’s fall; it is inherent in humanity from creation. It is in this sense that the sage twisted the episode of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil as beneficial from a sapiential perspective in the subsequent verses. In Sir 17:6-8, the sage made clear that the knowledge of good and evil should be understood as God’s beneficial endowment for humanity.

- (6) He made for them tongue and eyes; he gave them ears and a mind for thinking.
- (7) He filled them with knowledge and understanding, and showed them good and evil.
- (8) He set his eye upon their hearts to show them the majesty of his works. (Sir 17:6-8 RSV)

God’s endowment of the knowledge of good and evil for humanity is oriented to praise his holy name and proclaim the grandeur of his works (e.g., Sir 17:10). In a similar vein, hard work also cannot be the consequence of Adam’s fall: “Do not hate toilsome labor, or farm work, which were created by the Most High” (Sir 7:15 RSV). Both the mortality

of humanity and hard work go hand in hand with each other: “Much labor was created for every man, and a heavy yoke is upon the sons of Adam, from the day come forth from their mother’s womb till the day they return to the mother of all” (Sir 40:1 RSV). In Gen 3:19-20, both death and hard work is intertwined with each other as a result of Adam’s fall. Taken gnominically out of the original context, both death and hard work come to be used to account for the basic nature of humanity. Such a tendency can help us to understand why the referent of the phrase “the mother of all” in Sir 40:1 is the earth, despite the fact that the phrase “the mother of all the living” in Gen 3:20 refers to Eve. In this sense, this observation is well pointed: “[t]he full human cycle is plagued by mortality; birth is from the earth, death to the earth, and life a limited period” (Levison 1988:36).

However, while highlighting the mortality of humanity, the sage did not lose sight of the dominion of humanity over all creation. Gen 1:26-28 is alluded to in Sir 17:2: ἡμέρας ἄριθμοῦ καὶ καιρὸν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τῶν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς, “He gave to men few days, a limited time, but granted them authority over the things upon the earth (RSV).” The reasons why the authority of humanity over all creation is proffered are given in Sir 17:3: καθ’ ἑαυτὸν ἐνέδυσεν αὐτοὺς ἰσχὺν καὶ κατ’ εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς, “He endowed them with strength like his own, and made them in his own image (RSV).” God bestowed humanity strength like his own and created them in his own image. The term ἰσχὺς, “strength,” in Sir 17:3 connotes “dominion” according to the scriptural traditions such as Job 26:12 and Isa 40:26, in which the term ἰσχὺς denotes God’s control over his creation. It comports with the term κατακυριεύω, “to exercise dominion,” in Sir 17:4, which is also used in Gen 1:28. The dominion of humanity over all creation drives home the fact that being created in the image of God is also a part of their basic nature. In Sir 17:6-10, being created in the image of God is predicated on God’s endowment of the knowledge of good and evil.⁵¹ Goering’s observation is well pointed:

Sir 17.1-10 provides an account of the creation of human beings which ends with a sapiential statement about their universal purpose. Human beings have a general, God-given capacity for sensory perception, moral action, and intellectual acuity...This general wisdom given to all humankind is the first apportionment

⁵¹ For the textual issue in Sir 17:8b-10, see Skehan and Di Lella (1987:279).

which YHWH as creator bestowed upon “all flesh” in Sir 1.9b-10a.

(2009:83)

For the sage, although the basic nature of humanity is mortal and doomed to return to the earth from creation, humanity, as being created in the image of God, is also inherently endowed with wisdom and knowledge by which to make a discernment between good and evil.

Such a tendency to establish the basic nature of humanity can also be found in Sir 15:11-20. It is worth noting that Sir 15:11-20 is theodictic. The sage refuted the objector accusing that “‘Because of the Lord I left the right way’; for he will not do what he hates... ‘It was he who led me astray’; for he had no need of a sinful man” (Sir 15:11-12 RSV). First, leading people astray does not accord with God’s own character (e.g., Sir 15:11-13). Second, humanity is given the capacity to choose freely (e.g., Sir 15:14-17). Based on these two primary considerations, the sage came to the conclusion that “God observes all sin but refuses to give permission for it” (Levison 1988:34; e.g., Sir 15:18-20). Briefly put, in Sir 15:11-20, the sage dealt with the free will of humanity in the context of defending theodicy in relation to sin and human accountability. Sir 15:14 is explicit in this regard: “[i]t was he who created man in the beginning, and he left him in the power of his own inclination” (Sir 15:14 RSV). The term *yetzer* is translated as διαβουλίον. Both Gen 6:5 and 8:21 have a negative bearing on the term *yetzer*:

(5) Then the LORD saw that the wickedness of man was great on the earth, and that every intent (רָעָה) of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. (Gen 6:5)

(21) When the LORD smelled the sweet odor, the LORD said to himself: Never again will I curse ground because of human beings, for the intent (רָעָה) of man’s heart is evil from his youth; and I will never again destroy every living being, as I have done. (Gen 8:21).

However, by disregarding the original context of the Flood in Gen 6:5 and 8:21, the sage located the term *yetzer* in the context of creation in Genesis 1—2. “This transposition requires a transformation of meaning” (Levison 1988:35). The term *yetzer* appears to be

an inherent component of humanity proffered by God from creation. If it were evil, it makes God responsible for evil. As a result, the negative bearing on the term *yetzer* as the evil inclination is removed: “For Ben Sira, it is a neutral capacity which enables people to choose morally” (Levison 1988:35). The neutral understanding of the term *yetzer* in Sir 15:14 is stressed when the sage made a thematic parallel with Deut 30:15-20 in the subsequent verses: “[i]f you will, you can keep the commandments, and to act faithfully is a matter of your own choice” (Sir 15:15 RSV). However, it is nuanced in that humanity is disposed to choose to do either good or evil according to their *yetzer*, in the power of which God left humanity. In other words, the term *yetzer* cannot denote the free will of humanity monotonously. In elsewhere, Ben Sira is deterministic (e.g., Sir 33:7-15). Such a tension between free will and divine determinism cannot be easily resolved. Although humanity has a capacity to choose morally according to their *yetzer*, God bestowed humanity the *yetzer* from creation and left them in the power of their own *yetzer*. This is because “[t]he sage wrestles with the existence of evil and the omnipotence of God, and his firm belief in the latter forces him to trace all created elements back to their divine source” (Adams 2008:187). Then, the sage made it clear that there are two distinct strands of humanity (cf. Goff 2003:117-118).

(10) All men are from the ground, and Adam was created of the dust. (11) In the fullness of his knowledge the Lord distinguished them and appointed their different ways; (12) some of them he blessed and exalted, and some of them he made holy and brought near to himself; but some of them he cursed and brought low, and he turned them out of their place. (13) As clay in the hand of the potter – for all his ways are as he pleases – so men are in the hand of him who made them, to give them as he decides. (Sir 33:10-13 RSV)

Such a dualistic anthropology in Sir 33:10-13 lies in the sage’s observation of all the works of God that one should be the opposite of the other.

(14) Good is the opposite of evil, and life the opposite of death; so the sinner is the opposite of the godly. (15) Look upon all the works of the Most High; they likewise are in pairs, one the opposite of the other. (Sir 33:14-15 RSV)

This tendency of being dualistic in relation to theological anthropology becomes clearer in 4QInstruction.

In summary, Ben Sira gives a glimpse of how the sage would understand and interpret the biblical Adam in Genesis 1—3 from a sapiential perspective. The primary purpose of Ben Sira is not theological, but didactic or pedagogical. When the sage dealt with sin and human accountability, it is always centered on theodicy. Humanity is mortal and doomed to return to the earth. Death and hard work cannot be the consequence of Adam's fall. Aside from the mortality of humanity, the sage took hold of the dominion of humanity over all creation in that they were created in the image of God. Being created in the image of God denotes God's endowment of the knowledge of good and evil from creation. There is no mention of Adam's disobedience in relation to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. All in all, Sheppard's observation is worth citing in full hereof:

In summary, Sir. 17.1-4 illustrates again the thoughtfulness and intricacy with which the writer weaves related biblical themes into a single fabric. The individuality of Adam and Eve has been forfeited in the desire to gather various statements of universal significance for mankind as they appear in the Genesis chapters. They have been carefully arranged in an unnumbered anthological list which emerges as a gnomic and scripturally based abstraction of created humanity.

(1980:77-78)

Besides, for the sage, the term *yetzer* can be regarded as morally neutral. Humanity is given the capacity to choose freely in a nuanced sense. Ben Sira has “an unresolved tension between the role of free will and divine determinism” in relation to sin and human accountability (Goff 2003:118). It is also the case of 4QInstruction, to which we will turn.

4.2. Genesis 1—3 in 4QInstruction

4QInstruction (Sapiential Work A) contains the longest extant wisdom materials among Qumran literature (cf. Goff 2003).⁵² It has known as “*Musar Le-Mevin*.” As with Ben Sira modeled after Proverbs, 4QInstruction also stands in line with Proverbs. However, 4QInstruction “contains important material that is alien to biblical wisdom. This is most evident in the theme of revelation” (Goff 2013:14). Of most importance in this sense is the phrase רז נהיה (hereafter *raz nihyeh*). Goff (2013:14) translates it as “the mystery that is to be” (cf. Collins 2003). The phrase *raz nihyeh* revolves around theological anthropology in 4QInstruction. Thus it is necessary to look into the phrase *raz nihyeh* before dealing with theological anthropology in 4QInstruction.

The phrase *raz nihyeh* does not occur in the Jewish Scriptures. Outside of the Jewish Scriptures, it can be found in Qumran literature such as 1Q27 1 i 3-4 (x2; [par. 4Q300 3 3-4]) and 1QS 11:3-4 (x1). In 1Q27 1 i 3-4, the phrase *raz nihyeh* “is associated with eschatological judgment,” whereas, in 1QS 11:3-4, the same phrase “signifies supernatural revelation given to the elect” (Goff 2013:14; cf. Thomas 2009:156-160). However, the phrase *raz nihyeh* occurs over twenty times in 4QInstruction. The phrase *raz nihyeh* “constitutes an appeal to heavenly revelation that is at the core” of 4QInstruction (Goff 2003:13). Theological anthropology in 4QInstruction is centered on the question of who “has access to this mystery and should study it” (Goff 2013:15; cf. Thomas 2009:156).

(6) [... day and night meditate on the mystery of ex]istence (in Goff’s translation: “[...day and night meditate upon the mystery that] is to be”), and seek continuously. And then you will know truth and injustice, wisdom (7) [...] understand the wor[k of ...] in all their paths together with their visitations for all eternal periods, and eternal visitation. (4Q417 frag. 2 i 6-7 [DJD 34. frag. 1 i 6-7])⁵³

More than that, the phrase *raz nihyeh* revolves around God’s creation.

⁵² E.g., 1Q26, 4Q415-418, and 4Q423.

⁵³ N.b. In DJD 34, frag. 2 becomes frag. 1.

(8) And then you will know (the difference) between [goo]d and [evil in their] work[s,] for the God of knowledge is the foundation of truth, and through the mystery of existence (9) he expounded its basis. Its works ... [with all wis]dom, and with all [intelli]gence he formed it, and the dominion of its deeds (4Q417 frag. 2 i 8-9 [DJD 34. 1 i 8-9])

The phrase *raz nihyeh* is credited as an instrument of God's creation (ברזי נהיה). That is why the attainment of the knowledge of good and evil can be done by way of studying "the mystery that is to be." The similar understanding of the ways in which God created the world can be found in Proverb: "The LORD by wisdom founded the earth; By understanding He established the heavens" (Prov 3:19). Hence Goff (2013:15) is correct in saying that "[t]his 'mystery' has pedagogical potential because of its association with the created order."

In apocalyptic literature in the Second Temple period, the term *raz* (רז) refers to "esoteric (revealed) knowledge" (Thomas 2009:153). First of all, *1 Enoch* is explicit in this regard.

(19) After that there shall occur still greater oppression than that which was fulfilled upon the earth for the first time; for I do know the mysteries of the holy ones; for he, the Lord, has revealed (them) to me and made me know – and I have read (them) in the heavenly tablets. (*1 En.* 106:19 OPT 1:87)

The term *raz* occurs in the Aramaic Enoch scrolls (4Q204 frag. 5 ii), where corresponds to *1 En.* 106:13—107:2.

(26) in [their] d[a]ys. [Fo]r I know the mysteries of [the Lord which] (ברזי מריא) the Holy Ones have told me and have shown me [and which] (27) I read [in the tablets of] heaven. In them I saw written that [gene]ration after generation will perpetrate evil in this way and there will be evil [until there arise] (4Q204 frag. 5 ii 26-27)

In 4Q204 frag. 5 ii 26-27, the term *raz* refers to knowledge that the angels revealed to Enoch (cf. Nickelsburg 2001:537). These mysteries have Enoch know of the perpetuation of evil generation after generation. Other examples are 1QS 4:18; 1QH^a 12:28; 17:23;

19:19; 1QpHab 7:4-5; 4Q300 frag. 1a ii-b (cf. Goff 2013; Thomas 2009).

Aside from the term *raz* as referring to revealed knowledge in apocalyptic literature, the *niphal* participle of the verb $\sqrt{\text{היה}}$, *nihyeh*, also merits attention. The *niphal* participle of the verb $\sqrt{\text{היה}}$ can be used to overcome the temporal restriction of other verbal forms. Goff opines,

The temporal meaning of the word [נהיה] makes translating this phrase inherently problematic. I doubt whether any translation can fully convey its temporal sense. Any translation of נהיה must specify a single tense—past, present, or future. The word itself, however, is trying to convey the fact that היה נהיה extends throughout all of history... While no translation is fully adequate, this rendering of the phrase [“the mystery that is to be”] is better than other choices that have been suggested.

(2003:34)

Briefly put, the participle *nihyeh* connotes “the entire scope of time” (Goff 2013:16). Such usage of the *niphal* participle of the verb $\sqrt{\text{היה}}$ can be found in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*.

(15) the times of their reward. From the God of knowledge stems all there is and all there shall be (הויה ונהייה). Before they existed he established their entire design.

(1QS 3:15)

Goff (2013:16) concedes that the *niphal* participle “is used to convey that all things, in the present and the future, are established by God.” The similar usage of the *niphal* participle can be found in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4Q402 frag. 4 12).⁵⁴ However, Goff’s contention of the *niphal* participle of the verb $\sqrt{\text{היה}}$ seems to be a matter of the “big picture” (VanderKam 2005:118). Aside from such usage of the *niphal* participle *nihyeh*, it is clear that “the word היה itself often points toward the perception of an existential reality that transcends time—or in other words to the fullness of spatio-

⁵⁴ 4Q402 frag. 4 12 reads: (12) [... all the words of knowledge;] because from the God of knowledge comes all [that existed for ever. And through his knowledge]

temporal reality” (Thomas 2009:152-153).

Besides, by way of studying “the mystery that is to be,” the *Mevin* comes to know of the final (eschatological) judgment (e.g., 4Q416 frag. 1 and 4Q418 frag. 69 ii).

(13) its [judg]ment. And all injustice will end again, and the time of tru[th] will be complete [...] (4Q416 frag.1 13)

(8) all the foolish of heart will be annihilated, and the sons of iniquity will not be found any more. [And a]ll who clung to evil will be ashamed. [And then,] (4Q418 frag. 69 ii 8)

Both texts have in common with each other the fact that they describe the final (eschatological) judgment in terms of theophany. All creation is to be trembling before divine judgment. At the same time, “all injustice,” “all the foolish of heart,” and “sons of iniquity” will come to an end. All the more the *Vision of Hagu* in 4Q417 frag. 2 i 13-18 [DJD 34. frag. 1 i 13-18] illustrates that such an eschatological event is “an ordained and established feature of the natural order” from creation (Goff 2013:17).

All in all, it stands to reason that the phrase *raz nihyeh* denotes “a comprehensive divine scheme” from creation to judgment (Goff 2013:15). The *Mevin*, the addressee, is given access to it and encouraged to study it (e.g., 4Q417 frag. 2 i 6-7 [DJD 34. frag. 1 i 6-7]). 4QInstruction makes sense of divine control over all creation from creation to judgment by way of associating the phrase *raz nihyeh* with God’s creation.

The *Vision of Hagu* pericope in 4Q417 frag. 2 i 13-18 [DJD 34. frag. 1 i 13-18] gives a glimpse of theological anthropology in 4QInstruction. There are two distinct strands of humanity or the ways of being human: עַם רוּחַ, the “spiritual people,” and רוּחַ בֶּשֶׂר, the “fleshly spirit.” The “spiritual people” have access to the *Vision of Hagu*; the “fleshly spirit” are denied. The designation, the *Vision of Hagu*, remains enigmatic. The similar expression of the *Book of Hagu* occurs both in 1Q28a (1QSa) 1:7 and in CD 10:6; 13:6. The leaders of the Qumran community such as the judges and the priests are required to learn the *Book of Hagu*.

(6) learned in the book of hagu (בספר ההג) and in the principles of the covenant, between (CD 10:6)

(6) and the Inspector shall instruct him in the exact interpretation of the law (בפרויש) (התורה). Blank Even if he is a simpleton, he is the one who shall intern him, for theirs is (CD 13:6)

(7) [they shall edu]cate him in the book of hagu (בספר ההג), and according to his age, instruct him in the precept[s of] the covenant, and he will [receive] (1Q28a 1:7)

Although the content of the *Book of Hagu* remains enigmatic, it is likely to some extent that both the *Vision of Hagu* in 4QInstruction and the *Book of Hagu* have in common with each other the fact that they are pedagogical in nature (cf. Goff 2003). Elgvin (1997:94) insists that the designation “the *Vision of Hagu*” is “an apocalyptic, visionary book which reveals salvation history from creation to the last days.” It is in this sense that the content of the *Vision of Hagu* may be similar to that of *raz nihyeh*. He goes so far as to say that the *Vision of Hagu* could be Enochic texts such as the *Apocalypse of Weeks* and the *Animal Apocalypse*. Lange (1995) insists that the *Vision of Hagu* should be understood as a heavenly book, not an actual book (pace Elgvin 1997). Lange opines,

Inhalt dieses Buches ist die präexistente Ordnung von Sein and Welt, welche die Schöpfungsordnung, die Aufteilung der Wirklichkeit in Gut und Böse, Weisheit und Torheit, Wahrheit und Frevel, Geist des Fleishes und Volk des Geistes und die sich in der Thora artikulierende ethische Ordnung der Welt enthält.

(1995:89)

Lange refers the *Vision of Hagu* to the heavenly Torah (e.g., *Gen. Rab.* 1; 1Q28a 1:7). However, the Torah is not mentioned in 4QInstruction (cf. Goff 2003). Thus it is fair to say that “4QInstruction appeals to the ‘book of remembrance’ to assert the inevitability of the divine judgment, not that the nature of creation is inscribed in a heavenly Torah” (Goff 2013:160). In other words, the *Vision of Hagu* can be regarded as “an abstract entity, akin to the *raz nihyeh*, rather than a book” (Hogan 2008:55).

The “spiritual people” who have access to the *Vision of Hagu* is distinguished from the “fleshly spirit.” The *Mevin*, the elect, is to be identified with the “spiritual people,” not the “fleshly spirit.” The *Mevin* also has access to “the mystery that is to be,” *raz nihyeh*. The *Mevin* is also distinguished from the “fleshly spirit.”

(1) your lips he has opened a spring to bless the holy ones. And you, as (with) an eternal fountain praise [...] he has separated you from every (2) spirit of flesh ($\pi\pi\eta$ $\eta\omega\beta$). And you, keep yourself apart from everything he hates, and abstain from all abominations of the soul. [Fo]r he has made everyone, (4Q418 frag. 81 1-2)

The *Mevin* is to attain wisdom to conduct morally by way of studying “the mystery that is to be.”

(10) according to a[l]l ... [...] a[l]l ... [he ex]pounded to their mi[n]ds, to every cr[eatu]re to walk (11) in [the nature of] its understanding, and he expounded to [...] ... /all/ [...] ... and in the correctness of understanding are made kno[wn the sec]rets of (12) his thought, while one walks [per]fect[ly in all] one’s [d]eeds. Be constantly intent on these things, and understand [al]l (4Q417 frag. 2 i 10-12 [DJD 34. frag. 1 i 10-12])

Notwithstanding this, the *Mevin* is also warned of the plan of *yetzer ra* (יצר רע).

(12) let not the plan of an evil inclination (יצר רע) mislead you [...] (4Q417 frag. 2 ii 12 [DJD 34. frag. 1 ii 12])

While the term *yetzer* is morally neutral in Ben Sira, 4QInstruction has a negative bearing on the same term. That is why “4QInstruction puts forward two very different ways of being human. The ‘fleshly spirit’ represents a way of living that is to be avoided, while the ‘spiritual people’ signify an ideal to which the addressee is to aspire” (Goff 2003:82). Despite this difference between the two, 4QInstruction also has recourse to Genesis 1—3 when dealing with two distinct strands of humanity as an instruction for the attainment of wisdom.

Of most interest to note in the *Vision of Hagu* pericope is “its characterization of judgment” (Goff 2003:88). It is already made clear in 4Q416 frag. 1 12 that “every spirit of flesh [the fleshly spirit] will be stirred up (ויתערערו כל רוח בשר).” Contrary to this, the *Mevin*, the elect, is distinguished from the “fleshly spirit.” (e.g., 4Q418 frag. 81 1-2). The inevitability of the final judgment against the sons of Seth (the wicked) is clearly affirmed in the *Vision of Hagu* pericope.

(13) their effects. And then you will know et[ernal] glory [wi]th his wonderful mysteries (ליל) and his mighty deeds. And you, (14) understanding one, inherit your reward in the remembrance of the [... f]or it comes. Engraved is /the/ {your} portion (חרות⁷ מחוק), and ordained is all the punishment, (15) for engraved is that which is ordained (חרות מחוק) by God against all the ... [... of] the sons of Seth (בני שיית), and a book of remembrance is written in his presence (4Q417 frag. 2 i 13-15 [DJD 34. frag. 1 i 13-15])

Lange (1995:83) regards the phrase חרות מחוק, “engraved is that which is ordained,” as referring to the Sinai episode in that the similar expression in Exod 32:16 seems to be alluded to. Given that the Torah is even not mentioned in 4QInstruction, however, Goff’s observation is suggestive hereof: “If there is a reference to Exodus 32, it is used to assert that punishment is ordained to come” (2003:88). The phrase חרות מחוק is used to make sense of an inevitable judgment against (על) the sons of Seth (בני שיית). Thus it is made clear that, by way of studying “the mystery that is to be,” the *Mevin* comes to attain wisdom to conduct morally and to know of the final (eschatological) judgment against the wicked. In doing so, the theological anthropology of 4QInstruction comes to the forefront.

The *Vision of Hagu* pericope introduces two distinct strands of humanity or the ways of being human to the *Mevin*.

(16) for those who keep his word. And this is the vision of meditation and a book of remembrance. And he will give it as an inheritance to Enosh (אניש) together with a

spiritual /people/ (עֲרֵי רִיחַ), f[o]r (17) according to the pattern of the holy ones (כְּתַבְנִית קְדוּשִׁים) is his fashioning (יִצְרֵהוּ), but he did not give meditation (as) a witness to the spirit of flesh (רִיחַ בֶּשֶׂר), for it does not know the difference between (4Q417 frag. 2 i 16-17 [DJD 34. frag. 1 i 16-17])

The referent of the term אָנוּשׁ can be either humanity, Enosh the patriarch, or Adam (cf. Goff 2003). First, the fact that 4QInstruction introduces two distinct strands of humanity make it less likely that the term אָנוּשׁ refers to humanity (*pace* Elgvin 1997). Second, it is less likely that Enosh the patriarch acts as a recipient of revelation in that there is no evidence in the Second Temple period (cf. Elgvin 1997:88; Collins 1997a:124; *pace* Lange 1995). Goff (2003) proposes that the referent of the term אָנוּשׁ can be the biblical Adam. The term אָנוּשׁ may connote the biblical Adam in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*.

(17) the laws of all things and he supports them in all their affairs. He created man (וְהוֹרֵא אֶת אָנוּשׁ) to rule (18) the world and placed within him two spirits so that he would walk with them until the moment of his visitation: they are the spirits (1QS 3:17-18)

Goff (2003:96) goes on to say that the phrase כְּתַבְנִית קְדוּשִׁים, “the pattern of the holy ones, serves to make sense of his contention of the term אָנוּשׁ. The *Vision of Hagu* is given to the “spiritual people” because their *yetzer* is according to the likeness of the holy ones (e.g., 4Q416 frag. 2 iii 17).⁵⁵ There is no evidence in Qumran literature where the term קְדוּשִׁים, “holy ones,” refers to human beings other than the angels (Collins 1999:613-614). In 4Q400 frag. 1 ii and 11QMelchizedek 2:10, the same term refers to the angels. The phrase כְּתַבְנִית קְדוּשִׁים can be regarded as a paraphrasing of the phrase בְּצַלְמֵ אֱלֹהִים, “in the image of God,” in Gen 1:27, “taking אֱלֹהִים in its angelic sense” (Collins 1999:613-615). Collins (1999:614) goes on to say that “if God fashioned אָנוּשׁ in the likeness of the holy ones then his inclination is in their likeness too.” Briefly put, the “spiritual people” have an affinity with the angels from creation, whereas “the fleshly spirit” is not.

Genesis 1—3 is employed in 4QInstruction in order to instruct the *Mevin* about “the

⁵⁵ Collins (1999:613) regards the term כְּתַבְנִית as image or likeness. He also refers the term קְדוּשִׁים to the angels.

nature of his elect status” (Goff 2013:18). While Gen 1:27 is alluded to in order to make sense of “Adam’s affinity with the divine realm,” Gen 2:7 is alluded to in order to highlight “his base and earthly nature” (Goff 2003:98). *Gen. Rab.* 14:3 also speaks of Adam’s affinity with the angels by way of citing Gen 1:26-27. The Rabbis in *Genesis Rabbah* took hold of two inclinations of humanity due to two *yods* in Gen 2:7 (i.e., וַיִּצְרֶה):

“Said the Holy One, blessed be He: ‘Behold, I will create him [man] in [My] image and likeness; [thus he will partake] of the [character of the] celestial beings, while he will procreate [as is his nature] of the terrestrial beings.’ R. Tifdai [also] said in R. Aha’s name: The Lord reasoned: ‘If I create him of the celestial elements he will live [for ever] and not die; while if I create him of the terrestrial elements, he will die and not live. Therefore, I will create him of the upper and lower elements, if he sins he will die, and if he dies he will live.’”⁵⁶ (*Gen. Rab.* 14:3)

In 4QInstruction, Gen 2:7 is alluded to in order to highlight the mortality of the “fleshly spirit.” 4Q416 frag. 1 12-13 indicates that the “fleshly spirit” is destined to meet an inevitable punishment on the Day of Judgment. The term רוּחַ בָּשָׂר, “fleshly spirit,” may be a paraphrasing of the term נִפְשׁ חַיָּה, “a living being,” in Gen 2:7 (Goff 2003:98-99). It denotes that ‘fleshly spirit’ has an earthly and base nature. Contrary to this, Gen 1:27 is alluded to in order to make sense of Adam’s affinity with the angels. 4Q417 frag. 2 i 16-17 [DJD 34. frag. 1 i 16-17] indicates that the “spiritual people” are to be given an inheritance together with Adam. The *Vision of Hagu* appears as part of their inheritance in that the “spiritual people” have access to it, whereas the “fleshly spirit” is not. Theological anthropology in 4QInstruction is thus more dualistic and deterministic than *Genesis Rabbah*. Given that the *Vision of Hagu* is centered on divine judgment against the wicked, it is not far-fetched to assume that the “spiritual people” could attain the knowledge of good and evil with the help of the *Vision of Hagu* (cf. Goff 2003). This being the case, it stands to reason that Adam is also proffered the knowledge of good and evil from creation as part of his inheritance. Although there are two distinct strands of humanity or two ways of being human in 4QInstruction—the “spiritual people” and the “fleshly spirit,” the portrayal of Adam appears to be more positive than the canonical

⁵⁶ The translation is from Freedman and Simon (1983).

narrative of Genesis 1—3. Adam has access to supernatural wisdom and possesses the knowledge of good and evil from creation; his *yetzer* is according to the likeness of the angels. The *Vision of Hagu* is intended that the *Mevin* is to be identified with the “spiritual people” and is encouraged to emulate Adam according to the nature of his elect status (e.g., 4Q423 frag. 1). As with the “spiritual people,” the *Mevin* is given an inheritance of glory (e.g., 4Q416 frag. 2 iii 11-12). The *Mevin* can attain the knowledge of good and evil in an emulation of Adam’s work in Eden, that is, by way of studying “the mystery that is to be,” *raz nihyeh*. Both Gen 2:9 and 3:6 are conflated in 4Q423 frag. 1 1 with the result that all of the trees in Eden appear to provide wisdom. Unlike Genesis 1—3, none of them is prohibited. It coheres with the positive portrayals of Adam in 4Q417 frag. 2 i 17-18 [DJD 34. frag. 1 i 17-18]. 4Q423 frag. 1 2 indicates that the *Mevin* is given authority/dominion over the garden of Eden.

(1)...and every fruit of the produce and every delightful tree, desirable for making one wise. Is it not a de[*lightful and desirable*] garden...(2)...for [*making*] one v[*er*]y wise? He has given you authority (*הַמְשִׁילָכֶךָ*) over it to till it and keep it. *vacat*⁵⁷ A [*lush*] gar[*den*...] (4Q423 frag. 1 1-2)⁵⁸

The term *הַמְשִׁיל*, “dominion,” is used elsewhere to refer to the elect status, that is, an inheritance.

(1) your lips he has opened a spring to bless the holy ones. And you, as (with) an eternal fountain praise [...] he has separated you from every (2) spirit of flesh (*רוּחַ בְּשָׂר*). And you, keep yourself apart from everything he hates, and abstain from all abominations of the soul. [Fo]r he has made everyone, (3) and has given each of them their inheritance (*נַחֲלָתוֹ*). And he is your portion and your inheritance among the sons of Adam, [and over] his [in]heritance he has given them authority (*הַמְשִׁילָמֶכָה*). And you, (4Q418 frag. 81 1-3)

(11) and praise his name continuously. For from poverty he lifted your head, and he seated you among nobles. And over an inheritance of (12) glory (*בְּנַחֲלַת כְּבוֹד*) he has

⁵⁷ N.b. *Blink*

⁵⁸ The text and translation of 4Q423 is from Goff (2013).

given you dominion (דַּמִּשְׁלִיכָה). Seek his will continuously. *Blank* If you are poor, do not say: I am poor and (therefore) I can no[t] (4Q416 frag. 2 iii 11-12)

The same term also denotes Adam's stewardship (cf. Goff 2003:101-102; e.g., 4Q504 frag. 8 4-6; 4Q287 frag. 4 2; 4Q422 frag. 1 i 9-10; 4Q381 frag. 1 7; 1QS 3:17-18). 4Q423 frag. 1 indicates that heavenly wisdom, which Adam originally possessed in Eden, can be regarded as the knowledge of good and evil. Hence Goff (2013:18) is correct in saying that "[h]is stewardship over the garden signifies that the special knowledge he acquires through the mystery that is to be entails toil, denoting the text's emphasis on the study of this mystery." Briefly put, The *Mevin's* elect status should be understood as "a restoration of the idyllic relationship" between God and Adam (Goff 2003:100). Despite the fact that Adam's disobedience in Genesis 1—3 is out of his concern, the author of 4QInstruction attempted to make sense that both the attainment of wisdom and moral conduct should go hand in hand with each other from a sapiential perspective. This is because 4QInstruction is "the best example available of a sapiential text with an apocalyptic worldview" (Goff 2013:19). The author of 4QInstruction twisted the curse of Adam resulting from his disobedience in Gen 3:17-18 as a failure of his stewardship from a sapiential perspective.

(3) [...*but the earth*] will make thorn and thistle (קוץ ודָרָדֵר) sprout for you and its strength will not yield to you...(4) ...when you are disloyal. *vacat*...(4Q423 frag. 1 3-4)

In 1QH^a 16:24-25 [Suk. 8:24-25; DJD 40. 16:25-26], the phrase קוץ ודָרָדֵר, "thorn and thistle," points to the fact that the garden of Eden has fallen into disarray. Thus the same phrase in 4Q423 frag. 1 3 illustrates that there is a possibility of "an inversion of the idyllic setting of Eden" (Goff 2003:103). Such an inversion of Eden serves to warn the *Mevin* of neglecting the study of "the mystery that is to be." The garden of Eden of thorn and thistle due to the failure of Adam's stewardship will result in "a life of wickedness" (Goff 2003:103). It comports with the warning of *yetzer ra* in 4Q417 frag. 2 ii 12 [DJD 34. frag. 1 ii 12]. The term *yetzer* in 4QInstruction "signifies a person's inherent proclivity toward good and bad behavior" (Goff 2013:177). Despite the fact that the *Mevin* is to be identified with the "spiritual people," whose *yetzer* is according to the likeness of the

angels, there is still a possibility for the *Mevin* to go astray. That is why the *Mevin* is continually encouraged to attain wisdom to conduct morally by way of studying *raz nihyeh*. Albeit less conspicuous, the phrase *yetzer ra* in 4QInstruction can be regarded as “a proclivity toward wicked behavior that should be avoided” (Goff 2013:177). 4QInstruction’s admonition to “avoid sin and punishment” through the attainment of wisdom is “a hallmark of its sapiential tradition” (Chazon 1997:18).

At this juncture, it is necessary to make some comparison between Ben Sira and 4QInstruction. It serves as a summary. First, both in Ben Sira and in 4QInstruction, there is no prohibition of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (e.g., Gen 2:17). Adam’s disobedience in Genesis 1—3 is thus out of their concern. The mortality of humanity is inherent. The sage made clear that Adam was proffered the knowledge of good and evil from creation (e.g., Sir 17:7). For the sage, the knowledge of good and evil appears to be intertwined with the Torah in the context of the covenant (e.g., Sir 17:11-12). Briefly put, the Torah is associated with wisdom.⁵⁹ Granted that, humanity is given the capacity to choose freely (e.g., Sir 15:14-17). The term *yetzer* appears to be morally neutral. The negative bearing on the term *yetzer* as the evil inclination in Gen 6:5 and 8:21 is removed. However, for the author of 4QInstruction, although Adam originally possessed the knowledge of good and evil in Eden, the knowledge of good and evil is not publicly available to humanity. Only the “spiritual people” have access to “the Vision of Hugu,” through which to attain the knowledge of good and evil; the “fleshly spirit” is denied. Adam’s inheritance, whose *yetzer* is according to the angels, is only associated with the “spiritual people” (e.g., 4Q417 frag. 2 i 16-17 [DJD 34. frag. 1 i 16-17]). That is why the *Mevin* is continually encouraged to attain wisdom by way of studying *raz nihyeh*. In 4QInstruction, the Torah is not mentioned; revelation is stressed. The author of 4QInstruction conceded the mortality of humanity in a nuanced sense. Humanity is doomed to die from creation in Ben Sira. However, only the “fleshly spirit” will die in 4QInstruction without eschatological hope (e.g., 4Q416 frag. 1 12), whereas the *Mevin* identified with the “spiritual people” is promised to a blessed life after his death, which is an inheritance of the angels (e.g., 4Q416 frag. 2 iii 11-12). Ben Sira conflated Gen 1:27 with 2:7 in order to make sense of the nature of humanity in the context of defending

⁵⁹ For the relationship (identification) between wisdom and the Torah in Ben Sira, see Goering (2009).

theodicy. In terms of the elect status, the author of 4QInstruction employed Gen 1:27 in order to deal with the “spiritual people” who have an affinity with the angels and applied Gen 2:7 to the “fleshly spirit” in order to highlight the earthly and base nature.

Second, while both Ben Sira and 4QInstruction take hold of the free will of humanity from a sapiential perspective, divine determinism cannot be easily dismissed. Even Ben Sira, who emphasized the free will of humanity, conceded that there are two distinct strands of humanity according to the order of one being the opposite of the other (e.g., Sir 33:10-13): “As clay in the hand of the potter—for all his ways are as he pleases—so men are in the hand of him who made them, to give them as he decides” (Sir 33:13 RSV). Although humanity has a capacity to choose morally according to their *yetzer*, God bestowed humanity the *yetzer* from creation and left them in the power of their own *yetzer*. Such a tension between the free will of humanity and divine determinism cannot be easily resolved in Ben Sira, the purpose of which is didactic or pedagogical, not theological. Divine determinism is more stressed in 4QInstruction, which is centered on the elect status and the final (eschatological) judgment in the *Vision of Hagu* pericope. 4QInstruction is dualistic. Although Adam’s *yetzer* is according to the angles, there is also a warning of *yetzer ra* (e.g., 4Q417 frag. 2 ii 12 [DJD 34. frag. 1 ii 12]). The phrase *yetzer ra* denotes the evil inclination to bad behaviors the *Mevin* should avoid.

In summary, although there are differences between Ben Sira and 4QInstruction in their emphases and pedagogical issues, they have in common with each other the fact that they would interpret and understand the narrative of Genesis 1—3 from a sapiential perspective in their attempts to deal with sin and human accountability.

5. Time in Second Temple Judaism

Of most interest to note in the *Weltanschauung* of Second Temple Judaism is that Jewish authors of the Second Temple period attempted to situate their present predicaments (i.e., the Exile) within the scheme of continuous history (cf. Adams 2008). In doing so, creation, history, and covenant come to be intertwined with one another with the result that their covenant relationship with God is affirmed; their identity is secured. These are the ways in which they could understand the past and interpret the present. In the sections that follow, we will look into how the authors of Ben Sira, Jubilee, and *I Enoch* sought to alleviate the impasse of the Exile up to a point of the hope of the future according to their respective contexts.

When it comes to the concept of time, Bellia's observation is instructive hereof:

“Time” is an abstract concept, malleable and inert, easily tamed by historians, and by exegetes, and is a different thing from “duration” which, with its distance, short, medium, and long articulates temporal happenings, defining them as “event”, “trends”, and “structures”.

(2008:50)

A concept of time is to be interpreted, not to be described.⁶⁰ That is why Jewish authors of the Second Temple period had frequent recourse to the biblical narratives in their attempts to establish a hermeneutics of *their* time, according to which their present predicaments should be interpreted.

⁶⁰ For the study of a concept of time in the Jewish Scriptures and Qumran literature, see Brin (2001).

5.1. Ben Sira

Marböck (1999:17) calls both Sir 1:1-10 and Sir 24 as the “Zwei programmatische Weisheitstexte.” In these two texts, while God’s creation is narrated, the role of wisdom in relation to creation and Israel is stressed. Both Sir 1:10 and Sir 24 appear to be mutually referenced. The ways in which the sage dealt with wisdom in these two texts are not to point toward the “Wesen der Weisheit,” but to explain that “wie sie zu den Menschen kommt und wo sie in the Welt sichtbar wird” (Marböck 1999:17). Such ways of approaching wisdom can give a glimpse of how the sage attempted to incorporate creation, history, and covenant in these two texts.

Sir 1:1-10 is extant in Greek, Syriac, and Latin, not Hebrew (cf. Marböck 1999). In this study, therefore, the text of Sir 1:1-10 will be from Sirach (//1:1-8 RSV).⁶¹

(1) πᾶσα σοφία παρὰ κυρίου καὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (2) ἄμμον θαλασσῶν καὶ σταγόνας ὑετοῦ καὶ ἡμέρας αἰῶνος τίς ἐξαριθμήσει (3) ὕψος οὐρανοῦ καὶ πλάτος γῆς καὶ ἄβυσσον καὶ σοφίαν τίς ἐξιχνιάσει (4) προτέρα πάντων ἔκτισται σοφία καὶ σύνεσις φρονήσεως ἐξ αἰῶνος *(6) ῥίζα σοφίας τίς ἀπεκαλύφθη καὶ τὰ πανουργεύματα αὐτῆς τίς ἔγνω *(8) εἷς ἐστὶν σοφός φοβερὸς σφόδρα καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ *(9) κύριος αὐτὸς ἔκτισεν αὐτὴν καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἐξηρίθμησεν αὐτὴν καὶ ἐξέχεεν αὐτὴν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ *(10) μετὰ πάσης σαρκὸς κατὰ τὴν δόσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐχορήγησεν αὐτὴν τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.

(1) All wisdom comes from the Lord and is with him for ever. (2) The sand of the sea, the drops of rain, and the days of eternity—who can count them? (3) The height of heaven, the breadth of the earth, the abyss, and wisdom—who can search them out? (4) Wisdom was created before all things, and prudent understanding from eternity. (5) The root of wisdom—to whom has it been revealed? Her clever devices—who knows them? (6) There is One who is wise, greatly to be feared, sitting upon his throne. (7) The Lord himself created wisdom; he saw her and apportioned her, he poured her out upon all his works. (8) She dwells with all flesh according to his gift, and he supplied her to those who love him.

⁶¹ Despite the fact that English translation is from RSV in this study, it is expedient to follow the numbering of verses in Sirach.

Of most interest to note is that “the significance of wisdom’s origins in creation” comes to the forefront (Mermelstein 2014:21). All wisdom belongs to God (e.g., Sir 1:1). Wisdom was created before all creation came into being (e.g., Sir 1:4). All the more the root of wisdom goes beyond the grasp of the human cognition. A series of rhetorical questions in Sir 1:2, 3, and 6 serve to make sense that only God himself knows the root of wisdom (e.g., Sir 1:8): “den es gibt Antwort auf die Fragen von Vv 2.3.6” (Marböck 1999:20). That is why God apportioned different amounts of wisdom to various groups as he pleased (e.g., Sir 1:9). Humanity is given wisdom; wisdom is not earned (e.g., Sir 1:10). There is no part of humanity in creation. Nor is there no part of humanity in the attainment of wisdom (Mermelstein 2014:22). The attainment of wisdom is a matter of God’s sovereignty in Ben Sira. For a sapiential perspective, therefore, although the tension between the free will of humanity and divine determinism is still on the go, the sage continually encouraged that humanity “can” strive to achieve the “ought” of God (cf. Maston 2010:28). That is why the phrase φόβος κυρίου, “the fear of the Lord,” in Sir 1:11-12 is introduced as the primary attitude in relation to the obedience to the Torah (cf. Schnabel 2011:45). Marböck (1999:23) is of the opinion that “9b-10 sprechen vom Ziel der ganzen Bewegung: all Werke Gottes, alles Fleisch, die Gottesfürchtigen, sollen daran teilhaben. Damit ist zugleich das Stichwort für die Fortsetzung im folgenden Abschnitt gegeben.” It is worth noting that, says Goering (2009:21-22), the parallelism between the verb ἐκχέω, “to pour,” in Sir 1:9 and the verb χορηγέω, “to supply or lavish,” in Sir 1:10 is not about identification, but intensification. In other words, the objects of these verbs are not identical. The verb χορηγέω points to the fact that disproportionate amounts of wisdom are to be given to “a *particular subset of humanity*,” namely those who love God, whereas the object of the verb ἐκχέω appears as “*all of his creations, including all human beings*” (Goering 2009:22, italics original). Thus Goering insists that such ways of apportionment of wisdom in Sir 1:1-10 correspond to the taxonomy of divine revelation, which is either general or special. It is for this reason that Goering is led to propose that such a special apportionment of wisdom given to Israel, which stands in line with the Torah, refers to Israel’s elect status as God’s chosen people (cf. 2009: *passim*). Goering’s observation is suggestive hereof in that it demonstrates that, for the sage, wisdom can play a pivotal role in incorporating creation, history, and covenant.

Thus, both through the principles of divine sovereignty and the observation of nature, Ben Sira bases his doctrine of election on his creation theology. Ben Sira goes further, however, and suggests that the election of Israel has its roots among the original acts of creation...In the book of Sirach, however, the dominant biblical view of Israel's election as a historical phenomenon is eclipsed by the notion that Israel's chosenness originates in a primordial decision on the part of YHWH. Whereas the biblical tradition generally roots election in "historical providence," Ben Sira grounds election in "primordial determinism."

(2009:61, 63)

For the sage, Israel's covenantal relationship with God cannot begin at Mount Sinai, where the Torah was given to Israel. The Torah in a form of heavenly wisdom was already proffered by way of the special apportionment of wisdom in creation. In other words, Israel's covenantal history is closely intertwined with creation. Hence Mermelstein (2014:22) is correct in saying that "God bestowed a special gift of wisdom upon Israel, a people whose history continued the process of creation." It connotes that both the conferring of the Torah at Mount Sinai and the impasse of the Exile cannot be regarded as the discontinuity of Israel's covenantal relationship with God. The hermeneutics of Ben Sira's time should be understood in term of creation, in which Israel's elect status is secured.

The ways in which the sage was at pains to incorporate creation, history, and covenant according to his present context become clearer in Sir 24. In Sir 24, the sage made it clear that Israel's covenantal history can be regarded as "the completion of creation" (Mermelstein 2014:17). Sir 24 is also extant in Greek so that the text of Sir 24 is from Sirach. In Sir 24, wisdom is personified. Wisdom personified praises herself—known as "the Praise of Wisdom": "Wisdom will praise herself, and will glory in the midst of her people. In the assembly of the Most High she will open her mouth, and in the presence of his host she will glory:" (Sir 24:1-2 RSV). Prov 8:6-8 is alluded to in Sir 24:2. More than that, Skehan and Di Lella (1987:331) point out that "Ben Sira shows his awareness of the five-line stanzas with which the author of Proverb 8 developed his them." The remainder of Sir 24 is about wisdom's monolog. Although wisdom was also created before all

creation came into being, the divine origin of wisdom enables her to speak of her glory: “I came forth from the mouth of the Most High, and covered the earth like a mist” (Sir 24:3 RSV). Wisdom’s covering of the earth like a mist (ὡς ὁμίχλη κατεκάλυψα γῆν) resonates with the spirit of God moving over the face of the waters in Gen 1:2. It is also reminiscent of Gen 2:6, where the mist (ἄνεμος) is depicted as rising from the earth (cf. Sinnott 2005:121). It is fair to say that the sage employed both Gen 1:2 and 2:6 in his attempt to link wisdom with creation. Sir 24:5-6 indicates that wisdom played her part in creation: “Alone I have made the circuit of the vault of heaven and have walked in the depths of the abyss. In the waves of the sea, in the whole earth, and in every people and nation I have gotten a possession” (RSV). Sir 24:5-6 is not aimed at narrating the details of creation, but at highlighting wisdom’s holding sway of humanity from creation (ἐν παντί λαῷ καὶ ἔθνει ἐκτησάμην). It corresponds to the apportionment of wisdom in Sir 1:9. Sir 24:7 coheres with the special apportionment of wisdom in Sir 1:10: “Among all these I sought a resting place; I sought in whose territory I might lodge” (RSV). Mermelstein (2014:18) is of the opinion that “[t]he creation of humanity, however, does not mark the end to Wisdom’s travels; rather, creation only concludes once wisdom has located her resting place.” Wisdom’s dwelling with Israel, however, is according to divine commandments rather than to her own choice: “Then the Creator of all things gave me a commandment, the one who created me assigned a place for my tent. And he said, ‘Make your dwelling in Jacob, and in Israel receive your inheritance’” (Sir 24:8 RSV). God’s assignment of a tent for wisdom is reminiscent of “a priest ministering in the tabernacle” in the wilderness (Mermelstein 2014:18; cf. Skehan & Di Lella 1987:333). Sir 24:10-11 reads: “In the holy tabernacle I ministered before him, and so I was established in Zion. In the beloved city likewise he gave me a resting place, and in Jerusalem was my dominion” (RSV). It can give a glimpse of why the priests and the cult in the Jerusalem Temple appear to be favored by the sage (e.g., “the Praise of the Fathers” in Sir 44—50). Besides, it seems that, says Mermelstein (2014:18), wisdom’s wandering before her dwelling with Israel resonates with Adam’s union with Eve. Wisdom’s dwelling with Israel “occurs during a part of the process of creation” (Goering 2009:66). It helps us to understand the ways in which the sage was at pains to incorporate creation, history, and covenant. Israel’s covenantal history cannot be divorced from creation. The covenantal relationship between God and Israel is located in creation. Such a covenantal relationship

between God and Israel, which is manifested by wisdom's dwelling with Israel, is affirmed prior to the description of God's creation of wisdom: "From eternity, in the beginning, he created me, and for eternity I shall not cease to exist" (Sir 24:9 RSV). Hence Collins (1997a:51) is correct in saying that "[w]isdom's quest for a resting place completes the process of creation." Kugel (1998:664) concurs by saying that wisdom's dwelling with Israel was already determined by God at the time of creation.

Wisdom's dwelling with Israel and God's assignment of a tent for wisdom resonates with Deut 32:8-9, where YHWH assigned the nations to the sons of God: "When the Most High gave the nations their inheritance, When He separated the sons of man, He set the boundaries of the peoples According to the number of the sons of Israel. For the LORD's portion is His people; Jacob is the allotment of His inheritance." As aforementioned in the previous sections, the Song in Deuteronomy 32 appears as a framework of history in the Second Temple period. As Israel became the allotment of God's inheritance in Deut 32:9, wisdom's dwelling with Israel in Sir 24:8 consolidates Israel's elect status as God's chosen people. While Deut 32:8-9 is used to make sense that "Jewish history had its temporal beginning in creation," Deut 32:10 points toward "the historical moment at which Wisdom found its way to the Jews" (Mermelstein 2014:31). Deut 32:10 reads: "he found him in a desert land, And in the howling waste of a wilderness; He enriched him, He cared for him, He guarded him as the pupil of His eye." The Song in Deuteronomy 32 serves to make sense that, for the sage, Israel's history appears to be patterned after creation: "The description of Wisdom's restlessness in Sir 24:7 is shaped by the outlook of Deuteronomy 32 rather than that of Proverb 8 and Job 28" (Mermelstein 2014:32). Briefly put, Israel's covenantal history is far from discontinuous with creation. By linking the Song in Deuteronomy 32 with the creation narrative in Genesis 1, the sage attempted to situate Israel's elect status within the context of creation.

Sir 24:13-17 employs various Edenic metaphors in support of the foregoing wisdom's monolog. Wisdom's exhortation in Sir 24:19-22 is aimed at consolidating the foregoing wisdom's monolog. Despite the fact that the phrase οἱ ἐπιθυμοῦντές μου, "you who desire me (RSV)," in Sir 24:19 may be reminiscent of the description of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in Genesis 3:6, no prohibition is mentioned (e.g., Sir 15, 17).

Wisdom is depicted as the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. All the more humanity's access to wisdom, which will provide the knowledge of good and evil, is encouraged. In Sir 24:23, wisdom appears to be associated with the Torah: "All this is the book of the covenant of the Most High God, the law which Moses commanded us as an inheritance for the congregations of Jacob" (RSV). Mermelstein opines,

Covenantal history does not simply begin with the exodus or at Sinai but marks the completion of creation, as Israel flourishes in an edenic paradise. The historical narrative of Wisdom's travels, which Wisdom recounts with the assistance of Ben Sira, thus links creation and revelation in a striking way.

(2014:20)

Such an association of wisdom with the Torah—albeit implicitly— appears to fit nicely into theological anthropology in Sir 17. In Sir 17:6-8, it is made clear that, despite the mortality of humanity, the knowledge of good and evil denotes God's beneficial endowment for humanity. God's endowment of the knowledge of good and evil for humanity is oriented to praise his holy name and proclaim the grandeur of his works (e.g., Sir 17:10). Not unlike Sir 24, the conferring of the knowledge of good and evil to humanity in Sir 17 is made during creation.

In summary, along with the special apportionment of wisdom in Sir 1:10, wisdom's dwelling with Israel in Sir 24 gives a glimpse of why and how the sage managed to incorporate creation, history, and covenant according to his present context. As a result, the impasse of the Exile can be revoked and be alleviated up to a point of hope: Israel's covenantal relationship with God is affirmed; their identity is secured.

In digression, such a hermeneutics of Ben Sira's time paves the way for understanding "the Praise of the Fathers" in Sir 44—50. In "the Praise of the Fathers," the sage was at pains to make sure that Israel's history had been patterned after creation, in which the scheme of wisdom's wandering-her dwelling with Israel (and her ministering at a tent) is established. Israel's history has been peppered with the repetition of wisdom's wandering (i.e., the Exile) and her dwelling with Israel (i.e., restoration). In other words, the

Deuteronomic view of Israel’s history, namely “Sin-Exile-Return,” comes to be explained in terms of wisdom’s engagement with Israel. Granted that, the sage attempted to introduce Simon the high priest as the present beacon of wisdom’s dwelling with Israel (cf. Mulder 2003). Simon the high priest serves to make sense that Israel’s covenantal relationship with God is continued or resumed—albeit in a form of a priestly covenant other than a Davidic royal covenant. Simon the high priest appears to assume the roles of David and Phinehas. By way of locating Simon the high priest into the rank of Israel’s heroes, who are a representative of the Torah piety, the sage made his addressees convinced that the present situation in the course of history is far from discontinuous with creation.

Meanwhile, “the Praise of the Fathers” in Sir 44—50, especially in Sir 44 and 50, shows a thematic coherence with both Sir 1 and 24 (cf. Mermelstein 2014). The famous men (ἄνδρας ἐνδόξους) or men of piety (דסח שי אגנא MS B)⁶² in Sir 44:1 is reminiscent of the faithful (μετὰ πιστῶν) in Sir 1:14, who were given wisdom as “θεμέλιον αἰῶνος” for them and their descendants in Sir 1:15. The faithful in Sir 1:14 corresponds to those whose prosperity will remain with their descendants in Sir 44:11. Sir 44:11 in MS B makes this correspondence more probable.

(11) μετὰ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῶν διαμενεῖ ἀγαθὴ κληρονομία ἕκγονα αὐτῶν (Sirach)

(11) their prosperity will remain with their descendants, and their inheritance with their children’s children. (RSV)

(11a)...עם זרעם נאמן טובים (MS B)

In MS B, the referent of those whose prosperity will remain with their descendants appears to be the faithful (נאמן). Such a correspondence between Sir 1 and 44 can also be found in Sir 50, where the sage would introduce Simon the high priest as the man of piety at that time. Sir 50:22-24 reads:

(24) ἐμπιστεύσαι μεθ’ ἡμῶν τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἡμῶν λυτρωσάσθω ἡμᾶς (Sirach)

⁶² For Hebrew manuscripts of Ben Sira, See Beentjes (1997).

(22) And now bless the God of all, who in every way does great things; who exalts our days from birth, and deals with us according to his mercy. (23) May he give us gladness of heart, and grant that peace may be in our days in Israel, as in the days of old. (24) May he entrust to us his mercy! And let him deliver us in our days! (RSV)

(23) May he grant you a wise heart (חכמת לבב MS B) and abide with you in peace; (24) May his goodness toward Simeon (י'אמן עם ששעון חסדן MS B) last forever; may he fulfill for him the covenant with Phinehas (ברית פינחס MS B) So that it may not be abrogated for him or his descendants (לא ת[.]רמ לו ולזרעו MS B) while the heavens last. (NAB)

The role of Simon the high priest as the present beacon of wisdom's dwelling with Israel is more explicit in MS B rather than Sirach. While the correspondence between Sir 1 and 44 is used to make sense that men of piety in the course of Israel's history in Sir 44—49 form part of the faithful who were given wisdom as “θεμελίον αἰῶνος” for them and their descendants in Sir 1:14-15, the correspondence between Sir 1 and 50 serves to locate Simon the high priest into the rank of men of piety in Sir 44—49.

Mermelstein (2014:39) points out that “Ben Sira thus concludes the Praise of the Fathers with the hope that the Wisdom of creation, transmitted to the faithful from eternity, will rest with Simon and his descendants forever, thus bringing the process of creation to a decisive close.”

Not unlike Sir 24:12, Deut 32:8-9 is also alluded to in Sir 44:1-2.

(1) Let us now praise famous men, and our fathers in their generations. (2) The Lord apportioned to them great glory, his majesty from the beginning. (RSV)

As Sir 24 begins with wisdom's praise of herself, Sir 44 begins with praise of men of piety. Such ways of beginning both in Sir 24 and in 44 serves to highlight that men of piety in Sir 44:1 are associated with wisdom in Sir 24. Sir 24:1-2 also resonates with Sir 44:15.

(1) Wisdom will praise herself, and will glory in the midst of her people (ἐν μέσῳ λαοῦ αὐτῆς) (2) In the assembly of the Most High (ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ὑψίστου) she will open her mouth, and in the presence of his host she will glory: (Sir 24:1 RSV)

(15) Peoples (λαοί) will declare their wisdom, and the congregation (ἐκκλησία) proclaims their praise (Sir 44:15 RSV).

The close association with men of piety and wisdom is also affirmed. Those who were an honored people (ἐν λαῷ δεδοξασμένῳ), in whom wisdom dwelt, in Sir 24:12 also correspond to people who will declare their wisdom in Sir 44. Besides, it seems that God's apportionment of great glory, his majesty is reminiscent of God's apportionment of wisdom in Sir 1:9-10. More than that, however, Sir 44:2 shows a thematic coherence with Deut 32:8-9 (cf. Mermelstein 2014:39-40). Hence Mermelstein (2014:40) is correct in saying that "Ben Sira implies that these men of piety are the subjects of the Deuteronomic passage." As aforementioned in the previous sections, the Song in Deuteronomy 32 acts as a framework of history in the Second Temple period.

In summary, "the Praise of the Fathers" in Sir 44—50 illustrates the ways in which the hermeneutics of Ben Sira's time is applied to his present context, in which Simon the high priest plays an important role.⁶³

5.2. *Jubilees*

The book of *Jubilees* (hereafter *Jubilees*) accounts for revelation given to Moses during the forty days on Mount Sinai. *Jubilees* forms part of the *relecture* of the Jewish Scriptures in the Second Temple period. *Jubilees* is a retelling from Genesis to Exodus. In *Jubilees* 1, "God describes to Moses the apostasy and ultimate restoration of his people, which will take place in the future" (Wintermute 1985:35). Then, the rest of *Jubilees* deals with the revelation given to Moses through an angel of the presence. Of them, *Jubilees* 2—4 is concerned with creation. Of most interest to note is that *Jubilees* 1 hinges on the Song

⁶³ For the role of Simon the high priest in Ben Sira, see Mulder (2003).

in Deuteronomy 32 in support of God's dealings with Israel. Granted that, the author/redactor of *Jubilees* attempted to situate Israel's election within the context of creation.

The author/redactor of *Jubilees* employed the keeping of the Sabbath as the means by which he could make sense of Israel's election in creation. *Jub.* 2:1 reads: "And the angel of the presence spoke to Moses by the word of the LORD, saying, 'Write the whole account of creation, that in six days of the LORD God completed all his work and all that he created. And he observed a sabbath the seventh day, and he sanctified it for all ages. And he set it (as) a sign for all his work'" (OTP 2:55). Compared to Gen 2:2, the author/redactor of *Jubilees* made it clear that God's creation of all his works was completed in six days. The author/redactor of *Jubilees* appears to be "correcting" the creation narrative in Gen 2:2 (Kugel 2012:29). His intention is on highlighting God's keeping of the Sabbath in the seventh day. For instance, the fragment of *Jubilees* at Qumran reads as the following:

(1) [And the angel of the presence told Moses at God's command: « Write all the wo]rds of the creation: h[ow] (2) [on the sixth day yhw God finished all his works and all that he had created] and rested on the [seventh] day (3) [and made it holy for all the centuries and placed it as a sign for all] his works ». *Blank* (4Q216 5:1-3)

God finished all his works on the sixth day so that the seventh day is reserved for rest. Moreover, God made the keeping of the Sabbath as a sign for all ages. Kugel (2012:29) points out that Exod 31:17 is alluded to in the phrase "and he sanctified it for all ages": "It is a sign between Me and the sons of Israel forever; for in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, but on the seventh day He ceased from labor, and was refreshed." This being the case, the term sign is reminiscent of the covenant made between God and Israel in Exod 31:16: "so the sons of Israel shall observe the sabbath, to celebrate the sabbath throughout their generations as a perpetual covenant." Although the keeping of the Sabbath is intertwined with the covenant between God and Israel in Exod 31:16-17, "Sabbath observance is not presented as a covenant stipulation" (Blenkinsopp 2011:150). Instead, not unlike the rainbow as a covenantal sign in Gen 9:8-17, the keeping of the

Sabbath should be understood as “a sign pointing back to creation” (Blenkinsopp 2011:150). The author/redactor of *Jubilees* attempted to trace back the divine commandment of keeping the Sabbath up to a point of Israel’s election in creation. It becomes clear in *Jub.* 2:19-20.

(19) And he said to us, “Behold I shall separate for myself a people from among all the nations. And they will also keep the sabbath. And I will sanctify them for myself, and I will bless them. Just as I have sanctified and shall sanctify the sabbath day for myself thus shall I bless them. And they will be my people and I will be their God.
(20) And I have chosen the seed of Jacob from among all that I have seen. And I have recorded him as my firstborn son, and have sanctified him for myself forever and ever. And I will make known to them the sabbath day so that they might observe therein a sabbath from all work. (OTP 2:57)

In *Jub.* 2:19-20, the author/redactor of *Jubilees* made it clear that the keeping of the Sabbath is only permitted to a people chosen among from all the nations, namely Israel. The expression that “they will be my people and I will be their God” corresponds to the covenant-making formula in the Jewish Scriptures.⁶⁴ The fragment of *Jubilees* at Qumran is explicit in this regard.

(9) two kinds - he comman[ded us to observe the sabbath with him in the heavens and on the earth. And he said to us: « I am going to isolate for myself] (10) a nation among my nations. And [they will keep the sabbath and I will consecrate them as my people and I will bless them. They will be my people and I will be their God ».]
(11) And he chose the descendants of Jacob among [all those I saw. And I registered them for me as the first-born son and consecrated them to me] (12) for ever and ever. The [seventh] day [I will teach them so that they keep the sabbath on it above all. For I blessed them and consecrated them as an exceptional people] (13) among all the peoples so that together [with us] they keep [the sabbath. And he lifted up his statutes like a pleasant perfume which is acceptable in his presence] (4Q216 7:9-13)

The phrase “an exceptional people” can be reconstructed as “עם סגולה.” Segal (2007:280)

⁶⁴ For the covenant-making formula in the Jewish Scriptures, see Rendtorff (1998).

is of the opinion that, within the context of covenant-making both in the ANE and Israel, this phrase denotes “Israel’s special status relative to the other nations.” It is reminiscent of Exod 19:5-6: “Now then, if you will indeed obey My voice and keep My covenant, then you shall be My own possession (אֶרְצִי) among all the peoples, for all the earth is Mine; and you shall be to Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation. These are the words that you shall speak to the sons of Israel.” In Exod 19:5-6, Israel’s special status is contingent on their observance of the covenant, whereas, in 4Q216 7:12 (*Jub.* 2:21-22), Israel’s elect status is established from creation (cf. Segal 2007:280-281). In other words, Israel’s keeping of the Sabbath is used to make sense of their elect status from creation. The divine commandment of keeping the Sabbath is first given in the Decalogue in Exod 20:8-11. Then, in Exod 30:16-17, the covenantal relationship between God and Israel is affirmed by the divine commandment of keeping the Sabbath, albeit contingent on Israel’s obedience. The narrative of Exodus introduces Israel’s special status as God’s *segullah* in the course of the covenant-making. By locating the keeping of the Sabbath in the narrative of Exodus in the creation narrative in Genesis 1—2, the author/redactor of *Jubilees* was at pains to transpire “the universalistic tone of the Creation story in Gen 1:1—2:4a” into the particularistic tone of Israel’s election (Segal 2007:282). Meanwhile, the author/redactor of *Jubilees* made it clear that Israel’s elect status from creation is vouchsafed to divine commitment. Hence Gilders (2009:181) is correct in saying that “the covenant does not create a relationship, it signals it.” It is in this sense that, despite their breaking of the Sinai covenant, Israel’s covenantal history is far from discontinuous with creation.

The Song in Deuteronomy 32 also serves to do justice to divine commitment by way of locating Israel’s dire situation of the impasse of the Exile into the Deuteronomic view of Israel’s history. *Jub.* 1:4 reads: “And Moses was on the mountain forty days and forty nights. And the LORD revealed to him both what (was) in the beginning and what will occur (in the future), the account of the division of all of the days of the Law and the testimony” (OTP 2:52). Revelation given to Moses at Mount Sinai encompasses Israel’s history from the past to the future. Kugel (2012:20) points out that Israel’s future history refers to “the event of the Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem and the Jews’ subsequent exile.” Then, Deut 32:46 is alluded to in *Jub.* 1:5.

(46) he said to them, Take to your heart all the words with which I am warning you today, which you shall command your sons to observe carefully, even all the words of this law. (Deut 32:46)

(5) And he said, “Set your mind on every thing which I shall tell you on this mountain, and write it in a book so that their descendants might see that I have not abandoned them on account of all of the evil which they have done to instigate transgression of the covenant which I am establishing between me and you today on Mount Sinai for their descendants. (OTP 2:52)

There are two differences between Deut 32:46 and *Jub.* 1:5: One is that Moses was instructed to write divine revelation in a book for transmission in *Jub.* 1:5 (e.g., Exod 34:27); the other is that, for the former, divine revelation is about his warning of abandoning Israel *because of* their evil, whereas, for the latter, it is about his commitment of not abandoning Israel *in spite of* their evil. The expression that “on account of all of the evil which they have done” is reminiscent of Deut 31:18: “But I will surely hide my face in that day because of all the evil which they will do, for they will turn to other gods.” In Deut 31:18, the expression refers to a warning of divine abandonment, whereas, in *Jub.* 1:5, the similar expression is used to vouchsafe to divine commitment. The expression can be reconstructed in 4Q216 1:14 as the following: [על כל הרע אשר עשו להפר הברית] “[for all the evil which they did by breaking the covenant which]...” 4Q216 1:14 also resonates with Lev 26:44: “Yet in spite of this, when they are in the land of their enemies, I will not reject them, nor will I so abhor them as to destroy them, breaking My covenant (לְהַפֵּר) בְּרִיתִי with them; for I am the LORD their God.” Lev 26:44 is also about divine commitment *in spite of* Israel’s evil. It is not far-fetched to assume that the author/redactor of *Jubilees* would conflate Deut 32:46 with Lev 26:44 in support of divine commitment *in spite of* Israel’s evil. For the author of Jubilee, such divine commitment points toward his countless (covenantal) faithfulness: “And thus it will be, when all of these things happen to them, that they will know that I have been more righteous than they in all their judgments and deeds. And they will know that I have truly been with them” (*Jub.* 1:6, OTP 2:52). It seems that the author/redactor of *Jubilees* had recourse to divine faithfulness and justice in Deut 32:4: “The Rock! His work is perfect. For all His ways are just; A God

of faithfulness and without injustice, Righteous and upright is He.” In Deut 32:4, God’s faithfulness and justice is stressed so as to do justice to his judgment against Israel: “do you thus repay the LORD, O foolish and unwise people? Is not He your Father who has brought you? He has made you and established you” (Deut 32:6). Mermelstein (2014:96-97) points out that “[t]his set of verses from the beginning of the Song of Moses lies at the core of the message of the book of *Jubilees*...God instructs Moses to write *Jubilees* precisely to acquit God of any wrong for Israel’s suffering.” In light of divine faithfulness and righteousness, therefore, it is made clear that, says Kugel (2012:21), “[t]he point of *Jubilees* is that none of this came about because God had abandoned Israel, but because of the people’s own contrariness. At the same, he [= the author/redactor of *Jubilees*] asserts, even in their sinfulness, God has not abandoned them.” *Jub.* 1:7-8 contains various terms and expressions reminiscent of those in Deuteronomy 31 (cf. Kugel 2012:22-23, Wintermute 1985:52). It sets the stage for locating Israel’s dire situation into the Deuteronomic view of Israel’s history. *Jub.* 1:7-8 reads,

(7) “And you, write for yourself all of these words which I shall cause you to know today, for I knew their rebelliousness and their stubbornness before I cause them to enter the land which I swore to their fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, saying, ‘I will give to your seed a land flowing with milk and honey.’ (8) And they will eat and be satisfied, and they will turn to strange gods, to those who cannot save them from any of their affliction. And this testimony will be heard as testimony against them, (OTP 2:52-53)

The fragment of *Jubilees* at Qumran also reads,

(4) after other gods [who did not save them from any tr]oubles. And the [testimony] (תענות) will reply [to] (5) this testimony (תענות); bec[ause they will forget all my statutes, all that I] command you and they will g[o after] (6) [the nat]ions and [after their dis]gr[ace and after] their [shame]. And they will serve [their] g[ods who to them will be a hindrance,] (4Q216 2:4-6)

Wintermute (1985:52) makes notes in the marginal that Deut 30:20 and 31:20, 27 are alluded to herein.

(20) by loving the LORD your God, by obeying His voice, and by holding fast to Him; for this is your life and the length of your days, that you may live in the land which the LORD swore to your fathers, to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to give them (Deut 30:20)

(20) For when I bring them into the land flowing with milk and honey, which I swore to their fathers, and they have eaten and are satisfied and become prosperous, then they will turn to other gods and serve them, and spurn Me and break My covenant. (Deut 31:20)

(27) For I know your rebellion and your stubbornness; behold, while I am still alive with you today, you have been rebellious against the LORD; how much more, then, after my death? (Deut 31:27)

The parallel between Deuteronomy 32 and *Jub.* 1:7-8 illustrates that while the Song in Deuteronomy 32 acts as שירה witnessing God's dealings with Israel, *Jubilees* acts as תעודה transmitting God's dealings with Israel: "[T]he author of *Jubilees* identified his own book with the שירה of Deuteronomy 32" (Mermelstein 2014:99). Deut 32:17 is alluded to in *Jub.* 1:11 (e.g., 2 Chr 28:3; Ezek 20:31; *1 En.* 99:7).

(17) They sacrificed to demons who were not God, To gods whom they have not known, New gods who came lately, Whom your fathers did not dread. (Deut 32:17)

(11) And they will make for themselves high places and groves and carved idols. And each of them will worship his own (idol) so as to go astray. And they will sacrifice their children to the demons and to every work of the error of their heart. (OTP 2:53)

The sins listed in *Jub.* 1:11 are stereotypical other than actual, namely idolatry. Kugel (2012:23) is of the opinion that "these were a real problem in *Jubilees*' day. The same is true of child sacrifice to the demons (as mentioned in Deut 32:17) a practice which had likely ceased in Israel long before the time of *Jubilees*." The intention of the author/redactor of *Jubilees* is on exposing the nature of the sin. The divine prohibition of

idolatry is centered on the relationship between God and Israel. In Deut 32:17, the demons to whom Israel sacrificed are newcomers, whereas the relationship between God and Israel goes back to the hoary old times: “You neglected the Rock who begot you, And forgot the God who gave you birth” (Deut 32:18). By tracing back the relationship between God and Israel in Deuteronomy 32 in the hoary old times up to a point of creation, the author/redactor of *Jubilees* attempted to vouchsafe to divine commitment *in spite of* Israel’s evil reflected such stereotypical sins. It becomes clear in that the author/redactor of *Jubilees* “consistently contrasts Israel’s election with the lot of the Gentiles throughout the book” (Mermelstein 2014:101; e.g., *Jub.* 2:31; 15:31; 16:17-18; 22:9). As in *Jub.* 1:5, Deut 32:17-18 is alluded to in *Jub.* 1:13-14.

(13) And I shall hide my face from them, and I shall give them over to the power of the nations to be captive, and for plunder, and to be devoured. And I shall remove them from the midst of the land, and I shall scatter them among the nations. (14) And they will forget all of my laws and all of my commandments and all of my judgments, and they will err concerning new moons, Sabbaths, festivals, jubilees, and ordinances. (OTP 2:53)

In *Jub.* 1:13-14, Deut 32:17-18 is used to highlight the divine warning of the improper calendric practice other than divine commitment (cf. Kugel 2012:24). Notwithstanding this, it is fair to say that such a divine warning still hinges on divine commitment in that Israel’s restoration is promised in *Jub.* 1:15:

And afterward they will turn to me from among the nations with all their heart and with all their soul and with all their might. And I shall gather them from the midst of all the nations. And they will seek me so that I might be found by them. When they seek me with all their heart and with all their soul, I shall reveal to them an abundance of peace in righteousness. (OTP 2:53)

Jub. 1:15 appears as a “pastiche of biblical verses: Deut 6:5, 30:3; 2 Chr 15:2; Jer 29:13; Ps 119:165; Isa 61:3 Jer 33:15; Deut 30:1, 28:13; Gen 17:8; Lev 26:44; Exod 29:46.” (Kugel 2012:24). Israel’s restoration status in *Jub.* 1:16 is reminiscent of the blessings and the curses in Deuteronomy 28.

(16) And with all my heart and with all my soul I shall transplant them as a righteous plant. And they will be a blessing and not a curse. And they will be the head and not the tail. (OTP 2:53)

(44) He shall lend to you, but you shall not lend to him; he shall be the head, and you shall be the tail (Deut 28:44)

(13) And the LORD shall make you the head and not the tail, and you only shall be above, and you shall not be underneath, if you will listen to the commandments of the LORD your God, which I charge you today, to observe them carefully, (Deut 28:13)

Israel's restoration status in *Jub.* 1:16 make sense that the curses in Deut 28:44 comes to be changed as the blessings in Deut 28:13. Such a divine promise of Israel's restoration hinges on Israel's elect status from creation. It becomes clear in Moses's plea in *Jub.* 1:19-20, which is modeled after Deut 32:8-9 (cf. Mermelstein 2014:103).

(19) And Moses fell upon his face, and he prayed and said, "O Lord, my God, do not abandon your people and your inheritance to walk in the error of their heart. And do not deliver them into the hand of their enemy, the gentiles, lest they rule over them and cause them to sin against you. (20) "O Lord, let your mercy be lifted up your people, and created for them an upright spirit. And do not let the spirit of Beliar [=Belial] rule over them to accuse them before you and ensnare them from every path of righteousness so that they might be destroyed from before your face. (OTP 2:53)

For the author/redactor of *Jubilees*, Moses's plea points to the fact that only Israel should be understood as God's inheritance, not the Gentiles: God rules over Israel, whereas the spirit of Belial [= Beliar] rules over the Gentiles. Based on the distinction between Israel and the nations in Deut 32:8-9, the author/redactor of *Jubilees* attempted to develop the distinction between God and the spirit of Belial. Besides, Moses's plea in *Jub.* 1:19-20 is reminiscent of that of Deut 9:26: "And I prayed to the LORD, and said, 'O Lord God, do not destroy Thy people, even Thine inheritance, whom Thou hast redeemed through Thy

greatness, whom Thou hast brought out of Egypt with a mighty hand.” In Deut 9:29, Moses’s plea is centered on God’s mighty redemption out of Egypt. By conflating Moses’s plea in Deut 9:29 with the distinction between Israel and the nations in Deut 32:8-9, thus, the author/redactor of *Jubilees* attempted to make sense of the distinction between the mighty God and Belial. Both the distinction between Israel and the Gentiles and between God and Belial serve to bring Israel’s elect status from creation to the fore. Mermelstein (2014:103) points out that “Belial and the nations, acting in concert, threaten to undermine the relationship between God and Israel that originated at creation.” The warning against the Gentiles also occurs in *Jub.* 22:11-23, where Abraham admonished his grandson Jacob. *Jub.* 22:16 reads:

And you also, my son, Jacob, remember my words, and keep the commandments of Abraham, your father. Separate yourself from the gentiles, and do not eat with them, and do not perform deeds like theirs. And do not become associates of theirs. Because their deeds are defiled, and all of their ways are contaminated, and despicable, and abominable. (OTP 2:98)

Jacob appears to be part of creation. *Jub.* 2:15-16 reads: “(15) And the total was twenty-two kinds. (16) And he completed all of his work on the sixth day, everything which is in the heavens and the earth and the seas and the depths and in the light and in the darkness and in very place” (OTP 2:57). The number 22 corresponds to the generations from Adam to Jacob, whose descendants God has recorded as his firstborn son, in *Jub.* 2:23.

There were twenty-two chief men from Adam until Jacob, and twenty-two kinds of works were made before the seventh day. The former is blessed and sanctified, and the latter is also blessed and sanctified. One was like the other with respect to sanctification and blessing. (OTP 2:57)

The reason why God has recorded the descendants of Jacob as his firstborn son is because it traces back to creation. Briefly put, Israel’s elect status as God’s firstborn son is from creation. Notwithstanding this, it is made clear in Abraham’s admonition in *Jub.* 22:11-23 that the threatening of Belial and the Gentiles is temporarily effected so that Israel’s dire situation can be revoked: “But (as for) you, my son, Jacob, may God Most High help

you, and the God of heaven bless you. And may he turn you from their defilement, and from all their errors” (*Jub.* 22:19, OTP 2:98). *Jub.* 22:19 resonates with *Jub.* 1:22-25, in which Deut 31:27 is alluded to.

(22) And the LORD said to Moses, “I know their contrariness and their thoughts and their stubbornness. And they will not obey until they acknowledge their sin and the sins of their fathers. (23) But after this they will return to me in all unrighteousness and with all (their) heart and soul. And I shall cut off the foreskin of their heart and the foreskin of the heart of their descendants. And I shall create for them a holy spirit, and I shall purify them so that they will not turn away from following me from that day and forever. (OTP 2:54)

Jub. 1:22 is also reminiscent of Lev 26:40: “If they confess their iniquity and the iniquity of their forefathers, in their unfaithfulness which they committed against Me, and also in their acting with hostility against Me.” By conflating Lev 26:40 with Deut 31:27, the author/redactor of *Jubilees* attempted to highlight the role of repentance in bringing out God’s promise of restoration. In the Song in Deuteronomy 32, God’s vindication of his elect people, Israel, began with his retribution of Israel’s enemy according to his righteousness (e.g., Deut 32:35-36), whereas, in *Jub.* 1:22, God’s restoration of his elect people, Israel, began with Israel’s repentance. The intention of the author/redactor of *Jubilees* in highlighting the role of repentance is on vindicating God’s faithfulness: “[T]he sufferings of Israel had not been the result of the divine failure, but the predicted and promised consequences of their covenant violation” (Gilders 2009:180).

In summary, the jubilean conception of both Israel’s history in *Jubilees* 1 and creation in *Jubilees* 2 gives a glimpse of how and why the author/redactor of *Jubilees* managed to incorporate creation, history, and covenant according to his present context. Mermelstein’s observation is worth citing in full hereof:

In the book’s opening two chapters, its audience learns that the exile did not signal a temporal rupture, a new era represents God’s permanent absence. Rather, creation marks the only relevant beginning, and the challenges of the author’s present simply indicate that God has not yet implemented the plan that he formulated at creation.

(2014:106)

The ways in which the author/redactor of *Jubilees* employed both the Song in Deuteronomy 32 and the creation narrative in Genesis 1—2 shed more light on divine commitment. For the author/redactor of *Jubilees*, such divine commitment through Israel's history goes hand in hand with Israel's elect status from creation.

5.3. The *Animal Apocalypse*

The *Animal Apocalypse* (hereafter *An. Apoc.*) is the second dream vision (*1 Enoch* 85—90) in the *Dream Visions* in *1 Enoch* 83—90. The *An. Apoc.* is an allegorical description of Israel's history ranging from the creation of Adam to the time of Judas Maccabeus and even to the *eschaton* (cf. Nickelsburg 2001:357). Of most interest to note is that the allegorist dealt with Israel's history in a symbolic manner of mapping the subgroups of humanity into various types of animals. While the allegorist's understanding of Israel's history appears to be accord with that of the Jewish Scriptures—chronologically and thematically, the ways in which he described Israel's history are theriomorphic (cf. Venter 2004:714). Nickelsburg opines,

Although the Vision's order of events down to the Persian period largely follows the order the narrative books of the Bible, the author has selected and structured the material according to a scheme of sin, punishment, repentance, and restoration that has much in common with Deuteronomic theology.

(2001:359)

Albeit thematically correct, it seems that Nickelsburg's contention fails to correspond to the practical ways in which the allegorist attempted to flesh out Israel's history. Unlike Ben Sira and *Jubilees*, no single text of Deuteronomy, let alone the Song in Deuteronomy 32, is alluded to in the *An. Apoc.* In the *An. Apoc.*, the allegorist's approaching of Israel's history is episodic. In doing so, the allegorist had frequent recourse to Exodus when describing various episodes in the course of Israel's history. Notwithstanding this, that is not to say that Nickelsburg's contention is wrong. When we zoom out the panorama of

Israel's history for the big picture, the *An. Apoc.* is centered on the human predicament, namely "the presence of sin" (Nickelsburg 2001:355). The *An. Apoc.* revolves around sin and judgment, as well as the sources of sin and evil (Nickelsburg 2001:356). When we zoom in to each episode of the theriomorphic allegory of Israel's history, the *An. Apoc.*, does not appear to be Deuteronomistic (cf. Olson 2013:58-59). Nickelsburg (2001:359) concedes that "the differences from the Deuteronomic history are substantial... Thus the linear historical view in Deuteronomy is replaced by an eschatological dichotomy between the end of one era and the beginning of a new and final one." For Nickelsburg, the *An. Apoc.* is about theodicy, the scope of which reaches over humanity *in toto* (2001:357). Compared to Ben Sira and *Jubilees*, albeit different genres, what is clear to the *An. Apoc.* is the fact that the focus and intention of the allegorist in dealing with Israel's history should lie in somewhere else other than Israel's special relationship with God. It becomes clear in that, in *An. Apoc.*, Israel's relationship with God does not trace back to creation. The focus of the *An. Apoc.* is on the universality of sin over humanity *in toto*; the intention of the allegorist is on establishing theodicy reaching over humanity *in toto* at the *eschaton*.

Genesis 2—5 is narrated theriomorphically in *1 En.* 85:2-5. *1 En.* 85:1-5 reads:

(1) After this, I saw another dream; and I will show you everything, my son. (2) Then Enoch responded and said to his son, Methuselah: I shall speak to you, my son, hear my words and incline your ears to the dream vision of your father. (3) Before I married your mother, Edna, I was seeing a vision on my bed, and behold a cow [= bull] emerged from the earth, and that bovid was snow-white; and after it, there came forth one female calf [= heifer] together with two other calves, one of which was dark and the other red. (4) The dark calf gored that red calf and pursued it over the earth; thereafter I was not able to see that red calf. (5) but the dark calf grew big, and it brought along that female calf [= heifer]; and I saw that many bovids [= cattle], which resembled it, proceeded forth from it, and followed after him. (OTP 1:63)

It is more likely that *1 En.* 85:1 can be regarded as the ending part of the foregoing dream vision in *1 Enoch* 83—84 (Olson 2013:147). Olson's contention helps us to understand

why the first person in *1 En.* 85:1 is changed as the third person in *1 En.* 85:2. In *1 En.* 85:2-5, the creation narrative of Genesis 1—3 is out of the allegorist’s concern. Unlike Ben Sira and *Jubilees*, God’s creation of all his works is not mentioned. Adam’s creation is only depicted as the emerging of a white bull out of the earth. There is no mention of creation in the image of the holy ones, albeit mortal; no mention of the bestowal of the knowledge of good and evil; no mention of Israel’s election from creation; and no mention of an agent of creation such as wisdom. Thus Olson (2013:57, italics original) points out that “*assessing the Torah faithfulness of Israel* is nowhere presented as the key to understanding the ebbs and flows of history.” All the more there is no mention of God who definitely created all his works. For the allegorist, thus, Israel’s history does not begin at creation. It seems that the focus of the allegorist’s description of Adam’s creation as the white bull is on the color of the bull. Unlike Ben Sira and *Jubilees*, the Cain and Abel episode in Genesis 4 is narrated theriomorphically in *1 En.* 85:4: The dark calf stands for Cain; the red calf for Abel. Cain’s murder of Abel is one of the sources of sin and evil. The black bull’s goring and murdering of the red one signal the beginning of human history. Violence is the main feature of human history. In other words, the change of the color of the bulls connotes that human history has gone off the track. The lamentation of the first heifer [= Eve] in *1 En.* 85:6-7, which is not attested in Genesis 4, ensues after this tragic episode of Cain and Abel. *1 En.* 85:6-7 reads:

(6) That first heifer departed from before the face of that first bovid, and looked for that red calf, but could not find it; so she lamented over it with great lamentation, in searching for it. (7) I kept looking until that first cow [= bull] came and quieted her; from that moment, she stopped crying. (OTP 1:63)

It seems that the lamentation of Eve owes its existence to a word play between the Hebrew name הבל and the Aramaic verb אבַל, “to mourn.” (Nickelsburg 2001:372). Eve’s lamentation can also be found both in *Jub.* 4:7 and the *Apoc. Mos.* 3:3. However, both Eve’s search for Abel and Adam’s successful comfort for her are unparalleled in the Second Temple period. It is not clear that why the allegorist attempted to highlight Eve’s lamentation in relation to the Cain and Abel episode. Both Eve’s fruitless search for Abel and Adam’s successful comfort for her may be used to denote a transition: The transition

from despair to hope. When compared to both *Jub.* 4:7 and the *Apoc. Mos.* 3:3, it appears to be probable.

(7) And Adam and his wife were mourning four weeks of years on account of Abel. And in the fourth year of the fifth week they rejoiced. And Adam again knew his wife and she bore a son for him. And he named him Seth because he said, “LORD has raised up another seed for us upon the earth in place of Abel because Cain killed him.” (*Jub.* 4:7, OTP 2:61)

In *Jub.* 4:7, Eve’s lamentation is less stressed, whereas the author/redactor of Jubilees attempted to be correcting Gen 4:25, where Eve, instead of Adam, gave Seth his name (cf. Scott 2005:53). Eve’s lamentation in the *Apoc. Mos.* 3:3 is also less stressed and used to highlight divine revelation given to Adam through Michael the archangel that Cain is a son of wrath and his warning of not lamenting for Cain: εἰπέ τῷ Ἀδὰμ ὅτι τὸ μυστήριον ὃ οἶδας μὴ ἀναγγείλῃς Κάιν τῷ υἱῷ σου, ὅτι ὀργῆς υἱός ἐστιν. ἀλλὰ μὴ λυποῦ... , “Say to Adam that do not reveal the secret that you know to Cain your son, for he is a son of wrath. But do not grieve....”⁶⁵ (*Apoc. Mos.* 3:2). Contrary to this, the *An. Apoc.* sheds more light on Eve’s lamentation and Adam’s comfort for her. Adam’s successful comfort for Eve is led to her giving birth of Seth in *I En.* 85:8: “After that she bore two snow-white cows [= another white bull], and after it she bore many more cows [=bulls] as well as dark heifers” (OTP 1:63). Eve’s giving birth of a white bull comes to be coupled with a white bull born with a huge horn at the *eschaton* in *I En.* 90:37.

(37) Then I saw that a snow-white cow [= bull] was born, with huge horns; all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the sky feared him and made petition to him all the time. (OTP 1:71)

The white bull in *I En.* 85:8, to whom Eve gave birth after the Cain and Abel episode, acts as a sign of proleptic hope given to humanity *in toto*, who have gone off the track since the time of Cain. Likewise, the white bull born with a huge horn at the *eschaton* in *I En.* 90:37, also acts as a sign of eschatological hope given to humanity *in toto*, albeit

⁶⁵ Own translation.

survived through divine judgment against all enemies. *I En.* 90:38-39 reads:

(38) I went on seeing until all their kindred were transformed, and became snow-white cows [= cattle]; and the first among them became something [=lamb], and that something [= lamb] became a great beast with huge black horns on its head. The Lord of the sheep rejoiced over it and over all the cows [= cattle]. (39) I myself became satiated in their midst. Then I woke up and saw everything. (OTP 1:71)

From *I Enoch* 86 on, the allegorist dealt with each episode of Israel's history in terms of violence and conflict, ranging from the episode of the Watchers to that of Judas Maccabeus. The allegorist attempted to unfold Israel's history in the purview of human history. In other words, while the allegorist dealt with Israel's history, the scope of his application should reach over humanity *in toto*. The allegorist was at pains to make sense that each subsequent episode is repeated according to the pattern of unfolding history. Mermelstein (2014:137) is of the opinion that "the dominance of the Seleucids, Babylonians, Assyrians, Egyptians, and numerous other enemies constituted one largely homogeneous unit." Although seventy shepherds were appointed to oversee their destruction in the period of the present and the near past, they still appear to be patterned after the past (Mermelstein 2014:138). The violence of devouring is repeatedly patterned (e.g., *I En.* 86:4, 6; 89:42, 56-58, 66, 68; 90:2-3, 6, 11). The crying out for the divine action of salvation is also repeatedly patterned (e.g., *I En.* 87:1-88:3; 89:15-16, 19-20; 39, 52). Divine salvation is also repeatedly patterned (e.g., *I En.* 88:2, 89:6, 27, 43, 48, 90:18). Hence Mermelstein (2014:142) is correct in saying that "[t]he past serves as a paradigm for how God will respond in the present." Briefly put, the unfolding of Israel's history is according to the pattern of the violence of devouring-the crying out for the divine action of salvation-divine salvation. Thus it is not far-fetched to assume that the zoom-out view of the *An. Apoc.* can be regarded as Deuteronomic (cf. Nickelsburg 2001).

Meanwhile, the motif of blindness plays a pivotal role in unfolding Israel's history. For instance, the episode at the Red Sea in *I En.* 89:21-27 is explicit in this regard.

(21) I continued to see the sheep until they departed from (the presence) of the wolves, and the wolves (until) their eyes were dazzled [= blinded]; yet the wolves

went out to pursue those sheep, with all their might. (OTP 1:65)

(25) Those wolves were still not able to see the sheep, and (the sheep) walked through that pool of water; then the wolves followed the sheep and ran after them into that pool of water. (OTP 1:65)

As for Israel, the reversion of blindness plays an important role in bringing out divine salvation (e.g., 89::21, 28, 32-33, 41, 44, 54, 74; 90:6, 9-10, 26, 35): “The fate of Israel depends on whether their eyes were open or closed, that is, whether or not they obeyed the divine will” (Mermelstein 2014:144). However, Israel’s blindness appears to be persistent until the final period of seventy shepherds in *I En.* 90:6-7.

(6) Then, behold lambs were born from those snow-white sheep; and they began to open their eyes and see, and cried aloud to the sheep. (7) But as for the sheep, they (the lambs) cried aloud to them, yet they (the sheep) did not listen to what they (the lambs) were telling them but became exceedingly deafened, and their eyes became exceedingly dim-sighted. (OTP 1:69)

In the *An. Apoc.*, all damned humanity is depicted as being blinded, whereas all redeemed humanity as being opened. *I En.* 90:9-12 reads:

(9) I kept seeing till those lambs grew horns; but the ravens crushed their horns. Then I kept seeing till one great horn sprouted on one of those sheep, and he opened their eyes, and they had vision in them and their eyes were opened. (10) He cried aloud to the sheep, and all the rams saw him and ran unto him. (11) In spite of this, all those eagles, vultures, ravens, and kites until now continue to rip the sheep, swooping down upon them and eating them. As for the sheep, they remain silent; but the rams are lamenting and crying aloud. (12) Those ravens gather and battle with him (the horned ram) and seek to remove his horn, but without any success. (OTP 69-70)

The opening of eyes from blindness serves to initiate the crying out for the divine action of salvation. However, all enemies such as eagles, vultures, ravens, and kites remain blinded. In the *An. Apoc.*, military action ensues after both the opening of eyes and the

crying out for the divine action of salvation (e.g., 89:35, 42-49; 90:9-10). *I En.* 90:13-19 appears as a pastiche of *2 Maccabees* (cf. Olson 2013:217). According to the allegorist's understanding of Israel's history, the opening of eyes, the crying out for the divine action of salvation, and military action act as a prelude of divine salvation.

As aforementioned, the white bull in *I En.* 90:37 is a sign of eschatological hope by way of being coupled with the white bull in *I En.* 85:8. In *I En.* 85:8, another white Bull, namely Seth, is a sign of proleptic hope given to humanity *in toto*, who have gone off the track resulting from the Cain and Abel episode. Contrary to the Cain and Abel episode, Adam's creation, which is depicted as emerging a white bull out of the earth, connotes the prelapsarian state in the *An. Apoc.* There is no black or red, only white: "Creation is a seminal moment precisely because it predates the distinction between different types of animals" (Mermelstein 2014:147). For the allegorist, the presence of sin reflected the repeated violence and conflict in Israel's history can be revoked and remedied when the *Endzeit* becomes the *Urzeit*. It becomes clear in that, after the eschatological battle and divine judgment against all enemies, all kinds of animal, which are survived through divine judgment, becomes white cattles in *I En.* 90:38.

In summary, the allegorist's understanding of Israel's history is distinct from those of Ben Sira and *Jubilees*. This is because of the focus and intention of the allegorist in the *An. Apoc.* lies in somewhere else other than Israel's special relationship with God. The focus of the allegorist is on the universality of sin over humanity *in toto*. His intention is on establishing theodicy reaching over humanity *in toto*. The allegorist's conception of salvation appears to be universalistic. It is universalistic in that all humanity survived through divine judgment at the *eschaton* will be saved. It is also universalistic in that all blinded and violent enemies will be punished through divine judgment irrespective of their nationality. Notwithstanding this, the allegorist was at pains to establish the pattern of the unfolding of Israel's history such as the violence of devouring-the crying out for the divine action of salvation (accompanied with the opening of eyes and military action)-divine action. Both in Ben Sira and in *Jubilees*, the Song in Deuteronomy 32 serves as a framework of Israel's history. In the *An. Apoc.*, only the zoom-out view of Israel's history is Deuteronomic. The zoom-in view of each episode of Israel's history appears to be

fleshed out by Exodus. Besides, the *An. Apoc.* brings the presence of sin, as well as the sources of sin and evil, to the fore. The Cain and Abel episode marks the beginning of human history peppered with violence and conflict. Contrary to this, Adam's creation connotes the prelapsarian state. It gives rise to the notion of “*Endzeit gleicht Urzeit*” in the *An. Apoc.*

6. Concluding remarks

As aforementioned in the beginning of this chapter, Jewish authors of the Second Temple period managed to reconceptualize the *Weltanschauung*, into which creation, history, and covenant are incorporated, as the means by which they could make sense of their respective situations, peppered with severe theological, sociological, and political plights, in the course of history (the Second Temple period). As a result, they could manage to alleviate the impasse of the Exile up to a point of the hope of the future according to their respective contexts. Given that the *Weltanschauung* of Second Temple Judaism revolves around creation, history, and covenant, these three components have been handled respectively—albeit intertwined with one another. It was observed that, first, the Song in Deuteronomy 32 serves well as a framework of history. Despite some differences, Jewish authors of the Second Temple period managed to pattern the hermeneutics of *their* time after the Deuteronomic view of Israel's history. Where they are in the course of Israel's covenantal *history* can be anticipated; the impasse of the Exile cannot be unprecedented. Second, theological anthropology based on the interpretation of Genesis 1—3 gives a glimpse of how Jewish authors of the Second Temple period interpreted creation. The mortality of humanity is not prescribed but described. The tension between the free will of humanity and divine determinism is on the go; it cannot be easily resolved. Notwithstanding this, it is made clear that theological anthropology does justice to God's sovereignty so that *theodicy* is questioned and explained. Third, the hermeneutics of time in the Second Temple period serves well to link covenant with creation. Israel's special relationship with God is grounded in creation; Israel's *covenantal* history is far from discontinuous with creation at a time of severe theological, sociological, and political

plights *in spite of* their evil.

Understanding the *Weltanschauung* of Second Temple Judaism is preliminary for the chapters that follow. It will set the stage for better understanding to what sense and to what extent the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* will be developed in Second Temple Judaism. Besides, it will provide to the Qumran covenanters the theological texture for the justification of their time and place in relation to sin and human accountability. The Qumran covenanters would adopt and adapt such a *Weltanschauung* according to their own (sectarian) situations. For instance, dualism or dualistic ways of thinking of the Qumran community should be factored into adopting and adapting such a *Weltanschauung*. (Inaugurated) eschatology is also the case. Both dualism and eschatology should be understood as coming out of the soil of the *Weltanschauung* of Second Temple Judaism.

Chapter 3. Sin and human accountability in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*

1. Preliminary remarks

At first glance, the Watcher story appears to ascribe the source of sin and evil to demonic beings (cf. Sacchi 1990:83). Thus it comes as no surprise that human passivity in relation to sin and human accountability is explicit in the Watcher story in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, albeit different in detail. Boccaccini opines,

[T]he rebellion of the ‘sons of God’ ...is the mother of all sins, the original sin which corrupted and contaminated God’s creation and from which evil relentlessly continues to spring forth and spread...The consequent unleashing of chaotic forces condemns humans to be victims of an evil they have not caused and cannot resist.

(2002:91)

Notwithstanding this, such various understandings of the Watcher story in the Second Temple period illustrate that human activity in relation to sin and human accountability cannot be easily dismissed. The Watcher story in the Second Temple period owes its existence to the sons of God episode in Gen 6:1-4. Although it does not form part of the Flood narrative in Gen 6:9—9:19, it acts as a prelude to the Flood narrative both in Genesis and in the Watcher story (cf. Wright 2005). We will turn to the Watcher story in both *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* presently.

2. The *Book of the Watchers* in *1 Enoch*

1 Enoch is comprised of independent Jewish apocalyptic traditions, each of which appears to be pseudonymously authored by Enoch in Gen 5:21-24. While they were written in Aramaic (e.g., five Aramaic fragments of *1 Enoch*, that is, 4QEn^{a-g}), the entirety of *1 Enoch* is extant only in Ethiopic (*Ge'ez*), which is the translation of the Greek versions (e.g., the Akhmim manuscript and the *Chronography* of George Syncellus). *1 Enoch* can be divided into the following sections: The *Book of the Watchers* (*1 Enoch* 1—36); the *Book of Parables* (*1 Enoch* 37—71); the *Book of the Luminaries* (*1 Enoch* 72—82); the *Dream Visions* (*1 Enoch* 83—90); the *Epistle of Enoch* (*1 Enoch* 92—105); *The Birth of Noah* (*1 Enoch* 106-107); and *Another Book of Enoch* (*1 Enoch* 108) (cf. Nickelsburg 2001). The *Book of the Watcher* (hereafter *BW*) in *1 Enoch* 1—36 is the earliest among them. Based on the palaeographical date of 4Q201 (//4QEn^a ar), Stuckenbruck (2004:99) insists that “there is no reason to question J. T. Milik’s conclusion that the *Vorlage* behind 4Q201 dates as far back as the third century.” Kvanvig (2009) insists that the *BW* falls into the three sections as the following: “The Oracle of Judgment” (*1 Enoch* 1—5); “the Watcher Story” (*1 Enoch* 6—16); and “the Journeys of Enoch” (*1 Enoch* 17—36). Nonetheless, scholars point out that the *BW* is comprised of at least five independent units: *1 Enoch* 6—16 is divided into *1 Enoch* 6—11 and 12—16; *1 Enoch* 17—36 into *1 Enoch* 17—19 and 20—36 (cf. Reed 2005; Stuckenbruck 2004). When it comes to the integrating procedure of these five units, there is a scholarly agreement. Kvanvig opines,

The Rebellion Story (6—11) forms the oldest part. The next step is the inclusion of this story in the Enoch Story (12—16), creating the Watcher Story (6—16). Then comes the adding of the Journeys (17—36), and as the final step the Oracle of Judgment that introduces the whole book (1—5)

(2009:167)

“The Oracle of Judgment” in *1 Enoch* 1—5, which acts as an introduction not only to the *BW* but also to the *1 Enoch* as a whole⁶⁶, appears to have been integrated at the final stage

⁶⁶ Nonetheless, *1 Enoch* 1—5 appears to have been already integrated into the *BW* before *1 Enoch* reached its present form. Nickelsburg (2011b:47, italics original) state that “[t]he emphasis on the judgment and other points of similarity

of the integrating procedure of the *BW*. Given that both introduction and conclusion can provide a hermeneutical key to understanding the body of any text (e.g., in the practice of discourse analysis), such an integrating procedure of *1 Enoch* gives a useful hint at the intention of the redactor of *1 Enoch* that 1 Enoch 1—5 can provide a hermeneutical key to understanding the *BW*. It is for this reason that it is necessary to look into *1 Enoch* 1—5 before delving into the *BW*.

2.1. *1 Enoch* 1—5

As an introduction to the *BW*, 1 Enoch 1—5 brings “Heilsankündigung für die Auserwählten im Kontrast zum Unheil der Sünder” to the fore (Hoffmann 1999:128). *1 Enoch* 1—5 employs the similar terminology of 4QMMT as referring to distinct groups. The “you” group belongs to the sinner group. *1 En.* 5:4-6 reads:

(4) But as for you, you have not been long-suffering and you have not done the commandments of the Lord, but you have transgressed and spoken slanderously grave and harsh words with our impure mouths against his greatness. Oh, you hard-hearted, may you not find peace! (5) Therefore, you shall curse you days, and the years of your life shall perish and multiply in eternal execration; and there will not be any mercy unto you (6) In those days, you shall make your names an eternal execration unto all the righteous; and the sinners shall curse you continually—you together with the sinners. (OTP 1:15)

Contrary to this, the “they” group belongs to the elect group. *1 En.* 5:7-10 reads:

(7) But to the elect there shall be light, joy, and peace, and they shall inherit the earth. To you, wicked ones, on the contrary, there will be a curse. (8) And then wisdom shall be given to the elect. And they shall all live and not return again to sin, either by being wicked or through pride; but those who have wisdom shall be humble and not return again to sin. (9) And they shall not be judged all the days of their lives; nor die through plague or wrath, but they shall complete the (designated)

with chapters 20-36 suggest that chapters 1-5 were *composed* as an introduction to chapters 6-36” (see also Hoffmann 1999:127).

number of the days of their life. (10) And peace shall increase their lives and the years of their happiness shall be multiplied forever in gladness and peace all the days of their life. (OTP 1:15)

Both the blessings given to the elect group and the curses given to the sinner group resonate with the blessings and curses in Deuteronomy 28 (cf. Hartman 1979). Given that *I Enoch* seems to be silent about the Sinai covenant, however, Nickelsburg (2001:160) insists that the curses of the “you” groups in *I Enoch* 5 are reminiscent of that in Isaiah 65—66. A possibility remains open either to Deuteronomy 28 or to Isaiah 65—66. Hoffmann (1999:128) is of the opinion that “[d]as Schicksal der einen Gruppe im Verhältnis zu dem der anderen steht nicht nur im Mittelpunkt der Einleitungsrede, sondern darüber hinaus im Zentrum des gesamten Henochbuches.” In a similar vein, Heger (2011:198) points out that *I Enoch* is aimed at persuading the sinner group to repent and at encouraging the elect group to take hold of hope. *I En.* 91:4 reads:

(4) for I exhort you, (my) beloved, and say to you: Love uprightness, and it alone. Do not draw near uprightness with an ambivalent attitude, and neither associate with hypocrites. But walk in righteousness, my children, and it shall lead you in the good path; and righteousness shall be your friend. (OTP 1:72)

It corresponds to the ways in which the author/redactor of *I Enoch* began in *I En.* 1:1: “The blessing of Enoch: with which he blessed the elect and the righteous who would be present on the day of tribulation at (the time of) the removal of all the ungodly ones” (OTP 1:13). The author/redactor of *I Enoch* would conflate both Deut 33:1 and Num 24:3-4 (or Num 24:15-17a) into *I En.* 1:2 (cf. Nickelsburg 2011b:47).

(2) And Enoch, the blessed and righteous man of the Lord, took up (his parable) while his eyes were open and he saw, and said, “(This is) a holy vision from the heavens which the angels showed me: and I heard from them everything and I understood. I look not for this generation but for the distant one that is coming. (OTP 1:13)

(1) Now this is the blessing with which Moses the man of God blessed the sons of

Israel before his death (Deut 33:1)

(3) And he took up his discourse and said, The oracle of Balaam the son of Beor, And the oracle of the man whose eye is opened; (4) The oracle of him who hears the words of God, Who sees the vision of the Almighty, Falling down, yet having his eyes uncovered, (Num 24:3-4)

(15) And he took up his discourse and said, The oracle of Balaam the son of Beor, And the oracle of the man whose eye is opened, (16) The oracle of him who hears the words of God, And knows the knowledge of the Most High, Who sees the vision of the Almighty, Falling down, yet having his eyes uncovered. (17) I see him, but not now; I behold him, but not near;...(Num 24:15-17a)

While the form of *1 En.* 1:2 corresponds to that of Num 24:3-4, its content coheres with that of Deut 33:1 (cf. Nickelsburg 2001:137). By focusing on the modifications of the Balaam oracles in *1 En.* 1:2-3, Nickelsburg (2001:139) points out that such modifications serve to highlight “some of its author’s emphasis, which anticipate essential elements in the texts that follow in 1 Enoch.” The Blessing of Moses in Deuteronomy 33 serves to “turn the attention to the immediate future...The death of Moses marked the end of an era, but it also introduced a new era in which the people of God would receive the gift of God’s land, which had been anticipated since the promise made to Abraham” (Craigie 1976:391). In terms of theophany oracle, therefore, the author/redactor of *1 Enoch* introduces himself (in the guise of Enoch) to stand in line of the prophets in scriptural traditions (cf. Nickelsburg 2011b). It becomes clear in that *1 Enoch* 1—5 employs biblical allusions more frequently than other units of the *BW* (cf. Harman 1979:23-26; Nickelsburg 2001:142-149). Deut 33:2 is alluded to in *1 En.* 1:3, 4 and 9.

(2) And he said, the LORD came from Sinai, And dawned on them from Seir; He shone forth from Mount Paran, And He came from the midst of ten thousand holy ones; At His right hand there was flashing lightning for them. (Deut 33:2)

(3) And I took up with a parable (saying), “The God of the universe, the Holy Great One, will come forth from his dwelling. (4) And from there he will march upon Mount Sinai and appear in his camp emerging from heaven with a mighty power.

And everyone shall be afraid, and Watchers shall quiver...(9) Behold, he will arrive with ten million of the holy ones in order to execute judgment upon all. He will destroy the wicked ones and censure all flesh on account of everything that they have done, that which the sinners and the wicked ones committed against him. (*I En.* 1:3-9, OTP 1:13-14)

I En. 1:3-9 conflates Deut 33:2 with both Mic 1:3⁶⁷: “For behold, the LORD is coming forth from His place. He will come down and tread on the high places of the earth.” The difference between *I En.* 1:3-9 and Deut 33:2 is that, in the former, God came from Sinai, whereas, in the latter, God will march upon Mount Sinai from his dwelling. At least it seems that such a modification of Deut 33:2 makes sense of its conflation with Mic 1:3 with the result that it serves to retain the coherence in its current context: God will come forth from his dwelling and from there he will march upon Mount Sinai. Notwithstanding this, it cannot be used to evidence the dismissal of the Sinai covenant in *I Enoch* (see Heger 2011; Hoffmann 1999; *pace* Bedenbender 2000:228-230).⁶⁸ Although the Sinai covenant appears to be largely absent in *I Enoch*, the fact that the author/redactor of *I Enoch* employed allusions of Deut 33:1-2 in *I Enoch* 1 can give a useful hint at the implied stance of the author/redactor of *I Enoch* concerning the Sinai covenant. The immediate context of Deut 33:1-2 is about the proffering of the Law through Moses: “Moses charged us with a law, A possession for the assembly of Jacob” (Deut 33:4). Thus it is not far-fetched to assume that, although the author/redactor of *I Enoch* did not mention the Law explicitly, it would have implied that the Law (the Sinai covenant) will play a directive role in discerning what is good and what is evil (cf. Tigchelaar 2008a; Hoffmann 1999; Heger 2011).⁶⁹ Hence Tigchelaar (2008a:94) is correct in saying that *I Enoch* “precedes but also implies the Law. In this sense, there is no conflict between Enoch and Moses.” It is anachronistic that the pseudonymous Enoch spoke of the Sinai covenant. In order to gain authority of his work, the author/redactor of *I Enoch* would feel the need to avoid anachronism. In a similar vein, Hoffmann (1999:131) is of the opinion that “[d]as Gesetz Gottes, hinter dem sich fraglos die von Gott am Sinai erlassene

⁶⁷ E.g., other possible allusions are Jer 25:31; Hab 3:3, 6, 10.

⁶⁸ Bedenbender (2000) insists that the term Sinai in *I En.* 1:3-9 should be understood in terms that the author/redactor of *I Enoch* attempted to achieve the “Mosaisierung” of *I Enoch*, which was originally composed as non-Mosaic. For the so-called “Enochic Judaism,” see Boccaccini (1998).

⁶⁹ It should be borne in mind that the purity law is only prescribed by the Sinai covenant and the *BW* is also concerned with the ritual purity. See Werrett (2007) and Frölich (2015).

Mosetora verbirgt, ist und bleibt Maßstab für Gottes Urteil im Endgericht.” Notwithstanding this, it is fair to say that the author/redactor of *I Enoch* would transpire the implied role of the Sinai covenant into the universalistic plane. It becomes clear in *I En.* 5:7-9, where both the Law and wisdom appear to be mutually referenced.⁷⁰

I En. 1:1-2 introduces divine judgment at the *eschaton*. The theophany oracle in *I En.* 1:3—5:9 ensues after this introduction (cf. Nickelsburg 2001:137). Hoffmann’s observation on the structure of *I Enoch* 1—5 is instructive hereof:

Auf eine Theophanieschilderung, die bewußt als Theophanie zum Gericht gestaltet ist (1,3c-9), folgen eine Reihe von Imperativen, die zur Betrachtung irdischer und kosmischer Naturerscheinungen auffordern (2,1-5,3). Den Abschluß der Einleitungsrede bilden eien auf die Frevler bezogene Anklage (5,4a-d) und Unheilsankündigung (5,4e-6. 7c) sowie eine Heilsansage an die Auserwählten (5,7a-b. 8-9).

(1999:128)

In *I En.* 2:1—5:4, the contrast between the obedient creation and the disobedient humanity is repeatedly introduced. In doing so, the author/redactor of *I Enoch* attempted not only to highlight the sinfulness of humanity but also to make sense of the nature of the sinfulness of humanity. *I En.* 2:1—5:4 follows the pattern of the wisdom tradition in dealing with the taxonomy of what is good and what is evil. While all creation has kept their positions according to divine commandments, humanity has gone off the track. Hoffmann (1999:130) points out that “[i]m Mittelpunkt steht hierbei der Gedanke des Gehorsams der Schöpfungswerke gegenüber der ihnen von Gott auferlegten Ordnung.” The nature of the sinfulness of humanity lies in the fact that, unlike the obedient creation, humanity has changed (e.g., *I En.* 2:1, 2; 5:2) or transgressed (*I En.* 2:1; 5:4) the created order, which has been incumbent upon them from creation. *I En.* 2:1 read:

(1) Examine all the activit(ies which take place) in the sky and how they do not alter their ways, (and examine) the luminaries of heaven, how each one of them rises and

⁷⁰ Such a tendency is more explicit in *Jubilees*.

sets; each one is systematic according to its respective season; and they do not divert from their appointed order. (OTP 1:14)

In *1 Enoch* 1—5, “[k]osmische und ethische Sachverhalte gehören untrennbar zusammen” (Hoffmann 1999:132). In other words, for the author/redactor of *1 Enoch*, the orderliness of all creation in a cosmic sense is analogously used to refer to obedience to divine commandments in an ethical sense. The sinner group in *1 Enoch* 1—5 highlights human activity in relation to divine judgment, whereas the elect group in *1 Enoch* 1—5 highlights human passivity in relation to the divine gift. Hoffmann opines,

Aus 5,8 geht eindeutig hervor, daß auch die Auserwählten in der Zeit vor Gottes Gerichtshandeln nicht frei von Sünde waren. Sie machten sich der Sünde aus “Pflichtvergessenheit” und “Überheblichkeit” schuldig.
(1999:133)

Thus it stands to reason that the author/redactor of *1 Enoch* would hinge on the universality of sin over humanity *in toto*. It becomes clear in that both human activity in relation to divine judgment and human passivity in relation to the divine gift should go hand in hand with each other in understanding God’s dealings with humanity in *1 Enoch* 1—5. As a result, both divine sovereignty and theodicy are questioned and explained.⁷¹ That is why *1 Enoch* is eschatological in its direction.

Given that *1 Enoch* 1—5 appears to have been integrated into the *BW* at the final stage, Kvanvig (2009:170) points out that “1 En 1—5 is primarily formed on the basis of the Watcher Story as a master narrative.” Both the Watchers in *1 Enoch* 6—16 and humanity in *1 Enoch* 1—5 have in common with each other the fact that they changed and transgressed the created order, which has been incumbent upon them from creation. However, *1 Enoch* 1—5 does not explain how the Watcher story is interrelated with the sinfulness of humanity. At least we can glean information from the investigation in *1 Enoch* 1—5 that the Watcher story in the *BW* should be understood not only as etiological but also as typological.

⁷¹ For divine sovereignty and theodicy in *1 Enoch*, see Argall (1995).

2.2. *1 Enoch* 6—11

1 Enoch 6—11 is literarily distinct from other units of the *BW* in that Enoch the protagonist is not mentioned. That is to say, from a vantage point of the integrating procedure of the *BW*⁷², *1 Enoch* 6—11 provides a hermeneutical key to understanding the *BW*. Although the phrase “the sons of God” in Gen 6:1-4 does not occur in *1 Enoch* 6—11, at least it seems that the fact that the Watchers assume the role of the sons of God gives us a useful hint at the rationale of the author/redactor of *1 Enoch*’s appropriation of the sons of God episode in Gen 6:1-4 according to his purpose in composing the *BW*. When it comes to the role and status of the Watchers⁷³, the Watchers are a class of angels, whose task is to petition on behalf of humanity. *1 En.* 15:2 reads:

(2) And tell the Watchers of heaven on whose behalf you [= Enoch] have been sent to intercede: It is meet (for you) that you intercede on behalf of man, and not man on your behalf. (OTP 1:21)

The Watchers appear to be similar to the archangels in the *BW* (e.g., *1 En.* 14:1, 23; 15:3). As the archangels were given the role to watch in *1 En.* 20:1, the Watchers were also supposed to keep watching vigilantly according to the created order. *1 En.* 12:3-4a reads:

(3) And I, Enoch, began to bless the Lord of the mighty ones and the King of the universe. (4) At that moment the Watchers [= archangels] were calling me. And they said to me, “Enoch, scribe of righteousness, go and make known to the Watchers of heaven [= fallen angels] who have abandoned the high heaven, the holy eternal place...(OTP 1:19)

By comparing the role and status of the Watchers with those of the archangels, the author/redactor of *1 Enoch* pointed to the fact that the Watchers changed and transgressed the created order, which has been incumbent upon them from creation (e.g., like humanity

⁷² *1 Enoch* 6—11 is the earliest unit among the *BW*.

⁷³ For the term Watchers in the *BW*, see Wright (2005:99-100).

in *1 Enoch* 1—5). While adapting Gen 6:1-4 in the Watcher story in the *BW*, the author/redactor of *1 Enoch* may have recourse to Deut 32:8, albeit implicitly.

(8) When the Most High gave the nations their inheritance, When He separated the sons of man, He set the boundaries of the peoples According to the number of the sons of Israel (Deut 32:8)

Deut 32:8 is used to refer to the position of the Watcher prior to their fall in *1 Enoch* (Wright 2005:101). Based on the fact that the phrase בני ישראל, “sons of Israel,” in Deut 32:8 appears to be translated as ἀγγέλων θεοῦ in most LXX manuscripts, which corresponds to Aquila, whereas as υἱῶν θεοῦ in 848 and 106c, which corresponds to בני אלהים in 4QDeut,⁷⁴ Tov (1992:269) attempted to reconstruct the original wording of Deut 32:8 as the following: “[T]he Most High, ‘*Elyon*, fixed the boundaries of peoples according to the number of the sons of the God *El*.” This being the case, it is not far-fetched to assume that the author/redactor of *1 Enoch* would locate the Watcher story in the *BW* in the scheme of the Song in Deuteronomy 32. Along with the Blessing in Deuteronomy 33 in *1 Enoch* 1—5, the Song in Deuteronomy 32 serves as a framework of Israel’s history in *1 Enoch* 6—11. In the *An. Apoc.*, where the author/redactor of *1 Enoch* dealt with an allegorical description of Israel’s history ranging from the creation of Adam to the time of Judas Maccabeus and even to the *eschaton* (cf. Nickelsburg 2001:357),⁷⁵ the Watchers are depicted as stars.⁷⁶ *1 En.* 86:1-3 reads:

(1) Again I saw (a vision) with my own eyes as I was sleeping, and saw the lofty heaven; and as I looked, behold, a star fell down from heaven but (managed) to rise and eat and to be pastured among those cows...(3) Once again I saw a vision, and I observed the sky and behold, I saw many stars descending and casting themselves down from the sky upon that first star; and they became bovids among those calves and were pastured together with them, in their midst. (OTP 1:63)

In the *An. Apoc.*, there were two distinct traditions of the Watchers, namely the

⁷⁴ E.g., בני אלים or בני אל, 4Q44 (//4QDeut⁹).

⁷⁵ For both the zoom-out view’s Israel’s history and the zoom-in view of it in the *An. Apoc.*, see §5.3. in chapter 2.

⁷⁶ E.g., Ps 148:2; Job 38:7; *Sonn.* 1.134.

Shemihazah tradition and the Asael tradition, albeit less explicit in the *BW*. A star in *I En.* 86:1 refers to Asael; the stars in *I En.* 86:3 denote Shemihazah and the Watchers. We will turn to these two traditions in the *BW* presently.

I En. 6:1-2 resonates with Gen 6:1-2 as the following:

(1) Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them, (2) that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose. (Gen 6:1-2)

(1) In those days, when the children of man had multiplied, it happened that there were born unto them handsome and beautiful daughters. (2) And the angels, the children of heaven, saw them and desired them; and they said to one another, "Come, let us choose wives for ourselves from among the daughters of man and beget us children." (1 En. 6:1-2, OTP 1:15)

As aforementioned above, the Watchers appear to assume the role of the sons of God in Genesis 6 according to the purpose in composing the *BW*. Aside from that, what is added to the sons of God episode in Gen 6:1-4 is that the actions of the Watchers in the *BW* are aimed at the procreation of offspring. Such actions of the Watchers in the *BW* illustrate that the Watchers changed and transgressed the created order, which has been incumbent upon them from creation. *I En.* 15:4-7 reads:

(4) Surely you, you [used to be] holy, spiritual, the living ones, [possessing] eternal life; but (now) you have defiled yourselves with women, and with the blood of the flesh begotten children, you have lusted with the blood of the people, like them producing blood and flesh, (which) die and perish. (5) One that account, I have given you wives in order that (seeds) might be sown upon them and children born by them, so that the deeds that are done upon the earth will not be withheld from you. (6) Indeed you, formerly you were spiritual, (having) eternal life, and immortal in all the generations of the world. (7) That is why (formerly) I did not make wives for you, for the dwelling of the spiritual beings of heaven is heaven. (OTP 1:21)

The Watchers were created as the spiritual beings of heaven, who don't need procreation. Without the help of procreation, their existence was supposed to be eternal and holy. However, while having illicit union with women, the Watchers appear to change and transgress the created order prescribed for the spiritual beings of heaven. Of course, the motivation of the Watchers' transgression lies in the fact that they were driven by their lusts. Unlike Gen 6:1-4, the chief leader of the Watchers is named in *1 En.* 6:3.

(3) And Semyaz [= Shemihazah], being their leader, said unto them, "I fear that perhaps you will not consent that this deed should be done, and I alone will become (responsible) for this great sin." (OTP 1:15)

The chief leader of the Watchers is Shemihazah. He took the responsibility for such great sin of changing and transgressing the created order. Notwithstanding this, the rest of the Watcher also appear to be responsible for their sins due to their resolute response to Shemihazah's suggestion. *1 En.* 6:4-6 reads:

(4) But they all responded to him, "Let us all swear an oath and bind everyone among us by a curse not to abandon this suggestion but to do the deed." (5) Then they all swore together and bound one another by (the curse). (6) And they were altogether two hundred; and they descended into 'Ardos, which is the summit of Hermon. And they called the mount Armon, for they swore and bound one another by a curse. (OTP 1:15)

Although the actions of the sons of God in Gen 6:1-4 are depicted as morally neutral, those of Shemihazah and the two hundred Watchers, assuming the role of the sons of God in the *BW*, are depicted as morally negative or sinful. It becomes clear in that the actions of the Giants, the offsprings of the Watchers⁷⁷, are extremely heinous with the result that

⁷⁷ Although the term giant is also mentioned in Judith, which corresponds to the phrase "the sons of the Titans," it is less likely that the tradition behind Judith have in common with those of the *BW* (cf. Wright 2005:120).

(7) For their mighty one did not fall by the hands of the young men, nor did the sons of the Titans smite him, nor did tall giants set upon him; but Judith the daughter of Merari undid him with the beauty of her countenance. (Judith 6:7 RSV)

Despite the fact that *Sib. Or.* 2.231-232, where both the term giant and Titans occur as in Judith 6:7, is reminiscent of the Watcher story in the *BW*, it does not do justice to an attempt to identify the sons of the Titans, namely giants, in Judith 6:7 with the sons of the Watchers in *1 Enoch* 7.

the earth made accusation against them. *1 En.* 7:3-6 reads:

(3) These (giants) consumed the produce of all the people until the people detested feeding them. (4) So the giants turned against (the people) in order to eat them. (5) And they began to sin against birds, wild beasts, reptiles, and fish. And their flesh was devoured the one by the other, and they drank blood. (6) And then the earth brought an accusation against the oppressors. (OTP 1:16)

The Giants story in *1 En.* 7:3-6, which is reminiscent of Gen 6:11, takes departure from Gen 6:5 with reference to the cause of the Flood: The former ascribes it to such heinous actions of the Giants; the latter to the wickedness of humanity: “Then the LORD saw that the wickedness of man was great on the earth, and that every intent of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually” (Gen 6:5). Briefly put, it seems that *1 Enoch* 6—7 makes sense that “[d]ie Sündhaftigkeit der Welt wird auf die Vergehen der Engel zurückgeführt” (Hoffmann 1999:135).

Given that the name of the chief leader of the Watchers is given שמיחזה in 4Q201 (//4QEn^a ar) frag. 1 iii 6 and שמי חזה in 4Q201 frag. 1 iv 1, it stands to reason that Shemihazah refers to God’s seeing the name (cf. Nickelsburg 2001:178). However, unlike the other names of the leading Watchers in *1 En.* 8:3, which denote their roles in leading humanity astray after their fall, it is less clear that the name Shemihazah refers to his role in leading humanity astray or to his role prior to his fall (Wright 2005:120-122). At least it seems that the name of Shemihazah is concerned with divine sovereignty “beyond rebellion in the form of illegitimate behavior...” (Davidson 1992:43). It becomes clear in that divine sovereignty is proclaimed before delivering divine judgment to both Asael and Shemihazah in *1 En.* 9:6-8. *1 En.* 9:5 reads:

(5) You have made everything and with you is the authority for everything. Everything is naked and open before your sight, and you see everything; and there is nothing which can hide itself from you. (OTP 1:17)

The Watchers’ transgression goes beyond their committing of fornication to their transmitting of illegitimate instructions forbidden to humanity in *1 Enoch* 8, which is

known as the instruction tradition. *I En.* 8:1 reads:

(1) And Azaz’el [= Asael]⁷⁸ taught the people (the art of) making swords and knives, and shields, and breastplates; and he showed to their chosen ones bracelets, decorations, (shadowing of the eye) with antimony, ornamentation, the beautifying of the eyelids, all kinds of precious stones, and all coloring tinctures and alchemy. (OTP 1:16)

Although Asael appears as one of the leading Watchers in *I En.* 6:7, he is depicted as the chief leader among the Watchers, who led humanity astray by transmitting unlawful instructions in *I En.* 8:1-3. It seems that such illegitimate instructions cause humanity to commit fornication (e.g., *I En.* 8:2). *I En.* 8:2-3 reads:

(2) And there were many wicked ones and they committed adultery and erred, and all their conduct became corrupt. (3) Amasras [= Shemihazah] taught incantation and the cutting of roots; and Armaros the resolving of incantations; and Baraqiyal astrology, and Kokarer’el (the knowledge of) the signs, and Tam’el taught the seeing of the stars, and Asder’el taught the course of the moon as well as the deception of man. (OTP 1:16)

(3) Shemihazah taught spells and the cutting of roots. Hermani taught sorcery for the loosing of spells and magic and skill. Baraqel taught the signs of the lightning flashes. Kokabel taught the signs of the stars. Ziqel taught the signs of the shooting stars. Arteqoph taught the signs of the earth. Shamsiel taught the signs of the sun. Sahriel taught the signs of the moon. And they all began to reveal mysteries to their wives and to their children. (Nickelsburg & VanderKam 2012:25-26)

I En. 8:2 denotes human activity in relation to sin and human accountability. Asael’s transmitting of unlawful instructions goes hand in hand with the sinfulness of humanity: “Not only have the angels sinned, but people have too” (Davidson 1992:47). Thus the Asael tradition is used to refer to “the Adamic concept of human responsibility for evil in

⁷⁸ For the possible relationship between Azazel in Leviticus 16 and Asael in *I Enoch* 8, see Wright (2005). After dealing with textual issues concerning the name of Asael, he comes to the conclusion that “the translator of the Aramaic text to Greek was following a transliteration of the Aramaic rather than attempting to infuse the Leviticus idea of Azazel, as is found in the Ethiopic.”

the world” to some extent (Wright 2005:117). It is not far-fetched to assume that the wicked among humanity, who were given such unlawful instructions, may have persuaded Shemihazah and the two hundred Watchers in the Shemihazah tradition to have illicit union with women (cf. Reed 2005:31-32; VanderKam 1996:124-125). Nickelsburg’s (1977:397) reconstruction of the fragmentary Aramaic of *I En.* 8:1-2, which hinges on the *Chronography* of George Syncellus (or G^{syn}), demonstrates that the humanity given unlawful instructions “lead the holy ones astray.” This being the case, it coheres with the Watcher story in the *An. Apoc.* (e.g., *I En.* 86:1-3).

Given that Asael acts as a transmitter of instructions forbidden to humanity, Nickelsburg (2001:192-193) proposes that the Asael tradition in the *BW* owes its existence to the Prometheus myth in Hesiod’s *Theogony* 507—616 and *Works and Days* 42—105 or Aeschylus’s *Prometheus Bound*. Like Asael, Prometheus also transmitted the instruction of dealing with fire by rebelling against Zeus. As a result, he also came to be met with the punishment of incarceration in the wilderness. However, Nickelsburg (2001) fails to explain the differences between Asael and Prometheus (cf. Newsom 1980:314). For instance, In *Theogony*, Prometheus’s transmitting of the forbidden instruction of dealing with fire is aimed at promoting the convenience of humanity, whereas Asael’s transmitting of unlawful instructions is aimed at promoting violence: The former is morally good; the latter is morally evil.⁷⁹ At best it seems that both the Asael tradition and Prometheus myth point to the common source rather than direct influence (cf. Wright 2005:115-117).

Within the context of the instruction tradition, Shemihazah also appears as one of the Watchers, who led humanity astray by transmitting of unlawful instructions. Even divine judgment is first directed to Asael prior to Shemihazah (e.g., *I En.* 9:6-8).

(6) You see what Azaz’el [= Asael] has done; how he has taught all (forms of) oppression upon the earth. And they revealed eternal secrets which are performed in heaven (and which) man learned. (7) (Moreover) Semyaz [= Shemihazah], to whom you have given power to rule over his companions, co-operating, they went

⁷⁹ For more details on the relationship between Asael and Prometheus, see Frisch (2016).

in unto the daughters of the people on earth; (8) and they lay together with them— with those women—and defiled themselves, and revealed to them every (kind of) sin. (OTP 1:17)

The impact of Asael's role in leading humanity astray comes to the forefront in *1 En.* 10:8.

(8) And the whole earth has been corrupted by Azaz'el's [= Asael] teaching of his (own) actions; and write upon him all sin. (OTP 1:18)

While Shemihazah is depicted as responsible for the great sin of changing and transgressing the created order in *1 En.* 6:3, Asael is depicted as being blamed for all sin in *1 En.* 10:8.⁸⁰ The *BW* bears discontinuity or inconsistency. It points to the fact that the *BW* contains the two distinct traditions in relation to the source of sin and evil. However, such a discontinuity or inconsistency should not be understood as the literary byproducts of the integrating procedure of the *BW* (cf. Collins 1978:315-316). Instead, it should be understood as reflecting “the essential polyvalence of apocalyptic symbolism which enables it to be reapplied in new historical situations” (Collins 1982:98). It is for this reason that it is necessary to focus our attention on the literary functions of these two distinct traditions in the current context of the *BW*.⁸¹ Reed's (2005) observation on the relationship between the theme of sexual impurity and that of knowledge and violence is suggestive hereof: In *1 Enoch* 7, the theme of the Watchers' fornication or sexual impurity appears to be predominate, whereas the theme of the Watchers' transmitting of unlawful instructions appears to be subordinate to the former. However, in *1 Enoch* 8, the situation is reversed. The theme of the Watchers' transmitting of unlawful instruction comes to be predominate, whereas the theme of the Watchers' fornication comes to be subordinate to the former. In doing so, the author/redactor of *1 Enoch* was at pains to make sense of linking the Shemihaza tradition with the Asael tradition (cf. Reed 2005:31-32). Hence Reed (2005:32) is correct in saying that the Asael tradition “thus stresses the shared culpability of Asael and his human students and, moreover, highlights the responsibility of both men and women.” The Watchers' transmitting of unlawful instructions denotes

⁸⁰ Even the lists in *1 En.* 6:7-8 and 8:1-3 are different from each other.

⁸¹ See Collins (1978:316), who states that “the fact that these distinct traditions are allowed to stand in some degree of tension is already significant for our understanding of the function of this book.”

that both the Watchers and humanity came to transgress epistemological boundaries (or the created order in terms of epistemology) (cf. Reed 2005:32). While the Shemihazah tradition illustrates that the motivation of the Watchers' fornication lies in the fact that they were driven by their lusts, the Asael tradition illustrates otherwise that the corrupted state of the earth, including humanity, owes its existence to unlawful instructions, being transmitted and stirring up violence and fornication. Notwithstanding this, these two distinct traditions have in common with each other the fact that, irrespective of the types of their illegitimate behaviors, both the Watchers and humanity changed and transgressed the created order, which has been incumbent upon them from creation (e.g., 1 Enoch 1—5).

1 Enoch 1—5 helps us to understand to what extent and to what sense the author/redactor of *1 Enoch* would intend to incorporate both the Shemihazah tradition and the Asael tradition into one narrative in the *BW*. In terms of *1 Enoch* 1—5, the Watcher story in the *BW* should be understood not only as etiological but also as typological. Although the Watcher story in the *BW* revolves around the Watchers (fallen angels) and their illegitimate behaviors, “the interest lies beyond the angels” (Davidson 1992:44). The intention of the author/redactor of *1 Enoch* in dealing with the Watchers' transgression of divine commandments is on highlighting that God's dealings with both the Watchers and humanity are aimed at restoring the corrupted state of the earth to the original paradisaal state. *1 En.* 10:20-22 reads:

(20) And you cleanse the earth from all injustice, and from all defilement, and from all oppression, and from all sin, and from all iniquity which is being done on earth; remove them from the earth. (21) And all the children of the people will become righteous, and all nations shall worship and bless me; and they will all prostrate themselves to me. (22) And the earth shall be cleansed from all pollution, and from all sin, and from all plague, and from all suffering; and it shall not happen again that I shall send (these) upon the earth from generation to generation and forever. (OTP 1:18-19)

God's dealings with both the Watchers and humanity should be understood in terms of theodicy. The prayers of the four archangels in *1 Enoch* 9 are centered on divine inactivity

or indifference in relation to the Watchers' fornication and their transmitting of unlawful instruction and the ensuing violence (e.g. *I En.* 9:6-9). *I En.* 9:11 reads:

(11) And you know everything (even) before it came to existence, and you see (this thing) (but) you do not tell us what is proper for us that we may do regarding it.
(OTP 1:17)

However, such a seemingly divine inactivity or indifference comes to be revoked in *I Enoch* 10—11. By warning Noah of the flood through Sariel, God responded to the prayers of the four archangels with the result that both divine sovereignty and theodicy are questioned and explained. *I En.* 10:1-3 reads:

(1) And then spoke the Most High, the Great and Holy One! And he sent Asuryal [= Sariel] to the son of Lamech, (saying), "Tell him in my name, 'Hide yourself!' and reveal to him the end of what is coming; for the earth and everything will be destroyed. And the Deluge is about to come upon all the earth; and all that is in it will be destroyed. (3) And now instruct him in order that he may flee, and his seed will be preserved for all generation. (OTP 1:17)

Then, Raphael was sent to deal with Asael's transgression in *I En.* 10:4-8. Gabriel was sent to destroy the Giants, the offspring of the Watchers, in *I En.* 10:9. Michael was sent to deal with Shemihazah's transgression, along with the two hundred Watchers, in *I En.* 10:11-13. The scope of divine judgment goes beyond the Watchers' transgression: "And at the time when they will burn and die, those who collaborated with them will be bound together with them from henceforth unto the end of (all) generations (*I En.* 10:14, OTP 1:18)." All the wicked among humanity are also responsible for their deeds.

In summary, both the Shemihazah tradition and the Asael tradition illustrate that there is the tension between human activity and human passivity in relation to sin and human accountability. In the Shemihazah tradition, the source of sin and evil is extrinsic to humanity, whereas, in the Asael tradition, the source of sin and evil is both intrinsic and extrinsic to humanity (cf. Davidson 1992:47-48; Reed 2005:35).

2.3. *1 Enoch* 12—16

Of most interest to note is that, given that the theme of the Watchers' transgression of divine commandments in *1 Enoch* 6—11 continues to be developed in 12—16, Enoch the protagonist of *1 Enoch* comes again to the forefront and plays a leading role in developing the theme of the Watchers' transgression of divine commandments. *1 En.* 12:1-2 reads:

(1) Before these things (happened) Enoch was hidden, and no one of the children of the people knew by what he was hidden and where he was. (2) And his dwelling place as well as his activities were with the Watchers and the holy ones; and (so were) his days. (OTP 1:19)

1 En. 12:1-2 is a paraphrasing of Gen 5:24 (cf. Nickelsburg 2001:233): “And Enoch walked with God; and he was not, for God took him.” However, while the Enoch episode in Gen 5:24 is about God's taking him out at the end of his life, *1 En.* 12:1-2 is about God's commissioning him for the divine verdict. It seems that the author/redactor of *1 Enoch* would employ the Enoch episode in Gen 5:24 in order to introduce Enoch the protagonist as the antagonist to the Watchers. It becomes clear in *1 En.* 12:2, which the Enoch episode in Gen 5:24 does not bear. Aside from that, what is added to the Enoch episode in Gen 5:24 is that Enoch was commissioned to rebuke the Watchers for their changing and transgressing of the created order, which has been incumbent upon them from creation. Thus it comes as no surprise that Enoch appears to stand in contrast to the Watchers both in his ascending to the heavens and in his transmitting of beneficial instructions (cf. Reed 2005:46). *1 En.* 12:3-6 reads:

(3) And I, Enoch, began to bless the Lord of the mighty ones and the King of the universe. (4) At that moment the Watchers [= archangels] were calling me. And they said to me, “Enoch, scribe of righteousness, go and make known to the Watchers of heaven [= fallen angels] who have abandoned the high heaven, the holy eternal place, and have defiled themselves with women, as their deeds move the children of the world, and have taken unto themselves wives: They have defiled themselves with great defilement upon the earth; (5) neither will there be peace unto them nor the forgiveness of sin. (6) For their children [= the Giants] delight in seeing the murder

of their beloved ones. But they shall groan and beg forever over the destruction of their children, and there shall not be peace unto them even forever. (OTP 1:19)

Although Milik (1976:192) reconstructs Aramaic fragments of 1 Enoch at Qumran as *הוֹיִת קֵאֵם וּמְבִרֵךְ*, “I began to bless,” it is more likely that *1 En.* 12:3 stands in line with scriptural prophetic traditions concerning “a common posture for prayer” (Nickelsburg 2001:235).⁸² As in the theophany oracles in *1 Enoch* 1—5, the author/redactor of *1 Enoch* introduces himself (in the guise of Enoch) to stand in line of the prophets in scriptural traditions. The divine verdict against the Watchers' transgression is that there will be no forgiveness and no peace forever. Notwithstanding this, the scope of the divine verdict goes beyond the Watchers' transgression of divine commandments. All the wicked among humanity are also responsible for the corrupted state of the earth: “...as their deeds move the children of the world...” (*1 En.* 12:4). Hoffmann (1999:140-141) points out that “[i]n diesen Vers wird zum ersten Mal im Kontext des angelologischen Buches die aktive Mitverantwortung der Menschen für das Böse auf Erden explizit ausgesprochen.” Briefly put, along with the theme of the Watcher's transgression, human activity in relation to sin and human accountability also continues to be developed in *1 Enoch* 12—16.

While God's commissioning Enoch for the divine verdict revolves around the Shemihazah tradition in *1 Enoch* 12, Enoch went first to Asael in order to deliver the divine verdict in *1 En.* 13:1-3. As is clearly seen in *1 Enoch* 6—11, both Shemihazah tradition and the Asael tradition appear to be mutually referenced in *1 Enoch* 12—16 according to the purpose in composing the *BW*. Thus it is not far-fetched to assume that the author/redactor of *1 Enoch* deliberately omitted the name of Shemihazah in *1 Enoch* 12, with the result that both the Shemihazah tradition and the Asael tradition could be intertwined with each other without further ado. In doing so, the author/redactor of *1 Enoch* could manage to employ the Watcher story in the *BW* in relation to the sinfulness of humanity in terms of not only etiology but also typology. Enoch's rebuking of Asael highlights the extent to which Asael's and the Watchers' transmitting of unlawful instructions did and will wreak havoc on the earth resulting in the corrupted states of both the earth and humanity. *1 En.* 13:1-2 reads:

⁸² E.g., 1 Kgs 8:22; Pr Azar 2; Mark 11:25; Matt 6:5; Luke 18:11, 13.

(1) As for Enoch, he proceeded and said to Azaz’el [= Asael], “There will not be peace unto you; a grave judgment has come upon you. (2) They will put you in bonds, and you will not have (an opportunity for) rest and supplication, because you have taught injustice and because you have shown to the people deeds of shame, injustice, and sin. (OTP 1:19)

The response of Asael and the Watchers, who were frightened and trembling, is their begging Enoch for intercession on behalf of them (e.g., *1 En.* 13:3-6). Such a request for Enoch’s intercession on behalf of the Watchers is ironic in that their roles are reversed: “And tell the Watchers of heaven on whose behalf you have been sent to intercede: It is meet (for you) that you intercede on behalf of man, and not man on your behalf” (*1 En.* 15:2, OTP 1:21; e.g., *1 Enoch* 83—90). However, the negative result is adumbrated that divine forgiveness will be denied. *1 En.* 13:7-8 reads:

(7) And I went and sat down upon the waters of Dan—in Dan which is on the southwest of Hermon—and I read their memorial prayers until I fell asleep. (8) And behold a dream came to me and visions fell upon me, and I saw a vision of plagues (so that) I may speak to the children of heaven and reprimand them. (OTP 1:19-20)

The geographical name of Dan connotes divine judgment (cf. Nickelsburg 2001:247). Thus the negative result for Enoch’s intercession on behalf of Asael and the Watchers can serve to emphasize divine sovereignty in God’s dealings with the Watchers’ transgression. Given that such a negative result is also applicable to Shemihazah and the two hundred Watchers in the Shemihazah tradition on the one hand, and the name of Shemihazah, which connotes divine sovereignty, is deliberately omitted in *1 Enoch* 12 on the other, it becomes clear that the literary function of Enoch’s rebuking of the Watchers in *1 Enoch* 13 is to bring both divine sovereignty and theodicy to the fore. The negative result for Enoch’s intercession on behalf of the Watchers is reiterated and crystallized in “the book of the words of righteousness and the chastisement of the eternal Watchers” written in *1 Enoch* 14. *1 En.* 14:5-7 reads:

(5) From now on you will not be able to ascend into heaven unto all eternity, but

you shall remain inside the earth, imprisoned all the days of eternity. (6) Before that you will have seen the destruction of your beloved sons and you will not have their treasures, which will fall before your eyes by the sword. (7) And your petitions on their behalf will not be heard—neither will those on your own behalf (which you offer) weeping (and) praying—and you will not speak even a word contained in the book which I wrote. (OTP 1:20)

Both divine wrath and judgment hinge on divine sovereignty: “Accordingly he has created me and given me the word of understanding so that I may reprimand the Watchers, the children of heaven” (*1 En.* 14:3, OTP 1:20). The fact that God is the creator who set the order of all creation can drive home to the nature of the sin: They changed and transgressed the created order, which has been incumbent upon them from creation. In the rest of *1 Enoch* 14, Enoch’s seeing of throne vision, which resonates with Ezekiel 1, ensues after divine judgment against the Watchers. In this throne vision, divine sovereignty also comes to the forefront: “He needed no council, but the most holy ones who are near to him neither go far away at night nor move away from him” (*1 En.* 14:23, OTP 1:21). Unlike the Watchers, the archangels are keeping their position according to the created order. That is why, in *1 En.* 12:4, the archangels rebuked the Watchers, “who have abandoned the high heaven, the holy eternal place...,” which is their position according to the created order. Hence Davidson (1992:59) is correct in saying that “[t]he presence and behavior of the angelic hosts underscore the majesty and unrivalled supremacy of the God who gives a direct and authoritative word to Enoch.”

Such a great sin of changing and transgressing the created order results in the procreation of the Giants, which is unnatural to the heavenly beings. *1 En.* 15:3-4 reads:

(3) For what reason have you abandoned the high, holy, and eternal heaven; and slept with women and defiled yourselves with the daughters of the people, taking wives, acting like the children of the earth, and begetting giant sons? (4) Surely you, you [used to be] holy, spiritual, the living ones, [possessing] eternal life; but (now) you have defiled yourselves with women, and with the blood of the flesh begotten children, you have lusted with the blood of the people, like them producing blood and flesh, (which) die and perish. (OTP 1:21)

Procreation of offspring is originally given to humanity in that they are mortal with the blood of the flesh. There is no need for the heavenly beings to yearn for procreation. Therefore, the Giants, their offsprings, who appears to have wreaked havoc in the antediluvian era (e.g., *1 En.* 7:3-6), continues to wreak havoc on both the earth and humanity in the postdiluvian era. This is because evil spirits have come out of their dead bodies at the Flood. *1 En.* 15:8-9 reads:

(8) But now the giants who are born from the (union of) the spirits and the flesh shall be called evil spirits upon the earth, because their dwelling shall be upon the earth and inside the earth. (9) Evil spirits have come out of their bodies. Because from the day that they were created from the holy ones⁸³ they became the Watchers; their first origin is the spiritual foundation. They will become evil upon the earth and shall be called evil spirits. (OTP 1:21-22)

As a result of the illicit union between heavenly beings and earthly beings, Evil spirits appear to be continually existing even after the Giants' deaths at the Flood. However, *1 En.* 15:8-9 is not quite clear to understand. Tigchelaar (1996:204, italics original) points out that “[a]ccording to the reading of the Panopolis text (and the Ethiopic), evil *spirits* came out of the flesh of the giants, because they had a ‘spiritual’ origin, whereas the Syncellus text argues that the spirits are *evil*, because of the hybrid origin of the giants.” Dimant (1974) insists that there may be two distinct traditions in relation to the origin of evil spirits prior to the composition of the *BW*: The one is that evil spirits have come out of the dead bodies of the Giants at the Flood; the other is that evil spirits have been existing as such from birth. Then she goes so far as to say that the divine verdict against the Giants, which is delivered by Raphael and Gabriel in *1 Enoch* 10, fails to be fulfilled on account of the existence of evil spirits in *1 Enoch* 15. However, at least it seems that the divine verdict in *1 Enoch* 10 revolves around the heinous deeds of the Giants in the antediluvian era (cf. Wright 2005:152). Moreover, Dimant’s contention of two distinct traditions of the origin of evil spirits is untenable in that there is no solid textual evidence

⁸³ G^{sync} translates it as “from men,” whereas G^{pan} and Ge’ez translate it as “from above.” The latter is more probable (cf. Wright 2005:153 n.54). See Tigchelaar (1996:204), who states that “[t]he two Greek versions and the Ethiopic differ on several points, and the readings which we have do not always seem to make good sense.”

of not containing both *I En.* 15:9 and 16:1 in the *BW*. Given that the Watcher story in the *BW* should be understood not only as etiological but also as typological, evil spirits, which owes its existence to divine judgment at the Flood, can make sense of both the presence of sin and evil in the postdiluvian era *in spite of* divine judgment at the Flood and its eschatological consummation *because of* divine sovereignty. In other words, the divine verdict in *I Enoch* 10 will be consummated at the *eschaton*. *I En.* 16:1 reads:

(1) From the days of the slaughter and destruction, and the death of the giants and the spiritual beings of the spirit, and the flesh, from which they have proceeded forth, which will corrupt without incurring judgment, they will corrupt until the day of the great conclusion, until the great age is consummated, until everything is concluded (upon) the Watchers and the wicked one. (OTP 1:22)

The Watcher story in the *BW* is less aimed at explaining the etiology of the presence of sin and evil (cf. Heger 2011:108-110). It is more aimed at persuading the sinner group to repent and at encouraging the elect group to take hold of hope. The etiology of the presence of sin and evil in the *BW* serves to provide a typological reason for repentance of the wicked and hope of the elect. Hence Collins (2008:19-20) is correct in saying that “the focal point in all the Enochic books is the coming judgment... Angelic and demonic forces influence human affairs... The judgment is not only a cosmic judgment of the earth, but of individuals, who attain everlasting reward or punishment” (cf. Nickelsburg 2001:73). Granted that, evil spirits not only cause natural disasters but also threaten humanity. *I En.* 15:11-12 reads:

(11) The spirits of the giants oppress each other; they will corrupt, fall, be exited, and fall upon the earth, and cause sorrow. They eat no food, nor become thirsty, nor find obstacles. 912) And these spirits shall rise up against the children of the people and against the women, because they have proceeded forth (from them). (OTP 1:22)

Despite the fact that it does not surface in *I Enoch* 15 that evil spirits will lead humanity astray, it cannot be dismissed. By preferring νεμόμενα in G^{syn}, which seems to be a corruption of תעין, “leading astray,” or רעעין, “shattering,” to νεφέλας in G^{pan}, Nickelsburg (2001:267-268, 273) expands the lists of evil spirits to include their leading

astray of humanity. It seems that *I Enoch* 15—16 can be structured in a form of A-B-A': *I En.* 15:3-7 is about the Watchers' fornication; *I En.* 15:8—16:1 is about evil spirits and their harmful deeds; *I En.* 16:2-3 is again about the Watchers' transmitting of unlawful instructions and the sinfulness of humanity. Despite its compositional nature of the *BW*, such a *chiasmus* in its current context can point to the fact that the harmful deeds of evil spirits in *I En.* 15:8-12 come to be intertwined with both the Watchers' fornication in the Shemihazah tradition and the Watchers' transmitting of unlawful instructions in the Asael tradition, etiologically and typologically. Besides, the harmful deeds of evil spirits in the postdiluvian era harks back to the violence against humanity of the Giants in the antediluvian era. Thus it is likely that evil spirits play a certain role, albeit implicitly, in causing humanity to multiply evil deeds upon the earth (e.g., *I En.* 16:3).⁸⁴ Wright (2005:156) points out that “the author of *BW* introduced an answer to the evil in his day that the Genesis Flood narrative does not address.” The conundrum of the Flood narrative in Gen 6:9—9:19 is the presence of sin and evil in the postdiluvian era. The author/redactor of *I Enoch* was at pains to explain how sin survived through the lineage of Noah after the Flood. The solution of the author/redactor of *I Enoch* is that Evil spirits have come out of the dead bodies of the Giants at the Flood and instigated sin to survive through the generation of humanity in the postdiluvian era.

In digression, it is worth noting that evil spirits in the *BW* are different from the evil spirit in scriptural traditions. Both have in common with each other the fact that both troubled humanity in various ways. Notwithstanding this, while the evil spirit in scriptural traditions is explicitly sent by God (e.g., 1 Samuel 16 and 24), evil spirits in the *BW* owe its existence to the dead bodies of the Watchers. Briefly put, the former is legitimate; the latter is illegitimate. Thus the existence of evil spirits in the *BW* is used to explain theodicy in relation to the presence of sin and evil. Evil spirits in the *BW* can be regarded as a conflation between scriptural traditions and Ancient Near Eastern traditions (cf. Kvanvig 1988).

⁸⁴ Given that the Watcher story in the *BW* should be understood not only as etiological but also typological, although the Giants, who wreaked havoc violently both on the earth and humanity in the antediluvian era, were not depicted as transmitting of unlawful instructions, at least it seems that evil spirits may act as instigators of committing humanity such unlawful instructions in the postdiluvian era. *Jubilees* is explicit in this regard.

In summary, while the theme of the Watchers' transgression of divine commandments in *1 Enoch* 6—11 continues to be developed in 12—16, the author/redactor of *1 Enoch* attempted to make sense of the presence of sin and evil in the postdiluvian era in terms of evil spirits. Notwithstanding this, Enoch's rebuking of the Watchers serves to emphasize divine sovereignty: "In *1 Enoch* 16.1, he [= the author/redactor of *1 Enoch*] describes their unabated oppression and affliction of humanity, but he reports that there is a limit to their dominion" (Wright 2005:156). *In nuce*, theodicy is questioned and explained in the *BW*. The wicked have to repent; the elect has to take hold of hope. Of most interest to note is that both the Shemihazah tradition and the Asael tradition come to be intertwined with each other in Enoch's rebuking of the Watchers. While there is also the tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability in *1 Enoch* 12—16, the latter outweighs the former herein.

2.4. *1 Enoch* 17—36

Enoch's otherworldly journey is narrated in *1 Enoch* 17—36, which falls into the *1 Enoch* 17—19 and 20—36. Both wisdom and eschatology play an important role in approaching Enoch's otherworldly journey in *1 Enoch* 17—36. *1 Enoch* 17—36 is apocalyptic. It is fair to say that the *BW* is "a representative of the genre apocalypse" (Davidson 1992:63).⁸⁵ Delving into the details of Enoch's otherworldly journey goes beyond the scope of the chapter so that we will look into two passages: One is *1 En.* 19:1-2; the other is *1 En.* 32:6.

The Watchers' fornication is mentioned when Uriel showed Enoch the prison of the Watchers. *1 En.* 19:1-2 reads:

(1) And Uriel said to me, "Here shall stand in many different appearances⁸⁶ the spirits of the angels which have united themselves with women. They have defiled

⁸⁵ For the definition of the term apocalypse, see Collins (1979:9), who states that "[a]pocalypse' is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world."

⁸⁶ E.g., *T. Reu.* 5:6 and *Apoc. Mos.* 17:1, see Nickelsburg (2001:287).

the people and will lead them into error so that they will offer sacrifices to the demons as unto gods, until the great day of judgment in which they shall be judged till they are finished. (2) And their women whom the angels have led astray will be peaceful ones. (OTP 1:23)

However, the phrase “the spirits of the angels” is not clear to understand. It can refer either to evil spirits in *1 Enoch* 15 or to the spirits of the Watchers. Loader (2007:53) insists that *1 En.* 19:1 is “the first time reference to the activity of the evil spirits in terms of idolatry.” However, while evil spirits are designated explicitly *evil* spirits in *1 Enoch* 15, *1 En.* 19:1 does not designate the same way. Albeit possible, identifying the spirits of the angels with evil spirits in *1 Enoch* 15 requires more deduction from the distinct units of the *BW*: Evil spirits have come out of the dead bodies of the Giants—the Giants were the offsprings of the Watchers—evil spirits can be called as spirits of the Watchers on the basis of such a lineage. In terms of its compositional nature of the *BW*, it is less likely. Thus it is more likely that *1 Enoch* 19 can be traced back to a distinct Enochic tradition (cf. Reed 2005:50). Unlike *1 Enoch* 6—16, the Watchers’ fornication is only mentioned without their transmitting of unlawful instructions in *1 Enoch* 19. Aside from that, what is added to the Watchers’ transgression in *1 Enoch* 19 is that spirits of the Watchers appear to instigate humanity to commit idolatry: “...will lead them into error so that they will offer sacrifices to the demons as unto gods...” (*1 En.* 19:1, OTP 1:23). *1 En.* 19:1 is reminiscent of Deut 32:17 and Ps 106:37, where Israel’s committing of idolatry is predicted. Newsom (1980:322-323) insists that *1 Enoch* 17—18 bears a “pre-existing piece of Enochic tradition” and then *1 En.* 19:1-2 was added to *1 Enoch* 17—19 in order to interpret the prison of the rebellious stars as that of the Watchers. It seems that, within the current context, *1 Enoch* 19 serves to incorporate both the Watchers’ transgression and divine judgment in *1 Enoch* 6—16 and Enoch’s otherworldly journey in *1 Enoch* 17—18 into one narrative. Such a distinct Enochic tradition in *1 Enoch* 19 bears the problem of idolatry in the Second Temple period. The author/redactor of *1 Enoch* would explain the problem of idolatry in terms of the Watcher story in the *BW*. As is clearly seen in chapter 2, it is not far-fetched to assume that spirits of the Watchers’ instigating of idolatry may locate God’s dealings with the Watchers’ transgression in the Deuteronomic view of Israel’s history. The Watchers’ instigating of idolatry has recourse to scriptural

traditions. For instance, Deut 13:1-3 reads:

(1) If a prophet or a dreamer of dreams arises among you and gives you a sign or a wonder, (2) and the sign or the wonder comes true, concerning which he spoke to you, saying, Let us go after other gods (whom you have not known) and let us serve them, (3) you shall not listen to the words of that prophet or that dreamer of dreams; for the LORD your God is testing you to find out if you love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul.

The action of a spirit who will entice the prophets as a “deceiving spirit” is mentioned in 1 Kgs 22:21-22. Such malevolent spirits’ instigating of idolatry can also be found in scriptural prophetic traditions: “And it will come about in that day, declares the LORD of hosts, that I will cut off the names of the idols from the land, and they will no longer be remembered; and I will also remove the prophets and the unclean spirits from the land” (Zech 13:2). Despite the difficulty in identifying the spirits of the angels, therefore, it is fair to say that the Watchers’ transgression of divine commandments is closely linked with idolatry (cf. Loader 2007:54). While it is adumbrated in *1 Enoch* 12–16 that the harmful deeds of evil spirits include their leading astray of humanity, it is reiterated in a nuanced way in *1 Enoch* 19 that spirits of the Watchers will lead humanity astray up to a point of idolatry. Reed (2005:51) points out that “[n]ot only do they add idolatry to the list of the Watchers’ illicit teachings in *1 En.* 8, but some even cite this verse to underline the causal connection between the fall of the angels before the Flood and the continued activities of demons on the earth.” Briefly put, like evil spirits in *1 Enoch* 15, spirits of the Watchers in *1 Enoch* 19 is used to make sense of the presence of sin and evil.

By ascribing the cause of idolatry to spirits of the Watchers, the author/redactor of *1 Enoch* attempted to resolve the tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability. Nonetheless, textual variants of *1 En.* 19:2 in Greek versions and *Ge‘ez* points to the fact that such a tension cannot be easily resolved. In G^{pan} , the wives of the Watchers became sirens. In Hellenistic literature, sirens refer either to seductresses or to mourners (cf. Bautch 2006:770). Bautch (2006:771) points out that “the narrative context of *1 En.* 19:2 seemingly would lend itself to both images: sirens

as deadly seductresses and as mourners.”⁸⁷ In Ge‘ez, the wives became peaceful. The positive description of the wives in Ethiopic version illustrates that only the Watchers were blamed for their illicit union with women in that they were driven by their lusts, with the result that the wives came to be exculpated (cf. VanderKam 1996:32-33). However, it seems that the translator of *Ge‘ez* may mistake εἰς σεῖρηνας as εἰς εἰρηναῖαι and render it as kama salāmāweyāt (Bautch 2006:772). Bautch (2006:779) reconstructs the Aramaic wording as “וּנְשִׂיהוֹן דִּי מְלֹאנִיָּא דִּי חָטוּ לְהוֹיִן כְּשִׁלְיִמְן.” This being the case, *I En.* 19:2 is interpreted as the following: “[A]nd the wives of the transgressing angels will be brought to an utter end.” Briefly put, *I En.* 19:2 highlights the tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability: “Not only will the fallen watchers be imprisoned, but their *wives* will be vanquished or put to an end” (Bautch 2007:780, italics original).

The biblical Adam story in Genesis 1—3 is narrated in *I Enoch* 32, albeit in passing. *I En.* 32:6 reads:

(6) Then the holy angel Raphael, who was with me, responded to me and said, “This very thing is the tree of wisdom from which your old father [= Adam] and aged mother [= Eve], they who are your precursors, ate and came to know wisdom; and (consequently) their eyes were opened and they realized that they were naked and (so) they were expelled from the garden.” (OTP 1:28)

Unlike Ben Sira, Adam and Eve’s expulsion from the garden of Eden is mentioned. However, like Ben Sira, the focus of *I Enoch* 32 is on their knowledge of wisdom other than their disobedience resulting in expulsion. *I En.* 32:3 reads:

(3) And I came to the garden of righteousness and saw beyond those trees many (other) large (ones) growing there—their fragrance sweet, large ones, with much elegance, and glorious. And the tree of wisdom, of which one eats and knows great wisdom, (was among them). (OTP 1:28)

⁸⁷ E.g., Nickelsburg’s (1977:397) reconstruction of the fragmentary Aramaic of *I En.* 8:1-2: The humanity given unlawful instructions “lead the holy ones astray.”

Moreover, the motif of the garden of Eden is used to make sense that “*Endzeit gleicht Urzeit*” at the *eschaton* (e.g., the *An. Apoc.*). *1 En.* 25:4-6 reads:

(4) And as for this fragrant tree, not a single human being has the authority to touch it until the great judgment, when he shall take vengeance on all and conclude (everything) forever. (5) This is for the righteous and the pious. And the elect will be presented with its fruit for life. He will plant it in the direction of the northeast, upon the holy place—in the direction of the house of the Lord, the Eternal King. (6) Then they shall be glad and rejoice in gladness, and they shall enter into the holy (place); its fragrant shall (penetrate) their bones, long life will they live on earth, such as your fathers lived in their days. (OTP 1:26)

The longevity of human life at the *eschaton* is reminiscent of Isaiah 65. Meanwhile, both divine sovereignty and theodicy are questioned and explained. Isaiah 65 is about new creation after final judgment at the *eschaton* (e.g., Isa 65:17-25). Thus *1 Enoch* 25 is mainly aimed at restoring the corrupted state of the earth to the original paradisaical state (e.g., *1 En.* 10:20-22). The biblical Adam story in Genesis 1—3 in *1 Enoch* 32 should be understood in terms of the motif of the garden of Eden in *1 Enoch* 25. Meanwhile, both divine sovereignty and theodicy are questioned and explained. Hence Collins (2014a:72) is correct in saying that “[y]et the story of Adam and Eve does not seem to function as the primary account of the origin of sin in the Book of the Watchers. At least the spread of wickedness on earth is greatly intensified by the descent of the Watchers or fallen angels.”

Aside from the biblical Adam story in Genesis 1—3 in *1 Enoch* 32, the Cain and Abel episode in Genesis 4 is narrated in *1 Enoch* 22. *1 En.* 22:7 reads:

(7) And he answered me, saying, “This is the spirit which had left Abel, whom Cain, his brother, had killed; it (continues to) sue him until all of (Cain’s) seed is exterminated from the face of the earth, and his seed has disintegrated from among the seed of the people.” (OTP 1:25)

While, in *1 Enoch* 6—11, the Watchers’ transgression of divine commandments and the

violence of the Giants are the cause of the Flood, in *1 En.* 22:7, the continuous suing of the spirit of Abel against the offsprings of Cain appears to the cause of the Flood (e.g., *Wis. Sol.* 10:3-4). *1 En.* 22:7 indicates that the tradition, either oral or written, concerning the presence of sin and evil is far from monotonous in the Second Temple period. At least it seems that the author/redactor of *1 Enoch* would outweigh the Enochic tradition, which hinges on the Watcher story, over other traditions based on the Adam and Eve episode or the Cain and Abel episode in Genesis. For instance, the *Testament of Adam* appears to conflate various distinct traditions. *T. Adam* 3:5 reads:

(5) “You have heard, my son Seth, that a Flood is coming and will wash the whole earth because of the daughters of Cain, your brother, who killed your brother Abel out of passion for your sister Lebuda, since sins had been created through your mother, Eve. And after the Flood there will be six thousand years (left) to the form of the world, and then its end will com.” (Robinson 1983:994, OTP 1:994)

The author of *T. Adam* introduced Eve as the first perpetrator of sin. The *Life of Adam and Eve* is also the case. In *L.A.E.*, Adam, who suffered illness in his old age, explained the story of the Fall to his descendants as the following:

(1) Adam said this to all his sons while he was seized with great pains, and he cried out with a loud voice, saying, “Why should I suffer misery and endure such agony?”
(2) And when she saw him weeping, Eve herself began to weep, saying, “O LORD, my God, transfer his pain to me, since it is I who sinned.” (3) And Eve said to Adam, “My lord, give me a portion of your pain, for this guilt has come to you from me.”
(*L.A.E.* 35:1-3, OTP 2:272)

Such a tendency to ascribe the origin of sin to Eve in both *T. Adam* and *L.A.E.* is extraneous to the Watcher story in *1 Enoch*. However, similar motifs can also be found. Unlike Genesis 4, the motivation for Cain’s murder of Abel in *T. Adam* is lust. *1 Enoch* 6—11 indicate that the motivation of the Watchers’ fornication is their lusts. Of most interest to note is that the daughters of Cain appear to have illicit union with the Watchers. *T. Adam* makes sense that the presence of sin and evil should be the most enigma to Jewish authors of the Second Temple period with reference to divine sovereignty and theodicy. It stands

to reason that, along with the Cain and Abel episode in *1 En.* 22:7, the expulsion from the garden of Eden episode in *1 En.* 32:6 gives us a useful hint at the rationale of the author/redactor of *Jubilees* in approaching the presence of sin and evil in a more complicated manner than his predecessor.

In summary, Enoch's otherworldly journey in *1 Enoch* 17—36 contains two Enochic traditions distinct from *1 Enoch* 6—16: One is about the problem of idolatry; the other is about the biblical Adam story in Genesis 1—3. Nonetheless, in *1 Enoch* 17—36, there is also the tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability. Enoch's otherworldly journey in *1 Enoch* 17—36 also illustrates that the tradition concerning the presence of sin and evil is far from monotonous in the Second Temple period, although the author/redactor of *1 Enoch* outweighed the Enochic tradition over other traditions in his attempt to make sense of the presence of sin and evil in terms of divine sovereignty and theodicy.

3. The *Dream Visions* and the *Epistle of Enoch*

Despite the fact that both the *Dream Vision* (hereafter the *DV*) and the *Epistle of Enoch* (hereafter *EE*) are literary components of *1 Enoch*, these two Enochic traditions contain the different understanding of the Watcher story from the *BW*. Like the *BW*, both the *DV* and *EE* are also comprised of various units. Nonetheless, Reed (2005:74) points out that these various units have in common with one another the fact that “they adopt certain elements from the story of the fallen angels in *1 En.* 6—16, they neutralize the *Book of the Watchers*' angelic etiology of evil, reasserting human responsibility for sin and suffering.” It becomes clear when the unfolding of Israel's history from the past to the future is delivered through Enoch both in the *DV* (e.g., the *An. Apoc.* in *1 Enoch* 85—90) and in the *EE* (e.g., *1 En.* 91:11-17; 93:1-10). As is clearly seen in chapter 2, where the concept of time in the Second Temple period is handled, the unfolding of Israel' history narrated both in the *DV* and *EE* should be understood in terms of *vaticinia ex eventu* in

that the allegorist attempted to “depict the conflicts of the present as predetermined and to legitimate predictions about the future” (Reed 2005:74). Thus both protology and eschatology go hand in hand with each other when the allegorist employed the Watcher story both in the *DV* and in the *EE*. For instance, as aforementioned in the foregoing chapter, the unfolding of Israel’s history in the *An. Apoc.* can be epitomized as the following: “*Endzeit gleicht Urzeit.*”

The DV. Although the *An. Apoc.* appears to be theriomorphic, the Watchers are depicted as stars. Unlike the *BW*, in *1 Enoch* 86, Asael is the first to descend to the earth (e.g., *1 En.* 86:1). Unlike *1 Enoch* 8, Asael’s transmitting of unlawful instructions is not mentioned. Instead, *1 En.* 86:2 connotes that Asael was liable for the change of the color of the cattles as a result of intermingled marriages among humanity (cf. Nickelsburg 2001:373): “Then I saw these big and dark cows [= cattles], and behold they all changed their cattle-sheds, their pastures, and their calves; and they began to lament with each other” (*1 En.* 86:2, OTP 1:63). Reed (2005:76) insists that Asael’s transgression of “the boundary between heavenly and earthly realms” can be regarded as “the cause of improper sexual mingling.” Granted that, the change of the color of bulls speaks of more than an improper sexual mingling. Given that the white color of the bulls connotes the protological state in the *An. Apoc.*, the implication of the change of the color of bulls is that such an eschatological hope that “*Endzeit gleicht Urzeit*” will be given (e.g., *1 En.* 90:37-38). The other implication of the change of the color of bulls is about the universality of sin over humanity *in toto*: White bulls had disappeared out of the scene until a white bull was born at the *eschaton*. Shemihazah and two hundred Watchers are the second to descend to the earth (e.g., *1 En.* 86:3). The Watchers transformed into bulls. The transforming of the Watcher into bulls in *1 En.* 86:3 is used to make sense that how and why their illicit union with women was possible in *1 En.* 86:4 (e.g., *T. Reb.* 5:5-7). The Giants (i.e., elephants, camel, and donkeys) committed violence among humanity (e.g., *1 En.* 86:5-6). The earth’s lamentation on account of the Giants’ violence elicits the archangels’ intercession, who are depicted as human beings, in *1 Enoch* 87. The divine verdict in *1 Enoch* 88 appears to follow the order in *1 Enoch* 10, where all sin is ascribed to Asael in *1 En.* 10:8. *1 En.* 88:1-3 reads:

(1) I then saw one of those four who had come out earlier seizing that first star [= Asael], binding his hands and feet, and throwing him into an abyss—this abyss was narrow and deep, empty and dark. (2) Also one of them drew a sword and gave it to those elephants, camels, and donkeys [= the Giants]; then they began to attack one another, and on account of them the whole earth was quaking. (3) And as I continued to see in the vision, behold, from that time, one of the four, among those who had come out, was stoning from the sky, and gathering and taking away all the mighty stars [= Semihazah and two hundred Watchers], whose sexual organs were like the sexual organs of horses; then he bound all of them hand and foot, and cast them into the pits of the earth. (OTP 1:64)

In *1 Enoch* 86—88, unlike the *BW*, the Watchers' transmitting of unlawful instructions is not mentioned. This is because the Watchers' fornication and the Giants' violence appear as one of the instantiations of violence and conflict since the Cain and Abel episode in Genesis 4 (cf. Reed 2005:76). While, in the *BW*, the Watchers' transmitting of unlawful instructions is the cause of violence and conflict among humanity, in the *An. Apoc.*, both violence and conflict among humanity were already begun in the early stage of Israel's history when "the dark calf [= Cain] gored that red calf [= Abel] and pursued it over the earth" (e.g., *1 En.* 85:4, OTP 1:63). *In nuce*, the Watcher story in the *An. Apoc.* is more typological and less etiological. It becomes clear in that, in the *An. Apoc.*, unlike the *BW*, there is no mention of evil spirits who have come out of the dead bodies of the Giants. Seventy shepherds can be regarded as the allegorist's innovation. While there is no explicit connection between seventy shepherds and the Watchers in the *An. Apoc.*, there is an explicit connection between evil spirits and the Watchers in the *BW*. In a similar vein, in *1 En.* 83—84, the Watcher story also appears as one of the instantiations of violence and conflict. *1 En.* 84:4 reads:

(4) The angels of your heavens are now committing sin (upon the earth), and your wrath shall rest upon the flesh of the people until (the arrival of) the great day of judgment. (OTP 1:62)

There is only an implicit causal connection between the Watchers' transgression of divine commandments and the corruption of humanity. Reed (2005:79) points out that "[t]he text

focuses almost exclusively on the sins and punishments of humans, pushing the actions of the Watchers and the Giants into the background.” Likewise, in the *An. Apoc.*, the allegorist attempted to make sense that, as the Giants were punished due to their violence, seventy shepherds, namely the Gentiles who have domineered over Israel, will be punished due to their excessive violence at the *eschaton*.

In summary, about one hundred years after the composition of the *BW*, the *An. Apoc.* shows the heightened tension between the human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability.

The EE. The *Apocalypse of Week* (hereafter the *AW*) also revolves around the unfolding of the universal history from creation to the *eschaton*. Based on 4QEn^g, the original order of the *AW* can be reconstructed in the order of *I En.* 93:3-10 and 91:11-17 (cf. VanderKam 2002:368-373). The unfolding of the universal history from creation to the *eschaton* in the *AW* is “systematized into ten weeks” according to the divine plan (Reed 2005:77). Thus it stands to reason that the unfolding of the universal history is vouchsafed to divine commitment that the righteous will be rewarded, whereas the wicked will be punished at the *eschaton*. *I En.* 93:3-4 reads:

- (3) He then began to recount from the books and said, “I was born the seventh during the first week, during which time judgment and righteousness continued to endure.
- (4) After me there shall arise in the second week great and evil things; deceit should grow, and therein the first consummation will take place. But therein (also) a (certain) man shall be saved. After it is ended, injustice shall become greater, and he shall make a law for the sinners. (OTP 1:74)

The first consummation refers to the Flood narrative in Genesis 6—9. Unlike the *BW* and the *An. Apoc.*, there is no mention of the Watcher story in the *AW*. It is not far-fetched to assume that, like the *An. Apoc.*, the *AW* hinges on the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* in that the presence of sin and evil is just presumed without its etiology in *I En.* 93:4. Notwithstanding this, the divine verdict against the Watchers’ transgression is alluded to in the *AW*. *I En.* 91:15 reads:

(15) “Then, after this matter, on the tenth week in the seventh part, there shall be the eternal judgment; and it shall be executed by the angels of the eternal heaven—the great (judgment) which emanates from all of the angels. (OTP 1:73)

Although 4QEn^g frag. 1 iv 22-23 is too fragmentary and then the term the Watchers does not occur in *Ge'ez*, Stuckenbruck (2007:145-148) is of the opinion that such an eternal judgment, which will take place in the heavenly world at the *eschaton*, is about the divine verdict against the Watchers' transgression. Then, he renders *I En.* 91:15 as the following: “And it will be executed against the watchers of the eternal heaven, a great (judgment) that will be avenged in the midst of the angels” (Stuckenbruck 2007:14). This being the case, the divine verdict against the Watchers' transgression in *I En.* 91:15 gives us a useful hint at the rationale of the omitting of the Watcher story in *I En.* 93:3-4. In the *AW*, the Watcher story cannot be regarded as etiological. Hence Reed (2005:78) is correct in saying that “the author ironically downplays the Watchers' role in engendering human sin and suffering, even as he retains the didactic value of their punishment as proof of God's justice against any creature...who strays from the path of righteousness.” Contrary to this, the *AW* is peppered with human sin. Briefly put, the Watcher story in the *AW* is typological in that it is aimed at emphasizing both the inevitability and the uprightness of divine judgment at the *eschaton*: No sinner can escape from divine judgment; both divine sovereignty and theodicy are questioned and explained.

Aside from the *AW* in the *EE*, human activity in relation to sin and human accountability is stressed in *I Enoch* 98—99. *I En.* 98:4 reads:

(4) I have sworn unto you, sinners: In the same manner that a mountain has never turned into a servant, nor shall a hill (ever) become a maidservant of a woman; likewise, neither has sin been exported into the world. It is the people who have themselves invented it. And those who commit it shall come under a great curse. (OTP 1:78)

Sin has nothing to do with heavenly realms in that humanity has invented it. *I En.* 98:4 appears to be similar to Sir 15:11-20, where both human capacity and his ensuing responsibility in choosing what is just is stressed in the context of defending theodicy. It

becomes clear in *I Enoch* 99. *I En.* 99:7-8 reads:

(7) (And those) who worship stones, and those who carve images of gold and of silver and of wood and of clay, and those who worship evil spirits and demons, and all kinds of idols not according to knowledge, they shall get no manner of help in them. (8) They shall become wicked on account of the folly of their hearts; their eyes will be blindfolded on account of the fear of their hearts, the visions of their dreams. (OTP 1:80)

Both the phrases “the folly of their hearts” and “the fear of their hearts” are also used to make sense that human capacity and his ensuing responsibility come to the forefront in the *EE*. This is because humanity’s committing of idolatry is basically grounded in their ignorance/foolishness. Compare *I En.* 99:7-8 with 99:10: “In those days, blessed are they all who accept the words of wisdom and understand them, to follow the path of the Most High; they shall walk in the path of his righteousness and not become wicked with the wicked; and they shall be saved” (OTP 1:80). The contrast between the righteous and the wicked according to wisdom is also similar to theological anthropology in Ben Sira. García Martínez (1998:166) is the opinion that “[i]t is impossible not to conclude that the author of the Epistle is completely turning around the conclusion of the Book of Watchers in order to arrive at the opposite conclusion.” Although *I En.* 99:7 is reminiscent of *I En.* 19:1, there is no mention that spirits of the Watchers have instigated humanity to commit idolatry in the *EE*.

In summary, in the *EE*, human activity in relation to sin and human accountability is promoted, whereas human passivity is demoted.

In digression, a similar tendency to ascribe blame to humanity other than heavenly realms in terms that humanity is given the capacity to choose freely can be found in *Psalms of Solomon*, which comprises “the response of a group of devout Jews to the capture of Jerusalem by the Romans in the first century B.C.” (Wright 1985:639). *Pss. Sol.* 9:4-5 reads:

(4) Our works (are) in the choosing and power of our souls, to do right and wrong

in the works of our hands, and in your righteousness you oversee human beings. (5) the one who does what is right saves up life for himself with the Lord, and the one who does what is wrong causes his own life to be destroyed; for the Lord's righteous judgments are according to the individual and the household. (Wright 1985:660, OTP 2:660)

Pss. Sol. 9:4-5 is also reminiscent of Sir 15:14-15. Aside from Sirach in *Pss. Sol.* 9, Lev 18:5 is alluded to in *Pss. Sol.* 14:2-3, albeit paraphrased. *Pss. Sol.* 14:2-3 reads:

(2) To those who live in the righteousness of his commandments, in the Law, which he has commanded for our life. (3) The Lord's devout shall live by it forever; the Lord's paradise, the trees of life, are his devout ones. (OTP 2:663)

Pss. Sol. 14 speaks of God's righteousness and his faithfulness given to the righteous. God's dealings with the righteous and the sinners are just; both divine sovereignty and theodicy are questioned and explained: "For the ways of men are known before him always, and he knows the secrets of the heart before they happen" (*Pss. Sol.* 14:8, OTP 2:664). Thus *Pss. Sol.* 9 and 14 that human activity in relation to sin and human accountability is more stressed in terms of human capacity in choosing what is just.

4. Jubilees

Jubilees was originally written in Hebrew and then translated both in Greek and in Syriac. However, the entirety of *Jubilees* is extant only in Ethiopic, which is a translation of the Greek versions. There are also 14 Hebrew fragments at Qumran. The author/redactor of *Jubilees* would adopt and adapt the Watcher story in the *BW* according to the purpose in composing *Jubilees*, which is polemical in demonstrating "a particular point of the law" (Crawford 2008:67). As a *relecture* from Genesis to Exodus, the author/redactor of *Jubilees* appears to have leaned more on the Genesis materials when dealing with the Watcher story than his predecessor. Thus the author/redactor of *Jubilees* employed both

the Genesis materials and the Enochic traditions, albeit in tension. Both Moses and Enoch are thus credited as the important protagonists of *Jubilees*. Aside from adopting and adapting the Enochic traditions and leaning on the Genesis materials, *Jubilees* appears to bear other traditions absent in *1 Enoch*. Meanwhile, it is made clear that the author/redactor of *Jubilees* could provide alternative understandings of the presence of sin and evil in the Second Temple period.

Jubilees begins with the delivering of divine revelation to Moses through the angel of the presence. Divine revelation is about Israel's history from the past to the future, which is modeled after the Song in Deuteronomy 32.⁸⁸ After divine revelation being delivered to Moses, in which Israel's committing of idolatry is predicted (e.g., Deut 32:17), Moses distressed by divine revelation began to pray. *Jub.* 1:19-21 reads:

(19) And Moses fell upon his face, and he prayed and said, "O Lord, my God, do not abandon your people and your inheritance to walk in the error of their heart. And do not deliver them into the hand of their enemy, the gentiles, lest they rule over them and cause them to sin against you. (20) "O Lord, let your mercy be lifted up upon your people, and created for them an upright spirit. And do not let the spirit of Beliar [= Belial] rule over them to accuse them before you and ensnare them from every path of righteousness so that they might be destroyed from before your face. (21) But they are your people and your inheritance, whom you saved by your great might from the hand of the Egyptians. Create a pure heart and a holy spirit for them. And do not let them be ensnared by their sin henceforth and forever." (OTP 2:53-54)

Moses's prayer may be an independent material before integrating into *Jubilees*. While the term Belial is used other than Mastema in Moses's prayer, Mastema assumes the role of Belial in Moses's prayer in *Jubilees*. Thus it stands to reason that the author/redactor of *Jubilees* would employ an independent material of Moses's prayer as an introduction of *Jubilees* (e.g., a similar role of *1 Enoch* 1—5 in the *BW*). Granted that, Moses's prayer in *Jub.* 1:19-21 can serve to make sense where the author/redactor of *Jubilees* agreed with his predecessor and where he parted company with him. First, Moses's prayer begins and

⁸⁸ See § 2.5. in chapter 2.

ends by emphasizing the significance of heart: "...and your inheritance to walk in the error of their heart...Create a pure heart and a holy spirit for them..." Second, both the Gentiles and the spirit of Belial are credited as instigators of Israel's idolatry. In *Jub.* 15:28-32, the Gentiles appear to be subordinate to the dominion of the spirit of Belial and stand in contrast to the children of Israel. As is clearly seen in chapter 2, such a negative evaluation of the Gentiles goes hand in hand with Israel's elect status from creation. The role of Belial corresponds to that of the Satan in Job 1:6—2:7, 1 Chr 21:1, and Zech 3:1-2. *In nuce*, the role of Belial (//Mastema) in *Jubilees* is also situated within the divine administration. Lastly, the antidote to the spirit of Belial's ruling and leading Israel astray is the divine intervention of creating a pure heart.⁸⁹ Moses's prayer in *Jub.* 1:19-21 resonates with the golden calf episode in Deut 9:26-29. While, in Deut 9:26-29, Moses's plea is about God's ignoring of Israel's sin on account of the merits of their forefathers, in *Jub.* 1:19-21, Moses's plea is about God's creating of a pure heart on account of both Belial and the Gentiles' ruling and leading Israel astray. The Mastema story in *Jubilees* illustrates that the author/redactor of *Jubilees* has a tendency to emphasize human activity in relation to sin and human accountability than his predecessor. Thus Moses's plea for God's creating a pure heart shows the heightened recognition of the tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability in *Jubilees*.

The Watchers are first mentioned in *Jub.* 4:15 as the following:

(15) ...And she bore a son for him in the third week in the sixth year. And he called him Jared because in his days the angels of the LORD, who were called Watchers, came down to the earth in order to teach the sons of man, and perform judgment and uprightness upon the earth. (OTP 2:62)

Of most interest to note is that the Watchers in *Jub.* 4:15 is portrayed very positively. They appear to have been commissioned to descend to the earth in order to perform their duties as the Watchers (cf. Kugel 2012:47). While *1 En.* 6:1-2 connotes the Watchers' rebellion in heaven, *Jub.* 4:15 connotes the Watchers' rebellion in the earth (cf.

⁸⁹ E.g., Deut 9:29; Pss 51:12; 63:9; Hos 5:5; Deut 10:16; 14:1; 31:27; Lev 26:40; Exod 25:15; Jer 31:8; 10:10.

VanderKam 1999:155). Dimant (1974:99-100) insists that such a positive portrayal of the Watchers can be regarded as an alternative understanding of the Watcher story, which is polemical against the Watcher story in the *BW*. Segal (2007:126-132) is of the opinion that such a positive portrayal of the Watchers results from the author/redactor of *Jubilees*'s attempt to make chronological sense of the Watchers' descending to the earth at the time of Jared (e.g., *I En.* 6:6). After such a positive portrayal of the Watchers, Enoch is introduced as the first sage and assumed a similar but distinct role of Moses in *Jubilees* 1. *Jub.* 4:17 reads:

(17) This one was the first who learned writing and knowledge and wisdom, from (among) the sons of men, from (among) those who were born upon earth. And who wrote in a book the signs of the heaven according to the order of their months, so that the sons of man might know the (appointed) times of the years according to their order, with respect to each of their months. (OTP 2:62)

Unlike *I Enoch*, the author/redactor of *Jubilees* introduced Enoch as the first sage. It seems that the author/redactor of *Jubilees* attempted to invest authority on Enoch to the level of Moses, albeit not the same. The author/redactor of *Jubilees* regarded the Enochic traditions as authoritative (cf. Reed 2005:88-89). Divine revelation given to Enoch resonates with some parts of both the *DV* and the *BW* (cf. Boccaccini 2005:92-93). The Watcher story in the *An. Apoc.* is distinct from that in *BW*. First, Asael was the first to descend to the earth and then Shemihazah and two hundred Watchers were followed after him. *I En.* 86:1-3 reads:

(1) Again I saw (a vision) with my own eyes as I was sleeping, and saw the lofty heaven; and as I looked, behold, a star fell down from heaven but (managed) to rise and eat and to be pastured among those cows...(3) Once again I saw a vision, and I observed the sky and behold, I saw many stars descending and casting themselves down from the sky upon that first star; and they became bovids among those calves and were pastured together with them, in their midst. (OTP 1:63)

Although the portrayal of Asael is negative, it gives us a useful hint at the rationale of such a positive portrayal of the Watchers in *Jub.* 4:15, where the Watchers' fornication is

not mentioned but their transmitting of instructions is first mentioned. The Watchers' fornication is mentioned later in divine revelation. *Jub.* 4:22 reads:

(22) and bore witness to the Watchers, the ones who sinned with the daughters of men because they began to mingle themselves with the daughters of men so that they might be polluted. And Enoch bore witness against all of them. (OTP 2:62)

Like *I Enoch* 15, Enoch was sent to rebuke the Watchers' transgression of divine commandments in *Jubilees* 4. Unlike *I Enoch* 15, the Watchers' transgression in *Jubilees* 4 does not include their transmitting of unlawful instructions. Enoch's rebuke in *Jubilees* 4 is centered on the Watchers' fornication. By dealing with the Watcher story in the *An. Apoc.*, Reed (2005:75) points out that "it is striking that we find no reference to the illicit angelic instruction described in *I En.* 7:1, 8:1-3, 9:6, 10:7-8, 13:1, and 16:3. The 'Animal apocalypse' seems to depict Asael as the first Watcher to descend to the earth, but his corrupting teachings are entirely omitted from its retelling of angelic descent." This being the case, therefore, it is not far-fetched to assume that the author/redactor of *Jubilees* would neutralize the Asael tradition in the *An. Apoc.* in favor of beneficial instructions, which have been transmitted through Enoch⁹⁰ from generation to generation⁹¹, and follow the Shemihazah tradition in the *An. Apoc.* as it stands.

Second, as is clearly seen in chapter 2, the *An. Apoc.* also brings the presence of sin, as well as the sources of sin and evil, to the fore. Unlike the *BW*, the Cain and Abel episode in Genesis 4 marks the beginning of human history peppered with violence and conflict. Thus the harmful deeds of the Giants, the offsprings of the Watchers, appear as one of the instantiations of violence and conflict since the Cain and Abel episode in Genesis 4: It is more typological and less etiological. Compare the two following passages in the *An. Apoc.*

(4) The dark calf gored that red calf and pursued it over the earth; thereafter I was not able to see that red calf (*I En.* 85:4, OTP 1:63)

⁹⁰ E.g., *Jub.* 10:10, 12.

⁹¹ E.g., *Jub.* 7:38-39; 12:27; 21:10; 39:6; 45:16.

(5) So (the cattle) became fearful and frightened of them and began to bite with their teeth and swallow and to gore with their horns. (6) Then they began to eat those bovinds. And behold, all the children of the earth began to tremble and to shake before them and to flee from them. (*1 En.* 86:5-6, OTP 1:63)

When it comes to the literary relationship between *Jubilees* and the *DV*, Boccaccini (2005:93) points out that “[o]ne may conclude that *Jubilees* has some parallels with *Dream Visions*. These parallels, however, do not point to a literary dependency of *Jubilees* on *Dream Visions*, but on a common tradition, which is probably to be found in the *Book of the Watchers*.” Boccaccini’s observation is well pointed in that, although *Jubilees* also bears other traditions absent in *1 Enoch*, the ways in which the author/redactor of *Jubilees* parted company with the *BW* appear to be similar to those of *DV*. As in the *An. Apoc.*, the author/redactor of *Jubilees* attempted to “the origin of sin into the sphere of human responsibility” (Reed 2005:89). The biblical Adam story in Genesis 1—3 is narrated in *Jubilees* 3. *Jub.* 3:23-25 reads:

(23) And the LORD cursed the serpent and he was angry with it forever. And he was angry with the woman also because she had listened to the voice of the serpent and had eaten. And he said to her, (24) “I will surely multiply your grief and your birth pangs. Bear children in grief. And to your husband is your return and he will rule over you.” (25) And to Adam he said, “Because you listened to the voice of your wife and you ate from that tree from which I commanded you that you should not eat, the land shall be cursed because of you. Thorns and thistles shall sprout up for you. And eat your bread in the sweat of your face until you return to the earth from which you were taken because you are earth and to the earth you will return.” (OTP 2:60)

It is a paraphrasing of Gen 3:1-19. Unlike Ben Sira and 4QInstruction, where Adam’s disobedience is not mentioned, Adam and Eve’s disobedience is narrated in *Jubilees* 3 without significant alteration. What is adumbrated in *1 En.* 32:6 comes to be explicitly stressed in *Jub.* 3:23-25. Meanwhile, it seems that the Watchers in *Jubilees* come to be “not ultimately responsible for human sin, since Adam fell long before they came on the scene” (Collins 1997b:291). It becomes clear when the Cain and Abel episode in Genesis

4 is narrated in *Jub.* 4:2-4. The Cain and Abel episode is also narrated in *Jubilees* 4 without significant alteration. *Jub.* 4:2 reads:

(2) And at the beginning of the third jubilee, Cain killed Abel because the sacrifice of Abel was accepted, but the offering of Cain was not accepted. (OTP 2:61)

What is adumbrated in *1 En.* 22:7 comes to be explicitly stressed in *Jub.* 4:2-4. *In nuce*, there is the heightened recognition of the tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and accountability.

Jubilees 5 is a retelling of both the sons of God episode and the Flood narrative in Genesis 6—9. *Jub.* 5:1-2 reads:

(1) And when the children of men began to multiply on the surface of the earth and daughters were born to them, that the angels of the LORD saw in a certain year of that jubilee that they were good to look at. And they took wives for themselves from all of those whom they chose. And they bore children for them; and they were the giants. (2) and injustice increased upon the earth, and all flesh corrupted its way; man and cattle and beasts and birds and everything which walks on the earth. And they all corrupted their way and their ordinances, and they began to eat one another. And injustice grew upon the earth and every imagination of the thoughts of all mankind was thus continually evil. (OTP 2:64)

Jub. 5:1 resonates with the sons of God episode in Gen 6:1-4. At first glance, it is fair to say that the author/redactor of *Jubilees* attempted to modulate the Watcher story in the Enochic traditions into the form of the Genesis materials in Genesis 6. Like the sons of God episode in Gen 6:1-4, it seems that there is no explicit causal relationship between the Watchers' fornication in *Jub.* 5:1 and both the increasing of injustice on the earth and the corruption of humanity in *Jub.* 5:2 (cf. Segal 2007:107). Given that, in *Ge'ez*, the phrase "their way" in Gen 6:12 is expanded as "their way *and their prescribed course*" (*fānotomu wa-šar'ātomu*) in *Jub.* 2:1, Segal goes so far as to say that "it was precisely mankind's violation of the natural order that caused suspension of the laws of nature by the flood" (2007:107-108, italics original). However, albeit tenuous, *Jub.* 5:2-5 makes

sense that both the Watchers and humanity are liable for the antediluvian wickedness. Gen 6:5-12 is alluded to in *Jub.* 5:2-5. *Jub.* 5:3-5 reads:

(3) And the LORD saw the earth, and behold it was corrupted and all flesh had corrupted its order and all who were on the earth had done every sort of evil in his sight. (4) And he said, "I will wipe out man and all flesh which I have created from upon the surface of the earth." (5) But Noah alone found favor in the sight of the LORD. (OTP 2:64)

By dealing with the similarities and differences between Gen 6:5-12 and *Jub.* 5:2-5, van Ruiten (1997:68) points out that "[t]he omission of the mentioning of the repentance of God (Gen 6:6, 7c) has to do with the hermeneutical assumption that imperfection of God in His work is impossible." Both divine sovereignty and theodicy are important to the author/redactor of *Jubilees*. This is because the purpose in composing *Jubilees* is polemical in demonstrating "a particular point of the law" (Crawford 2008:67). Only the phrase "and they began to eat one another" in *Jub.* 5:1 cannot be found in Gen 6:5-12 but in *1 En.* 7:3-5 (van Ruiten 1997:69). While rearranging Gen 6:5-12 in *Jub.* 5:2-5, the author/redactor of *Jubilees* attempted conflate *1 En.* 7:3-5 with Gen 6:5-12. As a result, the author/redactor of *Jubilees* could put both the Watcher story in the Enochic traditions and the Genesis materials into together and introduce them as the causes of the Flood (e.g., *Jub.* 7:20-25). *Jub.* 5:2 harks back to Moses's prayer in *Jub.* 1:19-21: "...do not abandon your people and your inheritance to walk in the error of their heart...And do not let the spirit of Beliar [= Belial] rule over them to accuse them before you and ensnare them from every path of righteousness so that they might be destroyed from before your face..." Thus the divine verdict against the Watchers and the Giants in *Jub.* 5:6-11 hinges on such a causal relationship between the Watchers' transgression and the corruption of humanity. *Jub.* 5:6-11 reads:

(6) And against his angels whom he had sent to the earth he was very angry. He commanded that they be uprooted from all their dominion. And he told us to bind them in the depths of the earth, and behold, they are bound in the midst of them, and they are isolated. (7) And against their children a word went forth from before his presence so that he might smite them with the sword and remove them from under

heaven. (8) And he said, “My spirit will not dwell upon man forever; for they are flesh, and their days will be one hundred and ten years.” (9) And he sent his sword among them so that each one might kill his fellow and they began to kill one another until they all fell on the sword and they were wiped out from the earth. (10) And their parents also watched. And subsequently they were bound in the depths of the earth forever, until the day of great judgment in order for judgment to be executed upon all of those who corrupted their ways and their deeds before the LORD. (11) And he wiped out every one from their places and not one of them remained whom he did not judge according to all his wickedness. (OTP 2:64-65)

Jub. 5:6 harks back to the positive portrayal of the Watchers in *Jub. 4:15*. It does justice to God’s wrath. *Jub. 5:6* resonates with *1 En. 10:4-8*. Unlike the Watchers in the *BW*, it is clear that “*Jubilees* characterizes these angels not as evil so much as weak and thus disobedient” (Reed 2005:90). Unlike *1 En. 7:3-6*, where the harmful deeds of the Giants are depicted as their inherent nature, *Jub. 5:7* and 9 explain that the violence of the Giants in the antediluvian era is an implementation of the divine verdict against the offsprings of the Watchers. In doing so, the author/redactor of *Jubilees* attempted to change the referent of Gen 6:3 from humanity to the Giants in *Jub. 5:8*. The span of 120 years was sentenced to the offsprings of the Watchers and their generation as the remaining time before the Flood (cf. Kugel 2012:54). After the complete destruction of the Giants, the Watchers came to be met with the punishment of incarceration in the abyss of the earth forever. Such divine verdicts against both the Watchers and the Giants appear to hinge on divine sovereignty and theodicy in *Jub. 5:11*: “...and not one of them remained whom he did not judge according to all his wickedness.”

Jub. 5:12 also harks back to Moses’s prayers in *Jub. 1:19-21*. *Jub. 5:12* reads:

(12) And he made for all his works a new and righteous nature so that they might not sin in all their nature forever, and so that they might all be righteous, each in his kind, always. (OTP 2:65)

Jub. 5:12 can be regarded as the divine response to Moses’s plea in *Jub. 1:21*: “...Create a pure heart and a holy spirit for them. And do not let them be ensnared by their sin

henceforth and forever.” More than that, the beneficiaries of God’s creating of a pure heart are expanded from Israel to all creation. It is also reminiscent of *1 En.* 10:21: “and all the children of the people will become righteous, and all nations shall worship and bless me; and they will all prostrate themselves to me” (OTP 1:18-19). Notwithstanding this, the author/redactor of *Jubilees* attempted to develop Israel’s special status relative to the other nations. *Jub.* 5:17-18 reads:

(17) And for the children of Israel it has been written and ordained, “If they return to him in righteousness, he will forgive all of their sins and he will pardon all of their transgression.” (18) It is written and it is ordained, “He will have mercy on all who return from all their error, once each year.” (OTP 2:65)

Yom Kippur in Leviticus 16 is alluded to in *Jub.* 5:18. As is clearly seen in chapter 2, Israel’s special status as the elect people is rooted in creation. Granted that, Israel will have access to divine forgiveness by way of repentance. It becomes clear in that both the Watchers and the Giants had had no chance for repentance. Yom Kippur in Leviticus 16 is used to encourage Israel to repent herein (cf. Reed 2005:91). Such an exhortation to repentance shows the heightened tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability.

In summary, both the Watchers and humanity are liable for the antediluvian wickedness. They were all deserved divine judgment. However, only Israel will have access to divine forgiveness by way of repentance. Thus it stands to reason that, while the Watcher story in the *BW* should be understood not only as etiological but also as typological, God’s dealings with the Watchers and their offsprings in *Jubilees* are typological. This is because *Jubilees* bears other traditions absent in *1 Enoch* such as Moses’s prayer in *Jub.* 1:19-21, the biblical Adam story in Genesis 1—3 in *Jub.* 3:23-25, and such a positive portrayal of the Watchers in *Jub.* 4:15.

In *Jubilees* 7, Noah was wary of the demons’ leading of his descendants astray in the postdiluvian era. *Jub.* 7:27 reads:

(27) For I see, and behold, the demons have begun to mislead you and your children. And now I fear for your sakes that after I die, you will pour out the blood of men upon the earth. And you will be blotted out from the surface of the earth. (OTP 2:70)

Jubilees 10 appears as an actualization of Noah's wary of his descendants in *Jub. 7:27*. *Jub. 10:1* reads:

(1) In the third week of that jubilee the polluted demons began to lead astray the children of Noah's sons and to lead them to folly and to destroy them. (OTP 2:75)

Granted that, Noah's prayer explains how and why the demons come to lead humanity astray. While, in *Jub. 7:30-31*, Noah instructed his sons to the effect that they were anyhow responsible for their attempts to resist the demons' leading of them astray, in *Jub. 10:3-6*, Noah implored divine intervention to protect his descendants from the demons' leading of them astray. *Jub. 10:4-6* reads:

(4) But bless me and my sons. And let us grow and increase and fill the earth. (5) And you know that which your Watchers, the fathers of these spirits, did in my days and also these spirits who are alive. Shut them up and take them to the place of judgment. And do not let them cause corruption among the sons of your servant, O my God, because they are cruel and were created to destroy. (6) And let them not rule over the spirits of the living because you alone know their judgment, and do not let them have power over the children of the righteous henceforth and forever." (OTP 2:76)

Although they are not depicted as coming out of the dead bodies of the Giants at the Flood as in *1 Enoch 15*, evil spirits in *Jubilees 10* are also closely linked with the Giants: The Watchers were the fathers of these spirits. Given that the Giants are depicted as the offsprings of the Watchers in *Jub. 7:22-24*, it seems that the phrase "the fathers of these spirits" can be regarded as a metonymy. However, Segal (2007:274) contends that *Jubilees 10* bears other Noahide tradition, which is distinct from *Jubilees 7*. He goes so far as to say that the Noahide tradition in *Jubilees 10* may view evil spirits as the offsprings of the Watchers (Segal 2007:174; cf. Dimant 1974). Although *Jubilees 10*

contains other Noahide tradition, however, in terms of such a literary function between *Jubilees* 7 and 10, it is more likely that the author/redactor of *Jubilees* would have adapted the Noahide tradition in *Jubilees* 10 in accord with *Jubilees* 7 in order to make such a literary function sensible, although it may not be his main intention in incorporating two distinct traditions into one narrative. In *Jub.* 10:1, the author/redactor of *Jubilees* called the malevolent spirits as “the polluted demons,” whereas, in *Jub.* 10:3, he designated them as “evil spirits” in a seemingly embedded prayer. That is to say, the embedded prayer in *Jub.* 10:3 may be an independent material before incorporating into Noah’s prayer in *Jubilees* 10. At least it seems that evil spirits appear to be congenial to the polluted demons: These malevolent spirits are not only impure but also evil. The embedded prayer in *Jub.* 10:3 illustrates that evil spirits are to rule over humanity: “...and do not let the evil spirits rule over them...” Evil spirits’ ruling over humanity is reiterated in *Jub.* 10:6. The embedded prayer in *Jub.* 10:3 connotes that Noah’s plea hinges on Noah’s special relationship with God: “Great was your grace upon me...” The merits of Noah’s special relationship with God come to be expanded in *Jub.* 10:5: “...And do not let them cause corruption among the sons of your servant...” The expansion of the merits of Noah’s special relationship with God comports well with Israel’s elect status from creation. Israel’s elect status from creation, especially with reference to evil spirits’ ruling over humanity, is explicit in *Jub.* 15:28-32. Deut 32:8 is alluded to herein. *Jub.* 15:32 reads:

(32) But over Israel he did not cause any angel or spirit to rule because he alone is their ruler and he will protect them and he will seek for them at the hand of his angels and at the hand of his spirits and at the hand of his authorities so that he might guard them and bless them and they might be his and he might be theirs henceforth and forever. (OTP 2:87)

Noah’s imploration for divine intervention in *Jubilees* 10 is rooted in creation: Israel is the elect people from the creation so that God himself rules over them.

Noah’s prayer, in which Israel’s elect status from creation is stressed, appears to arouse confidence that both divine sovereignty and theodicy will be questioned and explained by way of divine judgment. *Jub.* 10:7 reads:

(7) And the LORD our God spoke to us so that we might bind all of them. (OTP 2:76)

At this juncture, the chief of the spirits, Mastema, enters into the scene so that the author/redactor of *Jubilees* parted company with his predecessor. Thus it stands to reason that the author/redactor of *Jubilees* attempted to situate the Mastema story within the context of both divine sovereignty and theodicy. *Jub.* 10:8-9 reads:

(8) And the chief of the spirits, Mastema, came and he said, “O Lord, Creator, leave some of them before me, and let them obey my voice. And let them do everything which I tell them, because if some of them are not left for me, I will not be able to exercise the authority of my will among the children of men because they are (intended) to corrupt and lead astray before my judgment because the evil of the sons of men is great.” (9) And he said, “Let a tenth of them remain before him, but let nine parts go down into the place of judgment.” (OTP 2:76)

Mastema asked God the creator for remaining some of evil spirits under his purview. Such a request illustrates that Mastema was not an enemy of God: The role of Mastema in *Jubilees* is situated within the divine administration; his mission is to corrupt and lead humanity astray (e.g., *Jub.* 11:11; 17:16; 18:9, 12). Kugel (2012:84) is of the opinion that the name of Mastema is “designed to evoke the name ‘Satan,’ from a similar-sounding root.” This being the case, it is fair to say that the role of Mastema is congenial to that of Satan in Job 1:6—2:7, 1 Chr 21:1, and Zech 3:1-2 (e.g., Belial in Moses’s prayer in *Jub.* 1:19-21). In other words, Mastema does not appear to act against the will of God in *Jubilees*. It becomes clear in *Jub.* 10:11, where the chief of the spirits is named as Satan other than Mastema: “...but a tenth of them we let remain so that they might be subject to Satan upon the earth.” Mastema and his evil spirits act as instigators of sins, including idolatry. *Jub.* 11:4-5 reads:

(4) And they made for themselves molten images, and everyone worshiped the icon which they made for themselves as a molten image. And they began making graven images and polluted likenesses. And cruel spirits assisted them and led them astray

so that they might commit sin and pollution. (5) And the prince, Mastema, acted forcefully to do all of this. And he sent other spirits to those we were set under his hand to practice all error and sin and all transgression, to destroy, to cause to perish and to pour out blood upon the earth. (OTP 2:78)

In *Jub.* 11:4, evil spirits under the purview of Mastema are depicted as cruel. It connotes that evil spirits revolve around not only natural evil but also a moral one. It seems that the role of evil spirits under the purview of Mastema comes to conflate that of evil spirits in *1 Enoch* 15 with that of spirits of the Watchers in *1 Enoch* 19. Mastema's ruling over humanity appears to be mandatory: The Gentiles are depicted as the people of Belial. However, only Israel will have access to the divine protection from Mastema's ruling over due to Israel's elect status from creation (e.g., *Jub.* 15:32), although Mastema appears to keep troubling Israel in *Jubilees*.⁹² *Jub.* 19:28-29 reads:

(28) And may the spirit of Mastema not rule over you or over your seed in order to remove you from following the LORD who is your God henceforth and forever (29) and may the LORD be for you and for the people a father always and may you be a firstborn son. God, my son, in peace." And the two of them went out together from Abraham. (OTP 2:93)

Jub. 19:28-29 is part of Abraham's blessing for Jacob. *Exod* 4:22 is alluded to in *Jub.* 19:29 so that it serves to solidify Israel's special relationship with God (cf. Kugel 2012:116). Abraham's blessing for Jacob in *Jub.* 19:26-29 harks back to Noah's prayer in *Jub.* 10:3-6. While Noah implored divine intervention to protect his descendants from the demon's leading them astray, Abraham implored divine intervention to protect his descendants from Mastema's ruling over them. Abraham's testimony in *Jubilees* 20 also harks back to Noah's wary of his descendants in *Jub.* 7:27. Like Noah in *Jub.* 7:27, Abraham commanded his descendants not to turn away from the way of the Lord in *Jub.* 20:2-4: "And he commanded them (a) that they should guard the way of the LORD so that they might do righteousness and each one might love his neighbor..." (*Jub.* 20:2, OTP 2:93). As in the Noah story in *Jubilees* 7 and 10, thus, the Abraham story in *Jubilees*

⁹² E.g., the Aqedah episode in *Jubilees* 17—18 and the Exodus episode in *Jubilees* 48.

19—20 shows the heightened tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability. It is already stressed in Abraham's prayer in *Jubilees* 12. *Jub.* 12:19-21 reads:

(19) And he prayed on that night, saying: "My God, the Most High God, you alone are God to me. And you created everything, and everything which is was the work of your hands, and you and your kingdom I have chosen. (20) Save me from the hands of evil spirits which rule over the thought of the heart of man, and do not let them lead me astray from following you, O my God; but establish me and my seed forever, and let us not go astray henceforth and forever." (21) And he said, "Shall I return unto Ur of the Chaldees who seek my face so that I should return to them? Or shall I dwell here in this place? Make the straight path prosper before you in the hand of your servant that he might serve. And do not let me walk in the error of my heart, O my God." (OTP 2:81)

Abraham's prayer in *Jub.* 12:19-21 resonates with Moses's prayer in *Jub.* 1:19-21, which acts as an introduction to *Jubilees*: Both Moses's and Abraham's prayer have in common with each other their pleas for protection from evil spirits' ruling over the thought of the heart of man and from walking in the error of the heart. *In nuce*, the phrase "the error of the heart" brings human activity in relation to sin and human accountability to the fore.

After delivering his testament, Abraham took the Watcher story and the Sodom story as examples. *Jub.* 20:5 reads:

(5) And he told them the judgment of the giants and the judgments of the Sodomites just as they had been judged on account of their evil. And on account of their fornication and impurity and the corruption among themselves with fornication they died. (OTP 2:94)

Unlike the Watcher story in the *BW*, God's dealings with the Watchers and the Giants can be regarded as typological. The Watcher story is used to encourage Abraham's descendants not to turn away from the way of the Lord.

In *Jubilees* 10, the motivation of Mastema's request for presiding evil spirits lies in that fact that "the evil of the sons of men is great" (e.g., *Jub.* 10:8). It connotes that the scope of Mastema's ruling over humanity is the wicked among humanity. In *Jub.* 10:10-13, the beneficial instructions given to Noah serve to protect the righteous from the harmful deeds of evil spirits (e.g., the medicines in Tobit 6 and 8). Thus Mastema's ruling over humanity can be regarded as a punishment deserved for the wicked.⁹³ Nonetheless, all humanity, except for the few righteous, are subordinate to the dominion of Mastema in *Jubilees*. It becomes clear in that Israel's apostasy is predicted and the apostate Israel will be called as "the sons of Belial." Deut 32:17 is alluded to herein. *Jub.* 15:33 reads:

(33) And now I shall announce to you that the sons of Israel will deny this ordinance and they will not circumcise their sons according to all of this law because some of the flesh of their circumcision they will leave in the circumcision of their sons. And all of the sons of Beliar [= Belial] will leave their sons without circumcising just as they were born. (OTP 2:87)

Thus it is not far-fetched to assume that the presence of sin and evil in the postdiluvian era arouses the awareness of the sinfulness of humanity, albeit slowly. Hence Reed (2005:94) is correct in saying that "the author pins this too on the human propensity to sin, further downplaying the role of the fallen angels in the origins of evil."

In summary, along with other distinct traditions absent in *1 Enoch*, the Mastema story in *Jubilees* 10 illustrates that the author/redactor of *Jubilees* attempted to "downplay the Watchers' role in the corruption of humankind" and then to "reassert human responsibility" (Reed 2005:95). It was observed that, unlike *1 Enoch*, the Watcher story in *Jubilees* can be regarded as typological. Both Moses's and Noah's prayer serve to emphasize the significance of the heart with reference to the presence of sin and evil. Moses's plea for creating a pure heart ironically connotes that Second Temple Jews began to beware of the sinfulness of humanity.

⁹³ See Segal (2007:117), who states that "the spirits are intended for the purpose of 'destroying and misleading' humanity, while Mastema is responsible for their punishment (v. 8)."

5. Concluding remarks

The Watcher story in the *BW*, which has recourse to the sons of God episode in Genesis 6:1-4, refers to Second Temple Jews' uneasiness in relation to the presence of sin and evil: God created all creation and they were good in the eyes of God. Then, why is there sin and evil in such a good creation? Whence do these sin and evil come from? Who will be blamed for? The *BW* of *1 Enoch*, which is the earliest, appears to ascribe blame to the Watchers and their offsprings. Asael is blamed for transmitting unlawful instructions (e.g., *1 En.* 8:1). Shemihazah and two hundred Watchers are blamed for having illicit union with women, as well as unlawful instructions (e.g., *1 En.* 7:1; 8:3-4). The Giants are blamed for violence on the earth (e.g., *1 En.* 7:2-6). Despite the fact that humanity also began to commit sins afterward, at best it seems that they are depicted as victims. However, it was observed that *1 Enoch* 1—5, an introduction to the *BW*, indicate that the Watcher story should be understood not only as etiological but also as typological.

Granted that, in the *BW*, there is the tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability, although the former outweighs the latter. Such a tension comes to be heightened when looking into the later Enochic traditions than the *BW*: the *DV* and the *EE*. The Watcher story is employed, in varying degrees, typologically both in the *DV* and in the *EE*. The Watcher story in these Enochic traditions appears as one of the instantiations of violence and conflict, albeit different in detail. The divine verdict against the Watchers, including their offsprings, is used to make sense of the certainty of divine judgment, which hinges both on divine sovereignty and on theodicy. In other words, it was observed that there is the heightened tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability both in the *DV* and in the *EE*: The latter outweighs the former. For instance, the allegorist in the *An. Apoc.* introduced the Cain and Abel episode in Genesis 4 prior to the Watcher story. Besides, seventy shepherds in the *An. Apoc.* do not correspond to evil spirits who have come out of the dead bodies of the Giants in the *BW*. Moreover, in the *AW*, the Watcher story is not mentioned, although the divine verdict against the Watchers at the *eschaton* is alluded to therein. *Jubilees* also appears to be similar to both the *DV* and the *EE*. What is implicit in the *BW* comes to be explicit in *Jubilees* (e.g., the biblical Adam story in Genesis 1—3 in

Jub. 3:23-25). Beside, *Jubilees* bears other traditions absent in *1 Enoch*. For instance, in the Mastema story, the author/redactor of *Jubilees* parted company with his predecessor. It was observed that the role of Mastema in *Jubilees* is situated within the divine administration; his mission is to corrupt and lead humanity astray (e.g., *Jub.* 11:11; 17:16; 18:9, 12). *In nuce*, Mastema and evil spirits in his purview are credited as instigators of sins. It becomes clear in that Adam and Eve's disobedience is narrated in *Jubilees* 3 without significant alteration. Meanwhile, it stands to reason that both the Watchers and humanity appear to be liable for the antediluvian wickedness in *Jubilees*.

In summary, it is fair to say that the Watcher story cannot resolve satisfactorily such a tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability. In other words, the Watcher story cannot quench Second Temple Jews' uneasiness in relation to the presence of sin and evil.

Chapter 4. Sin and human accountability in Qumran literature

1. Preliminary remarks

Both *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* appear to be authoritative for the Qumran covenants. Five Aramaic fragments of *1 Enoch* and fourteen Hebrew fragment of *Jubilees* are found at Qumran. Aside from these fragments, there are a few texts, in which the Watcher story is alluded to. Granted that, it is made clear that the Watcher story continues to play an important role in establishing the theologoumena of the Qumran community. Notwithstanding this, it comes as no surprise that dualism or dualistic ways of thinking of the Qumran community should be read into the Watcher story in the Second Temple period. Far from linking directly to the Watcher story in the Second Temple period, there are various types of prayers at Qumran such as penitential, incantation, and apotropaic prayers. These various types of prayers point to the fact that, in terms of the presence of sin and evil, the Qumran covenants were led to realize the severity of the sinfulness of humanity in a complicated and heightened manner. Such an awareness of the sinfulness of humanity goes hand in hand with the Qumran covenants' heightened uneasiness of impurity, either ritual or moral (cf. Klawans 2000). Aside from such prayers, there are also texts that are appropriate for this study such as the *Hodayot*, the *Rule of the Community*, the *Damascus Document*, and the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* (1QS 3:13-4:26). We will turn to these various issues at Qumran presently.

2. The Watcher story at Qumran

2.1. 1QapGen ar

1QapGen ar (//1Q20, *Genesis Apocryphon*) is pre-sectarian. The literary relationship of 1QapGen ar with both *I Enoch* and *Jubilees* has attracted scholarly attention (cf. Machiela 2009:8-17). The literary relationship between *I Enoch* and 1QapGen ar points to the fact that they would share “a common apocalyptic worldview,” in which Enoch acts as “a major conduit of divine revelation” (Machiela 2009:13). Besides, 1QapGen ar appears to be dating the biblical episodes according to jubilees as *Jubilees* does (cf. Bergsma 2007:252). Fitzmyer (2004:23) insists that “[t]here is nothing in this text that clearly links it with any of the known beliefs or customs of the Qumran sect.” Machiela (2009:8) points out that “[a]lthough the Genesis Apocryphon was probably not composed by the Qumranites, there has been unanimous agreement that it originated in the land of Israel.”

1QapGen ar is centered on both the Noah story (1QapGen ar 0—17) and the Abram story (1QapGen ar 19—22). Peters (2008:121) is of the opinion that both Noah and Abram in 1QapGen ar are introduced as “righteous archetypes who were delivered from outside threats, behaved as priests, and inherited the land.” Meanwhile, the Watcher story is narrated in 1QapGen ar 0-1, albeit fragmentary. 1QapGen ar 0:1-6 reads⁹⁴:

- (1) []. *k' l...*
- (2) []for in every (way) we shall welcome an adulterer
- (3) []*k (vacat)*
- (4) [al]l that he de[sired]
- (5) []*m* you will intensify your anger and will be sustained. But who is there
- (6) [who can withstand]*m* the heat of your anger. (*vacat*)

The term גִּיּוֹר in line 2 can be translated as an adulterer as the same term in *Tg. Neof.* of both Exod 20:14 and Lev 20:10 (cf. Fitzmyer 2004:117). Fitzmyer (2004:117) insists that line 4 may be reminiscent of Gen 6:5.

⁹⁴ The translation is from Fitzmyer (2004).

[..] כו[ל די חמ]°°[..] (1QapGen 0:4)⁹⁵

וְקַל־יִצְרָל מִקְשָׁבֶת לְבָנוֹ (Gen 6:5)

Despite it is speculative due to its fragmentary nature, it seems that the Watcher story is narrated in the beginning of 1QapGen ar. The Watcher story may also be alluded to in 1QapGen ar 0:17: “[]’n that they would not ally themselves by marriage w...n...why.” However, Machiela’s translation is different from Fitzmyer’s: “[]...seeking favor and... from the Lord of Eternity.” The difficulty in reading the manuscript of ISF_DO_00661 prevents us to translate line 17 with certainty as both Fitzmyer’s and Machiela’s show. At least it seems that 1QapGen ar 0:17 connotes the Watchers’ transgression of divine commandments. It becomes clear in that, in column 0 of 1QapGen ar, God’s anger appears as the divine response to the wickedness and violence of humanity and the Watchers (e.g., 1QapGen ar 0:5-6, 10, 12, 13). Column 1 of 1QapGen 13 is reminiscent of the *Book of the Watchers* in *1 Enoch*. 1QapGen ar 1:1-3 reads:

- (1) []...n and with the women
- (2) [].. Moreover, the mystery of evil which
- (3) [].tyn and the mystery which

Fitzmyer (2004:120) insists that the phrase רזו רשעא, “the mystery of evil,” in line 2 is “the Aramaic equivalent of the Qumran Hebrew expression רזי פשע,” namely the mystery of sin (e.g., 1Q27 1:2; 1QH^a 13:36 [Suk. 5:36, DJD 40. 13:38]). Peters (2008:107) points out that “the language of ‘women,’ the ones who are ‘bound,’ and the presence of evil and wickedness evoke the context within which Noah is introduced both in Genesis and in the *Book of Watchers*.” Notwithstanding this, the referent of the antediluvian wickedness in the Flood narrative appears to be indeterminate in 1QapGen ar 5:16-19, although it resonates with *1 Enoch* 106:19. In *1 Enoch* 106:19, eschatological destruction of evil through the flood is predicted by Enoch in an analogous manner of the Flood narrative. For the author of the *Birth of Noah* (*1 Enoch* 106—107), such an eschatological

⁹⁵ For the various scholarly reconstructions, see Machiela (2009:31).

destruction of evil through flood owes its existence to the Watchers' transgression of divine commandments, namely their illicit union with women, in the generation of Jared, Enoch's father (e.g., *1 En.* 106:13-14). Columns 2—5 of 1QapGen ar also revolve around the birth of Noah. Like *1 Enoch* 106, the antediluvian wickedness is also mentioned in column 5 of 1QapGen ar. Unlike *1 Enoch* 106, however, it is not clear whether such an antediluvian wickedness is attributed to humanity or to the Watchers. In columns 6—7 of 1QapGen ar, Noah's arrangement of the marriage of his sons and daughters stands in contrast to the Watcher's illicit union with women. It connotes Noah's uprightness. A vision given to Noah is introduced in 1QapGen 6:11—7:5. 1QapGen ar 6:16-20 reads:

- (16) [] .*rmw* and I pondered within me all the conduct of the children of the earth;
 I understood and made known all []
- (17) [][] *ql* they will split, and he chose(?)...them...
- (18) [] for] two weeks, and then from what w[ill be] hidden []
- (19) [] *m'yw*. the blood which the Nephilim shed. I was calm and I waited(?) unit
q[]
- (20) [] holy ones who were with the daughters of m[en].

Albeit its fragmentary nature, for the author of 1QapGen ar, both humanity and the Watchers appear to be liable for the antediluvian wickedness. Not only “all the conduct of the children of the earth” but also the transgression of “holy ones [= the Watchers] who were with the daughters of m[en]” would result in divine judgment through the flood.

In summary, it is fair to say that, in the Watcher story in 1QapGen ar, the tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability cannot be easily resolved. This is because the intention of the author of 1QapGen ar is on introducing both Noah and Abram as “righteous archetypes.”

2.2. 4Q180

4Q180, the so-called “*Pesher on the Periods*,” contains the designation Azazel in Leviticus 16, which is probably identified with Asael in the Watcher story in *I Enoch*.

(7) [And] interpretation concerning ‘Azaz’el and the angels wh[o came to the daughters of man] (8) [and s]ired themselves giants. And concerning ‘Azaz’el [is written ...] (9) [to love] injustice and to let him inherit evil for all [his] ag[e ...] (10) [...] (of the) judgments and the judgment of the council of [...] (4Q180 frag. 1 7-10)

The identification of Azazel with Asael also occurs in 4QEnGiants^a (//4Q203). A similar tendency to identify Azazel with Asael can be found in *Pesikta Rabbati* 34, later rabbinic literature *circa* ninth century CE. Stökl Ben Ezra (2003:87) is of the opinion that “the punishment of the demon [=Asael] resembles the treatment of the goat in aspects of geography, action, time and purpose.” Dimant (1978:327) insists that “[i]n my judgment such an identification (of ‘Asa’el and ‘Az’azel) is already assumed in the adaptation of the material in chap 10 [= *I Enoch* 10], where the punishments are commanded.” Besides, the fact that the punishment of Azazel acts as a representative of divine judgment against the Watchers in both the Asael tradition and the Sehemihazah tradition in *I Enoch* harks back to *I En.* 10:8, where all sin is ascribed to Asael. Given that the identification of Azazel with Asael has a bearing on divine judgment against the Watchers, at least it seems that, in 4Q180, the Watcher story appears as one of the instantiations of violence and conflict, which was deserved divine judgment (cf. Davidson 1992:273). Together with 4Q181, which probably belongs to the same work, 4Q180 is used to make sense that “the activity and events which occur in history are predetermined by God” (Charlesworth 2006:219). Within the context of divine sovereignty in history, the Watcher story in 4Q180 is typological. 4Q203 is also the case.

(5) Th[en] ’Ohyah [said] to Hahy[ah, his brother ...] Then he punished, and not (6) us, [bu]t Aza[ze]l and made [him ... the sons of] Watchers, (7) the Giants; and n[o]ne of [their] be[loved] will be forgiven [...] ... he has imprisoned us and has captured yo[u] (4Q203 frag. 1 i 5-7)

In summary, the identification of Azazel in Leviticus 16 with Asael in *I Enoch* serves to emphasize divine judgment against the Watchers with reference to divine sovereignty in history.

2.3. 4Q510—511

4Q510—511, the so-called “*Songs of the Maskil*,” belong to the category of apotropaic prayers among Qumran literature (cf. Eshel 2003). These apotropaic prayers are aimed at warding off evil spirits by way of praising God’s power. In 4Q511 (4QShir^b), the *Maskil* called the Giants as the bastards.

(1) in God’s council. Because He has placed [the wisdom] of his intelligence [in my] hea[rt, and on my tongue] (2) the praises of his justice and [...] ... And through my mouth he startles [all the spirits of] (3) the bastards (גִּמְזוּרִים), to subjugate [all] impure [sin]ners. For in the innards of (4) my flesh is the foundation of [...] and in] my body wars. The laws of (5) God are in my heart, and I get prof[it ...] ... all the wonders of man. The deeds of (6) guilt I pronounce wicked [...] God of ... *Blank* He (7) knows, and in his mysteries ... [...] ... the disputes of all (8) the spirits of ... [...] ... [...] (4Q511 frags. 48, 49 + 51 1-8)

The phrase כּוֹל רוּחֵי מְסֻזְרִים, “all the spirits of the bastards,” in lines 2 and 3 refers to the evil spirits, which have come out of the dead bodies of the Giants in *I Enoch*, in that the same term designates the Giants in *I En.* 10:9 (cf. Stuckenbruck 2014:84). Given that the term מְסֻזְרִים, “the bastards,” has a bearing on divine judgment against the Watchers and their offsprings in *I Enoch*, it can do justice to the *Maskil*’ attempt to ward off evil spirits apotropaically: As God had done in the past, he will have done both in the present and in the future. Briefly put, the Watcher story in 4Q511 is typological. It becomes clear in 4Q510, in which the *Maskil* praised divine sovereignty in history. The ongoing actions of evil spirits in the present remains within the purview of God (e.g., 4Q180).

(4) of his glorious majestic strong[hold]. *Blank* And I, a Sage, declare the splendour

of his radiance in order to frighten and terr[ify] (5) all the spirits of the ravaging angels and the bastard spirits, demons, Lilith, owls and [jackals ...] (6) and those who strike unexpectedly to lead astray the spirit of knowledge, to make their hearts forlorn. And you have been placed in the era of the rul[e of] (7) wickedness and in the periods of humiliation of the sons of lig[ht], in the guilty periods of / [those] defiled by/ iniquities; not for an everlasting destruction (8) [but ra]ther for the era of the humiliation of sin. [Blank] Rejoice, righteous ones, in the wonderful God. (4Q510 frag. 1 4-8)

In 4Q510, bastard spirits are listed as one of other malevolent spirits, who appear to have led the sons of light astray. Wright (2016:234) points out that “[t]he author incorporates the spirits that are spoken of in Ps 91, also those in Isa 13:21, along with those of spirits of the bastard giants of the Watcher tradition.” It seems that the etiological function of evil spirits in *I Enoch* comes to be attenuated in 4Q510—511 to some extent. This is because the role of malevolent spirits in this apotropaic prayer is translated into both cosmic and ethical dualism in line 6. The heart of the sons of light is the battleground against malevolent spirits in the context of cosmic and ethical dualism in lines 7-8.

In summary, 4Q510—511 indicate that, while not dismissing the extrinsic source of sin and evil, the *Maskil* began to turn his attention to the internal source of sin and evil. Malevolent spirits appear to have led the sons of light astray by way of attacking their heart (e.g., *Jub.* 10:1; 1QS 3:20-24). In actuality, the presence of sin and evil inside the heart of the sons of light is felt more seriously. It exacerbates the awareness of the sinfulness of humanity in the Qumran community. That is why such apotropaic prayers are necessary. Notwithstanding this, the *Maskil* encouraged the sons of light to ward off these malevolent spirits in the hope that God will have done both in the present and in the future as he had done in the past. Thus the heightened tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability is still on the go and more complicated than *I Enoch* and *Jubilees*. This is because the tension between free will and divine determinism should be read into the Watcher story in these apotropaic prayers.

2.4. 4Q444

4Q444, an apotropaic prayer, appears to be similar to 4Q510—511. The *Maskil* also called the Giants as the bastards.

(1) [... the wailing cries of her mourning. *Blank* I will subdue (2) [...] ... the truth and the justice (3) [... afflictions,] and until its dominions are complete (4) [... those who inspire him fear, all the spirits of the bastards (מַיְרִיזִים) and the spirit of uncleanness (4Q444 frag. 2 i 1-4 [DJD 29. frag. 1-4i + 5:5-8])

The spirits of the bastards, namely evil spirits in *I Enoch*, is juxtaposed with the spirit of impurity in line 4. In 4Q444, the *Maskil* confessed that the battleground against malevolent spirits is the innards of the flesh.

(1) And I belong to those who fear God; he opened my mouth with his true knowledge, and from his holy spirit [...] (2) ... [...] and they became spirits of dispute in my build. The precept of [...] (3) [...] the innards of the flesh. A spirit of knowledge and understanding, truth and justice, did God place in [my] heart [...] (4) [...] ... and be strong in the precepts of God, and in battling the spirits of iniquity, and not ... [...] (4Q444 frag. 1 1-4 [DJD 29. frag. 1 1-4i + 5:1-4])

Like 4Q510—511, due to its genre as apotropaic prayers, 4Q444 highlight the heightened tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability. In other words, there is the tension between free will and divine determinism. These apotropaic prayers resonate with Abraham's prayer in *Jubilees* 12: "Save me from the hands of evil spirits which rule over the thought of the heart of man, and do not let them lead me astray from following you, O my God; but establish me and my seed forever, and let us not go astray henceforth and forever" (*Jub.* 12:20, OTP 2:81). The difference between *Jubilees* 12 and these apotropaic prayers is that the battleground against malevolent spirits is translated into the heart of humanity in the latter.

2.5. 11Q11

11Q11, the so-called “the *Apocryphal Psalms*,” belongs to the category of incantation prayers among Qumran literature. These incantation prayers are distinct from apotropaic prayers that are aimed at directly addressing to the demon (cf. Eshel 2003). García Martínez (2007b:121) points out that “it consists of at least three apocryphal psalms followed by Ps 91, a psalm frequently quoted in Jewish amulets and incantations and considered in the Talmudic literature as the most appropriate remedy against demons.” 11Q11 points toward “an apparent increased awareness of a very active demonology” within the context of both cosmic and ethical dualism (Wright 2005:171). Granted that, 11Q11 is exorcistic. In 11Q11, the demon is identified with the seed of the holy ones, namely evils spirits in *I En.* 6—11, albeit implicitly.

(6) Who are you, [oh offspring of] man and of the seed of the ho[ly] ones? Your face is a face of (7) [delus]ion, and your horns are horns of illu[si]on. You are darkness and not light, (8) [injus]tice and not justice. [...] the chief of the army. yhwh [will bring] you [down] (9) [to the] deepest [Sheo]l, [he will shut] the two bronze [ga]tes through [which n]o (10) light [penetrates.] [On you shall] not [shine the] sun, whi[ch rises] (11Q11 5:6-10)

The portrayal of the demon in line 6 appears to be similar to that of “semi-divine figures known generally in Mesopotamia and Syria” (Frölich 2011:210). That is to say, in 11Q11, the Watcher story is conflated with other demonology in the Ancient Near Eastern. Like 4Q510—511, 11Q11 5:6-10 also emphasizes divine judgment against the Watchers and their offsprings. Unlike 4Q510—511, the battleground against the demon is not the heart of the sons of light. The recipient of this incantation prayer is a sick person. He is encouraged to confront the demon, who caused disease and disaster (cf. García Martínez 2007b:121). Within the confine of its genre as incantation prayers, both evil spirits, who caused natural evil, and divine judgment in *I Enoch* do justice to a sick person’s attempt to confront the demon. Nonetheless, given that the demon is depicted as darkness in line 7, at least it seems that natural evil, which the demon caused to the sons of light, is intertwined with moral evil in that, in Qumran literature, the motif darkness is used to refer to sin and impurity (Frölich 2013:46 n.117).

3. *Yetzer Ra* in pre-sectarian poetic texts

Such a tendency to turn more attention to the intrinsic source of sin and evil in various prayers at Qumran, which contain the Watcher story, is not only found but also developed in some prayers and texts at Qumran, which do not contain the Watcher story. While, in the former, the heart of human beings is the battleground against malevolent spirits, in the latter, human nature is predicated of the evil inclination (*yetzer ra*).

As is clearly seen in chapter 2, from a sapiential perspective, which traces back to creation, Ben Sira viewed the term *yetzer* as the neutral capacity given to humanity to choose morally. Nonetheless, with reference to the presence of sin and evil, the sage had recourse to divine determinism. There are two strands of humanity according to the pattern of God's creation: He proffers wisdom to whom he elects. The tension between free will and divine determinism cannot be easily resolved in Ben Sira. That is to say, from a phenomenological perspective, the *yetzer* appears to be evil without divine intervention. Granted that, it stands to reason that such a tension between free will and divine determinism comes to be heightened in a complicated manner on account of dualistic ways of thinking of the Qumran community. The dualism of the Qumran community is cosmic, ethical, psychological, and eschatological.⁹⁶ 4QInstruction is the case: There are two distinct strands of humanity or the ways of being human: עַם רוּחַ, the "spiritual people," and רוּחַ בֶּשֶׂר, the "fleshly spirit." The "spiritual people" have access to the *Vision of Hagu*; the "fleshly spirit" is denied. In 4QInstruction, thus, the phrase *yetzer ra* denotes the evil inclination to bad behaviors the *Mevin* should avoid. Besides, the heightened tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability in *I Enoch* and *Jubilees* precipitates such a tendency to have a negative bearing on the term *yetzer* as the evil inclination. Albeit not linear but convoluted in its development, the foregoing section makes sense of the rationale of gravitating the evil

⁹⁶ Cf. Xeravits (ed) (2010).

inclination at Qumran.

Some poetic texts, either pre-sectarian or sectarian, are concerned with the evil inclination. Some covenantal texts, which is sectarian, at Qumran also deal with the evil inclination. Nonetheless, the understanding of the evil inclinations in these prayers and texts is far from monotonous. We will turn to these issues presently.

3.1. 11Q5

Psalm 155. Of non-canonical psalms in the *Psalm Scrolls* found at 11 Cave, the purifying of the evil inclination is mentioned in 11Q5 24:3-17 (//11QPs^a 24, *Psalm 155*, which is the Hebrew version of the *Syriac Psalm 3*), albeit indirectly. Falk (2007:145) points out that 11Q 24:3-17 cannot be regarded as a penitential prayer but as a petitionary prayer. This is because there is no confession of sin. Notwithstanding this, the situation of distress, with which the psalmist would have faced, allows him to turn his attention to the intrinsic source of sin and evil and to realize his inclination to sin.

(10) Remember me and do not forget me or lead me into difficulties too great for me. (11) Remove the sin of my childhood from me and may my offences not be remembered against me. (12) Purify me, O yhwh, from evil plague (נגע רע), and may it stop coming back to /me/; dry up (13) its roots from me, may its lea[ve]s not become green in me. Glory are you, yhwh, (11Q5 24:10-13)

Although the term evil inclination// *yetzer ra* (יצר רע) does not occur in 11Q5 24:10-13, the semantically congenial term evil plague (נגע רע) in line 12 is used to refer to the innate state of the psalmist. Based on the psalmist's petition for removing the sin of his childhood from him in line 11, it is not far-fetched to assume that the confession of sin is presumed when the psalmist petitioned God for purifying him from evil plague in line 12. Ps 143:2 is alluded to in line 7 prior to the psalmist's petition for purifying him from evil plague.

(7) do not judge me by my sin because no-one living is just in your presence (115Q

24:7)

(2) And do not enter into judgment with Thy servant, For in Thy sight no man living is righteous (Ps 143:2)

The canonical psalmist's claim in Ps 143:2 serves to bring the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* to the fore. In actuality, the psalmist confessed that he could not overcome such a situation of distress without divine mercy. This is because such difficulties appear to have overwhelmed the psalmist (e.g., בקשות ממני in line 10).

The phrase נגע רע in line 12 connotes that the inner state of the psalmist is impure and sinful. The verb נגע is used to mean “to touch” or “to be struck.” However, verb נגע appears to be frequently allocated either with “unclean things in particular” or with “things which have to be protected from impurity” (Newton 1985:20; e.g., Num 4:15; 31:19; Lev 11:36; 15:10, 19; Exod 29:37; 30:29). The noun נגע is thus used to refer to disease and pain in general (e.g., Leviticus 13—14, 1 Kgs 8:37-38). The metaphorical use of the noun נגע is expanded to connote punishment for sins (e.g., 2 Sam 7:14; Isa 53:8, Ps 89:33). The general use of the noun נגע at Qumran is also similar to the biblical usages (e.g., CD 13:5; 4Q270 frag. 2 ii 12; 4Q274 frag. 1 i 4; 11Q19 48:15; 49:4; 58:4). A similar metaphorical use of the noun נגע is found in the *Hodayot* (e.g., 1QH^a 9:32; 13:28). The phrase נגע רע has a negative bearing on human nature in 11Q5 24. The psalmist's petition for drying up the roots of evil plague from him in lines 12-13 connotes that evil plague cannot be regarded as the human proclivity to committing sin, but as an irresistible condition of making humanity sinful and impure. Thus it is fair to say that the necessity of both purifying impurities and ameliorating the situation of disease and pain comes to be metaphorically translated into the psalmist's petition for both purifying evil plague and removing the situation of distress in this petitionary prayer. A similar tendency to refer ritual impurity to sin occurs in Ezek 36:16-22 and Ps 51:7-9. For instance, in Psalm 51, the purifying of impurity connotes the atonement of sin and the restoring of the relationship with God. Thus it is not far-fetched to assume that evil plague in 11Q5 24 acts as the cause of committing sin and of breaking the relationship with God.

Plea for Deliverance. The phrase *יצר רע* occurs in 11Q5 19 (//11QPs^a 19), the so-called “*Plea for Deliverance.*” Unlike 11Q5 24, Falk (2007:145) classifies 11Q5 19 as a penitential prayer in that it contains the psalmist’s confession of sin.

(10) because of my sins, and my iniquities have sold me to Sheol, but you, (11) yhwh, saved me, according to the abundance of your compassion and the abundance of your just acts. I, too, (11Q5 19:10-11)

The metaphorical expression in line 10 that the psalmist’s sins and iniquities have nearly put him to death sheds more light on the severity of the sinfulness of humanity. A similar expression can be found in 4Q504 (4QDibHam^a, *Words of the Luminaries*): “[of heart ... Behold, for] our [in]iquities were we sold, but in spite of our sins you did call us” (4Q504 frags. 1—2 ii 15). It seems that Isa 50:1 is also alluded to in 11Q5 19 as in 4Q504 frags. 1—2 ii (cf. Lange & Weigold 2011:136).

(1) Thus says the LORD, “Where is the certificate of divorce, By which I have sent your mother away? Or to whom of My creditors did I sell you? Behold, you were sold for your iniquities, And for your transgressions your mother was sent away (Isa 50:1)

Isa 50:1-3 serves to emphasize the severity of Israel’s sins and disobedience. Isa 50:1 appears as the divine response to Israel’s complaint in Isa 49:14-21: “But Zion said, “The LORD has forsaken me, And the Lord has forgotten me” (Isa 49:1). The severity of Israel’s sins and disobedience is stressed in Isa 50:1 in that there is no mention of divine forgiveness (cf. Joachimsen 2011:320). More than that, however, the psalmist’s confession of his sin is used to highlight the abundance of divine compassion and divine justice. In a similar vein, the divine response in Isa 50:1 serves to shed more light on the divine promise of restoration in Isaiah 53 (cf. Joachimsen 2011). After confessing his sin, the psalmist began to petition God for purifying his iniquities.

(14) and cleanse me from my iniquity. Bestow on me a spirit of faith and knowledge. Let me not stumble (15) in transgression. Let not Satan rule over me, nor an evil spirit; let neither pain nor evil purpose [= evil inclination] (*יצר ער*) (16) take

possession of my bones. Because you, yhwh, are my praise and in you I hope (11Q5 19:14-16)

Unlike 11Q5 24, the psalmist's petition in 11Q5 19 includes the protection from Satan's or evil spirit's or the evil inclination's ruling over him. 11Q5 19 resonates with Moses's prayer in *Jub.* 1:19-21. Without mentioning explicitly, the psalmist had recourse to the Watcher story in *1 Enoch* (e.g., evil spirits) and *Jubilees* (e.g., Satan//Mastema). The psalmist's petition for protecting from Satan's ruling over him is reminiscent of Psalm 119: "Establish my footsteps in Thy word, And do not let any iniquity have dominion over me" (Ps 119:113). The difference between Ps 119:133 and 11Q5 19:15 is that Satan and evil spirit come to be replaced with any iniquity (cf. Lange 2003). The evil inclination (יצר רע) is listed as one of the entities who appear to have ruled over humanity. It leads Tigchelaar (2008b:350-351) to insist that the evil inclination in 11Q5 19 can be regarded either as external to humanity or as "independent of a human heart." However, the similarities between 11Q5 24 and 11Q5 19 illustrate that the evil inclination in 11Q5 19 should also be understood as referring to the inner state of humanity as evil plague in 11Q5 24 does. Albeit different in its genre, these two prayers have in common with each other the fact that these two prayers are about the psalmist's petition for "mercy and forgiveness as well as spiritual strengthening and deliverance from danger" (Falk 2007:157). It is not far-fetched to assume that any iniquity's ruling over the canonical psalmist in Ps 119:133 is divided into both an external malevolent spirit's ruling over the psalmist and an internal evil inclination's ruling over him in 11Q5 24. Briefly put, such a subdivision reflects Second Temple Jews' attempts to answer—theologically, anthropologically, and cosmically—to an uneasy question of the presence of sin and evil. Like 11Q5 24, 11Q5 19 also has the recourse both to Ezek 36 and to Psalm 51. Both Ezek 36 and Psalm 51 make sense that "a cleansing should precede inner change" (Leene 2014:198). 11Q5 19 follows this order. While Satan appears to be external to humanity, the evil inclination appears to be internal to humanity: The latter result from the former (cf. Rosen-Zvi 2011:47).

In summary, 11Q5 indicates that the evil inclination is the irresistible condition of making humanity sinful and impure. The purifying of the evil inclination can be done only by

God. Thus it is fair to say that the evil inclination in 11Q5 serves to emphasize the severity of the sinfulness of humanity.

3.2. 4Q213a

There is a literary and thematic parallel between 11Q5 19 and Levi's prayer in the *Aramaic Levi Document* (hereafter *ALD*). The *ALD* belongs to the genre of testament and is pre-sectarian. While Lange (2003:262) insists that the *ALD* may be dependent on 11Q5 19 in terms of literary dependence between them, Stuckenbruck (2011:153) is of the opinion that "both Levi's prayer in the Aramaic Levi document and Moses's intercession in *Jubilees* 1.20 reflect the influence of a tradition that is extant through the "Prayer of Deliverance" [=11Q5 19]." Both 11Q5 19 and Levi's prayer in *A.L.D.* 3 (//4Q213a frag. 1 i 1-18//4QLevi^b ar) resonate with Moses's prayer in *Jub.* 1:19-21. Granted that, 4Q213a frag. 1 i 17 appears to be similar to 11Q5 19:15a.

(15) in transgression. Let not Satan rule over me, nor an evil spirit... (11Q5 19:15a)

(17) [... and] may no adversary (ܘܫܘܥ) rule over me (4Q213a frag. 1 i 17)

Although the evil inclination's ruling over humanity is not mentioned in 4Q213a, Levi's petition for removing evil [thought] in 4Q213a frag. 1 i 12-14 helps us to identify the evil inclination in 11Q5 19:15b.

(15)...let neither pain nor evil purpose [= evil inclination] (רע יצר) (11Q5 19:15b)

(12) [Now, then, my children are with me. Grant me all the] paths of truth; remove far (13) [from me, Lord, the spirit of injustice and] evil [thought] and fornication; turn away (14) [pride from me. Show me the holy spirit, counsel, wisdom, intelligence and [grant me] strength (4Q213a frag. 1 i 12-14)

Despite its fragmentary nature, at least it seems that, evil thought, which can also be

translated as the evil inclination,⁹⁷ in line 13 refers to the innate state of humanity. The evil inclination is grouped along with the spirit of injustice, fornication, and pride and comes to be the opposite of holy spirit, counsel, wisdom, and intelligence in line 14. Line 14 is reminiscent of Psalm 51. 4Q213a also follows the order of Ezek 36 and Psalm 51 (e.g., 11Q5 24). It harks back to Moses's prayer in *Jub.* 1:19-21: "...O Lord, my God, do not abandon your people and your inheritance to walk in the error of their heart" (*Jub.* 1:19, OTP 2:53). All in all, such a literary and thematic parallel between 11Q5 19 and 4Q213a (*//A.L.D.* 3) illustrates that the evil inclination in 11Q5 19 should also be understood as referring to the inner state of humanity.

3.3. 4Q436

4Q436 (4QBarkhi Nafshi^c) is a thanksgiving hymn. It is one of five fragment manuscripts (4Q434-438) known as the *Barkhi Nafshi* texts. In 4Q436 frag. 1, the hymnist attempted to make sense of the significance of the heart as "the seat of both virtuous and evil inclinations" (Heger 2011:304). God is thus first introduced as the instructor of the hymnist.

(1) knowledge to strengthen the downcast heart and to triumph in it over the spirit, to console those oppressed in the epoch of their anguish, to lift the hands of the fallen ones, (2) to make receptacles of knowledge, to give knowledge to the wise. And the upright will increase insight to understand (3) your deeds which you did in the years of old, in the years of generation after generation, eternal knowledge which (4) [yo]u [have set] in front of me. You have preserved your law before me, and your covenant has been confirmed for me, and you have strengthened upon my heart (5) [...] to walk in your paths. You called my heart to attention and you sharpened my kidneys so that they do not forget your laws. (6) [...] you [...] your law, and you opened my kidneys and you strengthened me so that I would follow the paths of (7) [...] your [...]. You have made my mouth like a sharpened sword and have opened my tongue to the words of holiness; and you have placed (4Q436 frag. 1 i 1-7)

⁹⁷ Cf. Vermes (1997).

It seems that 4Q436 frag. 1 i has recourse to Deuteronomy 30, where the significance of the circumcision of the heart is stressed: “Moreover the LORD your God will circumcise your heart and the heart of your descendants, to love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul, in order that you may live” (Deut 30:6). Seely (1999:151) points out that “[t]he theme of this text is the power of God to give understanding and knowledge to those whom the Lord has delivered.” Meanwhile, Seely (1999:151) goes on to say that the hymnist brought “the strengthening of the heart and the writing of the law on the inmost parts” to the fore in 4Q436 frag. 1 (e.g., 4Q434 frag. 1). It is worth noting that not only vocabulary in 4Q436 frag. 1 but also its theme appears to be similar to those of the wisdom tradition. What is added to the common features of the wisdom tradition is that the hymnist understood that the removing of the evil inclination is necessary to strengthen his heart and to transpose the law onto it (cf. Seely 1996:533).

(10) [...] you have [re]moved from me, and in stead of it you have given a pure heart; the evil inclination (עָרָב לֵב) [you have] remo[ved ...] (1) [...] you have placed in my heart; lewdness of eyes you have removed from me, and you have looked at [...] (2) [... st]ubbornness you sent away from me, and you turned it into humility; angry rage you removed [from me and you gave] (3) [me a spirit of pa]tience; arrogance and haughtiness you discarded from me [... to me, the spirit of] (4) [deceit you destroyed ...] ... you gave to me ... [...] (4Q436 frag. 1 i 10—ii 4)

Unlike Ben Sira, who viewed the *yetzer* as neutral, the hymnist regarded the *yetzer* as evil. It shows a phenomenological tendency to realize the severity of the sinfulness of humanity (e.g., 11Q5 19). Like 11Q5, the evil inclination should be understood as referring to the inner state of humanity (*pace* Tigchelaar 2008b:351).⁹⁸ In 4Q436 frag. 1 i 10—ii 4, the evil inclination is grouped along with lewdness of eyes, stubbornness, angry rage, arrogance, haughtiness, the spirits of deceit and comes to the opposite of a pure heart, humility, a spirit of patience. The fashioning of a pure heart in line 10 is reminiscent of Ps 51:11-12. While, in Ps 51:11-12, the canonical psalmist petitioned God for forgiving his sins and iniquities, in 4Q436 frag. 1 i 10, the hymnist petitioned God for removing the

⁹⁸ Although the verb גָּעַר in Zech 3:2 is allocated with Satan, the verb גָּעַר can also be allocated with malevolent entities, either external or internal (e.g., Gen 37:10; Rut 2:16; Pss 9:6; 68:31; 106:9; 119:21; Isa 17:13; 54:9; Jer 29:27; Nah 1:4; Mal 2:3; 3:11).

evil inclination. The difference between Psalm 51 and 4Q436 frag. 1 i illustrates that the evil inclination is the irresistible condition of making humanity sinful and impure (cf. 11Q5 24). Unlike 11Q5 19 and 4Q213a, there is no mention of external malevolent spirit such as Satan. This is because 4Q436 speaks of the power of God to give wisdom, which stands in line with the wisdom tradition, although its genre is a thanksgiving hymn.

In 1QS 5:5, in which Deut 30:6 is conflated with Deut 10:16, the *yetzer* is credited as the object of circumcision other than the heart, whereas, in 4Q434 frag. 1 i 4 (4QBarkhi Nafshi^a), which has in common with 4Q436 frag. 1 i its usage of body metaphor,⁹⁹ the object of circumcision is the heart.¹⁰⁰ Briefly put, although the *yetzer* cannot be identified with the heart, they are mutually referenced.

(5) and his eyes and the musings of his inclination. Instead he should circumcise in the Community the foreskin of his tendency (7צ״) and of his stiff neck in order to lay a foundation of truth for Israel, for the Community of the eternal (1QS 5:5)

1QS 5:5 is about conversion. The circumcision of the foreskin of the *yetzer* is required to establish the identity of the Qumran Community.

(6) covenant. They should make atonement for all who freely volunteer for holiness (לקודש) in Aaron and for the house of truth in Israel and for those who join them for community (ל״ת), lawsuit and judgment, (1QS 5:6)

For the Qumran covenanters, the requirement of the circumcision of the foreskin of the *yetzer* for entering into the Qumran community is a matter of identity as a holy people. Thus the *yetzer* refers metonymically to the heart polluted by sin and impurity, which necessitates circumcision.

(4) justice and uprightness, compassionate love and seemly behaviour in all their paths. No-one should walk in the stubbornness of his heart in order to go astray following his heart (בשרירות לבו לתעות אחר לבבו) (1QS 5:4)

⁹⁹ Cf. Popović (2007:287-288)

¹⁰⁰ For the possible relationship between the *Barkhi Nafshi* texts and 1QS 5:5, see Brooke (2000).

The phrase “the stubbornness of his heart” in line 4 is juxtaposed with the phrase “the foreskin of his *yetzer*” in line 5. Wells (2014:85) points out that “[h]erein lies the justification for appropriating Deuteronomy 30:1-10 for their own identity: they have removed their evil inclinations; they live covenant-keeping lives; and thus, they are the beginnings of God’s eschatological community.” All in all, such a usage of the term *yetzer* in 1QS 5:5 brings the sinfulness of humanity to the fore.

In summary, in 4Q436 frag. 1, the removing of the evil inclination is juxtaposed with the fashioning of a pure heart. The necessity of removing the evil inclination in order to transpose the law onto a pure heart shows a phenomenological tendency to realize the severity of the sinfulness of humanity. *In nuce*, without divine intervention and instruction, the hymnist confessed that he could not have done righteous behavior due to the evil inclination.

(7) [...] your [...]. You have made my mouth like a sharpened sword and have opened my tongue to the words of holiness; and you have placed (8) [...] instruction, so that they do not meditate on the actions of the man whose lips are in the Pit. You have strengthened my feet (4Q436 frag. 1 i 7-8)

3.4. 4Q504—506

4Q504—506, the so-called “the *Words of the Luminaries*,” are pre-sectarian. The *Words of the Luminaries* contain prayers being recited during the week. These prayers can be regarded as penitential prayers. Regev (2014:4) points out that “[t]he problem of sin and the attempt to overcome it is the basic outline of these prayers.” Like 4Q434 frag. 1 and 1QS 5:5, the significance of the circumcision of the heart is also stressed in 4Q504 frag. 4 (4QDibHam^a).

(11) [... wh]ich you chose. Circumcise the foreskin of [our heart ...] (12) [...] ... again. Strengthen our heart to do [...] (13) [...] to] walk in your paths *Blank* [...] (14) [...] Blessed is] the Lord who taug[ht us ...] (15) [...] Amen. Amen. *Blank* [*Blank*]

(4Q504 frag. 4 11-15)

Line 11 also conflates Deut 30:6 with 10:16. Like 4Q436 frag. 1, the psalmist's request of the circumcision of the heart is aimed at strengthening the heart in order to do God's will. While, in Deut 10:16, God appears to have required Israel to circumcise the heart in order to do God's will, in 4Q436 frag. 4, as well as 4Q434 frag. 1 and 1QS 5:5, God appears to be required of circumcising the heart of the psalmist: The direction of the divine commandment in Deuteronomy 10 is reversed (cf. Chazon 1991:167). Thus it stands to reason that 4Q436 frag. 4 emphasizes the severity of the sinfulness of humanity, which results in the psalmist's impotence to circumcise the heart. Given that the psalmist's confession of sins in lines 6-7 appears as the motivation of his petition for circumcising the heart in line 11, the necessity of the circumcision of the heart polluted by sin and impurity comes to the forefront in this penitential prayer (e.g., 1QS 5:5).

(6) [and do not ho]ld against us the iniquities of the forefathers in all their wic[ked] behaviour, [nor that] (7) [they were stiff]-necked. You, redeem us and forgive, [please,] our iniquity and [our] s[in] (4Q504 frag. 4 6-7)

Lines 6-7 are reminiscent of Lev 26:40-41. The correspondence of 4Q504 frag. 4 6-7 can be found in 4Q504 frags. 1—2 vi, which is also reminiscent of Lev 26:40-41.

(3) from our sin, for yourself. To you, to you, /Lord,/ belongs the justice, for (4) you are the one who has done all this. And now, on this very day (5) on which our heart has been humbled, we atone for our iniquity and the iniquity of (6) our fathers, for our disloyalty and /our/ {his} rebellious behaviour. We have not rejected (7) your trials, and our soul has not despised your punishments to the point of breaking (4Q504 frags. 1—2 iv 3-7)

The confession of sins in Lev 26:40-41 acts as a preliminary condition of Israel's returning from the Exile in Lev 26:42, the implication of which is to restore the covenantal relationship with God. Likewise, 4Q504 frags. 1—2 iv speaks of the consequence of the circumcision of the heart: The heart is humbled; the sins and iniquities of Israel are atoned; and the covenantal relationship between Israel and God is restored. Thus the circumcision

of the heart connotes that the heart polluted by sin and impurity acts as the cause of committing sin and of breaking the relationship with God. Given that the heart acts as “the seat of both virtuous and evil inclinations” (Heger 2011:304), the heart polluted by sin and impurity is occupied with the evil inclination. Although the term *yetzer* does not surface in the *Words of the Luminaries*, such a literary and thematic parallel with the *Barkhi Nafshi* texts and 1QS 5:5 points to the fact that 4Q504 frag. 4 would also show the *Tendenz*.

Like 4Q436 frag. 1, the earliest usage of the transposing of the law onto the renewed heart occurs in 4Q504 frags. 1—2 ii (cf. Chazon 1991).

(13) [...] ... with all (our) heart and with all (our) soul and to implant your law in our heart, (14) [so that we do not stray from it,] either to the right or to the left. For, you heal us of madness, /blindness/ and confusion (4Q504 frags. 1—2 ii 13-14)

While, in 4Q436 frag. 1, the transposing of the law onto a pure heart is juxtaposed with the removing of the evil inclination, in 4Q504 frags. 1—2 ii, the removing of the evil inclination is not mentioned. Notwithstanding this, the transposing the law onto the renewed heart is aimed at curbing the human inclination to sin (cf. Chazon 1991:237-238).

In summary, like the *Barkhi Nafshi* texts and 1QS 5:5, the psalmist in the *Words of the Luminaries* attempted to emphasize the significance of the circumcision of the heart and the transposing of the law onto the renewed heart. The heart polluted by sin and impurity brings the severity of the sinfulness of humanity to the fore. The absence of the removing of the evil inclination cannot fail to point to a phenomenological tendency to realize the severity of the sinfulness of humanity at Qumran.

3.5. 4Q393

4Q393 (4QCommunal Confession) resonates with Moses's prayer in *Jub.* 1:19-21 (cf. Falk 1999:144). 4Q393 can be regarded as a penitential prayer (cf. Falk 1999). The stubbornness of the evil heart is twice mentioned in 4Q393 frag. 3.

(3) [...] to Moses. Do not forsake your people [and] your inheritance. Do not let any man walk in the stubbornness of his [ev]il heart (לבו הרע) (4) against your will, Oh God, ... your people and your inheritance is for[sa]ken. Do not let any man walk (5) in the stubbornne[ss] of his evil heart (לבו הרע). Where is strength? And upon whom shall you shine your face? They will not be purified and sanctified, (6) and exalted high above everything. You are yhw, you have chosen our fathers long ago. (4Q393 frag. 3 3-6)

The stubbornness of the evil heart appears as the motivation of the psalmist's petition for divine intervention. The stubbornness of the evil heart is reminiscent of the stubbornness of the heart in Ps 81:13 (81:12 En): "So I gave them over to the stubbornness of their heart, To walk in their own devices (וַאֲשַׁלְחֵהוּ בְּפִשְׁרֵיהֶם לָלֶכֶת בְּמוֹעֲצוֹתֵיהֶם:)." It seems that the psalmist in 4Q393 frag. 3 attempted to emphasize the severity of the sinfulness of humanity by way of predicating the heart of evil. Like the *Words of the Luminaries*, although the evil inclination does not surface, it is not far-fetched to assume that the stubbornness of the evil heart can be regarded as a result of being occupied by the evil inclination. One possible reason for the absence of the phrase יצר רע is that 4Q393 frag. 3 is modeled after Moses's prayers in *Jubilees* 1. *Jub.* 1:19-21 reads:

(19) And Moses fell upon his face, and he prayed and said, "O Lord, my God, do not abandon your people and your inheritance to walk in the error of their heart. And do not deliver them into the hand of their enemy, the gentiles, lest they rule over them and cause them to sin against you. (20) "O Lord, let your mercy be lifted up upon your people, and created for them an upright spirit. And do not let the spirit of Beliar [= Belial] rule over them to accuse them before you and ensnare them from every path of righteousness so that they might be destroyed from before your face.

(21) But they are your people and your inheritance, whom you saved by your great might from the hand of the Egyptians. Create a pure heart and a holy spirit for them. And do not let them be ensnared by their sin henceforth and forever.” (OTP 2:53-54)

Line 3 in 4Q393 frag. 3 corresponds to *Jub.* 1:19. While the stubbornness of the evil heart is repeated again, both Belial’s and the Gentiles’ ruling over Israel are absent in 4Q393 frag. 3. This is because the focus of this penitential prayer is on confessing the community’s sins and iniquities. Those who will not be purified and sanctified on account of the evil heart in line 5 serves to highlight the significance of the fashioning of a pure heart in *Jub.* 1:21. God’s election of the forefathers in line 6 also comports well with Israel’s elect status in *Jubilees*.

The faithful inclination is mentioned in 4Q393 frags. 1—2 ii.

(4) ... [... stiff]ness of neck. Our God, hide (5) your face from [our] si[ns, and] wipe out [al] our iniquities. And create a new spirit (רוח חדשה) (6) in us, and establish in us a faithful inclination (יצר אמונות), and for the sinners ... (4Q393 frags. 1—2 ii 4-6)

The phrase יצר אמונות, “a faithful inclination,” should be understood as an antonym of the phrase יצר רע. It seems that the removing of the evil inclination is a preliminary step both to creating a new spirit and to establishing the faithful inclination. 4Q393 frags. 1—2 ii also follows the order of Ezekiel 36 and Psalm 51.

In summary, although the evil inclination does not surface, both the stubbornness of the evil heart and the faithful inclination serve to achieve what the evil inclination does in the foregoing prayers: Showing a phenomenological tendency to emphasize the severity of the sinfulness of humanity. Meanwhile, the psalmist’s petition in *Communal Confession* is grounded in the fact that divine intervention is necessary to curb the human inclination to sin.

4. *Yetzer Ra* in sectarian poetic and covenantal texts

4.1. The *Hodayot*

The *Hodayot* known as the “*Thanksgiving Psalms*” is a collection of hymns of the Qumran community: Most of the manuscripts are found at Cave 1 (1QH^{a-b}); some fragments are found at Cave 4 (4QH^{a-c} and 4QpapH^f). These fragments point toward a redaction history of the *Hodayot* (cf. Hughes 2006:2-11). When it comes to the appropriateness of some fragments found at Cave 4 for this study, Schuller’s observation is worth citing in full.

Although some quite small pieces can prove to be very significant (particularly for reconstructing the arrangement and extent of an individual manuscript) what we can learn from the 4Q manuscripts is limited. For the most part, they do not allow us to recover major portions of text missing in 1QH^a, nor do they readily answer many or most of our questions about the origin, authorship and purpose of this collection.

(1994:140)

Therefore, we will look mainly into 1QH^a for this study. 1QH^a is comprised of *Hymns of the Teacher* (columns 10—17) and *Hymns of the Community* (columns 4—9; 1QH^a 11:3-18; 15:29-36; 15:37—16:4; columns 18—26), which were probably independent materials before the collection of the *Hodayot* (e.g., 4QH^c contains only *Hymns of the Teacher*, whereas 4QH^a contains only *Hymns of the Community*. 4QH^b and 1QH^a include both). Albeit different in emphasis, both *Hymns of the Teacher* and *Hymns of the Community* have in common with each other the fact that they boil down to the vibrant relationship between the pessimistic anthropology and divine revelation. The designation *Hodayot* makes sense that its primary purpose is to praise God (hodaya). That is to say, the hymnist’s awareness of the sinfulness of humanity is always preceded by what God has revealed to the hymnist in relation to the presence of sin and evil.

By dealing with the hymnist’s hodaya in 1QH^a 9—11, Newsom (2004:173) insists that this hodaya is aimed at cultivating “the masochistic sublime” in that the awareness of

sinfulness should be understood as rhetorical with reference to the sublimity of God (cf. Sanders 1977). Newsom opines,

The positive pleasure of seeing oneself as constituted and destined for heavenly reward by means of the overwhelming power and mercy of God is grasped and intensified precisely by perceiving and articulating one's natural human sinfulness and loathsomeness.

(2004:173)

However, the hymnist appears not to speak of “the masochistic sublime” when we delve into the relationship between divine revelation and the awareness of sinfulness in the *Hodayot*. Besides, given that divine revelation is well attested in terms of divine determinism and divine sovereignty in the *Hodayot*, it is less likely that the hymnist “only arrived at the view that humans are sinful after they realised that God alone is just” (Maston 2010:92; *pace* Licht 1956:11-12). Nonetheless, Newsom's contention of “the masochistic sublime” demonstrates to the effect that the awareness of the sinfulness of humanity comes to the forefront in the *Hodayot*. Thus it comes as no surprise that, in the *Hodayot*, the tension between free will and divine determinism comes to be developed in a complicated and radicalized manner. Such a radicalizing of the relationship between divine agency and human agency also revolves around the heightened tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability. Of course, dualistic ways of thinking of the Qumran community, which is cosmic, ethical, psychological, and eschatological, should also be read into the *Hodayot*.

In columns 9—11, the hymnist made a confession that he came to realize the severity of the sinfulness of humanity as human nature due to the divine knowledge revealed to him.

(21) These things I know through your knowledge (מבִּינְתֶכֶה), for you opened my ears to wondrous mysteries although I am a creature of clay, fashioned with water (יֵצֵר סוּד הַעֲרוּהָ), (22) a foundation of shame and a source of impurity (הַחֲמֵר וּמִגְבַּל הַמַּיִם), (23) an oven of iniquity and a building of sin, a spirit of error and depravity (וּמִקְוֵר הַגְּדָה), (24) without knowledge, terrified by your just judgments (כּוֹר הַעֲוֹן וּמִבְּנֵה הַחֲטָאָה רוּחַ הַתּוֹעָה וְנִעוּדָה) without (23) knowledge, terrified by your just judgments. What can I say which is not known? Or declare which has not been told?

Everything (1QH^a 9:21-23 [Suk. 1:21-23; DJD 40. 9:23-25])

The divine knowledge revealed to the hymnist connotes that the hymnist would have recourse to the wisdom tradition, although he parted company with it in favor of divine determinism or predestination. Unlike Sir 15:11-20, where humanity is given the capacity to choose freely so that human responsibility for choosing what is just is required (cf. Psalm 1; Prov 8:20; 11:5), the *hodaya* in columns 9—11 has a negative bearing on humanity’s capacity to choose what is just. Human nature is predicated not only of its lowliness—“I am a creature of clay, fashioned with water” in line 21—but also of its sinfulness—“a foundation of shame and a source of impurity, an oven of iniquity and a building of sin, a spirit of error and depravity” in line 22. The hymnist’s awareness of the lowliness or unworthiness of humanity is reminiscent of Job 25:4-6. What is added to the *hodaya* in columns 9—11 is that the hymnist attempted to radicalize the sinfulness of humanity by way of associating it with the earthly origin of humanity. The awareness of lowliness and unworthiness of humanity is intertwined with that of the sinfulness of humanity. In column 5, the hymnist also associated the sinfulness of humanity with the earthly origin of humanity.

(20) all these matters and to have insight in [your wondrous] and great counsel?
What is someone born of a woman (*מה ילוד אשה*) among all your awesome works?
He is (21) a structure of dust fashioned with water (*מבנה עפר ומגבל מים*), his counsel
is the [iniquity] of sin, shame of dishonor (*ערות קלן*) and so[urce of] impurity, and a
depraved spirit (*רוח נעוה*) rules (22) over him. *Blank* If he acts wickedly, he will be
an eternal [sign,] a portent for generations, shame [for all] flesh. Only by your
goodness (23) is man acquitted, [purified] by the abundance of [your] compa[ssion].
You embellish him with your splendour, you install [him over an abun]dance of
pleasures, with everlasting peace (24) and length of days. For [you are the truth, and]
your word does not depart. *Blank* And I, your servant, have known (1QH^a 5:20-24
[Suk. 13:20-24; DJD 40. 5:31-35])

The phrase “born of a woman” is reminiscent of Job 14:1; 15:14; 25:4. In Job, the phrase “born of woman” connotes human weakness and mortality. In line 20, the hymnist also made a contrast between human weakness and mortality and the awesomeness of all

creation. In line 21, the hymnist explained why humanity is weak and mortal in terms of the earthly origin of humanity. In the *Hodayot*, human beings are weak and mortal *because of* they are “a creature of clay, fashioned with water” or “a structure of dust fashioned with water.” For the hymnist, human weakness and mortality are inherent in humanity without exception. Like column 9, the earthly origin of humanity is also intertwined with the sinfulness of humanity in column 5: “Weakness in terms of mortality is transformed to mean weakness in terms of morality” (Maston 2010:88). Lines 20-21 make sense that humanity is inevitably prone to commit sin according to its nature. It becomes clear when we look into the usage of the term בשר, “flesh,” in the Jewish Scriptures (cf. Maston 2010:84-85). According to the *TDOT*, the term בשר revolves around “its creatureliness, its absolute dependence on God, its earthly nature, and its weakness, inadequacy and transitoriness.” It is in this sense that it is necessary to look into the usage of the phrase רוּחַ בֶּשֶׂר, “the spirit of flesh,” in the *Hodayot*. Like 4QInstruction, the phrase רוּחַ בֶּשֶׂר refers to those to whom divine revelation is denied.

(19) for ever and ever. *Blank* In the mysteries of your insight [you] have apportioned all these things, to make your glory known. [However, what is] the spirit of flesh (רוּחַ בֶּשֶׂר) to understand (1QH^a 5:19 [Suk. 13:19; DJD 40. 5:30])

Human weakness and mortality serve to make human beings incapable of understanding divine mysteries, which plays a pivotal role in leading humanity to walk in God’s path (e.g., 4QInstruction). In column 4, therefore, the hymnist made a confession that only the divine knowledge can prevent him from sinning against God.

(22) [of your knowledge you pre]vent him from sinning against you, you [re]store his humility through your punishments, and by [...] you [...] his heart. *Blank* (1QH^a 4:22 [Suk. 17:22; DJD 40. 4:34])

The motivation of the hymnist’s plea for preventing him from sinning against God with the help of the divine knowledge is grounded in the fact that the hymnist introduced himself as a fleshly spirit.

(25) [...] in my vitals, for your servant is a spirit of flesh (לִשְׁרָר בְּשָׂר). Blank (1QH^a 4:25 [Suk. 17:25; DJD 40. 4:37])

Given that, in 4QInstruction, there are two strands of humanity according to God's election, the hymnist's introducing himself as a fleshly spirit appears to be an oxymoron in that he already belonged to God's elect people, the *Yahad*. Thus the hymnist's introducing himself as a fleshly spirit can be regarded as rhetorical in that it serves to shed more light on the severity of the sinfulness of humanity and his impotence to circumcise the heart (e.g., 4Q436 frag. 4.) Without divine intervention, in nature, humanity is prone to commit sin against God. It becomes clear in that the hymnist's introducing himself as a fleshly spirit corresponds to his foregoing confession of the depravity of his heart.

(19) ... [...] of my deeds and the depravity of my heart (נְעוּיִת לְבַי). Because I defiled myself with impurity, I [separated myself] from the foundation [of truth] and I was not allied with [...] (1QH^a 4:19 [Suk. 17:19; DJD 40. 4:31])

It seems that the depravity of the heart refers to human weakness and mortality. Given that, as is clearly seen in a foregoing section, the depravity of the heart can be regarded as a result of being occupied with the evil inclination (e.g., 4Q504), The hymnist attempted to associate the evil inclination with the earthly origin of humanity. *In nuce*, the evil inclination is inherent in humanity. It becomes clear in column 12, where the hymnist attempted to emphasize the severity of the sinfulness of humanity.

(29) your powerful acts to all living things. What is flesh compared to this? What creature of clay can do wonders? He is in iniquity (30) from his maternal womb (בְּעוּיִן מִרֶחֶם), and in guilt of unfaithfulness right to old age. But I know that justice does not belong to man nor to a son of Adam (אֲדָם בֶּן) a perfect (1QH^a 12:29-30 [Suk. 4:29-30; DJD 40. 12:30-31])

In line 30, the hymnist made a confession that human beings remain sinners from birth to death. Even, while the members of the *Yahad* took hold of the hope of restoring Adam's

glory at the *eschaton* (e.g., 1QH^a 4:15 [Suk. 17:15; DJD 40. 4:27]),¹⁰¹ they cannot also be completely freed from such a destiny of humanity (cf. Merrill 1975:38-39; *pace* VanLandingham 2006:121).

However, such a pessimistic anthropology in the *Hodayot* does not allow human responsibility for committing sin to be easily dismissed. Divine revelation always entails human obedience in the *Hodayot*. First, God has revealed the divine knowledge to the hymnist *in spite of* the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity, not *on account of* it. Column 18 is explicit in this regard.

(3) your [...], no-one contemplates them. What, then, is man? He is nothing but earth. *Blank* [From clay] (4) he is fashioned and to dust he will return. But you teach him about wonders like these and the foundations of [your] tru[th] (1QH^a 18:3-4 [Suk. 10:3-4; DJD 40. 18:5-6])

In lines 3-4, it is stressed that humanity is nothing but earth so that he will return to dust. Gen 2:7 is conflated with Gen 3:19 herein. The conflating of Gen 2:7 with Gen 3:19 serves to have a negative bearing on human nature. This is because the context of Gen 3:1-19 is about divine judgment against Adam's disobedience. At first glance, in line 4, such a lowliness and sinfulness of humanity appear as the motivation of revealing the divine knowledge to the hymnist: "Apart from divine intervention, humans will perish" (Maston 2010:86). Notwithstanding this, divine determinism and divine sovereignty come to the forefront in this *hodaya* in column 18.

(8) See, you are the prince of gods and the king of the glorious ones, lord of every spirit, ruler of every creature. (9) Apart from you nothing happens, and nothing is known without your will. There is no-one besides you, (10) no-one matches your strength, nothing equals your glory, there is no price on your might. And who (11) among all your wonderful great creatures will have the strength to stand before your glory? (1QH^a 18:8-11 [Suk. 10:8-11; DJD 40. 18: 10-13])

¹⁰¹ For the glory of Adam at Qumran, see Fletcher-Louis (2002).

Although the divine revelation of his knowledge appears to be motivated on account of the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity, it should be understood in terms of divine determinism and divine sovereignty: “Apart from you nothing happens, and nothing is known without your will.” In other words, the revelation of the divine knowledge cannot be regarded as a secondary mission to rescue humanity. Contrary to this, the divine knowledge should be understood as being revealed to the hymnist within the scheme of divine determinism or predestination.

Second, the role of the spirit that God created for the hymnist comes to the forefront in the *Hodayot*.

(31) path. To God Most High belong all the acts of justice, and the path of man is not secure except by the spirit which God creates for him (32) to perfect the path of the sons of Adam so that all his creatures come to know the strength of his power and the abundance of his compassion with all the sons of (1QH^a 12:31-32 [Suk. 4:31-32; DJD 40. 12:32-33])

The role of the spirit that God has created for the hymnist is to secure and perfect the path of the sons of Adam according to divine justice. In other words, within the scheme of divine determinism or predestination, the spirit that God has created for the hymnist is enacting what the hymnist came to know through divine revelation. The divine knowledge that the hymnist has chosen to be righteous by God allows him to do what is just with the help of the spirit that God has created for him. It becomes clear in column 8 where the role of the spirit that God has placed in the hymnist is stressed.

(18) And since I know that you have recorded the spirit of the just man, I have chosen to purify my hands in accordance with [your] will and your servant’s soul detests every (19) work of iniquity. I know that no-one besides you is just. I have appeased your face by the spirit which you have placed [in me,] to lavish (20) your [kind]nesses on [your] serv[ant] for [ever,] to purify me with your holy spirit, to bring me near by your will according to the extent of your kindnesses [...] and to act (21) with me [...] the place of [your] wi[ll] which you have cho[sen] for those who love you, and for those who keep your precep[ts ...] (22) in your presence [for

ev]er. [May ... not] associate with the spirit of your servant or with all [his] works
[...] (1QH^a 8:18-22 [Suk. 16:18-22; DJD 40. 8:28-32])

Maston (2010:95) points out that “the divinely given knowledge is the understanding that God establishes the human as righteous by giving his spirit to the human, which is itself an act of predestination.” The proper response of the hymnist to divine revelation is to obey divine commandments. Only the spirit that God has placed in the hymnist can make the hymnist capable of keeping divine precepts within the scheme of divine determinism or predestination. Hence Maston (2010:96) is correct in saying that “[w]hile his obedience is not the reason God acts to redeem him, it is nonetheless a necessary part of the life of the redeemed.” *In nuce*, the hymnist’s obedience to divine commandments, which is enacted by the spirit that God has placed in him, appears to be evidentiary for his elect status. Divine determinism or predestination is also stressed in column 7, although the role of the spirit that God has created for the hymnist is not mentioned.

(17) you have established even before creating him. How can anyone change your words? You, you alone, have [created] (18) the just man, and from the womb you determined him for the period of approval, to keep your covenant, and to walk on all (your paths), and to ... on him (19) with the abundance of your compassion, to open all the narrowness of his soul to eternal salvation and endless peace, without want. And you have raised (20) his glory above flesh. *Blank* But the wicked you have created for [the time] of your wrath, from the womb you have predestined them for the day of slaughter. (21) For they walk on a path that is not good, they reject your covenant, their soul loathes your [...], and they take no pleasure in what (22) you command, but choose what you hate. You have established all those [who ...] your [...] to carry out great judgments against them (1QH^a 7:17-22 [Suk. 15:17-22; DJD 40. 7:27-32])

Lines 17-19 indicate that, within the scheme of divine determinism or predestination, God chose the hymnist from the womb, which also connotes the lowliness of humanity, for eternal salvation. In doing so, God will make the hymnist capable of keeping the covenant and of obeying divine commandments. Although the spirit that God has created for the hymnist is not mentioned, the role of the spirit is presumed herein (e.g., columns 8 and

12). In lines 20-22, God's dealings with the wicked are the opposite of his dealings with the hymnist in lines 17-19. Both the hymnist's obedience to divine commandments in line 18 and the wicked's disobedience in lines 21-22 appear to be evidentiary for their respective statuses.

The depraved spirits' ruling over humanity in 1QH^a 5:21 is used to emphasize the sinfulness of humanity. Malevolent spirits' ruling over humanity appears to be a logical consequence of human weakness and mortality. Unlike apotropaic prayers, warding off malevolent spirits is out of the hymnist's concern herein. It becomes clear in column 11.

(20) have lifted me up to an everlasting height, so that I can walk on a boundless plain. And I know that there is hope for someone (21) you fashioned out of dust (צרתה מעפר) for an everlasting community. The depraved spirit (רוח נעור) you have purified from great offence so that he can take a place with (22) the host of the holy ones, and can enter in communion with the congregation of the sons of heaven. You cast eternal destiny for man with the spirits of (1QH^a 11:20-22 [Suk. 3:20-22; DJD 40. 11:21-23])

In line 21, the phrase “the depraved spirit” corresponds to the phrase “you fashioned out of dust”: The latter stands for human mortality; the former stands for moral weakness. Both human mortality and moral weakness appear to prevent humanity from entering in communion with the congregation of the sons of heaven [=angels] in line 22. Both human mortality and moral weakness are mutually referenced: “[B]ecause he is a weak creature, he is prone to evil” (Maston 2010:89).

The *yetzer* occurs in column 19.

(19) As for me, a source of bitter sorrow has opened for me, [...] grief has not been hidden from my eyes, (20) when I knew man's inclinations (בדעתי יצרי גב). [I considered] the response of mankind [and paid attention] to sin and the anguish (21) of guilt. These things have entered my heart, they have penetrated my bones, to [...] and to ponder in meditation (22) of anguish. /I have sighed on the harp of lament for every sorrow of anguish,/ with bitter wailing, until iniquity be destroyed, and

[...], and there be no more ravaging diseases. Then (1QH^a 19:19-22 [Suk. 11:16-19; DJD 40. 19:22-25])

The cause of the hymnist's lamentation in line 19 lies in the fact that he came to know his inclination in line 20. Line 20 harks back to line 16: "[...] because you have made me know the foundation of truth. [...]" (1QH^a 19:16 [Suk. 11:13; DJD 40. 19:19]). It points to the fact that the hymnist's awareness of the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity is preceded by divine revelation. The term *yetzer* also occurs in column 15.

(1) [...] I remain silent ... (2) [...] my [ar]m is broken at the elbow, my feet sink in the mud, my eyes are blind from having seen (3) evil, my ears, through hearing the shedding of blood, my heart is horrified at evil schemes, for Belial is present when their destructive inclination becomes apparent. (1QH^a 15:1-3 [Suk. 7.1-3; DJD 40. 15:4-6])

The cause of the hymnist's lamentation also lies in the fact that the human inclination is destructive and evil. In line 3, the presence of Belial appears to be a logical consequence of the human inclination. That is not to say that Belial's leading humanity astray is dismissed herein. That is to say that the hymnist spoke of the human inclination, which is destructive and evil. It harks back to 1QH^a 5:21, where the depraved spirits' ruling over humanity is used to emphasize the sinfulness of humanity. Although it is not predicated of evil, thus, the term *yetzer* in the *Hodayot* should be understood in terms of the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity (cf. Rosen-Zvi 2011:49; Hyatt 1956:276-284). Granted that, the term יצר, "inclination," is allocated with the term בשר, "flesh," in column 18.

(22) Because you have fashioned the sp[irit of your servant and in accordance with] your [wi]ll you have established me. You have not placed (23) my support in robbery, nor in wealth [...] my [hea]rt, nor have you placed the inclination of the flesh (יצר) (בשר) as my refuge. (1QH^a 18:22-23 [Suk. 5:22-23; DJD 40. 18:24-25])

Like columns 8 and 12, the hymnist made a confession that God has fashioned his spirit i
n line 22. The fashioning of his spirit in line 22 stands in contrast to the phrase יצר בשר, "the inclination of the flesh," in line 23. That is to say, the phrase יצר בשר refers to the

lowliness and sinfulness of humanity in the *Hodayot*. It becomes clear in that both greed and unjust material gain in line 23 have a negative bearing on human nature. The phrase יצר בשר indicates that the human inclination acts as a leading feature of the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity in the *Hodayot*. The term *yetzer* in column 13 also has a negative bearing on the human inclination.

(5) I give you thanks, Lord, because you did not desert me when I stayed among a for[eign] people [... and not] according to my guilt (6) did you judge me, nor did you abandon me to the plottings of my inclination (זמית יצרי) but you saved my life from the pit. You gave [...] among (1QH^a 13:5-6 [Suk. 5:5-6; DJD 40. 13:7-8])

The allocation of the noun יצר with the noun זמה clearly illustrates that any behavior according to the plot of the human inclination appears to be evil and shameful. This is because the verb זמה is used to refer to evil device (e.g., Isa 32:7) or shameful behavior (e.g., Judg 20:6; Jer 13:27; Job 31:11; Lev 18:17; 19:29; 20:14; Ezek 16:27, 43, 58; 22:9, 11; 23:21, 27, 29, 35, 44). Rosen-Zvi (2011:50) insists that the term *yetzer* “does not simply signify human deplorable nature here.” This being the case, 1QH^a 13:6 is unique in the *Hodayot* in that the term *yetzer* appears to be “an independent component” (Rosen-Zvi 2011:50). The phrase זמית יצרי, “the plottings of my inclination,” appears to be similar to the phrase ἐν χειρὶ διαβουλίου αὐτοῦ, “in the power of his own inclination (RSV),” in Sir 15:14. While the former is negative, the latter is neutral. However, the term διαβουλῖος, which is a translation of the term יצר, does not refer to an independent component. The phrase ἐν χειρὶ διαβουλίου αὐτοῦ is a rhetorical expression of being caught under the sway of the human inclination. Thus the phrase זמית יצרי in 1QH^a 13:6 is also a rhetorical expression of being under the negative sway of the human inclination.

This being the case, the term *yetzer* in column 13 should also be understood in terms of the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity (*pace* Rosen-Zvi 2011). A similar expression can be found in column 7.

(15) to desert all your precepts. *Blank* But I, I know, thanks to your intellect, that [...] is not by the hand of flesh (7 בשר), and that a man [can not choose] (16) his way, nor can a human being establish his steps. I know that the impulse (יצר) of

every spirit is in your hand (77יב), [and all] its [task] (1QHa 7:15-16 [Suk. 15:15-16; DJD 40. 7:25-26])

The phrase יד בשר, “the hand of flesh,” is also a rhetorical expression of being caught under the sway of the flesh, which reflects the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity. It becomes clear in that this phrase stands in contrast to divine determinism and divine sovereignty in line 16. Line 16 radicalizes what is nuanced or ambiguous in Ben Sira. While, in Sir 15:14-15, humanity is disposed to choose to do either good or evil according to their *yetzer*, in the power of which God left humanity, in Sir 33:7-15, Ben Sira is deterministic. The hymnist attempted to disambiguate the nuanced tension between free will and divine determinism by way of siding with divine determinism. Notwithstanding this, as aforementioned above, the role of the spirit that God has created for/placed in the hymnist makes sense that free will comes not to be dismissed but to be reinterpreted in terms of divine determinism.

In summary, the *Hodayot* is distinct in that the hymnist managed to associate human mortality with moral weakness. In other words, the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity hinge on the earthly origin of humanity. However, such a pessimistic anthropology appears to be situated within the scheme of divine determinism or predestination. Divine determinism or predestination makes sense of the vibrant relationship between divine revelation and the pessimistic anthropology in the *Hodayot*. The divine knowledge is revealed to the hymnist according to divine determinism because of his elect status. Such a divine knowledge allows the hymnist to realize that God has chosen him to be righteous despite the fact that he has fallen prey to the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity. Human obedience to divine commandments ensues after divine revelation. Despite the fact that, in nature, humanity is prone to commit sin, human obedience to divine commandments becomes possible due to the role of the spirits that God has created for/placed in the hymnist. Thus such a pessimistic anthropology cannot be regarded not only as “a masochistic sublime” with reference to the sublimity of God (*pace* Newsom 2004), but also as a consequence of the knowledge that only God is righteous (*pace* Licht 1956). Despite such an awareness of the sinfulness of humanity, the evil inclination does not surface in the *Hodayot*. However, the term *yetzer* is used to make sense of the lowliness

and sinfulness of humanity. The human inclination acts as a leading feature of the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity.

All in all, it is clear that there is the heightened tension between free will and divine determinism in the *Hodayot*: The former comes to be reinterpreted in terms of the latter. That is to say, there is also the heightened tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability. Both the pessimistic anthropology and divine determinism cannot dismiss human responsibility for committing sin in the *Hodayot*.

4.2. The Rule of the Community

The *Rule of the Community* (Serekh ha- Yahad) is one of the two most important sectarian texts for the constitution of the Qumran community: The other is the *Damascus Document*. The *Rule of the Community* is a composite text so that textual development is detected (cf. Mesto 1997). Twelve manuscripts are found at Qumran. Aside from 1QS, there are 4QS^{a-j} (//4Q255-264) and 5Q11. 4QS^a (circa 125-100 BCE) is the earliest among 4QS. Except for 4QS^a, 1QS (circa 100-75 BCE) is the earliest among these manuscripts (cf. Alexander 1996). Nonetheless, that is not to say that 1QS is original. Scholars are of the opinion that textual development in the *Rule of the Community* is detected in the direction from 4QS to 1QS (cf. Mesto 1997; Newsom 2004), although any attempt to trace the stages of textual development is uncertain and speculative (cf. Knibb 2000:796). Bockmuehl's observation is instructive hereof in that "it is clear that the manuscript tradition of the *Community Rule* did undergo significant changes, and these changes may attest developments both in the sect's corporate governance and in its overall understanding of theology and membership in the people of God" (1998:557). Given that 4QS is either short or fragmentary, we will look into 1QS for this study.

1QS 11. 1QS 11:2-15 is a hymnal material. In line 2, the *Maskil* attempted to lay the foundation of this hymn on divine determinism or predestination: "...As for me, to God belongs my judgment; in his hand is the perfection of my behavior with the uprightness of my heart;" (1QS 11:2). The divine knowledge revealed to the *Maskil* is mentioned in

lines 3-6: “(3)...For from the source of his knowledge he has disclosed his light, and my eyes have observed his wonders, and the light of my heart the mystery of...(6) wisdom that has been hidden from mankind, knowledge and prudent understanding (hidden) from the sons of man,...” (1QS 11:3-6). The content of the divine knowledge is introduced in lines 7-9a: “(7)...To those whom God has selected he has given them as everlasting possession; and he has given them an inheritance in the lot of (8) the holy ones. He unites their assembly to the sons of the heavens in order (to form) the council of the Community and a foundation of the building of holiness of holiness to be an everlasting plantation throughout all (9) future ages...” (1QS 11:7-9a). The divine knowledge is about the *Maskil*'s elect status. The *Maskil*'s elect status is aimed at receiving an inheritance in the lot of the holy ones [= angels]. After making sense of divine determinism or predestination and the divine knowledge revealed to him, the *Maskil* began to emphasize the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity in lines 9b-15.

(9) future ages. However, I belong to evil humankind, to the assembly of unfaithful flesh (בשר עול); my failings, my iniquities, my sins, { ... } with the depravities of my heart (נעויות לבי), (10) belong to the assembly of worms and of those who walk in darkness. For to man (does not belong) his path, nor can a human being steady his step; since the judgment belongs to God, and from his hand (11) is the perfection of the path. By his knowledge everything shall come into being, and all that does exist he establishes with his calculations and nothing is done outside of him. *Blank* As for me, if (12) I stumble, the mercies of God shall be my salvation always; and if I fall in the sin of the flesh (עוון בשר), in the justice of God, which endures eternally, shall my judgment be; (13) if my distress commences, he will free my soul from the pit and make my steps steady on the path; he will draw me near in his mercies, and by kindnesses set in motion (14) my judgment; he will judge me in the justice of his truth, and in his plentiful goodness always atone for all my sins; in his justice he will cleanse me from the uncleanness (יטהרני מגדת אנוש) of (15) the human being and from the sin of the sons of man (חטאת בני אדם), so that I can give God thanks for his justice and The Highest for his majesty. Blessed be you, my God, who opens (1QS 11:9-15)

Like the *Hoayot*, the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity are closely linked with the

divine knowledge revealed to the *Maskil*. Although the evil inclination does not surface, like the *Hodayot*, both the phrase *בשר עול*, “unfaithful flesh,” and the phrase *נעווח לבבי*, “the depravities of my heart,” in line 9 are used to highlight the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity. Despite the fact that God has chosen the *Maskil* to receive an inheritance in the lot of the holy ones, the *Maskil* realized that he has belonged to the assembly of worms and of those who walk in darkness in line 10a. Like the *Hodayot*, the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity hinge on the earthly origin of humanity. Notwithstanding this, the *Maskil*, who has received the divine knowledge, was encouraged to walk in God’s path in the hope of divine salvation, forgiveness, and mercy in lines 10b-14a. Jer 10:23 is alluded to in line 10b.

(23) I know, O LORD, that a man’s way is not in himself; Nor is it in a man who walks to direct his steps. (Jer 10:23)

(10)...For to man (does not belong) his path, nor can a human being steady his step; since the judgment belongs to God, and from his hand (1QS 11:10b)

Jer 10:23 hinges on divine determinism or predestination (cf. Prov 16:9). Jer 10:23 is also alluded to in 1QH^a 12:30 [Suk. 4:30; DJD 40. 12:31] (cf. Lange 2012:262): “...But I know that justice does not belong to man nor to a son of Adam a perfect (31) path.” The hymnist made a confession that walking in God’s path becomes possible with the help of the spirit that God has created for him: “...and the path of man is not secure except by the spirit which God creates for him” in 1QH^a 12:31 [Suk. 4:31; DJD 40. 12:32]. Thus such an encouragement to walk in God’s path in 1QS 11:10b-14 also hinges on divine determinism or predestination. Besides, although the spirit that God has created for/placed in the *Maskil* is not mentioned, it is not far-fetched to assume that it is presumed (e.g., 1QH^a 12:31). Line 13 is reminiscent of Ps 119:133, where the canonical psalmist’s plea for divine intervention is stressed: “Establish my footsteps in Thy word, And do not let any iniquity have dominion over me” (e.g. 1QS 3:9-10). That is why the *Maskil* petitioned God for purification according to divine justice or God’s righteousness (*בצדקתו*) in lines 14b-15. The hope for divine salvation, forgiveness, and mercy in line 14b-15 is concerned not only with the impurity of humanity (*נדה אנוש*) in line 14, but also with

individual sins in line 15 (הטאת בני אדם), which are missing in the *Hodayot* (cf. Licht 1965:225). Briefly put, for the *Maskil*, the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity (i.e., a *being* aspect of humanity) goes hand in hand with the sin of humanity (i.e., a *doing* aspect of humanity). It becomes clear in that both the term אנוש in line 14 and the term בני אדם, “sons of man,” in line 15 refer to all humanity. The heightened tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability comes to be more radicalized in the *Rule of the Community* than in the *Hodayot*. Despite the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity, the *Maskil* attempted to bring human responsibility for committing sin to the fore in this hymnal column 11. It is already made clear in column 10 when the *Maskil* made a resolution that he will not retain Belial within his heart: “...I shall not retain Belial within my heart...” (1QS 10:21). The *Maskil* appears to be able to refuse Belial to some extent (cf. Wells 2014:130; e.g., CD 16:4-5). However, it is less likely that the *Maskil* acts as an independent agency in refusing Belial within his heart. Like the *Hodayot*, it is more likely that the *Maskil*’s capability of refusing Belial becomes possible within the scheme of divine determinism or predestination. It becomes clear in that the *Maskil*’s resolution of refusing Belial is enveloped by divine determinism and divine sovereignty in columns 10—11: “...For to God (belongs) the judgment of every living being, and it is he who pays man his wages...” (1QS 10:18). Meanwhile, the *Maskil*’s capability of refusing Belial in column 10 corresponds to the encouragement to walk in God’s path in column 11. Briefly put, the radicalized relationship between divine agency and human agency in the *Hodayot* is still on the go in the *Rule of the Community*.

All in all, the difference between the *Hodayot* and the *Rule of the Community* is that the *Maskil* managed to make sense that both the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity (i.e., a *being* aspect of humanity) and individual sins (i.e., a *doing* aspect of humanity) are mutually referenced. From the vantage points of its genre, such a difference is not so important. The purpose statement of the *Rule of the Community* in column 1 gives us a useful hint at the rationale of the *Maskil* in emphasizing a *doing* aspect of humanity.

(1) For [the Instructor ...] ... for his life, [book of the Ru]le of the Community: in order to seek (2) God with [all (one’s) heart and] with a[ll (one’s) soul;] in order to do what is good and just in his presence, as (3) he commanded by the hand of Moses

and by the hand of all his servants the Prophets; in order to love everything (1QS 1:1-3)

The *Rule of the Community* is basically aimed at encouraging the members of the *Yahad* to obey God's commandments according to God's will. Column 5 is explicit in this regard.

1QS 5. The circumcision of the foreskin of the *yetzer* in 1QS 5:5 is handled in comparison to the circumcision of the foreskin of the heart in 4Q434 frag. 1. The circumcision of the foreskin of the *yetzer* in 1QS 5:5 is absent in both 4QS^b (//4Q256) and 4QS^d (//4Q258).

(4) justice and uprightness, compassionate love and seemly behaviour in all their paths. No-one should walk in the stubbornness of his heart in order to go astray following his heart (5) and his eyes and the musings of his inclination [= the plan of his inclination] (מחשבת יצר) ¹⁰². Instead he should circumcise in the Community the foreskin of his tendency and of his stiff neck in order to lay a foundation of truth for Israel, for the Community of the eternal (6) covenant. They should make atonement for all who freely volunteer for holiness in Aaron and for the house of truth in Israel and for those who join them for community, lawsuit and judgment, (1QS 5:4-6)

(4) compassionate [love] and seemly behaviour in all their paths. [No-one should walk in the stubbornness of his heart in order to go astray] (5) but one should establish a foundation of truth for Israel, for the Community for all [who freely volunteer for holiness in Aaron and for the house of] (4Q256 9: 4-5)

(4) [N]o-one should walk in the stubbornness of his heart in order to go astray, but one should establish [a foundation of] truth for Israel, for the Community for all (5) who freely volunteer for holiness in Aaron and for the house of truth in Israel and for those who join them for the Community. Blank And whoever enters the council of (4Q258 1:4-5)

Such a difference between 1QS and 4QS^{b,d} points toward the redaction history of the *Rule of the Community* (cf. Alexander 1996; Mesto 1997). In 4QS^{b,d}, the *Maskil* prohibited the

¹⁰² Although the noun √ מחשבת is plural, its meaning is singular.

members of the *Yahad* from walking in the stubbornness of the heart. At first glance, it seems that the *Maskil*'s prohibition in 4QS^{b,d} is centered on a *doing* aspect of humanity, the implication of which is that the *Maskil*'s prohibition remains within the purview of the human capacity. Notwithstanding this, a *being* aspect of humanity is still present in the *Maskil*'s prohibition, albeit implicitly. The phrase “the stubbornness of the heart” occurs frequently both in Deuteronomy and in Jeremiah.¹⁰³ In most cases, the phrase “the stubbornness of the heart” is used to explain why Israel committed sin against God and became apostate. In 1QS 5:5, the *Maskil* managed to shed more light on the fact that a *doing* aspect of humanity goes hand in hand with a *being* aspect of humanity by way of linking the circumcision of the foreskin of the *yetzer* with the *Maskil*'s prohibition from walking in the stubbornness of the heart. The *Maskil*'s prohibition becomes successful when the foreskin of the *yetzer* is circumcised. Briefly put, what is implicit in 4QS^{b,d} comes to be explicitly stressed in 1QS.

The phrase *מחשבת יצרו*, “the plan of his inclination,” in line 5 corresponds to the phrase *זמות יצרי* in 1QH^a 13:6 [Suk. 5:6; DJD 40. 13:8]. The fact that the phrase *מחשבת יצרו* is listed along with the heart and the eyes in lines 4-5 can give a glimpse of why the phrase *זמות יצרי* in 1QH^a 13:6 cannot be “an independent component” (*pace* Rosen-Zvi 2011:50). By dealing with 4Q417 frag. 2 i [DJD 34. frag. 1 i], Goff (2013:153) points out that noun *מחשבת* “is often associated with a deterministic mindset” in Second Temple Judaism. This being case, it is not far-fetched to assume that the phrase *מחשבת יצרו* is used to make sense that the human inclination to sin is deterministic. It gives a glimpse of the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity both in the *Hodayot* and in the hymnal material of 1QS 11. In lines 4-5, the allocation of the noun *יצר* with the noun *מחשבת* illustrates that any behavior according to the plan of the human inclination is to go astray. Although the evil inclination does not surface, the phrase *מחשבת יצרו* makes sense that the human inclination appears to be evil. Thus the circumcision of the foreskin of the *yetzer* cannot be done without divine intervention.

There is the tension between free will and divine determinism in 1QS 5.

¹⁰³ E.g., Deut 10:16; 29:18; Jer 3:17; 4:4; 7:24; 9:13; 11:18; 13:10; 16:12; 18:12; 24:17; Ps 81:13.

(10) who freely volunteer together for this truth and to walk according to his will. He should swear by the covenant to be segregated from all the men of injustice who walk (11) along the path of wickedness. For they are not included in his covenant since they have neither sought nor examined his decrees in order to know the hidden matters in which they err (12) by their own fault and because they treated revealed matters with disrespect; this is why wrath will rise up for judgment in order to effect revenge by the curses of the covenant, in order to administer fierce (13) punishments for everlasting annihilation without there being any remnant. *Blank...*(1QS 5:10-13a)

At first glance, it seems that 1QS 5:10-13a indicates “how far the sectarians were from denying freedom of choice” (Sanders 1977:263). However, it is less likely that the human choice is stressed without divine intervention in 1QS 5:10-13a. Collins (2014b:264) is of the opinion that “the issue of voluntary entrance into the community (e.g., 1QS 5:1)...is interpreted not to imply free will in the sense that divine agency would be absent.” As is clearly seen in the *Hodayot*, divine determinism does not exclude human obedience to divine commandments. Given that, in lines 4-5, the circumcision of the foreskin of the *yetzer* requires divine intervention, it is less likely that 1QS 5:10-13a highlights the human choice without divine intervention. The human choice to keep divine precepts with a whole heart and a whole soul in lines 8-9 becomes possible when it is enacted by the spirit that God has created for/placed in his elect people. The phrase “with whole heart and whole soul” is reminiscent of the *Shema* in Deut 6:4-5: “(4) Hear, O Israel! The LORD is our God, the LORD is one! (5) And you shall love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your might.” The context of the *Shema* in Deut 6:4-5 is the entrance into the Promised Land. First of all, the *Shema* demands human obedience. Nonetheless, the *Shema* traces back to the Exodus event, where divine intervention for Israel’s salvation is most explicitly stressed (e.g., Deut 6:12). It is reiterated in Deut 10:12, after which Moses’s exhortation to circumcising the foreskin of the heart is introduced in Deut 10:16. The circumcision of the foreskin of the *yetzer* in 1QS 5:5 is a conflation of Deut 30:6 with 10:16. Thus the *Shema* in Deut 6:4-5 should be understood in terms of divine intervention: human agency is preceded by divine agency. Then, it is also reiterated in Deut 26:16, with which the covenant renewal at Moab begins in Deut 26:16-19. The *Maskil* employed the covenant motif in 1QS 5:10-13a.

Within the scheme of divine determinism or predestination, the ways in which the wicked dealt with divine knowledge—hidden matters and revealed matters in lines 11-12—serve to evidence that they had no spirit that God has created for/placed in them so that they deserved the curses of the covenant in Deuteronomy 27—29. *In nuce*, 1QS 5 is Deuteronomistic. As is clearly seen in chapter 2 concerning the Deuteronomic view of Israel’s history in Second Temple Judaism, it stands to reason that the human choice in 1QS 5:10-13a appears to be evidentiary for his elect status. Like the *Hodayot*, free will should be reinterpreted in terms of divine determinism. This is because such a radicalized relationship between divine agency and human agency in the *Hodayot* is still on the go in the *Rule of the Community*.

All in all, given that 1QS 5 is about conversion, the intention of the *Maskil* in 1QS 5 is on encouraging the elect people to enter the covenant of God and then to obey divine commandments with a whole heart and a whole soul according to God’s will.

In summary, despite such a difference, the *Rule of the Community* shows the *Tendenz* of the *Hodayot* in dealing with the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity.

4.3. The Damascus Document

The *Damascus Document* is a composite text. Along with the *Rule of the Community*, the *Damascus Document* is the key text among Qumran literature (cf. Hempel 1998). The almost entirety of the *Damascus Document* can be found in the two medieval manuscripts at Cairo Geniza, from which the designation comes (Cairo Damascus Document//CD). These two medieval manuscripts are MS A and MS B. MS A, which is longer and older, falls into the two sections: The Admonition section (columns 1—8) and the Legal section (columns 9—16). MS B is comprised of two columns: One of two columns corresponds to columns 7—8 of MS A; the other is additional material. The original editor of CD referred two columns of MS B to CD 19—20. CD falls into the two sections: The Admonition section (columns 1—8; 19—20) and the Legal section (columns 9—16). Eight manuscripts of the *Damascus Document* are found at Qumran Cave 4, 5, and 6

(4QD, 5QD, and 6QD). Based on the paleographic data, the earliest manuscripts at Qumran, namely 4QD^a (//4Q266), dates back to the first half/middle of the first century BCE. These manuscripts at Qumran illustrate that “the mediaeval MSS were based on an ancient original” (Hempel 1998:2). Thus we will look mainly into CD for this study.

In column 2, the *Maskil* attempted to make sense of the relationship between divine agency and human agency in terms of divine determinism or predestination.

(1) God against their congregation, laying waste all its great number, for their deeds were unclean in front of him. (2) *Blank* And now, listen to me, all who enter the covenant, and I will open your ears to the paths of (3) the wicked. *Blank* God loves knowledge; he has established wisdom and counsel before him; (4) prudence and knowledge are at his service; patience is his and abundance of pardon, (CD 2:1-4)

In lines 1-4, the terminology of the wisdom tradition is employed, although CD is not a wisdom text (cf. Harrington 1996:85). For instance, Prov 5:7; 7:24; 8:32 are alluded to in lines 1-2. The divine knowledge or wisdom gives rise to God’s election of the remnants of Israel.

(11) And in all of them he raised up men of renown for himself, to leave a remnant for the land and in order to fill (12) the face of the world with their offspring. *Blank* And he taught them by the hand of «the anointed ones» with his holy spirit and through seers of the (13) truth, and their names were established with precision. But those he hates, he causes to stray. *Blank* (CD 2:11-13)

Divine agency, which appears to follow the scheme of divine determinism or predestination, is stressed. God leaves a remnant for the land in line 11 and causes the wicked to stray in line 13. The role of the holy spirit in delivering the divine knowledge to the remnants in line 12 comports well with that of the spirits in the *Hodayot*. The remnants are those who have been delivered the divine knowledge through the holy spirit. As a result, the remnants can walk perfectly in God’s path (e.g., CD 2:15) The remnants in line 12 stand in contrast to the wicked in the foregoing lines.

(5) to atone for those who repent from sin; however, strength and power and a great anger with flames of fire (6) by the «hand» of all the angels of destruction against those turning aside from the path and abominating the precept, without there being for them either a remnant (7) or survivor. For God did not choose (772) them at the beginning of the world (מקדם עולם), and before they were established he knew (CD 2:5-7)

While, in lines 5-6, divine judgment has been sentenced to the wicked according to their deeds, in line 7, it is made clear that the deeds of the wicked refer not only to divine determinism—God did not choose them at the beginning of the world—but also to the divine foreknowledge—God knew their deed before the wicked were established. Divine determinism or predestination goes hand in hand with the divine foreknowledge (*pace* Brand 2013). Briefly put, human agency (the deeds of the wicked) is also preceded by divine agency (the deeds of God). Thus human agency (the deeds of the remnants) in the subsequent lines should be understood in terms of divine agency (the deeds of God).

(14) *Blank* And now, sons, listen to me and I shall open your eyes so that you can see and understand the deeds (מעשי) of (15) God, so that you can choose (לבחור) what he is pleased with and repudiate (למאוס) what he hates, so that you can walk perfectly (16) on all his paths and not allow yourselves to be attracted by the thoughts [=plane] of a guilty inclination (יצר אשמה) and lascivious eyes (עיני זנות). For many (CD 2:14-16)

At first glance, it seems that the human capability to choose freely (human agency) is stressed. This is because CD 2:14—3:12 appears to be similar to the wisdom tradition (cf. Wacholder 2007:175-176). Nonetheless, in line 14, the deeds of God (divine agency) in opening the eyes of human beings do precede human understanding. It coheres with the role of the holy spirits in line 12. Thus it is less likely that “C'est par leur propre volonté qu'ils ont choisi la voie” (Marx 1967:164-165).¹⁰⁴ It is more likely that the human capability to choose freely is modulated by the divine knowledge delivered through the holy spirit (*pace* Heger 2011:339-340). In line 16, it is made clear that such a divine

¹⁰⁴ “It is by their own will that they chose the way” (own translation).

agency in opening the eyes of human beings is aimed at leading humanity not to be caught under the sway of the plan of the human inclination, which is guilty. The phrase *מהשבות יצר* can also be found in 1QS 5:4. Given that, in 1QS 5:4, the phrase *מהשבת יצרו* is used to make sense that the human inclination to sin is deterministic, it stands to reason that the plan of the *yetzer* is also deterministic. Line 14 also serves to explain how God causes the wicked to stray in line 13. By dealing with intentional and unintentional sin in Qumran literature, Anderson (1995:59-60) points out that the verb *תעה* in line 13 denotes any transgression against divine commandments, which are hidden. The same usage of the verb *תעה* occurs in CD 3:14: “hidden matters (נסתרות) in which all Israel had gone astray (תעו)...” Given that God’s opening the eyes of the remnants in line 4 allows them to walk perfectly in God’s path, God’s leading the wicked astray points to the fact that the divine knowledge has not been delivered to them. The reason why God has not delivered his knowledge to the wicked is already given in line 7: God did not choose them at the beginning of the world and foreknew their deeds. Briefly put, the deeds of the wicked (human agency) are preceded by divine determinism or predestination (divine agency).

Like the *Hodayot* and the *Rule of the Community*, the term *yetzer* is used to refer to the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity. The human inclination is deterministic; in nature, humanity is prone to committing sin. The phrase “the stubbornness of the heart” in lines 17-18 is used to explain why the Watchers came to commit sin against God.

(17) have gone astray due to these; brave heroes stumbled on account of them, from ancient times until now. For having walked in the stubbornness (18) of their hearts (בשרירות לבם) the Watchers of the heavens (עירי השמים) fell; on account of it they were caught, for they did not heed the precepts of God. (19) And their sons, whose height was like that of cedars and whose bodies were like mountains, fell. (20) All flesh which there was on the dry earth expired and they became as if they had never been, because they had realized (21) their desires and had failed to keep their creator’s precepts, until his wrath flared up against them. (CD 2:17-21)

In CD, the Watcher story is not etiologically used to refer to the source of sin and evil. The Watchers are introduced as one of the exemplars who did not heed the precepts of God but were attracted by the plan of a guilty inclination and lascivious eyes. In Num

15:39, Israel appear to have committed adultery by following after their own heart and their own eyes: “And it shall be a tassel for you to look at and remember all the commandments of the LORD, so as to do them and not to follow after your own heart and your own eyes, after which you played the harlot.” While the phrase “their own heart” corresponds to the phrase “the plan of a guilty inclination,” the phrase “their own eyes” corresponds to the phrase “lascivious eyes.” According to the usage of the term heart at Qumran, the heart acts as “the seat of both virtuous and evil inclinations” (Heger 2011:304). Granted that, the fact that the phrase “their own heart” in Num 15:39 corresponds to the phrase “the plan of a guilty inclination” brings pessimistic to the fore. In CD, thus, both the heart and eyes, which are parts of the body, appear to be inherently sinful and impure. That is to say, all the wicked came to be led astray due to their own plan of the *yetzer* and lascivious eyes, which reflect the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity, not due to the malevolent spirits (unlike *I Enoch* and *Jubilees*). It clearly shows that the heightened tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability comes to be further radicalized. Israel’s history being narrated in column 3 appears to be peppered with the phrase “the stubbornness of the heart.” Along with the phrases “the plan of a guilty inclination” and “lascivious eyes,” the phrase “the stubbornness of the heart” also reflects the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity. Like its Biblical usages in both Deuteronomy and Jeremiah, the phrase “the stubbornness of the heart” is used to explain why Israel committed sin against God and became apostate: In nature, humanity is prone to commit sin. In CD 20:9-10, those who have walked in the stubbornness of the heart go hand in hand with those who have placed idols in their heart. It is a hendiadys. Line 9 is reminiscent of Ezek 14:3-8: “Son of man, these men have set up their idols in their hearts, and have put right before their faces the stumbling block of their iniquity. Should I be consulted by them at all?” (Ezek 14:3). God’s punishment of cutting off from among Israel in Ezek 14:8 illustrates that any Israelite who committed idolatry motivated by his sinful heart cannot share the lot of God’s elect people. The *Maskil* attempted to apply God’s dealings with Israel in Ezek 14:3-8 to the members of the *Yahad*. Any ex-member of the *Yahad* is depicted as an idolator who has walked in the stubbornness of the heart. Like the *Hodayot*, the *Maskil* made sense that, while the members of the *Yahad* took hold of the hope of restoring Adam’s glory at the *eschaton* (e.g., CD 3:20), they cannot also be completely freed from the lowliness and sinfulness

of humanity. In column 2, the phrases “the stubbornness of the heart,” “the plan of a guilty inclination,” and “lascivious eyes” are used to make sense that the divine knowledge has not been delivered to the wicked within the scheme of divine determinism or predestination. Granted that, Israel’s choice to walk in the stubbornness of their hearts in column 3 should be understood in terms of such a radicalized relationship between divine agency and human agency: The latter is preceded by the former. Thus it is less likely that there was any possibility for both the Watchers and Israel not to commit sin against God, but they have failed to do so (*pace* Lichtenberger 1980:154; Brand 2013). It is more likely that, like the *Hodayot* and the *Rule of the Community*, free will should be reinterpreted in terms of divine determinism.

In summary, CD 2 shows the *Tendenz* of the *Hodayot* and the *Rule of the Community* in dealing with the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity. The fact that the Watcher story is introduced as one of the exemplars who walked in the stubbornness of their hearts illustrates that human responsibility for sin continues to be increasingly stressed in the *Damascus Document*.

5. Belial at Qumran

Belial (בליעל) is mentioned eighty-five times in Qumran literature. Belial appears to be “*the* metaphysical negative entity par excellence” at Qumran (Steudel 2000:334, italics original). In the *War Scrolls*, however, Belial is destined to be destroyed at the *eschaton*.

(5) I[srael. And th]is is a time of salvation for the nation of God and a period of rule for all the men of his lot, and of everlasting destruction for all the lot of Belial (גלל (בליעל). There will be...(13) [t]he[y] shall go out [to] destruction. In the war, the sons

of light (בני אור) will be the strongest during three lots, in order to strike down wickedness; and in three (others), the army of Belial (חיל בליעל) will gird themselves in order to force the lot of [light] (גורל אור) to retreat. (1QM 1:5, 13)

Until the *eschaton*, Belial's ruling over humanity appears to be rooted in dualism, which is cosmic, ethical, psychological, and eschatological.

(16) And all those who enter in the Rule of the Community shall establish a covenant before God in order to carry out (17) all that he commanded and in order not to stray from following him out of any fear, dread, or testing (18) (that might occur) during the dominion of Belial (ממשלת בליעל). When they enter the covenant, the priests (1QS 1:16-18)

The period from the present to the *eschaton* is depicted as the dominion of Belial, albeit temporarily and spatially permitted according to divine determinism or predestination. Those who do not enter the covenant of God are subordinate to the dominion of Belial. In other words, entering the covenant of God by way of becoming a member of the *Yahad* is to be released from the dominion of Belial. Besides, line 17 indicates that Belial seeks to stumble the members of the *Yahad*. Breaking the rules of the *Yahad* is to turn back to the dominion of Belial. The liturgical material in 1QS 2 is explicit in this regard.

(4) May he lift upon you the countenance of his favour for eternal peace ». *Blank*
And the levites shall curse all the men of (5) the lot of Belial (גורל בליעל). They shall begin to speak and shall say: « Accursed are you for all your wicked, blameworthy deeds. May God hand you over (6) to terror by the hand of all those carrying out acts of vengeance. May he bring upon you destruction by the hand of all those who accomplish (7) retributions. Accursed are you, without mercy, according to the darkness of your deeds (כחושך מעשיכה), and sentenced (8) to the gloom of everlasting fire. May God not be merciful when you entreat him. May he not forgive by purifying your iniquities. (9) May he lift the countenance of his anger to avenge himself on you, and may there be no peace for you by the mouth of those who intercede ». (10) And all those who enter the covenant (כול העוברים בברית) shall say, after those who pronounce blessings and those who pronounce curses: « Amen,

Amen ». (1QS 2:4-10)

This liturgical material has recourse to the blessings and curses in the Deuteronomy 27—28. Granted that, it comes as no surprise that the *Maskil* attempted to locate the dominion of Belial within the Deuteronomic view of Israel's history, where Israel's idolatry is predicted (e.g., the Song in Deuteronomy 32). Meanwhile, the *Maskil* managed to read dualism into the Deuteronomic view of Israel's history. The *Treatise of the Two Spirits* (1QS 3:13—4:26//4QS^c 5—6), in which the angel of darkness acts as the opposite of the prince of light, is explicit in this regard. It has been recognized that the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* may be an independent material before incorporating into the *Rule of the Community* (cf. Bockmuehl 1998:541-560).

(13) *Blank* The Instructor [=Maskil] should instruct and teach all the sons of light about the nature (תולדות) of all the sons of man, (14) concerning all the ranks of their spirits, in accordance with their signs, concerning their deeds in their generations, and concerning the visitation of their punishments and (15) the times of their reward. From the God of knowledge stems all there is and all there shall be. Before they existed he established their entire design (מהשבתם). (1QS 3:13-15)

The *Maskil* is commissioned to instruct the history of humanity to the sons of light, which will be unfolded within the scheme of divine determinism. In doing so, the *Maskil* managed to make sense of human nature (תולדות). Briefly put, the focus of the *Maskil* in the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* is on human nature. The noun מהשבתם can also be found in 4QMysteries (//4Q299). In 4Q299 frag. 3a ii-b 13, the noun מהשבתם is used to make sense of “a deterministic conception of the natural order” (Goff 2007:81). Divine determinism goes hand in hand with the divine foreknowledge. Thus lines 17-18 should be understood in terms of divine determinism.

(17) the laws of all things and he supports them in all their affairs. He created man to rule (18) the world and placed within him two spirits (שתי רוחות) so that he would walk with them until the moment of his visitation (פקודתו): they are the spirits (1QS 3:17-18)

God's creation of humanity is aimed at ruling over the world. Gen 1:27-28 is alluded to herein. What the *Maskil* twisted the creation narrative in Genesis 1 is that God prepared two spirits and endowed them within humanity at creation, with the result that human beings can walk with them until divine judgment at the *eschaton*. Lines 17-18 indicate that, in the *Treatise of the Two Spirits*, the relationship between divine agency and human agency is still on the go: The latter is preceded by the former. Free will is modulated by one of two spirits endowed within humanity according to divine determinism. These two spirits are the spirits of truth and of deceit (e.g., 1QS 3:19). Aside from human spirits, two external spirits appear to have respective dominions over humanity (e.g., 1QS 3:20-21). The dominion of the angel of darkness appears to be in compliance with the mysteries of God (רזי אל) in line 23. The phrase רזי אל corresponds to the phrase *raz nihyeh* in 4QInstruction, which is deterministic. Goff (2007:82) points out that, the phrase רזי אל refers to “the regulation of the natural order” both in 4Q299 frag. 5 and in 1QH^a 9. Along with the noun *מהשבת*, the phrase רזי אל serve to emphasize divine determinism or predestination herein. Despite divine determinism or predestination, even the sons of light appear to be stumbled by the dominion of the angel of darkness in lines 21-24. Nonetheless, it is no contradiction in that the *Maskil*'s confirmation of divine determinism or predestination is introduced in lines 25-26. Hence Rosen-Zvi (2011:51) is correct in saying that “[t]he double move...– transferring cosmic dualism into the hearts of people, and identifying human shameful *yetzer* with Belial's demonic plots – is meant to explain the temptation of the sons of light toward sin, and their feelings of depravity.” On the one hand, by emphasizing that the sons of light can be tempted to commit sin by the instigating of the angel of darkness, the *Maskil* managed to stand firm on the ground of divine determinism. On the other hand, by recognizing that the sons of light can and do commit sin, he emphasized the severity of the sinfulness of humanity. While column 3 is centered on cosmic dualism, column 4 is centered on both ethical dualism and psychological dualism (cf. Frey 1997: 289-295).¹⁰⁵ Notwithstanding this, both cosmic dualism and ethical dualism appear to be interlocking each other (cf. Popović 2007:181). Thus the human spirits in the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* can be regarded as the disposition of individual (ethical dualism) (cf. Knibb 1987:92-93). The role of the spirit of truth in 1QS 4:2-6a corresponds to that of the spirit that God has created for the hymnist in 1QH^a

¹⁰⁵ For the redaction history of the *Treatise of the Two Spirits*, see (Tigchelaar 2001:201-203).

12:31-32 [Suk. 4:31-32; DJD 40. 12:32-33]: “*Blank* These are their paths in the world: to enlighten the heart of man, straighten out in front of him all the paths of true justice, establish in his heart respect for the precepts” (1QS 4:2). That is to say, the role of the spirit to enlighten the heart of man comports well with the scheme of divine determinism or predestination in the *Hodayot*. What is added to the scheme of divine determinism in the *Hodayot* is that the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* speaks of the role of the spirit of deceit in 1QS 4:9-14, which is missing in the *Hodayot*. The history of humanity from the present to the *eschaton* in 1QS 4:15-23, in which spirits of truth and of deceit play an important role in implementing God’s will, reaches its climax when all the glory of Adam will belong to the sons of light in line 23. Before reaching its climax, the heart of humanity appears as the battleground of the spirits of truth and of deceit (psychological dualism) (*pace* Popović 2007:182). The last three lines, which serve to epitomize the *Treatise of the Two Spirits*, indicate that both ethical dualism and psychological dualism should be understood in terms of divine determinism (e.g., divine determinism and foreknowledge in 1QS 4:18-19).

(25) abhor the truth. For God has sorted them into equal parts until the appointed end and the new creation. He knows the result of their deeds for all times (26) [everlas]ting and has given them as a legacy to the sons of man so that they know good [and evil ... and] to cast the lots of every living being according to his spirit in [... until the time of] the visitation. (1QS 4:25-26)

All in all, the heightened tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability is still on the go, although cosmic dualism is stressed. What makes cosmic dualism of the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* distinct from Zoroastrian dualism is that the former is subordinate to divine determinism, whereas the latter is not (cf. Hultgren 2007). Such a cosmic dualism does not prevail in Qumran literature except for the *Visions of Amram*, where Amram dreamt of the dispute between Melchisedek and Melchiresha concerning their rulings over him. Melchiresha can be identified with Belial.

The human spirits in the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* appear to be similar to 4QZodiacal Physiognomy (cf. Allegro 1964:291). This is because, while two external spirits in

column 3 are about cosmic dualism, two internal spirits in columns 3—4 is about ethical and psychological dualism as the same as the spirits of light and of darkness in 4QZodiacal Physiognomy. However, there is a difference between the two. While, in the *Treatise of the Two Spirits*, the spirits of light and of darkness appear to be external, in 4QZodiacal Physiognomy, the spirits of light and darkness appear to be internal (cf. Albani 1999: 313-314). Notwithstanding this, such a difference is not so important. When it comes to the relationship between cosmic dualism and ethical dualism, Popović opines,

[P]eople partake of both spirits, but that their shares differ and that the balance is tipped in favor of either one of the two spirits. This would result in the end in the allotment of people to either the division of the spirit of light or that of the spirit of darkness.

(2007:184)

It seems that 4QZodiacal Physiognomy gives us a useful hint at the rationale of the relationship between cosmic dualism and ethical dualism in the *Treatise of the Two Spirits*.

In CD, the *Maskil* referred the present to the last days (אחרית הימים) (e.g., CD 4:4; 6:11). Then, the period of the last days is depicted as the “age of wickedness” (קץ הרשיע) (CD 6:10, 14; 15:7). The *Maskil* viewed the apostate members of the *Yahad* as being caught under the dominion of the spirits of Belial.

(2) the city of the temple with their impurity. *Blank* Every /man/ over whom the spirits of Belial (רוחות בליעל) dominate, (3) and who preaches apostasy (טהר), will be judged according to the regulation of the necromancer or the diviner. But every one who goes astray, (CD 12:2-3)

The *Maskil* in CD would understand the deeds of humanity as evidentiary for his elect status. The deeds of the apostate members of the *Yahad*, who turn back to the dominion of Belial, serve to evidence that they have not been true members of the *Yahad* (cf. Brown 2015:36). Belial’s three nets in CD 4:15-18 merits attention in that it gives a glimpse of what the dominion of Belial is about. Belial’s three nets is a paraphrasing of Isa 24:17.

(17) Terror and pit and snare Confront you, O inhabitant of the earth. (Isa 24:17)

(15) They are Belial's three nets (שלושת מצודות בליעל) about which Levi, son of Jacob spoke, (16) by which he catches Israel and makes them appear before them like three types of (17) justice. The first is fornication (תזנות); the second, wealth (גוון); the third, (18) defilement of the temple (טמא המקדש). He who eludes one is caught in another and he who is freed from that, is caught (CD 4:15-18)

Line 15 indicates that the *Maskil* would cite the *Testament of Levi*.¹⁰⁶ Although the relationship between the *T. Levi* and Isa 24:17 is not clear, at least it seems that both *T. Levi* and Isaiah 24 are concerned with the purity of priesthood (cf. Wacholder 2007:187-188). Thus the *Maskil* would have been familiar with the concept of Belial's three nets, which is the cardinal sins of Israel in the Second Temple period (e.g., *Pss. Sol.* 8:9; *Jub.* 7:20). It becomes clear in that Belial's three nets do not accord with the lists of sins in CD 4:19—5:15. While sexual sins are stressed, the other two are not. Such a discrepancy points toward the stages of textual development of CD (cf. Davies 1982:110-116). However, both Belial's three nets and the lists of sins in CD 4:9—5:15 have in common with each other the fact that they serve to highlight the power of evil, from which Israel, especially the priests, failed to escape: "The 'traps' he [=Belial] sets, meant to cause sin, seem impossible to escape" (Brand 2013:221). Besides, both Belial's three nets and the lists of sins in CD 4:19—5:15 illustrate that being caught in Belial's three nets owes its existence to the failure of the halakhic interpretation of the Law of the *Yahad*, which is closely linked with the divine knowledge in CD. It becomes clear in the subsequent lines, where the reason why divine judgment and wrath have been levied upon those who committed sexual sins is given.

(16) God visited their deeds, and his wrath flared up against their actions, for it is not an intelligent people (לא עם בינות); (17) they are folk bereft of advice (גוי אבט), in that there is no intelligence in them (אין בהם בינה). For in ancient times there arose (CD 5:16-17)

¹⁰⁶ A similar content can be found in A.L.D. 6:3, where there is no mention of three nets.

Given that even the priests in Jerusalem appear to have been caught by Belial's three nets by way of committing sexual sins, the concept of Belial's three nets is used to highlight the vulnerability of humanity in relation to the power of evil. Such a vulnerability of humanity in relation to the power of evil denotes the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity. The *Maskil's* warning of Belial's three nets points to the fact that, in nature, humanity is prone to commit sin. Without divine intervention, no one can escape from Belial's three nets.

(2) God. But God remembered the covenant of the forefathers. Blank And he raised from Aaron men of knowledge and from Israel (3) wise men, and made them listen...(CD 6:2-3a)

Divine intervention goes hand in hand with the divine knowledge. Without the help of the holy spirit, who serves to deliver the divine knowledge, no one cannot fail to follow the halakhic interpretation of the Law of the *Yahad*. Thus it stands to reason that the dominion of Belial should be understood in terms of divine determinism or predestination. Hence Brand (2013:224) is correct in saying that "Belial thereby serves to demarcate the community from other social groups who have not chosen to join the community." While dualism is in view, the dominion of Belial brings divine determinism or predestination to the fore in CD: Cosmic dualism fades out; ethical dualism fades in.

Mastema is mentioned once in column 16.

(4) according to their jubilees and their weeks ». And on the day on which one has imposed upon himself to return (5) to the law of Moses, the angel Mastema (מַלְאָךְ הַמַּשְׁטֵמָה) will turn aside from following him, should he keep his words. (CD 16:4-5)

It seems that the designation מַשְׁטֵמָה, "Mastema," shows a possible influence of *Jubilees* on CD. However, while, in *Jubilees*, it is Mastema who aided the Egyptian magicians (e.g., *Jub.* 48:9-11), in CD, it is Belial who raised up Yannes and his brother against Moses and Aaron (e.g., CD 5:18-19). By assigning the role of Mastema in *Jubilees* in

confronting Moses to Belial, the *Maskil* managed to introduce Belial as “a powerful force who opposed God’s chosen people,” albeit understood not as “strictly an angelic being,” but as “a metaphysical entity” in CD (Brown 2015:58). The Mastema story both in *Jub.* 48:9-11 and in CD 5:18-19 have in common with each other the fact that both Moses’s circumcision in *Jubilees* 48 and Abraham’s circumcision in CD 16 denotes the entering the covenant of God. By entering the covenant of God—by becoming the members of the *Yahad*, such a powerful force can be overcome. Abraham’s circumcision in CD 16 goes hand in hand with his knowledge: “This is why Abraham circumcised himself on the day of his knowledge...” (CD 16:6a). The knowledge that led Abraham to be circumcised makes sense that Mastema’s confrontation is also situated within divine determinism or predestination.

In summary, Belial appears to be closely linked with those who have not belonged to the *Yahad*. The dominion of Belial should be understood in terms of divine determinism or predestination. Granted that, both cosmic dualism and ethical dualism appear to be interlocking each other within the scheme of divine determinism.

6. Concluding remarks

1QapGen ar indicates that the tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability continues to be heightened in comparison to *I Enoch* and *Jubilees*. In 4Q180, Asael in the *BW* is identified with Azazel in Leviticus 16 with the result that divine judgment against the Watchers is stressed: The watchers are not introduced as the source of sin and evil. Both apotropaic prayers (4Q510—511, 4Q444) and incantation prayers (11Q11), in which the Watcher story is mentioned, have the recourse more to *Jubilees* than to the *BW* of *I Enoch*. It was observed that the emphasis of these apotropaic and incantation prayers is not on dealing with the Watcher story itself: it is used to do justice to the *Sitz im Leben* of the *Maskil*. 4Q510—511 indicates that the tension between free will and divine determinism should be read into the Watcher story. Both 4Q510—511 and 4Q444 make sense that the battleground against malevolent spirits

is translated into the heart of the sons of light. Unlike these apotropaic prayers, however, 11Q11 does not regard the heart of humanity as the battleground against malevolent spirits in that the recipient of this incantation prayer is a sick person. In 11Q11, the demon is depicted as darkness, which refers to sin and impurity.

It was observed that, pre-sectarian prayers appear to shed more light on the evil inclination (*yetzer ra*). 11Q5 (*Psalm* 115) indicates that the evil inclination is the irresistible condition of making humanity sinful and impure. There is a literary and thematic parallel between 11Q5 19 (*Plea for Deliverance*) and 4Q213a (*A.L.D.* 3). Both 4Q436 (4QBarkhi Nafshi^c) and 434 (4QBarkhi Nafshi^a) illustrate that the necessity of removing the evil inclination in order to transpose the law onto a pure heart serves to highlight the severity of the sinfulness of humanity. 4Q504—506 (the *Words of the Luminaries*) indicate that the psalmist managed to emphasize the significance of the circumcision of the heart and the transposing of the law onto the renewed heart. *In nuce*, the heart polluted by sin and impurity is used to highlight the severity of the sinfulness of humanity. The evil inclination does not surface in 4Q393 (4QCommunal Confession). Notwithstanding this, both the stubbornness of the evil heart and the faithful inclination serve to achieve what the evil inclination does in the foregoing prayers. Briefly put, the psalmist regarded divine intervention as necessary for the curbing of the human inclination to sin.

Such a tendency to realize the severity of the sinfulness of humanity in pre-sectarian poetic texts continues to be radicalized in sectarian poetic and covenantal texts. Although the evil inclination does not surface in the *Hodayot*, the term *yetzer* serves to make sense of the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity in terms of the pessimistic anthropology, which hinges on the earthly origin of humanity. Briefly put, the human inclination acts as a leading feature of the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity. Thus the heightened tension between free will and divine determinism can be detected in a more complicated and radicalized manner. As a result, human responsibility for committing sin cannot be easily dismissed in the *Hodayot*. Column 5 of the *Rule of the Community* is about conversion. At first glance, therefore, it seems that 1QS 5 emphasizes the human choice in making a decision to enter the covenant of God/to become the members of the *Yahad*. However, it is more likely that free will should be reinterpreted in terms of divine determinism or

predestination. It becomes clear in that 1QS 5 has recourse to the covenant renewal at Moab in Deuteronomy 26. Given that 1QS 5:5 is a conflation of Deut 30:6 with 10:16 so that it can locate 1QS 5 within the Deuteronomic view of Israel's history in the Second Temple period, it stands to reason that the human choice in 1QS 5:10-13a appears to be evidentiary for his elect status. Briefly put, the *Rule of the Community* shows the *Tendenz* of the *Hodayot* in dealing with the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity. In column 2 of the *Damascus Document*, the Watcher story is listed as one of the exemplars who walked in the stubbornness of their hearts. It clearly shows that human responsibility for committing sin is increasingly stressed. Such phrases "the plan of a guilty inclination," "the stubbornness of the heart," and "lascivious eyes" are used to make sense that the divine knowledge has not been delivered to the wicked within the scheme of divine determinism or predestination. That is to say, CD 2 also shows the *Tendenz* of the *Hodayot* and the *Rule of the Community* in dealing with the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity.

Granted that, Belial is closely linked with those who have not belonged to the *Yahad*. Both the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* and CD illustrate that the dominion of Belial should be understood in terms of divine determinism or predestination. Given that both cosmic dualism and ethical dualism is interlocking each other within the scheme of divine determinism, it stands to reason that, despite the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity, which hinge on the earthly origin of humanity, human responsibility for committing sin continues to be stressed in these sectarian poetic and covenantal texts.

As aforementioned in preliminary remarks, Qumran literature shows a tendency to realize the severity of the sinfulness of humanity in a complicated and radicalized manner. Such a *Tendenz* reaches its climax in both first century Jewish and early Christian literature, to which we will turn in the subsequent chapter.

Chapter 5. Sin and human accountability in *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch*, Romans, and James

1. Preliminary remarks

As aforementioned in chapter 2, the Babylonian Exile in 587/586 BCE led Second Temple Jews into a period of severe theological, sociological, and political plights. In a similar vein, the destruction of the Second Temple and Jerusalem in 70 CE by the Roman army also led the First-century Jews into another period of more severe theological, sociological, and political plights. It becomes clear in that the authors of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* attempted to twist the theologoumena of Jewish authors of the Second Temple period according to their respective contexts. What makes the authors of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* distinct from Jewish authors of the Second Temple period is that the former had different stances from the latter in relation to the presence of sin and evil. While adhering to questioning and explaining theodicy as Jewish authors of the Second Temple period did, the authors of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* appear to have further developed such a pessimistic anthropology in more an universalistic manner than the Qumran covenanters did. When compared to the authors of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, the apostle Paul is a different case. Most of all his letters had been written before the destruction of the Second Temple and Jerusalem took place. What drives home Paul's theologizing is not a historical event, but a historic event in the course of salvation history, namely the Jesus Christ event. It is for this reason that we can detect the continuity and discontinuity between Paul and the authors of the Second Temple period, as well as the authors of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, in relation to the presence of sin and evil. Albeit different in emphasis, James's theologizing is also driven home by the same historic event in the course of salvation history. To these issues, we will turn presently.

2. 4 Ezra

4 Ezra (//2 Esdras 3—14; circa 81-96 CE during the reign of the Roman emperor Domitian)¹⁰⁷ is an apocalypse, which is comprised of seven visions. Scholars appear to concur in a current scholarship that *4 Ezra* was composed by the hand of one author (cf. Stone 1990:14-21). The original Hebrew version is not extant. The extant versions are in Greek, Latin, Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, Coptic, and Georgian as secondary or tertiary translations of its Hebrew *Vorlage* (cf. Metzger 1983:518-519). The first three visions in *4 Ezra* 3—9 are appropriate for this study in that they contain a series of dialogues between Ezra and Uriel concerning both the presence of sin and evil and theodicy. The remaining four visions in *4 Ezra* 10—14 contain a series of apocalyptic materials given to Ezra (cf. Metzger 1983). While the first three visions are dialogical, the remaining four visions are apocalyptic.

Although the evil inclination (*yetzer ra*) does not surface in *4 Ezra*, the evil heart (*cor malignum*) is prevalent in *4 Ezra*, especially in dialogues between Ezra and Uriel. Given that, in Qumran literature, the heart is “the seat of both virtuous and evil inclinations” (Heger 2011:304), it was observed that the stubbornness of the heart is closely linked with the plan of a guilty inclination, albeit not identical. Thus the evil heart (*cor malignum*) in *4 Ezra* appears to be semantically congenial to the evil inclination (*yetzer ra*) in Qumran literature (cf. Hogan 2008:114). In the first dialogue in *4 Ezra* 3:1—5:20, the history of humanity, which is peppered with human sin, is narrated. All of the descendants of Adam belong to the category of sinners. Only a few exceptions are Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and David. Meanwhile, unlike Jewish authors of the Second Temple period, Ezra the protagonist of *4 Ezra* appears to have regarded the Mosaic Law as an ineffective antidote to the evil heart (*cor malignum*). Such an ineffectiveness of the Sinai covenant may point to the fact that God would have broken his covenant with Israel (cf. Bauckham 2008:298). *4 Ezra* 3:20-27 reads:

(20) Yet you did not take away from them their evil heart, so that your Law might

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Stone (1990:363-365).

bring forth fruit in them. (21) For the first Adam, burdened with an evil heart, transgressed and was overcome, as were also all who were descended from him. (22) Thus the disease became permanent; the law was in the people's heart along with the evil root, but what was good departed, and the evil remained. (23) So the times passed and the years were completed, and you raised up for yourself a servant, named David. (24) And you commanded him to build a city for your name, and in it to offer you oblations from what is yours. (25) This was done for many years; but the inhabitants of the city transgressed, (26) in everything doing as Adam and all his descendants had done, for they also had the evil heart. (27) So you delivered the city into the hands of your enemies. (OTP 1:529)

The evil heart (*cor malignum*) is depicted as an irresistible condition of making all of the descendants of Adam sinful and impure. That is to say, the evil heart denotes the human inclination to sin. Since Adam's disobedience, the evil heart acts as a permanent disease, by which all humanity has been infected. It appears to be similar to the evil plague in 11Q5 24. However, there is the difference between the two. While the evil plague in 11Q 24 can be purified, such a permanent disease in *4 Ezra* cannot be cured. It becomes clear in that, while, in both 4Q436 frag. 1 and 4Q504 frags. 1—2 ii, the transposing of the law onto the renewed heart serves to curb the human inclination to sin (see also 4Q510—511 and 4Q444), in *4 Ezra*, the evil heart still remains in the Israelite persistently in spite of the observance of the Mosaic Law: "This was done for many years; but the inhabitants of the city transgressed" (*4 Ezra* 3:25). Thus it is not far-fetched to assume that Ezra the antagonist attempted to universalize the yoke of damnation in 4QD^a (//4Q266) frag. 11, which has been levied upon the Gentiles (cf. Brand 2013).

(10) the [na]tions according to their families, and according to their languages, and according to their tribes, and you have led them astray in a trackless (11) wilderness. You chose our fathers and gave their descendants your truthful regulations (12) and your holy precepts, so that man could carry them out and live. And you established frontiers (4Q266 frag. 11:10-12)

As the Gentiles came to be led astray on account of the absence of the law in the *Damascus Document*, Israel also came to be exiled in spite of the presence of the Mosaic

law on account of the evil heart in *4 Ezra*. Briefly put, the evil heart serves to locate both Israel and the Gentiles under the yoke of damnation. Meanwhile, the nationalistic merit of Israel's elect status comes to be disfavored in *4 Ezra*. Both the evil heart and the ineffectiveness of the Mosaic Law to curb the human inclination to sin resulted in the Exile of Israel (e.g. *4 Ezra* 3:27). However, Uriel did not teach Ezra why the heart is evil (e.g., *4 Ezra* 4:4). While it is not clear whether the origin of the evil heart can be traced back to the creation of Adam or to Adam's disobedience (cf. Stone 1990:63), at least it seems that human responsibility for committing sin is stressed herein (e.g., *4 Ezra* 3:21). The origin of the evil heart is agnostic in that, for Uriel, divine providence is beyond human comprehensibility. *4 Ezra* 4:10-11 reads:

(10) And he said to me, "You cannot understand the things with which you have grown up; (11) how then can your mind comprehend the way of the Most High? And how can one who is already worn out by the corrupt world understand incorruption?" (OTP 1:530)

The human incomprehensibility of divine providence hinges on the innate state of human corruption resulting from the evil heart. In other words, while the origin of the evil heart cannot be proved, the existence of the evil heart should be presumed. Despite the fact that the Gentiles were more sinful than the Israelite, they came to fall under the yoke of damnation without distinction (e.g., *4 Ezra* 3:28). This leads Ezra the protagonist to continually complain of the ineffectiveness of the Mosaic law in curing such a permanent disease, namely the evil heart. *4 Ezra* 4:22-25 reads:

(22) Then I answered and said, "I beseech you, my lord, why have I been endowed with the power of understanding? (23) For I did not wish to inquire about the ways above, but about those things which we daily experience: why Israel has been given over to the gentiles as a reproach; why the people whom you loved has been given to godless tribes, and the Law of our fathers has been made of no effect and the written covenants no longer exist; (24) and why we pass from the world like locusts, and our life is like a mist, and we are not worthy to obtain mercy. (25) But what will he do for his name, by which we are called? It is about these things that I have asked." (OTP 1:530)

Notwithstanding this, the subsequent dialogues between Ezra and Uriel illustrate that the existence of the evil heart is simply presumed in *4 Ezra* (e.g., 4 Ezra 4:38; 7:46, 48; 68). Even though the author of *4 Ezra* introduced the Abrahamic covenant as an everlasting covenant, it comes to be counterbalanced by both the evil heart and the ineffectiveness of the Mosaic Law in *4 Ezra* 3:30-27. *4 Ezra* 3:13-15 reads:

(13) And when they were committing iniquity before you, you chose for yourself one of them, whose name was Abraham; (14) and you loved him and to him only you revealed the end of the times, secretly by night. (15) You made with him an everlasting covenant, and promised him that you would never forsake his descendants; and you gave to him Isaac, and to Isaac you gave Jacob and Esau. (OTP 1:528)

Such an everlasting covenant made with Abraham is also beyond human comprehensibility on account of such an ineffectiveness of the Sinai covenant. In terms of theodicy, it is untenable that the author of *4 Ezra* would regard the merit of the Abrahamic covenant as forfeited. Ezra's claim in *4 Ezra* 3:37 gives a glimpse of how the author of *4 Ezra* would maintain the balance between the Abrahamic covenant, which is everlasting, and the Sinai covenant, which is ineffective. *4 Ezra* 3:37 reads:

(37) You may indeed find individual men who have kept your commandments, but nations you will not find. (OTP 1:529)

The merit of the Abrahamic covenant cannot be nationalistic, but both individualistic and universalistic (cf. Longenecker 1991:53-54). Collins (1984:160) points out that “[i]f only ‘exceptional individuals’ can keep the commandments, then membership of a covenant people becomes irrelevant.” Notwithstanding this, Ezra's claim in *4 Ezra* 3:37 is used to favor the Israelite in comparison to the Gentiles (cf. Longenecker 1991:54). Stone's observation is instructive hereof:

[T]he seer's questions become more inclusive, touching eventually on the issue of “the few and the many”: Why were many created but only few saved? The angel

responds throughout in dialogue and prediction, and the dynamic of the interchange between the angel and Ezra gradually leads the seer from radical doubt of God's justice to acceptance of his incomprehensible providence.

(2013:4)

Given that the few individuals can keep divine commandments, we can pose a question as the following: How can it be possible to keep divine commandments in spite of the evil heart? Ezra's complaint in *4 Ezra* 7:69 and Uriel's response in 7:71—72 can give an answer to this question. *4 Ezra* 7:69-72 reads:

(69) And if we were not to come into judgment after death, perhaps it would have been better for us. (70) He answered me and said, "When the Most High made the world and Adam and all who have come from him, he first prepared the judgment and the things that pertain to the judgment. (71) And now understand from your own words, for you have said that the mind grows with us. (72) For this reason, therefore, those who dwell on earth shall be tormented, because though they had understanding they committed iniquity, and though they received the commandments they did not keep them, and though they obtained the Law they dealt unfaithfully with what they received. (OTP 1:539)

According to Uriel's explanation, the fact that, albeit tainted due to the evil heart, God proffered both understanding and the mind to human beings does justice to divine judgment against all humanity according to their deeds. Briefly put, although the Sinai covenant is ineffective in curbing the human inclination to sin, it is still working to the effect that it makes the Abrahamic covenant meaningful. For the author of *4 Ezra*, human beings endowed with the mind and understanding should act as moral beings. A similar tendency to view human beings as moral beings, which are endowed with reason, can be found in *4 Macc* 3:1-5.

(1) The argument is absolutely ludicrous, for reason is clearly not sovereign over its own inherent inclinations but over those of the body. (2) For instance, none of you can eradicate desire, but reason can ensure that you do not become enslaved to desire. (3) Anger none of you can eradicate from his soul, but reason can help you resist anger. (4) None of you can eradicate malice, but reason may be your ally in not

allowing you to be overwhelmed by malice. (5) For reason is not the uprooter of the passions but their antagonist. (OTP 2:547)

However, unlike *4 Ezra*, both reason and the Mosaic Law act as an effective antidote to the human inclination to sin or human desires in *4 Maccabees* (e.g., *4 Macc.* 2:23). That is to say, the ineffectiveness of the Sinai covenant does not mean the disability of it in *4 Ezra*. The ineffectiveness of the Mosaic Law in curbing the human inclination to sin does mean that the bar of being righteous by keeping divine commandments is too extremely difficult to pass over. *In nuce*, despite the fact that the curbing of the human inclination to sin requires human beings of extremely great effort due to evil heart and the ineffectiveness of the Mosaic Law (e.g., *4 Ezra* 7:19-24, 98, 92, 127; 8:56-60), human responsibility for committing sin is stressed in *4 Ezra* (cf. Brand 2013:133-134). See Ezra's encouragement in *4 Ezra* 14:34: "If you, then, will rule over your minds and discipline your hearts, you shall be kept alive, and after death you shall obtain mercy" (OTP 1:554).

Adam is blamed for the fall, which has been inherited by his descendants, in *4 Ezra* 7:118.

(118) O Adam, what have you done? For though it was you who sinned, the fall was not yours alone, but ours also who are your descendants (OTP 1:541)

No matter whether the origin of the evil heart can be traced back to the creation of Adam or to Adam's disobedience, Adam's fall appears to be corporate, but not representative. While the meaning of the fall herein is not certain, Adam's fall induced death into the life of his descendants: "For what good is it to us, if an eternal age has been promised to us, but we have done deeds that bring death?" (*4 Ezra* 7:119, OTP 1:541). Hogan (2008:117) points out that "[g]iven what Ezra has previously said about the 'evil heart,' it would be highly inconsistent if by 'the fall' he meant that Adam's transgression was the cause of the pervasive sinfulness of humanity." In other words, Adam's fall does not determine or direct the destiny of his descendants as sinners. (cf. McFarland 2010:30). The consequence of Adam's fall is not to inherit Adam's sin, but to inherit the evil heart (cf. Stone 1990:253). Albeit disproportionate, the few righteous remnants will remain

persistently (e.g., *4 Ezra* 7:127-128; see Ezra protagonist himself is righteous). Already in *4 Ezra* 7:12-14, Uriel made sense that Adam's fall has changed the situation, in which all humanity should be put. That is to say, "what had been made was judged" (*4 Ezra* 3:11, OTP 1:537) due to Adam's fall.

(12) And so the entrances of this world were made narrow and sorrowful and toilsome; they are few and evil, full of dangers and involved in great hardships. (13) But the entrances of the greater world are broad and safe, and really yield the fruit of immortality. (14) Therefore unless the living passes through the difficult and vain experiences, they can never receive those things that have been reserved for them. (OTP 1:537)

By transferring the implementation of divine salvation from this present world to the world to come, Uriel managed to question and explain both theodicy and divine sovereignty (cf. Longenecker 1991:78). The divine initiative reflected on the Abrahamic covenant in *4 Ezra* 3 should be understood in terms of such a changed situation resulting from Adam's fall in *4 Ezra* 7. Longenecker's observation is worth citing in full herein:

Adam's sin caused the order of the created world to be replaced by a new order. Accordingly, the present world is despaired of and deliverance is expected only within the coming of the future age. Uriel holds that the effects of Adam's sin were so destructive that, in the present order, God's mercy cannot be appealed to and ethnic particularism cannot be maintained. Instead, *human persistence* is upheld as the vehicle to salvation in the next age (7.3-0, 10-14).

(1991:78, italics original)

Thus Ezra's lamentation for Adam's fall in *4 Ezra* 7:118 cannot dismiss human responsibility for committing sin. Contrary to this, Uriel's claims in *4 Ezra* 7 serve to bring human responsibility for community sin to the fore. It becomes clear when Uriel cited Deut 30:19 in *4 Ezra* 7:129: "For this is the way of which Moses, while he was alive, spoke to the people, saying 'Choose for yourself life, that you may live!'" (OTP 1:541). From thence, the author of *4 Ezra* managed to shed more light on the fact that the beneficiaries of divine salvation at the *eschaton* will be the few righteous remnants, not

the ethnic Israel (e.g., *4 Ezra* 12:34; 13:48). Hence Bauckham (2008:308) is correct in saying that “the result is a strong emphasis on the need to merit eschatological reward by difficult obedience to the law.”

In summary, these dialogues between Ezra and Uriel in the first visions of *4 Ezra* illustrate that, first, the evil heart (*cor malignum*) is used to highlight the severity of the sinfulness of humanity: In nature, humanity is prone to commit sin. Second, although the Sinai covenant is ineffective in curbing the human inclination to sin, human beings endowed with the mind and understanding should act as moral beings in *4 Ezra*. Such a meager possibility to keep the divine commandments does justice to the meaningfulness of the Abrahamic covenant in *4 Ezra*. This is because the divine initiative reflected on the Abrahamic covenant is oriented to the world to come, not to the present world, on account of Adam’s fall. It is in this sense that it is still an everlasting covenant. Thus the human persistence under the current situation, in which all humanity should be put since Adam’s fall, plays a pivotal role in becoming the beneficiaries of such an eschatological salvation. It comes as no surprise that human responsibility for committing sin is increasingly stressed in *4 Ezra*. Although there are disputes between Ezra and Uriel at various points of *4 Ezra*, they have in common with each other the existence of the evil heart: It is only presumed. From thence, Ezra asked and Uriel responded in terms of divine sovereignty and theodicy.

3. 2 *Baruch*

2 Baruch (The *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*) is also an apocalypse, the focus of which is on questioning and explaining theodicy. While the original Hebrew version is not extant, the extant versions are in Greek, Syriac, and Arabic as secondary and tertiary translations of its Hebrew *Vorlage* (cf. Klijn 1983:615-616). Given that there is no mention of Bar Kokhba revolt in *circa* 132-136 CE, it seems that *2 Baruch* can be dated back to the interim period between the destruction of Jerusalem and the Second Temple and the Bar Kokhba revolt: “More precise indications of date are difficult to find” (Collins 1984:264).

At least it seems that *2 Baruch* was contemporary with *4 Ezra*. The similarities between *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* have been recognized among scholars. Although scholars concur that *2 Baruch* acts as a theological response to *4 Ezra* (cf. Bogaert 1969:287-288), the direction of influence between the two is not clear. Such similarities can also be explained in terms of the common source (cf. Hogeterp 2009:96). It is for this reason that it is necessary to look into *2 Baruch* on its own right (cf. Henze 2013). Aside from such similarities, there are also differences between the two. Unlike *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch* appears to be loosely structured (cf. Henze 2013:13). Of most interest to note is that the theological anthropology of *2 Baruch* appears to be more optimistic than that of *4 Ezra* 9 (cf. Bauckham 2001:181). There is no mention either of the evil heart (*cor malignum*) or of the evil inclination (*yetzer ra*).

Like *4 Ezra*, the author of *2 Baruch* attempted to shed more light on the human responsibility for committing sin. *2 Bar.* 15:5-6 reads:

(5) It is true that man would not have understood my judgment if he had not received the Law and if he were not instructed with understanding. (6) But now, because he trespassed, having understanding, he will be punished because he has understanding. (OTP 1:626)

The fact that human beings are endowed with understanding makes sense that human beings should act as moral beings. Unlike *4 Ezra*, however, both the evil heart and the evil inclination do not surface in *2 Baruch*. It is in this sense that the Mosaic Law does not act as an antidote to the human inclination to sin (cf. Brand 2013), with the result that an ineffectiveness of the Mosaic Law in curbing the human inclination to sin is also not mentioned in *2 Baruch*. Instead, human beings endowed with understanding appear to be capable of not trespassing the Mosaic Law: “With regard to sinners, *2 Baruch* is notably concerned to make clear that they are those who consciously and deliberately act wrongly (48:29, 40)” (Bauckham 2008:315). It does justice to divine judgment against human beings who trespassed divine commandments. Given that the ineffectiveness of the Mosaic Law in curbing the human inclination to sin is not mentioned, the bar of being righteous by way of keeping divine commandments cannot be regarded as extremely

difficult in *2 Baruch*. The ways in which human beings are being righteous in *2 Baruch* is to associate their lives with the Mosaic Law (e.g., *2 Bar.* 14:5; 38:4; 54:4-5, 21; 66:1; 75:7). For instance, *2 Bar.* 14:5 reads:

(5) What have they profited who have knowledge before you, and who did not walk in vanity like the rest of the nations, and who did not say to the dead: "Give life to us," but always feared you and did not leave your ways? (OTP 1:626)

Notwithstanding this, for the author of *2 Baruch*, salvation hinges on divine mercy in that even the righteous cannot be regarded as sinless (e.g., *77:6-7*; *78:7*; *84:10*; *85:15*). For instance, both *2 Bar.* *77:6-7* and *85:15* read:

(6) If, therefore, you will make straight your ways, you will not go away as your brothers went away, but they will come to you. (7) For he is merciful whom you honor, and gracious in whom you hope, and true so that he will do good to you and not evil. (OTP 1:647)

(15) Then he will make alive those whom he has found, and he will purge them from sins, and at the same time he will destroy those who are polluted with sins. (OTP 1:652)

Although the author of *2 Baruch* would acknowledge that the righteous who has associated his life with the Mosaic Law is not sinless, the theological anthropology of *2 Baruch* is more optimistic than that of *4 Ezra*. Meanwhile, human responsibility for committing sin is increasingly stressed in *2 Baruch*. It becomes clear when the author of *2 Baruch* dealt with both Adam's sin and Eve's disobedience (obedience to the serpent) in *2 Bar.* 48:42-43.

(42) And I answered and said: O Adam, what did you do to all who were born after you? And what will be said of the first Eve who obeyed the serpent, (43) so that this whole multitude is going to corruption? And countless are those whom the fire devours. (OTP 1:637)

Unlike *4 Ezra* 3:21, Adam is not depicted as being burdened with the evil heart. Unlike *4 Ezra* 7:118, Eve's disobedience is stressed herein. At first glance, it seems that both Adam's sin and Eve's disobedience act as the cause of the corruption of his descendants (*pace* Brand 2013). In *2 Bar.* 23:4, death was induced into the life of Adam's descendants on account of Adam's sin: Eve's disobedience is not mentioned herein. That is to say, Eve's disobedience is used to highlight the first human couple's disobedience against divine commandments. The corruption of humanity owes its existence to such a disobedience. Like *4 Ezra*, Adam's sin does not determine the destiny of his descendants as sinners. *2 Bar.* 54:15-19 is explicit in this regard.

(15) For, although Adam sinned first and has brought death upon all who were not in his own time, yet each of them who has been born from him has prepared for himself the coming torment. And further, each of them has chosen for himself the coming glory. (16) For truly, the one who believes will receive reward. (17) But now, turn yourselves to destruction, you unrighteous ones who are living now, for you will be visited suddenly, since you have once rejected the understanding of the Most High. (18) For his works have not taught you, nor has the artful work of his creation which has existed always persuaded you. (19) Adam is, therefore, not the cause, except only for himself, but each of us has become our own Adam. (OTP 1:640)

At first glance, it seems that Ramael's claim in *2 Bar.* 54:19 stands in contrast to Baruch's claim in 48:43. Ramael's claim in *2 Bar.* 54:15-19 illustrates that the consequence of the first couple's disobedience is not to inherit their sin, but to be caught under the sway of corruption. In other words, the term corruption in *2 Bar.* 48:43 is used to refer to the current situation, in which all humanity should be put. It is not far-fetched to assume that the term corruption assumes the role of the evil heart in *4 Ezra* or the evil inclination in Qumran literature. It becomes clear when Ramael allegorized the history of humanity in *2 Baruch* 56. *2 Bar.* 56:5-16 reads:

(5) And as you first saw the black waters on the top of the cloud which first came down upon the earth; this is the transgression which Adam, the first man, committed. (6) For when he transgressed, untimely death came into being, mourning was mentioned, affliction was prepared, illness was created, labor accomplished, pride

began to come into existence, the realm of death began to ask to be renewed with blood, the conception of children came about, the passion of the parents was produced, the loftiness of men was humiliated, and goodness vanished. (7) What could, therefore, have been blacker and darker than these things? (8) This is the beginning of the black waters which you have seen. (9) And from these black waters again black were born, and very dark darkness originated. (10) For he who was a danger to himself was also a danger to the angels. (11) For they possessed freedom in that time in which they were created. (11) And some of them came down and mingled themselves with women. (13) At that time they who acted like this were tormented in chains. (14) But the rest of the multitude of angels, who have no number, restrained themselves. (15) And those living on earth perished together through the waters of the flood. (16) Those are the first black waters. (OTP 1:641)

In verses 5-9, the black waters are introduced as the consequence of Adam's sin. Thus the covering of black waters over the earth connotes the sway of pollution, under which Adam's descendants have been caught since Adam's sin, in *2 Bar.* 48:23. The despicable situations listed in verse 6 serve to emphasize the actuality of the corrupted state of humanity. The severity of the corrupted state of humanity is stressed in verse 7: "What could, therefore, have been blacker and darker than these things?" This rhetorical question makes sense that there is no blacker and darker than the corrupted state of humanity. Such a corrupted state of humanity acts as the cause of the Watchers' transgression in verse 10: "For he who was a danger to himself was also a danger to the angels." This is a reversal of the *BW* of *1 Enoch*.¹⁰⁸ Reed (2005:111) points out that "[t]he causal arrow points the other way: it was humankind who corrupted the angels." A similar tendency to ascribe blame for the Watchers' transgression to humanity, especially to women, can be found in *T. Reub.* 5:4-6.

(4) For a woman is not able to coerce a man overtly, but by a harlot's manner she accomplishes her villainy. (5) Accordingly, my children, flee from sexual promiscuity, and order your wives and your daughters not to adorn their heads and their appearances so as to deceive men's sound minds. For every woman who schemes in these ways is destined for eternal punishment. (6) For it was thus that

¹⁰⁸ See chapter 3.

they charmed the Watchers, who were before the Flood. (OTP 1:784)

The phrases “by a harlot’s manner” and “from sexual promiscuity” connote the corrupted state of humanity (e.g., *1 En.* 8:1-2). *T. Reub.* 5:4-6 corroborates with *2 Bar.* 56:10-15 in highlighting both the corrupted state of humanity and human responsibility for committing sin. Thus it stands to reason that Rameel’s claim in *2 Bar.* 54:19 makes sense that, despite the fact that all humanity has been caught under the sway of corruption since Adam’s sin, human beings endowed with understanding should be responsible for disobeying the Mosaic Law: Human beings are moral beings.

In summary, the author of *2 Baruch* appears to have been more lenient than the author of *4 Ezra* in relation to the human capability of obeying divine commandments. While the term corruption connotes the evil heart, the evil heart does not surface. Besides, the ineffectiveness of the Mosaic Law is not mentioned in *2 Baruch*. Aside from these differences between the two, both *2 Baruch* and *4 Ezra* have in common with each other the fact that, despite the current situation, in which all humanity should be put since Adam’s disobedience, human beings as moral beings are responsible for committing sin.

4. Romans

The evil inclination does not surface in Paul’s letters, even in the New Testament. However, the semantically congenial term ἐπιθυμία, “desire,” can be found in 1 Thessalonians, the Corinthian correspondences, Galatians, and Romans (cf. Marcus 1986). Of these Paul’s letters, we will look into Romans presently in that Romans serves well to represent the theologoumenon of the Apostle Paul, at least among his undisputed letters. Philosophically speaking, Swinburne’s definition of desire is as the following: “I understand by a ‘desire’ or ‘want’ an involuntary inclination with which an agent finds himself to do some action or to have something happen” (1998:73; Rosen-Zvi 2011:12). More than that, the usages of desire in Second Temple Judaism have a negative bearing on the term ἐπιθυμία (the *Testaments of the Twelve*; e.g., *T. Reub.* 2:4; 4:7-9; 6:3-4; *T. Ash.*

3:2; 6:4-5; *T. Jos.* 7:4, 8; cf. Boccaccini 1991:222-223; Philo's works; e.g., *Dec.* 142; *Spec. Leg.* 4:79-91; cf. Edgar 2001:152 n.51). Besides, while the term ἐπιθυμία appears to be neutral in a few cases (e.g., Luke 22:15; Phil 1:23; 1 Thess 2:17), the majority of its usages is also negative in the New Testament (e.g., Mark 4:19; Rom 1:24; 6:12; 13:14; Gal 5:24; Col 3:5; 1 Tim 6:9; 2 Tim 3:6; 4:4; Jas 1:14; 1 Pet 1:14; 2 Pet 2:10; 1 John 2:16-17; Jude 18).

Romans 1—3. The term ἐπιθυμία in Rom 1:24 is used to highlight the idolatrous and hypocritical disposition of humanity *in toto*, although its primary referent appears to be the Gentiles (cf. Gaca 1999). It becomes clear in that Rom 1:18—2:29 can be structured in the form of a *chiasmus*:

A: 1:18-32	The sins of Gentiles out of an idolatrous disposition
B: 2:1-16	The righteous and impartial judgment of God against the one who has the idolatrous and hypocritical disposition
A': 2:17-29	The sins of Jews out of a hypocritical disposition

(Namgung 2016:62)

It has been generally recognized that Rom 1:18-32 has recourse to Wisdom of Solomon 13—14 (cf. Moo 1996; Carter 2004). In verses 24, 26, and 28, Paul made sense that the desire of the unrighteous' impure heart is closely linked with their idolatry: On the one hand, the desire of the impure heart leads the unrighteous to commit sexual immorality. Evil desires in the *Testaments of the Twelve* are also used to refer to sexual immorality (cf. Boccaccini 1991). On the other hand, sexual immorality, which is the cardinal sin of the Gentiles from the Jewish perspective in the Second Temple period, goes hand in hand with their committing of idolatry.

(24) Therefore God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, that their bodies might be dishonored among them (Διὸ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς)... (26) For this reason God gave them over to degrading passions; for their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural,(διὰ τοῦτο

παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας, αἵ τε γὰρ θήλειαι αὐτῶν μετήλλαξαν τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν εἰς τὴν παρὰ φύσιν,... (28) And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer, God gave them over to a depraved mind, to do those things which are not proper, (καὶ καθὼς οὐκ ἔδοκίμασαν τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα.) (Rom 1:24, 26, and 28)

Such a linking between sexual immorality and idolatry can also be found in Wis 14:12-31.

(12) For the idea of making idols was the beginning of fornication, and the invention of them was the corruption of life, (ἀρχὴ γὰρ πορνείας ἐπίνοια εἰδώλων εὕρεσις δὲ αὐτῶν φθορὰ ζωῆς) (Wis 14:12 RSV)

(27) For the worship of idols not to be named is the beginning and cause and end of every evil (ἡ γὰρ τῶν ἀνωνύμων εἰδώλων θρησκεία παντὸς ἀρχὴ κακοῦ καὶ αἰτία καὶ πέρας ἐστίν) (Wis 14:27 RSV)

The Jerusalem Council in Acts 15 also encouraged the Gentile Christians to abstain them from committing both sexual immorality and idolatry (e.g., Acts 15:20, 29; 21:25). Both sexual immorality and idolatry appear to be frequently associated with malevolent spirits in the Second Temple period (cf. Rosner 2007:111-112). For instance, Belial's three nets in CD 4:15-17 includes sexual immorality; wealth is also intertwined with idolatry (e.g., *T. Jud.* 18:2-6; 19:1). Belial's three nets refer to the cardinal sins of Israel in the Second Temple period (e.g., *Pss. Sol.* 8:9; *Jub.* 7:20). It was observed in the foregoing chapter that the *Maskil's* warning of Belial's three nets points to the fact that, in nature, humanity is prone to commit sin. Without divine intervention, no one can escape from Belial's three nets. Thus the concept of Belial's three nets is used to highlight the vulnerability of humanity in relation to the power of evil. Such a vulnerability of humanity in relation to the power of evil also makes sense of the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity. Along with the phrase "the stubbornness of the heart," the term *וְצַד*, "will," appears to cause human beings to commit sin in column 3 of the *Damascus Document* (cf. Brand 2013).

Although the term רצון is generally allocated with the divine will in the Jewish Scriptures, it is also allocated with human desire in Daniel, Nehemiah, and Esther. However, in CD 2:14—3:12, the term רצון is used to refer to the human inclination to sin (cf. Brand 2013). It was observed in the foregoing chapter that the phrase “the stubbornness of the heart” in CD 2:17-18 explains why the Watchers came to commit sin against God: The Watchers are introduced as one of the exemplars who did not heed the precepts of God but were attracted by the plan of a guilty inclination and lascivious eyes. Hence Marcus (1986:14) is correct in saying that “[s]ince the yēser is an idol, however, the concrete acts of idolatry to which Paul refers in Rom 1:21-24 are derivative of the primary idolatry of putting the yēser at the center of one’s being.” In a similar vein, Sprinkle (2013:131) points out that “Romans 1:21 underscores the depth of sin’s infection of the heart.” Granted that, such a chiasmic structure of Rom 1:18—2:29 illustrates that the Pauline notion of the justification of the ungodly appears to not only exacerbate the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity but also to maximize the necessity of divine intervention (cf. Namgung 2016:62; Sprinkle 2013). It becomes clear when we look into the broad context of Romans 1—3, which is structured in the form of a *chiasmus*:

A: 1:17a	The revelation of the righteousness of God to believers for salvation
B: 1:18	The revelation of the wrath of God to the ungodly and unrighteous for judgment
A': 3:21-26	The revelation of the righteousness of God to believers for salvation (Namgung 2016:65)

In terms of and in contrast to the idolatrous and hypocritical disposition of the ungodly and unrighteous, it is clear that, unlike the redactor of *I Enoch*, especially the *Epistle of Enoch*, “a salvific aspect of God’s righteousness is not only intertwined with but also ensues after its punitive aspect, not in a temporal manner but in a conceptual one” (Namgung 2016:65; cf. Linebaugh 2010:126). Albeit reductionistic, simply put, God’s wrath is to exacerbate the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity; God’s righteousness is to maximize the necessity of divine intervention. Thus it stands to reason that the term ἐπιθυμία in Rom 1:24 serves to make sense that Pauline anthropology is more pessimistic than those of Second Temple Judaism, not to mention Qumran literature (cf. Laato 1995).

It becomes clear when Paul made a declaration in Rom 3:9 that all humanity is under the power of sin.

(9) What then? Are we Jews any better off? No, not at all; for I have already charged that all men, both Jews and Greeks, are under the power of sin, (Rom 3:9)

Then, Paul's use of the catena of quotations from Psalm and Isaiah in Rom 3:10-18 serves to highlight the universality of sin over humanity *in toto*: "Paul's catena opens with five emphatic assertions to the effect that the truly righteous person simply does not exist" (Watson 2004:58). By dealing with Paul's use of the catena of quotations in Rom 3:10-18, Namgung (2016:157) points out that it is concerned with "an existential question as to the reconciliation of sinners with a righteous God." Such an existential question hinges both on the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity and on the necessity of divine intervention: "David himself was aware that sin is the universal human condition, and that what characterizes the people of God is not the absence of sin but the forgiveness of sin" (Watson 2004:65).

Romans 7—8. The Pauline pessimistic anthropology, the ineffectiveness of the Mosaic Law in curbing the human inclination to sin, and the power of sin/evil are dealt with in Romans 7—8. In doing so, the tension between divine agency and human agency in the Second Temple period comes to be more radicalized in terms of a new paradigm. The structure of Romans 7 falls into the following two subsections such as Rom 7:1-6 and 7:7-25. In verses 7-25, ἐγώ appears to be confronted with a desperate dilemma: The Mosaic Law play such a negative role in the course of salvation history, despite the fact that it is good, holy, just, spiritual, and even God's law (e.g., Rom 7:12, 14, 17, 22; cf. Namgung 2016). Thus it stands to reason that the power of sin revolves around the functioning of the Mosaic Law, not around the nature of the Mosaic Law itself.

(21) So I find it to be a law that when I want to do right, evil lies closest at hand.
(Rom 7:21)

Despite the fact that ἐγώ wants to do what is good, evil is present ἐμοί (cf. Dunn 1988:409;

Schreiner 1998:377). Hence Namgung (2016:83) is correct in saying that “the emphasis of Rom 7:7-25 is explicitly placed on the ontological impotence of the Mosaic law and the anthropological flaw of ἐγὼ calling for the necessity of the alternative way to salvation in the course of salvation history.” It reaches its climax in verse 24: “Wretched man that I am! Who will set me free from the body of this death (ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου)?” Although the term σῶμα, “body,” has no negative sense in general, the phrase ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου appears to be negative in that it harks back to the phrase τοῦτ’ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου, “that is, in my flesh,” in verse 18: “For I know that nothing good dwells in me, that is, in my flesh; for the wishing is present in me, but the doing of the good *is* not.” The term σάρξ, “flesh,” is a translation of the term בשר. As is clearly seen in the foregoing chapter, the term בשר is used to highlight the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity in Qumran literature: In nature, humanity is prone to commit sin (cf. Frey 2002). By dealing with the usages of the term בשר in Qumran literature, Frey (2002:404) points out that “there are major differences between the Jewish traditions and Paul, mainly in respect of the position toward the law.” This is because, unlike the Qumran covenanters, for Paul, the Mosaic Law appears to be ineffective in curbing the human inclination to sin: The Mosaic Law fails to lead to righteousness. Although the ineffectiveness of the Mosaic Law in curbing the human inclination to sin is also mentioned in *4 Ezra*, there is the difference between Ezra and Paul in terms of the degree of the ineffectiveness of the Mosaic Law: For the former, any possibility to obey divine commandments still remains for the few righteous; for the latter, no possibility remains for all humanity. The stark contrast between the flesh and the Spirit in Rom 8:5-8 makes sense of such an ontological impotence of the Mosaic Law in leading to righteousness.

(5) For those who live according to the flesh set their minds on the things of the flesh, but those who live according to the Spirit set their minds on the things of the Spirit. (6) To set the mind on the flesh is death, but to set the mind on the Spirit is life and peace (τὸ γὰρ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς θάνατος, τὸ δὲ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος ζωὴ καὶ εἰρήνη·). (7) For the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God; it does not submit to God’s law, indeed it cannot (διότι τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν, τῷ γὰρ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτάσσεται, οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται·); (8) and those who are in the flesh cannot please God. (Rom 8:5-8)

This is because, for Paul, humanity is given no capacity to turn toward God without divine intervention (e.g., Rom 8:1-4; cf. Sprinkle 2013:131). Despite such differences, Frey (2002:404) points out that “Paul’s usage of *σάρξ* as a striving opposed to God’s will and to his salvific acts proves to be deeply rooted in the Palestinian Jewish tradition.” Rom 5:12-21 also affirms the Pauline pessimistic anthropology: “The old age, the representative of which is Adam, has been subject to the mastery of sin leading to death. Quite the reverse, the new age, the representative of which is Jesus Christ, is being subject to the righteousness of God leading to eternal life” (Namgung 2016:77). While, in Qumran literature, the human capacity to keep divine precepts with the help of the spirit that God has created for/placed in the *Maskil* is maintained within the scheme of divine determinism or predestination, albeit difficult to do—in other words, humanity’s moral condition in Qumran literature is not completely negative, in Romans 5—8, “[h]umanity’s moral condition at the time of redemption is characterized by wickedness” (Sprinkle 2013:129). Hence Sprinkle (2013:129) is correct in saying that human beings “do not merely commit acts of sin but possess an inherently sinful nature.” While, in Qumran literature, entering the covenant of God/becoming a member of the *Yahad* does not mean the transformation of the novice in that the halakhic interpretation of the Law of the *Yahad* serves to facilitate the novice’s obedience to divine commandments in order to be reckoned as righteous at the *eschaton*, thus, in Romans, being justified by faith/becoming a member of the covenant people of God does mean the transformation of the novice from the wicked to the righteous. *In nuce*, the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity are exacerbated; the necessity of and effectiveness of divine intervention is maximized. While human obedience to divine commandments in Qumran literature is evidentiary for his elect status; the human achievement of the requirement of the law is evidentiary for his justification by faith (e.g., Rom 8:1-4). This is because, while the hermeneutics of time in the Second Temple period traces back to creation and God’s election of Israel or of the sons of light so that eschatology returns back to protology, the hermeneutics of Paul’s time hinges on Jesus Christ’s propitiatory sacrifice and the resurrection from the dead in the course of salvation history so that protology becomes commensurate with eschatology. While, although human agency is preceded by divine agency in Qumran literature, the relationship between divine agency and human agency appears to be synergistic, in Romans, including Paul’s other letters, the relationship

between divine agency and human agency appears to be monergistic. Such a radicalized relationship between divine agency and human agency in Qumran literature goes to the extreme that Paul made a declaration at the end of Romans 8 as the following: “For I am sure that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord” (Rom 8:38-39).

All in all, the similarities and differences between the Qumran covenanters and Paul illustrate that Paul managed not only to exacerbate the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity but also to maximize the necessity of and effectiveness of divine intervention. What makes both the Pauline pessimistic anthropology and the hermeneutics of time distinct from those of Second Temple Judaism is Jesus Christ’s propitiatory sacrifice and the resurrection from the dead in the course of salvation history.

5. James

The term ἐπιθυμία also occurs in Jas 1:14. Scholars agree that Jas 1:12-15 can be regarded as a continuation or a development of what James spoke of in 1:2-4 (cf. McKnight 2011:105-106; Wall 1997:58-59). It becomes clear in that the terminology of Jas 1:2-4 is also employed in 1:12-15.

(2) Count it all joy, my brethren, when you meet various trials (ὅταν πειρασμοῖς περιπέσητε ποικίλοις), (3) for you know that the testing of your faith produces steadfastness (ὅτι τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως κατεργάζεται ὑπομονήν). (4) And let steadfastness have its full effect, that you may be perfect and complete, lacking in nothing (ἵνα ἦτε τέλειοι καὶ ὀλόκληροι ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι). (Jas 1:2-4)

(12) Blessed is the man who endures trial (Μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὃς ὑπομένει πειρασμόν), for when he stood the test he will receive the crown of life which God has promised to those who love him. (13) Let no one say when he is tempted, “I am tempted by God”; for God cannot be tempted with evil and he himself tempts no one; (14) but

each person is tempted when he is lured and enticed by his own desire (ἕκαστος δὲ πειράζεται ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας ἐξελκόμενος καὶ δελεαζόμενος). (15) Then desire when it has conceived gives birth to sin; and sin when it is full-grown brings forth death (εἶτα ἡ ἐπιθυμία συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν, ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία ἀποτελεσθεῖσα ἀποκύει θάνατον). (Jas 1:12-15)

Jas 1:2-4 makes sense that “the *purpose* of trials is to produce mature Christian character” (McKnight 2011:69, italics original). In order to achieve such a purpose successfully, James acknowledged in advance that divine wisdom is necessary to the addressees of his letter (e.g., Jas 1:5-8): “If any of you lacks wisdom, let him ask God, who gives to all men generously and without reproaching, and it will be given him” (Jas 1:5). Davids (1982:65) points out that “[w]isdom’ functions for James in an analogous position to that which ‘Holy Spirit’ occupies for Paul.” Thus it is not far-fetched to assume that the position of the theologoumenon of James in the course of salvation history appears to be similar to that of Romans 8. In Rom 8:3-4, Paul made a sharp contrast between the flesh and the Spirit, in which Ezek 36:27-28 is alluded to. In doing so, Pauline exhortation to living up to “the righteous requirement of the law” through the mediating work of the Holy Spirit comes to the forefront (Kim 2002:161). In Rom 8:18, Paul made another contrast between present suffering and the assurance of the hope of future glory. Namgung (2016:85) points out that “Paul’s previous claim of participating in the suffering of Jesus Christ on the basis of the assurance of the hope of future glory is still an undercurrent to Rom 8:18-30.” In other words, such trials in Jas 1:2-4 appear to be appropriate for the eschatological phase of the reality of believers’ life (cf. Namgung 2016:85). Hence McKnight (2011:69, italics original) is correct in saying that “because James knows that his community will ask the penetrating question and that some are already questioning the goodness of God, he turns to *how God relates to trials* (1:12-18).”

The theological anthropology of James appears to stand in line with that of Ben Sira. First, like Ben Sira, James frequently employed a similar method of being the opposite when he substantiates important issues in the course of his argumentation. Second, both Ben Sira and James are theodictic and centered on divine wisdom. It seems that the term ἐπιθυμία denotes the neutral *yetzer* in Ben Sira, by which to maintain the human capacity

to choose morally. There is another attempt to refer the term ἐπιθυμία to the rabbinic understanding of *yetzer hara* and *yetzer hatov* (e.g., *b. Ber.* 61b). However, *yetzer hatov* does not surface in James. Thus it is less likely that such a rabbinic understanding of *yetzer hara* and *yetzer hatov* is appropriate for the term ἐπιθυμία in Jas 1:4. The fact that *yetzer hatov* does not surface in James also makes less likely that the term ἐπιθυμία denote the neutral *yetzer* in Ben Sira in that the term ἐπιθυμία in Jas 1:14 also has a negative sense: Desire gave birth to sin and sin to death (e.g., Jas 1:15). Given that, like the Qumran covenanters, James frequently employed the terminology of purity and perfection in discriminating the two opposite groups,¹⁰⁹ it is more likely that the theologoumenon of James is sectarian in nature, although it does not mean seclusion from the society as the Qumran covenanters of the *Yahad*. It becomes clear in that James consistently employed the term κόσμος, “cosmos,” as the sinful and impure value system (e.g., Jas 1:27; 2:5; 3:6; 4:4; cf. Lockett 2008). James’s understanding of κόσμος appears to be similar to the Qumran covenanters’ understanding of the dominion of Belial in the *Rule of the Community* and the *Damascus Document*. Thus James made the contrast between this-worldly wisdom, which comes from κόσμος and is predicated of “earthly, natural, demonic” (e.g., Jas 3:15), and other-worldly wisdom, which comes from above and is predicated of “pure, peaceable, gentle, reasonable, full of mercy and good fruits, unwavering, without hypocrisy” (e.g., Jas 3:17). James encouraged his addresses to resist the devil and to submit to God (e.g., Jas 4:7). Like the *Maskil*, James also emphasized the significance of purifying the heart and cleansing the hand (e.g., Jas 4:8).

(7) Submit therefore to God. Resist the devil and he will flee from you. (8) Draw near to God and He will draw near to you. Cleanse your hands, you sinners; and purify your hearts, you double-minded. (Jas 4:7-8)

The purifying of the heart comports with the *Maskil*’s exhortation in 1QS and CD, where the necessity of such a purification points to the fact that, in nature, humanity is prone to commit sin, namely the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity.

All in all, the fact that whatever belongs to κόσμος, which is sinful and impure, is hostile

¹⁰⁹ For the terminology of purity in James; see Lockett (2008).

to God in James illustrates that the term ἐπιθυμία does not denote the existential state of believers whose life stands in the eschatological phase of the so-called “already-not yet” tension. Those who have a desire, which gave birth to sin and to death, do not have other-worldly (divine) wisdom, but this-worldly wisdom: They belong to κόσμος, not to God. Thus it stands to reason that the term ἐπιθυμία is used to highlight that, in nature, humanity, who remains outside of God’s mercy, is prone to commit sin. However, that is not to say that believers who are the beneficiaries of God’s mercy are morally perfect. That is to say that there is hope that, with the help of divine wisdom, believers will pass through such trials leading to perfection at the *eschaton* (e.g., Jas 1:2-4, 5-8). The theological anthropology of James is as the same as the Pauline pessimistic anthropology.

6. Concluding remarks

For the authors of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, the destruction of the Second Temple and Jerusalem allows them to exacerbate the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity more severely than Jewish authors of the Second Temple period. Such a despondency of the absence of God resulting from Israel’s breaking the covenant comes to be felt more severely than ever before. Even the author of *4 Ezra* called the effectiveness of the Mosaic Law in curbing the human inclination to sin into question. While adhering to questioning and explaining theodicy and divine sovereignty, the authors of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* came to develop pessimistic anthropologies distinct from those of Second Temple Judaism. However, for the authors of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, albeit extremely difficult, a possibility is open for the few righteous remnants to obey divine commandments. As a result, the *angeli interpretes* of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* finally introduced an eschatological and apocalyptic solution to Ezra and Brauch’s complaints of the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity: There will be the remnants at the *eschaton*. For Paul and James, both their pessimistic anthropology and the hermeneutics of their time hinge on Jesus Christ’s propitiatory sacrifice and the resurrection from the dead in the course of salvation history. In other words, for Paul and James, the paradigm of the relationship between divine agency and human agency is shifted from synergism to monergism. Both the lowliness

and sinfulness of humanity and the ontological impotence of the Mosaic Law are exacerbated to the extreme; the necessity of and effectiveness of divine intervention is more maximized than both in *4 Ezra* and in *2 Baruch*.

Chapter 6. Conclusion

1. Summary

Sanders (1977:114) contends that “[s]in comes only when man actually disobeys; if he were not to disobey he would not be a sinner.” This study was thus motivated to critique Sanders’s contention in relation to sin and human accountability in Second Temple Judaism. The *Leitfrage* of this study has been proposed as the following: “How would Jewish authors of the Second Temple period answer the question as to whether one becomes a sinner because he/she sins or one sins because he/she is a sinner born with a sinful nature?” In an attempt to deal with this *Leitfrage* satisfactorily, this study was aimed at delving into various understandings of sin and human accountability in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, Qumran literature, *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch*, and the New Testament writings such as Romans and James.

As a preliminary investigation before delving into various understandings of sin and human accountability of the Second Temple Judaism, in Chapter 2, I have dealt with the *Weltanschauung* of Second Temple Judaism. It was observed that Israel’s covenantal history is far from discontinuous with creation at a time of severe theological, sociological, and political plights in spite of their evil. It becomes clear in that Jewish authors of the Second Temple period appear to have managed to alleviate the impasse of the Exile up to a point of the hope of the future according to their respective contexts. The *Weltanschauung* of Second Temple Judaism revolves around creation, history, and covenant. First, the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy 32 acts as a framework of history. Despite some differences, Jewish authors of the Second Temple period appear to have managed to pattern the hermeneutics of their time after the Deuteronomic view of Israel’s history.¹¹⁰ In other words, as far as where they are situated in the course of Israel’s covenantal history can be anticipated, the impasse of the Exile cannot be unprecedented. Second, theological anthropology based on the interpretation of Genesis 1—3 serves to

¹¹⁰ E.g., Qumran literature, Tobit, Testament of Moses, Philo, Josephus, and *Sifre* Deuteronomy.

make sense how Jewish authors of the Second Temple period interpreted creation. The mortality of humanity is not prescribed but described.¹¹¹ The tension between the free will of humanity and divine determinism is on the go; it cannot be easily resolved. Notwithstanding this, it is made clear that theological anthropology of Second Temple Judaism serves to do justice to God's sovereignty so that theodicy is questioned and explained. Third, the covenant is intertwined with creation by way of the hermeneutics of time in the Second Temple period. Briefly put, Israel's special relationship with God is grounded in creation. As a result, this hermeneutics of their time serves to tone down such severe theological, sociological, and political plights resulting from the Exile.

In Chapters 3, I have dealt with how the authors of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* understood the presence of sin and evil. Even though the Watcher story in these Enochic traditions serves to attribute the origin of sin to the fallen angels, it was observed that the Watcher story cannot quench Second Temple Jews' uneasiness in relation to the presence of sin and evil. The Watcher story in the *BW* of *1 Enoch* refers to Second Temple Jews' uneasiness in relation to the presence of sin and evil: Why is there sin and evil in such a good creation? Whence do these sin and evil come from? Who will be blamed for? The *BW* appears to have ascribed blame to the Watchers¹¹² and their offsprings, namely the Giants.¹¹³ Meanwhile, despite the fact that humanity also began to commit sins afterward, it seems at best that they are depicted as victims. However, *1 Enoch* 1—5 says otherwise in that the Watcher story should be understood not only as etiological but also typological. Humanity in the Watcher story is not a mere victim. That is to say, there is the tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability, although the former outweighs the latter in the *BW*. Such a tension appears to have been heightened in the later Enochic traditions such as the *DV* and the *EE*. These later Enoch traditions clearly show that human activity in relation to sin and human accountability began to outweigh human passivity. It becomes clear when the allegorist in the *An. Apoc.* introduced the Cain and Abel episode in Genesis 4 prior to the Watcher story. Seventy shepherds in the *An. Apoc.* do not correspond to evil spirits in the *BW*. Moreover, in the *AW*, the Watcher story is not mentioned, although the divine verdict against the Watchers

¹¹¹ E.g., Ben Sira and 4QInstruction.

¹¹² E.g., Asael in *1 En.* 8:1; Shemihazah and two hundred Watchers in *1 En.* 7:1; 8:3-4.

¹¹³ E.g., *1 En.* 7:2-6.

at the *eschaton* is alluded to therein. Such a tendency to emphasize human activity in relation to sin and human accountability can also be found in *Jubilees*. What is implicit in the *BW* comes to be explicit in *Jubilees* (e.g., the biblical Adam story in Genesis 1—3 in *Jub.* 3:23-25). Besides, *Jubilees* appears to have borne other traditions absent in *I Enoch*. For instance, in the Mastema story, the author/redactor of *Jubilees* appears to have parted company with his predecessor: The role of Mastema in *Jubilees* is situated within the divine administration; his mission is to corrupt and lead humanity astray (e.g., *Jub.* 11:11; 17:16; 18:19, 12). That is to say, Mastema and evil spirits in *Jubilees* are credited as instigators of sins. It becomes clear in that Adam and Eve's disobedience is narrated in *Jubilees* 3 without further ado. In *Jubilees*, both the Watchers and humanity appear to have been liable for the antediluvian wickedness. Even the Watcher story cannot resolve satisfactorily such a tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability. Meanwhile, *I Enoch*, later Enochic traditions, and *Jubilees* demonstrate that Second Temple Jews' uneasiness in relation to the presence of sin and evil appears to have been heightened, even though the hermeneutics of their time could help to tone down such severe theological, sociological, and political plights since the Exile.

In Chapter 4, I have dealt with Qumran literature. By focusing on the term *yetzer ra* both in pre-Qumran and in Qumran writings, Qumran literature shows a tendency to realize the severity of the sinfulness of humanity in a complicated and radicalized manner. The Watcher story in 1QapGen ar, 4Q180, 4Q510—511, 4Q444, and 11Q11 clearly shows that the tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability comes to be heightened in comparison to *I Enoch* and *Jubilees*. In 1Q180, the Watchers are not introduced as the source of sin and evil. Even both in apotropaic prayers (4Q510—511, 4Q444) and in incantation prayers (11Q11), the emphasis of these prayers is not on dealing with the Watcher story itself. Instead, it is used to do justice to the *Sitz im Leben* of the *Maskil*. 4Q510—511 indicates that the tension between free will and divine determinism should be read into the Watcher story. Both 4Q510—511 and 4Q444 demonstrate that the battleground against malevolent spirits is translated into the heart of the sons of light. In 11Q11, due to its genre as incantation prayer, the heart of humanity does not regard as the battleground against malevolent spirits as both in

4Q510—511 and in 4Q444. In 11Q11, however, the demon is depicted as darkness, which denotes sin and impurity.

In pre-sectarian prayers such as 11Q5, 4Q213a, 4Q436, 4Q504—506, and 4Q393, the evil inclination (*yetzer ra*) appears to have come to the forefront. In 11Q5 (*Psalms* 115), the evil inclination is the irresistible condition of making humanity sinful and impure. Both 11Q5 19 (*Plea for Deliverance*) and 4Q213a (*A.L.D.* 3) appear to have borne a literary and thematic parallel with 11Q5. Both 4Q436 (4QBarkhi Nafshi^c) and 434 (4QBarkhi Nafshi^a) illustrate that the necessity of removing the evil inclination in order to transpose the law onto a pure heart brings to the fore the severity of the sinfulness of humanity. It is also true of 4Q504—506 (the *Words of the Luminaries*) in that the psalmist appears to have managed to emphasize the significance of the circumcision of the heart and the transposing of the law onto the renewed heart. It stands to reason that the heart polluted by sin and impurity is used to highlight the severity of the sinfulness of humanity in these pre-sectarian prayers. Even though the term *yetzer ra* does not surface in 4Q393 (4QCommunal Confession), both the stubbornness of the evil heart and the faithful inclination serve to achieve what the evil inclination does in the foregoing prayers. It becomes clear when the psalmist regarded divine intervention as necessary for the curbing of the human inclination to sin.

Such a tendency to realize the severity of the sinfulness of humanity in pre-sectarian poetic texts continues to be radicalized in sectarian poetic and covenantal texts such as the *Hodayot*, the *Rule of the Community*, and the *Damascus Document*. Despite the fact that the term *yetzer ra* does not surface in the *Hodayot*, the term *yetzer* still appears to have served to make sense of the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity in terms of the pessimistic anthropology. Such a pessimistic anthropology hinges on the earthly origin of humanity. The earthly origin of humanity serves to make sense that the human inclination acts as a leading feature of the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity. That is to say, human responsibility for committing sin cannot be easily dismissed in the *Hodayot*. Column 5 of the *Rule of the Community* is concerned with conversion. It seems at first glance that 1QS5 emphasizes the human choice in making a decision to enter the covenant of God/to become the members of the *Yahad*. However, it is more likely that free will should be

reinterpreted in terms of divine determinism or predestination in that 1QS 5 has recourse to the covenantal renewal at Moab in Deuteronomy 26. Given that 1QS 5:5 is a conflation of Deut 30:6 with 10:16 so that it can locate 1QS 5 within the Deuteronomic view of Israel's history in the Second Temple period, it stands to reason that the human choice in 1QS 5:10-13a serves to evidence his elect status. Likewise, the *Rule of the Community* appears to have shown the *Tendenz* of the *Hodayot* in dealing with the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity. In column 2 of the *Damascus Document*, the Watcher story is listed as one of the exemplars who walked in the stubbornness of their hearts. Meanwhile, in CD 2, human responsibility for committing sin is increasingly stressed. Such phrases "the plan of a guilty inclination," "the stubbornness of the heart," and "lascivious eyes" are used to make sense that the divine knowledge has not been delivered to the wicked within the scheme of divine determinism or predestination. These sectarian poetic and covenantal texts clearly show that, despite the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity, which hinge on the earthly origin of humanity, human responsibility for committing sin comes to the forefront.

When looking at first century Jewish (*4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*) and early Christian (Romans and James) literature in Chapter 5, it was observed that the authors of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* appear to have developed further pessimistic anthropologies distinct from those of Second Temple Judaism. However, for them, a possibility is open for the few righteous remnants to obey divine commandments. It becomes clear when the *angeli interpretes* of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* finally introduced an eschatological and apocalyptic solution to Ezra and Baruch's complaints of the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity: There will be the remnants at the *eschaton*. It can be said that their understandings of sin and human accountability appear to be synergistic. For Paul and James, both their pessimistic anthropology and the hermeneutics of their time appear to have hinged on Jesus Christ's propitiatory sacrifice and the resurrection from the dead in the courses of salvation history. In other words, the paradigm of the relationship between divine agency and human agency is shifted from synergism to monergism. Meanwhile, both the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity and the ontological impotence of the Mosaic Law are exacerbated to the extreme, with the result that the necessity of and effectiveness of divine intervention is more maximized than both in *4 Ezra* and in *2 Baruch*.

2. Sin and human accountability in Second Temple Judaism

This researcher has pointed to the fact that Sanders's (1977:114) contention that "[s]in comes only when man actually disobeys; if he were not to disobey he would not be a sinner" appears to be untenable. While Sanders attempts to highlight human passivity in relation to sin and human accountability in terms of his covenantal nomism, this study has demonstrated that there is the tension between human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability in the Second Temple period. While the author of the *BW* of *1 Enoch* seems to be opportune to contend that humanity is a mere victim of the Watcher and his offsprings, our study in the *BW* of *1 Enoch*, later Enochic traditions such as the *EE*, the *DV*, and *Jubilees* says otherwise. The Pendulum swung to the side of human passivity in relation to sin and human accountability in the *BW* appears to have begun to move on to the side of human activity in relation to sin and human accountability in later Enochic traditions and *Jubilees*, although human passivity is not still dismissed. The Watcher story in Qumran literature also points to the same direction: The Watcher and evil spirits are introduced as instigators of sin, not the source of sin. Both the Watcher and humanity are liable to commit sin. Our study on the term *yetzer ra* in Qumran literature demonstrates that, while free will and divine determinism cannot be easily resolved, the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity, the origin of which is earthly, comes to the forefront. That is to say, it is not opportune to contend that "if he were not to disobey he would not be a sinner" (*pace* Sanders 1977:114). Of course, that is not to say that we can find the doctrine of original sin in the sense of the Patristic and Reformed traditions in Second Temple Judaism: It is anachronistic. Even the authors of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* in the first century took hold of the fact that the few righteous could obey the Mosaic Law, albeit extremely difficult. However, it stands to reason that Second Temple Judaism can give a certain glimpse of in what sense and in what extent Paul the Apostle claimed that "What then? Are we better than they? Not at all: for I have already charged that both Jews and Greeks are all under sin..." in Rom 3:9. As our study on Romans and James clearly shows, the Jesus Christ event serves to transform the hermeneutics of time in the Second

Temple period. Both Paul and James appear to have reinterpreted history, creation, and covenant, which comprise of the *Weltanschauung* in the Second Temple period, in terms of the Jesus Christ event.

We return to the *Leitfrage* of this study: “How would Jewish authors of the Second Temple period answer the question as to whether one becomes a sinner because he/she sins or one sins because he/she is a sinner born with a sinful nature?” This study has demonstrated that, while Second Temple Jews’ uneasiness in relation to the presence of sin and evil continues to be heightened, their respective approaches to sin and human accountability are far from monotonous. Notwithstanding this, it was observed that Second Temple Jews, especially the Qumran Covenanters and the Post-70 CE Jews, began to realize the severity of the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity. Our discourse with Hultgren, Rosen-Zvi, and Sanders in *Introduction* also points to the same direction. Both Hultgren’s (2007) and Rosen-Zvi’s (2011) studies clearly show that the universality of sin over humanity *in toto* should not be easily dismissed as a rhetorical expression compared to the sublimity of God when one attempted to establish the pattern of religion of Second Temple Judaism (*pace* Sanders 1977). All in all, this study has demonstrated in what sense and to what extent Second Temple Jews could have dealt with their uneasiness in relation to the presence of sin and evil. Human passivity and human activity in relation to sin and human accountability cannot be easily resolved; the tension between free choice and divine determinism is still on the go. Meanwhile, our study on the term *yetzer ra* indicates that the lowliness and sinfulness of humanity are increasingly stressed both in the Second Temple period and even further in the first century (e.g., *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*).

Works consulted

1. Primary sources

- García Martínez, F & Tigchelaar, E 1997-1998. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: study edition*.
Leiden: Brill.
- Hammer, R 1986. *Sifre: a Tannaitic commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy*. New
Haven: Yale University Press. (YJS 24.)
- Philo. *De vita Mosis*. In Loeb Classical Library, 1935. Philo, vol 6, tr by F H Colson.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- ___ *De virtutibus*. In Loeb Classical Library, 1968. Philo, vol 8, tr by F H Colson.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

2. Secondary sources

- Abasciano, B J 2005. *Paul's use of the Old Testament in Romans 9:1-9: an intertextual
and theological exegesis*. London: T & T Clark. (LNTS 301.)
- Adams, S L 2008. *Wisdom in transition: act and consequence in Second Temple
instructions*. Leiden: Brill. (JSJSup 125.)
- ___ 2010. Rethinking the relationship between “4QInstruction” and “Ben Sira.” *RevQ*
24/4, 555-583.
- Albani, M 1999. Horoscopes in the Qumran Scrolls, in Flint, P W & VanderKam, J C
(eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls after fifty years: a comprehensive
assessment*, vol 2, 279-330, Leiden: Brill.
- Alexander, P S 1996. The redaction history of “Serekh ha-Yahad”: a proposal. *RevQ* 17,
437-456.
- Allegro, J M 1964. An astrological cryptic document from Qumran. *JSS* 9, 291-295.
- Anderson, G A 1995. Intentional and unintentional sin in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in

- Milgrom, J, Wright, D P, Freedman, D N & Hurvitz, A (eds), *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern ritual law, and literature in honor of Jacob Milgrom*, 49-64. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Anderson, H 1985. 4 Maccabees, in Charlesworth, J H (ed), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol 2, 531-564. New York: Doubleday.
- Argall, R A 1995. *Reflections on 1 Enoch and Sirach: a comparative literary and conceptual analysis of the themes of revelation, creation and judgment*. Atlanta: Scholars Press. (SBLEJL 8.)
- Bauckham, R 2001. Apocalypses, in Carson, D A, O'Brien, P T & Seifrid, M (eds), *Justification and variegated nomism: the complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, vol 1, 135-187, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. (WUNT 2 140.)
- ___ 2006. Tobit as a parable for the Exiles of Northern Israel, in Bredin, M (ed), *Studies in the book of Tobit: a multidisciplinary approach*, 140-164. London: T & T Clark.
- ___ 2008. *The Jewish world around the New Testament: collected essays 1*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. (WUNT 233.)
- Bautch, K C 2006. What becomes of the angels' "wives"?: a text-critical study of "1 Enoch" 19:2. *JBL* 125/4, 766-780.
- Beentjes, P C 1997. *The book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: a text edition of all extant Hebrew manuscripts and a synopsis of all parallel Hebrew Ben Sira texts*. Leiden: Brill. (VTSup 68.)
- Bedenbender, A 2000. *Der Gott der Welt tritt auf den Sinai: Entstehung, Entwicklung und Funktionsweise der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik*. Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum. (ANTZ 8.)
- Bell, R H 1994. *Provoked to jealousy*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. (WUNT 2 63.)
- Bellia, G 2008. An historico-anthropological reading of the work of Ben Sira, in Passaro, A & Bellia, G (eds), *The wisdom of Ben Sira: studies on tradition, redaction, and theology*, 49-77. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. (DCLS 1.)
- Bergsma, J S 2007. *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran: a history of interpretation*. Leiden: Brill. (VTSup 115.)
- Blenkinsopp, J 2011. *Creation, un-creation, re-creation: a discursive commentary on*

- Genesis 1-11*. London: T & T Clark International.
- Boccaccini, G 1991. *Middle Judaism*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- ___ 1998. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: the parting of the ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- ___ 2002. *Roots of rabbinic Judaism: an intellectual history from Ezekiel to Daniel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- ___ 2005. *Enoch and Qumran origins: new light on a forgotten connection*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Bockmuehl, M 1998. Redaction and ideology in the "Rule of the Community (1QS/4QS)." *RevQ* 18/4, 541-560.
- ___ 2001. 1QS and salvation at Qumran, in Carson, D A, O'Brien, P T & Seifrid, M A (eds), *Justification and variegated nomism: the complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, vol 1, 381-414. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. (WUNT 2 140.)
- Bogaert, P 1969. *Apocalypse de Baruch: Introduction, traduction du syriaque et commentaire*. Paris: Editions du Cerf.
- Brand, M T 2013. *Evil within and without: the source of sin and its nature as portrayed in Second Temple literature*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (JAJS 9.)
- Braulik, G 1994. *The theology of Deuteronomy: collected essays of Gerog Braulik*, tr by U Lindbald. Texas: BIBAL Press.
- Brin, G 2001. *The concept of time in the Bible & the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 39).
- Britt, B M 2004. *Rewriting Moses: the narrative eclipse of the text*. London: T & T Clark International. (JSOTSup 402.)
- Brooke, G J 2000. Body parts in *Barkhi Nafshi* and the qualifications for membership of the worshipping community, in Falk, D K, Florentino, M G & Schuller, E M (eds), *Sapiential, liturgical, and poetical texts from Qumran Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo, 1998: published in memory of Maurice Baillet*, 79-94. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 35.)
- Brown, D R 2015. *The god of this age: Satan in the churches and letters of the Apostle*

- Paul*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. (WUNT 409.)
- Carson, D A 2013. Sin's contemporary significance, in Morgan, C W (ed), *Fallen: a theology of sin*, 21-37. Wheaton: Crossway.
- Carter, T L 2004. *Paul and the power of sin: redefining 'beyond the pale.'* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (SNTSMS 115.)
- Charlesworth, J H 2006. *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: the Dead Sea scrolls and the Qumran Community*, vol 2. Waco: Baylor University Press.
- Chazon, E G 1991. *A liturgical document from Qumran and its implication: "Words of the Luminaries" (4QDibHam)*. PHD Thesis. Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- ___ 1997. The creation and fall of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in Frishman, J & van Rompay, L (eds), *The book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian interpretation: a collection of essays*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Collins, J 1978. Methodological issues in the study of 1 Enoch: reflections on the articles of PD Hanson and GW Nickelsburg, in Achtemeier, P (ed), *Society of Biblical Literature 1978 seminar papers*, 315-322. New Orleans: Scholars Press. (SBLSP 14.)
- ___ 1979. *Apocalypse: the morphology of a genre*. New Orleans: Scholars Press. (Semeia 14.)
- ___ 1982. The apocalyptic technique: setting and function in the Book of Watchers. *CBQ* 44/1, 91-111.
- ___ 1984. *The apocalyptic imagination: an introduction to the Jewish matrix of Christianity*. New York: Crossroad.
- ___ 1997a. *Jewish wisdom in the Hellenistic age*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- ___ 1997b. *Seers, Sibyls, and sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Leiden: Brill. (JSJSup 54.)
- ___ 1999. In the likeness of the Holy Ones: the creation of humankind in a wisdom text from Qumran, in Parry, D & Ulrich, E (eds), *The Provo international conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: technological innovations, new texts, and reformulated issues*, 609-618. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 30.)
- ___ 2002. *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Routledge.
- ___ 2003. The mysteries of God: creation and eschatology in 4QInstruction and the

- Wisdom of Solomon, in García Martínez, F (ed), *Wisdom and apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls in the biblical tradition*, 287-305. Leuven: Leuven University Press. (BETL 168.)
- ___ 2008. How distinctive was Enochic Judaism? *Meghillot 5-6*, 17-34.
- ___ 2012. Prayer and the meaning of ritual in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in Penner, J, Penner, K M & Wassen, C (eds), *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and related literature: essays in honor of Eileen Schuller on the occasion of her 65th birthday*, 69-85. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 98.)
- ___ 2014a. *Scriptures and sectarianism: essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. (WUNT 332.)
- ___ 2014b. *The Oxford handbook of Apocalyptic literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Craigie, P C 1976. *The book of Deuteronomy*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Crawford, S W 2005. Reading Deuteronomy in the Second Temple period, in De Troyer, K & Lange, A (eds), *Reading the Present in the Qumran library: the perception of the contemporary by means of Scriptural interpretations*, 127-140. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. (SBLSS 30.)
- ___ 2008. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple times*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Crowe, B D 2012. *The obedient son: Deuteronomy and Christology in the gospel of Matthew*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. (BZNW 188.)
- Davids, P H 1982. *The epistle of James*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Davidson, M J 1992. *Angels at Qumran: a comparative study of 1 Enoch 1-36, 72-108 and sectarian writings from Qumran*. Sheffield: JSOT Press. (JSPSup 11.)
- Davies, P R 1982. *The Damascus Covenant: an interpretation of the "Damascus Document"*. Sheffield: JSOT Press. (JSOTSup 25.)
- Dimant, D 1974. *"The fallen angels" in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic book related to them*. PhD. Thesis. Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- ___ 1978. 1 Enoch 6-11: a methodological perspective, Achtemeier, P (ed), *Society of Biblical Literature 1978 seminar papers*, 323-339. New Orleans: Scholars Press. (SBLSP 14.)

- Dunn, J D G 1988. *Romans 1-8*. Dallas: Word Books Publisher. (WBC 38a.)
- Edgar, D 2001. *Has God not chosen the poor?: the social setting of the Epistle of James*. London: T & T Clark. (LNTS 206.)
- Elgvin, T 1997. *An Analysis of 4QInstruction*. PHD Thesis. Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Eshel, E 2003. Apotropaic prayers in the Second Temple period, Chazon, E G, Clements, R & Pinnick, A (eds), *Liturgical perspective: prayer and poetry in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19-23 January, 2000*, 69-88. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 48.)
- Falk, D K 1999. Biblical adaptation in 4Q392 *Works of God* and 4Q393 *Communal Confession*, in Parry, D & Ulrich, E (eds), *The Provo international conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: technological innovations, new texts, and reformulated issues*, 126-146. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 30.)
- ___ 2007. Scriptural inspiration for penitential prayer in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in Boda, M J, Falk, D K & Werline, R A (eds), *Seeking the favour of God: the development of penitential prayer in Second Temple Judaism*, vol 2, 127-157. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. (SBLEJL 22.)
- Fitzmyer, J A 2003. *Tobit*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. (CEJL.)
- ___ 2004. *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran cave 1 (1Q20): a commentary*. 3rd ed. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico. (BibOr 18b.)
- Fletcher-Louis, C H T 2002. *All the glory of Adam: liturgical anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 42.)
- Fraade, S D 1991. *From tradition to commentary: Torah and its interpretation in the Midrash Sifre to Deuteronomy*. New York: SUNY Press. (SUNYJ 73.)
- Freedman, H & Simon, M 1983. *Midrash Rabbah: Genesis*. London: Soncino Press.
- Frey, J 1997. Different patterns of dualistic thought in the Qumran library: reflections on their background and history, in Baumgarten, J M, Bernstein, M J, Martínez, F G & Kampen, J (eds), *Legal texts and legal issues: proceedings of the second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran studies, Cambridge, 1995: published in honour of Joseph M.*

- Baumgarten*, 275-336. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 23.)
- ___ 2002. Flesh and spirit in the Palestinian Jewish sapiential tradition and in the Qumran texts: an inquiry into the background of Pauline usage, in Hempel, C, Lange, A & Lichtenberger, H (eds), *The wisdom texts from Qumran and the development of sapiential thought*, 367-404. Leuven: Leuven University Press. (BETL 159.)
- Frisch, A 2016. *The Danielic discourse on empire in Second Temple Literature*. Leiden: Brill. (JSJSup 176.)
- Frölich, I 2011. Healing with Psalms, in Penner, J, Penner, K & Wassen, C (eds), *Prayer and poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and related literature: essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the occasion of her 65th birthday*, 197-215. Leiden: Brill.
- ___ 2013. Evil in Second Temple texts, in Koskeniemi, E & Frölich, I (eds), *Evil and the devil*, 23-50. London: T & T Clark. (LNTS 481.)
- ___ 2015. The female body in Second Temple literature, in Xeravits, G G (ed), *Religion and female body in Ancient Judaism and its environments*, 109-127. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. (DCLS 28.)
- Gaca, K L 1999. Paul's uncommon declaration in Romans 1:18-32 and its problematic legacy for pagan and Christian relations. *HTR* 92/2, 165-198.
- García Martínez, F 1998. Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in Collins, J J (ed), *The encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: the origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*, vol 1, 162-192. New York: Continuum.
- ___ 2007a. *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran origins and apocalypticism*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 63.)
- ___ 2007b. *Qumranica Minora II: the thematic studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 64.)
- Gathercole, S J 2002. *Where is boasting? early Jewish soteriology and Paul's response in Romans 1-5*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Gilders, K 2009. The concept of covenant in Jubilees, in Boccaccini, G & Ibba, G (eds), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: the evidence of Jubilees*, 178-192. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Glassen, T F 1961. *Greek influence in Jewish eschatology: with special reference to the*

Apocalypses and Pseudepigraphs. London: SPCK.

- Goering, G S 2009. *Wisdom's root revealed: Ben Sira and the election of Israel*. Leiden: Brill. (SJSJ 139.)
- Goff, M J 2003. *The worldly and heavenly wisdom of 4QInstruction*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 50.)
- ___ 2007. *Discerning wisdom: the sapiential literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Leiden: Brill. (VTSup 116.)
- ___ 2013. *4QInstruction*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. (WLAW 2.)
- Haber, S 2008. "They shall purify themselves": essays on purity in early Judaism, ed by A. Reinhartz. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. (SBLEJL 24.)
- Hall, G H 2000. *Deuteronomy*. Joplin: College Press Publishing. (CPNIV.)
- Hartman, L 1979. *Asking for a meaning: a study of 1 Enoch 1-5*. Lund: Gleerup.
- Harrington, D J 1973. Interpreting Israel's history: the Testament of Moses as a Rewriting of Deut 31-34, in Nickelsburg, G (ed), *Studies on the Testament of Moses: seminar papers*, 59-68. Cambridge: Society of Biblical Literature.
- ___ 1996. *Wisdom texts from Qumran*. London: Routledge.
- Hays, R B 1989. *Echoes of Scripture in the letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Heger, P 2011. *Challenges to conventional opinions on Qumran and Enoch issues*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 100.)
- Hempel, C H 1998. *The laws of the Damascus Document: sources, tradition, and redaction*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 29.)
- Henderson, R 2014. *Second Temple songs of Zion: a literary and generic analysis of the Apostrophe to Zion (11QPS^a XXII 1-15), Tobit 13:9-18 and 1 Baruch 4:30-5:9*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. (DCLS 17.)
- Hoffmann, H 1999. *Das Gesetz in der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Hogan, K 2008. *Theologies in conflict in 4 Ezra: Wisdom, debate, and apocalyptic solution*. Leiden: Brill. (SJSJ 130.)
- Hogeterp, A L A 2009. *Expectations of the end: a comparative traditio-historical study of eschatological, apocalyptic and messianic ideas in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 83.)

- House, P R 1990. *The unity of the Twelve*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. (JSOTSup 77.)
- Hultgren, S 2007. *From the Damascus covenant to the covenant of the community: Literary, historical, and theological studies in the Dead Sea scrolls*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 66.)
- Hughes, J A 2006. *Scriptural allusions and exegesis in the Hodayot*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 59.)
- Hyatt, J P 1956. The view of man in the Qumran "Hodayot." *NTS* 2/4, 276-284.
- Isaac, E 1983. 1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch, in Charlesworth, J H (ed), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol 1, 5-89. New York: Doubleday.
- Joachimsen, K 2011. *Identities in transition: the pursuit of Isa. 52:13-53:12*. Leiden: Brill. (VTSup 142.)
- Johnson, M D 1985. Life of Adam and Eve, in Charlesworth, J H (ed), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol 2, 249-295. New York: Doubleday.
- Kaiser, O 1998. Der Mensch als Geschöpf Gottes: Aspekte der Anthropologie Ben Siras, in Egger-Wenzel, R & Krammer, I (Hrsg), *Der Einzelne und seine Gemeinschaft bei Ben Sira*, 1-22. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. (BZAW 270.)
- Kee, H C 1983. Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, in Charlesworth, J H (ed), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol 1, 775-828. New York: Doubleday.
- Kim, S Y 2002. *Paul and new perspective: Second thoughts on the origin of Paul's gospel*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. (WUNT 140.)
- Klawans, J 2000. *Impurity and sin in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Klijn, A F J 1983. 2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch, in Charlesworth, J H (ed), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol 1, 615-652. New York: Doubleday.
- Knibb, M A 1987. *The Qumran community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ___ 2000. Rule of the Community, in Schiffman, L H & VanderKam, J C (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol 2, 793-797. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kugel, J L 1998. *Traditions of the Bible: a guide to the Bible as it was at the start of the Common Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ___ 2012. *A walk through Jubilees: studies in the Book of Jubilees and the world of its*

- creation*. Leiden: Brill. (JSJSup 156.)
- Kuhn, H-W 1966. *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil. Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesu*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (SUNT 4.)
- Kvanvig, H S 1988. *The roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian background of the Enoch figure and of the Son of Man*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag. (WMANT 61.)
- ____ 2009. Enochic Judaism—a Judaism without the Torah and the Temple?, in Boccaccini, G & Ibba, G (eds), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: the evidence of Jubilees*, 163-177. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Laato, T 1995. *Paul and Judaism: an anthropological approach*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Lange, A & Weigold, M 2011. *Biblical quotations and allusions in Second Temple Jewish literature*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Lange, A 1995. *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 18.)
- ____ 1997. The Essene position on magic and divination, in Bernstein, M, García Martínez, F & Kampen, J (eds), *Legal texts and legal issues: proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*, 377-436. Leiden: Brill.
- ____ 2003. Considerations concerning the “spirit of impurity” in Zech 13:2, in Lichtenberger, D, Römheld, D & Lange, A (eds), *Die Dämonen: Die Dämonologie der israelitische-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt*, 254-268. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- ____ 2012. The textual history of the Book of Jeremiah in light of its allusions and implicit quotations in the Qumran *Hodayot*, in Penner, J, Penner, K & Wassen, C (eds), *Prayer and poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and related literature: essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the occasion of her 65th birthday*, 251-284. Leiden: Brill.
- Leene, H 2014. *Newness in Old Testament prophecy: an intertextual study*. Leiden: Brill. (OTS.)
- Levison, J R 1988. *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism from Sirach to 2 Baruch*. Sheffield:

JSOT Press. (JSPSup 1.)

- Licht, J 1956. The doctrine of the Thanksgiving Scroll. *IEJ* 6/1, 1-13.
- ___ 1961. Taxo, or the Apocalyptic doctrine of vengeance. *JJS* 12, 95-103.
- ___ 1965. *Megillat ha-Serakhim mi-Megillot Midbar Yehudah: Serekh ha-Yahad, Serekh ha-'Edah, Serekh ha-Berakhot*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute.
- Lichtenberger, H 1980. *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (SUNT 15.)
- Lierman, J 1976. *The New Testament Moses: Christian perceptions of Moses and Israel in the setting of Jewish religion*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. (WUNT 173.)
- Lincicum, D 2010. *Paul and the early Jewish encounter with Deuteronomy*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. (WUNT 2 284.)
- Linebaugh, J A 2010. Debating diagonal δικαιοσύνη: The epistle of Enoch and Paul in theological conversation. *Early Christianity* 1/1, 107-128.
- Loader, W 2007. *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees on sexuality: attitudes towards sexuality in the early Enochic literature, the Aramaic Levi document, and the Book of Jubilees*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Lockett, D R 2008. *Purity and worldview in the Epistle of James*. London: T & T Clark. (LNTS 366.)
- Longenecker, B W 1991. *Eschatology and the covenant: a comparison of 4 Ezra and Romans 1—11*. Sheffield: JSOT Press. (JSNTSup 57.)
- Lundbom, J R 2013. *Deuteronomy: a commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Machiela, D A 2009. *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: a new text and translation with introduction and special treatment of columns 13—17*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 79.)
- Mack, B 1985. *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira's hymn and praise of the fathers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Magness, J 2002. *The archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Marböck, J 1999. *Weisheit im Wandel*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. (BZAW 272.)
- Marcus, J 1986. The evil inclination in the letters of Paul. *IBS* 8, 8-21.
- Marx, A 1967. Y a-t-il une prédestination à Qumran? *RevQ* 6/2, 163-181.

- Maston, J 2010. *Divine and human agency in Second Temple Judaism and Paul: a comparative study*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. (WUNT 2 297.)
- Mayes, A D H 1981. *Deuteronomy*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. (NCBC.)
- McFarland, I A 2010. *In Adam's fall: a meditation on the Christian doctrine of original sin*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell (CCT.)
- McKnight, S 2011. *The letter of James*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. (NICNT.)
- McLay, R T 2006. Biblical texts and the Scriptures for the New Testament Church, in Porter, S (ed), *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, 38-58. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Mermelstein, A 2014. *Creation, covenant, and the beginnings of Judaism: reconceiving historical time in the Second Temple period*. Leiden: Brill. (JSJSup 168.)
- Merrill, E H 1975. *Qumran and predestination: a theological study of the thanksgiving hymns*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 8.)
- Mesto, S 1997. *The textual development of the Qumran Community Rule*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 21.)
- Metzger, B M 1983. The Fourth Book of Ezra, in Charlesworth, J H (ed), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol 1, 517-559. New York: Doubleday.
- Milik, J T 1976. *The books of Enoch: Aramaic fragments of Qumran Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Moo, D 1987. Paul and the law in the last ten years. *SJT* 40/2, 287-307.
- ___ 1996. *The epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. (NICNT.)
- Moore, C A 1996. *Tobit: a new translation with introduction and commentary*. New York: Doubleday. (AYBC 40.)
- Morawe, G 1963. Vergleich des Aufbaus der Danklieder und hymnischen Bekenntnislieder (1QH) von Qumran mit dem Aufbau der Psalmen im Alten Testament und im Spätjudentum. *RevQ* 4/3, 323-356.
- Morland, K A 1995. *The rhetoric of curse in Galatians: Paul confronts another Gospel*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Mulder, O 2003. *Simon the High Priest in Sirach 50: an exegetical study of the significance of Simon the High Priest as climax to the Praise of the Fathers in Ben Sira's concept of the history of Israel*. Leiden: Brill. (JSJSup 78.)

- Namgung, Y 2016. *The vexata quaestio of Paul's quotations in the epistolary framework of Romans 1—11*. PHD Thesis. University of Pretoria.
- Nelson, R D 2004. *Deuteronomy: a commentary*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Newsom, C A 1980. The development of 1 Enoch 6-19: cosmology and judgment. *CBQ* 42/3, 310-329.
- ___ 2004. *The self as symbolic space: constructing identity and community at Qumran*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 52.)
- Newton, M 1985. *The concept of purity at Qumran and in the letters of Paul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (SNTSMS 53.)
- Nickelsburg, G W E 1977. Apocalyptic and myth in 1 Enoch 6-11. *JBL* 96/3, 383-405.
- ___ 2001. *1 Enoch: a commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, chapters 1-36, 81-108*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press. (Hermeneia.)
- ___ 2011a. The we and the other in the worldview of *1 Enoch*, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and other early Jewish texts, in Harlow, D C, Hogan, K M, Goff, M & Kaminsky, J S (eds), *The "other" in Second Temple Judaism*, 262-278. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- ___ 2011b. *Jewish literature between the Bible and Mishnah*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Nickelsburg, G W E & VanderKam, J C 2012. *1 Enoch: the Hermeneia translation*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Nwachukwu, M S C 2002. *Creation-covenant scheme and justification by faith: A canonical study of the God-human drama in the Pentateuch and the letter to the Romans*. Roma: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana. (TG 89.)
- Olson, D C 2013. *A new reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*. Leiden: Brill. (SVTP 24.)
- Peters, D M 2008. *Noah traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls: conversations and controversies of Antiquity*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. (SBLEJL 26.)
- Popović, M 2007. *Reading the human body: physiognomics and astrology in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Hellenistic-early Roman period Judaism*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 67.)

- Priest, J 1983. Testament of Moses, in Charlesworth, J H (ed), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol 1, 919-934. New York: Doubleday.
- Reed, A Y 2005. *Fallen angels and the history of Judaism and Christianity: the reception of Enochic literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Regev, E 2014. Sin, atonement, and Israelite identity in the Words of the Luminaries in relation to 1 Enoch's Animal Apocalypse. *HUCA* 84, 1-23.
- Rendtorff, R 1998. The covenant formula: an exegetical and theological investigation. Edinburgh: T & T Clark. (OTS.)
- Rey, J-S 2009. *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatology*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 81.)
- Robinson, S E 1983. Testament of Adam, in Charlesworth, J H (ed), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol 1, 989-995. New York: Doubleday.
- Rosen-Zvi, I 2011. *Demonic desires: yetzer hara and the problem of evil in late antiquity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Rosner, B S 2007. *Greed as idolatry: the origin and meaning of a Pauline metaphor*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Sacchi, P 1990. *Jewish apocalyptic and its history*, tr by W J Sort. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. (JSPSup 20.)
- Sanders, E P 1977. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: a comparison of patterns of religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- ___ 1983. *Paul, the law, and the Jewish people*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Schnabel, E J 2011. *Law and wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul*. Oregon: Wipf & Stock.
- Schreiner, T R 1998. *Romans*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic. (BECNT 6.)
- Schuller, E M 1994. The Cave 4 Hodayot manuscripts: a preliminary description. *JQR* 85, 137-150.
- Scott, J M 2005. *On earth as in heaven: the restoration of sacred time and sacred space in the Book of Jubilees*. Leiden: Brill. (JSJSup 91.)
- Seely, D R 1996. The "circumcised heart" in 4Q424 "Barki Nafshi." *RevQ* 17, 527-535.
- ___ 1999. 4Q437: a first look at an unpublished *Barki Nafshi* text, in Parry, D W & Ulrich, E (eds), *The Provo international conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: technological innovations, new texts, and reformulated issues*, 147-160. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 30.)
- Segal, M 2007. *The book of Jubilees: rewritten bible, redaction, ideology and theology*.

- Leiden: Brill. (JSJSup 117.)
- Sheppard, G T 1980. *Wisdom as a hermeneutical construct: a study in the sapientializing of the Old Testament*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. (BZAW 151.)
- Sinnott, A M 2005. *The personification of Wisdom*. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Skehan, P W & Di Lella, A A 1987. *The wisdom of Ben Sira: a new translation with notes*. New York: Doubleday.
- Sprinkle, P M 2013. *Paul & Judaism revisited: a study of divine and human agency in salvation*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic Press.
- Studel, A 2000. God and Belial, in Schiffman, L H, Tov, E & VanderKam, J C (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: fifty years after their discovery 1947-1997; proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*, 332-340. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
- Stökl Ben Ezra, D 2003. *The impact of Yom Kippur on early Christianity: The day of atonement from Second Temple Judaism to the fifth century*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. (WUNT 163.)
- Stone, M E 1990. *Fourth Ezra: a commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*, ed by F M Cross. Minneapolis: Fortress Press. (Hermeneia.)
- Stone, M E & Henze, M 2013. *4 Ezra and 2 Baruch*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Strack, H L & Billerbeck, P 1961. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch: Die Briefe des Neuen Testaments und die Offenbarung Johannis*, vol 3. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Stuckenbruck, L T 2004. 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 Auffarth, A & Stuckenbruck, L T (eds), *The fall of the angels*, 87-118. Leiden: Brill. (TBN 6.)
- ___ 2007. *1 Enoch 91-108: commentaries on early Jewish literature*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- ___ 2011. "Protect them from the evil one" (John 17:15): light from the Dead Sea Scrolls, in Coloe, M L & Thatcher, T (eds), *John, Qumran, and the Dead Sea Scrolls: sixty years of discovery and debate*, 139-160. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. (SBLEJL 32.)
- ___ 2014. *The myth of rebellious Angels: studies in Second Temple Judaism and New*

- Testament Texts*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. (WUNT 335.)
- Swinburne, R 1998. *Providence and the problem of evil*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Thiessen, M 2004. The form and function of the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32:1-43). *JBL* 123/3, 401-424.
- Thomas, S I 2009. *The “mysteries” of Qumran: mystery, secrecy, and esotericism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. (SBLEJL 25.)
- Tigay, J 1996. *Deuteronomy: the traditional Hebrew text with the New JPS translation*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society. (JPSTC.)
- Tigchelaar, E 1996. *Prophets of Old and the day of the end: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers, and Apocalyptic*. Leiden: Brill. (OTS 35.)
- ___ 2001. *To increase learning for the understanding ones: reading and reconstructing the fragmentary early Jewish sapiential text, 4QInstruction*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 44.)
- ___ 2008a. Balaam and Enoch, in van Kooten, G H & van Ruiten, J (eds), *The prestige of the pagan prophet Balaam in Judaism, Early Christianity and Islam*, 87-99. Leiden: Brill. (TBN 11.)
- ___ 2008b. The evil inclination in the Dead Sea Scrolls, with a re-edition of 4Q468I (4QSectorian text?). *Empsychoi Logoi* 73, 347-358.
- Tov, E 1992. *Textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Tromp, J 1993. *The Assumption of Moses: a critical edition with commentary*. Leiden: Brill. (SVTP 10.)
- Uusimäki, E 2016. *Turning Proverbs towards Torah: an analysis of 4Q525*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 117.)
- VanderKam, J C 1995. *Enoch: a man for all generation*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press. (SPOT.)
- ___ 1996. 1 Enoch, Enochic motifs, and Enoch in early Christian literature, in VanderKam, J C & Adler, W A (eds), *The Jewish Apocalyptic heritage in early Christianity*, 33-101. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- ___ 1999. The angel story in the Book of Jubilees, in Chazon, E, Stone, M & Pinnick, A (eds), *Pseudepigraphic perspective: the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls; Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead*

- Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 31.)
- ___ 2002. *From revelation to canon: studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple literature*. Leiden: Brill.
- ___ 2005. Review of M. Goff, the worldly and heavenly wisdom of 4QInstruction. *CBQ* 67, 117-118.
- VanLandingham, C 2006. *Judgment and justification in early Judaism and the Apostle Paul*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.
- van Ruiten, J 1997. The interpretation of Genesis 6:1-12 in Jubilees 5:1-19, in Albani, M, Frey, J & Lange, A (eds), *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, 59-75. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. (WUNT 65.)
- Venter, P M 2004. Reviewing history in apocalyptic literature as ideological strategy. *HTS* 60/3, 703-723.
- Vermes, G 1997. *The complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Wacholder, B Z 2007. *The new Damascus Document: the midrash on the eschatological Torah of the Dead Sea Scrolls: reconstruction, translation and commentary*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 56.)
- Wall, R W 1997. *Community of the wise: the letter of James*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International. (NTC.)
- Waters, G P 2006. *The end of Deuteronomy in the epistle of Paul*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. (WUNT 2 221.)
- Watson, F 2004. *Paul and the hermeneutics of faith*. London: T&T Clark International
- Weitzman, S 1994. Lessons from the Dying: the role of Deuteronomy 32 in its narrative setting. *HTR* 87/4, 377-393.
- ___ 1997. *Song and story in Biblical narrative: the history of a literary convention in ancient Israel*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Wells, K 2014. *Grace and agency in Paul and Second Temple Judaism: interpreting the transformation of the heart*. Leiden: Brill. (NTSup 157.)
- Werrett, I 2007. *Ritual purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Leiden: Brill. (STDJ 72.)
- Wintermute, O S 1985. Jubilees, in Charlesworth, J H (ed), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol 2, 35-142. New York: Doubleday.
- Wright, A T 2005. *The origin of evil spirits: the reception of Genesis 6:1-4 in early Jewish literature*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. (WUNT 2 198.)

- ___ 2016. The demonology of 1 Enoch and the New Testament Gospels, in Stuckenbruck, L T & Boccaccini, G (eds), *Enoch and the Synoptic Gospels: reminiscences, allusions, intertextuality*, 215-243. Atlanta: SBL Press. (SBLEJL 44.)
- Wright, G E 1962. The lawsuit of God: a form-critical study of Deuteronomy 32, in Anderson, B W & Harrelson, W (eds), *Israel's prophetic heritage: essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, 26-67. London: SCM Press.
- Wright, R B 1985. Psalms of Solomon, in Charlesworth, J H (ed), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol 2, 639-670. New York: Doubleday.
- Xeravits, G G (ed) 2010. *Dualism in Qumran*. London: T & T Clark International. (LSTS 76.)