WHEN GIANTS DREAMED ABOUT THE FLOOD

THE BOOK OF GIANTS AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE BOOK OF WATCHERS

I. INTRODUCTION

Frank Moore Cross, in his famous article on the scripts of the Dead Sea Scrolls, devotes significant attention to an Aramaic text that is “provisionally designated pseudo-Enoch.” This manuscript is now classified as 4Q530 and considered part of the Book of Giants. In his 1961 study, Cross understood this manuscript as having some sort of connection to the figure of Enoch and Enochic literature, but he did not press the matter further. A lack of clarification regarding the relationship between 1 Enoch and the Book of Giants still persists, as is evident in the official title of the Giants manuscripts – “EnochGiants”. While the past generation has witnessed dramatic growth of scholarly interest in the books that comprise 1 Enoch, the Book of Giants is given much less attention, although its official edition is now available. In this article I address how this intriguing

1. I thank Elizabeth Scott and Kyle Roark, whose valuable comments improved this essay.
4. The main manuscripts of the composition are generally considered to be 1Q23, 1Q24, 2Q26, 4Q203, 4Q530, 4Q531, 4Q532, 4Q533, 4Q206a 2-3 and 6Q8. These texts are available in S.J. PFANN, Cryptic Texts / P. ALEXANDER, et al., in consultation with J. VANDERKAM – M. BRADY, Miscellanea. Part 1: Qumran Cave 4 XXVI (DJD, 36), Oxford, Clarendon, 2000, pp. 8-94; PUECH, DJD, 31 (n. 2), pp. 9-115 (the relevant fragments in these volumes are edited, respectively, by Stuckenbruck and Puech). Many of these texts were available earlier in J.T. MILIK, The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4, Oxford, Clarendon, 1976, pp. 298-339.
composition should be understood vis-à-vis the books of 1 Enoch, in particular the Book of Watchers. I shall argue that Giants, while clearly reliant on this text, reflects creativity that often makes it quite different from Watchers. Milik argued that Giants should be considered, like Watchers, a pseudepigraphon attributed to Enoch. I will argue that Giants is not pseudepigraphic, since there is no evidence that it is attributed to a venerable figure from the past. I will also assess the viability of the classification “parabiblical” for the Book of Giants. While neither category is ideally suited for Giants, it can be heuristically useful to classify the composition as parabiblical and the work can be profitably related to pseudepigraphic literature since the text draws upon writings attributed to Enoch.

II. THE BOOK OF GIANTS – SOME BASIC ISSUES

The Book of Giants manuscripts are the fragmentary remains of an Aramaic narrative about the offspring of angels who descended to earth and slept with women. Much of the story is lost. There is no agreement on the basic narrative structure of the work. Several aspects of the Book of Giants, however, are clear. One, the text focuses on several named giants, including Ohyah, Hahyah, Mahaway, Gilgamesh and Hobabish. These individuals are part of a larger community, the most common term for which is גברים. Numerous Early Jewish texts attest named angels but the Book of Giants is exceptional in ancient Judaism for its named giants. Two, the text draws from ancient Near Eastern tradition, as indicated by Qumrān, in RHRP 83 (2003) 41-59 (esp. pp. 44-57); S. UHLIG, Das äthiopische Henochbuch (JSHRZ, 5), Gütersloh, Mohn, 1984, pp. 755-760.


6. This involves sequencing the fragmentary manuscripts of the composition, an issue about which several scholars disagree. See L.T. STUCKENBRUCK, The Sequencing of Fragments Belonging to the Qumran Book of Giants: An Inquiry into the Structure and Purpose of an Early Jewish Composition, in JSP 16 (1997) 3-24. Note also GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, Qumran and Apocalyptic (n. 4), pp. 110-113.

7. Why this word is translated as “giant” is a larger issue that is beyond the purview of this essay, but it is related to the fact that the key term ב_products of Gen 6,1-4 corresponds in the Septuagint to γίγαντες. See further M.J. GOFF, When Giants Walked the Earth, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, forthcoming.
the name Gilgamesh. Three, the composition utilizes and refashions the myth of the descent of the angels found in the Book of Watchers. Four, Enoch himself plays an important role in the Book of Giants, also showing direct reliance upon Enochic tradition. Five, later texts attest traditions found in the Book of Giants, as Milik discerned – the Manichaean Book of Giants (late third century CE) and the late rabbinic compilation The Midrash of Shemḥazai and 'Azael.

III. The Book of Giants and 1 Enoch: A Muddled Relationship

In one of the first references to the Qumran Enochic texts, Milik provided in 1956 a citation from this corpus: "(Let it be known to you")\(^\text{10}\). This is from 4Q203 8 6, a text now identified as from the Book of Giants, not Watchers or any other book of 1 Enoch. Similarly, none of the non-Cave 4 Giants manuscripts, all of which were published by 1962, show any awareness by their editors that they are part of a Book of Giants\(^\text{11}\).

Milik eventually established that the scrolls include a composition which he entitled the Book of Giants that is separate from the texts that

8. The name Hobabish is widely suspected to be a form of Humbaba, the powerful monster slain by Gilgamesh and Enkidu in the famous Mesopotamian epic. See M.J. Goff, Gilgamesh the Giant: The Qumran Book of Giants’ Appropriation of Gilgamesh Motifs, in DSD 16 (2009) 221-253.


11. 1Q23 and 1Q24 appear in D. Barthélemy – J.T. Milik, Qumran Cave I (DJD, 1), Oxford, Clarendon, 1955, pp. 97-99. The texts are described as “deux apocryphes en araméen”. It is suggested (p. 99) that 1Q23 may be from the book of Enoch. 2Q26 and 6Q8 were both first published in DJD, 3. See M. Baillet – J.T. Milik – R. de Vaux, Les ‘petites grottes’ de Qumran (DJD, 3), Oxford, Clarendon, 1962, pp. 90-91, 116-119. 2Q26 is entitled “Fragment de Rituel (?)” and 6Q8 is listed as “un apocryphe de la Genèse”. All of these texts are re-published by L.T. Stuckenbruck in DJD, 36 (n. 4), pp. 49-94.
now comprise 1 Enoch. He does not say so directly, but this realization was presumably based upon the affinities between the Qumran Book of Giants and the Manichaean Book of Giants. But Milik refused to separate the Qumran Giants book fully from 1 Enoch. He argued that Giants was originally the second book of an Enochic Pentateuch that was later replaced by the Similitudes of Enoch (1 Enoch 37–71). He suggested that Christians eventually removed this text from 1 Enoch because of its esteemed reputation among the Manichaeans. This thesis relies upon the claims that Similitudes is a Christian composition from the third century CE and that 1 Enoch should be envisioned as a pentateuch, consciously modeled after the Mosaic Torah. Both of these opinions have been evaluated and widely rejected by subsequent scholarship.

Milik also based his argument on codiological evidence. He argued that 4Q203, a text of Giants, and 4Q204, part of the 4QEnoch corpus, were originally part of the same manuscript. Stuckenbruck has reasonably critiqued this view, while granting that they have the same scribal hand, pointing to material differences between the two manuscripts.

12. There is clearly some sort of connection between the two compositions. Several names of giants appear in both works and they share several of the same narrative features. For example, an Uighur manuscript of this text describes a figure traveling to meet Enoch, who refers to the traveller as “son of Virōgdād” (frag. B). See Henning, The Book of Giants (n. 9), p. 65. The Middle Persian name means “gift of lightning” is thus similar to the name of Baraqel (“lightning of God”). The figure who journeys to Enoch in the Manichaean text can thus be identified as Mahaway, the son of Baraqʾel, as in the Qumran Book of Giants (6Q84 1–4). See further Appendix I, in Goff, When Giants Walked the Earth (n. 7); Milik, The Books of Enoch (n. 4), pp. 309–10. Consult also Reeves, Jewish Lore (n. 4), p. 31; Stuckenbruck, The Book of Giants (n. 4), pp. 1–2.


17. He observes, for example, that 4Q204 often marks a new section with indentation or a vacat, whereas 4Q203 tends to have entire lines blank. Also, 4Q204 has ruling for lines but none is evident in 4Q203. See Stuckenbruck, DJD, 36 (n. 4), pp. 9–10; Id., The Book of Giants (n. 4), p. 67. Tigchelaar favors the view that 4Q203 and 4Q204 were written by the same scribe while arguing that this does not confirm Milik’s hypothesis of an Enochic Pentateuch or that Giants and Watchers were ever part of the same composition. See E.J.C. Tigchelaar, Notes on Fragments of 4Q206/206a, 4Q203-204, and Two Unpublished Fragments (4Q59?), in Meghillot 5-6 (FS Devorah Dimant) (2008) *187-*199, esp. p. 197.
IV. THE BOOK OF GIANTS: AN ENOCHIC PSEUDEPIGRAPHON?

Milik claimed that the Book of Giants is a pseudepigraphon ascribed to Enoch. Key for his opinion are fragments he classified as 4QEnoch 2 and 3 i-ii (4Q206). He not only understood these fragments as part of his book of Enoch (hence the classification 4QEnoch). He made the striking assertion that they attest the beginning of the Book of Giants. His enumeration of the fragments as 4QEnoch 2 and 3 reflects the view that they come between Watchers and the Dream Visions (1 Enoch 83–90), and thus belong to the second booklet of 1 Enoch. The last column of 4QEnoch 1 (xxvii) is from the end of Watchers (1 En. 32, 3.6; 33, 3–34, 1) and 4QEnoch 4 i attests a version of 1 En. 88,3–89,6. There is no evidence, however, that the four texts in question in fact come from the same manuscript. Milik’s 4Q206 2 and 3 i-ii are now classified by Puech, respectively, as 4Q206a 2 and 1 i-ii to distinguish them from the Aramaic Enoch corpus.

Milik argued that the two fragments under discussion preserve the beginning of the Book of Giants. Line 2 of fragment 2 mentions Enoch and fragment 1 i 6 the shedding of blood, presumably a reference to the giants’ misdeeds on earth. Milik transcribed in 4Q206a 2 2 הָעָזָי, reconstructing “the vision … was sh]own to Enoch.” The “vision” that Milik had in mind was presumably the Book of Giants itself. He supports his view that these fragments are from the beginning of the work by transcribing רֶבֶן אֱיִּהְיָה (“Behold, the Great One”) in 4Q206a 2 3, which is similar to the expression נִסָּר הַדָּוָה (“The Great Holy One comes forth”) of 4QEnoch 1 i 5 (1 En. 1, 3).

20. MILIK, The Books of Enoch (n. 4), p. 58, in a thesis that strains credulity, argued that his Enochic Pentateuch circulated in two volumes, one with four Enochic documents (Watchers, Giants, Dreams, and the Epistle of Enoch) and that the Astronomical Book was treated separately.
24. Milik’s reconstruction may have been influenced by the clearly attested word הָעָזָי in 4QEnoch 1 xxvii 21 (the last line of the Book of Watchers in this manuscript, followed, in his view, by the Book of Giants).
Milik’s views on 4Q206a have not fared well. The material evidence of 4Q206a 2-3 is not clearly legible and alternative readings have been offered which do not accord with 1 En. 1,3. Most commentators agree that the extant letters of the key verb are אַת but understand the line quite differently from Milik. Reeves, following Beyer, transcribes אֵיתן, “was revealed” (an option that Milik granted is possible) and understands it not as conveying Enochic authorship but rather that the misdeeds of the watchers and giants were revealed to the patriarch. Both scholars understand the fragment as from an early portion of Giants but not necessarily its beginning. Stuckenbruck reads the line, like Reeves, as asserting that antediluvian misdeeds on earth were related to Enoch, but instead transcribes הָלַךְ וּאַתָּחְנֹךְ, “it was reported to Enoch.” Puech hypothetically suggests reading אַתָּחְנֹךְ (“j’ai vu”), arguing that 4Q206a 2-2, not unlike 4QS30 2 ii 14-16, conveys that the visions disclosed to the brothers were relayed to Enoch so that he could interpret them. While 4Q206a 1-2 are too fragmentary to assess conclusively their content or where they fit into the narrative sequence of Giants, it is fair to say that Milik’s understanding of the fragments should not be endorsed. Since Giants is not clearly attributed to a venerable and authoritative figure of the past, there is no reason to classify it as a pseudepigraphon, in the strict understanding of the term as denoting texts attributed to authors who did not in fact write them.

V. The Book of Watchers and the Book of Giants: A Common Narrative Thread

It is not difficult to see why Milik argued that Giants was once part of 1 Enoch. The work displays numerous affinities with the texts that

25. Instead of Milik’s אַתָּחְנֹךְ אַתָּחְנֹךְ, Beyer, ATTM (n. 4), p. 1.260, transcribes אַתָּחְנֹךְ אַתָּחְנֹךְ. Most commentators have favored variants of Beyer’s suggestion over that of Milik. See Puech, DJD, 31 (n. 2), p. 112; Reeves, Jewish Lore (n. 4), p. 57. Stuckenbruck follows Milik’s transcription of the text at hand but does not agree that 4Q206a 1-2 are from the beginning of the composition. See Stuckenbruck, DJD, 36 (n. 4), p. 44; Id., The Book of Giants (n. 4), pp. 191-192.

26. For him this implies that Enoch was not on earth but heaven at the time. See Reeves, Jewish Lore (n. 4), p. 76 (classifying the fragment as “QG2”); Beyer, ATTM (n. 4), p. 1.260 (understanding the fragment as “G2”).

27. Stuckenbruck, DJD, 36 (n. 4), pp. 44-45; Id., The Book of Giants (n. 4), pp. 192-193; Puech, DJD, 31 (n. 2), p. 112. dismisses Stuckenbruck’s view that the key letter is a waw, suggesting that it is a zayin, shin or het.

28. Puech, DJD, 31 (n. 2), p. 112. The putative first speaker would then be one of the two brothers. Since the only direct interaction in the composition between Enoch and a giant involves Mahaway, it might be better to posit that the first person speaker is this giant.

comprise this composite text, especially the *Book of Watchers*. There is general agreement that *Giants* draws upon the core myth of *Watchers*. This is clear, for example, from 4Q531 1, which may be from the beginning section of the composition. Line 5 includes the brief statement “it was not enough for them”, using the verb פָּק (Peal; cf. 4Q532 1 ii + 2 10). The same root (Aphel) is used in 4QEn a 1 iii 18 (*1 En. 7,3*; cf. 4QEnb 1 i 2 22) to describe the insatiable appetite of the giants, who consume the toil of humankind. 4Q531 1 5 alludes to the same element of the *Watchers* story, since l. 6 refers to the giants’ desire to eat.

4Q531 1 also mentions the birth of the giants. The text begins with a reference to creatures defiling themselves, presumably the watchers (l. 1; 4QEn a 1 iii 14). Line 3 asserts that they “begat”, a reference to their siring of their sons the giants, who are mentioned in l. 2 (cf. 4Q203 7b i 3). This is confirmed by the fact that other texts of *Giants* present the protagonists of the narrative as the sons of the watchers. The giant Mahaway states that his father is named Baraqel (6Q8 1 4). According to *1 En. 6,7*, Baraqel is one of the watchers under the leadership of Shemihazah (4QEn b 1 iii 8).

It has been reasonably reconstructed in 4Q530 2 ii 5 that ʾOhyah and Hahyah are the sons of Shemihazah, although no text of *Giants* asserts this explicitly. The *Midrash of Shemhazai and ʿAzazel* claims that the angel Shemhazai fathers two sons, Heyya (הייא) and ʿAheyya (אהייא). These two giants correspond to Hahyah (ההיה) and Ohyah (אוהיה) of *Giants*, whom the composition presents as brothers.


31. STUCKENBRUCK, *The Book of Giants* (n. 4), p. 151. MILIK, *The Books of Enoch* (n. 4), p. 308, also argued that this text is from the beginning of the scroll, while insisting that 4Q206 2 constitutes the opening of the composition, as discussed above.


34. Affinity is also evident between the visions of the brothers in both texts. In the midrashic text one of the brothers (it does not say which) dreams of a garden that is destroyed except for a tree with three branches. One can presume that the dreamer is Heyya, since Hahyah has a similar dream in 4Q530 2 ii 6-13 (see below). The other brother in the rabbinic work (ʿAheyya) has a vision of a flat stone which is effaced, except for one line of writing. This is similar to 2Q26, which mentions a tablet that is washed and erased. A variant of the tradition regarding the names of these giants appears to be preserved in the Babylonian Talmud, since *b. Nid. 61a* presents Ahijah (אחיה) as the son of Shemihazah. The tradition that Shemihazah is the father of two brothers is also attested in
The Book of Giants contains no vivid or extensive depiction of the violence inflicted by the giants, a core aspect of the antediluvian narrative in Watchers. Giants, however, alludes to this motif several times. 1Q23 9 + 14 + 15 4 reads: “they killed many.” 4Q530 1 i 4 refers to an accusation made against murderers, presumably pronounced by their victims’ souls, which remain in the blood spilled upon the earth, as in Watchers (cf. 1 En. 8.4–9.2; 4Q531 7 4; 4Q531 10 2). 4Q532 1 ii + 2 9 claims “great damage they inflicted (חֶבַל וָחָלָל) on [the] earth”.

The antecedent of the verb has not survived but is most likely the giants. This interpretation is supported by 4Q203 8, in which a tablet written by Enoch chastises the giants for their crimes (more on this fragment below). This text also mentions the activity of the sons (l. 10) and then, using the same root as the 4Q532 text, asserts: “the destruction (חֶבַל) which you have commited (חֶבַל אַהֲר) on it [the earth]” (l. 11). 4Q533 4 alludes to bloodshed and lies, both presumably carried out by the giants (l. 2). Line 3 mentions a flood upon the earth, suggesting that l. 2 describes antediluvian crimes. 4Q531 7 6 is reasonably reconstructed as comparing spilled blood to great rivers. Lines 4-5 are addressed to someone who has killed people with a sword. The Animal Apocalypse alludes to the giants carrying out their violence with a sword, suggesting that 4Q531 7 is oriented to an unnamed giant who used a sword to commit murder.

While the ultimate fate of the giants is never recounted in the extant texts of the Book of Giants, they make assertions on this topic that resonate with Watchers. In the latter composition the watchers are thrown into a valley in which they are kept for seventy generations to await their destruction at the final judgment (1 En. 10.11-13; cf. 4Q203 7b i 5). The giants, by contrast, have their physical bodies obliterated but their spirits

35. Line 5 supports this reading of 1Q23 9 + 14 + 15, since it includes the phrase “one hundred giants”.

36. Both texts use הָלַק to describe the accusation that is made against the giants and watchers (Giants: 4Q203 8 10; 4Q530 1 4; cf. 4Q531 34 1; Watchers: 4QEnn 1 iv 11; 4QEnn 1 iii 11; 4QEnn 1 xxii 4).


38. Jubilees similarly portrays Enoch as in Eden “writing condemnation and judgment of the world” (4.23).

39. STUCKENBRUCK, The Book of Giants (n. 4), p. 190, classifies this fragment as 4Q556 6. See also REEVES, Jewish Lore (n. 4), pp. 80-81.

40. Cf. 4Q531 28 1; 4Q531 32 2; 4Q206 3 (= 4Q206a 1) i 3. 4Q531 19 1 mentions violence (חֶבַל) upon the earth.

41. In both the Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 88.2) and Jubilees (5.9) the giants murder each other with swords. See STUCKENBRUCK, The Book of Giants (n. 4), p. 148; GOFF, Monstrous Appetites (n. 32), pp. 28-29.
live on, to pester and harass humankind (15,8-12; cf. 10,9)\textsuperscript{42}. This tradition is attested elsewhere in Early Judaism, as evident in the phrase “the spirits of the bastards”, which denotes demonic forces, a caustic reference to the illicit marriages of the giants’ parents (4Q510 1 5; 4Q444 1-4 i + 5 8)\textsuperscript{43}. The Book of Giants is compatible with this tradition since it emphasizes the destruction of the giants’ bodies. 4Q531 19, after mentioning much violence (חמס) upon the earth, reads: “we are nei[ther] bones nor flesh … [f]lesh and we will be blotted out from our form” (ll. 3-4)\textsuperscript{44}.

One of the most important connections between Giants and Watchers is the figure of Enoch himself. Both texts present him as a legendary scribe. Giants hails the patriarch as a “scribe of interpretation” ( ספר הפרשא; 4Q203 8 4; 4Q530 2 ii 14). Watchers extols Enoch in a similar way, as a “scribe of truth” (γραμματεὺς τῆς ἀληθείας; ṣaḥāfi/ṣedq; 1 En. 15,1; cf. 12,4)\textsuperscript{45}. He is a central figure in Watchers, as is well-known. He is also important in the best preserved narrative sequence of Giants, which centers around the giants’ reactions to the visions given to the brothers ʾOhyah and Hahyah. Mahaway is commissioned by the other giants to journey to Enoch, so that he can interpret these visions (ll. 22-23). Mahaway returns to the giants with two tablets which he received from the antediluvian sage. The giants and their fathers are harshly rebuked by Enoch via the tablets, which proclaim judgment against them for their crimes (4Q203 8 6-15). There are also significant differences Enoch in Giants and Watchers, as discussed below.

VI. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GIANTS AND WATCHERS

There are substantial differences between Giants and Watchers. I place these differences into three categories – those that fill in and expand details found in Watchers; details that primarily do not fill in lacunae

\textsuperscript{42} This assertion is in tension with 1 En. 10,15, in which God urges Michael to destroy the spirits of the giants.


\textsuperscript{44} This fragment is listed as 4Q531 14 in STUCKENBRUCK, The Book of Giants (n. 4), pp. 159-160, who also discerns the fragment’s affinity with 1 Enoch 15.

\textsuperscript{45} The tradition that Enoch is a scribe and a writer of texts is expanded in subsequent texts of 1 Enoch and patent in Jubilees, which praises him as the inventor of writing. See, for example, 82,1; 92,1; 104,12-13; Jub. 4,17-22. Consult NICKELSBURG, 1 Enoch 1 (n. 15), pp. 73-78, 270; J.C. VANDERKAM, Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition (CBQ MS, 16), Washington, DC, Catholic Biblical Association, 1984, pp. 104, 180-184.
in *Watchers* but are consistent with post-*Watchers* texts of *1 Enoch*; and details that do not accord at all with *Watchers* or other booklets of *1 Enoch*.

1. Giants as Exegetically Filling Out *Watchers*

The *Book of Watchers* has an exegetical dimension – it provides details that are left unanswered in the version of Genesis it utilized, as numerous scholars have observed. *Watchers*, for example, provides the names of the angels, or at least of their chiefs, and states that the total number of those who descended is two hundred, whereas Genesis never offers these details. *Watchers* also specifies, unlike Genesis, that the angels descend to earth at Mount Hermon. Key components of *Giants* allow for the thesis that as *Watchers* is to Genesis, so *Giants* is to *Watchers* – that *Giants* is a product of someone reading *Watchers* closely and giving further refinement to the story, by filling out details unaddressed in *Watchers*. García Martínez expresses this point by describing *Giants* “as a continuation and a complement of the *Book of Watchers*”. The most obvious example of this perspective is the names of the giants. In *Watchers* the angels have names but not their sons; in *Giants* both groups do.

Also, the visions by Ohyah and Hahyah and the efforts by the giants to understand them answer important questions left unexplored by *Watchers*: how did the giants come to realize their fate? What was their reaction? *Watchers*, in the forms in which it has survived, shows little interest in such issues. *1 Enoch* 10 depicts God in heaven commissioning Gabriel (v. 9) and Michael (v. 15) to destroy the giants. Gabriel is told to make them exterminate one another in a “war of destruction” (אבדן קרב; *4QEn* 1 iv 6), but the text provides no further details on this conflict. *Watchers*’ other account

---


48. There are minor differences regarding this expression in the various witnesses of *Watchers*, but they all assert that the giants fight in a war. See S. Bhatro, *The Shemihazah
of the punishment of the giants is also located in heaven. 1 Enoch 15,8-12 portrays the giants as a monstrous admixture of spirit (heaven) and flesh (earth), and describes their bodies as destroyed but with their evil spirits still intact, as mentioned above. This passage is part of Enoch’s throne vision and thus is directly addressed to Enoch in heaven from God himself (14,24–16,4). In 1 En. 15.9 God claims that the spirits of the giants have been removed from their bodies, but there is no focus on what exactly happens to them or how. 1 Enoch 14,6, which is part of God’s rebuke of the angels that Enoch is to convey to them, also briefly mentions their destruction. The watchers are to witness the elimination of their sons by the sword, presumably a reference to the “war of destruction”. One can infer that at this point in the narrative the giants have not yet been destroyed. But there is no account of what happens on earth to them. Giants fills out this major gap of Watchers. The extant material of Giants, however, focuses not on the “war of destruction” in which they are slaughtered but rather on how they try to learn about their ultimate fate (see below).

2. Elements of Giants in Continuity with post-Watchers Enochic Traditions: The Figure of Enoch and Revelation

Some elements of Giants are not simply exegetical expansions of Watchers but are better characterized as consistent with traditions evident in texts of 1 Enoch written after Watchers. This is above all evident in Giants’ portrayal of Enoch. In Watchers Enoch deals directly with the watchers who descended. They ask him to send a petition on their behalf to God, so that they may be forgiven (13,3-4). In Giants the giants do not request that Enoch offer a petition to God⁴⁹. They do, however, approach him through Mahaway and ask him for a favor. He travels to Enoch, so they he may relate to the giant “the interpretation of the dreams” (4Q530 2 ii 23). They seek him out because they are afraid of and confused by the dreams⁵⁰. Also in Watchers Enoch attempts to intercede on behalf of the watchers; there is nothing of the sort in the Giants.

⁴⁹. Puech, DJD, 31 (n. 2), p. 38, emends 4Q530 7 ii 3 to read “a petition of extension of the giants” (באהבת הרות הרוהро). The first word is actually באחת, which he considers to be an error. If one grants Puech’s transcription, one can suppose that the giants asked, perhaps in a letter conveyed by Mahaway to Enoch, for a delay of their punishment. 4Q530 7 ii 3 is not amended in Stuckenbruck, The Book of Giants (n. 4), p. 124.
⁵⁰. The angels are afraid in 1 En. 13,3.
In fact, Giants makes the opposite point, since Enoch proclaims judgment against them (4Q203 8).

The key difference regarding Enoch in Giants and Watchers, however, involves the theme of revelation. In Watchers Enoch receives supernatural revelations from angels. By contrast, in Giants Enoch is a source, rather than a recipient, of divine knowledge. Mahaway asks Enoch for the interpretation of the dreams. Enoch provides Mahaway with two written tablets (4Q203 7b ii 3). The first may have contained the interpretation of the dreams but only the text of the second tablet has survived (4Q203 8). This is read aloud, probably by Mahaway, before the assembled watchers and giants. The writing upon this tablet asserts that they have committed crimes and that an accusation has gone up against them. This portrayal of Enoch is quite different from that of Watchers. Enoch does not himself receive visions or dreams as in Watchers but rather interprets those of others. It is Mahaway, not Enoch as in Watchers, who journeys to attain knowledge (to Enoch!). 4Q203 8 assumes that Enoch can interpret divine visions and does not consider it necessary to explain why he is an exceptional source of knowledge.

The presentation of Enoch in Giants fits much better with post-Watchers texts than Watchers itself. Giants has a strong parallel with the birth of Noah story in 1 Enoch 106–107 and also the Genesis Apocryphon. In the two latter texts, when the strange appearance of the newborn Noah makes his father Lamech afraid, he dispatches his own father Methusaleh to go to Enoch (Methusaleh’s father; Gen 5,21), in order to learn about Noah. The Epistle of Enoch assumes, not unlike Giants, that Enoch is a source of special knowledge (cf. 1 En. 82,1-3). Enoch, in the first person, reports that Methusaleh found him “at the ends of the earth” (106,8). In Giants Mahaway similarly travels “the great desert” to reach Enoch (4Q530 7 ii 5). In the Genesis Apocryphon, Lamech urges his father Methuselah, as in the Epistle, to journey to Enoch to learn about

51. Unfortunately, the text breaks off just when Enoch begins to interpret them (4Q530 7 ii 10).
52. STUCKENBRUCK, The Book of Giants (n. 4), p. 27.
53. For recent studies comparing these two texts, consult several essays in BERTHELOT – STOKEL BEN EZRA, Aramaica Qumranica (n. 21). Relevant articles include E. Eshel, The Genesis Apocryphon (1QapGen) and Birth of Noah (4QEnoch ar), 277-297; M. WIEGOLD, Aramaic Wunderkind: The Birth of Noah in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran, 299-315.
55. This may presuppose the account of Enoch’s travels in Watchers. In 1 Enoch 28–32 he finds the paradise of righteousness in a mountain range in the midst of a desert (esp. 28,1-2; cf. 4Q209 23 9-10).
the baby Noah. The *Genesis Apocryphon* also includes the motif of great travel, like the two other texts. Methuselah journeys across the “land of Parvaim” to contact Enoch (1QapGen 2,23). *Genesis Apocryphon* and *I Enoch* 106–107 indicate that *Giants* is not simply a text written by someone who read *Watchers* and filled out parts of the book. The author(s) of *Giants* read *Watchers* in the context of later Early Jewish traditions about Enoch as a human transformed by his encounters with the heavenly realm.

3. Elements of Giants That Diverge Significantly from Watchers

Significant elements of *Giants* are either strikingly different from *Watchers* or in outright contradiction with it. Major issues in *Watchers* are completely unaddressed in the extant remains of *Giants*. *Watchers*‘ theme of illicit revelation of heavenly secrets involving topics such as metallurgy and cosmetics, most prominent in *I Enoch* 8, is not a major theme in the *Giants* texts. Since this issue speaks to the relationship between the angels and their wives, this omission may reflect an editorial decision to focus more exclusively on the giants. This would also explain why...

---


57. *Giants* and *Genesis Apocryphon* unfortunately have another point in common – in both compositions the text breaks off just when Enoch begins to speak and provide the interpretation that has been asked of him (4Q530 7 ii 10-11; 1QapGen 3,3).

58. There may be an allusion to the illicit revelation motif in IQ23 9 + 14 + 15 2, “and they knew the mysteries of …” (אֶדֱעֲו דְּבֵר וַתְּנַשְּׁלוּ). This reconstruction is suggested by MILIK, *The Books of Enoch* (n. 4), pp. 302-303, and is mentioned but not endorsed by STUCKENBRUCK, DJD, 36 (n. 4), p. 55. Milik’s reconstruction is plausible but must remain tentative. This text at issue mentions other motifs that are also in *Watchers*, such as giants and murder, increasing the likelihood of the presence of the theme of the revelation of mysteries, since it is a major theme in *Watchers*. The verb ידועו (“they knew”) is clearly a masculine plural in distinction from the feminine plural, which is attested in Qumran Aramaic (1QapGen 13,16). The antecedent of the verb thus could not be the wives and is thus likely the watchers or the giants (cf. *1 En*. 16,3). Not enough survives of the fragment to decide which of these antecedents is more likely. See T. MURAOKA, *A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic* (ANES, 38), Leuven, University Press – Peeters, 2011, p. 99; S.I. THOMAS, The “Mysteries” of Qumran: Mystery, Secrecy, and Esotericism in the Dead Sea Scrolls (SBL EJL, 25), Atlanta, GA, Society of Biblical Literature, 2009, p. 21; MILIK, *Turfan et Qumran* (n. 9), p. 120.

59. Note that *1 En*. 8,3(G997) claims that the angels provide the illicit revelation to their children as well as their wives. The instruction theme in *Watchers* is generally considered secondary to the text. It is possible that *Giants* worked with a version of *Watchers*...
the oath of the angels is not a major element in *Giants* (*1 En. 6,4-6*)\(^{60}\).

In addition, *Giants* barely addresses the theme of unsanctioned sexual activity, a major issue in *Enoch* 6–16\(^{61}\).

a) The Giants in the Book of Watchers and the Book of Giants

The most significant difference between *Giants* and *Watchers* regards their portrayals of the giants. *Watchers* has an unambiguously negative attitude towards them. In *En. 10*, G not only calls for their judgment but also insults them: “Go, Gabriel, to the bastards (μαζηρέους), to the half-breeds (κιβδήλους), to the sons of miscegenation (υἱοὺς τῆς πορνείας); and destroy the sons of the watchers from among the sons of men”\(^{62}\). All three of the insults in this verse express the view that the marriages of their parents are illegitimate and underscore the impurity of the children of the angels (cf. *En. 12*,3-4). None of these insults survive in the Aramaic Enoch corpus (cf. 4QEn b i 5-6). The Greek term μαζηρέος, however, suggests a Semitic origin (ممزر), as does the expression “the spirits of the bastards” since the phrase מזרות רוחי found in the Qumran scrolls denotes demonic powers, as mentioned above.

*Watchers* also emphasizes the violence of the giants. They are not simply powerful warriors. They are wild cannibals who commit heinous atrocities. The key text is *En. 7*,3-5:

> They [the giants] were devouring the labor of all the sons of men, and men were not able to supply them. And the giants began to kill men and to devour them. And they began to sin against the birds and beasts and creeping things and the fish and to devour one another's flesh. And they drank the blood

that did not have this stratum. For an overview of the instruction theme in *Watchers*, see YOSHIO REED, *Fallen Angels* (n. 15), pp. 24-58.

60. PUECH, DJD, 31 (n. 2), p. 38, reasonably reconstructs a reference to swearing an oath in 4Q530 ii 9.

61. Addressing both the watchers and their sons, Enoch’s rebuke chastises them for committing “fornication” (זנות) on the earth (4Q203 8 9). Lines 7 and 8 are fragmentary but appear to mention, respectively, the wives first of the angels and then of their sons. The accusation of fornication extends to both groups. The tradition that the giants themselves have children is in *En. 7*,2 (G Syn): “And the giants begot Nephilim, and to the Nephilim were born Elioud”. For discussion of this passage, see NICKELSBURG, *Enoch 1 Enoch* (n. 15), p. 185; GOFF, *Monstrous Appetites* (n. 32), pp. 21-22.


63. This translation is from NICKELSBUG, *1 Enoch 1* (n. 15), p. 182. For variants, see BHAYRO, *The Shemihazah and Asael Narrative* (n. 48), pp. 68-70.
The giants, driven by their voracious appetites, pose a threat to the entire natural order. They violate the Jewish taboo of consuming blood, a prohibition in both priestly law and the Noahide covenant (Gen 9:4; Lev 17:11)64. *Watchers* offers a bitterly negative portrait of the giants. They are, quite literally, evil bastards.

The *Book of Giants*, I suggest, offers a more nuanced and less negative portrayal of the giants. In this composition God never calls them bastards. *Giants* never emphasizes that the giants are the monstrous spawn of human-divine unsanctioned marriages that violates the natural order (contrast *1 En*. 15:8-10). *Giants* is also different from *Watchers* with regard to the theme of violence. As discussed above, this trope is attested in *Giants*. But the composition has no parallel to the vivid, horrific violence of *1 En*. 7:3-5. While *Giants* associates the destruction of the giants with their appetite (e.g., 4Q532 1 ii + 2 9-10), the crime of cannibalism is not present in *Giants*, in contrast to *1 Enoch* 7. Similarly, no text claims that they drank blood, whereas this is explicit in 4QEnb 1 ii 25a. The absence of anthropophagous violence in *Giants* could simply be an accident of preservation. This omission, however, is consistent with the extant text. Moreover, the references in *Giants* to the violence of the giants are consistently brief. They are presented as acts that have taken place in the past. No text describes them as killing in the narrative present.

b) Double Dreams, Prayer and Repentence

The core narrative of *Giants* about the visions of Ohyah and Hahyah has no parallel in *Watchers*. The motif in *Giants* of dreams that predict the future, as Dimant has observed, is consistent with post-*Watchers* texts of *1 Enoch* (chs. 83–90)65. These compositions also attest the theme of dreams coming in pairs. In the *Book of Dreams* Enoch conveys two visions to his son Methuselah (83,2; 85,1). *Giants* expands this trope in ways that have little to do with *Watchers*. The key visions in *Giants* are the two dreams of 4Q530 2 ii. The fact that Ohyah and Hahyah are brothers also sets up the doublet theme. Enoch sends two tablets to the giants (4Q203 7b ii 2-3) and Mahaway’s journey to Enoch is the second time he has travelled to him (4Q530 2 ii 22-24; 4Q530 7 ii). If one makes the reasonable assumption that his prior visit to Enoch was, like the second, to request the interpretation of a dream, the composition likely has two brothers who each have two dreams66. Genesis, in its story of Joseph,

---

64. Goff, *Monstrous Appetites* (n. 32), pp. 29-33.
66. One of the earlier visions is probably of a tablet that is partially effaced, partially preserved in 2Q26. See Goff, *Gilgamesh the Giant* (n. 8), pp. 246-247.
offers an explanation for a person receiving two visions: “And the dou-
bling of Pharaoh’s dreams means that the thing is fixed by God, and God 
will shortly bring it about” (41,32; cf. Dan 2,1; 4,5). This verse suggests 
that the doubling bolsters the legitimacy of the visions they receive. 
Perhaps the author suspected that some readers would doubt that the 
giants could receive authentic visions from heaven.

The first vision of 4Q530 2 ii, disclosed to Hahyah, involves a garden 
filled with trees that is destroyed by fire and water, except for one tree 
with three roots (4Q530 2 ii 11). The second, given to ‘Ohyah, is an 
account of the ruler of heaven coming to earth with his angelic retinue, 
with books being opened for judgment. The second is a vision of the-
ophanic judgment. The first is a reference to the flood and the survival 
of Noah and his three sons67. Both visions presage the destruction of the 
giants in the flood. Having the opportunity to learn this beforehand (not 
unlike Noah himself) raises a key question which has no parallel in 
Watchers – why would God send them such visions in the first place? 
If they are doomed to destruction, why bother? Stuckenbruck explains 
this by writing “the effect of the story [of Giants] is to reinforce the view 
that demonic evil is aware of its ultimate demise in a world that is under 
divine rule”68. So understood, the giants receive the visions so that they 
know that God is the one who kills them. The extant evidence suggests 
to me, however, a different interpretation. Giants contains evidence that 
at least some of the giants become aware of their sins and acknowledge 
their defeat, suggesting that some of them tried to change their evil ways.

Reflection by the giants on their finitude most likely prompted the dis-
closure of the two visions in 4Q530 2 ii. The full narrative is not available, 
but the column begins with an unnamed giant mentioning “the death of 
our souls” (l. 1). 4Q530 2 ii 1-3 asserts that ‘Ohyah reports to the assem-
bled giants what Gilgamesh had said to him on an earlier occasion. This 
prior moment is likely described in 4Q531 22. In this text a giant pro-
claims that he fought bitterly and lost. The key passage reads:

[When I was mig]hty, with the powerful strength of my arm and my great 
strength, [I attacked a]ll flesh and made war against them. But [I was] not 
[strong (enough) and] I, with us, was [not] able to prevail because my accus-
ers [are the angels who] reside [in] the [heavens] and in the holy places they

in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conversations and Controversies of Antiquity (SBL EJL, 26), 

68. L.T. STUCKENBRUCK, Giants, Book of, in J.J. COLLINS – D.C. HARLOW (eds.), The 
also Id., The Book of Giants (n. 4), p. 93.
encamp. [They were] not [wiped out because they are stronger than me. 

vacat [Behold, a roaring [voice] of the beasts of the field has come and the 

men of the field cry out (for) [their revenge] (ll. 3-9)69.

The speaker realizes that angels defeated him, and that humans and 

animals have called out for revenge against him70. Milik understood the 

speaker as Shemihazah71. Subsequent commentators realized, however, 

that the emphasis on the figure’s strength and fighting suggests he is a 

giant72. The giant in question is speaking with ʾOhyah, who reports that 

a dream has disturbed him (l. 9). The only other giant mentioned in 

4Q531 22 is Gilgamesh. It is reasonable to posit that he is the speaker in 

ll. 3-773. This interpretation is supported by 4Q530 2 ii 1-3, in which 

ʾOhyah conveys to the other giants what Gilgamesh had told him. 4Q531 

22, though incomplete, suggests that even before the disclosure of the two 

visions of 4Q530 2 ii at least one of the giants (Gilgamesh) is no longer 

a wild, uncontrollable cannibal. Rather, he is a warrior who acknowl-

edges with regret that he was defeated in battle.

There is fragmentary evidence that some giants prayed to God for 

forgiveness74. At the end of Enoch’s rebuke in 4Q203 8, after chastising 

the watchers and their sons for their crimes, he tells them, using a plural 

imperative, to pray (צלו; l. 15). Stuckenbruck argues that this call for prayer 

is not a sign that forgiveness is possible but rather that “their praying is 

a sign of defeat signaling a contrast with the ultimate lot of the earth’s 

victims”75. Some texts suggest another explanation. 4Q531 18 is frag-

mentary but begins with language that would be appropriate in a prayer 

addressed to God – “holy and elevated” (קדיש הר; l. 1). The speaker, in 

the first person plural, goes on to state “we who have sinn[ed]” (אנחנא 

נא̊ח̊טי̊ד̊י̊) and, switching to the singular, that he is destroyed (מחבל 

ה; 


69. For the official edition of this text, see PUECH, DJD, 31 (n. 2), pp. 74-78. Further 

discussion of this text is in GOFF, Gilgamesh the Giant (n. 8), pp. 240-245. 

70. Also note how the passage utilizes the theme of arrogance. While several Early 

Jewish authors assert the arrogance of the giants, Giants claims that, in the case of at least 

some giants, they were arrogant, falsely relying on the might of their own strength, but 

because they were defeated by the angels, they no longer are (3 Macc 2,4; Wis 14,6; 

Josephus, Ant. 1.73).


72. REEVES, Jewish Lore (n. 4), pp. 118, 158; STUCKENBRUCK, The Book of Giants 

(n. 4), pp. 166-167.

73. GOFF, Gilgamesh the Giant (n. 8), pp. 242-243.

74. This trope may be related to I En. 13,4, in which the angels wish to beseech God 

for forgiveness but are too ashamed of their crimes to do this themselves and thus ask 

Enoch to do so.

The speaker understands himself as part of a group that has sinned and realizes his imminent demise. His identity is not explicit, but he is likely one of the giants, who, understanding his fate, has become contrite and remorseful. What triggered this realization is not stated, but it is plausible that 4Q531 18 contains the plaintive prayer of a giant who has learned of Enoch’s interpretation of the dreams of ’Ohyah and Hahyah, most likely from hearing Enoch’s tablet being read aloud (4Q203 8).

There is similar material elsewhere in Giants. In 4Q531 23 an unnamed giant realizes his fate: “I will be killed and I will die” (l. 3). 4Q531 19, discussed above, begins by mentioning deeds of great violence (שגיא חמס; l. 2). The speakers, in the first person plural (l. 3), realize that they are to die, most likely because of their crimes on the earth. 4Q530 1 i contains a similar assertion by an unnamed giant that the giants as a whole are to die. The fragment begins, in the first person singular, with the speaker traveling to houses of escape, perhaps in a futile attempt to evade God’s punishment (l. 3). He is aware that the souls of his victims have cried out for justice. This apparently leads him to conclude “we shall die together” (l. 5). There are several fragmentary references to some of the giants expressing awareness that they have sinned and will die.

4Q203 9 suggests that some giants prayed after hearing Enoch’s rebuke in 4Q203 8. The fragment contains remnants of a prayer. The prayer mentions quaking before God’s glorious splendor, who is praised for knowing all mysteries (ll. 2-3). Line 4 states that nothing has overpowered the deity, using a form of the root תקף. This term denotes strength and the line likely alludes to failed efforts by the giants to use their strength to oppose God and his angels. This interpretation is suggested by 4Q531 22 in which a giant, as discussed above, realizes that his efforts at war against humans and angels have failed. This giant (probably Gilgamesh) concludes that they “are more powerful than I”, using the same root in 4Q203 9 4 (מני תקיפין; cf. 4Q203 7b i 5). The speaker(s) of 4Q203 9 also acknowledge the greatness of God’s kingship (l. 6). Milik argued that this text contains fragments of a prayer uttered by Enoch; this opinion has been endorsed by Stuckenbruck, although in the official edition

76. I agree with PUECH, DJD, 31 (n. 2), p. 71, that the Pael participle is best read as a passive, contra STUCKENBRUCK, The Book of Giants (n. 4), p. 159. Also note the fragmentary reference to sins in 4Q530 20 3.

77. MILIK, The Books of Enoch (n. 4), p. 316, joins fragment 10 to this text, as do BEYER, ATTM (n. 4), p. 1.266 (his “G13”) and REEVES, Jewish Lore (n. 4), p. 57 (his “QG 3”). The two fragments are treated separately by STUCKENBRUCK, DJD, 36 (n. 4), pp. 34-38.
of Giants he favors the view that the speaker is an angel. It is indeed possible that the prayer is spoken by Enoch. 4Q203 9 has similarities to the petitionary prayer he utters in 1 En. 84,1-6, in which he asks God not to destroy all of humanity in response to the watchers and giants’ crimes (cf. 9,4-11; 63,2-4). But there is no unambiguous evidence that Enoch carries out such a prayer in Giants. While 4Q203 9 is too fragmentary to merit conclusive assessments, I suggest that its prayer is spoken by some of the giants and perhaps their angelic fathers. This would be consistent with the texts, discussed above, that convey the realization of sin and anxiety of some of the giants.

c) Remorse, Forgiveness and Mercy in the Manichaean Book of Giants

The Manichaean Book of Giants endorses the thesis that some giants understood themselves as sinful and prayed to God for forgiveness. This is most evident in Uighur fragments of the work published by Wilkens in 2000. One of these texts, Mainz 344a, reads:

[The book] of the confession of the [strong] giant [Sāhm]. The strong [giant] Sāhm bent [both] his knees, [bowed] and arose before the god of the sun, whose head is Splendor, and asked for forgiveness. He spoke as follows: ‘O god of the sun, whose head is com[passionate] …

In this text a giant named Sāhm confesses before God. The fragment does not state what he is confessing for. In another Uighur fragment, U 222, which Wilkens argues should be joined to Mainz 344a, Sāhm claims that he is filled with “abhorrent sin” because he has killed many creatures. Another text of the Manichaean Book of Giants (T ii S 20;
Henning’s Text H) explains that Sāhm is the Sogdian equivalent of the name Ohya. The giant in Mainz 344a and U 222 thus corresponds to ‘Ohyah of the Qumran Book of Giants. The Uighur fragments of the Manichaean Book of Giants elucidate texts from the Qumran work in which a giant shows awareness of sin, such as 4Q531 18. Mainz 344a and U 222 express a theme that is important in the Qumran Book of Giants but poorly preserved in its extant fragments – that some of the giants realized their sins, felt remorse and may have prayed to God for mercy.

The Sogdian text T iii 282 (Henning’s Text E) not only supports the thesis that some giants experienced a change of heart, but also suggests that this development should be connected to Enoch’s rebuke (4Q203 8). The key passage reads:

… [when] those demons that were [timid], were very, very glad at seeing the apostle. All of them assembled before him. Also, of those that were tyrants and criminals, they were [worried] and much afraid.

The text goes on to relate that some “demons” speak with the apostle about sin. The “demons” are likely the giants (cf. 1 En. 15,8-12) and perhaps the watchers as well. In Text E the giants are divided into two camps, one of which rejoices in seeing the “apostle” and the other, described as “tyrans and criminals,” become afraid when they see him. The apostle is not named, but on the basis of the Qumran Book of Giants, is easily identified as Enoch (4Q203 8). He is called an “apostle” elsewhere in the Manichaean Book of Giants (e.g., M10II and TM 423d; Henning’s Text A and B). The fragment is reasonably interpreted as attesting a division among the giants, triggered by learning of their fate through Enoch. It is quite likely that Enoch’s presence makes some afraid because they have continued their wicked ways and see that punishment is imminent, whereas another group has become recalcitrant and changed their ways, and thus expect a more positive assessment from him than the other faction does.

84. WILKENS, *Neue Fragmente* (n. 81), pp. 137-138, understands this point.
86. The phrase “two hundred demons”, an allusion to the two hundred watchers, is in the Manichaean Book of Giants. See, for example, T ii 1 and T ii S 20 (Henning’s Text G and H, respectively).
87. One must grant that in the Qumran text they do not meet Enoch in person, as appears to be the case in the Manichaean text. Rather the giants learn of his views though the recitation of a stone tablet (4Q203 8).
Something along these lines is present in the Manichaean Book of Giants. A Sogdian fragment, T ii 1 (Henning’s Text G), describes the division of a group into two camps: “And they led one half of them eastwards, and the other half westwards, on the skirts of four huge mountains, towards the foot of the Sumeru mountain, into thirty-two towns which the Living Spirit had prepared for them in the beginning.” Not enough of the text survives to know the fate of both groups, but one is located in cities that had been constructed for them (the other group is presumably destroyed). Another Manichaean text, the Coptic Kephalaia, from the horde of writings discovered in Medinet Madi (Egypt) published in the 1930s, preserves a variant of this tradition, asserting that some of the giants are not wiped out but rather placed in cities (changing the number from 32 in the Sogdian text to 36):

Again, before the watchers rebelled and came down from heaven, a prison was fashioned and constructed from them in the depths of the earth, below the mountains. Before the children of the giants were born, they who had [no] knowledge of righteousness in them nor divinity, thirty-six cities were assigned and constructed for them wherein the children of [the giants would] live; they who would come to beget from each other, they who shall spend ten hundred years alive (Keph. 117,1-9).

The Manichaean Book of Giants and the Kephalaia preserve two traditions that are significant for the interpretation of the Qumran Book of Giants. One, some giants became remorseful for their crimes and confessed and, two, that a substantial number of giants were not killed but rather lived in cities built for them. The Manichaean Book of Giants does not state why they are allowed to live in such places but it is reasonable to connect this to the preceding point – the giants confessed and received divine mercy. The Manichaean material not only supports the opinion that in the Qumran composition some giants were aware of their sins and sought to change their ways, a trope poorly preserved in the extant fragments, such as 4Q531 18. The Manichaean texts T ii 1 and Keph. 117...
also endorse the speculation that in the Qumran *Book of Giants* some giants were spared and survived the flood\(^{91}\).

As discussed above, in the Qumran text several giants express concern that they will die (e.g., 4Q531 19) and Enoch asserts that they will face a harsh judgment. But no extant fragment says what actually happens. The Manichaean *Book of Giants* suggests that in the Qumran work some giants, upon praying to God, received forgiveness and thus avoided destruction. Not unlike the prophet Jonah’s proclamation to Nineveh that the city will be destroyed, which is averted upon the repentance of the people, it is reasonable to speculate that a change of heart among some giants results in God showing mercy and sparing them. This would be, in the context of ancient Jewish literature, a novel and unusual explanation for the view, attested elsewhere (e.g., Pseudo-Eupolemus and the Babylonian Talmud [b. *Nid.* 61a]) that some giants did not perish in the flood\(^{92}\).

d) Elements of *Giants* that Contradict *Watchers*

Some aspects of *Giants* contradict *Watchers* or may presuppose a different version of the book than the versions we possess. In *Watchers*, as discussed above, God orders Gabriel and Michael to destroy the giants (*1 En.* 10,9,15). Enoch’s reprimand of the giants in 4Q203 8 proclaims their judgment but never mentions Gabriel or Michael. These names never occur in the extant fragments of *Giants*. Lines 9-10 of 4Q203 8 mention the accusation of the earth crying out for justice against the giants and their fathers. Line 12 begins “has reached Raphael,” referring presumably to the accusation. In *1 En.* 9,1-3, by contrast, the cries of the earth reach *four* archangels in heaven, Michael, Sariel, Raphael and Gabriel. Though not explicit, it appears that Raphael has been chosen to implement God’s proclaimed destruction of the giants and the watchers. This not only contradicts the claim of *1 Enoch* 10 that Gabriel and Michael wipe out the giants. *Giants*, in comparison to *Watchers*, gives more power to Raphael. In *Watchers* he is assigned only to imprison the watcher Asael and is never associated with the giants at all (10,4-8; cf. 22,3-7)\(^{93}\).

---


92. One could base this conclusion on Genesis 10, the chapter after the end of the flood, which describes Nimrod, called a גבר. See Stuckenbruck, *The ‘Angels’ and ‘Giants’ of Genesis 6:1-4* (n. 91), pp. 356-357.

93. The motif that Raphael carries out the destruction of the giants has a parallel in the book of Tobit. In this book he knows how to defeat the powerful demon Asmodeus, teaching Tobias how to do so (6,17-18; 8,1-3).
There are hints that *Giants* has a sequence of events that does not accord with that of *Watchers.* 4Q203 7b i 5 reads “he has imprisoned us (עגננא) and overpowered (תקף) you.”94 Then the watchers and the giants together hear the written reprimand of Enoch (frg. 8).95 4Q203 7b i 5 is best read as a statement from the watchers to their sons. In *I En.* 10,12 Shemihazah and his collaborators are bound and imprisoned to await final judgment. *Giants* utilizes this same trope. But the sequence of events is different. *I Enoch* 14,6 clearly states that the watchers are to witness the destruction of their sons *before* they are bound and imprisoned96. In *Giants* the bound watchers and the defeated giants listen to Enoch together. The giants are defeated but have not yet had their bodies destroyed. The fragmentary evidence of *Giants* hints at a different sequence of events than that of *Watchers.* Unfortunately not enough of *Giants* survives to understand fully its arrangement of events.

**VII. THE AUTHORITY OF THE BOOK OF GIANTS AND THE MANICHAEAN EVIDENCE**

The question of how *Giants* should be related to *Watchers* raises the issue of the status of *Giants* as an independent text. Milik emphasized the popularity and authority of the *Book of Giants,* making the incredible claim that “No work of ancient Jewish literature had in antiquity a circulation comparable with that of the *Book of Giants*”97. While this claim is hyperbolic, it is based on the solid conclusion, first discerned by Milik himself, that the Manichaean *Book of Giants* preserves traditions attested in the Qumran *Book of Giants.* Reeves goes so far as to understand the compositions as two recensions of the same book98. It is probably more accurate to state that the Manichaean work relies on traditions preserved

94. The verb *Giants* uses to describe the imprisonment of the watchers (נשע) denotes in the Aramaic Enoch texts the place where souls await judgment. *I Enoch* 22,4 reads: “these are the pits for the place of their confinement (נשע בית; 4Q206 1 xxii 1). Thus they were made until the day (on) which they will be judged, and until the time of the day of the end of the great judgment that will be exacted from them”. MILIK, *The Books of Enoch* (n. 4), p. 189, supplements the word נשע in his reconstruction of *I En.* 10,13 (4Q204 1 v 1).
95. 4Q203 7b ii 3: “and the second until now has not been read”.
96. *I En.* 14,5b-6: “and it has been decreed to bind you in bonds in the earth for all the days of eternity. And that before these things, you will see the destruction of your sons, your beloved ones, and that you will have no pleasure in them”.
in the Qumran Giants text, but that both writings circulated in a variety of versions. The fact that Early Jewish traditions preserved in the Qumran Book of Giants are major elements of the Manichaean Book of Giants not only indicates that Mani drew upon older Enochic writings but also suggests he, in the third century CE, regarded them as having a form of authority, perhaps even with a kind of scriptural status, which he sought to replicate in the Manichaean canon of scriptures. Mani actively encouraged a corpus of scriptures in his religion and several Manichaean canon lists from antiquity include his Book of Giants.99

There is no evidence that the Qumran Book of Giants had any form of scriptural or authoritative status in the Second Temple period. Nevertheless, the story was likely, not unlike Watchers, popular and widely read. This is suggested by the large number of manuscripts of the work found among the Dead Sea Scrolls, more than Watchers (at least nine versus six). Whereas Watchers texts were discovered only in Cave 4, those of Giants are from four caves (1, 2, 4 and 6), a rare distinction among the Qumran Scrolls. It is likely that Giants simply was read for purposes of entertainment, as an engaging account of the world before the flood, a subject of wide interest in Judaism at the time.

There is, however, ample evidence that Giants, while it may not have had an authoritative or scriptural status during the time of its composition, reflects strategies of legitimization that no doubt increased its readership and popularity as a text. The utilization by Giants of Watchers, containing a narrative of angels that was well known in the late Second Temple period, is key in this regard.100 Relatedly, the prominent role Giants accords to Enoch as an authoritative source of knowledge and interpretation likewise appealed to attested and well-known conceptions in the era of this figure. The primordial past was a common subject in Jewish writings from this period, also suggesting that Giants was a popular text at the time.101


101. For this issue in a different text, see H. Nai man, Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and Its Authority Conferring Strategies, in JSJ 30 (1999) 379-410.
VIII. Conclusions: The Book of Giants, Pseudepigraphy and Parabiblical Literature

The considerable differences between *Giants* and *Watchers* problematize the view that *Giants* simply rewrites *Watchers* and fills in details left unaddressed in the latter text. The author(s) of *Giants* were creative and wished to tell a story about the giants that often has little in common with *Watchers*. *Giants* was produced by an author who was exposed to traditions about Enoch and the watchers myth that are evident in other Early Jewish texts, such as the *Epistle of Enoch*, *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*. These compositions attest the popularity of the watchers myth in the period. *Giants*, however, cautions us that it is by no means clear that these works engaged and reflected upon one authoritative version of *Watchers*. Varying versions of this text have survived and it is possible that *Giants* utilized a version that is no longer extant. One should understand *Giants*’ use of *Watchers* in a way that appreciates the pluralform and dynamic nature of the scriptural enterprise of Early Judaism.

This nuanced view of the relationship between *Giants* and *Watchers* allows for renewed consideration of the Book of Giants in relation to the issue of pseudepigraphy102. Above I argued that *Giants* should not be considered a pseudepigraphon, in the sense that it is not attributed to an authoritative figure. This understanding of the term is, however, not the only one that is used. Many texts, for example, included in Charlesworth’s famous *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* do not fit the narrow definition of pseudepigrapha (texts with false attributions) and the same can be said for the new collection produced by Bauckham, Davila and Panayotov103. VanderKam has lamented that the label pseudepigrapha is


103. The Charlesworth volume, for example, includes several works in which the author gives his own name, such as Artapanus, Eupolemus and Ezekiel the Tragedian. Note also that the volumes by Bauckham et al. include the Manichaean *Book of Giants* – a welcome addition to scholarship, but this work, like the Qumran *Book of Giants*, has no attribution...
often used as a “vague” and “catch-all” category that encompasses a wide range of non-canonical materials. Reed helpfully reminds us about the historical development of pseudepigrapha as a scholarly classification of ancient texts, arising primarily from Johann Albert Fabricius’ *Codex pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti* (1713) and thus in the context of theological concerns and debates from the Early Modern period, rather than the ancient world itself. This contextualization of the term forces one to grant that the category pseudepigrapha is at best a heuristic tool and not an approach to the material used by the ancient authors themselves.

While the Qumran *Book of Giants* is not pseudepigraphic, the category of pseudepigraphic literature can be a useful and instructive category with which to understand the composition. To put a point made above in another way, the composition relies upon and is in conversation with what one could call an “Enochic discourse” of Early Judaism, that is, a matrix of traditions in which this figure is prominent that shaped how ancient authors present him in their writings. The *Book of Watchers* in its present form is attributed to Enoch (1 Enoch 1,1). But this is most likely not necessarily the case in the version utilized by the *Book of Giants*, which probably did not include chapters 1–5, commonly regarded as a later addition to *1 Enoch*. The Enochic literature upon which *Giants* drew not only features this patriarch but over time came to be understood as authored by him. The *Book of Giants* can perhaps be seen, not unlike the *Book of Watchers* itself, as an early step in this process since in *Giants* Enoch is the author of a distinct segment of the composition, rather than of authorship whatsoever. Consult R. BAUCKHAM – J.R. DAVILA – A. PANAYOTOV, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Noncanonical Scriptures, Volume 1*, Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 2013; STUCKENBRUCK, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* (n. 102), p. 153.


106. STUCKENBRUCK, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* (n. 102), p. 157, also observes that *Giants* is similar to pseudepigraphic texts such as *1 Enoch* while not a pseudepigraphon itself. Since the beginning of *Giants* has not survived, one could posit that the text began with a lost attribution to a particular figure. Since the giants are prominent in the work it would be more reasonable to speculate, were there such an attribution, that the putative author is one of the sons of the watchers rather than Enoch. Alternatively, since several giants are prominent in the work, one could suppose that different sections of the work were attributed to different giants.


the work as a whole. It should also be pointed out that one common feature of Aramaic pseudepigrapha is the use of first-person language, as evident, for example, in the Aramaic Levi Document and the Visions of Amram. First person language is prominent in Giants. This is another instance of the composition having affinity with pseudepigraphic literature, even though it is not pseudepigraphic itself.

Scholarship has in recent years developed another literary category that can be instructive to apply to the Book of Giants—“parabiblical” or, as Robert Kraft would prefer, “parascriptural.” This classification is used for compositions which, while not biblical texts themselves, contain narratives that ultimately rely upon scriptural materials. The revision of the label proposed by Kraft conveys that in the late Second Temple period there is authoritative literature but not necessarily a Bible, at least not in the modern, canonical sense. Giants illustrates the ambiguity of this issue very well. On the one hand it can be reasonably understood as parabiblical, since its narrative derives ultimately from Genesis 6. Giants also illustrates the imprecision of this literary category, since the work is much more reliant on Watchers, itself a parabiblical text, than Genesis 6 (making Giants a para-parabiblical text?). A similar issue is seen in Tigchelaar’s

109. 4Q203 8 purports to be a tablet written by Enoch, as discussed above. The body of 4Q203 8 is demarcated by vacats (ll. 3, 15) and line 1 preserves the remnants of what appears to be a title: “[the] bo[ok of]” (ארכ). It is tempting to add the word “Enoch”. There is a parallel in 1 En. 14,1, in which Enoch in the first person reports his throne room vision in a form that is presented as a “book”: “The Book of the Words of Truth (ארכ ערכ יבש רפ ס) and the Reprimand of the Watchers” (cf. 1QapGen 5,29; 19,25). The line in question from 4Q204 is prefaced, like 4Q203 8 1, by a vacat.


helpful effort to give precision to the category “parabiblical literature”\textsuperscript{113}. He suggests we should make a distinction between parabiblical texts that are “rewritings of earlier scriptures” and those that are not based on older texts, even if they invoke scriptural figures. While \textit{Giants} clearly fits into Tigchelaar’s first category rather than his second, the scriptural status of the work it utilized (\textit{Watchers}) is itself ambiguous in the late Second Temple period. For \textit{Giants} one should perhaps slightly nuance the above category and understand it as parabiblical in the sense that it is a ‘rewriting of earlier authoritative writings’. The \textit{Book of Giants} does not neatly fit into the category of either pseudepigraphic or parabiblical literature, but the latter is more applicable than the former. There was marked interest in the antediluvian age in the late Second Temple era and the literature on this subject produced during this period took a variety of forms that resist rubrics of orderly classification. The \textit{Book of Giants} creatively draws upon Enochic traditions about the antediluvian period to fashion a fascinating but poorly preserved narrative about the sons of the watchers.
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\textsuperscript{113} Tigchelaar, \textit{Forms of Pseudepigraphy} (n. 102), pp. 90-91.