
The Watchers in Rewritten Scripture: The Use of the *Book of the Watchers* in *Jubilees*

TODD R. HANNEKEN

This essay explores the intersection of two distinctive Jewish compositions from antiquity. The *Book of the Watchers* is distinctive in that its influence greatly surpassed its authority. That is, themes and motifs from the *Book of the Watchers* pervade western thought on supernatural evil and its resolution well beyond the extent to which the book itself was cited as scriptural authority.¹ Although its direct authority can be generally characterized as “waning” over the centuries, the earliest evidence indicates influence among some Jews comparable to works that became canonical for all Jews and Christians.² As it is, the work survived as canonical only in Ethiopia.

The *Book of Jubilees*, itself surviving as canonical only in Ethiopia, has been called by Kugel a “hero” of early biblical interpretation as he

1. For a thorough treatment of the reception history of the *Book of the Watchers* and indirect influence see Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

2. Some scholars would find this grossly understating the central role of the *Book of the Watchers* within an Enochic alternative to the Pentateuch, understood as definitive of a competing form of Judaism called Enochic Judaism. The phrase “Enochic Pentateuch” traces back to G. H. Dix, “The Enochic Pentateuch,” *JTS* 27 (1925–1926) 29–42. See also J. T. Milik and M. Black, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); Paolo Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History* (JSPSup 20; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990); Gabriele Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991).

defines it.³ Kugel acknowledges the problems with the categories “early,” “biblical,” and “interpretation,” but he succeeds in describing the major features of how Jews and Christians approached scripture through the crucial period of the formation of the canon, features that generally remained dominant for centuries until the rise of modern biblical interpretation. Although Kugel decides to treat both the *Book of the Watchers* and *Jubilees* as interpretation rather than scripture, he acknowledges that they are on the edge of the “somewhat arbitrary” distinction made with retrospect of most lasting influence.⁴

If we set aside the canon of scripture as it endured in Judaism, we see that *Jubilees* interprets the *Book of the Watchers* as scripture. Much as it does with Genesis, Leviticus, and Isaiah, *Jubilees* accounts for the *Book of the Watchers*, addresses problems in the apparent meaning, and provides a meaning consistent with a broader set of theological principles. Studying the manner in which *Jubilees* uses the *Book of the Watchers* leads us to a greater understanding of the concept of scripture held by at least one second-century teacher, the process of interpretation when the problems in the source are deeply theological, and the process of composition. Tracing the tensions in the sources used and produced by the author of *Jubilees* will lead us to a discussion of authorship that relies on rhetorical analysis rather than multiplicity of authorship to explain the use of the *Book of the Watchers* in *Jubilees*.

I. Manner of Use

Jubilees reflects use of the major booklets of *1 Enoch* available by 160 B.C.E. The present concern is with the *Book of the Watchers*, but the context of the use of the other Enochic books should be mentioned briefly. *Jubilees* does not dwell on other Enochic books, but does assert knowledge of some form of the *Astronomical Book* and the *Book of Dreams*, as well as other testimonies evocative of the opening of the *Epistle* and the *Apocalypse of Weeks*. Many scholars, often interested in relative dating, have discussed whether a particular text is reflected in *Jubilees*.⁵ Less attention has been

3. James L. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998) 32.

4. *Ibid.*, 29–30, especially note 23.

5. R. H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees: or The Little Genesis* (London: A. and C. Black, 1902) xlv, lxxviii–lxxii, 36–37; Pierre Grelot, “Hénoch et ses écritures,” *Revue*

paid to manner of use. Two general points can be drawn from the numerous problems discussed by previous scholarship. First, the author asserts knowledge of the books of Enoch with such directness and brevity as to suggest that accounting for the complete library of “Enoch’s books” was the deliberate point. Second, the author’s skewed portrayal of the contents of those books does not undermine the fact that they were known, but fits with the pattern of interpretation and appropriation discussed in this essay.

A. *Jubilees* Persistently Uses the Complete *Book of the Watchers*

The case for direct literary dependency is strongest for *Jubilees*’ use of the *Book of the Watchers*. Even the most skeptical views of literary dependency yield somewhat on at least part of the *Book of the Watchers*.⁶ We will save for last the strong evidence for adaptive use of the Watchers narrative (1 *Enoch* 6–11) as we know it. First, we will consider the other sections in order to establish the probability that *Jubilees* uses the entire book,

Bible 82 (1975) 481–500; Milik and Black, *The Books of Enoch*, 11–12, 24–25, 45, 48; James C. VanderKam, “Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources,” *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 13 (1978) 229–51; reprint, pages 305–31 in *From Revelation to Canon* (Leiden: Brill, 2002); idem, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984) 142–44, 181, 234–35; idem, *Enoch, A Man for All Generations* (Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament; Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1995) 113–15; George W. E. Nickelsburg, 1 *Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001) 73–76; Michael A. Knibb, “Which Parts of 1 *Enoch* Were Known to *Jubilees*? A Note on the Interpretation of *Jubilees* 4.16–25,” in *Reading from Right to Left: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of David J.A. Clines* (eds. J. Cheryl Exum et al.; JSOTSup 373; London; New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003) 254–62; J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, “A Literary Dependency of Jubilees on 1 *Enoch*?,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005) 90–93; Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 87–95; Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (JSJSup 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 103–43; John Sietze Bergsma, “The Relationship Between Jubilees and the Early Enochic Books (Astronomical Book and Book of the Watchers),” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* (eds. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibbá; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009) 36–51. The works by Reed and Segal pay greater attention to manner of use and will be considered more below.

6. It is easy to miss in van Ruiten’s 2005 article (“A Literary Dependency of Jubilees on 1 *Enoch*?,” 90) that he is speaking only of *Jub.* 4 in doubting the evidence for literary dependency on 1 *Enoch*. He adds (p. 93) that the parallel between *Jub.* 7:22 and 1 *Enoch* 7:2 on the Elyo does support dependency. However, on this see Siam Bhayro, “The Use of Jubilees in Medieval Chronicles to Supplement Enoch: The Case for the ‘Shorter’ Reading,” *Henoch* 31 (2009) 10–17, here 15. Bhayro argues that this fragment of 1 *Enoch* from Syncellus reflects the influence of *Jubilees* on the text tradition of 1 *Enoch*.

including the introduction (1–5), testimony to the Watchers (12–16), and heavenly tour (17–36). These sections often receive less scholarly attention, perhaps because scholars treat the *Book of the Watchers* as a whole, such that evidence of use of any part obviates discussion of other parts. It will be important for our discussion to recognize the seams and tensions within 1 *Enoch* 1–36, and nevertheless indicate that *Jubilees* reflects use of the *Book of the Watchers* as we have it. Perhaps also scholars pay less attention to the use of the other chapters because the motifs seem less interesting, or the adaptations diminish evidence of direct dependence. It will be important for our discussion to consider that the use of the *Book of the Watchers* pervades different parts of *Jubilees* and different parts of the *Book of the Watchers* as we have it, and that the pattern of adaptation is persistent.

Even the introduction (1 *Enoch* 1–5), regarded as the latest part of the *Book of the Watchers*, resonates with *Jubilees*.⁷ One general similarity is the theme of forgiveness of sin only for the chosen (1 *Enoch* 1:8; 5:6, likewise *Jub.* 5:17–18). A detail often related by context to the *Dream Visions*, “he saw everything and understood” (*Jub.* 4:19), could also echo “as I heard everything from them, I also understood what I saw” (1 *Enoch* 1:2). Perhaps the most distinctive similarity between the introduction of the *Book of Watchers* and *Jubilees* pertains to the restoration of longevity.

They will transgress no more, nor will they sin all the days of their life, nor will they die in the heat of <God’s> wrath. But the number of their days they will complete, and their life will grow in peace, and the years of their joy will increase in rejoicing and eternal peace for all the days of their life. (1 *Enoch* 5:8–9)⁸

Jubilees 23 uses similar images, indicated with underlining.

In those days the children will begin to study the laws, to seek out the commands, and to return to the right way... They will complete and

7. Lars Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1–5* (ConBNT 12; Lund: Gleerup, 1979) 138–45; Nickelsburg, 1 *Enoch* 1, 132. The introduction presupposes 12–36, which presupposes 6–11, so the introduction is the latest composition, even if 6–11 was later redacted into the narrative.

8. All quotations of 1 *Enoch* are taken from George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, 1 *Enoch: The Hermeneia Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012).

live their entire lifetimes peacefully and joyfully. ... For their entire lifetimes ... very happy forever and ever. (*Jub.* 23:26–30)⁹

Common use of Third Isaiah is relevant but not sufficient to explain the resonance. The dense collocation of terminology and even much of the sequence is distinctive. One may maintain that the authority comes from Isaiah, but it is Isaiah read through the *Book of the Watchers*, which contributes the thematic summary.

Jubilees 4:22 states that Enoch testified to the Watchers who had sinned, and this reflects the major structure of *1 Enoch* 12–16, particularly as laid out in the framework in 12:4; 13:1; 16:2; and 16:4.¹⁰ The motif of written testimony is dominant in both *Jubilees* (4:18, “He was the first to write a testimony,” 19, 23), and this section of *1 Enoch* (13:4, 6; 14:1, etc.). Furthermore, the account of the origin of demons as the spirits of slain giants matches between *Jubilees* 10:5 and *1 Enoch* 15:8 – 16:1.¹¹ Despite matching perfectly in these basic premises, *Jubilees* adapts freely according to the theological principles we will consider more below. There is no heavenly bureaucracy requiring Enoch to testify on behalf of the Watchers, the emphasis is on human responsibility, and demons explain the suffering of the wicked, not the righteous.

The case for use of the last section of the *Book of the Watchers*, Enoch’s heavenly tour in *1 Enoch* 17–36, is limited by the distinctiveness of the parallels, but the fact remains that *Jubilees* accounts for the basic contents of these chapters with the summary, “He was, moreover, with God’s angels for six jubilees of years. They showed him everything on earth and in the heavens—the dominion of the sun—and he wrote down everything” (*Jub.* 4:21).¹² *Jubilees* seems to distinguish this from the *Astronomical Book*, which is better suggested earlier in the chapter (*Jub.* 4:18). One may point to Genesis 5 or claim ubiquitous traditions that interpret Genesis 5 to mean Enoch was taken from the earth in order to tour with angels. Nevertheless, *Jubilees* reads Genesis 5 through the lens of the interpretation best known from *1 Enoch*. For a more specific parallel, one might examine the claim in

9. Unless noted otherwise, translations are taken from James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text* (2 vols.; CSCO 510; Leuven: Peeters, 1989).

10. Knibb, “Which Parts of *1 Enoch* Were Known to *Jubilees*?” 259.

11. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 73.

12. Knibb (“Which Parts of *1 Enoch* Were Known to *Jubilees*?” 259) considers this sufficient evidence that *Jubilees* asserts knowledge of these chapters. See also, Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 74.

both that demons explain idolatry (*1 Enoch* 19:1; *Jub.* 1:11; 11:4).¹³ Again, it need not be argued that *1 Enoch* is the only possible source for such a notion, only that *Jubilees* reads portions of *1 Enoch* along with other sources, and understands the other sources under the influence of portions of *1 Enoch*. Of course there are also major disagreements between *Jubilees* and these chapters, disagreements which are better explained next, with consideration of *Jubilees*' use of the core narrative of the Watchers who sinned in *1 Enoch* 6–11.

B. *Jubilees* Closely Follows the Structure and Motifs of the Narrative in *1 Enoch* 6–11

Jubilees uses the narrative of the sinful Watchers as we know it from *1 Enoch* 6–11. The evidence is not merely the number and specificity of motifs, but the same narrative structure and sequence of motifs. It will be especially important for our consideration of authorship and composition to recognize that *Jubilees* knows *1 Enoch* 6–11 as we have it, with its identifiable tensions and seams. That is, *Jubilees* knows the *Book of the Watchers* in a form in which two or three narrative strands are edited together in a context provided by Genesis 6. Some of the tensions and seams in *Jubilees* can be explained by tensions and seams in the sources used by *Jubilees*, and do not indicate that *Jubilees* itself had multiple authors.

Although scholars continue to differ on details, most follow Devorah Dimant in the observation that within *1 Enoch* 6–11 one can identify distinct narrative threads that could have and presumably did exist as independent narratives before being edited together in the *Book of the Watchers* as we know it.¹⁴ Although they are edited into a common framework, the chapters distinguish two names and primary sins: Shemihazah leads angels who sinned through marrying human women, and Asael sins through teaching

13. James C. VanderKam, "The Demons in the *Book of Jubilees*," in *Die Dämonen: die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt* (eds. Armin Lange, et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003) 339–64, here 354; Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 93.

14. Devorah Dimant, "The 'Fallen Angels' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic Books Related to Them" (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1974 [Hebrew]). See also the discussion in James C. VanderKam, "The Angel Story in the Book of Jubilees," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Esther G. Chazon et al.; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 151–70, here 151–52.

forbidden technologies. The punishment of these sins seems distinct from the flood in most of the narrative; although in a few verses the connection is made. This development may itself reflect the redactional history of Genesis 6, since Gen 6:1–4 can be read either as a discrete unit or in the context of the chapter as we have it, which would suggest a causal relationship with the flood and various other comments about the wickedness and punishment of humans. Segal has already elaborated the development of 1 *Enoch* 6–11 and demonstrated that *Jubilees* knows it in its current, combined state.¹⁵ Although *Jubilees* irons over some seams, for example by dropping the names of the angels associated with distinct sins, other seams remain, such as the distinct punishments of imprisonment for the Watchers, sword and warfare for the giants, and flood for humans. It is clear that *Jubilees* uses the *Book of the Watchers* as we know it, with its identifiable tensions. It is generally accepted that *Jubilees* uses sources which contain tensions within themselves, with other authoritative sources, and with later theological principles.

Jubilees persistently reflects 1 *Enoch* 6–11 in chapter 5 and elsewhere. Perhaps most important is the identical sequence and structure of motifs, namely the motifs of giants devouring one another, announcement of the flood, the divinely initiated sword and war between the giants (linked to Gen 6:3), the fathers watching, the double incarceration of the fathers in the depths of the earth, and new creation.¹⁶ *Jubilees* consistently and thoroughly reformulates its sources other than Genesis, but particular phrases do appear in addition to the broader structure and motifs. *Jubilees* uses the term “Watchers” for the angels who sinned in five places throughout the book.¹⁷ *Jubilees* also follows the *Book of the Watchers* for the motif of illicit teaching, although it is moved to a different place in the narrative and changed in content, as discussed below. *Jubilees* also matches the *Book of the Watchers* in the phrase “great day of judgment” (1 *Enoch* 10:6 and *Jub.* 5:10; 23:11). The “new creation” in *Jub.* 5:12 matches the idea of 1 *Enoch* 10–11, although for the formulation one would have to go to 1 *Enoch* 72:1.¹⁸

15. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 109–16.

16. *Ibid.*, 115–16; Nickelsburg, 1 *Enoch* 1, 73.

17. Apparently *Jubilees* does not allow a category of Watchers who did not sin. Cf. Dan 4:13, 17, 23. In *Jub.* 2:2 the highest orders of angels are named as the angels of the presence and the angels of holiness, and are never equated with Watchers.

18. *Jubilees* 5:12 reads literally “new and righteous creation,” translated by VanderKam “new and righteous nature.” Cf. Isaiah 65:17; 66:22 (new heavens and new earth).

As we shall see, the motifs are adapted in very different directions, but the basic fact of resonance remains.

C. *Jubilees* Interprets the *Book of the Watchers* as Scripture

Thus far we have seen that *Jubilees* depends heavily on the narrative of the Watchers as we know it in *1 Enoch* 6–11. It is reasonable to conclude further that *Jubilees* uses the complete *Book of the Watchers*. Although the depth of interest is not uniform, *Jubilees* seems to go out of its way to claim knowledge of the *Astronomical Book* and the *Book of Dreams* in some form, and perhaps even the basic premise of the *Apocalypse of Weeks* from the *Epistle*. Our interest is not merely whether *Jubilees* knew these sources, but how *Jubilees* used these sources. It remains for us to consider how *Jubilees* worked out the perceived theological problems in the sources, and whether such use of sources should be considered “authorship” or “redaction.” Before proceeding, we should be clear with our categories, and at least grapple with the question: Does *Jubilees* use the *Book of the Watchers* as scripture? If not, can we distinguish a distinct category, such that *Jubilees* uses the *Book of the Watchers* as interpretation of scripture?

The difficulty of the question cannot be avoided by refusing to ask it. Often the unstated assumption is that the author of *Jubilees* knew a category of scripture which corresponds to the Bible of Rabbinic Judaism, and that other works including *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* itself fall in a different category, namely interpretations of scripture. For example van Ruiten discusses the narrative of the Watchers in *Jub.* 5:1–19 as an interpretation of Genesis 6:1–12, and describes all other sources as “current interpretations of the text” of Genesis.¹⁹ It is not wrong to describe the *Book of the Watchers* as an interpretation of Genesis, but interpretations can themselves become sources for interpretation.²⁰ Van Ruiten’s categories of scripture and interpretation may also explain his unwillingness to accept

19. J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, “The Interpretation of Genesis 6:1–12 in *Jubilees* 5:1–19,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. Matthias Albani et al.; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997) 59–75, here 74.

20. Fishbane and Levinson, among others, have shown time and again that the interpretation of sources is an ongoing process, and interpretations quickly become sources themselves. Michael A. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1985); Bernard M. Levinson, *Legal Revision and Religious Renewal in Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008). Note in particular Levinson’s extensive annotated bibliography.

allusions and similarities to the *Book of the Watchers* as evidence that it is a source for *Jubilees*. “Differences in wording” does not mean a source is not used and interpreted.²¹ *Jubilees* may follow Genesis in a particularly close way, but it is also clear that *Jubilees* interprets Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and Psalms even when not using the same words.²² Unlike van Ruiten, Segal fully recognizes the close dependence of *Jubilees* on the *Book of the Watchers*, but still seems to operate with categories of scripture and interpretation, the latter of which includes the *Book of the Watchers*. The *Book of the Watchers* is an “extant rewritten story” redacted into rewritten scripture, but it is not scripture and the rewriting of it is not rewritten scripture.²³ *Jubilees*’ rewriting of Genesis is interpretation and its rewriting of the *Book of the Watchers* is redaction.

The alternative, that *Jubilees* interprets the *Book of the Watchers* in the same way that it interprets other sources that became canonical, has already been suggested by Reed: “It is clear, for instance, that the author reads Gen 6:1–4 through 1 *Enoch* 6–16 (BW). Indeed, it may be more accurate to say that the author reworks the *Book of the Watchers* just as he reworks Genesis, selectively expanding, omitting, and reinterpreting passages to fit his own aims.”²⁴ Although *Jubilees* depends on Genesis more than the *Book of the Watchers* for its overall structure, the manner of use is comparable to the use of Genesis and other sources. Reed avoids the term “scripture,” but does suggest a category of authoritative sources: “The *Book of the Watchers* was clearly a privileged source and intertext for the

21. Van Ruiten, “The Interpretation of Genesis 6:1–12 in *Jubilees* 5:1–19,” 73; idem, *Primaevial History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the Book of Jubilees* (JSJ-Sup 66; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 197. We may want to distinguish between interpretations that follow a source closely or loosely, but we cannot exclude either. Alexander suggested the terms “centripetal” and “centrifugal” to describe the distinction between interpretations that keep returning to a source and those that use it as a starting point for a digression. Philip S. Alexander, “Retelling the Old Testament,” in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF* (ed. Donald A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1988) 99–121, here 117.

22. James L. Kugel, “The *Jubilees* Apocalypse,” *DSD* 1 (1994) 322–37; Todd R. Hanelken, *The Subversion of the Apocalypses in the Book of Jubilees* (SBLEJL 34; Atlanta: SBL, 2012) 225–36; VanderKam, “The Angel Story in the Book of Jubilees,” 164–69; John Sietze Bergsma, *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran: A History of Interpretation* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

23. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 4–5, 142. For the latest discussion of rewritten scripture see Molly M. Zahn, “Genre and Rewritten Scripture: A Reassessment,” *JBL* 131 (2012) 271–88.

24. Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 89.

author of *Jubilees*, and his description of Enoch's composition of this text (4:21–22) suggests that he granted it an authority akin to Genesis itself."²⁵ Reed's assessment is consistent with the evidence discussed here, and we can move further toward an understanding of the category "scripture" as far as the author of *Jubilees* is concerned, and demonstrate that the *Book of the Watchers* belongs in that category.

For the present we will speak only of how *Jubilees* uses sources, and not attempt a comprehensive definition and methodology for establishing a category "scripture." It is no small task to define a category that is both appropriate to ancient times and useful to scholars. It would be relatively easy to establish that *Jubilees* uses a category defined as writings revealed from heaven to ancient heroes and preserved by the Levites.²⁶ However, such a definition would not tell scholars much about how such a category was used. For the present, progress can be made by thinking about scripture as *received writings that need to be interpreted*. In particular, it will be necessary to focus on the component "need" to be clear that not all writings used in other writings are scripture. There is indeed a distinction between interpretations and other sources that can be used if they are convenient and helpful, and scripture which must be accounted for especially when it does not clearly make the point the interpreter wishes to make. Scriptural sources are unlike other sources in that they cannot be ignored. If such a distinction between obligatory and optional is to be labeled as scripture and interpretation, it is essential to be clear that the categories are not inherent qualities of texts, but distinct ways of using sources. Again, scripture by any definition includes writings that are themselves interpretations of older sources.²⁷ Furthermore, the identification of the use of a source as scripture is not challenged by disagreements and tensions. Indeed, the "need" to interpret is strongest when the apparent meaning of a source is other than the meaning proposed by the interpreter.²⁸ Thus, the question becomes: does *Jubilees* use the *Book of the Watchers* as a convenient, pre-fabricated articulation of its

25. *Ibid.*, 94.

26. See especially, *Jub.* 45:16, "He gave all his books and the books of his fathers to his son Levi so that he could preserve them and renew them for his sons until today."

27. See note 20.

28. This point was already suggested in, Todd R. Hanneken, "The Status and Interpretation of Jubilees in 4Q390," in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam* (ed. Eric F. Mason et al; 2 vols.; JSJSup 153; Leiden: Brill, 2011) 2:407–28, here 407.

own understanding of Genesis and primordial times, or does *Jubilees* need to account for these writings and interpret them as meaning something other than what they appear to mean, something consistent with the ideas of the interpreter?

Jubilees approaches the *Book of the Watchers* differently than other Enochic literature, but the core pattern of accounting for writings and reassigning meaning remains constant. *Jubilees* insists on being aware of the *Astronomical Book*, but re-assigns its meaning to supporting the same calendar as *Jubilees*. *Jubilees* claims to know of Enoch's dreams, heavenly journey, and testimony, but presents them as examples of the author's own very different views. *Jubilees* says more to account for the Watchers narrative, which allows us to say more about how *Jubilees* uses it. Two considerations will suggest that *Jubilees* uses the *Book of the Watchers* as a source that needs to be interpreted: *Jubilees* uses the *Book of the Watchers* persistently and for multiple purposes, and *Jubilees* substantially alters the meaning the source may appear to have on its own.

The first point is lost in studies that focus only on the fourth and fifth chapters of *Jubilees*. Those chapters are foundational in establishing awareness of the life and writings of Enoch and the story of the Watchers. However, *Jubilees* does not stop using the *Book of the Watchers* after the flood story.²⁹ Not only does *Jubilees* continue to use it, *Jubilees* puts it to different uses. The *Book of the Watchers* is not simply an extant rewriting of Genesis 6 pulled off the shelf and redacted for that purpose, then put back on the shelf. After *Jubilees* 4 and 5, five other chapters continue to make use of the *Book of the Watchers*, in addition to references to other testimonies of Enoch.³⁰

29. Bergsma ("The Relationship Between Jubilees and the Early Enochic Books [Astronomical Book and Book of the Watchers]," 50) makes the point that the use of the *Book of the Watchers* does die down after the flood and does not appear in the second half of *Jubilees*. This is an appropriate response to claims that *Jubilees* follows the same basic stream of Judaism as the Enochic literature or can even be considered Enochic literature itself. One would not want to say that the use of the *Book of the Watchers* is more central than Leviticus or Deuteronomy, but it is used more than would allow us to dismiss it as an adopted interpretation of Genesis.

30. For examples of other testimonies attributed to Enoch, see *Jub.* 7:38, which attributes to Enoch a testimony of legal interpretation pertaining to first-fruits, known to later audiences as *Lev.* 19:23–25. Similarly, *Jub.* 21:10 attributes to Enoch sacrificial laws known to us from *Lev.* 19:5–8.

- *Jub.* 7:21–22 – Noah gives commands to his grandchildren (a form of Noachide laws), using the Watchers as examples of the sins of fornication, impurity, and injustice.
- *Jub.* 8:3 – After the division of the nations, not before the flood, *Jubilees* addresses illicit angelic teaching, with modification of contents (from various technologies to only astrology) and consequence (from all humanity to only Babylonians).
- *Jub.* 10:5 – *Jubilees* follows the *Book of the Watchers* for the origin narrative and destructive nature of demons, but not their fate.
- *Jub.* 11:4 – Demons explain the driving force behind idolatry, related to *1 Enoch* 19:1, with additional emphasis on Gentiles.
- *Jub.* 20:5 – *Jubilees* uses the giants as an example of perfect justice, along with Sodom, which takes over as the dominant example.

The persistent use is not a matter of repetitiveness on the same point. *Jubilees* re-purposes the *Book of the Watchers* with a very different view of theodicy. *Jubilees* also develops an additional purpose, the explanation of idolatry. Furthermore, *Jubilees* develops the story as a testimony against intermarriage.³¹ Last but not least, *Jubilees* puts the *Book of the Watchers* to a new purpose in establishing the boundaries between Israel and the nations, which requires repositioning some elements after the division of nations.

We have already encountered many ways in which *Jubilees* does not merely incorporate a story or motif from the *Book of the Watchers*. A systematic examination of the major differences will establish that *Jubilees* needs to interpret the *Book of the Watchers* because it needs to account for and provide new meaning to received writings that otherwise appear to contradict the author's view of theodicy and other fundamental theological issues. This will support the previous point that *Jubilees* wrestles

31. The *Book of the Watchers* may have been written partially for a purpose of opposing certain priestly marriages, but *Jubilees* develops the theme explicitly for all of Israel. It has been argued by Suter ("Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in *1 Enoch* 6–16," *HUCA* 50 [1979] 115–35) and Nickelsburg ("Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *JBL* 100 [1981] 575–600) that concern about priestly marriages may underlie the original composition of the *Book of the Watchers*. Reed ("Enochic and Mosaic Traditions in *Jubilees*: The Evidence of Angelology and Demonology," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* [eds. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009] 353–68, here 360–61; eadem, *Fallen Angels*, 91–92), building on Halpern-Amaru (*The Empowerment of Women in the Book of Jubilees* [JSJSup 60; Leiden: Brill, 1999] 147–59), has shown that the point has become explicit in *Jubilees* and generalized as a paradigm for all intermarriage between Israel and Gentiles.

with the *Book of the Watchers* as scripture, and lead to the following point about the unity of composition of *Jubilees*, namely the theological uniformity in the author's rewriting of other sources and the legal conclusions drawn from them.

II. *Jubilees* Changes the Theological Meaning of the Watchers Story

An explanation of how *Jubilees* uses the *Book of the Watchers* must account for the manner in which *Jubilees* does not merely adopt elements, but adapts the fundamental theological message. The use of scripture exhibited by *Jubilees* is interpretation at the deepest level. It involves reconciling sources, harmonizing ideas, and wrestling with ideas that cannot be harmonized. The extent to which *Jubilees* demonstrates a need to dramatically re-appropriate the fundamental messages of the *Book of the Watchers* is not simply a matter of polemic between competing forms of Judaism. Furthermore, the wrestling does not undermine the claim that *Jubilees* uses the *Book of the Watchers* as scripture. *Jubilees* interprets the *Book of the Watchers* because it needs to do so. It needs to account for the narrative and traditional motifs, but adapts the apparent meaning to conform to a very different theological perspective. Specifically, *Jubilees* changes key details to replace the view of unjust suffering. In Judaism at the time of *Jubilees* and beyond, few theological issues were more discussed than reconciling the experience of unjust suffering with the belief in a single, omnipotent, just God (theodicy). The manner in which *Jubilees* accounts for the *Book of the Watchers* and confronts the apparent meaning on this fundamental theological issue tells us about the use of scripture in *Jubilees* and beyond.

A. Overview of the Contested Issue of Unjust Suffering

Jubilees transforms the Watchers traditions from an etiology of injustice into a paradigm of perfect justice. In the *Book of the Watchers* evil is understood as independent, cosmic opposition to God. Evil originated in heaven and was imposed on the human realm.³² In *Jubilees*, there is evil

32. For the centrality of the explanation of evil and suffering in the *Book of the Watchers* see John J. Collins, "The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature and the Dead Sea

in the sense of disobedience or sin, and suffering as a just punishment of sin, but *Jubilees* denies the existence of evil in the sense of unjust suffering. The case of the Watchers is one example among many testimonies of the absolute principle stated clearly in *Jub.* 5:18, “There is no injustice.” Two related general principles follow. First, *Jubilees* transforms the story of the Watchers from an explanation of suffering in the present to a story resolved in the past with no lingering relevance except as an exhortation to avoid sin. In the *Book of the Watchers* the spread of evil was only partially checked in the days of Noah.³³ Demons and destructive teachings continue to rule the earthly domain. The flood is a prototype for a future judgment, destruction, and restoration of an elect remnant. Justice is promised for the future, but absent in the present, deferred until a final batch process of judgment. In *Jubilees*, on the contrary, there are no lingering effects of the sin. Judgment, punishment, and restoration have already been perfectly executed. There are many days of judgment, not one deferred batch judgment. The second related principle is that *Jubilees* transforms the function of the narrative for the human audience. The *Book of the Watchers* can be seen as consolation to those who suffer and an exhortation to endure in hope of future vindication.³⁴ The righteousness of those who suffer is unchallenged. *Jubilees* denies that the righteous suffer, and reframes suffering as a consequence of sin, such that the purpose of the narrative becomes an exhortation to avoid sin. Similarly, the angels who sin go from the paradigmatic “other” who victimize the audience, to paradigms of human sin and accountability whose relevance is tied to the ways in which they are like the human audience (specifically, Israel). The general principle of perfect justice and related principles of past resolution and function as exhortation against human sin will be illustrated with seven specific adaptations

Scrolls,” in *Congress Volume, Paris 1992* (ed. John Adney Emerton; VTSup 61; Leiden: Brill, 1995) 25–38; reprint, pages 287–99 in *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1997) here 288–90.

33. This is most apparent in the promised restoration in *1 Enoch* 10:18–11:2, which was not fulfilled in the days of Noah. See the discussion in Grant Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (JSJSup 115; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 33–34.

34. The evidence that the *Book of the Watchers* could be read this way and was read this way at the time of *Jubilees* depends not only on the features of the *Book of Watchers* itself, but the other Enochic books, such as the *Animal Apocalypse* and *Apocalypse of Weeks*, which read and follow the *Book of the Watchers* in this way. For more on the function of the genre “apocalypse” in general see Adela Yarbro Collins, “Introduction,” *Semeia* 36 (1986) 1–11 and the other essays in that issue.

that *Jubilees* makes to the narrative from the *Book of the Watchers*. First, consideration of context in modern scholarship, the rest of *Jubilees*, and ancient Judaism will set the stage.

Many of the differences in the Watchers stories of the *Book of the Watchers* and *Jubilees* are frequently noted in scholarship, either as passing curiosities or as evidence that *Jubilees* does not even know the *Book of the Watchers*.³⁵ The theological significance of the pattern of differences is less frequently discussed. Three notable exceptions, Reed, Stuckenbruck, and Segal, arrive at assessments very similar to the generalizations above. In 2005, Reed noted that *Jubilees* links the punishment of humans in the flood, the imprisonment of the Watchers, and death by sword among the giants as three examples of perfect justice.³⁶ In 2009 she concluded more generally, “Jubilees’ depiction of angels and fallen angels draws heavily on Enochic models. Yet it transforms these models by subordinating them to a theodicy more in line with the Deuteronomistic principle.”³⁷ Similarly, Stuckenbruck noted the adaptation in function, “Rather than etiologically explanatory, the force of these stories—including that of the fallen angels—is exhortational and paradigmatic.”³⁸ Segal also recognizes the rejection of the explanation of evil in the *Book of the Watchers*, and notes the repurposing from etiology of evil to paradigm of sin and punishment, and the emphasis on God as the perfect judge.³⁹ Here the major qualification, to be discussed in the following section, is that Segal finds this true of what he calls the redactional layer in *Jub.* 5:13–18 (and other places throughout the book), but not the adopted material in *Jub.* 5:1–12.⁴⁰ The theological tension evident in the way *Jubilees* uses its sources has been observed and warrants further attention.

35. Van Ruiten, “The Interpretation of Genesis 6:1–12 in *Jubilees* 5:1–19,” 73.

36. Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 91.

37. Eadem, “Enochic and Mosaic Traditions,” 366–67.

38. Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “The Book of Jubilees and the Origin of Evil,” *ibid.*, 294–308, here 307. Similarly, VanderKam, “The Angel Story in the Book of Jubilees,” 170.

39. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 138–40.

40. Segal (*ibid.*, 323) also observes that *Jubilees* rejects the view that evil originated in angelic sin and remains to be judged fully in the future, but comes to different conclusions about what view of evil is promoted. Segal proposes that *Jubilees* understands evil as created dualism, much like the Instruction on Two Spirits. If that were the case one would expect to find evidence of it in the creation account. Rather, if one understands evil as unjust suffering, *Jub.* 5:13 is clear, “there is no injustice.” If one understands evil as suffering, then it does come from God, but it is just punishment for sin, not dualism of independent good and evil cosmic forces.

A brief look at broader context will illustrate the significance of the explanation of unjust suffering in Jewish thought around the time of *Jubilees*. First, the theological principle of perfect justice resonates throughout *Jubilees*, not only in its treatment of the *Book of the Watchers*.⁴¹ For example, *Jubilees* turns Cain into an example of perfect justice, supernaturally killed in the manner in which he killed (*Jub.* 4:31), contrary to Genesis which does not mention the death (penalty or natural) of Cain. Starting with the Abraham cycle, the Watchers as examples of perfect justice are joined and then replaced by Sodom, which becomes the dominant example (*Jub.* 16; 20:5–6; 22:22; 36:10).⁴² Outside the *Book of Jubilees*, concern with the issue, and a position relatively close to *Jubilees*, can be found in Ben Sira. Sirach 2 claims that the truly righteous face suffering only as temporary trials, and are always vindicated in life, implying “no” to the rhetorical question, “has anyone hoped in the Lord and been disappointed?” (*Sir* 2:10). Chapter 39 speaks more generally about the goodness of the cosmos, and denies the existence of injustice. “Evil” in the sense of bad things is only for the wicked, and hence not evil in the sense of unjust suffering (*Sir* 39:25–27). The point is repeated and summarized at the end of the chapter, “The works of God are all of them good; every need when it comes he fills. No cause to say: ‘This is not as good as that’; for each shows its worth at the proper time” (*Sir* 39:33–34). Recognizing the theological similarity between Ben Sira and *Jubilees* on this point pays dividends in applying the substantial scholarship on the relationship between Ben Sira and the early Enochic literature. The tension is widely observed, although it has been characterized variously as rivalry, indirect polemic, or direct polemic.⁴³ Along with the similarity between Ben Sira and *Jubilees* on their views of cosmic justice stands a stark difference on how they use the *Book*

41. See also *ibid.*, 137–42.

42. *Sirach* 16:7–8 also seems to associate Sodom with the giants as examples of sin and punishment.

43. The explanation as rivalry between competing schools is made most persuasively by Randal A. Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation and Judgment* (SBLEJL 8; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995) 250. The explanation as indirect polemic is advanced by Benjamin G. Wright, “‘Fear the Lord and Honor the Priest’: Ben Sira as Defender of the Jerusalem Priesthood,” in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference, 28–31 July 1996, Soesterberg, Netherlands* (ed. Pancratius C. Beentjes; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997) 189–222, here 220. The explanation as direct polemic is argued by Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism*, 80. See also Saul M. Olyan, “Ben Sira’s Relationship to the Priesthood,” *HTR* 80 (1987) 261–86, here 279–80.

of the *Watchers*. Whereas Ben Sira at most alludes derisively to Enochic literature,⁴⁴ *Jubilees* asserts awareness of the entire available corpus and reclaims the meaning of the major motifs of the *Watchers* story. With the broader significance in mind we turn to seven specific adaptations *Jubilees* brings to the *Watchers* story appropriated from the *Book of the Watchers* and made to fit a theology of perfect un-deferred justice.

B. Angels Descend to Earth on a Good Mission

The *Watchers* story in the *Book of the Watchers* opens with a conspiracy in heaven of angels knowingly rebelling against God. This emphasis on the supernatural origin of evil imposed on humans from without is widely recognized as among the most fundamental features of the theodicy of the *Book of the Watchers*.⁴⁵ *Jubilees* flatly rejects this view. Although it takes only a few words, *Jubilees* twice rejects the heavenly origin of sin, making this the most plainly observed divergence from the *Book of the Watchers*.⁴⁶ *Jubilees* asserts that the angels came to earth with a good mission from God, and only much later fell into the sin of intermarriage. The first mention comes in the genealogy of Jared, “He named him Jared because during his lifetime the angels of the Lord who were called *Watchers* descended to earth to teach mankind and to do what is just and upright upon the earth” (*Jub.* 4:15). The point is repeated in the story of sin and punishment, “Against his angels whom he had sent to the earth he was angry...” (*Jub.* 5:6). The theological difference is clear. Is evil a supernatural force of enmity against God, or is evil succumbing to temptation in the human realm? Is it cosmic or earthly in origin and nature?

As profound as the divergence is on first sight, we must also consider the argument by Segal that there is no profound theological claim here, but only chronological tinkering. That is, Segal argues, *Jubilees* is constrained

44. On this point see the works in the previous note, especially Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 74–82, 231 and his understanding of Sir 3:21–28; 16:17–23; 32:15–17; and 34:1–8.

45. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 41, 46–47; Gabriele Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History, from Ezekiel to Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002) 90–91.

46. For example, VanderKam (“The Angel Story in the Book of *Jubilees*,” 155) observes that the change “protects the reputation of heaven by distancing it from evil.” Reed (“Enochic and Mosaic Traditions,” 360–62) observes the move from an etiology of evil to a testimony against intermarriage, such that *Watchers* intermarrying on earth is comparable to Israel intermarrying in foreign lands.

by the chronology suggested by Genesis, which would place the birth of Jared (whose name suggests “descent”) well before the flood, and the angelic intermarriage understood as occurring 120 years before the flood. Two weaknesses in Segal’s argument should be noted, along with a deeper issue that the theological significance remains even if the change also meets a chronological need.

First, Segal dismisses the explanation that *Jubilees* deliberately shifts the origin of sin from heaven to earth, and VanderKam’s explanation in particular. Segal’s basis is the example of Mastema, from which he concludes that “it is reasonable to posit that the assumption of an evil angel in heaven did not trouble the rewriter theologically.”⁴⁷ But the example of Mastema better illustrates the *rejection* of cosmic evil arrayed against God. Although Mastema does take on the biblical role of accuser in the heavenly court (*satan*), Mastema does not rebel against God, and is not a formidable enemy. The trouble that Mastema does create for the righteous is in fact *Jubilees*’ effort to distance negative action from God, including initiating a cruel test of Abraham (*Jub.* 17:16 cf. Gen 22:1 and Job 1–2), trying to kill Moses (*Jub.* 48:2 cf. MT Exod 4:24), and empowering the Egyptian magicians (*Jub.* 48:9 cf. Exod 7:11–13; 9:12).⁴⁸ As is often the case, the perceived tension or equivocation in *Jubilees* about supernatural destructive forces comes directly from the tensions in the sources *Jubilees* is trying to reconcile.

Second, the chronological need which Segal identifies as the sole purpose of the change hangs entirely on the interpretation of “in the days of Jared” to mean “just prior to the birth of Jared,” as opposed to “during the lifetime of Jared” (as translated by VanderKam). *Jubilees* stands among many ancient texts to take the 120 years of Gen 6:3 as time until judgment and the name Jared in Gen 5:15 to refer to the decent of angels.⁴⁹ There is no reason *Jubilees* could not have reconciled the tension in the same way that its sources did, by placing the decent during the lifetime of Jared (such that he was either named prophetically or remembered by a name other than one given at birth). As Segal observes, *Jubilees* follows the precise formulation of the source, “in the days of Jared” (1 *Enoch* 6:6; 4QEn 102

47. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 126.

48. For more on Mastema throughout *Jubilees* see Hanneken, *Subversion of the Apocalypses*, 70–82.

49. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 183–85, 212–313. See also 1 *Enoch* 6:6; 106:13; 1QapGen 3:3; 4Q252.

I iii 4; cf. “in the generation of Jared,” 1 *Enoch* 106:13). Segal’s argument that this formulation is a problem for *Jubilees* (unlike its source) depends on analogy with *Jub.* 8:8. This verse does correspond to “in his days” in Gen 10:25, but *Jubilees* does *not* render it as “in his days” but rather, “at the time when he was born” (literally: on the day that he was born). The comparison does not prove that when *Jubilees* says “in his days” it means “at the time when he was born,” but rather that *Jubilees* distinguishes between the two.⁵⁰ Thus, when *Jub.* 4:15 says “in his [Jared’s] days” it does *not* mean “at the time of his birth” but rather, “during his lifetime,” as in VanderKam’s translation and 1 *Enoch* 6:6. Thus, there is no chronological problem, because 120 years before the flood easily falls within Jared’s lifetime.

But there is also a deeper issue here, more at the heart of how *Jubilees* uses its sources. Even if it were the case that *Jubilees* was also meeting a chronological need with this change, that would not diminish its theological significance. It is difficult to believe that an ancient Jewish author or redactor would make this change twice without recognizing its implications, and would not look for a different chronological solution if the change created unintended theological meaning. Indeed, it is necessary to understand Segal’s broader argument in order to understand his determination to describe this change as “unrelated to the theological outlook of the ‘rewriter.’”⁵¹ Segal’s broader argument is that *Jubilees* does not have an author, but a redactor who fits together many preexisting narratives and adds a layer of legal and chronological commentary. Although it has long been recognized that *Jubilees* uses many sources besides Genesis and Exodus, Segal pushes further to claim that the theology of the redactor can be found only in the legal and chronological layer, and not the narrative

50. The phrase “in his days” also appears in *Jub.* 10:19 correlating the birth of Ragew/Reu with the construction of the Tower of Babel. In the text as it stands, “in his days” unambiguously means “during his lifetime.” Segal makes a reasonable case for emending 10:18 from the 33rd to 34th jubilee, despite various problems (Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 129–30 n. 72). However, even with the emendation, Ragew/Reu was already born when they started building. Thus Segal argues for a double-emendation, claiming a second scribe made a second change in response to the first change (dropping 33rd from *Jub.* 10:20). The argument from sequence is not convincing because backtracking somewhere is inevitable, but the double-emendation is plausible if we assume verses 18 and 20 but not 27 are corrupt. Even with the double-emendation, however, the tower had not been built until Ragew/Reu’s lifetime (5–11 years old), although the process had begun earlier. Thus, VanderKam’s rendering is still sensible, “during his lifetime they built the city and tower” (*Jub.* 10:19).

51. *Ibid.*, 126.

layer.⁵² In the case of *Jubilees* 5, verses 1–12 are lifted from the *Book of the Watchers*, and the theology of the redactor does not appear until verses 13–18. Yet in this first example we see that *Jubilees* does make a change to the source, that change does have theological significance, and further, that theological significance matches the emphasis on a perfectly just cosmos in the “redactional layer.” Segal is forced to argue that the change has no theological significance as merely an accident of superficial chronological tinkering, and that it is merely a coincidence that the change matches the theology of the redactor. The obvious alternative is that the person who produced *Jubilees* used many sources, attempted with great difficulty to reconcile the tensions within and between them, and reworked them as thoroughly as necessary to fit his own theological priorities. We can benefit from studying the seams and unresolved tensions, and thereby gain insight into the priorities that governed reconciling sources in tension. However, we should not deny the theological significance of the rewriting, or exclude creative use of sources from our concept of authorship in antiquity. We shall return to the unity of *Jubilees* 5 and the conception of authorship that applies to it in the final sections.

C. *Jubilees* Moves Illicit Teaching to after the Division of the Nations

One of the more subtle, and more often misunderstood, curiosities of the manner in which *Jubilees* uses the *Book of the Watchers* is the treatment of the illicit teachings associated with Asael. It is true both that *Jubilees* ignores the motif in its retelling of the Watchers story in chapter 5, and that *Jubilees* uses the motif. *Jubilees* includes the idea of illicit angelic instruction, but reframes some of the same instructions as licit. *Jubilees* adapts and moves the motif to an entirely different place in the narrative. We can observe this as another example of *Jubilees* using the *Book of the Watchers* persistently and creatively, not just excerpting it in a certain context. We can learn more about the theological significance of the alteration by considering why *Jubilees* would reuse the source in such a way.

In the *Book of the Watchers* all humanity is corrupted by illicit angelic teaching, and the consequences continue long after the angels themselves are bound in the depths of the earth. In general, the *Book of the Watchers* is universal, both in its setting before the division of the nations, and in the

52. *Ibid.*, 34–35, 322, discussed further below.

absence of anticipation of the categories of Israel and other nations.⁵³ In particular, the technologies listed in the *Book of the Watchers*, regretted or not, are general characteristics of ancient civilizations, including Israel: iron weapons, jewelry, cosmetics, cutting of roots (pharmacology), magic, and astrological omens (*1 Enoch* 8:1–3). In addition to the issue of universalism, the illicit teachings are intertwined with the view of the justice of the cosmos in the present. In the *Book of the Watchers* the present world does not reflect God’s justice but rather the corruption introduced by cosmic rebellion against God. Justice remains for the future.

Jubilees, from beginning to end, maintains both the special status of Israel apart from all other nations, and God’s perfect justice in the present. In order to account for the tradition of illicit angelic teaching and bring it into conformity with those two principles, several changes need to be made.

8:2 When the boy [Noah’s great-grandson Kainan] grew up, his father taught him (the art of) writing. He went to look for a place of his own where he could possess his own city. 8:3 He found an inscription which the ancients had incised in a rock. He read what was in it, copied it, and sinned on the basis of what was in it, since in it was the Watchers’ teaching by which they used to observe the omens of the sun, moon, and stars and every heavenly sign. 8:4 He wrote (it) down but told no one about it because he was afraid to tell Noah about it lest he become angry at him about it.

First, moving the account shifts the significance for theodicy. The earth has not been corrupted, humanity has not been corrupted, only one nation (Babylon as it turns out) has been corrupted. The existence of bad teaching in the world is not denied, but it is isolated. This is the second point: the righteous Noah is protected from complicity. The *Book of the Watchers* does not say how the technologies survived the flood, but Noah’s family constitutes the prime suspects by process of elimination. *Jubilees* maintains Noah’s innocence by explaining that the teachings survived without help from Noah or his immediate household, and indeed despite his clear intent. Certainly the category “Noah’s Books” would not include such teachings.

Yet there is no avoiding that the chosen line did eventually become corrupt, so *Jubilees* transforms the story into a tool for setting the stage for

53. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 54, 76.

Abraham. The illicit teaching of the Watchers explains how Abraham was born into a corrupt family, and elevates Abraham for single-handedly correcting the illicit teaching of the Watchers (*Jub.* 12:17), which led to him receiving additional licit teaching, including angelic guidance in restoring Noah's books (*Jub.* 12:27). That is, the omens of heavenly signs are passed down to Ur of the Chaldeans. The illicit teaching explains the astrology of the Babylonians (*Jub.* 11:3, 8; which Abraham was born into and corrected, 12:17), which is associated with the idolatry of the Babylonians (11:4; which Abraham was born into and corrected, 11:16; 12:2, 12), which explains how the Babylonians fell under the jurisdiction of the demons and Mastema (11:5; 11:11; whom Abraham defeated 11:24; 18:12). Thus the motif of illicit angelic teaching, though removed from the story of the Watchers in *Jubilees* 5, takes on a central role in establishing narrative continuity from the Noah stories to the Abraham stories. Scholars sometimes speak dismissively of *Jubilees* as retelling stories, fixing problems as it goes. In this case we see a much more substantial reconstruction of a narrative from disparate sources. The contrast between the illicit knowledge of the Babylonians and the licit knowledge of Abraham (passed down through the Levites) also enhances again *Jubilees*' persistent contrast between Israel and the nations.⁵⁴

D. The Consequence of Demons Moved to after the Division of the Nations

Jubilees also reinterprets the role of the demons from explaining unjust suffering to assuring perfect justice. In the *Book of the Watchers* the demons are indiscriminately destructive. They explain the illness and suffering of the righteous. There is no justice in the destruction they cause, and they are not judged in the present age.

They are making desolate without (incurring) judgment. They will make desolate until the day of the consummation of the great judg-

54. *Jubilees* also reworks the contents of the angelic teaching. While Israel can hardly claim to be free of the corruption of making iron weapons (1 *Enoch* 8:1), *Jubilees* revises the contents of the illicit teaching to include only Babylonian astrology (perhaps also touching on the polemic against the Babylonian calendar, *Jub.* 6:36). Reed (*Fallen Angels*, 92–93) notes the transformation of the motif from an etiology of sin to an etiology of divination. Stuckenbruck (“The Book of Jubilees and the Origin of Evil,” 305) notes that *Jubilees* diminishes illicit teaching and moves some to the category of licit teaching. In particular, the cutting of roots is illicit in 1 *Enoch* 8:3 and using plants as medicine is licit in *Jub.* 10:12.

ment, when the great age will be consummated. It will be consummated all at once. (1 *Enoch* 16:1)

Simply put, they are evil in the way the *Book of the Watchers* understands evil, as causing unjust suffering. *Jubilees* adopts the basic premise of the origin of demons as the spirits of the slain giants, their half-angel nature that can neither be killed nor ascend to heaven (1 *Enoch* 15:8–10; *Jub.* 10:5). *Jubilees* also accepts that they are “evil,” but the radical theological change is to redefine evil itself.

The view of demons in *Jubilees* is comparable to the view of scorpions in Sirach: they seem bad but they are actually good because they only serve the purpose of punishing the wicked. They are agents of justice.

Fire and hail, famine and disease: these too were created for punishment. Ravenous beasts, scorpions, vipers, and the avenging sword to exterminate the wicked: All these were created to meet a need, and are kept in his storehouse for the proper time. When he commands them, they rejoice, in their assigned tasks they do not disobey his command. That is why from the first I took my stand, and wrote down as my theme: The works of God are all of them good; he supplies for every need in its own time. There is no cause then to say: “This is not as good as that”; for each shows its worth at the proper time. (Sir 39:29–34)

The point here could be fairly paraphrased as “there is no injustice” (*Jub.* 5:13). *Jubilees* does not avoid using the word “bad” or use the word “good” in describing the demons, but *Jubilees* does limit the role of demons to the good purpose of punishing wickedness. *Jubilees* might also substitute “God allowed the demons to be released” for “God created,” but generally *Jubilees* imposes the theology articulated by Ben Sira (no direct dependence is here argued) on the story of the Watchers and their offspring articulated by the *Book of the Watchers*.

Whereas Ben Sira merely asserts that scorpions only afflict the wicked, *Jubilees* modifies and develops the narrative to clarify the just purpose of the demons and the immunity of the righteous.⁵⁵ First, *Jubilees* avoids the

55. Much of the discussion here about the demons in *Jubilees* already appeared in Todd R. Hanneken, “Angels and Demons in the Book of Jubilees and Contemporary Apoca-

impression that demons or any other cosmic force would be difficult for God to defeat at any time, or that it is necessary to wait for a final consummation. According to *Jubilees*, the demons were already eradicated, and it was as easy as Noah asking God to do so (*Jub.* 10:1–7). *Jubilees* then justifies why some demons should and do exist, much as Ben Sira justifies the creation of scorpions, “because the evil of mankind is great” (*Jub.* 10:8). The angel of hostility (Mastema) needs their assistance in punishing, “for they are meant for (the purposes of) destroying and misleading before my authority” (*Jub.* 10:8).⁵⁶ Furthermore, in *Jubilees* not only is the role of the demons diminished, their number is diminished by 90% (*Jub.* 10:11). *Jubilees* is the only ancient text to claim a radical diminishment of demonic power realized in the past.⁵⁷ Furthermore, God orders the angels to give extra protection against demons, “Noah wrote down in a book everything (just) as we had taught him regarding all the kinds of medicine, and the evil spirits were precluded from pursuing Noah’s children” (*Jub.* 10:13).

But the evil spirits are not precluded from pursuing *all* of Noah’s children, at least not in the long run. This is the key distinction that requires *Jubilees* to move this part of the story of the Watchers from *Jubilees* 5 to *Jubilees* 10, much like the illicit teaching that corrupted one nation (Babylon) but not another (Israel). The story is moved to after the division of the nations because *Jubilees* wants to claim that national boundaries are essential for understanding the role of the demons. Ultimately, the demons are precluded only from pursuing Israel. The next verse specifies that Noah did not give his books to all his sons, but only Shem (*Jub.* 10:14), and the books ultimately end up preserved by the Levites (*Jub.* 45:16). As we have already seen, *Jubilees* develops the link between demons and idolatry, and further links demons and idolatry to other nations. For *Jubilees*, intermarriage, assimilation, gymnasium, and idolatry are closely associated, and any part entails all others. In this way, *Jubilees* departs from the theodicy of Ben Sira as well as the *Book of the Watchers*. The line between righteous and wicked, protected by God or afflicted by just punishment, is primarily national, blurred only to the extent to which Israel assimilates to other nations.

lypses,” *Henoch* 28 (2006) 11–25. See also VanderKam, “Enoch Traditions,” 330–31; idem, “The Demons in the *Book of Jubilees*,” and Reed, “Enochic and Mosaic Traditions.”

56. VanderKam’s translation reads, “before my judgment.” For more on this translation see Hanneken, *Subversion of the Apocalypses*, 77 n. 58.

57. VanderKam, “The Demons in the *Book of Jubilees*,” 354.

While it is often noted in modern scholarship that *Jubilees* adopts the premise of the demons story from the *Book of the Watchers* with certain variations, it is often missed how fundamentally the theology differs and how deep the reuse runs. *Jubilees* does not merely incorporate some elements from the *Book of the Watchers* and move on. The narrative restructuring of separating the demon story from the Watchers story supports an elaborate theological restructuring. Demons are no longer an explanation of unjust suffering, but part of a cosmic system of perfect justice. Demons no longer fit universal history from primordial times, but the particular histories of Israel and the nations. For *Jubilees*, the system of righteousness and wickedness, protection and punishment, is fundamentally predicated on the division of the nations.

E. Human Responsibility Emphasized

Another deep theological divergence in *Jubilees*' use of the *Book of the Watchers* is the emphasis on human responsibility. In the *Book of the Watchers* rebellion against God originates in the cosmos and is imposed on earthly victims. Human wickedness is not denied, but its origin is superhuman.⁵⁸ In *Jubilees* the emphasis is on human sin, and the flood in particular is entirely blamed on human sin. Angelic sin is analogous to human sin, but angelic sin does not diminish human responsibility. The fundamental difference is between cosmic evil imposed on humans and human sin punished by the cosmos.

This point is too easily dismissed as dependence on Genesis or combining Genesis with the *Book of the Watchers*. It is true that Genesis makes the basic point, "God saw that great was the wickedness of humanity on the earth," leading to the flood (Gen 6:5). But *Jubilees* takes human responsibility as a theological theme well beyond this verse. The theme runs throughout the *Book of Jubilees* and is infused into the retelling of the Watchers story.⁵⁹ We find here a pitfall in scholarly discussion of how *Jubilees* uses its

58. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 46–47.

59. The emphasis on human culpability is prevalent in other parts of the book, including *Jub.* 4:19, 23; 10:8; 11:17; and 23:18. Scholars have also noted the prevalence of human responsibility in *Jubilees*. See VanderKam, "Enoch Traditions," 329–30; Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 118; Bergsma, "The Relationship Between Jubilees and the Early Enochic Books (Astronomical Book and Book of the Watchers)," 48; Collins, "The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 291; Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 94.

sources, namely, mistaking an identification of the source of a verse for an explanation of the verse. In this case, Genesis is the source of *Jub.* 5:3 and the basic premise of human responsibility for the flood. Yet, just because *Jubilees* finds an idea in Genesis does not mean the author does not believe it, and indeed extend it as a theological principle well beyond Genesis and even impose it back onto Genesis. When *Jubilees* imposes the theological principle of human responsibility and perfect justice onto the Watchers story it is not simply alternating dependence but thoroughly reusing based on theological principles.

To some extent, the absence of human responsibility in the *Book of the Watchers* as we have it and as the author of *Jubilees* had it may be an accident of its development. The angelic sinners may have originated as thinly-veiled allusions to human sinners.⁶⁰ The flood, which distinctly entails human suffering, may have been a secondary development among stories originally concerned only with angelic sin and consequences.⁶¹ Whether originally intended or not, the *Book of the Watchers* as received in the mid-second century B.C.E. lacked any explanation of the justice of humans drowning in the flood.⁶² Indeed, on the rare occasion that humans in general, besides Enoch and Noah, appear, they appear as innocent victims. Consider for example, “And now look, the spirits of the souls of men who have died make suit, and their groan has come up to the gates of heaven, and it <does not cease> to come forth from the presence of the iniquities that have come upon the earth” (*1 Enoch* 9:10). The flood is alluded to as a cleansing of the earth, not a just punishment for human sin (e.g., *1 Enoch* 10:20).

It is no accident that *Jubilees*' version of the Watchers story leaves no humans as innocent victims. Indeed, *Jubilees* also insists that animals sinned and deserved their own punishment, whereas Genesis might suggest that humans were culpable and animals were caught up in the punishment as innocent victims (*Gen* 6:5–7). *Jubilees*' insistence that the cosmos is perfectly just requires not only for humans to deserve their suffering (without blaming it on angels), but also for animals to deserve their suffering (with-

60. Suter, “Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest,” 115–35; Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 575–600.

61. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 109–11.

62. Reed (*Fallen Angels*, 95) identifies the shift from or correction of emphasis on non-human culpability as a trend in second-century Enochic writings. She points particularly to *1 Enoch* 98:4.

out blaming it on humans). Some of the changes are specific, such as the change from humans being devoured by giants (1 *Enoch* 7:4) to humans devouring each other (*Jub.* 5:2).⁶³ The more striking change is the persistent emphasis on personal (human and animal) responsibility in *Jubilees*.⁶⁴ The flood killed all humans and land animals except for those on the ark, so *Jubilees* insists that all of them were wicked, even the cattle, “all animate beings corrupted their way—(everyone of them) from people to cattle, animals, birds, and everything that moves about on the ground” (*Jub.* 5:2). In three verses (*Jub.* 5:2–4) the phrase “all animate beings” or “all of them” is repeated eight times. *Jubilees* fundamentally reorients the Watchers story from a story of super-human sin explaining unjust human suffering, to a story of perfect justice, primarily for human sin with angelic sin (and bovine sin) in a supporting role.⁶⁵

F. Angelic Mediation Downplayed

Another theological difference between *Jubilees* and the *Book of the Watchers* might be missed as simply relying on Genesis for a phrase rather than the *Book of the Watchers*, but the implication is to reject one of the core claims about God’s justice. In the *Book of the Watchers* God’s transcendence is taken to the extent that God’s justice is essentially absent in the visible world in the present time. God’s justice is assured, but it assured for the future great day of judgment. In the meantime human access to God at its best is mediated by good angels. Thus, without considering the larger patterns in *Jubilees*, one might skim over the phrase in *Jubilees*, “The Lord saw that the earth was corrupt” (*Jub.* 5:3) as a simple paraphrase of Genesis “The Lord saw that great was the wickedness of humanity on the earth” (Gen 6:5). But if one thinks of *Jubilees* 5 as an interpretation of the *Book of the Watchers*, it becomes significant that *Book of the Watch-*

63. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 118.

64. *Jubilees* 5, constrained by the received narrative, treats the sinners as collective groups (all the Watchers, all the giants, all the humans besides Noah), but the need to account for every individual in the group reflects an emphasis on individual sin and punishment. Cf. Sir 16:11–14.

65. Besides responsibility for the flood, human responsibility underlies other variations in *Jubilees* from the *Book of the Watchers*. For example, in the *Book of the Watchers* Enoch testifies at length on behalf of and against the Watchers. In *Jubilees* testimony against the Watchers is mentioned once (4:22) and greater emphasis is placed on Enoch testifying to humans (4:18, 19, 24; 10:17).

ers says no such thing. Rather, God's intervention is mediated by angels. Indeed, the route is quite circuitous from its origin in the cry of the human victims, which is then raised by the earth, then reaches the gates of heaven, then comes to the committee of angels who discuss the request to bring suit to God, who then decide to approach God, who then make a long speech asserting that God already knows all things, but politely noting that no action has been taken (*I Enoch* 8:4—9:11).⁶⁶ The divine response is no less mediated. Although the *Book of the Watchers* asserts the inevitability of God's perfect justice, it also fully accounts for delay in its realization.

On the one hand, *Jubilees* does make use of angelic mediation. On the other hand, angelic mediation is never incompetent or bureaucratic such as to explain the absence of justice in the present.⁶⁷ The point is carried through the Watchers story and stated most clearly in the explanation of how Ishmael's circumcision did not make him God's chosen people (apparently also developing the ancient versions of Deut 32:8).⁶⁸

For there are many nations and many peoples and all belong to him. He made spirits rule over all in order to lead them astray from following him. But over Israel he made no angel or spirit rule because he alone is their ruler. He will guard them and require them for himself from his angels, his spirits, and everyone, and all his powers so that he may guard them and bless them and so that they may be his and he theirs from now and forever. (*Jub.* 15:31–32)

Again, *Jubilees'* view of angelic mediation depends on the nation. For Israel, there is no archangel, there is no mediation, there is no bureaucracy.⁶⁹ Angels perform tasks such as dictation (*Jub.* 1:27), tutoring Hebrew (*Jub.* 12:27), and memory aids (*Jub.* 32:25), but *Jubilees* emphasizes that they do not interfere, “For I know and from now on will inform you—not from

66. Angelic mediation of divine sovereignty is described elsewhere in the *Book of the Watchers*, “Michael, one of the holy angels, who has been put in charge of the good ones of the people,” (*I Enoch* 20:5).

67. This point about the lack of angelic mediation for Israel according to *Jubilees* previously appeared in Hanneken, “Angels and Demons,” 18–20; and idem, *Subversion of the Apocalypses*, 64–70.

68. On the texts and interpretations of Deut 32:8 see VanderKam, “The Demons in the *Book of Jubilees*,” 352–54.

69. Cf. Sir 17:17, “Over every nation he appointed a ruler, but Israel is the portion of the Lord.”

my own mind because this is the way the book is written in front of me, and the divisions of times are ordained on the heavenly tablets” (*Jub.* 6:35). The most angelic mediation we see in *Jubilees* is the tendency to attribute to the angel of hostility (Mastema) negative actions that are attributed to God in Genesis and Exodus (*Jub.* 17:16; 48:2, 9). However, Mastema never violates the principle quoted above from chapter 15. At most, this angel may at times take on the role of angelic ruler of Egypt, but does not rule over Israel even temporarily and never claims any success against God’s people, only shame.⁷⁰ The basic point remains that *Jubilees* uses the *Book of the Watchers* but finds no use for chapter 9, the intercession of the four archangels. *Jubilees*’ view of perfect justice does not leave room for angelic bureaucracy.

A related divergence may or may not be theologically significant. The *Book of the Watchers* names many angels, and *Jubilees* does not. At most, one might argue that Mastema is a name, mainly because those responsible for translating *Jubilees* into Greek and other languages chose to transliterate “Prince Mastema” rather than translate, “prince of hostility.” Yet, it stands to reason that the author of *Jubilees* may have originally intended this as a title or description rather than a name.⁷¹ At most this is one questionable exception compared to copious names of good and bad angels given in the *Book of the Watchers*. What is less certain is whether this point has any theological significance in the middle of the second century B.C.E. We do have much later information from Josephus that the Essenes prided themselves on the secret knowledge of the names of the angels (*B.J.* 2.142).

G. The Great Day of Judgment Has Already Happened

The *Book of the Watchers* and *Jubilees* share a common principle that God is just. The difference is whether God’s justice is deferred until a future day of judgment or realized in the present. They also share the phrase, “great day of judgment.” The difference is whether it has already happened. In the *Book of the Watchers*, the great day of judgment will be in the future. This final consummation will bring justice at the end of this age, but in the

70. Note in particular that Mastema is not blamed for the successful evil perpetrated against God’s people, the throwing of male infants into the Nile.

71. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 118; James C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (Missoula: Scholars, 1977) 266; Hanneken, *Subversion of the Apocalypses*, 71–75.

meantime justice is not guaranteed. The flood in the days of Noah points forward to the final consummation. In the *Book of Jubilees*, however, the flood was the great day of judgment. It has been fully resolved, and serves as an example of perfect justice. Although he differs on whether this is a by-product of redaction or a theological innovation persistent throughout the chapter, Segal has similarly noted that *Jubilees* identifies the great day of judgment as the flood and transforms the story from an etiology of injustice to an example of justice.⁷² More can be said to support this point and correct the bias of translators in assuming that a great day of judgment is necessarily future.

Throughout the *Book of the Watchers* the assumption is that primordial evil is unresolved. Evil can be explained and its defeat can be assured, but it undoubtedly continues in the present. Judgment is resolutely in the future tense. That the *Book of the Watchers* was read this way in the second century could also be supported from other Enochic books. Two passages in the *Book of the Watchers*, concerning the sinning angels and the demons, make clear an important claim which *Jubilees* flatly rejects: they have not yet been judged. First, the Watchers have been arrested, but they are still awaiting trial.

And to Michael he [God] said, "Go, Michael, bind Shemihazah and the others with him, who have mated with the daughters of men, so that they were defiled by them in their uncleanness. And when their sons perish and they see the destruction of their beloved ones, bind them for seventy generations in the valleys of the earth, until the day of their judgment and consummation, until the everlasting judgment is consummated. Then they will be led away to the fiery abyss, and to the torture, and to the prison where they will be confined forever. And everyone who is condemned and destroyed henceforth will be bound together with them until the consummation of their generation. <And at the time of the judgment, which I shall judge, they will perish for all generations.> (*I Enoch* 10:11-14)

The persistent future tense cannot refer to the immediate future, even within several hundred years. Rather, the judgment is significantly later than the flood, and later than the time of the Second Temple period audi-

72. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 132-35, 137, 139.

ence. “Seventy generations” need not be calculated more precisely than “an exceedingly long time” as found in the parallel passage about Asael, “And cover him with darkness, and let him dwell there for an exceedingly long time. Cover up his face, and let him not see the light. And on the day of the great judgment, he will be led away to the burning conflagration” (1 *Enoch* 10:5–6). In both cases the binding of the Watchers is not their punishment, it is merely their detention prior to their punishment. The torture of the fiery abyss awaits the future consummation and judgment.

The point is no less clear in the case of the demons, who in the *Book of the Watchers* are not even detained in the present. After a long description that assumes their continuing evil presence on the earth, their future judgment is described.

From the day of the slaughter and destruction and death of the giants, from the soul of whose flesh the spirits are proceeding, they are making desolate without (incurring) judgment. Thus they will make desolate until the day of the consummation of the great judgment, when the great age will be consummated. It will be consummated all at once. (1 *Enoch* 16:1)

The audience of the book, though assured of future justice, understands the present as part of the great age that has not yet been consummated. The audience still suffers the presence of demons and other unjust evil in the world.

Jubilees reverses the view of injustice in the present simply by retelling the Watchers story as an example of perfect justice in the past, rather than an etiology of injustice. *Jubilees* adopts the double binding of the Watchers, but transforms it from a detention prior to judgment, to judgment itself. Furthermore, as Segal also noticed, the great day of judgment is understood here as the flood, not a future judgment.⁷³ The past judgment of the Watchers is most clear in verse 11, “He [God] obliterated all from their places; there remained no one of them whom he did not judge for all their wickedness.” The past tense and comprehensiveness are clear and emphatic. Another verse is clear enough in the Ethiopic, although modern translators into English have proceeded with the assumption that the great

73. *Ibid.*, 133. In general, there are many days of judgment in *Jubilees* and individuals and nations are judged when appropriate, not delayed until a final consummation. On judgment in general in *Jubilees* see Hanneken, *Subversion of the Apocalypses*, 153–65.

day of judgment is necessarily in the future. The most influential English translations are those of Charles, Wintermute, and VanderKam.⁷⁴ The Watchers were tied up in the depths of the earth . . .

... until the day of the great condemnation, when judgment is executed (Charles' translation before emendation)

... until the day of the great condemnation, when judgment shall be executed (Charles' emendation)

... until the day of great judgment in order for judgment to be executed (Wintermute)

... until the great day of judgment when there will be condemnation (VanderKam)

Charles noted that the entire passage is set in the past tense relative to Moses and seems to refer to the flood, but Charles rejected this as “practically inconceivable.”⁷⁵ He goes on to emend, asserting that the translator from Hebrew to Greek mistook converted perfect verbs for perfect verbs. Wintermute accurately renders the infinitive as expressing purpose, “in order for judgment to be executed.” Like the others, however, he uses “until,” which might imply that the binding of the Watchers is not permanent, but temporary until a day of judgment (as in *BW*). Yet, as we have seen the next verse claims that they have already been judged. VanderKam translates the infinitive as a future tense, apparently assuming, with Charles, that the day must remain for the future. The best translation in context takes the entire phrase as expressing the purpose of the imprisonment of the Watchers: “for the great day of judgment, so that there would be justice.”⁷⁶ That is, the Watchers were sent to prison so that the day of judgment would be complete. The great day of judgment is the day, or short period of time, when the sinners of that generation were judged: the giants were killed in the war; the flood was decreed for the humans (and cattle); and last but not

74. Charles, *Jubilees*; O. S. Wintermute, “Jubilees,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983) 35–142; James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text* (2 vols.; CSCO 511; Leuven: Peeters, 1989).

75. Charles, *Jubilees*, 44.

76. אֱלֹהִים : דָּלוּת : רָעָה : שָׁמַר : אֱלֹהִים : יָמֵהּ < *εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως μεγάλης εἶναι κρίμα < *יְוָם לְהוֹרֵת מִשְׁפָּט הַדִּין הַגָּדוֹל לְהוֹרֵת מִשְׁפָּט. The asterisks indicate that the Greek and Hebrew suggestions are reconstructed, not attested. Cf. 2 Pet 2:9; 3:7; Jude 6.

least the Watchers were imprisoned (permanently). There are no imperfect verbs for the punishment of the Watchers, other than “they were watching” the war between their sons. The complete set of sinners (Watchers, giants, land creatures) was already judged in the past, shortly after their sin with no substantial delay. Throughout the narrative the entire episode is set as an example of perfect justice, using narrative elements from the *Book of the Watchers* but not its core view of justice as deferred until a future consummation. According to *Jubilees*, there are no enduring consequences of angelic sin except the lesson to be learned from their mistake. *Jubilees* reinforces this general principle with the next point, the new creation already happened.

H. The New Creation Has Already Happened

For the audience in the second century B.C.E., the question of God’s justice did not depend merely on the historical facts of the status of the case of the Watchers. The issue in the present was the ongoing corruption, or lack thereof. Do humans today have a fair chance, or are we still suffering as victims of an ancient heavenly rebellion? The same basic theological issue may be more familiar from debates centuries later about the sin of Adam. 4 Ezra complains that justice is stacked against humans because primordial sin is inherited but goodness is not, “The disease became permanent” (4 Ezra 3:21–22). Elsewhere, the protagonist cries out, “O Adam, what have you done? For though it was you who sinned, the misfortune was not yours alone, but ours also who are your descendants!” (4 Ezra 7:118).⁷⁷ This view is echoed by the protagonist of 2 *Baruch* (48:42), and then rejected, “Adam is therefore not the cause, save only of his own soul, but each of us has been the Adam of his own soul” (54:19, Charles’ translation).⁷⁸ The issue

77. Michael E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 63–67, 258–59.

78. One could also discuss the same core issue as addressed in Paul, Augustine, and his opponents. See the discussion by George Nickelsburg in the forthcoming proceedings of the 2011 Enoch Seminar, “A New Testament Reader’s Guide to Second Baruch or a Second Baruch Reader’s Guide to the New Testament.” A more debated example, but more pertinent in directly addressing the sin of the Watchers, surrounds the interpretation of 1 *Enoch* 98:4, which seems to emphasize that the angelic origin of sin does not exculpate human sinners. Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 1 *Enoch* 91–108 (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007) 343–47. Both examples are discussed in Collins, “The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 296–98.

of a lasting contagion is closely related to the question of the origin of evil. The view that evil is imposed on humanity from beyond the earthly realm can be associated with the view that evil is imposed on the individual in the present by primordial events. Justice may yet be promised for the future, but individuals in the present are unjustly immersed in injustice and suffering for sins that are not their own. The *Book of the Watchers* uses the story of the Watchers to explain evil as originating long ago and persisting for a very long time before injustice is eradicated and a new era of righteousness is created. *Jubilees* uses the story of the Watchers to explain an example of perfect justice with no persisting consequences. The new and righteous creation has already occurred.

As we have already seen, the *Book of the Watchers* is explicit that the consequences of sin, particularly the illicit teachings and demonic spirits of the Watchers' children, continue unabated until the final day of judgment. Following the day of judgment, *1 Enoch* describes a new creation. The following excerpt from the longer passage (*1 Enoch* 10:16—11:2) conveys the essential features of the new creation: it must describe the future because impurity exists in the present, it erases national boundaries, and it is permanent.

Cleanse the earth from all impurity and from all wrong and from all lawlessness and from all sin, and godlessness and all impurities that have come upon the earth, remove. And all the sons of men will become righteous, and all the peoples will worship (me), and all will bless me and prostrate themselves. An all the earth will be cleansed from all defilement and from all uncleanness, and I shall not again send upon them any wrath or scourge for all the generations of eternity. (*1 Enoch* 10:20–22)

The idea of a new creation could come from many sources, but context rather than similarity suggests that the new creation in the *Book of the Watchers* is being addressed in *Jubilees*.⁷⁹ The story of the Watchers, judgment, and flood combine with the new creation in the same narrative. Indeed, the *Book of the Watchers* plays with the relationship between the flood and the final judgment, suggesting the former as a type for the latter.⁸⁰

79. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 73.

80. The typological relationship between the flood and the final judgment carries

However, the distinction is explicit in the case of the judgment occurring seventy generations or an exceedingly long time later, and clear enough in the description of the new creation which could not describe the days of Noah.

The *Book of Jubilees* concludes its narrative of the Watchers as an example of perfect justice by denying that lasting effects of primordial sin continue to haunt humanity. In particular, *Jubilees* says explicitly that the new creation has already happened.

He made a new and righteous creation for all his works so that they would not sin with their whole nature until eternity. Everyone will be righteous—each according to his kind—for all time. (*Jub.* 5:12)

Following Segal, this translation differs from VanderKam, who renders, “new and righteous nature for all his creatures.” The point remains with either translation, but “new and righteous creation” makes the present point more clear. The verse resonates with the *Book of the Watchers* so strongly that, taken out of context, it may seem to refer to a future restoration. Yet, as Charles, VanderKam, Segal, Stuckenbruck and others already noticed, it is here applied to the flood in the past tense.⁸¹ Like 2 *Baruch*, *Jubilees* here asserts that sin after the flood is not caused by sin before the flood, but rather there was a fresh start. Sinners after the flood have no one to blame but themselves. The fact that people did sin again makes the example of primordial justice more salient, but personal responsibility is as applicable to all sinners as it was to the first.⁸²

through other Enochic writings, including the *Dream Visions* and *Apocalypse of Weeks*, which calls the flood the “first end” (1 *Enoch* 93:4).

81. Charles (*Jubilees*, 44) sees this is a problem and postulated error in the translation of Hebrew converted perfects. VanderKam (“The Angel Story in the Book of Jubilees,” 162–63; “The Demons in the *Book of Jubilees*,” 358) does not see a problem in understanding the new (and improved) creation as following the flood, even if the second new creation fell into sin as well. Segal (*The Book of Jubilees*, 132–35) sees this is a problem and attempts to explain it as an accident of the compositional history of *Jubilees*, not a theological point. Stuckenbruck (“The Book of Jubilees and the Origin of Evil,” 307) does not discuss the new creation per se, but observes the basic point here, that evil “has not been inherited from any prior event in the narrative; it is simply presented as a consequence of [the sinners’] own making.” Thus, *Jub.* 5:12 helps explain *Jub.* 10:8. The later statement that humanity “has *now* become evil,” implies that sin did not continue from primordial times but rather began anew after the new creation. See also van Ruiten, *Primaeval History Interpreted*, 197 n. 45; and Gene L. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees* (SPB 20; Leiden: Brill, 1971) 48.

82. Again, *Jubilees* qualifies the claim with a distinction between the nations. Whereas

In this case as in the others, *Jubilees* accounts for the story of the Watchers and gives it meaning consistent with theological perspectives as odds with the *Book of the Watchers*. By asserting knowledge of the Watchers tradition *Jubilees* asserts that its view is not naïve, lacking knowledge available to other Jews. It accounts for the stories of those who think differently and appropriates them. It stands to reason that *Jubilees* uses the *Book of the Watchers* not because it helps interpret Genesis, but because it has to. For this author, the *Book of the Watchers* could not be ignored, denied, or attacked as a whole. It could be—and had to be—interpreted. This important distinction, we have suggested, is a hallmark of scripture in the second century B.C.E.

III. The Unity of *Jubilees* 5

Tensions abound in the *Book of Jubilees*. The present argument is that the tension between *Jubilees* and the *Book of the Watchers* is fundamentally the tension between the imperative to account for scripture (or traditions widely held as authoritative), and the imperative to defend a uniform theological perspective at odds with the apparent meanings of a diversity of sources. More in the terms of the book itself, *Jubilees* works to assert that there is a single, coherent divine source of all revelation, the heavenly tablets, that accounts for a plurality of books in different voices. Whereas modern interpreters foster attention to diversity within the plurality, *Jubilees* epitomizes the premodern view that perfect unity can be found, indeed reconstructed, in all of scripture.⁸³ The very enterprise of bringing together sources and ideas already in tension makes it inevitable that tensions would appear in *Jubilees*, including the tension between a story of angelic sin and the principles of perfect justice and human responsibility.

Another attempt to explain the tensions within the *Book of Jubilees* warrants consideration. Using the tools of source criticism, it is possible to explain seams in language or ideas as the result of multiple authors. In its

the *Book of the Watchers* called for an erasure of national divisions, the statement “each according to his kind” fits with the persistent ontological distinction between Israel and the nations throughout *Jubilees*. For more on eschatological restoration elsewhere in *Jubilees* see Hanneken, *Subversion of the Apocalypses*, 171–93.

83. For more on the premodern assumption of perfection see the writings of James Kugel, especially *Traditions of the Bible*, 17–18.

ideal form, the assumption is that a single source is coherent in language and ideas, and seams originate when sources are edited together. Complexity arises when those sources edited together themselves become sources for other works. In the case of *Jubilees*, there has never been doubt that the book draws from multiple sources which themselves have multiple sources. These sources include several books that became canonical as well as some Enochic books and other writings not known to us, perhaps related to a book of Noah and the *Genesis Apocryphon*. The question is not whether *Jubilees* uses sources, but how *Jubilees* uses sources. Segal characterizes the use of sources as redaction rather than authorship, arguing that the borrowed material is only lightly edited to fit its new context. Thus, *Jubilees* is not a coherent composition and does not have an author, only a redactor, who collected narratives and added a relatively small amount of new material.⁸⁴ One general issue is how we conceive of authorship in antiquity. The issue for understanding *Jubilees* is whether we can speak of the ideas and concerns of the book as a whole, or only the parts identifiable as the redactional layer. The core agreement is that *Jubilees* 5 is representative of the process of composition throughout *Jubilees*. Segal's attention to seams has great potential to elucidate the process of composition, but it is argued here that *Jubilees* reworks its sources thoroughly, particularly on the deeper theological levels, does so consistently, and that such thorough reworking of sources constitutes authorship.

Segal finds three type of material in *Jubilees*: narrative, legal, and chronological. The legal and chronological material share language and ideas, but the narrative material contradicts itself or the chronological/legal material. These contradictions could not have existed in the mind of a single person. Consequently, the chronological/legal material is the contribution of the redactor and reflects the worldview of the redactor. The redactor compiled the narrative material from various sources, which have their own authors and reflect their own different worldviews. Thus we can speak of the theology of the redactor but not the book, and we can only draw from the legal and chronological material. In *Jubilees* 5, verses 13–18 can be identified as the voice of the redactor. Verses 1–12 are adopted from a preexisting narrative, a version of the *Book of the Watchers*, and do not reflect the theology of the redactor, according to Segal.⁸⁵

84. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 35.

85. *Ibid.*, 137, 142.

Segal's overall argument hinges on cumulative contradictions between the distinctive types of material. He recognizes that individual contradictions might be explained by various means, but claims that the simpler solution of multiple authors explains them all at once. Scope does not allow consideration of all the claimed contradictions, but we can consider an alleged contradiction in the Watchers story in *Jubilees* 5. Segal does not claim this as the sole example of a contradiction, but it is representative in three ways. First, the term "contradiction" overstates the incompatibility of the ideas in tension. Second, it can be explained as using sources that are already in tension. Third, it has little or no theological consequence. The tension is whether the 120 years until punishment (Gen 6:3) refers to the time before the death of the giants by the sword (as is explicit in *Jub.* 5:8), or the time before the death of the humans in the flood (which might be argued if the book proceeds in chronological order).⁸⁶ First, the tension is easily resolved by understanding the reference as both. Indeed, *Jubilees* suggests that the punishments of the Watchers, giants, and humans were proximate in time, even a "great day of judgment" (*Jub.* 5:8). Segal counts it as impossible to understand God's decree as occurring within 11 years of the sin of the angels because the giants had to be born and spread wickedness.⁸⁷ However, given the principle of God as the perfect judge, it may have taken no more time for God to recognize such fundamental evil and its consequences. Whatever tension is created by interpreting Gen 6:3 as referring to both the giants and the humans is kept short of an outright contradiction by the vague wording of the chronological note, "in a certain (year) of this jubilee" (*Jub.* 5:1). Second, as Segal seems to recognize, the tension is explicable within the complex histories of the *Book of the Watchers* and Genesis. The application of Gen 6:3 to the giants in *Jub.* 5:8 follows *1 Enoch* 9–10 (despite some problem in the difference between 500 years and 120 years). This passage from the Shemihazah strand may predate the incorporation of the flood into the story, or at any rate not be concerned with explaining the time until the flood. But by all accounts even within the compositional history of the *Book of the Watchers* the flood was a part of the punishment plan. Add to that an additional effort to read the *Book of the Watchers* and Genesis 6 as telling the same story, and there is no surprise at all that some redundancy and tension would persist. The third and

86. *Ibid.*, 25, 119–25.

87. *Ibid.*, 124.

most fundamental point applies even in other cases when “contradiction” may not be an overstatement. That is, the contradiction in a small detail (or arguably implied small detail) has little or no theological significance. If anything it marks consistency with the theological themes to interpret a verse about judgment as comprehensive and prompt. Other contradictions, such as whether Adam was created on the sixth day (as implied by Gen 1) or the third day (as implied by a calendar beginning with the creation of the sun), reflect at most lack of attention to detail, not haphazard bricolage of contradictory theological perspectives. Demonstrating the use of sources by illustrating seams left from the process of reconciling sources does not establish lack of theological coherence in the final product.⁸⁸

Indeed, Segal’s bolder claim that the theology of the redactor can only be found in the legal and chronological material, not the adopted narratives, fails with *Jubilees* 5. Segal rightly recognizes *Jub.* 5:13–18 as emphasizing God’s perfect justice, but for Segal’s general thesis to hold he has to argue that *Jub.* 5:1–12 does not reflect the theology of the redactor, but rather the theology of the source, in this case, the *Book of the Watchers*. Yet we have seen that *Jub.* 5:1–12 reflects the same theology of perfect justice as *Jub.* 5:13–18, often in strong contrast to the simple sense of the *Book of the Watchers*. The emphasis on the original good mission of the angels,

88. On the topic of perceived contradictions we should consider also the claim by Kugel (“On the Interpolations in the *Book of Jubilees*,” *RevQ* 24 [2009] 215–72, here 230–33) that the description of the day of atonement in *Jub.* 5:17–18 as a day of repentance contradicts the description in *Jub.* 34:18 as a day of mourning. Even though Ravid (“המינוח המיוחד של” לזוחות השמים בספר היובלים *Tarbiz* 68 [1999] 463–71, here 471) identifies both as reflecting the identical style, Kugel (distinguishing the style “written and ordained” from “ordained”) designates the former as an interpolation and the latter as part of the original book. The same points about Segal’s perceived contradiction could be made of Kugel’s: the same author could see both repentance and mourning as components of the festival and focus on one or the other in the appropriate context; the different foci are found already in the sources available; there is little or no theological significance to the difference. Despite the similarity in reconstructing stages of composition based on contradictions, Kugel’s argument is very different from Segal’s and does not have the same implication for our understanding of how *Jubilees* uses the *Book of the Watchers*. Whereas Segal holds *Jubilees* as a disunity with a thin redactional layer, Kugel holds *Jubilees* as a basic unity (including the rewriting of the *Book of the Watchers*) with a few short interpolations (224). More importantly, Kugel recognizes the layers as being theologically compatible, such that one can speak generally of the ideas of the book as a whole along with the added determinism of the interpolator (257, 267, 272). Kugel imagines the interpolator as making friendly amendments to a book already appreciated as correct. Kugel suggests that an interpolator adds emphasis on divine justice in *Jub.* 5:13–18, but if anything this amplifies a theme already found in the chapter (although Kugel suggests the “new creation” might have seemed to undermine perfect justice).

human (and animal) personal responsibility, God's unmediated judgment, the non-deferred punishment of the Watchers, the past great day of judgment, the new and righteous creation, and general comprehensiveness of judgment all appear in *Jub.* 5:1–12. Segal argues that the good mission of the Watchers, for example, is an accident of chronological redaction and not a theological innovation, but the simplest solution this time is the comprehensive solution: the verses interpret the *Book of the Watchers* but rework the story so thoroughly in language and ideas as to be counted as a newly authored composition.

IV. Authorship

Jubilees 5 is indeed an illustrative representative of the process of composition of *Jubilees*. However, it is a model not of redaction but of authorship. This authorship is a process of weaving together multiple traditions and ideas—often in tension or conflict already—and reworking them to conform to the author's own compositional and ideological priorities. Even without accepting the claimed contradictions or model of redaction, we can learn much about authorship in antiquity from Segal's analysis of the seams in the compositional process of *Jubilees*. Three insights follow regarding the derivative nature of authorship, the horizon of acceptable "contradictions," and the rhetorical significance of the distinct literary styles.

First, Segal's discussion can illustrate for us that originality is not a central requirement of authorship in antiquity. Indeed, the model of authorship that developed in nineteenth-century Europe does not accurately describe the composition of *Jubilees*, which prizes resonance with familiar authorities over originality.⁸⁹ The use of sources in *Jubilees*, though long recognized, yet remains under-appreciated in quantity and in quality. Segal may underestimate the innovation brought to the *Book of the Watchers* in *Jub.* 5:1–12, and overestimate the novelty of *Jub.* 5:13–18, which resonates

89. On the inapplicability of the ideal of "originality" from modern conceptions of authorship for understanding authorship in antiquity see Angela Kim Harkins, *Reading with an "I" to the Heavens: Looking at the Qumran Hodayot through the Lens of Visionary Traditions* (Ekstasis: Religious Experience from Antiquity to the Middle Ages 3; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012) 69–71; and Esther G. Chazon, "Scripture and Prayer in 'the Words of the Luminaries,'" in *Prayers that Cite Scripture* (ed. James L. Kugel; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006) 25–41, here 41.

deeply with Deuteronomy.⁹⁰ Nevertheless, Segal rightly presents *Jubilees* as attempting to integrate and reconcile sources well beyond Genesis-Exodus, and plausibly suggests that this practice goes beyond the use of sources which happen to be known to us.

Second, Segal's study of "contradictions" illustrates what kinds of tensions were tolerable for the author. As already suggested, on the theological level *Jubilees* goes to great effort to bring the story of the Watchers into line with the principle of perfect justice found more in other sources. Meanwhile, the chronological concern is not such an obsession that the author needs to be more precise than "in a certain year of this jubilee" (*Jub.* 5:1), or keep straight whether Adam was created on day 3 or day 6. Indeed, other than emphasis on the liturgical calendar and Exodus fulfilling the release and return of Leviticus 25, it is easy to overestimate the chronological concern in *Jubilees*.⁹¹ Segal's attention to the tensions not only in *Jubilees* but in the sources used by *Jubilees* can in fact illustrate the tolerance for tensions in ancient literature. We write the way we read. In modern times we are trained to see contradictions. We identify them when we read, and avoid them when we write. In particular, biblical scholars are trained to recognize seams in Genesis and the *Book of the Watchers*. The author of *Jubilees*, on the contrary, was trained to read for unity. The author did not read Genesis through the eyes of the Documentary Hypothesis, so tangents and shifts in rhetoric would have seemed normal and perfectly acceptable in new compositions. The author did notice some of the same problems as modern critics, such as when the woman was created, but pursued compatibility. The tensions that Segal identifies as contradictions tell us what the author did *not* consider a theological problem in need of fixing.

Third, Segal (and Kugel, see note 88) bring us back to an observation made by Ravid, that there are seams in the language of *Jubilees*. Others have noticed some seam in *Jubilees* beginning at 5:13. The explanation of multiple authors is not necessary, but some explanation is necessary. If not

90. Deuteronomy is the main but not exclusive source from which *Jub.* 5:13–18 could have drawn. In Deuteronomy we find the themes of judgments and decrees written in a book (29:20; 30:10), God's judgment as impartial for the great and small (1:17), God not accepting bribes (10:17–18), and Israel's complete repentance met with mercy and forgiveness (30:2–3). In addition, Amos 9:2–3 makes the point that God's justice extends to everything from heaven to the bottom of the sea, and all the hiding places in between. Second Chronicles 7:14 bears a particularly close semantic and syntactic resemblance to *Jub.* 5:17, and of course Lev. 16:34 describes the annual day of mercy.

91. See James M. Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven: The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees* (JSJSup 91; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

source criticism, this may be an occasion for rhetorical criticism.⁹² Ravid did not posit multiple authors but rather a literary device of specialized language used to create a consistent legal formula.⁹³ She noticed a clustering of distinctive terms around mentions of the heavenly tablets, which also appear in clusters without explicit mention of the heavenly tablets. Beyond some unsurprising correlated terms, such as “written,” “ordained,” and “inscribed,” additional legal terms cluster in the same passages, such as “law,” “testimony,” “command the Israelites,” and various expressions of eternity and annual recurrence.⁹⁴ On this basis Ravid identified *Jub.* 5:13 and 17 as using this specialized language. Reed also noticed some stylistic distinction, and characterized *Jub.* 5:13–18 well as “the homiletical interpretation that concludes the account.”⁹⁵ Translators seem also to agree that *Jub.* 5:13 should begin a new paragraph. The argument for the compositional unity of *Jubilees* 5 does not require its rhetorical homogeneity. So what makes this little homily distinct from its surroundings, if not a different author?

One possibility might be a moderate version of Segal’s thesis, such that relatively speaking the author is more dependent on sources, however thoroughly rewritten, in *Jub.* 5:1–12 and less dependent, or more original, in *Jub.* 5:13–18. This explanation fails if we consider the dependence of *Jub.* 5:13–18 on sources besides the *Book of the Watchers* and Genesis.⁹⁶ The sources change, but not the derivative nature of composition.

Another way to characterize the rhetorical seam is as an abstract generalization. Verses 13–18 differ from their context in that they apply immediately to the second-century audience rather than the story of ancient events. They describe general principles in the abstract, and anticipate the distinction between Israel and the nations that relates directly to the Jewish audience but tangentially to the antediluvian example of justice. The story of the Watchers establishes the testimony of an example of perfect justice, and the heavenly tablets state the eternal and relevant principle to be gath-

92. For more on rhetorical criticism and its usefulness for understanding the use of language to persuade in ancient Jewish texts, see Carol A. Newsom, “Rhetorical Criticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods* (ed. Maxine L. Grossman; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010) 198–214.

93. Ravid, “המניח המיוחד של לוחות השמים בספר היובלים,” 469.

94. *Ibid.*, 465–66.

95. Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 91.

96. See above, note 90.

ered from the testimony. The specialized language of the heavenly tablets can also be thought of as an elevation of rhetoric to be more emphatic and vociferous.

One can also use the seams in use of sources to analyze the rhetorical structure of the chapter. *Jubilees* 5 opens with a close paraphrase of Genesis 6, establishing the place in the narrative structure determined by rewriting Genesis–Exodus. The continuation draws from the *Book of the Watchers*, which *Jubilees* follows closely for narrative structure and key elements, but appropriates theologically. *Jubilees* 5:13–18 continues logically, if not seamlessly, by resonating with a different source. There is continuity in the theme of perfect justice. There is a seam in the transition from dissonant use of authority to consonant use of authority. The appropriated Watchers story (verses 1–12) sounded familiar in narrative but unfamiliar in theology. The appropriation is completed with another passage that is familiar as the straight-forward sense of Deuteronomy, and familiar with the now appropriated Watchers story. Had the author not included *Jub.* 5:13–18 the dissonance with the *Book of the Watchers* might have been unresolved, but 5:13–18 establishes resonance with scripture. The interpretation of the *Book of the Watchers* needs justification, or at least rhetorical resolution. The rhetoric of *Jubilees* establishes that the theological message of the Watchers story is the theological message of Deuteronomy, and not whatever message may have previously seemed to follow logically from the story. In terms of narrative, it may be true that the chapter flows smoothly if *Jub.* 5:13–18 were omitted. However, in terms of theological rhetoric, the appropriation made to the Watchers story in the previous verses requires support, emphasis, abstraction, and reapplication for the audience. Were it omitted the changes made to the Watchers story might have been odd but unresolved in theological message.

V. Conclusion

Jubilees interprets the *Book of the Watchers* and other Enochic literature because it has to. At the very least, *Jubilees* asserts knowledge of all the Enochic writings available by the mid-second century B.C.E., if only to assert that no revealed information has escaped attention. *Jubilees* offers a detailed accounting for the central narrative of the origin, nature, and continuation of evil in the world, the *Book of the Watchers*. The author never

signals open polemic. The authority of Enoch as a recipient of revelation is not rejected but claimed and appropriated. In these chapters as elsewhere, *Jubilees* asserts that Enoch's books properly understood say the same thing as Leviticus and Deuteronomy.⁹⁷ But the necessity of interpreting the *Book of the Watchers* comes precisely from the fact that, left uninterpreted, the *Book of the Watchers* seems not to say the same thing as Leviticus and Deuteronomy on perfect divine justice in human history. For various reasons not entirely knowable by us, *Jubilees* chooses not to reject the authority of Enoch and the *Book of the Watchers*, but to appropriate them by giving them a new meaning. Just as Enoch is now understood to teach the sacrificial laws used in the Jerusalem temple, the *Book of the Watchers*, properly understood, gives testimony of God's perfect and prompt justice. The author accounts for the major motifs of the narrative, but interprets them according to different theological principles.

The task of reconstructing the heavenly tablets that account for all revelation to Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Jacob, and Moses—the complete library of books preserved by the Levites “until today” (*Jub.* 45:16)—was no easy task. The author may well be called “something of a genius,”⁹⁸ for drawing so many sources into a relatively coherent composition. The seams that remain detectable can tell us about the process of composition. Redundancy in interpreting the same verse twice (e.g., Gen 6:3 referring to judgment of giants or humans) was a virtue in the ancient process of authorship, not a contradiction as it might be in modern ideals of authorship. Similarly, uniformity in style was no more expected of an author than it was found in sources such as Genesis. It was an acceptable rhetorical device to change tone or offer an aside relating a story of the past to the actual audience. Similarly, repetition of formulae in certain emphatic passages serves a purpose and does not reflect a poverty of language skills. Contradictions that remain should be approached as indicative of what was not a priority for the author. Overall, the coherence of the composition on theological principles can be judged remarkable.

97. See above, note 30.

98. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 32.