



BRILL

Dead Sea Discoveries 16 (2009) 21–53

Dead Sea
Discoveries

www.brill.nl/dsd

Gilgamesh the Giant: The Qumran *Book of Giants*' Appropriation of *Gilgamesh* Motifs

Matthew Goff

Dodd Hall M05, Department of Religion, Florida State University,
Tallahassee, FL 32306, U.S.A.
mgoff@fsu.edu

Abstract

The Qumran Book of Giants shows familiarity with lore from the classic Mesopotamian *Epic of Gilgamesh*. It has been proposed that the author of the Book of Giants drew from the epic in order to polemicize against it. There is much to commend this view. The name of the hero of the tale is given to one of the murderous, wicked giants of the primordial age. Examination of fragments of the Book of Giants, in particular 4Q530 2 ii and 4Q531 22, however, suggest that key aspects of its portrayal of Gilgamesh the giant cannot be explained as polemic against Mesopotamian literary traditions. The Book of Giants creatively appropriates motifs from the epic and makes Gilgamesh a character in his own right in ways that often have little to do with *Gilgamesh*.

Keywords

Book of Giants; Gilgamesh

1. Introduction¹

Many writings of the Hebrew Bible and Early Judaism can be elucidated through comparison with ancient Near Eastern texts, but few mention specific details from them. One exception is the fascinating but fragmentary Aramaic composition from Qumran known as the *Book of Giants*.²

¹ I thank Eibert Tigchelaar for his assistance in helping me think through the main *Book of Giants* texts discussed in this article and Clare Rothschild for her comments on an earlier draft.

² The following manuscripts are generally considered to comprise the *Book of*

This work contains a narrative involving the ante-diluvian giant offspring of the angelic Watchers known from the Enochic *Book of the Watchers*. The *Book of Giants* recounts the iniquitous exploits of the giants, like *Watchers*, but also describes visions they receive and their reactions to them. The composition gives the names of several giants: 'Ohyah, Hahyah, Aḥiram, Mahaway, Gilgamesh and Ḥobabish. The latter two resonate with the *Gilgamesh* epic. The name Ḥobabish derives from Humbaba, the powerful monster slain by Gilgamesh and Enkidu. J.T. Milik, a scholar of enormous importance for the study of the *Book of Giants*, was the first to make this identification.³

This article poses three research questions. What are the affinities between the *Book of Giants* and the epic of *Gilgamesh*? On the basis of these similarities, how should the relationship between these two texts be understood? What do the only two fragments of the *Book of Giants* that mention Gilgamesh, 4Q530 2 ii 1–3 and 4Q531 22, contribute to the question of how the composition should be understood vis-à-vis the epic? Scholars who work on the scrolls are now in a good position to address

Giants: 1Q23, 1Q24, 2Q26, 4Q203, 4Q530, 4Q531, 4Q532, 4Q533, 4Q206a 2–3 and 6Q8. The Giants fragments are available in S.J. Pfann et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 8–94; É. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes Araméens, Première Partie (4Q529–549)* (DJD 31; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 9–115 (the relevant fragments in these volumes are edited, respectively, by Stuckenbruck and Puech). Core scholarship on the *Book of Giants* includes J.T. Milik, “Turfan et Qumran: Livre des géants juif et manichéen,” in *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt* (ed. G. Jeremias et al.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 117–27; idem, “Problèmes de la littérature hénochique à la lumière des fragments araméens de Qumrân,” *HTR* 64 (1971): 333–78 (esp. 366–72); idem, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 298–339; K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 258–68 (= *ATTM*); idem, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 119–24 (= *ATTME*); F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 97–115; J.C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 14; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992); L.T. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Text, Translation, and Commentary* (TSAJ 63; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997).

³ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 313.

these issues because of the publication of A.R. George's excellent comprehensive edition of *Gilgamesh*.⁴

Reeves argues that the *Book of Giants* “attests the vitality of Mesopotamian literary traditions among learned scribal circles in the final centuries before the Common Era.”⁵ The author of the Qumran text, he proposes, worked with an Aramaic copy of *Gilgamesh*, which he draws from polemically. The venerated hero of Mesopotamian culture is transformed into an evil giant. The *Book of Giants* is, in Reeves' formulation, an anti-pagan, particularly an anti-*Gilgamesh*, text. Puech has put forward a compatible but different opinion.⁶ The *Book of Giants* is for him a negative response to Hellenistic Upper Galilean cultic practices. In a similar vein, Jackson imagines *Gilgamesh* was originally one of a larger sequence of Gentile figures who are parodied as demons in the *Book of Giants*.⁷

⁴ A.R. George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic: Introduction, Critical Edition and Cuneiform Texts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003). Unless otherwise noted, translations and citations of *Gilgamesh* are from this edition of the Standard Babylonian Epic (SB). Scholarship on the epic includes: T. Jacobsen, *The Treasures of Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), 195–219 (reprinted in Foster, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, 183–207); A. Shaffer, “Gilgamesh, the Cedar Forest and Mesopotamian History,” *JAOS* 103 (1983): 307–13; W. Moran, “The Gilgamesh Epic: A Masterpiece from Ancient Mesopotamia,” in *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East* (ed. J.M. Sasson; 4 vols.; New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan, 1995), 4.2327–36 (reprinted in Foster, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, 171–83); B.G. Foster et al., eds., *The Epic of Gilgamesh* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2001); T. Abusch, “The Development and Meaning of the Epic of Gilgamesh: An Interpretive Essay,” *JAOS* 121 (2001): 614–22; J.H. Tigay, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Wauconda: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 2002); A.R. George, “The Epic of Gilgamesh: Thoughts on Genre and Meaning,” in *Gilgamesh and the World of Assyria: Proceedings of the Conference held at Mandelbaum House, The University of Sydney, 21–23 July 2004* (ed. J. Azize and N. Weeks; ANES 21; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 37–65.

⁵ Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 126. See also Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 72–74.

⁶ *DJD* 31:15.

⁷ D.R. Jackson, “Demonising Gilgamesh,” in Azize and Weeks, *Gilgamesh and the World of Assyria*, 107–14 (esp. 113). Contrast the assessment of L.T. Stuckenbruck, who has argued that the Qumran text borrows general motifs from the story-line of *Gilgamesh* without stressing any polemical engagement with the work. See his “Giant Mythology and Demonology: From the Ancient Near East to the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Die Dämonen. The Demonology of Israelite-Jewish and*

The first section of this essay demonstrates that there are several parallels between the *Book of Giants* and *Gilgamesh* aside from having names in common. These topics include archaic protagonists of divine-human parentage, wicked spirits, dreams, warriors of giant stature and Mount Hermon. From these affinities, it is reasonable to conclude with Reeves and other scholars that the author of this Qumran text was to some extent familiar with the epic. The exact mode of transmission remains unclear and, I will argue, there does not appear to be enough engagement with the epic to agree with Reeves' opinion that the Qumran author used an Aramaic translation of *Gilgamesh*. Reeves reasonably concludes that the *Book of Giants* adapts elements from *Gilgamesh* for polemical purposes, but the point is in genuine need of qualification. The portrayal of Gilgamesh in 4Q530 2 ii 1–3 and 4Q531 22 indicates that the *Book of Giants* borrows from *Gilgamesh* but makes its giants characters in their own right in ways that often have little to do with the epic. Gilgamesh, I shall argue, is a giant who is defeated and then cursed because of the machinations of 'Ohyah, who attempts to pin the impending punishment of the giants on Gilgamesh alone. These events resonate less with the epic and more with core themes in the *Book of Giants* such as the inevitability of the giants' judgment and punishment, and their reactions to this fate. Important aspects of the Qumran text are better viewed as an exercise in creative adaptation of *Gilgamesh* motifs than polemical repudiation of revered Mesopotamian lore. The Qumran text's use of the epic is similar to other instances of familiarity with Gilgamesh outside of cuneiform literature, such as Aelian's *On the Nature of Animals* and Lucian's *De Dea Syria*.⁸

Early Christian Literature in Context of their Environment (ed. A. Lange et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 313–38 (esp. 332).

⁸ *On the Nature of Animals* and possibly *De Dea Syria* (both 2d c. C.E.) reconfigure elements from the epic in ways that have little to do with the Mesopotamian poem itself. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 313, incorrectly observes that the *Book of Giants* contains “the only mention of Gilgamesh outside the cuneiform literature.” In *On the Nature of Animals* 12.21 a child named Gilgamos is thrown from a citadel and saved by an eagle. He is raised by a gardener and grows up to become a king of Babylon. This story is nowhere in the epic itself but Aelian attests a degree of legitimate tradition since he understands Gilgamos to be a king of Babylon. For other affinities between this text and the epic, see George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.61. Lucian's *De Dea Syria* 17–27 contains a lengthy story of Combabos. This name may derive from Humbaba, although this is a disputed point. Combabos is not a monster but a handsome man who is a

2. Thematic Similarities between the Qumran *Book of Giants* and the Epic of Gilgamesh

2a. Ancient Protagonists of Divine-Human Parentage

Several core features of *Gilgamesh* are broadly compatible with the *Book of Giants*. The epic is set in hoary antiquity. In Tablet XI the hero speaks with Utnapishtim, who survives the flood. The primordial time-frame of *Gilgamesh* is consistent with the ante-diluvian setting of the *Book of Giants*. It is reasonable to speculate that the Qumran *Book of Giants* originally included a giant whose name derives from Utnapishtim, as Reeves has argued, although this figure does not appear in any of its extant texts.⁹

friend of King Seleucus. J.L. Lightfoot argues against a connection between this figure and Humbaba. C. Grottanelli contends, by contrast, that there are several thematic parallels between *De Dea Syria* and *Gilgamesh* and that Combabos has much in common with several characters from the epic, including Enkidu. George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.64–65, does not think that *De Dea Syria* draws on any specific episode of *Gilgamesh* but rather that the text loosely incorporates elements from the cultural heritage of the ancient Near East and reformulates them in a new way. See J.L. Lightfoot, *Lucian on the Syrian Goddess* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 393; C. Grottanelli, “The Story of Combabos and the Gilgamesh Tradition,” in *Mythology and Mythologies. Methodological approaches to intercultural influences* (ed. R.M. Whiting; Melammu Symposia 2; Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2001), 19–27 (esp. 24); Lucian, *De Dea Syria* (Harmon, LCL) 4.366.

There also are references to Gilgamesh in later Christian and Islamic texts. An example of the former is the scholia to Genesis written by the 9th-century Nestorian bishop Theodore bar Konai, which contains a list of ancient kings, one of which is named Gilgamesh. The tale of Buluqiya, which is in some versions of the *Arabian Nights*, contains numerous motifs that are similar to the epic of *Gilgamesh*. See S. Dalley, “The Tale of Bulūqiyā and the *Alexander Romance* in Jewish and Sufi Mystical Circles,” in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.C. Reeves; SBLJL 6; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 239–69. For criticism of her views, see George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.65–68. Consult also Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 120–21; Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 109; Tigay, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic*, 252–53; M. Schwartz, “Qumran, Turfan, Arabic Magic, and Noah’s Name,” in *Charmes et Sortilèges. Magie et Magiciens* (ed. R. Gyselen; Res Orientales 14; Bures-sur-Yvette: Groupe pour l’Étude de la Civilisation du Moyen-Orient, 2002), 231–38.

⁹ J.C. Reeves, “Utnapishtim in the *Book of Giants*?” *JBL* 112 (1993): 110–15.

In the epic Gilgamesh, like the giants, is the product of divine-human parentage. This lineage is not treated as an unnatural mixing of separate realms, in marked contrast to the giants. Gilgamesh is two-thirds divine and one-third mortal (I.48). His mother Ninsun is a goddess whose name

See also idem, *Jewish Lore*, 126. He suggests that the giant Atambīsh, a figure attested not in the Qumran *Book of Giants* but in the later Manichean *Book of Giants* (*Kawān*), can be derived from Utnapishtim. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 298–300, recognized that the Qumran *Book of Giants* has numerous points of similarity with the former text, suggesting that the Early Jewish work attests traditions that shape the *Kawān*. See also his “Turfan et Qumran,” 124–25. In one text of the Manichean *Book of Giants*, named frg. L (for Leningrad, where it is housed), Mahaway goes to Atambīsh to relate “everything” to him. In another Middle Persian fragment, classified as M5900, Atambīsh is associated with “two hundred” (Watchers presumably, but the text is broken off at this point). Three giants associated with him are slain. For frg. L, see W. Sundermann, “Ein weiteres Fragment aus Manis Gigantenbuch,” in *Hommages et opera minora 9: Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata* (Acta Iranica 23; Leiden: Brill, 1984), 491–505 (esp. 497–98); for M5900, idem, *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer* (Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients 8, Berliner Turfantexte 4; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1973), 77–78.

R.V. Huggins argues that Atambīsh in the Manichean material should be understood as a reference not to a giant but rather to Enoch. See his “Noah and the Giants: A Response to John C. Reeves,” *JBL* 114 (1995): 103–10. He agrees, however, in the basic Atambīsh = Utnapishtim identification proposed by Reeves, modifying it as Atambīsh = Utnapishtim = Enoch. It is reasonable to posit, with Reeves and Huggins, that the name Atambīsh in the Manichean *Book of Giants* corresponds to a name in the Qumran *Book of Giants* that is not attested in any surviving fragment. But the lack of evidence regarding such a figure limits the contribution of this possibility to the interpretation of the composition. See also W. Sundermann, “Mani’s ‘Book of the Giants’ and the Jewish Books of Enoch: A Case of Terminological Differences and What It Implies,” in *Irano-Judaica III. Studies Relating to Jewish Contacts with Persian Culture throughout the Ages* (ed. S. Shaked and A. Netzer; Jerusalem: Ben Zvi, 1994), 40–48; George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.60, 155; L.T. Stuckenbruck, “The ‘Angels’ and ‘Giants’ of Genesis 6:1–4 in Second and Third Century B.C.E. Jewish Interpretation: Reflections on the Posture of Early Apocalyptic Traditions,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 354–77 (esp. 360); W.B. Henning, “The *Book of Giants*,” *BSOAS* 11 (1943–46): 52–74; J.C. Reeves, “Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library,” in *Tracing the Threads*, 173–203.

means “Queen of the wild cows.”¹⁰ His father Lugalbanda is a sly hero who is a leading character in Sumerian epics.¹¹ Perhaps due to his divine lineage, Gilgamesh was over time deified, and by the Old Babylonian period his name appears in god lists.¹²

2b. *Evil Spirits*

In Mesopotamian lore, more than in the epic itself, Gilgamesh was hailed as a judge and ruler of the shades in the underworld.¹³ It was common to exorcise evil spirits by beseeching Gilgamesh to accept them under his jurisdiction in the netherworld. One prayer, classified as KAR 227, reads: “O King Gilgamesh, superb judge of the Anunnaki, judicious prince...

¹⁰ T. Jacobson, “Lugalbanda and Ninsuna,” *JCS* 41 (1989): 69–86 (esp. 74); S. Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 40–41.

¹¹ The two Sumerian epics in which he is prominent are “Lugalbanda in Khurumkurra” and “Lugalbanda and Enmerkar.” There are other Mesopotamian traditions in which Lugalbanda is not simply a human being. He has been depicted as a wicked spirit known as a *lillu*-demon. There is another tradition preserved in the Sumerian King List in which Lugalbanda is a divine king of Uruk who reigned 1,200 years. According to one motif in the epic, Lugalbanda is the personal god (*ilum*) of Gilgamesh. See, for example, OB III.271 and SB VI.165. Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia*, 129, suggests this refers to a statue of his father and reflects a degree of ancestor worship. Consult further George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.215, 244, 2.822; B. Alster, “Epic Tales from Ancient Sumer: Enmerkar, Lugalbanda, and Other Cunning Heroes,” in *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, 4.2315–26 (esp. 2316–17); S.N. Kramer, *The Sumerians: Their History, Culture and Character* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1963), 273–74; P.P. Vértessal-ji, “La déesse nue élamite’ und der Kreis der babylonischen ‘Lilû’-Dämonen,” *Iranica Antiqua* 26 (1991): 101–48 (esp. 136); W. Farber, “Lilû, Lilitu, Ardat-lilî. A. Philologisch,” *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* (ed. E. Ebeling et al.; 10 vols.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1928–2005), 7.23–24, and, in the same volume, E. Porada, “Lilû, Lilitu, Ardat-lilî. B. Archäologisch,” 24–25; K. van der Toorn, “The Theology of Demons in Mesopotamia and Israel. Popular Belief and Scholarly Speculation,” in *Die Dämonen*, 61–83; Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 158.

¹² George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.119–35.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 1.127–35. This tradition is associated with Tablet XII of the epic, which is generally regarded as a translation of the Sumerian myth “Bilgames and the Netherworld” that was appended to the composition. See *ibid.*, 1.47–54; Foster, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, 129–43.

overseer of the underworld, lord of the nether regions... Eradicate the sickness [of my] body, drive out the Evil Thing... [*expel*] the evil that [resides] in my body.”¹⁴ In the *Book of Giants* Gilgamesh is not a ruler of evil spirits but rather one of the giants who eventually become spirits.¹⁵ A fuller version of this tradition is in the *Book of the Watchers*, in which the giants are forced after their physical destruction to roam the earth as evil spirits—the sort that cause difficulties for ordinary people, much like those over whom Gilgamesh rules in Mesopotamian tradition.¹⁶ The *Book of Giants*’ reliance on basic elements of the narrative in *Watchers* makes it a valid possibility that the author of the former text was familiar with the fate of the giants presented in *Watchers*, and that in its fuller form the *Book of Giants* attested this motif. In this case, the spirits of the giants in the *Book of Giants* would be functionally similar to the kind over which Gilgamesh has dominion in Mesopotamian tradition.

2c. *Dreams*

Gilgamesh has several dreams in the epic. In Tablet I, for example, he describes his dreams to his mother Ninsun, who interprets them for him (ll. 245–97). An important cluster of Gilgamesh’s dreams occurs before the battle with Humbaba. While the exact number and precise content of the dreams is obscured by the fragmentary condition of Tablet IV, in general the dreams terrify Gilgamesh and presage his fight with Humbaba. They take place when Gilgamesh and Enkidu journey to the Cedar Forest in Lebanon. The dreams are a result of Gilgamesh’s attempts to receive a night-vision, suggesting that he is trying to learn from the gods what the outcome of the battle will be. In them he confronts his fear of the mon-

¹⁴ George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.132–35.

¹⁵ 4Q531 19 2–4 reads “many [dee]ds of violence on the dry land... n[ot] bones are we and not flesh... and we shall be wiped out from our form.” Cf. 4Q511 35 7; 4Q511 48, 49 + 51 2–3. Consult *DJD* 31:71–72; Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 159–60; *DSSR*, 3.493.

¹⁶ “But now the giants who were begotten by the spirits and flesh—they will call them evil spirits upon the earth, for their dwelling will be upon the earth... And the spirits of the giants <lead astray>, do violence, make desolate, and attack and wrestle and hurl upon the earth and <cause illnesses>” (*1 En.* 15:8, 11). See G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36, 81–108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 267–75.

ster, which he must overcome before he can defeat him (cf. IV.241–242). Core elements of the dreams are interpreted as references to Humbaba. He is likened to a mountain in Enkidu's interpretation of one of Gilgamesh's dreams (IV.30–31).¹⁷ According to an Old Babylonian fragment from Nippur, in one dream Humbaba is symbolized by an Anzû-bird, a fearsome griffin-like creature with wings and a lion's head: "I watched an Anzû-bird in the sky... it rose like a cloud, soaring above us... its face was very strange, its speech was fire, its breath was death" (ll. 11–14).¹⁸ Ironically, given Gilgamesh's intense response to Enkidu's death, to defeat Humbaba he must transcend his fear of dying in battle.¹⁹

Dreams are a major theme in the Qumran *Book of Giants*. Important aspects of the extant narrative revolve around dreams and the giants' reaction to them. The core text for this topic is 4Q530 2 ii, which describes two visions, one disclosed to the giant Hahyah and the other to his brother 'Ohyah.²⁰ Hahyah has a dream of a large garden that is tended by gardeners (ll. 6–12). Fire and water destroy the grove, except for one tree with three branches.²¹ 'Ohyah has a dream in which he sees God descend and sit on a throne, with a heavenly host in attendance (ll. 15–20). In language reminiscent of Dan 7, books are opened and judgment is uttered

¹⁷ Lines 14–15 of an Old Babylonian fragment of the epic, now in the Schøyen collection, read: "Now, my friend, the one to whom we go, is he not the mountain? He is something very strange!" See George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.227, 235.

¹⁸ The description of the bird's speech and breath evokes a refrain used for the voice of Humbaba (e.g., II.291–92). See Alster, "Epic Tales from Ancient Sumer," 4.2316–17; J. Goodnick Westenholz, *Dragons, Monsters, and Fabulous Beasts* (Jerusalem: Bible Lands Museum, 2004), 32–33; Tigay, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic*, 124; George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.243–44.

¹⁹ IV.245 reads "Forget death and [seek] life!"

²⁰ DJD 31:28–38. Several fragments of 4Q530 comprise this text: 2, 6, 7, 8–11, and possibly 12. For the sake of convenience I refer to this text as 4Q530 2 ii, which contains the first large amount of text in the column.

²¹ Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 95–102, argues that this tree becomes a "Tree of Life" in Central Asian Manichaeism. See also H.-J. Klimkeit, "Der Buddha Henoch: Qumran und Turfan," *ZRG* 32 (1980) 367–77; A.A. Orlov, "The Flooded Arboretums: The Garden Traditions in the Slavonic Version of 3 *Baruch* and the *Book of Giants*," in *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha* (JSJSup 114; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 289–309.

(ll. 18–19).²² These dreams are recounted before the assembled giants (4Q530 2 ii 5; cf. l. 15). They become afraid (l. 20), and they want to learn the interpretation of the visions. They commission the giant Mahaway to journey across “the great wilderness” (מדברא רבא) to reach Enoch, who, the text assumes, can interpret the dreams (4Q530 7 ii 5; 4Q530 2 ii 21–24; cf. l. 14).²³ The dreams clearly refer to the giants’ destruction in the flood.²⁴ The surviving evidence is sparse but suggests that they realize judgment is inevitable.²⁵ The dreams establish that the giants are given the opportunity to know their fate. Their reaction of fear to the visions is thematically similar to Tablet IV of the epic when Gilgamesh journeys to fight Humbaba. In both texts dreams are the medium through which the protagonists confront the possibility that they will be destroyed.²⁶ In the case of the epic, Gilgamesh’s fears prove to be unfounded. The giants of the Qumran text are not so lucky.²⁷

²² R.E. Stokes, “The Throne Visions of Daniel 7, *1 Enoch* 14, and the Qumran *Book of Giants* (4Q530): An Analysis of Their Literary Relationship,” *DSD* 15 (2008): 340–58; L.T. Stuckenbruck, “The Throne-Theophany of the *Book of Giants*: Some New Light on the Background of Daniel 7,” in *The Scrolls and The Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. S.E. Porter and C. Evans; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 211–20; Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 305.

²³ This is different from the *Book of Watchers*, in which Enoch is a recipient, rather than a source, of divine knowledge. The portrait of Enoch in the *Book of Giants* is closer to that of the “birth of Noah” story in *1 En.* 106–107 and the Genesis Apocryphon (e.g., 2:19–25), in which Methusaleh travels to Enoch for an explanation of the strange appearance of Noah when he is born. See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 541.

²⁴ Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 65.

²⁵ 4Q531 19 4, for example, reads “we shall be wiped out from our form.” 4Q530 1 i 5 states “we will die together” (גמורת כחדא). 4Q533 4 3 asserts that “a flood is upon the earth (גבול על ארעא)” and line 2 mentions crimes of deceit and bloodshed.

²⁶ J.C. Reeves suggests that the prominence of dreams in the *Book of Giants* is a conscious parody of the *Gilgamesh* epic. See his “Review of L. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*,” *JQR* 90 (1999): 223–26 (esp. 226). Reeves’ proposal merits further consideration but is weakened by the likely interpretation that Gilgamesh does not receive visions in the *Book of Giants*, a position I argue below.

²⁷ No account of the giants’ destruction is extant in the text. Given their realization that they will die, it is reasonable to infer that originally the composition did assert that most or all of the giants perished in the flood. Stuckenbruck has

2d. *Giant Warriors*

In the Mesopotamian poem Gilgamesh is praised as a great warrior. This reputation is borne out in his defeat of Humbaba, a legend also found in Sumerian myth.²⁸ This is compatible with the giants of Jewish tradition, who are regarded as mighty warriors (גבורים). In the epic Gilgamesh is incredibly large. This is most explicit in a Hittite version of *Gilgamesh*, which opens with an account of his height: “His body was eleven yards [in height]; his breast was nine [spans] in breadth” (§2).²⁹ This would make him almost twice as tall as Goliath, whose height is six cubits and a span, according to 1 Sam 17:4. The beginning of the Standard Babylonian version emphasizes the size of Gilgamesh’s stride: “A triple cubit was his foot, half a rod his leg. Six cubits was [his] stride” (I.56–57). He is also described as “Gilgamesh so tall, perfect and terrible” (I.37; cf. II.164). The most striking account of Gilgamesh’s giant stature occurs during his fight with Humbaba. The battle is an etiological legend that explains the formation of the Rift Valley of Lebanon: “At the heels of their feet the earth was splitting apart, as they whirled around Sirara and Lebanon were sundered” (V.133–134).³⁰ The weaponry of Gilgamesh and Enkidu is incredibly heavy. They have swords and hatchets fashioned that each

made the observation that Gilgamesh in the epic tries and fails to attain eternal life and the giants in the *Book of Giants* try and fail to avoid destruction in the flood. He writes that the motif of Gilgamesh’s “illusionary search for immortality” influences the basic story-line of the *Book of Giants*. See his “Giant Mythology and Demonology,” in *Die Dämonen*, 313–38 (esp. 332).

²⁸ The tales are “Gilgamesh and Huwawa A” and “Gilgamesh and Huwawa B.” Translations are in Foster, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, 104–20. Consult also Alster, “Epic Tales from Ancient Sumer,” 4.2317; George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.9–11; D.O. Edzard, “*Gilgames und Huwawa*: Zwei Versionen der sumerischen Zedernwaldepisode nebst einer Edition von Version “B” (München: Verlag der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1993).

²⁹ This translation is from Foster, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, 158. See also George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.447; Tigay, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic*, 110–18; Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 120.

³⁰ In an earlier version the mountains are split by the deafening yell of Humbaba (Huwawa) (Old Babylonian Ischchali fragment, l. 31’, rev.). See George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.263, 266. The significance of this region is examined below.

weigh seven talents. This is approximately two hundred kilograms, which would make each weapon much heavier than Goliath's spear.³¹

The portrayal of Humbaba as a gigantic creature is also conveyed by associating him with a massive cedar tree. When he is defeated they fell a “lofty cedar, whose top abutted the heavens” (V.293–294).³² From the tree they make a giant door. Enkidu says to Gilgamesh that he made (or will make) “a door—six rods is its height, two rods its breadth, one cubit its thickness, its pole, its top pivot and its bottom pivot are all of a piece” (ll. 295–296).³³

2e. *Mount Hermon*

Both the Qumran *Book of Giants* and the epic of *Gilgamesh*, at least according to one Old Babylonian tablet, can be related to Mount Hermon. There is no surviving connection between the giants and Mount Hermon in the *Book of Giants*, but it is reasonable to speculate that there was such an association in the original text since the *Book of the Watchers* situates the descent of the Watchers and their pact to sleep with women (the mothers of the giants) at this mountain (cf. *1 En.* 6:6; 13:7–9; 4QEn^a 1 iii 4–5).³⁴ An Old Babylonian fragment of the *Gilgamesh* epic (OB Ish-

³¹ I base this on Late Bronze Age Mesopotamian copper ingots that signify talents which weigh 28–30 kilograms. West of the Euphrates in this period the talent was often reckoned as 3,000 shekels. Following this standard, each weapon of Gilgamesh (7 talents = 21,000 shekels) is roughly 35 times heavier than Goliath's spear, which, according to 1 Sam 17:7, weighs 600 shekels. See further M.A. Powell, “Weights and Measures,” *ABD*, 6.897–908 (esp. 905); Foster, *The Gilgamesh Epic*, 20.

³² As with Humbaba in *Gilgamesh*, the stature of the giants of Enochic legend is compared to both mountains (cf. IV.30–31) and cedar trees in Early Jewish literature: “And their [the Watchers'] sons, whose height was like that of cedars and whose bodies were like mountains, fell” (CD 2:19; cf. Amos 2:9). These tropes are not present in the *Book of Giants*. Also note the later Hebrew term גולמיש, which refers to a type of cedar tree (e.g., *b. Sanh.* 108b).

³³ George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.613, suggests that the preterite construction of the verb is corrupt. He also argues (2.828) that the explanation that the pivots and pole are of a “single piece” implies that the entire door and its constituent parts are from a single, very large tree.

³⁴ Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 124, 161. See also Stuckenbruck, “Giant Mythology,”

chali) considers the location of the Cedar Forest guarded by Ḫuwawa to be “Sirion and Lebanon” (*sa-ri-a ù la-ab-na-an*), that is, “Hermon and Lebanon” (l. 31’, rev.; cf. SB V.134).³⁵ While this fragment is too old to be directly linked to the *Book of Giants*, it does establish an archaic connection between giant warriors and Mount Hermon.³⁶

3. Possible Modes of Transmission

The parallels reviewed above between the *Book of Giants* and *Gilgamesh* suggest that the author of the Qumran text shows familiarity with the epic beyond the utilization of the names Gilgamesh and Humbaba. Regarding how its author was exposed to Gilgamesh traditions, several possibilities are available. The Middle Babylonian *Gilgamesh* fragment

326–27. G.W.E. Nickelsburg argues that *1 En.* 12–16 were produced in northern Galilee and that these chapters “reflect visionary activity in the area of Dan and Hermon.” See his “Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee,” *JBL* 100 (1981): 575–600 (esp. 586); idem, *1 Enoch* 1, 230–31. See also M.A. Knibb, “Interpreting the Book of Enoch: Reflections on a Recently Published Commentary,” *JSJ* 33 (2002): 437–50 (esp. 449–50).

³⁵ George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.263; T. Bauer, “Ein viertes altbabylonisches Fragment des Gilgamesh-Epos,” *JNES* 16 (1957): 254–62 (esp. 256). The name Hermon derives from a Hebrew root referring to a ban or taboo and is not attested in other ancient Near Eastern literatures. Names such as “Senir” or “Sirion” for the mountain are much more common (cf. Deut 3:9). It is not clear that older versions of the epic situate the forest in Lebanon. See J. Hansman, “Gilgamesh, Humbaba and the land of the ERIN-trees,” *Iraq* 38 (1976): 23–35; J. Klein and K. Abraham, “Problems of Geography in the Gilgamesh Epics: The Journey to the ‘Cedar Forest,’” in *Landscapes: Territories, Frontiers and Horizons in the Ancient Near East. Papers presented to the XLIV Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Venezia, 7–11 July 1997. Part III. Landscape in Ideology, Religion, Literature and Art* (ed. L. Milano et al.; Padova: Sargon, 2000), 63–73; R. Arav, “Hermon, Mount,” *ABD*, 3.158–60; E. Lipiński, “El’s Abode: Mythological Traditions Related to Mount Hermon and to the Mountains of Armenia,” *OLP* 2 (1971): 13–69.

³⁶ The Canaanite kings Og and Sihon, who are identified as giants in later Judaism, are both associated with Mount Hermon in Joshua (12:4–5; 13:10–11). In rabbinic tradition Og and Sihon are called “the sons of Ahijah the son of Shemhazai,” one of the leading Watchers (*Tg. Ps-Jon.* Deut 2:2; 3:11).

from Megiddo, written in the 14th c. B.C.E., if not earlier, establishes that the text was in the region long before the composition of the *Book of Giants*.³⁷ One could conclude that knowledge of the epic entered Palestine in the Late Bronze Age. Although, if one adopts this position, it is difficult to explain why there is such a large chronological gap, well over a thousand years, between the *Book of Giants* and the Megiddo fragment, during which Palestinian literature shows little if any direct knowledge of *Gilgamesh*.³⁸ Aside from the possibility of older tradents, knowledge of the epic surely was brought to Palestine by Jews who returned from the eastern Diaspora. Daniel and several other Jews are taught “the literature and language of the Chaldeans” (Dan 1:4). While a fictional tale, it suggests that its author considered it possible for at least some Jews in Babylon to receive such an education. *Gilgamesh* would have been an important text they would have learned.³⁹ Even if one does not grant that the book of Daniel implies that some Jews acquired a Babylonian education, the Murashu archive attests Jews in the fifth c. B.C.E. who were immersed in the local economy.⁴⁰ They doubtlessly came into contact with people who had an education in which *Gilgamesh* was part of the curriculum. In the exilic period, and well into the second c. B.C.E., copies of the epic were

³⁷ George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.339–47.

³⁸ L.T. Stuckenbruck and K. van der Toorn have expressed doubt that one can conclude that knowledge of the epic was in Palestine in the last few centuries B.C.E. on the basis of the Megiddo fragment. See respectively, “Giant Mythology,” 332–33, and “Echoes of Gilgamesh in the Book of Qohelet?” in *Veenhof Anniversary Volume: Studies Presented to Klaas R. Veenhof on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. W.H. van Soldt et al.; Leiden: Netherlands Institute of the Near East, 2001), 503–14 (esp. 512). R.C. van Leeuwen argues that Isa 14 reflects familiarity with the epic. He contends that this chapter constitutes an “inversion” of elements from *Gilgamesh*, a conscious effort to recast elements from the epic “in a way that unmistakably distinguishes the one group from the other.” See his “Isa 14:12, *hōlēš ‘al guym* and Gilgamesh XI,6,” *JBL* 99 (1980): 173–84.

³⁹ George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.33–39; D.M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 17–46 (esp. 41).

⁴⁰ M.D. Coogan, *West Semitic Personal Names in the Murashû Documents* (HSM 7; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976); M.W. Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire: The Murashû Archive, the Murashû Firm, and Persian Rule in Babylonia* (Leiden: Brill, 1985).

being produced.⁴¹ Knowledge of *Gilgamesh* may have also entered into Early Judaism in the Persian and/or Hellenistic periods.

There is not enough evidence to endorse Reeves' suggestion that the author was working with an Aramaic copy of *Gilgamesh*, although this possibility cannot be dismissed outright.⁴² More familiarity with the epic, in my judgment, would be required for this conclusion. The *Book of Giants* does not demonstrate knowledge of core elements of the plot of the epic, Mesopotamian deities who are prominent in *Gilgamesh*, such as Ishtar, or other key characters such as Enkidu. A reasonable assessment is that the author had indirect knowledge of *Gilgamesh*, perhaps because Jews returning from the Eastern Diaspora brought this knowledge to Palestine with them.⁴³

4. The *Book of Giants*—an Anti-Pagan Text?

Having established that the author of the *Book of Giants* was familiar with *Gilgamesh* traditions, the question becomes *why* he was drawing upon them. Puech and Reeves have argued that the composition appropriates *Gilgamesh* lore for polemic ends. Émile Puech contends that the *Book of Giants* was written in response to mythological and cultic developments in northern Syro-Palestine, especially in the region of Banias and Hermon.⁴⁴ Drawing on the *Phoenician History* by Philo of Byblos (preserved by Eusebius), Puech argues that by 200 B.C.E. cultic practices in Dan and Banias promoted syncretism of Hellenistic and Phoenician myth. Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica* 1.10.29 reads:

In the thirty-second year of his own assumption of royal authority Elos, i.e., Kronos, trapped his father Ouranos in a certain inland

⁴¹ Most of the available Babylonian copies of the epic are written after the destruction of the Assyrian empire (612 B.C.E.) and attested up to the Arsacid period (2d–1st c. B.C.E.). The latest *Gilgamesh* text has a colophon that dates it to 130 B.C.E. See George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.381.

⁴² Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 120.

⁴³ Beyer, *ATTM*, 1.259, pointing to the names Gilgamesh and Ḥobabish, suggests that the *Book of Giants* has a Babylonian provenance. Their names do not comprise sufficient evidence to support this conclusion (cf. 1Q23 13 2).

⁴⁴ *DJD* 31:14–16. See also É. Puech, “Les songes des fils de Šemiḥazah dans le livre des Géants à Qumrân,” *CRAIL* (2000): 7–25.

place. He overpowered and castrated him near springs and rivers. There Ouranos was made an object of worship and breathed his last and the blood from his genitals dropped into the springs and the rivers' waters. Even now the place is shown.⁴⁵

According to Puech, this text preserves knowledge of actual cultic practices carried out in the vicinity of Hermon in the second c. B.C.E. The *Book of Giants*, he argues, represents an effort to denounce this worship. The Qumran text was, in his view, written by official leaders, "prêtres ou sages de Jérusalem," who were critical of northern heterodox cults: "en situant dans cette région l'origine des pratiques démoniaques, Gilgamesh étant lui-même un dieu chthonien, régent des Enfers."⁴⁶ Following this formulation, the *Book of Giants*' portrayal of Gilgamesh is not polemic against Mesopotamian culture but rather against northern Syro-Palestinian traditions, one of which is Gilgamesh.⁴⁷ In a similar vein, David Jackson has suggested that the *Book of Giants* is an anti-Gentile text.⁴⁸ According to his reading the entire composition becomes a kind of "in joke" with which oppressed Jews make light of their foreign dominators.

It is not clear that Philo of Byblos preserves reliable knowledge of Upper Galilee cults active in the second c. B.C.E.⁴⁹ Even if one were to

⁴⁵ Philo of Byblos' account also associates mountains in this region with giants (1.10.9). In Greek tradition, as recounted by Hesiod, the giants are formed from the drops of blood that fell when Ouranos was castrated (*Theog.* 183–187). See H.W. Attridge and R.A. Oden, Jr., *Philo of Byblos: The Phoenician History* (CBQMS 9; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981), 41–43, 55.

⁴⁶ *DJD* 31:15.

⁴⁷ Important for this viewpoint is the Megiddo Gilgamesh fragment and the epic's placement of Humbaba in a grove in Lebanon.

⁴⁸ Jackson, "Demonising Gilgameš," 113. In particular, he stresses that the figure of Gilgamesh is a veiled effort to demonize the Seleucid Empire.

⁴⁹ The issue of Philo of Byblos aside, Hellenistic cultic practices were carried out in Upper Galilee during the late Second Temple period. This does not mean, of course, that the *Book of Giants* was written in response to them. A cult devoted to Pan at Baniyas near Mount Hermon was in operation in the second c. B.C.E. Writing in this century, Polybius mentions the Paneion, a cave devoted to Pan, in Baniyas when discussing Antiochus III, who defeated an Egyptian general in this region in 200 B.C.E. (16.18.2; cf. 28.1.3). Excavations confirm the site's antiquity. Z.U. Ma'oz suggests that the worship of Pan at this site may have been started by the Ptolemies in the third c. B.C.E., perhaps installed to compete with

grant that point, to endorse Puech's argument one must take the questionable position of viewing the *Book of Giants* as a kind of 'orthodox' book written against religious developments not in line with the views of Jerusalem officials. The composition is normative in that it recounts the proclamation of judgment against creatures who are wicked. But one looks in vain for other indicators that the text asserts the viewpoint of Jerusalem officials. Proper worship or ritual purity are never explicit issues. The assertion of judgment against the giants never functions as an opportunity to emphasize the sovereignty of God or that his temple is in Jerusalem. The text is not, it seems to me, designed to describe polemically political powers or syncretistic cults as, respectively, Jackson and Puech have argued. Allusions to contemporary Hellenistic Phoenician worship or foreign rulers are weak at best.⁵⁰

Reeves understands the *Book of Giants* to be a self-consciously anti-pagan text. He argues that the composition's appropriation of the names Gilgamesh and Humbaba "represents a bold polemical thrust against the revered traditions of a rival culture, analogous to the denigration of pagan deities or idol-worship found in Jewish writings like the Book of Jubilees

and replace the worship site at Dan, which is only four kilometers away from Baniyas and in use at least up to the third c. B.C.E. See his "Baniyas," in *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (ed. E. Stern; 4 vols.; Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society & Carta, 1993), 1.136–43 (esp. 137). T. Vassiliadis argues that "it is an established historical fact" that there was a sanctuary of Pan in operation at the site by the early 2d c. B.C.E. See his "The 'God Who Is in Dan' and the Cult of Pan at Baniyas in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods," *ErIsr* 23 (1992): 128–35 (esp. 133). Consult further S. Dar, *Settlements and Cult Sites on Mount Hermon, Israel: Ituraean Culture in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Oxford: Hadrian Books, 1993); Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 238–47.

Though I do not advocate this possibility, one could speculate that the passage of Philo of Byblos cited above, which associates the castration of Ouranos with a Levantine river, can be connected to Baniyas with the help of *b. Sanh.* 98a. This text states that the students of R. Jose b. Kisma ask him for a sign of the advent of the messiah and, among other things, he responds by invoking the waters of Baniyas (the headwaters of the Jordan) to turn to blood. See Ma'oz, "Baniyas," 138.

⁵⁰ Additionally, the fact that the giants are not punished with banishment to the netherworld argues against the view that the *Book of Giants* portrays Gilgamesh as, in the words of Puech, a "régent des Enfers."

or Bel and the Dragon.”⁵¹ The fact that Gilgamesh, a heroic warrior in the epic, is presented in the Qumran text as one of the wicked giants confirms the basic contours of this thesis. An examination of the Gilgamesh fragments of the *Book of Giants*, 4Q530 2 ii 1–3 and 4Q531 22, indicates, however, that important elements of the work’s portrayal of Gilgamesh have little to do with the epic itself.

5. Gilgamesh and Hobabish in the *Book of Giants*

5a. 4Q530 2 ii and 4Q531 22

Gilgamesh and Hobabish are each attested in two passages of the *Book of Giants*. The name “Gilgamesh” is found in 4Q530 2 ii 2 (גלגמיט) and 4Q531 22 12 (לגמיש[ג]); “Hobabish” is in 4Q530 2 ii 2 (ח[ו]בב[ו]בס) and 4Q203 3 3 (חובבש). 4Q530 2 ii 1–3, while poorly preserved, sets the stage for the two crucial visions of the garden and theophanic judgment that occur later in the column. The pericope has not received much scholarly attention.⁵² It is the only fragment of the work in which the names Gilgamesh and Hobabish occur together.

4Q530 2 ii begins:

...concerns the death of our souls. [And] all his companions [ent]ered and [’Ohy]ah told them that which Gilgamesh (גלגמיט) had said to him. H[o]babish (ח[ו]בב[ו]בס) opened his mouth (אפחא) and [judg]ment was pronounced against his soul. The guilty one cursed the princes (רוזניא) and the giants rejoiced over it. He returned, he was curs[ed and he brought a comp]laint against him. (4Q530 2 ii 1–3)⁵³

⁵¹ Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 126.

⁵² Several commentators on 4Q530 2 ii, working before the critical edition of its fragments were published, show no knowledge of the opening pericope of the reconstructed column. See, for example, Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 58; García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 104; Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 304; Beyer, *ATTM*, 1.264 (his “G9”). For the official transcription of 4Q530 2 ii, see Puech, *DJD* 31:28. Note also *DSSR*, 3.484–85.

⁵³ The ink on this fragment is faded in places and the leather surface is wrinkled, making it difficult to read. Earlier transcriptions of this passage include Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 105; Beyer, *ATTME*, 120. Several aspects of the transcription of this pericope require comment.

Several details of this passage are obscure: (1) what 'Ohyah says to the other giants; (2) what Ḥobabish does; (3) against whom judgment is pronounced; (4) the identity of the “guilty one”; (5) the identity of the “princes”; (6) why the giants rejoice; (7) who returns in line 3, and if this is the same figure who is then cursed or the one who brings a complaint. Underlying all of these questions is how the pericope functions as an occasion for the disclosure of the visions of the garden and the theophany.

1. The word “ent]ered” (לָוַיַּע) has poor material support and is not transcribed in the editions of Beyer and Stuckenbruck. Another word could be envisioned here but it is a reasonable reconstruction since after this word the giants are together (cf. 4Q530 1 i 8, **על לבנשת גבריא**).
2. The word [’Ohy]ah ([היה]או) is not well preserved, even though all commentators accept this reconstruction. Another possible reconstruction is Hahyah ([היה]ה), who is also prominent in 4Q530 2 ii. If one follows the placement of fragments 6 and 7 in Puech’s edition of this composite text, the lacuna is better filled with two letters than one. This supports the consensus view. 4Q531 22, discussed below, also suggests that it is 'Ohyah who reports to the other giants what Gilgamesh said.
3. Another important term, Ḥobabish (חַבְבִּישׁ), has very poor material support (and depends on the placement of fragments 6 and 2 in relation to one another). Beyer and Stuckenbruck do not transcribe this name but only **בה]**. The final letter appears to be a *samek*, in support of Puech’s transcription, but one must grant that this reading is obscured by a crack in the leather and ink erosion. No other name of a giant could end with these letters (in 4Q203 3 3 the name of Ḥobabish ends with a *šim*), with Atambish (see above) being a possible exception.
4. Transcribing the word “[judg]ment” (דָּן) relies on scant physical evidence. The reading is in Puech and Stuckenbruck but not Beyer. Context supports this transcription. That someone is judged is implied by the term that follows, **חַיִּבָּא**, “the guilty one.” The parallelism of **אפחא** and **מתאמר]** דָּן suggests that the giant opens his mouth to utter judgment against someone else, and that both statements refer to the same act of uttering judgment.
5. Reading **חַיִּבָּא** (“the guilty one”) is complicated by ink erosion and a crack on the leather surface. Beyer reads **ורבא** and Stuckenbruck **לנא רבא**. The upper stroke of a *lamed* that Stuckenbruck discerns follows a crack in the leather that travels up past line 1 and is better understood as a shadow rather than ink.
6. Regarding the phrase **ואתל]ט וקבל** I tentatively follow Puech, but there is very little physical evidence upon which to base a reconstruction. Stuckenbruck does not attempt a reconstruction for these words and Beyer transcribes **לואזל]**.

Stuckenbruck entitles the opening section of 4Q530 “The Giants are Reassured through Gilgamesh.”⁵⁴ He suggests that the giants rejoice because Gilgamesh has received a vision that leaves “some room for hope” with regard to the fate of the giants.⁵⁵ The argument relies on an interpretation of 4Q531 22 12, which Stuckenbruck translates as “[Gi]lgamesh, tell your [d]ream” (לְגַמִּישׁ אָמַר [ח] לְמַכָּה [ג]).⁵⁶ So understood, Gilgamesh’s vision offered a measure of hope to the giants when they were told about it in 4Q530 2 ii. Upon hearing of it, they celebrated. The claim that Gilgamesh is a visionary would provide a strong parallel to the *Gilgamesh* epic.

I agree with Stuckenbruck that 4Q531 22 bears on the interpretation of 4Q530 2 ii, but not with his opinion that the former text depicts Gilgamesh as a visionary.⁵⁷ A key passage of 4Q531 22 reads:

[When I was mig]hty, with the powerful strength of my arm and my great strength, [I attacked a]ll flesh and made war against them (cf. Dan 7:21). But [I was] not [strong (enough) and] I, with us, was [not] able to prevail because my accusers [are the angels who] reside [in] the [heavens] and in the holy places they encamp. [They were] not [wiped out because the]y are stronger than me. *vacat* [Behold, a roar]ing [voice] of the beasts of the field has come and the men of the field cry out (for) [their revenge]. (4Q531 22 3–9)⁵⁸

⁵⁴ Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 104.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 108.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 164. So also Beyer, *ATTME*, 119. In the presentations of 4Q531 22 11–12 in Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 60, and Beyer, *ATTM*, 1.262, only the word “Gilgamesh” is visible. See also Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 313; García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 105. In Stuckenbruck’s arrangement the fragment in question is 4Q531 17.

⁵⁷ S. Dalley also understands Gilgamesh as a visionary in the *Book of Giants*. She briefly asserts that the composition “relates a dream of Gilgamesh about a divine court of judgment set in a heavenly garden with trees.” See her “Occasions and Opportunities. 2. Persian, Greek, and Parthian overlords,” in *The Legacy of Mesopotamia* (ed. S. Dalley et al.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 35–55 (esp. 43). George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.62, is justly critical of Dalley’s claim. The vision of a garden in 4Q530 2 ii 6–12 is disclosed to Hahyah, not Gilgamesh.

⁵⁸ For the official edition of this text, see Puech, *DJD* 31:74–78. Other transcriptions include Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 60; Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 162;

In response the giant 'Ohyah claims that he has had a vision: “And then 'Ohyah said to him ‘my dream has oppressed [me]’” (l. 9).⁵⁹ Considering this giant to be the visionary here makes sense given his prominent vision in 4Q530 2 ii.⁶⁰ 'Ohyah replies to what the speaker of lines 3–7 has said. 'Ohyah asserts that he “knows”—this knowledge pertains to his vision but what exactly he knows is not clear (l. 10). Puech reconstructs line 11 as the giant saying that “the judgment of the assembly” “will not hasten.” The Aramaic here, however, is very fragmentary and not enough evidence survives to endorse his reconstruction. But semantically it is a reasonable suggestion, since the core visions of the *Book of Giants*, those of 4Q530 2 ii, signify the judgment of the giants.⁶¹

Milik, without elaboration, asserted that the speaker in lines 3–7 was the Watcher Šemihazah.⁶² Reeves argues that the speaker is more likely a

Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 307, Beyer, *ATTM*, 1.262. With the exception of line 8, there are no major differences in the transcriptions of this pericope in these editions. In line 8 the important expression [רַה]קל גַע (“a roar[ing] [voice]”) has very little material support. A reconstruction of]רַה is not attempted in Stuckenbruck or Reeves. Beyer reads למנט]רה (“zur Bewachung”). Milik, like Puech, suggests גַע]רַה. The transcripton of Puech makes sense on semantic grounds. The speaker of ll. 3–7 has fought against “a]ll flesh” and he has been defeated; it is reasonable to suppose that some sort of rebuke has been uttered against him (this also makes Puech’s supplement at the beginning of line 9, “their revenge,” plausible). If one understands “beasts of the field” and “the men of the field” to be in parallelism, one would expect the subject of אַתָּה to be similar in meaning to the participle modifying “men,” קרִינִי, “cry out.” See further Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 186.

⁵⁹ Most commentators, despite a *vacat* separating the word “Ohyah” from the verb of the sentence, take 'Ohyah as the subject in line 9. See, for example, Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 164; Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 65; Puech, *DJD* 31:75; Beyer, *ATTM*, 1.262. The claim that the dream “oppressed” him (אַנְסַנְי) probably means that it overwhelmed him, in the sense that at first he did not understand the dream. In Dan 4:6 [v. 9 Eng] Daniel’s interpretative prowess is praised: “No mystery overwhelms you” (בְּלִירָז לֹא־אַנְסַנְי לְךָ) (cf. 1QapGen 2:13).

⁶⁰ This argues against taking 'Ohyah as a vocative (which would make him the giant who is told about the oppressive dream rather than the one who has it), a possibility that Tigchelaar has stressed (oral communication; see also *DJD* 31:77).

⁶¹ He reconstructs the key phrase as [תָּא]דִין כְּנֶשֶׁת. See *DJD* 31:74. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 162, offers no transcription for this part of 4Q531 22 11.

⁶² Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 307. So also Beyer, *ATTM*, 1.262, who calls this text “Das Gespräch des Semiasa mit seinem Sohn Uhja.” This title is given in

giant, appealing to the tradition that the giants were arrogant (cf. 3 Macc 2:4; Wis 14:6; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.73).⁶³ Stuckenbruck agrees with Reeves' analysis but does not identify who is speaking.⁶⁴ Aside from 'Ohyah, the only other giant named in 4Q531 22 is Gilgamesh. It is more reasonable to consider him 'Ohyah's interlocutor, and thus the speaker of lines 3–7, than to insert another figure into the story. The motif of warfare is also compatible with the view that the speaker is a giant.

4Q531 22 as a whole should be understood as a conversation between Gilgamesh and 'Ohyah. For this interpretation one key issue is how line 12 should be understood. Puech reconstructs line 12 as stating "Then G]ilgamesh said 'your [d]ream is com[plete (?)].'"⁶⁵ So translated, Gilgamesh is talking to someone else to whom the vision was disclosed—presumably to 'Ohyah who speaks of a vision in lines 9–11. Stuckenbruck, by contrast, understands Gilgamesh as a vocative and the verb as an imperative ("Gi]lgamesh, tell your [d]ream"). Puech's understanding of the line is to be preferred. 4Q530 2 ii establishes that 'Ohyah is a recipient of visions in the composition, but there is no unambiguous evidence elsewhere in the text that Gilgamesh receives a vision.⁶⁶ Stuckenbruck's

idem, *ATTME*, 119, as well. See also García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 105.

⁶³ Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 118, 158. Arrogance is certainly a motif in 4Q531 22 3–7 but this should be qualified with the observation that such confidence is very much in the past; the speaker realizes that he was not strong enough against his opponents. His confidence has collapsed.

⁶⁴ Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 166–67.

⁶⁵ Unfortunately, it is not at all clear what Gilgamesh says about 'Ohyah's dream. The word "com[plete]" has extremely poor material support. Puech, *DJD* 31:74, suggests transcribing]ⲙ]ⲧⲱ. Below I argue that, while there is not enough physical evidence to endorse this reconstruction, semantically it is a reasonable suggestion.

⁶⁶ 4Q531 46 may recount another vision of 'Ohyah, but the evidence is too meager to state this conclusively. This suggestion is made by Puech, *DJD* 31:93. Portions of two lines of 4Q531 46 survive: "And I, 'O[hyah...] I went up and entered he[aven]." Puech's reconstruction is supported by the L fragment of the Manichean *Book of Giants*, which states that the giant Sāhm "had a dream. He came up to heaven." 'Ohyah and Hahyah are at times referred to in the *Kawān* as Sāhm and Narimān, respectively, who are figures from Iranian epic tradition. See further Henning, "The *Book of Giants*," 57; P.O. Skjærvø, "Iranian Epic and the Manichean *Book of Giants*. Irano-Manichaica III," *ActaOrHung* 48 (1995):

opinion that a vision was disclosed to Gilgamesh requires positing two visionaries—’Ohyah in lines 9–11 and Gilgamesh in line 12. This is possible but it would be simpler to interpret line 12 not as introducing a new vision but referring to the one of lines 9–11. Gilgamesh states that he has been defeated (ll. 3–7), this reminds ’Ohyah of a vision (ll. 9–11), and Gilgamesh then says something about ’Ohyah’s vision (l. 12).⁶⁷ There is no explicit example of Gilgamesh having a dream or vision in the *Book of Giants*. This constitutes a significant difference from the epic of *Gilgamesh*.

The trope of 4Q531 22 that Gilgamesh despairs from his loss in combat has no strong parallel in the *Gilgamesh* epic. There the hero’s sorrow is legendary, but it is triggered by the death of Enkidu, not by a defeat in battle. In the epic Gilgamesh never suffers a major loss when fighting. His defeat in the *Book of Giants* could be a conscious effort to reverse his victorious exploits in the epic. This possibility is weakened, however, by the fact that Gilgamesh’s defeat is only reported, not recounted. If it had been important for the author of the Qumran text to reverse the hero’s status as a victor, it is likely that more narrational focus would have been placed on his defeat.

In 4Q531 22 Gilgamesh, while his exploits probably involved other giants, emphasizes his own defeat and an outcry against him rather than the giants as a whole.⁶⁸ The fragment, unlike other first person acknowledgments of imminent destruction in the composition, does not stress that Gilgamesh and his plight are part of the judgment of a larger community of giants or the Watchers.⁶⁹ This realization can shed light on the statement in 4Q530 2 ii 1 that ’Ohyah tells the assembled giants “that which Gilgamesh had said to him.” ’Ohyah, I suggest, told the giants that

187–223 (esp. 199); Sundermann, “Ein weiteres Fragment,” 497; Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 121.

⁶⁷ I address below the issue of identifying this vision.

⁶⁸ He says he was not be victorious “with us” (l. 5), presumably referring to other giants.

⁶⁹ 4Q531 18 4 reads “I am ruined (אָנֶה מַחְבֵּל) and they de[stroy...].” Line 3 reads “we, for [our] sins...” 4Q531 23 3: “I will be killed and I will die (אֶתְקַטֵּל וְאָמוּת).” The only legible expression of line 2 reads “all the wicked,” suggesting that the speaker realizes his own demise is part of a larger judgment against the wicked. In these instances the identity of the speaker can not be established.

Gilgamesh *alone* has been singled out for judgment.⁷⁰ Gilgamesh states in 4Q531 22 that he has been defeated, not that he will be judged by God. Positing that 'Ohyah twists what Gilgamesh told him would explain why the giants rejoice in 4Q530 2 ii 3—they (mistakenly) think that they as an entire group are not to be punished for their crimes.⁷¹ Drawing from 4Q531 22 8, 'Ohyah may have said that Gilgamesh asserted that the animals and men of the field cried out against him.⁷² The issue is not that Gilgamesh had a vision that offered hope to the giants, as Stuckenbruck suggests. Rather 'Ohyah attempts to turn Gilgamesh into a “scape-giant.” This in turn explains why the dreams of the garden and the theophany follow in 4Q530 2 ii. They establish that there are no grounds for the giants to rejoice. The visions affirm that a broader indictment has been made against the giants. God sends them these visions because their conduct in the beginning of 4Q530 2 ii indicates that they did not

⁷⁰ This would mean that 4Q531 22 precedes 4Q530 2 ii in the narrative sequence of the composition, as Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 167, has suggested. With regard to 4Q530 2 ii vis-à-vis 4Q531 22, the former is placed before the latter by Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 58, 60, for whom they are QG4 and QG 9, respectively, in his arrangement of the fragments. 4Q531 22 comes before 4Q530 2 ii in the sequence of Beyer, *ATTM*, 1.262, 264, for whom they are, respectively, G6 and G9. Consult also L.T. Stuckenbruck, “The Sequencing of Fragments Belonging to the Qumran *Book of Giants*: An Inquiry into the Structure and Purpose of an Early Jewish Composition,” *JSP* 16 (1997): 3–24.

⁷¹ Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 107. 4Q530 1 i 4 asserts that those who have been killed have made a complaint and cry out against their killers and then line 5 states “we will die together.” If one takes this as chronologically prior to 4Q530 2 ii, 4Q530 1 i portrays all of the giants as concerned that they will be killed for their crimes. 4Q530 2 i + 3, if it were better preserved, could also shed light on the mood of the giants. Line 4 mentions the counting of years (the giants are counting the years until they are judged?). Line 6 is transcribed in *DJD* 31:25, as “Do [n]ot rejoice” (לֹ תִחַדְדוּן א). Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 103–4, transcribes instead כַּל יִחַדְדוּן [כ], “a]ll (?) will rejoice.” Puech’s reading is more likely but there is not sufficient evidence to interpret the phrase.

⁷² In *1 En.* 7:6 the earth makes an accusation against the “lawless ones,” who are presumably the Watchers and the giants. Cf. 8:4; 9:2; 4Q531 14 3; 4Q532 2 9; 4Q533 4 1. The themes of bloodshed on the earth and a cry for judgment reaching the angels are present in the recently published XQpapEnoch (*1 En.* 8:4–9:3). See E. Eshel and H. Eshel, “New Fragments from Qumran: 4QGen^f, 4QIsa^b, 4Q226, 8QGen, and XQpapEnoch,” *DSD* 12 (2005): 134–57 (esp. 151–57).

understand earlier visions. Major themes of this pericope, such as the actions of 'Ohyah against Gilgamesh, the fear of 'Ohyah and other giants that they will be destroyed, and the false hope that this fate has been averted, provided at Gilgamesh's expense, do not have strong parallels in the *Gilgamesh* epic.

Understanding Gilgamesh as the speaker in 4Q531 22 can help explain the obscure cursing language of 4Q530 2 ii 2–3. After the giants listen to 'Ohyah, Ḥobabish opens his mouth and judgment is pronounced against “his soul” (l. 2).⁷³ A clear answer regarding the antecedent of “his” is not available. I propose that it is Gilgamesh who has been singled out by 'Ohyah.⁷⁴ The phrase “the death of our souls” of line 1 suggests that the giants assembled because of concerns about their fate. Anxious that they will be punished for their crimes, they are relieved to hear that Gilgamesh alone has been designated for punishment. They respond by cursing him and rejoicing. It is significant that Ḥobabish speaks out against Gilgamesh, since this evokes the archaic trope of conflict between Gilgamesh and Humbaba.

In response, “the guilty one cursed the princes” (חיבא לט לרוזניא) (l. 2). If the interpretation I've proposed is correct, “the guilty one” would be Gilgamesh. Angered by being singled out for judgment, Gilgamesh curses the other giants. I agree with Stuckenbruck that the word רוזניא refers to the giants rather than human princes, although the term is admittedly not used elsewhere to denote giants.⁷⁵ Human kings play no role whatsoever in the text. In the Hebrew Bible and Ben Sira the term refers to Gentile

⁷³ Puech, *DJD* 31:30, proposes that Ḥobabish roars, translating the Aphel פחא as “hurla.” As he notes, this would portray him as similar to the monster Humbaba, whose “voice is the Deluge, his speech is fire, his breath is death.” *DSSR*, 3.485, translates “shouted (?)” See also George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.266.

⁷⁴ Puech, *DJD* 31:32, tentatively suggests that the judged figure is 'Azazel. One could argue that another giant, perhaps 'Ohyah, is cursed by Ḥobabish, but I see scant warrant for positing that he has any other giant in mind aside from Gilgamesh. One could also speculate that Ḥobabish pronounces judgment against himself, but there is no evidence in the text that would support this reading. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 107, suggests that “his” may refer to one of the Watchers, possibly 'Azazel.

⁷⁵ Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 107. The “princes” for him are a group of giants that does not include Hahyah and 'Ohyah.

kings, so the use of this word may reflect the tradition that the old kings of the land were giants.⁷⁶

There is not enough evidence to interpret satisfactorily the statement following the rejoicing of the giants which Puech reconstructs as “He returned and he was curs[ed and he brought a comp]laint against him” (4Q530 2 ii 3). With considerable hesitation, I suggest the following scenario. Gilgamesh is not at the assembly of giants but hears the powerful voice of Ḥobabish utter judgment against him, not unlike the cry of the beasts that has gone up against him. He then in line 2 curses the giants and in line 3 returns to the assembly of giants, where he is cursed again, and, in response he lodges a complaint against Ḥobabish.⁷⁷ It is also possible that he was present at the assembly of 4Q530 2 ii when judgment was spoken against him, then left (an action not mentioned in the text) and returned. The giant bringing the complaint against Gilgamesh in line 3 would likely be either Ḥobabish or ’Ohyah, but there is not enough evidence to decide which of these two.

5b. *Deceit and Visions*

Following the hypothesis that what ’Ohyah tells the giants in 4Q530 2 ii 1–3 is based on his encounter with Gilgamesh in 4Q531 22, the vision of ’Ohyah mentioned in lines 9–12 of this fragment cannot be the one he receives in 4Q530 2 ii 15–20. Mahaway’s journey to Enoch for an interpretation of the visions of 4Q530 2 ii is *not* the first time the giant traveled to the “scribe of righteousness.” The giants explain the selection of Mahaway for this task by stating “because an earlier ti[me] you have heard his voice” (ll. 22–23). When speaking to Enoch, Mahaway describes his visit as his “second” (תניינות) request for an interpretation of a vision (4Q530 7 ii 7; cf. 4Q203 8 3).⁷⁸ Given the intent of the second visit, one

⁷⁶ E.g., Deut 3:11; Num 13:33. For the word רזון used for Gentile kings, see Ps 2:2; Isa 40:23; Prov 8:15; Sir 44:4 (cf. Prov 14:28; 31:4).

⁷⁷ Following Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 105, and Puech, *DJD* 31:30, I regard ותב as a finite verb phrase, “And he returned.” תב can mean “again” but since the word immediately precedes a *waw* plus finite verb ((ואתל[ט]), I understand ותב in a similar way. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 106, understands the subject of תב to be ’Ohyah. I see little justification for this view, although it is a possible option.

⁷⁸ *DJD* 31:38. Despite its fragmentary nature, 4Q530 7 ii appears to contain

can reasonably assume that the purpose of the first was to seek an interpretation of a vision.

The vision mentioned in 4Q531 22 9–12 is probably recorded in 2Q26, and this is likely the subject of Mahaway's first visit to Enoch.⁷⁹ This poorly preserved fragment mentions a tablet which is submerged in water so that it may be effaced (למַמְחָק) (l. 1).⁸⁰ The waters rise above it (l. 2) and it is then lifted from the waters (l. 3). No extant word in 2Q26 describes it as a vision but it has been reasonably understood in this way.⁸¹ Later texts that contain traditions attested in the *Book of Giants* describe a vision of an erased tablet.⁸² In *The Midrash of Šemḥazai and 'Aza'el* the angel Šemḥazai has two sons, Heyya (הייא) and 'Aheyya (אהייא).⁸³ The names correspond, respectively, to the brothers Haayah (ההיה) and 'Ohyah (אוהיה) of the Qumran *Book of Giants*. Heyya and 'Aheyya each have a vision. One is of a flat stone “like a table” on the earth, the writing upon which is erased by angel (except for four words) and the other is of a garden that is destroyed, except for a tree with three branches.⁸⁴ A variant of this pair of visions is attested in the Middle Persian *Kawān*, frg. j.⁸⁵

a request for interpretation of the dreams of 4Q530 2 ii. This is suggested by the admittedly poorly preserved word גַּנְגַּי, “gar]deners” in line 11. Haayah's dream in 4Q530 2 ii includes gardeners, who water the trees of the garden (ll. 7–8). See Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 95–96.

⁷⁹ *DJD* 36:73–75. This text was originally published in M. Baillet et al., *DJD* 3:90–91.

⁸⁰ The key word “wash” (הַדִּיחוּ) has been understood as a perfect (Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 335) and as an imperative (Beyer, *ATTM*, 1.266; Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 64; idem, *DJD* 36:74).

⁸¹ Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 66. Beyer, *ATTM*, 1.266, argues that this text describes the destruction of the Watchers and the giants.

⁸² The affinities of these later texts to 2Q26 indicate that the fragment is reasonably considered part of the Qumran *Book of Giants*, *contra* Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 51, who does not include it in his analysis of the composition.

⁸³ This is according to the Oxford Bodleian manuscript version of the text (the “B” text). See further Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 321–29; M. Gaster, *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel Or, The Hebrew Bible Historiale* (Whitefish, Mont.: Kessinger Publishing, 2007) 52–54; Stuckenbruck, *DJD* 36:74–75; García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 101.

⁸⁴ Their father Šemḥazai interprets them to mean that God is about to bring a flood. See Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 86–88.

⁸⁵ This fragment states that a *txtg* threw something (or was thrown) in the

The second vision in *The Midrash of Šemḥazai and ‘Aza’el* corresponds to Hahyah’s vision of a garden that is destroyed (except for a tree with three branches) in 4Q530 2 ii. The best analogue in the *Book of Giants* for the other vision in this midrashic text is the submerged tablet of 2Q26. *The Midrash of Šemḥazai and ‘Aza’el* does not say which brother has which dream, but on the basis of 4Q530 2 ii one can posit that in the later midrash Heyya has the vision of the garden. This would mean that ‘Aheyya has the vision of the stone tablet. Thus one can infer that 2Q26 contains remnants of a vision of a tablet disclosed to ‘Ohyah.

Milik interpreted 2Q26 as referring to two tablets, one representing the sinking of the wicked generation in the flood, the second “the ‘board’ of salvation, the ark of Noah and his three sons.”⁸⁶ Multiple tablets, however, are not explicit in the text and there is no clear warrant in the text to assert that it mentioned more than one.⁸⁷ But Milik was right to think that there are positive and negative elements in the vision. In the vision of the flat stone in *The Midrash of Šemḥazai and ‘Aza’el*, the tablet is erased but not entirely, since an angel scrapes away the writing except for one line with four words. This is reasonably interpreted as signifying the destruction caused by the flood, which will wipe out most but not all of humankind. The tablet of 2Q26, which is submerged and then lifted from the waters, can be understood along similar lines.⁸⁸ This interpretation is supported by the vision of the garden in 4Q530 2 ii, all the trees of which are obliterated except for one with three shoots, which is, as mentioned above, probably a reference to Noah and his three sons. 2Q26 is plausibly interpreted as a vision that foretold the destruction of all or

water. Soon after this the giant Narīmān (= Hahyah) sees a garden with rows of trees. Henning, “The *Book of Giants*,” 60, notes that the Persian word *txtg* may mean “board.” Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 334, argues that this must be the case on the basis of 2Q26. Milik’s suggestion is endorsed by Sundermann, “Ein weiteres Fragment,” 492. See also Henning, “The *Book of Giants*,” 57, 60.

⁸⁶ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 335.

⁸⁷ לוחא (“the tablet”) occurs four times in four partially preserved lines, always in the singular. The term also occurs in 1Q23 31 2, again in the singular.

⁸⁸ This is also suggested by 4Q203 8, in which a proclamation of judgment written by Enoch is read out to the giants from a tablet (cf. 4Q203 7b). See A.A. Orlov, “Overshadowed by Enoch’s Greatness: ‘Two Tablets’ Traditions from the *Book of Giants* to *Palaea Historica*,” in *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism*, 109–31.

most of the giants in the flood.⁸⁹ No other vision in the *Book of Giants* can be better understood as the topic of Mahaway's first trip to Enoch than that of 2Q26.

2Q26, so interpreted, provides a context for 'Ohyah's actions in 4Q530 2 ii and 4Q531 22. When 'Ohyah learns about Gilgamesh's defeat, he responds by speaking of a vision that probably signifies the destruction of all or most of the giants in the flood.⁹⁰ This would not be a cause for celebration among the giants. Identifying the vision of 'Ohyah in 4Q531 22 9–12 explains why he stresses in 4Q530 2 ii 1–3 *what Gilgamesh said* while omitting a key part of the conversation—the vision he himself mentioned to Gilgamesh. 'Ohyah does not tell an outright lie but is deceitful regarding what he tells the other giants about his conversation with Gilgamesh. He emphasizes what Gilgamesh said, construed to the effect that he alone has been defeated. The effect of 'Ohyah's spin is to make it appear that only Gilgamesh is to be punished. There is no reason to think that he was successful in his bid to plant blame on Gilgamesh. This “scape-giant” role of Gilgamesh and his interactions with 'Ohyah have no parallel in the epic of *Gilgamesh*.

Two items support the claim that 'Ohyah dishonestly attempts to place judgment on Gilgamesh alone. One is the theme of deceit in the *Book of Giants* and the second regards internecine strife between 'Ohyah and other giants. First, one of the stated crimes of the giants is deceit. 4Q533 4, which refers to the flood in line 3 (גבול), contains the following in lines 1–2: “to de]ceive (לש[קרה) [upon] the earth all which... [blood] was poured and lies (כדבין) they were s[peaking” (cf. 4Q530 20 1).⁹¹ This preserves two charges raised against the giants that are associated with the

⁸⁹ Line 4 of 2Q26 is very poorly preserved and may read “for them all” (להן) (בול). This reading is in Stuckenbruck, *DJD* 36:74; idem, *The Book of Giants*, 64; Beyer, *ATTM*, 1.266, but there is not enough material evidence to endorse the transcription. If one grants this reading, it may refer to the destruction of “all” the giants. A later Jewish tradition posits that at least some of the giants survived the flood. See further Stuckenbruck, “The ‘Angels’ and ‘Giants’ of Genesis 6:1–4,” 358; idem, *The Book of Giants*, 38.

⁹⁰ This supports the reconstruction of 4Q531 22 12 of Puech, *DJD* 31:74: “your [d]ream is com[plete (?).”

⁹¹ *DJD* 31:110. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 189, gives essentially the same transcription but classifies the fragment in question as 4Q556 6. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 237, transcribes לב[קרה (“to examine”). See also Beyer, *ATTM*, 1.260.

flood—murder and deceit.⁹² The era of the giants is characterized by deceit in *1 Enoch* and other Early Jewish texts.⁹³

The thesis that 'Ohyah engaged in deceit at the expense of Gilgamesh is also supported by 6Q8 1 (cf. 1Q23 29).⁹⁴ This fragment contains remnants of an altercation between 'Ohyah and Mahaway.⁹⁵ Line 2 establishes that the former giant is speaking to the latter. Line 3 has the statement “Who has shown you everything?” Line 4 reads “Baraq'el my father was

⁹² Both of these topics may be in the text Milik identified as 4Q206 3, but the transcription of the core passage is in dispute. According to Stuckenbruck, *DJD* 36:46, 4Q206 3 i 6 mentions the shedding of blood (בה דם הוה שפייד) and line 7 is too fragmentary to yield a transcription. See also idem, *The Book of Giants*, 195. Beyer and Puech, however, transcribe in line 7 the phrase הוּמָן [ש] קָרִין, “they were deceitful” (cf. 4Q533 4). See, respectively, *ATTM*, 1.260, and *DJD* 31:111. Puech calls the text in question 4Q206a 1 (Milik's 4Q206 3) to distinguish the fragment from Milik's reconstruction. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 237, as part of his thesis that the *Book of Giants* was the second book of an “Enochic Pentateuch,” placed 4Q206 2 and 3 just after the end of the *Book of the Watchers* (or the Aramaic material that preserves the final material available in *Watchers*, 4QEn^c 1 xxvii). Thus he understood these two fragments as comprising the beginning of the *Book of Giants*. See further E.J.C. Tigchelaar, “Notes on Fragments of 4Q206/206a, 4Q203–204, and Two Unpublished Fragments (4Q59?),” *Meghillot* 5–6 (2007) (= Dimant volume): *187–*199.

⁹³ In the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, the second week is the era of the flood: “there will arise a second week, in which deceit and violence (שקרא וחמסא) will spring up, and in it will be the first end, and in it a man will be saved (Noah)” (*1 En.* 93:4; 4QEn^s 1 iii 25). The word חמס is prominent in the biblical flood story (Gen 6:11, 13). *Second Baruch* 56, while it does not mention the giants specifically, characterizes the time of the Watchers and giants as one of deceit (vv. 2, 11–13; cf. *Sib. Or.* 1.177–178). See Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 77–78; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 443; Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 264; K. Koch, “History as a Battlefield of Two Antagonistic Powers in the Apocalypse of Weeks and in the Rule of the Community,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 185–99 (esp. 192).

⁹⁴ *DJD* 36:78–80. This is a re-edition; the fragment was originally published in *DJD* 3:116–19. See also Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 196–200; Beyer, *ATTM*, 1.262; É. Puech, “Les Fragments 1 à 3 du *Livre des Géants* de la grotte 6 (*pap6Q8*),” *RevQ* 19/74 (1999): 227–38.

⁹⁵ Commentators have observed that there is a conflict between these two giants. See Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 199; Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 107.

with me.” This is a claim uttered by Mahaway in response to ’Ohyah.⁹⁶ The statement seems to be uttered in light of line 3—“Who has shown you everything?” ’Ohyah is apparently questioning Mahaway’s account of his journey to Enoch. Either disputing that Mahaway went to Enoch or questioning the value of what Mahaway learned from him, ’Ohyah interrupts him: “Mahaway had not [fi]nished [te]lling what [Enoch had shown him . . . and ’Ohyah answered and said to] him, ‘I have heard of fou[r] wonders! If [a] barren [?] [woman] were to give birth . . .” (ll. 5–6; cf. *Jub.* 37:20–23).⁹⁷ ’Ohyah’s statement is not fully preserved, but he seems to assert that he, not Mahaway, possesses access to divine knowledge. ’Ohyah

⁹⁶ 4Q530 7 ii, however, gives no indication that Mahaway journeyed to Enoch accompanied by his father. It is possible that Mahaway is lying in 6Q8 1 4 in response to the hostile questioning of ’Ohyah. Baraq’el is the ninth Watcher mentioned in *1 En.* 6:7 (cf. 4QEn^a 1 iii 8). In a Uighr version of the Manichean *Book of Giants*, the “son of Virogdad” is associated with making a great journey to Enoch, as Mahaway does in 4Q530 7 ii. In fragment c of the *Kawān* Mahaway appears to state that Virogdad is his father. “Virogdad” means “from lightning [it is] given,” and thus approximates the meaning of “Baraq’el” (“lightning of God”). In the *Midrash of Šemhazai and ’Aza’el* the father of Heyya and ’Aheyya is Šemhazai. While no surviving portion of the Qumran *Book of Giants* states so, it is reasonable to assume that the father of the brothers ’Ohyah and Hahyah is Šemihazah, not Baraq’el. See further W.B. Henning, “Neue Materialien zur Geschichte des Manichäismus,” *ZDMG* 90 (1936): 1–18 (esp. 4); idem, “The *Book of Giants*,” 60, 65; Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 198; Puech, “Les Fragments 1 à 3,” 231.

⁹⁷ The term “barren” (סְרִיָּקָה) is very difficult to decipher and cannot be taken as a conclusive reading. The word “four” follows the transcription [ע] אַרְבַּע of Puech, “Les Fragments 1 à 3,” 230. Most commentators follow Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 300, who transcribes אַרְוִי, “behold.” See, for example, Stuckenbruck, *DJD* 36:78; Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 59; Beyer, *ATTM*, 1.262. Baillet, *DJD* 3:117, did not offer a transcription for the term in dispute. I follow Puech because on the photograph there is a bottom hook on the final visible letter of the disputed word that one would find in a *bet* not a *waw*. Also the space between the word in question and the next allows for an additional letter after the last visible traces. In either reading, there is not enough material to interpret sufficiently what ’Ohyah says to Mahaway.

According to Stuckenbruck’s reconstruction of 6Q8 1 5, Mahaway is interrupted when saying what Baraq’el had shown him. But 4Q530 7 ii establishes that Mahaway travels to get knowledge from Enoch, not Baraq’el. See also idem, *The Book of Giants*, 197.

certainly does not want to hear about what Mahaway learned from Enoch.⁹⁸ This fits perfectly with the understanding of 'Ohyah's conduct sketched above. He would not have been happy to learn from Mahaway that Enoch has interpreted a vision to signify that most or all of the giants are to perish in the flood.

6. Conclusion

There are thematic similarities between the *Gilgamesh* epic and the *Book of Giants*. Both are set in deep antiquity and contain a character named Gilgamesh who is a gigantic warrior. Dreams are a major theme in both compositions. Gilgamesh in the *Book of Giants* is a wicked figure, like the giants in general, whereas in the epic Gilgamesh is a hero and revered king. The Gilgamesh of the Qumran text loses his battle against humans and angels in 4Q531 22, and in the literary epic he is victorious in combat against Humbaba. Such contrasts suggest not only a degree of knowledge of the Mesopotamian epic on the part of the Qumran text's author, but also that there is a polemical edge in his adaptation of motifs from this epic, as Reeves has stressed. The present article suggests this realization should be qualified by two points.

(1) Core elements of the epic have no analogue in the *Book of Giants*. In the Qumran text Gilgamesh is not a king and has no friend who could be compared to Enkidu. Ḥobabish never guards a forest and there is no grand battle between him and Gilgamesh. Other giants such as 'Ohyah and Mahaway are more prominent in the composition than Gilgamesh and Ḥobabish. The knowledge of the author of the *Book of Giants* of the *Gilgamesh* epic does not seem to be informed by an Aramaic text of *Gilgamesh* which the author consults and polemically reworks, as Reeves proposes. The author's familiarity with the epic is better attributed to indirect knowledge of Mesopotamian legends regarding the figure of Gilgamesh.

⁹⁸ A Sogdian fragment of the Manichean *Book of Giants* (Henning frg. C) attests an account of the giant Sāhm (= 'Ohyah) attempting to kill Mahaway. Strife among the giants is also attested in frg. j of the *Kawān*: "Thereupon the giants began to kill each other and [to abduct their wives]." See Henning, "The *Book of Giants*," 60, 66. Also note 4Q530 5 1, which may refer to 'Ohyah: "his brother [will ru]le ov[er...]" (לְט אַחֵוּהִי עֵלְלִי שִׁי).

(2) Major aspects of the portrayal of Gilgamesh in the *Book of Giants* are shaped by larger themes in the composition rather than a hostile stance towards the epic of *Gilgamesh*. In 4Q531 22 the giant Gilgamesh tells 'Ohyah about his defeat, and 'Ohyah replies by mentioning a vision previously disclosed to him, the content of which is probably in 2Q26. Motivated by the fear that he and the giants in general will be destroyed in the flood, 'Ohyah attempts to plant the blame for their crimes on Gilgamesh alone. The futile attempt to single out Gilgamesh for judgment is the occasion for the two visions of 4Q530 2 ii, which emphasize that most or all of the giants will be judged and destroyed in the flood. Knowledge of the epic of *Gilgamesh* offers little assistance in the interpretation of these key events of the *Book of Giants*. The core goal of the composition is to portray the ante-diluvian giants as evil and recount their exploits and punishment, not to polemicize against the *Gilgamesh* epic, or, as Puech argues, against Hellenistic pagan worship in the Upper Galilee.⁹⁹ The text creatively appropriates motifs from the epic and makes Gilgamesh a character in his own right. The composition constitutes an important example of the recrudescence of ancient Near Eastern tradition in Early Jewish literature.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁹ This assessment is consistent with the views of George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic*, 1.69–70. He argues that no post-cuneiform text reveals “certain knowledge of the Babylonian epic.” He grants that Aramaic papyri of *Gilgamesh* may have existed but concludes “all one can say is that individual themes and episodes of Gilgamesh, where they are suspected of surviving in later literatures, were transformed by a variety of intermediate stages, about which we can know almost nothing, into the very different tales of very different worlds.”

¹⁰⁰ F.M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), 343–46; J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 18–19.