has often been considered a reference to a king of Babylon or Assyria, metaphorically likened to the morning star whose brightness is erased by the rising of the sun. It now appears that the roots of the passage are in Canaanite legend and literature. The Ugaritic poem of Shachar and Shalim tells of two divine children, Shachar, dawn, and Shalim, dusk, who were born as a result of the intercourse of the god El with mortal women. The original story of Shachar is thus related to that of the Watchers: both involve a hierogamy in which a divine being descends to a mortal woman.[36]

Whatever the intention of Isaiah, the Apocalyptic writers took the passage as a reference to the fall of one of the heavenly host. In the Book of Enoch, the falling angels are likened to stars falling from heaven. The identification of angels with stars is not uncommon in the Old Testament, but the imagery of Enoch indicates that a certain overlap between the Watchers myth and the passage in Isaiah may already have begun.[37]

36. G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Edinburgh, 1956), pp. 22–23. The preferred transliteration of the Hebrew is *Helel ben Shachar*.

37. A fundamental inconsistency of these myths is the chronology of the fall. The Watcher angels fell *after* Adam and Eve had already left Eden and produced many generations of children, the sin of the Watchers being placed in the time of Noah. The Watchers seduce the daughters of men, and they also teach mankind useful knowledge. But mankind's acquisition of this knowledge is displeasing to the Lord. The myths of the fall of Adam and Eve and that of mankind at the time of the Watchers can from the structural point of view be considered the same myth with the meaning that humanity acquired knowledge that the Lord wished to hide from them. The myth is typologically similar to that of the Titans in Greece. For Adam and Eve were tempted by an evil angel, Satan. And if logic and chronology were followed, this temptation would be impossible, since the angels had not yet fallen. The efforts of modern scholars to build in a consistency by speaking of a distinction between the Watchers and Satan has led to an artificial separation of the two: Satan or the *satans* and the other evil angels are essentially the same. The Christians would resolve the ambivalence by gradually forgetting the story of the Watchers altogether and emphasizing the fall of Satan through his envy of the Lord *before* the creation of Adam. Such refinements are not necessary to understand the myth, which, like most myths, should not be expected to be logically or serially consistent. Another apparent inconsistency is that evil spirits are sometimes perceived as the ruined angels themselves, sometimes as the giants whom their intercourse with the daughters of men produced, and sometimes as the ghosts of the giants after they were slain by the avenging angels. Again, if understood as myth, the story is comprehensible without being consistent.

Four ideas, hitherto separate, are now united: (1) the sin of the Devil as pride; (2) the ruin of the Watchers through lust; (3) the fall of the *Helel ben-shahar* from heaven; (4) the descent of the Watchers for the purposes of sin. The falling or fading star, equated now with Satan, gives a new name, Lucifer, to the Devil, and substantially enriches the myth. In the New Testament (Luke 10:18), Satan falls from heaven like lightning. Luke seems to have united the idea of the fallen angels with Lucifer and so identified Satan, chief of the ruined angels, with the fallen one cast down from heaven.[38]

To sum up: the *bene ha-elohim* are the heavenly court, the pantheon of the Lord. But some of them sin, through lust or pride. If through pride, they are cast down from heaven; if through lust, they descend voluntarily but are then cast down into the pit as punishment for their sins. They are imprisoned in the darkness, either in the earth (in its valleys or beneath its surface) or in the air. They not only sin themselves but also tempt humanity to sin. Their chief is the chief of tempters. Sometimes all sin is attributed to him, yet Yahweh explicitly grants him the right to continue to do mischief. As far remote from the divine nature as Azazel or Mastema might appear to be, they still have the function of servants, arms, tools of the God. They still represent an aspect of the God's personality. The *bene ha-elohim* are progressively differentiated from the good side of the God and so progressively become more evil. But their original relationship to the God can still be perceived.

The second great fault line upon which the nature of the God divided was that of the *mal'ak Yahweh*. The *mal'ak Yahweh* is the emissary or messenger of the God. Like the *bene ha-elohim*, the *mal'ak* is an aspect of the divine nature. But he differs from the *banim* in one important respect: they remain in heaven with the God, but the *mal'ak* roams the world in his ser-

38. See Karl Schmidt, "Lucifer als gefallene Engelmacht," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 7 (1951), 161–179.

39. See Kluger, pp. 55–76.

has explicitly granted Mastema the right to keep one of ten demons in order to continue to exert his will over man. Mastema is the leader of the fallen Watchers, but he appears also to be the lieutenant of Yahweh. The author of Jubilees cannot forget that Yahweh himself must be the ultimate author of the ills of the world.

Two other Apocalyptic works add significantly to the myth.[32] The Testament of Reuben contains some details that eventually become important in witch lore.[33] As Eve tempted Adam, Reuben says, so did women allure the Watchers by using seductive makeup and hair styles: the burden of sin is placed upon man, or rather upon woman. The Watchers, being spiritual creatures, cannot themselves beget children, so they appear to women while the women are having intercourse with their husbands. Lusting after the Watchers, the women conceive alien forms from the seed of men. A variant of this incubus myth appears frequently in the history of medieval witchcraft: the witch conducts her revels while appearing to be safely in bed with her husband.

The Book of the Secrets of Enoch adds to the myth the significant new element that the angels rebelled on account of pride.[34] The key passage is: "And one from out the order of

32. In addition, the Testament of Dan (109–106 B.C.) reports that Satan is the leader of the Watchers (5:5–6); the Damascus Rule (Qumran), ch. 2, says that the Watchers fell "because they walked in the stubbornness of their heart": Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 2d ed. (Harmondsworth, 1970), p. 99. Later both Josephus and Philo refer to the Watchers and the giants, but without developing the myth. The Testaments were written in Hebrew probably about 109–106 B.C.; the texts contain some Christian additions.

33. T. Reub. (109–106 B.C.), 5:6–7.

34. The Book of the Secrets of Enoch is also called Slavonic Enoch or 2 Enoch. Its only complete extant version is in Slavonic. There are two elements in Slavonic Enoch. The first is a short core, originally in Greek (the text now lost) and possibly as early as the first century A.D. The second is a long elucidation that may date as late as the fifteenth century and betrays Christian influence or even origins. See A. Vaillant, *Le Livre des secrets d'Hénoch* (Paris, 1952). Vaillant argues that the longer element, which contains most of the interesting material relating to Satan, must postdate the Apocalyptic period. Many modern scholars do not accept the argument of Vaillant and continue to date the content, though not the present form, of Slavonic Enoch to the Apocalyptic period. See Albert Marie Denis, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs de l'Ancien Testament* (Leiden, 1970), pp. 28–29. The key passage is 29:4–5. If the story in Slavonic Enoch of the pristine revolt of Satan through pride is later than the Apocalyptic period, this would help explain the lack of clarity and agreement on the subject in the New Testament and the Fathers, most of whom followed the story of the lust of the angels rather than their pride. It is possible that not until Origen in the third century was there a clear account of what has come to be Christian tradition: that Satan's sin was pride, that he fell before the creation of Adam, and that he was the tempting serpent in the garden. See Otto Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (New York, 1965), pp. 622–623. Eissfeldt says that the book in its present form is Christian but "appears to rest upon an older Jewish original . . . before A.D. 70" (p. 623).

angels, having turned away with the order that was under him, conceived of an impossible thought, to place his throne higher than the clouds above the earth, that he might become equal in rank to any power. And I threw him out from the height with his angels, and he was flying in the air continuously above the bottomless."

The combination of the motifs of rebellion and lust melded two originally discrete sins, and two originally different motives for sin, on the part of the angels.

In yet another way the idea of a prideful fall was added to the concept of the Devil. In the Book of Isaiah it is written:

> How you have fallen from heaven, bright morning star,
> felled to the earth, sprawling helpless across the nations!
> You thought in your own mind,
> I will scale the heavens;
> I will set my throne high above the stars of God,
> I will sit on the mountain where the gods meet
> in the far recesses of the north.
> I will rise high above the cloud-banks
> and make myself like the Most High.
> Yet you shall be brought down to Sheol,
> to the depths of the abyss.[35]

This "bright morning star," or perhaps more literally translated from the Hebrew *Helel ben-shahar*, "bright son of the morning,"

35. Isa. 14:12–15.

to rescue them. The archangels slay the giants, whose ghosts remain to "afflict, oppress, destroy, attack, do battle, and work destruction on the earth."[23] The avenging angels attack the Watchers themselves: Raphael binds Azazel and casts him through an opening in the desert into the darkness; other Watchers are cast into the deep valleys of the earth; and their punishment will endure until the day of judgment.[24]

The myth of the Watchers as told in Enoch thus squarely attributes sin to the angels and describes their punishment. Though they descend from heaven voluntarily, their latter end is a true "fall": they are cast down into pits of darkness by the avenging angels of the Lord. Are the Watchers then the ultimate cause of sin on earth? Enoch is not at all certain. In the first place, their descent occurs long after the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Eden and the sin of Cain against Abel, and Enoch declares that "sin has not been sent upon the earth, but man himself has created it."[25] And if the Watchers sin, the heart of their sin may be in subjecting themselves to Azazel or Semyaza, who is the origin of all evil.[26] The ambivalence of the Book of Enoch, written over a period of a century and a half by a number of authors, indicates that in the Apocalyptic period the concept of the origin of evil was very much in flux.

A number of other accounts of the Watchers appeared in the Apocalyptic period. The Book of Jubilees says that in the days of Jared, the Watcher angels descended to the earth.[27] They did not come to earth for the purpose of sinning but rather "that they should instruct the children of men, and that they should do judgment and uprightness on the earth."[28] Only after they

23. Ethiopic En. 15:11.

24. Note that the author of Ethiopic Enoch does not use the flood as the means of punishment, another indication that the Genesis story does not intend the deluge as a punishment for the *banim*.

25. Ethiopic En. 98:4.

26. Ethiopic En. 54:6, a later addition, names Satan both as their leader and as their punisher.

27. Jubilees was written between 135 and 105 B.C. by a Pharisee who expected the immediate arrival of the Messianic kingdom.

28. Bk. Jub. 4:15.

arrive on earth do they lust after the daughters of men and defile themselves. The ambivalence of these angels is clear: their original intent is good, but they yield to sin. Once they have sinned, their works are evil. Their leaders are Belial and Mastema; their children are giants who wreak destruction and entice people to sin. The Lord punishes the Watcher angels by binding them in the depths of the earth, and he causes their children the giants to do battle with one another to their mutual destruction.[29] The spirits of the slain giants remain upon earth, doing evil and tempting mankind to sin. Noah therefore prays to Yahweh for help, and Yahweh replies by ordering the spirits to be bound in the darkness. But then Mastema arises and goes before Yahweh and says, "Lord, Creator, let some of them remain before me, and let them hearken to my voice, and do all that I shall say unto them; for if some of them are not left to me, I shall not be able to execute the power of my will upon the sons of men." And Yahweh replies: "Let the tenth part of them remain before him, and let nine parts descend into the place of condemnation." And so the angels of the Lord bind nine of ten of the evil spirits in the darkness but the tenth part of the angels are spared so that "they might be subject before Satan on the earth."[30] The function of these beings, sometimes equated with demons, is to tempt humanity to abandon the ways of the Lord for sin: later, Isaac will be able to promise Jacob that for the sake of the Covenant "the spirits of Mastema shall not rule over thee or over thy seed to turn thee from the Lord."[31]

In Jubilees, then, the Watchers do not introduce sin, for they come in the days of Jared, five hundred years after the creation. Yet they and their progeny exacerbate the sins of the world. Their leader Mastema or Satan, as prince of the fallen angels and leader of the tempters of mankind, has now acquired a pronounced diabolical cast. Yet Yahweh himself has not only permitted the sin of the Watchers and the temptation of men, he

29. Bk. Jub. 5:6–11.

30. Bk. Jub. 10:1–12. Mastema and Satan are to be considered identical.

31. Bk. Jub. 19:28.

But also in an early passage, an angel of the Lord blocks the road on which Balaam seeks to travel riding an ass. Since the angel obstructs the road, he is referred to as a *satan*. Here for the first time a supernatural being is called a *satan*, but again the sense is clearly that of a common noun. The angel is not a *being* called a "*satan*"; he merely acts in this particular instance as an obstructor of the road (Numbers 22:22–35). A third dimension of the word *satan* appears in Zechariah 3:1–2: "Then he showed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, with the Adversary standing at his right hand to accuse him. The Lord said to the Adversary, 'The Lord rebuke you, Satan, the Lord rebuke you who are venting your spite on Jerusalem.' " [19] This passage is a striking development. Although the presence of the Hebrew article indicates a common rather than a proper noun ("the satan"), the idea of personality is still conveyed. Here is a supernatural being who not only acts as obstructor but whose nature and name are those of an obstructor. Next, this being shows himself in overt hostile opposition to at least one man, for the adversary stands before the God to accuse Joshua. Satan appears here in the specific sense of an *accuser*, a sense broadly accepted in Apocalyptic Judaism and Christianity owing to the connotations of the Greek *diabolos*. There is a hint of Satan's opposition to Yahweh as well as to

diabolus). The psalm was composed in the third or second century B.C; the earlier passages have pre-exilic origins and were compiled in the post-exilic period. Kluger, pp. 34–35, sees even in these passages a hint of the personality of Satan in that all these adversaries are opposed to right and proper order. There is a possible connection between the name of Satan and the verb *sut*, "to roam," which would emphasize the role of Satan as a spy. Harry Torczyner, following Adolphe Lods in *Mélanges syriens*, suggests that "the figure and role of the Satan derives from the Persian secret service. . . . We now understand that there are in God's service, as in that of any earthly king, secret roving officials, who go and come and report to him on the doings of his subjects" (Torczyner, *The Book of Job* [Jerusalem, 1957], pp. 38–45). Lods argues that Satan, viewed this way, is an obstructor only of unlawful deeds. But this still leaves unanswered the question why the God declares certain deeds unlawful rather than others. The Devil still appears as the agent of God's destruction.

19. Here "Satan" is translated by *diabolos* in the Septuagint and *Satan* in the Vulgate. The passage is early post-exilic, dating from about 520–518 B.C.

human beings, for the God reproaches him for his activities. Yet Satan appears merely to be punishing Joshua for his sins; rather than having any malicious intent, he may simply have failed to understand that Yahweh intended to be merciful. Yahweh permits Satan to stand before him and speak to him in the heavenly court: the Satan is one of the *bene ha-elohim* and thus in some indirect way a manifestation of the God himself.[20]

Before examining further the development of the character of Satan in the context of the Book of Job, I return to the Watcher angels and their leader. Semyaza encourages the Watchers to make a formal, mutual agreement that none will falter in his desire to slake his lust for the daughters of men. The Watchers descend (they do not fall) from heaven of their own free will, alighting upon Mount Hermon, and take human wives to whom they teach the arts of magic and agriculture. Another Watcher, Azazel, variously Semyaza's lieutenant, equal, or superior, also teaches men to manufacture weapons tempting them to violence and ornaments tempting them to vanity.[21] The Watchers here play a role very similar to that of the Titans in Greek myth: they increase the knowledge of mankind, but they do so against the will of the God, who regards their instruction as sinful. In the Hebrew story, the lust of the Watchers is additional proof of their vice, as is the nature of their offspring. The children of women and Watchers are giants who turn upon mankind, destroying possessions and devouring human flesh. Humanity now complains to the Lord, saying, "Thou seest what Azazel hath done, who hath taught all unrighteousness on earth. . . . And the whole earth has been corrupted through the works that were taught by Azazel: to him ascribe all sin."[22] The Lord answers the prayers of mankind and sends down the four archangels, Uriel, Raphael, Gabriel, and Michael (aspects of the protective side of the divine nature)

20. If the second part of the passage is translated to mean that Satan is "venting his spite" on the holy city of Jerusalem, the hint of opposition to Yahweh is stronger. But the original meaning of the passage is very unclear.

21. The name Azazel derives from the scapegoat story of Numbers, but the Azazel of Ethiopic Enoch is now a definite personality.

22. Ethiopic En. 9:6; 10:8.

hand in bringing out their evil nature. And it now becomes clear, as it was not in Genesis or Psalms, that these fallen beings are evil indeed.[15]

The Watcher angels—as they are now called—have a leader, whose name is Semyaza.[16] The names of the Devil vary, particularly in the Apocalyptic period: he is Belial, Mastema, Azazel, Satanail, Sammael, Semyaza, or Satan.[17] These names have different origins, and the beings they denote differ in their origins and functions one from another. But gradually they coalesce. The Devil becomes a spiritual being personifying the ori-

15. The late Jewish inclination to take the Genesis passage as referring to "angels" is reflected in the Septuagint, where the original translation of the *bene ha-elohim* of Genesis was *angeloi*—thus it appears in Philo—and was changed later to the more correct reading *hyioi*.

16. Semyaza is first called their leader in En. 6:3; the term "Watchers" is first used in 10:7 and is the most common term employed by the Apocalyptic writers. It appears in the Old Testament only in the Book of Daniel, which is itself an Apocalyptic book written 166–164 B.C.

17. Belial (Gk: Beliar) may derive from *beli*, "without," and *ya'al*, "profit," and so mean "worthless." See Theodore H. Gaster, "Belial," *Encyclopedia Judaica* (New York, 1970), 4, 427–428; Hans W. Hupperbauer, "Belial in den Qumrantexten," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 15 (1959), 89. In the Qumran texts, the term is used in a number of ways, sometimes merely as an adjective connoting evil, other times as a name of the personification of evil. In the Old Testament, Belial appears in Deut. 13:13; Judg. 19:22; 20:13; and 1 Sam. 1:16; 2:12; 10:27; 25:17, but he has little or no personality. The term *belial* is often simply a common noun signifying people who act reprehensibly, as in Deut. 13:14; Prov. 19:29; Nah. 1:11. Belial appeares in the Apocalyptic and Qumran literature as the prince of evil. He is completely absent in Rabbinical literature. See J. Michl, "Katalog der Engelnamen," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, V (1962), 209. Mastema may derive from the Hebrew *mastemah*, "enmity," or the Aramaic *mastima*, "accuser," and so is related to Satan. Mastema does not appear in the Old Testament but is a prince of evil in the Apocryphal period: Michl, p. 221. Azazel or Asasel appears in Lev. 16:8 and 10:26, where his personality is ill defined; there he seems to be the principle of impurity. Later he becomes a prince of evil. His name may derive from *'azaz* and *'el* and mean the "strong one of the God." He was originally a god of the desert and may derive from the Canaanite god 'Asiz, who caused the sun to burn strongly. There is a possible influence of the Egyptian Seth on Azazel. See Kluger, p. 41; Roskoff, I, p. 183; Michl, pp. 206–207. Satanael or Satanail is derived from Satan; he does not appear in the Old Testament but is a prince of evil in the Apocalyptic period: Michl, pp. 232–233. Sammael, whose name derives from *sami* ("blind"), first appears in the Amoraic period. See Michl, p. 231, and Gershom Scholem, "Sammael," *Encyclopedia Judaica*, 14, 719–722. Semyaza, whose name may mean "rebel" or "watcher," appears briefly as leader of the evil angels in the Apocalyptic literature: Michl, p. 234. Beelzebub or Beelzeboul appears in the Old Testament as a god of Ekron in 2 Kings 1:2–6; 16. The Septuagint and New Testament translated the Hebrew as Beelzeboul, which was adapted by the Vulgate as *Beelzebub*. The origin of the name is uncertain. See Edward Langton, *Essentials of Demonology* (London, 1949), pp. 166–167. Beelzebub appears frequently in the New Testament as a name of the Devil, but not as yet in the Old Testament or Apocalyptic literature.

gin and essence of evil: there can be only one Devil. Previous studies that have concentrated exclusively upon the name of Satan have obscured this fact. As the Devil has many names in different religions, so he has many names within the Judeo-Christian tradition itself.

Of all these names, that of Satan became the greatest. "High on a Throne of Royal State, which far / outshone the wealth of Ormus and of Ind . . . Satan exalted sat." The reasons for this pre-eminence are: (1) the word *satan* appears more frequently and more prominently than the names of the others, and (2) it appears at a number of crucial points. The victory of "Satan" over "Azazel" or "Belial" is less the victory of one kind of *being* over another than the victory of one *name* over the others. Satan, Azazel, Belial, and Mastema were none of them in their origins a principle of evil, but in the Apocalyptic literature they converge in that direction. What is important is the development of the *concept* of the principle of evil, with which the name of Satan was linked more closely than any other.

The Hebrew word *satan* derives from a root meaning "oppose," "obstruct," or "accuse." It was translated by the Greek *diabolos*, "adversary," whence it passed into Latin *diabolus*, German *Teufel*, and English *devil*. The basic denotation of the term, then, is "opponent." In this simple sense the word *satan* appears as a common noun several times in the Old Testament in reference to a human opponent, as when David says to the sons of Zeruiah, "What right have you . . . to oppose me today?" or "What right do you have to play the opponent against me?"[18]

18. 2 Sam. 19:22. Here the Vulgate translates: "Cur efficimini mihi hodie in satan?" Other appearances of *satan* as a common noun in the Old Testament: 1 Sam. 29:24; 1 Kings 5:4; 11:14–25; Ps. 109:6 (LXX: *diabolos*; Vulg:

evil of the world could no longer be attributed to Yahweh, who now said: "Call heaven and earth to witness; call them to witness, for I have left out evil and created good, because I live, says the Lord."[12]

One of the earliest and most influential Apocalyptic accounts of the ruin of the *bene ha-elohim* is the Book of Enoch.[13] In this book, Enoch is taken on a journey of inspection around the earth and to Sheol.[14] During the journey he sees the sons of God in their ruined state and learns their story. Enoch's account is in the nature of a gloss upon the original passage in Genesis. According to Enoch, "the angels, the children of the heaven, saw and lusted after" the daughters of men. The Apocalyptic writer here has taken a long step in the development of the Devil. He reaffirms the original closeness of the *bene ha-elohim* with the Lord—they are children of heaven—but by demoting them to the status of angels, Enoch has safely removed them beyond the limits of the divine nature itself, and this in turn allows him and his fellow Apocalyptic writers a free

12. 4 Ezra 2:14.

13. This is the book known as 1 Enoch or Ethiopic Enoch because it is fully extant only in an Ethiopian version. It is composed of a number of elements dating from about 200 B.C. to about 60 B.C. The relevant chapters are 6–36. For this and other references to the Apocalyptic literature, see R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1913), II: *Pseudepigrapha*.

14. Sheol appears first in Num. 16:30 and then in Job 30:23. It is beneath the earth and is "the land of destruction, forgetfulness, and silence" (Charles, p. 230). The spirit of the dead individual exists there disembodied in a joyless, lonely, shadowy state. Both the good and the evil go there at death. From the second century B.C., during the Apocalyptic period, the original concept was changed by the idea of the last judgment and retribution. Since the Apocalyptic writers came to limit resurrection from the dead to the righteous and to leave the unrighteous below, Sheol began to be thought of as a place of punishment. At that time it was assimilated to the idea of Gehenna. Gehenna (Ben-hinnom) is a valley near Jerusalem originally associated with the worship of Moloch. Jeremiah curses it (7:31–32; 19:2, 6; 32:35), and Isaiah (66:24) says that rebellious and apostate Jews suffer punishment there by fire. In Ethiopic Enoch it remains a place of punishment for apostate Jews. For the Rabbis it was a place of eternal damnation for the Gentiles and of temporal punishment for rebellious Jews. Once the ideas of Sheol and Gehenna fused, the composite was adopted as the Christian idea of hell.



William Blake, "Satan before the Throne of God," 1820. God is surrounded by the court of heaven, the *bene ha-elohim*, as Satan appears before him to ask permission to tempt Job. Courtesy Dr. J. Street, Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge.

the answer is best provided by examining the way in which the twinning of the divine nature took place.

The God divided, to change the metaphor, along two geological fault lines. The first fault line is that provided by the *bene ha-elohim*; the second that represented by the *mal'ak Yahweh*.

There seems to be evidence of the survival of some elements of Hebrew polytheism in the Hexateuch, where the Elohist source consistently uses the plural *Elohim*, "Lords," to refer to God.[7] In Genesis 3:5 the serpent tells Eve that she and Adam will become as *gods* if they eat the fruit of the tree. The God sometimes uses a pronoun "we" that is more than a mere royal convention. He appears both in the Pentateuch and in later writings as the God of Hosts surrounded by a heavenly council, a *sod*.[8] This heavenly court is often called the *bene ha-elohim*, "sons of the Lord," comparable to the "sons of the God" in Canaanite religion. In Canaan these "sons" are gods, manifestations of the divine principle.[9] Clearly the original idea in Hebrew religion was that Yahweh was surrounded by a pantheon comparable to that of Zeus or Wotan. The idea of a pantheon was displeasing to a strict monotheism, and the *banim* (*bene ha'elohim*) became shadowy figures. Yet they retained an important function in separating the evil aspect of the divine nature from the good.

The Book of Genesis relates that early in the history of the human race, the *bene ha-elohim* looked upon the daughters of men and found them beautiful. They had intercourse with these women and by them begot a race of giants called *nephilim*.[10] These offspring of the *banim* and women were "the

7. The Elohist source is usually dated about 800 B.C. See Aubrey Johnson, *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God*, 2d ed. (Cardiff, 1961).

8. Kluger, *Satan*, p. 101, n. 54, shows that scholars do not agree as to the correct interpretation of the term *Yahweh Seba'ot*. The *sod* is clearly implied in 1 Kings 22:19–22 and Isa. 6.

9. Theodore M. Gaster discusses the Canaanite parallel to the *banim* in his *Myth, Legend, and Custom in the Old Testament* (New York, 1969), p. 79.

10. Gen. 6:1–4. The passage appears in the course of a discussion of the life of Noah, but it is not clear that the author intended to say that the event took place in Noah's time. *Nephilim* may derive from the Hebrew *nefal*, to fall.

heroes of old, men of renown." Following these events, the Lord sent the deluge upon the earth, but this punishment was ascribed not to the sins of the *banim* but to those of men, who "had done much evil on earth" (Genesis 6:5). The Book of Psalms says that "God takes his stand in the court of heaven to deliver judgment among the gods themselves" and concludes "Gods you may be, sons you all of the Most High, yet you shall die as men die; princes fall, every one of them, and so shall you."[11] Here the Lord judges the members of his heavenly court and causes them to fall for their sin. The fall may consist of the passage from immortality to mortality, or a fall from power, or both. It does not appear to imply a fall from heaven. There is no indication what the sin of the gods was. The passage of Psalms is at least five hundred years removed from that of Genesis and written in a very different intellectual context. Yet each passage indicates the existence of the heavenly court and the sin of at least some of its members. It was left to the writers of the Apocalyptic period to develop these ideas.

The Jews of the Apocalyptic period did not understand why Yahweh had abandoned Israel. If he had, they mused, then there could be no more hope for Israel as a nation among nations. Evil ruled the world in their time; the Messiah, they thought, must soon come; and in the meanwhile each individual must do his own duty to the Lord. In those dark days individual morality was increasingly conceived as a matter of avoiding sin rather than of practicing virtue, and this brooding presence of sin and evil lingered in Rabbinic and Christian thought. The

11. Ps. 82:1–7. This psalm dates from the third or second century B.C. In the midst of this passage are a few verses that textual criticism has shown are independent and inserted by the final editor of Psalms from a different context. These intercalated verses refer to human princes rather than to the *banim*. See Bernard Bamberger, *Fallen Angels* (Philadelphia, 1952), pp. 10–11. These verses had great influence upon both Latin and Greek Christianity. In the Vulgate, the key phrases are "Deus stetit in synagoga deorum. . . . Ego dixi; dii estis, et filii Excelsi omnes." In the Septuagint, they are: "Ho theos estē en synagōgē theōn. . . . Egō eipa, theoi este, kai hyioi hypsistou pantes." "God" is a translation of the Hebrew *El*, and "gods" of the Hebrew *elohim*. The "Most High" is *Elyon* and may be translated "a high god."

manity. Yahweh made the human race happy in the Garden of Eden, but the first couple disobeyed him and in consequence were expelled from Paradise. The Old Testament did not make of this story the basis for a doctrine of original sin, as later the Rabbinic, and even more, the Christian writers would, but it did follow the theme of human perversity and sin through Cain, Sodom and Gomorrah, the faithlessness bringing punishing flood at the time of Noah, and the repeated inconstancy of the Israelites during the settling of Canaan and in the period of the kingdoms.[6] The idea that humanity had alienated itself from the God was already firm in Genesis 6:5–6: "When the Lord saw that man had done much evil on earth and that his thoughts and inclinations were always evil, he was sorry that he had made man on earth." The constant backsliding of the Hebrew kings and people from the Covenant caused the Lord further regrets and inclined him to chastise his people repeatedly. Yet both sins and punishments were so frequent and so great that they seemed disproportionate to the powers of puny man

6. The interpretation of the story of the expulsion of Adam and Eve in Gen. 3 continues to be the subject of lively debate. Modern scholars reject the notion that the writer of Gen. 3 intended to equate the serpent with the Devil. Only in Apocalyptic and later literature does the serpent become the tool of Satan or Satan himself. Of recent interpretations of the sin of Adam and Eve some of the most useful are in Martin Buber, *Good and Evil* (New York, 1953); George Wesley Buchanan, "The Old Testament Meaning of the Knowledge of Good and Evil," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 75 (1956), 114–120; W. Malcolm Clark, "A Legal Background to the Yahwist's Use of 'Good and Evil' in Genesis 2–3," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 88 (1969), 266–278; Joseph Coppens, *La Connaissance du bien et du mal et le péché du paradis* (Louvain, 1948); A. M. Dubarle, *The Biblical Doctrine of Original Sin* (New York, 1964); J. M. Evans, *Paradise Lost and the Genesis Tradition* (Oxford, 1968); Robert Gordis, "The Knowledge of Good and Evil in the Old Testament and the Qumran Scrolls," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 76 (1957), 123–138; Cyrus Gordon, *The Ancient Near East*, 3d ed. (New York, 1965), pp. 36–37; Julius Gross, *Entstehungsgeschichte der Erbsündendogmas; von der Bibel bis Augustinus* (Munich, 1960); Herbert Haag, *Is Original Sin in Scripture?* (New York, 1969); F. R. Tennant, *Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin* (Cambridge, 1903); Norman P. Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin* (London, 1927). The doctrines of the fall and of original sin have been less consistent than flexible in the hands of mythographers and theologians. See Evans, p. 10.

to displease the deity. And always at the back of their minds the Hebrews wondered how it was that the God, all powerful and all knowing as he was, would permit humanity to sin. The corrupt will of human beings seemed insufficient to explain the vast and terrifying quantity of evil in the world.

For an answer, the Hebrews turned to another explanation: the instigator of evil was a malignant spirit whose power to offend was far greater than that of mere mortals. The malignant, destructive aspect of Yahweh was subtracted from him and ascribed to a different spiritual power, the Devil. In effect, a twinning occurred in the divine nature, similar to the twinning in the God of Egypt or of Canaan. The one God split into two parts. One, the good aspect of the God, became "the Lord." The other, the evil aspect, became "the Devil." At the same time that the Hebrews continued to insist upon monotheism as the essential element of their religion, they moved unconsciously toward dualism. Explicitly they were monotheists: there was only one God, and his name was Yahweh. The God was omnipotent. But now the God was wholly good; evil was alien to his nature. Yet evil still existed. To explain the existence of evil, the Hebrews had to move in the direction of dualism. They were never fully aware of what they had introduced into a religion in which any retreat from monotheism was the greatest blasphemy. Even the Apocalyptic literature stops short of explicitly asserting that the Devil is totally evil in origin and essence. This tension between explicit monotheism and implicit dualism became characteristic of Hebrew and Christian religion.

This theodicy was hindered—or helped—by an important blurring of distinctions. Before, Yahweh had been the God, the antinomy of inner opposites. Now, Yahweh became the Lord, the good aspect of the God. The name Yahweh, and the loyalty of the Hebrews to Yahweh, was applied strictly to the good twin. What of the evil twin? In a strict monotheist religion he could not be a god. What was he then? The answer proved difficult for both Jewish and Christian theologians. Historically,

while he is in the land of Egypt, and when Pharaoh falls in love with Sarah and wishes to marry her, innocently believing her to be Abraham's sister, the God punishes Pharaoh, striking him "and his household with grave diseases." In Exodus, Yahweh repeatedly hardens the heart of Pharaoh, causing him to deny the Hebrews' request to leave Egypt. Yahweh visits the unfortunate Egyptians with plague after plague. Each time, when Pharaoh begins to yield, Yahweh hardens his heart to resist further and to bring further disasters down upon himself and his people. At last the God punishes him by slaying all the firstborn of Egypt, passing over the children of Israel and sparing them alone.[4]

If ever the Hebrews showed mercy to their enemies, the God upbraided them for neglecting his will (Judges 2:1–2). Nor was it only Gentiles against whom the God raised his hand. When Achitophel sought to persuade Absalom to reconcile himself with David his father, Yahweh led the young man astray, for it was his "purpose to frustrate Achitophel's good advice and so bring disaster upon Absalom (2 Samuel 17:14)." Yahweh could even treat all Israel as he did the Egyptians. He said to the prophet Isaiah, "Go, and tell this people, hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and convert, and be healed. Then said I, Lord, how long? And he answered, until the cities be wasted without inhabitant, and the houses without man, and the land shall be utterly desolate" (Isaiah 6:9–11). At this stage of Hebrew religion there is no significant distinction between the ambivalence of the God Yahweh and the ambivalence of the God of monism.

The figure with whom Jacob struggled at the ford of Jabbok may be the evil aspect of Yahweh (Genesis 32:22–32). The shadow of the God appears even more clearly in Exodus 4:24–26, where the God seeks to murder Moses on his journey

4. Exod. 3:19; 7:13–22; 9:12, 35; 10:1, 20, 27; 11:10; 13:15.

back to Egypt from Midian: "During the journey, while they were encamped for the night, the Lord met Moses, meaning to kill him, but Zipporah picked up a sharp flint, cut off her son's foreskin, and touched him with it, saying, 'You are my blood-bridegroom.' So the Lord let Moses alone." In Deuteronomy 32: 41–42, Yahweh sounds much like destroying Sekhmet or Anath:

> When I have whetted my flashing sword,
> when I have set my hand to judgement,
> then I will punish my adversaries
> and take vengeance on my enemies.
> I will make my arrows drunk with blood,
> my soul shall devour flesh,
> blood of slain and captives,
> the heads of the enemy princes.

The savage nature of Yahweh in preprophetic Hebrew religion reflects the savage mores of the wandering, conquering Israelites. As the Hebrews became more settled, they moderated their morality. The ethical teaching of the prophets emphasized mercy and care for the poor, widowed, and homeless, and it insisted upon the responsibility of the individual for avoiding promiscuity, drunkenness, bribery, and lying. The Hebrew sense of good and evil shifted from its previous emphasis upon ritual tabu in the direction of a practical and humane ethic of mutual human responsibility. As this occurred, Yahweh's characteristics changed.[5]

No longer easy in their minds about ascribing rapine and destruction to the will of their God, the Hebrews sought new theodicies. One was that evil was the result of the sin of hu-

5. It is more difficult to use figurative language when speaking of Yahweh than when speaking of Marduk, Horus, or Ahura Mazda, because of the old assumption of Western civilization that the God of the Bible, and only the God of the Bible, is the idea of the God as he exists objectively. Atheists as well as believers have made this assumption. I do not make it here. When I say "Yahweh did," I mean the phrase exactly as if I were saying "Marduk did." In other words, I use "Yahweh did" as an abbreviation of, for example, "the writer of Joshua believed or said that Yahweh did."

and evil. We are accustomed to thinking of Yahweh in his creative aspects, but let us now consider his shadow.

In the early Old Testament traditions, the morality of the Hebrews was linked to transgressions of tabu more than to violations of social justice. The Old Testament condemns transgressions against Yahweh, such as idolatry, blasphemy, profanation of the Sabbath, and oath-breaking. The books of Leviticus and Deuteronomy testify to the importance of ritual and tabu. Insofar as the Israelites were enjoined to justice, it was primarily in regard to their dealings with other Israelites. Toward the Gentiles their behavior was as fearsome as that of Ashurnasirpal to his victims.

When the Israelites invaded Canaan, Joshua "captured the city [of Hazor] and put its king to death with the sword. [The Israelites] killed every living thing in it, and wiped them all out; they spared nothing that drew breath, and Hazor itself they destroyed by fire. . . . The Israelites plundered all these cities and kept for themselves the cattle and any other spoil they took; but they put every living soul to the sword until they had destroyed every one; they did not leave alive any one that drew breath." The Israelites attributed this policy to the will of Yahweh. If the Canaanites, perhaps forgivably, attempted to block the conquest of their homeland by the savage Israelites, it was

---

works. I am deeply indebted in the present chapter to Kluger's work, which is an example of the utility of Jungian thought in illuminating the history of concepts. Robert Gordis, in his *Book of God and Man* (Chicago, 1965), pp. 69–71, argues that the separation of the Lord and Satan occurred under Mazdaist influence. There is danger of simplification in equating Yahweh with the God. One of the earliest scriptural traditions is that of the Yahwist, who refers to the one God as Yahweh; but the Elohist uses the term Elohim. The latter is usually translated "Lord." Our term "God" of course has Germanic rather than Hebrew linguistic origins. The two terms Yahweh and Elohim were assimilated by the compilers of the Pentateuch as references to one being; but the fact remains that two different terms were used, and it is not self-evident that the Yahwist and the Elohist had the same concept in mind when they wrote. The word "Elohim" has the curious quality of being plural in number, as if the Elohist considered the one God to be somehow also plural. For simplicity, I shall always refer to the God of Israel as Yahweh, rather than Elohim.

Yahweh who had hardened their hearts: "It was the Lord's purpose that they should offer an obstinate resistance to the Israelites in battle, and that thus they should be annihilated without mercy and utterly destroyed." Yahweh ordered the conquest of Canaan, he then caused the Canaanites to resist, and he finally ordained their utter ruin at the hand of his chosen people. Few gods of Egypt, Babylonia, or Canaan itself were so ruthless.

And to the Israelites themselves Yahweh was scarcely more kind. When one among them had kept some of the spoil from a captured city for himself rather than giving it to Yahweh (in care of his priests), Yahweh punished the children of Israel, causing them to be defeated at the hands of the Canaanites. Joshua asked Yahweh what was to be done, and the God replied that Joshua was to discover the culprit. Lots were cast, by which the God's mind could be made manifest. The lot fell upon Achan. Achan confessed, and the Israelites took him up to the Vale of Achor, where they stoned him to death. And "the Lord's anger was abated." In reward, Yahweh delivered the city of Ai to the Israelites, and the Israelites "cut down to the last man all the citizens of Ai who were in the open country or in the wilderness to which they had pursued them," and then returned "to Ai and put it to the sword. The number who were killed that day, men and women, was twelve thousand, the whole population of Ai."[3] The logic was pitiless: the God had chosen Israel as his people, any Gentile who stood in Israel's path was to be mercilessly destroyed, and any Israelite who disobeyed Yahweh's command was likewise to be put to death.

Since the God of Israel was the only God, the supreme power in the cosmos, the orderer of all things, no deed could be done unless he willed it. Consequently, when anyone transgressed morality, it had to be Yahweh himself who caused the transgression. And so in Genesis 12:17, the God causes Abraham to pretend that Sarah is his sister rather than his wife

3. Josh. 7–8; 11:10–15; 11:20. The prosecution of the Holy War in Joshua follows from an idealized theological postulate owing much to the utopian thinking of the Deuteronomist. Cf. the Qumran War Scroll (1 QM).

prominent. Some of these works expressed the view that the oppression of the Jews indicated that the world was now in the power of the Devil. In the old days, patriarchs and kings had ruled, but in the latter days the Devil had established his rule over the earth. Soon, however, the kingdom of the Devil (the "old eon") would perish before the time of the Messiah, who would bring a "new eon," a reign of justice and light. Into the mouths of ancient patriarchs or prophets the Apocalyptic authors placed their own prophecies of the ruin and regeneration to come. As these prophecies were based upon events that had already occurred in the time of the real authors, they had of course already partly come true and so gained further validation in the minds of those who heard them. In opposition to Apocalyptic literature, that of the rabbis was little concerned with demonology, which accounts for the fact that the Devil has been much less important in modern Jewish thought than in Christian.

At least four interpretations of the origins of the Hebrew Devil have been influential in modern times. The first is that Satan was a demon among demons who rose to the position of their chief. This interpretation fails in many respects. There is no evidence of any kind that there ever was a petty demon named Satan, and although there are many manifestations of evil among Hebrew demons, no demon (with the one exception of Azazel) ever approaches the lofty position of apotheosis of evil. The second is that Satan is a personification of the evil impulse within man. In this argument, he is an earlier, parallel, and more personal expression of the Rabbinic *yetser ha-ra*, "evil inclination." It is true that all cosmic conceptions may ultimately be psychological projections, but at least some of the Old Testament authors themselves considered Satan an objective reality, and this argument fails. The common assumption that Satan was one of the God's functionaries whose morals and motivations continually declined is less an explanation than a description that fails to say why this process should have occurred. The fourth explanation best grasps the historical metabolism of the concept: Satan is the personification of the dark



Moses presenting the law to the Jews, manuscript illumination, France, fourteenth century. The horns of Moses were originally horns of power; later Christian tradition made them the symbol of the supposed alliance between the Jews and the horned Satan. Courtesy Bavarian State Library, Munich.

side of the God, that element within Yahweh which obstructs the good.

Whatever the origins of Hebrew monotheism, the Old Testament writers had come to identify Yahweh, the god of Israel, with the one God of the cosmos. Since Yahweh was the one God, he had to be, like the God of monism, an "antinomy of inner opposites."[2] He was both light and darkness, both good

2. Carl G. Jung, *Answer to Job* (London, 1954), p. 369. This has been recognized by a number of writers over the past century, beginning with Gustav Roskoff, *Geschichte des Teufels*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1869); Paul Volz, *Das Dämonische in Jahwe* (Tubingen, 1924); Gustav Mensching, "Teufel: Religionsgeschichtlich," *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 3d ed. (Tubingen, 1957), VI, 704–705. It was Jung who put the point most clearly, and his work was followed by one of his pupils in the best explanation of the origin of Satan: Rivkah Schärf Kluger, *Satan in the Old Testament* (Evanston, Ill., 1967), first published under the author's maiden and European name: Rosa R. Schärf, *Die Gestalt des Satans im Alten Testament* (Glarus, 1948), and then under the name of Rivkah Schärf, "Die Gestalt des Satans im Alten Testament," pt. 3 of C. G. Jung, *Symbolik des Geistes* (Zurich, 1953). Her book is admirable, but it has two limitations: on occasion, it takes the Jungian interpretation farther than the evidence warrants; and it does not deal adequately with the personification of evil by the Hebrews in the Apocryphal and Apocalyptic

5 Hebrew Personifications of Evil

> Woe unto them that desire the Day of Yahweh! What do you look for from the Day of Yahweh? It will be darkness and not light.
>
> —Amos 5:18

"I create the light; I create the darkness": so boasts the God Yahweh (Isaiah 45:7). In pre-exilic Hebrew religion Yahweh made all that was in heaven and earth, both of good and of evil. The Devil did not exist. The Hebrew concept of the Devil developed gradually, arising from certain tensions within the concept of Yahweh. Since Judaism and Christianity are live options for many of us, it is more difficult here than elsewhere to avoid a confusion between the metaphysical and the historical. What I intend is a discussion of the historical development of the concept rather than a metaphysical statement. One implication for theology should be made explicit, however, for its opposite has been frequently and vigorously stated. The fact that the Devil is not fully developed in the Old Testament is not a ground for rejecting his existence in modern Jewish and Christian theology. That would be the genetic fallacy: the notion that the truth of a word—or a concept—is to be found in its earliest form. Rather, historical truth is development through time. Another difficulty arises in discussing the concept in Hebrew religion. I have defined the Devil as the personfification of evil in any culture. But the word "Devil" derives through Latin from the Greek *diabolos*, which is a rendition of the Hebrew *satan*. Conceptually, the Hebrew Satan is one manifestation of the Devil, not the Devil *par essence*.

This chapter is concerned with the development of the concept of the Devil in Hebrew religion from the Old Testament through Apocalyptic and Qumran literature. The Old Testament was compiled over a long period from about 900 B.C. to about 100 B.C. Most of its books were written down in their present form during and after the period of the Babylonian Captivity (586–538) and show traces of Canaanite, Babylonian, Iranian, and Hellenistic influence. Neither the dates nor the sources of most Old Testament books are firmly established.[1]

The Apocrypha are scriptures excluded from the Hebrew canon of the Old Testament. Debates as to which of the many alleged holy books extant were truly inspired arose as early as the fourth century B.C., and the final form of the Hebrew canon was not established until the first century A.D. In the meantime, the scriptures were translated into Greek about 250 B.C. This work, the Septuagint, was expanded over the centuries to contain a number of books that were ultimately rejected from the Hebrew canon. These books, many of which reflect the misery of the Jews under Syrian and Roman oppression, were written from about 200 B.C. to about 150 A.D., and though they were excluded from the canon, they had great influence.

The suffering of the Jewish people in this period also produced a variety of literature generally described as Apocalyptic. These writings, a few of which were deemed canonical, consisted largely of visions in which the end of this world was

1. Scholars have long agreed, for example, that the Hexateuch is based on four major (as well as some minor) sources: the Yahwist (c. 900 B.C.), the Elohist (c. 800), the Deuteronomic (c. 680), and the Priestly (450-400), but assignation of materials to these sources is tentative. See the review of Frank Moore Cross's *Canaanite Myth* by Cyrus Gordon in the *American Historical Review*, 79 (1974), 1149. "Apocrypha" derives from the Greek *apokryptein*, "to hide"; "Apocalypse" derives from *apokalyptein*, "to reveal." These writings are also called the Pseudepigrapha because their authors ascribed them to the ancient patriarchs and prophets. Sometimes they are also called "apocrypha," but none of them ever found their way into a canon. The Qumran literature can properly be considered in the same context as the Apocalyptic: see Harold H. Rowley, *The Growth of the Old Testament*, 3d ed. (London, 1967), and David S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia, 1964).