

Your Daughters Do Not Give to Their Sons and Their Daughters Do Not Take for Your Sons (Ezra 9,12)

|| Intermarriage in Ezra 9-10 and in the Pre-Maccabean
Dead Sea Scrolls $\cup ; \cup$

Teil 1

Armin Lange*

A significant number of the Dead Sea Scrolls found in the Qumran caves attest to compositions which did not become part of the Hebrew Bible and which were written before the Hellenistic religious reforms of the years 175-164 B.C.E. This literature provides crucial contextual evidence for the interpretation of late biblical texts. As of to date though it is mostly an unclaimed treasure in interpreting the Hebrew Bible.¹

In this study, I will ask in how far the pre-Maccabean literature from the Qumran library sheds new light on the much debated question of the rejection of mixed marriages in the Ezra 9-10.² I will approach this question both with regard to the rejection of intermarriages by the final redaction of the book of Ezra / Nehemiah as well as the rejection of intermarriages by Ezra himself.

The book of Ezra / Nehemiah has a complicated redaction history and dates in its final stage to early Hellenistic times, probably to the reign of Alexander the Great (see below notes 134-135). Ezra's and Nehemiah's reforms are one of the most complex issues to discuss in the study of the history of Persian time Yehud. For lack of space, I can only summarize the position of H. Donner at this place.³ Nehemiah came to Jerusalem in the 20th year of the reign of Artaxerxes (Neh 1,1; 2,1) and staid for 12 years (Neh 13,6). During this time Nehemiah was in conflict with a governor of Samaria called Sanballat (see Neh 2,10.19; 4,1; 6,1-2.5.12.14; 13,28). A letter from Elephantine suggests that this

* I am indebted to my assistant, Mr. Matthias Weigold for his careful editing of this article.

¹ I have discussed further examples for the importance of the pre-Maccabean texts from the Qumran library for the understanding of late biblical books in Lange, *Literature* 276-305.

² For the question in how far the Dead Sea Scrolls help to better understand the rejection of mixed marriages in the final redaction of the book of Ezra / Nehemiah, see also Lange, *Significance* (forthcoming).

³ Donner, *Geschichte* 451-453.

particular Sanballat was governor of Samaria during the reign of Artaxerxes I Longimanus (465/464-425 B.C.E.). This would mean that Nehemiah's first stay in Jerusalem took place in the years 445/444-433/432 B.C.E. His second stay (Neh 13,6-29) happened most probably before the death of Artaxerxes I Longimanus although the book of Ezra / Nehemiah provides insufficient information for more precise dates.

Ezra's mission is more complicated to date but seems to presuppose Nehemiah's activities. Ezra 9,9 mentions a wall (גִּדֵּר) in Judah and Jerusalem. The way this passage is phrased excludes a metaphoric use of גִּדֵּר. Hence, Ezra must have been in Jerusalem after Nehemiah rebuilt its city wall. Furthermore, Nehemiah's demographic policy (Neh 7,4-73) does not consider the returnees coming with Ezra to Jerusalem. Further information can be gained out of the short mention of the high priest Jehohanan son of Eliashib in Ezra 10,6. He was high priest during the reign of Artaxerxes II Mnemon (404-359/358 B.C.E.).⁴ This corresponds well with Ezra 7,7-9 which dates the arrival of the Ezran returnees in the seventh year of the reign of king Artaxerxes. This means Ezra arrived in Jerusalem in the seventh year of Artaxerxes II Mnemon, i.e. 398/397 B.C.E.⁵

That at least in its core stratum the Nehemiah memoir goes back to Nehemiah himself is rarely doubted.⁶ It records several measures Nehemiah took during his missions to Jerusalem. Some of these measures attest to the realization of a political schedule by Nehemiah while others respond to developing situations. The heterogeneous character of the Nehemiah memoir shows that it underwent comparatively little theological reworking and is thus an important historical source. This is especially true for the Persian documents it contains.

The Ezra memoir is coined by a coherent theological program. Ezra 7-8 describes how Ezra is commissioned and comes to Yehud. Ezra 9-10 reports how Ezra cleanses the community in preparation for the proclamation of the cultic law. Neh 8-10 depicts Ezra's public reading of the law and its cultic installation. Ezra is described as a reformer who develops the theological program of a cultic community based on its (cultic) law. The suspicions about the authenticity of the Ezra memoir are confirmed by the observation that

⁴ For the complicated discussion about the identity of Jehohanan son of Eliashib, see VanderKam, Joshua 49-63.85-99.

⁵ Cf. e.g. Ahlström, History 879-882.

⁶ For the Nehemiah memoir (Neh 1,1-7,72a; 11,1-2; 12,31; 13,4-31) as a document going at least in substantial parts back to Nehemiah himself, see Reinmuth, Bericht, esp. 263-327. For Neh 13,23-29 as part of the Nehemiah memoir and for its historicity, see Kellermann, Nehemia 51-55; Williamson, Ezra 394.

several of the Ezra passages in the book of Ezra / Nehemiah have close parallels in the Nehemiah memoir. The figure of Ezra seems to have been patterned after Nehemiah.⁷ The well founded doubts about the historicity of the Ezra memoir make a historical assessment of the marriage reforms reported in Ezra 9-10 rather difficult.

But ancient Jewish literature preserved in the Qumran library and elsewhere provides new evidence. 1) Several Jewish texts which were written in the 3rd century B.C.E. or earlier engage the issue of mixed marriages. I.e. the Qumran library and other sources preserve Jewish literature which is more or less contemporary to the book of Ezra / Nehemiah⁸ and can provide a Jewish context for its attitude towards mixed marriages. 2) These 3rd century B.C.E. texts allow also to better understand which parts of Ezra 9-10 might have been added by a redactor in early Hellenistic times and which parts might go back to Persian times. I.e. the Dead Sea Scrolls help to answer the question if Ezra did enact marriage reforms or not. 3) The Book of Watchers provides important contextual evidence for the rejection of intermarriages by Ezra himself because its narrative kernel, the so-called Shemihazah myth, goes back to the 5th century B.C.E.

In this article, I will first survey Jewish attitudes towards exogamy and endogamy from the Iron Age until the Babylonian exile. Afterwards I will study the debate about mixed marriages in Jewish texts from the 5th century B.C.E. To better understand the rejection of exogamy in the final redaction of the book of Ezra / Nehemiah I will study intolerant attitudes towards intermarriage in early Hellenistic times. In a conclusion I will apply my results to the interpretation of Ezra 9-10.

1. Mixed Marriages from the Iron Age until the Babylonian Exile

In ancient Israel and Judah, contacts with other cultures and ethnicities were limited for the majority of the Jewish and Israelite populations. As a consequence, exogamy, i.e. intermarriage, was the exception and not the rule. The postexilic book of Ruth is a good example. Although it clearly reflects a positive attitude towards the marriage of a Moabite woman and Jewish man, it does not presuppose intermarriage as a widespread phenomenon. On the contrary, it needs to go through a significant narrative effort to explain how Ruth as a Moabite became the wife of a Jew (Ruth 1,1-5).

⁷ For doubts about the historicity of the Ezra memoirs report see also Grabbe, *Reconstructing* 98-106; Grabbe, *History* 327-331; Smith-Christopher, *Marriage*, 243-265.

⁸ For the date of the book of Ezra / Nehemiah (see below notes 134-135).

The liberal attitude of the postexilic book of Ruth towards mixed marriages is reflected by a wide range of Iron Age traditions. Mostly, the polytheistic religion of Iron Age Israel and Judah did not have a problem with intermarriage.⁹ Examples from the narrative traditions of Iron Age Israel and Judah include Esau's marriages with a Canaanite and two Hittite women (Gen 26,34; 28,6-9), Judah's marriage with a Canaanite (Gen 38,2), Joseph's marriage with an Egyptian (Gen 41,45), Moses' marriage with a Midianite / Kushite (Exod 2,21), Samson's marriage with a Philistine (Judg 14; 16,4-22), David's marriage with a Calebite and an Aramean (2Sam 3,3), Bathsheba's marriage with a Hittite (2Sam 11,3), Solomon's marriage with a multitude of foreigners (1Kgs 3,1; 11,1; 14,21), and Ahab's marriage with a Phoenician (1Kgs 16,31). Furthermore, 1 Kings claims that the mother of the Phoenician king Hiram was from the tribe of Naphtali (1Kgs 7,13-14). Whether the historicity of these reports is to be doubted or not, they reflect a *Zeitgeist* which accepts the notion of intermarriage. The same liberal attitude towards mixed marriages is also reflected in legal texts. Examples are Deut 21,10-14 which allows a warrior to marry a prisoner of war and Lev 24,10 which mentions the son of a Jewish woman and an Egyptian as a member of Israel.

Later biblical texts (see e.g. Num 12,1 and 1Kgs 11,1-13; 16,31-33) criticize some of the exogamous marriages listed above harshly and thus mark a changed attitude towards intermarriages. Most of these criticisms can be found in deuteronomistic texts or deuteronomistic redactions. Hence, deuteronomism with its monolatric or henotheistic thought marks a change in the Jewish attitude towards intermarriages. With the reforms of king Josiah and especially with the extensive development of deuteronomistic thought during the Babylonian exile the exclusive veneration of the national deity of Israel became part of the Jewish cultural identity. The deuteronomistic polemics against the intermarriages of king Solomon (1Kgs 11,1-13) or king Ahab (1Kgs 16,31-33) are paradigmatic. Jews follow foreign gods because they are married to non-Jewish spouses. Hence, mixed marriages were not an ethnic but a cultural challenge. Intermarriages are regarded as diluting the exclusive veneration of YHWH and thus as diluting the Jewish cultural identity (cf. also Exod 34,14-16 [K^D]; Deut 7,1-5; Josh 23,12-13; Judg 3,5-7).¹⁰

That this dilution of cultural identity motivated Jewish criticism of intermarriage is also reflected in the Non-P and P parts of the Pentateuch. Examples from the Non-P material include criticism of the intermarriage between humans and angels in Gen 6,1-4 and the passage about the so-called rape of Dinah in Gen 34. Both non-P and P parts of the Pentateuch emphasize the endogamous

⁹ Cf. e.g. Meyers, Eve 184.

¹⁰ Cf. e.g. Meyers, Eve 184-185.

marriages of Abraham (Gen 11,29; 20,12), Isaac (Gen 24), and Jacob (Gen 28,1-29,30). These reports about the endogamous marriages of the patriarchs point to a diaspora situation and its special needs for the preservation of cultural identity as a further motivator for the Jewish rejection of intermarriage in exilic times. The most gruesome narrative realization of this need for cultural self-preservation is the Phinehas story (Num 25,6-15). Phinehas and his descendents are rewarded with the perpetual high priesthood because Phinehas murdered a Jew and his Midianite wife on account of their intermarriage.

2. The Rejection Mixed Marriages in the 5th century B.C.E.

In Persian times, the resettlement policy of the Persian empire for Coele-Syria turned the issue of intermarriages into a prevailing cultural challenge for Second Temple Judaism. Assyrian and Babylonian imperial policies led to a dramatic decrease in the population of Coele-Syria. O. Lipschits has shown that compared to the late Iron Age the settled area in Judah decreased by 72.3% in Persian times. For Persian time Yehud, this means a total population of 30,125 people as compared to 108,000 citizens during the late Iron Age.¹¹ Other surveys give even lower population numbers for the Persian subprovince of Yehud. Also based on archeological data, C.E. Carter estimates the population of Yehud in the years 538-450 B.C.E. to 10,850 persons which would have increased in the years 450-332 B.C.E. to 17000.¹² Neither Lipschits' nor Carter's statistics make a large migration of 42000 Jewish returnees from Mesopotamia to Yehud plausible as it described in Ezra 2 / Nehemiah 7. Beyond the literary fiction of the book of Ezra / Nehemiah historical reality features only a small group of Jewish returnees.¹³

When Coele-Syria became part of the Achaemenid empire the Persians were forced to redevelop the area. Based on an archeological analysis of Persian time strata of various sites in Coele-Syria, E. Stern describes the Persian development policy as follows:

The Persians – in order to overcome the consequences of the Babylonian occupation – apparently utilized different methods from those employed by the Assyrians and the Babylonians. They did not destroy everything and remove the booty to Babylon, as did the Babylonians, nor did they bring new settlers to the desolate land, as the Assyrians had done. They simply allowed people from surrounding areas who were up to it to settle the half-empty regions. Our impression is that this was accomplished by various extant local authorities (as

¹¹ Lipschits, *Changes* 323-376, esp. 356.363-364; Lipschits, *Fall* 134-184.258-271.

¹² Carter, *Province* 106-145, esp. 135; Carter, *Emergence*, 172-248.

¹³ See Carter, *Province* 136-137; Carter, *Emergence* 285; Lipschits, *Changes* 365; Lipschits, *Fall* 271.

an almost private initiative), such as the kings of Tyre and Sidon. The coastal region of Palestine indeed appears, for the most part, to have been populated from the beginning of the Persian period by Phoenicians from these two cities. This had been clearly shown by the excavations at coastal towns: Acco, Dor, Jaffa, Ashkelon, Gaza, and Ruq'ish. The same conclusion is valid in regard to the Galilee. Here and there, some new elements, such as Greeks and Arabs, also settled, in particular in the south and in Gaza.

It should be assumed that in the beginning the coastal settlements were renewed. Only later did the new prosperity reach the inland mountainous region, too. This process was slow at first, but gradually gained momentum. Despite its slowness, its aim was clear: the erection of settlements of various sizes on massive scale throughout the country, but mainly along the coastal strip; the renewal of international trade on a large scale; and successful development of the countries economy.¹⁴

It might be added to Stern's description that in the south the Persian resettlement policy led to a continuous growth of Idumea into formerly Jewish territories.¹⁵ A later reflection of the successful Persian redevelopment of Coele-Syria can be found in the onomasticon of 4th century B.C.E. Samaria. For the inhabitants of 4th century B.C.E. Samaria, the Wadi ed-Daliyeh papyri attest to a variety of theophoric elements in the names of citizens of Samaria. The Samaritan names include elements referring to Jewish, Phoenician, Aramaic, Arabic, Moabite, and Babylonian deities: Yahweh, Baal, Qosh, Sahar, Chemosh, Nabu.¹⁶

Although the region of Yehud is less well documented, it can be assumed that Yehud was part of the overall Persian resettlement scheme. And that due to slow beginnings, the resettlement process reached Yehud only by the 5th century B.C.E. This compares well with the complaint of the Nehemiah memoir that Jewish children speak the languages of various neighboring people but not the language of Judah (Neh 13,24). Such a loss of linguistic identity could very well be a consequence of the resettlement of the half desolated areas of Coele-Syria by the surrounding nations.

The resulting multiethnic and multireligious population of Coele-Syria seems to have led to an increase in mixed marriages which by the 5th century BCE made intermarriage an intensely debated issue in Judaism. This is documented not only in the book of Ezra / Nehemiah itself but also in other texts. The Jewish archives of the Nile island Elephantine document intermarriages in its Jewish community.¹⁷ And both Josephus and the Samaria Papyri attest to a

¹⁴ Stern, *Archaeology* 580-581.

¹⁵ See Lemaire, *Beitrag* 15-20. For a survey of the archeological sites of Persian time Idumaea, see Stern, *Archaeology* 443-454.

¹⁶ Cf. Ahlström, *History* 899.

¹⁷ Cf. e.g. Porten, *Archives* 3-61.149. 173-174.178; 248-253; Eshkenazi, *Shadows* 24-43.

pattern of intermarriage between the Samaritan and Jerusalemite elites.¹⁸ A Persian time advocate of Jewish intermarriage can be found with the book of Ruth.¹⁹ It tells the story of the Moabite widow of a Jew. She integrates herself successfully into Jewish culture and becomes the ancestor of king David. The book of Ruth emphasizes, how Ruth acts according to the law of levirate marriage (Deut 25,5-10) when she searches for a new Jewish husband. It makes the counterargument to Persian time polemics against intermarriage. Mixed marriages do not pollute the Jewish temple community and do not cause the loss of cultural identity. On the contrary, in following the laws of levirate marriage (Deut 25,5-10) the foreigner Ruth acts like the role model of a Jewish woman.

Other Persian time Jewish literature attests to harsh opposition against the notion of Jewish exogamy. Two different strands can be identified in the Persian time campaign for endogamy. Some texts enforce endogamy only for the priests viz. the high priests while others apply it to all Jews. In the next two paragraphs I will first discuss various texts from the Hebrew Bible which reject intermarriages. Afterwards I will ask how these observations relate to the Persian time strata of the Book of Watchers.

2.1. Priestly Endogamy and its Democratization

After the Babylonian exile, the priesthood developed its own attitude towards the question of endogamy. In Persian times, Judaism defined itself not so much as a political or ethical community but as a cultic one. The purpose of Israel's existence was to serve god in his temple. Israel is Israel as long as it performs the cult faithfully. The covenant with its god is realized in this cult. Israel is not a nation or a political power. It is the adherence to the torah as realized in the Jerusalem cult that constitutes Israel's identity. Given the importance of the cult, it cannot surprise that special laws regulated the life of the priests which were the main cultic communicators between Israel and its god. A major concern of these regulations was to avoid defilement of the priests and alienation of Israel from its god by way of priestly defilement.

2.1.1. Lev 21,13-15

To preserve priestly holiness and thus the holiness of the sanctuary, the holiness code of P developed special regulations whom priests were allowed to marry and whom not (Lev 21,6-9.13-15).²⁰ They occur in a passage which is

¹⁸ Cf. Cross, Samaria 189-197.

¹⁹ For a Persian time date of the book of Ruth, see e.g. Zenger, Buch Rut 226.

²⁰ For a Persian time date of Lev 21,13-15, see Blum, Studien 319-322.

coined by the rhetoric of holiness, defilement, profanation, and uncleanness.²¹ Violations invalidate the offerings performed by the violating priests who desanctified themselves.

It cannot surprise that the high priest as the human center of the Jerusalem cult is commanded to marry only out of a rather selected group of women.

13 He shall marry only a woman who is a virgin. 14 A widow, or a divorced woman, or a woman who has been defiled, a prostitute, these he shall not marry. He shall marry a virgin of his own kin, 15 that he may not profane his offspring among his kin; for I am the Lord; I sanctify him. (Lev 21,13-15 NRSV)

R. Albertz brings it to a point: “But he (scil. the high priest) was also subject to intensified priestly conditions of holiness (Lev 21.10-13) and therefore was the only one who had the privilege of entering the holy of holies ..., and performed the liturgy on festivals (sabbath, annual festivals) and in particular on the day of atonement.”²² The special cultic role of the high priest necessitates avoiding any chance of defilement. Hence, the high priest is only allowed to marry a virgin from a priestly family.²³

2.1.2. Ezek 44,22

The regulations for the priests in Ezek 44,17-27²⁴ advocate the same concern for the holiness of the priest as does Lev 21. Woven into the different regulations for the priests of Ezek 44,17-27 are different forms of קֹדֶשׁ (see Ezek 44,19.23.24.27). Hence, Ezek 44,17-27 is put under the *Leitmotiv* of holiness.²⁵ Given that Ezek 44,17-27 develops its individual laws out of Lev 10; 21²⁶ and other authoritative traditions,²⁷ it is all the more interesting that the marriage regulations for the priests do not draw on Lev 21,6-9 but on the marriage regulations for the high priests in Lev 21,13-15. This democratization of high priestly halakhah reflects an increased concern for the defilement of the sanctity of priests as the cultic intermediators between god and his chosen people.

²¹ Cf. Hartley, Leviticus 346.

²² Albertz, History 460.

²³ For this meaning of מַעֲמִיר in Lev 21,14, see already Philo, De specialibus legibus 1,110; cf. e.g. Hurvitz, Study 67-69; Milgrom, Leviticus 1819-1820.

²⁴ For a postexilic setting of Ezek 44,22, see e.g. Zimmerli, Ezekiel II 463; Tuell, Law 176-177.

²⁵ Allen, Ezekiel 251-252.

²⁶ Cf. Fishbane, Interpretation 294-295; Allen, Ezekiel 263.

²⁷ Cf. Block, Book 642; Pohlmann, Prophet 594-596.

They shall not marry a widow, or a divorced woman, but only a virgin of the stock of the house of Israel, or a widow who is the widow of a priest. (Ezek 44,22 NRSV)

The differences between the two texts point to the concerns of Ezek 44,22. It clarifies the ambiguous term *מֵעַמּוּד* out of Lev 21,14 as “from the house of Israel,” i.e. a priest can only marry an Israelite virgin. Furthermore, the priests of Ezek 44,22 are allowed to marry a widow of a priest while in Lev 21,14 the high priest is not. This points to endangerment of the holiness of a priestly husband as the main concern of the endogamy law in Ezek 44,22. The widow of a priest was not in contact with the alien sphere of non-priests and can thus not endanger the holiness of a priestly husband.²⁸

2.1.3. *Mal 2,11-12*

Already before the mission of Nehemiah, the concept of a cultic Jewish cultural identity led to a democratization of priestly endogamy laws. A good example is an early addition²⁹ to the book of Malachi in Mal 2,11-12.³⁰

11 Judah has been faithless, and abomination happened in Israel and in Jerusalem; for Judah has profaned the sanctuary of the Lord, which he loves, and has married the daughter³¹ of a foreign god. 12 May the Lord cut off from the tents of Jacob anyone who does this – the aroused one and the lover – and who brings an offering to the Lord of hosts.³²

The remark “which he loves” (*אֲשֶׁר אֹהֵב*; Mal 2,11) shows that in Mal 2,11-12 it is the sanctuary through which Judah is special. Hence, Mal 2,11-12 follows also the idea of a Jewish cultic identity. Its context attests to the same language of holiness and defilement as observed in Lev 21 and Ezek 44,17-27 but Mal 2,11-12 adds a rhetoric of deception and faithlessness to it. Exogamous marriages do not just endanger the special cultic relation between Israel and its god through the defilement of priests. They are an evil in itself. Those who

²⁸ For this interpretation of Ezek 44,22, cf. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel II* 460; Allen, *Ezekiel* 263-264; Block, *Book 642*.

²⁹ For Mal 2,11-12 as a 5th century B.C.E. addition to the book of Malachi which was composed before the mission of Nehemiah, see Meinhold, *Malachi* 190-197.

³⁰ For a survey of earlier interpretations of Mal 2,11-12, see Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi* 113-119.

³¹ 4QXII^a reads *בֵּית* instead of *בַּת*. With all probability this reading is due to scribal error (cf. Fuller, *Problems* 51).

³² For the translation “the aroused one and the lover,” see Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi* 2:12 295-298; Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi* 94-99.

marry the daughter of a foreign god (בת אל נכר), i.e. a foreign women,³³ profane and thus de-sanctify the sanctuary of the lord. The husband of a foreigner continues to bring sacrifices to YHWH while also being affiliated with the gods of his wife.³⁴ Hence, if Jews marry non-Jewish partners, an abomination (תועבה) develops. This keyword introduces deuteronomic ideas into the priestly thought of Malachi and evokes the philosophy that the veneration of other deities causes catastrophic punishment.³⁵

Mal 2,11-12 differs in two respects from the Holiness Code and the temple vision of the book of Ezekiel. It applies the laws of (high) priestly endogamy to all Jews and it specifies how intermarriage carries defilement. The husbands of non-Jewish women are affiliated with foreign deities through their wives and could therefore introduce non-Jewish culture into the Jerusalem cult.³⁶ This element of foreign religion de-sanctifies the Jerusalem sanctuary³⁷ as it is not exclusive to YHWH anymore.³⁸ Judah as a cultic community loses its sanctity³⁹ and its cultic identity. Any intermarriage endangers the cultic identity of Judaism which runs through the Jerusalem temple.

2.1.4. *The Mission of Nehemiah (Neh 13,23-29)*

Neh 13,23-29 is part of the Nehemiah memoir. It is hence highly probable that it reflects historic measures taken by Nehemiah himself. As Mal 2,11-12, Nehemiah seems to have democratized the priestly notion of endogamy and applied it to all Jews.

Neh. 13,23-24 mentions language disabilities of children out of mixed marriages. That Nehemiah connects the language issue with the problem of mixed marriages shows, in the 5th century B.C.E. exogamy was not rejected because of ethnicity but because of the endangered Jewish cultural identity. Hence, Neh 13,25-27 refers to the negative role model of Solomon's mixed marriages. Unlike its *Vorlage* (1Kgs 11,1-13), Neh 13,26 does not accuse Solomon's foreign wives of having him lured away to the veneration of their foreign gods but that they caused him to sin (חטא Hi.). Mixed marriages are a

³³ For this meaning of the phrase בת אל נכר, see Glazier McDonald, Malachi 91-93; Glazier McDonald, Intermarriage 603-604.

³⁴ Cf. Glazier McDonald, Malachi 99.

³⁵ Cf. Meinhold, Malachi 205.

³⁶ Cf. Schreiner, Mischehen 221-223; Glazier-McDonald, Malachi 89-91.119-120; Glazier-McDonald, Intermarriage 610.

³⁷ For קדש יהודה as a designation of the Jerusalem temple, see e.g. Glazier-McDonald, Malachi 89.

³⁸ Cf. Glazier McDonald, Intermarriage 604.

³⁹ Cf. van der Woude, Malachi's 67.

violation of Jewish religious culture even if the veneration of other gods is not involved. Inter marriages need to be avoided, because they result in a loss of Jewish conduct and thus of Jewish identity.

Therefore, Nehemiah summarizes his activities with regard to mixed marriages as a cleansing from anything foreign, i.e. anything that is not receptive to YHWH (Neh 13,30).⁴⁰ As an extreme example for how to deal with intermarriage, Neh 13,28-29 describes the case of a grandson of the high priest Eliashib and his marriage with the daughter of the Samaritan governor Sanballat. Nehemiah drove him out of the Jewish community. Nehemiah's policy is thus in line with his general exclusion of foreigners from Judaism as attested in Neh 13,1-3. Jews who live in a mixed marriage lose their Jewish cultural identity and need to be removed from Judaism.

To summarize: Before the Babylonian exile, intermarriage was not a disputed issue. The diaspora situation of the Babylonian exile led to a strong support of endogamy versus exogamy. Most exilic polemics against exogamy are incorporated into existing authoritative texts by way of redaction. The small size of Persian time Yehud and the Persian resettlement policy for Coele-Syria turned intermarriage into one of the major problems of postexilic Judaism. Persian time rejections of intermarriage are based on the idea of a cultic Jewish identity. In the beginning, postexilic prohibitions of intermarriage seem to be restricted to the (high) priests (Lev 21,13-15; Ezek 44,22) as their intermarriage with non-Jews could defile the cult. Both an early insertion into the book of Malachi (Mal 2,11-12) and the Nehemiah memoir (Neh 13,23-29) attest an expansion of the priestly marriage prohibition towards all Jews arguing that the cult could be defiled by all of its members. The postexilic rejection of intermarriages did not remain undisputed. In support of intermarriages, the book of Ruth depicts the Moabite woman Ruth as an exemplary member of the Jewish cultic commune.

2.2 Intermarriage in the Shemihazah Myth (1En *6-11)

The Book of Watchers (BW; 1En 1-36) is a paratext to Gen 5,21-24 and Gen 6,1-4, which has undergone a complicated textual history.⁴¹ The earliest manuscript of the BW is 4QEn^a at which was produced in the first half of the 2nd century B.C.E.⁴² Milik has shown that copyist errors and the orthography of

⁴⁰ For this meaning of נכר, see Lang, נכר 460-461.

⁴¹ For the textual history of the BW, see Bhayro, Narrative 45-53.219-226. The Greek Vorlage of the Ethiopic translation was not identical to the text of Codex Panopolitanus but close to it (cf. Milik, Books 71-72; Bhayro, Narrative 223-224).

⁴² Milik, Books 140.

4QEn^a ar argue for a date of its *Vorlage* in the 3rd century B.C.E.⁴³ Logical inconsistencies like the absence of Enoch in 1En 6-11 indicate that the BW is the result of a complex history of redactional growth. Parts of 1En 6-11 seem to preserve the narrative kernel of the BW, which was first enlarged by 1En 12-16 and later by 1En 17-19. 1En 1-5; 20-36 were added to 1En 6-19 in one or more later redactions.⁴⁴ Taking the BW's dependence on various Jewish scriptures from exilic and post-exilic times (see e.g. Ezek 1-2; 40-44 in 1En 14,8-16,4) and its somewhat intricate redactional history into consideration, it seems highly unlikely that the BW was finalized before the 3rd century B.C.E.⁴⁵ while a later date is excluded by Milik's observations concerning the *Vorlage* of 4QEn^a ar.

The narrative nucleus of the BW, the so-called the Shemihazah myth, can be found in 1En 6,1-8; 7,1abc-2,6; 8,4; 9,1-5,7-8ab,9-11; 10,1-3,11-22; 11,1-2.⁴⁶ Some specialists suggest a setting for the Shemihazah myth in the 5th century B.C.E.⁴⁷ while others doubt this dating⁴⁸ and propose early Hellenistic times.⁴⁹ In my opinion, the intricate redaction history of the BW argues for a significantly earlier date of the Shemihazah myth than the beginning of the 3rd century B.C.E. The prominence of the rejection of intermarriages in Persian times could suggest a 5th century B.C.E. setting. Corroboration for such a setting might be found in the name of the seventh angelic chief of the fallen watchers,

⁴³ Milik, Books 141; cf. 22-23.

⁴⁴ For the literary growth of the BW, see Nickelsburg, Apocalyptic 384-386; Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 165 and ad loc. Cf. also Hanson, Rebellion 195-233; Newsom, Development 310-329. For a summary of various reconstructions of the BW's redactional history, see Tigchelaar, Prophets 152-164, 168-172.

⁴⁵ For a 3rd century B.C.E. date of the BW, see e.g. Milik, Books 28; VanderKam, Enoch 111-114; Kvanvig, Roots 95-96; Reed, Angels 61-69.

⁴⁶ See Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 165,254-256. It has repeatedly been claimed that this Shemihazah myth was in turn part of a Book of Noah which is now lost. Other parts of this text would be preserved in 1En 106-107 and various passages of the Book of Similitudes (1En 54,7-55,2; 60; 65,1-69,25). For this idea cf. e.g. Charles, Book 24-25; Bartelmus, Heroentum 154-156; Uhlig, Henochbuch 506; Rubinkiewicz, Book 151; Sacchi, Apocalyptic 83. But the end of the Shemihazah myth presents an eschatology which is difficult to imagine in the middle of a Book of Noah. 1En 6-11 should be understood as a literary work in its own right which was incorporated into the BW (cf. Tigchelaar, Prophets 156-157).

⁴⁷ Milik, Books 25-34; Sacchi, Apocalyptic 61-62,212-213; Rubinkiewicz, Book passim (Rubinkiewicz wants to date even a later reworking of the Shemihazah myth into the 5th century B.C.E.); Boccaccini, Hypothesis 77.

⁴⁸ See. e.g. Collins' apodictic criticism of P. Sacchi: "There is no reason to push the date back to the fifth century" (Origin 28 note 10).

⁴⁹ Cf. e.g. Hanson, Rebellion 218-220.

Daniel (1En 6,7; cf. the later paraphrase in the Book of Similitudes [1En 69,2]).⁵⁰

The use of the names Dan'el and Daniy'el in ancient Jewish literature has a characteristic history. From the Iron Age no Israelite or Jewish use of the names Dan'el and Daniy'el is preserved. In exilic times, in a Mesopotamian setting,⁵¹ the book of Ezekiel mentions the name דניאל⁵² repeatedly. Ezek 14,14,20; 28,3 point to a positive reception of the Dan'el of Canaanite legend in Mesopotamian Judaism of exilic times.⁵³

Outside the Daniel literature and the book of Daniel itself the name Daniel is rare in the Jewish onomasticon of the Second Temple period.⁵⁴ Until the turn of the eras it is not attested on Jewish seals or in other Jewish inscriptions. Only in a 1st century C.E. ossuary inscription from Jerusalem, a Joseph son of Daniel is mentioned.⁵⁵ Another late use of the name Daniel might be attested in a Jewish re-marriage contract of the year 124 C.E. (Mur115). Among the signatures on the *verso* of the document a damaged name reads Δα[...⁵⁶ In the 1st century B.C.E.,⁵⁷ the Letter of Aristeas lists a Daniel as one of the translators of the Pentateuch into Greek (*Let. Aris.* 49). *Jub.* 4,20 mentions that Enoch's father in law who also was his uncle, was named Daniel. 1Chr 3,1 gives the name of David's second son as דניאל which is a reinterpretation of 2Sam 3,3 where David's second son is named דלוייה.⁵⁸ The first attestation of the name Daniel in the Jewish onomasticon outside the Daniel legends is Ezra 8,2 (cf. Neh 10,7). The name designates a Jew who migrated from Mesopotamia to Yehud.

The name Daniel is very prominent in the Book of Daniel and other Daniel literature from the Qumran library. The Daniel literature transforms the hero of Canaanite myth into a Jew in the Babylonian exile.⁵⁹ There can be no doubt, that the biblical book of Daniel as attested in the MT is to be dated in the years

⁵⁰ In 1En 6,7 the Ethiopic translation reads *dn'el* while its paratext in 1En 69:2 attests to *dnyl*. The *dn'el* of 1En 6,7 is a transcription of the Greek Δανειηλ which is still attested in Codex Panopolitanus. The Aramaic manuscripts 4QEn^{ac} leave no doubt that the seventh chief of the fallen watchers was called Daniel and not Dan'el. 4QEn^a 1 iii 8 reads דניאל while 4QEn^c I ii 26 has דניאל.

⁵¹ For an exilic setting, see Zimmerli, Ezekiel I 313; Zimmerli, Ezekiel II 76.

⁵² The Ketib reads in all three references Dan'el, which was reinterpreted by the Qere and by the LXX as Daniel. Both were influenced by the postexilic book of Daniel. See e.g. Noth, Noah 252-254.

⁵⁴ Cf. e.g. Ilan, Lexicon 87 (s.v. דניאל – Daniel).

⁵⁵ See the report of Kloner / Stark, Jerusalem 145.

⁵⁶ Cf. Benoît, Textes 254.

⁵⁷ For a date of the Letter of Aristeas in the 1st century B.C.E., see Lange, Law (forthcoming).

⁵⁸ Cf. McCarter, Samuel 101; Willi, Chronik 110. Contra Knoppers, Chronicles 318.

⁵⁹ Cf. Day, Daniel 182-183; Collins, Daniel דניאל 220.

167-164 B.C.E. But it has been long agreed that the first part of the book, Dan 1-6, incorporates earlier legends. According to Kratz, early stages of narrative tradition behind Dan 1-6 go back into the late 6th and 5th century B.C.E. and developed in Mesopotamian Jewry.⁶⁰

To summarize: During the Babylonian exile, the Dan'el figure of Canaanite myth became accepted in (Mesopotamian) Judaism. During Persian times the Mesopotamian diaspora developed Daniel legends which responded to threats to Jewish identity in a diaspora situation. Jewish returnees used the name Daniel during the 5th century B.C.E. in Yehud. At that time, these returnees from Mesopotamia brought the Daniel legends with them. Since this time an almost exclusively positive use of the name Daniel can be observed in Jewish texts from Coele-Syria.

The use of the name Daniel in the BW attests to a very different reception of the Canaanite Dan'el figure. In 1En 6,7, it turns the paradigmatic just of non-Jewish legend into the seventh chief of the fallen watcher and demonises him in this way. The BW had almost no effect on Jewish culture in its use of the name Daniel. After the Daniel-legends became prominent in Yehud it was unimaginable to name a prominent demon Daniel. From the 5th century B.C.E. onwards the name Daniel could not be connected any more with such a negative person.

Given this history of the name Daniel in the Jewish onomasticon, a setting for the Shemihazah myth after the 5th century B.C.E. is very unlikely. The Shemihazah myth reflects a stage in the Daniel tradition, when Daniel was still perceived as a non-Jewish figure in Persian Yehud. Such a 5th century B.C.E. date for the Shemihazah myth is corroborated by its main subject matter, i.e. the intermarriage between the watchers and human women. The question of intermarriage was a main topic of dispute in 5th century B.C.E. Yehud.

The text of the Shemihazah myth as isolated by Nickelsburg (1En 6,1-8; 7,1abc.2-6; 8,4; 9,1-5.7-8ab.9-11; 10,1-3.11-22; 11,1-2)⁶¹ displays a distinct story line. The Shemihazah myth begins and ends with a descent. It tells the story of how the heavenly watchers recognize the beauty of human women, come down to earth, take women for themselves and have sex with them (1En 6,1-7,1). After the corresponding punishment of the deluge an eschatological time of blessing will commence and the heavenly storehouses of blessing will open and their content will descend on earth (1En 11,2).

Between the two descents the Shemihazah myth tells how the watchers procreate (1En 7,2), how their children, the giants, devour all life on earth (1En 7,3-5), how the souls of the deceased and the empty earth cries out to heaven (1En 8,4), how the holy ones in heaven look down to earth, how they recognize

⁶⁰ See e.g. Kratz, *Translatio* 134-148.

⁶¹ See note 46.

the dire straits earth and its population is in (1En 9,1-3), how the holy ones bring earths' fate to god as the ruler of the universe in describing the misdemeanor of the watchers and their offspring (1En 9,4-5.6-10), and how god responds to the plead of his holy ones. He issues a warning to Noah (1En 10,1-3). He orders Michael to punish the watchers and to perform a summary cleansing of the depopulated earth by way of the deluge. In turn, the descendants of Noah will populate the earth and at an unspecified moment in time and an age of eschatological bliss will commence (1En 10,4-11,2).

In this story, the watchers are variously accused and slandered for their mixed marriages with human women. In 1En 6,3 these intermarriages are described as a great sin (ἀμαρτίας μεγάλης). Why intermarriage is regarded as a principal sin in the Shemihazah myth becomes apparent in later parts of the narrative. The Shemihazah myth criticizes the intermarriage of the watchers by employing a rhetoric of impurity, defilement, and cleansing. Regrettably, none of the vocabulary in question is preserved in the Aramaic Enoch manuscripts from Qumran. But the Greek translation is extant. 1En 7,1; 9,8; and 10,11 state that the watchers defiled themselves (μιαίνεσθαι, ἐμιάνησαν, μίανθηται) through the human women. And 1En 10,11 states that they communicated their uncleanness (ἀκαθαρσία) to the watchers.

The defilement of the watchers should not be understood as a communication of menstrual uncleanness by their human spouses⁶² but by their intercourse with women forbidden to the watchers.⁶³ The Shemihazah myth does not mention any bleeding of the watcher's spouses in connection with their sexual intercourse. That the watcher's defilement is not caused by the menstrual uncleanness of their human spouses is confirmed by 1En 9,9 and 10,15. In both places, the giants are called half-breeds (1En 9,9 κίβδηλα⁶⁴; 1En 10,15 τῶν κίβδηλων). In Lev 19,19 and Deut 22,11 κίβδηλος translates the Hebrew term כִּשְׂמֹנֶה which signifies a cloth or garment made out of two different materials. Hence, the use of κίβδηλος in 1En 9,9; 10,15 creates a link to the *kil'ayim* laws of Lev 19,19. Like the offspring of two different breeds of animals or a garment made out of two different kinds of materials the giants are flawed as they are the offspring of a union of two different kinds. Hence, in the Shemihazah myth the defilement of the watchers results out a mixture of two things which do not belong together, i.e. the watchers' intercourse with human women.

⁶² Thus e.g. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 225.

⁶³ Cf. Loader, Enoch 11-15; Himmelfarb, Temple 227-228.

⁶⁴ In 1En 9,9, only Syncellus reads κίβδηλα while both Codex Panopolitanus and the Ethiopic text attest to an "abbreviated paraphrase of the longer form of Sync" (Black, Book 132).

It is this defilement resulting out of the unequal union between watchers and humans that necessitates god's order to Michael to cleanse the earth (καθαρίσαν) from "all the impurities" (πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας; 1En 10,20). Michael's cleansing seems to be a prefiguration of the eschatological cleansing (καθαρισθήσεται) from all defilement (ἀπὸ παντὸς μιάσματος) and all uncleanness (ἀπὸ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας) which is forecasted in 1En 10,22.

The Shemihazah myth is concerned with the purity of the watchers. The watchers are defiled by their human spouses because such a union is prohibited under the *kil'ayim* laws of Lev 19,19.⁶⁵ Both the rhetoric of defilement and purity as well as the *kil'ayim* laws are priestly concepts. The use of priestly language and ideas in connection with the intermarriage of the watchers creates the suspicion that as angels the watchers have the status of heavenly priests. This is corroborated by 1En 9,1 which states that the angels remaining in heaven looked upon the earth out of the heavenly sanctuary.⁶⁶ Before descending to earth the watchers were angelic priests in the heavenly sanctuary.

When the Shemihazah myth tells the story of the fallen heavenly watchers and their human spouses it tells a story of the intermarriage of heavenly priests with human women which had catastrophic consequences.⁶⁷ In the context of the 5th century B.C.E., such a story can only be understood as a polemic against priestly exogamy. The Shemihazah myth resembles esp. Ezek 44,22. Given its priestly language and the rhetoric of defilement employed to denounce the fallen heavenly watcher, it is very likely that the Shemihazah myth responds to mixed marriages of Jerusalem priests as e.g. mentioned in Neh 13,28. But that the Shemihazah myth is "a composition supporting Ezra's reform"⁶⁸ seems doubtful as it attacks only priestly exogamy and not all Jewish intermarriages.

⁶⁵ Cf. e.g. Fröhlich, *Mamzēr* 114.

⁶⁶ Codex Panopolitans and the Ethiopic text lack the phrase ἐκ τῶν ἄγιων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ which is attested in Syncellus^{a,b}. The reading of Syncellus is confirmed by Milik's reconstruction of 4QEn^a (4Q201) ar 1 iv 7 (בן קדשני שמויה), Books 157; contra Bharyo, Shemihazah 78, who reads בן קדן in 4QEn^a ar 1 iv 7).

⁶⁷ Cf. the interpretation of the final stage of the BW as polemics against priestly intermarriages by Suter, Angel 122-124; Suter, Revisiting 140; Nickelsburg, Enoch 585; Macaskill, Purity 78-82. Himmelfarb, Levi 12, thinks that the final stage of the BW argues against intermarriages of priests with Jewish women of non-priestly families.

⁶⁸ Rubinkiewicz, Book 154.

3. The Question of Inter-marriage in the Book of Ezra / Nehemiah in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls

The extensive scholarly debate about inter-marriage in Second Temple Judaism is characterized by a neglect of Jewish writings from early Hellenistic times. M. Himmelfarb's recent statement "that in the Second Temple period after the time of Ezra inter-marriage more or less disappeared as a subject of public concern" is characteristic for this attitude.⁶⁹ This situation is unfortunate as several Jewish texts from early Hellenistic times engage with the issue of mixed marriages. I.e. the Qumran library and other ancient Jewish sources preserve Jewish literature which is more or less contemporary with the final stage of the book of Ezra / Nehemiah⁷⁰ and can hence provide a Jewish context for its attitude towards mixed marriages.

Early Hellenistic times are characterized by an ongoing process of Greek acculturation in Coele-Syria in general and the Ptolemaic province of Yehud in particular. Examples are the history of the Tobiad family⁷¹ and the book of Ecclesiastes.⁷² During the late 4th and the 3rd century B.C.E. mixed marriages are often tolerated in Jewish literature. Examples are the book of Esther – in its MT version probably written at the end of the 4th or the beginning of the 3rd century B.C.E.⁷³ – and 1-2 Chronicles.⁷⁴ The book of Esther does not need to justify or defend Esther's marriage with a Persian king but takes it for granted.

1-2 Chronicles deletes the harsh criticism of inter-marriages out of its DtrH base text. Even the many intercultural marriages of Solomon are not touched on, although in the DtrH they serve as an explanation for the divide into a northern and a southern kingdom after Solomon's death. 1-2 Chronicles even accepts inter-marriages in several cases.⁷⁵ 1Chr 2,3 notes that the first wife of Judah, Bath-Shua, was a Canaanite who delivered three sons for him. Furthermore, 1Chr 2,17 notes an inter-marriage between the sister of David and an Ishmaelite. 1Chr 2,34-35 notes that a man called Sheshan marries his daughter with an Egyptian slave. Subsequently the mixed marriages of king David with a

⁶⁹ Himmelfarb, Book 133.

⁷⁰ For the date of the book of Ezra / Nehemiah (see below notes 134-135).

⁷¹ For the Tobiad family and its Hellenizing preferences, see Schäfer, History 18-21.

⁷² For Greek influence on Ecclesiastes, see e.g. Braun, Koheleth.

⁷³ For the date of the book of Esther, cf. e.g. Zenger, Buch 307-308.

⁷⁴ For 1-2 Chronicles und Ezra-Nehemiah as two separate literary works (see below). For a date of 1-2 Chronicles in early Hellenistic times, see e.g. Kaiser, Grundriß 147-148; cf. also Japhet, Chronicles 23-28; Knoppers, Chronicles 101-117.

⁷⁵ For the inter-marriages reported in the genealogies of 1 Chronicles and their implications pertaining the Chronicler's tolerance for inter-marriages, see Knoppers, Inter-marriage.

Calebite and an Aramean from 2Sam 3,3 are reiterated in 1Chr 3,1-2. And 1Chr 4,18 claims that a certain Mered married a daughter of Pharaoh while 1Chr 4,22 mentions that a person called Saraph married into Moab.

But tolerance is not the only Jewish attitude towards intermarriages in early Hellenistic times. The Book of the Words of Noah in 1QapGen ar (1Q20), the Book of Watchers, the Aramaic Levi Document, the Temple Scroll, and the book of Tobit point towards a rejection of intermarriages by the majority of Judean Jewry in this period.

3.1 *The Book of the Words of Noah (BWN)*⁷⁶

The only copy of the BWN is part of a collective manuscript from the Qumran library called 1QGenesis Apocryphon. In this manuscript, the Book of the Words of Noah covers 1QapGen ar V:29-XVIII:?.⁷⁷ The BWN is a re-narration of Gen 6-9, which enlarges the biblical story significantly. Different parts of the Book of the Words of Noah are incorporated into the book of Jubilees (*Jub.* 8-9), the Third Sibylline Oracle (Sib. Or. 3,110-161), and the War Scroll (1QM I-II).⁷⁸ And it is possible that the book of Tobit is influenced by the BWN in its mention of Noah's endogamy (Tob 4,12).⁷⁹ The widespread authority of the BWN already in the middle of the 2nd century B.C.E. and possibly earlier (Tob 4,12) argues for a date no later than the 3rd century B.C.E.

⁷⁶ My ideas on the topic of intermarriage in the BWN are significantly influenced by discussions with my assistant, Mr. Matthias Weigold, whom I owe a special gratitude for this invigorating discourse.

⁷⁷ For 1QapGen ar V:29-XVIII:? as attesting to an independent Book of Noah, see Steiner, *Heading*; cf. also Stone, *Book(s)* 8. The heading *כתב מולי נח* is reminiscent of 1En 14:1 (4QEn^c ar 1 vi 9) where the vision of Enoch is described as *ספר מולי קושטנא* "the book of the words of truth." Similarly, in 4Q543 1 I (par. 4Q545 1 i 1), the Vision of Amram is entitled *כתב מולי חזוה עמרה* "the book of the words of the vision of Amram." This understanding of 1QapGen ar V:29-XVIII:? has been criticized by Dimant, *Noah* 144-146; Dimant, *Fictions* 240-242, and Bernstein, *Noah* 226-231. But both graphical markers and a heading indicate the beginning of a new book. External markers in a manuscript take precedent over textual observations. Furthermore, the discussion whether 1QapGen V:29-XVIII:? preserves an independent literary work should be separated from its identification with the Book of Noah mentioned in later sources as the one does not necessarily need to be connected with the other. For an overview about later mentions of a Book of Noah, see e.g. García Martínez, *Qumran* 24-43, and Stone, *Book(s)* 9-23.

⁷⁸ For the reception of the Book of the Words of Noah in the literature of Second Temple Judaism, see Scott, *Division* 300-303.

⁷⁹ See below, note 128.

The BWN addresses the issues of intermarriage and endogamy repeatedly. Endogamy is first mentioned at a crucial place in the narrative of the BWN. 1QapGen ar VI:6-9 argues that god saved Noah from the deluge because of his righteousness. The text is guided by Gen 6,8-10. But different from Gen 6,8 it gives a reason why Noah was regarded righteous by god.

vacat 6 Then I, Noah, became a man, and I clung to uprightness and strengthened myself in [...] 7 [Ba]raqiel, and I took 'Imzera', his daughter, as my wife; she conceived from me and bore me th[re]e sons [and daughters] 8 [...] Then I took wives for my sons from the daughters of my brothers, and I gave my daughters to the sons of my brothers according to the eternal law 9 [which] the Most High gave to human beings. *vacat* (1QapGen VI:6-9)⁸⁰

Although Noah's endogamy is not mentioned in the preserved text it must have fallen victim to manuscript damage as the texts emphasizes how Noah arranged endogamous marriages for his sons.⁸¹ The endogamy of Noah⁸² and his sons is the only example given by the BWN, how Noah came true to his claim "I clung to uprightness" (1QapGen ar VI:6). Noah's righteousness is thus his practice of endogamy. And it is Noah's righteousness which saved him and his family from the flood. Hence, in the preserved text of the BWN, Noah and his family were saved from the flood because of their endogamous marriages. The crucial importance of endogamy for the BWN is also illustrated by its claim that Noah and his sons practiced endogamy according to the "eternal law" (כרת חוק עלמא 1QapGen ar VI:8). The phrase "eternal law" refers to the heavenly law otherwise mentioned in connection with the heavenly tablets.⁸³ In the BWN intermarriage means a violation not just of the torah but of the heavenly law itself.

The second time the BWN addresses the question of intermarriage is found in 1QapGen ar VI:20. The manuscript 1QapGen ar is rather deteriorated at this place. What is preserved shows that the BWN reiterates the story of the fallen angels and their female spouses of Gen 6,1-4.

⁸⁰ Translation according to Fitzmyer, Genesis 77.

⁸¹ Cf. Bernstein, Noah 208.

⁸² Qimron, Edition 107-108, reads 1QapGen ar VI:6-9 as referring to interfamily marriage. But there is no reason for a distinction between interfamily marriage and marriage inside one's own people in the BWN. With Noah as the forefather of post-diluvian humanity both categories are one and the same.

⁸³ That the phrase כרת חוק עלמא ("according to the eternal law"; 1QapGen ar VI:8) refers to the heavenly tablets becomes apparent when read in light of *Jub* 28,6, where the heavenly tablets are mentioned in connection with marriage (cf. Fitzmyer, Genesis 148).

קדישין די עם בנת אנוש

holy ones who were with the daughters of m[en]⁸⁴

Immediately after the mention of the intermarriage between holy ones and human women, the BWN describes the deluge. Although this sequence is guided by the book of Genesis, it seems likely that for the BWN the angelic exogamy of the fallen holy ones caused the deluge. If intermarriage leads to universal destruction in the BWN the key importance of the intermarriage prohibition cannot be overstated for the BWN.

Whether the BWN's enforcement of endogamy is also reflected in the numbers of sons and daughters born to Shem, Ham, and Japheth in 1QapGen ar XII:10-12⁸⁵ must remain speculation. It is remarkable though that Shem on the one hand has five sons and five daughters (lines 10-11) allowing five endogamous couples. On the other hand, Ham has four sons and seven daughters and Japheth seven sons and four daughters. The offspring of Shem – out of which Judah developed – is thus the only one which provides the perfect match for endogamous couples while the sons and daughters of Ham and Japheth would have needed to look outside their forming ethnic and cultural groups for a partner.

The manuscript deterioration of 1QapGen ar makes conclusions about the socio-cultural context of the BWN's attitude to exogamy impossible. A comparison with the Book of Watchers (BW) would argue for an anti-Hellenistic background, i.e. the preservation of Jewish cultural identity by way of ethnic isolation. Therefore, I will turn now to the question of intermarriage in the BW.

3.2 *The Book of Watchers (BW)*⁸⁶

J.J. Collins has emphasized that in its various literary strata the BW is written so unspecific that the story of the watchers can function as a “paradigmatic model which is not restricted to one historical situation.” Collins dubs this as the “essential polyvalence of apocalyptic symbolism.”⁸⁷ Although it is doubtful whether the original Shemihazah myth was an apocalypse, Collins' observation explains why the BW was repeatedly reread and reapplied to various historical situations in its long redaction history. For reasons of space, I cannot discuss every redaction individually but will restrict myself to the BW's final redaction. It should be noted though that E.J.C. Tigchelaar⁸⁸ understands

⁸⁴ Transcription and translation according to Fitzmyer, Genesis 76-77.

⁸⁵ Thus VanderKam, Granddaughters 460-461.

⁸⁶ For the textual and redaction history of the BW as well as its date.

⁸⁷ Collins, Technique 98.

⁸⁸ Tigchelaar, Prophets 198-203; cf. Tigchelaar, Remarks 143-144.

1En 12-16 as a response to Manasseh's intermarriage with the daughter of the governor of Samaria and the subsequent exodus of Manasseh and some of his priestly followers to Samaria shortly before the conquest of Coele-Syria by Alexander the Great.

In the final stage of the BW, the intermarriage of the fallen heavenly watchers with human women is "one of the basic oppositions of the myth of the fallen angels in 1En 6-11."⁸⁹ In its understanding of intermarriage, the BW draws on Gen 6,1-4. 1En 6-11 reports how the heavenly watchers recognize the beauty of human women, go down to earth, marry them and procreate with them. This union is qualified in 1En 9,9 as defilement.

The watchers' intermarriage has two consequences: 1) the watchers teach their spouses different forms of knowledge and corrupt humanity in this way (1En 7,1; 8,1-3). 1En 9,6 qualifies this knowledge as hidden:⁹⁰

You see what Asael has done, who has taught all iniquity upon the earth, and has revealed the eternal mysteries that are in heaven, which the sons of men were striving to learn. (1En 9,6)⁹¹

2) the Watcher's offspring, the giants, devastate the earth by devouring it (1En 7,3-6). 1En 9,9 summarizes this as follows:

"And now behold, the daughters of men have born sons from them, giants, half-breeds. And the blood of men is shed upon the earth, and the whole earth is filled with iniquity."⁹²

At the end of the myth, 1En 9-11 describes how the angels who remained in heaven petition god to help his creation, how the deluge will come upon the earth as a just punishment and cleansing, how the watchers will be bound for seventy generations, and how after the day of their judgement a time of eternal righteousness will evolve. The remaining chapters of the BW (1En 12-36) describe how Enoch becomes an intermediary between the fallen watchers and god and how Enoch fulfils this function by way of an otherworldly journey.

It has been argued that the terminology of defilement as well as the former priestly status of the fallen watchers in the heavenly sanctuary would show that the BW attacks intermarriages between priests and non-Jewish women or Jewish women of non-priestly background. While this is true for the Shemihazah myth, in the final stage of BW, later redaction(s) combined Jewish myths in a way that they counteract Greek mythology. There is surprising correspondence between various parts of Greek mythology on the one hand and 1En

⁸⁹ Suter, *Angel* 122.

⁹⁰ See Koch, *Adam* 187-194.

⁹¹ Translation according to Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 202.

⁹² Translation according to Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 202.

6-11 as well as later parts of the BW on the other hand – a correspondence which was already recognized by ancient Jewish authors (cf. Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* 1,73).⁹³

The titan Prometheus teaches forbidden knowledge (Platon, Protagoras 320c-322a)	The Watchers teach forbidden knowledge (1En 7-8; 9,8!)
Prometheus was bound by Zeus (Hesiodus, Theogonia 521-523)	The Watchers will be bound (1En 10,4.12)
Pandora's box as humanities' punishment for Prometheus' gift of fire (Hesiodus, Theogonia 570-577)	The Watchers' teaching as a cause of the deluge (1En 9-11)
The titan Kronos devours all of his children (Hesiodus, Theogonia 453)	The giants devour everything on earth (1En 7,3-6)
The titans are banned to Tartaros (Homerus, <i>Ilias</i> 14,279; Hesiodus, Theogonia 697.851; Hymni Homerici, Hymnus ad Apollinem 335; Pausanias, <i>Graeciae Descriptio</i> 8,37,3)	The watchers will be banned to a special place of punishment (1En 18,11-19,2; 21)

Other parallels with the partly angelic parentage of the giants include myths about the partly divine parentage of various Greek heroes and a passage from Hesiod's *Catalogi feminarum sive Eoearum*:

Now all the gods were divided through strife; for at that very time Zeus who thunders on high was meditating marvellous deeds, even to mingle storm and tempest over the boundless earth, and already he was hastening to make an utter end of the race of mortal men, declaring that he would destroy the lives of the demi-gods, that the children of the gods should not mate with wretched mortals, seeing their fate with their own eyes; but that the blessed gods henceforth even as aforesaid should have their living and their habitations apart from men. But on those who were born of immortals and of mankind verily Zeus laid toil and sorrow upon sorrow.⁹⁴

By combining Greek myth with Jewish myth the BW slanders Greek culture as something that was taught already once by the watchers to their exogamous wives. As a consequence the deluge came. The implication for a time of

⁹³ For the influence of Greek myth on the BW, see e.g. Glasson, *Influence*; Nickelsburg, *Apocalyptic* 395-397.399-404; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 191-193; Bartelmus, *Herontium* 160-166; Newson, *Development* 314; VanderKam, *Enoch* 126-128; Reed, *Angels* 39-40. To observe the correspondences between the BW and Greek myth does not deny that earlier stages of the BW are influenced by ancient Near Eastern mythology (see e.g. Hanson, *Rebellion* 202-218; Hanson, *Response*). It demonstrates rather how the final redaction of the BW is able to combine earlier Jewish and ancient Near Eastern mythology into a parody of Greek myth (cf. already Collins, *Issues* 319-320).

⁹⁴ Translation according to Evelyn-White, *Hesiod* 199.201.

increased Greek cultural influence is evident. Greek acculturation is comparable to the teaching of the fallen heavenly watchers. Its consequences will be as bad as the deluge was.

But the BW does not just issue a general warning against Hellenism. It is more specific and attacks the mixed marriages of watchers and human women. As the union between watchers and humans brought forth the giants, mixed marriages between Jews and Greeks will also have terrible consequences and threaten Judaism in its very existence. Greek intermarriage provokes Jewish conversion to Hellenism and thus to idolatry. The consequences for Judaism might be as catastrophic as the deluge was. The BW tells the story of the intermarriages between watchers and humans to encounter and battle Greek influence on Judaism in favour of traditional Jewish culture.

This interpretation is confirmed by Uriel's words about the fallen watchers at their place of punishment in 1En 19,1.

And Uriel said to me, "There stand the angels who mingled with the women. And their spirits – having assumed many forms – bring destruction on men and lead them astray to sacrifice to demons as to gods until the day of the great judgment, in which they will be judged with finality."⁹⁵

In this text, the influence of the fallen watchers leads to sacrificing to false gods and thus to a loss of religious integrity for humankind. Vice versa such a loss of religious integrity happens also to the fallen watchers as a consequence of their intermarriage. 1En 9,8; 12,4; and 15,3 all emphasize that the watchers are defiled due to their sexual union with human women.⁹⁶ As a consequence their religious integrity is lost. This rhetoric of defilement affiliates the BW with the Aramaic Levi Document.

Armin Lange
University of Vienna, Institute for Jewish Studies
Spitalgasse 2, Hof 7.3
1090 Vienna
Austria
E-Mail: armin.lange@univie.ac.at

⁹⁵ Translation according to Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 276.

⁹⁶ Cf. Fröhlich, *Mamzēr* 113-114; Loader, Enoch 13-15.29-30.