



An Unknown Danielic Pseudepigraphon from an Armenian Fragment of Papias*

BASIL LOURIE

St Petersburg, Russia

Abstract

In this article it is demonstrated that one of the Papias' quotes preserved in the Armenian version of the *Commentary on Apocalypse* by Andrew of Caesarea goes back to an otherwise unknown Danielic pseudepigraphon, which is the oldest known witness of a peculiar tradition where the Watchers are good angelic beings responsible for, together with Michael, the revelation of the Law to Moses.

Keywords: Papias, Danielic pseudepigrapha, Watchers, Moses, archangel Michael, Law.

1. Introduction

A fragment of Papias known from the Armenian version of the *Commentary on the Apocalypse* of Andrew of Caesarea was republished by Fölker Siegert in 1981 on the basis of five manuscripts.¹ This fragment

* I would like to express my gratitude to Lorenzo DiTommaso and Loren T. Stuckenbruck for helping me to clarify several points in the argumentation and for improving my English.

1. Siegert 1981: 606-607, 611 n. 10. Siegert used the *editio princeps* of 1855 based on three manuscripts of Jerusalem (the oldest of which is dated to 1306) and

poses several problems, a few of which I have addressed in a previous publication on the topic.²

In my previous study I conclude that:

1. The Armenian fragment that is missing from the extant Greek text of Andrew of Caesarea (and its Slavonic version³) is in fact part of the Armenian version of the authentic Greek text as it was composed by the seventh-century author. It was mutilated, however, by late Byzantine censorship because of some of the archaic features of its exegesis.⁴
2. This Armenian fragment contains the quotation from Papias as retained by Andrew himself. Despite Siegert's view, the end of the quotation occurs at precisely the point where the Armenian editors of the Jerusalem 1855 *editio princeps* inserted a paragraph break.⁵
3. Papias' quotation offers a paraphrase of a pre-Christian Danielic source that is reflected in Dan. 4.14 MT and in some early Christian works.

My task in the present study is to reread the Armenian fragment (i.e. the first paragraph according to Siegert's publication), and to examine

checked additionally two manuscripts from Vienna, the Library of Mechitarists, Nr 351 (thirteenth–fourteenth centuries) and Nr 61 (eighteenth–nineteenth centuries).

2. Lourié 2008 (2002). The fragment in question, although not unnoticed, has not received the attention it deserves. There is a brief mention of Siegert's publication in the entry *CPG* 1047 = Papias Hierapolitanus, *Explanatio sermonum Domini* (fragmenta et testimonia) (Geerard 1983: 20–21). Cf. Lourié 2008 (2002): 512–13, for a discussion of the criticism of Siegert by Körtner (1983: 35–36), and recently a detailed study of the fragment by Enrico Norelli (2005: 394–411). Körtner's criticism aims mostly at the genuineness of the fragment within the text of Andrew of Caesarea, and does not affect directly the authenticity of Papias' citation.

3. Unfortunately, a very important Georgian version of Andrew's *Commentary* remains unpublished and even unchecked.

4. Norelli (2005: 398–406) does not believe that the text proper to the Armenian version belongs to the genuine text of Andrew's *Commentary*. This part of Norelli's argumentation is, however, very scanty and, unlike my 2002 paper, does not take into account the relevant details of the history of the Byzantine exegesis and the circumstances of appearance of the Armenian version of Andrew's text.

5. Norelli (2005: 398–406), without knowing my work, also concludes that only the first paragraph according to the Jerusalem edition could contain genuine Papias' material. As to the attribution to Papias of the first paragraph, Norelli concludes that this 'non è impossibile', but could not be demonstrated 'con sufficiente probabilità' (pp. 406–407).

the exegetical traditions which might have informed Papias' words. My goal is to shed some light on the contents and *Sitz im Leben* of Papias' Pseudo-Danielic source.

2. Papias' Armenian Version and Its Greek Original

Andrew of Caesarea quotes Papias' commentary on Rev. 12.9, the fall of the Dragon on the earth. One phrase of our Armenian fragment is preserved in the extant Greek text of Andrew of Caesarea, and, because of this, Siegert recognized it as belonging to Papias (Siegert 1981: 611 n. 14).

The relevant passage is quoted in English translation below. The parentheses indicate the place where there is a slight difference between the Armenian version and the extant Greek text. I have retranslated some key words into Greek; these are placed in brackets together with the corresponding parts of the Armenian original⁶:

And Papias in his sermon [said] as following: 'The heaven did not bear his [Dragon's] earthly thoughts (խորհրդոց = φρονημάτων), because it is impossible to the *light* to have *communion with darkness* [cf. 2 Cor 6.14].⁷ He [Dragon] was cast out into the earth [Rev. 12.9] to live here, and, when mankind came where he was, he did not allow [them] to behave [վարիլ = ἄγειν] according to the natural needs [ես նմա բնական կրիքն = κατὰ τὰς φυσικὰς χρείας], but led them astray into many evils. But Michael and his warriors who are the Watchers [վերակառուք = ἐγρήγοροι] of the universe did help to mankind, as and Daniel taught, by giving the La⁸ and by making the prophets wise.'

Previous translators (including myself, in my translation into Russian) have understood the Armenian կիրք as a rendering of the Greek πάθη ('passions', plural; the Armenian word, too, is in plural form) or πάθος ('passion', singular; this Armenian word can be used in plural

6. The Armenian fragment republished by F. Siegert was translated into German by him, into Russian by me, and into Italian by Valentina Calzolari, with republication of Siegert's Armenian text (Norelli 2005: 394-99). It was also translated into English by J. Alexanian in Lightfoot, Harmer and Holmes (2007: 763) (first published in 1992).

7. The extant Greek text in the critical edition reads: οὐ γὰρ ὁ οὐρανὸς ἔφερε γήινον φρόνημα, ὅτι τῷ φωτὶ τὸ σκότος ἀκοινωνήτων (Schmid 1955: 130.8-9).

8. Here Armenian has plural զօրէս translated as it is by Siegert, Alexanian, and Calzolari ('laws' etc.). However, Armenian plural օրէք (աւրէք) has the meaning of singular as well and, thus, is normally applied to the Law of Moses in, for example, the Armenian Zohrab Bible.

in the sense of Greek singular, including an abstract sense such as ‘passibility’).⁹ In this case, it is difficult to understand what Papias means when he uses the phrase ‘natural passions/passibility’ in a positive sense, especially in the sense of direct opposition to the sinful behaviour. Even my previous understanding of Էիրք as ‘passibility’ would fit better with the wording of later patristic authors than with that of Papias.¹⁰

However, we have neglected another sense of the Armenian word—‘use, usage’ or ‘need’, which is a rendering of Greek χρεία.¹¹ In fact, the phrase κατὰ τὰς φυσικὰς χρείας perfectly fits both the context of Papias and the common philosophical language of his epoch.

3. Papias and Stoic Naturalism

About one century after Papias (*fl. c.* 100 CE),¹² Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* II, 20, 119), quoting or paraphrasing some Stoic philosopher(s), makes use of the expression φυσικὰι χρεῖαι as ‘hunger, thirst, cold, marriage’.¹³ Such was the common understanding of the human ‘natural needs’ (φυσικὰι χρεῖαι) in the natural sciences in antiquity.¹⁴

9. Siegert: ‘Leidenschaften’; Alexanian: ‘passions’; Lourié: ‘страдательность’ (τὸ παθητόν = ‘passibility’).

10. Cf. the discussion in Lourié 2008 (2002): 513–14. No discussion in Siegert or Alexanian. Norelli (2005: 404–405) uncritically accepts Calzolari’s translation. He rejects a parallel with Rom. 1.24, 26–27 (proposed by Siegert and Kürzinger) on the ground that the real sense of these verses is different from the (alleged) sense of Papias’ phrase and proposes instead his own understanding. However, Norelli’s parallels (from Ireneus and Theophilus of Antioch) do not include the peculiar expression ‘natural passions’ (as resulting from the sin).

11. Cf. especially Awetik’eian, Siwrmēlean and Awgerean (1836–37: I, 1099), *s.v.* Էիրք. Available online: Weitenberg *et al.*, 2003.

12. See Körtner 1983: 89–94, 167–72, 225–26, with the review of previous discussions.

13. Published as number 405 among the *fragmenta moralia* of Chrysippus (280–206 BCE) by H. von Arnim (1903: 98.21). According to von Arnim, the whole fragment covers about one line from the previous section of *Stromata* (II.20.118). In fact, there is no firm ground to attribute the quotation to Chrysippus himself, even if it is indeed a piece of Stoic philosophy. See, for the criticism that von Arnim’s criteria in his search of Chrysippus’ fragments are too loose, Gould 1970: 1–3. Our fragment is known from only one source, and without explicit attribution. It is worth noting that in dealing with our text of Clement, P. Karavites holds up as a parallel from the side of the Stoics the fragment 405 (von Arnim) of Chrysippus, without realizing that this

We have no precise date for the ultimate source of Clement,¹⁵ but it has a good chance to be as early as Papias or perhaps even earlier. In any case, it represents an established tradition of referring to the necessities related to maintaining life: ‘physical (natural) needs’. Clement’s description of these needs is a formulation of one of the main principles of the Stoic philosophy called ‘naturalism’ by modern scholars.

Stoic naturalism can be summarized as ‘happiness and virtue consisting in living in accord with nature’. Appropriately, any disaccord with nature produces an evil, especially an unreasonable passion of soul (Irwin 2007: 345). Hence Clement writes: ‘The passion of lust is absolutely not necessary, but it is an effect of some natural needs: hunger, thirst, cold, marriage’.¹⁶

As we see from our passage, Papias adds that the cause of such an undesirable effect, when the man is going astray in pursuing of his natural needs, is the ‘Dragon’ (Rev. 12.9), that is, Satan. Of course, this is somewhat beyond the tenets of Stoicism.

At about the same time as Papias, an anonymous Christian apologist of the late second century expressed Stoic ‘naturalistic’ views in an almost undigested manner: ‘It is usual to those who are obliged by the natural deficiency or need (διὰ φυσικὴν ἔνδειαν ἢ χρείαν) to steal and to rob such things as gold or silver or animal or something else required to food or shelter or usage’. This state of affairs is considered to be natural and, as such, opposed to another state of resurrection where nobody needs to steal or rob because there

fragment is nothing but a quotation from Clement himself. Cf. Karavites 1999: 40 n. 75.

14. Examples: Agatharchides (second century BCE), *Fragmenta* (Jacoby; TLG 0067.004) F 2a,86,F fragment 19.125; Diodorus Siculus (first century BCE), *Bibliotheca historica* (TLG 0060.001) I,35,7.8 (in both cases, human needs in broad sense are meant), Claudius Ptolemaeus (second century CE), *Apotelesmatica* (TLG 0363.007) IV,5,17.5, and Hephaestion Thebanus (fourth century CE), *Apotelesmatica* (TLG 2043.001), 176.4 (Pingree) (almost the same text in both, where especially the ‘natural need’ of ἀφροδίσια [sexuality] is meant).

15. The *terminus ante quem* is the date of the composition of *Stromata*, which was written by Clement in his later years, somewhere in the early third century (he died between 211 and 216). Obviously, his source must be older than this, and thus closer to Papias or Chrysippus.

16. Καθόλου γὰρ οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον τὸ τῆς ἡδονῆς πάθος, ἐπακολούθημα δὲ χρεῖαις τισὶ φυσικαῖς, πείνη, δίψη, ρίγη, γάμος.

is neither deficiency nor need at all.¹⁷ Such an attitude of the apologist is not the same as that of Papias, who expressly states that ‘many evils’ result from a manipulation by the human ‘natural needs’ from outside, by the force of a foreign will. The apologist, a genuine follower of the Stoics, highlights the role of the human will itself in its leading astray. Papias, on the contrary, stresses how the demonic will can mislead the will of a human being.

In later Eastern Christian tradition, Papias’ approach becomes normative, but the technical language of ‘natural needs’ fades. There is one important exception, however: the late fourth-century *Corpus Macarianum* (composed in Greek, but mostly in Syria by a Syrian). One of its homilies is dedicated to the demonic manipulations of the human will using human ‘fulfilment’ (ἐκπλήρωσις) of the ‘natural needs’ (αἱ φυσικαὶ χρεῖαι) as a ‘pretext’ (πρόφασις) (Collection I, homily 25). According to the homilist, this order of demonic activity was first established in the transgression of Adam,¹⁸ that is, exactly at the place indicated by Papias.

4. Papias on the Watchers

Papias’ authority for the story of Michael and his ‘Watchers’ is ‘Daniel’, but his precise source is unclear. Despite Siegert’s note ‘Sic!—Vgl. Dan. 12, 1 ff.’ (Siegert 1981: 611, note 16), the verses Dan. 12.1 and following have nothing to do with the Law, prophets and Watchers, even if Dan. 12.1 does mention Michael.¹⁹ So, unless he was mistaken in his reference, Papias refers to a Daniel tradition other than what we know from the canonical book of Daniel, even if we take into account all its known versions and recensions.²⁰ A reference

17. Anonymous author of the treatise *De resurrectione*, 23,5, attributed, until recently, to Athenagoras of Athens. See Marcovich 2000: 48, and on the authorship and date, see pp. 1-3.

18. Macarius the Great/Symeon of Mesopotamia, Homily I.25, esp. §13, cf. §§2, 6 and 15-16 (Berthold 1973) (*TLG* 2109.001).

19. Rejecting Siegert’s parallel Dan. 12.1, Norelli (2005: 406) proposes instead the slightly closer parallels Dan. 10.13, 21 (Michael as a protector of Israel). However, these verses say nothing about the Watchers.

20. See, on the various texts of the canonical book of Daniel, Collins 1993; Di Lella 1977; Moore 1977; Koch 1987; Lust 1993. Critical editions and studies of some Oriental Christian versions: Cowe 1992; Taylor 1994. Cf. also Löfgren 1936.

to a Pseudo-Danielic source, elsewhere unknown,²¹ is therefore the first interesting point in our ‘story of Michael’.

The second and the third points concern the roles of Michael and the Watchers. Although the intercession of the angels in the revelation of the Law to Moses at Sinai is a well-known early Christian tradition that goes back to a pre-Christian Jewish milieu, any specific role of Michael in this process is almost unknown.²² As to the Watchers, their intercession at Sinai is not only at odds with mainstream Jewish and Christian traditions; it also goes against the well-established and prevailing tradition in both Jewish and Christian worlds that associates them with the Giants. This tradition commences with *1 Enoch* (‘Book of Giants’, third century BCE),²³ and progresses through the Qumranic texts,²⁴ ending in the Middle Age Byzantine historiographers,²⁵ and thus becoming a part of the trivial mediaeval knowledge. In my opinion, this is the reason why our fragment was excised from the Greek text of St Andrew’s *Commentary*.

Not all early Jewish traditions about the Watchers/Giants are negative. For instance, in *Jub.* 4.15 the Watchers were sent to earth to teach humanity ‘to make justice’, in contrast to *1 Enoch* where they taught only bad things. Nevertheless, *Jub.* 7.21 contains the standard story of their fall, which occurred before the Flood, that is, long before Moses.

In our Papias fragment, however, the Watchers’ image not only is a positive one, with no connection to Giants, but is crucial for the Jewish Scriptures—because the Watchers, together with Michael,

21. Cf. DiTommaso 2005.

22. Norelli (2005: 405-406) underlines this fact, providing no specific reference to Michael as the intermediary in the revelation of Moses’ Law.

23. Norelli (2005: 408-409) does not discern between the Enochic tradition on the Watchers and the tradition represented in our fragment.

24. See the references in Lourié 2008 (2002); they include, beside the patristics, texts such as Gal. 3.19; Acts 7.38; Heb. 2.2 and a reference to Deut. 32.2 LXX. As to the Qumranic connections and other pseudepigraphic literature, cf. the review article by F. García Martínez 1992: 91-115 and also Stuckenbruck 1997. For the intertestamental literature, including the targumim, see Díez Merino 1984. Cf. also Mach 1992. Especially for the *Hekhaloth* literature, see Schäfer 1988: 250-76 and Halperin 1988. For Manichaic connections of the related traditions, cf. Reeves 1992.

25. Especially in John Malalas (seventh century) and George Syncellus (early ninth century) (Adler 1989).

become the intercessors in the revelation of the Law to Moses. This is an independent tradition that we must trace.

5. Other *testimonia* of the Same Tradition

There are two early Christian texts, both in Greek, that preserve the same tradition. In addition, there is a third Greek Christian text, from the fifth century, which has to be read in the light of two previous sources and which could shed some light on them both. There also is one Qumranic text in which one can find some connection to our tradition.

The first *testimonium* belongs to Origen, in fragment 109 of his *Commentary on Lamentations* preserved in the catenae. The author discusses the only place in the Christian Greek Bible (that is, not in Aquila or Symmachus) where the term ἐγρήγοροι occurs, Lam. 4.14 LXX: 'Her watchers (ἐγρήγοροι) were shaken in the exits, they were defiled with blood. Since they could not help it, they touch their garments.'²⁶ The relevant part of the commentary runs as follow: ἐγρηγόρους ἡ γραφή τοὺς ἀγγέλους καλεῖ, ὥς παρὰ τῷ Δανιήλ, οὗτοι δὲ ἦσαν, δι' ὧν ἴσως καὶ ὁ διὰ Μωσέως νόμος ἐδόθη κατὰ τὸ «εἰ γὰρ ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς νόμος» [*'Watchers the Scripture calls angels, as (it is) in Daniel. And they were those by whom probably the Law that (is) through Moses has been given, according to for if the Law spoken by angels... (Heb. 2.2)'*].²⁷ Origen mentions the watchers in the situation of the reception of the Law by Moses and refers to Daniel.

Our second source is the Greek title of a pseudepigraphic work called *Apocalypse of Moses* or *Life of Adam and Eve*. This title, which is lacking from all its Oriental and Latin versions, bears no internal relation to the text and is considered a later addition peculiar to the

26. Translation by Peter J. Gentry in Pietersma and Wright 2007: 941.

27. Origenes, *Fragmenta in Lamentationes (in catenis)*, fr. 109.3-5, in (Klostermann 1901: 235-78, quoted according to TLG 2042.011). In all the mss of Heb. 2.2 there is 'word', λόγος) here instead of 'law' (νόμος); this variant reading which is not very strange in the early patristic context, where among the titles of the Lord was νόμος καὶ λόγος. Cf. *Kerygma Petri*, fr. 1 (= quoted in Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* I,29,182 and II,15,68), and the discussion of these and other sources in Daniélou 1964: 164.

Greek recension.²⁸ However, for us it is an independent source representing some ancient tradition, regardless of its date. The title in question is: Διήγησις καὶ πολιτεία Ἀδὰμ καὶ Εὕας τῶν πρωτοπλάστων, ἀποκαλυφθεῖσα παρὰ θεοῦ Μωϋσῇ τῷ θεράποντι αὐτοῦ, ὅτε τὰς πλάκας τοῦ νόμου τῆς διαθήκης ἐκ χειρὸς κυρίου ἐδέξατο, διδαχθεὶς ὑπὸ ἀρχαγγέλου Μιχαήλ ('The Story and Life of Adam and Eve the first-created, revealed by God to Moses his servant, when he received from the hand of the Lord the tablets of the Law of the Covenant',²⁹ being taught by archangel Michael').

There is no mention of the Watchers, or of Daniel. But, in this case, Michael is mentioned as an intercessor between Moses and God on Sinai.

Third, in the commentary of Theodoret of Cyrus on Gal. 3.19, where the Law is said to be 'ordained by angels', Michael, Daniel, the angels, and the citation of Heb. 2.2 are gathered together around the figure of Moses on Sinai. This text is especially informative if checked against its more archaic background, which I argue is the same as that quoted above in the commentary by Origen. We will see here how the same exegetical tradition that we have already seen in Origen loses any mention of watchers.

Having quoted Heb. 2.2, Theodoret continues: Καὶ γὰρ τὸν Μιχαὴλ αὐτοῖς ἐπέστησεν ὁ τῶν ὅλων θεὸς, καὶ τοῦτο ἡμᾶς ὁ μακάριος ἐδίδαξε Δανιήλ. Καὶ τῷ μεγάλῳ δὲ Μωσῇ ὑπέσχετο συμπέμψειν τὸν ἄγγελον τῷ λαῷ³⁰ ('Because God of all established them Michael,

28. I am grateful to Dr Alexey G. Dunaev for calling my attention to this source. Its critical edition (Bertrand 1987) is grounded on Nagel 1972. The work is certainly pre-Christian Jewish, even if the attempts at precise localization within its Jewish context failed (Levison 1988: 163-90). For the larger context, cf. Stone 1996.

29. On the very peculiar phrase 'the Law of the Covenant' known so far only from the Latin and Georgian versions of the *Epistles* attributed to Anthony the Great (CPG 2330), and also recovered with a great certitude in one place of the Tura papyrus of Didymus the Blind, *Commentarii in Zacchariam* 3, 171.4 (TLG 2102.10), see Lourié 2008 (2002): 521 and Couilleau 1977: 173-83. The Tura papyrus is the only case, besides the title of the Greek recension of *Life of Adam and Eve*, where the term 'the Law of the Covenant' is available directly in its Greek original (I owe this reference to Alexey G. Dunaev); before this, it was known only in the Latin and Georgian versions of the *Epistles* attributed to Anthony the Great.

30. Theodoret of Cyrus, *In Gal.* 3.19; PG 82, col. 481. Again, I owe this reference to Alexey G. Dunaev. See also his valuable large note in Lourié (2008 [2002]: 517-18), reviewing patristic testimonies on the intermediary of angels in revelation of the Law.

and this is what blessed Daniel taught us. And to great Moses He [*scil.*, God] promised to send together [with him] to the people an angel [Exod. 32.34]’).

Let us compare this quotation with our first *testimonium* from Origen. An angelic intercession on Sinai is explained with the same double reference to Heb. 2.2 (quoted explicitly in both cases) and to a ‘Daniel’ (not quoted *verbatim*, in both cases as well). This is a distinctive mark of a common exegetical tradition. So, if we are still in the same exegetical vein, we have to identify ‘Michael’ and the ‘angel’ of Theodoret with the ‘Watchers’ of Origen—taking into account that, according to our Papias, these ‘Watchers’ are the guard of the same Michael! In other words, ‘Watcher’ is replaced by ‘angel’. Such a replacement is an example of the so-called concealment (of one notion by another), a phenomenon which affected very much the whole tradition under discussion (see below, section 7).

If this is the case, then perhaps Theodoret is the last of the Fathers (Andrew of Caesarea taken aside) to refer to an obscure Danielic source attributing to Michael and his angels-watchers an intercessory role in the revelation of the Law on Sinai.

It is also true that Michael himself could appear as a divine or, at least, a quasi-divine figure,³¹ and so, he is a proper intermediary, if not (for some traditions) the ultimate source of the revelation on Sinai.

An echo of our tradition might be perceived as well in a messianic document from Qumran, 4QMes Ar ii, 16 (*alias* 4QNoah ar = 4Q534): ‘His [messianic figure’s of the “Elect of God”] deed will be like that of the Watchers (עִירִי).’³² I would avoid here any discussion of the role of the Watchers in this document, but this line alone suggests that they are considered as some mediators of the revelation, comparable to the Messiah, and certainly not as fallen beings.

Now we can reconstruct the skeleton of our source:

1. It claims the authority of Daniel, and
2. describes the revelation of the Law to Moses on Sinai, when

31. See, for instance, Barbel 1964 (1941): 34-45. Cp. Stuckenbruck 1995. The basic collection of the early Christian and Jewish traditions related to Michael has been published by Leuken (1898). Cf., additionally, the important evidence of the *liturgical* invocation of Michael as Christ (Donadoni 1975).

32. See García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1998: 1072 and 1073, text and translation. On this text, see also García Martínez 1992: 1-44 and Fitzmyer 1971: 127-60.

3. Michael and
4. his angelic warriors—Watchers—
5. are the intercessors, and where
6. the Watchers are the helpers of the men,
7. with no connection to the fallen angels.

6. Biblical Connections

Despite the fact that our Danielic source cannot be identified with any part of any known recension of the canonical Daniel, it has some connection with the book, and especially Dan. 4.14 MT, the relevant part of which is lacking from the LXX (cf. its corresponding verse, Dan. 4.17 LXX), although it is translated into Greek by Aquila and Symmachus, as well as by Pseudo-Theodotion.³³

The Aramaic of Dan. 4.14 MT runs as follows: ‘The sentence is rendered by decree of the watchers, the decision is given by order of the holy ones, in order that all who live may know that the Most High is sovereign over the kingdom of mortals; he gives it to whom he will and sets over it the lowliest of human beings’ (NRSV). The Aramaic for ‘by decree of the watchers, the decision is given by order of the holy ones’ is *בגורת עיריין פתגמא ומאמר קד ישיין*. Aramaic *עיריין*, ‘watchers’, is rendered as *ἐγρήγορος* by Aquila and Symmachus, transliterated as *ip* by Pseudo-Theodotion and reinterpreted as *ἄγγελος* in the LXX in two neighbouring verses, Dan. 4.13, 23 LXX (= 4.10, 20 MT).

Although Dan. 4.14 does not mention Moses or the Law revelation on Sinai, its topic is very similar: the word *פִּתְגָּם* (Old Persian loan-word in both Aramaic and Hebrew) has a rather vague meaning including that of ‘commandment’ (BDB: 1109, cf. 834).

Therefore, one can cautiously conclude that our Danielic source could be either a Persian Jewish tradition without any connection to the canonical book of Daniel or a tradition which was included into a lost recension of the latter.

7. How ‘Good Watchers’ Became Angels

It is possible that this Danielic source depended on a tradition that was in conflict with most of the biblical and para-biblical literature.

33. On this translation, see esp. Schmitt 1992.

We have already noticed that in our source the Watchers are good angelic beings, in contrast to the mainstream tradition where they are rather seducers of humankind.

In the *testimonia* from Theodoret and Origen we have seen the term ‘watcher’ replaced by the neutral term ‘angel’. We have seen as well the same in the LXX translation of Daniel 4. But the earliest roots of this tradition are most probably within the Hebrew Bible itself, as Robert Murray suggests (Murray 1984).

Murray’s article is instructive. He is working in a well-known field, although with new tools. It is well known that references to (quasi-) divine beings were often excluded, by one means or another, from the Hebrew Bible (e.g. Deut 32.43, where the ‘sons of God’—preserved in the LXX and confirmed by Qumran—are deleted from the MT). Sometimes, such names are not deleted, but rather distorted to obtain another meaning with a minimal alteration of the pronunciation. It is possible that the phenomenon of Aramaic–Hebrew bilingualism interfered in our case. Processes like these, then, might have influenced the history of the Aramaic term for ‘watcher’.

According to Murray, there was an ancient Hebrew word **ʿyr* (pronounced as *ʿār* / *ʿēr* [pl. *ʿārîm* / *ʿērîm*]), which had the etymological meaning ‘protect’ and designated protecting deities. By extension, *ʿār* / *ʿēr* could denote benevolent beings, and so be applied to good angels, obedient to God’ (p. 315), although not to the fallen Giants, let us note. Then, ‘like *malʾāk*, *ʿār* / *ʿēr* was adopted in Aramaic, where we find it vocalized *ʿîr* and soon understood as “one who keeps awake” [that is, etymologized as a genuine Aramaic word]’ (p. 315).

During the process of suppression of the names of the pagan deities, this word became subject to various changes. Sometimes it was replaced by its (consonantal) homograph ‘town’ (e.g. Mic. 5.13), while at other times it was replaced by somewhat similar words with similar meaning relating to angelic/divine beings, such as, *šîr* (‘messenger’ or maybe ‘intercessor’—as in Isa. 63.9, where it is rendered by LXX as πρέσβυς in a verse very important for us: ‘It was no ambassador or angel but the Lord himself that saved them’³⁴).

Finally, and this is the most original part of Murray’s argument, sometimes the concealment was controlled by the purposes of the satire—‘to help laugh them [polytheistic deities] out of people’s

34. Translation by Moisés Silva in Pietersma and Wright 2007: 872.

hearts'. So, a 'mocking substitute' of *ʿārîm* / *ʿērîm* appears: it is *ʿiwrîm*, 'blind ones': 'This would be the origin of the satirical sequence "they have eyes and see not", etc. (Pss. 115.5-7; 135.16-18). Perhaps it was "Second Isaiah" who began the game' (cf. Isa. 42.7, 16-19; 43.8 and cf. 44.18—pp. 312-13). The case of *ʿiwrîm* turned out to be analogous to that of another protecting divinities, *psh* (another root with the meaning 'protect'), as is especially evident in 2 Sam 5.6: '...the *ʿiwrîm* and *pishîm* which the Jebusites said would defend them... both refer to protecting deities' (p. 312).

Yet the textbook case is Lam. 4.14, on which, as we have seen, Origen comments: 'They have wandered *as blind men* in the streets' (NRSV), where the MT is 'rendered' here as 'Her watchers were shaken in the exits' by LXX (pp. 312-13). The only explanation of this fact is that the Hebrew original of LXX has had 'watchers' instead of 'blind ones'.

Two important points emerge from this review of Murray's study. First, our term *ʿîr* turns out to be somewhat akin to the term *ṣîr*: sometimes they are even used as synonyms, as in Isa. 63.9. This corresponds to the intercessory role of the Watchers in our Danielic source. Even if suppressed and 'concealed', this role is familiar to the biblical literature.

Second, in some contexts blindness could be an appropriately descriptive designation for the Watchers who are, by definition, never sleeping and must be always clairvoyant.

The idea that some deities must be punished by blindness is certainly older than its 'satirical' applications. What is especially significant to us is that it is already connected to the name of Daniel in Ugarit. Thus, in a prayer of Daniel (Dan^{el}) against ʿAnatu (1 Aqht 167-68), we find *ʿwr. yštk. bʿl. lht. wʿlmh*: 'let Baʿal make thee blind from now and forever'.³⁵

35. Cuneiform text (Virolleaud 1936: Pl. IV), and p. 170 for transliteration and an incomplete French translation. An English translation, by C.H. Gordon (1966: 137), reads: 'May Baal make thee one-eyed / From now and unto eternity...' For the need to reconstruct the original text in some minor points, as well as for a Russian translation and for a brief discussion on blindness as a punishment throughout the ancient Near East, cf. Shifman 1993.

8. Conclusion

The reconstruction of the contents of the Danielic pseudepigraphon that is preserved in Papias suggests that it would have fit the main Danielic tradition where the angels are intermediaries in the revelation of the Law on Sinai to Moses. Unlike Daniel, Moses is not mentioned explicitly in Papias' fragment, but other very close witnesses of the same tradition suggest that it is Moses who is actually meant as the recipient of the revelation of Law.

Beside the explicit reference to Daniel and the implicit presence of Moses, our fragment stresses the revelatory work of the 'Watchers' who, by contrast, are considered fallen or rebellious in the influential tradition of the Enochic *Book of Watchers*.

Our source does not yet substitute the term 'Watchers' with the neutral term 'angels'. This is possibly an argument for its relatively early date.

Bibliography

- Adler, W.
1989 *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 26; Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Publishing Service).
- Awetik'ean, G., X. Siwrnēlean, M. Awgorean
1836–37 Նոր Բառգիրք Հայկազնիս լեզուի [New Lexicon of Armenian Language] (2 vols.; Venice: Society of Mechitarists).
- Barbel, J.
1964 (1941) *Christos Angelos: die Anschauung von Christus als Bote und Engel in der gelehrten und volkstümlichen Literatur des christlichen Altertums* (Bonn: Peter Hannstein).
- Berthold, H.
1973 *Makarios/Symeon, Reden und Briefe. Die Sammlung I des Vaticanus graecus 694 (B). I. Teil* (GCS; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag).
- Bertrand, D.A.
1987 *La Vie grecque d'Adam et Ève. Introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire* (Recherches intertestamentaires, 1 ; Paris: Mame).
- Collins, J.J.
1993 *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press).
- Couilleau, G.
1977 'L' « alliance » aux origines du monachisme égyptien,' *Collectanea Cisterciensia* 39: 170–93.
- Cowe, S.P.
1992 *The Armenian Version of Daniel* (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies, 9; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press).

- Daniélou, J.
1964 *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (trans. J.A. Baker; London: Darton, Longman, & Todd).
- Di Lella, A. A.
1977 *The Book of Daniel* (AB, 23; Garden City, NY: Doubleday).
- Díez Merino, L.
1984 'Los « vigilantes » en la literatura intertestamentaria,' in N. Fernandes Marcos, J. Treballe Barrera, J. Fernandez Vallina (eds.), *Simposio biblico español (Salamanca, 1982)* (Madrid: Universidad Complutense): 575-609.
- DiTommaso, L.
2005 *The Book of Daniel and the Apocryphal Daniel Literature* (SVTP, 20; Leiden: Brill).
- Donadoni, S.
1975 'Les graffiti de l'église de Sonqi Tino,' in K. Michałowski (ed.), *Nubia. Récentes recherches. Actes du colloque nubien international au Musée National de Varsovie. 19-22 juin 1972* (Warsaw: Musée National, Varsovie): 31-39.
- Fitzmyer, J.A.
1971 *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: Chapman).
- García Martínez, F.
1992 *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ, 9; Leiden: Brill).
- García Martínez, F., and E.J.C. Tigchelaar
1998 *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition. II. (4Q274-11Q31)* (Leiden: Brill).
- Geerard, M.
1983 *Clavis patrum graecorum. I. Patres antenicaeni* (Corpus Christianorum; Turnhout: Brepols).
- Gordon C.H.
1966 *Ugarit and Minoan Crete: The Bearing of Their Texts on the Origins of Western Culture* (New York: Norton & Company).
- Gould, J.B.
1970 *The Philosophy of Chrysippus* (Albany: SUNY Press).
- Halperin, D.J.
1988 *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (TSAJ, 16; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
- Irwin, T.H.
2007 'Stoic Naturalism and Its Critics,' in B. Inwood (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 345-64.
- Karavites, P. (Panayotis)
1999 *Evil, Freedom, and the Road to Perfection in Clement of Alexandria* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, 43; Leiden: Brill).
- Klostermann, E.
1901 *Origenes Werke. Bd. 3. Klageliederhomilien, Klageliederkommentar, Erklärung der Samuel- und Königsbücher* (GCS, 6; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs).
- Koch, K.
1987 *Deuterokanonische Zusätze zum Danielbuch. Entstehung und Textgeschichte* (2 vols.; AOAT, 38; Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).

Körtner, U.H.J.

- 1983 *Papias von Hierapolis: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des frühen Christentum* (FRLANT, 133; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Leuken, W.

- 1898 *Michael. Eine Darstellung und Vergleichung der jüdischen und der morgenländisch-christlichen Tradition vom Erzengel Michael* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Levison, J.R.

- 1988 *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (JSPSup, 1; Sheffield: JSOT Press).

Lightfoot, J.B., J.R. Harmer and M.W. Holmes (eds.)

- 2007 *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations of Their Writings* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 3rd edn).

Löfgren, O.

- 1936 *Studien zu den arabischen Danielübersetzungen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der christlichen Texte. Kritik des Peschittatextes* (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1936, 4; Uppsala: Uppsala universitet).

Lourié, B.

- 2008 (2002) 'Цитата из Папия в составе армянской версии Толкования на Апокалипсис св. Андрея Кесарийского: перевод и историко-эзегетическое исследование' ('A Quotation from Papias within the Armenian Version of the *Commentary on Apocalypse* of St Andrew of Caesarea: Translation and Study in the History of the Exegesis'), in A. Г. Дунаев (ed.), *Писания Мужей Апостольских* (A. G. Dunaev [ed.], *Writings of the Apostolic Fathers*) (Moscow: Izdatel'skij Sovet Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi): 511-32.

Lust, J.

- 1993 'The Septuagint Version of Daniel 4-5', in A.S. van der Woude (ed.), *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (BETL, 106; Leuven: Peeters Press): 39-53.

Mach, M.

- 1992 *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabinischer Zeit* (TSAJ, 34; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Marcovich, M.

- 2000 *Athenagorae qui fertur De resurrectione mortuorum* (Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae*, 53; Leiden: Brill).

Moore, C.A.

- 1977 *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions* (AB, 44; Garden City, NY: Doubleday).

Murray, R.

- 1984 'The Origin of Aramaic 'ir, Angel', *Orientalia* 53: 303-17.

Nagel, M.

- 1972 'La Vie grecque d'Adam et Ève. Apocalypse de Moïse' (unpublished dissertation, l'Université de Strasbourg).

Norelli, E.

- 2005 *Papia di Hierapolis. Esposizione degli oracoli del Signore, i frammenti* (Milan: Paoline).

- Pietersma, A., and B.G. Wright (eds.)
 2007 *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under That Title* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Reeves, J.C.
 1992 *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press).
- Schäfer, P.
 1988 *Hekhalot-Studien* (TSAJ, 19; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
- Schmid, J.
 1955 *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes. I. Der Apokalypse-Kommentar des Andreas von Kaisareia. I. Text* (Münchener theologische Studien, 1, Historische Abteilung Ergänzungsband, 1; Munich: Eos Klosterverlag St. Ottilien).
- Schmitt, A.
 1992 'Die griechischen Danieltexte (θ' und ο') und das Theodotionproblem', *BZ* 36: 1-29.
- Shifman, I.S.
 1993 *Угаритский эпос [Ugaritic Epos]* (Памятники письменности Востока, CV, 1; Moscow: Nauka).
- Siebert, F.
 1981 'Unbeachtete Papiasitate bei Armenischen Schriftstellern', *NTS* 27: 605-14.
- Stone, M.E.
 1996 *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve: Edited with Introductions, Translations and Commentary* (SVTP, 14; Leiden: Brill).
- Stuckenbruck, L.T.
 1995 *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and the Christology of the Apocalypse of John* (WUNT, II/70; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
 1997 *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (TSAJ, 63; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
- Taylor, R.A.
 1994 *The Peshittā of Daniel* (Monographs of the Peshittā Institute, Leiden, 7; Leiden: Brill).
- Virolleaud, Ch.
 1936 *La légende phénicienne de Daniel. Texte cunéiforme alphabétique avec transcription et commentaire, précédé d'une introduction de la civilisation d'Ugarit* (Mission de Ras-Shamra, 1; Bibl. archéologique et historique, 21; Paris: P. Geuthner).
- Von Arnim, H.
 1903 *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta. III. Chrysippi fragmenta moralia. Fragmenta successorum Chrysippi* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Weitenberg, J.J.S. et al.
 2003 *LALT: Leiden Armenian Lexical Textbase* (Leicester: Scholarly Digital Editions), online: <http://www.sd-editions.com/AnaServer?lalt+0+start.anv+id=> .