Note: this is the AOV (author's original version) of an article in the Journal of Theological Studies published by Oxford University Press. The DOI of the published article is: doi:10.1093/jts/fly165

New Testament Satanology and Leading Suprahuman Opponents in Second Temple Jewish Literature: A Religion-Historical Analysis

Abstract

The challenge of reconceptualising mythological concepts like the Devil in contemporary Christian theology is well known, but some interpreters find a demythologised Devil already within the New Testament. To evaluate this approach exegetically, this study attempts to reconstruct the religion-historical setting of New Testament Satanology by exploring leading suprahuman opponents (LSOs) in pre- and non-Christian Second Temple Jewish literature. In contrast to most previous attempts at such a reconstruction, the present study is methodologically conservative, admitting into evidence only texts that can be reliably assigned to a pre-70 C.E. date and non-Christian Jewish provenance. The investigation shows that there was no standard Jewish Satanology during the Second Temple period. Moreover, 'Satan' is not clearly attested as a personal name prior to the New Testament and may therefore be a title or *Funktionsbezeichnung* in most occurrences therein. New Testament Satanology shows significant continuity with earlier and contemporaneous Jewish LSO-concepts but is relatively more homogeneous, suggesting that a consolidation of Satanological terminology and concepts occurred very early in church history. This consistency, together with the abundance of mythological religion-historical parallels to the New Testament Devil, suggest that the early church uniformly understood the Satan as a mythological being—probably an angel.

Keywords: Satan, Devil, Second Temple Judaism, New Testament, Mythology, Demythologisation

1. Introduction

Mark 1:13 places Jesus 'in the wilderness forty days, being tempted ὑπὸ τοῦ σατανᾶ.' Although some details about ὁ σατανᾶς emerge from other pericopae within the Gospel, the author never directly explains the term. The cursory way this arthrous noun is introduced suggests a 'well-defined and widely known' figure.[1] A backstory about the Satan[2] must have existed and been so familiar to early Christian communities that authors saw no need to recapitulate it when introducing the Satan into their writings.[3] Thus early Christian writings provide 'little explicit information' concerning 'the ontological status of Satan,'[4] with the unfortunate consequence that the Satan's earliest Christian backstory is lost to history.[5] Christian theologians of later centuries were left to piece together and further develop a Satanology using surviving texts and traditions.

According to the traditional Christian consensus, the Satan is a fallen angel.[6] For many contemporary Western Christians, such a Devil is an untenable vestige of prescientific cosmology,[7] and scholars of religion have offered various proposals on what to do with him, such as the following four. (1) A *Bultmannian demythologising hermeneutic*. Bultmann

[1] Jeffrey B. Gibson, *The Temptations of Jesus in Early Christianity* (JSNTSup 112; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), p. 58.
[2] Contrary to the convention of uniformly translating ὁ σατανᾶς as a proper name in the New Testament ('Satan') and ὁ διάβολος as a title ('the Devil'), this study will normally refer to 'the Satan' since, as will be argued below, ὁ σατανᾶς is probably a *Funktionsbezeichnung* in most of its New Testament occurrences.
[3] Erkki Koskenniemi perceptively suggests based on the passing allusions in Paul's letters to Gentile churches that Paul probably included 'Satan and the demonic world' 'in his elementary instruction' ('"For We are Unaware of His Schemes": Satan and Cosmological Dualism in the Gentile Mission,' in Jan Dochhorn, Susanne Rudnig-Zelt, and Benjamin Wold (eds.), *Das Böse, der Teufel und Dämonen—Evil, the Devil, and Demons* [WUNT 2/412; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016], p. 125).
[4] James W. Boyd, *Satan and Māra: Christian and Buddhist Symbols of Evil* (Studies in the History of Religions 27; Leiden: Brill, 1975), p. 63.
[5] C. Michael Robbins, *The Testing of Jesus in Q* (Studies in Biblical Literature 108; New York: Peter Lang, 2007), p. 62.
[6] The Devil is described as an 'apostate angel' by numerous patristic writers beginning with Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer*. 5.24.3). The earliest conciliar definition on the Devil, from the First Council of Braga (563 C.E.), referred to the Devil as an angel and was concerned mainly with combating the idea that he has creative power or is independent of God. For discussion and primary sources see Jeffrey Burton Russell, *Lucifer: The Devil in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984), p. 95.
[7] This is less so, however, in the global South. See, e.g., the discussion of African readings of the Satan in Thomas J. Farrar and Guy J. Williams, 'Talk of the Devil: Unpacking the Language of New Testament Satanology,' *JSNT* 39 (2016), pp. 87-8.

famously argued that the mythological notions of the New Testament—which, for him, included the Satan[8]—are obsolete in light of modern science and need to be reinterpreted in existentialist terms.[9] (2) A *social-scientific hermeneutic*. Pagels' research exemplifies the quest to understand the *anthropological phenomenon* of belief in the Satan rather than to directly extract *theological meaning* from this concept. Like the Bultmannians, she allows that Jews and Christians in antiquity regarded the Satan as a supernatural figure but is less interested in the precise theological content of this belief than in its '*social* implications.'[10] (3) *Non-mythological exegesis*. This approach reaches a similar theological destination as the previous two but travels a different route. Its distinctive feature is the claim that the biblical authors *themselves* interpreted the Satan rationalistically and without commitment to the mythological connotations of such language. It thus achieves demythologisation already at the level of exegesis—a boon to conservative interpreters who are—unlike the Bultmannians—reluctant to disagree with the theological perspectives of the biblical authors. Because evaluating this third approach is a primary objective of this study, it requires more detailed description. Ling, who conceptualises the Devil as 'a faceless, featureless, dis-unifying, disintegrating force' with a 'sociological nature and function,' justifies this de-personalising approach by claiming that the New Testament writers themselves are

---

[8] See, e.g., Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. Kendrick Grobel, 2 vols. (London: SCM, 1952-5), vol. 1, p. 258.

[9] Rudolf Bultmann, 'The New Testament and Mythology,' in Hans Werner Bartsch (ed.), *Kerygma and Myth: A Theological Debate*, trans. Reginald H. Fuller, (2nd edn.; London: SPCK, 1964), p. 5.

[10] Elaine Pagels undertakes 'to investigate specifically *social* implications of the figure of Satan in the New Testament gospels' ('The Social History of Satan, Part II: Satan in the New Testament Gospels,' *JAAR* 62 [1994], p. 19). However, this is not because she doubts that the gospels' reflect a mythological concept of the Satan. She criticises 'liberally minded Christians' who 'ignore or minimise' the 'blatant supernaturalism' of the New Testament gospels' depiction of Satan ('Social History of Satan, Part II,' p. 18). Two good examples of the sociological approach at the level of an individual passage are essays on 1 Pet. 5:8 by Paschke and Thurén. Paschke argues that the social context of the lion simile is Roman *ad bestias* execution of Christians, but does not discuss how the writer understood the διάβολος figure theologically apart from concluding that the Devil 'was seen as responsible for what was going on in the arena at the *ad bestias* executions of Christians' (Boris A. Paschke, 'The Roman *ad bestias* Execution as a Possible Historical Background for 1 Peter 5.8,' *JSNT* 28 [2006], p. 498). Thurén asserts that the διάβολος of 1 Pet. 5:8 denotes 'more than a sinister traditional character' (Lauri Thurén, '1 Peter and the Lion,' in Ida Fröhlich and Erkki Koskenniemi (eds.), *Evil and the Devil* [LNTS 481; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013] p. 144). Specifically, the author uses the rhetorical device of *prosopopoiia* to project the socio-political threat faced by the addressees onto the mythological figure of the lion-like Devil instead of identifying their human antagonists ('1 Peter and the Lion,' pp. 152-4).

'remarkably non-committal…about this matter of a personal prince of evil.'[11] Roberts avers, 'It seems to me not inconsistent with the Synoptic references [to the Devil] to take them as being, *even originally*, a picturesque way of speaking about evil in the world' as opposed to an assertion of objective reality.[12] Wink contrasts the 'popular Christian fantasy' that Satan is a 'literal 'person'' with the 'Satan of the Bible,' namely 'the symbolic repository of the entire complex of evil in the present order…the archetypal representation of the collective weight of human fallenness…a field of negative forces…a profound *experience* of numinous, uncanny power in the psychic and historic lives of real people.'[13] Phipps interprets the gospel wilderness temptation story as expressing 'ancient Jewish psychology in a picturesque manner,' flatly asserting that 'ancient Jews did not interpret Satan or devils in a literal manner.'[14] (4) *Neglect of Satanology in biblical scholarship.* This may not be a conscious approach *per se*, but it is a phenomenon that has attracted attention, especially in Pauline scholarship,[15] and may be a further consequence of the other three approaches. If the Satan can ultimately be explained in terms of existential, sociological or psychological realities, and especially if the biblical writers understood the Satan in such terms, one can move immediately to these categories and there is little need for 'Satan' language. This trend is not

[11] Trevor Ling, 'Personality and the Devil,' *Modern Churchman* 5 (1962) pp. 142-7.
[12] Robert Campbell Roberts, *Rudolf Bultmann's Theology: A Critical Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), pp. 130-1, emphasis added. Roberts is criticising Bultmann's thoroughgoing demythologising programme and advocating instead an eclectic approach to New Testament mythology. He describes ancient belief in mythological evil as 'naïve folk-tales' and suggests that the New Testament writers were either 'self-consciously allegorical or otherwise non-literal' in their use of such language, or else unreflective and thus 'had no opinion one way or the other about [the Devil's] objective existence.'
[13] Walter Wink, *Unmasking the Powers: The Invisible Forces That Determine Human Existence* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), pp. 24-5.
[14] William E. Phipps, *Supernaturalism in Christianity: Its Growth and Cure* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2008), p. 351.
[15] Becker, for instance, notes modern scholarship's 'lack of interest' in 'Paul's understanding of evil and of figures representing evil,' the explanation for which lies 'not so much in the scarcity of references as in the theological presuppositions of modern exegesis,' such as their 'objections against a thinking in terms of specific figures of evil, angels, demons, or further mythical beings or powers' (Michael Becker, 'Paul and the Evil One,' in *Evil and the Devil,* p. 127). Similarly, Tilling laments a 'blind spot' in German Pauline scholarship, 'effectively deleting the (presumably embarrassing) notions of Satan, demons, and powers, and focusing instead usually exclusively on anthropological terms and existential "realities" such as Sin and Death' (Chris Tilling, 'Paul, Evil, and Justification Debates,' in Chris Keith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (eds.), *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity* [WUNT 2/417; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016], p. 222). Both scholars regard this trend as an outgrowth of Bultmannian demythologisation, though Tilling emphasises that it is actually an aberration of Bultmann's hermeneutic, which sought to *interpret* mythological language and not to *disregard* it.

limited to the academy, as is apparent in the Church of England's recent approval of an alternative baptismal liturgy that deletes all reference to the Devil to make it 'culturally appropriate and accessible.'[16]

Having outlined various modern approaches to reconceptualising the Devil in religious studies, we can state the purpose of the present study. This study is not concerned with the theological legitimacy of a Bultmannian demythologisation programme, nor with reconstructing the sociological or cultural circumstances that gave rise to belief in the Satan. Rather, this study aims to recover the theological content of the New Testament writers' Satan-concept (Satanology), and thereby to ascertain whether New Testament Satanology, at the level of grammatical-historical exegesis, *is in fact mythological*. The methodology consists primarily of exploring religion-historical antecedents and parallels to New Testament Satanology in the Second Temple Jewish milieu within which Christianity emerged. The term LSO ('leading suprahuman opponent') will be used throughout to refer to suprahuman or transcendent figures in Second Temple literature that personify or lead opposition to God's people. This term seems preferable to 'Satan figure,' not only because such figures are often not designated 'Satan,' but also because the term 'Satan figure' may contribute to the anachronistic presupposition of a linear, 'biographical' trajectory from השטן in the Hebrew Bible to ὁ σατανᾶς in the New Testament. By scholarly convention, however, the term 'Satanology' will be used for any expressed theological concept of an LSO, consisting especially of the figure's designation(s), nature, functions and attributes.

[16] Trevor Gundy, 'Church of England's alternative baptism liturgy drops reference to devil,' *The Washington Post* (Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/religion/church-of-englands-alternative-baptism-liturgy-drops-reference-to-devil/2014/01/06/b4d11bbe-7707-11e3-a647-a19deaf575b3_story.html, January 6, 2014). Ling insisted that in denying 'personality' to the Devil he was 'on no account' denying the Devil's 'reality' ('Personality and the devil,' p. 147). Responding to an unnamed critic who accused him of doing so, Ling was adamant that 'The Devil must not be allowed to do his old disappearing trick!' Nevertheless, the Devil indeed appears to be doing 'his old disappearing trick' within the liturgy of Ling's own ecclesiastical tradition.

The contention herein is that Satanology throughout the New Testament is better described as *mythological*, portraying the Satan as a transcendent personal being (most likely an angel), than as *rationalistic*, portraying the Satan as a merely symbolic representation of psychological or social forces.[17] This claim will be supported by showing that the closest terminological and conceptual parallels to New Testament Satanology in pre- and non-Christian Second Temple Jewish literature occur in texts that reflect mythological Satanology, and that the New Testament writers show no sign of eliminating the mythological connotations of their Satanological vocabulary.

2. Methodology

Before embarking on an exploration of Second Temple literature we need to explain our choice of which texts to include and which to omit. This study is methodologically conservative, admitting into evidence as possible background to New Testament Satanology only texts that can be assigned with high probability to a non-Christian Jewish provenance and a date of approximately 70 C.E. or earlier. This is a departure from previous analyses of early Christian Satanology, which typically draw on works of disputed Second Temple date and/or non-Christian provenance.[18]

---

[17] This is not to dispute that sociological and psychological factors may have contributed to belief in the Satan, as argued for instance by Elaine Pagels, *The Origin of Satan: How Christians Demonized Jews, Pagans, and Heretics* (New York: Random House, 1995).

[18] See, e.g., Herbert Haag, *Teufelsglaube* (Tübingen: Katzmann, 1974); Paolo Sacchi, 'The Devil in Jewish Traditions of the Second Temple Period (c. 500 BCE-100 CE),' in *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*, trans. William J. Short (JSPSup 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), pp. 211-232; Gibson, *Temptations of Jesus*; David C. Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew* (SNTSMS 88; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Piero Capelli, 'The Outer and Inner Devil: On Representing the Evil One in Second Temple Judaism,' in Mauro Perani (ed.), *'The words of a wise man's mouth are gracious' (Qoh 10,12): Festschrift for Günter Stemberger on the occasion of his 65th birthday* (Studia Judaica 32; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005), pp. 139-152; Robert C. Branden, *Satanic Conflict and the Plot of Matthew* (Studies in Biblical Literature 89; New York: Peter Lang, 2006); Robbins, *Testing of Jesus in Q*; Stefan Schreiber, 'The Great Opponent: The Devil in Early Jewish and Formative Christian Literature,' in Friedrich Vinzenz Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas and Karin Schöpflin (eds.), *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings: Origins, Development and Reception* (DCLY; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), pp. 437-57; Guy J. Williams, *The Spirit World in the Letters of Paul the Apostle: A Critical Examination of the Role of Spiritual Beings in the Authentic Pauline Epistles* (FRLANT 231; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009); Derek R. Brown, *The God of This Age: Satan in the Churches and Letters of the Apostle Paul* (WUNT 2/409; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015); Gerd Theißen, 'Monotheismus und Teufelsglaube: Entstehung und Psychologie des biblischen Satansmythos' in Nienke Vos and Willemien Otten

Pseudepigrapha that are used by some of these authors but omitted from the present analysis on grounds of date and/or provenance include *Ascension of Isaiah, Testament of Job, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Life of Adam and Eve/Apocalypse of Moses, Apocalypse of Zephaniah* and *Testament of Solomon*.[19] There is now a scholarly consensus that *Ascension of Isaiah* is a Christian composition dating from between 70-120 C.E.[20] Efforts to extract a Jewish *Vorlage* from the earlier chapters have been abandoned.[21] The next three texts mentioned above are classified by Nickelsburg as 'of disputed provenance.'[22] Davila warns concerning disputed works (among which he mentions *Testament of Job* and *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*) that 'their data should not form the basis of theories and reconstructions that are otherwise unsupported.'[23] *Testament of Job* 'is usually dated to somewhere between the second century BCE and the second century CE.'[24] While not ruling out the possibility of an early Jewish origin, Davila considers 'Christian circles in Egypt in late antiquity' a more likely provenance.[25] Concerning *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Twelftree writes of a 'growing consensus' that this is 'a Christian work…from the middle of the second century.'[26] This position has long been championed by de Jonge.[27] It must be conceded that DeSilva has recently put forward cogent arguments for the minority position that 'a pre-Christian Jewish

---

(eds.), *Demons and the Devil in Ancient and Medieval Christianity* (SVC 108; Leiden: Brill, 2011), pp. 37-70; Thomas J. Farrar and Guy J. Williams, 'Diabolical Data: A Critical Inventory of New Testament Satanology,' *JSNT* 39 (2016), pp. 40-71.

[19] Also excluded on grounds of post-70 C.E. date are *Apocalypse of Abraham* and *Testament of Abraham*.

[20] Jonathan Knight, 'The Portrayal of Evil in the Ascension of Isaiah,' in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, p. 299.

[21] Richard Bauckham, 'The Continuing Quest for the Provenance of Old Testament Pseudepigrapha,' in *The Jewish World around the New Testament: Collected Essays I* (WUNT 233; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), p. 468.

[22] George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (2nd edn.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), p. 301.

[23] James R. Davila, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* (JSJSup 105; Leiden: Brill, 2005), p. 234.

[24] Maria Haralambakis, *The Testament of Job: Text, Narrative and Reception History* (LSTS 80; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2012), p. 1.

[25] Davila, *Provenance*, 217.

[26] Graham H. Twelftree, 'Exorcism and the Defeat of Beliar in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,' *VC* 65 (2011), p. 170.

[27] E.g., Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin* (2nd edn.; GTB 25; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1975), p. 125; Marinus de Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature: The Case of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve* (SVTP 18; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

original stands behind, and is more or less recoverable from, the present form of the document,'[28] but we will err on the side of caution and exclude the *Testaments*. The *Life of Adam and Eve* (also known, in its Greek form, as *Apocalypse of Moses*) could be dated 'anywhere between 100 and 600 CE.'[29] Gathercole notes that the date of composition 'could be as early as the first or second century C.E.' but that the text's provenance (Jewish or Christian) is much debated.[30] The *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* survives only in fragments, so 'basic questions of date, provenance, and interpretation remain uncertain.'[31] The significance of the *Testament of Solomon* for New Testament Satanology lies in its use of the name Beelzebul (cf. Matt. 10:25; 12:24-27), but this writing probably dates from the fourth century C.E.[32]

Those who maintain the value of such literature as New Testament background may object to the decision to disqualify them from this study. However, to exclude them here is not to deny

---

[28] David A. DeSilva, 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs as Witnesses to Pre-Christian Judaism: A Re-Assessment,' *JSP* 23 (2013), p. 39 n. 42. If one were to follow DeSilva and include the *Testaments* in the data set, one could refer to Twelftree, 'Exorcism and the Defeat of Beliar,' and Tom de Bruin, *The Great Controversy: The Individual's Struggle Between Good and Evil in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (NTOA 106; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014), esp. pp. 114-19. 'Beliar' is the primary designation for the LSO in the *Testaments.* The extant text also uses the designations ὁ σατανᾶς (*T. Dan* 3.6, 5.6, 6.1; *T. Gad* 4.7; *T. Ash.* 6.4 v.l.), ὁ διάβολος (*T. Naph.* 8.4, 8.6; *T. Naph.* 3.1 v.l.; *T. Gad* 5.2 v.l.; *T. Ash.* 1.9 v.l.; 3.2 v.l.), ὁ ἐχθρὸς (*T. Dan* 6.3, 6.4, 6.2 v.l.) and ὁ ἄρχων τῆς πλάνης (*T. Sim.* 2.7, where a v.l. reads ἄγγελος for ἄρχων; *T. Jud.* 19.4). The text-critical problems with most references to διάβολος are notable: in the last two cases mentioned the word appears to have been introduced in place of διαβούλιον ('inclination,' a word that translates the Hebrew יצר in Sir. 15:14). Moreover, Origen attributes to the *Testaments* the view 'that individual Satans ought to be understood in individual sinners' (*Homilies on Joshua* 15.6, trans. Barbara Bruce, in Cynthia White (ed.), *Origen: Homilies on Joshua* [FC 105; Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2010], p. 149). However, this insight does not correspond to a direct statement in the extant text of the *Testaments.* Origen may have understood ὁ σατανᾶς in *T. Dan* 3.6 as a common noun parallel to ὁ θυμούμενος ('the wrathful man') in 3.5, but given his own clear belief in the Satan, the text before him may have made this more obvious than our text does. These observations make it rather likely that διάβολος, σατανᾶς (as a proper noun) and ἐχθρὸς (the latter used as a Satanological designation for the first time in Matt 13:39 and Luke 10:19) are redacted into the *Testaments*. A pre-Christian original composition, if it existed, seems likely to have referred to an LSO named Beliar and described as the prince (or angel) of deceit. This Beliar, who rules the wicked, has spirits and is placed in dualistic antithesis and conflict with God, would be comparable to Belial in the *Damascus Document* and the *War Scroll*, though his influence in the *Testaments* is predominantly internal and ethical.

[29] Marinus de Jonge and Johannes Tromp, *Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature* (GAP 4; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), p. 77.

[30] Simon J. Gathercole, 'The Life of Adam and Eve (Coptic Fragments): A new translation and introduction,' in ed. Richard Bauckham, James R. Davila, and Alexander Panayotov (eds.), *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Noncanonical Scriptures* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), p. 22.

[31] John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (3rd edn.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), p. 242.

[32] Peter Busch, *Das Testament Salomos: Die älteste christliche Dämonologie, Kommentiert und in deutscher Erstübersetzung* (TUGAL 153; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), p. 20.

their relevance to New Testament research. Some of them, admittedly, *might* be non-Christian and early and, even if not, might preserve pre-Christian Jewish traditions. Nevertheless, by excluding them we mitigate the risk of anachronism and circularity that would arise if a *precedent for* early Christian Satanology were established using literature that may have been *influenced by* early Christian Satanology.

Two other works (*Joseph and Aseneth* and *2 Enoch*) are excluded less because of dubious date or provenance than due to text-critical problems with references to an LSO.[33] Although 'Nearly all recent scholars' have assigned *Joseph and Aseneth* to between approximately 100 B.C.E. and 100 C.E.,[34] there are dissenting voices.[35] In any case, the lone reference to an LSO (as ὁ διάβολος in 12.9-10, a further identification of the 'wild old lion' that persecutes Aseneth) is text-critically uncertain and may be a late interpolation.[36] Without this clarifying gloss, the lion might refer to Atum, the sun-god of Heliopolis.[37] Most scholars date *2 Enoch* no later than the first century C.E.,[38] though this continues to engender debate.[39] However, the material most relevant to our study—the references to Satanael (*2 En.* 7.3; 18.3; 29.4-5;

[33] Similarly, *Sibylline Oracles* Book 3 dates from the first century B.C.E. but the reference to Beliar in 3.63 was almost certainly not part of the original book (Rieuwerd Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and its Social Setting: With an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* [SVTP 17; Leiden: Brill, 2003], pp. 130, 137).
[34] John J. Collins, 'Joseph and Aseneth: Jewish or Christian?' *JSP* 14 (2005), p. 100.
[35] Notably, Ross S. Kraemer dates *Joseph and Aseneth* no earlier than the third century C.E. (*When Aseneth Met Joseph: A Late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and His Egyptian Wife, Reconsidered* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998], p. 239).
[36] Edith M. Humphrey, *Joseph and Aseneth* (GAP 8; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), p. 20.
[37] Marc Philonenko, *Joseph et Aséneth: Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction et Notes* (Studia Post-Biblica 13; Leiden: Brill, 1968), p. 171. Of course, this lion-god, understood as an active, persecuting foe, may still qualify as an LSO, though it might also be metonymy for Aseneth's human persecutors, the god's devotees (12.7).
[38] John J. Collins, 'The Afterlife in Apocalyptic Literature,' in Alan J. Avery-Peck and Jacob Neusner (eds.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part Four: Death, Life-After-Death, Resurrection and the World to Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity* (HO 49; Leiden: Brill, 2000), p. 132.
[39] See, e.g., Andrei A. Orlov, 'The Sacredotal Traditions of 2 Enoch and the Date of the Text,' in Andrei A. Orlov and Gabriele Boccaccini (eds.), *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only* (Studia Judaeoslavica 4; Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 103-16; David W. Suter, 'Excavating 2 Enoch: The Question of Dating and the Sacerdotal Traditions,' in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch*, pp. 117-26.

31.3-6)—is absent from recension A and thus text-critically suspect. Only a passing reference to 'the adversary' (*2 En.* 70.6) is common to both the A and J recensions.[40]

Literature that meets our date and provenance criteria and contain text-critically reliable material relevant to our study are as follows: four books of the Hebrew Bible (Numbers, Job, Zechariah and 1 Chronicles), their LXX translations, Sirach, *Wisdom of Solomon*, the *Book of the Watchers*, the *Book of Jubilees*, the *Book of Parables*, the *Moses Fragment*, selected Qumran literature, and two pseudo-Philonic works (*On Samson* and *Biblical Antiquities*). There are numerous other non-Christian Jewish texts that date from before or shortly after 70 C.E. but do not mention an LSO (e.g., other Hebrew Bible and LXX texts, *Psalms of Solomon*, *Letter of Aristeas*, Philo, Josephus, *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*).

3. LSOs in pre- and non-Christian Second Temple Jewish literature

3.1. Hebrew Bible

The word שטן occurs in the Hebrew Bible as a common noun meaning 'adversary' and describing humans (e.g., Hadad the Edomite in 1 Kgs 11:14). In four passages, however, שטן is used of a celestial being (Num. 22:22-32; Job 1-2; Zech. 3:1-2; 1 Chr. 21:1). In Numbers 22, Yahweh's angel blocks Balaam's way 'as an adversary' (לשטן); thus שטן is not the angel's primary designation. However, in Job's prologue and the vision of Zechariah 3, we encounter a figure designated השטן (with definite article). Scholars agree that the setting of both passages is the divine council.[41] 1 Kgs 22:19-23 narrates another divine council scene that is 'rather reminiscent of Job 1-2.'[42] Consequently, השטן is universally understood as a heavenly

[40] F. I. Andersen, '2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,' in *OTP*, vol. 1, pp. 200-1.
[41] Peggy L. Day, *An Adversary in Heaven: śāṭān in the Hebrew Bible* (HSM 43; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), p. 79; Michael H. Floyd, *Minor Prophets, Part 2* (FOTL 22; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), p. 374; Sara Japhet, *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993), p. 375; Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8* (AB 25B; New York: Doubleday, 1988), p. 184; Ellen White, *Yahweh's Council: Its Structure and Membership* (FAT 2/65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), p. 65.
[42] Esther J. Hamori, 'The Spirit of Falsehood,' *CBQ* 72 (2010), p. 19.

being in Job and Zechariah—usually as a prosecutor in the celestial courtroom,[43] though Stokes regards the being's function as that of executioner.[44]

Scholars dispute the specificity of השטן in Job and Zechariah. Since Hebrew proper names almost never take the definite article, השטן is almost certainly not a proper name.[45] Day interprets the article to mean 'a certain one,' i.e., 'a certain unspecified accuser.'[46] Joüon and Muraoka identify this as a legitimate—albeit rare—function of the Hebrew article called 'imperfect determination.'[47] However, Bekins argues that such grammarians have misunderstood non-prototypical usage of the article; instead such instances introduce 'a referent in relation to a contextually salient semantic frame.'[48] Concerning השטן in Job and Zechariah, Bekins thinks the most likely semantic frame for שטן is the office of prosecutor in the heavenly council.[49] Thus, as most scholars agree, the article probably identifies שטן as an adversarial (prosecutorial?) portfolio within the heavenly court,[50] or as a 'specific celestial being' who occupies this office.[51]

Another debated issue concerning השטן in Job and Zechariah is the figure's moral character. Most scholars concur that this figure is subordinate to Yahweh's authority,[52] since he solicits and receives Yahweh's permission to attack Job. However, assessments of the moral

---

[43] Armin Lange, 'Satanic Verses: The Adversary in the Qumran Manuscripts and Elsewhere,' *RevQ* 24 (2009), p. 43; Jan P. Fokkelman, *The Book of Job in Form: A Literary Translation with Commentary* (SSN 58; Leiden: Brill, 2012), p. 15; Mark J. Boda, *The Book of Zechariah* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), p. 230.
[44] Ryan E. Stokes, 'Satan, Yhwh's Executioner,' *JBL* 133 (2014), pp. 251-70.
[45] George L. Klein, *Zechariah* (New American Commentary 21B; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2008), p. 135; Christopher A. Rollston, 'An Ur-History of the New Testament Devil: The Celestial שׂטן (śāṭān) in Zechariah and Job,' in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, p. 4. Unwilling to rule out a proper name is Antti Laato, 'The Devil in the Old Testament,' in *Evil and the Devil,* p. 4.
[46] Day, *An Adversary in Heaven,* p. 43.
[47] Paul Joüon and Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 2 vols. (Subsidia Biblica 14; Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2003), vol. 2, p. 511.
[48] Peter Bekins, 'Non-Prototypical Uses of the Definite Article in Biblical Hebrew,' *JSS* 58 (2013), p. 226-30.
[49] Peter Bekins, e-mail message to author, April 6, 2017.
[50] Capelli, 'The Outer and Inner Devil,' p. 140.
[51] Laato, 'The Devil in the Old Testament,' p. 19.
[52] Marvin E. Tate, 'Satan in the Old Testament,' *RevExp* 89 (1992), p. 463; Janet E. Tollington, *Tradition and Innovation in Haggai and Zechariah 1-8* (JSOTSup 150; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), pp. 115-16; Susanne Rudnig-Zelt, 'Der Teufel und der alttestamentliche Monotheismus,' in *Das Böse, der Teufel und Dämonen*, p. 16.

character of השטן range from 'noble' and 'good'[53] to 'morally neutral'[54] or ambiguous,[55] to 'not…normative,'[56] characterised by *Hinterhältigkeit,*[57] 'insolent'[58] or 'evil.'[59] Rollston emphasises the utility of a prosecutor's role but neglects the antagonism between השטן and Yahweh, who accuses השטן of having 'incited me against [Job] to ruin him for nothing' (Job 2:3 NAB) and who 'rebuke[s]' השטן (Zech. 3:2), with the verb גער denoting Yahweh's 'particularly strong invective against his opponents.'[60] Sacchi notes negative statements about angels elsewhere in Job (4:18; 15:15).[61] Hence, while השטן in the Hebrew Bible is not 'the malevolent prince of demons that "Satan" subsequently became,'[62] there is tension in the figure's relationship with Yahweh.[63]

1 Chr. 21:1 tells how שטן (anarthrous) 'rose up against Israel, and he incited David to take a census of Israel' (NAB). Here the Chronicler hypostatises 'the anger of Yahweh' (2 Sam. 24:1) into a separate being.[64] Most scholars regard this שטן as a celestial being,[65] though Japhet understands it as an anonymous human adversary.[66] Furthermore, many scholars have identified 1 Chr 21:1 as the earliest occurrence of 'Satan' as a proper name.[67] However,

---

[53] Rollston, 'An Ur-History of the New Testament Devil,' pp. 15-16.
[54] Dominic Rudman, 'Zechariah and the Satan Tradition in the Hebrew Bible,' in Mark J. Boda and Michael H. Floyd (eds.), *Tradition in Transition: Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 in the Trajectory of Hebrew Theology* (LHB/OTS 475; New York: T&T Clark, 2008), p. 192. Rudman is describing the majority view; his own assessment is more negative.
[55] Tate, 'Satan in the Old Testament,' p. 463.
[56] Boda, *Zechariah,* p. 230.
[57] Haag, *Teufelsglaube,* p. 204.
[58] Sydney H. T. Page, *Powers of Evil: A Biblical Study of Satan and Demons* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995), p. 29.
[59] Laato, 'The Devil in the Old Testament,' p. 19.
[60] Klein, *Zechariah,* p. 136.
[61] Sacchi, 'The Devil in Jewish Traditions,' p. 217.
[62] Floyd, *Minor Prophets,* p. 374.
[63] Page, *Powers of Evil,* p. 27.
[64] Laato, 'The Devil in the Old Testament,' p. 20; cf. Haag, *Teufelsglaube,* pp. 213-15.
[65] Day, *An Adversary in Heaven,* p. 144; Ryan E. Stokes, 'The Devil Made David Do It… or 'Did' He? The Nature, Identity, and Literary Origins of the "Satan" in 1 Chronicles 21:1,' *JBL* 128 (2009), pp. 97-99.
[66] Japhet, *I & II Chronicles,* p. 375.
[67] Haag, *Teufelsglaube,* p. 214; Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8,* p. 183; Charles Fontinoy, 'Les noms du Diable et leur etymologie,' in Jean Kellens and Pierre Lecoq (eds.), *Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata* (Acta Iranica 23; Leiden: Brill, 1984), p. 158; Sacchi, 'The Devil in Jewish Traditions,' p. 222; Page, *Powers of Evil,* p. 34; Richard H. Bell, *Deliver Us from Evil: Interpreting the Redemption from the Power of Satan in New Testament Theology* (WUNT 216; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), p. 10; Schreiber, 'The Great Opponent,' p. 440.

recent studies have shown that שטן here is a common noun denoting an anonymous heavenly adversary.[68] The notion of 'a satan' as an anonymous heavenly being may help to explain how 'satan(s)' became a *category* of transcendent beings in later Second Temple texts (see below).

To summarise, the Hebrew Bible occasionally uses the word שטן of celestial beings. In the two arthrous cases, השטן serves as the *Funktionsbezeichnung* of a morally ambiguous heavenly figure.[69] There is 'no Satan in the Old Testament' in the later sense of the word,[70] but there is a kernel from which later, sometimes more elaborate, Satanologies developed. Direct influence of the biblical השטן on New Testament Satanology is evident in passages such as Luke 22:31-32 and Rev. 12:10 that cast ὁ σατανᾶς in the role of heavenly prosecutor.[71]

3.2. Septuagint

The LXX translators rendered השטן in Job and Zechariah into Greek as ὁ διάβολος and 'sons of God' (בני האלהים, Job 1:6) as 'the angels of God' (οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ). These decisions reveal something about the LXX translators' understanding of השטן. First, this figure is probably viewed ontologically as an angel or a comparable class of being. Second, Wieger finds that in classical Greek, διάβολος denotes someone with the ability and the will to do evil, especially with their words.[72] The LXX translators thus give השטן 'une connotation

[68] Day, *An Adversary in Heaven*, p. 149; Gary N. Knoppers, *I Chronicles 10-29: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 12A; New York: Doubleday, 2004), p. 744; Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, p. 374; Stokes, 'The Devil Made David Do It,' pp. 99-105.
[69] Rudnig-Zelt, 'Der Teufel und der alttestamentliche Monotheismus,' p. 6.
[70] Tate, 'Satan in the Old Testament,' p. 467.
[71] David Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor: Prayer and Christology in Luke-Acts* (WUNT 2/49; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), pp. 154-5; Page, *Powers of Evil*, p. 30; François Bovon, *L'Évangile selon saint Luc*, 4 vols. (CNT 3; Genève: Labor et Fides, 2007-11), vol. 4, p. 220.
[72] Madeleine Wieger, '«Celui qu'on appelle διάβολος» (Apocalypse 12,9): L'histoire du nom grec de l'Adversaire,' in Michael Tilly, Matthias Morgenstern, and Volker Henning Drecoll (eds.), *L'adversaire de Dieu—der Widersacher Gottes* (WUNT 364; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), pp. 205-6.

péjorative':[73] 'the accuser' is no longer morally ambiguous. Accordingly, recent English LXX translations render ὁ διάβολος in Job and Zechariah as 'the slanderer.'[74] Ὁ διάβολος eventually became a technical term for a specific personage.[75] This is not yet the case in the LXX, where in localised contexts the term can have other referents (Haman in Esth. 7:4, 8:1). Nevertheless, since the Greek definite article consistently functions determinatively[76] and since 'slanderer' can hardly be a portfolio in the heavenly council, Job and Zechariah LXX clearly depict ὁ διάβολος as a specific being and not merely an office. Thus the LXX creates a bridge between the Hebrew Bible's heavenly accuser and the later Devil.[77]

Two sapiential texts that were eventually transmitted with the LXX possibly refer to a LSO: Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon. Sirach was written in Hebrew by a Jerusalemite sage c. 180 B.C.E. and translated into Greek by the author's grandson five or six decades later.[78] Sir. 21:27 reads, 'When an impious person curses the satan (τὸν σατανᾶν), he curses his own soul.'[79] The Hebrew text of this verse does not survive, but it almost certainly used the word שטן. It is not certain that the Hebrew read השטן, since the translator sometimes introduces the article when translating a generic, anarthrous noun (e.g., ὁ ἐχθρὸς, 'the enemy,' for שונא in Sir. 12:8, 10 and for אויב in 12:16, following Hebrew MS A.[80]

Since the Greek translation of Sirach is generally not word-for-word[81] and introduces theological changes,[82] perhaps the translator understood this 'satan' differently than his

---

[73] Wieger, '«Celui qu'on appelle διάβολος»,' p. 208.
[74] Claude E. Cox, 'Iob,' in *NETS*, p. 670; George E. Howard, 'The Twelve Prophets,' in *NETS*, p. 815.
[75] Wieger, '«Celui qu'on appelle διάβολος»,' p. 216.
[76] Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), pp. 216-31.
[77] Rudnig-Zelt, 'Der Teufel und der alttestamentliche Monotheismus,' p. 1 n. 1.
[78] Richard Coggins, *Sirach* (GAP 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998), pp. 18-19.
[79] Benjamin G. Wright, 'Sirach,' in *NETS*, p. 736.
[80] Hebrew text is taken from Pancratius C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew* (VTSup 68; Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 39-40.
[81] Benjamin G. Wright, *No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to its Hebrew Parent Text* (SBLSCS 26; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), p. 249.
[82] E.g., belief in an afterlife—so Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987), p. 86.

grandfather.[83] The decision to transliterate rather than translate this word indicates that the translator is alluding to a known figure and not merely using a common noun—especially since σατανᾶν appears to transliterate the Aramaic סטנא rather than the Hebrew שטן (cp. the transliteration σαταν in 3 Kgdms 11:14).[84] Hence, the view that ὁ σατανᾶς denotes a generic human adversary here, though widely held,[85] is untenable, though this may well have been the sense of שטן in the Hebrew original (cp. the similar aphorism in Sir. 21:28).

A second view understands τὸν σατανᾶν as a celestial opponent. Since Sirach's pragmatic theology shuns cosmic speculation, however, the proverb is frequently understood as a subtle polemic *against* belief in such a figure. Boccaccini states that the saying aims to 'stigmatize the "impious" belief in the existence of the heavenly enemy.'[86] Similarly, Sacchi finds that for Sirach 'the devil does not exist: Satan is only a metaphor to indicate our worst instincts.' He paraphrases, 'When the impious curses the satan, he *only* curses himself' (emphasis added).[87] Scholars following this interpretation often regard the verse as a critique of early Enochic theology.[88] A polemical relationship between Sirach and Enochic apocalypticism is

[83] Paul Van Imschoot, *Théologie de l'Ancien Testament*, 2. vols. (Tournai: Desclée, 1954-6), vol. 1, p. 138; Lange, 'Satanic Verses,' pp. 42-3.
[84] Fontinoy, 'Les noms du diable,' p. 161; Moisés Silva, *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis*, 4 vols. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014), vol. 4, p. 264.
[85] Haag, *Teufelsglaube*, p. 198; Christian Kurzewitz, *Weisheit und Tod: Die Ätiologie des Todes in deer Sapientia Salomonis* (TANZ 50; Tübingen: Francke, 2010), p. 166 n. 483; Skehan and Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, pp. 311-12; John G. Snaith, *Ecclesiasticus* (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), p. 110; Giuliano Vigini, *Siracide: con testo e note di commento a fronte* (Milano: Paoline, 2007), p. 128. Johannes Marböck, *Jesus Sirach 1-23* (HTKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2010), pp. 257-8, follows this view while remaining open to Boccaccini's interpretation (discussed below).
[86] Gabriele Boccaccini, 'Where Does Ben Sira Belong? The Canon, Literary Genre, Intellectual Movement, and Social Group of a Zadokite Document,' in Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér (eds.), *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira: Papers of the Third International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Shime'on Centre, Pápa, Hungary, 18-20 May, 2006* (JSJSup 127; Leiden: Brill, 2008), p. 36.
[87] Sacchi, 'The Devil in Jewish Traditions,' p. 223. See also Brown, *The God of this Age*, p. 29; Nicholas J. Ellis, 'A Theology of Evil in the Epistle of James: Cosmic Trials and the Dramatis Personae of Evil,' in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, p. 273; Henry Ansgar Kelly, *Satan: A Biography*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 75.
[88] Gabriele Boccaccini, 'Inner-Jewish Debate on the Tension between Divine and Human Agency in Second Temple Judaism,' in John M. G. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole (eds.), *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment* (LNTS 335; London: T&T Clark, 2006), p. 16; Capelli, 'The Outer and Inner Devil,' pp. 141-2; Paolo Sacchi, *The History of the Second Temple Period* (JSOTSup 285; London: T&T Clark International, 2000/2004), pp. 411-12.

likely,[89] including in the matter of angelology.[90] However, the polemical interpretation of Sir. 21:27 is overly subtle. It is also historically suspect, since early Enochic theology (discussed below) had no active 'Satan' or LSO to curse.

Sirach praises 'the twelve prophets' (Sir. 49:10), presumably including Zechariah, and the book reflects the influence of Job in several places.[91] Moreover, while Ben Sira 'shows no great interest' in angels,[92] the notion of an adversarial angel is consistent with the Greek translator's theology, since he appears in Sir. 48:21 to have introduced such a being—the destroyer of the Assyrians—who was absent from the Hebrew text.[93] It is therefore unlikely that Ben Sira's grandson regarded belief in a celestial adversary like that found in Job and Zechariah as impious. Probably, Sirach's translator opposes a practice of cursing the Satan, *whom he viewed as a legitimate heavenly functionary*. Several Qumran texts, some dating from the first century B.C.E., reflect a liturgical practice of cursing LSOs (1QM 13.4; 4Q280 2.2; 4Q286 7 ii).[94] Sir. 21:27 may be a polemical reaction to a similar practice. How might

---

[89] Benjamin G. Wright III, '1 Enoch and Ben Sira: Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Relationship,' in Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins (eds.), *The Early Enoch Literature* (JSJSup 121; Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 159-76.

[90] Nuria Calduch-Benages, 'The hymn to the creation (Sir 42:15-43:33): a polemical text?' in Angelo Passaro and Giuseppe Bellia (eds.), *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology* (DCLS 1; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), pp. 125-6.

[91] Cf. Jeremy Corley, 'Searching for structure and redaction in Ben Sira: An investigation of beginnings and endings,' in *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*, pp. 24-25, 39; Pancratius C. Beentjes, ''Full Wisdom is from the Lord': Sir 1:1-10 and its place in Israel's Wisdom literature,' in *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*, p. 150; Skehan and Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, p. 40.

[92] Lester L. Grabbe, *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period*, 2 vols. (LSTS 47; London: T&T Clark, 2006-8), vol. 2, p. 257.

[93] Hebrew MS B refers to a plague (במגפה) as the agent of destruction where the Greek has ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ. Cf. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*, p. 87; Pancratius C. Beentjes, 'In Search of Parallels: Ben Sira and the Book of Kings,' in *'Happy is the One who Meditates on Wisdom' (Sir. 14,20): Collected Essays on the Book of Ben Sira* (CBET 43; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), p. 196.

[94] See below for further discussion of these texts. 1QS 2.4-10 records a liturgical curse uttered against 'the men of Belial's lot' but not against Belial himself. It may be objected that in none of these texts is the object of the curse called '(the) Satan'—it is Belial, or Melki-rešaʿ. However, that may be precisely the point: replacing the heavenly adversary's biblical designation with a derogatory epithet is part of the impiety, so Ben Sira's grandson indignantly preserves the being's correct, God-given appellation. *Jubilees*, which almost certainly predates Greek Sirach, never refers to cursing of the LSO Mastema, although it does introduce formulaic curses into its patriarchal narratives that are absent from Genesis (e.g., *Jub.* 4.5; 9.14-15; 24.28-33), which likely reflect liturgical practice (notice 'Amen' in 4.5 and 9.15). Since *Jubilees* clearly influenced the Satanological ideas of the Qumran sect in other respects (see below), it is plausible that the Qumran sect's practice of cursing an LSO originated in the pre-sectarian reception-history of *Jubilees* in the mid- to late second century B.C.E.

the translator have conceived of the curse recoiling upon the curser? One possibility that dates back to Origen (*Hom. in Jos.* 15.6) is that when an ungodly person curses the Satan he is cursing himself inasmuch as he too is *a* satan in the common-noun sense.[95] Another possibility is that he who curses the Satan blasphemes the heavenly prosecutor, inadvertently giving him grounds for an indictment.[96] Whatever the case, Greek Sirach appears to reflect a Satanology commensurate with that of Job and Zechariah, although the single, passing mention of the Satan suggests his unimportance for the translator's theology.

Wisdom of Solomon is a Hellenistic Jewish work probably written between c. 50 B.C.E. and 40 C.E.[97] Wis. 2:24 declares, according to Knibb's recent translation, that 'through the envy of the devil (φθόνῳ...διαβόλου) death entered the world, and those who belong to his party experience it.'[98] Like Knibb, most scholars identify this anarthrous διάβολος as the Devil.[99] However, a few scholars have identified this envious διάβολος as Cain,[100] an interpretation that the earliest Christian citation of this text (*1 Clem.* 3.4-4.7) seems to follow. Zurawski, meanwhile, meticulously argues that this anarthrous διάβολος denotes a generic adversary.[101] None of these interpretations seems conclusive and we may have to admit ignorance. Given

---

[95] Caesar Seligmann, *Das Buch der Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* (Breslau: Schlesische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 1883), p. 44 n. 1; Conleth Kearns, 'Sirach,' in *NCCHS*, p. 555.

[96] Jude 8-10 may reflect a similar perspective by condemning those who 'blaspheme the glorious ones' and commending Michael for not presuming to pronounce a blasphemous judgment on the Devil. A warning against speaking so as to give an 'opening to Satan' is attributed to the tannaitic Rabbi Jose in the Babylonian Talmud (b. Ber. 19a, 60a; b. Ket. 8b; cf. Bernard J. Bamberger, *Fallen Angels: Soldiers of Satan's Realm* [Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1952], p. 98).

[97] Cf. Lester L. Grabbe, *Wisdom of Solomon* (GAP 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), pp. 87-94. He suggests that an Augustian date 'presently hold[s] the balance of the argument.'

[98] Michael A. Knibb, 'Wisdom of Salomon,' in *NETS*, p. 700.

[99] David Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 43; New York: Doubleday, 1979), p. 121; Bell, *Deliver us from Evil*, p. 15; Mareike Verena Blischke, *Die Eschatologie in der Sapientia Salomonis* (FAT 2/26; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), pp. 99-102; Jan Dochhorn, 'Mit Kain kam der Tod in die Welt. Zur Auslegung von SapSal 2,24 in 1 Clem 3,4; 4,1-7, mit einem Seitenblick auf Polykarp, Phil. 7,1 und Theophilus, Ad. Autol. II, 29,3-4,' *ZNW* 98 (2007), pp. 150-1; Jeffrey Burton Russell, *The Devil: Perceptions of Evil from Antiquity to Primitive Christianity* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), pp. 200-1; Sacchi, 'The Devil in Jewish Traditions,' pp. 226-27; Theißen, 'Monotheismus und Teufelsglaube,' pp. 50-1.

[100] Richard J. Clifford, *Wisdom* (New Collegeville Bible Commentary 20; Collegeville: Liturgical, 2013), p. 21; Kelly, *Satan: A Biography*, pp. 78-9; John R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (Bloomsbury Academic Collections; London: Bloomsbury, 1988/2015), pp. 51-2.

[101] Jason M. Zurawski, 'Separating the Devil from the *Diabolos*: A Fresh Reading of Wisdom of Solomon 2.24,' *JSP* 21 (2012), pp. 366-399.

the uncertainty, we cannot reliably infer from this text that the Devil was implicated in an aetiology of death in pre-Christian Jewish thought.[102]

3.3. *Book of the Watchers* (*1 Enoch* 1-36)

The *Book of the Watchers* was composed in stages, with the earliest form of the story written well before 200 B.C.E.,[103] possibly as early as 500 B.C.E.[104] The book contains an angelic rebellion myth that elaborates on Gen. 6:1-4 to help explain earthly evil.[105] In the myth's earliest form the leader of the rebellious angels (Watchers) is named Shemihazah and the angels' main transgression is mating with human women (*1 En.* 6-7). These unions produce hybrid offspring—giants—who terrorise the earth and are destroyed in the Flood. In subsequent layers of tradition, Asael—one of Shemihazah's lieutenants in *1 En.* 6.7, whose transgression is revealing forbidden knowledge to humans—supersedes Shemihazah in prominence (*1 En.* 8.1-3; 9.6-7; 10.4-12; 13.1-3).[106] Another later redactional development uses the story as an aetiology for ongoing demonic activity: the giants' departed evil spirits 'continue to oppress mankind.'[107] The Watchers themselves, however, are imprisoned and inactive.[108]

The *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 En.* 85-90) is a second-century B.C.E. addition to the Enochic corpus.[109] An interesting development occurs in this text inasmuch as the Watchers—here depicted as stars—have a single, clearly defined leader: one star falls first, followed by others

---

[102] However, see below on Gadreel in *1 En.* 69.6.
[103] George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1-36, 81-108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), p. 170.
[104] Sacchi, 'The Devil in Jewish Traditions,' pp. 212-13.
[105] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, pp. 46-7; Matthew Goff, 'Enochic Literature and the Persistence of Evil: Giants and Demons, Satan and Azazel,' in *Das Böse, der Teufel und Dämonen*, p. 57.
[106] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 171-72.
[107] James P. Davies, 'Evil's Aetiology and False Dichotomies in Jewish Apocalyptic and Paul,' in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, p. 177; cf. *1 En.* 15.8-16.1.
[108] Sacchi, 'The Devil in Jewish Traditions,' p. 218.
[109] Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, p. 85.

(*1 En.* 86.1-3).[110] Enochic theology up this point does not appear to have been influenced by השטן from the Hebrew Bible. However, the Enochic notions of fallen angels and evil spirits would soon become intertwined with Satanology.

3.4. *Book of Jubilees*

The *Book of Jubilees*, composed in the mid-second century B.C.E.,[111] is a retelling of Genesis and half of Exodus that has been described as 'Narrative with Systematic Demonology.'[112] *Jubilees* further develops the Enochic Watchers tradition through 'a combination of demonic enemies and their satanic leader who remains active in the heavenly court.'[113] The Ethiopic version in which *Jubilees* survives in its entirety designates the LSO 'Mastema' and 'Prince Mastema.'[114] In *Jub.* 10, God is about to imprison all the evil spirits but Mastema appeals to God that one-tenth be left to him that he might 'exercise the authority of my will among the children of men' (*Jub.* 10.8).[115] His request is granted. Thereafter, Mastema is introduced at strategic points in the narrative. He sends birds to devour the seed sown in the land, only to be thwarted by young Abram (*Jub.* 11.11-24)—a story that may have influenced the Synoptic Gospels' Satanological interpretation of the birds in the parable of the sower (Mark 4.15 and parallels).[116] Later Mastema provokes God to test Abraham by ordering him to sacrifice Isaac (*Jub.* 17.15-16; cp. Gen. 22:1), tries to kill Moses on his way to Egypt (*Jub.* 48.2-3; cp. Ex. 4:24), enables Pharaoh's magicians to perform wonders (*Jub.* 48.9; cp. Ex. 7:11) and is identified with the destroyer of Ex. 12:23 (*Jub.* 49.2).

---

[110] Theißen, 'Monotheismus und Teufelsglaube,' pp. 44-5.
[111] James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (GAP 9; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), p. 21.
[112] Ida Fröhlich 'Evil in Second Temple Texts,' in *Evil and the Devil,* p. 33.
[113] Ellis, 'A Theology of Evil in the Epistle of James,' p. 267; cf. *Jub.* 5, 10.
[114] Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 'The Demonic World of the Dead Sea Scrolls,' in *Evil and the Devil,* pp. 65-6. The Latin fragments likewise preserve two references to *princeps mastima* (*Jub.* 18.12; 48.2).
[115] Trans. O. S. Wintermute, 'Jubilees,' in *OTP,* vol. 2, p. 76.
[116] Michael P. Knowles, 'Abram and the Birds in Jubilees 11: A Subtext for the Parable of the Sower?' *NTS* 41 (1995), pp. 145-51.

משטמה is a Hebrew word meaning 'loathing' or 'hostility' that occurs in the Hebrew Bible in Hos. 9:7-8.[117] Several scholars believe that *Jubilees'* original Hebrew designation was 'prince of hostility' or 'angel of hostility' but that translators mistook the rare Hebrew word משטמה for a proper name.[118] This is supported by the occurrence of the title שר המשטמה in 4QPseudo-Jubilees (4Q225 2 i 9), a text dependent on *Jubilees*,[119] and in the *Book of Asaph the Physician*, a medieval text that appears to preserve 'an early, but secondary, Hebrew version' of *Jub.* 10.1-14.[120] Relevant to understanding this being's designation as a 'prince' (שר) is the use of this title for patron angels of nations (both good and bad) in Dan. 10:13, 20-21 and 12:1 (cp. *Jub.* 15.31-32). This idea of national angels is rooted in the divine council concept—just as השטן is in Job and Zechariah.[121] In the Theodotion Greek translation of Daniel, שר is rendered with ἄρχων—the word the Synoptic Evangelists use when describing Beelzebul (whom they identify with Satan) as 'ruler of the demons' (Mark 3:22 par.).[122] Jubilees, too, introduces Mastema as 'prince of the spirits' (*Jub.* 10.8). Indeed, a Greek fragment of *Jub.* 17.16 calls Mastema ὁ ἄρχων τῶν δαιμονίων, the exact title used in Matt. 12:24, though this may represent a late assimilation of *Jubilees* to Christian Satanology.[123]

---

[117] James L. Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of its Creation* (JSJSup 156; Leiden: Brill, 2012), p. 83; Miryam T. Brand, *Evil Within and Without: The Source of Sin and Its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature* (JAJSup 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), p. 179.

[118] Devorah Dimant, 'Between Qumran Sectarian and Non-Sectarian Texts: The Case of Belial and Mastema,' in Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008)* (STDJ 93; Leiden: Brill, 2011), p. 247; Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, p. 83; Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, p. 179 n. 43.

[119] James Kugel, 'Exegetical Notes on 4Q225 "Pseudo-Jubilees",' *DSD* 13 (2006), p. 98.

[120] Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (JSJSup 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007), p. 174 n. 13; cf. Todd R. Hanneken, *The Subversion of the Apocalypses in the Book of Jubilees* (SBLEJL 34; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), pp. 72-5.

[121] John J. Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), p. 374.

[122] The Old Greek version renders שר with στρατηγός here. Θ is generally much closer to the MT than the Old Greek (T. J. Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison* [JSOTSup 198; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995], p. 15). The original Θ translation appears to have influenced the New Testament and is therefore pre-Christian (Alexander A. Di Lella, 'The Textual History of Septuagint-Daniel and Theodotion-Daniel,' in John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint (eds.), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, 2 vols. [VTSup 83; Leiden: Brill, 2001], vol. 2, pp. 593-6).

[123] The Greek translation of Jubilees cannot be firmly dated earlier than 220 C.E. (James M. Scott, 'The Division of the Earth in Jubilees 8:11-9:15 and Early Christian Chronography,' in Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey and Armin Lange (eds.), *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* [TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997], pp. 295-6; James C.

The Ethiopic text of *Jub.* 10.11 calls Mastema either 'Satan' or 'the Satan' (Ethiopic lacks a definite article, so it is impossible to be sure which).[124] No earlier known writings use 'Satan' as a proper name, and Jubilees uses the word 'satan' four other times in a stock phrase describing idyllic times (past and eschatological) when there is 'no satan or any evil one' (*Jub.* 23.29; 40.9; 46.2; 50.5). In these instances 'satan' is a common noun,[125] referring to generic adversaries human and/or supernatural.[126] Most scholars think *Jub.* 10.11 originally read 'the Satan,' a title.[127] Perhaps the original Hebrew read השטן in the sense of Job and Zechariah, which became a proper name in the process of translation into Greek and then Ethiopic (as happened with משטמה). On the other hand, the *Book of Asaph the Physician* reads שר המשטמה rather than השטן at this point in the text, which may reflect the original reading.[128] Although this emendation is far less likely than Hanneken avers,[129] one cannot be certain that the original Hebrew text used השטן as a designation for Mastema. Regardless, however, Jubilees' Mastema closely parallels Job's השטן. Indeed, the two figures' names 'derive from

---

VanderKam, 'The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees,' in Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba (eds.), *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009], pp. 14-15). The surviving fragment of *Jub.* 10.7-9—preserved, like *Jub.* 17.16, by George Syncellus (d. 806 C.E.; cf. Albert-Marie Denis, *Introduction Aux Pseudégraphes Grecs D'Ancien Testament* [SVTP 1; Leiden: Brill, 1970], pp. 152-3)—is evidently a paraphrase rather than a literal translation. Here the Mastema figure is called ὁ διάβολος and the rationale for his retention of one-tenth of the spirits ('for testing of men,' πρὸς πειρασμὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων) is markedly different than in either the Ethiopic text or the *Book of Asaph the Physician.*

[124] Stokes, 'What is a Demon?', p. 270 n. 38.

[125] Gene L. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees* (JSJSup 20; Leiden: Brill, 1971), p. 39 n. 1.

[126] Dimant, 'Belial and Mastema,' p. 252; Hanneken, *Subversion of the Apocalypses,* p. 74; Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees,* p. 191; Stokes, 'What is a Demon?', p. 269.

[127] Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees,* p. 83; Segal, *Book of Jubilees,* p. 176 n. 19; Stuckenbruck, 'Demonic World of the Dead Sea Scrolls,' p. 63; VanderKam, *Jubilees,* p. 43.

[128] Hanneken, *Subversion of the Apocalypses,* pp. 74-5.

[129] The importance of the *Jubilees* material in the *Book of Asaph* is entirely medicinal—it is called the 'book of remedies' and attributed to Noah. Major differences between the *Book of Asaph* recension of this passage and *Jubilees* (Ethiopic text and Greek fragments) correspond to the medical emphasis of the *Book of Asaph* and thus *Jubilees* arguably preserves an earlier form of the text. Specifically, in the *Book of Asaph*, disease and healing play a much more prominent role than in the *Jubilees* versions. Meanwhile, the *Book of Asaph* marginalises the Mastema figure (who has no direct involvement with disease or healing but only commands the spirits): he is mentioned only once and does not act or speak. In view of this marginalisation it is understandable that the *Book of Asaph* would use the figure's primary designation שר המשטמה on the one occasion when it mentions him, rather than a title (השטן) that *Jubilees* applied to him only once. This seems a more plausible scenario than that a redactor or translator of *Jubilees* replaced 'Prince Mastema' with 'the Satan' in 10.8 but left this designation intact elsewhere.

the cognate roots *śṭm*/*śṭn*,'[130] so Mastema's designation is probably designed to evoke the biblical השטן.[131] Furthermore, numerous scholars note the close parallel between Job's prologue and *Jubilees' Aqedah* story and infer that the former inspired the latter.[132]

In several ways *Jubilees'* Mastema represents a religion-historical bridge linking the biblical השטן to New Testament Satanology. First, Mastema is clearly an individual and not merely a role or office.[133] Second, Mastema does not operate solo but 'has jurisdiction over a contingent of evil spirits.'[134] Third, Mastema is portrayed more negatively than the biblical השטן: he is 'shamed' (Latin: 'confused') when Abraham passes the *Aqedah* test (*Jub.* 18.12) and on another occasion Mastema is temporarily bound to prevent him from accusing Israel (*Jub.* 48.15; cp. Matt. 12:29; Rev. 20:2). Mastema also foretells 'my punishment' (*Jub.* 10.8), possibly implying that he will be punished, though conversely this might refer to his role as punisher.[135] Despite these developments, Mastema remains subordinate to God and retains access to the heavenly court.[136] He is not God's opponent in any dualistic sense.[137]

3.5. *Book of Parables* (*1 Enoch* 37-71)

The *Book of Parables* (henceforth Parables) survives only within the Ethiopic text of *1 Enoch* but was composed in either Aramaic or Hebrew.[138] It can be conclusively dated to around the

---

[130] Devorah Dimant, *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (FAT 90; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), p. 147.
[131] Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees,* p. 84.
[132] Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* pp. 183-84; Dimant, 'Mastema and Belial,' p. 250; Hanneken, *Subversion of the Apocalypses,* pp. 78-9; Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees,* p. 108; Segal, *Book of Jubilees,* p. 10; VanderKam, *Jubilees,* p. 52.
[133] VanderKam, *Jubilees,* p. 128.
[134] Stuckenbruck, 'Demonic World of the Dead Sea Scrolls,' p. 64.
[135] Punished: VanderKam, *Jubilees,* p. 128; Punisher: Hanneken, *Subversion of the Apocalypses,* p. 77 n. 58; Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* p. 225. In context, the latter admittedly seems more likely.
[136] Sacchi, 'The Devil in Jewish Traditions,' p. 224; Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* p. 180.
[137] Hanneken, *Subversion of the Apocalypses,* pp. 79-80; *pace* Goff, 'Giants and Demons, Satan and Azazel,' p. 52.
[138] George W. E. Nickelsburg, 'Chapters 37-71: The Book of Parables,' in George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 37-82* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress), p. 4. All translations from *Parables* herein are Nickelsburg's.

time of Herod the Great: late first century B.C.E. or early first century C.E.[139] Davila classifies *Parables* among 'largely intact ancient Jewish pseudepigrapha beyond reasonable doubt.'[140] Some scholars believe based on geographical and botanical references that *Parables* was written in Galilee,[141] which would make it invaluable for reconstructing the historical setting of Jesus and the earliest church. Moreover, *Parables* may have directly influenced some New Testament writers.[142]

The LSO in *Parables* is named Azazel, a term derived from Lev. 16:8-10 (where it may already be the name of a demon).[143] However, his name in the Hebrew/Aramaic original may have been Asael, since in the *Book of the Watchers*, Aramaic fragments give the name Asael where the later Ethiopic version has Azazel.[144] *Parables* emphasises the primordial angelic sin of revealing forbidden secrets to humans more than that of mating with human women (*1 En.* 65.6-8; 69.6-9).[145] It may be that Asael/Azazel in the *Parables* 'has not yet been bound' but is 'still at work,'[146] but *Parables* is more interested in Asael's/Azazel's eschatological punishment than any present activity. The description of a 'burning furnace' 'being prepared for the host of Azazel' (*1 En.* 54.5-6), i.e. 'Azazel and all his associates and all his host' (*1 En.* 55.4), closely resembles Matt. 25:41, which speaks of 'eternal fire prepared for the Devil and his angels' (cp. 'furnace of fire' in Matt. 13:42). This is especially striking when one

---

[139] James H. Charlesworth, 'The Date and Provenance of the Parables of Enoch,' in Darrell L. Bock and James H. Charlesworth (eds.), *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift* (Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 11; London: T&T Clark, 2013), p. 56; Nickelsburg, 'Book of Parables,' pp. 58-63.
[140] Davila, *Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha*, p. 230.
[141] Motti Aviam, 'The Book of Enoch and the Galilean Archaeology and Landscape,' in *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*, p. 169; Charlesworth, 'Date and Provenance of the Parables of Enoch,' p. 56.
[142] 'There is some consensus that the author of Matthew knew the *Parables*' (Nickelsburg, 'Book of Parables,' p. 72; cf. Leslie W. Walck, *The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and in Matthew* (Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 9; London: T&T Clark, 2011), and some evidence suggesting that Jude knew the *Parables* as well (Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 'The Book of Enoch: Its Reception in Second Temple Jewish and in Christian Tradition,' *Early Christianity* 4 [2013], pp. 15-16).
[143] Cf. Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1992), pp. 1020-1.
[144] Nickelsburg, 'Book of Parables,' p. 202.
[145] Nickelsburg, 'Book of Parables,' p. 45.
[146] Sacchi, 'The Devil in Jewish Traditions,' p. 228. On this issue, see further Nickelsburg, 'Book of Parables,' pp. 201-3.

considers that Matt. 25:31-46, like *Parables* (*1 En.* 61.8, 62.2-5, 69.27-29), describes the 'Son of Man' as presiding over the final judgment seated on 'the throne of his glory,' a phrase found only in *Parables* and Matthew.[147]

Parables uses the word 'S/satan' four times, two plural (*1 En.* 40.7; 65.6) and two singular (53.3; 54.6). 'The satans' in *1 En.* 40.7 are a class of celestial accusers who are driven away by the archangel Phanuel.[148] This language is clearly influenced by Job's and Zechariah's השטן.[149] In *1 En.* 65.6 the earth's inhabitants are condemned for having 'learned all the secrets of the angels, and all the violence of the satans.' The parallelism with 'angels' suggests that these satans are also transcendent beings. Their role here is apparently to provoke violence.[150] This function is described in more detail in *1 En.* 69.6 where an angel named Gadreel—probably one of these satans—is credited with having shown the sons of men 'the blows of death' and various weapons. Interestingly, Gadreel is also credited with having 'led Eve astray'—probably the earliest explicit reference to demonic involvement in the serpent's deceit of Eve (cp. Rev. 12:9).[151]

Turning to the singular references, *1 En.* 53.3 speaks of angels of punishment 'preparing all the instruments of (the) Satan.' Again, Ethiopic lacks an article, so this could be a title or a name. This Satan appears to be the punisher rather than the punished, since the following verses explain that the instruments are being prepared for the kings and the mighty of the earth. (The) Satan is also mentioned in *1 En.* 54.6, which foretells that 'the host of Azazel' will be punished for 'becoming servants of (the) Satan.' This Satan, being master of

---

[147] Walck, *The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and in Matthew*, p. 243.
[148] Nickelsburg, 'Book of Parables,' pp. 130-2.
[149] Neil Forsyth, *The Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), p. 211. Incidentally, the divine combat myth in Ancient Near Eastern sources and in the Hebrew Bible, although not treated in this study, also played an important role in the development of early Jewish and Christian Satanologies, as Forsyth shows.
[150] Nickelsburg, 'Book of Parables,' p. 283.
[151] That is, depending the date and exegesis of Wis. 2:24 (see above).

Asael's/Azazel's host of fallen angels, appears to be Asael/Azazel himself.[152] Since Asael/Azazel already has a name, 'the Satan' in the original text was probably his title or *Funktionsbezeichnung.*[153]

To recapitulate, the Satan in *Parables* is a malevolent angel named Asael/Azazel who leads a host of other angels/satans.[154] Their functions are to incite violence, accuse humans before God, and inflict punishment; yet he and his host are themselves destined for eschatological punishment.

3.6. *Moses Fragment*

The *Moses Fragment* is a pseudepigraphon likely written between 4 B.C.E. and 30 C.E.,[155] though at least one scholar regards it as a later Christian work.[156] Davila classifies this work, like *Parables*, among 'largely intact ancient Jewish pseudepigrapha beyond reasonable doubt.'[157] The single surviving Latin manuscript is a translation from Greek, which was probably the original language,[158] though a Semitic original is possible.[159] This manuscript is

---

[152] Goff, 'Giants and Demons, Satan and Azazel,' pp. 54-5; Nickelsburg, 'Book of Parables,' p. 45; *pace* Sacchi, 'The Devil in Jewish Traditions,' pp. 228-9.
[153] Lange, 'Satanic Verses,' p. 44; cf. Andrei A. Orlov, *Dark Mirrors: Azazel and Satanael in Early Jewish Demonology* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2011), pp. 97-8.
[154] Matthew Black, *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch: A New English Edition* (SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985), p. 200; C. Marvin Pate, *Interpreting Revelation and Other Apocalyptic Literature: An Exegetical Handbook* (Handbooks for New Testament Exegesis; Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2016), p. 90; Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*, p. 37; Stokes, 'What is a Demon?', p. 271.
[155] Johannes Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary* (SVTP 10; Leiden: Brill, 1993), pp. 116-17; Kenneth Atkinson, 'Taxo's Martyrdom and the Role of the *Nuntius* in the "Testament of Moses": Implications for Understanding the Role of Other Intermediary Figures,' *JBL* 125 (2006), p. 467; Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, p. 160; Fiona Grierson, 'The Testament of Moses,' *JSP* 17 (2008), p. 276.
[156] Edna Israeli, '"Taxo" and the Origin of the "Assumption of Moses",' *JBL* 128 (2009), pp. 735-57.
[157] Davila, *Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha*, p. 230.
[158] Tromp, *Assumption of Moses*, p. 118; Grierson, 'Testament of Moses,' p. 275.
[159] Atkinson, 'Taxo's Martyrdom,' p. 454.

commonly identified with the *Testament of Moses*[160] or the *Assumption of Moses,*[161] titles known from later Christian book lists. Grierson maintains there is insufficient evidence to identify the *Moses Fragment* with either work.[162]

Like *Jubilees,* this document's genre is best described as 'rewritten Bible.'[163] The extant text foretells that when God's kingdom appears, 'the devil will come to an end, and sadness will be carried away together with him' (10.1).[164] The Latin word translated 'devil' is *zabulus,* a linguistically modified transliteration of διάβολος.[165] Since Latin lacks a definite article, it is uncertain whether the Greek read διάβολος or ὁ διάβολος, but the context seems to demand the latter. This is apparently the earliest text outside the LXX to call an LSO ὁ διάβολος. The text implies that sadness is the work of the Devil and foretells his demise in language similar to that of Mark 3:26.[166] The language may be a more developed version of the formula in *Jub.* 23.29 and 50.5 foretelling an idyllic future with 'no satan or any evil one.'

Most scholars believe, based on testimony preserved in patristic literature, that the lost ending of the *Moses Fragment* is the source of the allusion in Jude 9 to a quarrel between Michael and the Devil over Moses's body.[167] Grierson, however, concludes that 'it is impossible to know Jude's source beyond a considerable degree of doubt.'[168] Although some uncertainty is warranted, several factors support identifying the *Moses Fragment* as Jude's source. First, in 11.5-8 Joshua speaks of Moses' impending death and burial in lofty terms that may anticipate

[160] Richard J. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC 50; Waco: Word, 1983), pp. 65-76; Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination,* p. 159.
[161] Tromp, *Assumption of Moses;* John Muddiman, 'The Assumption of Moses and the Epistle of Jude,' in Axel Graupner and Michael Wolter (eds.), *Moses in Biblical and Extra-Biblical Traditions* (BZAW 372; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), p. 169.
[162] Grierson, 'Testament of Moses,' p. 274.
[163] Atkinson, 'Taxo's Martyrdom,' p. 456.
[164] Trans. Tromp, *Assumption of Moses,* p. 19.
[165] Cf. Tromp, *Assumption of Moses,* pp. 31-3.
[166] Tromp, *Assumption of Moses,* p. 229.
[167] Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter,* pp. 65-76; Gene L. Green, *Jude & 2 Peter* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), pp. 79-80; Muddiman, 'The Assumption of Moses and the Epistle of Jude,' p. 172; Robert L. Webb, 'The Use of "Story" in the Letter of Jude: Rhetorical Strategies of Jude's Narrative Episodes,' *JSNT* 31 (2008), p. 59.
[168] Grierson, 'Testament of Moses,' p. 271. If so, we can only posit that *some* apocryphal text composed after Zechariah and before Jude recounted a quarrel between Michael and the Devil over Moses's body.

further narrative material about Moses' body (which in any case might be expected in a 'Testament' or an 'Assumption'). Second, the *nuntius* figure of 10.2 may serve as a heavenly counterpart to the Devil,[169] foreshadowing a subsequent encounter between the Devil and Michael. Third, Gelasius's citation of *Moses Fragment* 1.14 and attribution thereof to the *Assumption* adds weight to patristic testimony identifying the Assumption as Jude's source.[170]

The motif of opposition between an angel and an LSO is paralleled in Zech. 3:1-2 (the ultimate source of Michael's words, 'The Lord rebuke you,' in Jude 9), *Jub.* 48.2-4 (where an angel delivers Moses from Mastema's hand), 4QVisions of Amram (where Amram sees two angelic figures quarrelling over him; see below) and Rev. 12:7-9 (where the angels of Michael and the Devil do battle).

3.7. Qumran Literature

Recent scholarship has moved away from the older view that cosmic dualism was fundamental to the Qumran sect's worldview.[171] Studies such as Brand's have uncovered diverse approaches to sin and evil not only across different documents but across redactional stages of the same document.[172] The texts discussed below have been selected from the wider Qumran library because—in their extant form—they reflect clear belief in an LSO. They should not be taken as representative of the full range of theological perspectives attested at Qumran.

Damascus Document

---

[169] Atkinson, 'Taxo's Martyrdom,' p. 475.
[170] Johannes Tromp, 'Origen on the Assumption of Moses,' in Florentino García Martínez and Gerard P. Luttikhuizen (eds.), *Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome: Studies in Ancient Cultural Interaction in Honour of A. Hilhorst* (JSJSup 82; Leiden: Brill, 2003), p. 325. For a brief overview of the complex patristic testimony concerning the *Testament of Moses* and *Assumption of Moses*, including primary and additional secondary sources, see Kenneth R. Atkinson, 'Herod the Great as Antiochus *Redivivus:* Reading the *Testament of Moses* as an Anti-Herodian Composition,' in Craig A. Evans (ed.), *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture*, 2 vols. (LSTS 50-51; London: T&T Clark International, 2004), vol. 1, p. 137 n. 9.
[171] Philip R. Davies, 'Dualism in the Qumran War Texts,' in Géza G. Xeravits (ed.), *Dualism in Qumran* (LSTS 76; London: T&T Clark, 2010), p. 8; Jutta Leonhardt-Balzer, 'Evil at Qumran,' in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, p. 18.
[172] Brand, *Evil Within and Without.*

The Damascus Document was composed by the middle of the first century B.C.E. at the latest.[173] This text shows literary dependence on Jubilees, citing it by name and deriving from it the term מלאך המשטמה ('angel of hostility'; CD 16.1-6; cp. 4Q270 6 ii 18; 4Q271 4 ii 6).[174] This figure is said to turn aside from following those who keep the Torah, which parallels the Devil's departure from Jesus after he used the Torah to parry the temptations (Q 4:1-13).[175]

The Damascus Document's preferred term for an LSO, however, is Belial (Hebrew: בליעל), mentioned five times.[176] It is unclear whether the Damascus Document equates the angel of hostility with Belial.[177] The word Belial occurs twice in *Jubilees* (1.20; 15.33), but there it is probably a common noun meaning something like 'worthlessness,' as frequently in the Hebrew Bible.[178] While in some Dead Sea Scrolls texts בליעל remains a common name, in others, including the Damascus Document, it has become the name of an archdemon.[179] Belial is depicted as tempter and deceiver of Israel, using 'three traps' to induce the Israelites to stumble: unchastity, wealth and defilement of the sanctuary (CD 4.12-19).[180] This parallels the Devil's three attempts to entrap Jesus in the temptation narrative (Q 4.1-13).[181] This passage also depicts Belial as having 'dominion' in 'the imperfect age preceding the eschaton.'[182] Paralleling *Jubilees*, Belial is said to have spirits that cause people to speak

[173] Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* p. 75.
[174] Cf. VanderKam, *Jubilees,* p. 19.
[175] Cf. Michael Morris, 'Apotropaic Inversion in the Temptation and at Qumran,' in *Das Böse, der Teufel und Dämonen,* p. 98; Benjamin Wold, 'Apotropaic Prayer and the Matthean Lord's Prayer,' in *Das Böse, der Teufel und Dämonen*, pp. 109-10.
[176] Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* p. 220.
[177] See discussion in Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* pp. 255-6; Stuckenbruck, 'Demonic World of the Dead Sea Scrolls,' p. 64.
[178] VanderKam, *Jubilees,* pp. 127-8; Hanneken, *Subversion of the Apocalypses,* p. 73; *pace* Brand (*Evil Within and Without,* pp. 219, 225), who regards Belial as the name of a demon here.
[179] Francis Daoust, 'Belial in the Dead Sea Scrolls: From Worthless to Stumbling Block to Archenemy,' in Lorenzo DiTommaso and Gerbern S. Oegema (eds.), *New Vistas on Early Judaism and Christianity: From Enoch to Montreal and Back* (Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 22; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016), pp. 217-33; Stuckenbruck, 'Demonic World of the Dead Sea Scrolls,' p. 66.
[180] Cf. Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* p. 277.
[181] So H. A. Kelly, 'The devil in the desert,' *CBQ* (1964), pp. 211-12; Luigi Schiavo, 'The Temptation of Jesus: The Eschatological Battle and the New Ethic of the First Followers of Jesus in Q,' *JSNT* 25 (2002), p. 154.
[182] Cf. Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* p. 221.

apostasy (CD 12.2-3).[183] The Damascus Document does not feature a pronounced dualism in its depiction of Belial,[184] though he does appear opposite the 'Prince of Lights' in CD 5.18.[185] Again echoing *Jubilees*, the Damascus Document identifies Belial as the power behind the Egyptian magicians who opposed Moses (CD 5.18-19). Belial also functions as the eschatological punisher of evildoers (CD 8.1-3).

War Scroll (1QM)

The War Scroll can be dated to the mid- to late first century B.C.E., though other fragmentary War Rule materials have been found that may be a few decades older.[186] The War Scroll in its extant form depicts Belial as a powerful figure who leads the sons of darkness into battle against the sons of light (1QM 1.1).[187] Belial is mentioned fourteen times but mainly as a passive role-player who 'accomplishes no action.'[188] Like the Damascus Document, 1QM 13.11 describes Belial as an 'angel of hostility' (מלאך מסטמה), undoubtedly under the influence of *Jubilees*.[189] Also paralleling *Jubilees* and the Damascus Document, the War Scroll depicts Belial as commanding subordinates: 'the spirits of his lot—angels of destruction' (1QM 13.1-6).[190]

The War Scroll's division of humanity into opposing camps characterised by light and darkness, with Belial leading the forces of darkness, reflects a clear cosmic dualism.[191] Similar light/darkness imagery is used to characterise the Satan in dualistic terms in the New Testament (Acts 26:18; 2 Cor. 4:3-6; Col. 1:12-13). Belial ('the prince of the dominion of

---

[183] Cf. Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* 226-27.
[184] So Philip R. Davies, 'Dualism in the Qumran War Texts,' p. 9; Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* p. 231.
[185] CD 5.17c-19 may be an interpolation (Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* p. 223).
[186] Daoust, 'Belial in the Dead Sea Scrolls,' pp. 226-7; Leonhardt-Balzer, 'Evil at Qumran,' pp. 28-9.
[187] Daoust, 'Belial in the Dead Sea Scrolls,' p. 217; Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* p. 233.
[188] Daoust, 'Belial in the Dead Sea Scrolls,' p. 230.
[189] Brand (*Evil Within and Without,* p. 234) suggests that this passage identifies *Jubilees'* Mastema with Belial, while Dimant ('Belial and Mastema,' p. 244) thinks Belial in the *War Scroll* is a spirit subject to Mastema.
[190] Trans. Florentino García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*, trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson (2nd edn.; Leiden: Brill, 1996), p. 108.
[191] Bell, *Deliver us from Evil,* p. 20; Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* p. 237.

evil,' 1QM 17.5) also has an angelic counterpart in 1QM 17.6-7, namely 'the majestic angel…Michael.'[192] This dualistic opposition between Michael and Belial parallels Jude 9 (and its source, probably the *Moses Fragment*) and Rev. 12:7-9. The War Scroll qualifies its dualistic language monotheistically by emphasising that God created Belial (1QM 13.11).[193]

Community Rule (1QS)

The Community Rule has 'a complex redaction history.'[194] The best known Community Rule scroll, 1QS, is 'usually dated to the early first century B.C.E.'[195] Belial has a less pronounced role in the Community Rule than in the Damascus Document or the War Scroll. The emphasis is entirely on the 'people of Belial's lot' rather than Belial or his spirits, so that 'Belial is present only in name.'[196] There is, however, a self-contained section within 1QS (3.13-4.26) known as the Treatise of the Two Spirits that reflects a cosmic dualism akin to that of the War Scroll.[197] The Treatise divides humanity into two groups, the 'sons of justice' who are led by the 'Prince of Lights,' and the 'sons of deceit' who are led—astray—by the 'Angel of Darkness' (1QS 3.20-22).[198] Like the War Scroll, the Treatise emphasises that God 'created the spirits of light and of darkness' (1QS 3.25), thus subordinating dualism to monotheism. The redacted Treatise combines both internal (psychological) and external (demonic) forces in its explanation of sin, thus representing a refined, comprehensive view of evil.[199]

4QBerakhot (4Q286-290) and 4QCurses (4Q280)

---

[192] Trans. Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, p. 112.
[193] Cf. Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* p. 234.
[194] Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* p. 84.
[195] Leonhardt-Balzer, 'Evil at Qumran,' p. 18.
[196] Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* p. 277.
[197] Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* p. 257; Philip R. Davies, 'Dualism in the Qumran War Texts,' p. 10.
[198] Trans. Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated,* p. 6.
[199] Theißen, 'Monotheismus und Teufelsglaube,' pp. 52-3; Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* p. 270; Leonhardt-Balzer, 'Evil at Qumran,' p. 21.

These two texts were cited in the discussion of Sir. 21:27 since they reflect a practice of cursing an LSO liturgically. They also introduce new Satanological terminology not encountered so far. The fragmentary liturgical texts 4QBerakhot are dated paleographically to the mid-first century C.E.[200] 4Q286 7 ii 5, in the context of curses aimed at Belial, the spirits of his lot and his sons, directs a curse at a figure called […]הרש. This incomplete word is רשע ('evil') with the article affixed. If it were an attributive adjective it would follow the modified noun. Thus, since no noun precedes it, numerous scholars regard it as a substantive: 'the evil one.'[201] This is probably an alternative designation for Belial.[202] While there are other occurrences of 'evil ones' (plural) referring to supernatural beings (e.g., *Jub.* 10.11, of Mastema's spirits; Philo, *Gig.* 17, of unholy angels), this is the closest parallel to the use of ὁ πονηρός as an alias for the Satan in early Christianity.[203]

4QCurses, another fragmentary text, dates from the first century B.C.E.[204] It pronounces a curse on Melki-rešaʿ (מלכי רשע, literally 'ruler of wickedness'; 4Q280 2.2),[205] who is presumably the counterpart of 'the angelic Melchi-ṣedeq' (מלכי צדק).[206] Melki-rešaʿ also appears in 4QVisions of Amram (4Q543-549), where he argues with a figure identified as 'ruler over all light' who has 'three name[s' (4Q544 2-3).[207] Hence it is likely also that

---

[200] James R. Davila, *Liturgical Works* (Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls 6; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), p. 42.
[201] Matthew Black, 'The Doxology to the Pater Noster with a Note on Matthew 6.13b,' in Philip R. Davies and Richard T. White (eds.), *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (JSOTSup 100; Sheffield: Sheffield Academi, 1990), p. 334; Davila, *Liturgical Works,* p. 59; Leonhardt-Balzer, 'Evil at Qumran,' p. 27; B. Nitzan (ed. and trans.), '4QBera-e (4Q286-290),' in Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov (eds.), *Poetic and Liturgical Texts* (The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader 5; Leiden: Brill, 2004), p. 439.
[202] Davila, *Liturgical Works,* p. 61.
[203] E. Isaac understands a reference to 'the Evil One' in *1 En.* 69.15 ('1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch,' in *OTP*, vol. 1, p. 48), but Nickelsburg notes textual confusion here and concludes that the Ethiopic word in question, *ʾakāʾe*, is the name of an oath ('Book of Parables,' pp. 304-7).
[204] Davila, *Liturgical Works,* p. 42.
[205] B. Nitzan (ed. and trans.). '4Q280 (4QCurses),' in Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov (eds.), *Additional Genres and Unclassified Texts* (The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader 6; Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 166-7.
[206] 4QCurses does not identify the counterpart of Melki-rešaʿ, but Melchizedek is 'depicted as Belial's adversary in *11QMelchizedek*' (Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* p. 249; cf. Stuckenbruck, 'Demonic World of the Dead Sea Scrolls,' p. 62). Some scholars believe that Michael, the Prince of Lights and Melchizedek were equated at Qumran (cf. Collins, *Daniel,* p. 375).
[207] É. Puech (ed.). '4QVisions of ʿAmram$^{a\text{-}f,\ g?}$ ar (4Q543-549),' in Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov (eds.), *Parabiblical Texts,* trans. E. Cook (The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader 3; Leiden: Brill, 2005), p. 423.

Melki-rešaʿ has three names,[208] the other two perhaps being Belial and the Angel of Darkness.[209]

Overall observations on Qumran literature

Reimer regards the Belial figure of the Scrolls as rooted in 'the Satan figure of the Hebrew Bible' and ontologically as an angel.[210] The word שטן itself occurs five times in the Dead Sea Scrolls, but probably always as a common noun.[211] Two of these occurrences—Aramaic Levi Document 3.9 and 11QPlea for Deliverance 19.15—are in apotropaic prayers that parallel the petition, 'Deliver us from (the) evil (one)' in Matt. 6:13.[212] In these prayers, like in *Parables*, שטן appears to denote a class of demonic beings.[213]

Finally, one text from Qumran appears to have deliberately eliminated Satanology. The hymns 4QBarkhi Nafshi praise God for having rebuked the evil inclination (יצר רע), using language that shows literary dependence on Zechariah 3.[214] Thus God's rebuke of השטן has been replaced with a rebuke of the evil inclination. This likely reflects a 'process of abstraction' whereby the external LSO is replaced with an internal inclination.[215]

3.8. Pseudo-Philonic works

Under this subsection are grouped two unrelated works incorrectly attributed in antiquity to Philo. *On Samson* is a Diaspora synagogue sermon transcribed probably by a contemporary

[208] Dimant, 'Belial and Mastema,' p. 256 n. 91.
[209] Note that Daoust ('Belial in the Dead Sea Scrolls,' p. 231) and Dimant ('Belial and Mastema,' p. 246 n. 49) urge caution in equating these figures.
[210] Andy M. Reimer, 'Rescuing the Fallen Angels: The Case of the Disappearing Angels at Qumran,' *DSD* 7 (2000), pp. 346-7.
[211] Stuckenbruck, 'Demonic World of the Dead Sea Scrolls,' pp. 62-4; Dimant, 'Belial and Mastema,' pp. 251-2.
[212] Wold, 'Apotropaic Prayer.'
[213] Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* pp. 209-10; Henryk Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document* (JSJSup 86; Leiden: Brill, 2004), p. 216; Jonas C. Greenfield, Michael E. Stone and Esther Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary* (SVTP 19; Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 129-30; Lange, 'Satanic Verses,' p. 40; Stokes, 'What is a Demon?', p. 271.
[214] E. Tigchelaar, 'The Evil Inclination in the Dead Sea Scrolls, with a Re-edition of 4Q468i (4QSectarian Text?),' in Alberdina Houtman, Albert de Jong, and Magda Misset-van de Weg (eds.), Empsychoi Logoi—*Religious Innovations in Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 351-52.
[215] Brand, *Evil Within and Without,* pp. 47-48; similarly, Ishay Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires: 'Yetzer Hara' and the Problem of Evil in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press), p. 47.

of Philo.[216] The text, which survives only in an Armenian version, makes one passing reference to 'Satan' (anarthrous) as 'le barbier intelligible' who 'accompagnait le coiffeur visible' (*On Samson* 1).[217] The adjectives used for the two barbers probably translate the Greek pair νοητός and αἰσθητός, which are often set in antithesis.[218] For example, Aristotle describes mathematical circles as νοητός and circles of bronze or wood as αἰσθητός (*Perseus* 7.1036a). If the reference to 'Satan' is authentic then this author probably had a rationalistic, depersonalised Satanology, with 'Satan' functioning as a coded expression for the evil conscience.[219] This would be unsurprising in an Alexandrian milieu that produced the works of Philo, who for example identified the serpent of Genesis 3 as a figurative representation of pleasure (*Leg.* 2.74) and thus as the counsellor of man (σύμβουλος ἀνθρώπου; *Agr.* 97).[220] On the other hand, 'Satan' may be a later Christian gloss clarifying the otherwise obscure 'intelligible barber.'[221] Supporting the interpolation hypothesis is the interpolated reference to the Devil into the Armenian version of Philo's *Q.G.* 1.36,[222] which was transmitted in the same manuscript tradition as *On Samson*. Hence, caution is needed in making Satanological inferences from this text.

Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum is an undoubtedly non-Christian Jewish work[223] that survives in a Latin translation of a Greek translation of a Semitic—probably Hebrew—original.[224] It is

---

[216] Folker Siegert and Jacques de Roulet, *Pseudo-Philon: Prédications Synagogales: Traduction, Notes et Commentaire* (SC 435; Paris: Cerf, 1999), pp. 20-22, 39.
[217] Trans. Siegert and de Roulet, *Prédications Synagogales,* p. 107.
[218] Siegert and de Roulet, *Prédications Synagogales,* p. 107 n. 2.
[219] Siegert and de Roulet, *Prédications Synagogales,* p. 188.
[220] Charles Baladier interprets the σύμβουλος of *On Husbandry* 97 as an attenuated allusion to the διάβολος of the LXX ('Devil,' in Barbara Cassin (ed.), *Dictionary of Untranslatables: A Philosophical Lexicon* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014], p. 213). Elsewhere, Philo says of an arrogant person that his ignorance 'accuses (κατήγορον) him' and that he has 'God for his adversary and avenger (ἀντιδίκῳ καὶ κολαστῇ)' (*On the Virtues* 172-74), thus apparently absorbing Satanological functions into God and the self.
[221] Siegert and de Roulet, *Prédications Synagogales,* p. 107 n. 3.
[222] C. D. Yonge, *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged* (rev. edn.; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1855/1993), p. 798; cp. Ralph Marcus, *Philo, Supplement I: Questions on Genesis* (LCL 380; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953/1961), pp. 21-2.
[223] So Davila, *Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha,* p. 230.
[224] Daniel J. Harrington, 'The Original Language of Pseudo-Philo's "Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum",' *HTR* 63 (1970), pp. 503-14; Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum: with Latin Text and English Translation,* 2 vols. (AGAJU 31; Leiden: Brill, 1996), vol. 1, pp. 276-7.

generally dated to the first century C.E., with debate focusing on whether it is pre- or post-70 C.E.,[225] though the *terminus ante quem* is mid-second century and a Hadrianic date is plausible.[226] The combination of undoubtedly non-Christian provenance and possible pre-70 C.E. date makes it methodologically viable for this study (though only marginally so). In addition to referring to envious and sinful angels (*L.A.B.* 32.1-2; 34.3), there is a passing reference to an LSO in a retelling of the grisly tale of Judges 19 (*L.A.B.* 45.6). Here the Lord speaks to the adversary (Latin: *anteciminum*) about the foolishness of the people and possibly issues a command to intervene.[227] *Anteciminus* transliterates the Greek ἀντικείμενος, a participle that sometimes translates שטן in Greek Bible versions.[228] and occurs several times (with the article) in early Christian literature as a Satanological designation (e.g., 1 Tim. 5:14; *1 Clem.* 51.1; *M. Polyc.* 17.1; Ptolemy, *Ad Flora* 3.2).[229] Latin lacks an article, but the Greek probably read τὸν ἀντικέιμενον and translated the Hebrew השטן. This author, like the author of *Jubilees*, has understood Job's and Zechariah's השטן as an individual being and inserted him retroactively into another biblical narrative—a practice that may result from the application of a *Gezerah Shavah* hermeneutic.[230] However, the reduction of this figure to a passive listening role may signal a deliberate diminution of his importance.

3.9. Classifying Second Temple Jewish Satanologies

---

[225] Cf. Bruce Norman Fisk, *Do You Not Remember? Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo* (JSPSup 37; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), p. 34.
[226] Jacobson, *Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, vol. 1, pp. 209-10.
[227] Jacobson, *Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum,* vol. 2, p. 1037.
[228] C.f. Harrington, 'Original Language,' p. 508; G.J.M. Bartelink, 'ANTIKEIMENOΣ (Widersacher) als Teufels- und Dämonenbezeichnung,' *Sacris Erudiri* 30 (1987), pp. 208-9.
[229] Cf. Farrar and Williams, 'Diabolical Data,' 58-59.
[230] This ancient rule of biblical exegesis entails interpreting two passages jointly when they share an important phrase (David Instone Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE* [TSAJ 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992], pp. 17-18). Hence, regardless of whether the authors of Job and Zechariah intended השטן to denote a specific personal being or merely an office or role occupied by an anonymous functionary, readers of both passages might infer that, because השטן was active in two different periods of history, he must be a specific celestial being. This would naturally invite speculation on when *else* השטן might have been active.

Approaches to Satanology were diverse in Second Temple Judaism and there does not seem to have been a *communis opinio*. There was no standard Jewish LSO concept that the early church simply inherited, no linear development from Hebrew Bible to New Testament. The Satanologies of Second Temple texts can be grouped into three broad categories: *non-existent*, *rationalistic* and *mythological*. Numerous texts fail to mention any LSO and certain of these appear to have replaced an LSO with an abstraction (4QBarkhi Nafshi; possibly Philo, *Virt.* 172-74). Other texts mention a muted LSO who plays no active role (Sirach, Community Rule, *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*) or is described in abstract language (*On Samson*, if 'Satan' is not a late gloss) and may therefore reflect a partially or entirely 'demythologised' Satanology. Still other texts describe an active LSO modelled after the biblical השטן (LXX, *Jubilees*, *Parables*, Jude 9's source [most likely Moses Fragment] and several Qumran texts). The question is, into which of these categories do the New Testament writings fall?

4. New Testament Satanology compared with Second Temple Jewish parallels

The New Testament contains approximately 130-140 references to an LSO under various designations.[231] Although New Testament Satanological language is diverse, there is an underlying terminological and conceptual coherence relative to the Second Temple literature surveyed above that allows us to speak of New Testament Satanology, not Satanologies, and to speak of 'the New Testament Satan' rather than various New Testament LSOs.[232] Every New Testament 'authorial category' uses at least one of two primary Satanological designations, ὁ σατανᾶς and its Hellenised synonym ὁ διάβολος.[233] Neither of these terms has a strong claim to normative status as the primary Satanological designation in pre-Christian

[231] An exact count of 137 is reached by Farrar and Williams, 'Diabolical Data,' p. 61.
[232] *Pace* Koskenniemi, who holds that 'Early Jewish satanalogy in all its variations flourishes in layers of the New Testament' ('Satan and Cosmological Dualism,' p. 125).
[233] Farrar and Williams, 'Talk of the Devil,' p. 75.

Jewish writings.[234] Thus, by making these terms normative and ignoring several Satanological designations found elsewhere in Second Temple literature (Mastema; Azazel/Asael; Melki-rešaʿ; Angel of Darkness; Belial, apart from 2 Cor. 6:15), the New Testament writers bear witness to a consolidation of Satanological terminology. This process features prominently in the Synoptic Gospels' Beelzebul controversy, where Jesus shares his opponents' belief in a prince of demons but discards their preferred designation 'Beelzebul' in favour of ὁ σατανᾶς (Mark 3:22-30; Matt. 12:24-32; Luke 11:15-22). This consolidating tendency may even go back to the historical Jesus, since the Beelzebul pericope is widely regarded as historically accurate.[235] Other common New Testament Satanological designations include ὁ πονηρός ('the evil one,' twelve times) and ὁ ἄρχων ('the prince/ruler' [of the demons; of this world; of the power of the air], eight times).[236] Interestingly, the four most common designations in the New Testament all have Second Temple Jewish precedents or parallels—mostly in texts with a supernatural Satanology (Table 1).

Table 1: Second Temple Jewish antecedents/parallels to common New Testament LSO designations

Greek Term	Translation	Antecedents/Parallels	Partial or possible antecedents/parallels

[234] '(The) satan' is the primary designation of an LSO in the Hebrew Bible and probably Sir. 21:27 and a secondary designation in *Jub.* 10.11 and *1 En.* 53.3, 54.6. Thus Laato rightly states that 'we lack an established tradition whereby the name of the personal Evil or the leader of demons is Satan' ('The Devil in the Old Testament,' p. 4). Ὁ διάβολος or equivalent is the primary designation of an LSO only in the LXX, the *Moses Fragment* and Jude 9's source (if different from *Moses Fragment*), and possibly Wis. 2:24.

[235] Many scholars affirm the historical accuracy of the pericope, though not necessarily the Beelzebul-Satan equation specifically (Graham H. Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus* [WUNT 2/54; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993], p. 113; Darrell L. Bock, 'Blasphemy,' in Craig A. Evans (ed.), *The Routledge Encyclopedia of the Historical Jesus* [New York: Routledge, 2008], pp. 75-6; Dwight D. Sheets, 'Jesus as Demon-Possessed,' in Scot McKnight and Joseph B. Modica (eds.), *Who do my opponents say I am? An Investigation of the Accusations against Jesus* [LNTS 327; London: T&T Clark, 2008], p. 29). R. A. Piper suggests that Q's introduction of 'the vocabulary of *Satan* rather than *Beelzebul*, may be a later addition to the context' but 'early enough in order to account for a similar structure in Mark' ('Jesus and the Conflict of Powers in Q,' in Andreas Lindemann (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* [BETL 158; Peeters: Leuven University Press, 2001], p. 335).

[236] Cf. Farrar and Williams, 'Diabolical Data,' pp. 43-6, 56-7.

ὁ σατανᾶς	the Satan	Job 1-2; Zech. 3:1-2; *1 En.* 53.3; 54.6; Sir. 21:27	*Jub.* 10.11; *On Samson* 1; *L.A.B.* 45.6
ὁ διάβολος	the Devil	Job 1-2 LXX; Zech. 3:1-2 LXX; *Moses Fragment* 10.1 and lost ending/Jude 9 source	Wis. 2:24
ὁ πονηρός	the evil one	4Q286 7 ii 5	Melki-rešaʿ (4Q280 2.2; 4Q544 2.13); plural/generic 'evil ones' (*Jub.* 10.11, 23.29, 40.9, 46.2, 50.5; Philo, *Gig.* 17); *1 En.* 69.15
ὁ ἄρχων	the ruler/prince	Prince Mastema/the prince of hostility (*Jub.* 10.8-11 etc.; 4Q225 2 i 9); the prince of the dominion of evil (1QM 17.5); Melki-rešaʿ (4Q280 2.2; 4Q544 2.13)	the prince of Persia/Greece (Dan. 10.13, 20)

Before making a comparison between Second Temple Jewish and New Testament Satanology (or Satanologies), we must make an important religion-historical observation: there is not a single clear occurrence of 'Satan' as a proper name—in any language—before the New Testament.[237] This finding contrasts with Day's oft-cited assertion that the earliest

[237] As discussed above, שטן is probably a common noun in 1 Chr. 21.1 and in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and '(the) Satan' (Eth. *sayṭān*) probably corresponds to a *Funktionsbezeichnung* in the original Hebrew text of *Jub.* 10.11 (if it was there at all) and in the *Book of Parables* (*1 En.* 53.3; 54.6; cf. Stokes, 'What is a Demon?', pp. 270-1).

datable evidence for satan used as a proper name comes from *Jub.* 23:29 and *Moses Fragment* 10:1, both of which she dates to c. 168 B.C.E.[238] Our contention here is more restrictive even than Lange's conclusion that 'Satan' became a proper name 'in the 1st century C.E. or slightly earlier.'[239] It is in line with Stokes' finding that 'In the Hebrew Scriptures and early Jewish writings,' 'satan' refers to various kinds of human and superhuman attackers/executioners, one of whom is '*the* Satan.'[240] Thus, although 'Satan' eventually became a proper name both in patristic Christianity and rabbinic Judaism (and is such in many modern languages), we should not conclude that it has transitioned from *Funktionsbezeichnung* to name in any early Christian text without compelling exegetical reasons to do so.[241] The tendency of modern New Testament translations to always render ὁ διάβολος 'the devil/der Teufel/le diable' but ὁ σατανᾶς 'Satan' is a groundless inconsistency. Future translations should include the definite article with 'Satan' in most cases and should also capitalise 'Devil/Diable' to avoid creating a false semantic contrast between ὁ διάβολος and ὁ σατανᾶς.

Ὁ σατανᾶς is probably a *Funktionsbezeichnung* in Sir. 21:27 and in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (if regarded as pre-Christian) as well. The anarthrous 'Satan' in *On Samson* 1 is probably a name in the Armenian version, but one cannot be sure this was the case in the original Greek, and anyway the word may be a late gloss.

[238] Day, *An Adversary in Heaven,* p. 128. This claim is repeated by Victor P. Hamilton, 'Satan,' in *ABD,* vol. 5, p. 987; Tate, 'Satan in the Old Testament,' p. 465; Branden, *Satanic Conflict,* p. 26. It is problematic concerning *Jubilees* (see above) and concerning *Moses Fragment* 10.1, which surely read (ὁ) διάβολος and not (ὁ) σατανᾶς in Greek, which was likely the original language.

[239] Lange, 'Satanic Verses,' p. 48.

[240] Stokes, 'What is a Demon?', p. 271.

[241] It seems there is no impediment to interpreting σατανᾶς as a title or *Funktionsbezeichnung* in the majority of arthrous cases in the New Testament. A case in point is Rev. 12:9, where διάβολος is more likely to be a proper name than σατανᾶς (NA28: ὁ καλούμενος Διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς ['the one called "Devil" and "the Satan"']; א: ὁ καλούμενος Διάβολος ὁ Σατανᾶς ['the one called "Devil the Satan"'!]; cp. Rev. 20:2). Among anarthrous cases, the omission of the article can be explained on purely syntactic grounds in Mark 8:33, Matt. 4:9, 16:23 (vocative), 2 Cor. 12:7 (cp. ἄγγελος κυρίου in Matt. 1:20 and elsewhere). Following NA28, this leaves only Mark 3:23 and Luke 22:3. In the former instance, Jan Dochhorn plausibly interprets σατανᾶς as a common noun: 'How can a satan cast out a satan?' ('The Devil in the Gospel of Mark,' in *Evil and the Devil,* p. 104). In the latter case it is not impossible to read 'Then *a satan* entered into Judas…' (cp. *1 En.* 65.6), but the Lucan context makes it more likely that 'the Satan' is in view (cf. Luke 22:31, 53). Hence, Luke's narrative aside about Judas may represent the earliest extant use of 'Satan' as a proper name. Σατανᾶς may have followed a similar trajectory to Χριστός in developing from a title into a proper name in the Gentile church. Even in the Apostolic Fathers, ὁ σατανᾶς may still be a title (Ign. *Eph.* 13.1; *Barn.* 18.1; Pol. *Phil.* 7.1). It is in Justin that Σατανᾶς is first unquestionably a name (*Dial.* 103.5). The earliest Hebrew text where שטן is indisputably a proper name seems to be *t. Shab.* 17.2-3, which states that angels of Satan (שמלאכי שטן) accompany a wicked man on his journey.

The *terminological* consistency of New Testament Satanology appears to be paralleled by a *conceptual* consistency in the functions and attributes assigned to the Satan.[242] Again, most of these features have precedents or parallels in Second Temple texts that feature a mythological Satanology (Table 2). Nevertheless, some features of New Testament Satanology are innovative—especially those associated with Christology. These include Christ's or the Son of Man's supersession of Michael and other angelic figures as the Satan's dualistic counterpart in some texts (e.g., Matt. 13:38-43; 2 Cor. 6:15), the Satan's role in bringing about Jesus's death (Luke 22:3, 53; John 13:2, 27; 1 Cor. 2:8) and Jesus' decisive defeat of the Satan, particularly through the cross (Mark 3:27 par.; Heb. 2:14; 1 John 3:8; Rev. 12:10-11). The Satanological dimension to the cross-event may have developed in the context of its interpretation as a Passover due to the role of the destroyer in the Exodus narrative (Ex. 12:23; *Jub.* 49.2; cf. 1 Cor. 5:4-8, 10:10; Heb. 2:14, 11:28).[243]

Table 2: Second Temple Jewish parallels to New Testament Satanological functions and attributes

Satanological function/ attribute	Representative New Testament texts	Antecedents/parallels
Testing, temptation or seduction	Matt. 4:1-11 par.; Acts 5:3; 1 Cor. 7:5; 2 Cor. 4:4; 2 Tim. 2:26	Job 1-2; 1 Chr. 21:1; *Jub.* 17.15-18.12; *1 En.* 65.6; CD 4.12-19; 1QS 3.20-22; *On Samson* 1
Accusation of humans[244]	Luke 22:31; Jude 9; 1 Tim.	Job 1-2; Zech. 3:1-2; *Jub.*

[242] See Farrar and Williams, 'Talk of the Devil,' pp. 80-2, especially Table 1.
[243] See discussion in Jan Dochhorn, 'Die Bestrafung des Unzuchtsünders in 1 Kor 5,5: Satanologische, anthropologische und theologische Implikationen,' in *Das Böse, der Teufel und Dämonen,* pp. 130-4; Farrar and Williams, 'Diabolical Data,' pp. 54-6.
[244] Note however that New Testament writers tend to subvert the Satan's efficacy as an accuser—at least of Christians—for Christological reasons (Luke 22:31-32; Rev. 12:10; cf. Rom. 8:31-34). A possible exception is 1 Tim. 3:6, if τοῦ διαβόλου there is a subjective genitive.

	3:6; Rev. 12:10	48:16-18; *1 En.* 40.7; Jude 9 source; 1QM 13.11
Destruction or punishment of humans	1 Cor. 5:5; 10:10; Heb. 2:14; 11:28	Job 1-2; *Jub.* 48.2-3; 49.2; *1 En.* 53.3; CD 8.1-3
Rule over demonic or angelic forces	Mark 3:22-27 par.; Luke 10:18-19; Matt. 25:41; Eph. 6:11-12; Rev. 12:7-9	*Jub.* 10.8-11; *1 En.* 54.5-6; CD 12.2-3; 1QM 13.1-6; 1QS 3.24
Set within system of cosmic dualism	Matt. 13:38-39; Acts 26:18; 2 Cor. 6:15; 1 John 4:4; Rev. 12:7-9	CD 5.18; 1QM 17.6-7; 1QS 3.20-22; 4QVisions of Amram; Jude 9 source
Rules present age until eschaton	Matt. 13:38-42; Luke 4:5-6; 2 Cor. 4:4; 1 John 5:19	*Jub.* 10.8-11; CD 4.12-19; 1QM 14.9; 1QS 4.19-20
Object of eschatological punishment	Matt. 25:41; Rom. 16:20; Heb. 2:14; Rev. 20:10	*Moses Fragment* 10.1; *1 En.* 54.5-6; 4QCurses; 4QBerakhot

Turning to ontology, LSOs are identified as angels in several Second Temple texts, whether explicitly (CD 16.5; 1QS 3.20-21; 1QM 13.11; 4Q286 2 ii 7) or by association (Job 1:6 LXX; Zech 3:1; *Jub.* 48.1-4 etc.; *1 En.* 53.3; 54.5-6; 65.6; Jude 9's source). In the New Testament, too, the Satan is associated with angels (Matt 25:41; 2 Cor 11:14; 12:7; Jude 9; Rev 12:7-9).[245] No such angelic associations are found in Second Temple texts with a rationalistic Satanology.

[245] Other features of New Testament Satanology are very difficult to explain if the Satan is other than a real being. In both surviving redactions of the Q temptation story, for instance, the Devil demands of Jesus a *physical* act of worship (Matt. 4:8: ἐὰν *πεσὼν* προσκυνήσῃς μοι; Luke 4:6: σὺ οὖν ἐὰν προσκυνήσῃς *ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ*).

Finally, the New Testament Satan is vividly active. He comes and goes, engages in dialogue and demands obeisance (Matt. 4:1-11), files suit (Luke 22:31), lies and murders (John 8:44), inflicts illness (Acts 10:38), disguises himself as an angel of light (2 Cor. 11:14), devises schemes (Eph. 6:11), interferes with travel plans (1 Thess. 2:18), prowls about like a predator (1 Pet. 5:8), throws believers into prison (Rev. 2:10) and accuses them day and night (Rev. 12:10). In all this the New Testament Satan more closely parallels the active LSOs of the mythological type in Second Temple literature than the inactive LSOs of the rationalistic type who are present in texts in name only.

From the New Testament emerges a picture of an LSO that is strikingly consistent both terminologically and conceptually compared to the diverse LSOs found—and *not* found—in other Second Temple literature.

5. Non-mythological exceptions in New Testament Satanology?

Some readers may object that we have too easily posited Satanological homogeneity in the New Testament without proper attention to diversity. Caird, for instance, averred that while some New Testament writers undoubtedly regarded the Satan as a literal person, others, such as Paul, may have viewed him as a figurative personification.[246] It is admittedly difficult from the limited evidence available to us to rule out the possibility that some New Testament writers held a more rationalistic, less mythological Satanology. However, several points can be made in defence of the claim that the diversity in New Testament Satanology orbits a basically homogeneous mythological concept of the Devil that was part of earliest Christian theology.

First, the terminological consistency already highlighted, standing as it does in marked contrast to wider Second Temple Judaism, implies a common historical origin for New

[246] G. B. Caird, *New Testament Theology*, ed. L. D. Hurst (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), p. 110.

Testament Satanology—and no more plausible origin can be offered than the teachings of the historical Jesus and the earliest Palestinian church. If all New Testament Satanology is descended from a single basic idea with one or two normative designations (ὁ σατανᾶς or its Semitic equivalents and ὁ διάβολος as a biblically validated translation thereof), it probably also had some mythological content at its point of origin that was included in elementary Christian teaching. If so, then the burden of proof lies with those who posit that particular writers within a few decades abandoned this mythological content even as they continued to use Satanological language.

Second, the paucity of rationalistic, demythologised LSOs *among those Second Temple texts that do mention such figures* means there is little religion-historical precedent for inferring that a New Testament writer who uses Satanological language has demythologised it. Nor can one plausibly claim that a writer who mentions an LSO is merely paying lip service to a prevailing Jewish notion. Numerous Second Temple Jewish texts mention no LSO, so a writer who disbelieved in a mythological LSO had no obligation to use such language.

These two arguments place the burden of proof squarely on those who interpret the Satanology of particular New Testament writings non-mythologically. Yet scholars who arrive at non-mythological exegesis of New Testament Satanology rarely offer positive evidence. The inference is made from a writer's infrequent mentions of the Satan, or (*unstated*) lack of commitment to belief in this figure, or failure to attribute much concrete activity to him. Let us briefly consider three writers who are sometimes thought to have had a demythologised Satanology: James, Paul and the author of John.

James

Allison infers from the Epistle of James's single reference to the Devil (Jas 4:7) the author's 'scant interest' in this figure.[247] However, if the Devil had no important role in the author's theology, why mention him at all? Wischmeyer goes even further in a recent study of the epistle's view of evil, suggesting that 'Man könnte sogar im Gegensatz zum Mythos vom Bösen den Gedanken von einer ethischen Entmythologisierung des Bösen im Jakobusbrief ins Spiel bringen.'[248] This inference is, like Allison's, based primarily on negative evidence.[249] Wischmeyer also views James's emphasis on the anthropological source of sin (Jas 1:13-15) as evidence for demythologisation due to an assumed dichotomy between mythological and anthropological aetiologies of evil.[250] However, this dichotomy has recently been shown by Davies not to hold in other Second Temple Jewish texts.[251] A more balanced reading of James's theology of evil is offered by Ellis. Having posed the question 'whether the heightened anthropological emphasis in the Epistle…indicates a theological attempt by the author to "demythologise" cosmic evil,' Ellis demurs, wondering whether an 'anthropologically-weighted, demythologising approach to James does not under-emphasise the supernaturalism inherent to the Epistle's cosmology.'[252] While giving due weight to the sophisticated anthropology of Jas 1:13-15, Ellis emphasises that in James's theology of evil 'An external satanic figure operates in a directly combative role against humankind (4:7)'. Anthropological and mythological explanations of evil are not antithetical in James; 'the

[247] Dale C. Allison, Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of James* (ICC; London; T&T Clark, 2013), p. 626.
[248] Oda Wischmeyer, 'Zwischen Gut und Böse: Teufel, Dämonen, das Böse und der Kosmos im Jakobusbrief,' in *Das Böse, der Teufel, und Dämonen,* p. 168.
[249] While conceding that demons are 'einfach Bestandteil frühjüdischer und frühchristlicher Weltsicht' and that 'der Teufel als Person beschrieben' (163-64?), she argues that 'Der Verfasser vermeidet den kosmologischen Dualismus,' that he lacks 'ein thematisches Interesse an Dämonen,' and that 'Auch der Teufel hat keine eigene Rolle.'
[250] ('Das Böse selbst liegt weder im Teufel noch in den Dämonen, *sondern* im Menschen'…'Ihm geht es nicht um böse Geister oder einen Ursprungmythos des Bösen, *sondern* um das Böse in den Menschen,' 167-68)
[251] James P. Davies, 'Evil's Aetiology and False Dichotomies in Jewish Apocalyptic and Paul,' in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, pp. 169-89.
[252] Ellis, 'A Theology of Evil in the Epistle of James,' pp. 275-6.

solution to evil' is 'the resistance of satanic prosecution *and* the reunification of the human heart'.[253]

Paul

Forbes summarises Paul's references to the Satan by calling it 'significant' 'how little we learn of any active role for "spirits" and Satan in Pauline theology beyond the general-purpose role of opposition.'[254] However, texts such as 1 Cor. 7:5, 2 Cor. 2:11, 2 Cor. 4:4, 2 Cor. 11:14, 1 Thess. 2:18 and 2 Thess. 2:9 (this last text admittedly of disputed authorship) all presuppose an active Satan. 2 Cor. 11:14 and 12:7 link the Satan closely to the category of 'angel,' the latter possibly in the overtly cosmological setting of Paul's heavenly journey (12:2-4).[255] The likelihood that Paul identifies the Satan with the Destroyer from the Exodus Passover narrative (1 Cor. 5:4-8; 10:10; cf. Ex. 12:23) also supports a mythological reading of his Satanology.[256]

Dunn doubts whether Paul himself had 'clear beliefs' about heavenly beings such as the Satan—he may have used such terminology because it 'expressed widely held current beliefs,' but his 'relative detachment' from myth and 'lack of commitment' suggest that perhaps 'Paul himself engaged in his own demythologization at this point.'[257] Yet Paul nowhere makes a 'lack of commitment' to Satanology explicit. Moreover, while he shows a clear preference for the more existential categories of sin and death in the argument of Romans, mentioning the Satan only once,[258] one again risks a false dichotomy by insisting

---

[253] Ellis, 'A Theology of Evil in the Epistle of James,' p. 280 (emphasis added).
[254] Chris Forbes, 'Paul's Principalities and Powers: Demythologizing Apocalyptic?', *JSNT* 23 (2001), p. 67.
[255] Cf. Robert M. Price, 'Punished in Paradise: An Exegetical Theory on II Corinthians 12:1-10,' *JSNT* 7 (1980), p. 37; James Buchanan Wallace, *Snatched into Paradise (2 Cor 12:1-10): Paul's Heavenly Journey in the Context of Early Christian Experience* (BZNW 179; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), pp. 272-3. Becker observes that 2 Cor. 12:7 presupposes 'a kind of Satanic hierarchy in analogy to the heavenly retinue' ('Paul and the Evil One,' p. 136).
[256] See references in note 243 above.
[257] James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), pp. 109-10.
[258] In fact, this one occurrence (Rom. 16:20) falls within an interpolation according to Robert Jewett (*Romans* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007], pp. 986-96; for counterarguments see Douglas A. Campbell, *The*

that existential and mythological categories were either/or for Paul rather than both/and. A number of recent studies of Paul's theology of evil have concluded that the apostle did hold a mythological belief in the Satan.[259]

Gospel of John

Charlesworth allows that John contains 'traces of the older view, that the devil is a personified creature (e.g. viii. 44), but one should expect such ideas because of the *Weltanschauung* of John's day; however, the main thrust of this gospel is that the devil has been demythologized.' His evidence for this contention is again largely negative: 'Jesus is *not* portrayed as struggling against an evil spirit… Satan is *not* characterized as a "spirit" or angel'.[260]

Pagels asserts that John 'dismisses the device of the devil as an independent supernatural character'; the Devil rather serves 'to characterize *human* opposition.'[261] A major reason for this inference is that John omits the wilderness temptation story and Jesus's exorcisms—again, an argument from negative evidence. Certainly the absence of exorcisms is significant, but does not imply that the author lacked the Synoptic evangelists' belief in demons.[262] Various other explanations have been proposed for this absence,[263] and it is noteworthy that John 12:31 'uses the vocabulary of exorcism to describe the overthrow of the demonic ruler

---

Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013], pp. 513-14). Implicit reference to the Satan is also likely in Rom. 8:31-34, 38.

[259] Guy J. Williams, *The Spirit World in the Letters of Paul the Apostle: A Critical Examination of the Role of Spiritual Beings in the Authentic Pauline Epistles* (FRLANT 231; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), pp. 87-109; Brown, *The God of This Age*; Becker, 'Paul and the Evil One'; Torsten Löfstedt, 'Paul, Sin and Satan: The Root of Evil according to Romans,' *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 75 (2010), pp. 109-34; Tilling, 'Paul, Evil, and Justification Debates,' 220.

[260] James H. Charlesworth, 'A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS III, 13-IV, 26 and the "Dualism" Contained in the Fourth Gospel,' *NTS* 15 (1969), pp. 405-406.

[261] Pagels, 'The Social History of Satan, Part II,' pp. 40, 52.

[262] *Contra* Justin Meggitt, 'The historical Jesus and healing: Jesus' miracles in psychosocial context,' in Fraser Watts (ed.), *Spiritual Healing: Scientific and Religious Perspectives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 21.

[263] See Eric Plumer, 'The Absence of Exorcisms in the Fourth Gospel,' *Bib* 78 (1997), pp. 350-68; Ronald A. Piper, 'Satan, Demons and the Absence of Exorcisms in the Fourth Gospel,' in David G. Horrell and Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *Christology, Controversy and Community: New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole* (NovTSup 99; Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 253-78.

of this world.'[264] Several recent studies have pushed back against demythologising exegesis of the Johannine LSO.[265] Aune states the basic reason succinctly: 'the various aliases "ruler of this world," "Satan," and "Devil" are designations for a personal being'[266] (as, most likely, is 'the evil one' in John 17:15). Of the few other examples we have seen of early Jewish texts with a rationalistic Satanology, none approaches the richness of Johannine Satanological vocabulary. Moreover, the term 'prince' (e.g., שר or ἄρχων) frequently designates LSOs in early Jewish and Christian literature but seemingly never a demythologised opponent.[267] The language of the Satan 'entering into' Judas (John 13:27) is that of an evil spirit (cp. Mark 5:13; Q 11:26). Thus, even if the reification of the Satan is less explicit in the fourth gospel than in the Synoptics, it remains likely that this author understood the Satan in mythological terms.

In summary, there is very little positive evidence favouring non-mythological exegesis of James's, Paul's or John's Satanology. The popularity of such exegesis among contemporary scholars says more about such scholars' worldview than that of the early church.

6. Conclusion

This study has argued from Second Temple Jewish background evidence that New Testament Satanology is better described as mythological than as rationalistic. Specifically, the New Testament writers probably understood the Satan as an angel (and there is no clear reason to

---

[264] Eric Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity* (WUNT 2/157; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), pp. 134-5.

[265] Judith L. Kovacs, '"Now Shall the Ruler of This World Be Driven Out": Jesus' Death as Cosmic Battle in John 12:20-36,' *JBL* 114 (1995), pp. 227-47; Torsten Löfstedt, 'The Ruler of This World,' *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 74 (2009), pp. 55-79; Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 'Evil in Johannine and Apocalyptic Perspective: Petition for Protection in John 17,' in Catrin H. Williams and Christopher Rowland (eds.,), *John's Gospel and Intimations of Apocalyptic* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), pp. 205-6.

[266] David E. Aune, 'Dualism in the Fourth Gospel and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reassessment of the Problem,' *in Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul in the Context of Jewish and Greco-Roman Antiquity: Collected Essays II* (WUNT 303; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), p. 135.

[267] In addition to the non-Christian Jewish texts discussed above, see, e.g., Mark 3:22 par.; Eph 2:2; Ignatius *Phld.* 6.2; *Magn.* 1.2; *Trall.* 4.2; *Rom.* 7.1; *Eph.* 17.1; 19.1; Ascen Is.; *Barn.* 4.13; 18.2; M. Polyc. 19.2; *Ascen. Is.* 1.3; 10.12; 4.2-3; 10.29. Clinton Wahlen notes the close semantic similarity between ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου and Beelzebul, or at least Matthew's understanding of this name in Matt 10:25 (*Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels* [WUNT 2/185; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004], p. 126.

posit any exceptions). This conclusion is supported by numerous terminological and conceptual parallels between the New Testament and Second Temple texts with angelic or at least quasi-angelic LSOs. In certain cases direct literary dependence can be posited (e.g., Luke 22:31-32 on Job 1-2; Matt. 25:41 on *1 En.* 54:5-6; Jude 9 on *Moses Fragment*). Conversely, the few Second Temple Jewish expressions of Satanology that may be more rationalistic than mythological (Sirach, Community Rule, 4QBarkhi Nafshi, *On Samson, Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*) lack clear New Testament parallels. The cumulative weight of evidence makes for a compelling case: traditional 'angelomorphic' Christian Satanology is firmly grounded in the religion-historical context of the New Testament, while the non-mythological exegesis of New Testament Satanology posited by Ling, Wink, Phipps *et al* is not. Future research should attempt to reconstruct the Satanology of the historical Jesus in order to assess the extent to which his teachings and deeds explain the relative unity of New Testament Satanology in comparison to Second Temple Judaism.

The problem of making New Testament Satanology culturally accessible to Christians remains, especially in the West where there is little room for an apostate angel in the prevailing scientific worldview. However, simply deleting the Devil from the church's vocabulary does not seem a viable solution. That such deletion has followed in the wake of scholarly demythologising programmes designed to *salvage* Christian Satanology suggests that contemporary reconceptualisations of the Devil have hitherto lacked the explanatory power and rhetorical sharpness that Satanology held in the early church.