

RESURRECTION AND THE JUDGMENT OF THE TITANS:

ἡ γῆ τῶν ἀσεβῶν IN LXX ISAIAH 26.19

Brook W.R. Pearson

יחיו מתידך נבלתי יקימון הקיצו ורצנו שכני עפר
כי של אורה שלך וארץ רפאים תפיל:
(MT Isa. 26.19)

Your dead will live, their bodies will rise; sing, dweller in dust,
for your dew is like a dew of light, *and on the land of shades you will
cause it to fall.*

ἀναστήσονται οἱ νεκροὶ καὶ ἐγερθήσονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις καὶ
εὐφρανθήσονται οἱ ἐν τῇ γῆ ἡ γὰρ δρόσος ἡ παρὰ σοῦ ἱαμα αὐτοῖς
ἐστὶν ἡ δὲ γῆ τῶν ἀσεβῶν πεσεῖται (LXX Isa. 26.19)

The dead will arise and those in the tombs will be awakened—those that
are in the earth will rejoice, for the dew from you is a means of healing
to them; *but the land of the unholy/ungodly/profane ones will fall.*

1. Introduction

One of the most difficult aspects of Septuagintal studies is the determination of the way in which the Septuagintal text was read by those for whom it was translated.¹ This difficulty probably explains why the LXX

1. For a survey of notable studies in this regard on LXX Isaiah, see S.E. Porter and B.W.R. Pearson, 'Isaiah through Greek Eyes: The LXX of Isaiah', in C.C. Broyles and C.A. Evans (eds.), *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition* (2 vols.; VTSup, 70; FOTL, 1; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997), II, pp. 531-46. An encouraging development is the incipient launch by E.J. Brill Publishers, Leiden, of the Septuagint Commentary Series, edited by S.E. Porter, R. Hess, J. Jarick and J. Schoper. See Porter and Pearson, 'Isaiah through Greek Eyes', pp. 545-46. One of the reasons why Septuagintal studies face difficulties in this way is the inability to determine exactly the nature of the LXX text—is it a faithful translation of the Hebrew we now know as the MT, or did it translate some different form of Hebrew text, or did it simply create a new sense for the material it was 'translating', all of its own accord? Of course, there is always the possibility that the text we know as the LXX was influenced by Christian revision (the earliest

has been studied primarily as a window through which to peer at an earlier phase in the editorial development of the Hebrew Bible, rather than as a document in its own right. This is, however, changing.² It is the purpose of this paper to examine the concept of resurrection in LXX

complete manuscripts being, after all, fourth century), or responsible for subsequent revision of the Hebrew itself (which we now cannot tell, as such changes would be incorporated in the MT). The existence of so-called 'proto-Masoretic' texts of both Hebrew and Greek material—the most notable example in Greek being the Twelve Prophets scroll from the Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr; for a thorough, if somewhat unwieldy, examination of the various relationships between the LXX, 8HevXIIgr, and the MT, see E. Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever [8HevXIIgr]* [DJD, 8; The Seiyâl Collection, 1; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990], pp. 99-158. Less complicated discussions can be found in D. Barthélemy, 'Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'Histoire de la Septante', *RB* 60 [1953], pp. 18-29; *idem*, *Les devanciers d'Aquila* [VTSup, 10; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963], esp. pp. 203-22 for discussion of the 'proto-Masoretic' nature of 8HevXIIgr; also B. Lifshitz, 'The Greek Documents from the Cave of Horror', *IEJ* 12 [1962], pp. 201-207; and P. Katz, 'Justin's Old Testament Quotations and the Greek Dodekapropheton Scroll', *Studia Patristica* 1 = [TU, 63; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957], pp. 343-53). Other 'revisions' of the Greek (i.e. the Aquilan and Theodotian rescensions) complicate the problem further, and discussion of documents such as the *Letter of Aristeas* and its possible connection to controversies over LXX revision suggests an even greater complexity. In the light of these problems, it is perhaps unwise to read the LXX as a single unity, or even to imagine that we are aware of the chronological relationships between different Greek and Hebrew manuscripts and rescensions.

2. The approach utilized in this paper, and in my forthcoming commentary on LXX Isaiah (*Isaiah* [Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden: E.J. Brill, forthcoming]) seeks to examine LXX Isaiah first in the light of its surrounding cultural, religious and political landscapes, rather than the MT. Comparisons of differences (not 'changes') may then help to describe the chronological relationships between the different traditions, but will avoid the trap of needing to find 'translational intention'. This is a point I.L. Seeligmann (*The LXX Version of Isaiah* [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1948], p. 95) makes very well, with his insistence that 'passages that were translated literally in a given book of the Septuagint are of equal importance as free paraphrases: both represent fragments of the religious notions of the translator concerned' (see discussion and application [to LXX Isa. 40.3-6] of this principle in Porter and Pearson, 'Isaiah through Greek Eyes', pp. 542-45). If Seeligmann is correct in this (although he seems to assume that one could actually tell when the translator was doing one or the other), then the question becomes moot. Cf. J. Lust, 'Introduction', to J. Lust, E. Eynikel and K. Hauspie (eds.), *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (2 vols.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992), I, pp. x-xi, who misses these points in his assertion that, 'even when the Septuagint is studied for its own sake, it still should not be forgotten that it is a translation'.

Isaiah in the light of the appearance of giants in the translation, one of the many clear elements of Hellenistic literary influence on the Isaiah translator/redactor. To anticipate my conclusions, there seems to be a close connection between 'giant' language in LXX Isaiah, the growing traditions concerning the נפלים and רפאים in Jewish literature from the Hellenistic period, the Titans of Greek mythology, and the ἀσεβεις—the 'ungodly/unholy/profane ones' whose land, according to LXX Isa. 26.19, will be destroyed.

2. *Giants, Titans and Mighty Men:*

The נפלים, רפאים and גבורים in the LXX

The LXX translators, when faced with the Hebrew words גבור, רפאים and נפלים, had recourse to multiple Greek lexical items with which to translate them. However, there was more than simple lexical choice involved in the translation of these words—in an era of oriental self-justification in response to Greek political, military and ideological dominance, much concern was shown for establishing the superiority (often simply on the basis of anteriority) of one's culture over the Greeks (and, of course, over one's non-Greek neighbours as well).³ At the same time, however, part of this process was to show that Greek myths and legends were simply legends concerning one's own people, or concerning things about which one's own myths and legends were at least knowledgeable. This established both the antiquity of one's culture (something which the Greeks did not have to nearly the same degree as the oriental cultures they dominated), and the grounds for superiority of one's own culture over others.⁴ In light of this trend within oriental literature as a whole during this period, but specifically within Jewish literature, it is quite interesting to note which traditions from Jewish antiquity are revived and augmented during the Hellenistic era. One of these, perhaps one of the most important, is the tradition

3. See E.J. Bickerman, *The Jews in the Greek Age* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988), pp. 218-36 for an incisive analysis of the international ideological infighting of the Hellenistic era with regard especially to chronology.

4. Consider the tradition preserved in (pseudo-)Eupolemus (fr. 1 [Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 9.17.8-9]), discussed below, that Abraham had been the one to pass on his astrological wisdom to the Egyptians (which he himself got from Enoch, who is equated with Atlas), thus clearly 'establishing' the superiority of Hebrew wisdom and tradition over the Egyptian.

concerning the giants who appear at various junctures in the Hebrew Bible. These were seen by post-biblical Jewish authors as clearly connected with the myths of the Greeks concerning the predecessors of the Olympian gods—the Titans.

The three specific Hebrew terms worthy of mention in this regard are: גבורים and רפאים. In the Hebrew Bible, the נפלים are the 'fallen ones' who first appear in Gen. 6.4, reappear briefly in Num. 13.33 as the ancestors of the Anakites (cf. LXX Deut. 1.28, where the Hebrew ענקים בני 'sons of the Anakim' is translated as 'sons of the giants'), and then disappear from the Hebrew Bible (except for a possible allusion in Ezek. 32.27). The LXX translators of Genesis and Numbers have chosen to translate both of these instances with γίγας.⁵ The word in the Hebrew Bible most often translated as γίγας is גבור,⁶ but there is also one other group in the LXX translated with γίγας, namely the enigmatic רפאים. Significantly, the רפאים are translated not only with γίγας, but also with τῑτάν—an extremely suggestive conflation of Greek mythology with the Hebrew traditions.⁷ The second of these two translations suggests

5. The translator of Ezek. 32.27 has faithfully translated גבורים נפלים as τῑν γιγάντων τῑν πεπτωκότων, but the confluence of the terms 'mighty men' and the participle 'fallen', possibly already an allusion by Ezekiel to Gen. 6.4, may not have been lost on the translator, hence his decision to translate גבור with γίγας. It is impossible to be certain, since the translator of Ezekiel always uses γίγας to translate גבור (Ezek. 32.12, 21, 27; 39.18, 20).

6. LXX Gen. 6.4; 10.8, 9 (twice); Isa. 3.2; 13.3; 49.24, 25; Ezek. 32.12, 21, 27; 39.18, 20; Pss. 18.6; 32.16; 1 Chron. 1.10.

7. Whereas גבור, when not translated as γίγας, becomes ισχυρός, a participle of δύναμαι, δυνατός, or μέγας (all of which fall within a reasonably similar semantic field), the רפאים are treated in several different ways:

- (1) simple transliteration (LXX Gen. 15.20; Deut. 2.11, 20; 3.11, 13; Josh. 15.8; 18.16 [as Εμεκραφοῖν, a transliteration of both the Hebrew עמק—'valley', and רפאים]; 2 Kgdms 23.13);
- (2) omitted or altered in the translation (LXX Josh. 17.5; Isa. 17.5 [where 'Valley of the Rephaim' has become 'a rich valley']);
- (3) translated as ἰατρος, 'healers/physicians' (LXX Ps. 87.11; Isa. 26.14);
- (4) translated as γίγας (LXX Gen. 14.5; Josh. 12.4 [cf. Deut. 3.13, where Og is identified as the king of Bashan, which the MT tells us is the land of the Rephaim, and which the translator simply transliterates, whereas here, in Joshua, the translator tells us he is king of Bashan, ὑπελείφθη ('left over') ἐκ τῑν γιγάντων]; 13.12; possibly 2 Kgdms 21.11, although there is no Hebrew text for the second half of this verse in the LXX, and it seems to be a displaced fragment of text at any rate, probably also v. 22,

the importance of another word used in the LXX, namely Τάρταρος—the place in Greek mythology in which the Titans were imprisoned after their battle with Zeus. In one of the three occurrences of this word, LXX Prov. 30.16, it translates the Hebrew שְׁאוֹל, 'Sheol'.⁸ In the other two, however, the word is simply used to indicate a place—'the deep' (LXX Job 40.15 [MT 40.20]; 41.23 [MT 41.24]).⁹ The use of Enochic traditions in 2 Peter 2, where the verb ταρταρώ ('cast into Tartarus') is used of the angels who sinned (v. 4), hints at the further importance of Tartarus in subsequent Christian conceptions of the underworld, mediated through the Jewish appropriation of them during the second Temple period.

although the Hebrew בנת להרפה ילדו 'sons of the Rapha in Gath' [surely mistranslated as 'descended from the giants in Gath', RSV], which could be seen as being related to the רפאים, is actually retained alongside ἀπόγονοι τῑν γιγάντων in the LXX, which treats 'Rapha' as a proper name [see BDB s.v. רפה, p. 952]; Isa. 14.9; Job 26.5; Prov. 21.16; 1 Chron. 11.15; 14.9 [cf. v. 13, which adds 'of the giants' to 'valley', apparently to agree with v. 9]; 20.4 [cf. vv. 6, 8, which display the same understanding of 'Rapha' as 2 Kgdms 21.22];

- (5) translated as τῑτάν (LXX 2 Kgdms 5.18, 22);
- (6) translated as γηγενής 'son of the earth/earthborn' (i.e. son of Gaia—usually a reference to the non-Titan sons of Gaia, the Cyclopes and the Hecatonchires) (LXX Prov. 2.18; 9.18); and finally,
- (7) translated only once as ἀσεβής 'ungodly/unholy' (LXX Isa. 26.19), which is the special focus of this paper.

8. On Sheol, see J. Jarick, 'Questioning Sheol', in this volume.

9. An interesting point with regard to this latter translation is the way in which it betrays an acceptance of at least part of Greek cosmology, and perhaps more than that, by the translator/redactor of LXX Isaiah. As A. van der Kooij ('Isaiah in the Septuagint', in Broyles and Evans (eds.), *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*, II, pp. 513-29, here p. 513; cf. Porter and Pearson, 'Isaiah through Greek Eyes', p. 534) notes, 'LXX Isaiah represents an unique case within the LXX of the Old Testament as a whole, in being a free translation which reflects at several places an actualizing translation of the Isaianic prophecies'. While the acceptance of Greek cosmology, or at least Greek cosmological terms, on the part of other LXX translators does not necessarily relate directly to the question at hand, the use of these terms does suggest at least a comfortability on the part of the LXX translators with a Greek conception of the underworld. We have no reason to believe that the language was not accompanied by at least some of the belief behind it.

3. The Greeks, their Gods and the Giants

Before we can unravel the usage of Titan/giant terminology in LXX Isaiah and other Second Temple Jewish literature, it is important that we are familiar with both the classical form of the primaeval myths of the Greeks and some of the developments that these underwent in later Hellenistic literature.

Sprung directly from Chaos (Hesiod, *Theogony* 116-25), Gaia and Uranus were parents to many of those figures with which we are concerned in this paper: the twelve Titans, the three Cyclopes and the three Hecatonchires. Uranus's hatred for his own children was such that, as they were born, he took each one and 'hid them all in the depths of the earth and did not allow them to emerge into the light' (*Theogony* 155). This place of hiding is most probably to be associated with Tartarus, or was later so associated. At length, Gaia decided that she had had enough of her husband's 'wickedness' towards her children, and went to them where they were hidden. She had crafted a plan to usurp the power of her husband through the help of her children. Having fashioned a sickle of adamant, she planned to lure Uranus to her bed, and then have one of her children castrate him. None of the twelve Titans, the Cyclopes, or the Hecatonchires were willing to perform this task, except Kronos—youngest of the Titans. In the aftermath of the castration, the divine genitals gave 'birth' to Aphrodite, and, as blood dripped from the severed genitals and hit the ground, 'giants' sprang up, who are to be seen as a separate race of giants, perhaps to be associated with heroic figures in the distant past, as they are described as 'shining in their armour and carrying long spears in their hands' (*Theogony* 186).¹⁰ This act allows Kronos and the rest of the twelve Titans access to the upper world again, and may be seen as the paradigm of resurrection stories to follow in Greek literature, as it establishes a precedent of movement in and out of the underworld. After this, Kronos, married to his sister, Rhea, becomes the father of the gods who will later become the Olympians (*Theogony* 453-506). Following in his father's footsteps, he, in fact, devours each one of his children as they are born, hoping to

10. See M.L. West, *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966 [repr. Oxford: Sandpiper Books, 1997]), pp. 220-21 for discussion. It may be that the translation of גִּיגָיִם with γίγας in the LXX occasionally reflects such a separate race of giants, rather than the Titans, esp. in LXX Gen. 10.8, 9 and the similar passage in 1 Chron. 1.10, as well as Ezek. 32.27, discussed above, n. 5.

forestall a prophecy that he will be overcome by his own son (*Theogony* 462). Because of this, his wife, Rhea, went to their parents, Uranus and Gaia, for advice (who are, it must be admitted, eminently qualified to advise on this particular problem). So, following their advice, she hid Zeus on the island of Crete, and gave Kronos a stone wrapped in swaddling cloths, which he happily swallowed, thinking it to be Zeus. Later, Zeus, having been reared successfully on Crete, made war on his father Kronos, allied to some of Kronos's brothers, and to his half-brothers, the Hecatonchires and the Cyclopes. Along with these were the rest of Zeus's siblings, whom he had tricked Kronos into regurgitating, preceded by the stone which had doubled as the infant Zeus.¹¹ According to this myth, called the 'Titanomachy', it was the Cyclopes who made for Zeus his thunder and lightening, which he used in the battle against his father.¹² Victorious, Zeus either imprisoned both his father and his father's brothers in Tartarus, from whence Kronos eventually escaped to live in the idyllic 'Isles of the Blessed', or spared his father from imprisonment and allowed him to go immediately to the Isles of the Blessed.¹³ Either way, an important outcome of this war is

11. This stone was supposedly set up by Zeus at Delphi, and was still revered in the Hellenistic period. See Pausanias 10.24.6 and C. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Myth as History: The Previous Owners of the Delphic Oracle', in J. Bremmer (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* (London: Routledge, 1988), pp. 215-41, esp. pp. 233-35.

12. H.S. Versnel ('Greek Myth and Ritual: The Case of Kronos', in Bremmer [ed.], *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, pp. 121-52, here p. 123) suggests that the use of Zeus's thunder and lightening to defeat Kronos is an interpolation, and that the Hecatonchires should be seen as the original victors of the battle (albeit under the command of Zeus). Cf. West, *Hesiod: Theogony*, p. 351, who thinks the addition to the original myth is Hesiod's own work: 'It may be thought that it does not say much for Zeus' aim that while earth, sky, and sea crashed and seethed, the Titans merely felt the θερμός ἀντητή. But Hesiod cannot allow Zeus' bolts to be more effective than this, because it is the Hundred-Handers who must overwhelm the Titans.'

13. There is some confusion over the status of some of the material in Hesiod's *Works and Days*—169 (listed as 169 and 169a-e in the LCL edition, but as 173a-e in West's text), which says 'his bonds the father of men and gods had broken' and tells us that Kronos now reigns on the Isles of the Blessed as king, is probably not original. It only exists in two of the papyrus versions of the poem, and other manuscripts and *scholia* put it (or parts thereof) at different places. See M.L. West, *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978 [repr. Oxford: Sandpiper Books, 1997]), pp. 194-96, who points out (p. 195) that this version of the fate of Kronos was known to Pindar (*Ol.* 2.70-75), who probably obtained it from a

the imprisonment and chaining of the Titans in Tartarus, who are then guarded by the Hecatonchires (*Theogony* 718).

An additional element of interest with regard to the subject of this paper is the second removal of beings from the underworld—while Kronos was the first to return from the underworld to exact his bizarre revenge on his father, Uranus, the Cyclopes and Hecatonchires were still imprisoned in Tartarus, bound in the chains in which Uranus had originally placed them. Zeus freed them from their bondage—first the Cyclopes (*Theogony* 501; it was gratitude for this action that caused them to forge and give the thunder and lightning to Zeus), and then the Hecatonchires. This return from the underworld is no less significant for its conclusion, when the Titans are returned to the underworld where Uranus had originally chained them (*Theogony* 718).

With regard to later developments of this story, there is one version of this myth in particular which could very well be important for our discussion—the Orphic myth of the slaughter of Zagreus. This central myth in the Orphic mysteries contains a development of the Titan myth in which the Titans are brought into conflict with Zeus as the result of Hera's inciting them to kill (and eat) Zagreus, Zeus's son by Persephone. The heart of Zagreus is saved, however, and, when eaten by Zeus, becomes the genesis of a new Zagreus—Dionysus.¹⁴ What inter-

Pythagorean source; cf. Versnel, 'Greek Myth and Ritual', p. 123.

14. See the *Orphic Fragments* 60–235; Callimachus, *Fr.* 643; Euphorion, *Fr.* 13. As M.P. Nilsson (*A History of Greek Religion* [trans. F.J. Fielden; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2nd edn, 1949], p. 217) puts it, 'The myth of the Titans' crime against Zagreus might be taken as an aetiological tale intended to explain the central rite in the Dionysiac orgies, the tearing to pieces and devouring of the god personified in an animal, but with this rite, Orphicism indissolubly associates the myth of man's origin from the ashes of the Titans, in which particles of the divine Zagreus were also present'. Cf. Plato's reference (*Laws* 701c) to 'the Titanic nature' of man, which forms the flip side of this story, and may help explain the concept of original sin in later Christian theology, or perhaps even earlier Jewish discussions of the two natures in man. There has been some question as to the antiquity of this version of the myth, but there are several reasons to think that it was indeed as old as at least the fifth century BCE—Plato's statement in *Laws* 701c makes little sense without the anthropogony as given in this tale, and one of Plato's disciples, Xenocrates, also referred to the Titans and Dionysus to explain Plato, *Phd.* 62b. See the discussions in W. Burkert, *Greek Religion* (trans. J. Raffan; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985), pp. 297–99; W.K.C. Guthrie, *The Greeks and their Gods* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1954), pp. 318–21; and Nilsson, *History of Greek Religion*, pp. 216–18.

ests us in this story is not so much the explanation of the origin of Dionysus, but rather the role of the Titans in it. They are seen as essentially evil or wicked beings, and are alternatively either destroyed or are cast into Tartarus, where they are bound with chains.

4. *Giants and Titans in Second Temple Jewish Literature*

In section 5, I will look at the way in which 'giant' language is used and translated within LXX Isaiah, but for now, the example of LXX Isa. 14.9, where גִּיָּמִים is translated with a form of $\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\alpha\varsigma$, will be instructive. In an earlier paper, it was suggested that this translation, together with the shift in subject from שָׂמַיִם in the Hebrew to $\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ in the LXX, showed that the translator was, either consciously or unconsciously, ignoring the translation 'shades' for גִּיָּמִים , and choosing 'giants' because of the growing traditions concerning giants in the Jewish literature of the period (*I Enoch, Jubilees*, etc.).¹⁵ Indeed, this tradition had such clear parallels with the Greek myths of the Titans and giants that even Josephus was forced to admit the similarity,¹⁶ and Philo, although he denies its validity, shows that at least some of his contemporaries thought that the Genesis 6 giants were those of the Greek myths of the Titans¹⁷—"Now the giants were on the earth in those days" (Gen. 6.4). Some may think that the Lawgiver is alluding to the myths of the poets about giants, but indeed myth-making is a thing most alien to him' (*On the Giants* 58, LCL).¹⁸ Other writers, however, were more willing to

15. Cf. Porter and Pearson, 'Isaiah through Greek Eyes', pp. 540–41. On the *Traditionsgeschichte* of the giants in intertestamental Jewish literature, cf. L.T. Stuckenbruck, 'The Throne Theophany of the Book of Giants: Some New Light on the Background of Daniel 7', in S.E. Porter and C.A. Evans (eds.), *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (JSPSup, 26; RILP, 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), pp. 211–20, esp. p. 214 n. 8.

16. *Ant.* 1.73 (LCL): 'For many angels of God now consorted with women and begat sons who were overbearing and disdainful of every virtue, such confidence they had in their strength; in fact the deeds that tradition ascribes to them resemble the audacious exploits told by the Greeks of the giants.' Section 74 goes on to tell of their relationship with Noah.

17. A good example of such a contemporary would be book 3 of the *Sibylline Oracles*, where the author re-tells the primaeva history of the Greeks, but with the assumption that the Titans are actually human. There is a similar assumption that these are the mighty men and giants spoken of in the book of Genesis.

18. J. Levison (*The Spirit in First Century Judaism* [AGJU, 29; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997], pp. 139–42) discusses Philo's conception of the spirit/spiritual in *On*

explore this point of cultural contact and to build upon it, in the atmosphere of the *Interpretatio Graeca*.¹⁹ One of these writers is the author preserved in Eusebius's quotations of the historian Alexander Polyhistor, often identified as Pseudo-Eupolemus,²⁰ but whose work should probably be seen as coming from two different sources—the first actually part of the work of Eupolemus, and the second exactly as its first words say, 'anonymous works'.²¹ If we follow this reasoning,

the *Giants*, but ignores the connection of the Greek myth regarding the origin of the spirits/daemons in the souls of the Titans. While Philo castigates those who think that the giants mentioned in Genesis 6 are to be equated with the Greek myths, he is himself the recipient of a Stoic reworking of those exact traditions. His idea that 'souls and daemons and angels are but different names for the same one underlying object' (*On the Giants* 16, LCL) depends quite heavily on the Greek concept of the origin of the daemons.

19. M. Hengel's discussion of this (*Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* [2 vols.; trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1974], I, pp. 255-314) is the shortest section of his magisterial study, as well as perhaps its most interesting. It is probably best to think of the *Interpretatio Graeca* as a two-way street—not only did the Greeks try to understand other cultures' traditions in light of their own (e.g. Alexander the Great and his men 'discovering' a city founded by Dionysius near Mt Koh-i-nor, just Northeast of the Indus River, on the basis of the common ivy growing wild on the hill upon which it was built [see Arrian 5.1-2; Quintus Curtius 8.10.7; Diodorus Siculus prologue; Plutarch, *Life of Alexander* 58.6; and discussion in R. Lane Fox, *Alexander the Great* (London: Penguin Books, 1986 [1974]), pp. 340-41]), but other cultures also tried to understand the Greeks in light of their own traditions (e.g. the legendary connections between the Spartans and the Jews: see Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I, p. 72 for discussion).

20. Pseudo-Eupolemus is preserved in Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 9.17.2-9 (fr. 1) and 9.18.2 (fr. 2) (*FGrH* 724). For discussion and translation of these passages, see R. Doran, 'Pseudo-Eupolemus: A New Translation and Introduction', *OTP*, II, pp. 873-79; B.Z. Wacholder, *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College and Jewish Institute of Religion, 1974) (including ET), esp. pp. 104-106 and 313-14; Greek text and ET, C.R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors. I. Historians* (SBLTT, 20, Pseudepigrapha, 10; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1983), pp. 157-87; Greek text, A.-M. Denis, *Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum Quae Supersunt Graeca: Una Cum Historicum et Auctorum Iudaeorum Hellenistarum Fragmentis* (ed. A.-M Denis and M. de Jonge; PVTG, 3; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1970), pp. 197-98; discussion, H.W. Attridge, 'Historiography', in M.E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), pp. 165-66.

21. Doran ('Pseudo-Eupolemus', pp. 874-76) persuasively argues against the identification of the first fragment of 'Pseudo-Eupolemus' (Eusebius *Praep. Evang.*

then, we are really only speaking of one 'author' (Eupolemus, under whose name fr. 1 should be placed) and either anonymous 'works' or simply anonymous 'traditions', without a written form of which Polyhistor was aware.²² It is a co-reading of these two sources which makes the material in fr. 1 of interest in the discussion of giants, and may explain why the two sources have been kept together for so long. In fr. 2, Polyhistor records the tradition that Abraham traced his ancestry to the giants, and that these giants, who lived in Babylonia, were destroyed by the gods on account of their impiety. He further notes that one of the giants was known as 'Belos', probably to be identified with Bel from Babylonian mythology, and that this Belos was the one who built the tower in Babylonia (Babel), after which it was named. With no obvious connection at all, we are told that 'After Abraham learned astrology, he first went to Phoenicia and taught it to the Phoenicians; later he went to Egypt'. This lack of connectivity, however, is explained if one turns to fr. 1, earlier in both Eusebius's text and, presumably, Polyhistor's, and hence probably meant to be assumed when reading fr. 2. In fr. 1, we are told the story of Abraham's birth in Babylonia, his education in Chaldean astrology, his travels to Phoenicia, and his eventual move to Egypt, where he taught the Egyptian priests astrology and other arts. Up to this point, the material in fr. 2, other than the tracing of Abraham's ancestry to the giants, appears to be a simple summary of fr. 1. From this point on, however, it is unclear what the exact relationships are. Although Belos appears in fr. 2 as one of the giants who escapes the wrath of the gods and builds Babylon, and fr. 1 explicitly identifies him as Kronos,²³ fr. 1 does not likewise explicitly identify Abraham's decent

9.17.2-9) as both 'Pseudo-' and by a Samaritan. In agreement with this, I will here treat fr. 1 as a part of the genuine Eupolemus's *oeuvre*, and the implications of that identification in terms of the level of Hellenization on the part of Eupolemus should also be noted.

22. The Greek allows for either of these interpretations, as ἀδεσπότης is not accompanied by any noun which would indicate the written nature of these traditions, and the summary nature of the following material makes it seem even less likely that Polyhistor is doing anything but quoting oral tradition.

23. There is some disagreement concerning this point—Wacholder (*Eupolemus*, p. 313), following the text as it stands in Eusebius (Βαβυλωνίους γὰρ λέγειν πρώτων γενέσθαι Βῆλον, ὃν εἶναι Κρόνον...), translates it as 'The Babylonians say that the first (giant) was Belus, who is Kronos...' Doran ('Pseudo-Eupolemus', pp. 877-78 n. 34 and p. 881 n. 's') suggests that this translation is faulty, in that (1) Belos was typically identified with Zeus in attempts to synchronize Babylonian

as traceable to the giants. It does, however, make it clear (9.17.2) that the founders of Babylon, from which Abraham came, were the giants who escaped the flood, and that Enoch, founder of astrological wisdom according to this fragment, is to be identified with Atlas (9.17.9). If this is read in tandem with the myth of the Titanomachy, we are presented with a very interesting picture. On the one hand, fr. 1, by Eupolemus, seems to be very negative regarding the giants—they escape the flood only to face God's wrath a second time for the building of 'the tower well known in history' (9.17.2), and are scattered over the face of the earth. On the other hand, the identification of Enoch with the second generation Titan, Atlas, and the implicit descent of Abraham from the giants responsible for the foundation of Babylon would argue for a reasonably ambivalent, and maybe even positive, view of at least some of the giants. It is possible that this ambivalence betrays an understanding of the various 'races' of giants presented in Greek literature,²⁴ and that those who are to be identified with the ancient mighty men/ heroes are those who are viewed positively, while the Titans take on a darker role.²⁵

mythology with Greek (see, e.g., Herodotus 1.181.2), and (2) a simple emendation to ...ὄν εἶναι Κρόνου would alleviate this problem. The key to this issue, as Doran admits ('Pseudo-Eupolemus', p. 877 n. 34), seems to be the decision one makes on the authorship of these two fragments—if they are both by the same author, it would make sense that the two stories should be understood as mutually intelligible and leave the identification of Belos as Kronos in fr. 1. If, however, we follow the judgment that these two fragments are from different sources, then it may still be better to leave the tradition in fr. 1 as it stands—without emendation. In this case, it would appear that both Eupolemus in fr. 1 and the anonymous tradition(s) in fr. 2 concur on both the identity of Belos and his status as a giant/Titan.

24. Cf. Ezekiel the Tragedian, *Exodus* 79-81: 'Then at my feet a multitude of stars fell down, and I their number reckoned up. They passed like armed ranks of men', which suggests overlap with the picture of the 'giants' formed from the droplets of blood from Uranus' severed genitals (*Theogony* 186, and see above).

25. Cf. Wis. 14.6: 'even in the beginning when arrogant giants were perishing...' Interestingly, Hengel's treatment of this in *Judaism and Hellenism*, I, p. 204—'The Enoch tradition was... not the exclusive possession of the Hasidic, apocalyptic wisdom teachers; rather, it is possible that the Hellenists in Shechem [Hengel thinks (pseudo-)Eupolemus is an "Anonymous Samaritan"] and Jerusalem developed their own "Enoch tradition" in the identification with Atlas'—is undermined by his own recognition (I, p. 190) that the same features are present in *I Enoch* itself, and that the 'Hellenists' actually display fewer 'Hellenistic' features than the 'Hasidic, apocalyptic wisdom teachers'. As always in this debate, termi-

The book of *Jubilees*, so important for the Qumran community,²⁶ also reflects this Hellenistic conflation of the Titan myth with Israelite tradition. *Jubilees* 5.1-19 is a fascinating re-telling of the Genesis 6 stories about the offspring of angels and women, the Nephilim, who are the נַפְלִיִּים²⁷—the 'mighty men of old'. *Jubilees* follows the Genesis text fairly closely in the description of the ante-diluvian period and the wickedness that began to grow in man. What is interesting is that, although the birth of the giants is followed by the statement: 'And injustice increased upon the earth, and all flesh corrupted its way', the link between these two aspects of the ante-diluvian period is not made clear. Although Wintermute, the translator of the *OTP* edition of *Jubilees*, has decided to head it with the title, 'Corruption of all flesh when angels mate with humans',²⁸ it is by no means clear from this passage that the mating of the angels with human women was the cause of this corruption. In fact, it is easier to demonstrate, on the basis of *Jubilees*, at least, that it was the Watcher angels themselves who are to be held responsible for various wickednesses. *Jubilees* 5.6 tells of the binding of the angels in the depths of the earth (surely a scene to be equated with the binding of the Titans), and 5.7 tells of the destruction of their children, the giants (possibly to be equated with the punishment along with their parents of second generation Titans like Atlas, who had supported Kronos in the Titanomachy). The following verse, however, seems to be out of place—'And he said: "My spirit will not dwell upon man forever; for they are flesh, and their days will be one hundred and ten years"' (v. 8), as the following two verses return to the fate of the giants and their parents, the Watcher angels, who are to be 'bound in the depths of the earth forever, until the day of the great judgment in

nology is tendentious, and may mask many definitional problems that need to be brought into the light.

26. See J.C. VanderKam and J.T. Milik, '*Jubilees*', in H. Attridge *et al.* (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4. VII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (DJD, 13; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), pp. 1-186 for the eight different *Jubilees* MSS from cave 4 (4QJubilees^{a-h}), 3 MSS with texts like *Jubilees* (4QpseudoJubilees^{a-g}), and one with a citation of *Jubilees* (4Q228), as well as the *Jubilees* texts 1Q17-18, 2Q19-20, 3Q5, 4Q176.21-23 (which may be two different texts). The possibility that *Jubilees* was seen as authoritative at Qumran—perhaps even on par with biblical documents—cannot be easily discounted.

27. As seen above, this was also often translated 'giant'.

28. O.S. Wintermute, '*Jubilees: A New Translation and Introduction*', *OTP*, II, pp. 35-142, quotation p. 64.

order for judgments to be executed upon all of those who corrupted their ways and their deeds before the LORD' (v. 10, *OTP*). It may be, however, that the writer of *Jubilees* was familiar with the form of the Titan myth as transmitted by the Orphic mystery of Zagreus, which links the genesis of humans with the destruction of the Titans, and so would think it entirely appropriate to explain the newly limited lifespan of humans as a result of his version of the Titanomachy.

T.F. Glasson, in a book all but ignored in contemporary scholarship, has surveyed the ways in which the Greek concepts of Titan and giant are developed, and coincide and are conflated with Israelite traditions by Jewish writers of the Second Temple period.²⁹ There is no point in repeating his work here. However, it is perhaps worthwhile to note his comments made with regard to *Sib.Or.* 2.228-32,³⁰ that it 'seems to clearly identify the Titans with the "sons of God" of Genesis 6'.³¹ We might also mention that the use of the Titan tradition in this passage is part of a larger discussion of the resurrection of the dead, which, in the part identified as a remnant of the Jewish substratum before the Christian redaction,³² links the Ezekiel 37 vision of the revivification of the dry bones with the Titans' judgment after removal from Tartarus.³³

29. T.F. Glasson, *Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology with Special Reference to the Apocalypses and Pseudepigraphs* (London: SPCK, 1961), Chapters 9-11, pp. 57-73.

30. 'Then Uriel, the great angel, will break the gigantic bolts, of unyielding and unbreakable steel, of the gates of Hades, not forged of metal; he will throw them wide open and will lead all the mournful forms to judgment, especially those of ancient phantoms, Titans and the Giants and such as the Flood destroyed' (*OTP*).

31. Glasson, *Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology*, p. 64. He goes on to note that 'The second book of the Oracles is Christian, but it is fairly obvious that an older view is reflected here'.

32. See J.J. Collins, 'The Sibylline Oracles: A New Translation and Introduction', in *OTP*, I, pp. 317-472, here pp. 330-32. Cf. *idem*, 'The Development of the Sibylline Tradition', *ANRW* II.20.1 (1987), pp. 421-59, esp. pp. 430-36 on *Sib.Or.* 3.

33. The use of this passage in a clear resurrection sense becomes fully developed in the aftermath of the Bar Kokhba revolt in 132-35 CE, when it seems to have been appropriated by the surviving followers of Bar Kokhba. If my hypothesis is correct, these post-revolutionary followers of Bar Kokhba seem to have gone to the length of gathering and re-interring the bones of their fallen comrades, presumably in the hope of a future bodily resurrection (see esp. *Targ. Ezek.* 37 and B.W.R. Pearson, 'Dry Bones in the Judean Desert: The Messiah of Ephraim, Ezekiel 37, and the Post-Revolutionary Followers of Bar Kokhba', *JSJ* 29 [1998], pp. 192-201, for discussion).

It may very well be that this passage held resurrection motifs (now explicit after the Christian redaction) in its earlier Jewish form, and that, even if it did not, the Titan myth is intimately linked by at least one early Christian writer with the resurrection of the dead.³⁴

It is probably best to think in terms of the Greek myths concerning the Titans and giants when approaching Jewish writings of the Second Temple period, including the *LXX*, rather than positing only minor cosmetic influence on otherwise strongly Israelite traditions. It may be that this could provide the key to the sometimes confusing use of these traditions in this literature. If we try to look at this from the perspective of the biblical tradition, it would seem that the identification by some Second Temple writers of the people at Babel as *giants* would allow the Greek myth and the biblical account to be quite simply conflated. The descendants of the Titans are thus the men that descended from the remnant of the giants who survived the wrath of God or the gods in the form of the flood, while the Watchers/'sons of God' are, for the most part, the Titans, bound by 'God' in Tartarus.³⁵

34. However, *Sib.Or.* 1.307-23 also deals with the Titans, identifying them as the seventh generation from Adam, and treats the 'Giants' as separate from these, seeing them as the Watchers (1.87-103). Interestingly, though the terminology does not match up with other uses of 'Titan', the cosmology does—Adam and the rest of mortal men die and go to Hades (1.80-86), but the Watchers are bound in Tartarus (1.100-103). Cf. also *Sib.Or.* 4.180 (composed sometime after 70 CE), which also has an Ezekiel 37-like revivification followed by a judgment (see Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I, p. 200).

35. There are also several passages in the Enochic literature which could be examined profitably in this connection, e.g., *I En.* 10.4-12; 15-17; 18.11-19.3; 21. Cf. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I, p. 190: 'The analogy [in these passages] to the fall of the Titans in Greek myth is much closer than Iranian dualism... especially as the fallen angels, like Aeschylus' Prometheus, revealed certain cultural benefits and secret knowledge to men'. By way of comparison, we might mention a passage in Diodorus Siculus (1.25.6-7), which mirrors these attempts by Jewish writers to explain their traditions in the light of Greek ones, except that Diodorus's passage is a record of an Egyptian conflation. In it, Diodorus describes how the Titans had killed Horus and hidden his body under water, and that his mother, Isis, discovered the secret of immortality, and so, 'not only raised him, giving him his soul, but made him to share in immortality' (μη μόνον ἀναστήσαι, δοῦσαν τὴν ψυχὴν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀθανασίας ποιῆσαι μεταλαβεῖν). Diodorus then goes on to tell us that Horus is actually Apollo, and it would seem that the form of this myth in Siculus also reflects the Orphic Zagreus myth discussed above. What is perhaps most interesting about this conflation of the two or three mythic sequences is that Diodorus is not an Egyptian, but rather a Greek speaking writer from Sicily! This is

5. Who Are the ἀσεβῶν in LXX Isa. 26.19, and Where Do they Live?

The MT of Isaiah 26.19 has a clear suggestion of resurrection to it—

חַיֵּי מַתֵּיף נִבְלָתִי יִקְוֹמוּן הַקִּיצוֹ וְרִנְנוּ שִׁכְנֵי עָפָר
כִּי פֶלֶא אֲוֵרַת פְּלִיף (אֲרִץ רַפְאִים תְּפִיל):

Your dead will live, their bodies will rise; sing, dweller in dust,
for your dew is like a dew of light, and on the land of shades you will
cause it to fall.

Commentators have noticed this,³⁶ and it is thus perhaps surprising that

indeed the *Interpretatio Graeca* in action. There is one additional text which may be of relevance in this regard, although its indeterminate date and origin necessitates its relegation to the footnotes: *Orphic Hymn* 37, 'To the Titans' may be a further connection between the Titans and resurrection. This hymn follows the anthropogony of the Zagreus myth, but concludes with the lines: ὕμᾱς κυκλήσκω μῆνιν χαλεπὴν ἀποπέμπειν, εἴ τις ἀπὸ χθονίων προγόνων οἴκοις ἐπελάσθη ('I call upon you to send away severe anger, if any [of my?] ancestors sank under the earth to [your?] houses'). It may be that this recalls the story of some Greek hero entering and returning from Hades, but it is difficult to tell exactly what the implications of these lines are. Cf. A.N. Athanassakis, *The Orphic Hymns: Text, Translation and Notes* (SBLTT, 12; GRR, 4; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1977), p. 124. See also A.-F. Morand, 'Orphic Gods and other Gods', in A.B. Lloyd (ed.), *What Is a God? Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity* (London: Gerald Duckworth; Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 1997), pp. 169-81, for a more general discussion of the Orphic Hymns with regard to dating, etc.

36. Cf. J. Day, 'The Dependence of Isaiah 26:13-27:11 on Hosea 13:4-14:10 and its Relevance to Some Theories of the Redaction of the "Isaiah Apocalypse"', in Broyles and Evans (eds.), *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah* (originally appeared in *JTS* 31 [1980], pp. 309-19), I, pp. 366-68, where he surveys and lists the several views of redaction of the Isaiah Apocalypse, rejecting them on the basis of the clear unity of the passage and its systematic usage of Hos. 13.4-14.10. What is especially interesting to note is the high number of redaction-theorists who wish to place Isa. 26.19 at a rather late stage. Day (pp. 366-67 and n. 40) points out that O. Plöger (*Theocracy and Eschatology* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968], pp. 71-75, 77; German: *Theokratie und Eschatologie* [WMANT, 2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1959], pp. 89-94) even places it as late as the Ptolemaic period (see also A. Bertholet, 'The Pre-Christian Belief in the Resurrection of the Body', *AJT* 20 [1916], p. 25); contrary to these, cf. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I, p. 196 and II, p. 130 n. 571. It must be considered, in the light of the discussion here in my paper, whether the corporate sort of resurrection present in the MT of Isa. 26.19 actually displays the sorts of developments that the Hellenistic period brought with it with regard to conceptions of the underworld, death and resurrection. G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in*

I have chosen to do this paper on the LXX of Isaiah 26, rather than on the original Hebrew. However, there is a fundamental difference between the cosmology, as it were, of the Hebrew and that of the LXX. The identity, history and connections with ancient Near Eastern mythologies of the רפאים are all topics worthy of study, and it is indeed very probable that Near Eastern myths influenced the Greeks in the formation of their own myths (or were the genesis of Greek myths from the earlier Mycenaean period³⁷), as well as the traditions contained in the Hebrew Bible. However, by the time of the translation of the LXX, the window through which these myths are seen by the descendants of the Israelites is clearly a Greek one. It is interesting to note the way in which these particular traditions are picked up again by the Jews, perhaps as the result of an extra-biblical tradition of exilic origin that made such connections also with Babylonian mythology, but it is the subsequent world of Hellenism, with all its multifarious cultural influences, that provides the impetus for the return of the importance of these myths to Jewish literature, as seen above.

The LXX Isa. 26.19 passage, however, is different from its Hebrew cognate.³⁸ While the Hebrew may very well have provided a suggestive framework upon which to hang the theology of the Titan myth, it is the Hellenistic-Oriental myth-conflation of the Titans and their imprisonment in Tartarus that provides the driving force behind such a move. What betrays the translator/redactor's dependence upon the theology/cosmology of the Titan myth is precisely that which seems to mask it—instead of translating רפאים simply with γίγας, or even ἰατρός ('healer'), as he does in 26.14, he chooses ἀσεβής. 'Healer' is one of the possible meanings of the רפא in Hebrew, and almost certainly the

Intertestamental Judaism (HTS, 26; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1972), unfortunately ignores such questions.

37. For the Near Eastern form of the Orphic Zagreus myth, and the etymological identification of the participants in the orgiastic feast of the Orphic mysteries, see J.E. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (Whitstable, England: Whitstable Litho, 1980 [1903]), pp. 492-94, and W. Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence in the Early Archaic Age* (trans. M.E. Pinder and W. Burkert; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), pp. 94-96.

38. Note the discussion above in n. 1 regarding the study of the LXX with regard to the MT. In this discussion, because of the texts of Isaiah at Qumran, which betray no significant differences from the MT for Isaiah 26, I am treating the linear relationship between them as MT (or simply Hebrew)→LXX.

sense of it meant in the context of 26.14, but the translator, by rendering it with the word *ἰατρός*, has obscured, perhaps on purpose, the lexical link between 26.14 and 19. As Gibson points out, 'Rapha' was the name for an Ugaritic god of healing, mentioned in the Ebla tablets, and the identification of giant figures with this god or his attributes makes sense in the context of ancient Near Eastern cosmologies.³⁹ It is, however, interesting that the author of Isaiah does not seem to have assumed such a cosmology when writing, as the close lexical connection between the two resurrection-related statements in vv. 14 and 19 does not seem to be paralleled by a close ideational connection. The translator, however, given his Greek understanding of the *רַפְּאֵל*, seems to have been uncomfortable with this passage as it stood. Verse 14 in the MT suggests that the former rulers of the nation of Israel, now dead (or perhaps envisioned to be dead at some future time), will not rise, as they are now shades (*רַפְּאֵל*). Verse 19 suggests that, in what is probably to be seen as a national or corporate 'resurrection' of Israel, the 'dew of light' of the Lord will fall on the land of the shades (*רַפְּאֵל*). This would suggest that the negative statement regarding the non-resurrected or even resurrectable status of the dead shades in v. 14 is contradicted in v. 19. The translator thus retained v. 14 as a negative statement, but omitted any reference to giants, and then changed the thrust of v. 19 into a negative statement, limiting the healing benefit of the Lord's 'dew' strictly to the (presumably human) dead, but suggests that *ἡ... γῆ τῶν ἀσεβῶν πεσεῖται*, 'the land of the ungodly/unholy/profane ones will fall'. Given the differentiation between the place whence the dead will be resurrected and *ἡ... γῆ τῶν ἀσεβῶν*, it is probable that the reference to *ἡ... γῆ τῶν ἀσεβῶν* is meant to indicate the pit of Tartarus, and that the inhabitants of this place are to be differentiated from the rest of the dead.⁴⁰ Given the prominence of the Titans in other Hellenistic period Jewish literature (as discussed above), it is hard to believe that the initial audience of this passage could have seen them as anything but the Titans, and their 'land' as anything but Tartarus. This identification, then, would suggest two things: (1) If this is the case, the paradigm of resurrection for the translator/redactor of LXX Isaiah was a Greek one—his cosmology and even theology were highly influenced by the Greek conceptions of the underworld. (2) Read in tandem with

39. A. Gibson, *Text and Tablet* (forthcoming), Chapter 2.

40. Again, cf. *Sib.Or.* 1.80-86 and 100-103, where the place of abode for human dead, Hades, is differentiated from that of the Titans, Tartarus.

Sib.Or. 2.221-37, which follows the exact same pattern in what is also a discussion of the resurrection, first with dead being raised (using the Ezekiel 37 tradition), and then the leading forth and destruction of the Titans, it could be that the resurrection to which LXX Isa. 26.19 refers is something already associated with the final judgment, and may even be a bodily resurrection. However, it would seem that it is the Greek mythological framework of the Titans, and its paradigm of movement in and out of the underworld, that provided the impetus for this restatement and revision of Isaiah 26.

Resurrection

**Stanley E. Porter,
Michael A. Hayes
and
David Tombs**

Journal for the Study of the New Testament
Supplement Series 186

Rochampton Institute London Papers 5



1444