

Going Through Hell; TAPTAPOΣ in Greco-Roman Culture, Second Temple Judaism, and Philo of Alexandria*

Clint Burnett (Boston College)

This article questions the longstanding supposition that the eschatology of the Second Temple period was solely influenced by Persian or Iranian eschatology, arguing instead that the literature of this period reflects awareness of several key Greco-Roman mythological concepts. In particular, the concepts of Tartarus and the Greek myths of Titans and Giants underlie much of the treatment of eschatology in the Jewish literature of the period. A thorough treatment of Tartarus and related concepts in literary and non-literary sources from ancient Greek and Greco-Roman culture provides a backdrop for a discussion of these themes in the Second Temple period and especially in the writings of Philo of Alexandria.

I. Introduction

Contemporary scholarship routinely explores connections between Greco-Roman culture and Second Temple Judaism, but one aspect of this investigation that has not received the attention it deserves is eschatology. The view that the eschatology of the Second Temple period was shaped largely by Persian eschatology remains dominant in the field.¹ As James Barr has observed, “Many of the scholars of the ‘biblical theology’ period, were very anxious to make it clear that biblical thought was entirely distinct from, and owed nothing to, Greek thought. ... Iranian influence, however, seemed ... less of a threat.”² This is somewhat surprising, given that many Second Temple Jewish texts, including the writings of Philo of Alexandria, mention eschatological concepts developed in a Greco-Roman context. Significant among these are the many references to the Greco-Roman subterranean prison of Tartarus and the related mythology of the Titans and Giants. What are we to make of these references to Hellenistic mythology within Jewish works? Without attempting

* This article would not be possible without the inspiration and aid of Richard E. Oster, Jr., Professor of New Testament at Harding School of Theology. I dedicate this article to him and his legacy of searching for truth. Translations of ancient texts are my own unless otherwise indicated.

- 1 “In modern scholarship the controversy goes on, but it seems that the tendency to admit Iranian influence prevails to varying degrees.” See A. Hultgard, “Persian Apocalypticism,” in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism* (3 vols.; eds. B. McGinn, J. J. Collins, and S. J. Stein; New York: Continuum Publishing Company, 1998), 1:79; A. Hultgard, “Persian Religion,” in *Dictionary of Early Judaism* (eds. J. J. Collins and D. Harlow; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010), 1048–50.
- 2 J. Barr, “The Question of Religious Influence: The Case for Zoroastrianism, Judaism, and Christianity,” *JAA* 53 (1985): 201–25, 202–03.

to dismantle the established scholarly view of Persian culture as a source for eschatology in Second Temple Judaism, I wish to demonstrate that an appeal to the influence of Persian eschatology does not adequately account for the presence of these concepts in the sources. The purpose of this project, therefore, is three-pronged. We will explore: (1) the formation and development of Tartarus and related myths within ancient Greece, (2) the dissemination and impact of these mythological concepts upon Greco-Roman culture, and finally, (3) the influence of Tartarus, Titans, and Giants on Jewish texts of the Second Temple Period, using Philo as a particular example of the phenomenon.

II. Tartarus in Grecian Culture

The Greek historian Herodotus notes that Homer³ and Hesiod are responsible for the cosmologies and theogonies of the ancient Greeks (*Hist.* 2.53). Consequently, any query into the origins of Tartarus must begin with these poets; for, “Bestimmend für das, was man von Göttern sagt und glaubt, werden die Dichter.”⁴ According to these ancient laureates, Tartarus is a stygian realm in the absolute depths of Hades, which functions as a prison for those who have opposed the Olympian gods, such as Cronos and Typhoeus (Hesiod, *Theog.* 805–80).⁵ Among the detainees of Tartarus, the most infamous are the Titans (Τιτῆνες) and Giants (Γιγάντες).⁶ The Titans, who symbolize chaos and

- 3 Although interesting, the current debate over the historical Homer or Homers is irrelevant to my argument: “Homer lies at the foundation of the Greek tradition, and his prominence in the educational curriculum until the end of antiquity means that he is fundamental for Greek religious thought in Hellenistic and Roman periods.” E. Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity* (3rd ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003), 150. See also H. Mommsen, “Homerus,” in *Brill’s New Pauly Encyclopedia of the Ancient World* (23 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2003–2011), 6:450–63.
- 4 “Die ‘homerische’ Epik ist eine in der Mündlichkeit begründete, sehr wirkungsvolle Kunstform erzählender Dichtung, traditionell und zugleich ständig sich erneuernd, improvisierend, mit einer Kunstsprache, die alsbald in ganz Griechenland verstanden wurde, mit dem speziellen Versmaß des Hexameters, vorgetragen von wandernden ‘Sängern.’ ... In diese zunächst mündliche Welt der Erzählungen, die offenbar in ganz Griechenland bald mit Anteilnahme, ja Identifikationsbemühungen verfolgt werden, tritt die Schrift.” W. Burkert, “Die Gestaltwerdung der Götter,” in *Die Rückkehr Der Götter* (Berlin: Schnell and Steiner, 2008), 75.
- 5 See, further, C. Lochin, “Tartarus” in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (8 vols.; Munich Verlag: Zurich, 1981–1999), 7:848. Hades is located beneath the earth and receives the majority of the deceased. Hesiod, *Op.* 150–55; *Scut.* 150–55; Homer, *Il.* 1.1; 3.320–25; 5.645–54; 6.280–85; 8.10–15, 480–85. On Tartarus as a prison for the Titans, see Homer, *Il.* 8.475–84; 14.2ff, 275–80; Hesiod, *Theog.* 115–20, 678–85, 715–40, 805–10, 850, 865–70; *Scut.* 150, 253–60. See also the Homeric Hymns, *To Pythian Apollo* 334–36; *To Hermes*, 254–60, 375–80. Apollodorus locates Tartarus in the region of Hades and as distant as the earth is from the sky (*Library* 1.1), while Hesiod notes that just as it takes a bronze anvil ten days to fall from heaven to earth, so it takes the same bronze anvil ten days to fall from the surface of the earth to Tartarus (*Theog.* 697–731).
- 6 A common view holds that, “the two [groups, i.e., the Titans and Giants] are not clearly distinguished in imperial times”; M. L. West, “Notes on the Orphic Hymns,” *The Classical*

upheaval in the cosmos, are archaic deities who attempted to overthrow the Olympian gods (Hesiod, *Theog.* 662–97). Their *coup d'état* was unsuccessful, and Zeus banished them into misty Tartarus, returning order to the universe (*Theog.* 729–30). Hesiod, who provides the oldest narrative of titanomachy, closely associated the Titans with their subterranean prison in his use of the appellation *τιτῆνας χθονίους* (subterranean or chthonic Titans).⁷ At the conclusion of the battle, Hesiod records the gods' triumph and the ensuing reign of Zeus: "When the blessed gods had finished their toil, and settled by force their struggle for honors with the Titans, they pressed far-seeing Olympian Zeus to reign and to rule over them" (*Theog.* 880–85 [Most, LCL]).

After Zeus incarcerated the Titans within Tartarus, another horde – the Giants – arose to exact revenge upon the Olympian gods.⁸ Apollodorus, who records one of the most comprehensive accounts of gigantomachy, notes that after the confinement of the Titans, the goddess Gaia (Γῆ) was enraged and conceived children with Heaven (Οὐρανός) in order to retaliate against the gods (*Library* 1.6.1). Thus "Die hatten den Auftrag, die Herrschaft der Unsterblichen zu stürzen und damit die neu konstituierte allumfassende göttliche Ordnung zu vernichten."⁹ On this occasion, however, the gods were unable to vanquish their foes alone. They were forced to enlist the aid of a human, Hercules, in their defeat of the Giants and the restoration of order to the cosmos. In some versions of this story, the banished Titans return from Tartarus to assist the gods in the battle against the Giants.¹⁰

The mythology of Tartarus, the Titans, and the Giants became a vibrant part of Greek eschatology. Post-Homeric and Hesiodic authors indicate the widespread acknowledgement of Tartarus, its location (under the earth), and its function (as a prison). Numerous authors, including Aeschylus,¹¹ Aristophanes,¹² Bacchylides,¹³ Euripides,¹⁴ Pindar,¹⁵ and Sophocles,¹⁶ all make references to Tartarus, the Titans, and the Giants in their works, and they appear to presuppose their audiences' knowledge of the mythology surrounding these themes.

Quarterly 18 (1968): 288–96, 292. However, Xenophanes is evidence that the two groups were combined long before the imperial period, frag. 1 (see below).

7 See LSJ, "χθονίος." For a discussion of the significance of *τιτῆνας χθονίους* see R. Mondi, "Tradition and Innovation in the Hesiodic Titanomachy," *TAPA* 116 (1986):25–48, 41–43.

8 G. M. A. Hanfmann, "Giants," *OCD* (4th ed.; New York: Oxford, 2012), 616.

9 C. Maderna, "Der Pergamonaltar und der Mythos der Gigantomachie," in *Die Rückkehr Der Götter* (Berlin: Schnell and Steiner, 2008), 383–401, 383.

10 *Ibid.*, 389–90. The Titans are found on the eastern frieze and the southern frieze of the Pergamum Altar. See P. von Zabern, *The Pergamon Altar* (Mainz: Verlag, 1995), 22–23; see further discussion below.

11 *Eum.* 5–7; 70; *Prom.* 152–54; 220–25; 125–30; 425–30; 1025–30; 1050–55.

12 *Av.* 465–70; 695–700; *Nub.* 850–53; *Eq.* 1310–15; *Thesm.* 1035–40.

13 *Dithyrambs* 60–65.

14 *Bacch.* 450–55; *Cycl.* 5–10; *Hec.* 470–74; *Herc. Fur.* 175–80; 1185–95; *Iph. taur.* 220–25; *Ion* 455–57; *Orest.* 265.

15 *Pyth.* 1.15–20; 5.95–100; 8.12–17; *Nem.* 7.30–35.

16 *Oed. Col.* 1 55–60; 390–95; *Trach.* 1055–60.

By the time these authors composed their works, the concept of Tartarus possessed a certain clear taxonomy, which included its: 1) location within Hades, 2) function as a prison and place of punishment, and 3) stygian environment. These qualities often become implicit points of reference for Tartarus, which may not in fact be mentioned by name. When the poet Pindar, for example, compares life to a chariot race, he notes:

To attempt a contest and be successful brings release from sadness. Wealth adorned with excellence brings many opportunities, rousing deep wild ambitions; it is a brilliant star, a man's true light, at least if one has and knows the future, that the reckless souls of those who have died on earth immediately pay the penalty – and for the crimes committed in this realm of Zeus there is a judge below the earth; with hateful compulsion he passes his sentence (*Ol.* 2.50–61 [Race, LCL]).

Though Pindar does not specifically say that “reckless souls immediately pay the penalty” in *Tartarus*, this seems to be implied in his larger statement. Furthermore, Pindar exemplifies an evolution in the mythology surrounding Tartarus with the claim that “reckless souls immediately pay the penalty” and are judged after death. While some scholars suggest that the concept of individualistic punishment in Tartarus evolved with the popularity of Orphism (see below), Pindar is confirmation that the components for this adaptation were present in Greek culture in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C.E., before the rise of Orphism.¹⁷

Some Greeks were skeptical of the notion of Tartarus and questioned its existence. The pre-Socratic philosopher Xenophanes was critical of Homer's and Hesiod's influence upon the masses.¹⁸ “Homer and Hesiod have ascribed to the gods all things that are a shame and a disgrace among mortals, theft and adulteries and mutual deception” (Fr. 11 [Wheelwright]). Thus in describing the proper devotion to the gods Xenophanes chides anyone who repeats “those old hackneyed tales of Titans and Giants” (Fr. 1 [Wheelwright]). Notably, though, in chastising those who believe in the myths affiliated with Tartarus, Xenophanes acknowledges the impact of Homer's and Hesiod's works upon Greek theology and culture.

In the classical era of Greece, the concept of an evolved Tartarus was popularized by Orphism,¹⁹ which “exerted a powerful influence on some Greek authors and thinkers ... [such as] Plato.”²⁰ Orphism is named after its mythological founder, the poet Orpheus, who is credited with creating the myster-

17 Pindar “was born probably in 518 BC. The tradition (one of several competing accounts) that he lived to the age of eighty is at least roughly correct ...” C. Carey, “Pindar,” *OCD* (4th ed.; New York: Oxford, 2012), 1148.

18 Burkett, “Die Gestaltwerdung,” 108.

19 C. Caslame, “Orphism, Orphic Poetry,” in *Brill's New Pauly*, 10:249–58; L. J. Alderink, *Creation and Salvation in Ancient Orphism* (American Classical Studies 8; Ann Arbor, Mich.: American Philological Association, 1981), 66–80.

20 A. Bernabé and A. I. J. S. Cristóbal, *Instructions for the Netherworld: The Orphic Gold Tablets* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 162; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 1, 175; G. H. Baudry,

ies of Dionysus (Apollodorus, *Library* 1.3.2). According to Orphic ideology, Zeus destroyed the Titans for consuming his child Dionysus. In the process of vanquishing them, humans were formed from the Titans' residue. Thus, according to Orphism, human beings "contain in themselves ... both titanic/evil and divine/good."²¹ The goal of Orphism is to purge the human body of all evil titanic influence and return to the realm of the divine; the alternative is to face punishment within Tartarus,²² which often included, but was not limited to, lakes of fire such as Acheron.²³

The mythology surrounding Tartarus had other significance as well. It provided a measuring rod for human conflict, in the image of the battle between the gods and the Titans, as for example in the language Isocrates uses to discuss the Trojan War (*Hel. Enc.* 10.53). In addition, gigantomachy was incorporated into Greek culture as a subject of classical Greek art. The object known as the drinking cup of Aristophanes (dated to c. 410 B.C.E.) discovered in Vulci, Italy, portrays Poseidon poised to slay a Giant while the goddess Gaia, the mother of the Giants, pleads for mercy.

Tartarus, then, was a dismal place of punishment according to the ancient bards of Greece. Although originally a prison for the Titans and other offenders against the Olympian gods, Tartarus evolved in the popular consciousness of ancient Greece and its surrounding neighbors into a penal institution for anyone who lived impiously. Its established taxonomy within Greek literature made it possible to refer to Tartarus implicitly, while the image of gigantomachy became an explicit theme in the art of the classical period. Even among skeptics, such as Xenophanes, who might reject the truth-value of these myths, they remained potent points of cultural reference.

"Le Tartare: De la mythologie grecque a la liturgie chretienne," *MScRel* 52 (1995): 87–104, 89–90.

21 H. J. Klauck, *The Religious Context of Early Christianity: A Guide to Greco-Roman Religions* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 118–19.

22 A corpus of texts known as the Orphic Golden Tablets aided the deceased in the navigation of the underworld with passwords and directions. One text instructs the deceased to say, "I have paid the punishment that corresponds to impious acts" (*The Orphic Gold Tablets* L. 10a–b). This is probably related to the belief that humanity is part Titan, and therefore must purge the guilt of the Titans' sin against Dionysus before they can rest in the underworld. See Bernabé and Cristóbal, *Instructions*, 105–7.

23 Plato, *Phaed.* 111e–112a; 113a–e; 114a–e; *Gorg.* 523c–e; 524a–c; 525a–c; 526b. Baudry, "Le Tartare," 90–92. This time period also sees in descriptions of Tartarus the appearance of imagery of numerous subterranean rivers that fuse with mud and fire and converge beneath the earth in great crevasses. According to Plato, these lakes are the destination for those who have been judged "incurable" and "curable," i.e., souls that must make restitution for their evil deeds. See Plato, *Phaed.* 111e–112a; 113a–e; 114a–e; *Gorg.* 523c–e; 524a–c; 525a–c; 526b. An example of the diversity of punishment within Tartarus appears in Aristophanes' observation that an eel will tear apart a body and allow the Tithrasian Gorgons to feast upon its organs (*Ran.* 460–502). Although the ancient poets of Greece assert that humans such as Sisyphus were tormented in Hades for crimes committed in their lifetimes (Homer, *Od.* 11.590–94), by the first century C.E., such punishment is located in Tartarus (on Sisyphus, see Vergil, *Aen.* 6.535–55; 575–80).

III. Tartarus in Greco-Roman Culture

Greek Literature. Homer's and Hesiod's fables about the Titans, Giants, and Tartarus were known, as well, in the larger Greco-Roman world.²⁴ The Greek historian Polybius, observing the piety of the Roman people, connects it with fear of the gods and punishment in Hades:

Wherefore, to my mind, the ancients were not acting without purpose or at random, when they brought in among the vulgar those opinions about the gods, and the belief in the punishments in Hades: much rather do I think that men nowadays are acting rashly and foolishly in rejecting them (*Hist.* 6.56 [Paton, LCL]).

Though he does not explicitly indicate that chastisement occurs in Tartarus, Polybius' treatment of Hades and the taxonomy surrounding Tartarus imply that it does. Strabo makes the connection more explicitly: "Now, that night is a thing of evil omen and associated with Hades, is obvious; also that Hades is associated with Tartarus" (*Geogr.* 3.2.12 [Jones, LCL]).

The myths of the Titans and Giants were popular among Greek-speaking peoples of the Greco-Roman world, who often combined the two groups in their treatments of them.²⁵ According to Diogenes, the great Stoic philosopher Zeno composed a work known as *On the Giants* (*Lives of the Eminent Philosophers* 7.174–76). Strabo and Pausanias, in their accounts of travels in the ancient world, indicate a number of nuances in myths surrounding the Giants and Titans.²⁶ The Greek historian Diodorus of Sicily was aware of a unique euhemeristic mythology surrounding the Titans and Giants.²⁷ Interestingly, in Diodorus's account, Dionysus, not Zeus, vanquished the Titans (3.73.7–8), and the king of the gods fought numerous wars with the Giants before finally defeating them (5.71.4–6).

Not all Greek-speaking peoples of the Greco-Roman world accepted the mythology of Tartarus. While Strabo recognizes the widespread association of Hades and Tartarus and the popularity of the gigantomachy, he also attempts to demythologize Tartarus by suggesting that Homer invented the misty realm after learning of a region known as "Tartessus" (*Geogr.* 3.2.12–13). And Polybius's comments noted above indicate that many people of his day had rejected "vulgar opinions about the gods, and the belief in the punishments in Hades" (*Hist.* 6.56 [Paton, LCL]). Notwithstanding the popular conjecture of Polybius's time, he criticizes these individuals as "acting rashly and foolishly" (*Hist.* 6.56 [Paton, LCL]).

24 Pausanias, *Descr.* 8.37.5; Herodotus, *Hist.* 2.53.

25 Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 360e; Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 187c.; Schmitz, "Gigantes," 2:267; West, "Note," 292.

26 Strabo, *Geogr.* 6.3.5; 7.25–27; 10.5.9; 11.2.10; Pausanias, *Descr.* 7.18.4; 7.26.12.

27 Diodorus purports that the Titans were human beings who aided humanity in numerous ways and were subsequently lauded for their accomplishments (5.66.1–5.). Cronus, for example, taught people how to live in a civilized manner (5.66.4), while Hyperion educated humans about astronomy (5.67.1).

Latin Literature. Appreciation of the mythology of Tartarus (Latin *Tartarus*, *Tartara*, *Tartareus*) is also evident within Latin literature of the Greco-Roman era. The early Latin poet Plautus compares the struggles of life with titanomachy (*Pers.* 1.1), and in one of the more popular ancient Latin works, Vergil incorporates the common Greek placement, function, and description of Tartarus (*Aen.* 6.535–55; 575–80). When Aeneas descends into the underworld, he notices lakes of fire, the sounds of people being tortured, and the Titans locked within Tartarus: “Here the Titanic race (*Titania pubes*), the ancient sons of Earth, hurled down by the lightning-bolt, writhe in the depths” (*Aen.* 6.576–85 [Goold and Fairclough, LCL]).²⁸ The Latin poet Ovid confirms the taxonomy of Tartarus on several occasions (*Metam.* 6.670–76) and even equates death with being sent to Tartarus (*Metam.* 12.245–59). Moreover, Ovid notes that he sang songs in honor of the gods’ victory over the Giants, providing the location (the Phelgraean Plains) where Zeus struck them with his lightning bolt (Ovid, *Metam.* 10.142–52; *Tristia* 2.330–40).

Martial, in his attempts to console parents who have lost a child, affirms that their daughter is not being tortured in Tartarus: “Little Erotion shall not fear the darkened shades nor the vast mouths of the Tartarean hound (*Tartarei...canis*)” (*Epigrams* 5.34 [Bailey, LCL]). The Roman poet Lucan records a lengthy presentation of Tartarus in which he notes the presence of stygian lakes, imprisoned Giants (*Gigantes*), and those souls who are “damned” (*nefas poenaeque nocentum*)” (*Pharsalia* 6.624–750). Lucan also refers to the Titans numerous times, often connecting them with their fiery subterranean punishment in Tartarus.²⁹

Even “bones of prehistoric animals were occasionally believed to be the bones of giants.”³⁰ Suetonius records such a mistaken identification when he notes that Caesar Augustus decorated one of his villas with the bones of the Giants (*Aug.* 722–23). Finally, Horace affirms that everyone possesses knowledge of the gods’ defeat of the “impious Titans” and their subsequent imprisonment in Tartarus. In his description, he combines the Titans with the Giants (*Carm.* 3.4).

Of course, as with Greek literature, awareness was not equivalent with acceptance. The Epicurean poet Lucretius was not only critical of Tartarus, but also of most things religious (*De Rerum Natura* 3.1010–15). Yet, on the other hand he acknowledges the mass belief in Tartarus: “for as to what men sometimes will affirm; that more than Tartarus (the realm of death) they fear diseases and a life of shame” (*De Rerum Natura* 3.41 [Rouse and Smith, LCL]).

28 In Servius’s ancient commentary on the *Aeneid*, he notes that Tartarus is for the punishment of the impious (*ubi puniuntur impii*), *Com. Aen.* 6.543. On Servius’s commentary on the *Aeneid*, see E.O. Wallace, *The Notes on Philosophy in the Commentary of Servius on the Eclogues, the Georgics, and the Aeneid of Vergil* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), 121.

29 *Pharsalia* 1.1–32; 1.33–50; 3.1–50; 7.337–459; 8.109–210; 9.250–318; 9.319–409.

30 Hanfmann, “Giants,” 616.

Seneca, writing to console a friend who has lost a loved one, dismisses the idea of punishments after death:

Reflect that there are no ills to be suffered after death, that the reports that make the Lower World terrible to us are mere tales, that no darkness is in store for the dead, no prison, no blazing streams of fire, no river of Lethe, that no judgment-seats are there, nor culprits, nor in that freedom so unfettered are there a second time any tyrants. All these things are the fancies of poets, who have harrowed us with groundless terrors ... death is neither good nor evil (*Marc.* 19.4, Gummere, LCL).

If fear of punishment in Tartarus was not present in the Greco-Roman world, Seneca would not have had a reason to console and encourage his friend, Marcia. And we must not assume that Seneca dismissed the notion of Tartarus outright. The occasion of his composition must be taken into consideration, for in two other works, *Hercules Oetaeus* (1758–90) and *Oedipus* (160–65), he is less skeptical of Tartarus and equates death with “descending to the realms of Tartarus (*Tartari intrasti*)” (*Herc. Ot.* 1758–90 [Miller, LCL]).

Numismatics. Outside of the literary sources, Tartarus and related myths also appear in the material evidence from the Greco-Roman world. One important example of non-literary evidence is found in numismatics. Roman numismatics were part of a meticulous propaganda structure that served to inform and indoctrinate the masses.³¹ As a result, the Roman government channeled the iconography it desired the public to view “through the medium of the historical relief into visual symbolism.”³² It is therefore significant that the Roman government capitalized upon myths associated with Tartarus. On the obverse of a coin from Lisidia, Emperor Septimius Severus is pictured, while the reverse depicts Zeus enthroned above two Giants.³³ The coin’s symbolism is clear. It parallels Septimius’ authority with that of the king of the Olympian gods – absolute, unrivaled, and victorious over all evil and chaos.

Inscriptions. Noting the vast corpus of epigraphy from the Greco-Roman world, Louis Robert characterizes the Greco-Roman world as “une civilisation d’épigraphie”;³⁴ Brian McLean indicates that “there is virtually no aspect of ancient life on which epigraphy does not bear”;³⁵ and Richard Lattimore

31 On numismatics, see M. Crawford, “Numismatics,” in *Sources for Ancient History* (ed. M. Crawford; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 185–233; R. Oster, “Numismatic Windows into the Social World of Early Christianity: A Methodological Inquiry,” *JBL* 101 (1982): 195–223; C. H. V. Sutherland, *Roman Coins* (New York: Putman, 1974), 7–9.

32 Oster, “Numismatic,” 201.

33 Classical Numismatic Group, Inc., n.p. [cited 10 October 2011] <http://www.cngcoins.com/Coin.aspx?CoinID=121933>. There was disagreement in the Greco-Roman world concerning the appearance of the Giants. Ovid indicates that the Giants have snakes for legs (*Tristia* 4.15–20), while Pausanias rejects the notion that the Giants had serpent legs as an “absurd tale” (*Descr.* 8.29.3).

34 L. Robert, “Les épigraphies et l’épigraphie grecque et romaine,” in *Opera minora selecta: Epigraphie et antiquités grecques* (ed. L. Robert; Amsterdam, 1969), 5.65–109, 84.

35 B. McLean, *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods from Alexander the Great Down to the Reign of Constantine* (323 B. C. – A. D. 337) (Ann Arbor:

affirms the view that inscriptions represent the ideology of all social classes.³⁶ The inscriptions that follow provide a second layer of non-literary evidence for the assimilation of Tartarus and related myths into popular eschatology.

Greek Epitaphs. Though the denizens of the Greco-Roman world expressed diverse views of death, “it would seem that most of Greek and Roman thought was in agreement so far as this, that in the process of death the soul escaped the body and went elsewhere ... the soul, then, is something contained within the body ... which is released by death.”³⁷ Some Greco-Roman epitaphs thus express interest in the destination of the disembodied soul. Tartarus was not a particularly popular theme in epitaphs, but references to Tartarus and related myths do exist. Significant among them is an inscription from Naxos in which the deceased boasts of a destination that is not “dark Tartarus.”

Ναίω δ' οὐκ Αχέροντος ἐφ' ὕ[δ]ασιν, οὐδὲ κελαινὸν Τάρταρον, ἀλλὰ [δ]ό[μου]ς ε[ὕ]σε[ι]
βέων ἔλαχον.

I dwell not by the waters of Acheron nor in dark Tartarus. The abode of the pious has fallen to my lot.³⁸

Whoever commissioned this epitaph accepts a notion of a divided afterlife in which the righteous are rewarded and the impious are punished. A second funerary inscription, this one from Naples, exemplifies the connection of Tartarus and Hades and the dismal nature of the stygian prison:

Ἄγγελε Φερσεφώνης, Ἑρμῇ, τίνα τόνδε προπονπεῖς εἰς τὸν ἀμείδητον Τάρταρον
Ἰίδεω.

Hermes, messenger of Persephone, why do you send him before us to Hades' Tartarus, where there is no laughter?³⁹

Another epitaph warns potential grave robbers of destruction by the hands of a Titan:

ἐάν τις τοῦτῳ τῷ ἡρωεῖῳ κακὴν προσοίσει, Ἥλιε Τειτάν τὴν αὐτὴν [χ]άριν ἀντάποδος.

Whoever lays a wicked hand upon this tomb, do you, O Titan Helius, do him the same favor.⁴⁰

University of Michigan Press, 2011), 1. Fergus Millar places “central importance” on the study of epigraphy, F. Millar, “Epigraphy” in *Sources for Ancient History*, 80–136, 80.

36 R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1962), 16–17.

37 *Ibid.*, 21–22.

38 *Inscriptiones Graecae* 12.5.62.7–8. For translation see Lattimore, *Themes*, 35. See also SEG IX 498; SEG XXX 1430.

39 *Epigrammata Graeca* 575. For translation see Lattimore, *Themes*, 87. Hades' abduction of Persephone is attested in sources from the Greco-Roman world: Apollodorus, *Library* 1.3, 5; Homer *Il.* 9.455–60; 565–70.

40 *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua* I. 399 (Bashara). For translation see Lattimore, *Themes*, 110. “The fact that the sun is part of the natural cosmos as well as a god finds expression

These brief examples indicate an assimilation of Tartarus and related mythology into some elements of Greco-Roman eschatology.

Much like the literary evidence, however, epitaphs also reflect a diverse perspective. Lattimore presents a funerary inscription from Rome that he sees as questioning the existence of Tartarus (I am less than convinced of his claim):

Εἰ δὲ τίς ἐστι νόος παρὰ Τάρταριν ἢ παρὰ Λήθη.

If one can think in Tartarus or beside Lethe.⁴¹

Some relevant inscriptions appear to go so far as to repudiate any belief in an afterlife. The message of the epitaph below from Rome is ambiguous, but it seems to suggest that the author was an annihilationist.

ἀλλ'εἴ γ' ἐν φθιμένοισιν τις αἴσθησις.

If indeed the dead can perceive anything.⁴²

Another is unequivocal: nothing happens after death.

Μὴ μου παρέλθης τὸ ἐπίγραμμα, ὁδοιπόρε, ἀλλὰ σταθεὶς ἄκουε καὶ μαθὼν ἄπι. Οὐκ ἔστι ἐν Ἅδου πλοῖον, οὐ πορθμεὺς Χάρων, οὐκ Αἴακος κλειδοῦχος, οὐχὶ Κέρβερος κύων. ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες οἱ κάτω τεθνηκότες ὅστέα, τέφρα γεγονάμεν, ἄλλο δὲ οὐδὲ ἐν. Εἴρηκά σοι ὀρθῶς. ὕπαγε, ὁδοιπόρε, μὴ καὶ τεθνακῶς ἀδόλεσχός σοι φανῶ.

Wayfarer, do not pass by my epitaph, but stand and listen, and then, when you have learned the truth, proceed. There is no boat in Hades, no ferryman Charon, no Aeacus keeper of the keys, nor any dog called Cerberus. All of us who have died and gone below are bones and ashes: there is nothing else. What I have told you is true. Now withdraw, wayfarer, so that you will not think that, even though, dead, I talk too much.⁴³

These epitaphs provide an indication of the diversity of eschatological beliefs available to Greek-speaking inhabitants of the Greco-Roman world. While some were persuaded of the existence of mythological Tartarus, others vacillated, and some rejected any credence of an afterlife at all.

Latin Epitaphs. Latin inscriptions from the Greco-Roman world also employ mythological Tartarus. Our first example, an epitaph from Ammaedara, accepts a divided afterlife of punishment and reward and boasts that the deceased is not in Tartarus:

*Iam te non T[ar]tara crudelem tene[re]nt set Elysium campus occupavit.*⁴⁴

Now Tartarus will not hold unfortunate you, but the Elysian Field seized you.

The originator of an inscription from Lambaesis seems to hope that a loved one is in a better place than Tartarus:

in Helios' classification as a Titan, who is a descendant of Uranus and Gaia and their son Hyperion." See "Sol," in *Brill's New Pauly*, 13:608–9.

41 *Epigrammata Graeca* 722.5; see Lattimore, *Themes*, 56.

42 *Epigrammata Graeca* 700.4; see Lattimore, *Themes*, 56.

43 *Epigrammata Graeca* 646 (Rome). See Lattimore, *Themes*, 75.

44 *Carmina Latina Epigraphica* 1515.8–9 (Ammaedara).

*Credo tibi gratum, si haec quoque Tartara norunt.*⁴⁵

I believe the best for you, if this Tartarus also had known (?).

As these epitaphs demonstrate, at least some Latin-speaking denizens of the Greco-Roman world also assimilated Tartarus into their eschatology.

Much like the Greek funerary inscriptions, Latin epitaphs also could call into question the existence of an afterlife. After surveying countless Greek and Latin epitaphs, Richard Lattimore affirms, “the Latin inscriptions which express doubt about the afterlife are far more numerous than the Greek...[and] denials of immortality appear in a far greater number of Latin inscriptions [than Greek].”⁴⁶ A few examples will suffice.

Some inscriptions affirm that the deceased has ceased to exist in any form:

Non fui fui non sum non desidero (CIL 8.3463)

I was not, I was, I am not, I do not desire.

N(on) F(ui) F(ui) N(on) S(um) N(on) C(uro) (CIL 5.2893)

I was not, I was, I am not, I do not care.

Other epitaphs are clear that nothing comes after death:

*Sumus mortales, immortales non sumus.*⁴⁷

We are mortals, we are not immortals.

*Nil mihi post fine[m] est: nil volo: nil cupio.*⁴⁸

There is nothing of me after death: I say nothing: I desire nothing.

Hic ego sum perpetuus (CIL 3.2512).

I am here perpetually.

The occurrences of Tartarus in Latin epitaphs seem to indicate a higher incidence of questioning or repudiation of Tartarus than appears evident in the Greek-language epitaphs. Nevertheless, the concept played some role in their eschatology as well.

Iconography. As in the classical period in Greece, depictions of gigantomachy were popular in the Greco-Roman period.⁴⁹ Here, again, the iconography may have reminded viewers of the Giants’ final destination in Tartarus. One enormous vase, dating c. 310 B. C. E., depicts detailed illustrations of gigantomachy, including imagery of the Giants with serpents attached to their bodies. This imagery is in line with the scholarly claim that some time in the

45 *Carmina Latina Epigraphica* 576.

46 Lattimore, *Themes*, 59.

47 *Carmina Latina Epigraphica* 191.

48 *Carmina Latina Epigraphica* 2071 (Timgad).

49 Artists’ depictions of the Giants were visible in numerous sites across the Greco-Roman world, including Athens, Corinth, Delphi, Hieropolis, Naples, and in the Germanic provinces. See A. Ley, “Giants II: Iconography” in *Brill’s New Pauly*, 5:845–46. Iconography of gigantomachy has also been discovered in Priene, Akragas, Argos, Termessus, and Olympia; see E. Kuhnert, “Giganten,” in *Lexikon Der Griechischen Und Römischen Mythologie* (ed. W. H. Roscher; Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1978) 2:1639–73.

fourth century B. C. E. artists began portraying the Giants with serpents attached to their bodies,⁵⁰ but we should note that Pausanias provides evidence that this portrait was only one of at least two competing descriptions (*Descr.* 8.29.3). Objects of this sort would have been a constant reminder of the gods' defeat of the Giants and their fate.

Perhaps the greatest iconographic example of Tartarus and related mythology, however, is one of the ancient world's largest altars,⁵¹ the Pergamum Altar. King Eumenes II (197–159 B. C. E.), the son of the first king of Pergamon, Philetarus, probably had this altar constructed in 190 B. C. E., following his victory over the combined forces of the Seleucids and Celts.⁵² According to the ancient Latin author Lucius Ampelius, the Pergamum Altar was a "great marble altar, forty feet high with huge sculptures; moreover it contains gigantomachy" (*Liber Memorialis* 8.14). "Sein Aufbau bestand ganz aus Marmor, des von den Inseln Prokonnesos (heute: Marmara im Marmara-Meer bei Kyzikos) und Lesbos auf den Burgberg gebracht wurde."⁵³ More importantly, the scenes depicted on the altar portray the ancient world's greatest example of gigantomachy. "Weit über 20 Gigantennamen, von denen sich mindestens 16 gesichert rekonstruieren lassen, sind erhalten geblieben."⁵⁴ The altar also portrays the Titans aiding the gods in their endeavor to subdue the Giants.⁵⁵

Several scenes from the altar are evidence of the blending of the Titans into gigantomachy. One image, on the southern frieze, shows the Titan Phoebe, armed with a torch, battling a giant.⁵⁶ On the eastern frieze, the Titan Hekate, equipped with a torch and shield, is pictured in combat with the Giant Klytios.⁵⁷

Clearly, with the construction of this altar Eumenes II attempted to correlate his victory over the Seleucids and Celts with that of Zeus's over the Giants; both are to be understood as authoritative, final conquerors of evil and chaos. "Die Schlacht zeigte sich als eine Allegorie des siegreichen göttlichen Prinzips über dessen allumfassende Bedrohung."⁵⁸ Furthermore and particularly important for this study, the Pergamum Altar would have been a constant re-

50 Ley, "Giants," 847–48: "Initially represented as hoplitai or 'wild' warriors, the Giants also appear from about 400 BC as snake-legged monsters; on the Pergamum Altar some of the Giants are for the first time ... depicted in the shape of birds, lions, or bulls. In Roman antiquity too the pictorial motif of gigantomachy remains current ... Snake-legged Giants are to be found particularly on monumental columns depicting Jupiter fighting a giant of upper Germanic provinces."

51 Klauck, *Religious Context*, 24.

52 V. Kästner, "Pergamon – Der antike Ort und sein Altar," in *Die Rückkehr der Götter: Berlins verborgener Olymp* (Berlin: Schnell and Steiner, 2008), 365–66.

53 *Ibid.*, 366.

54 Maderna, "Der Pergamonaltar," 384.

55 *Ibid.*, 389–91.

56 von Zabern, *Pergamon*, 23.

57 *Ibid.*, 22.

58 Maderna, "Der Pergamonaltar," 384.

minder for the inhabitants of Pergamum of gigantomachy/titanomachy and its relation to mythological Tartarus.

Pergamum was not the only city in Asia Minor to exploit gigantomachy for political purposes. The ancient city of Miletus made use of gigantomachy in a shrine dedicated to the worship of the Roman emperor. Images displaying gigantomachy were discovered on the city's bouleuterion, one of the most important buildings in the city.⁵⁹ One sculpture found on the bouleuterion depicts the goddess Artemis killing the Giant Tityos. The mythic tradition reports that after Tityos was killed, he was sentenced to eternal punishment in Tartarus.⁶⁰ Friesen notes the importance of this monument:

We have a good example of local mythology appropriated to support Roman imperialism in a specific setting ... By visually 'retelling' the mythic stories of Miletos in this ritual setting, their meaning was altered to reflect and to promote a particular social hierarchy. The local stories of vengeance and divine judgment upon evildoers were deployed to support Roman rule and the collaboration of local elites ... with Rome.⁶¹

Thus it is significant that local authorities of Roman Asia attempted to promote political propaganda by exploiting myths related to Tartarus in their quest to dominate the populace.

Greco-Roman iconography also depicted scenes of punishment in the afterlife. Pausanias reports on a massive painting, now no longer extant, constructed by the fifth century B.C.E. Greek artist Polygnotus. In his careful description of the work, he reports that one section of it depicts scenes of various impious persons being tortured in Hades. With respect to the image of a father choking a rebellious son, he comments that the young man is drinking "his cup of woes in Hades" (*Descr.* 10.28.4–5). Next to the surly young man, Pausanias notes a man guilty of sacrilege being punished by a woman "skilled in poisonous and other drugs" (*ibid.*). Finally, Pausanias records the presence of a demon in Hades, which he admits is an addition to the Homeric underworld, that consumes the flesh of corpses (*ibid.* 10.28.7). Tartarus, it thus appears, was a part of life across the Mediterranean basin, in epitaphs and images, coinage, and items related to worship.

Conclusion. The presence of mythological Tartarus in Greco-Roman culture was undeniable, with a mythical tradition that can be seen in literature, epitaphs, numismatics, and iconography. But not everyone who was exposed to these concepts accepted them at face value. We have seen evidence for rejection of the concept of Tartarus, and even an outright repudiation of any form of an afterlife. We should keep this diversity in mind as we turn to the impact of the concept of Tartarus upon Second Temple Judaism and Philo of Alexandria.

59 S. Friesen, "Myth and Symbolic Resistance in Revelation 13," *JBL* 123 (2004): 281–313, 287.

60 Vergil, *Aen.* 6.576–90; Servius, *Com. Aen.* 6:506; Friesen, "Myth," 289.

61 Friesen, "Myth," 289.

IV. Tartarus in Second Temple Judaism of the Greco-Roman Period⁶²

Origins of Second Temple Eschatology. As our project moves into the relationship between Tartarus and Second Temple Judaism, a few words must be said about ancient Hebrew and later Jewish eschatology. Hebrew eschatology differed radically from the eschatology of the Second Temple period. Considering that most of the cultures surrounding the ancient Hebrews possessed some form of a developed afterlife,⁶³ it is theologically significant that the Israelites did not. The Hebrew Scriptures simply observe that the dead (either wicked or good) go to sheol (Isa 28:15), which stands “in marked contrast” to other ancient Near Eastern cultures.⁶⁴ Notwithstanding, “sometime after the exile, [Hebrew eschatology] went through a sequence of incisive changes” from outside influences.⁶⁵ A result of these changes is the appearance of a belief in bodily resurrection (Dan. 12:1–5) and the promise of the punishment of the wicked (Isa 66:24).⁶⁶

Something more must account for the development of the eschatology of the Second Temple period, which assumes a divided underworld in which the wicked are punished with fire and the righteous are rewarded (e.g., *1 Enoch*). Some scholars, such as Hultgard, have argued that Persian ideas permeated the Judaism of this period and led to the development of ideas of a bodily resurrection and a divided afterlife consisting of paradise and hell.⁶⁷ But the Persian texts used to substantiate this claim are late. Hultgard, even while proposing an argument for Persian influence, acknowledges that the relevant eschatological Persian texts date from the ninth century C. E. (e.g., *Yansa* 31.3).⁶⁸ Furthermore, and more significantly, an argument for perpetual, subterra-

62 On the afterlife in the Second Temple period, see R. Bauckham, “Life, Death, and the Afterlife in Second Temple Judaism,” in *The Jewish World Around the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2010), 245–56; M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 196–202; T. J. Lewis, “Dead, Abode of the,” in *ABD* 2:101–5; S. J. D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (Louisville, Ky.: John Knox Press, 1987); G. Nickelsburg, “Resurrection” in *The Dictionary of Early Judaism* (eds. J. J. Collins and D. Harlow; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010): 1142–43.

63 E.g., the Egyptian *Book of the Dead*, *The Descent of Inanna*, and *Gilgamesh*, to name only a few. See J. Jarick, “Questioning Sheol” in *Resurrection* (eds. S. Porter, M. Hayes, and D. Tombs; New York: T&T Clark, 1999), 22–32; P. S. Johnston, *Shades of Sheol: Death and Afterlife in the Old Testament* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2002), 69–85.

64 Johnston, *Shades*, 69; Jarick, “Questioning Sheol,” 22–32.

65 Jeremiah, “אֲדָמָה,” *TDNT* 1:147.

66 Even though this text later became the Jewish and early Christian proof-text for hell, nowhere does it indicate that chastisement occurs underground. In the context of the passage, the author notes that as people exit from worship, they will witness the punishment of those who rebelled against God (Isa. 66:24); J. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 55–66 (ABC)* (New York: Doubleday, 2003), 316–17.

67 Hultgard, “Persian Religion,” 1048–50. “For more than 200 years Palestine was under Persian rule, and contacts between Jews and Iranians in the Hellenistic and Roman periods were accompanied by political sympathy.” *Ibid.*, 1048.

68 Hultgard, “Persian Religion,” 1049.

nean punishment is not found within Persian eschatology and therefore cannot account for its presence within Second Temple eschatology. T. F. Glasson astutely notes, “If the new [Jewish] eschatology was Persian, it is curious that it should have emerged only after more than a century of Greek rule.”⁶⁹ Numerous scholars (including Charles,⁷⁰ Cohen,⁷¹ Glasson, Hengel,⁷² Jeremias, Lichtenberger,⁷³ and Nickelsburg; see below)⁷⁴ have noted that the eschatology of the Second Temple period was influenced by Hellenistic thought. And nowhere is Jewish engagement with Hellenism more evident than the assimilation of Tartarus and related mythology within Second Temple eschatology.

Tartarus and the Titans/Giants within the LXX. Exactly when Second Temple Jews began to equate sheol with the Greek concept of ᾗδης is not expressly clear.⁷⁵ Papyrological evidence indicates that as late as the fifth century B. C. E., the Jews at Elephantine still understood sheol simply as the grave.⁷⁶ However, by the time of the translation of the LXX, ᾗδης was synonymous with sheol.⁷⁷ It is striking that the translators of the LXX adopted the idea of Tartarus (τάρταρος) on three separate occasions – Job 40:20; 41:24; Prov 30:16.⁷⁸ These occurrences are neither found in the MT nor the Targumim of

69 T. F. Glasson, *Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology* (London: SPCK, 1961), 1; Barr, “The Question,” 201.

70 R. H. Charles notes that the texts of 1 Enoch 17–19 “are full of Greek elements”; Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* (3 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 2:199; Jeremias, “ᾗδης,” 1:147.

71 Cohen, *Maccabees*, 43–44, 91–92. Cohen notes the close affinities of the resurrection and the Greek doctrine of immortality of the soul. “A close ally of the doctrine of the bodily resurrection is the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Because of its affinities with the speculations of Greek philosophy, this doctrine was popular with Greek-speaking Jews, notably Philo.” *Ibid.*, 92.

72 Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 196–202.

73 H. Lichtenberger, “Resurrection in the Intertestamental Period and Rabbinic Theology,” in *Reincarnation or Resurrection?* (trans. J. Bowen; eds. H. Häring and J.-B. Metz; Maryknoll, N. Y.: SCM Press, 1993): 23–31.

74 G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972).

75 Cohen, *Maccabees*, 43–44. Cohen posits that “concern for the fate of the individual in both this world and the next . . . perhaps derived from Hellenistic culture,” and more specifically, Greek philosophy. “Much of the Jewish thinking of the questions of fate, free will, immortality, and divine providence was influenced by, or at least was expressed in, the terminology of Greek philosophy.”

76 A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B. C.* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1967), no. 71:15.

77 The LXX most commonly rendered sheol, ᾗδης. The Greek translation of the Pentateuch includes seven references to ᾗδης (Gen 37:35; 42:38; 44:29, 31; Num 16:30, 33; Deut 32:22). Another fifty-odd uses of this term appear in the remainder of the LXX.

78 Exactly when the Hebrew texts of Job and Proverbs were translated into Greek remains unknown. Cook proposes two separate translators for the LXX texts of Job and Proverbs and argues that the translator of Proverbs “had an excellent Greek literary education”; see J. Cook, “Aspects of the Relationship Between the Septuagint Versions of Proverbs and Job,” *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 45 (1995),

Job or Proverbs, and thus seem to reflect additions to the Hebrew texts. The first occurrence of Tartarus in the LXX indicates that four-footed beasts (?) (τετράποσιν) dwell within it (Job 40:20). It is difficult to say what the translator meant with this vague reference. A four-footed beast, Cerberus, does exist in Greco-Roman mythology,⁷⁹ and it is possible that the translator had a reference to this mythological beast in mind. However, this first occurrence of Tartarus remains ambiguous.

The second usage of the term reflects the Greco-Roman comprehension of Tartarus as a deep place (Job 41:24), while the third occurrence states that Hades, the love of a woman, and Tartarus are never satisfied (Prov 30:16). It is clear from these last two occurrences that the translators maintained the common Greco-Roman taxonomy of Tartarus as a deep place associated with Hades (Strabo, *Geogr.* 3.2.12). If these three occurrences represent additions to the text, it is striking that nowhere in the LXX did a translator feel compelled to explain the characteristics of Tartarus. Rather, using the same approach that we brought to bear upon the ancient Greek and Roman cultural references above, it seems that the translators assumed their audiences' familiarity with the concept.

This hypothesis is strengthened by the LXX translators' use of mythology related to Tartarus. Numerous times throughout the LXX, the translators chose to render the Hebrew terms *gibbôr*, *gibbôrîm*, *npîlîm*, and *rpā'im* with the terms γίγας and τίταν.⁸⁰ As Pearson has masterfully shown in a recent article, "there was more than simple lexical choice involved in the translation of these words."⁸¹ Rather, the Jewish translators were attempting to legitimize and legitimate their religion over that of the Greeks by proving the antiquity of their religious ideology.⁸² Considering the ingrained nature of the myth of Tartarus, the Titans, and the Giants in Greco-Roman culture, what better apologetic could Jews have brought to bear than the proof that the myths related to Tartarus were actually Jewish in origin? This conclusion is only strengthened when we notice that many Second Temple period Jewish writers acknowledged (sometimes grudgingly and other times willingly,

309–23. See also, "Aspects of the Translation Technique Followed by the Translator of LXX Proverbs," *JNSL* 22 (1996): 143–53.

79 Apollodorus, *Library* 2.5.12 ff; Hesiod, *Theog.* 310–5; Pausanias, *Descr.* 3.25.6.

80 Relevant translations: *npîlîm* is rendered γίγας in Gen 6:4; Num 13:3; Ezek 32:27; *gibbôr* is rendered γίγας in Gen 6:4; 10:8, 9; Isa 13:3; 49:24, 25; Ezek 32:12, 21, 27; 38:18, 20; *rpā'im* is rendered γίγας in Gen 14:5; Josh 12:12; Isa 14:9; Job 26:5; Prov 21:16; 1 Chr 11:15; 14:9; 20:4; *rpā'im* is rendered τίταν in 2 Sam 5:18, 22. See B. Pearson, "Resurrection and Judgment of the Titans: ἡ γῆ ἁσέβων in LXX Isaiah 26.19," in *Resurrection*, 33–51; J. C. Reeves, "Giants," in *The Eerdmans Dictionary*, 676–77. Reeves gives no explanation for the origin of the Giants but notes that they are "thus freaks or monsters who do not fit within the accepted parameters that govern society." This explanation is strikingly similar to and mirrors the function of the Giants of Greek and Greco-Roman mythologies.

81 Pearson, "Resurrection," 35.

82 *Ibid.*

sometimes consciously, perhaps at other times unconsciously) the association of the Greco-Roman Giants or Titans with the Giants of their own religious culture (see below).

Tartarus and the Titans/Giants in 1 Enoch. Tartarus and related myths appear also in the *Book of Enoch*, which witnesses a strong similarity to Greco-Roman eschatology.⁸³ Concerning the eschatology of *1 Enoch*, Cohen suggests that it is the first instance of “the new doctrine [of rewards and punishments in the underworld] ... in inchoate form.”⁸⁴ In the *Book of Watchers* (1–36), which probably dates from the third century B.C.E.,⁸⁵ Enoch embarks on a journey into the underworld that is strikingly similar to journeys made into Hades by Hellenic mythological heroes. From Homer’s *Odyssey* (Book 11) and Hesiod’s lost work *The Descent of Theseus into Hades*, visits to the underworld are a staple of Greek culture.⁸⁶ Nickelsburg is thus correct when he concludes, “the closest analogy to chaps. 17–19 [of *1 Enoch*] is the Nekyia, an account of journeys to the realm of the dead found in Hellenic and Hellenistic texts.”⁸⁷

On his subterranean excursion, Enoch describes a clear division within Hades of rewards for the righteous and punishments for sinners, a feature common to Greco-Roman mythology and “wholly consonant with the Greek Nekyia’s report of post-mortem punishments.”⁸⁸ Moreover, as Enoch continues his journey, he meets Uriel, who is identified by the Gizeh Greek text of *1 Enoch* as the angel τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ τατάρου (*1 En.* 20.2). Nickelsburg and VanderKam follow this reading in their new translation of *1 Enoch*, over the Ethiopic,⁸⁹ which makes no reference to Tartarus, but instead notes that Uriel is the angel of the world and trembling (?). This choice follows an explicit translation philosophy, to consult the Greek text of *1 Enoch* only “where it is available and provides better readings and gives a better sense of the original Aramaic.”⁹⁰ Nickelsburg

83 G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 294–95.

84 “In the third and second centuries B. C. E. we also hear for the first time of immortality and resurrection as the rewards that await the righteous, and of eternal punishments that await the wicked. In the pre-exilic portion of the Bible, *sheol* is the ultimate destination for the disembodied souls of everyone, righteous and wicked alike. In Sheol, much like the Greek Hades, there is no judgment and no reward ... Neither Job nor Ben Sira (about 200 BCE) knows anything of a reward and punishment in the hereafter.” Cohen, *Maccabees*, 91.

85 G. W. E. Nickelsburg and J. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), 3.

86 Glasson, *Greek*, 8, 13–19.

87 Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 31.

88 *Ibid.*, 280.

89 Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 40.

90 *Ibid.*, 13. Curt Niccum also rightly advocates the Greek reading over the Ethiopic. He argues that *1 Enoch* was translated into Ethiopic from Greek and that the translators of the Ethiopic text were unable to render the translation of Tartarus properly; he finds further support of this view in the omission of the verb form of Tartarus (ταρταρώω) in the Ethiopic translation of 2 Pet 2:4. Curt Niccum, personal communication, Sept. 30, 2010. Some are reluctant to accept the Greek reading of Tartarus, given the relative absence of the term in Second Temple Jewish literature; see, e. g., M. Black, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 162.

and VanderKam thus consider the Greek reading of Tartarus to be closer to the Aramaic original of the text.⁹¹

The author of *1 Enoch* also seems to have Tartarus in mind when describing Uriel's domain. Note the following from *1 Enoch*:

From there I traveled to another place, more terrible than this one. And I saw terrible things – a great fire burning and flaming there. And the place had a narrow cleft (narrowing) to the abyss, full of great pillars of fire, borne downward. Neither the measure nor the size was I able to see or to estimate. Then I said, “How terrible is this place and fearful to look at!” Then Uriel answered me, one of the holy angels who was with me, and said to me, “Enoch, why are you so frightened and shaken?” And I replied, “Because of this terrible place and because of the fearful sight.” And he said, “This place is a prison for the angels. Here they will be confined forever” (*1 En.* 21:7–10).

The depiction in *1 Enoch* appears much like the Greco-Roman authors' descriptions of Hades and Tartarus: an immeasurable, horrific place located in the abyss, consisting of fire and flames. In another section of *1 Enoch*, Uriel tells Enoch that the place of burning, flaming fire is a perpetual prison for the angels who sinned by having intercourse with women. Concerning these angels, the author indicates they are chained in the abyss (*1 En.* 53:1–3).⁹² These angels, then, are strikingly similar to the Titans and Giants of Greco-Roman mythology, chained in the midst of Tartarus for their chaotic actions.⁹³ Taking this into consideration, Nickelsburg is surely right when he posits:

Perhaps more than anywhere else in these chapters [i. e., chapters 17–19], this passage contains a complex of noteworthy verbal parallels with Hesiod, which may well indicate direct or indirect contact with the Greek tradition. Tartarus, the prison of the Titans, is located at “the ends of the huge earth” (πελώρης ἔσχατα γαίης). It is “a great gulf” (χάσμα μέγ'), so deep that a falling bronze anvil would take ten days to hit bottom (the same distance as from heaven to earth), and a man would take a year to reach its floor.⁹⁴

91 The content of the Aramaic text of *1 Enoch* remains an open question. What is clear is that the translator of the Greek text believed that Tartarus was what the author(s) had in mind.

92 As mentioned above, Hengel notes the length of time that these angels are punished, ten thousand years, and suggests it has a connection to “the doctrine of the transmigration of the soul in the Pythagoreans and Orphics.” Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 201.

93 Loren Stuckenbruck astutely notes, “The binding of the angels as a whole into the earthly depths ... derives from the widespread images associated with the binding and incarceration of the Titans in Tartarus in Greek mythology”; L. Stuckenbruck, “The ‘Angels’ and ‘Giants’ of Genesis 6:1–4 in Second and Third Century BCE Jewish Interpretation: Reflections on the Posture of Early Apocalyptic Traditions,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 354–77, 370. Bremmer concludes, “Knowledge by the authors of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, or their source, of the Greek myth of the Titans via the *Titanomachy*, directly or indirectly, can therefore hardly be doubted.” J. Bremmer, “Remember the Titans!” in *The Fall of the Angels* (eds. C. Aufarth and L. T. Stuckenbruck; Leiden: Brill, 2004): 60. It is noteworthy that the author of the Christian work 2 Peter, who borrows from *1 Enoch*, indicates that the angels who sinned were chained and cast into Tartarus (ταρταρώ), 2 Pet 2:14.

94 Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 286–87.

Nickelsburg consequently concludes, "A number of elements ... suggest the influence of Greek myths. The battle of the giants suggests the Titanomachia and the Gigantomachia."⁹⁵ If the author of *1 Enoch* made use of Greco-Roman mythology, either consciously or unconsciously, this supports the argument that Greco-Roman mythology thoroughly permeated Second Temple Jewish eschatology (even among the Covenanters who composed the Dead Sea Scrolls).⁹⁶ In addition, this cultural overlap may account for the origin of the popular Watcher tradition of the Second Temple period,⁹⁷ which cannot be accounted for by a straightforward reading of Gen 6:1–4 alone.

*Tartarus and the Titans/Giants within the Sibylline Oracles.*⁹⁸ Whatever the intentions of the author of *1 Enoch*, it is apparent that when later:

Jewish authors started ... to compare their culture with the Greek one and to make connections between biblical myths and Greeks mythology, they appropriated the Titan myth as well. Passing remarks on the Titans appear in numerous Greek translations of Hebraic texts, but also in the euhemeristic third "Sibylline oracle."⁹⁹

In the process of exploring Greco-Roman mythological connections to Judaism, the author of the Third Sibyl¹⁰⁰ reworks the Genesis story and combines

95 G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6–11," *JBL* 96 (1977): 383–405, 395.

96 Though the entirety of *1 Enoch* was not discovered at Qumran, "material ... is preserved in twelve scrolls." J. VanderKam and P. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Harper Collins: San Francisco, 2002) 194–96. Seven copies of *1 Enoch* have been discovered in the caves at Qumran. These extant portions of *1 Enoch* indicate that the Covenanters of Qumran were at least aware of Enoch's Tartarus and may have incorporated it into their eschatological perspective. In support, the scrolls possess numerous references to a subterranean fiery punishment. At the end of the age, the sons of Belial will be sentenced "to gloom of everlasting fire" (4Q256 III:2). The Rule of the Community notes that the sons of darkness are destined "for permanent terror and shame without end with the humiliation of destruction by the fire of the dark regions ... in bitter weeping and harsh evils in the abysses of darkness" (1QS IV:12–13). As the sons of darkness are defeated in the great battle presented in the War Scroll, the text indicates their destination is the fire "in the dark places of Abaddon, in the places of destruction of Sheol" (1QM XIV:17–18). See also 1QS II:15; IV:12–13; 4Q204. Moreover, the text of 1QH^a IV:13 states that sinners will burn in "the foundations of mountains and fire ... [at] the base of Sheol." And in 4Q204 God sends his holy ones to take vengeance upon the Watchers and imprison them in an everlasting prison (4Q204 V:1). To the extent that the scrolls sectarians derived their notions about rewards and punishments from *1 Enoch*, they were thus inadvertently influenced by Greco-Roman mythology.

97 Ancient references to the Giants include *1 En.* 7; 9:7–10; 15:1–4, 8–9; 16:120; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.72–74; Philo, *QG* 1.82; *Wis.* 14:6; *Sir.* 16:7; 3 *Bar.* 3:26; 3 *Macc.* 2:4; *Jdt.* 16:6; *The Book of the Giants*; 4Q510–11; 4Q180–81; 4Q370; 11Q11. On the interpretation of Gen 6 in the Second Temple period, see J. Bremmer, "Remember," 35–61; Pearson, "Resurrection," 33–51; Stuckenbruck, "The 'Angels' and 'Giants,'" 354–77; L. T. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997).

98 See L. DiTommaso, "Sibylline Oracles," *The Eerdmans Dictionary*, 1226–28.

99 J. Bremmer, "Titans," in *Brill's New Pauly*, 14:737. Other Jewish writers, such as Josephus, acknowledged the similarities between the Greek Titans/Giants and the Jewish Giants, but attempted to distance them from one another (*Ant.* 1.73).

100 Buitenwerf dates Book 3 to between 180 and 116 B. C. E. but doubts its Egyptian origin. See R. Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and Its Social Setting* (Leiden: Brill,

biblical tradition with Hesiod's *Theogony*, providing a Jewish demythologization of the Tartarus account. The Third Sibyl presents the Titans, Zeus, Cronos, and other Greco-Roman mythological figures in a euhemeristic manner. While maintaining the heart of the Greek fables, the author indicates that Cronos and the Titans were not gods, but "savage men" (*Sib. Or.* 3.137, 154–55): "Cronos and Titan and Iapetus reigned, the best children of Gaia and Ouranos" (3.110–11). Particularly noteworthy is the author's identification of the parents of the Titans as Gaia and Ouranos, which must come out of the earlier Tartarus tradition. The author also appears aware of the circumstances surrounding Zeus's birth and preservation from destruction. A further parallel to the Watchers of *1 Enoch*, who taught the people the art of war (*1 En.* 7–8), appears in the assertion that Cronos and the Titans "stirred up a great war, [which] is the beginning of war for all mortals" (*Sib. Or.* 3.137, 153–55). It is because of these actions that God destroyed the Titans (*Sib. Or.* 3.156–58). The Third Sibyl thus provides a clear example of a Second Temple period incorporation of Greco-Roman mythology in a Jewish religious and cultural context.

Such incorporation is not unique to Book 3 in the *Sibylline Oracles*. Books 1 and 2 of the *Oracles* (dated to somewhere between 30 B. C. E. and 250 C. E.) are likely a unit¹⁰¹ and consist "of an original Jewish oracle and an extensive Christian redaction."¹⁰² They also frequently mention Tartarus, the Titans, and the Giants. As the author describes the creation of the world, he records that God created the earth by "draping it around with Tartarus" (*Sib. Or.* 1.9–10). The author also identifies the Watchers of the Second Temple period with the Giants (*Sib. Or.* 1.120–25) and indicates that they "went under the dread house of Tartarus" (*Sib. Or.* 1.95–102). Furthermore, as the author describes the judgment of the dead, he notes that:

Uriel, the great angel, will break the gigantic bolts, of unyielding and unbreakable steel, of the gates of Hades, not forged or 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 (2.227–332).

The author of *1 Enoch* describes Uriel as the angel of the world and Tartarus; in the above account, he will break the chains that bind the Titans and Giants and will open the gates of Hades. The notion that the Titans and Giants

2003), 126–34. Hengel argued for a second century B. C. E. date and an Egyptian origin: M. Hengel, *Jews, Greek and Barbarians* (trans. J. Bowden: Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 98, while Collins held to a date of 31 B. C. E., with Egypt as its place of origin: J. J. Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (Missoula, Mont.: SBL, 1974), 21. DiTommaso dates Book 3 to 165–145 B. C. E. and gives it an Egyptian origin: DiTommaso, "Sibylline Oracles," 1226–27.

101 Collins, "The Sibylline Oracles," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J. Charlesworth; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1983–85), 1:330.

102 *Ibid.* DiTommaso notes the probability that the "lack of reference to the destruction of the Temple (an event mentioned in 1.193–96, but in a Christian passage) might denote a pre-70 C. E. date"; DiTommaso, "Sibylline Oracles," 1227.

are chained within Tartarus and that gates are present in Hades are staples of Greco-Roman mythology dating back to the time of Homer.¹⁰³ Additionally, much like many Greco-Roman authors, the author of Books 1–2 combines the Titans and Giants. But what is most striking about this occurrence is the explicit equation with the Watcher tradition, in the claim that the Titans and Giants themselves were destroyed in the great deluge. For the composer of Books 1–2, the Watcher tradition is equated with the Titans and Giants of Greco-Roman mythology; they were destroyed by the flood, and then sent bound to Tartarus (1.95–102).¹⁰⁴ The *Sibylline Oracles* thus provide clear confirmation of a Jewish assimilation of Tartarus, the Titans, and the Giants into Second Temple period literature.

Tartarus within Burial Practices of the Second Temple Period. As in our historical inquiry into Greco-Roman culture, non-literary sources provide a foil to literary evidence for the history of Second Temple Judaism. It is clear from literary evidence that some Second Temple period Jews consciously or unconsciously assimilated Greco-Roman mythology into their eschatology. What does the material evidence suggest?

A Roman-period ossuary from Jerusalem provides some startling evidence. Discovered in November of 1990 and bearing the inscription, “Miriam the daughter of Shim’on,”¹⁰⁵ this ossuary contained a body with a coin (of Agrippas I dated 42/3) placed inside its skull.¹⁰⁶ What is so striking about this discovery is that it:

Provides proof for the existence of the Greek pagan practice of placing a coin in the mouth of the deceased as a payment to Charon, the ferryman who carries the spirits of the dead across the river Styx to Tartarus.¹⁰⁷

I would argue that this find provides evidence that at least some first-century Palestinian Jews adopted Greco-Roman mythology into their funeral practices, and thus probably into their eschatological perspectives.

Conclusion. By the time of the Second Temple period, there were Jews who incorporated Greco-Roman Tartarus, the Titans, and the Giants into their religious perspective. It is not clear when this engagement occurred, but it probably dates to around the time of the Greek translation of the books of Job and Proverbs, which reference Tartarus three times. These occurrences affirm

103 Apollodorus, *Library* 2.5.12ff; Homer, *Il.* 5.645–50; 9.310–15; 23.70–75; Homer *Od.* 14.155–60.

104 The author of the Sibyl also describes punishments that will be found in Gehenna, which it equates with “dark, dank Tartarus” (*Sib. Or.* 2.283–305). Book 2 also contains a description of the punishments that await the unrighteous in Gehenna. The author notes the presence of fire, rivers, chains, unbreakable bonds, infernal beasts, and immeasurable darkness (*Sib. Or.* 2.286–96). Book 4, which is dated around the first century C.E. (Collins, “The Sibylline Oracles,” 1:381), also connects Tartarus to Gehenna (*Sib. Or.* 4.183–86).

105 S. Wolf, “Archaeology in Israel,” *AJA* 97 (1993): 135–63, 152.

106 *Ibid.*

107 *Ibid.* See Euripides, *Alcestis* 252; Pausanias, *Descr.* 10.28.2; Vergil, *Aen.* 6.295–30.

the Greco-Roman taxonomy of Tartarus and likely presuppose prior Jewish knowledge of the stygian prison. The LXX translators were not the only Jews to make use of Tartarus, however. The author of 1 Enoch not only employed Tartarus, but also derived much of his work from Greco-Roman mythology, subsuming the taxonomy of Tartarus and equating the Watcher tradition with titanomachy and gigantomachy. Whether he did this consciously remains unknown to us. In contrast, the author of Books 1 and 2 of the *Sibylline Oracles* consciously and clearly affirmed that the Titans and Giants of Greco-Roman mythology were indeed the angels and Giants of the Second Temple Jewish tradition. Similarly, the composer of Book 3 of *Oracles* attempts to demythologize the stories of Tartarus, the Titans, and the Giants. These Second Temple period literary sources affirm the influence of Greco-Roman mythology on the Jewish eschatology of the period, as does the limited material evidence of the ossuary from Jerusalem with its coin for Charon.

The Second Temple period engagement with Tartarus and related myths should not be framed as an “assimilation” or an embrace of paganism. To the contrary, in an era in which the antiquity of religion was viewed as something laudable, this engagement reflected an endeavor “to show that Greek myths and legends were simply legends” relevant in their own way to the ancient tradition of the Jews.¹⁰⁸ Thus Artapanus, the Jewish historian from Alexandria, indicates in his *Concerning the Jews* that Moses was the teacher of Orpheus (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 431d). Similarly, Aristobulus records the similarities between Judaism and Plato and concludes, “it is manifest that many things have been borrowed by the aforesaid philosopher, for he is very learned” (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 664a–664b [Gifford]). As a result of this quest to promote their own religion, Second Temple Jews were able to present a monotheistic tradition that synthesized the best of paganism within it.¹⁰⁹ Concerning this phenomenon, Glasson astutely notes, “The point rather is that contact with other cultures encouraged and stimulated Jews to develop and extend their teaching in their own characteristic ways.”¹¹⁰ Perhaps no greater example of this occurrence exists in Second Temple Judaism than Philo of Alexandria. We turn now to Philo and his use of Tartarus and related mythology.

108 Pearson, “Resurrection,” 35.

109 Cohen, *Maccabees*, 43.

110 Glasson, *Greek*, 84.

V. Tartarus in Philo of Alexandria¹¹¹

Tartarus within Philo. Philo's main eschatological concern is clearly for the elect Jewish nation (*Praem.* 163–72).¹¹² In *De praemiis et poenis* Philo discusses the accolade for the proselyte and the castigation of the apostate Jew:

Ὁ μὲν ἔπηλυσ ἄνω ταῖς εὐτυχίαις μετέωρος ἀρθεὶς περίβλεπτος ἔσται, θαυμαζόμενος καὶ μακαριζόμενος ἐπὶ δυσὶ τοῖς καλλίστοις, τῷ τε αὐτομολῆσαι πρὸς θεὸν καὶ τῷ γέρας λαβεῖν οἰκειότατον τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ τάξιν βεβαίαν, ἣν οὐ θέμις εἰπεῖν, ὁ δ' εὐπατρίδης παρακόψας τὸ νόμισμα τῆς εὐγενείας ὑποσυρήσεται κατωτάτῳ πρὸς αὐτὸν τάρταρον καὶ βαθὺ σκότος ἐνεχθεὶς, ἵνα ταῦτα ὁρῶντες τὰ παραδείγματα πάντες ἄνθρωποι σωφρονίζωνται, μανθάνοντες ὅτι τὴν ἐκ δυσγενείας ἀρετὴν φνομένην θεὸς ἀσπάζεται, τὰς μὲν ρίζας ἐὼν χαίρειν, τὸ δὲ στελεχωθὲν ἔρνος, ὅτι μετέβαλεν ἡμερωθὲν πρὸς εὐκαρπίαν, ἀποδεχόμενος.

The proselyte exalted aloft by his happy lot will be gazed at from all sides, marveled at and held blessed by all for two things of highest excellence, that he came over to the camp of God and that he has won a prize best suited to his merits, a place in heaven firmly fixed, greater than words dare describe, while the nobly born who has falsified the sterling of his high lineage will be dragged right down and carried into Tartarus itself and profound darkness. Thus may all men seeing these examples be brought to a wiser mind and learn that God welcomes the virtue which springs from ignoble birth, that He takes no account of the roots but accepts the full-grown stem, because it has been changed from a weed into fruitfulness (*Praem.* 152, Colson, LCL).

Philo, like other Jews and non-Jews in the Greco-Roman world, accepted the established taxonomy of Tartarus – its environment and location – and a divided afterlife of rewards and punishments.¹¹³ In this case, he imagines rewards for the proselyte in heaven and punishment for the heterodox Jew in Tartarus. What does this punishment entail? While Philo does not indicate

111 Recent introductions to Philo include C. Mondésert, “Philo of Alexandria,” *The Cambridge History of Judaism* (4 vols.; ed. S. Katz; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006): 3:877–900; P. Borgen, “Philo of Alexandria,” *ABD* 5:333–42; K. Schenck, *A Brief Guide to Philo* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005); G. Sterling, “Philo,” in *The Eerdmans Dictionary*, 1063–70. See also the classic treatments of S. Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979) and E. R. Goodenough, *The Politics of Philo Judaeus* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938).

112 T. Tobin, “Philo and the Sibyl: Interpreting Philo’s Eschatology,” *StPA* 9 (1997): 84–103, 94–95.

113 Philo advocates a twofold division of the afterlife consisting of rewards for the righteous and punishment for the impious, a view that is visible both here and in his *QE*. In this work, Philo indicates that the holy soul, i. e., the soul that lives with his passions bridled, is divinized and ascends to God, while those who have lived a life of unrestricted passion will be “drawn downward ... to the depths of Tartarus” (Philo, *QE* 2.40). These convictions concerning Tartarus take an unusual turn in his *Legatio*. In a likely attempt to flatter the emperor, Philo asserts that Caligula drove evil “into the utmost corners and recesses of Tartarus” (Philo, *Legat.* 49, 103). Hesiod claims that Zeus drove the Titans out of heaven and into Tartarus, *Theog.* 815–20; Apollodorus posits that Zeus “shut the Titans in Tartarus,” *Library* 1.2.1.

what retributions the apostate Jew will receive in Tartarus in *De praemiis et poenis*, he does discuss types of punishments the wicked will suffer in another work, *De cherubim*:

But to him that is weighed down and enslaved by that fierce and incurable malady, the horrors of the future must needs be undying and eternal: he is thrust forth to the place of the impious, there to endure misery continuous and unrelieved (ἐν ἄκρατον καὶ συνεχῇ βαρυσδαιμονίαν ὑπομένη) (1.139, [Colson, LCL]).

Notice that Philo indicates that the impious will encounter horrors and perpetual misery, which accords with the already established taxonomy of Tartarus. Moreover, in the same document Philo explicitly acknowledges his dependence upon Greco-Roman mythology, when he notes:

He who thinks it a strange and alien thing will incur the penalty of Sisyphus, crushed by a vast and hopeless burden, unable even to lift his head, overwhelmed by all the terrors which beset and prostrate him, and increasing each misery by that abject spirit of surrender, which belongs to the degenerate and unmanly soul (*Cher.* 78 [Colson, LCL]).

Clearly, Philo equates punishment with incurring “the penalty of Sisyphus,” locked in Hades, according to Greco-Roman mythology (and in Tartarus, according to later Greco-Roman authors), for offending the Olympian gods.

Philo’s language in describing the fate of the heretical Jew is notably analogous to the vernacular that Greco-Roman authors use to describe the destiny of the impious. Numerous Greek and Latin authors indicate that the Titans, Giants, and evil human beings are “cast,” “hurled,” or “imprisoned” in Tartarus.¹¹⁴ This is an image that is absent from the three occurrences of Tartarus in the LXX (Philo’s point of scriptural reference), which suggests that Philo’s understanding was formed somewhere other than in the biblical text. Philo was well aware of Greco-Roman authors and quoted more than fifty of them in his corpus of compositions.¹¹⁵ Thus his comprehension of Tartarus suggests a strong dependence upon Greco-Roman culture.

Interestingly, even though Philo seems to treat Tartarus as a literal place of punishment in *De praemiis et poenis*, he also interprets Tartarus in a metaphorical way, in *Quaestiones et solutions in Genesim*. In this document Philo likens a sybarite to a “true Tartarus”:

Do you see that it is by one who considers earthly things superior to heavenly things that such a mode of speech is introduced? But let all thanks be given to a gracious and beneficent one who does not permit the mind to be emptied and bereft of an excellent and most divine form when it descends into an earthly body and is burned by the necessities and flames of desire, for these are a true Tartarus, but he permits it to spread its wings sometimes and to behold heaven above and to taste of that sight (4.234 [Marcus, LCL]).

114 Aeschylus, *Prom. Bo.* 1050–55; Apollodorus, *Library* 1.1.1–4; 1.2.1–6; 3.10.4; Euripides, *Or.* 253; Hesiod, *Theog.* 865–70; Homer, *Il.* 8.10–15; Homeric Hymns, *To Hermes* 256–60; Plato, *Phaed.* 114a; *Gorg.* 526b.

115 Sandmel, *Philo*, 15.

From this occurrence it seems that Philo did not imagine literal punishments within Tartarus, but understood Tartarus as a metaphorical idea for a materialistic person. Which interpretation is correct? Did Philo believe in a literal Tartarus, or was he convinced that it was only metaphorical? This eschatological tension within Philo should not surprise us. Years ago, E. R. Goodenough noticed that Philo held contradictory eschatological notions in his mind. He thus concluded, “Philo’s honesty is honestly presenting his own vacillations. So all the contradictions together make here the total picture of his ideas on the subject of life after death.”¹¹⁶ For Philo, then, Tartarus was a place of literal punishment for the wicked, but it was also true that a life devoted to materialism was already an existence in a state of Tartarus. To the extent that there is tension in Philo’s view of Tartarus, then, it is a productive tension.

The Titans/Giants in Philo. The impact of Greco-Roman mythology may be visible, as well, in Philo’s discussions of the biblical Giants, in *De Gigantibus* and *Quaestiones et solutions in Genesim*.¹¹⁷ Here again, Philo’s understanding of the Giants is both literal and metaphorical, reflecting tensions with respect to their framing. In *Gig.* he asserts:

ἴσως τις τὰ παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς μεμυθευμένα περὶ τῶν γιγάντων οἶεται τὸν νομοθέτην αἰνίττεσθαι πλείστον ὅσον διεστηκότα τοῦ μυθοπλαστεῖν καὶ τοῖς ἀληθείας ἵχνεσιν αὐτῆς ἐπιβαίνειν ἀξιοῦντα.

Some may think that the Lawgiver is alluding to the myths of the poets about the giants, but indeed myth-making is a thing most alien to him, and his mind is set on following in the steps of truth and nothing but truth (58–59 [Colson, LCL]).

A few observations are in order. First, Philo indicates that some people of his day (perhaps including some Jews), associated the biblical Giants with the Giants of Greco-Roman mythology. Second, he desires to correct this erroneous view. As a result, he attempts to distance the biblical Giants from the Giants of the poets (Homer and Hesiod).¹¹⁸ In the process, Philo interprets the Genesis passage allegorically (*Gig.* 58–61) and demonstrates that the purpose of the pericope is to illustrate the threefold division of human beings: the earth-born (*Gig.* 66), heaven-born (*Gig.* 62), and God-born (*Gig.* 58–61).¹¹⁹ The earth-born, such as Nimrod, seek pleasure; the heaven-born, like Abraham, strive for knowledge and arts; the God-born are priests and prophets.

116 E. R. Goodenough, “Philo on Immortality,” *HTR* 39 (1946): 85–108, 106.

117 For more on Philo’s treatment of the Giants, see L. T. Stuckenbruck, “To What Extent Did Philo’s Treatment of Enoch and the Giants Presuppose a Knowledge of the Enochic and Other Sources Preserved in The Dead Sea Scrolls?,” *SPhA* 19 (2007): 131–42; A. Wright, “Some Observations of Philo’s *De Gigantibus* and Evil Spirits in Second Temple Judaism,” *JSJ* 36 (2005): 471–88.

118 Philo’s Greek text of Gen 6:1–4 supplies “angels of God” for “sons of God” in Gen 6:2; Philo, *Gig.* 6.

119 In *QG* Philo uses similar language to describe the plight of humanity. He indicates that the person who meditates upon earthly passions and desires is a true Tartarus. Philo, *QG* 4.234.

In another context, Philo interprets Gen 6:1–4 in a literal manner, claiming:

The poets (οἱ ποιηταὶ) relate that the giants were earthborn children of the earth. But he (Moses) uses this name analogically and frequently when he wishes to indicate excessive size of the body, after the likeness of Haik. And he relates that their creation (γένεσιν) was a mixture of two things, of angels and mortal women. But the substance (οὐσία) of angels is spiritual (πνευματική); however, it often happens that they imitate the forms of men and for immediate purposes, as in respect of knowing women for the sake of begetting Haiks (QG 1.92 [Marcus, LCL]).

As in his metaphorical treatment of the Giants, here too Philo connects the mythology of the Giants to the poetry of Homer and Hesiod. In stark contrast to his interpretation of the Giants in *De Gigantibus*, however, here he seems to affirm the common Second Temple view that angels had sex with women and produced offspring. This progeny were literal giants, who consisted of spirit and flesh, and whom Philo refers to as Haiks (?).¹²⁰ Here again we see in Philo an acceptance of the common Second Temple interpretation of Gen 6:1–4, along with a simultaneous understanding of the Giants in allegorical terms. More significantly, we may note that in both of Philo's treatments of Gen 6:1–4 he acknowledges a common tendency to equate the Giants of Greco-Roman mythology with the Giants of the biblical tradition; this is a tendency that he attempts to challenge, whether he treats the Giants as literal or metaphoric concepts.

Conclusion. The evidence from Philo of Alexandria's use of Tartarus supports the view that his eschatology was influenced by Greco-Roman culture. He confirms the established taxonomy of the environment, location, and function of Tartarus. Some of this imagery was available to Philo in texts of the LXX (e. g., Prov 30:16; Job 40:20; 41:24). However the language Philo uses in association with Tartarus, especially the claim that people are pulled downward into it (*Praem.* 152), suggests his dependence upon Greco-Roman authors. But Philo does not seem to have consciously adopted the Giants of Greco-Roman mythology into his religious ideology. Rather, when he does discuss the Giants, he attempts to distance the Genesis tradition from that of Greco-Roman mythology.

VI. Conclusion

This survey of literary and non-literary sources demonstrates that a sizable number of the inhabitants of the Greco-Roman world, including a company of Jews, accepted, or were at least familiar with, the mythology of Tartarus and the Titans and Giants. These myths were not a part of Persian culture, so their appearance in the culture of Second Temple Judaism requires further expla-

120 Ralph Marcus, translator of Philo *Supplement I* for the Loeb Classical Library edition, suggests Haik is a substitution for the Greek hero Heracles, 61.

nation than the influence of Persian eschatology on the Jewish tradition can support. The most probable and least problematic solution for the number of appearances of Greco-Roman eschatological concepts within Second Temple Judaism is thus found in the Greco-Roman cultural context in which these Second Temple Jewish traditions developed.